Durham University

Durham E-Theses

The VoB shakespeare translation. An assessment to the contribution made by Johann Heinrich VoB and his sons to the theory practice of Shakespeare translation in Germany

Lesley M. Drewing

How to cite:

Drewing, Lesley M. (1993) The VoB shakespeare translation. An assessment to the contribution made by Johann Heinrich VoB and his sons to the theory practice of Shakespeare translation in Germany. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/5774/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Lesley M. Drewing

The Voß Shakespeare translation. An assessment of the contribution made by Johann Heinrich Voß and his sons to the theory and practice of Shakespeare translation in Germany.

Thesis submitted to the University of Durham
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
1993

On the few occasions mention has been made of the Voß Shakespeare translation since completion of its publication in 1829, it has generally been in a negative comparison with the so-called Schlegel/Tieck translation as the "classic" German Shakespeare. This bias, originating from contemporary critics and reinforced in the last quarter of the nineteenth century by Johann Heinrich Voß's biographer, has been perpetuated without detailed analysis of the translation and without consideration of the Voßs' notions of translation. In order to provide a basis for assessing whether this judgement would or should be revised today, modern concepts of literary translation in general and (Shakespeare) drama in particular are considered alongside changing translation theories and practice in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Germany. Particular attention is given to the theories and translation of drama and to the translation of Shakespeare up to the beginning of the nineteenth century in order to ascertain what theoretical and practical resources the Voßs had at their disposal. An examination of the concepts of translation and language evolved by the Voßs reveal that they differ from contemporary theory and practice. Detailed analysis of a representative selection of Shakespeare passages translated by the Voßs establishes that the practical application of these theories also results in a rendering of Shakespeare quite different from the Schlegel/Tieck translation. The Voßs' achievement is then assessed with the help of their own criteria and of those we might apply today; reasons are suggested for the negative reception of their work, and for its general rejection in favour of the Schlegel/Tieck Shakespeare. The place of the Voß Shakespeare is finally considered in the continuing tradition of German Shakespeare translation.

The Voß Shakespeare translation. An assessment of the contribution made by Johann Heinrich Voß and his sons to the theory and practice of Shakespeare translation in Germany

by

Lesley M. Drewing

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

**Thesis submitted to the University of Durham
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

1993

UNIV DUNELM

- 2 JUL 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

PREFACE i

I **Introduction** 1

i) Modern concepts of translation 1

ii) Modern concepts of translating drama in general and Shakespeare in particular 7

iii) The tradition of German Shakespeare translation within which the Voß family worked 17

II **The Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries** 21

Chapter One: German concepts of translation in this period 21

Chapter Two: Concepts of drama and of translation of dramatic texts 36

Chapter Three: German Shakespeare translation before the Voßs 54

III **The Voßs' Contribution** 70

Chapter One: Their theories of translation and their translation practice 70

i) Johann Heinrich Voß 70

ii) Heinrich Voß 80

Chapter Two: Their Shakespeare translations 84

i) Source texts, aids and resources 84

ii) The early stages 84

iii) The development of the project 90

Chapter Three: Analysis of selected passages and aspects of style 98

i) Criteria for selection 98

ii) Selected passages:

a) Rhetoric, argument, multiple significance *Macbeth, Hamlet* 99

b) Lyrical intensity: *Romeo and Juliet* 121

c) Delicacy and wit: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* 133

iii) Selected aspects of style:

a) Wordplay: double entendre/ semantic wordplay, homonyms/ homophones, jingles 143

b) Song texts: *Tempest, Twelfth Night, A Midsummer Night's Dream, Winter's Tale* 171

c) Plain dramatic dialogue: *Othello, Julius Caesar* 191

IV **Conclusion** 208

i) The Voßs' achievement 208

ii) Contemporary reception and polemic 214

iii) The domination of Schlegel/Tieck 225

iv) The persistence of controversy in German Shakespeare translation 229

NOTES 236

BIBLIOGRAPHY 288

PREFACE

The Voß Shakespeare translation was a joint undertaking by Johann Heinrich Voß (1751-1826), poet and philologist, and his two sons Johann Heinrich Voß. jr. (1779-1822), philologist and teacher of the classics, and Abraham Sophus Voß (1785-1847), also a teacher of the classics. To avoid confusion between father and son, Johann Heinrich, jr. will be referred to below as Heinrich Voß. Although the Voß Shakespeare translation has the unique status of being the first complete verse translation of Shakespeare in German, it has been almost entirely neglected ever since completion of its publication in 1829 in favour of the so-called Schlegel/Tieck *Shakespeare*. A preliminary comparison of these two versions revealed, however, that the Voß *Shakespeare*, although different from the Schlegel/Tieck translation, often seemed to be more accurate, and thus worthy of closer investigation. What elements contribute to this greater accuracy, and why, if this is indeed the case, has the Voß *Shakespeare* been neglected, at best acknowledged but at the same time dismissed as insignificant?

Initially, this research began as a comparative exercise. However, although to compare the Voß *Shakespeare* with that of Schlegel/Tieck was illuminating, mere comparison of the two translations with the original Shakespeare text tended to produce a list of differences within the various translation categories, rather than a clear picture of the merits and weaknesses in the Voß rendering. This method was further rejected as inadequate as it gives only a poor indication of whether the differences in translation are due to different degrees of skill, or to a fundamentally different concept of and approach to translation. It offers no indication at all of the criteria by which contemporary reception judged the two translations, and thus no basis for assessing whether they would or should be judged differently today.

In order, therefore, to establish a context within which more than a mere empirical approach can be adopted for the critical assessment of the Voß *Shakespeare*, the thesis will begin by considering how translation (of literary work in general and of Shakespeare in particular) is conceived today. The notion of "equivalence" is examined and considered in the various modern approaches to translation. To give a clear idea of what theoretical and practical resources the Voßs had at their disposal for the Shakespeare trans-

lations and of what models they had to work with, the second section will examine the changing notions of language and concepts of translation in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Germany and the practical application of these concepts during this period in the translation of drama in general and of Shakespeare in particular.

Section three of the thesis then attempts to explain what theoretical translation criteria the Voßs themselves evolved; what experience and skills (both separately and jointly) they brought to the Shakespeare project; what help they received; what Shakespeare translations they produced. Reference was made to both published and unpublished sources in this investigation; the unpublished material not only revealed the history of the development of the Voß Shakespeare enterprise, it also provided information which indicated that much of what *has* been written on the Voß Shakespeare rendering requires revision.

Since so little attention has been paid to the Voß *Shakespeare*, section three concludes with an in-depth analysis of a representative selection of their translations. Key passages differing in style, techniques and function will be examined to test the quality of the Voß rendering. As, in spite of an extensive search, no 1804-1813 Leipzig edition (Johnson, Steevens, Reed and Malone) of Shakespeare's source texts, the edition used by the Voßs in their translation, could be located, the analysis is based on the 1833 Leipzig edition (Johnson, Steevens, Reed and Malone). Reference has also been made to various volumes in the *The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare*, particularly to compare different readings and to consult the short and longer notes. The unpublished sources referred to above also proved invaluable for this exercise. Amongst other things they showed that whatever their reputation, the Voßs were highly professional in their approach to translation.

For all his assiduity in completing publication of the Voß *Shakespeare*, it was considered expedient in this chapter of analysis to ignore for present purposes the translations of Abraham Voß. Heinrich Voß thought Abraham was weak, and it is not easy to see how far and on what basis Abraham and Heinrich collaborated. It can, on the other hand, be ascertained from available evidence exactly what Heinrich did in his own, unaided work, exactly what principles of translation he followed, and exactly how these compared with his father's theory and practice.

The Conclusion of the thesis attempts to assess the Voßs' achievement in the light of their own translation criteria and of the concepts we might apply today. By examining the practices of translation criticism and the nature of audience/reader expectations in the case of literary translation, it attempts to account for the contemporary reception of the Voß Shakespeare translation, especially for its rejection in favour of the Schlegel/Tieck Shakespeare rendering. The Conclusion finally looks at the persisting controversy in the field of German Shakespeare, whether as a text to be read or as a stage play, and considers the Voßs' place in a continuing tradition of German Shakespeare translation.

I. Introduction

i) Modern concepts of translation

Modern literary translation has two sources: translation as practised by the Romans and those Bible translations which closely follow the idiom of the Hebrew or Greek languages. The underlying principle of the Roman translation process was to enrich their systems of language and literature, an exercise in aesthetics; the original Greek text served not only as a model to be imitated, but also to be improved on by means of the translator's own language creativity.[1] In the case of the Romans, the original text is of secondary significance as a work of art in its own right. Conversely, those Bible translators who subordinate style and the national idiom to literal fidelity, as opposed, for example, to the Bible translation of M. Luther, whose main objective was to produce a version which could be easily read by the individual practising Christian; or, as opposed to the version authorised by King James I in 1611 which, in view of its liturgical purposes, is characterised by the dignity and elevation of its language, do so in accordance with their convictions that not one jot of the Word of God may be altered. In 1937, German translators of a modern Jewish version of the Bible undertook to achieve a rendering 'wie sie durch Jahrtausende im Judentum lebendig und geheiligt gewesen ist, ... auch da, wo [der Text] uns schwierig und dunkel erscheint'. Their chief concern was to keep as closely as possible to the original Word of God, which could only be achieved by their priority 'an dem Satzbau und Erzählungsstil des Hebräischen der Bibel festzuhalten'.[2] Here, the original text not only demands unreserved respect from the translator, it also dictates the language and style of his/her translation.

It is from these two sources of translation practice that the seemingly mutually incompatible notions of literal fidelity and equivalent effect translation arise, which in turn have been a point of debate right through the history of translation theory.

In the case of literary texts, both literal translations and freer translations which are more readable and convey a better sense of the spirit of the original have laid claim in Germany to the qualifying adjective "treu", and each has been requalified by its respective opponents with the derogatory attribute "bloß": "Wörtlich

treu" versus "sinngemäß treu" and "bloß sinngemäß" versus "bloß treu". If we pursue this line, it becomes hard to see why either type of translation should not be legitimately regarded as "treu". Or is there such a thing as greater fidelity and lesser fidelity? Should "fidelity" be a decisive criterion for the assessment of translation at all?

The central issue in any approach to translation theory today is still the question as to how the translated text compares (or should compare) with the source text. As W. Wilss comments, the issue is basically unchanged, only its denotation is different. The criterion is now known as "equivalence":

> Kaum ein Begriff hat in der übersetzungstheoretischen Diskussion seit der Antike soviel Nachdenken provoziert, soviel kontradiktorische Meinungsäußerungen bewirkt und so viele Definitionsversuche ausgelöst wie der Begriff der Übersetzungsäquivalenz zwischen ausgangs- und zielsprachlichem Text.[3]

"Equivalent" is defined as "equal in value", "having the same result"; it is not synonymous with the word "identical". Any translation worthy of its name must be equal in value to its original text. The question is: Equal in value in what respect(s)? Various translation theorists have speculated from what discipline the term "equivalence" might have originally been taken.[4] As it is a very general term, it could, in fact, have come from a number of disciplines. Equality of value certainly means that if objects, circumstances or facts are compared, one or more (relevant) elements are equal - not necessarily the objects, circumstances or facts *per se*. In the theory of quantities we speak of equivalence if two numbers are equal. K. Reiss and H.J. Vermeer point out that this use in particular of the term "equivalence" is bound to lead to undesirable associations in the theory of translation. The equivalence of two quantities implies that it is possible to allocate their elements a single-value, which, in the case of the sign elements of two texts, the one a translation of the other, is certainly not applicable.[5]

Equivalence then is seen as a relative term which depends on what factor(s) the translator decides to retain as invariants and what factor(s) he/she is willing to forfeit in favour of the chosen predominant factor(s). In discussing A. Lefevere's seven definitions

of translation strategies [6], S. Bassnett-McGuire remarks:

> The deficiencies of the methods [Lefevere] examines are due to an overemphasis of one or more elements ... at the expense of the whole. In other words, in establishing a set of methodological criteria to follow, the translator has focused on some elements at the expense of others and from this failure to consider [the text] as an organic structure comes a translation that is demonstrably unbalanced. [7]

The notion of equivalence ('a much-used and abused term in Translation Studies'[8]) varies depending on the particular approach towards translation theory. The linguistic approach to the theory of translation (and this includes text linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics and psycholinguistics)[9] attempts to differentiate between translation and other forms of text refraction. The linguistic approach analyses the conditions which determine translatory decisions and selections from a number of potential equivalents on the lexical, syntactical, sentence and text level. This is an empirical approach which endeavours to provide a universal model of language equivalent linguistic categories in order to explain how language - and, therefore, by definition, texts and translation - work.

Although these so-called equivalent universal categories present us with the most convenient tools that seem to work most of the time, this approach clearly has a limited scope.[10] Wilss defines the science of translation as a 'Konglomerat theoretischer, deskriptiver und anwendungsorientierter Fragestellungen' which needs to be approached from various theoretical and methodological positions.[11] The focus of purely linguistically oriented approaches on the description of norms and regularities in the relations of source and target texts (whereby it is more often than not the '"unregelmäßigen" Entsprechungen' which present the greatest problems in translation practice[12]) explains their limited exclusive application in the case of literary translation. Universal language equivalent categories are more likely to occur in non-literary translations in which (technical) terminology and standard syntactical analogies allow for routine - or partially routine - translatory procedures.[13] The fact that linguistically oriented translation theory presumes that each language can say the same thing using its own parallel system is often taken as a pre-ordained or axiomatic theoretical given. What is not taken into consideration in such arguments is the

fact that every language is an individual, independent system which is exploited in a unique, creative and specific way by the speakers of and writers in that language in order to communicate what can be termed "language specific" messages which may very well be untranslatable from one language to another. Sign-oriented scholars such as Y. Tobin have already adopted this point of view and focus their work on (non-)equivalence and translatability. [14]

A different approach is the theoretical approach. The dominant factor in the theoretical approach to translation rooted in speech act theory (information theory) is the function of the text. According to Reiss and Vermeer, 'Der Zweck [der Translationshandlung] heiligt die Mittel'.[15] A translation may be regarded as 'geglückte Interaktion, wenn sie vom Rezipienten als hinreichend kohärent mit seiner Situation interpretiert wird und kein Protest in welcher Form auch immer, zu Übermittlung, Sprache und deren Sinn ('Gemeintem') folgt'.[16] On the basis of this concept, Reiss and Vermeer concede the translator a great deal of freedom: it is his or her decision, whether, what and how elements of the text should be translated. [17] The Reiss/Vermeer 'allgemeine Translationstheorie' perceives the possibility of varying forms of the source text in the target language, depending on which function the translator deems adequate, e.g.: 'Don Quijote als literarisches Kunstwerk der Weltliteratur, als Kinder- und Jugendbuch usw.'.[18] Translation is also perceived as 'gesamtmenschliches Handeln': it even includes 'als Sondersorte von Transfer die Möglichkeit des Umsetzens von sprachlichem in aktionales Handeln und umgekehrt'. [19] For Vermeer, even 'intersemiotische Übersetzung' or 'Transmutation' is nothing other than translation. [20] As an example of transmutation, Vermeer cites the work of P. Bretthauer: 'Neulich hat Peter Bretthauer, IÜD, Heidelberg, vorgeführt, wie eine wortreiche chinesische Betriebsanleitung für einen Kassettenrecorder in eine fast textlose deutsche Bildanweisung übersetzt wird'.[21] J. Holz-Mänttäri, also an adherent of the functionalistic theory of translation, cryptically remarks: 'Es [ist] *terminologisch* sekundär, was als "Translation" gefaßt oder etwa als "Paraphrase", etc. davon abgehoben wird'.[22] M. Ammann, on the other hand, goes so far as to dispute the necessity of any terminological defferentiation at all between paraphrase, commentary, summary, imitation, etc. etc.:

> Die Diskussion, wie das Kind zu nennen ist, scheint mir müßig. Man schafft den Absolutismus nicht ab, ohne daß sich

> dabei gleichzeitig Rolle, Funktion und Benennung von König, Junker oder Knecht ändern. Auf der Grundlage der modernen Translationstheorien läßt sich von "Translation" sprechen, wenn ein Ausgangstext (mündlicher oder schriftlicher Art) zu einem bestimmten Zweck als Vorlage für die Herstellung eines Textes in der Zielkultur verwendet wurde.[23]

This statement does not even rule out the possibility of a totally new text being termed a translation [24], and because the functionalistic theory of translation does not deem it necessary to delimit the notion of translation, on its own it supplies no basis for empirical analysis.

Comparative translation studies, rooted in literary theory, endeavour to assess the value and function of translations in the literary system of the target language. G. Toury states that a 'translation will be taken to be any target-language utterance which is presented or regarded as such within the target culture, on whatever grounds'.[25] Toury's notion of 'presentation' as translation implies that a source text is presumed to exist which has served as a basis for the translation. Whether, however, such a text really exists and in what ways source text and target text are related is irrelevant for the actual determination of the object: that is why so-called pseudotranslations are also the object of Translation Studies.

It is Toury's hypothesis 'that *translations are facts of one system only*'[26], namely of the literary system of the target language. This hypothesis determines the process of analysis. The initial stage comprises analysis of the translated text without reference to the original text. The second stage consists in analysing translational phenomena which are defined as translational solutions to translation problems. This is carried out 'by means of the mediating functional-relational notion of TRANSLATIONAL EQUIVALENCE'. [27] As soon as the term equivalence is introduced, however, and applied to linguistically defined elements of source and target text, this (literary) comparative approach cannot work without the normative categories of linguistic research.

As this approach seeks to ascertain the status of translation in the target literary system, it is also necessary to compare the literary norms applicable in the source language with those of the

target language.[28] We cannot reflect upon literary translation in isolation from the status of the genre and the original author in the target literary culture of the day; or in isolation from the dominant poetics and ideology of the period in which the translation is produced. Toury considers the occurrence of different manifestations of a foreign literary text in the target language:

> The norms which govern the formulation of a translation into a certain literature (and language) may be similar to or different from those that govern the composition of a corresponding text in that literature. In cases of the first type, the translation will look very much like an original text and the borderlines between the two classes may even be culturally ignorable. In such cases ... the source text may well come to play a reduced part in the establishment of the translation. In cases of the second type, the translation will differ from an original text, sometimes rather radically, both in appearance (surface realization) and in position and status. In such cases the source text may be found to have played an increased role in the establishment of the translation and in the realization of the difference between it and an original composition in the target language/literature.[29]

The second type of text specified here appears to weaken Toury's hypothesis "that *translations are facts of one system only*", particularly from the point of view of the recipient. If the translation differs in surface realisation from an original text, it is most likely that the recipient will also identify this text as a translation and thus perceive it as belonging to another system. This also raises the question as to whether texts which have only been exposed as translations after thorough philological analysis can be considered an appropriate object of translation studies at all. And what about texts which claim to be paraphrases, versions or adaptations? Where and on the basis of what criteria do we draw the line?

The theories considered so far, though they illimunate various aspects of translation, do not constitute an adequate guide for the practising translator. Literary translation in particular, despite the spectacular development of linguistic, textual and critical studies over the past few decades, in spite of successive new ap-

proaches in this discipline, still seems to lack an adequate theory. Bassnett-McGuire affirms the need for a close relationship between the theory and the practice of translation.[30] M. Snell-Hornby, on the other hand, talks about 'what can only be described as a great gulf between translation theory and practice'.[31] General translation theory has followed its own paths that have virtually never even touched on the frontiers of literary work, an area which has often been considered taboo, an area strewn with exceptions. Theory and practice remain so divorced from each other that in the field of literary translation it still seems to be the case that there is nothing like personal experience of the job itself. G. Steiner openly admits that 'in the daily practice of translation, the sum of empirical evidence, of "pragmatics", is, self-evidently, the most telling'.[32] Literature is a particular form of language, 'toujours un système de conflits'.[33] When it undergoes translation in an empirical application of the notion of equivalence, a literary work is of necessity reproduced in the target language under the effect of differing internal stresses, because the textual rules are now different, as indeed is the whole linguistic and aesthetic system.[34] This is a vast problem, well beyond the scope of the present thesis; but those aspects of it which affect dramatic translation generally and Shakespeare in particular must be given at least some consideration here.

ii) Modern concepts of translating drama in general and Shakespeare in particular

Drama with its wealth of possibilities to express the life and times of a particular nation the most comprehensively and the most directly is probably altogether the least suitable literary genre "for export". Not only must the translator have a full command of language (both source and target languages), he/she must also be well-acquainted with the culture, life and customs of the source nation. The translator of drama should always remember that 'die Bühnenübersetzung in der Regel zweierlei Funktionen erfüllt: Sie wird gelesen, und sie bildet die Grundlage für eine Inszenierung'.[1] G. Mounin writes that 'Theaterstücke immer für ein bestimmtes Publikum übersetzt werden'.[2] According to R. Kloepfer, it is up to the translator to present 'die Korrelation von rationaler und sinnlicher Bedeutungsphase ...in einer bühnenwirksamer Weise'.[3]

Translating the works of a poet such as Shakespeare in their organic entirety is at one and the same time a challenging and strictly speaking impossible task. Shakespeare will never be completely recoverable as Shakespeare in a foreign language: translators can only ever try to achieve an approximation. The problem begins with the various devices and techniques which go to make up Shakespeare's stylistic effects. Let us take the proverb or the fixed metaphor, which can be grouped together because 1) they are linguistically fixed elements, and changes, except for humorous purposes, are not permissible and 2) there are two possible ways of dealing with them in translation, but as highly culturally determined elements, caution is always necessary when these prefabricated pieces of language are encountered. There are cases where English and German have exactly equivalent expressions, but if it is necessary to use a discretionary translation, all kinds of questions arise. How did Shakespeare use the proverb or fixed metaphor at the turn of the 17th century?[4] What effect did he wish to achieve with it? Are some elements of the proverb essential for the translation? Is it a fixed metaphor which Shakespeare has poeticised? Often, the only answer to this problem is to render the unit non-metaphorically, bringing out the basic meaning of the idiomatic expression as simply as possible. But already, the quality of the original has suffered in its reproduction.

Similar questions arise in the case of metaphor and imagery. The images with which the translator is confronted in Shakespeare are seldom of a purely descriptive nature; rather, they are lexical units with a strong connotative element for which an equivalent must be found in the target language. The comparison implicit in the metaphor presents an even greater problem. Often, metaphors are a characterisation device which gives insight into the thought process of a character, into his or her view of the world, the character's level of intelligence. In the character of Hamlet, for example, metaphor is both an expression of his highly developed speech level and a masking device ('antic disposition'). Any non-metaphoric expression of these devices in translation, any paraphrasing of the images, would rob this character of these distinctive and unique traits of speech. The same applies for the metaphor in its affective role. The abundance of metaphors derived from the lexical sets 'rankness', 'sickness', 'vulgarity', 'bestiality' in *Hamlet*, or those of 'health', 'sleep' and 'food' which reverberate through *Macbeth*, for instance, reflect the emotional quality of the situ-

ation and are vital for the German translation.

Wordplay, a game that Shakespeare played through his habit of consonantal and vocalic association, is probably the greatest headache for the translator. Deciding whether the pun can be saved in translations or not is difficult enough, deciding through what means is even more difficult. It is, of course, possible to compensate in translation with a different form of wordplay, either immediately before or after the position of the pun in the original text.[5] This at least maintains a modicum of the quality of the text; any attempt, however, to echo the actual wordplay of the original must always be undertaken with the reader/audience fully in mind. The German language does not lend itself to wordplay as easily as the English: wordplay is therefore not a common feature of German drama. A German rendering *can* reduce a Shakespeare pun to contrived corn, and thus do him more damage than omitting his wordplay altogether.

And we must remember that dramatic blank verse has to sound like speech. Shakespeare began as an imitator of Marlowe, structuring his rhythm in single well-balanced lines, each of which is a self-contained unit, and all of which are cast in a remarkably similar mould. As comparative prosody teaches that the German blank verse is more regular than the English, we must assume that, as far as rhythm and metre are concerned, the German translator is faced with relatively few problems in Shakespeare's earlier plays. As, however, in later plays, the rhythmic quality adapts freely and flexibly to Shakespeare's dramatic expression, the translator's task becomes more arduous. In the hands of Shakespeare, blank verse is a remarkably subtle tool which is used to reflect or evoke a wide range of moods and feelings. Metrical inversion, anapaestic substitutions, spondees, medial caesuras, tetrameters or trimeters, even longer iambic lines, all also serve to structure the patterns of gesture, expression and (speech) movement and/or to reflect the state of the character's mind. These are integral features of the dramatic text, and as such require as close as possible a rendering in the German.

As we move more closely into the syntax and lexis of Shakespeare's plays, we see that the different 'levels' of translation are still by no means exhausted. The role of rhetoric in the organisation of Shakespeare's material, or in characterisation - significant in *Love's Labour's Lost*, for example, less schematic in later plays such as *Much Ado About Nothing* and *As You Like It*, must

be taken into consideration by the translator. Different levels of style, markers such as formal syntax and copious lexis should also be reflected in the translation. The combination of linguistic units, not only for their sense patterns but also for their sound patterns, should be reproduced as far as possible. If Shakespeare's language is rhymed, the words involved are chosen not only for their properties of metre and sound, but, very importantly, also of meaning.

Since the end of the 18th century, German translators have been finding ways and means of manipulating language, pushing even at the limits of its own internal system, in order to reproduce Shakespeare in his entirety, but we shall see evidence of this in the later section on German translations of Shakespeare wordplay. Regarded in a compact summary such as this, Shakespeare's language and form in confrontation with (literary) German would indeed seem to almost indicate the limits of translatability - even excluding phenomena such as wordplay.

Today, stage effectivity and performability constitute the central issues of drama translation. Mounin goes so far as to maintain:

> Man muß die Bühnenwirksamkeit übersetzen, bevor man sich um die Wiedergabe der literarischen oder poetischen Qualitäten kümmert, und wenn dabei Konflikte entstehen, muß man der Bühnenwirksamkeit den Vorzug geben.[6]

When translating drama, the translator should employ 'weniger wörtliche Übersetzungsverfahren ... und eher jene Verfahren, die Vinay Transpositionen und vor allem Äquivalenz nennt'. He continues:

> [Der Übersetzer] muß nicht nur Aussagen übersetzen, sondern auch Kontexte und Situationen, und zwar so, daß man sie unmittelbar versteht, um darüber lachen oder weinen zu können.[7]

The principles of stage effectivity and performability are emphasised over and again by modern theory on the translation of drama texts.[8] Most scholars and translators now agree that the performability of the translated text is more important than fidelity to the original text.[9] The emphasis lies on its conception for the stage, the conditions of which it must fulfil. On the other hand,

however, modern theory is not suggesting that the translation which focusses on the text as a performance should deviate from the original, or indeed contain modifications to the original text. The problem of performability in translation is 'an extra dimension'.[10] The translator of drama should still endeavour to reproduce the original text in all that it involves. This includes dealing with varying language levels within the original text[11]; taking into consideration the characteristics of sound and rhythm of the original play. But factors such as the audience enter into the 'Plurimedialität'[12] of the dramatic text, and as these influence the treatment of the play, they too have to be regarded in translation.[13]

Modern theory demands then a drama translation which represents a faithful reproduction of the original play in print, but one which also, in its making, takes into account all of the elements of that play as a play for the stage. H. Sahl complains about the dilemma which this demand cannot fail to bring for the translator:

> Einerseits hält man ihm [dem Übersetzer] vor, daß er die Dinge *doch so stehen lassen könne* - erlaubt er sich aber, was Regisseuren und Dramaturgen ohne weiteres erlaubt ist, nämlich, im Interesse des Theaters und seines Mandanten gewisse Änderungen vorzunehmen, so wird er mit erhobenem Zeigefinger zur Ordnung gerufen.[14]

Clearly, in practice there is some question as to what lies in whose competence. When asked about his views on and practices with foreign plays, V. Canaris, *Generalintendant* of the Düsseldorf *Schauspielhaus* replied that he required in a translation not only 'den Stil, das Sprachklima eines Autors in [der] deutsche[n] Sprache, sondern es geht auch darum, die Theatermöglichkeiten, die der Text hat, aufzuspüren und in eine entsprechende deutsche Theatersprache, in einen entsprechenden Dialog umzusetzen'.[15] Where, however, modern theory expects the translator to fulfil all of these requirements[16], Canaris informs us:

> Viele Übersetzungen, insbesondere von alten Stücken, (entstehen) in Zusammenarbeit mit einem Regisseur. Denn es hat sich herausgestellt, daß Stücke, die öfter und immer wieder und vor allem auf der Grundlage von älteren Übersetzungen gespielt werden, in Gefahr geraten, sozusagen der Überset-

zung stärker als dem Original verpflichtet zu sein.[17]

Canaris specifically cites the works of Shakespeare as a classic example of this inherent danger.[18] Indeed, Canaris' doubts about the wisdom of producing Shakespeare in an older German version are symptomatic of wider current disquiet over dramatic translations generally and over Shakespeare translations particularly. U. Suerbaum formulated his uncertainties concerning the problems involved in a German Shakespeare for the German stage as early as 1969:

> Die Interessen der Bühne müssen ... gegen einen originalen oder originalgetreuen Shakespeare-Text gerichtet sein, der für das elisabethanische Sprech- und Deklamationstheater geschrieben ist, der viel zu komplex ist, um auf einmal theatralisch kommunizierbar zu sein, und der so hochgrading determiniert ist, daß er die Spiel- und Deutungsfreiheit einengt.[19]

Suerbaum appears to be concerned at that stage with the problem formulated by Goethe: '*Drama* - Gespräch in Handlungen, wenn es auch nur vor der Einbildungskraft geführt wird'.[20] Shakespeare's text, whether the original or in translation, cannot be fully realised on the stage. By 1972, however, Suerbaum is more hopeful:

> Das Theater müßte ... daran interessiert sein, auf der Grundlage von deutschen Versionen zu spielen, die der Sprach- und Sinnstruktur des englischen ... Textes möglichst nahe stehen.[21]

But when he considers the modern Shakespeare versions actually being used on the German stage, he can only establish that translators are still working 'in der bisherigen Weise, mit kleinen und vorsichtigen Schritten in den Bahnen der Tradition'.[22] Suerbaum is not pleading in favour of what F. Nies terms modern 'Text-Panscherei'[23], but for a German Shakespeare translation based not on the 18th-century translations of Shakespeare, but on the findings of international contemporary discussion and interpretation.[24] He advocates a German Shakespeare for the stage which reflects the original English text itself on every level. But he sees little chance of this being realised unless 'sprachliche Restriktionen gelockert würden, wenn [nicht] dem Übersetzer gestattet würde, ohne Rücksicht auf konventionelles sprachlich-poetisches Wohlverhalten der deutschen Sprache

abzuverlangen, was sie nur hergibt'.[25] Suerbaum rejects Shakespeare versions worked according to the modern principles of 'der Sprechbarkeit, des Bühnengerechten und der Modernität'. For him, these considerations are merely means to 'Erleichterung und Anpassung'.[26]

Suerbaum's uncertainties and requirements are not dissimilar to those of Canaris: a Shakespeare version *not* based on early verse renderings. As to Suerbaum's demand for a German Shakespeare play which is as close as possible to the English text, however, Canaris explains that when dealing with the 'Vielzahl von Zweifach-, Dreifach- und Vierfachbedeutungsmöglichkeiten und -bödigkeiten' of Shakespeare's language, no time is wasted in Düsseldorf in endeavouring to find translations. 'Das Schöne beim Theater ist, daß, wenn man die Möglichkeit in der Sprache nicht findet, man vielleicht eine auf der Szene findet, im Inszenatorischen, im Gestischen, im Mimischen oder in der Bewegung'.[27] This means that a considerable part of the text is translated into physical and visual terms. But Canaris' idea of translating into mimetic terms will not work any better than textual translation unless the producer has a good command of English; how is he otherwise to know what the extra layers of meaning are?

There are, then, four different approaches to a German Shakespeare for the stage: 1) adaptation of one of the older verse translations designed for the reader. The most widely used texts in this case are those of A.W. Schlegel, D. Tieck and Wolf Graf Baudissin (the so-called *Schlegel/Tieck Shakespeare*), and more recently of E. Fried. Suerbaum maintains that the reason for this is: 'Man (kann) mit diesen Texten freier verfahren'. Two contrasting adaptations of Schlegel's and Fried's translation of *Julius Caesar* (whereby the German texts are very similar in both tone and language) were produced in Berlin, for example. J. Fehling's production (1941), based on Schlegel, eleminated all the political aspects of the play. H. Hollmann's production in 1972, based on Fried, on the other hand emphasised not only the political in general, but democracy in particular.[28]

2) A text which has been translated expressly to suit the requirements of the (modern) stage. Examples of this are the translations of H. Rothe between 1922 and 1959, an anti-Schlegel translation: of R. Flatter, who translated 24 plays between 1940 and 1955 and R. Schaller, who translated 20 plays between 1960 and 1967, five

of which are still in script form. The latest published stage translation of Shakespeare is P. Handke's *Das Wintermärchen*. This incorporates a good deal of trendy slang (frequent use of the term 'girls' and the interjection 'yeah'), contemporary allusions ('Darauf ein Königsbier [*König-Pilsner*/"Darauf einen Dujardin"] gleich an der Ecke' for 'For a quart of ale is a dish for a king' - IV, iii) and unnecessarily crude (and here inaccurate) turns of phrase: 'Denn in dieser Zeit kriegt man nichts als Kinder von ausgeleierten Weibern', for 'for there is nothing in the between but getting wenches with child' - III, iii. N. Greiner describes the translation as 'eine "moderne" Shakespeareübersetzung in "moderner Sprache", deren Aktualität solange anhalten wird, wie die Aktualität der Akzente, die sie setzt'.[29]

3) A translation worked jointly by translator and producer such as the stage translation of K. Reichert (Frankfurt/M.) and of F. Günther (Bodensee), who, together with P. Dannenhöfer (producer), translated *As you like it* (1988) and *Twelfth Night* (1991) respectively for the Kieler Schauspielhaus. [30]

4) This final approach favours Shakespeare's original text in its entirety, in German, but one not influenced by the German poetics and language of the day. In this respect, Suerbaum has an ally in F. Nies. As both a translation theorist and a translator, Nies rejects the idea of translating expressly for the stage and of modernising European classic drama. He favours the 'originalgetreue' translation (all elements of the German text as close as possible to the original text) for the stage, a translation which exploits the wealth and potential of the German language to reconstitute the original. Suerbaum explains, however, how rare this occurrence is:

> Die Shakespeare-Übersetzungen sind nur ein kleiner Sektor des deutschen Sprachgeschehens. Aber wenn die Vorgänge auf diesem Sektor in irgendeiner Weise repräsentativ sind, dann deuten sie an, daß der Glaube, unsere Generation hätte sich in ihrem Verhältnis zur Sprache von allen Tabus und von überkommenen Idealen des Maßhaltens und Konformierens befreit und akzeptiere auch das Ungewöhnliche, nicht stimmt.[31]

An example of a Shakespeare production designed according to these latter principles is cited by Canaris: a Shakespeare production by Peter Stein, 'der durch seine eher literarische Art des

genauen Lesens und Übersetzens des Textes der Sprache ein Übergewicht gegenüber den visuellen Darstellungsmitteln einräumt'.[32] Canaris' verdict on this production: 'Wenn er [Stein] irgendwo gescheitert ist, dann bei Shakespeare, den er nur einmal inszeniert hat'.[33] Peter Zadek, on the other hand, who 'bei *Othello* - in einer bestimmten Phase auf einen sprachlich sorgfältig geformten Text verzichtete', was, in Canaris' view, highly successful in presenting true Shakespeare on the German stage: 'Er [Zadek] hat in seiner Art, die Szene zu *zeigen*, eine eigene und, so paradox es klingen mag, doch Shakespeare-nahe Übersetzung geschaffen' (my italics).[34] It would indeed seem that what in the original Shakespeare text represented 'Sprech- und Deklamationstheater' can now only be expressed on the German stage through visual impulses, 'transportiert durch Theatermittel'.[35] Fortunately, Shakespeare is now *read* in Germany almost exclusively in the original. He is, however, still one of the most frequently produced classical dramatists on the German stage. Suerbaum may be correct when he claims 'die Inszenierungen der übersetzten Texte (sind) nicht etwa von vornherein (den englischsprachigen Aufführungen) unterlegen, sondern [sie können] im allgemeinen den Vorzug der größeren Kühnheit, Variabilität und Aktualisierung für sich buchen'[36]: the question is, is the audience still seeing and hearing *Shakespeare*?[37]

When we consider that even in the so-called 'originalgetreue' translations for the reader, 'Sinnkomponenten des Originals bei der Übertragung verlorengingen - so daß also der deutsche Shakespeare nur ein Original-Shakespeare minus x wäre'[38], how much more of Shakespeare's language and style must be forfeited in a translation which takes performability, speakability and the requirements of the theatre into account right from the beginning of the translation process? We read on the dust-jacket of P. Handke's translation of *The Winter's Tale* that there has always been a 'gewisse Wahlverwandtschaft' between Handke's translations [39] and his own creative writing, and that his *Wintermärchen* is no exception:

> Auch in diesem Falle hat Peter Handke Shakespeares *Wintermärchen* nicht nachgedichtet, sondern, im strikten Sinne des Wortes, über-tragen. Damit hat er einen für sich stehenden, auf den deutschen Sprachrhythmus und die deutschen Sprachbilder zu lesenden Text geschaffen, der bewußt jede antimoderne Wendung vermeidet. Er hat keine deutschen Äquivalente gesucht, sondern eine eigene, sensible, unpathetische Spra-

che gefunden.[40]

Compare this critique, however, with the review by N. Greiner of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*:

> Überall dort, wo die musikalische Qualität des Shakespeareschen Blankverses funktional wird und zu Thema, Figur, Situationsbezeichnung entschieden beiträgt, stellen sich bei Handke Verschleifungen und Vereinheitlichungen ein. Die vielfältigen und gerade theatralisch wirksamen stilistischen Markierungen einzelner Redeformen ... bleiben [zusammen] mit der Klangfarbe der Verse Shakespeares [bei Handke] auf der Strecke. Beeinträchtigt wird damit auch das Märchenhafte, das versöhnliche Element besonders des zweiten Teils[41].

We must now ask ourselves how H. Karasek of *Der Spiegel* can say after its première on the *Berliner Schaubühne* in summer 1991 that Handke's translation 'die schönste Shakespeare- *Aneignung* ist, die in den letzten Jahren zu hören war' (my italics)[42], whilst R. Michaelis of *Die Zeit* can call it a 'schöne, poetisch genaue Übersetzung'.[43] Handke's *Wintermärchen* is just one of the many translations which, Suerbaum maintains, 'unbeschadet einer differenzierenden Qualitätswertung - als verschiedene und grundsätzlich gleich legitime Möglichkeiten gelten, Shakespeare zu verdeutschen'.[44] It is not a question of the legitimateness of this practice, but it is disputable whether this is still *Shakespeare*. As most German translations of Shakespeare go, there is clearly no such thing as a German *Shakespeare* for the stage, only a *German* Shakespeare.

Probably the best current solution to the problem of the German Shakespeare, and one which at least partially fulfils the demands of Suerbaum (based on the findings of contemporary Shakespeare discussion and research), was found in 1986, when publication began of the original Shakespeare text on one page and a prose translation on the opposite page.[45] These translations were commissioned by the Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft and various translators/scholars are engaged in the work. With the addition of a critical apparatus based on that of the *Arden Shakespeare*, together with detailed notes on original performances of the plays and further dramaturgical notes, the text can at least be assimilated in context by the reader's imagination. This should provide a more accurate representation of Shakespeare than the German stage seems able to provide

for those unable to understand Shakespeare's original, as well as a basis for the appreciation of criticisms by scholars such as Suerbaum. These continuing discussions of both theory and practice have certainly made us aware of the field of problems in which the modern translator of Shakespeare works. But what were the perceptions and preoccupations of German Shakespeare translators in the past? What criteria determined their view of translation in general and of translating drama, and Shakespeare in particular?

iii) The tradition of German Shakespeare translation within which the Voß family worked

Germany has produced innumerable translations of Shakespeare, either of individual plays or groups of plays rendered by the same translator; others were translations of the complete works, whether by one or more than one translator. The history of German Shakespeare translation began in 1741 with the rendering of *Julius Caesar*[1]; to date it extends up to 1991 with the translation of *The Winter's Tale*.[2] One of the landmarks in this 250-year history was C.M. Wieland's *Shakspear Theatralische Werke*, eight volumes containing 22 dramas (1762-1766). With the exception of one play (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*) the translation is in prose. This was followed by J.J. Eschenburg's rendering of the complete works in *William Shakespear's Schauspiele*, 12 volumes (1775-1777). This too is a prose translation with the exception of his rendering of *Richard III*. 1797 to 1801 saw the first verse translation of 16 plays by A.W. Schlegel, still the most dominant German Shakespeare translation both on the stage and as a reading text; eight volumes, supplemented in 1810 by his verse translation of *Richard III*. This verse edition was completed between 1830 and 1833 by D. Tieck and Wolf Graf Baudissin under the auspices of L. Tieck.

In 1858, after a veritable proliferation of new Shakespeare translations, most of which are now forgotten and many of which incorporated the Shakespeare translations of A.W. Schlegel[3], F. Dingelstedt began to organise a (composite) complete edition of Shakespeare's plays to be translated expressly for the stage. This first endeavour to eliminate the practice of adapting for the stage Shakespeare texts which had been translated for the reader, never materialised as a complete edition.[4] Following the edition of the original Shakespeare plays which N. Delius supplied with a critical

apparatus and historical notes (1854-1861)[5], new composite translations appeared, based on the Schlegel-Tieck translation, but revised in accordance with Delius' philological findings.[6] Between 1871 and 1873, M. Bernays, disturbed by the eclectic nature of these composite Shakespeare translations, completely restored the Schlegel-Tieck edition with the aid of the original German manuscripts.[7]

Still working in the main from the original Schlegel-Tieck translations, but greatly influenced by the stylised aesthetics of S. George, F. Gundolf both extended the Schlegel-Tieck Shakespeare tradition into the 20th century and reinforced the German Shakespeare translation as a text for the reader.[8] The Shakespeare renderings of R.A. Schröder, who translated ten plays round about the period of the Second World War, had similar consequences.[9] Meanwhile, however, a Shakespeare for the German stage had not been neglected. Between 1922 and 1936, H. Rothe produced (modernised) stage translations of 22 plays, and completed the edition from 1958 to 1959, after his return from exile.[10] In 1939, R. Flatter based his stage translations on the Folio editions of Shakespeare's original texts in an endeavour to reproduce the dramatical content of Shakespeare's plays in German.[11] His aim had been to translate all the plays, but only 24 were published. In his Shakespeare translations for the German stage, R. Schaller concentrated on speakability and content rather than on form. Only his 15 most widely used translations are available in print.[12] Since 1963, the Shakespeare renderings of E. Fried have enjoyed ever-increasing popularity, both on the German stage and as reading texts. Although Fried, like Schaller, rejected the notion of an exact reproduction of the form of the plays in favour of a more accurate rendering of the contents, his translations are very closely based on the Schlegel-Tieck editions.[13]

The Voß Shakespeare translation was a joint undertaking by Johann Heinrich Voß and his sons Heinrich and Abraham Voß. The collaboration began as early as 1806, when Heinrich moved from Weimar to join his family in Heidelberg. Having already published translations of two Shakespeare plays[14], Heinrich continued his Shakespeare translations in Heidelberg, soon to be joined in this undertaking by Abraham. Between 1810 and 1815, the two sons published a further three volumes of Shakespeare's plays, none of which had been rendered in German by Schlegel.[15] By 1816, however, the decision had

been made to attempt a complete edition, i.e. to translate also those plays already available in the Schlegel rendering, and Johann Heinrich Voß was persuaded to join the venture. The first two volumes were published in 1818, the ninth and final volume came out in 1829.[16] F. Brockhaus agreed to publish 2,000 copies of the Voß complete Shakespeare, but refused to continue after the first three volumes had appeared. Not only had sales been disappointing, but news of other Shakespeare translations was circulating. In 1822, at the request of Johann Heinrich Voß, H. Erhard of the Metzler Verlag, Stuttgart, who had published other works by Johann Heinrich Voß with much success, agreed to continue publication of the complete Voß Shakespeare. [17]

It took almost eight years for the subsequent volumes to appear. In spite of Heinrich's assurances to Erhard that, with the exception of one play, all of the manuscripts were press proof, this was not the case, and five years after Heinrich's death and one year after the death of his father, Abraham had the task of producing fair copies of the manuscripts and supervising the printing of all outstanding items. Progress in printing was much hindered by the fact that the capacity of the presses was overloaded, and Abraham complains in an unpublished letter to Metzler dated 31 December 1825:

> Indem ich schließlich einen herzlich gemeinten Wunsch zum Neujahr hersetze, erlaube ich mir noch die Anfrage, wie Sie es mit dem Shakspearedrucken zu halten gedenken. Seit einem Vierteljahr warte ich auf Correkturen, und doch steht der Druck mitten in einem Stücke! [18]

The publication of the Voß complete Shakespeare was a test of patience for both parties, and when it did finally appear in its entirety, it was only to exist as one of too many other (composite) editions of the German Shakespeare in verse.

Contemporary reception of the first two volumes of the Voß Shakespeare was, to say the least, negative. Zelter, for example, remarks in a letter to Goethe dated 14 January 1821 that the Voß Shakespeare merely demonstrated how 'unverwüstlich' Shakespeare was. Jean Paul, on the other hand, does write to Heinrich Voß on 30 August 1818:

> An Deines Vaters Übersetzung hab' ich die alte Gediegenheit bewundert, die Silber in das kleinere Gold für den engeren Raum umsetzt. Nur müssen bei seinem Grundsatze, daß Text und Übersetzung sich mathematisch decken sollen, Härten vorkommen, zumal bei Shakespearischer Knospenhärte statt Blätterweiche. Herrlich benutzt und bereichert er die Sprache ... Ich freue mich unendlich auf das Fortfahren. [19]

With few exceptions, critics and friends were both shocked and indignant at the audacity of the Voßs in rendering those plays which Schlegel had already translated into German. In view of Jean Paul's positive assessment and the fact that Johann Heinrich Voß already had a weighty and well-attested reputation as a translator of the classics, and considering that Heinrich Voß knew enough to realise when he needed advice and assistance from others, the Voß translation can hardly have been as worthless as it has been made out. If the Burgtheater decided repeatedly to produce the Voß translation on the stage[20], it must have been good enough to satisfy some kind of reputable criteria for dramatic dialogue. The obvious course then is to look at criteria by which the Voß translations were a) created and b) judged, since these discrepancies in its assessment could be accounted for by differences in approach to translation. The basis for judgements made on the Voß Shakespeare, including those of modern critics, turns out to be almost impossible to establish, for apparently few critics had read it at all, let alone carefully.[21] One of the main objections, whether argued or not, seems to have been simply that it was not Schlegel/Tieck. But this is hardly a basis for determining its merits or demerits. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of later research into German Shakespeare translations has been based on a comparison with Schlegel/Tieck as the "classic" German Shakespeare; this entirely begs the question of who worked with what criteria of translation and linguistic resources, and whether an Elizabethan craftsman and genius of the theatre would or should sound in translation like a nineteenth-century Romantic man of letters. If he does, we may have some delightful dramas, but it may not be Shakespeare.

II THE EIGHTEENTH AND EARLYNINETEENTH CENTURIES

II Chapter One: German concepts of translation in this period

The Rationalist approach

Although translation theory of a kind did begin to emerge in the *Frühaufklärung*, it was governed wholly by the tenets of Rationalist aesthetics. Rationalism perceived translation almost as a mechanical substitution of word for word. G.W. Leibniz and C. Wolff held the theory that words were signs arbitrarily attached to the idea or thing they denoted in any given language, that words were mere symbols of thought; and could thus be safely converted into any other language by the sign denoting it in another. Words themselves and the manner of their combination are not considered worthy of interest.[1] The following definition given by J.H. Winckler is representative of the language and translation principles of the day:

> Eine Sprache ist ein Ausdruck der Gedanken durch die Töne der Zunge ... Zwischen einem solchen Tone, und einem Gedanken ist keine nothwendige Verknüpfung. Denn die Erfahrung bezeugt, daß einerley Gedanken durch mancherley Töne in ganz verschiednen Sprachen können ausgedruckt werden.[2]

It is thus not surprising that, particularly in the case of literary translation, the individual aesthetic properties of the original text were not considered important. The main consideration in the ideology of the *Frühaufklärung* was the German reader: the main objective, therefore, was to make translations conform to a model which could be clearly apprehended by the German reader. Any variations in style, which are inevitable in the works of an author with another cultural background, another language, were to be ironed out in translation. This is evident in the translations of J.C. Gottsched, translations of French dramas, of periodical essays from the *Tatler* and *Spectator* and of works which dealt with the moral and didactic issues constituting the programme of the *Aufklärer*. Since these translations were aimed at the wider public, the translator endeavoured to maintain a simple, easily understandable style and logical clarity of expression.

Gottsched maintains:

> Ein geschickter Uebersetzer wird Ausdrückungen wählen, die seiner Sprache eigenthümlich sind, ob sie gleich zuweilen von dem Grundtext etwas abzugehen scheinen.

The translator's main objective should be that he endeavour 'sich nicht so wohl alle Worte, als vielmehr den rechten Sinn, und die völlige Meynung eines jeden Satzes, den man übersetzet, wohl auszudrücken.[3] The term 'geschickter Uebersetzer' already implies Gottsched's notion of translating as a craft with easily handled techniques, as is further shown by the definition which he gives of "Übersetzung" in his *Handlexikon* (1760):

> Übersetzung ... ist eine sehr nützliche Übung in der Schreibart ... Wer sich nun zum Übersetzen geschickt machen will, der tut sehr wohl, wenn er die Übersetzungen anderer Gelehrten vornimmt, und sie mit ihrem Original vergleicht.[4]

The imitation of models is apparently the key to a translator's skill.

G. Venzky, a disciple of Gottsched, sets down similar maxims in his treatise on *Das Bild eines geschickten Uebersetzers.*[5] If the translation renders 'den Verstand einer ursprünglichen Schrift deutlich und vollständig ...: So ist sie so gut, als das Original selbst'.[6] A translation, however, which deviates from the conventions of the German language and reflects the linguistic/stylistic features of the foreign text is considered 'ungeschickt, übelgerathen, fehler- und mangelhaft'. It corrupts the mother-tongue and furthermore violates the laws of 'Natürlichkeit' and 'Ungezwungenheit' (a logical conclusion from the point of view of the *Frühaufklärer*). Since the author of the original text must appear in the translation to have been German and have written it in German, every translation is subject to the same stylistic requirements as original German texts.[7] This means, in Shakespeare's case, none of the bombast of the dark age of baroque, but language which is in accordance with rationalised, standardised principles and ordinary educated usage.

This led to the view that a skilful translation, i.e. one that abridges, concentrates and elucidates the original text, might even

excel the original.[8] According to this concept, the translator was conforming wholly with the aesthetics of the day if he "improved" his original text: omitted or supplemented words, rearranged syntax, replaced archaisms with modern terms, made several short sentences out of one long one, reduced the number of metaphors and other poetic devices. The language was to be such that the reader of the "translated original" was not even aware that he was reading a translation. The translator was free to do as he pleased with the form of the original text. Foreign verse written in unfamiliar metre might not only be transposed into the then popular French alexandrine metre, it might even be rendered in prose. Poetry was valued for its structure, its "mechanics" and assimilated purely intellectually. Its form was considered to be mere embellishment and thus either replaceable or superfluous.

In advancing the cause of creative "imagination" against the merely reproductive "imagination" favoured by the Rationalists, J.J. Bodmer and J.J. Breitinger also effected a shift in concepts of translation. The notion of fidelity was no longer centred on similarity of ideas, but on similarity of effect. Unlike Gottsched, Breitinger perceived the individual characteristics of languages which result from the different ways of life, customs and mentalities of the different nations.[9] These 'Idiotismi', particular idioms, characteristic terms, the use of metaphors, special word order and sentence construction should be translated in such a way that their specific effect on the reader of the original is not hidden from the reader of the translation. In Breitinger's opinion:

> Von einem Uebersetzer wird erfordert, daß er eben dieselben Begriffe und Gedancken, die er in einem trefflichen Muster vor sich findet, in eben solcher Ordnung, Verbindung, Zusammenhange, und mit gleich so starckem Nachdrucke, mit andern gleich-gültigen bey einem Volck angenommenen, gebräuchlichen und bekannten Zeichen ausdrücke, so daß die Vorstellung der Gedancken unter beyderley Zeichen einen gleichen Eindruck auf das Gemüthe des Lesers mache.[10]

But Breitinger does not stop at this demand for equivalence of effect produced by two different national linguistic systems. Whereas up to then the status of the original as a text in its own right had been largely ignored in the translation process, it was simply a medium for transporting an idea, for Bodmer and Breitinger it was

more than this; the emotional and other connotations it carried in the original were also seen as worthy of translation. The reader's emotions and imagination, as well as intellect, were to be brought into play. Breitinger now recommends that the very devices which constitute the style of the original should be used in the translation, provided that they also serve to enrich the German language. As an example, he cites the case of the Ancients and their use of participial constructions to achieve the 'Nachdruck einer geschickten Kürtze'. He advises the translator either to reproduce this effect by using an alternative structure which follows the conventional pattern of the German language (advice which might have come from Gottsched), or, and this is where Breitinger goes a good step further than Gottsched, to echo this brevity 'auf die gleiche Participal-Weise', even though this might not be usual practice in the German of the day.[11] Breitinger's historical appraisal of the literature of other nations was beginning to broaden the horizons hitherto restricted by Gottsched's exclusive occupation with the present. A feeling for the unique, the individual character of foreign works and their authors was developing alongside Gottsched's normative Rationalist aesthetics. The principles of standardisation imposed by Gottsched were somewhat shaken by Breitinger's conviction that 'gute Uebersetzungen dienen können, eine Sprache zu bereichern'.[12]

Behind these seemingly trail-blazing theories, however, lay a very traditional perception of language. In spite of his discernment of the unique historical nature of poetry, Breitinger still adhered to the Rationalist notion of reason and language as two entirely separate functions of the intellect: reason is the foundation of language, therefore language is purely instrumental. This explains why Breitinger can still confidently claim that translating is capable of perfect solution.

Although Breitinger's translation theories did provide a contrary stand to those of Gottsched, it was nevertheless the theories of Gottsched which continued to dominate the art of translating. Lessing may have maintained that the translations of the Swiss school were 'treuer und richtiger ... als andere, ... ungemein reich an guten nachdrücklichen Wörtern, an körnichten Redensarten', but he still complained that they were 'unangenehm zu lesen ..., weil selten eine Periode ihre gehörige Rundung und die Deutlichkeit hat, die sie durch die natürliche Ordnung ihrer Glieder erhalten muß'.[13]

Lessing's own principles were still much governed by Rationalist attitudes of Gottschedian provenance, but his discussion of translation also reveals his doubts about the *Nachahmungsprinzip* as postulated by Gottsched. Almost as if in direct reply to Gottsched's definition of "Übersetzung", Lessing remarks:

> Unsere Übersetzer verstehen selten die Sprache; sie wollen erst verstehen lernen; sie übersetzen sich zu üben, und sind klug genug, sich ihre Übungen bezahlen zu lassen. Am wenigsten aber sind sie vermögend, ihrem Originale nachzudenken. [14]

It is clear from this that Lessing rejects the idea of translating as a craft which can be learned. He considers a thorough knowledge of the language of the foreign text essential, and in establishing that the original text requires appropriate reflection, he is also demanding that this original process of creativity be repeated as a new process of creativity.

Like M. Opitz and like Gottsched, Lessing was convinced of the suitability of the German language for poetic expression. He, too, deplored the 'Sprachenmengerey ..., welche der Krieg damals [1618-1648] auf deutschen Boden brachte', and which was still evident in the 'fremden Wendungen und Wortfügungen, welche [unsere neuesten und besten Schriftsteller] aus dem Französischen und Englischen ... häufig herüber nehmen'.[15] But where Gottsched had declared every German dialect with the exception of that of Upper-Saxony-Meissen to be unfit, incorrect and corrupted German, Lessing was now advising the 'neuesten und besten Schriftsteller' to study German dialects and the history of their language and to exploit the potential of the 'alten lautern und reichen Sprache der guten Dichter aus der Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts'. [16]

The purpose of Lessing's own intensive efforts to catalogue and define etymologically the lexical gems of the past was to enrich German literary language.[17] We have already noted his appreciation of the strength and vigour of the language of the Swiss translators. Lessing's stylistic ideals are clarity and ordered conciseness, qualities which he found lacking in the Swiss school. His judgement of translations, however, was based principally on these stylistic ideals, which could only be achieved if the translator combined 'feines Gefühl mit einem ... richtigen Urteile' in the process of

translation.[18] Indeed, Lessing's approval, for example, of the 'unzählig kleine Verbesserungen und Berichtigungen desjenigen, was in der Urschrift oft ein wenig schielend, ein wenig affektiert ist', which J.N. Meinhard had undertaken in his translations of early Italian verse[19], still reflects the precepts established by Gottsched.

Lessing's discussion of Meinhard's *Versuche über den Charakter und die Werke der besten italienischen Dichter* (1763-64) constitutes the unequivocal expression of his own perception of the ideal translator: '[Meinhards] Stil ist rein, kurz, gedrängt ... und beständig klar', all of the qualities which the Swiss translations did not possess. Where, however, much of the translation work from Switzerland Lessing was referring to had attempted to reproduce the original text in both content and verse form, Meinhard 'kompensiert die Schönheiten der Versifikation, die *notwendig* verloren gehen müssen, ... mit der reinsten, geschmeidigsten, wohlklingendsten *Prosa*' (my italics).[20] This statement clearly defines the limits to which the new process of creativity should be taken in order to preserve clarity in translation.

These requirements may be prescriptive, but they still represent what was best in German Enlightenment aesthetics, and his admiration of the 'Lebhaftigkeit der Einbildungskraft' and the 'Reichtum an Bildern' in Meinhard's renderings reaches far beyond the principle of "imitatio litterarum".

Sturm und Drang and Empfindsamkeit

In the meantime, however, quite different notions of language and style were emerging in the writings of J.G. Hamann, who claimed: 'Die Reinigkeit einer Sprache entzieht ihrem Reichtum: eine gar zu gefesselte Richtigkeit, ihrer Stärke und Mannheit'.[21] Hamann, who was deeply influenced by British empiricism and sensationism, had begun towards the end of the 1750s to advance a justification of inspiration and a defence of genius against the Rationalist tenets of reason and learning, against the 'mathematische Lehrart' as applied by the Rationalists to aesthetics. Why, he wanted to know, were they still demanding that the poet follow nature, when their 'mordlügnerische Philosophie die Natur aus dem Wege geräumt [hatte]'?[22]

For Hamann, too, poetry is the imitation of nature; but of nature which 'würkt durch Sinne und Leidenschaften'. [23] Furthermore language and thought are not two processes, but one; language conveys directly the innermost soul of individuals and societies. His absolute faith in Holy Writ and mystical interpretation of truth as revealed in consonance through both nature and the Bible, and his 'acknowledgement of the Bible as the highest authority in poetry'[24], render the Bible 'das gröste (sic) Muster und der feinste Probierstein aller menschlichen Kritik'.[25] The fact that in the Bible we find 'eben die regelmäßige Unordnung, die wir in der Natur entdecken' frees the poet of the restraints of ordered clarity.[26] As 'Die Schrift mit uns Menschen nicht anders reden (kann), als in Gleichnissen', the language of the poet, the only true language, must be rich in imagery.[27]

Hamann's explication of the essence of genius, which ignores or infringes the rules of art and invents its own, inimitable rules, planted seeds of doubt as to the validity of the theory that there was such a thing as a translation which could be termed 'vollkommen gültig'. For Hamann, the historically conditioned structure and texture of poetry, the sensuous, the imagery and the figurative language are not merely a vehicle for some central Rationalist idea: they represent a unique form in which the invisible entity of the soul manifests itself. The sensuous element inherent in poetry must be preserved in the translation. As translating is a form of language communication derived from poetry, the relation of a translation to its original text must be the same as the reverse side of a coin to its face. This is an inference which would make the 'Unvollkommenheit' of translations natural and necessary.[28] What Hamann demands of a translation is what Dryden terms 'paraphrase, or translation with latitude':

> Dryden sahe früh genug ein, daß Genauigkeit am besten den Sinn eines Schriftstellers erhielte, und daß Freyheit am stärksten seinen Geist ausdrückte. Derjenige verdient den höchsten Preis, welcher einen eben so treuen als angenehmen Abdruck liefern und dieselben Gedanken mit der selben Schönheit mittheilen kann. [29]

J.G. Herder's discernment of the distinctness of the ages of artistic creativity did serve to reinforce the ideas which Hamann had postulated, but it also opened up quite new dimensions for

insights into the problem of translation, for each had a different view of the power of the word, and this engendered a different view of translation. Herder appealed to translators not to look upon their art as a purely philological exercise, but to analyse and absorb the original text in all its characteristic features and details. For Herder, the translator was a philosopher, poet and philologist in one, whose duty it was to preserve in its unadulterated form all of the beauty of the original text.[30] With these dictates he is extending the concept of genius when he sees a 'schöpferisches Genie' not only in the original author, but also in the translator.

This revolutionary conception of the translator as a creative genius, and Herder's demand for a translation to be a transmission of the organic unity of the original in its entirety was a watershed in the course of eighteenth-century translation theory. The words of the creator-poet thus acquired that sacredness and influence which were otherwise seen only in the words of the Bible.[31] With the increasing authority of the new classical movement which began with Winckelmann, this reverence was bestowed above all on Greek and Latin poetry, not only for the sake of its excellence, but also for the beneficial effects which these languages could have on the German language; and translation was a discipline which not only clearly illustrated the temporal and cultural differences involved in the two texts, but which also gave the translator the opportunity to render an exemplary work in German. The 1770s saw a flood of Homer translations, either in iambic verse, in hexameters or in (rhythmic) prose, whereby the respective translators wasted no time in publicly defending their own decision in respect of translation form, or in critically appraising the efforts of their rivals.[32]

Various insights were gained in the course of this work, the most important being recognition of the limitations of the lexis of the German language and its syntactical inflexibility. Many translators, no matter how familiar they were with the problems of the two language systems, were not able to reproduce the pliancy of the classical languages. This meant that Herder's ideas were not able to replace completely the traditional practice of paraphrasing, substituting, adapting. Many translators still felt obliged to follow the narrow, prescribed path of German language conventions. 'Aus Furcht, finster zu werden'[33], they still changed word order, substituted participial constructions and avoided anything which might offend

the 'normal' educated reader.

The tendency to concentrate attention on a stylistically acceptable *German* version continued, in spite of the fact that the range of stylistic models available was constantly being extended. F.G. Klopstock had already enriched German literature with a poetic language far removed from the desiccation of Rationalist literary principles.[34] Klopstock was also an advocate - if slightly more moderate in his views than Herder - of the theory that the translator's primary obligation was to the original text. His demands, too, were for 'Treu dem Geiste des Originals' and 'Schönheit des Leibes', not, however, for a poet-translator of equal rank with the original poet, but for a more modest and realistic 'künstlerische Begabung'.[35] Like Breitinger and those translation theorists who followed, Klopstock appealed to the translator for a bolder, more imaginative use of the German language, since 'Sinn und Zweck von Übersetzungen' was also 'Bereicherung, Erweiterung, Erneuerung der Sprache'. It was wrong and unnecessary, whenever incongruence between the two languages occurred, to decide in favour of the German text at the expense of the original.

The generating force in Klopstock's poetic language is his conviction that the language of poetry is and must be quite different from that of prose. Not only is Klopstock unafraid to use participial constructions in his work and poetic translations, these often also consist of startling compounds, archaisms replace everyday expressions, syntactical inversions enable Klopstock to place speech units of significance in more prominent rhythmical positions. Even as Breitinger had maintained that the origin of poetic inversion was in the language of emotion, Klopstock sees 'Unvermuthete, scheinbare Unordnung' as a device which 'setzt die Seele in eine Bewegung, die sie für die Eindrücke empfänglicher macht'.[36] In conjunction with his treatises on prosody and his demand for a rendering of the whole organic unity of a foreign text in German, he illustrates the significance of the integral nature of meaning, sound and position of a word or phrase.

The examples which Klopstock gave of a bold, imaginative use of language gradually began to emancipate the translator from the normative aesthetics of a Gottsched. *Der Messias* was received with the enthusiasm and praise of C.E. v. Kleist, C.M. Wieland and Herder and the dispassionate admiration of Lessing.[37] Despite the scorn of the

Gottsched disciple C.O.v. Schönaich, Klopstock had given to German literature a model for that flexibility and invention which theorists had required for the language of poetic translation. The spirit of a text, its organic unity could be reproduced if the translator heeded Klopstock's warning: 'Buchstabe und Geist stehen geradezu im Gegensatz, wenn der Buchstabe nicht auch den Geist vermittelt'.[38]

New developments: A.W. Schlegel and Romantic translation theory

In the German Romantic period translation was conceived of on an even broader basis. Translation was no longer simply the discipline of rendering a text in another language, it took on the additional meanings which the word has in English today: to express in another form of representation, to imply or declare the significance of, to interpret.[39] Novalis stipulates three hierarchical categories of translation, 'grammatische', 'verändernde', 'mythische'[40], and claims that 'nicht bloß Bücher, alles kann auf diese drei Arten übersetzt werden'.[41] For Fr. Schlegel, translation is an integral part of the 'progressive Universalpoesie'; literature is seen as a process, as an impelling moment of history; translation as a thought category. Similarly A.W. Schlegel, for whom every artist is a translator. For him, one aspect of 'Übersetzertalent' is 'die Kraft, in die innerste Eigenthümlichkeit eines großen Geistes einzudringen'[42]; for all of the Jena Romantics, translation is also literary reproduction in the form of 'symphilosophieren' and 'sympoetisieren'. Like Herder, they saw the vital role of the poet in maintaining access to the origins of man's creative expression by constantly regenerating language and thought.

The early German Romantic period was thus a fertile one for translation in its primary modern sense. In accordance with the aesthetic programme of the Romantics, A.W. Schlegel remarks:

> Nur die vielfältige Empfänglichkeit für fremde Nationalpoesie, die wo möglich bis zur Universalität gedeihen soll, macht die Fortschritte im treuen Nachbilden von Gedichten möglich.

And although he continues by acknowledging that 'schon Beispiele genug vorhanden sind, um an ihnen nach der Verschiedenheit der möglichen Aufgaben das richtige Verfahren auf Grundsätze zurückzufüh-

ren', and that he is actually engaged in such an endeavour, there is comparatively little recorded evidence of attempts on his part to solve the practical problems of translating.[43] Comments on the art of translation scattered throughout A.W. Schlegel's theoretical writings and his letters bear witness, however, to his debt to Klopstock and Herder. Of Klopstock he remarks:

> Wären wir nicht jetzt durch die ängstliche Gebundenheit der Wortfolge geplagt, wenn die Sache nicht durch Klopstock zuerst eine andere Wendung genommen hätte?[44]

A.W. Schlegel's affinity with Herder is manifest in his demand for 'poetisches Übersetzen'; whereby not merely a kindred affinity between original author and translator is required, but also an 'unendliche Annäherung an das Original', a reproduction of 'Form und Eigentümlichkeit' of 'Hauch und Ton'. This is not to say, however, that Schlegel did not advance further theories of translation and extend the practice of translation.

Schlegel's introduction to his translated fragment of Dante's *Divina Commedia* represents a first attempt at a psychological approach to the qualities of an original's author. Schlegel admits that Dante 'sich gleich in Sprache und Ausdruck ungemessene Freiheiten erlaubt', but since this poem is an 'unwillkürlicher Abdruck seines [Dante's] Innern selbst', it is the duty of the translator to produce a faithful rendering of those 'fehlerhaften Eigentümlichkeiten ... und Verwahrlosungen'.[45] They are, Schlegel maintains, an integral part of the poet's psychological make-up and are often combined with the most noble of traits. This is an example of the 'Übersetzertalent' penetrating the characteristics of a great spirit in order to reproduce the entire organic unity of a foreign text. As Schlegel concludes, 'Das Kunstwerk wollen wir gern vollkommen; den Menschen wie er ist'.[46]

For Schlegel, the organic form of poetry, the moulding of the contents, was of more significance than the contents themselves. When translating, he attempted to grasp this form by applying terms such as 'Gang und Maß der Perioden', 'Pausen', 'Einteilungen der Gedanken' and took as the starting point of his rendering the formal elements of the original before proceeding to echo the stylistic features as closely as possible. Reproducing the metrical forms of modern poetry, he maintained, was not difficult, as German verse had

adopted its metrical forms, and hence their associations with foreign sounds, from foreign poetry ever since the *Minnesang*.

For this reason, Schlegel insisted not only on the feasibility of a faithful reproduction of the metrical form of the original text, but above all on the echo of the sound of the original lines. Schlegel's own translations in the German hexameter and blank verse contributed greatly to halting the tradition of what Novalis termed 'Travestieren, wie Bürgers Homer in Jamben, Popens Homer, die französischen Übersetzungen insgesamt'.[47] Translation within the same language is as vital as translation between languages: both processes require analysis of the aesthetic character of the text, the one as a basis for explication, the other as a prerequisite for translation into a different language. In both cases, the objective of the analysis is to achieve a 'Gesamteindruck'.[48] A.W. Schlegel may not have documented systematically 'das richtige Verfahren' for translating a foreign text, or even always applied his theories to his own translations; but the sum of his comments and the translations he did are still evidence of a total emancipation from the Gottschedian idea of imitation.

Early 19th-century systematisation

A.W. Schlegel's concept was soon to be further elaborated and systemised by F. Schleiermacher's view of translation in terms of hermeneutics. His analysis of language and the essential process of understanding describes two levels of language - whether spoken or written. Schleiermacher conceives of language 'teils aus dem Geiste der Sprache, aus deren Elementen sie zusammengesetzt ist, als eine durch diesen Geist gebundene und bedingte ... Darstellung' and 'aus dem Gemüt des Redenden als eine Tat, als nur aus seinem Wesen gerade so hervorgegangenen und erklärbar'.[49]

For Schleiermacher, this results in two possible approaches to a text: a purely grammatical interest in the text and its significance within the history of a certain age, and a psychological interest in the development of a text, in the 'ursprünglichen psychischen Prozeß der Erzeugung und Verknüpfung von Gedanken und Bildern'.[50] Problems involved in understanding the former can be resolved by means of comparison with similar structures already understood; in the case of the latter, one has to rely on intuition ('Divination'). To at-

tain this 'mehr divinatorische als demonstrative Gewißheit', it is necessary 'daß der Ausleger sich in die ganze Verfassung des Schriftstellers möglichst hineinversetzt' to the extent that a state of 'Kongenialität' exists between analyst and author.

These notions have a dichotomic effect on Schleiermacher's theories of translation. He can now distinguish between the 'Paraphrast' as translator and the 'Nachbildner' as translator. The task of the former is 'dolmetschen': 'Der Paraphrast verfährt mit den Elementen beider Sprachen, als ob sie mathematische Zeichen wären'. The medium of this type of translation is prose. The imitator, on the other hand, 'gesteht, man könne von einem Kunstwerk der Rede kein Abbild in einer anderen Sprache hervorbringen, das in seinen einzelnen Teilen den einzelnen Teilen des Urbildes entspräche'.[51] For this reason, the 'Nachbildner' endeavours to maintain the overall impression of the original by compiling 'ein Ganzes, aus merklich von den Teilen des Urbildes verschiedenen Teilen', with the result that the identity of the original text is forfeited. Thus, the translator is fulfilling his duty neither to the original text nor to the contemporary reader. Since, however, it is the duty of the translator to lead the reader towards the original foreign text, he must take into consideration and preserve the unique characteristics of this text, even if it means deviating from national linguistic norms. Schleiermacher therefore prescribes a *via media* between paraphrasing and imitation:

> [...] ein unerlaßliches (sic) Erforderniß dieser Methode des Uebersezens ist eine Haltung der Sprache, die nicht nur nicht alltäglich ist, sondern die auch ahnden läßt, daß sie nicht ganz frei gewachsen, vielmehr zu einer fremden Aehnlichkeit hinübergebogen sei [...].[52]

Where, Schleiermacher further maintains, there is a strong motivation to understand literary texts, and the mother tongue is a reasonably flexible language, this method of translating will gradually become a natural phenomenon, an integral part of overall literary and intellectual developments: 'Wie es [das Übersetzen] einen bestimmten Wert erhält, gibt es auch einen sichern Genuß'.[53]

A process of expanding and systematising ideas and impulses which had emanated from Herder and the Romantics on the problems of translating was also undertaken by J.W. v. Goethe and W. v. Humboldt.

Goethe expresses notions similar to those of Schleiermacher's 'fremde Aehnlichkeit' when he maintains:

> Die Deutsche Sprache gewinnt immer mehr Biegsamkeit sich andern Ausdrucksweisen zu fügen; die Nation gewöhnt sich immer mehr, Fremdartiges aufzunehmen, sowohl in Wort als Bildung und Wendung'.[54]

The principles of translation which Goethe deduces from historical developments in this field culminate in a demand for perfect identity between original text and translation. The 'Interlinearversion' of a foreign text ensures that 'wir uns zu dem Fremden hinüber begeben und uns in seine [des fremden Autors] Zustände, seine Sprachweise, seine Eigenheiten finden sollen'.[55]

W. v. Humboldt also attached considerable importance to the 'Ahndung des Fremden'. His theories prescribe two functions for the translation: to communicate different and new forms of art whose existence would otherwise only be known to those with a command of the foreign language, and to expand the significance and capacity for expression of the native tongue. Both of these factors represent a positive gain for literature in general, always provided that the uniqueness of the original text is preserved.[56]

To sum up almost a century of German translation theory: for Gottsched and his school, 'Treue zum *Sinn* des Originals' was required. The translator was committed to rendering those "truths" contained in the original text which complied with issues constituting the Enlightenment programme. The individual and particular aspects of the text, its poetry and form, were as irrelevant for the translator as he himself considered them to be for the original author. The translation ideals of Bodmer and Breitinger were much the same, although their affirmation of a place in literature for *das Wunderbare* did give more prominence to the form of the text and ultimately open up the way towards a translation ideal of similarity of effect.

The notion of 'Treue zur *Wirkung*' evolved from the middle of the 18th century onwards. Greater resources of German literary language and, later, Herder's evolutionary historical ideas on language and literature made it possible for the translator to represent in his rendering the individual character of the original text. For the

German reader, the translator's rendering was a substitute for the original text, and was therefore required to demonstrate adequate poetic qualification. One of the results of these requirements was that, where formerly there was such a thing as one 'accepted' German version of the original, now diverse translations of the same text could exist side by side.

The notion of 'Treue' which developed in the late 1770s was that of 'Treue zum *Werk*'. Any approach which threatened to disturb the organic entirety of the foreign literary text, such as identifying and highlighting its positive features and effective aspects, was rejected. The focus was shifted from the author exclusively to his work. The aim of the translator was neither to replace the original nor to bring it closer to the reader: in fact, the translation abandoned any claim to an existence in its own right. Only in this way could the original text be allowed to manifest itself through the translation. At no point did one particular view simply supplant another. 'Treue zum Sinn' and 'Treue zur Wirkung' coexisted until the end of the 18th century; for the last quarter of this century, all three views existed side by side. But no matter what the notions of fidelity, two basic elements were essential for translating literary texts: i) translation principles - a theory of translation, and ii) a sound knowledge, not only of the foreign language, but also of the mother tongue - in this order. Where one of these two elements was weak, or had not even been considered, the result was an inferior literary translation.

III Chapter Two: Concepts of drama and of translation of dramatic texts

The literature of other Western European countries played an enormous role in stimulating, provoking and forming German literature in the greater part of the eighteenth century. This applies particularly to drama. When Gottsched decided to scrap the crude forms of theatrical entertainment which were still being provided in Germany in the third decade of the century, and replace them with something entirely new, it was to France that he turned for stimulation. The German intellectual climate had begun to favour a historical outlook, and Gottsched believed that drama, which had flourished in classical times, had been brought to perfection in seventeenth-century France. This encouraged him in the idea that drama might be brought to the same stage of advancement in Germany by the simple process of imitating and translating French tragedy in the traditional grand manner and French comedy. The significance of translation is reflected in the fact that the first two volumes of Gottsched's *Die deutsche Schaubühne* (1741-1745)[1] contained almost exclusively translations of the plays of, amongst others, Corneille, Racine, Molière, Voltaire and Holberg. Not until volume three of the *Schaubühne* do we find an increase in the number of original German plays.

Gottsched made the theatre into a moral platform from which the middle-classes were to be enlightened. He proved by his own attempts that it was possible to produce comedies and tragedies in accordance with rules by means of imitation and translation as he had prescribed in his *Versuch einer Critischen Dichtkunst* (1730): plays made to recipes for perfectly regulated drama. Adherence to dramatic unities is essential; literary language is to be confined to uncluttered, refined diction to ensure that important truths are conveyed to the audience. Any genre of literature can only fulfil its didactic purpose if it follows rules which guarantee logical clarity and transparency. Any trace of language levels which did not accord with common standards endangered drama's task of educating the audience in good taste. The translators of drama commissioned by Gottsched were therefore pledged to avoid in their renderings any manifestations of the language of emotions. A measure of comedy might be provided in a play, but anything emotional which veiled the moral-didactic purpose of the play was to be modified.

This early Enlightenment notion of drama greatly restricted the notion of the functions of translation. It also restricted the view of Shakespeare. This can be seen in Gottsched's evaluation of Shakespeare, whom he dismissed as the epitome of 'Unvernunft' and a prime example of the worst violations of the "rules".[2] However, "common sense" was a rather more flexible concept than Gottsched realised. Bodmer and Breitinger were able to open up subjective scope for the poet and effect more latitude for the translator by applying common sense *reasonably*, but their commitment to rationalist poetics prevented them from progressing far in this direction in their own literary production. Similarly, J.E. Schlegel was able to modify the accepted views on *mimesis* by insisting on a lesser degree of exactness and imitation.[3] He was also able to make a tentative but remarkable attempt at explaining and evaluating Shakespeare from the nature and essence of Shakespeare's dramas. He recognised that the value of Shakespeare's poetry must be judged, not by the imitation of action, but of character, and that therefore the classical rules appropriate for the tragedy were of secondary importance here. This, however, does not deter Schlegel from criticising Shakespeare's failure to observe the unities and his use of language levels inappropriate for tragic characters, or of a certain bombast. All of this contributes, in the view of the Enlightener, to Shakespeare's failure to realise the function of the tragedy:

> [...] ein Poet, der Trauerspiele schreibt, thut es, um in seinen Zuschauern edle Regungen und Leidenschaften, vermittelst der Nachahmung zu erwecken: und alles, was dies hindert, ist ein Fehler, es mag so gut nachgeahmt seyn, als es will.[4]

And Schlegel's own literary production continued in the rhetorical, alexandrine style, always in accordance with the Aristotelian unities.

In the 1750s, however, the climate of German drama began to change. Schlegel had re-examined notions of appropriate ranks for the heroes of tragedy and comedy. All orders of society were acceptable for the comic hero. This not only assured pleasure for all classes of audience, it also fulfilled the didactic requirements of the play more effectively.[5] F. Nicolai was now to revise the nature and role of poetic rules.[6] And, in his treatise *Das Neueste aus dem Reiche des Witzes* (1751), Lessing asserts that the so-called rules

of art are not static, but flexible and therefore subject to continual change as writers of genius take new directions.[7] For Lessing, the aim of the tragedy is to exercise in the audience 'eine Fähigkeit im Mitleiden'[8]. He does not, however, mean the pity founded on Rationalist notions of moral instruction. Lessing is advocating a natural moral sense guided purely by the emotions. He requires the language of passion and emotion to be expressed as it is naturally expressed in its (normally) private surroundings, not in the "public" rhetoric of the hero of title, power and position. Only in this way can the audience participate vicariously in the grief and pain of the hero or heroine. Hence Lessing's criticism of L.A. Gottsched's translation of F. de Graffigny's play *Cénie*. Here Lessing gives us a representative view of translations carried out in accordance with the tenets of the Enlightenment programme: 'jede feinere Gesinnung ist in ihren gesunden Menschenverstand paraphrasiert, jeder affektvolle Ausdruck in die toten Bestandteile seiner Bedeutung aufgelöst worden'. The *Frühaufklärung* may have its poetic rules and its pre-prescribed standards of language, but, says Lessing, so do the emotions:

> Es ist ganz um sie [die Sprache des Herzens] geschehen, sobald man diese verkennt und sie dafür den Regeln der Grammatik unterwerfen und ihr alle die kalte Vollständigkeit, alle die langweilige Deutlichkeit geben will, die wir an einem logischen Satz verlangen.[9]

Similarly, Lessing comments on the register of the French original dialogue and that of the translation: 'der häßliche Ton des Zeremoniells; verabredete Ehrenbenennungen kontrastieren mit den Ausrufungen der gerührten Natur auf die abscheulichste Weise'.[10]

In amplifying these theories throughout and beyond the decade, Lessing not only drew impulses, models and parallels from France, he also turned to English drama and literature of ideas.[11] 1754 saw his translation of J. Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*[12]; and his own play *Miss Sara Sampson*, which was published one year later, owes much to England. G. Lillo's *George Barnwell*, or *The London Merchant* (1731) and E. Moore's *The Gamester* (1735), two plays whose melodrama and pathos were favourable to the psychological climate of 18th-century England and its susceptibility to emotion, also became models for the *bürgerliches Trauerspiel*, and thus for *Miss Sara Sampson*.

Most dramatists in 18th-century Germany perceived the term 'bürgerlich' in this new genre as denoting a tragedy in which only those actions are imitated which constitute middle or lower class life. Lessing himself never advances a theory expressly on the domestic tragedy; it is merely implicit in his more general concept of the tragic as purely 'human', purely 'moving'. Lessing's notion of the hero of this new type of tragedy is a classless, sensitive, viz. moral being; universal human traits are portrayed in this type of tragedy, and as such are identified with the domestic, the private, the family, rather than with class.[13]

Lillo was also received by Lessing through the theories and plays of Denis Diderot, who was an enthusiastic imitator of elements of Lillo's drama. Diderot differentiates between the 'tragédie domestique', 'welche unser häusliches Unglück darstellt', and the classical 'tragédie héroique', 'welche zu ihrem Gegenstand das Unglück der Großen und die Unfälle ganzer Staaten hat'.[14] What distinguishes these two types of tragedy for Diderot is not class or rank, but the public and private nature of the tragic action.

In 1760, Lessing translated Diderot's *Le fils naturel* (1757) and *Le père de famille* (1758), and accompanied these with a translation of Diderot's *Essai sur la poésie dramatique* (1758). Although Diderot's own plays are not a very convincing proof of the validity of his own precepts that the domestic tragedy should reflect genuine dramatic emotion in its speech, for Lessing they are a significant source of reference.[15] Like Diderot, Lessing recommends 'kleine Nachläßigkeiten', 'geschmeidiger Dialog' and speech which is true to the manifestation of 'augenblickliche Eingebung'.[16] Where, however, Diderot had difficulty in distinguishing between true dramatic emotion and sentimental bombast, Lessing's explanatory style, the explicit reflexions of the character on his/her own emotions, still tended to hinder the depiction of these in their naturally rapid and confused course, even in his later plays.[17] Judging by his translations of Diderot and the comments on and sample translations of J. Banks' *Graf von Essex* in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, or even his improvements on Frau Gottsched's translation of *Cénie*, Lessing feels more confident rendering the emotions expressed by the protagonist of another dramatist than he does in allowing his own hero or heroine to manifest passion.

Nonetheless, Lessing is convinced of the power of language to

evoke the physical reality of passion; and sees this best realised in the works of Shakespeare. The role which Shakespeare's dramas and his dramatic techniques played in Lessing's literary discussion is, however, difficult to pinpoint precisely. When he integrates Shakespeare into his literary criticism and deliberations, Lessing does not supply us with any form of concrete analysis.[18] This, however, is not surprising. Had he attempted to subject his perception of Shakespeare to analytical discussion under his own (Lessing's) interpretation of the Aristotelian tenets, applying his own astringent views on the *Mischspiel*[19] and his reservations on confronting the audience with historical facts[20], his own aesthetic system would have been undermined. The fact that Lessing qualifies his belief that translation of Shakespeare's works into German rather than those of the *tragédie classique* would have been more beneficial to developments on the German stage is symptomatic of his attitude towards the works of Shakespeare: Shakespeare's works for Germany, but 'mit einigen bescheidenen Veränderungen'. [21]

Nontheless, unlike Gottsched's resort to tradition in efforts to rehabilitate German drama, Lessing's led to innovation. Through Lessing's efforts in particular, 18th-century Germany gradually became aware of the interrelations of European literatures and the growing convergence of their developments. Up to the mid-1700s, translations of these literatures had served three purposes: translations of French and English aesthetics had been instrumental in developing new accents in German drama; translations of plays (mainly French) had helped to re-establish a (moral-didactic) repertoire for German theatres [22]; some of the great European classics had been made available by means of partial translations or synopses, often as illustrations in support of theoretical discussion. It is in this latter group that the works of Shakespeare were introduced, which meant that, for the most part, sample translations constituted the extent of Germany's acquaintance with his actual works.[23] But this was to change, for the plays of Shakespeare were soon to become the focus of discussion of German drama translation. In the ensuing discussion there will thus tend to be a certain overlap with parts of Section II Chapter Three on Shakespeare Translations before the Voßs. The discussion here, however, is of a more general nature and should serve to underpin later consideration of the particular difficulties involved in translating Shakespeare. We shall see how different translators recognised different problems and solved them in different ways. This resulted in the development of a pool of

ideas, up to the point where A.W. Schlegel produced the definitive Shakespeare.

Cautious advances

By 1760, an *image* of Shakespeare was quite clearly evolving in literary discussion, always determined by the differing degrees of conformity with Enlightenment thought and discipline of style. Much of this German Shakespeare discussion was based on the work of early 18th century English Shakespeare critics; Shakespeare was the great genius, was sublime, went 'beyond nature'.[24] The dilemma of these critics, however, was to decide whether respect for the new classical principles of writing, i.e. rules, should modify or destroy their respect for Shakespeare, or, *vice versa*, whether the Shakespearian mode of writing, and the one now favoured, should *both* be recognised as valid. In Germany, these notions are reflected in the seeming contradiction within C.M. Wieland's perception of Shakespeare. Obviously influenced by A. Pope's approach to Shakespeare, Wieland perceives 'alle Schönheiten und Mängel der Natur' in Shakespeare's works.[25] Yet even those who admire Shakespeare's 'gigantische Vorstellungen', his characterisation and passion had to agree with Shakespeare's adversaries that his work broke every rule in the book, and his poetic diction was 'roh, und incorrect'.[26] For the literary establishment of mid-18th-century Germany, Shakespeare's 'failure' to conform to norms was disconcerting on the one hand, but represented on the other the essence of his greatness.

Judging Shakespeare through these preconceived opinions and grievances was to judge him through the poetics of the *Aufklärung* and the linguistic conventions of the day. We can add to this the prevailing Rationalist notion in Germany of form as an incidental property of poetry which required no attention in the translating process. This explains how Shakespeare could be approached, criticised and admired in Germany at this time from all perspectives concerning the *content* of his works, but not from the point of view of the shape, structure and movement that made the content what it was. This also explains why Wieland could do no other than translate Shakespeare's works into prose.[27] The alternative at this stage of development in translation theory, which, lacking the dimensions of Herder's notion of the organic unity of poetry, was still governed in practice by Rationalist principles, was to leave Shakespeare as

he was, untranslated. [28]

But even prose translation presented a challenge. Prose dialogue and ordinary characters were familiar enough on the German stage in comedy and now, through Lessing, also in tragedy. But these plays, whether original German or translations were for the most part set in a contemporary context; and for all Lessing's demands for a true expression of emotion, language and style were far removed from the vivid expression and tightly managed dialogue of Shakespeare. Wieland was therefore obliged to create his own 'Shakespeare' language, if, as he said, he did not intend to have his Shakespeare speaking German 'wie er selbst vielleicht sich ausgedrückt hätte, wenn er Garrick's Zeitgenosse gewesen wäre'.[29] The result was a completely new manifestation of German prose language; translation language which, although compared with Shakespeare's syntax and bold figurative expression was often bland, nevertheless appeared to Wieland's contemporaries overpowering and distorted. In the Eschenburg-*Vorankündigung*, Wieland himself admits that his translation language is very atypical of the prose of the day: '[...] ein Shakespear muß getreu copiert werden (sollte der Sprache dadurch einige Gewalt geschehen) oder gar nicht'.[30]

J. J. Eschenburg revised and completed Wieland's Shakespeare from 1775 to 1777 and in 1782[31]. A.W. Schlegel commends Eschenburg's success in achieving with his rendering 'mit gründlicher Sprachkunde, seltnem Scharfsinn im Auslegen, und beharrlicher Sorgfalt ... Vollständigkeit im Ganzen und Genauigkeit im Einzelnen'.[32] Eschenburg indeed translates the original faithfully, sentence for sentence, but in prose. The only exceptions are *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (which Wieland had also originally rendered in verse), songs, prologues, epilogues, masques and the witches scenes in *Macbeth*. These were all rendered in verse form by Eschenburg, as was his translation of *Richard III*. He had already almost completed this play in blank verse before he even embarked on the Wieland revision.

As we are dealing here with a predominantly prose translation of Shakespeare, we can appreciate that 'Genauigkeit im Einzelnen' has a rather limited application. Eschenburg is no exception when it comes to the Rationalist notion of form as a mere embellishment and thus superfluous in the process of translation. This is illustrated particularly clearly in his own verse translation of *Richard III*. Faithful to his principle of translating as literally as possible,

nothing is omitted, nothing is changed. Faithful to his aim, however, to make his Shakespeare rendering as clear and comprehensible as possible, he tends to amplify. This complicates the syntax and necessitates a considerable number of enjambements. The overall result is that even Eschenburg's verse reads more like prose.

But this phenomenon is not surprising when we consider his attitude to the works of Shakespeare and to his concept of the role of the translator. It is quite clear from Eschenburg's own comments that his interest in revising the Wieland Shakespeare was primarily a philological one. In his treatise *Ueber W. Shakspeare*, he discusses genius as compared with taste and accuses Shakespeare of vulgarity in his 'rohe Mischung tragischer und komischer Scenen', 'die öftere und unschickliche Mischung von Niedrigkeit und Würde, vom Ernsthaften und Lächerlichen in seiner Darstellung'.[33] Even Eschenburg's notion of "nature" is redolent of "rules". But we should still not perceive his Shakespeare translation so much in the Rationalist sense as in the ethos of the conscientious philologist. In spite of his apparently conservative, conventional attitude towards Shakespeare's drama techniques, the object of his undertaking was to provide an accurate and lucid rendering of Shakespeare plays.

Sturm und Drang

By the 1770s the works of Shakespeare based on Wieland's version and later also on that of Eschenburg, were becoming a permanent fixture in the repertoires of the German-speaking stage. Meanwhile, Shakespeare had also become the central figure in a cult of genius whose main form of literary expression was drama.[34] Up to now, each generation of German poets had felt the need to find precedents to reinforce or stimulate dramatic innovations; the *Sturm und Drang* now needed an authority to whom, so they thought, rules and precept had been of no importance. For the *Sturm und Drang* imitators, Shakespeare's freedom of time and place, his double plots and mixture of tragedy and comedy gave authority for a chaos that was euphemistically called 'ein Wunderganzes'.[35]

The rousing words in Goethe's *Rede zum Shakspeares-Tag* (1771), 'Auf die Reise meine Herren! die Betrachtung so eines einzigen Tapfs [Shakespeare] macht unsere Seele feuriger und größer als das Angaffen eines tausendfüßigen königlichen Einzugs'[36] are the plea for

drama to be released from its commitment to morals and didacticism. The main aim now is to awaken the need for protest against the prevailing conditions which have made for bourgeois (political) impotence. The poets of the *Sturm und Drang* are also committed to releasing the language of drama from the conventions of literary German. Their language of drama is almost exclusively prose, an imitation of the robust, vivid and blunt prose of Shakespeare. Their vigorous style defies syntactically complete sentences; exclamation follows exclamation; newly compounded words heighten the graphic quality of the language; syntactic inversion enhances the pathos. Everything is there that Lessing had required for that direct expression of passion - and more.[37] Reason no longer invigilates over emotions and passion.

Sturm und Drang dramatists converted various aspects of Shakespeare to their individual needs. Goethe's *Götz* has a deliberately disjointed structure modelled on Shakespeare's short, fragmentary scenes. F.M. Klinger's *Otto* (1775) lifts characters and relationships from Shakespeare's *Lear* and *Othello* (as well as names and scenes from Goethe's *Götz*), and its mode (or lack) of construction really does approach the point of chaos. The accumulative effect which J. M. R. Lenz achieves by following the technique of detached, episodic scenes, tends in some of his plays in the same direction as *Otto*. All of Lenz's plays with the exception of *Die Soldaten* are fragmented by changes in scene where not really necessary, by arbitrary shifts in level and by irrelevant interpolations. Apart from this attempted structural reflection of Shakespeare, Lenz also includes songs in his plays; in *Der Engländer*, in *Die Alten* and, most effectively, in *Die Soldaten*, Act II, Scene iii. The Romeo and Juliet motif in *Der Hofmeister* illustrates Lenz's incorporation of themes from Shakespearian drama.

Yet Lenz is also an exception in *Sturm und Drang* reception of Shakespeare. He is the only poet to approach Shakespeare pragmatically in his theoretical writings as a writer for the stage. This kind of approach is closely linked with Lenz's strong sense of obligation in his own plays, not only to awaken the spirit of awareness and protest in his bourgeois audience, but also to provide effective models for constructive action. Having dreamed the dream of *L'an deux mille quatre cent quarante* in L-S. Mercier's utopian novel (1768), Lenz finds in Mercier's dramatic theory *Du Théâtre où Nouvel essai sur l'art dramatique* (1773) a reinforcement of his own

notion of drama as a vehicle for social reform, as a mirror and projection of the whole of society, of its present and its problems.

In his deliberations on the function of the theatre, Lenz draws an analogy between the stage and life.[38] The theatre is a training ground for coping with real life: 'Was könnte eine schönre Vorübung zu diesem großen Schauspiel des Lebens sein, als wenn wir da uns itzt noch Hände und Füße gebunden sind, in einem oder andern Zimmer unsern Götz von Berlichingen den einer aus unsern Mitteln geschrieben, eine große Idee - aufzuführen versuchten'.[39] Lenz applauds Goethe's *Götz* as a cross-sectional tableau of 16th-century life with individualised characters speaking and acting in the language of their own class in society. Above all, however, he sees all of his dramatic requirements fulfilled in the works of Shakespeare. His plays represent 'ein Theater fürs ganze menschliche Geschlecht ..., wo jeder stehn, staunen, sich freuen, sich wiederfinden konnte, vom obersten bis zum untersten'.[40]

In establishing that Shakespeare's plays bring 'Dasein und Realität'[41] to the stage, psychologically credible characters - high and low, truly embedded in society, thinking and acting according to social realities, Lenz is already laying the foundations of realistic drama. In his treatise *Über die Veränderung des Theaters im Shakespear* (1776), Lenz shows little patience with those poets who see Shakespeare's greatness only in the fact that he did not observe a single rule of the stage, for they are mistaken: Shakespeare did indeed have a "plan"; unity of intention in his plotting and his characterisation: 'Das *Interesse* ist der große Hauptzweck des Dichters, dem alle übrigen untergeordnet sein müssen - fodert dieses - fodert die Ausmalung gewisser Charaktere, ohne welche das Interesse nicht erhalten werden kann, unausbleiblich und unumgänglich Veränderung der Zeit und des Orts, so kann und muß ihm Zeit und Ort aufgeopfert werden'.[42] Considering the nature of the reception of Shakespeare by Lenz's own contemporaries and the fact that even Samuel Johnson's suggestions did little to further an understanding of Shakespeare's mode of construction (*Preface* to Shakespeare, 1765), Lenz's approach must be seen as a remarkable advance. In theory, Lenz's view of Shakespeare is mature - if still limited. His strength is that he judges Shakespeare by his profound sense of the human situation, a judgement that was greatly influenced by Lenz's own social conscience and didactic impulse. Where Wieland was restricted in his Shakespeare translation by prevailing aesthetic

postulates, Lenz is hindered in his by his strong notion of drama as an effective medium in a movement for social change. Lenz's announcement of his intention to translate *Love's Labour's Lost* ('Anmerkungen', p. 363) contains words and phrases which lead us to believe that a reader-oriented translation never even occurred to him: 'Menschen, die sterben nicht *vor unsern Augen* ... Sie werden also hier nicht ein Stück *sehen*, das den und den, der *durch Augengläser* bald so, bald so verschoben drauf *losguckt*, allein interessiert, sondern wer Lust und Belieben trägt, jedermann, bringt er nur *Augen* mit' (my italics).

A further Shakespeare translation was undertaken between 1777 and 1783 by G.A. Bürger. Bürger concentrated on Shakespeare's 'popularity', on his social immediacy. This translation is of particular interest as it was commissioned by F.L. Schröder, then director of the Hamburg *Nationaltheater*. Shakespeare's *Macbeth* was to be rendered on the basis of Schröder's own stage adaptation and a Davenant-Garrick treatment of the play.[43] Apart from the witches scenes, Bürger translated in prose. As he was specifically required to regard his rendering as a text for stage performances, we should assume under normal circumstances that he would respect the original text 'in its function as one element in another, more complex system'.[44] This means, as a text still to be "translated" into stage action by the producer and the actors, and finally made complete by the imaginative powers of the audience. An analysis of how these factors actually influenced Bürger's rendering can be found in K. Kauenhowen, *Gottfried August Bürgers Macbeth-Bearbeitung*.[45] What is of interest to us here is how Bürger's own notions of Shakespeare and of translation and how contemporary aesthetics are manifested in his rendering.

When Bürger couples Shakespeare's name with those of Homer and Ossian it is as a *Volksdichter* in Bürger's discussion of *Popularität der Poesie* (1784). *Volkspoesie*, Bürger stresses, is not a genre as many have tried to prove, but a mark of perfection: 'Alle Poesie soll volksmäßig sein'. Where Herder's notion of *Volkspoesie* is closely associated with his conception of the poet/philosopher's task to maintain access to the sources of poetry, always renewing and stimulating language and ideas for the people, Bürger perceives *volksmäßig* more in terms of (folk) poetry with a particular appeal for the people.[46] Bürger perceives Shakespeare's works as being from the people, about the people (drawing materials from community life,

from local and national history, from legend and from folklore), and for the people. Bürger's own favoured form of literary expression is the ballad with its typical themes of adventure, war, love, death and the supernatural. His association of Shakespeare with Homer and Ossian is therefore not hard to understand.

Bürger's aim in translations was to achieve equivalence of effect.[47] The reader should be able to forget that he is reading a translation and imagine that this is how the foreign poet would have sounded had he been German, not what the poet's language really sounded like. Although he was translating Shakespeare's *Macbeth* expressly for the stage, this maxim still applied. Many of the stylistic devices of the *Sturm und Drang* characterise his language: a prominent or unusual positioning of adjectives; many expletives and a multitude of exclamations. The expletives (e.g. 'Hu! Welch ein Donner und Schlackerwetter! ... Ha! Sieh! ... Ho! - Lebt ihr [...]?', Bürger I, 4, p. 289) do not, as Bürger may have intended, serve to draw the German audience closer to the action on the stage: they in fact detract from the action and shift the emphasis to the speaker('s) declamation, thus lending parts of the play an inappropriate intensity. Bürger's additions to and shifts in the *Macbeth* text have nothing to do with the ambition of the *Frühaufklärung* to improve the original text in translation. Rather, it is a highly-developed sensitivity for what elements in the original text are responsible for producing the effect it does on the translator, and his ability to apply the means and possibilities of his own language to create the same desired effect. It was Shakespeare's appeal to the masses as a *Volksdichter*, as Bürger terms him, and the folk elements, which very often took the form of comic prose and banter in the works of Shakespeare, that made a particularly strong impact on Bürger. His resort to colloquialisms is an answer to a call for greater consideration of the receptive capacity of the audience, a call which also contributed much to releasing aesthetics and poetic language from their regulatory conventions. If we were to translate Bürger's *Macbeth* back into English, it would bear little resemblance to Shakespeare's play, but it would make very good entertainment for an 18th-century audience in Drury Lane.

F. v. Schiller and the idealist aesthetic

In Schiller, similar views to those of Bürger were supplanted by an aesthetic dominated by theory. One of Schiller's main criticisms of Bürger's theory and practice of *Volksdichtung* is: 'Hr. B[ürger] *vermischt* sich nicht selten mit dem Volk, zu dem er sich nur herablassen sollte, und anstatt es scherzend und spielend zu sich hinaufzuziehen, gefällt es ihm oft, sich ihm gleichzumachen'. Reverting to a position of early Classicism and Rationalism, Schiller accuses Bürger in his works of 'Versündung gegen den guten Geschmack' and requires of the ideal *Volksdichter* that he maintain only an *indirect* relationship with his reader/audience and avoid presenting any strong situations in over-animated speech. His advice to Bürger is not to forget: 'Eine der ersten Erfordernisse des Dichters ist Idealisierung, Veredlung'.[48] But this had not always been Schiller's attitude towards folk elements. Resuming the ideals of Lessing and Lenz in his own demand for a stage which conveyed to the imagination and senses of the audience *direct* impressions of moral passions, Schiller considers 'Volksgegenstände' the appropriate object of drama, as the theatre was 'eine Schule der praktischen Weisheit, ein Wegweiser durch das bürgerliche Leben'.[49] *Kabale und Liebe* (1784) was Schiller's last projection of these ideals. In 1787 his blank verse tragedy *Don Carlos* was published. The verse is impassioned but already evinces a new balance and control. This drama and Schiller's review of Bürger represent his departure along the path of Classicism and idealist aesthetics.

The above development is reflected to some extent in Schiller's relation to the works of Shakespeare. In his *Vorrede* to *Die Räuber* (1781), Schiller praises and defends the nature of Shakespeare's passion, the expression of this in human voices, his ability to catch 'die Seele gleichsam bey ihren verstohlenen Operationen'.[50] Only representations such as this can guarantee that the audience is *directly* affected in its recognition that the characters share with it the same human condition. The vivid yet pithy vignettes which Schiller paints of Macbeth before and after Duncan's murder[51], or of Lear's failing sanity and the heartlessness of Goneril and Regan[52] reflect the deep impression which Shakespeare's portrayal of emotion made on him. Although Schiller never lost sight of the impact which such scenes had had on him, developments in his own theories of drama effected a great change in his conception of Shakespeare's works.

Schiller established the essential difference between himself and Shakespeare as poets in his treatise *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* (1795). Both Shakespeare and Homer were naive poets; poet and work of art were one: 'Wie die Gottheit hinter dem Weltgebäude, so steht er hinter seinem Werk; *er* ist das Werk, und das Werk ist *er*; man muß des erstern schon nicht wert oder nicht mächtig oder schon satt sein, um nach *ihm* zu fragen'.[53] This notion of identity contrasts with the distance and objectivity of Schiller's position, who spoke *through* his characters to ensure that permanent truths of humanity and freedom were being uttered and that his characters remained representative. This was one of the reasons why he particularly appreciated Shakespeare's solution to the portrayal of the Commoners/Citizens in *Julius Caesar*. Unlike Goethe in *Götz*, Shakespeare had rapidly sketched individuals whose function was to *typify* the people of Rome. This and Shakespeare's use of rhetorical devices to represent what cannot be portrayed or expressed at first hand were elements which contributed to what Schiller considered the basic law of drama: tight coordination of all components and techniques.

In the light of such requirements, it is not difficult to understand why Schiller could not really accept the Fool or Clown scenes in Shakespeare's dramas. These represented episodic interruptions in the continuity of the concept of action. In fact, they should have fulfilled Schiller's requirement in his theories for 'Ruhe in [der] Handlung' in order that 'das Gemüt des Zuschauers auch in der heftigsten Passion seine Freiheit behalte'.[54] The effective stage presence of the Fool as an aid to indicating truths in the play and adding to their pathos and humanity should have appealed to Schiller in its function as a vehicle for objective pointers. But he preferred to recommend for Shakespeare's dramas the distancing use of the interpolated comment of the Chorus: '[Der alte Chor] würde ohne Zweifel Shakespeares Tragödien erst ihre wahre Bedeutung geben'.[55] The Chorus would provide an effective means of separating the nature of the naive poet (true reality) from the ideal reality made accessible by art. For Schiller, tragic art is a moral activity, a means of presenting truth freed from the distortions and accretions of sensual perception, a way of making man free.

In his own translation of *Macbeth*[56], he had, therefore, of necessity to forfeit Shakespeare's vivid portrayal of outer reality and integrate the supernatural and baser elements of the drama into

his own ideal reality. In *Macbeth*, Shakespeare examines evil in all its aspects, both as an objective force and as an inner cancer. The natural and divine order is disrupted before our eyes. Evil is made tangible by Shakespeare's use of imagery designed to create an atmosphere of darkness, polluted, foul air, oppressive isolation, fear and disease. Schiller takes great care in his rendering that none of this is unleashed. Schiller expressed his surprise in a letter to Goethe of 28 November 1796 that fate had played so little part in (Shakespeare's) Macbeth's tragedy and that in the final count it was Macbeth's own decision, his own responsibility and his own hands which actually brought his downfall. Schiller therefore strove to base Macbeth's tragic fall on the 'Zwang der Umstände'.[57] In his treatise *Über die tragische Kunst* (1791), Schiller affirmed: 'Ein Dichter, der sich auf seinen wahren Vorteil versteht, wird das Unglück nicht durch einen bösen Willen, der Unglück beabsichtigt, noch viel weniger durch einen Mangel des Verstandes ... herbeiführen'.[58] In the interests of this principle Schiller amended Shakespeare's "failing" and intensified the perspectives of outward influence in order to admit a degree of exculpation for Macbeth. Rather as in the Holinshed source, Schiller's witches took on the role of "Fatal sisters", simply working the oracle; chance became *Schicksal* in the German rendering; "truth" became *Orakel*. Lady Macbeth is incriminated in Schiller's adaptation in matching degree with her husband's ennoblement.

But if this attitude is restrictive, in one respect Schiller is innovative. His *Macbeth* is the first German rendering of this play in blank verse. Iambic verse had become the favoured metric pattern for Classical drama. The Classicist's particular attention to form meant particular attention to dramaturgical elements in the play; it meant fewer characters, fewer scenes and realistic details. All of these elements are reflected in Schiller's rendering of *Macbeth*, and were we to examine it as a verse rendering of Eschenburg's prose translation, we would establish that the substance of the drama had almost become another, a dramatisation in full accordance with Classical aesthetics.

Schiller's *Macbeth* represents a practical application of the final position of aesthetic theory reached by the *Aufklärung* in Germany. The poets of the *Aufklärung* had come a long way towards appreciating and understanding the works of foreign dramatists. Apart from sample translations, none, however, had attempted to

reproduce these works in German with philological accuracy and fidelity to poetic form, even though Breitinger and, to a certain extent, Lessing had expressed the desirability, Klopstock, Hamann and Herder the primacy of this approach. Poets had gradually learned that they could not judge mechanically by the rules: in criticism and comment common sense had to be applied. But common sense was one thing, poetics and aesthetics another. They could have followed Klopstock's and Herder's call for a poetic reflection of both content and form in translations or the practice of Lenz and Bürger, but it would have meant breaking the rules applicable to contemporary creative production, and these exerted the greater sway.

The Early Romantics

The strongest assertion of the poet's need to make his own laws comes from the Schlegel brothers in their *Athenaeum* definitions of Romanticism as an attempt to express a kind of universal poetry. One of the first manifestations of this *Universalpoesie* comes in the form of a tragedy (*Leben und Tod der heiligen Genoveva*, 1799-1800) by Ludwig Tieck.[59] Tieck drew inspiration for this tragedy from three sources: his own translation of Cervantes' *Don Quixote* (1799-1801) and his occupation with the dramas of Calderón; his unique fascination with Shakespeare's works and techniques; and the folk stories, popular medieval tales from which he took characters and plot for his own dramas. There is little about *Genoveva* which can be said to have been influenced by developments in concepts of drama from Gottsched to Goethe and Schiller. The tragedy knows no restrictive theatre conditions; it consists of 61 scenes requiring 28 different stage-sets. Blank verse alternates with sonnets, sonnets with stanzas of differing length and metre, but most frequently the terzina. The overall effect is a combination of Shakespeare's style and qualities of Spanish lyrical poetry.

Although verse drama had returned to the literary scene in 1787 with *Iphigenie* and *Don Carlos*, it was the drama of Tieck which played a decisive role in new approaches to translating dramatic texts. The Romantics' idea of 'Universalpoesie' removed all the restraints of a normative aesthetic, an aesthetic which would be understood by the average German reader or received by scholarly opinion. The translator, the poet could draw on whatever resources came his way, from a hitherto unparalleled richness and diversity of

possibilities. Tieck, for example, had not only incorporated in *Genoveva* the seemingly Romantic values of Spanish and English literature and an idealised medieval world, the pluralism of his style and form finally demonstrated a complete rejection of binding literary standards in favour of a freer and more personal creative expression. As a theory of translation, this is clearly a great improvement; but what kind of Shakespeare translation would it produce? It ought to lead to a much greater appreciation of *Shakespeare's* diversity; but the notion of *Treue* here, first and last, is *Treue* to the Romantic translator's own inspiration, not to the original text.[60]

The Romantic preoccupation with drama - whether it be the drama of the Ancients, Calderón or Shakespeare - might, in theory, have led to a greater understanding of Shakespeare's writing for the theatre; but it seems as though it in fact had much more to do with an ideal of art than with a grasp of dramatic form or of *Theaternähe*.[61] Drama, and most particularly verse drama, is seen as the pinnacle of poetic achievement; translation of drama as the worthiest form of literary translation. Schleiermacher, for example, excludes certain types of prose translation from the realms of literary translation right from the beginning: 'So schließt sich der Uebersetzer von Zeitungsartikel und gewöhnlichen Reisebeschreibungen zunächst an den Dolmetscher an, und es kann lächerlich werden, wenn seine Arbeit größere Ansprüche macht, und er dafür angesehen sein will als Künstler verfahren zu haben.'[62] But even where this is not snobbery, the emphasis is on the 'literary'; Most of these efforts are aimed at the cultivated, cosmopolitan reader and one able to appreciate *Universalpoesie*, and they tend to lose sight of the finite difficulties of specific theatrical requirements, or the playwright writing of the social evils affecting a specific audience in a specific age and place. Such a view could greatly enhance the appreciation of Shakespeare's subtlety and finesse; but his popular elements (in all senses), or his specifically Elizabethan characteristics, are less likely to come through in translation.

We have covered a range of theoretical approaches to drama and the translation of drama; from the didactic ideals of a Gottsched, through Lessing's innovations, Schiller's idealism and the stylistic adaptability of the Romantics. Is it any different in our present-day? Do not critics/readership also have a variety of conflicting views? As the 18th century progressed, there was a generally in-

creased awareness of the problems of translation, and of the problems of translating drama. But each school of thought seems to have illuminated *different* aspects of Shakespeare, rather than *more* of him. Let us now turn to consider how Shakespeare's work in particular fared in the 18th and early 19th century practice of translation.

III Chapter Three: German Shakespeare translation before the Voß

Wieland

As mentioned above, strictly speaking, Caspar Wilhelm von Borck's translation of *Julius Caesar* (1741) was the first Shakespeare rendering in German. Translated in rhyming alexandrines, it was carried out in full compliance with the normative rules of the day. But this rendering did little more than incite the Shakespeare debate between Gottsched and J.E. Schlegel.[1] The course of a historical process of Shakespeare translation properly began with Wieland only 150 years after the original dramas were written. In spite of the contemporary custom of making foreign classics available to German-speaking countries by means of partial translations and synopses[2], Wieland undertook to embark on a translation of the complete works of Shakespeare. Various factors contributed to this decision, not least of them being Wieland's appointment to the position of director of the Biberach theatrical society on 7 January 1761.

Wieland's play *Lady Johanna Gray* in blank verse had had a considerable success on the stage in Winterthur. This encouraged Wieland to arrange Shakespeare's *Tempest* for a stage performance in Winterthur on 20 July 1758. Wieland had already written an appraisal of Shakespeare in 'Theorie und Geschichte der Red-Kunst und Dicht-Kunst' (1757)[3], and between 1761 and 1782 was able to stage or have staged in Biberach his translations of *Tempest*, *Macbeth*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Othello*, *As You Like It* and *Two Gentlemen of Verona*.[4] He translated 22 of Shakespeare's dramas with next to no working Shakespeare library. Although various English critical works on Shakespeare had been available since 1726, according to past research, Wieland's source text was Warburton's edition of *Shakespeare's Works* (Dublin, 1747), and his sole works of reference were Boyer's *French-English and English-French Dictionary* (Lyons, 1756), later also Ludwig's *English, German and French Dictionary* (Leipzig, ^{3}1763) and Ludwig's *Teutsch-Englisches Lexicon* (Leipzig, ^{3}1765).[5] In Wieland's correspondence there is also evidence of access to private and university libraries as well as of assistance from his publishers in consulting works of reference and other English Shakespeare editions.[6]

Despite his 'Rationalist' side, like Bürger and the later Roman-

tics Wieland was initially attracted by the folk and fairy-tale elements of Shakespeare's plays. He began by translating *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in blank verse, with the mechanicals' performance of 'Pyramus and Thisbe' rendered in alexandrines. Eschenburg retained most of the songs in *Midsummer Night's Dream* in his Shakespeare rendering, and A.W. Schlegel adopted Wieland's translation of the play within the play and four songs for his own translation. Later, however, whether because Wieland overestimated his own ability, or because his enthusiasm for the project waned, he translated the remaining 21 plays in prose, reverting to verse only for the few songs he included in his translations. Having failed to render in rhyme the rhymed proverbs spoken by the Fool in *Lear* I, iv, 116-125 (Wieland renders with a vague echo of Shakespeare's rhythm only) and 137-144 (Wieland renders in prose), the Fool's song in the same scene (lines 163-166 and 171-174) is replaced by a footnote:

> Der Übersezer bekennt, daß er sich ausser Stand sieht, diese, so wie künftig, noch manche andre Lieder von gleicher Art zu übersezen; denn mit dem Reim verliehren sie alles.

He concludes by adding the original version of the song to the footnote 'damit andre, wenn sie Lust haben, mit mehrerm Erfolg, sich daran versuchen können'.[7] However, *Lear* was only Wieland's second translation. Viewed as a whole, Wieland's Shakespeare translation did not follow a uniform pattern. His early attempts adhere closely to the original text, but his later renderings evince a very free translation. The fact that he was working on *Don Silvio* and *Agathon* at the same time as on the Shakespeare translation, and his comment in a letter to his publishers written on 25 July 1764 that the Shakespeare translation was a task he could pursue 'mitten unter allen Arten anderer Geschäfte und Zerstreunungen' (sic) as it was 'fast bloß mechanisch' may be some indication of the reasons for this.[8]

But despite his initial love of the unusual in Shakespeare, and no matter whether the translation was free or literal, Wieland never wavered in his conviction that Shakespeare's dramas had 'flaws' which should not be inflicted on the German reading-public and audiences. As early as 1757 he had taken exception to the 'läppische Jeux d'Esprit', the puns and the 'pöbelhafte Scherze'.[9] Nurtured by Bodmer in Zürich between 1752 and 1759 on Dryden's, Addison's and Pope's Shakespeare commentary, Wieland obviously drew conclusions

from Pope's *Preface to Shakespeare*. Pope had drawn an analogy between Shakespeare's works and a Gothic cathedral: variety and grandeur, but with crude anomalies in construction and style.[10] Wieland thus felt justified in providing with his translation a unified sequence of what he considered to be the elements of propriety and regularity. Single lines, whole speeches, complete scenes, in *Twelfth Night* even the whole of the fifth act, were either denied Wieland's readers/audience altogether or summarised and/or severely criticised in his annotations.

Wieland's Shakespeare translation thus in many ways remained what he himself termed a 'literarisches Abenteuer', the product of an activity he regarded as 'Erholung von noch mühsamern Geschäften', a '*curarum dulce lenimen*'.[11] Reception and reviews by his contemporaries were generally negative. The traditionalists still considered that a man like Shakespeare should never have been translated anyway; the 'Shakespearomanen' of the *Sturm und Drang* criticised Wieland's Rationalist half-heartedness; authorities on the English language left little unscathed in Wieland's efforts. Nevertheless, this translation did make Shakespeare's dramas (partially) accessible to the German public (including some of Wieland's own literary colleagues) for the first time in a form which Lessing, at least, spontaneously appreciated, and Goethe in retrospect confirmed as historically meritorious. [12]

The apparent casualness of Wieland's attitude to this translation seems less like the failure to grasp Shakespeare's range than like a defensiveness against the perception that translation was beyond him. In many ways, this typifies the mixed feelings of the Rationalist towards Shakespeare: Shakespeare was a great dramatist, but his works were severely flawed in German translation by the normative approach of the Rationalists. Neither their theory nor their practical resources were adequate to cope with the task; but at least they recognised Shakespeare's stature and began to spread his fame. We must most certainly give Wieland credit for being the first one to attempt a translation of Shakespeare's works, rather than simply talking about them.

Eschenburg

The revision and completion of Wieland's Shakespeare translation which Eschenburg undertook comprised the translation of the fourteen dramas Wieland had omitted, the provision of a translation for those parts which Wieland had not rendered, either because he was unable to, or because he considered them not worth translating, and a complete revision of the Wieland rendering. His Swiss publishers, Orell, Gessner (Füssli) & Comp., came up with an extremely practical solution for the revision work. They specially bound a copy of the Wieland Shakespeare interleaved with plain white paper. Using the Johnson-Steevens and the Malone and Reed Shakespeare editions, Eschenburg compared Wieland's translation with the original, 'Periode für Periode, Glied für Glied, Wort für Wort'.[13]

It has already been mentioned that, apart from his rendering of *Richard III*, Eschenburg retained German prose for the plays. It has also been mentioned that the verse translation of *Richard III* sounds more like prose than blank verse due to the complicated syntax and number of enjambements. The prose character of the language is further intensified here by the fact that Eschenburg's imagery lacks the density and intensity of that in the original text. A brief look at the first few lines of Richard's monologue in V, iii, 178-182 will illustrate this point:

> Give me another horse! bind up
> my wounds!
> Have mercy, Jesu! I did but dream.
> O coward conscience, how dost thou afflict me!
> The lights burn blue. It is now dead midnight.
> Cold fearful drops stand on my trembling flesh.
>
> Gebt mir ein andres Pferd! - Verbindet mir
> Die Wunden! - Gott, erbarm dich meiner! - Still!
> Ich träumte nur! - Du Memme, du, Gewissen,
> Wie quälst du mich! - Die Lichter brennen blau!
> Ist's nicht um Mitternacht! - Mein Leib erzittert,
> Und kalte, bange Tropfen stehn auf ihm![14]

The distribution of one concept of thought/meaning over two lines in the cases of '... Verbindet mir/Die Wunden' and '... Die Lichter brennen blau!/Ist's nicht um Mitternacht' results in a normal

speech/prose rhythm. This retards the process of declamation and robs the passage of all of its urgency. The atmosphere conveyed in 'dead midnight' is destroyed, as is the intensity of Richard's fear in the final line of this extract. Eschenburg comments himself on his verse rendering of *Richard III*:

> (Man) vergesse nicht, daß in der prosaischen Uebersetzung Spuren jenes metrischen feyerlichen Tons zurück bleiben mußten, die hier mehr abstechen müssen, als im Original. Ich wünschte, daß meine metrische Uebersetzung Richards des Dritten auch dem Deutschen Leser, dem die englische Sprache fremd ist, das, was ich hier eigentlich sagen will, noch fühlbarer und auffallender machen könnte. [15]

This seems a strange thing to say: 'in order to appreciate my prose style better (apparently he had been accused of 'das Unnatürliche oder Schwülstige' in his prose [16]), read my blank verse translation of *Richard III*.' He was certainly aware of the weaknesses in his verse translation, but then he was not accustomed to working with verse as a means of expression in dramatic form. But more importantly, he was aware that there is more to Shakespeare's 'innere Form' than mere 'Einkleidung' [17]. Certainly, from a philological point of view, Eschenburg's prose translation is a significant improvement on that of Wieland, and although his translation was met with immediate harsh criticism, it served as a valuable aid to later translators in its (limited) meticulous 'Genauigkeit im Einzelnen'.

Herder

Meanwhile, *Sturm und Drang* poets had been revealing different dimensions of Shakespeare's work in fragmentary translations. Wieland's failure to render in German most of the songs in Shakespeare's works had caused comment, in particular from Herder, who saw these songs as the purest manifestation of English folk-poetry. Provoked by Wieland's remissness, towards the end of the 1760s Herder not only began to translate songs from the plays, he also added sample translations of lyrical dialogue from the romances and comedies, and monologues and fragments of scenes from *Macbeth*, *Hamlet* and *Lear*. These remained unpublished until 1778/79, when a selection was included in Herder's volume of *Volkslieder*.[18]

Where the songs are an integral part of the dialogue or development of the scene (e.g. *Tempest*, I, ii and V, i; *Othello*, IV, iii; *Twelfth Night*, I, i and II, iv; *Hamlet*, IV, v), Herder has translated them in context. It was not his intention to represent Shakespeare's work generally as lyric poetry or to have it labelled as folklore. Following his own dictates on the organic form of poetry, his fragmentary translations are an exemplary reproduction of Shakespeare's original text on all levels. This can be seen from the following short extract taken from Herder's translation of *Othello*, IV, iii:

Emil. Shall I go fetch your night-gown?
Des. No, unpin me here;
This Lodovico is a proper man.
Emil. A very handsome man.
Des. He speaks well.
Emil. I know a lady in Venice would have walk'd
bare-foot to Palestine for a touch of his
nether lip.
Des. [Singing]
The poor soul sat sighing, by a sycamore tree,
Sing all a green willow:
Her hand on her bosom her head on her knee,
Sing willow, willow, willow.
[...]
Prithee hie thee: he'll come anon:-

Sing all a green willow must be my garland.
Let nobody blame him, his scorn I approve,-
Nay, that's not next. Hark! Who's that knocks?

Aemilie.
Soll ich das Nachtzeug holen?
Desdem. Nein, nur hier
Steck mich noch los. Der Ludoviko
Ist doch ein artger Mann.
Aemilie. Ein hübscher Mann.
Desdem.
Und spricht sehr gut. -

Aemilie. Ich weis eine Dame in Venedig, die nach dem gelobten Lande barfuß gewandert wäre, um einen Druck von seiner Unterlippe.
Desdemone singt.

Arm Mädchen saß singend, am Waldbaum saß sie,
Singt alle, mein Kränzel ist Weide.
Die Hand lag am Busen ihr, 's Haupt am Knie,
Singt Weide, grüne Weide!
Und Thränenfluth floß ihr, die Felsen wohl brach,

'Bitt dich, mach fort, er ist den Augenblick da.

Singt alle, von Weiden mein Kränzlein muß seyn.
Komm niemand und tadl' ihn. Er gefällt mir nun so.

Nein das folgt noch nicht. Horch, was klopft? [19]

It is impossible to say why Herder omitted to translate certain lines in this passage, particularly the line *The fresh streams ran by her, and murmur'd her moans* with its beauty of both content and sound. But the poetic language of Herder's song is apt, and the linguistic and formal variety of Shakespeare's English emerges vividly in translation, even where the rendering is doubtful.

Lenz

Lenz accompanied his *Anmerkungen übers Theater* with the first German translation of Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost* under the title of *Amor vincit omnia*.[20] There is much to criticise in this rendering. Clarke is right when he observes: 'Was ihm [Lenz] unübersetzbar war, wurde nicht übergangen, sondern er setzt meist etwas Eigenes, ihm passend Erscheinendes, an die Stelle des Fortgelassenen'.[21] Lenz translated in prose. Only the sonnets and poems scattered through the play are rendered in verse. He failed to reflect the various language levels of the play: the sophistication and euphuism of the courtly language, the linguistic excesses contained in Shakespeare's parody of this; the 'scraps' from the 'feast of languages' of the village worthies. Everything is adjusted by Lenz to one level of boisterous comedy. Scenes are shortened in order to accelerate plot development. And yet particular characteristics of Shakespeare's work are strikingly well conveyed in this translation.

The original version of the following extract from Berowne's soliloquy which concludes Scene 1, Act III of *Love's Labour's Lost* is rich in imagery and alliteration. Berowne is expressing the contempt which he feels for himself and Rosaline, the woman who has ensnared him, despite his mocking attitude towards love:

> *Ber.*
> O! and I forsooth in love!
> I, that have been love's whip;
> A very beadle to a humorous sigh;
> A critic, nay, a night-watch constable,
> A domineering pedant o'er the boy,
> Than whom no mortal so magnificent!
> This wimpled, whining, purblind, wayward boy,
> This signor junior, giant-dwarf, dan Cupid;
> Regent of love rhymes, lord of folded arms,
> The annointed sovereign of sighs and groans,
> Liege of all loiterers and malcontents,
> Dread prince of plackets, king of codpieces,
> Sole imperator and great general
> Of trotting paritors: O my little heart!
> And I to be a corporal of his field,
> And wear his colours like a tumbler's hoop!
> What! I love! I sue! I seek a wife!

> *Biron* O und ich! in Liebe versunken! sonst die Geißel der Verliebten, der Büttel jedes zärtlichen Seufzers, Richter - nicht- Nachtwächter, Constabel, keifender Schulmeister der jugendlichen Regungen, o kein Sterblicher so stolz und vermessen als ich. Dieser wimmernde, gellende, stockblinde, unnütze Junge Cupido, der König schnarrender Sonnette, Herr zusammengeschlagener Arme, Fürst der Seufzer und o! Lehnsherr aller Faullenzer und Tagdiebe, Selbstherrscher der Unterröcke, Heerführer der Pflastertreter - (herunter mein Herz!) und ich der Corporal unter seiner Leibschwadron! Ich der Reifen, durch den dieser Seiltänzer seine Sprünge macht. Ich liebe, ich verfolge, ich hetze ein Weib![22]

This rendering evinces a remarkable degree of congeniality between translator and original author, an empathy which is reflected, in spite of the prose form, in Lenz's terse and vivid poetic diction, in the aptness of language; the empathy of a translator who never

loses sight of his author as a playwright. Although *Love's Labour's Lost* does not appear to have been one of Goethe's best-loved Shakespeare plays, he nevertheless comments on Lenz's rendering:

> Herder dringt in das Tiefere von Shakespeares Wesen und stellt es herrlich da; Lenz beträgt sich mehr bildstürmerisch gegen die Herkömmlichkeit des Theaters, und will denn eben all und überall nach Shakespearescher Weise gehandelt haben... Für seine Sinnesart wüßte ich nur das anglische Wort whimsical... Niemand war vielleicht eben deswegen fähiger als er, die Ausschweifungen und Auswüchse des Shakespearschen Genies zu empfinden und nachzubilden... Er behandelt seinen Autor mit großer Freiheit, ist nichts weniger als knapp und treu, aber er weiß sich die Rüstung oder vielmehr die Possenjacke seines Vorgängers so gut anzupassen, sich seinen Gebärden so humoristisch gleichzustellen, daß er demjenigen, den solche Dinge anmuteten, gewiß Beifall abgewann.[23]

These Shakespeare translations of Herder and Lenz were not motivated by any grand ambition to provide Germany with their own Shakespeare; they were merely the product of a deep admiration for Shakespeare's dramas. In undertaking these devoted tasks, however, Herder succeeded in demonstrating that prose renderings could be overcome, and Lenz's efforts caught the essence of Shakespeare's comedy and wit. Insofar, both attempts were instrumental in advancing the process of German Shakespeare translation. Bürger's translation of the witches scenes in his stage adaptation of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* must also be seen as the opening up of a new dimension of mystery and horror. Such scenes had hitherto either been cut or soft-pedalled for the German audience. We have already mentioned that Bürger's own favoured form of literary expression was the ballad with its typical themes of adventure, war, love, death and the supernatural. It is not difficult to understand, therefore, how he came to see *Macbeth* as a play, not with an all-pervading characteristic of evil, but of the eerie and uncanny.

Wieland was much on his own as far as a translation of the works of Shakespeare were concerned: his efforts represented a tentative beginning. Eschenburg was also on his own as a translator of Shakespeare, but his effort was a much more systematic one. Herder, Lenz and Bürger, although all representatives of *Sturm und Drang*, in

their separate ways, each brought significant advances in particular individual areas of Shakespeare translation, complementary both to earlier efforts and to each other.

A.W. Schlegel

By the time A.W. Schlegel decided in 1796 to undertake a blank verse translation of Shakespeare's dramas, he had, encouraged by Bürger, already experimented with a rendering of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet* in alexandrines (both of which he later re-wrote in blank verse, except for V, i in *MSND* and II, iii in *R&J*). Between 1797 and 1801, eight volumes of *Shakspeare's dramatische Werke* were published by J. R. Unger in Berlin[24], followed eventually by a rendering of *Richard III* in 1810 for his new publisher G.A. Reimer in Berlin. However, Schlegel was not to be moved to any further effort in translating Shakespeare; and his work was continued by Dorothea Tieck and Wolf Graf Baudissin. That Ludwig Tieck is associated with this Shakespeare rendering not as a translator but purely in an advisory capacity with responsibility for editing and compiling annotations is still unknown to a good many Germans. Hence they are also ignorant of the fact that it was his daughter Dorothea and Wolf Graf Baudissin who had a considerable hand in supplying the so-called Schlegel-Tieck translation.[25] Ludwig Tieck did, however, begin to translate Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost* between 1800 and 1809, but this exists in print only in H. Lüdeke's essay 'Zur Tieck'schen Shakespeare-Übersetzung'.[26]

The extent of the ignorance of these facts becomes patently obvious when we consider that H. Egbring successfully submitted a doctoral dissertation at the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster in 1911, in which he attempted to prove that 'Im Macbeth Schlegel ein deutsches Werk geschaffen (hat), das sich treu und fest dem Urbild anschließt und doch nirgends eine sklavische Abhängigkeit von dem Original verrät'.[27] The Schlegel-Tieck *Macbeth* was translated by Dorothea Tieck at the beginning of the 1830s.

M.C. Lazenby sets down the aim of her doctoral dissertation as follows:

> The purpose of my investigation was to ascertain whether Schlegel had drawn from ... earlier translations and if so,

> to determine the nature and extent of his borrowing ... I found many instances of similarities, which, taken as a whole, constitute unimpeachable evidence that Schlegel was making frequent reference to both of the earlier translations.[28] [i.e. to Wieland and Eschenburg].

U. Suerbaum goes so far as to say that '[Schlegels] eigentlicher Ansatzpunkt nicht das deutsche Versdrama ist, sondern Eschenburg'.[29] Schlegel himself admits in respect of the Eschenburg Shakespeare: 'So viel mußten wir haben, um noch mehr begehren zu können', and that the Eschenburg translation was 'genau und vollständig'.[30] Certainly Eschenburg had looked upon Shakespeare's verse as potential prose, and his aim had been to produce a perfect paraphrase. Now, for Schlegel, Shakespeare's drama was poetry, and each poetic category required reflection in the German rendering in accordance with his own principles of translation. While his work was guided by these principles, there were many resources other than the eloquence of Wieland's rendering or the painstaking philological efforts of Eschenburg from which Schlegel was able to draw: Herder's contributions to the philosophy of language and to the theory and practice of translation; the fruitful developments in German literary language - Klopstock's odes, J.H. Voß's translations of the Ancients, to name but two; the theories expounded by Voß on the art and practice of verse translation and on the significance of prosody; Eschenburg's profound knowledge of the most recent English publications on Shakespeare's dramas.[31]

But whatever Schlegel owed to earlier prose translations, his renderings represent a tremendous achievement in the history of German literary translation - particularly when we consider the problems involved in translating Shakespeare's dramas: irregularities of rhythm within the basic blank verse; rhyme; wordplay; metaphor; syntax; lexis; language levels; to say nothing of the tightly woven texture of his verse. The Schlegel-Tieck-Baudissin Shakespeare still remains the standard work in Germany, constantly reprinted, particularly, for the reader.

Yet critics and other Shakespeare translators have indicated weaknesses as well as strengths in this rendering. Possibly one of the very first critics was Wieland:

> Denn daß Schlegels gekünstelte Jamben, wobey Shakespeare mehr verlieren als gewinnen wird, wenig Glück machen, Eschenburgs Arbeit hingegen immer wesentliche Vorzüge vor der Schleglischen (sic) behaupten wird, darauf könnt Ihr sicher rechnen.[32]

Wieland's diagnosis was mistaken; but then he did have a vested interest in the Eschenburg prose rendering. Two of the later main criticisms were: deviations from the original meaning[33] and forfeiture of certain important effects in the original in favour of Romantic stylistic ideals. R. Schostack writes:

> '[...] die romantische Patina verdunkelt den Elisabethaner, Man muß nur die erotischen Stellen betrachten, die bei Shakespeare ins Obszöne gehen; die Romantiker machen daraus oft geradezu biedermeierlich anmutende Genre-Stücke'.[34]

Similarly, in his discussion of the drawbacks of the German blank verse translations of Shakespeare, R. Vollmann comments on the Schlegel-Tieck rendering:

> Während Eschenburg noch an späteren Auflagen feilte, erschienen schon die ersten Shakespearestücke in der uns allen vertrauten und eben allzu vertrauten romantischen Übersetzung ... In dieser Zeit ist die deutsche Sprache ausgereift, ... [die neue Übersetzergeneration] geht mit der jetzt erworbenen Eleganz und Finesse so selbstverständlich um, daß jede Kante glatt und jede Ecke unanstößig wird.[35]

Most of the weaknesses are in fact pre-programmed in Schlegel's own discussion of theories of translation applied specifically to the works of Shakespeare.[36] Here he confirms that iambic metre is ideal in verse drama as it '(beflügelt) den gewöhnlichen Schritt der Rede, ohne sich *zu auffallend* von ihm zu entfernen' (114) (my italics). Where the translator is not able to render the text line for line, he must still be sure to maintain the metrical balance: 'geht [der Übersetzer] in einem Verse über das Maß hinaus, so muß er es auch in den folgenden, bis er sich wieder in gleicher Schritt gesetzt hat' (117). (This juggling act is bound to involve the use of 'fillers', and result in expanding and weakening Shakespeare's original form of expression). Schlegel's most rigorous recommendation in matters prosodic and metric is that the translator 'sich vor

einer zu steifen Regelmäßigkeit in seinen reimlosen Jamben (hüte)' (117).

As to language and poetic diction, the translator should make as flexible use of the German language as possible, 'aber nie dürfte sie schwerfällig werden' (116f). Schlegel concedes: 'Luthers Kernsprache ist noch jetzt deutscher als manche neumodische Zierlichkeit', but carefully prescribes: 'Ein *ganz leichter Anstrich* des Alten in Wörtern und Redensarten würde *keinen Schaden tun*' (118) (my italics). Shakespeare's rhymes are 'veraltet, dunkel und fremd'; no British poet had mastered the art of rhyming until Pope brought it 'zur höchsten möglichen Vollendung'(115). The translator should therefore handle rhymes with his own poetic discretion (117). Where features of wordplay cannot be rendered exactly or substituted, they should be omitted (probably the most sensible piece of advice Schlegel offers the Shakespeare translator), as should any 'durchaus fremde(n) und ohne Kommentar unverständliche(n) Anspielungen' (117f). The same applies to 'bloß zufällige Dunkelheiten' (118) (a term open to interpretation and licence). The most striking comment, however, is: 'Übrigens wäre alles sorgfältig zu entfernen, was daran erinnern könnte, daß man eine Kopie vor sich hat' (117).

When compared with Shakespeare's original dramas, the Schlegel-Tieck version does indeed read like a different kind of text. Shakespeare's richly modulated rhythm has been tempered into regularity; unusual or too commonplace components of speech have been avoided; there is a prevalence of vocabulary et al. used only in the literary language of the day. Insofar, Schlegel may be said to have 'classicised' Shakespeare greatly to his disadvantage: syntax and language reflect general deference to criteria of balance and restraint which waters down the tone of the original. As M. Atkinson aptly comments: 'We are reminded ... of an arrangement for strings of a work written for full orchestra'.[37]

Nevertheless, through the efforts of A.W. Schlegel, almost half of Shakespeare's complete works became available to the German public in verse form. H. Rothe refers to the 'Anspruch der Endgültigkeit' which Schlegel's Shakespeare rendering made on its appearance. But Rothe explicitly contrasts this literary 'classic' with what he takes to be Wieland's theatrical version: 'Durch Wieland wurde Shakespeare auf die deutsche Bühne gebracht ... Schlegel (entdeckte) Shakespeare in Deutschland für die Literatur'.[38] Schlegel himself

refers primarily to 'dem deutschen Leser' in his discussion of the translation [39], but so did Wieland and Eschenburg before him. It was theatrical producers such as F.L. Schröder in Hamburg or H. v. Dalberg in Mannheim who adapted these two latter versions and cut them to suit the requirements and dictates of the German stage.

By the end of the 18th century, both Goethe and L. Tieck were demanding unabridged, 'original' translations of Shakespeare for the stage.[40] Tieck saw this need supplied by Schlegel's renderings, and in 1799, A.W. Iffland premièred Schlegel's *Hamlet* in Berlin. Goethe, as director of the Weimar *Hoftheater*, at first chose to ignore the availability of Schlegel's renderings and in 1800 put on a first performance of Schiller's version of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* in Weimar. Although Goethe did stage Schlegel's *Julius Cäsar* in 1803 and his *König Johann* (adapted for the Weimar stage by Heinrich Voß) and *Merchant* in 1806, he nevertheless saw a need to supply his own (Classicist) adaptation of Schlegel's *Romeo und Julia* for the *Hoftheater* in 1811. These two new ventures illustrate that the need for other Shakespeare translations was not obviated by the appearance of Schlegel's renderings. Goethe's and Tieck's notions of unabridged Shakespeare in its original verse form for the German stage were very different.

Schiller

On 14 May 1800 Schiller's rendering of *Macbeth* was premièred at the *Hoftheater* in Weimar, with a repeat performance on 26 June 1800 in Lauchstädt, i.e. at the height of Schiller's preoccupation with Classical aesthetic criteria. Accordingly, Shakespeare's play was subjected to a process of extreme classicisation in form, content and stage production. Schiller's starting point was prose; he based his rendering on Eckert's revised pirate edition of the Eschenburg translation, but also found himself obliged to use the original text in cases where neither Wieland nor Eschenburg had provided clear translations.[41] The focus of Schiller's approach in this *Macbeth* rendering is, however, German verse. Further adaptations were necessary to accommodate stage conditions in Weimar and Lauchstädt. These included cutting certain secondary characters and avoiding certain scene changes (the whole of Act II, for instance, takes place in an ante-chamber within the castle). It is understandable that Schiller omitted all of Shakespeare's allusions to English politics, the

Church and the Court of James I. Perhaps to compensate for this, he added explanations to make the historical context easier for the audience to understand (e.g. lines which served as a sort of *Who's Who*; definitions of the relationships of characters, etc.). While these modifications are dramaturgically desirable, they also, of course, serve to free the actions of what Schiller would consider superfluous elements and thus contribute to a concentration of the essentials. Schiller enhances this aspect of unity by rendering only what is absolutely necessary in the sub-scenes for the understanding and furthering of the main action of the play.

In order to achieve his own ideal reality, Schiller portrays the witches and the porter in a manner almost beyond recognition for those familiar with the original drama. The witches are divested of the trappings of witchcraft; he even avoids Shakespeare's use of repetition in the witches' dialogue because of its redolence of evil spells. The porter in all his roles becomes merely a hymn-singing paragon of virtue. They must all be a part of a moral world order in which each character has his/her distinct position from the outset. As for Macbeth himself, Schiller's interest is focussed exclusively on the Macbeth who, although he succumbed to evil, nevertheless shows himself throughout to have potential which is not subject to instinct and impulses of passion. Throughout the whole of the rendering, the atmosphere is grave but majestic, the language eloquent and edifying. In order to retain unity on this level, Shakespeare's prose dialogue is also rendered in verse in which classical harmony and balance prevail. Shakespeare's *Macbeth* is already a very short play and one that is known for the relentless speed of its action. The reduction in scene changes and linear concentration which Schiller undertook provided the brevity but did not reflect the relentlessness.

This attempt which Schiller made to render Shakespeare in accordance with his own theories of drama did not, however, prove a successful recipe. Reception of his *Macbeth* was mixed. His portrayal of the witches in particular seems to have provoked extremes of admiration and utter disappointment. Heinrich Voß writes to H.C. Boie on 9 April 1804: 'Sonnabend hatten wir den 'Macbeth'; er ward meisterhaft gegeben ... Die Hexen waren junge Mädchen, schön von Wuchs, und recht artig gekleidet, die eine sogar zierlich'.[42] This would seem to be an appropriate representation of the role which Schiller allotted to the witches in his rendering. K.A. Böttiger, on the other

hand, maintained that a good part of the audience would have preferred to see 'statt der drei unbeweglichen und langsam tönenden Zwittergestalten lieber drei schnelltrippelnde, vielgewandte, geschäftige Hexenmütterchen'. [43] One of the June entries in K.W.F. Solger's diary, however, reads:

> Ich muß gestehen, daß nach meiner Einsicht das Stück durch die Bearbeitung eben nicht gewonnen hat. Daß der König auf's Theater gebracht ist, mag gut seyn. Aber die Hexenscenen sind sehr abgekürzt, und, wie ich fürchte, nicht zu ihrem Vortheil. Ueberdies sind aus den Hexen große, kolossale Figuren geworden, von männlichem Ansehn, die sich langsam und feierlich bewegen. Außerdem daß nach meinem Gefühl immer mehr Phantastisches in den alten Weibern liegt, als in so edlen Gestalten, daß ferner mit diesen auch die volksmäßig schauerlichen Gesänge nicht recht stimmen, finde ich auch im Original, daß mehrere Ausdrücke offenbar auf alte eingeschrumpfte Weiber deuten. [44]

Schiller later offered his manuscript to Iffland in Berlin for twelve *Dukaten*. Iffland declined. Goethe, however, gave a second performance in Weimar on 7 April 1804, and it is at this precise point that the Voß family first enters into the historical process of German Shakespeare translation. For this was the performance that the 24 year-old Heinrich Voß attended, and on 8 June 1805 his own rendering of Shakespeare's *Othello* was produced on that very same stage.

The 18th century German translation of Shakespeare brought a range and variety of practical approaches to the task. Whether because of or in spite of their theoretical insights, German Shakespeare translators perceived and attempted to render many of Shakespeare's qualities, and collectively their achievement was considerable. But even the Schlegel Shakespeare translation, arguably the best considered so far and carried out with the benefit of accumulative theoretical insights and translation practice of more than half a century, has its serious critics. Shakespeare still presented a challenge to German literary translators.

III: THE VOßs' CONTRIBUTION

Chapter One: Their theories of translation and their translation practice

i) Johann Heinrich Voß

We have considered German concepts of translation in the 18th and early 19th century and seen how these applied during this period in the translation of drama, in particular in the translation of Shakespeare's plays. It is now time to examine the translation theories and practice of Johann Heinrich Voß and Heinrich Voß. Let us recall the different notions of 'Treue' which were developed within the discussion of translation in 18th century Germany: 'Treue zum Sinn des Originals', 'Treue zur Wirkung' and 'Treue zum Werk'.

'Treue zum Werk' (see definition on p. 35) as Johann Heinrich Voß's principle of translation practice and theory is evident as early as 1772 when, as a student at Göttingen University, he undertook a translation of Horatian odes. His ideal of a "correct" rendering which does justice to *all* of the "beauties" of the original is expressed in a letter to E.T.J. Brückner, dated 26 October 1772:

> Ich habe noch fünf Übersetzungen aus Horaz, sie sind aber noch alle zu uncorrect, als daß ich sie Ihnen schicken kann ... Es giebt Stellen, wo eine Übertragung a l l e r Schönheiten u n m ö g l i c h ist; entweder man muß umschreiben, und dann geht der Nachdruck verloren, oder man muß etwas Preis geben.[1]

This illustrates not only the significance of the original text as the "model" for Voß's translation, it also implies that he has recognised the danger of allowing one's own literary ideals to be projected into a translation. To avoid paraphrase and hence loss, and still maintain the form of the original text would mean, however, exploiting the whole of the resources of the German language and the creative use of German syntax.[2] Voß set to work energetically to assess and document what these resources were.

As a member of the *Göttinger Hain*, and thus a poet in Klopstock's train, Johann Heinrich Voß could not accept the forms of literary German as prescribed by Gottsched and the *Frühaufklärung*. It was his conviction that German poetic language resources went beyond the

narrow limits of *Hochdeutsch*. Even before J.C. Adelung's intentions to publish his dictionary were made known, Voß, J.M. Miller and L.C.H. Hölty were making plans for the compilation of an *Allgemeines Wörterbuch für Deutschland*, in which

> alle Wörter, veralterte und unveralterte, so weit es sich thun läßt, aus ihrer ersten Quelle abgeleitet, und ihre immer veränderten Bedeutungen angezeigt, auch mit den noch übrigen Wörtern im Englischen, Plattdeutschen und Schwäbischen verglichen werden sollen.[3]

Friends in Mecklenburg and Holstein were requested to collect and note down dialect idioms and words used 'unter den Bauern'; Luther and the *Minnesänger* were scoured in an attempt to put back into the language 'die alte Nerve, die die deutsche Sprache ehedem hatte, und durch das verwünschte Latein und Französisch ganz wieder verloren hat'.[4] Voß saw Gellert as the chief offender in 'französisch Deutsch' and thus hardly the right poet to choose 'seine Prosa für ein Muster der Schreibart auszugeben'.[5] Voß advances the work of Lessing, E. von Kleist, S. Geßner, K.W. Ramler, H.W. von Gerstenberg and Klopstock against that of Gellert. In calling not only for a greater lexical distinction between poetry and prose, but also for a syntactical one, Voß maintains as early as 1773 that one could be far more creative in these spheres than either Klopstock or Ramler had been, 'ohne die Grundveste der Sprache zu erschüttern'.[6]

Together with Wieland, Bürger, Klopstock and others, Voß was one of the strongest opponents of Adelung's prejudiced and restrictive principles. From 1802 to 1804, with the help of his son Heinrich, Voß combed Reformation and pre-Reformation writings, selecting lexical items to be added or amended in the Adelung and Frisch dictionaries, much in the manner already exercised in the Göttingen days. His efforts culminated in a detailed review of almost book length of Adelung's dictionaries, supporting his own theories with a review of Klopstock's *Grammatische Gespräche*.[7] Here, Voß refutes Adelung's definition of 'Hochdeutsch' as that German spoken by 'der Sächsischen feinen Gesellschaft' by advancing J.G. Schottel, J. Bödiker, J.L. Frisch and Leibniz as historical proof that even since the 17th century:

> *Hochdeutsch* (ward) allgemein die Sprache des höhern Deutschlands mit ihren verschiedenen Mundarten, wie *Niederdeutsch*

> die Küstensprache von Flandern bis Liefland, samt der holländischen Mundart, genannt; im engern Sinn aber bedeute *gutes* und *reines Hochdeutsch* die aus allen hochdeutschen Mundarten zu gemeinsamer Verständigung ausgesonderte Buchsprache.[8]

Voß's demand is for a German dictionary which orders and defines 'den ganzen Umfang seiner [Deutschlands] gemeinsamen Sprache'.[9]

Voß also points out that it is not only the upper ranks of society that define standards of written German for the nation, but 'die *guten* Schriftsteller', examples of whom, however, Voß is unable to find anywhere in Adelung's compilations.[10] Contrary to Adelung, Voß considers German to be

> gleich (dem Griechischen), eine ursprüngliche, aus eigenem Vermögen sich ergießende, im Ganzen und im Einzelnen regsame, und mit immer erneutem Zuwachs aus sich selber fortströmende Sprache,

which should never be allowed either to be conserved like an 'abgeschnittene todte Masse' or be trapped in the 'angewiesenen Damme der Mode und der Willkühr'.[11] Voß's letters from his days in Göttingen onwards bear constant witness to this notion of language as organic continuity, and he considered his own translation work as an effective means of liberating literary language from the influences of the 'immer nachwachsenden Gottschede'.[12]

Voß's early translation work was motivated by a lively exchange of criticism and cooperation with his contemporaries. Although in these early translations (Horatian and Pindaric odes, 1772 to 1773) Voß made every effort to reflect as many of the "beauties" of the original text as possible, the elaborate stanza structure and metrical patterns of these odes presented a great obstacle. Herder's comments on Voß's Pindar translations is that they lacked 'Pindars Sprache im Klangbau und Sylbenbau'.[13] Voß was aware of this. Voß had also seen that Bürger's translation of the *Iliad* (iambic pentameter) was good, but that 'die Harmonie des Hexameters verloren war'.[14] When, in 1775, therefore, Voß came to translate Thomas Blackwell's *Enquiry into the life and writings of Homer*, he did not, like Blackwell, leave the Homer quotations in Greek, but translated them into German, and in the original hexameters.[15] This translation was pub-

lished in 1776; by Easter 1779, Voß had completed a translation of the entire *Odyssey* - in hexameters. But his translation work was by no means restricted to the Classics. In 1774, he was commissioned by the *Buchhändler* Weygand to translate periodical essays from *Connoisseur, Idler, Rambler* and *World*. In 1775, his German translation *Alemberts Versuch über den Umgang der Gelehrten und Großen, über den Ruhm, die Mäcenen und die Belohnungen der Wissenschaften* was published, 1776-1777, his translation from English, *Shaftesbury's filosofischen Werke* in two volumes, in the first of which he had assistance from Hölty. In 1777, Voß and H.C. Boie translated *Chandlers Reisen in Griechenland*, and from 1781 to 1785, Voß's translation from French *Die tausend und eine Nacht* was published.[16]

Voß's first translation of the *Odyssey* was not based on a mature metrical system, so that there were some metrical and prosodic failings.[17] Voß was fully aware of these and he embarked on a systematic study of metre. In 1785, he began his theoretical analyses of the hexameter. With a now enhanced discernment of the practical potential of both the German and the classical languages, he employed analogies with music to explain the differences between the German and the classical hexameter. He illustrated the relation of rhythmic periods to units of meaning, of quality and quantity of syllables to individual concepts, their emphasis, tone and timbre. He stressed the necessity of reproducing the particular word-sounds and the metric expression of rhetorical patterns in the original text as closely as possible in translation. The results of these analyses were initially set down in outline in the *Vorrede* to Voß's translation of Virgil's *Georgics* (1789), with the translation itself as an illustration of the application of these findings. A much more detailed version of the theories was published in 1802 as *Zeitmessung der deutschen Sprache*.[18] Still applying these findings rigorously, Voß began to translate the *Iliad* and to revise his *Odyssey*. In October 1786, he remarks to his friend C.E. Esmarch:

> Vieles, was damals nur dunkles Gefühl bei mir war, ist seitdem helle Regel geworden; und ich bin nicht leicht in Gefahr, nach einem falschen Ziele zu steuern und Kräfte zu verschwenden. Die Odyssee selbst hat durch meine Arbeit noch gewonnen; und ich habe beschlossen, vieles im Versbau, was ich bisher noch als kleineres Übel dulden zu müssen glaubte, schlechterdings auszumerzen. [19]

The *Iliad* and the revised *Odyssey* were published in 1793. Whilst still working on them, Voß writes to J.W.L. Gleim:

> Homer ist, wie in der Erfindung, die den Übersezer nichts angeht, so in der Darstellung das höchste Ideal, bis auf die feinsten Grazien des Ausdrucks, der Wortfolge, des Periodenbaus, des Klangs und der Bewegung. Je näher ihm, desto vortreflicher. Ihn übertreffen zu wollen, ist die Frechheit des gefallenen Engels, es zu wähnen, seine Verfinsterung.[20]

Once more, Voß emphasises the pre-eminence of the original text and the necessity for as objective an approach to this text as possible. His 'new' method of translating which results from the metrical analyses prescribes as one of the priorities:

> Wer in gleiche Versart übersezt, muß auch, so viel möglich, gleiche Verhältnisse der rhythmischen Periode zur Periode des Gedankens beobachten; er muß nicht, wie es fällt, mit dem Gedanken bald diesseits der rhythmischen Schlüsse und Ruhepunkte, die der sorgfältige Dichter gegen einander abmaß, zurückbleiben, bald darüber hinausgehen; er muß, wenn auch die kleineren Theile manchmal ein geringes Mehr oder Weniger zulassen, doch die ganze Periode weder durch Einengung noch durch Erweiterung wesentlich umbilden; er muß, mit einem Worte, die Zahl der Verse weder vermindern noch vermehren.[21]

If the translator deviates from the original text, then the 'Bau der Periode zugleich und des Verses [wird] zerstört'.[22] This is the principle to which Voß adhered from the middle of the 1780s onwards.

Maintaining the original metre in translation to this degree naturally involves trenchant modulations in word order and in the structure and assembly of individual words. The rules which Adelung had set down in *Ueber den Deutschen Styl* (1785) were either stretched or broken in all of Voß's translations. Adelung rejected the classical metres altogether for German poetry, as they were based on language systems which constituted syllabic qualities and quantities not contained in the German language.[23] He prescribed only iambs, trochees or dactyls. Voß translated Greek hexameters into German hexameters. For the sake of clarity and comprehensibility, Adelung is opposed to any flexibility in word order.[24] Voß makes

bold use of inversion, changes parataxis into hypotaxis in order to reflect the depth and density of the original text better. He uses the participle in ways that even Klopstock had not attempted. Adelung requires that poetic expression should conform to the generally accepted German language norms.[25] Voß makes great use of compounds, particularly those consisting of noun + participle and adjective + participle. He revives verb prefixes which were considered archaic, he prefixes adverbs to coin neologisms, uses contractions of words, e.g. 'Schöne' instead of 'Schönheit', which were also considered obsolete forms. He revived many words from the Middle Ages and used many dialect words and phrases.

Voß conceded variations from the original text only where the character of the two language systems evinced too great a divergence. Where this case arose in the 1781 translation of the *Odyssey*, Voß almost always came down in favour of the German system. In the 1793 revision he makes his own language of translation adapt wholly to the language of Homer. Not only did this allow the original text to manifest itself truly through his German rendering, the translation itself was also unique in its influence on and enrichment of German literary language. T.Heinsius sums this up in his *Theoretisch-praktisches Lehrbuch des gesammten Deutschen Sprachunterrichts*:

> *Voß*, gebildet durch griechischen Geist, hat diese freiere Konstruktion in seinen meisterhaften Übersetzungen - diesen echten Werken der Kunst - mit Glück versucht, und sie dadurch gewissermaßen volksmäßig gemacht. *Göthe*, *Schiller*, *Schlegel* und andere, ... sind dem geist- und erkenntnißreichen Übersetzer in ihren Originalwerken gefolgt.[26]

Not only did Voß's Homer translations gain considerable credit, tribute was also paid to his translations of Virgil, Ovid, Horace and other Ancients. In view of the fact that Adelung's influence was still much at work and that a large part of the reading-public had a deep-seated aversion to anything innovative, it was not to be expected that Voß's translations receive unreserved acknowledgement. However, Voß's theories and practice of translation gained more and more acceptance. Several translators abandoned their own translation efforts as they thought they would not be able to compete with Voß.[27] The editor of the *Neuer Teutscher Merkur* commented on a specimen of a new translation of the *Aeneid* (translator unnamed): 'Der

Kampf mit einem *Voß* über die Uebersetzerpalme ist so mißlich und - verwegen, daß allerdings schon Muth dazu gehört, auch nur den Gedanken dazu zu fassen'.[28] F. Hölderlin expresses his admiration for Voß's translation methods. In a letter to C.L. Neuffer dated 19 January 1795, Hölderlin tries to persuade Neuffer not to give up his idea of translating the *Aeneid*: 'Laß Dich durch Voß nicht abschröken. Tritt kühn heraus, u. laß die Leute sich wundern, über den Menschen, der sich mit Vossen messen wollte.[29] Many more examples could be cited.

Voß drew approval from more august quarters, too. When Goethe maintains that there are three phases of translation which can be both recurrent and simultaneous in the same language system, he cites Johann Heinrich Voß as the initiator of the third and finest phase:

> So erlebten wir den dritten Zeitraum, welcher der höchste und letzte zu nennen ist, derjenige nämlich, wo man die Übersetzung dem Original identisch machen möchte, so daß eins nicht anstatt des andern, sondern an der Stelle des andern gelten soll. Diese Art erlitt anfangs den größten Widerstand; denn der Übersetzer, der sich fest an sein Original anschließt, gibt mehr oder weniger die Originalität seiner Nation auf, und so entsteht ein Drittes, wozu der Geschmack der Menge sich erst heranbilden muß. Der nie genug zu schätzende Voß konnte das Publikum zuerst nicht befriedigen, bis man sich nach und nach in die neue Art hineinhörte, hineinbequemte. Wer nun aber jetzt übersieht, was geschehen ist, welche Versalität unter die Deutschen gekommen, welche rhetorische, rhythmische und metrische Vorteile dem geistreich-talentvollen Jüngling zur Hand sind, wie nun' - (*i.e. in the wake of Voß's achievements!*) - 'Ariost und Tasso, Shakespeare und Calderón, als eingedeutschte Fremde, uns doppelt und dreifach vorgeführt werden, der darf hoffen, daß die Literaturgeschichte unbewunden aussprechen werde, wer diesen Weg unter mancherlei Hindernissen zuerst einschlug.[30]

And Wilhelm v. Humboldt, who is fully aware of the negative influence which imitating the rhythm and diction of the Ancients can have on the 'poetischen Schwung' of the German language, acknowledges in the introduction to his 1816 version of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* his own debt to Johann Heinrich Voß's philological efforts:

> Es ist nicht zu sagen, wie viel Verdienst um die deutsche Nation durch die erste gelungene Behandlung der antiken Silbenmasse Klopstock, wie noch weit mehr Voss gehabt, von dem man behaupten kann, dass er das klassische Altertum in die deutsche Sprache eingeführt hat. Eine mächtigere und wohlthätigere Einwirkung auf die Nationalbildung ist in einer schon hoch cultivierten Zeit kaum denkbar, und sie gehört ihm allein an. Denn er hat ... die feste ... Form erfunden, in der nun, solange Deutsch gesprochen wird, allein die Alten deutsch wiedergegeben werden können, und wer eine wahre Form erschafft, der ist der Dauer seiner Arbeit gewiß.[31]

Similar achknowledgements are to be found in the works of K.W.F. Solger and Schleiermacher. [32]

Schleiermacher, Goethe and W. v. Humboldt have already been noted as perceiving 'fremde Aehnlichkeit' through perfect identity of the translated text with the original as the highest aim in the translation process. This would explain their admiration for and debt to Johann Heinrich Voß. Voß's German hexameters (*Luise*, 1783-84) are generally considered to have been an inspiration for Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea* (1797).[33] However, although Schiller expressed his appreciation of both Voß's *Iliad* rendering and of his idyll *Luise* in his treatise *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung*, and although he and Voß personally held each other in respect, there could be no point of contact as far as their literary work was concerned.[34] Any influence which Voß might have had on Schiller's Classicist style is only likely to have come indirectly through W.v. Humboldt. [35]

How though, as we have seen above, does Heinsius come to place A.W. Schlegel alongside the Classic poets Goethe and Schiller as a pursuer of the translation ideals of Johann Heinrich Voß in his own work? For Schlegel, far from praising the 1793 version of the *Odyssey*, pilloried it in 1796 as fully 'misrathen', due, paradoxically to un-Greek Germanisation and at the same time 'Undeutschheit'; word order and syntax are criticised, Voß's attempts at neologisms considered abortive; the overall impression is described as 'moderner Pomp'.[36]

This review was published one year before Schlegel began work on

his Shakespeare translations unaided. In 1789, Schlegel was still only experimenting in Shakespeare translation under the auspices of Bürger. They translated *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in alexandrines with much of the exaggerated pathos and the *Sturm und Drang* elements with which Bürger had rendered *Macbeth*. It was also the same year as Schlegel published his essay *Etwas über William Shakespeare*. In this Schlegel again establishes the importance of a faithful reproduction of the metrical form of the original text and of moulding the contents to this. The significance of echoing 'Gang und Maß der Perioden', 'Pausen' and 'Einteilung der Gedanken' had already been stressed. Even if Schlegel did still identify 'fehlerhafte Eigentümlichkeiten' and 'Verwahrlosungen' in the original text when, for Voß, the original text was 'Schönheit' in its entirety, basic similarities of principle are still clearly recognisable. The sum of requirements which constitute A.W. Schlegel's theory of translation and his renderings of Shakespeare are considered, even today, to represent the decisive turning-point in the theory and practice of translation in Germany.[37] Yet Johann Heinrich Voß had not only supplied in 1789 a metrically and linguistically exact translation of Virgil's *Georgicon*, he had also accompanied this with an outline of his fully mature theory of translation.

This factor, together with the following development, is almost always overlooked in research into the 18th-century theory and practice of translation. In 1801, A.W. Schlegel published a second review of Voß's 1793 *Odyssey*, explaining that *this* review

> eine Stelle in der Geschichte der Aufnahme (bezeichnet), welche das Werk [Voß's 1793 *Odyssey*] in Deutschland fand, und eine Uebersicht der widerstrebenden Gewöhnungen geben (kann), die der beharrliche und seine Bemühungen immer ins Große treibende Urheber dabei zu überwinden hatte, und nunmehr wirklich schon weit mehr überwunden hat als vor fünf Jahren.[38]

A third impression of Schlegel's *Voß/Odyssey* review (1827) with a particularly hefty attack on Voß's use of the hexameter proves to be very confusing for anyone who is unaware that it is an act of pure polemic. It was principally a reaction to Voß's polemic against the Romantics in his *Antisymbolik*[39], and it was certainly further aggravated by the appearance in that same year of the last but one volume of the Voß complete Shakespeare, which contained Johann

Heinrich's rendering of *Hamlet*. Schlegel suddenly agrees to consider supplying further Shakespeare translations for a 'Pracht-Ausgabe' of Shakespeare's works based on his own original renderings.[40]

By 1801, Schlegel had completed the largest part of his Shakespeare translations. Now he concedes that Voß has indeed regenerated the original Homer text as nearly as possible, and expresses his admiration for the 'Vorrechten und Freiheiten' which Voß allows himself in the use of the German language. Schlegel even admits here that he has followed Voß's principles in his own work, 'besonders bei der Behandlung der Deutschen Sprache und des Versbaus'.[41] F. Schlegel also considers his brother to have graduated from not understanding Voß's hexameters in 1796 both to fully appreciating them five years later and even applying Voß's principles in his own translations; 'voßieren', as F. Schlegel terms it.[42] These latter remarks may help to explain why Heinsius included A.W. Schlegel in his tribute to Johann Heinrich Voß.

Johann Heinrich Voß established a new method of translation which he explained publicly in 1789, and in 1791[43], and published in full detail in 1802. It was acknowledged after reconsideration by A.W. Schlegel in 1801 and, in conjunction with their own translation ideals, by Schleiermacher, Goethe and W. v. Humboldt, amongst others, throughout the second decade of the 19th century. Yet, since then, with the exception of his rendering of the *Odyssey*, Voß's achievements have more or less passed into oblivion. Enquiries have revealed that few people under the age of thirty have ever even heard of Johann Heinrich Voß; those over sixty generally only know him if they happened to have been 'put through' Homer at school[44]; one or two people (well) over sixty will have read and still remember Voß's *Der siebzigste Geburtstag* (1781) or *Luise*. His name is otherwise forgotten by the wider reading-public. The collapse of Voß's reputation, and the influence or otherwise of polemic on his translation practice, must be considered later. We have certainly seen here that Johann Heinrich Voß's approach to translation was thorough and carefully thought out and that the wealth of knowledge and experience he brought to this approach was great. First we must consider what concepts of translation influenced Heinrich Voß.

ii) Heinrich Voß

Unlike Johann Heinrich Voß, whose translation work covered ancient and modern texts, epic verse, prose and drama, Heinrich Voß's experience was limited to translations of drama: Aeschylus and Shakespeare. Compared with Johann Heinrich, who had published exhaustive analyses of rhythm and metre in which he examined the significance for translations of the coincidence of metrical and rhetorical emphasis and patterns, degrees of stress in words and prases and sense stress patterns, Heinrich's contribution to the *theory* of translation was modest. But it was usually linked with discussion of Shakespeare's metre, style and diction. As in the case of his father, therefore, Heinrich's theory and practice of translation evolve from his recognition and understanding of the individual elements which go to make up the whole of the original text.

Two prefaces constitute Heinrich's published theories, one to his early translations of *Othello* and *Lear* (1806)[1], and one introducing the Voß complete Shakespeare (1818)[2]. Aspects of these theories are aired and tested in private correspondence throughout and beyond the intermediate years. The latter preface comprises an analysis of insights into Shakespeare's language, poetic diction and rhythm; it follows up in much greater detail and with competence born of practice, aspects which he had tentatively discussed twelve years previously. Now we have a confident and pragmatic approach to what the original text requires of the translator.

Heinrich's strongest warning to the translator of Shakespeare in the preface to the complete Shakespeare is 'nicht ohne erschöpfende Kenntnis des gesamten deutschen Sprachschazes ... ans Werk zu gehen; und zugleich alles steife, pedantische, modische, sorgfältig zu meiden' (XLI). Colourful and varied use of the German language includes minting new words through compounds: Heinrich has observed that this is often Shakespeare's method of, for example, revitalising fixed metaphors. In view of Shakespeare's accurate and honest rendering of the raw material of human nature in his characters, Heinrich's plea to the translator is to forget 'den Moder der Buchsprache' and instead 'wie Doctor Luther sagt, dem unverkünstelten Volke "fleißig ins Maul sehen", und dafür sorgen, daß das lebendig ergriffene Wort auch lebendig ins Gehör falle' (XL-XLI).

The Voß maxim that the language, style and rhythm of the trans-

lation are dictated by the original and not imposed upon it applies as far as possible right down to the word order of the translated text. Particular emphasis is laid on the exact re-structuring of the laconism and density of Shakespeare's style, in which 'Bild auf Bild, Gedank' auf Gedanke sich drängt'. Heinrich illustrates with one line from *Macbeth* the danger of interchanging parts of speech in translation. Lady Macbeth remarks of Duncan: 'After life's fitful fever he sleeps well' (III,ii,23). Schiller did not retain the word order and translated: 'Sanft schläft er auf des Lebens Fieberangst'. Heinrich comments on this:

> Der Unterschied ist nicht unbedeutend. Bei Shakspeare trit der herbe Gedanke an des Lebens Mühseligkeit zurück vor dem milden an die Grabesruhe, der, zuletzt vernommen, die Seele, wie der Balsam die Wunde erquickt; bei Schiller wird die schon überharschte Wunde noch einmal aufgerissen. (LIV)

This observation is just one example of the sensitivity and conscientiousness with which Heinrich Voß approaches Shakespeare's text. Here he was dealing with a larger syntactical structure; but the individual word and its position in the original text also have authority over the translator and his version, and this justifies, where necessary, an alien word order in the German translation. [3]

Considerations such as this can, of course, become a great problem when the translator is also committed to structuring the patterns of rhythm and metre to conform as closely as possible to the original. Nonetheless, Heinrich sees it as of importance, as implied in his view of translators who try to resolve the 'irregularities' in Shakespeare's iambic pentameter:

> [Shakespeare] an solchen Stellen, wie oft geschehen ist, mit Flickwörtern beispringen wollen, heißt seine tiefe Absicht verkennen. (LXXI)

Although Heinrich's analysis lacks the precision and volume of his father's theories, there can be no doubt that their perceptions, principles and practice of translation are very similar. Mention was made earlier of the increase in confidence and competence with which Heinrich approached this task. Compare, for example, comments in his 1806 preface to *Othello* and *Lear* such as 'Und dies ist eine von den erfreulichen Ausnahmen, die dem eintönigen Jambus etwas mehr Abwech-

selung geben' (xv), which Heinrich passes on Shakespeare's use of the caesura; or Heinrich's unwillingness to exceed the pentameter in one line, but rather make two lines and 'catch up' with the original later, a policy 'welches doch in keiner willkührlichen rhetorischen Erweiterung des Gedankens, sondern nur in einer von der Natur unserer Sprache abhangenden räumlichen Ausdehnung besteht' (xvii). He blames these latter problems for the translator on 'die englische Sprache, [die] wegen ihrer vielen einsylbigen Worte einer Kürze fähig ist, vor der die unsrige verstummen muß' (xvi-xvii). Then we have the 'kleine Unvollkommenheiten des Dichters, die zu seinem negativen Character gehören' and which Heinrich has purposely not rendered in his German *Othello* and *Lear*. These 'imperfections' are defined as lines 'wo sich die Sprechenden in der Mitte des Verses ablösen, beide Hälften mehr als ein Ganzes bilden, oder wenn der Accent des Verses hier oder da mit dem des Gedankens in eine zu heftige Fehde geräth'. It would seem at this stage that the problem is not so much Shakespeare's 'Unvollkommenheiten' as Heinrich's inexperience, since he preferred to leave these little details 'bis sie eine geübtere Hand hinwegschafft' (xviii).

These qualifying comments, which are much reminiscent of A.W. Schlegel's discussion on translating Shakespeare go hand in hand, however, with some of the essential findings Heinrich is later to elaborate. When he translated *Othello* in 1804, it was under the auspices of Schiller; when he translated *Lear* in 1805, Goethe was his mentor. Both of these plays, Heinrich informs us, are translated 'im Ganzen nach den Grundsäzen der W. Schlegelschen [Arbeit]'.[4] Certainly the most striking feature of these renderings is the regularity and evenness of the iambic pentameter verse. This is achieved by the usual means of elision or "fillers" or extra lines. Apart from one or two instances where Heinrich has deviated from the overall restrained poetic diction and rhythmic smoothness, and actually copied the metrical periods and reconstructed the phraseology of the original text, these versions almost seek to conceal the distinctive features of Shakespeare's original. A review which Heinrich wrote of Schlegel's translation of *Richard III* in December 1811[5] illustrates clearly how his views and preoccupations developed from the early to the later prefaces. In a letter to Friedrich Diez dated 4 January 1819, Heinrich admits:

> 'Freilich stimmt das Gesagte [in the review] nicht mit meiner Vorrede zum Othello und Lear; aber damals stand ich auf

> einer andern Stufe der Erkenntnis; und eine Hyperbel hat wohl jeder in seinem Leben einmal, wo nicht drucken lassen, doch gedacht'.[6]

Heinrich appears to have shifted from imitations of Schiller and Schlegel towards something much closer to his father's translation criteria.

By 1810, when Heinrich has completed his rendering of *Macbeth*, there is already a noticeable change in his translation approach, no longer talk of irregularities and omissions.[7] He appears to have recognised that the danger of making Shakespeare speak as a contemporary German of this age is uniformity, and uniformity is a heavy price to pay for readability. As Heinrich's work proceeds, he seeks more and more to reproduce the word order and syntactical movement of the original, carefully copying the alien movement of the rhetorical organisation and its rhythm. We see how far Heinrich has come since 1806 when he can now claim: 'Gleicher Räumlicher Umfang (nicht als sklavische, sondern als geistige Regel) gehört mir auch zur höhern Treue'.[8] But whereas Johann Heinrich brought very considerable philological, linguistic and prosodic knowledge, important insights into the theory and practice of translation, and had a weighty reputation as a translator, Heinrich's contribution to theory was slight. What is significant for Heinrich is his growing expertise specifically as a translator of *Shakespeare*, and his capacity to harness the insights and expertise of others as he becomes ever aware of the challenges presented by Shakespeare. As far as Johann Heinrich Voß's theories of translation are concerned, there are clear indications that the foundation of these is 'Treue zum Werk'. This is also the principle to which Heinrich adhered. The translation theories of Johann Heinrich soon came to be applied throughout the Voß Shakespeare translation, also by his sons, even before Johann Heinrich joined the undertaking. What then is also important is Heinrich's decision to draw on his father's great resources and, eventually, to ensure Johann Heinrich's central involvement in what became a major project.

III Chapter Two: Their Shakespeare Translations

i) Source texts, aids and resources

The Voßs were meticulous in their researches and use of printed resources throughout the project. The source text of the Voß complete *Shakespeare* is Johnson and Steevens, *Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare*, London, 1778; Leipzig edition, 1804 - 1813.[1] A comparison showed that the copious notes which Heinrich compiled for each drama are also based on the glossary and notes to this edition of the original plays. The notes in the Voß *Shakespeare* include explanations of German archaisms and dialect words and phrases, and a justification for their use in the translation. Volume I of the Voß *Shakespeare* opens with a *Vorrede*, also written by Heinrich, comprising a biography of Shakespeare and a portrait of his 'inneres Leben', a (critical) history of English Shakespeare editions and a well-founded refutation of 18th century German and English criticism of Shakespeare's "faults". The biographical details are based on the preface to Edmund Malone's Shakespeare edition (*History of the Stage*, 1790) and Nathaniel Drake's *Shakespeare and his Times* (1817).[2]

Although the *Katalog der Bibliothek von Johann Heinrich Voß, welche, vom 9. November 1835 an, in Heidelberg öffentlich versteigert werden soll*[3] revealed no further relevant Shakespeare literature apart from Eschenburg's prose translation, it did contain a surprisingly large amount of English classics (in English) and one or two English grammar books: S. Oliver's *Critical grammar of the English language* (London, 1825); B.F. Wagner's *Englische Sprachlehre* (Hamburg, 1800). The only English dictionary listed was a bilingual Spanish/English, English/Spanish dictionary compiled by P. Pineda (London, 1740). But they also drew very fully indeed on theoretical and practical resources available from personal contacts with contemporaries.

ii) The early stages

Heinrich Voß had been encouraged to undertake a translation of *Othello* in 1803 by Goethe [1], although up to this point, Shakespeare was known to Heinrich in the original and in translation only from private reading. In the last week of November, 1804, Voß wrote to

his friend Bernhard Rudolf Abeken in Berlin[2], 'Ich habe ... Goethe einen Akt aus *Richard III* metrisch übersetzt gebracht, der ihm viel Freude gemacht hat. Nun hat er mich gebeten, den *Othello* für die Bühne zu bearbeiten, wobei er mir helfen will'.[3] Most of the actual help, however, was given by Schiller, help which resulted, for the stage production of *Othello*, in 'wesentliche Aenderungen' to both Heinrich's translation and Shakespeare's original text.[4] Schiller modified Voß's text in three different ways: he abridged the original, he made changes in the (literary) language Voß had used, and he expurgated any 'obscenities' which he considered to exceed the aesthetic-moral tolerance of the day. An abridgement similar to that exercised in Schiller's own rendering of *Macbeth* was undertaken in Act I in particular. Modifications which Schiller made to Voß's language were concentrated on 'mangelhafte Ausdrücke'[5], and on an overall harmonising of the language so that it reflected the gracefulness and clarity required by the classicist (Voß had handed over to Schiller 'den Entwurf einer getreuen Uebersetzung'- vi). The third type of modification (expurgation) was more trenchant, and had weighty consequences for Act IV. One typical example of these offending elements will suffice: Voß comments in his *Vorrede* on Act IV, Scene i, '[Schiller] läßt mit der Ohnmacht des Othello beginnen, die Jago durch die Worte: 'Sei wirksam Arzenei, u.s.w.' hinlänglich erläutert. Wir *schließen* aus der furchtbaren Wirkung *auf* eine furchtbare Ursache, statt daß uns im Original Ursache und Wirkung, auf eine fast zu freie Art vor Augen geführt werden.' (vii) (My italics)

'Ursache und Wirkung' are presented by Shakespeare in the first fifty lines of IV,i. Their omission denies the audience an illustration of Othello's mental suffering and the diabolical detachment with which Iago induces and increases it. We witness how Othello's physical collapse is preceded by an emotional breakdown, signalled by a breakdown in the coherence of his language. Judging by similar instances of lexical/phrasal substitutions and omission, it is Iago's exploitation of language and significant play on the meaning of the word "lie" in these lines which Schiller finds unnecessary and unsuitable.[6] In the *Vorrede*, Voß termed all of these modifications 'sinnvolle Aenderungen des verewigten Mannes'. In a letter dated 13 March 1808, however, Heinrich discloses to A.W. Schlegel: 'Das Übersetzen verstand [Schiller] nicht; ich weiß noch, welche Kämpfe und Wortwechsel ich mit ihm beim Othello hatte, meine und seine Manier betreffend'.[7] In the end, Schiller lost, for the text

which Heinrich handed in for publication in 1806 was his own original, 'getreue', unexpurgated translation of *Othello*.

By the beginning of September 1805, Heinrich Voß had also completed a translation of *King Lear*, again commissioned by Goethe. Goethe appears to have performed a similar mentor function here to that of Schiller in the *Othello* translation. As, however, Goethe seems at the same time to have had a more urgent need of a stage adaptation of Schlegel's rendering of *King John* from Heinrich, Voß's *Lear* was published but never staged.[8]

G. Freih. von Vincke regrets that the 'freiere und leichtere Bewegung' which Voß 'als richtig erkannt hatte' for the language of his first two Shakespeare translations, was replaced in his later revision of these plays by an 'allzuenges Anschmiegen an den englischen Text'.[9] At the early stage, there is little evidence of Heinrich's later conscious divergence from the theories and practice of Schiller and Schlegel. He himself explains in April 1805 that this original translation work was 'im Ganzen nach den Grundsätzen der W. Schlegelschen gearbeitet'[10], and in the *Vorrede* to *Othello* that his joy would be complete if A.W. Schlegel '[ihn] ... als seinen nicht unwürdigen Nachfolger erkennte'. (xx)[11]

There is no doubt, as Larson has ascertained, that these two translations represent a reflection of Schiller's classicism and Schlegel's predominantly smooth and regular renderings of Shakespeare. Whether, however, Larson is correct in maintaining that, in the light of the above, these first translations of Heinrich Voß may be considered a 'bewußte Fortsetzung von Schlegels Shakespeareübersetzung' is open to doubt.[12] Certainly there are statements in the *Vorrede* to the *Othello* translation which beg indulgence towards those 'kleine Nachlässigkeiten ..., die ein großer Mann [Shakespeare) begeht, der nicht in berechneten Einzelheiten sondern in großen Massen vollkommen ist' (xiif). He is, of course, referring to the 'slight irregularities'[13] which Schlegel interpreted in the metrical structures, and which both Schlegel and Voß endeavour to smooth out in their translations at the turn of the century. On the other hand, however, if Heinrich's efforts do represent a conscious continuation of Schlegel's work, it would not appear to be in the same vein. For this same *Vorrede* already contains indications of those practices and observations which are soon to make the Voß translation of Shakespeare something very distinct from that of

Schlegel. Heinrich remarks on the prevalence of masculine endings in Shakespeare's blank verse and on how the use of a feminine ending or feminine caesura is by no means arbitrary (xiv). In Schlegel's Shakespeare rendering, by contrast, there is a preponderance of lines with feminine ending. Voß admires Shakespeare's use of half-lines in situations of strong emotion (xv), whereas Schlegel has a tendency to fill in incomplete lines in his translation.[14] Voß tells of how he 'borgte aus den Schäzen altdeutscher Schriften' where the German of the *Goethezeit* proved inadequate; and when these offered no solution, how he simply reproduced Shakespeare's own compounds: 'Von der Art sind *lust-dieted*, lustersäuft, *self-subdued*, selbstbezwungen, *high-engender'd*, hocherzeugt, *easy-borrowed*, leichterborgt u.s.w.' (xv). There is no hard evidence that he was influenced by his father at this stage; but these are the very aspects of poetic diction which A. W. Schlegel pilloried in 1796 in his review of Johann Heinrich Voß's revision of his translation of the *Odyssey*. G. Häntschel, a recent critic, comments on this *Odyssey* revision:

> Schon jetzt zeichnen sich Tendenzen ab, die fortan [Vossens] Lebenswerk bestimmen: er arbeitet nicht für das gegenwärtige Publikum, sondern gegen den Geschmack seiner Zeit. Leitbild sind ihm nicht bestimmte literarische Erwartungen seiner Umwelt, sondern ganz allein Homer selbst: 'Je näher ihm, desto vortrefflicher'.[15]

The 'Tendenzen' to which Häntschel refers - absolute priority of the original text over the conventions of contemporary poetic language and the creation by Voß of a flexibility, vitality and richness in German syntax and language hitherto unknown - were to bring Voß's *Odyssey* into ever closer affinity with Homer's original text.[16] These are the principles which can also be applied 23 years later to the translations of Shakespeare which Johann Heinrich Voß contributed to the Voß complete edition of Shakespeare's dramas. Heinrich, too, gradually becomes committed to these translation principles as his original conformity with Weimar and Schlegel gives way to the evolution of different values and the conscious adoption of a new approach to the rendering of Shakespeare.

It is interesting to consider in this context some comments Heinrich made some twelve and fourteen years after his time in Weimar; especially when we remember that in April 1804, Heinrich was in raptures over Schiller's *Macbeth*; in January 1805 he was over-

joyed at having 'Goethes and Schillers ungeteilten Beifall' for his Shakespeare translations [17]; in 1806, his happiness would have been complete if A.W. Schlegel only recognised him as 'seinen nicht unwürdigen Nachfolger'. In 1817, having just spent some time on yet another revision of his own *Macbeth* translation, Heinrich remarks to Jean Paul Richter, 'Wie prächtig hält Shakspeare diese [Macbeths] Zusammenkunft mit den Hexen. Sie stehen allerdings um ihn, leibhaft, gräßlich anzusehen (nicht holde Jungfrauen, wie Schiller will), sondern Weiber mit häut'gen Lippen und Fingerstummeln'. [18] On 10 July 1817, during Jean Paul's stay in Heidelberg, Heinrich writes to his parents who are visiting friends and relatives in Schleswig-Holstein:

> An meinem Heinrich IV nimmt er [Jean Paul] gewaltigen Antheil. Ich las ihm vor, während er den Schlegel in der Hand hatte, und er erstaunte über die Abweichung. Ich stellte ihn zur Rede, wie er Schlegeln so außerordentlich als Sprechkünstler hätte loben können. Er wollte mir nicht Rede stehen. Ich selbst, meinte er, hätte Schlegeln als tüchtigen Shaksperübersetzer genannt. 'Das hat mir der liebe Gott schon verziehn', sagte ich ihm, ich that es als junger Mensch nach damaliger Einsicht; ich hielt damals auch meinen Othello und Lear für etwas hochvollendetes; denn sonst hätt' ich das Zeug nicht drucken lassen; jetzt habe ich eins wie das andre geringschäzen gelernt.'[19]

Clearly, the years between Heinrich's first translations and these remarks are significant.

Heinrich himself explains in a letter to Rudolf Abeken in February 1808: 'Daß ich an den *Macbeth* gehe, könnte anmassend scheinen, da ich Schillern zum Vorgänger habe - allein Schiller hatte andere Zwecke, und hat keineswegs ein treues Abbild geben wollen'.[20] Admittedly in June 1810 he tactfully assures Charlotte Schiller, 'Mein *Macbeth* ist nicht selbständige Bearbeitung, sondern nur sklavisch treue Übersetzung'.[21] But in an unpublished, undated letter to Abeken, whose contents however suggest that it was written in late 1808, Heinrich emphasises the individual, independent nature of his translation: 'Von meinem Macbeth erscheinen nächstens im Morg[en]-blatt einige Hexenscenen, die ich für gelungen und teuflisch genug halte. Von Bürger ist nichts drin als der wiederkehrende refrain - Von Wieland - Eschenburg, dem Schiller gefolgt ist, gar nichts.'[22]

By August 1810, Heinrich has already handed to Eichstädt his review of Schlegel's translation of *Richard III*. The review takes the form of a comparison of an extract from Schlegel's rendering with Heinrich's suggested version of the same passage.[23] In an unpublished letter to Abeken dated 27 September 1811, Heinrich assures his friend:

> [...] ich stelle mich Schlegeln jetzt völlig gleich. .. Ich werde ... ernstlich an eine Übersezung des ganzen Richards gehen - dann ohne Schlegel vor mir zu haben, übersezen ... Ich begreife [Franz] Passow nicht, wenn er Schlegel's Richard 'das Ideal einer Sh.[akespeare] Übersezung' nennt. Mir kommt dieser gerade recht liederlich vor. ... In Schlegels Vorlesungen über Shakspeare ist auch nicht der rechte Nerv. Oft ist es ein zierliches Gewäsch.'[24]

Heinrich has finally rung the curtain down on a period which we might term the "prelude" to the Voß Shakespeare translation. This preliminary period determined standards for the language of literature for decades to come; overwhelmed by the attention and praise given to him by Goethe and Schiller, Heinrich Voß produced translations which reflected the literary and theatrical demands of the day rather than the works of Shakespeare. We have, however, also seen from these Weimar years that the seeds of other models of Shakespeare translation were already planted in his letters and early renderings. These also indicated who had influenced his translation ideals: the observations which Heinrich set down on Shakespeare's devices and style and his own methods of dealing with these leave no doubt that his principal maxim in translating is, like his father's 'Je näher [Shakespeare], desto vortrefflicher'.

In November 1806, Heinrich joined his family in Heidelberg, where they had moved from Jena in July 1805. Here, together with his brother Abraham, Heinrich continued his Shakespeare translations. The first fruits of the Heidelberg years were Heinrich's translation of *Macbeth* and Abraham's rendering of *Cymbeline*. Still carefully limiting themselves to texts which Schlegel had not undertaken, by 1815 they had extended these by two further volumes: Volume 2: *Wintermärchen* (Heinrich), *Coriolan* (Abraham), Volume 3: *Antonius und Kleopatra* (Abraham), *Die Lustigen Weiber von Windsor* and *Die Komödie der Irrungen* (Heinrich).[25] But the project was soon to become much bigger and much more important.

iii) The development of the project

An unpublished letter from Heinrich to Abeken (3 July 1816) gives us some idea of the commitment with which Heinrich approached his Shakespeare translation:

> Der Shakspeare erfüllt so mein ganzes Wesen, daß es mir in der That Mühe kostet, die drei Morgenstunden dem Aristophani treu zu bleiben; und Shksp. ist Schuld daran, daß ich meine Herbstreise nach Jena, Rudolst[adt] u. Bittenburg in eine Osterreise 1817 verwandelt habe ... Aber kann ich gegen die Nothwendigkeit ankämpfen? [1]

The word 'Nothwendigkeit' can be interpreted as covering three aspects of Heinrich's occupation with Shakespeare; a) his own inner urge to devote so much time to Shakespeare translation; b) the help which Abraham requires with his translations; c) the time and energy Heinrich thinks it necessary to invest in negotiations with publishers and in polemicizing publicly and privately against the Schlegel Shakespeare translation. The fact that, in addition to translating the plays published by Cotta between 1810 and 1815, Heinrich had also revised his *Lear* (1812) and *Othello* (1816) and that the renderings of *Titus Andronicus*, *Love's Labour's Lost* and *The Taming of The Shrew* were well underway by 1816[2], vouches for his personal enthusiasm and commitment. Just one quotation will suffice to illustrate both Heinrich's conscientious attitude towards his work and the extent to which Abraham relied on his help: 'Aber offenherzig gesagt: Abrahams Uebersetzung bei ihren vielen Verdiensten [...] ist zu getreu, um <u>noch getreu</u> zu sein. In Versen wie ... finde ich Shakspeare nicht wieder, der in Construktionen meistens so sehr leicht ist; wo er's nicht ist, ist's Kühnheit ... Dann sind Abrahams Ausdrücke oft zu niedrig; <u>Schuft</u>, <u>Lump</u> kommt sehr oft vor ... Mach ihn doch darauf einmal aufmerksam'.[3]

The third aspect, polemic, began with Heinrich's 1811 review of Schlegel's rendering of *Richard III* mentioned above. Schlegel never did act on the advice of his publisher, Reimer, in this matter, to find 'eine angemessene Gelegenheit, die unerhörte Unverschämtheit der Hrn. Gebrüder Voß zu züchtigen'.[4] Had he done so, it is doubtful whether Heinrich would later have restricted his criticism of Schlegel and his Shakespeare renderings to private correspondence. This criticism ranged, however, from the tactful but strategic, to

downright insults.[5] As Heinrich's confidence in his work increased, so did his polemic. His certainty that the Voß Shakespeare translations represented a 'Bühnen willkommene Verdeutschung in geistig aufgefaßter Form und in einer frischen wahrhaft Shakespearischen Sprache' was supported by the conviction that only 'prosaischen Köpfen und struppigen Romantikern eine Uebersetzung wie die Schlegelsche, die, bei Spracharmut und Geistesleere, an der äußern Form ängstlich haftet, noch immer lieb bleiben (wird)' (letter to Cotta, 31.01.1817).[6]

Heinrich had succeeded in the previous spring in persuading his father to join the Shakespeare undertaking. A decision had been made 'nunmehr den ganzen Shakspeare [zu] übersezen'. Heinrich explains to Abeken in his letter of 3 July 1816:

> Wir [Heinrich und Abraham] fühlen beide, daß wir zwar vieles leisten können, aber vieles, u. wohl noch mehr als jenes unerreicht lassen müssen. Das hat mich oft schon mit bitterm Schmerz erfüllt, nicht unsertwegen, sondern Shakspearswegen, der in der vollendeten Gestalt dastehn sollte.[7]

This combination of perfectionism and anti-Schlegel feeling gave great offence and caused immediate problems. Reinhard Wittmann describes Cotta's reaction to the Voß 'Vorsatz, auch die von Schlegel gedeutschten Stücke noch einmal in unserem [dem Vossischen] Sinne zu übertragen'[8]: 'Die spröde Konkurrenz zur romantischen, eingängigen Übersetzung Schlegels fand wenig Anklang - deshalb verzichtete Cotta 1817 auch auf die Gesamtausgabe, die ihm für 4 Carolin pro Bogen, rund 16 Reichstaler angetragen wurde'.[9] Not only did Cotta turn down the offer of a *complete* Shakespeare which Heinrich made in January 1817, he also stopped the printing of the 1810-1815 Shakespeare editions. Friedrich Brockhaus, however, thought the venture promising, particularly with Johann Heinrich Voß's participation [10], and the first three volumes of *Shakspeare's Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß und dessen Söhnen Heinrich Voß und Abraham Voß* appeared in 1818 and 1819. These volumes contained Johann Heinrich's renderings *Der Sturm*, *Sommernachtstraum* , *Romeo und Julia*, *Kaufmann von Venedig*, *Was Ihr Wollt* and *Wie es euch gefällt.* They also included Heinrich's translations *Viel Lärmens um Nichts*, *Der Liebe Müh umsonst* and *König Lear*, as well as Abraham's renderings *Maß für Maß*, *Die gezähmte Keiferin* and *Timon von Athen*. Publication of the remaining volumes (III to IX) was undertaken from 1822 by Metzler

after a disagreement between Johann Heinrich and Brockhaus over reducing the number of copies in the edition from 2000 to 1000.[11] Volume IV contained *König Johann* and *König Richard der Zweite* translated by Johann Heinrich and *König Heinrich IV, Teil 1, Teil 2* translated by Heinrich. Volume V, also 1822, included *König Heinrich der Fünfte* translated by Heinrich and *König Heinrich der Sechste I, II, III* translated by Abraham. Volume VI (1824 to 1825) contained *Troilus und Kressida* translated by Johann Heinrich, *König Richard III* translated by Heinrich, *König Heinrich der Achte* and *Koriolan* translated by Abraham; Volume VII (1825) *Othello* and *Die Irrungen* translated by Heinrich, *Julius Cäsar* translated by Johann Heinrich and *Antonius und Kleopatra* translated by Abraham; Volume VIII (1827), *Hamlet* translated by Johann Heinrich, *Die lustigen Weiber zu Windsor* and *Ende Gut alles Gut* translated by Heinrich, and *Cymbelin* translated by Abraham. All the plays in volume IX (1829), the final volume, were translated by Heinrich: *Wintermärchen*, *Die beiden Veroneser*, *Macbeth* and *Titus Andronicus*.

In volume VII, Metzler has attributed the translation of *Antony and Cleopatra* to Johann Heinrich Voß. This has led to a wrong dating of Johann Heinrich's initial participation in the Shakespeare translation. Wilhelm Herbst, Johann Heinrich Voß's biographer, records him, in accordance with Metzler, as the translator of *Antony and Cleopatra*. As this play had already appeared in 1815 in Volume 3 of *Schauspiele von W. Shakspeare, übersetzt von Heinrich und Abraham Voß*, the assumption was made by Herbst that 1814 was the start of Johann Heinrich's collaboration. [12] We know, however, from Heinrich's letter to Abeken (3 July 1816) that his father's participation began in 1816. In addition to this, Abraham himself explicitly states in an unpublished letter to Metzler dated 3 October 1825 'Das Manuscript von Anton und Kleopatra, von Abraham Voß werden Sie wahrscheinlich schon erhalten haben'.[13]

Here then, for the first time, was direct competition for the Schlegel Shakespeare renderings. The ensuing polemic was so violent that it cannot be evaluated with any accuracy until the results of the translation have been surveyed. But even before the translations were published, Solger expressed his doubts about the undertaking in a letter to Abeken, dated 23 February 1817:

> Über Vossens Unternehmung mit dem Shakspeare bin ich ganz Deiner Meinung; ich würde wenigstens die Stücke, die

> Schlegel schon übersetzt hat, aus dem Spiele gelassen haben, und ich habe ihm dieses bei meinem Besuche ... auch ehrlich gesagt.[14]

Even Abeken had reservations about the complete Voß Shakespeare, in spite of his own involvement in the undertaking:

> Zuerst sage ich Dir ganz rücksichtslos, daß ich von der Vorstellung, als wenn im Schlegel gar nichts zu bessern sei, zurückgekommen bin. Er ist oft zu glatt und seine Uebersetzung macht dem nicht immer gutierten Dichter dem Deutschen gar zu mundrecht; auch hat er unserm Wortschatz wohl nicht in dem Maße benutzt, wie ein Uebersetzer des Shakspeare es sollte ... Vortrefflich dünkt mir dagegen Schlegel im Humoristischen; denn auch in den längeren Reden, wo Shakspeare in den Zug kam, und auch in ihm nichts an Abrundung des schönen Flusses zu verlangen übrig bleibt.[15]

Nevertheless, throughout the whole of the Voß undertaking, Rudolf Abeken played a large part in supporting Heinrich in word and deed. Heinrich's and Abraham's Shakespeare manuscripts or first drafts of scenes in letters, whether revisions of translations or new translations, were always sent to Abeken in Osnabrück. Abeken read them through and returned them to Heidelberg with criticism, comments and queries where necessary. He also, however, willingly grappled with any particularly difficult parts of the original plays, always supplying in his letters to Heinrich a detailed analysis of his reading of the lines in question. The kind and scale of difficulties which could arise where the Leipzig Johnson and Steevens edition offered no assistance can be seen in extracts from their unpublished correspondence on the problems in lines 56-60, Act IV, Scene ii of *Love's Labour's Lost*. Shakespeare's text runs as follows:

> The praiseful princess pierc'd and prick'd a pretty
> pleasing pricket;
> Some say, a sore; but not a sore, till now made
> sore with shooting.
> The dogs did yell; but I to sore, then sorel jumps
> from thicket;
> Or pricket, sore, or else sorel; the people fall
> a hooting,

If sore be sore, then L to sore makes fifty sores;
O sore L!
Of one sore I an hundred make, by adding but
one more L.

Heinrich's first call for help with these lines comes in a letter dated 18 November 1814[16]: the problem lies initially only with 'sore' and 'sorel'. Abeken's reply of 24 December 1814 comes 'nachdem [er] eine Weile innehielt, um die erwünschten Hirschrufe anzusehen'. He suggests the word 'Kronhirsch' as a potential starting point for the lexical fields 'royal (hunter)' and 'game deer'. Both Heinrich and Abeken are correct in suspecting that Holofernes' lines are 'not pure nonsense'.[17] Abeken manages to work out 'die Steigerung sore = sore (wund), sore L = 50 sores, O sore L (L) = Spießhirsch'.[18] This still fails to solve all of Heinrich's problems. When he has almost completed the first draft of *Love's Labour's Lost* in 1816, these lines are still not translated. In a letter to Abeken dated 3 July, 1816, he writes:

> Ich weiß nun gar kein Mittel, das L der Hunde anzubringen, außer ich mache eine Elle daraus; aber was soll sich ellen? Nur die Zinken und Zacken des Kronhirsches können sich ellen. Abeken, ich muß, hohl mich der Teufel einen Kronhirsch haben. Nun frage ich weiter: Auf was Art und Weise komme ich zu einem Kronhirsch? Alle Jäger und Forstbeamten, die ich befragt habe - u. beiläufig gesagt: die Leute halten mich hier schon für toll wegen meiner hirschlichen Fragen: sie geben mir zur Antwort: er müßte vorher ein Gabelhirsch gewesen sein (oder auch Gabler; doch den nenn' ich nicht, aus Ehrfurcht gegen den Jenaer Theologen, dem seine Frau schon fünfmal eine Gabel vor die Stirn gesetzt hat). Und, lieber Gott, was ein Gabler werden will, muß bei Zeiten ein Spießer gewesen sein, oder ein Spießhirsch, wie man im Odenwald sagt.'[19]

Abeken had called these lines of Shakespeare 'einen verzweifelten Zweifelsknoten', and expressed his doubts about the first line in particular: 'Unübersetzbar werden die vielen P im ersten Verse sein.' The results of these combined efforts are as follows:

Prinzessin Preisvoll pirscht' und prickt' ein Wildprett
prall und prächtig.
Man nannt' es Spießhirsch; denn gespießt zu Spieß-
hirsch ward das Hirschlein. -
Halt! nicht vom Spießhirsch so hallo't! Ein Gabelhirsch
ja, dächt' ich,
Ein Gabelhirsch zum Gabeln ists! schrie drein ein klein
sein Bürschlein. -
Nein, prahlt man: prangt nicht kronenwerth die Schüzin?
Sagt denn: Kronhirsch! -
Kreuzbar! zum Kronhirsch krönen wir des alten Hirsch-
bocks Sohn Hirsch!
Hell gellt der Beller Lustgebell; dies helle L gesell' ich
Zur Kron', und goldhell ellen sich die Zinklein sechzehnellig.[20]

This example alone illustrates not only Heinrich's assiduity and conscientiousness, but also his ingenuity; this rendering is anything but, what many have termed the Voß *Shakspeare*, 'hölzern'. There is also a clear indication in his correspondence that, despite all the toil and effort, he never loses his sense of humour. It furthermore illustrates the quality and reliability of Abeken's support.

There were other consultations, too. Where glossary, notes and Abeken failed, Heinrich was fortunate in having a native speaker at hand from 1811 to the year of his death. Mr Pickford is first mentioned in a letter to Abeken dated 30 October 1811:

> Wegen 'marry, garlick, to mend her kissing with' habe ich Herrn Pickford, einen gescheiten und belesenen Engländer befragt u. zu meiner Freude erfahren, daß meine Auslegung die richtige sei. Die Stelle soll in Engl[and] sprichwörtlich sein.[21]

Curiously, Abeken is not given any personal details about Mr Prickford until three years later, when Heinrich writes:

> Ich werde noch einmal ein Stück mit einem Engländer namens Pickford durchgehn. Dieser liebenswürdige Mann lebt vor den Heidelberger Thoren mit Frau und 6 Kindern ein gar glückliches Leben. Ich besuche ihn dann und wann, und unsere Gespräche kommen gar nicht von Shakspeare weg. Da er aus der

> Gegend von Stratford gebürtig ist, und die altenglische Sprache mit Sinn und Geschmack studiert hat, kann er mir vieles erklären, wo die Lexika schweigen, und die Editionen, die zum Theil nur die Sprache in u. um London, Oxford und Cambridge kennen, auf Irrwege gehen. Ihm verdanke ich z.B. die richtige Erklärung der letzten Strophe vom Lied des Autolycus.[22]

Elsewhere in this letter, Heinrich sets out his problems with Falstaff/Nym/Pistol banter in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*; he has obviously forgotten his mention of Pickford in connection with *The Winter's Tale*. In addition, by 1822, Heinrich has found a second native speaker, a Mr. Mitchell. It is impossible to say to what extent Messrs. Pickford and Mitchell were involved in clarifying problem lines for Heinrich. Obviously, at times, Abeken was the last resort. For example, neither Mitchell nor Pickford are able to help Heinrich further in his second revision of *Othello* with the lines 'but (alas!) to make me/A fixed figure for the time of scorn/To point his slow and moving finger at;' (IV, ii, 54-56), other than to point out a similar image in the 104th sonnet: 'Meinen beiden Engländern hier, Mitchell und Pickford, ist die Stelle dunkel ... Ich weiß, daß Schiller sich auch nicht herausfand; drum ich das Bild von der Sonnenuhr ehemals ganz fahren ließ. Abeken gieb mir Auskunft'.[23]

The correspondence between Abeken and Heinrich, particularly Heinrich's letters, gives us an excellent picture of the difficulties involved in translating Shakespeare and of the deliberation and care which went into even the slightest case of semantic opacity. The way in which Heinrich deduces meanings from words and phrases used similarly in other Shakespeare plays is an indication of how familiar he was with the original plays.

There is no record whatsoever in these many letters of Heinrich's ever seeking advice on the plays which Johann Heinrich Voß translated. He merely gives us the approximate starting date of his father's collaboration, and an indication of when he finished. On September 1st 1818, Heinrich writes to Abeken:

> Mein Vater kehrt wohl nie zum Shakspear zurück, da er die schwersten Stücke übersetzt hat, u. so viel vorwärts ist, daß in jedem künftigen Bande ein Stück von ihm kömmt (im nächsten sogar zwei ...), so wollen wir beiden [Heinrich und

Abraham] schon mit dem übrigen fertig werden.[24]

No-one has ever before troubled to investigate how the Voß complete Shakespeare developed or how they approached their work. This research into the unpublished correspondence of Heinrich and Abeken has revealed that whatever else, the Voßs were highly professional in their approach to translation and that their Shakespeare endeavours were by no means the 'cottage industry' implied by Schlegel. On the contrary, they sought and received advice from a wide variety of competent sources.

III Chapter Three: Analysis of selected passages and aspects of style

i) Criteria for selection

A discussion of all of the Shakespeare plays Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß translated is not possible. An attempt will therefore be made to consider as wide a cross-section as possible, given the severely limited scope, to test these translators in their rendering of Shakespeare's range and diversity. To achieve this, key passages have been chosen which differ in style, techniques and function: monologues and dialogue from tragedy and comedy will be subjected to a detailed analysis of both formal elements of surface structure with the subcategories rhythm, metre, rhyme, euphony and, on the content level, of semantic equivalence, imagery, figures of speech, syntax, register. Further specific features of Shakespeare's style will be examined along the same systematic lines in order to test a) the quality of the Voß rendering of the passages in context and b) the degree to which Johann Heinrich and Heinrich maintain this quality across a wide range of translations.

ii) Selected passages:

a) Rhetoric, argument, multiple significance:
Macbeth, Hamlet

***Macbeth*, I, vii, 1-28.**
Johnson, Steevens et al., Leipsic, 1833

If it were done, when 'tis done, then 'twere well
If it were done quickly: If the assassination
Could trammel up the consequence, and catch,
With his surcease, success; that but this blow
Might be the be-all and end-all here, 5
But here, upon this bank and shoal of time, -
We'd jump the life to come. - But, in these cases,
We still have judgement here; that we but teach
Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return
To plague the inventor: This even-handed justice 10
Commends the ingredients of our poisoned chalice
To our own lips. He's here in double trust:
First, as I am his kinsman and his subject,
Who should against his murderer shut the door, 15
Not bear the knife myself. Besides, this Duncan
Hath borne his faculties so meek, hath been
So clear in his great office, that his virtues
Will plead like angels, trumpet-tongued, against
The deep damnation of his taking off: 20
And pity, like a naked new-born babe,
Striding the blast, or heaven's cherubim, hors'd
Upon the sightless couriers of the air,
Shall blow the horrid deed in every eye,
That tears shall drown the wind. - I have no spur 25
To price the sides of my intent, but only
Vaulting ambition, which o'er-leaps itself
And falls on the other. -

Macbeth, I, vii, 1 - 31, translated by Heinrich Voß[1]

Wär's, wenn gethan, auch abgethan, gut wär's,
Man thät es schleunig. Wenn der Meuchelmord
Der Folgen Flug einfangen könnt, und haschen
Durch sein Vollziehn ein gut Gedeihn, so daß
Der Streich das Eins-und-Alles wäre hier, 5
Nur hier, auf dieser seichten Furt der Zeit; -
Wegspringen wollt' ich über's künft'ge Leben.
Doch solche Thaten richten sich schon hier;
Die blut'ge Lehre, die wir andern geben,
Fällt, kaum erteilt, auf des Erfinders Haupt; 10
Die gleichausspendende Gerechtigkeit
Setzt uns den eignen Giftkelch an die Lippen.
Er wohnet hier in doppeltem Vertraun:
Erst weil sein Blutsfreund und Vasall ich bin,
Was beides hemmt die That; dann, weil sein Wirt, 15
Der seinem Mörder schließen soll die Thür,
Nicht selbst das Messer führen. Ueber das
War dieser Duncan ein so milder Herrscher,
So makellos in seinem großen Amt,
Daß seine Tugenden, wie Engel, einst 20
Anklagen werden mit Posaunenzungen
Den Höllengreuel seiner Wegraffung;
Und Mitleid, wie ein nackt, neubürtig Kind,
Daher im Sturme fahrend, oder wie
Ein Himmels-Cherub, reitend durch die Luft 25
Auf unsichtbarem Renner, hauchen wird
Die grause That in jedes Aug', bis Thränen
Den Wind ersäuft. Ich habe keinen Sporn,
Um meinen Plan zu stacheln, als allein
Den Ehrgeiz, der sich selber überspringt, 30
Und jenseits nieder taumelt.

For Macbeth, Thane of Glamis and now Thane of Cawdor, the first of the witches' prophecies has immediately come true. News of the arrival of Duncan at Macbeth's castle seems to present the ideal opportunity to realise the most important prediction made by the Witches. Macbeth's desire for the crown pushes nearer and nearer to the surface of his consciousness, but the idea of murder as a means of helping along the prophecy is still governed in Macbeth by reason and conscience and a sense of values.

This, his first soliloquy, reveals the nature of his mental conflict in a taut rhetorical structure: 'If ... when ... then' (l.1); the use of 'If' again in line 2; the equally firm logic in 'But in these cases' (l.7); 'First' (l.13); 'then' (l.14); 'Besides' (l.16). With the exception of the first line, Heinrich Voß reproduces in his translation all of these conjunctions and particles which serve as organisers through the rhetoric structure: 'wenn' (l.1); 'Wenn' (l.2); 'Doch solche Thaten' (l.8); 'Erst' (l.14); 'Dann' (l.15); 'Ueber das' (l.17). The translation of the first line

> 'Wär's, wenn gethan, auch abgethan, gut wär's'
> ('If it were done, when 'tis done, then 'twere well')

evinces two discrepancies. The conjunction 'If' which introduces the conditional construction serves as a semantic signal, and Voß's rendering of 'If it' with 'Wär's' forfeits this signal function. The syntactical pointer 'then' is omitted in the translation. However, Voß does compensate with a device which has a twofold effect. He reverses the normal order of 'wär's gut'. The spondee which this occasions reflects both the emphasis provided by the word 'then' and the strategically placed 'well' at the end of the line in the original.

In English the first line and a half of the soliloquy owes its compact straightforwardness to a sequence of 12 monosyllables and repetitive sound patterns. Shakespeare's use of the past participle 'done' three times accentuates one of the play's key words. Voß retains neither the passive use of the verb throughout nor the repetitive sound pattern: 'gethan ... abgethan ... man thät'. In spite of the impersonal pronoun, the use of the active voice in 'man thät' (l.2) destroys Shakespeare's expression of Macbeth's deliberations on a strictly abstract level at this point.

UNIV DUNELM

As there is a preponderance of words of Germanic origin in these first lines, it is not difficult for Voß to produce alliteration which comes very close to the original. Shakespeare's groupings here are [tw], [k], [w] and [t]. Voß reproduces [v] and [t].

The insecurity of the tough-minded attitude expressed in this first simple statement is exposed by the very terms in which Macbeth elaborates on it. His willingness to ignore the possibility of divine retribution after death is negated even as he considers it. The lines which constitute the first part of the amplification

> '...If the assassination
> Could trammel up the consequence, and catch,
> With his surcease, success; ...'(ll.2 to 4)

contains a strategic intermixture of Latinate words. This is missed in the translation:

> '...Wenn der Meuchelmord
> Der Folgen Flug einfangen könnt, und haschen
> Durch sein Vollziehn ein gut Gedeihn,' (ll.2 to 4).

Voß does, however, capture the strenuous activity implied in 'trammel up', and the energy of sound in 'catch', enhanced by its position at the end of the line, is also well reflected in Voß's choice of 'haschen'. The words 'Vollziehn' and 'Gedeihn' may, like 'surcease' and 'success' be well-matched in sound and emphasis, but even if they were juxtaposed, this would not excuse the fact that 'Vollziehn' with its reference only to 'Meuchelmord' forfeits the potential predication of 'surcease' to both Duncan ('his') and 'consequence'.

It is almost impossible to reproduce in German the aural effects of these lines, due partly to the Latinate words. The grouping of sibilants in the word 'assassination' creates a completely different effect from the varying compounds of the dull German morpheme 'Mord'. The [k] alliteration of line 3 is cacophonous. It then leads into the triumph of a further sequence of sibilants - 'surcease, success', which in turn links with and underscores the word 'assassination'.

The alliteration and assonance in Voß's equivalent lines show

that he had certainly recognised Shakespeare's intentions, but in translation the dramatic effect is greatly toned down. The [f] alliteration ('Folgen Flug einfangen', 'Vollziehn') by no means matches the harshness of Shakespeare's device. Although Voß's translations 'Meuchelmord' and 'gut Gedeihn' are each alliterative, the very close link between the two concepts is lost.

> 'But here, upon this bank and shoal of time,-
> We'd jump the life to come.-' (ll.6 & 7)
> 'Nur hier, auf dieser seichten Furt der Zeit;-
> Wegspringen wollt' ich übers künft'ge Leben.' (ll. 6 & 7)

If we take over the final word 'here' from line 5, this metaphor expressing the impermanence of life is allocated particular significance in the original as an intensification of a sequence. Voß maintains the sequence but does not reproduce the grouping of nouns and monosyllables 'bank', 'shoal', 'time'. By translating 'shoal' as an attributive of 'bank', Voß spoils somewhat the clarity and formal simplicity of the image, but the choice of words is apt.

The predominant [b] alliteration in lines 4 to 6 of the original is rendered in the translation with [z] ('so', 'seicht') and [s] ('daß', 'das', 'Eins..', '...Alles') and with [a^{i}] assonance. Where Shakespeare suggests a link between the first line and a half and 'We'd jump the life to come' (l.7), Voß also supplies a definite [v] link ('Wegspringen wollt' ich'). This echo is important as this clause is the resolution of all the foregoing hypotheses.

Macbeth's apparent indulgence in illusion is quickly corrected in his sober acknowledgement of justice on earth:

> '.... - But in these cases,
> We still have judgement here; that we but teach
> Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return
> To plague the inventor: ...'(ll. 7 to 10)

> 'Doch solche Thaten richten sich schon hier;
> Die blut'ge Lehre, die wir andern geben,
> Fällt, kaum erteilt, auf des Erfinders Haupt;' (ll. 8 to 10).

In this and the ensuing image, certain points are expressed in Latinate words, which once again presents problems for the trans-

lator into German. The boxed syntax in lines 9 and 10 appears to reflect the image in Macbeth's mind of a violent deed rebounding upon its perpetrator. This is intensified by the personification of 'bloody instructions'. The syntax is reproduced well by Voß, but the image greatly weakened by the choice of words. 'Fällt auf des Erfinders Haupt' fails to convey the relentless retaliation expressed in the original, and the article before 'blut'ge Lehre' detracts from the impact of the personification. The [t] alliteration in the original is reproduced by Voß in 'blut'ge', 'fällt', 'erteilt' and 'Haupt'.

> '...:This even-handed justice
> Commends the ingredients of our poisoned chalice
> To our own lips'. (ll. 10 to 12)

> 'Die gleichausspendende Gerechtigkeit
> Setzt uns den eignen Giftkelch an die Lippen'. (ll. 11 and 12).

The hypostatization of 'justice' consists of a past participial adjective denoting a condition or state, plus noun, governing a verb with abstract connotation. Voß has made the adjectival participle present, i.e. active, denoting a process, but consistently followed the subject with a concrete verb. The fact that Voß has omitted to translate the word 'ingredients' does not impair the metaphor. On the contrary, a rendering of this one word would have required several additional syllables and upset the balance. The near rhyme in the original of 'justice' and 'chalice' is compensated by Voß with alliteration and assonance: 'Gerechtigkeit', 'Giftkelch'. These are commendable translation tactics which result in an excellent translation.

'He's here in double trust' (l.12) begins a third statement, which, together with lines 1 and 2 and 'But in these cases' (l.7), constitutes the framework of the first sixteen lines. What, up to line 12, has been expressed in abstract terms, i.e. no explicit reference to either the murder - 'it' (ll.1/2), '*the* assassination' (l.2), or the victim - '*his* surcease' (l.4) (my italics), is now supplied with concrete details. Macbeth well knows his obligation to Duncan, and this insight sharpens his moral awareness:

'First, as I am his kinsman and his subject,
Strong both against the deed; then, as his host,
Who should against his murderer shut the door,
Not bear the knife myself. Besides ...' (ll. 13 to 16)

'Erst weil sein Blutsfreund und Vasall ich bin,
Was beides hemmt die That; dann, weil sein Wirt,
Der seinem Mörder schließen soll die Thür,
Nicht selbst das Messer führen. Ueber das' (ll. 14 to 17).

It is no longer imagery which dominates the amplification of Macbeth's simple statement, but alliteration and assonance which knits together key words. The assonance of 'double trust' is not reproduced ('Er wohnet hier in doppeltem Vertraun': - line 13), but [v] alliteration runs through lines 13 to 15: 'wohnet', 'weil', 'Vasall', 'was', 'weil', 'Wirt'. Modal and main verb are linked by alliteration in line 15: 'should ... shut'; 'murderer' and 'myself' in lines 15 and 16; 'not' and 'knife' and 'bear'/'Besides' in line 16. In his equivalent lines 16 and 17, Voß has [z] alliteration: 'seinem', 'soll', 'selbst'. [m] alliteration provides a link, albeit not so pertinent as Shakespeare's, between 'Mörder' and 'Messer'.

Without any break in syntax, at line 18 the description of Duncan's noble qualities leads into a climactic vision of the universal distress which would be caused by the treacherous murder of such a virtuous king:

'...that his virtues
Will plead like angels, trumpet-tongued, against
The deep damnation of his taking off:' (ll. 18 to 20)

'Daß seine Tugenden, wie Engel, einst
Anklagen werden mit Posaunenzungen
Den Höllengreuel seiner Wegraffung;' (ll. 20 to 22).

Having required an extra line for his translation of lines 16 to 20, Voß provides no equivalence of actual line content until line 22. His rendering of the metaphor in lines 18 to 20 of the original is, however, excellent on several levels. Although the coalescence of the simile 'Will plead like angels' is not retained, the position of 'wie Engel' as a qualifier of the word 'Tugenden' echoes the parenthesis ('trumpet-tongued') and allows for a reproduction of

the run-on-lines. These accommodate the strategic positioning of significant words ('virtues', 'The deep damnation'). Although there is only coincidence of position in 'Den Höllengreuel', it is commendable that Voß has allocated a prominent place to 'Posaunenzungen' in line 21, as this compensates in part for the juxtaposition of 'angels' and 'trumpet-tongued' in the original.

'Höllengreuel' and 'Wegraffung' promise to lead us into the tumult of Macbeth's mind, but the result is disappointing. The rapid succession with which the images now follow reveals that Macbeth himself is equally horrified. The fusion of helpless innocence with violent cosmic power evokes an apocalyptic vision, suffused with implications of the Last Judgement and that spiritual retribution which Macbeth scorned earlier in the soliloquy.

> 'And pity, like a naked new-born babe,
> Striding the blast, or heaven's cherubim, hors'd
> Upon the sightless couriers of the air,' (ll. 21 to 23)

> 'Und Mitleid, wie ein nackt, neubürtig Kind,
> Daher im Sturme fahrend, oder wie
> Ein Himmels-Cherub, reitend durch die Luft
> Auf unsichtbarem Renner, ...' (ll. 23 to 26).

Unfortunately, Voß's translation loses impetus at times. The dynamic inherent in 'striding the blast' is neither accurately nor adequately reproduced by 'Daher im Sturme fahrend'. The word 'striding' evokes a far wilder, more purposive image than what in translation simply amounts to 'riding along', a term which is neither metaphorical nor evocative. The incorporation of the word 'sprengend' or 'rittlings', for example, would have improved the image both in sound and sense. The shift in line content in the translation has also made it impossible for Voß to reproduce the prominent position of Shakespeare's 'hors'd'. It is the final, stressed word of an eleven syllable line, and an elision of the past participle. Various arguments disqualify Voß's use of the word 'reitend' here. 'Striding' and 'hors'd' are synonymous, but the latter implies a state or position in contrast to the vigour suggested in the present participle 'striding'. Voß would have achieved more accuracy here if he had exchanged 'fahrend' and 'reitend', even at the expense of the proximity of 'reitend' and 'Renner' and alliteration.

But the use of two present participles is still inept, as they represent parallels which, in turn, tend to harmonise the image rather than contribute to creating a scene of apocalyptic intensity.

> 'Shall blow the horrid deed in every eye,
> That tears shall drown the wind. ...' (ll. 24 and 25)

> '...,hauchen wird
> Die grause That in jedes Aug', bis Thränen
> Den Wind ersäuft. ...' (ll. 26 to 28).

The more conventional passive structure 'drowned in tears' is rendered in the active voice by Shakespeare in line 25 to create the poetic metaphor 'tears shall drown the wind'. It is hard to explain how the grammatical error in Voß's translation 'bis Thräne*n*/Den Wind ersäuf*t*' (my italics) was overlooked during his otherwise thorough revision of the drama in 1817/1818. As 'ersäuft', a strong verb, cannot conceivably represent an ellipsis for the present perfect, the error must lie in the word 'Thränen'. Had he added a sixth iambic foot instead of the spondee on 'Thränen', the syllables in 'Thränenflut' would have claimed the same duration in metre, and the subject would have agreed in number with the verb.

Shakespeare's creation of this vision is inimitable in the totality of its sound effects. Not only does the onomatopoeia of words like 'trumpet-tongued', 'striding', 'blast' and 'blow' contribute to the impact of the images. The euphony of 'naked new-born babe' and 'heaven's cherubim' contrasts with the harder 'striding' and 'hors'd', 'sightless couriers' and 'horrid deed'. The [t] alliteration of 'trumpet-tongued' links with 'taking-off' and 'tears', the [d] alliteration and long-vowel assonance of 'deep damnation' with 'horrid deed' and 'drown'. All these elements combine in a masterly phonopoeia.

Although Voß has again shown a clear awareness of these devices, the effect created in his translation represents a considerable toning down of the images. The words 'Wegraffung' and 'hauchen' are onomatopoeic. [gR] alliteration links 'Höllengreuel' and 'grause That'; [t], 'That' and 'Thränen', [R], 'reitend' and 'Renner'. The [a^{u}] assonance intensifies 'hauchen' and 'Aug''. The alliteration in 'nackt, neubürtig Kind' though produces an effect quite contrary to that in the original. The number of syllables may correspond with

the English text, but the combination of the single syllabled elision 'nackt' and the [k] alliteration results in an inept harshness. Yet where Shakespeare has achieved a harder sound to evoke the image of violence, Voß's environment is much more benevolent. The preponderance of long vowel sounds, the frequent occurrence of the sonorants [R], [m] and [l] and the soft tones of 'daher', 'fahrend', 'Luft', 'hauchen' are rather drowsily pleasing and virtually obliterate the dramatic effect of the original.

The surreal horror of these lines has already brought home to Macbeth the realisation that he is not the man to commit murder. Although the concrete argument has been left behind by line 18, Macbeth's conclusion renews the practical vein in which he had begun:

> '...- I have no spur
> To prick the sides of my intent, but only
> Vaulting ambition, which o'er-leaps itself
> And falls on the other. -' (ll. 25 to 28)

> '.... Ich habe keinen Sporn,
> Um meinen Plan zu stacheln, als allein
> Den Ehrgeiz, der sich selber überspringt,
> Und jenseits nieder taumelt.' (ll. 28 to 31).

The image of horse and rider which forms the basis of the expression of ambition as the only incentive for Duncan's murder just glimpses through Voß's rendering of these lines. The density of meaning attained by means of Shakespeare's wordplay on 'spur' and the ensuing animation ('prick the sides of') of the abstract noun 'intent' defies any wholly equivalent translation. A decision must be made here either in favour of formal equivalence and semantic losses, or contrived semantic equivalence and deviating form. Voß sensibly decided on the former. He has had to forfeit 'the sides of' (l.26) and 'vaulting' (l.27) in his translation, whereby the play on the word 'vaulting' cannot be realised in German in any case. In doing this, he has gained almost identical metre and the enjambement in lines 29/30. It is particularly important to retain this run-on-line for the positioning of the keywords 'allein' and 'Ehrgeiz'. The expression '... only/Vaulting ambition' is strategically placed as it indicates that Macbeth recognises the insignificance of earthly ambition when compared with the spiritual forces unleashed in his

imagination.

The reflective, probing nature of this passage and the close weaving of syntactical devices defy a regular metrical flow. Successive heavy syllables pick out important words in the argument as well as the pointers through the rhetorical organisation. It is important to note that up to line 16 the soliloquy consists of only three sentences. This is a device with which Shakespeare expresses Macbeth's intellect and simultaneously contrasts his mode of speech with that of Lady Macbeth. These large syntactical units are, however, broken up by altogether eight caesuras, denoted either by a semi-colon or a colon. Five of these caesuras are followed by an enjambement (lines 2, 4, 8, 10 and 16). The result is a formal expression of the fitful movement of Macbeth's probing thoughts. The half-lines after the caesuras commence a new association, or modification of one past, which then usually runs its course for a further full line, reaching an early conclusion at the next caesura. The enjambements allow a strategic positioning at either the beginning or the end of the run-on-line for words of particular significance: 'assassination' (line 2), 'blow' (line 4), 'bloody' (line 9), 'to plague', 'justice' (line 10).

Of these first sixteen lines, eleven deviate in metre from the iambic pentameter: lines 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 16. In lines 16 to 20, probing thoughts no longer necessitate the medial caesura; Macbeth's recollection of Duncan's virtues is only too clear. Predominantly regular iambic pentameter and four successive run-on-lines support this. '..., that his virtues' (line 18), which leads into the climax of a metaphorical cascade, is, however, allotted an anapaest and spondee. Syntax and rhythm are restless as the images of Pity appear in line 21. '... like a naked' has an anapaest; line 22 opens with a metrical inversion on 'Striding the blast' and ends with a spondee on the eleventh syllable 'hors'd'. The rhythm is accelerated by the enjambement in lines 22/23, but then subsides into iambic pentameter as the verb of the subject 'Pity' concludes the image with a metaphor depicting the consequences in lines 24 and 25.

When Macbeth finally once more considers himself and his intentions, the renewed device of the medial caesura introduces a note of resignation. The iambic pentameter follows through from line 24 into the metaphor 'I have no spur/To prick the sides of my intent'. After

a feminine ending in line 26, 'Vaulting ambition, which o'er-leaps' is expressed by a dactyl, an iamb and an anapaest, and 'on the o(ther)' (line 28) by an anapaest.

Voß has not adhered entirely to the formal pattern of the original first sixteen lines. He ends the first caesura (line 2) with a full-stop, thus creating four larger syntactical units. In line 4 he ignores the caesura and attaches a clause of result to the previous clause: 'Durch sein Vollziehn ein gut Gedeihn, so daß/Der Streich das Eins-und-Alles wäre hier'. Instead of expressing a new association in the thoughts of a man speaking under pressure, Voß's Macbeth is already voicing logical conclusions. The flow is again interrupted abruptly in line 6 of the translation, where Macbeth's deliberations on transitory earthly success come to a halt with a semi-colon. This isolates the ensuing resolution 'Wegspringen wollt' ich übers künft'ge Leben' from its foregoing hypotheses. This main clause takes up a full line of translation.

It is now no longer possible before line 15 (line 14 of the original) to render in translation the medial caesuras and thus the expression of Shakespeare's formal device to cross-set the rhetorical pattern against the pentameter. Three enjambements in the German do, however, coincide with those of the original: lines 1, 3 and 11; Shakespeare's lines 1, 3 and 10. With the exception of 'Der Streich' (beginning of line 5, Shakespeare's 'blow', end of line 4), the position in translation of words of significance corresponds exactly with that of the original.

Significant words in the argument and the rhetorical pointers have been emphasised throughout in the metre of the translation. In the first seventeen lines, ten lines deviate in meter: lines 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15 and 17, whereby in lines 1, 2, 14, 15 and 17 there is almost identical correspondence with the original in both line content and irregularity of metre. In lines 17 to 22, Voß retains for the most part the regular iambic pentameter to express the 'clarity' of Duncan's reign, and three of the enjambements are reproduced which coincide with the original: lines 17/18, 20/21 and 21/22. There is no variation in metre to correspond with 'that his virtues' and thus no metrical echo of the gradual upsurge of the imagery. However, an inversion and a dactyl are used to counterpoint 'Anklagen' (line 21) and 'Wegraffung' (line 22) respectively.

Voß does vary the rhythm of the images of Pity. Line 23 corresponds in metre exactly with line 21 of the original. The metrical inversion at the beginning of line 22 of the original is rendered by Voß in line 24 with a spondee: 'fahrend'. But he does not succeed in conveying rhythmically the crowding of images and the impact of the real climax, the vision of 'heaven's cherubim'.

The steady movement of Macbeth's conclusion is reproduced in lines 28 and 29 of the translation. Although the syntactical balance of line 27 of the original is not echoed, the word 'Ehrgeiz' (line 30) is rendered with a spondee. An anapaest follows, as in the original text, on 'der sich sel(ber)'. The conclusion of the last half-line with a spondee on 'taumelt' wrongly lends the soliloquy an air of finality. The abrupt interruption in mid-sentence is not only denoted in the original by Shakespeare's "missing" word 'side', it is also conveyed by the final unstressed syllable.

Although Voß found it necessary to forfeit a number of the medial caesuras, he has taken care to reflect irregularities in metre whenever feasible, so that the movement in the first half of the German text is often well-reflected. In the main, his rendering of this monologue reveals the sensibility of a good translator. His understanding of the English text is thorough and he has a fine feeling for the stylistic devices and metaphorical elements of the original. Wherever possible, he has reproduced Shakespeare's word order and still managed in several cases to create a metaphor of poetic effect. He has certainly recognised the significance of alliteration and assonance in linking concepts within the text, even if it was not always possible to reproduce these features. The weakest part of the translation is without doubt Macbeth's vision. Where Voß otherwise shows no tendency whatsoever towards polishing and smoothing out Shakespeare's text in translation, his rendering here manifests a definite lack of substance. We should not, however, forget that Heinrichs's translation of *Macbeth* was the first attempt after Schiller's translation to render both form and content in German. It was not followed with any notability until the beginning of the 1830s when D. Tieck translated the play for the Schlegel/Tieck *Shakespeare*.

Hamlet, I. ii. 1-16
Johnson, Steevens et al., Leipsic, 1833

Though yet of Hamlet our dear brother's death
The memory be green; and that it us befitted
To bear our hearts in grief, and our whole kingdom
To be contracted in one brow of woe;
Yet so far hath discretion fought with nature, 5
That we with wisest sorrow think on him,
Together with remembrance of ourselves.
Therefore our sometime sister, now our queen,
The imperial jointress of this warlike state,
Have we, as 'twere, with a defeated joy, - 10
With one auspicious, and one dropping eye;
With mirth in funeral, and with dirge in marriage,
In equal scale weighing delight and dole, -
Taken to wife: nor have we herein barr'd
Your better wisdoms, which have freely gone 15
With this affair along: -

Hamlet, I. ii. 1-16, translated by Johann Heinrich Voß[1]

Obzwar des Bruders, unsres Hamlet, Tod
Frisch dem Gedächtnis bleibt, und uns geziemt,
Zu trauren herzlich, und dem ganzen Reich,
Zu wölken gleichsam eine Stirn des Grams;
Doch hat Vernunft so die Natur bekämpft, 5
Daß wir mit weiserm Schmerz nun denken sein,
Zugleich auch mit Erinnrung unser selbst.
Drum unsre Schwester einst, nun Königin,
Die Throngenossin dieses streitbarn Staats,
Sie haben mit gedämpfter Freude wir, 10
Mit einem Frohblick, Einem Thränenblick,
Mit Wonn' am Sarg, mit Leid am Brautaltar,
In gleicher Schal' abwägend Lust und Weh,
Erwählt zur Frau. Nicht sperrten wir darin
Uns eurer bessern Weisheit, die geneigt 15
Mitlenkte dies Geschäft. -

In this speech[2], Claudius gives a rhetorically convincing report on the state of the nation after the death of King Hamlet. Striking features of the original text are the carefully balanced, well-structured argumentative style of the speech. Lines 1 to 16 serve superficially to define Claudius as the man elected king by the Council, the man committed to the glorious memory of his predecessor, the man who guarantees the continuation of hitherto ordered values and who appears to ascribe considerable authority to the Council. His flattering, well-measured gratitude is being expressed towards an ostensibly strong Privy Council, of which Polonius is the senior councillor. It has, after all, put Claudius on the throne in spite of public objection, passed over the legitimate heir, and sanctioned Claudius's incestuous marriage to the late king's widow. Yet analysis reveals how Shakespeare compels constant reassessment of Claudius's seeming wordly wisdom and fulsome platitudes.

'Though yet of Hamlet our dear brother's death' (l.1)

In omitting to translate the word 'dear' in l.1, Voß has forfeited Shakespeare's added intensity of expression and a strategic device. His inversion in 'Obzwar des Bruders, unsres Hamlet, Tod' and modification of 'Hamlet' by the possessive adjective is little compensation for the alliteration in 'dear brother's death'. If we compare this line with its almost identical repeat in l.19 ('our late dear brother's death'), a mere social convention, [3] we are made aware of the ambiguity of the first line. As is the case in 'sometime sister', alliteration does not here simply weld two units into positive expression; it serves rather as a signal for us to question Claudius's diplomacy and motivation.

This text is closely woven together with imagery and metaphors. It is imperative in a translation of this part that the individual metaphorical elements be rendered as closely to the original as possible, as it is these which serve to mask the true Claudius and his intentions. A transferred epithet forms the basis of the first metaphor 'The memory be green' (l.2). 'Green' is here synonymous with 'fresh', but also used in this metaphor to convey the recency of Hamlet's burial.[4] To emphasise the semantic significance of this adjective, it is prominently positioned immediately before the caesura. Voß, too, gives his translation 'frisch' a prominent place at the beginning of l.2, but the concept as a whole ('Frisch dem Gedächtnis bleibt') forfeits much of the impact of the metaphor. The

association of this translation with the German idiom 'frisch in Erinnerung bleiben' robs it of its figurative strength, and there is no echo of either the transferred epithet or the semantic wordplay.

'To bear our hearts in grief' (l.3) would at first glance appear to be a dead metaphor. Not until we break down the components do we realise that the idioms would be 'a heart bears ...' or 'to bear one's grief' and that this is a poetic deviation from the idiomatic. Voß has insofar avoided the idiomatic construction in that his translation 'Zu trauren herzlich' is an unusual semantic combination. The word 'herzlich' in conjunction with lexical items concerned with bereavement is normally applied as an adjective with the noun 'Beileid'. But although Voß's rendering approximates an oxymoron, it is still a rather weak equivalent of Shakespeare's device. It is surprising that not even the modern translators of *Hamlet* have considered the potential of the German idiom 'Trauer tragen' for this rendering.[5]

> '...and our whole kingdom/To be contracted in one brow of woe' (ll.3/4)

These lines contain three devices which are closely combined. Firstly, 'to contract one's brow', a dead metaphor which, secondly, personifies the word 'kingdom'. Thirdly, 'brow of woe', another metaphor which, in conjunction with the first two devices, expresses features distorted by pain and sorrow. Voß translates '...,und dem ganzen Reich,/Zu wölken gleichsam eine Stirn des Grams'. He not only deviates from the German idiom 'die Stirn falten', he makes a normally reflexive verb (sich (be)wölken) transitive. Qualified by the adverb 'gleichsam', this translation reproduces the metaphorical element and gives a very apt and poetic reflection of the whole nation gathering together in mourning. The [k] alliteration ('kingdom', 'contracted') is reflected by Voß in [a^{i}] assonance ('Reich', 'gleichsam').

> 'Yet so far hath discretion fought with nature
> That we with wisest sorrow think on him' (ll. 5 and 6)

'Discretion' and 'nature' reflect here the Renaissance antinomy of Reason and Nature. Their presentation as two personified antagonists attempting to resolve a conflict lends this line a quasi allegorical function. The translator's sensitivity to this device is important

as it constitutes a part of Claudius's strategy of non-involvement. As two independent antagonists, wholly detached from the person of Claudius, 'discretion' and 'nature' offer a further screen behind which he, the true agent of the *un*natural state of affairs, can conceal himself.

Voß translates line 5 as 'Doch hat Vernunft so die Natur bekämpft', a rendering marred only by the use of the definite article. As quasi personifications, it is imperative that 'discretion' and 'nature' be translated without determiners. But in spite of the article before 'Natur', Voß has at least reflected the historical dimension of the concept. Apart from Flatter and Rothe, he is the only Shakespeare translator of significance to date to reproduce 'discretion' correctly as 'Vernunft'.[6]

As the conflict indicated in line 5 was not resolved, line 6 offers as a compromise the synthesis 'wisest sorrow'. Voß's rendering 'Daß wir mit weiserm Schmerz nun denken sein' does not allot the necessary emphasis to the original superlative. This hypostatization on the surface represents that same reason and nature, but reason ('wisest') has outweighed and assured some attention to Claudius's own well-being ('Together with remembrance of ourselves' - 1.7). The comparative form, obviously used to save syllables, is not an adequate rendering here. [w] alliteration and sibilants in the original are echoed in translation by [v] alliteration.

'The imperial jointress of this warlike state' (1.9)

The translation of the word 'jointress' appears to have presented problems for some of the celebrated German Shakespeare translators. The word 'Erbin' is incorrect here, and the resultant 'Erbin dieses ... Staats' fatal for the political interpretation of the play.[7] Voß quite correctly translates 'Throngenossin'.

The phrase 'warlike state' virtually invites a German rendering by a compound noun. 'Kriegerstaat', a state of warriors, may render the meaning, but it forfeits entirely the metaphorical aspect of this phrase which is achieved by the very combination of an animate adjective with an abstract noun. Voß has aptly reflected this as 'dieses streitbarn Staats'. The [s] alliteration in the original is echoed by sibilants in the translation ('Die Throngenossin dieses streitbarn Staats').

For the characterisation of Claudius it is important in lines 5 to 14 to keep in mind the instrumentalisation of the action - Claudius's ostensibly passive role in all these matters. Shakespeare achieves this by using prepositional modifiers ('with' and 'in') and parallelism. Dislocations of syntax in lines 8 and 9, where we assume Gertrude to be the subject of the sentence until we reach line 10, allow the true agent once again to fade into the background. The following prepositional structures and parallelism play a particularly important part as digressions between subject and auxiliary verb in line 10 and the main verb in line 14: 'Have we ... /Taken to wife'.

'With one auspicious, and one dropping eye' (l.11) is a poeticised form of the idiom 'to laugh with one eye and cry with the other'. The two difficulties posed to the translator into German here are to avoid the dead metaphor and reflect the stylistic nuance which Shakespeare employs in this and the ensuing metaphor, namely the combination of antonyms of Latinate and Germanic origin - 'auspicious'/'dropping' and 'mirth'/'dirge'. This latter device is almost impossible to render in German translation, but Voß has found an acceptable solution to both problems by coining neologisms.

He translates line 11 'Mit einem Frohblick, Einem Thränenblick'. Although the compounds and their juxtaposition lend the line a density which is not inherent in the original, the metaphorical and poetical elements are preserved. The etymological aspects of Shakespeare's adjectives in line 11 have been acknowledged by Voß insofar as he has at least varied the word-class of the two initial morphemes of the compound nouns: 'Froh...'/adjective, 'Thränen...'/noun.

'With mirth in funeral, and with dirge in marriage' (l.12) presents several problems for the translator. The temptation is once again great to save syllables by compounding the nouns. However, it is important that the arrangement of the four nouns be retained, as the line gains its tension from the very paradox of the component pairs 'mirth-funeral' and 'dirge-marriage'. Voß echoes with an excellent rendering, every component present, including the suggestion of personification in the original: 'Mit Wonn' am Sarg, mit Leid am Brautaltar' (l. 12).

Voß's rendering of 'delight' as 'Lust' in the line 'In equal scale weighing delight and dole' (l.13) is unsuitable as an element

in this game of ambiguity and hypocrisy. Claudius is far too astute to give himself away by a word with such libidinal connotations. What might be suggested on the stage through intonation or gesture is another matter, but the word 'delight' is primarily a word with romantic associations. Voß translates this line: 'In gleicher Schal' abwägend Lust und Weh' (l.13).

> '...: nor have we herein barr'd
> Your better wisdoms, which have freely gone
> With this affair along: ...' (ll.14 to 16)

Claudius as the agent shelters again behind these metaphors. The ambiguity of the main clause 'nor have we herein barr'd/Your better wisdoms' therefore requires a metaphorical rendering which is devoid of any suggestion of active personal intervention. Claudius must uphold the appearance of not having sought election, but then finally of not having refused to follow the call either. Voß translates: 'Nicht sperrten wir darin/Uns euer bessern Weisheit'. This is a suitably passive and equivocal expression, and its reflexivisation even lends it a metaphorical element.

The ensuing relative clause 'which have freely gone/With this affair along' intensifies the impersonal and the evasive. What methods Claudius applied to win the Council to go 'freely' along with him in his securing of the throne and his sister-in-law as a wife are only later revealed by the ghost: 'With witchcraft of his wit, with traitorous gifts' (I,v,43). The ambiguous quality of Claudius's language is therefore very aptly rendered by Voß: 'die geneigt/Mitlenkte dies Geschäft'. He has avoided the mistake which almost all other *Hamlet* translators have made, that of translating 'go along with' with a verb requiring the pronoun 'uns', e.g. 'beistimmen', 'freistimmen', 'zustimmen', etc. This pronoun renders Claudius the very agent in all these matters, so that the final sentence in translation explicitly cancels out all the ambivalence of foregoing references to this. Voß's interpretation however remains consistently correct and his translation 'geneigt mitlenken' echoes precisely that note of prevarication with which Shakespeare concludes this part of Claudius's speech.

Voß reproduces the instance of anaphora in lines 11 and 12 ('with'/'mit'). Shakespeare's masterly arrangement of a chain of

alliteration ([w], [d], [m]) and assonance ([ɑɪ],[ɜ],[ə]) in lines 11 to 16 is only represented to a limited extent and then in a more arbitrary distribution: [fr] (if we include the word 'Freude' in line 10), [v] and [l]; [a:], [ei] and [ä].

As might be expected, in the original the rhetoric of Claudius's speech resists the smooth regularity of the iambic pentameter. The fact that these sixteen lines of blank-verse include seven lines with metrical inversion (lines 1, 3, 4, 8, 12, 13 and 14), a thirteen syllable line (line 2) and four feminine endings is a clear indication of the semantic primacy over the form of the text. Three of the metrical inversions enhance the development of the argument by providing stress on the conjunctions 'though' (line 1), 'nor' (line 14) and on the first syllable of the adverb 'therefore' (line 8). Claudius's use of participial constructions, on the other hand, is underscored by trochaic metre (*Ta*ken to *wife*, In *e*qual *Scale Weigh*ing). The regular iambic pentameter is further broken up by attributes requiring stress (and our *whole king*dom, in *one brow* of *woe*) and by the multi-syllabic words of Latinate origin (memory, imperial, auspicious).

The original text also contains five enjambements, each of which is combined with either a metrical inversion and /or a medial caesura (lines 1/2, 2/3, 3/4, 14/15 and 15/16). The syntax here defies the normal capacity of a rhythmical unit, as is clearly seen in the first seven-line sentence.

These deviations from the regular blank-verse scheme are not largely due to providing for gestural elements in the text. The abundance of nuclear syllables and metrical variations serves rather to obstruct a declamatory rendering. The close weaving of rhetorical figures compels the speaker to linger, in spite of the run-on-lines, thus affording the audience more time in which to assimilate and reassess Claudius's motives and feelings.

Voß, too, has seven metrical inversions (lines 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13 and 14). These include the stressed rhetorical pointers '*Obzwar*' (l. 1), '*Nicht*' (l. 14) and '*Drum*' (l. 8), an echo of the unusual length of line two of the original with an inversion on '*Frisch* dem Ge*dächt*nis', of the trochee in line 13 ('In *glei*cher *Schal ab*wägend') and line three ('*herzlich*, und dem *ganz*en *Reich*'). The inversion in '*Ta*ken to *wife*' is not echoed, but rendered in iambic

pentameter. Neither are the inversion and spondee in line four of the original reflected in translation, although the stress does fall naturally on '*ei*ne *Stirn* des *Grams*'. Three of the five enjambements are reproduced by Voß (lines 1/2, 14/15 and 15/16), in each case of which the rhythmic flow is interrupted by irregularity in rhythm and a medial caesura in lines 1/2 and 14/15 and a medial caesura in lines 15/16. As lexis, dislocations of syntax and involved syntax are mainly responsible for the metrical inversion and other metrical irregularities in the original, considerable losses in metrical equivalence would not be surprising in translation. The high degree of fidelity which Johann Heinrich Voß maintains on this level, without impairing meaning and expression is, therefore, all the more remarkable.

Although there are inaccuracies and weak points in the translation of this passage, they cannot obscure the fact that Voß's translation extract from Claudius's speech evinces a clear interpretative understanding of the original text. Voß's close adherence to the word order of the original ensures that the significant rhetorical/dialectical pattern of the speech is maintained. His rendering of the metaphorical language illustrates his unerring grasp of the essence of Shakespeare's devices and his ability to reflect these with poetic equivalence as far as the German language allows. A fine feeling for the significance of metrical irregularities ensures that these are echoed as nearly as possible in the translation. Voß's achievements with regard to this text are notable on every level.

If we look at these two translations - Heinrich's *Macbeth* extract and that from Johann Heinrich's *Hamlet* - side by side, the influence of Johann Heinrich's translation theories and practice on his son's work is evident. Both perceive the source text as preeminent; both attempt to come as close as they can to recreating the language and formal structures of the original. Heinrich first translated *Macbeth* in 1808/1809, but subjected this rendering to a number of revisions over the following approximately ten years. Johann Heinrich produced one version of *Hamlet* some time between 1816 and 1818. Although this extract from Heinrich's final version of *Macbeth* is a great improvement on most levels on that of the first translation, it is not as successful as his father's *Hamlet* extract. There is no doubt from this analysis that Heinrich, too, is fully aware of the essence of Shakespeare's devices: his efforts

here, however, do not match the remarkably successful rendering of the *Hamlet* extract by Johann Heinrich on any level. This is certainly due partly to the fact that Heinrich *revised* the first edition of *Macbeth* instead of re-translating it, and partly due to lack of experience.

b) Lyrical intensity

***Romeo and Juliet*, III, v, 1-36, Johnson, Steevens et al., Leipsic, 1833**

Wilt thou be gone? it is not yet near day:
It was the nightingale, and not the lark,
That pierc'd the fearful hollow of thine ear;
Nightly she sings on yon pomegranate tree:
Believe me, love, it was the nightingale. 5

It was the lark, the herold of the morn,
No nightingale: look, love, what envious streaks
Do lace the severing clouds in yonder east:
Night's candles are burnt out, and jocund day
Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain tops; 10
I must be gone and live, or stay and die.

Yon light is not day-light, I know it, I:
It is some meteor that the sun exhales,
To be to thee this night a torch-bearer,
And light thee on thy way to Mantua. 15
Therefore stay yet, thou need'st not to be gone.

Let me be ta'en, let me be put to death;
I am content, so thou wilt have it so.
I'll say, yon grey is not the morning's eye,
'Tis but the pale reflex of Cynthia's brow; 20
Nor that is not the lark, whose notes do beat
The vaulty heaven so high above our heads:
I have more care to stay than will to go: -
Come, death, and welcome! Juliet wills it so. -
How is't my soul? let's talk, it is not day. 25

It is, it is, hie hence, be gone, away;
It is the lark that sings so out of tune,
Straining harsh discords, and unpleasing sharps.
Some say, the lark makes sweet division;
This doth not so, for she divideth us: 30

Some say, the lark and loathed toad change eyes;
O, now I would they had chang'd voices too!
Since arm from arm that voice doth us affray,
Hunting thee hence with hunts-up to the day.
O, now be gone; more light and light it grows. 35

More light and light? - more dark and dark our woes.

***Romeo and Juliet*, III, v, 1-36, translated by Johann Heinrich Voß**[1]

Willst du schon gehn? Noch dämmert nicht der Tag.
Die Nachtigall, und nicht die Lerche wars,
Die hell dein furchtsam Ohr durchschmetterte;
Auf dem Granatbaum singt sie jede Nacht.
Gewiß, mein Traut, es war die Nachtigall. 5

Die Lerche wars, der Früh Heroldin, nicht
Die Nachtigall. Sieh, Traut, welch böser Streif
Ostwärts verbrämt zerwallendes Gewölk.
Die Nachtkerzlein verglühn; der muntre Tag
Klimmt auf den Zeh'n die Nebelberg' empor. 10
Weggehn ist Leben mir, Verziehn ist Tod.

Das ist kein Tageslicht dort; ich weiß es, Ich!
Es ist ein Luftschein, den die Sonne haucht,
Daß er die Nacht dir Fackelträger sei,
Dir leuchtend auf dem Weg nach Mantua. 15
Drum weile noch; nichts drängt dich wegzugehn.

Laß sie mich fahn, laß sie mich weihn dem Tod!
Mir ist es recht, wenn du es haben willst.
Gern nenn ich jenes Grau nicht Morgenblick,
Nein, blassen Abglanz nur von Luna's Stirn. 20
Nicht sei's die Lerch' auch, deren Ton dort steigt
Zur Himmelswölbung hoch ob unserm Haupt.
Nicht mag ich gehn, viel lieber bleib' ich da! -
Willkommen, Tod, mir! So wills Julia! -
Nun? laß uns kosen, Herz; nicht tagt es dort. 25

Es tagt, es tagt! eil', eil' hinweg! fort, fort!
Die Lerch' ists, die so schrill singt außer Ton,
Uns harschen Mishall zirpt, unleidlich scharf.
Man sagt, die Lerch' hebt kräuselnd süßen Lauf;
Nein, herb' erzwingt sie Irrlauf, der uns trennt. 30
Die Augen, sagt man, tauschten Lerch' und Kröt';
O hätten sie die Stimmen auch getauscht!
Jetzt Arm aus Arm schreckt uns ihr Tireli,
Dich jagend mit dem Jagdaufruf der Früh!
O geh doch! heller hellt das Morgenroth! 35

Es hellt? Nein, dunkler dunkelt uns die Noth.

As a relatively early play, *Romeo and Juliet* evinces literary and linguistic qualities which indicate a middle-distance stage in the evolution of Shakespeare's mastery. This conversation between Romeo and Juliet, a kind of aubade, is rich in a style of imagery representative of Shakespeare's transition from extravagant rhetoric and expanded images to a more concentrated style. The images, concerned mainly with light and bird-song, are unobtrusive, but so effective that the translator's task to capture their essence without interpreting or generalising is not an easy one.

The syntax of the passage is straightforward with little subordination. The vocabulary is predominantly of Germanic origin. These are formal factors which are highly conducive to Voß's desire for perfect identity between original text and translation. But although Voß was most certainly familiar with the *Tagelied* of *Minnesang* tradition, this romantic/lyrical blank-verse from *Romeo and Juliet* is a medium far removed from the didactic/political literary cause and purview of the poet Johann Heinrich Voß.

In his translation of the first metaphor ('It was the nightingale,...,/That pierc'd the fearful hollow of thine ear'), Voß has employed a device of Shakespeare's own:

> 'Die Nachtigall ...wars,
> Die hell dein furchtsam Ohr durchschmetterte;'(ll.2&3)

He has compounded a prepositional prefix and an intransitive verb to form a transitive one, and a most apt neologism for this

context. The result is an echo of both the action of piercing ('durch...') and of the agent ('schmettern'- the warbling of a song-bird). By only suggesting the noun 'hollow' though with the adverb 'hell' and not actually realising the word itself in translation, Voß sacrifices an image drawn from architecture, an association which is picked up again in lines 21/22 of the original. The [ɪə] assonance in Shakespeare's line 3 is reflected by Voß in the syllables 'furcht...'and 'durch...'.

The first few lines of this dialogue convey some of the urgency with which Juliet tries to convince herself and Romeo that the time has not yet come to part. But the lark, herold of their final parting, is already in the sky, and Romeo gently coaxes Juliet out of her self-deceit in a series of short but insistent images in lines 7 to 10.

> '...look, love, what envious streaks
> Do lace the severing clouds in yonder east.'(ll.7 & 8)

> '...Sieh, Traut, welch böser Streif
> Ostwärts verbrämt zerwallendes Gewölk'. (ll. 7 & 8)

The dynamic inherent in the depiction of the parting clouds ('zerwallendes Gewölk') is well reproduced. The verb 'verbrämt' for 'lace', with its primary sense of to edge material with some decorative border, is a far more poetic and accurate term than the word 'säumt' which is used in the bulk of German *Romeo and Juliet* translations. Voß is also one of the few translators to render the word 'envious' in its meaning of 'malicious', although the notes in the Leipsic Edition were of no assistance to him here. The [l] alliteration and [i:] assonance in the original is represented in the German translation by [ɛ:] assonanace and [v] alliteration.It is not an easy task to preserve this image without losing a lot of its intensity. Most other translations are either grossly simplified or reproduce a static image.[2]

> 'Die Nachtkerzlein verglühn; ...'(l.9)

Voß's translation for 'Night's candles are burnt out' (l.9) does, however, forfeit much of the obvious significance of the original metaphor. 'Verglühn' is inadequate in both tense-form and meaning. Shakespeare's stars are extinguished, not simply blown out

to be relighted. Voß's choice of word and tense imply an action in progress of gradual smouldering down and lack that definitive quality necessary here.

We have a similar situation in the ensuing image:

> '...,and jocund day
> Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain tops'; (ll. 9 & 10)

Shakespeare is again describing a completed process. In Voß's rendering

> '...,der muntre Tag
> Klimmt auf den Zeh'n die Nebelberg empor' (ll.9 & 10)

the dawn is still rising behind the mountain and not already standing on the summit. Only the word 'klimmt' echoes Shakespeare's short, light vowel sounds in 'tiptoe', 'misty' and 'top'. The somewhat heavy sounds in Voß's rendering otherwise suggest a rather laboured accent. The word order, however, is identical with that of the original without appearing unnatural.

> 'I must be gone and live, or stay and die.' (l.11)

The elegant antithesis with which Romeo sums up his observations here is simple and sincere. Its main grammatical constituents are six monosyllabic verbs - an impossible structure to echo in German within the iambic pentameter. But Voß provides a rendering of Shakespeare's brevity and the preponderance of one single part of speech by translating the antonyms 'be gone' and 'stay' as verbal nouns and 'life' and 'death' as nouns:

> 'Weggehn ist Leben mir, Verziehn ist Tod'. (l.11)[3]

Where the translation attempts to emulate the formal pattern of the line, however, the resultant density inevitably forfeits some of the elegance of Romeo's statement. The oneness which Juliet feels with Romeo's fate is expressed in Shakespeare's end rhymes 'die' (l. 11) and 'I' (l. 12). These are not reproduced by Voß.

> 'Let me be ta'en, let me be put to death;
> I am content, so thou wilt have it so'. (ll.17 and 18)

The tenor of line 11 is reflected in these lines when the impulsive Romeo willingly surrenders to Juliet's tenacious persuasion. In line 17, Voß retains the word order before the caesura and reflects the elision 'ta'en' poetically with an archaic form of the verb 'fangen': 'Laß sie mich fahn'. The spontaneity and straightforwardness of this utterance (which is echoed in the second half of Shakespeare's line) is then, however, completely lost in the bombast of 'laß sie mich weihn dem Tod'. Line 18 then evinces an exaggerated simplicity and near-nonchalance: 'Mir ist es recht, wenn du es haben willst'. The content is accurate, but the formal balance and much of the poetry of the sentence is lost.

> 'Nor that is not the lark, whose notes do beat
> The vaulty heaven so high above our heads:' (ll. 21 and 22)

In these lines, Shakespeare again takes up the imagery drawn from architecture. After a rather contorted effort at echoing Shakespeare's double negative ('Nicht sei's die Lerch' auch'), Voß achieves almost perfect identity on every level, including the [h] alliteration in line 22.

> 'Nicht sei's die Lerch' auch, deren Ton dort steigt
> Zur Himmelswölbung hoch ob unserm Haupt'. (ll. 21 and 22)

The image is slightly marred by the use of the word 'Ton' for 'notes', particularly as Voß uses this word again in line 27 for 'tune'. 'Schlag' would have been a preferable alternative in line 21, and indeed enhanced the sound of the line.

> 'I have more care to stay than will to go:-
> Come, death, and welcome! Juliet wills it so.-'(ll.23 and 24)

> 'Nicht mag ich gehn, viel lieber bleib' ich da!
> Willkommen, Tod, mir! So wills Julia!' (ll. 23 and 24)

Shakespeare presents Romeo in a conflict in line 23 in which inclination proves stronger than will and stronger than the fear of death. Voß's translation of this line is devoid of any conflict. Thus the significance of 'will', noun, line 23 and 'wills', verb, line 24 is lost, as is then the impact of the well-rendered 'Willkommen, Tod, mir' in line 24. Voß has also forfeited the balance of Shakespeare's rhyming couplet in the translation. Of all places, he

chooses line 23 to forsake his aim for perfect identity and reverses the sentence order and syllable count. But Shakespeare's six syllables in the *first* half of the comparative form in this line are necessary in that position to accommodate the successive stressed syllables and pauses in the first half of line 24. The set of four syllables in the second half of line 23 are to fit the laconic 'Juliet wills it so' in line 24. Had Voß deviated from his ideal in line 24, too, and added an eleventh syllable to the line, e.g. 'So will *es* Julia', instead of 'So wills Julia', he would have evened up the balance with 'viel lieber bleib' ich da' (l. 23) and improved the rhyme considerably.

As in lines 11 and 12, Shakespeare again establishes a coalescence of the two lovers by providing end rhymes ('day' and 'away') in lines 25 and 26. These have been rendered by Voß with 'dort' and 'fort'.

> 'It is the lark that sings so out of tune,
> Straining harsh discords, and unpleasing sharps.' (ll. 27 and 28)

The words with which Voß reproduces Juliet's admission that it is indeed the lark and therefore unwelcome are an excellent choice, the sounds both reflecting the sense and conveying in their harshness Juliet's resentment:

> 'Die Lerch' ists, die so schrill singt außer Ton,
> Und harschen Mishall zirpt, unleidlich scharf.'(ll. 27 and 28)

Voß prepares the way for the image with the toad in lines 31 and 32 with the onomatopoeic verb 'zirpen' for 'straining'. This word can be applied to the monotony of stridulation in birds and frogs alike. The [a:] assonance and sibilant overtones of Shakespeare's lines are reproduced in German also by [a:] and its combination with [Rʃ] and [ʃ] alliteration.

> 'Some say the lark makes sweet division;
> This doth not so, for she divideth us:
> Some say, the lark and loathed toad change eyes;
> O, now I would they had chang'd voices too!' (ll. 29 to 32).

The gravity of the situation has also dawned, and Juliet's thoughts crowd towards the climax in line 35 in associated images.

Parallelisms introduce these two statements made by Juliet. They are in turn intensified by parallels within each couplet. Shakespeare continues in the music idiom in line 29 with a play on the word 'division', which he takes up as a verb in line 30. Lines 31 and 32 have the verb 'change' in common, lines 32 and 33, the word 'voice'. Each of these words has a prominent position near the end of the line. Voß translates these lines as follows:

> 'Man sagt, die Lerch' hebt kräuselnd süßen Lauf;
> Nein, herb erzwingt sie Irrlauf, der uns trennt.
> Die Augen, sagt man, tauschten Lerch' und Kröt;
> O hätten sie die Stimmen auch getauscht!' (ll. 29 to 32).

The introductory parallelisms in lines 29 and 31 have been reproduced, but with a variation in word order in line 31. This inversion was necessary in order to afford 'Die Augen' an equivalent prominent position in the line. Of the internal parallelisms, the 'division'/'divideth' wordplay is the most difficult to render. Voß is the first translator to attempt a play on the word 'Lauf', the equivalent German word for 'division', a descant of short, quick notes. His invention of the word 'Irrlauf', probably suggested by 'Irrfahrt' but implying something amiss in the course of events, fits splendidly here. Voß's wordplay is further enhanced by the adjective 'süß' in line 29 and the adverb 'herb' in line 30. Because of the number of syllables required to express this device, 'This doth not so' (l.30) has been aptly rendered simply by 'Nein'. The [s] and [d] alliteration in lines 29 and 30 of the original is reflected in translation by [l] and [h] alliteration and [e:] assonance. 'Lauf' and 'trennt' have been prominently positioned at the end of the line.

Where 'tauschen' is repeated in line 32 in its past participle form as in the original and in a position which emphasises its significance, 'Stimmen' in the same line is not echoed in line 33, but rendered by 'Tireli'. This provides a bad rhyme for 'Früh' in line 34. (Shakespeare: 'affray' and 'day').

The word 'loathed' (l. 31) has been omitted in translation, an important word both from an emotive and a sound point of view ('lark

and loathed toad'). Voß could have used the word 'Unk' for 'toad', which would at least incorporate a sense of the ugly and indeed provide a further internal rhyme ('und Unk'). As it is, the [əʊ] assonance is reproduced by [a^{u}], the [l] alliteration not at all.

> 'Jetzt Arm aus Arm schreckt uns ihr Tireli,
> Dich jagend mit dem Jagdaufruf der Früh!' (ll. 33 and 34)

The intensification 'Hunting ... with hunts-up' (l. 34) has been translated as nearly as possible to the original. 'Jagdaufruf' does not, however, contain reference to anything but blood sports. In order to provide some match for the striking [h] alliteration of the original line 34, the weak [j] alliteration has been supplemented by the sound echo in '(Jagd)aufruf' and 'Früh'.

> 'O, now be gone; more light and light it grows.
> More light and light? - more dark and dark our woes'.
> (ll. 35 and 36)

> 'O geh doch! heller hellt das Morgenroth!
> Es hellt? Nein, dunkler dunkelt uns die Noth!'
> (ll. 35 and 36)

The final rhyming couplet is an excellent poetic rendering of the original. Shakespeare's repetition of the two contrasting comparative adjectives of 'light' and 'dark' obtain their intensity in translation from Voß's use of the comparative adjectives and their verbal equivalents. Romeo's questioning echo at the beginning of line 36 and his retorting comment have been aptly reproduced by structures parallel with those in line 35 and intensified to reflect the impact of the original by the addition of the word 'Nein' and a series of stressed syllables. This is an apt rendering of the now figurative use of 'dark' and an equivalent expression of the presage of the situation.

Both the original passage and Voß's translation comprise 36 lines. Of the 36 lines of this lyrical verse, two have weak endings (lines 14 and 29) and ten have irregularities of metre (lines 1, 4, 7, 12, 14, 16, 17, 24, 28 and 34). There is a metrical inversion in the second foot of lines 1, 17 and 34: '*Wilt* thou be *gone*?', '*Let* me be *ta'en*', ('*let* me be *put* to death') and '*Hun*ting thee *hence*'. Each of these concepts has a specific and gradually heightening reference

to (the consequences of) Romeo's leaving. The lilting rhythm of line 4 of the original reflecting the song of the nightingale is also rendered by in inversion, this time on the third and fourth syllables. The song of the lark in line 28, which is no longer sweet in Juliet's ears, is rendered in three consecutive dactyls and concluded on a strong syllable. The metrical irregularities which occur within Juliet's first five lines also serve to transmit some of the unease inherent in her plea.

Spondees reinforce persuasive or imploring imperatives in lines 7, 16 and 24: 'look, love', 'stay yet' and 'Come, death'. Spondees are also used to emphasise aspects of the dominant imagery of the play in lines 12 ('day-light') and 14 ('torch-bearer').

Enjambements occur in lines 7/8, 9/10 and 21/22 of the original. The first two instances allow for gestural impulses, as Romeo bids Juliet follow his embrace of the dawn sky. The enjambement in lines 21/22 accelerates the tempo as Romeo leads up to his impetuous resolve to stay and face the consequences. Of the two feminine endings in the original text, that of line 29 coincides with a nine syllable line, an irregularity which signals the very mockery of the words as Juliet speaks them.

Voß's translation has one line of eleven syllables (l. 12) which, however, aptly ends on the heavily stressed repetition of 'Ich'. He has incorporated irregularities of metre in thirteen lines, five of which coincide with the original lines (lines 1, 4, 7, 17 and 24). He reproduces the metre of four of these lines (l, 4, 7,17) with perfect identity. A reproduction of the metre in line 34 of the original, which completes a sequence of irregularities parallel with those in lines 7 and 17, was not possible in translation. A sequence of parallel spondees (lines 7, 16 and 24) is similarly broken in translation where, in line 16, the syllable count does not permit an elision of the imperative 'weile', which would have supplied the spondee. It is the syllable count of the compounds 'Tageslicht' (l. 12) and 'Fackelträger' (l. 14) which makes it impossible for Voß to give these images a precise metrical underscoring. He does, however, provide a spondee in line 12, albeit on '*Tageslicht dort*'.

Voß has compensated for these losses in metrical equivalance by supplying further variations in metre in lines 3, 8, 11, 19, 20, 27,

30 and 36. The verb 'durchschmetterte' completes line 3 on two light syllables, a device which enhances the sense of the verb ('warble') and rhythmically preludes the song of the nightingale in line 4. The metrical inversion in line 8 on 'verbrämt' emphasises the contrast between the verb and the adjective qualifying its subject '*böser* Streif' (my italics). The spondee and inversion in line 27 substitutes Shakespeare's deviation from iambic pentameter in line 28, which intensifies the "discordant"song of the lark.The remaining irregularities in rhythm are supplied by spondees, in line 11 accentuating the verbal noun 'Weggehn' and in lines 19, 20 and 21 '*Gern nenn'*ich', '*Nein, bla*ssen', '*Nicht sei's*'respectively. Here, the spondee heightens the close association of these concepts of Romeo's distortion of reality. Voß has further suitably emphasised the word 'Nein' in lines 30 and 36 with a spondee, as in each case the one negative stands for a larger syntactical unit in the original.

All three enjambements have been reproduced by Voß, plus an enjambement in lines 6/7. The appositional pre-modifying genitive and the polysyllabic German words 'Heroldin' and 'Nachtigall' make a second caesura in line 6 and the run-on-line unavoidable. Although Voß maintains the iambic pentameter in line 6, the result is a break in the rounded harmony of syntax and metre.

Alternating phases of self-delusion and selfless devotion create an increasing degree of tension in the sub-text of this passage. This is manifested on the level of expression by contrasting images of night and day, union and parting. Variations in rhythm give added depth to the texture of the passage, for this is no ordinary aubade; it is charged with an imminent threat of death. Taken overall, the rendering which Johann Heinrich Voß gives evinces an awareness of the sensuous qualities of the text and the density of its imagery. He has succeeded in providing a striking reflection of the antitheses and colourful yet poetic images, and in doing so, recreated the sounds and atmosphere which greatly contribute to this rise in tension. The deviations which do occur in Voß's translation of this passage in no way detract from the merit of this achievement.

In his detailed comparison of the Voß and the Schlegel translations of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, K. Holtermann concludes with the following remarks:

> 'Wie weit wird ... Voß' Übersetzung von der Schlegelschen übertroffen! Selbst da, wo Schlegel irrt, ist *seine Auffassung* (my italics) meistens dem Geiste Shakespeares entsprechend, dessen Verständnis er sich mit seinem Gefühle zu eigen gemacht hat, was sich ... von Voß durchaus nicht sagen läßt.'[4]

This statement was made on the basis of numerous, carefully selected examples which were mostly one-liners. The results of this present analysis of a longer passage translated by Voß serve at least to redress the imbalance in Holtermann's comments. These comments are unfair to Voß, and arguably also to Shakespeare, insofar as Holtermann equates the 'spirit of Shakespeare' with the 'spirit of Schlegel'.

c) Delicacy and wit:

***A Midsummer Night'sDream*, II, i, 1 - 17 and 42 - 58**
Johnson, Steevens et al., Leipsic, 1833

Fairy:

Over hill, over dale,
Thorough bush, thorough briar,
Over park, over pale,
Thorough flood, thorough fire,
I do wander every where, 5
Swifter than the moones sphere;
And I serve the Fairy Queen,
To dew her orbs upon the green.
The cowslips tall her pensioners be,
In their gold coats spots you see; 10
Those be rubies, fairy favours,
In those freckles live their savours.
I must go seek some dew-drops here,
And hang a pearl in every cowslip's ear.
Farewell, thou lob of spirits, I'll be gone: 15
Our Queen and all her elves come her anon.
[...]
Puck:

Thou speak'st aright;
I am that merry wanderer of the night.
I jest to Oberon, and make him smile,
When I a fat and bean-fed horse beguile,
Neighing in likeness of a filly foal: 5
And sometime lurk I in a gossip's bowl,
In very likeness of a roasted crab;
And, when she drinks, against her lips I bob,
And on her wither'd dew-lap pour the ale.
The wisest aunt, telling the saddest tale, 10
Sometime for three-foot stool mistaketh me;
Then slip I from her bum, down topples she,
And *tailor* cries, and falls into a cough;
And then the whole quire hold their hips, and loffe;
And waxen in their mirth, and neeze and swear 15
A merrier hour was never wasted there. -
But room, fairy! Here comes Oberon.

***Sommernachtstraum*, translated by Johann Heinrich Voß**[1]

Elf:

Über Berg, über Thal,
Durch Wald, durch Flut,
Über Zaun, über Pfahl,
Durch Qualm, durch Glut,
Wandr' ich meine Weg' entlang, 5
Schneller als des Mondes Gang.
Dienstbar der Feenfürstin bethaun
Muß ich die Kreis' auf grünen Aun.
Die Primeln sind ihr Prachtgeleit;
Sie tragen Fleck' am goldnen Kleid, 10
Seht, rubinhell, Feenbegabung;
Jeder Tupf haucht süße Labung.
Nun muß ich spähn, wo Thau blinkt vor;
Ein Perlchen hang' ich in jeder Primel Ohr.
Lebwohl, du plumper Geist, ich eile hin; 15
Gleich samt den Elfen kommt die Königin.
[...]
Puck:

Ich bins, der gerne drollt,
Bin dir der lose Nachtmann Tückebold.
Mir oft belächelt Oberon den Spaß,
Lock' ich den Hengst, der strozt von Bohnenfraß,
Und wiehr' als junge Stut' ein bräutlich Juch! 5
Oft laur' ich der Gevatterin im Krug,
Als wohlgerösteter Holzapfel rund;
Wenn dann sie trinkt, klatsch! fahr' ich an den Mund,
Und auf die Wamp' ihr schütt' ich braunes Äl.
Die weise Muhm' im schönsten Morderzähl 10
Hält mich für ihr dreibeinig Stühlchen, sieh,
Und senkt den Sterz; ich weich'; um purzelt sie,
"Daß dich der Schneider!" rufend, kreischt und hustet;
Die Schwesterschaft hält sich die Bäuch', und prustet
In Lachen, toll vor Freud', und schwöret laut: 15
Nein solche Lust ward niemals hier geschaut! -
Doch Plaz, mein Elflein! hier kommt Oberon.

In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Shakespeare convinces us of the magical loveliness of Fairyland and the ethereal nature of Oberon, Titania and their followers through the power of the most enduringly beautiful poetry. All the speeches of the fairies, whether the followers of Titania or mischievous spirits like Puck, are sharply detailed and imaginatively vivid. In Act II, Scene i, we are led into this world of fairies and magic for the first time. The preamble is compact with information, as well as a skilful creation of the dual 'fairy' atmosphere: beauty and delicacy, and rustic folklore. In the swift, effortless verse of the fairy, we immediately sense a world of lightness, speed, and magically transformed nature; in the vignettes of Puck's nocturnal operations, later powers of transformation are anticipated as he gloats over his disguises.

The diminutive elves are associated in the minds of the audience with a minuteness impossible to reproduce on the stage. They hide in acorn-cups, wear coats of bats' wings, make fans of butterflies' wings, hang dew-drops in cowslip bells. Puck's powers and antics, his speed, are all familiar to a superstitious audience. The words the fairies speak are as enchanting and evocative as their visual appearance. The excitement Puck takes in physical pranks is exactly conveyed through the physical excitement of his language. It is imperative that these (contrasting) atmospheres be conveyed in the language of the German translation.

Fairy

Rhythm and sound are the two most important features of the fairy's lines 1 to 16, as their main task is to transport the audience from the world of reality into a fairy realm; to create a completely different atmosphere. This is immediately established in the rhythm of the first four lines, as it sounds quite different from anything heard in the play before. A mellifluous sound is produced by long vowels and diphthongs (in the end rhymes in particular) and fricatives and plosives ([t], [s], [p]). The many sibilants also serve to characterise the tiny voice of this diminutive creature. The language is simple and the syntax uncomplicated. Personification of the cowslips (pensioners, tall, coats), jewel metaphors for 'spots' and 'dew' (rubies, pearl) add to the magic and illusion conjured up in this fairy realm.

The rhythm varies from anapaests (2 beats, lines 1 - 4) to trochees (4 beats, lines 5 - 7), iambics (4 beats, lines 8 and 9), trochees (4 beats, lines 11 and 12) and iambics (4 beats, line 13; 5 beats, lines 14-16). The rising metre of the first four lines reflects the smooth, swift rhythm of flight. After basic information has been given in the trochaic lines 5 to 8, iambics take us into the 'secret' tasks of nature. The return to trochees in line 11 indicates movement to gain a closer look at the cowslips, with a renewal of iambics as the fairy remembers his/her duties.

Apart from lines 5/6, 11/12, 15/16, the end rhymes of Johann Heinrich Voß's rendering contain either long vowels or diphthongs. As in Shakespeare's original text, there is an overall preponderance of these (Shakespeare 81:42; Voß 70:51). The [b], [p] and [f] alliteration in lines 1 to 4 of the original has not been reproduced. End rhymes and single syllable nouns have necessitated the re-positioning of the word 'Flut', thus disturbing the sets of associated features of nature and the elements. Where the word 'Zaun' is acceptable here for 'park' since it indicates land enclosed for a specific, private purpose, the word 'Qualm', which is not an element of nature, is out of place except as an associated word with 'Glut'.

The [w] alliteration in line 5 is echoed in translation. Although the [s] sounds in line 6 are not reproduced, Voß has compensated in line 7 with [f] alliteration ('Feenfürstin'). The [əʊ] assonance in line 10 of the original is similarly compensated for in line 9 with [pr] alliteration. Much of Shakespeare's personification of the cowslips is lost in translation. The collective noun 'Prachtgeleit' and the omission of a rendering of 'tall' is only slightly offset in the following line by the verb 'tragen'. When, however, this verb is coupled with the 'Pracht' element of the compound noun, the emphasis is still on the uniform rather than on the 'man' inside it.

Lines 11 and 12,' Those be rubies, fairy favours,/In those freckles live their savours' are beautifully rendered by Voß: 'Seht, rubinhell, Feenbegabung;/Jeder Tupf haucht süße Labung'. Although the metaphor of the jewel has been forfeited, it is well replaced by the metaphor in line 12 ('Jede Tupf haucht'), and the couplet still conveys the image of something delicate and precious. The whole is enhanced by the echo of Shakespeare's liquid, spirant and plosive consonants.

The [p] alliteration in lines 14 and 15 of the translation is not a very apt alternative to Shakespeare's [s] and [d] alliteration in line 13. The metaphor 'wo Thau blinkt vor' does, however, recover the poetry and add the 'sparkle' that was missing in the rendering 'rubinhell'. The translation of 'lob (of spirits)' in line 15 with 'plumper Geist' (course, rustic) is apt both in sound and meaning.

The rhythm of the first four lines is somewhat marred in Voß's rendering by the obligatory single syllable preposition 'durch'. Although the duration of the two unstressed syllables in lines 1 and 3 is no longer than that of the single unstressed syllable 'durch'in lines 2 and 4, these purely iambic lines do detract from the rhythmic 'swish' of flight. The trochees in lines 5 and 6 of the translation correspond exactly with those of Shakespeare. At this point, Voß makes a definite caesura, then beginning line 7 as a syntactically new sentence. Lines 7 and 8 of the original text pose considerable problems for the translator because of their simplicity. All words are single syllables apart from 'Fairy' and 'upon', and only four beats per line are available for the translator. Voß has recovered the single syllables in line 8 at the expense of line 7. 'Fairy Queen' and 'To dew' occupy neighbouring prominent positions in the original, but not in the same line. Voß has overloaded line 7 in attempting to solve this dilemma, allotting the end position to his rendering of 'To dew' (bethaun), and providing 'Feenfürstin' immediately before that with a spondee. This dactyl, spondee, anapaest rhythm lends the line a solemn dignity where at the most, simple pride is intended. The run-on-lines 7 and 8 in Voß's rendering are conditioned purely by the syntax and cannot possibly be realised in speech, whether one begins line 8 with a dactyl or with an iamb.

Line 10 of the original consists of a dactyl, spondee and iamb to underscore the splendour of the royal bodyguards. This is the line which could do with the dignity of Voß's line 7, but instead, it is rendered in straightforward iambs. Lines 11 and 12 change back to trochees after a semi-colon at the close of line 10. It has already been mentioned that movement or gesture appears to be indicated here, a closing in towards the cowslips. Although Voß echoes the rhythm of these two lines exactly, his use of the imperative 'Seht' followed by a caesura does make explicit what Shakespeare has implied in rhythm only.

The fairy's recollection that duty calls is reflected by a return to iambs in line 13, which Voß, once again, reproduces exactly. The final three lines of the original passage are spoken in regular iambic pentameter. Voß is obliged to use an anapaest in the third foot of line 14, as all eleven syllables have to be articulated. No elision is possible between 'ich' and 'in' due to the [ç] sound. The alternative to 11 syllables is a second elision which does not offer much improvement. Shakespeare's lines all have masculine endings apart from lines 11 and 12 (favours/savours); the same applies for Voß's rendering (Feenbe *gabung*/Labung).

Although lines 7 and 14 are rhythmically unacceptable in the Voß translation, there is no doubt that he was well aware of the significance of the varied rhythms in this passage: the necessary contrast of these 16 lines with the preceding prose and ensuing iambic pentameter in their function as an introduction to a whole new world of nature and beings. In spite of the difficulties involved, Voß has succeeded in reflecting as much of the simplicity and sound of Shakespeare's text as he possibly could, *overlooking* not a single detail and recovering much of the beauty and poetry of the passage.

Puck

Where rhythm and sound were important in the lines of the Fairy, in Puck's lines the semantic aspect dominates. Puck provides the play with most of its feeling of ludicrousness and irresponsibility. His delight in his own mischief is obvious. Where magic enabled the Fairy to transform nature, for Puck, it is the source of pranks. Each trick is re-lived in these lines with relish and in laconic (imitating a horse, 2 lines; becoming a crab apple, 4 lines; turning into a three-legged stool, 6 lines) but amazingly vivid language. The passage is in rhyming couplets and iambic pentameter, with variations in rhythm in lines 2, 5, 10, 12, 14 and 17.

When in line 2, Shakespeare introduces the word 'wanderer (of the night)', it is to be seen as an association with the Fairy's wandering 'swifter than the moon's sphere', and as an extension of Puck's initial question 'Whither wander you?' in the first line of the scene. Voß has not taken up this direct allusion, but merely implied this in 'der *lose* Nachtmann'. The semantic content of lines 1 and 2 have been transferred to different parts of speech alto-

gether in translation and in the process, doubly intensified. The confirmation of the Fairy's conjecture that he is Puck is rendered in a double 'I am' ('Ich bins', 'Bin dir'); the adjective 'merry' is contained in the relative clause 'der gerne drollt', and again, implicitly, in 'Tückebold'. 'Tückebold' in turn echoes the mischief inherent in 'lose'. In view of all the aliases and the account of assorted antics provided by the Fairy's previous speech, this rendering is acceptable, particularly in echoing Puck's pride in his antics.

In line 4, the adjective 'fat' has, like the adjective 'merry' above, been incorporated in a relative clause as the verb 'strozt'. The entire clause 'strozt vor Bohnenfraß' is an excellent rendering of the image Shakespeare conjures up. The two meanings 'deceive' and 'charm' inherent in the word 'Beguile' are both realised by Voß in 'Lock'' and 'ein bräutlich Juch' (lines 4 and 5). The prominent position of the onomatopoeic present participle 'Neighing' is unfortunately lost in the single syllable stem 'wiehr'', although the onomatopoeia is retained, and the diphthong variable in its duration.

The term 'Gevatterin' for 'gossip' (line 6) is an apt equivalent in that it has the same etymological root as the word 'gaffer' (elderly, rustic old fellow). Where Shakespeare has divided line 7 almost equally into the prepositional phrase 'in very likeness of' and 'a roasted crab', the nine syllables which Voß allots to the crab apple constitute, for him, a rare case of redundancy in blank verse rendering. The end position of the onomatopoeic word 'bob' is replaced in translation by an onomatopoeic realisation of the resultant sound in mid-line parenthesis ('Klatsch'). Although there is, once more, a slight tendency towards redundancy, this is a most effective solution. 'Wither'd dew-lap' in line 9 becomes 'Wamp''. In Middle High German, the words *wambe*, *wampe* and *wamme* are synonymous realisations of a definition of exterior and interior aspects of the abdomen. Although 'Wamme' later referred to the 'dewlap', there still appears to be interchangeability between 'Wampe' and 'Wamme' in colloquial use, particularly in Hesse and Bavaria. Whether 'Wampe' or 'Wamme', the connotation of 'dewlap' with cattle still seems to indicate that the 'gossip' has considerable bulk.

The 'wisest aunt' in the third episode is introduced by Voß as the 'weise Muhm'' (line 10), an obsolete and apt expression for

'aunt' or 'nurse', considering *OED*'s definition of, 'old woman'; 'the greatest wiseacre among the cronies'. Although Voß turns the 'saddest tale' (line 10) into the 'schönsten Morderzähl', the relish inherent in these components in the original (also indicated by the preceding caesura) with which the 'aunt' would surely tell her tale, is certainly echoed in German. As the caesura is forfeited in translation, a degree of redundancy is necessary on the semantic level. In line 12, Shakespeare describes the process of the stool moving as the aunt prepares to sit down, in one single action, although we *see* both. This concentration is not possible in German. Voß's answer to the problem is excellent: 'Und senkt den Sterz; ich weich''. The retention of the single syllables and the use of the word 'Und' rather than the personal pronoun 'sie' almost welds the two actions into one. Although the explicit request for attention at the end of line 11 ('sieh') could be interpreted as introducing the Fairy directly into the vignette, whereas this gesture does not explicitly occur in the original until Puck's reminiscences are over (line 17), Shakespeare does have a caesura at the end of line 11 which also indicates Puck's preparation for demonstration.

Voß's choice of 'Schwesterschaft' with which to render the 'quire', whether Shakespeare intended this to mean simply 'company' or 'a vocal group', indicates that he envisaged Puck in entirely female company. This is indeed suggested by the typical female gesture of hands on hips when overcome by hearty laughter. Although Voß has not reflected the archaism and unusual forms in 'waxen', 'loffe' and 'neeze', nor rendered the two latter verbs as two single actions, the noise and intensity of laughter ('prustet/In Lachen'-snorting with laughter) and the increasing mirth ('toll vor Freud') are still re-created well.

The end rhymes are maintained in the translation throughout, whereby those in lines 5/6 ('Juch/Krug') and lines 11/12 ('sieh/sie') are somewhat contrived. Puck's increasing delight in his pranks is not only reflected in the increasing length of each vignette as his memories unfold, but also in an increased number of caesuras and irregularities in metre (caesuras: lines 8, 10, 12, 13 and 15; irregular metre: lines 2, 5, 10, 12, 14 and 17). The spondee in line 2 of the original ('I am') is reflected by Voß with a spondee ('Bin dir'); that in line 5 ('Neighing'), not. Voß does, however, introduce line 4 with a dactyl ('Lock' ich den') in order to echo the prominent position of Shakespeare's 'beguile'. The cli-

max in line 8 of the original is enhanced by the two caesuras before the utterance of the main clause, 'against her lips I bob'. In Voß's translation, the word 'Klatsch' is enclosed within two caesuras and rendered as a spondee, thus lengthening the duration of this syllable and reproducing an almost identical build-up to the climax. Line 10 is enhanced by a dactyl on 'telling the' immediately following a caesura. The reason for this caesura, now underscored by metric irregularity, has already been explained (irony), as has Voß's compensation on the semantic level of this line.

Line 12 of the original contains a caesura and a dactyl, which beautifully echoes the motion of 'down topples she'. Voß cannot avoid two caesuras in this line, but both clearly follow the gestural patterns. The exact syntactical rendering which Voß gives of the unit 'down topples she' necessitates two consecutive stressed syllables ('*um pur*(zelt'), which do not tripple quite as easily off the tongue as Shakespeare's dactyl. The caesuras in line 13 are retained, as is the regular iambic pentameter. The 11 syllables in line 14 of the translation and the enjambement enable Voß to reproduce the two dactyls in Shakespeare's line ('then the whole quire hold their'). The rhythmic variations and caesuras (which are also reproduced exactly) are important here in reflecting the 'applause' which Puck receives for his antics. The spondee in line 14 ('room, fairy') is not reflected, but the line is also otherwise rendered in iambic pentameter, with both caesuras in place. Voß has two feminine endings (lines 13/14: 'hustet/prustet'); Shakespeare has none.

Although this rendering does evince a tendency towards redundancy in three instances (one of which is unavoidable), it by no means disturbs the homogeneity of the semantic level of the text. Apart from the two feminine endings, there is still not a syllable more than in the original passage: yet every detail is there. The language is vivid and creates just that picture of rusticity that we see in the original. We still feel Puck's antic movements in the rhythm, his ever-increasing excitement, until in line 16 he dwells for a moment on the success of his last trick. Certainly, the woods, nature, the rustic environment is the world of Johann Heinrich Voß's own idylls, but in his rendering of the Puck extract we not only feel that he was at home here, we also see that he thoroughly enjoyed being there. In Heinrich junior's unpublished letters we have a record of his own ability to feel his way into Shakespeare's created worlds; in the instance of these two passages translated by

Johann Heinrich, the record is manifest in the rendering.

Both of these two illustrative passages belong to the enchanted world, but each world has a specific type of language: the delicacy of the fairy's language and the nimbleness and pertness of that of Puck. Not only has Voß re-created Shakespeare's enchanted world in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, he has also achieved that fine distinction between the two types of language.

iii) Selected aspects of style:

a) Wordplay: double entendre/ semantic wordplay, homonyms/homophones, jingles

The way in which a translator handles the reproduction of Shakespeare's wordplay is a testimonial to his knowledge of Shakespeare's English as well as to his own ability as a poet. In the case of most of the 18th century and early 19th century translators of Shakespeare, some of Shakespeare's wordplay either went unnoticed or remained an enigma due to the inadequacy of the annotated editions of the original works available. As to the obscene wordplay, the note provided in the 1833 Johnson and Steevens Leipzig edition for *Hamlet* III, i, 140-141 ('Ay, or any show that you'll show him: Be not you ashamed to show') speaks for itself as a restraining edict:

> 'The conversation of Hamlet with Ophelia, which cannot fail to disgust every modern reader, is probably such as was peculiar to the young and fashionable of the age of delicacy. The poet is, however, blameable: for extravagance of thought, not indecency of expression, is the characteristic of madness, at least such madness as should be represented on the scene.' (Note 35, page 1034).

Various factors combine to make the reproduction of wordplay difficult or even impossible: a lesser frequency of homonyms in German than in English; different concepts of meaning in the English word and its German equivalent, which can give the expression a totally new affective value in translation; the syntactical incongruity of the two languages; the different historical conditions of Shakespeare's English and, in this case, 18th and early 19th century German. The translator who does not wish to forfeit the reproduction of a play on words therefore often has to content himself with one of the following alternative means of rendering: the original wordplay can be projected onto a different level of style, i.e. elevated or lowered; it can be cast in a different form of expression, e.g. assonating wordplay or a jingle in German in place of an English quibble; if necessary, it can be replaced by a German equivalent quite different in form and content from the original.

No matter which strategy is applied, the main consideration

should be to achieve an equivalent effect. The translator's first task therefore is to ascertain the dramatic and aesthetic function of wordplay. In the comedies and in the comic sub-plot it often serves as a device through which congenial, more intelligent figures display their linguistic agility and wit at the expense of, sometimes less amiable, characters of lower intellect. Semantic wordplay is incorporated in dialogue and represented on both levels of meaning, at times initially intended unambiguity couched in a context which readily encourages its use on a different level of meaning in reply. Or the homonymic and homophonic pun is bandied backwards and forwards. It is important for the translator to note that Shakespeare used puns which were familiar to or easily comprehensible for characters on stage and audience alike. This guaranteed the comic effect.

But the translator is faced with real difficulties when confronted with semantic wordplay in which two or more meanings/allusions are contained in one single utterance of the word. It is seldom the case that the German language can provide an equivalent - especially where the *double entendre* is of a particularly obscene nature. Hamlet employs this device as a means to shatter the facade of morals and propriety which surrounds him. His single utterance of the *double entendre* is often intended solely for the audience, who are then required to apply its underlying allusion in the context. The desired effect here is an alertness in the audience to what *is* 'rotten in the state of Denmark' and identification with the protagonist as he and his audience move into intellectual alliance in the shared cognition of the innuendo.

The jingle is probably the least taxing manifestation of wordplay for the translator into German to deal with. Whether it takes the form of repeated words or stem-related words, phrase echoes, a parody of the euphuistic style, particularly when based on Latinate words, or a combination of antonyms with alliteration or assonance, these can usually be rendered in German with much more ease and flexibility. The only form which may present a problem is the etymological device where deviation or inflection in a combination of stem-related words also creates a second meaning.

The following analyses from various Shakespeare dramas will illustrate how Johann Heinrich Voß and Heinrich Voß handled the different types of wordplay in their German translations.

Double entendre / semantic wordplay

Hamlet's projection of disgust towards his mother onto Ophelia manifests itself in Act III, Scene ii in a series of particularly gross insults. Sexual jesting underlies the *mots à double entente* with which he taunts Ophelia before and during the performance of the 'mouse-trap'.

Having refused his mother's invitation to sit by her during the play, Hamlet makes the following suggestive approach to Ophelia:

> 'Lady, shall I lie in your lap?' (l. 110)

The reference to the female pudendum contained in the word 'lap' makes what Hamlet in line 112 also modifies to an innocent enough request under the circumstances into a propositioning. Johann Heinrich Voß translates:

> 'Fräulein, darf ich im Schooß euch ruhn?'

The word 'Schoß', which also alludes to the internal female reproductive organs ('Mutterleib'), is the closest approximation to the ambiguous 'lie/lap' possible in the German language. It does, however, represent a considerable change in level of style and content. The bluntness and vulgarity of what amounts to the implication of a purely physical act of lovemaking in the original is not only euphemised in the German expression 'Schoß', the underlying question is lent a different, affective value. Both of these elements are further enhanced by Voß's use of 'ruhn' for 'lie' rather than 'liegen'.

We might suspect from the above rendering that Voß had not recognised the *double entendre* in this passage at all were it not for his translation of Hamlet's simulated surprise in

> 'Do you think, I meant country matters?' (l. 115)

> 'Denkt ihr, ich meinte Bauernspaß?'

The homophony of the first syllable of the word 'country' and a further vulgar term for the pudenda presents a similar problem for the translator as the word 'lap' in line 110. This time, however,

Voß's translation leaves no doubt as to his awareness of the sexual allusion. Right up to the last generation the term 'der Bauer' (original meaning: *voluptas, libido*) was used through the ages throughout Germany in vulgar speech and various combinations to express methods of attaining sexual relief. 'Warmer Bauer', for example, indicated the natural way of sexual intercourse, 'kalter Bauer' meant 'onanism'.[1] The homonymity of the word 'Bauer' with its obvious rustic connotations in its meaning of 'peasant' or 'worker of the land' makes the word an apt and impressive realisation of Shakespeare's wordplay, and its compounding with 'Spaß' results in a superlative and uninhibited equivalent of the whole original phrase.

In lines 232 to 239 of the same scene, Hamlet has been interpreting the action on the stage for Ophelia. He continues to utter obscenities to her, this time taking up an innocent remark which Ophelia makes and elaborating on its innuendo. In reply to Hamlet's suggestion that he could provide the dialogue to accompany a love-making scene with Ophelia and a lover, Ophelia remarks

> 'You are keen, my lord, you are keen.' (l. 244)

The primary meaning of 'sharp-tongued', which is intended by Ophelia, is interpreted by Hamlet in its second, sexual sense of 'libidinous'. Using the noun 'edge' in line 245 to establish the double meaning of 'keen', Hamlet retorts with a *double entendre* which, in its context, particularly that of the possessive adjective 'my',removes any doubt as to how the audience should interpret it:

> 'It would cost you a groaning to take off my edge.' (l. 245)

Voß translates:

> 'Scharf seid ihr, gnäd'ger Herr, sehr scharf.'
>
> 'Es kostet Euch manches Ach, eh' ihr mich abgestumpft.'

Like Shakespeare, Voß works with two different words to establish the sexual implication. The adjective 'scharf' reflects precisely the two levels of meaning in 'keen'. The *double entendre* in Hamlet's reply is reproduced by the verb 'abstumpfen' ('blunt', 'flatten'; 'take the edge off one's appetite') and rendered explicit

in its sexual innuendo by the object pronoun 'mich'. This provides the unusual, but in this case apt, occurrence of a verb used figuratively in its reference to the primary allusion of the word 'scharf' and literally in its reference to the secondary suggestion of providing male sexual relief. This is an equivalent rendering.

Some examples of semantic wordplay in *Twelfth Night* will serve to illustrate how Johann Heinrich Voß dealt with this aspect of wordplay in the comic sub-plot. In Act I, Scene iii, Maria holds her own with Sir Toby Belch and Sir Andrew Aguecheek in some driving repartee. Maria informs Sir Toby that Olivia objects to his late hours and drinking habits:

Maria: 'Ay,but you must confine yourself within the modest limits of order'. (II. 8 and 9)

The verb 'confine' is taken up by Sir Toby in a contrived secondary meaning of the word and combined with the etymologically related adverb 'fine':

Sir Toby Belch: 'Confine? I'll confine myself no finer than I am.' (l. 10)

This example, like many others in Shakespeare's comic quibbling, tends towards the jingle. Johann Heinrich Voß has rendered it as such, playing on the word 'hübsch':

Maria: 'Ja, ihr müßt euch aber doch hübsch halten in den ehrbaren Schranken der Ordnung.'

Junker Tobi: 'Hübsch halten? Ich will nicht hübscher mich aufhübschen als ich bin.'

The adverb 'hübsch' in Maria's admonition ('like a good chap'; 'as is proper') can either be seen to retain its grammatical function in Junker Tobi's 'Hübsch halten?' as an elliptic echo of Maria's statement, or interpreted as an adjective, '(sich) hübsch halten', to keep oneself trim, handsome, etc. This would be clarified by the appropriate accentuation of the exclamation: emphasis on the verb where 'hübsch' is an adverb, and on the word 'hübsch' if it is seen as an adjective. Whichever the case, the rendering is a suitable modulation from the figurative meaning of 'confine oneself' (l. 8)

to Sir Toby's new definition of 'confine' as 'dress up' in line 10. This new definition fully justifies Voß's coining the neologism 'sich aufhübschen' (sich ausputzen) to complete what is an equivalent rendering of the original on every level.

The classic pun on 'nature'/'natural' in lines 27 to 29 of the same scene

Sir Toby: '...and hath all the good gifts of nature'

Maria: 'He (Sir Andrew) hath indeed, - all most natural'
(ll. 27 to 29)

presents a problem for the German translator in that the words 'natürlich' and 'Natur' have no associations with the mental deficiency which can be implied in the term 'a natural'. Voß echoes Sir Toby's words almost exactly:

Junker Tobi: '...und hat alle guten Gaben der Natur.'

His rendering of Maria's 'most natural', however, can only be considered a weak compensation for Shakespeare's semantic wordplay:

Maria: 'Ja, in der That, als leibhafter Natursohn.'

The word 'Natursohn' only has associations with 'innocence', 'artlessness', '(positive) simplicity', and these hardly provide an accurate element of characterisation for Sir Andrew. Voß has salvaged the repetition of 'Natur', and the term 'Natursohn' does acquire a shade of irony through the qualification 'leibhaft' ('in person', 'a very ...') and the ensuing 'branding' which Maria supplies: 'Denn neben dem Erzgecken ist er zugleich ein Erzkrakeeler' ('for, besides that he's a fool, he's a great quarreller'). Although this is no real match for Shakespeare's original, the rendering does convey the necessary gibe and it is the closest German equivalent without paraphrasing.

Later in this same scene, Sir Andrew Aguecheek boasts of his prowess as a dancer:

'Faith I can cut a caper.' (l. 118)

Sir Toby Belch's jesting reply takes up the verb 'cut' and refers, without explicit mention of the word, to the second meaning of 'caper', the pickled flower-buds of the caper bush which are used to make sauce:

'And I can cut the mutton to't.'

Voß again resorts to the jingle for his translation of this semantic wordplay:

Junker Andreas: 'Mein Seel, ich mache die Kapriol euch -'

Junker Tobi: 'Wie man Kapper und Oliv' einmacht.'

The verbs 'machen' and 'einmachen' have replaced the figurative and literal senses of 'cut', and 'caper' is realised in its two different meanings. Salvaging the semantic identity in 'caper' has, however, involved a little contrivance. The word 'Oliv'' may have been used for two purposes: to establish a lexical field for what is most likely a dialect rendering of the standard 'Kaper',[2] and perhaps also to combine with 'Kapper' to suggest a phonetic echo of the whole word 'Kapriol'- [kapRio:l]; [kapəRo:l] (Kapper/Ol). The verb 'einmacht' ({mix together} and preserve) might be seen to support this device. Voß has certainly deviated from the standard pronunciation of 'Kaper' to provide [a] assonance with 'Kapriol'. If the transposition of phonemes was an intended device, it is certainly an imaginative and skilful example of wordplay. But it is doubtful whether it would actually convey itself to the audience with sufficient spontaneity as such. It lacks the logical semantic reference of Shakespeare's 'cut a caper' to 'cut mutton' to the accompanying 'caper sauce', which would require no reflection on the part of the audience. In Voß's rendering, the humorous element would at best be seen immediately in the fact that one would no sooner pickle capers and olives together than believe Sir Andrew capable of cutting an elegant caper. A greater degree of habitual collocation is required in the wordplay to guarantee the quality of wit of the original and its pragmatic equivalence.

In Act III, Scene i of *Romeo and Juliet*, Mercutio, who is a master of the *double entendre*, this time strikes a bitter note of irony at his own expense as he takes leave of his friends, following injuries sustained in his fight with Tybalt:

'Ask for me tomorrow, and you shall find me a grave man.' (l. 102)

Johann Heinrich Voß translates:

'Fragt nach mir morgen, und ihr treft mich gar gesetzt.'

The semantic play on the word 'grave' ('Grab' and 'ernst') is enhanced in its note of portent by its syntactical realisation as a single syllable adjective qualifying a noun of similar syllable length, and by its position at the end of the sentence where the intonation falls. Most German translators, including the modern ones, have echoed the auxiliary verb 'shall' in the main clause with either an auxiliary or a modal verb in German.[3] In doing this in a prose text they have inevitably lost the end position of the clause to the main verb. Voß has sensibly used the so-called *Präsens*$_{III}$ to render 'shall find' ('treft'), thus leaving himself free to reproduce the position of the semantic wordplay at the end of the sentence. The temporal component 'morgen' in the introductory imperative provides sufficient reference to the future without the auxiliary verb.

Voß's rendering of the word 'grave' with 'gesetzt' reflects the adjectival meaning of the original perfectly. The second, nominal sense 'Grab' is only suggested in the past participle, but the context makes it quite clear that 'gesetzt' is an ellipsis requiring the prefix 'bei' for full representation as 'buried' or 'entombed'. The single syllable particle 'gar' preceding the participle helps to prompt this insertion. But this is not the only function of the particle. The long syllable 'gar' and the [g] alliteration in 'gar gesetzt' combine to create a tone which corresponds with the weight and sombreness of the original 'grave man'.

It is also possible that Voß intended a play on the word 'gar'. In its meaning of 'very', 'not half ...' it represents an intensification of the word 'gesetzt'. It could however allude to the following sentence 'Ich bin *gepfeffert* für die Welt' (my italics), which renders 'I am peppered ... for this world.' The word 'gar' in the adjectival sense of 'well-cooked', 'done' would, after all, be a plausible association with 'gepfeffert' as 'seasoned and ready'. This would not exceed the density or level of style of Shakespeare's wordplay in Mercutio's farewell speech as a whole, nor would it be

out of character for Mercutio's ready wit in all situations.

Semantic wordplay on the word 'points' occurs in two plays translated by Heinrich Voß - *Winter's Tale* and *1 Henry IV*. In Act IV, Scene iv of *Winter's Tale* a servant announces the arrival of Autolycus the pedlar and recites a list of the haberdashery he is carrying for sale:

> 'He hath ribands of all the colours i' the rainbow; points, more than all the lawyers in Bohemia can learnedly handle, though they come to him by the gross;' (ll. 206 to 209).

The reference to the word 'lawyer' establishes the second meaning of 'points' as legal points, as opposed to the primary sense here of 'tagged laces', which functioned as a type of braces. In his note to *Was ihr wollt* I.5.c), Heinrich defines the latter as 'Haken oder Hefte ... , die, an der Hose befestigt, in zwei Löcher des Wamses eingriffen, damit die Hose nicht herabfiel'. Unlike his father, Heinrich sensibly avoided playing on the words 'Haken' or 'Hefte' of his own definition.[4] He renders the above as follows:

> 'Er hat Bänder von allen Farben im Regenbogen; Spizen (sic), mehr als alle Advokaten in Böhmen zu ihrem Kram verbrauchen können, und kämen sie zu ihm in hellem Haufen;'

Heinrich's choice of the word 'Spitzen' here is excellent. Its primary meaning of 'lace' fits into the lexical field of 'Kurzwaren' and yet alludes, if a little more ironically than Shakespeare's 'legal points', to the language of the legal profession. 'Spitzen' implies 'Spitzfindigkeit' which aptly characterises the sophistry and subtlety of aspects of legal argument.

In *1 Henry IV*, Act II, Scene iv, 'points' refers to the tip of a sword and the 'tagged laces'. In the Boar's Head, Falstaff is inadvisedly indulging in tall talk of his exploits when he and his thieving associates were in turn set upon by 'thieves':

> Falstaff: '.... These nine in buckram, that I told thee of, --'
>
> P. Henry: 'So two more already.'

Falstaff: 'Their points being broken, - -'

Poins: 'Down fell their hose.' (ll. 237 to 240).

Heinrich Voß translates lines 239 and 240:

Falstaf: 'Da ich die Bande gesprengt hatte, -'

Poins: 'Nieder fiel ihnen die Hose!'

The original passive phrase 'Their points being broken' is now rendered as an active clause indicating, not the weakened position of the attackers, but how their position was weakened. This allows Voß to incorporate play on the word 'Bande' in his rendering. Because of the grammatical gender, 'Bande' for 'band of thieves' has only a glancing association with the word 'das Band' as part of the 'tagged laces'. The wordplay is, however, consolidated by the double meaning of the word 'sprengen'. In its sense of 'sever,' the verb applies to the cutting through of the laces, and in its meaning of 'scatter' covers the surface representation of 'scattering' the pack.

Semantic play on the word 'points' would be lost on most members of an English audience once this type of suspenders had disappeared from fashion. Even the 'English' Falstaff would have to imitate with his sword a slash across the midriff in order to prepare the audience for the wit in 'Down fell their hose'. Although, therefore, Voß's rendering lacks the pithiness of Shakespeare's original, with appropriate action it will evoke the desired response.

In the dialogue between the Earls of Kent and Gloucester at the opening of *King Lear*, we learn that Gloucester's younger son is illegitimate. Kent is puzzled at Gloucester's first reference to this:

Kent: 'I cannot conceive you'.

Glos.: 'Sir this young fellow's mother could;'
(II. 11 and 12)

To provide a *double entendre* in translation for the Latinate word 'conceive' ('understand', 'become pregnant') inevitably means a

change in level of style. Heinrich Voß prepared two translations of *King Lear*, one in 1806, when his experience in Shakespeare translation was limited to a rendering of *Othello* under the auspices of Schiller, and a thorough revision which was begun in 1812 and completed some six years later. His original version of the above was:

Kent: 'Ich begreif' Euch nicht.'

Glos.: 'Die Mutter dieses Burschen konnte es desto besser.'

He then revised this to

Kent: 'Herr, ich kann euch nicht fassen.'

Glos.: 'Herr, des Burschen Mutter hat mich gefaßt.'

Both renderings tend towards the bawdy. This is however not out of place when we consider lines 20 to 22: 'this knave came somewhat saucily into the world ...; there was good sport at his making'. The original version is by far the better of the two renderings. The verb 'begreifen' is a more formal word for 'understand' than 'fassen' and therefore a more apt translation of 'conceive'. The mere implication of the second meaning of 'begreifen' in the first rendering is much more subtle and elegant than the realisation of 'gefaßt' in the later revision. The second meaning of 'begreifen' is a far more pertinent representation of sexual allusion; not merely 'grasp' or 'catch hold of', but 'feeling', 'touching', 'handling'. The expression 'hat mich gefaßt' is more redolent of a game of tag.

In *Othello* we have a further play which was originally translated by Heinrich Voß in 1805-06 and which underwent sporadic stages of revision between 1816 and 1822. Again, it is interesting to compare two versions of the same *double entendre*. In a fit of uncontrolled jealousy, Othello makes accusations against Desdemona in Act IV, Scene ii which are without foundation and thus totally incomprehensible for her. Bewildered, she asks

'Alas, what ignorant sin have I committed?' (l. 72)

In his retort, Othello takes up the word 'committed' three times (lines 74, 75 and 78) in its second sense of 'to sin', particularly when applied to adultery:

'...What committed!
Committed! - O thou public commoner!' (ll. 74 and 75)

In the original rendering, Heinrich Voß translates

'Welch unbewußten Fehl hab' ich begangen?'
'...Was begangen!
Begangen! - O gemeine Buhlerin!'

The word 'begehen' has a now obsolete second reference to coarse forms of sexuality. The word 'Fehl' for 'sin' does not, however, prepare the context sufficiently well for this meaning to find an immediate response in the minds of the German audience. The *double entendre* becomes clear only at the mention of the word 'Buhlerin', which provides the reference to illicit lovemaking. Had he, however, translated 'sin' in line 74 with its German equivalent 'Sünde', 'committed' in its sense of 'to do' or 'to perpetrate' would have been lost.

Perhaps realising this, Voß revises his translation to

'Was hab' ich denn unwissend fehl gethan?'
'...Was fehl gethan?
Fehl, fehl! - O du gemeine Buhlerin!'

whereby the wordplay is forfeited altogether. But his solution in the form of an echo is an excellent alternative. The intensity created by the four uses of the word 'fehl' adequately reflects the aesthetic device used by Shakespeare. It characterises both the protagonist in his pain and anger and the situation in which the device is employed. Whereas the original rendering is a 'half-measure' attempt, the echo comes over with full effect. This revision shows that if the Voßs' broad principle of 'Treue zum Werk' is not feasible, they can and do fall back on a translation for equivalent effect.

Semantic wordplay, in particular the more vulgar *double entendre*, is the most difficult of the punning devices for which to find German semantic equivalents which are also spontaneously received by the audience. We can see from the above analyses that adequate rendering depends very much on the imaginative links and associations which the translator is capable of forging and expres-

sing in his own language. Although the examples given represent only a fraction of Shakespeare's semantic wordplay, they do illustrate the sensitivity and skill with which Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß have approached this type of pun. Inevitably some particular implication in content or aspect of style may be lost where substitution is necessary to express the device in German. But neither father nor son has made the mistake of allowing their committal to near perfect identity to inhibit them in the case of semantic wordplay (cf. p. 83 'Gleicher Räumlicher Umfang, nicht als sklavische sondern als geistige Regel'). Indeed they have supplied some excellent German equivalents, often different in form and sometimes in content from the original, but always with an eye to the effect that is to be achieved.

Homonyms/homophones

Act I, Scene i of *Julius Caesar* allows us a gradual transition from semantic wordplay to the homonymic pun. When the tribune Marullus asks one of the commoners what his trade is, he glibly replies

> '..I am but, as you would say, a cobbler.
>
> '...which is, indeed, sir, a mender of bad soles.'
>
> (ll. 11 and 14).

Johann Heinrich Voß translates:

> '..Bin ich nur, was man nennt, ein Flicker.
>
> '..zu bessern, Herr, den schlechten Wandel.'

Voß has chosen to render both puns as semantic wordplay. The word 'Flicker' for 'cobbler' expresses exactly the primary meaning of 'to mend shoes' and the second, derogatory, meaning implied by Shakespeare of 'to botch' or 'to bungle'. The pun inherent in 'a mender of bad soles' must either be rendered as a jingle in German with 'Sohle'- 'Seele', or, a word must be used which can have reference to both 'ein Schuster' and 'ein Seelenarzt'. The word 'Wandel' is certainly a tempting solution; we can detect a literal meaning of 'walking', 'wandering', and the figurative sense of 'behaviour',

'way of life'. But as far as comic effect and audience reaction are concerned, the solution is only just tolerable. Shakespeare's realistic level of expression, a pun which is immediately recognised by the audience, has been shifted onto a more poetic level, a quibble which bears the traits of complex semantic wordplay and therefore requires considerable deliberation before it is appreciated.

The following lines from *Hamlet* II, ii represent a final warning from Hamlet to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern that he is not deceived by their façade and a reminder to the audience of Hamlet's sanity:

> 'I am but mad north-north-west: when the wind is southerly, I know a hawk from a handsaw.' (ll. 374 and 375).

There are various theories as to the origin and interpretation of the proverbial saying 'I know a hawk from a handsaw',[5] but Johann Heinrich Voß's only official elucidating source of information was the notes in the Leipzig Shakespeare edition. These informed him that it was 'A proverbial speech'. It is doubtful, therefore, whether Voß was aware of the possible intended homophonic pun on a corrupt pronunication of 'hernshaw', [hæ ns ɔ], and the word 'handsaw', or even of the second meaning of 'hawk' as a plasterer's board. Whatever the case, only one dimension of meaning could possibly be reflected in German, and this is how Voß dealt with it:

> 'Ich bin nur toll bei Nordnordwest; wenn der Wind südlich ist, unterscheid ich Habicht und hölzernes Huhn.'

He has firstly ignored the 'handsaw' and very sensibly concentrated on the alliteration which is so typical of such proverbs. But the contrasting element in 'hölzernes Huhn' for 'weathercock' (Voß deliberately avoids the usual term 'Wetterhahn') not only forms a logical connection with the winds, it also provides an item with double meaning in its apt incongruity with the word 'Habicht'. Voß has thereby achieved a comic effect which will immediately be appreciated by the audience, retained alliteration and wordplay and even an element of semantic equivalance.

An element of social criticism is introduced in Act V, Scene i of *Hamlet* when the grave-diggers argue as to the rights and wrongs of a Christian burial for one who has committed suicide. This criti-

cism culminates in the paradox that only workers of the soil and grave-diggers are true gentlemen:

> 1 Clown: '...Come, my spade. There is no ancient gentlemen but gardeners, ditchers, and grave-makers; they hold up Adam's profession.'
> 2 Clown: 'Was he a gentleman?'
> 1 Clown: 'He was the first that ever bore arms.'
> 2 Clown: 'Why, he had none.'
> 1 Clown: 'What art a heathen? How dost thou understand the Scripture? The Scripture says, Adam digged; Could he dig without arms?' (ll.29-37)

The banal pun on 'arms' ('Wappen', 'Arme') has undergone various linguistic and metaphorical contortions in the hands of translators who have done their utmost to salvage semantic identity.[6] But their efforts only succeeded in forfeiting a device which is an integral part of the characterisation of the grave-diggers: an uneducated mind, and a ready but trite wit, one which would have immediate appeal for the audience.

Johann Heinrich Voß deals with this pun as follows:

> Erster Todtengräber:
> '...Komm, mein Spaten. Es giebt nicht so alte
> Edelleute, wie Gärtner, Kleier und Grabmacher.
> Sie sezen Adams Gewerbe fort.'
> Zweiter Todtengräber:
> 'War der ein Edelmann?'
> Erster:
> 'Er war der erste, der sich auf die Faust verstand.'
> Zweiter:
> 'O nicht doch!'
> Erster:
> 'Was? bist ein Heide? Kennst du die Schrift nicht?
> Die Schrift sagt: Adam grub! Konnt' er graben ohne
> Faust?'

In order to reproduce the transparency of this pun, Voß has dismissed the point of comparison in the shape common to both spade and escutcheon as a contextual indicator and taken the 'bearing of arms' in its allusion to combat for his rendering. The

expression 'sich auf die Faust verstehen' (to be an expert fighting man) has reduced Adam's heraldic bearings to a metaphorical pugilistic skill, but at the same time provided a pun ('konnt' er graben ohne Faust?') which evinces equivalence on every level. The pun is not contrived, it functions perfectly as a characterisation device, as the level of expression is consistent with the colloquial style and language level of the context, and it is humorous.

Although *Love's Labour's Lost* may be straightforward as far as the plot is concerned, it presents a particularly stiff challenge to the translator. Language ranges from the elegant courtly style of the day with its verbal arabesque of wit, its rhyming and sonnets to the parody of the linguistic pedantry and high ambitions of learning which constitutes the sub-plot. The convoluted preciosity of Armado's speech, the malapropisms and confusions of Costard, the generous sprinkling of Latin in dialogue involving Holofernes and the witty hair-splitting of Moth all contribute to the evolution of wordplay and puns which demand of the translator a great deal of skill and creativity. One acute test can be found in Act IV, Scene ii of the play when Jaquenetta unwittingly initiates a homophonic pun with her deviating pronunciation of the word 'parson':

> 'God give you good morrow, master person (sic).' (l. 79)

From this ensues an associative flight of fantasy on the part of Holofernes which ultimately lands us in the semantic field of cellarage:

> Hol. 'Master person - *quasi* pers-on. And if one should be pierced, which is the one?'
> Cost. 'Marry, master schoolmaster, he that is likest to a hogshead.' (ll.80-83).

This transition would not be difficult for Shakespeare's audience to follow, as 'person' and the then English pronunciation of 'pierce' [pɜrs] and the provincial [ɔn] or [ən] pronunciation of 'one' are homophonic. It is then not far to the association with 'barrel' and its realisation as 'hogshead', a term which was also common for 'blockhead'.

To render this in German with a degree of semantic fidelity is difficult, to achieve the same laconicism is virtually impossible.

Heinrich Voß translates:

> Jakobine:
>
> 'Geb' euch Gott guten Morgen, Herr Pfarr.'
>
> Holofernes:
>
> 'Herr Pfarr, Farr, *id est* Ochs. Und wär' ein Ochs hier, wer wär' es?'
>
> Schädel:
>
> 'Ei, Herr Schulmeister, Er, der wie ein Oxhoft giebt aus dem Haupt ochsichte Gelahrtheit.'

Voß, too, sets out from a homophonic pun, which, however, is dictated by his adherence to a reflection of 'hogshead' ('Oxhoft') at the climax of the wordplay. Homophony of a lazy pronunciation of the word 'Pfarrer' and the now obsolete word 'Farre', meaning 'ox', allows him to establish the homophony which he will later require with 'Ox'. Where he could, he has substituted the components of the original well: Holofernes' savouring of the synonymy of 'Pfarrer' and 'Ochs' (also a term for 'blockhead', 'fool', and an anticipation of line 84 of the original) via homophony; the Latin expression is echoed, and the chiastic structure of Holofernes' second sentence ('one'/'one'), which even suggests further wordplay, has been rendered by homophony ('wär''/'wer').

As the word 'Oxhoft' here signifies no more than 'cask', it is rendered in a simile, with the word 'Haupt' establishing figurative reference to debilitated mental powers. The two Teutonic cognate forms *hoft* and 'Haupt' are fused by the deviant realisation of 'ochsige Gelehrtheit'. It expresses on the one hand the bird-wittedness of Shakespeare's 'erudite' Sir Nathaniel as object of 'Er, der ... giebt', and on the other hand, in its simulation of drunken speech ('ochsichte Gelahrtheit'), is object of 'Oxhoft ... giebt'. The latter suggests that Voß was aware of Crow's ascertainment that 'piercing a hogshead' was a sixteenth and seventeenth century idiom for a bout of hard drinking.[7] Voß has managed to reproduce Shakespeare's wordplay admirably, considering the brevity of what Shakespeare's characters actually realise in words, and the extent of what is left unsaid in their ambiguity. Although the unambiguity of the German equivalent of 'hogshead' necessitated additional devices to guarantee clarity for the audience, Voß has succeeded in keeping these to a minimum: a second, but etymologically related subject, and an object with two corresponding features of reference. The

complete result is a witty compact entity with logical inner development.

Homophonic wordplay on the words 'waist' and 'waste' occurs in both *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and *2 Henry IV*, in each case a quip on Falstaff's circumference. In *Merry Wives* Act I, Scene iii, Falstaff, who is 'out at heels' sees a way of improving finances by making love to the wives of Ford and Page, since it is they who hold their husbands' purse-strings. He announces his plan to Pistol and Nym as follows:

> 'My honest lads, I will tell you what I am about.' (l. 36)

The ambiguity of the object clause produces a spontaneous pun from Pistol:

> 'Two yards and more.' (l. 37)

Both figurative and literal levels of the verbal phrase governing 'waist' and 'waste' have been established, now to be elaborated on by Falstaff:

> 'No quips, now, Pistol; Indeed I am in the waist two yards about: but I am now about no waste; I am about thrift.' (ll. 38 and 39)

The pun on 'waist' ('Taille') and 'waste' (Verschwendung'), coupled with the two meanings of 'to be about' ('to have in mind' and 'to measure ...in circumference') has been resolved.

Shakespeare's wordplay evolves initially from a deliberate misinterpretation on Pistol's part of Falstaff's 'what I am about'. Heinrich Voß has employed a similar device:

> Falstaf:
> 'Meine ehrlichen Leute, ich will euch meine Tücke sagen.'
> Pistol:
> 'Die ist zwei Ellen und darüber.'

The humour in Voß's rendering is created by the ostensible auditory confusion of the two closely sound-related words 'Tücke' and 'Dicke' and Pistol's resulting inappropriate comment on Falstaff's state-

ment. Voß continues with Falstaff's clarification of the disturbance in communication:

> 'Jetzt keine Possen, Pistol; im Ernst, ich habe wol zwei Ellen in der Dicke; aber ich meine jetzt nicht die Dicke, die verzehrt, sondern die Tücke, die ernährt.'

The homophony in 'waist' and 'waste' is reproduced in the near homophony of 'Tücke' and 'Dicke'. As compensation for the repeated use of the two levels of 'I am about' and for the non-realisation of the words 'waste' and 'thrift' ('gain', 'profit'), Voß has employed the concluding jingle. This device serves as an echo, 'waste' is suggested in obesity as a constant drain on resources ('die Dicke, die verzehrt'), and the dubious means of replenishment or 'thrift' in 'eine Tücke, die ernährt'. This is a very skilful rendering which forfeits none of Shakespeare's spontaneity and compactness.

Falstaff is being taken to task in *2 Henry IV* Act I, Scene ii by the Lord Chief Justice for his errant ways and his influence on Prince Hal. The Lord Chief Justice reminds Falstaff:

> 'Your means are very slender, and your waste is great.'

Falstaff:

> 'I would it were otherwise; I would my means were greater, and my waist slenderer.' (ll. 222 - 225)

This is a straightforward pun, but one which must again be rendered with different devices. Heinrich Voß translates:

Oberrichter:

> 'Eure Mittel sind schmal, und euer Aufwand groß.'

> 'Ich wollt' es wär nicht so! Doch leider, zum Aufwenden bin ich Schmalhans, und groß ist mein Mittelstück.'

Where Shakespeare's device has necessitated only an interchange of the adjectives in the comparative form and the substitution of the homophone 'waist', Voß has had to do a little more juggling. The homonymy in 'Mittel' (means) and 'Mittel(stück)' ('centre cut', 'flank') comes closest to supplying the hint of a pun. The qualifiers have been interchanged, but, as 'schmal' and 'Aufwand' do not

connote, an alternative solution had to be found. The quasi-antonomasia 'Schmalhans' is contrived here, since it is normally only used in the saying 'bei ihnen ist Schmalhans' ('they are on short commons'), and the verbal noun structure 'zum Aufwenden' really requires 'zu' plus adjective to be syntactically precise. However, as a two-syllable compound noun, 'Schmalhans' does match well with the compound 'Mittelstück', so that the sentence balance of the original is reproduced.

It can be seen from Heinrich Voß's unpublished letters to Bernhard Rudolf Abeken that *Merry Wives* was translated in 1813, and *Henry IV, Part I and II* during the years 1817 and 1818. Although the context of both the above puns is semantically and syntactically uncomplicated in the original, the strategy which Shakespeare applied for his pun in *Merry Wives* requires more ingenuity of the translator. Inspite of the fact that Voß rendered this four years before the pun in *2 Henry IV*, he has tackled it far more elegantly and efficiently. His version of the pun in *2 Henry IV* is semantically overloaded and, partly due to the deviant use of 'Schmalhans', fails to draw immediate response.

From these examples, it can again be seen that, although the German renderings occasionally lack the laconicism and immediate intelligibility of the original, the translators have never failed to grasp the pun in all its aspects. Indeed, most of the renderings evince an outstanding degree of equivalence on every level.

Jingles

The jingle, repetition and assonant and alliterative wordplay often serve to intensify or emphasise other devices or types of wordplay. In the flower passage of *Winter's Tale*, Act IV, Scene iv, we have an example of the jingle amplifying antithesis. As Perdita is presenting flowers 'to men of middle age' Camillo, having already been given flowers in the order of seniority, remarks:

> 'I should leave grazing, were I of your flock,
> And only live by gazing.' (ll. 108 and 109)

Heinrich Voß has found a good equivalent in

> Kamillo: Die Weide ließ ich, wär ich euer Lamm,
> Mich bloß an euch zu weiden.'

This represents one of the rare fortunate coincidences where the meanings, here of the two rhyming gerunds, in the original can actually be expressed by two levels of meaning in etymologically related forms in German. The word 'Weide' meaning 'pasture' covers 'grazing', whilst the figurative verb 'sich weiden an' provides an excellent reproduction of 'gazing' in its meaning of 'to revel in', 'to feast one's eyes on'. The jingle is retained, and the metre is identical with the original.

In the following example from Act IV, Scene iii of *Othello*, antithesis is inherent in the rhyming words themselves. Desdemona is asking Emilia what it would take for her to betray Iago. Having been asked if she would do it for the whole world, Emilia replies:

> 'The world is a huge thing: 'Tis a great price
> For a small vice.' (ll. 68 and 69)

In his first version of *Othello*, Heinrich Voß had obviously not recognised Shakespeare's device:

> Emilia: 'Die Welt ist mächtig groß, ein hübscher Preis
> Für eine kleine Schuld.'

In the later revision, however, he has profited from practice and experience:

> 'Die Welt ist mächtig weit; ein großer Lohn
> Für kleinen Hohn.'

Although the word 'Schuld' in the first version is in fact a closer rendering of 'vice' than the later word 'Hohn' ('taunt', 'mockery'), the rhyme is an important device. And 'Hohn' can indeed be justified in the light of Emilia's statement in lines 74 and 75:

> 'who would not make her husband a *cuckold*,
> to make him a monarch.' (My italics)

Voß does not echo the additional intensification which Shakespeare gives the antithesis through the heavy stress on 'great price' and 'small vice'. This is made impossible by the inflected adjectives.

The same drama gives us an instance of a combination of assonance, alliteration and the jingle to intensify antithesis. This culmination is fittingly the vehicle for Othello's final words in V, ii:

> 'I kiss'd thee, ere I kill'd thee;- No way but this,
> Killing myself, to die upon a kiss.' (ll. 359 and 360)

Again, Heinrich Voß's original version of these lines is an indication of his lack of experience in recognising and rendering Shakespeare's devices:

> 'Ich küßte dich, eh' ich dich tödtete;
> Jetzt kann ich mir nichts schöneres erwerben
> Am Lebensziel, als sanft im Kuß zu sterben.'

From this paraphrastic rendering, which at least acknowledges the rhyming couplet, he later graduates to:

> 'Dich küßt' ich, eh' ich tödtet'; o Genuß!
> Mich selbst nun tödtend, sterb' ich hier im Kuß.'

As is so often the case where Shakespeare uses alliteration to highlight antitheses, the German language provides no equivalents. Thus the translator is restricted to reflecting only the jingle. Voß has done this well here, echoing exactly the parts of speech which Shakespeare employs in 'kiss' and 'kill'. Voß's rendering of 'no way but this', however, is neither an accurate translation of the English, nor is it in keeping with either the situation or Othello's speech. 'o Genuß!' is an unfortunate choice of interjection considering that Othello's final line combines the motifs of death and, in the very word 'die', the Elizabethan denotation for sexual fulfilment. For the sake of his rhyming couplet, Voß has given the latter allusion a most unsuitable added dimension.

The protagonist Hamlet is often prone to repetition when aroused or brooding. Just two examples will illustrate how Johann Heinrich Voß deals with this device. In Act I, Scene v, the Ghost has ex-

tracted a vow of revenge from Hamlet, but as soon as Hamlet is alone again, doubts flood in and resolution gives way to anger and uncertainty. No sooner has he erased past memories than he notes in his 'tables' an 'epigram' which was prompted by thoughts of Claudius:

> 'O villain, villain, smiling, damned villain.
> (...)
> That one may smile, and smile, and be a villain;'
> (ll. 106 and 108)

Voß translates:

> 'O Schuft, o Schuft, verdammter, Lächlerschuft.-
> (...)
> Auch lächelnd oft und lächelnd, ist man Schuft.'

Although the original text presents neither semantical nor syntactical problems for the translator, exact reproduction of the pounding rhythm and the epigrammatic style of line 108 is essential. To retain this rhythm, Voß has made a compound word out of 'smiling villain'. Retaining syntactical fidelity with 'lächelnder, verdammter Schuft' would have meant metrical inversion and a loss of Shakespeare's rhythmic reflection of Hamlet's anger. As it is, Voß has only had to forfeit Shakespeare's two feminine endings. Although the two instances of 'smile' in line 108 have been rendered as present participles, the line of translation still has all the neatness and economy required.

In Act IV of *Hamlet*, the hunt for Polonius's body is not made any simpler by the antic comments with which Hamlet stalls in Scene iii, when Claudius finally demands to know where Polonius is. Repetition forms the basis of Hamlet's wordplay when he wittily expounds on the theme of 'death the leveller':

> '...a certain convocation of politic worms are e'en at him. Your worm is your only emperor for diet: we fat all creatures else, to fat us; and we fat ourselves for maggots: Your fat king, and your lean beggar, is but variable service; two dishes, but to one table; that's the end.'
> (ll. 19 to 24)

Johann Heinrich Voß translates:

> '..Ein' Art Versammelung
> Statskluger Würm' ist eben dran. Der Wurm
> Ist euch Erzkaiser für den Fraß. Wir mästen
> All andres Ding, zu mästen uns, und mästen
> Uns selbst für Maden. Eur Mastkönig und
> Eur magrer Bettler sind verschiedne Tracht,
> Zwei Platten Eines Mahls nur; damit aus.'

It is not clear why Voß has translated Hamlet's prose into iambic pentameter. Certainly, both prose and verse are spoken in a number of situations throughout the play by many of the characters. But this is by no means arbitrary; it depends very much on the nature of the episode or on its immediate context. Voß, whose aim, we must not forget, was near as possible perfect identity with the original, must have known that there is always a good dramatic reason for Shakespeare's turning to prose. But although he has also imposed additional restrictions on his rendering by using blank-verse, he has nevertheless handled the device of repetition well.

The language level and cynical tone of the passage are reflected in words such as 'statsklug' for the double meaning of 'politic' ('shrewd' and 'engaged in statecraft'), 'Erzkaiser' as an ironic intensification ('only emperor'), set against 'Fraß' for 'diet', a term which fits very well with 'Mastkönig' and the repetition of 'mästen'. The strategic repetition of the indefinite possessive adjective 'your' with its particular note of condescension has been omitted in translation in the first occurrence and rendered as a dative pronoun in the second. In this realisation, it takes on a function of reference to a particular addressee (in this case, Claudius), which disturbs and distorts the rhetorical pattern.

There is no possibility of echoing Shakespeare's play on the word 'diet' in line 21 and the allusion, recalled by its context, to the 'Diet of Worms', as the German equivalent is 'Reichstag zu Worms'. But Voß does offer a little compensation in the form of additional [m] alliteration in the antithesis 'Mastkönig' and 'magrer Bettler' and in the significant nouns 'Mader' and 'Mahl'.

In *1 Henry IV*, Act II, Scene iv, we have a passage representing a parody of the euphuistic style whose ornate floridity was already

declining in popularity by the early 1590's. Shakespeare was not a great friend of euphuism, but this parody is interwoven with some of the alliterative devices and puns already discussed. Falstaff is playing the part of Prince Henry's father in order to rehearse the Prince for his confrontation with the King next day, following a night spent in the Boar's Head Tavern:

> '... for though the camomile, the more it is trodden on, the faster it grows, yet youth, the more it is wasted, the sooner it wears. That thou art my son, I have partly thy mother's word, partly my own opinion. ... If then thou be son to me, here lies the point; - Why, being son to me, art thou so pointed at? Shall the blessed sun of heaven prove a micher, and eat blackberries? a question not to be asked. Shall the son of England prove a thief and take purses? a question to be asked. ... for, Harry, now I do not speak to thee in drink, but in tears; not in pleasure, but in passion; not in words only, but in woes also; -
>
> (ll. 395 to 412)

Heinrich Voß translates:

> '... Ob die Kamille zwar,
> Je mehr sie wird getreten, schneller wächst,
> Doch Jugend wird, jemehr gebraucht, vernutzt.
> Daß du mein Sohn bist, zeugt der Mutter Wort,
> Theils eigene Vermutung; - ...
> Wenn du mein Sohn denn bist, da steckt das Ziel,
> Warum, da du mein Sohn, zielt Spott auf dich?
> Soll Gottes hehre Sonn' als Schwänzerin
> Brombeeren naschen? Ja, das fragt sich wol!
> Soll Englands Sohn Dieb sein und Beutel schneiden?
> Ja, ja, das fragt sich wol! ...
> Denn jezo, Heinrich, red' ich nicht zu dir
> Im Trunke, nein in Thränen; nicht in Freude,
> Nein Leide; nicht im Wort, nein auch in Weh. -'

As Heinrich Voß otherwise translates Falstaff's speech in the form of the original, we can only conjecture why he has transposed this particular passage into blank-verse: he may have been prompted to do so because of the language level, or because Falstaff is playing the role of the King. Whatever the reason might be, he has, like his

father in the analysis above, restricted himself considerably both semantically and syntactically.

Much of the antithetical style of the original 'camomile' simile and the effect it is illustrating has been forfeited in translation through the restraints of the iambic pentameter. The conjunction 'ob ... zwar', the particle 'doch' and the boxed syntax offer little compensation for the rhetorical balance and parallelism of Shakespeare's style. Neither the [j] alliteration of 'yet youth' introducing the main clause nor the [w] alliteration of the antithesis 'wasted'/'wears' have been reproduced. The same criticism applies for the second sentence. The rhetoric pointers 'partly'/'partly' have been rendered only once, and that as an adverbial qualifier of what seems to be merely an adjunct. Had Voß adhered to prose in his translation, he could have echoed every device up to this point.

The rhetorical framework of the second half of the passage quoted, beginning 'If then thou be son to me' is looser and easier to accommodate in blank-verse. Voß renders the remainder of the passage with altogether more fidelity: all the rhetorical pointers are in place ('Wenn', 'da', 'Warum', 'Denn'), as are the parallelisms ('Soll', 'Soll'; 'Ja', 'Ja' for the repetition of 'a question'; 'nein ... nicht' and 'nicht ... nein' for the repetition of 'not ... but'); the wordplay on 'point' has been reproduced as a jingle ('Ziel', 'zielt'); the [z] alliteration of 'Sohn' and 'Sonn'' are the only possible substitutes for the English homophones; the alliteration of the antithesis 'pleasure'/'passion' has been transferred in translation to 'Trunke'/'Thränen'; the [w] alliteration of 'words' and 'woes' is echoed in the [v] alliteration of 'Wort' and 'Weh'.

There does, however, appear to be a discrepancy in meaning between the original phrase 'a question not to be asked' and Voß's translation 'Ja, das fragt sich wol!'. Although Voß differentiates in his translation of the parallel phrase 'a question to be asked', by emphasising the affirmative ('Ja, ja, das fragt sich wol!'), this does not reflect the essential sense of the negative comment on Shakespeare's parody of metaphysical imagery and its function as an analogy.

In Act II, Scene ii of *Hamlet*, Gertrude admonishes Polonius with the words 'More matter, with less art' (l. 95), a phrase which ex-

plicitly draws our attention to the euphuistic style of Polonius's speech which Shakespeare parodies with such excellence. Having for once bluntly stated 'I will be brief: Your noble son is mad' (l. 92), Polonius continues to expound on this in his accustomed manner:

> 'Madam, I swear, I use no art at all.
> That he is mad, 'tis true: 'tis true, 'tis pity;
> And pity 'tis, 'tis true: a foolish figure;
> But farewell it, for I will use no art.
> Mad let us grant him then: and now remains,
> That we find out the cause of this effect;
> Or rather say, the cause of this defect;
> For this effect, defective, comes by cause:
> Thus it remains, and the remainder thus.
> Perpend.' (ll. 96 to 105)

Johann Heinrich Voß translates:

> 'Traun, Königin, gar nicht gebrauch' ich Kunst: -
> Daß er ist toll, ist wahr: auch wahr, 's ist Schad;
> Und Schad' ist, es ist wahr. - Die närrische Figur!
> Doch mag sie gehn! denn nicht gebrauch' ich Kunst. -
> Toll also nehmen wir ihn an. Nun bleibt,
> Daß wir erspähn den Grund zu dem Effekt;
> Nein richtiger, den Grund von dem Defekt;
> Denn der Effekt da im Defekt hat Grund.
> Dies bleibt denn nach, und dies Nachbleibsel nun
> Erwägt. -'

Up to line 99 we have almost perfect identity with the original. There is no possibility of rendering the [t] and [f] alliteration of the English text, but Voß has compensated a little with the [a:] assonance of 'wahr' and 'Schad''. He has also provided an additional device in the parallelism in lines 96 and 99, 'nicht gebrauch' ich Kunst'. The double meaning suggested in 'foolish figure' ('person' and 'poetic device') is echoed exactly in translation due to the Latinate origin of the word.

It is this same factor which provides for an effortless reproduction of the 'effect'/'defect' jingle and, as *Hamlet* has, and must have, a high proportion of Latinate words, every opportunity must be taken to provide these where possible in German translation, but

without, of course, exceeding the proportionate frequency of occurrence of these words in the German language. Voß has varied the repetition of 'remain', 'remainder' ('bleiben') with the prefix 'nach' for metrical reasons, but retained the same parts of speech. He has also incorporated 'Erwägt' ('Perpend') in a logical syntactical sequence, thus slightly marring the element of *nonsensical* repetition and with this, an example of what can happen if style has priority over substance.

Voß has rendered four lines with irregularities of metre (lines 1, 3, 4 and 5). Lines 1, 4 and 5 coincide with three of Shakespeare's four (lines 1, 4, 5 and 9), so that we have a very close equivalence on the levels of content, form and expression. Because the bulk of modern audiences is unfamiliar with the euphuistic manner, there can be little aesthetic appreciation of the parodistic dimension here. However, Voß's fidelity to the original text will assure a reaction to the obvious affectation of Polonius's speech on a line with Gertrude's prompt of 'Mehr Inhalt, minder Kunst'.

Seemingly insuperable hurdles have to be taken time and again by the translator of Shakespeare. This is particularly true in the case of Shakespeare's wordplay. The polysemic potential of the English language in confrontation with the more monosemic character of German would often appear to indicate the limits of translatability. This dealing with wordplay, once its dramatic and aesthetic functions have been identified, requires a good deal of skill and creativity and a none too conservative attitude towards language. The Voß translation practice - whether father or son - of exploiting all available resources of the German language, from archaisms to the modern, from High German to dialects, and, where necessary, to the coining of neologisms, has stood them in excellent stead here. There are, of course, instances where, in spite of the Voß obligation to the source text, they have had to undertake a shift in equivalence of type of wordplay; there are cases where the wordplay is somehat weakened. We have, however, seen that both translators have endeavoured wherever possible to reflect Shakespeare's original device in both its aesthetic and its dramatic function. When we compare the modern renderings of Shakespeare's wordplay, then we must regard these achievements of Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß as remarkable, for the degree of equivalence in many of these 20th century translations is only marginally greater; at times, indeed inferior.

b) Song texts

Songs and music can play a vital role in Shakespeare's plays, and the songs can take different forms and functions: they serve as devices for entrances, exits and scene changes, or as incidental music; others give expositional information or set the scene, enhance the atmosphere. Those in *Twelfth Night* are, for example, very closely matched to the text and the action that is taking place at that moment. The snatches of song sung by the Fool in *King Lear* are more often than not a satirical comment on the action. On the other hand, the songs in *As You Like It* seem to bear no relation to the text, and appear to have been put there simply to amuse and entertain. Obviously, where songs are an integral part of the action of the play, an adequate translation of these is essential.

The Tempest (*Der Sturm*)

Music and song are integral to the performance of *The Tempest*, in fact, there are more specific instructions for music in the original text and stage directions of this play than in any other Shakespeare drama. Once we have seen, particularly through Caliban, whose ability to hear music indicates a nobler side to his otherwise brutish character, how music permeates the play, we can indeed say with Ariel, 'they smelt music' (IV,i,178). The Elizabethans inherited the medieval conception of music as a symbol of divine harmony, and *The Tempest* is much concerned with the need for due form and order so that egotism cannot injure the rights of others and distort the body politic. The theme of change and (spiritual) journeys run through the play, the first transformation being introduced in a song by Ariel as he orders his fellow spirits to allay the storm:

Ariel's Song

Come unto these yellow sands,
And then take hands:
Curt'sied when you have, and kiss'd,
(The wild waves whist,)
Foot it featly here and there; 5
And, sweet sprites, the burden bear.
Hark, Hark!

Bur. Bowgh, wowgh.
The watch-dogs bark:
Bur. Bowgh, wowgh. 10
Hark, hark! I hear,
The strain of strutting chanticlere
Cry, Cock-a-doodle-dow.

(I,i)

Although it is Ariel's *music* that actually calms the storm, the text is important in stressing both the ethereal quality of the spirit, and his function as Prospero's chief agent of magic, without whom his project would fail. The words can also be considered as the 'libretto' to a masque dance, through which the storm and Ferdinand's sorrows are stilled. The text is an invitation to Ferdinand to draw forward onto the island, and the beauty of the words ultimately lead him to the loveliness of Miranda.

Johann Heinrich Voß translates:

Ariel *singt*

Kommt hieher auf gelben Sand,
Und fügt die Hand!
Dann mit Kußhand euch geneigt!
Der Seeschwall schweigt.
Dreht euch drall im Takt entlang, 5
Geister, und tönt Endeklang!
Horch! was gellt?
(*Stimmen* : Wau! wau!)
Der Hofhund bellt!
(*Stimmen* : Wau! wau!) 10
Horch, horch! was dort?
Haushahn, der stolze Gockellord,
Kräht Melodie:
Kikeriki!
(*Stimmen* : Kikeriki!) 15

Alliteration contributes greatly to the beauty of the first part of this 'magic song', for both the waves and Ferdinand are to be *charmed*. The [k] alliteration in 'Come' (line 1), 'court'sied' and 'kiss'd' (line 3) is realised by Voß in 'Kommt' (line 1) and 'Kuß(hand)' (line 3). 'Wild waves whist' is reflected in

'(See)schwall schweigt' in line 4. 'Foot' and 'featly' in line 5 are realised in 'Dreht' and 'drall'. There is no echo of the [s] and [b] alliteration in line 6. 'Hofhund' (line 9) and 'Haushahn' (line 12) do provide a little compensation, but certainly not sufficient when we take into consideration the 'strain' and 'strutting' in line 12 of the original.

The stages in the dance itself, and the order of events altogether in the song, are open to different interpretations depending on whether we read 'kiss'd' as a reflexive verb, or as a verb governing 'The wild waves whist'. Johnson and Steevens have not followed the First Folio, which provides a caesura after 'have' in line 3 and an enjambement at the end of the line. They have taken 'The wild waves whist' to be an absolute construction, indicating that the storm is already quietened. This, however, throws line 3 into confusion, as the formal steps in dancing were joining hands, curtseying, and a kiss at the *end* of the dance. Voß has the sprites join hands, and then makes the curtseying and kissing one action at the opening of the dance, expressing with 'Der Seeschwall schweigt' the already calm condition of the sea. The dance itself is by no means reflected in its neat, nimble steps, as Ariel requires. The adverb 'drall' for 'featly' (line 5) has undergone a functional shift; it is, strictly speaking, a noun which expresses the twisting, spinning or twirling movement of, for example, yarn on a bobbin, of a ball, or of a bullet in flight[1]. Although this conjures up a whirling dervish rather than a dance of sprites, 'drall' does supply some important alliteration.

Johnson and Steevens, like most editors, have also deviated from the First Folio in line 6 ('And sweet sprites bear/The burthen.'), and reversed the order of the words. In Voß's translation, the vocative 'Geister' explicitly invokes the 'Dreht euch drall im Takt entlang', and only implicitly the action 'tönt Endeklang'. This is a clear deviation from the original. The word 'Geister' becomes far too prominent, and its position immediately after the final nasal consonant in 'entlang', makes articulation difficult. The word 'burden' rather than the more usual 'chorus' has been reproduced by an apt 'Voß' compound 'Endeklang'.

As the music begins to assuage Ferdinand's grief for the father he believes dead, the every-day sounds of the cock and the watch-dog enter his consciousness, indicating that some form of normality is

returning. Voß has reflected this part with one or two small changes, but the image which these sounds and chorus evoke is nonetheless vivid. 'Was gellt' was necessary in line 7 to provide a rhyme for 'bellt' in line 9, just as 'was dort' (line 11) for 'I hear' supplies a rhyme word for 'Gockellord', and 'Kräht Melodie' (line 13), a rhyme with 'Kikiriki'.

Thus the rhyming couplets of the original are maintained throughout Voß's translation. The only deviations in syllable count and metre occur in line 7 ('Hark, hark!'; 'Horch! was gellt?'), line 12, whereby the syllable count is identical, but 'Haushahn' takes a spondee in place of Shakespeare's iamb on 'The strain'. The six syllables of 'Cry, Cock-a-doodle-dow' (iambic trimeter) are rendered in two lines of four syllables each, which are realised in iambs, with an inversion on '*Ki*keri*ki*'. The rhythm in line 6 of Voß's translation is, however, badly disturbed by the position of 'Geister' at the opening of the line. The caesura after the second syllable of the line instead of after the first and fourth syllables, upsets the balance of this line and that of the end of the previous line.

Johann Heinrich's translation of 'Ariel's song' ist not a very successful one on any level, particularly in the first six lines. Although the syllable unit is almost identical and he has endeavoured to reproduce alliteration and rhyme, the overall sound in the first half of the song reminds one of a country-dancing formation rather than the light-tipping movements of spirits. The second half of the song is more successful. Although there is a preponderance of aspirate alliteration in Voß's lines 9 and 12 which does not echo Shakespeare's greater variety of alliteration he has compensated successfully on the context level in line 12 with his neologism 'Gockellord'.

The mood of the sea having been changed, Ariel's second song follows almost immediately and continues the allaying of Ferdinand's anguish by impressing on him that his father, though reportedly dead, is undergoing a process of change into the rare beauty of another existence:

Ariel['s] song

Full fadom five thy father lies;
Of his bones are coral made;
Those were pearls that were his eyes:
Nothing of him that doth fade,
But doth suffer a sea-change 5
Into something rich and strange.
Sea-nymphs hourly ring his knell:
Hark! now I hear them, - Ding-dong, bell.
(I,ii)

This song also introduces a main theme of the play: that it is only through suffering and death of the old ways that rebirth is experienced. Alonso, having undergone the physical torment of storms at sea, must now undergo the torment of conscience so that he may be transmuted through a sea-change. Alliteration still renders this song reminiscent of a magic spell to accompany the transformation of Alonso, but the content level is also significant here. Johann Heinrich Voß translates:

Ariel singt,

Fünf Mann tief muß dein Vater ruhn.
Sein Gebein ward Astkorall,
Perlen sind die Augen nun;
Nichts von jenem kennt Verfall;
Nein durch Meerverwandlung gleich 5
Wird es Kleinod, fremd und reich.
Stündlich läuten Meerfräulein
Todtenpuls' ihm, leis und fein.
Horch! Dingdong gehn die Glöckelein.
(I,ii)

Voß reflects (inadequately) only the [f] alliteration in line 1: there is no reflection of the [aɪ] assonance. There is no reproduction of the [s] sounds in line 5 to 6 which enhance the word 'sea-change', or of the [n] in line 7 to underscore 'knell'. Although shifting textures and robust strength of language are a feature of *The Tempest*, it is doubtful whether Johann Heinrich Voß's nautical metaphor 'Fünf Mann tief' for 'Full fadom five' is adequate either for the language of Ariel or for the solemn elegiac beauty of the

song. The second line, however, is fully in keeping with the mood of the original. 'Astkorall' is yet another successful 'Voß' compound which not only avoids a feminine ending ('Koralle(n)'), but which aptly describes coral in its shape and not only in its substance.

By separating Alonso from Ferdinand, Prospero wishes to make them both psychologically vulnerable in their grief, thus rendering contrition and reconciliation more possible. However, Ferdinand should be comforted at least in the knowledge that 'Nothing of him [Alonso] that doth fade,/But doth suffer a sea-change/Into something rich and strange' (lines 4 to 6). The parallelism of the two intensified verbs 'doth fade'/'doth suffer', almost juxtaposed through the ellipsis ('But [that]') are very difficult indeed to reproduce in German. Because of its significance in the play, it is, however, desirable that 'sea-change' be realised as a noun in translation. Voß has handled this quite well by rendering 'Meerverwandlung' in an adverbial phrase (line 5), and for the verb, by drawing a parallel with line 2 ('ward Astkorall') to render 'suffer' as verb and complement: 'Wird Kleinod' (line 6). The resultant semantic paucity of the verb is compensated by the word 'Kleinod', in its reflection of the sense of 'precious' in 'rich and strange'.

Line 7 of the original has been rendered in two lines. Although this is a rare procedure for Voß, a translation of all the components of the original line would require at least ten syllables. The 16 syllable capacity of two lines, however, necessitates 'fillers'. These are supplied in the adverbs 'leis und fein'. 'Todtenpuls'' (a neologism) is a redundant (metaphorical) rendering of 'knell', but a nevertheless sonorous and apt one which by no means overloads the *two* lines of the song.

The basic rhythm of the song is trochaic tetrameter, with a heavy stress on the final syllable. Variations occur in the following lines of the original: an inversion in line 1 on '*Full* fadom *five*'; this is echoed exactly in the final line. Line 5, the most important line of the song, has an inversion and a spondee on 'a *sea-change*'. Voß has two parallel variations in the first and the last lines, with inversions on 'muß dein *Va*ter' and 'gehn die *Glö*ckelein'. Otherwise his verse is in regular trochaic tetrameter, which means that the significance of line 5 is not underscored metrically. Where Shakespeare has one enjambement (lines 5/6), Voß has two due to the additional (8th) line.

In view of the semantic significance of this song as an introduction to one of the main themes of the play, Voß's translation may be considered successful. What he does not recreate adequately are the fricative sounds in Shakespeare's original and his sparse use of harsh consonants. This is a device which serves to reinforce the air of incantation, and although Voß has reproduced the basic rhythm of the song, the sound falls somewhat short of the original.

***Twelfth Night* (*Was ihr wollt*)**

There are four songs scattered through *Twelfth Night*, all of them introduced and sung by Feste, the clown. Feste plays a significant role in commenting on or contributing to the theme of music and melancholy in the play, but he also sings songs of love and madness, two further themes in this play. The song 'I am gone, sir' is sung outside Malvolio's cell at the end of Act IV, Scene ii, and its contents enter directly into the action of the episode:

Clown: I am gone, sir,
And anon sir,
I'll be with you again,
In a trice,
Like to the old vice, 5
Your need to sustain;

Who with dagger of lath,
In his rage and his wrath,
Cries, ah,ha! to the devil:
Like a mad lad, 10
Pare thy nails, dad,
Adieu, goodman drivel.

Regardless of the beauty of Feste's other songs in the play, he has a cruel streak. He takes revenge for Malvolio's slighting of him in Act I, Scene v so seriously that he never forgives him. He relishes Malvolio's downfall and taunts him mercilessly when, disguised as the curate Sir Topas, Feste visits Malvolio in his darkened cell. Feste's final song represents a bitter and triumphant parting gibe. The song is of an extempore nature, tells of Vice (Feste) helping the devil (Malvolio), and deteriorates towards the end into the parody of a madman. Johann Heinrich Voß translates:

Narr singt.

Ja, geeilt, Herr!
Unverweilt, Herr,
Komm' ich wieder getrollt!
Ja, im Hui,
Wie der höllische Pfui,
Bring' ich, was ihr nur wollt.

(IV,ii)

As we see, Voß capitulates before Shakespeare's images of Vice and the devil, and renders only what is directly necessary for the completion of the action in IV,ii. Malvolio's final words 'I prithee, be gone', immediately before the Clown begins to sing, are echoed in the first words of Feste's song: 'I am gone, sir'. Voß takes up this parallel in his translation: Malvolio: 'Ich bitt' dich, geeilt', to which Feste responds, 'Ja, geeilt, Herr'. The participle 'getrollt' (at a leisurely pace) in line 3 is a further reflection of Voß's awareness of the integral nature of the song in the action and development of the play, and a (compensatory) example of Feste's callousness. 'Getrollt' suggests that Malvolio's wait for pen and paper will be as extended as Feste's taunting of him inside and outside the cell. Feste tantalises Malvolio as often as he possibly can. Remember, for instance, that he could have given Olivia Malvolio's letter much earlier than he in fact did. As it stands between 'geeilt', 'unverweilt' and 'im Hui' (in a trice), all of which are assurances of immediate attention to Malvolio's request, 'getrollt' expresses some of the nonsense contained in the second half of the original song.

The devil appears only as an allusion; 'der höllische Pfui'. This could be a play on the expletive 'Pfui Teufel' or the expression 'Höllenpfuhl'; no matter which, it is a successful echo of the ramblings of madness, particularly in its associative extempore rhyme with 'Hui'. Even if the final line of Feste's song in Voß's translation does bring the scene to a more rational close than Feste's original words, it does at least have a twist in it ('Was ihr (nur) wollt') almost worthy of Shakespeare. Although Voß's version of the song does not reflect Feste's vivid demonstration of madness, he has reinforced the lines as an integral part of the action and introduced at least an element of lunacy. Voß has echoed the mocking rhythm of Shakespeare's first four lines exactly: the

rhyme scheme is the same as in the original song. Although condensed and adapted in content, the song is well-rendered in German.

A Midsummer Night'sDream (*Sommernachts-Traum*)

The song 'You spotted snakes' in Act II, scene ii, lines 9 to 23 is a lullaby. Titania is sung to sleep by the fairies, and the lyric also suggests that they will protect her while she is sleeping (although we know that 'Never harm, nor spell nor charm', /Come our lovely lady nigh' is likely to prove to be in vain). Oberon has already described in II,i,249 to 267 the lush vegetation of the bank where Titania rests after her revels, and the creatures of nature addressed by the fairies are easy to imagine there. Just as in all the speeches of the fairies, the lullaby convinces us that they are at one with the forces of nature, that the fairies are spirits that do indeed have power and influence in the natural world.

Song

You spotted snakes, with double tongue,
Thorny hedge-hogs, be not seen;
Newts and blind worms, do no wrong;
Come not near our fairy queen:

Chorus

Philomel, with melody, 5
Sing in our sweet lullaby;
Lulla, lulla, lullaby; lulla, lulla, lullaby;
Never harm, nor spell nor charm,
Come our lovely lady nigh;
So, good night, with lullaby. 10

II

Weaving spiders, come not here:
Hence, you long-legg'd spinners, hence:
Beetles black, approach not near;
Worm, nor snail, do no offence.

The lines are mellifluous, enhanced by soft consonants and long vowel sounds. The lullaby's soothing rhythm is rather like a chant which induces sleep and at the same time wards off dangers and disturbances. Johann Heinrich Voß's version is as follows:

Eine Stimme

Züngelschlänglein, blank und bunt,
Borstenigel, weg von da!
Molch und Blindwurm, räumt den Grund;
Schlafen will Titania!

Chor

Nachtigallenmelodie 5
Tön' uns sanft zum Lullawi
Lulla lulla lullawi; lulla lulla lullawi!
Fern sei Trug, fern Bann und Fluch,
Unsrer holden Fürstin hie!
Gute Nacht nun, lullawi! 10

Eine Stimme

Webespinnchen, webst du da?
Flieh', o Langbein, fliehe weit!
Braune Käfer, kommt nicht nah!
Schneck' und Raupe, thut kein Leid!

Although Voß renders the movement of the snake's tongue ('züngeln': to dart;) rather than its shape, the translation is no less effective. The [s] alliteration in lines 1 and 2 of the original is reflected in the [b] of 'blank', 'bunt' and 'Borsten'. The command, 'Weg von da' in line 2 appears to determine a gesture which is not contained in Shakespeare's line, and one which at first would seem to disrupt the smooth rhythm of a lullaby. When, however, we consider line 12 of the original text, 'Hence, you long-legg'd spinners, hence', we find just this same gestural understructure in Shakespeare's song. The plea addressed to the newts and slow-worms, 'do no wrong' has been translated in more neutral terms: 'räumt den Grund'. Both newts and 'blind worms' (German: Blindschleichen) contribute 'poison'd entrails' to the witches brew in *Macbeth*, but perhaps Voß was aware that neither species is poisonous[2], particu-

larly as the warning 'Come not near' in line 4 is rendered in German simply as an explanation: 'Schlafen will Titania!'

The beautiful 'rocking' sound created by the counter-balance of the last two syllables of 'Philomel' and the first two syllables of 'melody' could have been reproduced verbatim in German ('Philomel', mit Melodie'). However, Voß's rendering of lines 5 and 6 is still very apt and soothing, particularly with the neologism 'Lullawi' for 'lullaby'. Its association with the lexicalised verb 'lullen' makes it perfectly understandable for the audience. The internal rhyme in line 8 has been reproduced, as have here, and elsewhere, the seven single syllable words. The negative 'nor...nor' is reflected in 'Fern ... fern'. Only the alliteration ([n] and [l]) in lines 8 to 10 is missing in the German, although some compensation is provided in line 10 in '...Nacht nun'.

Shakespeare's use of 'weaving spiders' and 'spinners' both here and in *Romeo and Juliet* I,iv,62 and 64 has been the subject of much conjecture.[3] Does Shakespeare mean the crane-fly (or daddy-long-legs) by 'spinner', or are 'weaving spiders' and 'spinners' a clear indication that he meant only spiders? Voß's distinction between 'Webespinne' in line 11 and 'Langbein' (substitutional morphemes whose approximate referent can be deduced from the context) in line 12 is a reasonable poetic compromise, particularly as he has also reflected the 'spinners' again in the verb 'weben' in line 11. The frame 'Hence ... hence' of line 12 is reproduced in 'Flieh ... flieh weit'. It was sensible of Voß not to disturb the mellifluousness of the song by introducing the dissonance of 'schwarz' to qualify the beetles (line 13): the euphony of 'black' is far better reproduced in the liquid '*br*aun'. Line 13 provides alliteration in 'Käfer, kommt nicht nah'. The diminutive affix on 'Züngelschlänglein' and 'Webespinnchen' enhances both the sound and the reflection of minuteness in the scene.

The metrical pattern of the verses of the original song is trochaic trimeter with a heavy stress on the seventh syllable. The only rhythmic deviation occurs in line 1, which has eight syllables and begins on an unstressed syllable. Lines 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 of the refrain have the light, tripping rhythm of an opening and closing dactyl, with a heavy stress on the fourth syllable. Line 7 consists of two trochees and a dactyl, repeated. Apart from line 1, which in the German version contains only seven syllables (regular trochaic

trimeter), Voß does not vary in metre at all from the original.

The music to this song is an important element in the creation of atmosphere in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. The rhythm and euphony of the lullaby are designed to lull Titania into sleep, and insofar the lullaby is also part of the action. The words are a significant component of the scene's setting, a delightful fantasy surrounding Titania's own secret bower, near a green glade and a hawthorn bush (see III,i, 3 and 4). An adequate rendering on all levels of translation is therefore more than desirable. The version that Johann Heinrich Voß has produced fulfils all of the requirements of this song.

***The Winter'sTale* (*Wintermärchen*)**

The songs in this play are sung by Autolycus, pedlar and self-confessed thief. He has two functions in the play: his presence helps to balance any tendency the audience might have to see Bohemia as an idyllic pastoral world. Autolycus, like his namesake in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is a master of dishonest arts and as such, in his second function, presents in the play a mirror image of all the honest arts. The use of disguise which figures significantly in the action of the play is a symbol of a) innocent deceptions intended to bring about good results and b) the use of art to deceive and lead astray. Thus he presents one of the major topics of the play. His great comic vigour, his performances and his songs are examples of his use of art to deceive, for they mitigate any unsavoury impression we might have of him.

Autolycus introduces himself for the first time in the song 'When daffodils' (IV,iii,1-12). The light-heartedness and roguishness of the song serve as a contrast to the tragic intensity of the previous scenes in Leontes' court:

Enter Autolycus singing

When daffodils begin to peer, - -
With, heigh! the doxy over the dale. -
Why, then comes in the sweet o' the year;
For the red blood reigns in the winter's pale.

The white sheet bleaching on the hedge, - 5
With, hey! the sweet birds, O, how they sing! -
Doth set my pugging tooth on edge;
For a quart of ale is a dish for a king.

The lark, that tirra-lirra chants, -
With hey! with hey! the thrush and the jay: - 10
Are summer songs for me and my aunts,
While we lie tumbling in the hay.

The language of the song, its rogue's slang and its carefree message are all elements of characterisation of Autolycus. The lyric reflects his worldly self-interest and his honesty, insofar as he makes no bones about his stealing.[4] The whole of the first verse, but line 4 in particular, sums up the basic progression of the play: the long wintry period established by Leontes, in which he banished human values such as love, joy, hospitality and good friendship, is over. The second line of each verse represents a varied form of refrain. All but nine words of the song are monosyllables, a factor which presents problems for the translator into German right from the beginning. Heinrich Voß translates:

Autolykus trit [sic] singend auf

Wenn blau hervor das Veilchen lacht -
He, juch! mit der Dirne wie wohlgemut!
Dann kommt des Jahres Lust und Pracht,
Roth herscht [sic] im Winterblaß das Blut.

Die Leinwand, weiß auf grüner Bleich - 5
He, juch! von Vöglein wie klingt das Thal -
Wezt mir den Mausezahn sogleich;
Denn ein Maß gut Bier ist ein königlich Mahl.

Die Lerche mit Tirilirigesang -
He, juch! auch Dohl' und Amsel dabei - 10
Sind mir und den Muhmen ein Sommerklang,
Indeß wir liegen, und tummeln im Heu.

If Heinrich chooses violets to herold the spring, then probably in order to be able to reflect some of Shakespeare's alliteration in this first verse. Shakespeare has [d] alliteration in lines 1 and 2,

and [r] alliteration in line 4. Heinrich responds with [bl] in lines 1 and 4, and [f] in line 1 ('hervor ... Veilchen'). The translation 'Dirne' for 'doxy' does not reflect slang or idiolect, but it is a typical northern German dialect expression for 'lass', 'maid', 'wench'. The connotation of 'doxy' with 'kept woman' is also inherent in the word 'Dirne', not only in modern usage: one of the definitions of the Middle High German 'dierne' is a woman who 'sells' herself ('feile Person'). The metaphor in line 4 of the original ('For the red blood reigns in the winter's pale') is, as already mentioned, an important indicator in the play, and as such requires an adequate rendering. Apart from a functional shift in the word 'red', Heinrich has successfully rendered his metaphor through a more or less word for word translation. The fact that the prominent position of the word 'pale' (possibly an indication that Shakespeare intended a play on the word: 'pale' also means 'fenced area') is forfeited in translation, is not a serious loss; and the word 'blaß', or the alternative 'bleich' has little other potential.

Line 5 of the original, the subject of the verb 'doth set' in line 7, conveys three pieces of information in straightforward syntax and, with the exception of 'bleaching', in mono-syllabic words. Heinrich has managed to reproduce all of this information in the same number of syllables: 'Die Leinwand, weiß auf grüner Bleich'. 'Bleiche' is another expression for 'Bleichplatz'. The conclusion of the sentence in line 7, 'Doth set my pugging tooth an edge', has set more than one Shakespeare editor conjecturing. 'Pug' is a Warwickshire dialect word for 'to pull' or 'to offend', and thus may have meant 'steal'.[5] The *Oxford English Dictionary* gives 'prig' as a synonym for 'to steal' in common use during the 16th and 17th centuries. Johnson reads 'progging' and notes this as indicating 'thieving'. Whatever the realisation, editors are agreed that 'thieving' or 'stealing' was the word intended by Shakespeare, and Heinrich's rendering 'Mausezahn' is an excellent combination of an apt compound and the appropriate language level. 'Mausen' is a slang expression for 'to pilfer' or 'to steal', and as an element of the compound 'Mausezahn' fits extremely well with 'wetzen' (to whet or sharpen (the appetite to steal)).[6] The assonance ([ɑɪ] in line 5) and alliteration ([m] in lines 7 and 8) are not a reflection of the original text.

The word 'aunts' in line 11 has the same meaning as 'doxy' in line 2. Heinrich apparently did not know this, as 'Muhme' is now an

obsolete word for any female relative (with the exception of mother/daughter relationships and sister), and thus quite inappropriate here. Johann Heinrich Voß's use of the word 'Muhme' for 'wisest aunt' in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, I, i, 51 is an example of 'Muhme' more accurately applied. We can only assume that Heinrich perceived only the most innocent of intentions in 'liegen, und tummeln im Heu' with Autolycus. The [s] alliteration in 'summer songs' (line 11) has been reflected in 'mir' and 'Muhmen' in the same line. Heinrich has rendered 'With heigh (hey)' in each refrain as 'He, juch', although there is a possibility that the country dance, or its tune, may be referred to in line 10 (see *Love's Labour's Lost*, V, i, 134: 'let them dance the hay'.[7]

The rhythm of the original song is carried throughout by four heavy stresses in each line, each line beginning on an up-beat. Anapaestic substitutions occur in the last foot of line 2, the first and third foot of line 4, the second foot of line 6, the first, third and fourth foot of line 8, and in the last foot of lines 10 and 11. Heinrich has maintained the rhythm of the original throughout, with anapaestic substitutions in the second and third foot of lines 2, 9 and 11, the last foot of lines 6 and 10, in the first, third and fourth foot of line 8, and in the third and fourth foot of line 12. Heinrich has twelve substitutions to Shakespeare's nine, and lines 1, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 10 are metrically identical to the original lines. Considering Shakespeare's licence in matters metrical here and the number of German syllables required to render English mono-syllables, this is no mean feat, for Heinrich has also captured the atmosphere of the song and reproduced most of its content adequately.

When we recall this song as an introduction of Autolycus into the play and its function as characterisation, in part as a significant indication that the climate of Leontes' court no longer prevails for a while, but also as a disguise to make us think that this rogue is just an amusing, incorrigible rogue, then Heinrich's rendering is successful. He echoes the lilting rhythm and makes a good effort at reflecting the language level; all of the components are there in the German translation; the spring, the rogue and a good rendering of the key line 4 in verse one.

Immediately after the song, Autolycus informs us that he is a fugitive from the court, a former servant of the prince, fallen on

hard times. His next short song is included as a means of exposition. 'But shall I go mourn' (IV, iii, 15-22), tells us what benefit Autolycus seeks from his withdrawal into the country and the community of shepherds:

But shall I go mourn for that, my dear?
The pale moon shines by night:
And when I wander here and there,
I then do most go right.

If tinkers may have leave to live, 5
And bear the sow-skin budget;
Then my account I well may give,
And in the stocks avouch it.

Heinrich translates:

Doch sollt' ich, Schaz, drum traurig sein?
Der Mond scheint Nachts so blank;
Und wandr' ich frisch Land aus Land ein,
Recht geh' ich meinen Gang.

Wenn Keßler frei im Lande leben, 5
Den Ranzen voll Gepäck,
Denn darf ich Red' und Antwort geben;
Im Stock auch sprech' ich keck.

The first stanza of the original song is straightforward and presents no problems to the translator with its mainly single-syllable words of Germanic origin. By means of elision in the first person singular verbs, Heinrich is able to maintain almost identical syllable count. The [w] alliteration in line 3 of the original is reflected in line 4 of the translation in 'geh'' and 'Gang'. The second stanza, particularly lines 7 and 8, on the other hand, initially proved problematic on the content level.[8] Even in the final version, we still gain the impression in lines 7 and 8 that Heinrich has not quite reproduced what Shakespeare writes. The problem appears to lie in the caesura at the end of line 7 of the translation. Where in the original verse, lines 7 and 8 are clearly connected by the same object ('account ... it': account for myself as a tinker), line 8 of the translation seems to be a line independent of what the 'Red' und Antwort' alludes to in line 7. As it is quite plain from Heinrich's

letters that he eventually understood perfectly what the lines mean, we can only assume that he did not want to forfeit the alliteration ([ʃ]) and assonance ([e]), or that he was restricted by the rhyme 'keck'. The alliteration and assonance compensate Shakespeare's [b] in line 6 and [aʊ] in lines 7 and 8. The [l] alliteration in line 5 is echoed in 'Lande' and 'leben' in the same line of the translation.

The rhythm here is iambic tetrameter alternating with lines of iambic trimeter, two of which (lines 6 and 8) have feminine rhymes. Line 1 has an anapaestic substitution in the second foot. Apart from this latter variation, Heinrich has reproduced the rhythm exactly.

Heinrich's rendering of the following Autolycus' song 'Lawn as white' (IV, iv, 220-232) was taken over by Dorothea Tieck for her own translation of *Wintermärchen*[9] (with the exception of two words and two lines), presumably because she considered it fully adequate. The song, a typical pedlar's song, is sung at the sheep-shearing feast as Autolycus encourages people to buy his wares:

Enter Autolycus, singing

Lawn as white as driven snow;
Cyprus, black as e'er was crow;
Gloves, as sweet as damask roses;
Masks for faces, and for noses;
Bugle bracelets, necklace-amber, 5
Perfume for a lady's chamber:
Golden quoifs, and stomachers,
For my lads to give their dears;
Pins, and poking-sticks of steel,
What maids lack from head to heel: 10
Come, buy of me, come; come, buy, come buy;
Come, buy, &c.

This is a difficult song to translate, not only because of the historical-cultural references in the text (for which Johnson et al. give no help in their notes), but also because of the similes in the first three lines, and not least because of the rhymes. Heinrich translates:

Autolykus, singend

Linnen, weiß wie frischer Schnee,
Kreppflor, schwärzer als die Kräh',
Handschuh, süß wie Frühlingsrasen,
Masken für Gesicht und Nasen,
Armband, Halsgelenk, voll Schimmer, 5
Räuchwerk für ein Damenzimmer,
Goldne Müz und blanker Laz,
Junggesell, für deinen Schaz,
Was ein Mädchen haben muß,
Schmuck zu gehn von Kopf zu Fuß. 10
Kauft, Bursche, daß ich Handgeld löse,
Kauft, kauft, sonst wird das Mädchen böse!
Heran, kauft, kauft! -

The original song begins with three comparisons, which, unless expressed idiomatically in the target language, lose their impact as part of the 'sales patter': 'white as driven snow', 'black as e'er was crow' and 'sweet as damask roses' (lines 1, 2 and 3). The first comparison has its equivalent in German; to adhere to the rhythm, to find suitable rhymes *and* equally idiomatic comparisons for lines 2 and 3 is, however, as we see from Heinrich's translation, impossible. The proverbial comparison for 'black' in German is 'wie die Rabe', 'Rabenschwarz'. 'Krähe' are black, and 'Kräh' produces one of those rare equivalent rhyme pairs (Schnee/Kräh), but the idiomatic/poetic element of the line is lost. Similarly, line 3: 'süß wie Frühlingsrasen' produces no metaphorical association whatsoever. Heinrich would have been wiser to supply a courtesy rhyme here, e.g., 'Frühlingsr*o*sen/Nasen', and thus retain what in German would be an idiomatic comparison.

Of the translations for Autolycus' wares, 'Kreppflor' (line 2) is tautological, as each element of the compound means 'crape for mourning'. When articulated on the stage, it could, however, be taken to indicate the black material (crepe) and the finished mourning band (Flor), i.e. two products. The bugle-bracelet (made of black glass beads) was probably unknown to Heinrich; necklace, on the other hand certainly not (line 5). Unless he was trying to compensate for the plain 'Armband', it is difficult to say why he chose a neologism 'Halsgelenk' (presumably derived from the 'links' of a chain) for 'necklace'. As, however, he can see that the necklace is

either made of amber, or amber beads are on sale to make necklaces, it is altogether a most inapt compound. The collective noun 'Räuchwerk' (Räucherwerk), on the other hand, is an excellent rendering of 'perfume' in this context. The 'poking-sticks' (line 9 of the original) proved too much for Heinrich. He has omitted this line altogether and made two lines out of line 10 of the original: 'What maids lack from head to heel'; 'Was ein Mädchen haben muß,/Schmuck zu gehn von Kopf zu Fuß'. The substitution subordinate clause 'daß ich Handgeld löse' (line 11) is a deviation from the original text, but a judicious one. The repetition of the velar consonants 'kommt, kauft' does not have the persuasive sound of the traditional English cry 'Come (and) buy'.

Alliteration features in the original text in line 5 ([b]), line 9 ([p]) and line 10 ([h]). Heinrich responds with alliteration in line 2 ([k]) and in line 9 ([m]). The rhythm in lines 1 to 10, consisting of four stressed syllables in a seven syllable line is reproduced exactly in the translation. Where line 11 of the original text has two iambs, followed by a spondee and two iambs and line 12 two heavy stressed syllables at the beginning and three iambs, Heinrich's lines each consist of a heavy stress on the first syllable, followed by four trochees.

Considering the difficulties involved here for the translator, Heinrich has on the whole produced a reasonably acceptable rendering. Apart from the poor translation for 'necklace' and the unavoidable losses in lines 2 and 3, he has clearly attempted to echo as much of the original as he could on all levels of translation.

We have seen that some of Shakespeare's songs are of very high lyrical quality and that they present the translator with considerable problems. Wieland declined to translate most of the songs which occur in the plays he translated; of the modern translators, Hans Rothe also reproduced only a part of them. The Voß Shakespeare translation contains all of the songs, but some are, as we have also seen here, reduced in length. It is doubtful whether the Voß family had access to the 16th and 17th century English melodies to which these songs are reputed to have been sung. It is, however, quite obvious that the translators of the songs analysed here have taken great pains to reproduce the rhythm as closely as possible to that of the original text and that efforts have also clearly been made to reproduce quality, quantity and number of syllables wherever pos-

sible.

What particularly distinguishes the translations of Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß, however, is the constant awareness and consideration in translation of aspects of these songs as integral parts of the play. We are convinced again and again that these two translators understood the original text, had assimilated the original play before they began to translate, to the extent that they knew how any section, element or component related to the structure, content and development of the play as a whole.

c) Plain dramatic dialogue: Othello, Julius Caesar

Othello, I, i, 82-117, Johnson Steevens et al., Leipsic, 1853

Brabantio: What is the reason of this terrible summons?
What is the matter there?
Roderigo: Signior, is all your family within?
Iago: Are your doors locked?
Bra.: Why? wherefore ask you this?
Iago: 'Zounds, sir, you are robbed; for shame, put on your gown; 5
Your heart is burst, you have lost half your soul;
Even now, very now, an old black ram
Is tupping your white ewe. Arise, arise;
Awake the snorting citizens with the bell,
Or else the devil will make a grandsire of you: 10
Arise, I say.
Bra.: What, have you lost your wits?
Rod.: Most reverend Signior, do you know my voice?
Bra.: Not I; what are you?
Rod.: My name is - Roderigo.
Bra.: The worse welcome:
I have charg'd thee, not to haunt about my doors: 15
In honest plainness thou hast heard me say,
My daughter is not for thee; and now, in madness,
Being full of supper, and distempering draughts,
Upon malicious bravery, dost thou come
To start my quiet. 20
Rod.: Sir, sir, sir, - -
Bra.: But thou must needs be sure,
My spirit, and my place, have in them power
To make this bitter to thee.
Rod.: Patience, good sir.
Bra.: What tell'st thou me of robbing? this is Venice;
My house is not a grange.
Rod.: Most grave Brabantio, 25
In simple, and pure soul I come to you.
Iago: 'Zounds, sir, you are one of those, that will not serve God,
if the devil bid you. Because we come to do you service,
you think we are ruffians: You'll have your daughter
covered with a Barbary horse: you'll have your nephews
neigh to you: you'll have coursers for cousins, and 30
gennets for germans.

Bra.: What profane wretch art thou?

Iago: I am one, sir, that comes to tell you, your daughter and the Moor
are now making the beast with two backs.

Othello, I, i, 82 - 117, translated by Heinrich Voß[1]

Bra.: Was ist der Grund so fürchterliches Lerms?
Was giebt es da?

Rod.: Signor, ist all eur Hausgesind' um euch?

Jago: Die Thüren zu?

Bra.: Nun? warum fragt ihr das?

Jago: Ihr seid beraubt. - O Schmach! den Mantel um! 5
Brech' euer Herz; die halbe Seel' ist hin!
Nun, seht, nun, nun: ein alter schwarzer Bock
Kurzweilt um eur weiß Lamm. Heraus, heraus!
Weckt die schlaftrunknen Bürger mit Geläut;
Sonst macht der Teufel euch zum Großpapa! 10
Auf, sag' ich, auf!

Bra.: Was? seid ihr irr' im Kopf?

Rod.: Ehrwürd'ger Herr, ist meine Stimm' euch kund?

Bra.: Mir nicht; wer bist du?

Rod.: Mein Nam' ist Roderigo.

Bra.: Schlimmer Gast!
Du sollst ja nicht mir schwänzeln um mein Haus. 15
Freimütig hab' ich dir erklärt, für dich
Ist meine Tochter nicht; und nun, wie rasend,
Vom Nachtschmaus voll, und taumelndem Getränk,
Mit Pazigkeit und Bosheit, kommst du da,
Und störst die Ruh' mir.

Rod.: Herr, Herr, Herr! - 20

Bra.: Doch sei gewiß, ich habe Mut und Macht,
Dir's zu vergällen.

Rod.: Ruhig, guter Herr.

Bra.: Was sprichst du mir von Raub? Dies ist Venedig;
Mein Haus kein Landhof.

Rod.: Don Brabantio,
In aller Unschuld komm' ich her zu euch. 25

Jago.: Ihr seid des Schlages, Herr, der nicht dient Gott,
Heißt's euch der Teufel. Weil wir kommen, euch
Zu dienen, nehmt ihr uns für Schelm'? Ihr wollt
Die Tochter kuppeln einem Barbarhengst;
Wollt Enkel sehn, die euch anwiehern; wollt 30
Postpferd' als Vettern, Zelterchen als Nichten.
Bra.: Welche Lästermaul bist du?
Jago: Der Botschaft bringt,
Daß eure Tochter und der Mohr jetzt machen
Den Doppeladler.

Shakespeare is, among many other things, a master of the dramatic opening scene, but in few of his plays does he succeed so well in creating mystery and suggesting relationships as in *Othello*. It is night in a street in Venice, and outside the house of Brabantio, a respected senator, Iago and Roderigo are talking together. As often, we are pitched into the middle of a conversation, and a somewhat heated one at that. Soon, we discover that the cause of the argument arises from the secret marriage which has just taken place between Desdemona, Brabantio's only daughter, and Othello, the Moorish general. Iago appears to have accepted money from Roderigo to arrange a marriage between Roderigo and Desdemona. In the circumstances, Iago must now try to renew Roderigo's confidence in his competence and loyalty, by assuring Roderigo of his hatred of Othello. It also appears that Brabantio is ignorant of his daughter's marriage, and as part of his plan, Iago urges Roderigo to wake him and tell him.

Even in this short extract we are made aware of points of contrast in the characters of Roderigo and Iago. Roderigo, hesitant, weak and malleable, pathetic to the extent of becoming something of a comic figure, contributes five half lines in an attempt to persuade Brabantio even to listen, and one full one in *quasi* apology. Iago, on the other hand, knows only outspoken frankness and makes no bones about informing Brabantio of his daughter's elopement in crudely graphic terms. While the full story emerges in Iago's words at the beginning and end of this extract, Brabantio addresses only Roderigo, so annoyed and impatient at being disturbed that he is deaf to Iago's news. The exchanges are urgent and sharp. The extract combines blank verse which is so flexible and natural that it is not far removed from the language of everyday speech, and Iago's prose in ll 27 - 31 and 33f.

Iago's first lines of blank verse (lines 5 - 11) are packed with urgency and violence, the first two lines consisting of one syllable words only. Heinrich Voß translates:

> Ihr seid beraubt. - O Schmach! den Mantel um!
> Brech' euer Herz, die halbe Seel' ist hin!

The omission of a rendering of ''Zounds, sir,' robs this, Iago's first line of its urgency. His appeal to Brabantio not to disregard this news ('for shame'), is again an indication of the gravity of the situation, and has been wrongly interpreted by Heinrich. His parenthesis 'O Schmach!' (*O* shame!) represents rather a qualification, a direct reference to the 'deed', and not simply an interjection, as in Shakespeare's original. The verb 'Brech'' in 'Brech' euer Herz' (line 6) can only be either a subjunctive ('möge euer Herz brechen') or an imperative governing 'euer Herz'. Whichever Heinrich intended it to be, it certainly does not reflect the *condition* of Brabantio's heart which Shakespeare expresses in the original line. The [h] alliteration is reproduced in the translation, the assonance in 'heart' and 'half' at best in 'ist hin'.

The modified adverbs 'Even now, very now' opening line 7 are urgent and insistent. These require a particularly emphatic rendering in German to compensate for the present progressive introspective action expressed in 'is tupping', which cannot be realised in German. Heinrich creates this intensity well with the repetitive 'Nun', and even recovers some of the aspect of the verb 'is tupping' by inviting Brabantio to look at what Iago sees in his mind's eye ('seht'). The terms in which Iago tells the story are deliberately violent and obscenely animalistic. The theme of racial prejudice is introduced here in the crudest possible way, linked as it is to the imagery of bestial copulation. Heinrich's translation 'kurzweilt' for 'is tupping', even though a neologism insofar as the word does not exist as a verb, is much too weak and euphemistic. Even in conjunction with the subject 'Bock', which also contains the figurative meaning of 'lecher', rather than the exact translation 'Schafbock', the verb does not reproduce the crudity of the original. An echo of the [j] alliteration in line 8 ('your ... ewe') is impossible in German. It is also impossible to say why 'snorting' has been rendered with 'schlaftrunknen'. The English word still conveys an element of the animalistic, and could easily have been translated with the present participle adjective 'schnaubenden', which consists of

syllables of exactly the same length.

Brabantio can only deduce from Iago's speech that Iago and Roderigo are either mad or drunk. He sees his suspicions confirmed when he is told that one of the two men is Roderigo. Heinrich's rendering of 'The worse welcome' (line 14), 'Schlimmer Gast', is probably the best solution where so few syllables are available, but the word 'Gast' suggests some form of acceptance on the part of Brabantio, which is by no means intended here. 'Schwänzeln' (to faun) in line 15 for 'haunt' is appropriate, but 'Du sollst ja nicht' for 'I have charg'd thee' lacks the resolute vigour behind the first person singular subject. Heinrich does, however, bring in this personal pronoun in the following line in 'hab' ich dir erklärt', which serves to offset the deficiency in line 15 to a slight extent. Apart from the adjective 'taumelnd' in line 18 (which suggests a state of reeling drunkenness) rather than the far milder adjective 'distempering' (causing a person to be excited), the remaining lines of Brabantio's tirade are aptly translated. 'Nachtschmaus' reflects the late-night indulgence which Brabantio believes has contributed to the resultant 'Pazigkeit' (insolence, line 19) with which he is violently interrupted. Alliteration enhances the expression of the height of Brabantio's anger in lines 18 to 20: the [d] alliteration in 'distempering draughts' and the [ʃ] and [st] sibilants in 'malicious', 'dost' and 'start'. Heinrich reflects these in the [ts] of 'Pazigkeit', the [s] of 'Bosheit', the [st] of 'kommst' and the [ʃt] and [st] of 'störst'.

Just as this alliteration enhances the degree of Brabantio's anger, the [p] and [b] plosives in lines 21 and 22 ('spirit','place', 'power' and 'bitter') serve to underline the seriousness of his threat. In combining the second half of line 21 and line 22 of the original in translation ('Doch sei gewiß, ich habe Mut und Macht'), Heinrich has forfeited an element of characterisation which Shakespeare appears to supply here. By allotting 'My spirit' a position of prominence at the beginning of the line and adding, in parenthesis, 'and my place', almost as an afterthought, we are given an indication of the integrity of Brabantio, which is later confirmed by the Duke of Venice: in the Venetian senate, Brabantio is 'gentle signior', and 'Good Brabantio', whose counsel and advice are genuinely prized, 'We lack'd your counsel and your help tonight' (I,iii, 50, 172 and 51). Brabantio would obviously only use his position where his own energies failed.

Heinrich's translation of the quality 'Mut' and the attainment 'Macht', juxtaposed as they are and enhanced by alliteration cast a rather different light on Brabantio's character.

Iago's exasperation at this diversion from his purpose leads him back into obscenity and profanity, this time expressed in *his* idiom - prose. Where otherwise Heinrich has rendered prose with prose throughout the play, he has ignored this change in lines 26 to 31 and 32 to 34, and continued in blank verse. He supplies no reason for this in his notes to the play, nor is there any record of these lines ever having been realised as blank verse in the Folios or Quartos. Heinrich's blank verse rendering is all the more surprising since he did use prose for these lines in his first translation of *Othello* in 1806.

Again, Heinrich has omitted to translate the interjection ''Zounds', so that the first line of blank verse (line 26) conveys calm reason rather than impatience. 'Kuppeln' in line 29 is once more too euphemistic for 'covered with', although it does suggest 'procuring' or 'pimping' in the (il)legal sense. The anaphora ('you'll have') is rendered at the beginning of each unit, but the taunting sound of the [n], [k] and [dʒ] alliteration in lines 30 and 31 of the original is not echoed. Had Heinrich defined his 'gennets' as 'Neffen' rather than 'Nichten', this would have provided a modicum of echo with 'Vettern'. 'Nichten' was probably chosen to suit the term 'Zelter' (palfrey), which was normally ridden by a woman.

Brabantio's definition of Iago as a 'profane wretch' (line 32) is reproduced in all its disdain in Heinrich's translation 'Lästermaul'. Heinrich's attempt to echo both sets of alliteration in lines 33 and 34 ('Moor...making' and 'beast...backs') by using the heraldic term 'Den Doppeladler' does not produce the same degree of distortion - either of Iago's mind or of the anticipated progeny ('beast') of Desdemona and Othello.

The general air of tension and uncertainty is recreated by the short, sharp retorts which punctuate the three longer speeches. The volley of half-line exchanges (lines 4, 11, 14, 21, 23 and 25) has been rendered metrically as follows: the first half of line 4 in the original consists of an anapaest and a spondee, followed in Brabantio's responding question by three iambs. Heinrich translates the whole line in regular iambic pentameter. The elliptical nature

of his rendering does not compensate for the urgency conveyed in Shakespeare's rhythm. Line 11 is rendered exactly as the original in iambic pentameter. Line 14 is also rendered in iambic pentameter, although the original line contains two spondees (Rode *rigo* and *worse wel*come) and a feminine ending which enhances the oxymoron. Considering the significance of the semantic parallels highlighted by the spondees, regular iambic pentameter is not adequate.

Heinrich has taken line 20, 'To start my quiet' and combined it with 'Sir, sir, sir' to make a metrically complete line, instead of 'Sir, sir, sir' and 'But thou must needs be sure' as in the original text. This disturbs the pattern in which, up to now, Brabantio has always had the 'last word' in these exchanges. Line 23 of the original 'To make this bitter to thee' and 'Patience, good sir' (iambs; line 22 in the translation), consists of an inversion on 'bitter' and on 'Patience'. These also require consideration in translation, as the second half of the line marks the point at which Roderigo begins to make a little headway in the exchange. Although Heinrich supplies a dactyl on 'Dir's zu ver(gallen)', the second half of the line continues in regular iambs. Shakespeare's line 25 consists of regular iambic pentameter (6 feet); Heinrich's equivalent line 24 has a spondee on 'Landhof' and he begins the second half of the line with a trochee. The spondee on 'Landhof' corresponds with the heavy stress syllable 'grange', which in turn contrasts with the feminine ending on 'Venice'. It is important that these devices be echoed as they help to explain why Brabantio initially refuses to be convinced that there is anything amiss. A grange is an isolated (farm)house, far from the amenities of civilisation and order. Brabantio contrasts this with the simple proper name 'Venice'. In its golden days, which included the time when *Othello* was originally performed, Venice was the greatest commercial republic in Europe, and stood for civilisation and democracy - by the standards of the day. For Brabantio it is inconceivable that robbery and violence could occur in the heart of such a centre of refinement and civil order. Heinrich also echoes the feminine ending on 'Venedig'.

The amount of 11 and 12 syllable lines in this extract (10 in all) is an indication of the disruption, and of the closeness of the blank verse to the rhythm of prose. The missing opening spondee on ''Zounds, sir' (line 5) in Heinrich's rendering detracts much from the directness and sense of purpose with which Iago opens his first longer speech. Shakespeare continues immediately with an anapaest

before the caesura ('you are robbed'), and ends the line with three iambs. This is lost in Heinrich's line of iambic pentameter. Line 6 of the original begins with two iambic feet and continues with an anapaest, spondee and an iamb. Heinrich begins the line with a trochee, followed by an inversion on the second syllable of 'euer', and continues the second half of the line in three iambs. In spite of the heavy stress on 'halb', 'Seel' and 'hin', and the inversion in the first half of the line, his rhythm does not underline the insistency and brutality with which Iago informs Brabantio that he has lost his daughter.

Two anapaests ('Even now, very now') underscore the simultaneity of the exchange outside Brabantio's house and Othello's and Desdemona's love-making. Heinrich supplies each of his three adverb particles with heavy stress and, like Shakespeare, continues the rest of the line and the whole of the following line 8 in iambics. The caesura in each line is retained, as is the enjambement between subject and verb in these lines. Iago's demand that the tocsin be rung in line 9 is highlighted by a dactyl on 'citizens', which is supplied in translation on 'schlaftrunknen'. The dire consequence of refusing to answer the alarm call is expressed in line 10: Brabantio will become grandfather to the devil's (Othello's) progeny. The weight of this line is reflected in its 12 syllables, a dactyle on 'devil will' and a spondee on 'grandsire' and its prose-like rhythm. Heinrich's rendering in regular iambic pentameter is highly unsatisfactory.

Brabantio's anger manifests itself from lines 17 to 20 in a build-up of prepositional and participial phrases before the main clause finally arrives in 'dost thou come/To start my quiet'. Each of these four lines is of irregular length, line 17 closing with a feminine ending, line 18 opening with an anapaest, and the main clause concluding in an enjambement. Heinrich renders the syntactical units in almost exact reflection of the original, and supplies the eleventh syllable on 'rasend'. Otherwise, the rhythm of line 18 is regular iambic pentameter, and there is no enjambement in lines 19 to 20. The 'missing' enjambement is rather a mystery, as the comma at the end of line 19 is grammatically incorrect. Had Wolf Graf Baudissin not done exactly the same in his translation, the comma might have been seen as a printing error.[2] Needless to say, the blank verse form of Iago's concluding words in Heinrich's translation impair the overall rendering, prose is a significant device

in characterisation and in reflecting the 'level' of the scene.

Considering these lines, amongst other things, as a contrast of character aspects between Roderigo and Iago as expressed in their reserved and blunt, brutal language respectively, we must say that Heinrich has captured this contrast quite well right from the beginning in lines 3 and 4, and including Brabantio's apt observations in the words 'schwänzeln' and 'Lästermaul'. If we accept that decorum dictates the euphemistic expression of 'tup' and the figurative use of 'cover with', and if we admit Heinrich's unfortunate omission of the strong interjections and the unforgiveable blank verse rendering of prose, we can also say that he has come close to a good reflection of Iago's obscenities and profanities. The same has been established for the expression of Brabantio's anger. It is important to emphasise Heinrich's faithfulness in rendering the metre wherever possible, particularly where the rhythm enhances semantic elements such as 'Venice' and 'grange'. The fact, however, that Heinrich has reflected only one of the seven 11 or 12 syllable lines has forfeited some of the prose-like rhythm of Brabantio's and Iago's blank verse, and the translation has lost surprisingly much in lines 5 and 26 without those interjections ''Zounds, sir'.

JuliusCaesar

At the beginning of Act II, Scene 1, Brutus, awake in the middle of the night before the Ides of March, is walking in his garden and debating with himself whether or not Caesar will be a tyrannical ruler, and arrives at the conclusion that only Caesar's death can prevent this harmful development. He calls his boy-servant, Lucius, to light a candle in his study.

***JuliusCaesar*, II,i, ll. 1-9, 35-45, 59-60 and 70-76.**
Johnson, Steevens et al., Leipsic, 1833

Bru. What, Lucius! ho! -
I cannot, by the progress of the stars,
Give guess how near to day. - Lucius, I say! -
I would it were my fault to sleep so soundly. -
When, Lucius, when? Awake, I say: What, Lucius! 5

Enter Lucius

Luc. Call'd you, my lord?
Bru. Get me a taper in my study, Lucius:
When it is lighted, come and call me here.
Luc. I will, my lord.

[...]

Re-enter Lucius

Luc. The taper burneth in your closet, sir. 10
Searching the window for a flint, I found
This paper, thus seal'd up; and, I am sure,
It did not lie there, when I went to bed.
Bru. Get you to bed again, it is not day.
Is not tomorrow, boy, the ides of March? 15
Luc. I know not, sir.
Bru. Look in the calendar, and bring me word.
Luc. I will, sir. *Exit*
Bru. The exhalations, whizzing in the air,
Give so much light, that I may read by them. 20

Opens the letter and reads

[...]

Re-enter Lucius

Luc. Sir, March is wasted fourteen days. *Knock within*
Bru. 'Tis good. Go to the gate; somebody knocks. *Exit* Lucius.

[...]

Re-enter Lucius

Luc. Sir, 'tis your brother Cassius at the door,
Who doth desire to see you.
Bru. Is he alone?
Luc. No, sir, there are more with him. 25
Bru. Do you know them?
Luc. No, sir; their hats are plucked about their ears,
And half their faces buried in their cloaks,
That by no means I may discover them
By any mark of favour.
Bru. Let them enter. *Exit* Lucius.

Julius Cäsar, II, i, 1-8, 35-46, 58-59, 69-75, translated by Johann Heinrich Voß.[1]

Brutus

He, Lucius, auf!
Ich kann nicht rathen aus der Sterne Bahn,
Wie nah der Tag ist. - Lucius, sag' ich, ho! -
Ich wollt', es wär' mein Fehl, so derb zu schlafen. -
Nun, Lucius, komm! wach auf! kommt, Lucius, ho! 5

Lucius, kommend

Rieft ihr, o Herr?

Brutus

Bring' Licht in's Kabinet mir, Lucius.
Wenn's brennt, komm her und ruf.

Lucius

Ich eil' o Herr.

[...]

Lucius, zurückkommend

Die Kerze brennt in eurem Zimmer, Herr.
Am Fenster sucht' ich Feuerstein, und fand 10
Dies Briefchen, so versiegelt; und ich weiß,
Es lag nicht da, als ich zu Bette ging.

Brutus

Geh wieder nur zu Bett, fern ist der Tag.
Sind morgen nicht die Merz-Idus, mein Sohn?

Lucius

Ich weiß nicht, Herr. 15

Brutus

Sieh im Kalendar nach, und bring' Bescheid.

Lucius

Gleich, Herr. *Er geht*

Brutus

Die Dünste dort, hinzischend durch die Luft,
Sie leuchten, daß ich lesen kann dabei. (*Er öfnet* (sic) *den Brief, und liest.*)

[...]

Lucius, zurückkommend

Vom Merz flohn vierzehn Tage, Herr. 20

(*Man klopft.*)

Brutus

Gut. Geh zur Pforte; jemand klopft. (*Lucius* geht.)

[...]

Lucius, zurückkommend
Eur Bruder Cassius, Herr, ist an der Thür,
Und wünschet euch zu sehn.

Brutus

Ist er allein?

Lucius

Nein, Herr, da sind noch andre.

Brutus

Kennst du sie?

Lucius

Nein, ihre Hüte, Herr, gehn über's Ohr, 25
Und ihr Gesicht ist halb vermummt im Mantel,
Daß keineswegs ich sie erkennen kann
An Einem Zug' im Antlitz.

Brutus

Laß sie ein. (*Lucius* geht.)

This plain dramatic dialogue alternates up to line 75 with three monologues spoken by Brutus which portray the workings of his reflective mind and his inward insurrection.[2] Opinion differs widely on the character of Brutus[3], but no matter how we judge him, he is shown in this scene to be an honourable, idealistic man, a loving, gentle husband and, in the passage under consideration, a master who inspires the devotion of servants like Lucius. The passage has various functions: a) it introduces Brutus as the "private" man; b) it serves to move the action forward (the discovery of the letter, the first mention of the Ides of March since the Soothsayer's warning, the arrival of visitors); c) it generates a degree of tension and atmosphere (the middle of the night, candle, again, the sudden discovery of the letter and the strange bearing of the visitors).

The content level presents few difficulties for the translator. The 19th Century translator may not have been familiar with the expletive 'when' in line 5 as (here) synonymous with the word 'what' in line 1 and line 5[4] . (Certainly the 1833 Leipzig Shakespeare edition gives no assistance as it only explains the phrase 'any mark of favour' as 'any distinction of countenance' in this particular passage). Otherwise, Shakespeare's language is relatively straightforward here, which makes one wonder why, apart from the metrical convenience, Voß chose the word 'derb' in line 4 to represent 'soundly' as a connotation with the word 'sleep'. It is not only

out of keeping with the general neutral/formal level of language here, it does not seem to convey the right meaning. According to *Grimm*'s general definition, 'derb' means 'fest', but more in conjunction with consistency, 'tüchtig'; 'solidus' and 'gravis' are supplied as a measure of meaning. The adjective generally connotes character, indicating a certain robustness; and can also be rendered by 'kräftig' in the sense of nourishing. The basic rhythm of this dialogue is iambic pentameter, but this incorporates a natural stress pattern to produce normal speech rhythm. This effect is achieved right at the beginning in line 1 (spondee, iamb, line 3 (three iambs, followed by an inversion on 'Lucius, I say') and line 5 (spondee, three iambs, spondee, trochee). The effect of normal speech is here further enhanced by the use of the expletives 'what', 'ho', 'when' and the pause-filler in lines 3 and 5 'I say'. Such fillers are an essential part of the communicative process and give the illusion of colloquial speech. The metrical inversions in line 6, in the first two feet of line 7 and of line 8 also help to create this effect. Lucius's use of the word 'Sir' in lines 18, 21, 23, 25 and 26 necessitate a spondee; line 14 opens with a metrical inversion; line 17 consists of two dactyls and two iambs, line 22 of an iamb and two metrical inversions. All of these irregularities in metre underscore the colloquial nature of this dialogue. Shakespeare has two enjambements, lines 11/12, whereby line 12 also has a medial caesura, and lines 28/29. Lines 4, 5, 7, 25 and 29 have feminine endings, a device in this passage which also contributes to conveying the effect of normal speech (rhythm).

It is this effect that Voß has to reproduce in his German version of the exchange between Brutus and Lucius, beginning with the impatient exclamations in the first five lines. Voß has achieved this in typical German idiom: 'He', 'auf' (line 1); 'sag' ich', 'ho' (line 3); 'Nun', 'komm', 'kommt' (the formal imperative, rather more commanding, to express Brutus's increasing impatience), 'ho' (line 5). Although Voß has translated 'I say' in line 3, he had to omit this same term in line 5 in order to retain the staccato effect of the line. Incorporating the German for 'I say' would have meant changing the word order and in turn impairing the rhythm. From a syntactic viewpoint, the German idiom does not permit the normal word order of subject/verb; the inversion 'sag' ich' as used in line 3 is the "ready-made" German utterance, since it normally follows either an imperative or an address, usually an animate entity, and usually with a distinctive intonation. The metre of the first five

lines is reproduced exactly except for the last three words of line 5. The rhythm of lines 2 and 3, however, is smoother than in the original, since Voß has not reproduced the parenthesis in line 2, which, in turn, has made it necessary to place the medial caesura in line 3 exactly in the middle of the line rather than, like Shakespeare, after the first six syllables of a ten-syllable line.

Line 6 is an exact metrical echo of the English text, as syllable count and word order can be reproduced word for word. Although the metrical irregularities of lines 7 and 8 of the original dialogue have been rendered in regular iambic pentameter, whereby line 9 of the original has been incorporated into line 8 in translation to form a complete iambic pentameter, it does not detract from the naturalness of the dialogue. Lines 9 to 12 are remarkable in their near-exact reproduction of word order, metre, syllable count and enjambement. The only slight divergencies occur in line 10 (Shakespeare line 11) where the first two components of the sentence have been reversed, thus not permitting a reflection of Shakespeare's metrical inversion, in line 11 (Shakespeare line 12), in which the medial caesura is placed after the seventh syllable (Shakespeare after the sixth) and in line 12 (Shakespeare line 13) in which the inflected word 'Bette' consists of two syllables. Lines 13 to 17 (Shakespeare 14 to 18) vary in rhythm at line 13 (Shakespeare 14) and line 17 (Shakespeare 18). Voß has regular iambic pentameter in line 13, but on the content level loses nothing of the gentleness inherent in Brutus's command, simply because he inserts the particle 'nur': it suggests that same degree of caring and sympathy inherent in the modern equivalent of 'Geh' Du nur ins Bett'. Line 17 (Shakespeare line 18) consists only of a spondee, whereas Shakspeare has an iamb plus spondee; but for that it is an idiomatic translation.

Lines 18 and 19 (Shakespeare 19 and 20) are rendered metrically and rhythmically exactly as the original. The neologism 'hinzischend' in line 19 is an excellent answer to the onomatopoeic original word 'whizzing', expressing the rushing along of meteors with a hissing sound.[5] Both the original line 21 and Voß's translation (line 20) consist of eight syllables. Where, however, Shakespeare begins with a spondee, as is the case in all the lines in which Lucius addresses his master as 'Sir', Voß has regular iambic pentameter. Voß's rendering of the next line (22 in the original) also consists of eight syllables, whereas Shakespeare has ten; Voß begins with a spondee, followed by three trochees; Shakespeare has an iamb

and two inversions. This curtailed line in Voß's translation, the weightiness of the spondee and the falling rhythm of the trochees all combine to convey a different reaction on the part of Brutus on hearing the knock at the door from that of Shakespeare's Brutus. In the original text ''Tis good' appears to dismiss Lucius's confirmation of the date, as something more important must be dealt with at that moment. The two metrical inversions on 'Go to the gate. Somebody knocks' convey a sense of urgency and apprehension which is lacking in the Voß rendering of this line. His Brutus gives the impression of being a man in control of the situation here: the matter-of-fact response 'Gut' and the regular rhythm of 'Geh zur Pforte; jemand klopft' do not provide the tension and apprehension which, in the original, lead into the arrival of Cassius with a group of muffled men.

Apart from the spondee which opens line 23, Voß's equivalent line 22 is identical in rhythm and metre, as is line 23 (Shakespeare line 24). This also applies for the following line with the exception of the feminine ending of the original. Where Shakespeare begins line 26 (Voß line 25) with a spondee on 'No, Sir', Voß has an inversion as, in order to retain as much of the iambic pentameter of the line as possible, he has had to change the word order. Other than the feminine ending in line 26 of the translation (Shakespeare line 27), rhythm and metre are identical, as is the case in line 28 of the original (Voß line 27), including the enjambement. Again, other than the failure to reflect the feminine ending of the final line of the original, Voß's reflection of rhythm and metre is identical.

Clearly, Voß has endeavoured to reflect all levels of translation as closely as possible to the original. Divergencies occur almost solely on the metrical level, and then only where a more exact reflection of rhythm and metre would have impaired the effect of natural spoken German. The one main - and not insignificant - flaw is line 21 (Shakespeare line 22) in its failure to generate that degree of tension and atmosphere necessary to lead into a development which, by line 112, when Brutus joins the conspiracy, concludes the first subordinate phase of the play's action.

The passage of dramatic dialogue from *Othello* translated by Heinrich and the above from *Julius Caesar* translated by Johann Heinrich show striking differences in language and noticeable simil-

arities in function: a) both passages serve as characterisations through levels of language; b) both serve to move the action forward and c) both consist of blank verse which is sufficiently flexible and natural to produce the language of normal speech. Because language serves as a characterisation device, Heinrich was dealing with two different language levels; the baseness of Iago's language and the more formal language of Brabantio and Roderigo. This more formal language is, however, blemished in parts by Brabantio's anger and tempered by Roderigo's cowardice. The language of the Brutus/Lucius exchange on the other hand is on a neutral to formal level throughout after the opening five lines. Unlike his father, Heinrich was confronted with the special effects of alliteration which enhanced the degree of Iago's crudeness and of Brabantio's anger. He should, as we saw, also have been dealing with prose dialogue (Iago) as a larger unit of characterisation through language. This he ignored. Nevertheless, Heinrich did a good job of reflecting the language variances in this passage, even if he was not quite so successful in reproducing in German that prose-like rhythm of the blank verse. His attention to sound is commendable. As, compared with the *Othello* passage, the language in the Brutus/Lucius dialogue is relatively straightforward, Johann Heinrich was able to concentrate his efforts on reproducing the rhythm and metre of prose-like speech and the more formal level of language. This he does extremely well with the unfortunate exception of one significant line and the one word ('derb') which mars the almost consistently formal level of language.

IV CONCLUSION

i) The Voßs' achievement

We have already considered the problems involved in translating Shakespeare into German blank verse. They range from understanding the English text, through devising strategies in the language of translation in order to reproduce in an inflected language the rhythm and density of Shakespeare's language and style, to adequately rendering the functional variety of imagery, wordplay and rhymes. These are points that have repeatedly and unanimously been emphasised by all generations of Shakespeare translators from Wieland to Erich Fried.

This consensus of opinion does not, however, prevail when it comes to reflecting on the *type* of language and methods of translation appropriate for rendering the plays of Shakespeare in German. The following almost conflicting notions have influenced Germany's varied and prolific production of Shakespeare translations: that the language and style of the German Shakespeare texts should be familiar to the German reader and audience; or, conversely, the German Shakespeare should actually convey that it is a translation and not another German text; Shakespeare's characters should speak the German language of the day, or, the historicity of Elizabethan English should be reflected in the translation. [1] The problem here is, how , since Germany had no parallel Renaissance culture. Contrived archaizing? The uniqueness, the distinctive features of the original text should be reflected in translation, or, the translator should seek to conceal the individuality of the English text in his German rendering. No matter which notion the translator favours here, is not the translation nevertheless still bound up in historicism, and should not the translator endeavour to 're-cycle' and 'refract' the Shakespeare canon for modern German readers and audiences and for future generations? Apart from this latter deliberation initiated most significantly by Bertolt Brecht [2], these contrasting concepts of language and translation have shaped the history of the German Shakespeare almost since its beginnings, and, no matter which notions the translators adhered to, they frequently claimed that their rendering was 'originalgetreu'.

These varying approaches suggest that translation can be perceived as occupying various points along a scale extending from, to use Dryden's terminology, imitation to metaphrase, but it is not merely a question of the degree of freedom or fidelity inherent in the translation; they point rather to a different basic principle. Conventional poetic German of the day as the language of translation, the notion that words and sense are separable, adaptation in accordance with the *spirit* of the source text are all set against what amounts to breaches of language conventions, a rendering dictated by the source text, whose words and their arrangement are not simply considered by the translator a medium through which the original poet conveys his meaning. Form and content are inseparable.

This, as we have ascertained, is the principle underlying the Voß translation of Shakespeare's works. When Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß approach and assimilate the original Shakespeare text, there is no thought of differentiating 'positive aspects' and 'weaknesses' in the original text, or 'essential' and 'non-essential' features, 'effective' and 'less effective' devices, because distinctions such as these upset the organic wholeness of a poetic work. The Voß Shakespeare translation embodies the insight that sense in poetry is inseparable from word, syntax and rhythm. It rejects conventional ideals such as readability, by achieving an apparently simpler, more radical one: to translate the words, even the syllables, and thus to render the exact succession of poetic ideas as closely as ever possible, and so to *reconstitute* Shakespeare's dramas in the German language. This form of translation creates a text which neither replaces nor displaces the original text; it is intended neither to bring the original closer to the reader/audience, thus relieving them of the task of approaching the original themselves, nor to anticipate any form of interpretation. Many of the structures or turns of phrase which may be strange or displeasing to the German ear have their origins in Shakespeare's text. Only translations worked to these principles allow the reader/audience with no knowledge of English to gain an impression of what Shakespeare's dramas are really like.

A decisive criterion in the Voß Shakespeare rendering was the consistent and exact as possible transposition of Shakespeare's original metre. This, they knew, meant ordering the German language contained within these metrical patterns as closely to the English text as possible. Both Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß *listened* to

the language of Shakespeare, not only to its melody but also to its sound; for they knew that sound effects are an important element of Shakespeare's language; and they listened equally carefully to the language of translation which they used to reconstitute Shakespeare in German. Although the metric and rhythmic patterns are rendered closely, other sound effects such as alliteration and assonance, a resultant harsh or soft timbre, cannot always be reproduced: but they have tried for a near equivalent.

Johann Heinrich Voß was denied any 'sympathische Vertrautheit mit [Shakespeares] Original';[3] the metaphrastic approach of both Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß to literary translation has been taken as indicative of an inadequate command of the English language.[4] But we now have ample evidence to show that Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß understood most of Shakespeare's English, even when Shakespeare's language was pushing at the limits of its own internal system. Heinrich always insisted that Shakespeare was never easy to understand for the native English reader/audience and that in translation therefore 'so wasserklar wie Kotzebue und Iffland kann nun Shakspeare einmal nicht werden, so lang er Shakspeare sein und bleiben soll'.[5] Although Heinrich assures us that 'in den Vossischen Uebersezungen weder ein seltenes Wort, noch eine kühne Wendung ist, die nicht irgendwo bei einem Vorgänger aus der vorgottschedischen Zeit, oder irgendwo in der lebendigen Volkssprache sich findet'[6], the copious notes which Heinrich supplies to each play are necessary to guide the reader through the oddities and otherness of the Voß *Shakespeare*. Heinrich's practice accords with his stated principle: 'Ich kann die verständliche Modernisirung nicht leiden. Dazu sind Anmerkungen da, um das antiquarische kennen zu lernen'.[7] Any difficulties resulting for the reader are clearly felt to be worthwhile.

It is difficult to be altogether temperate when admiring the way in which Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß 'Germanise' Shakespeare's poetic diction, how they exploit the resources of the German language in order to obtain the equivalent kind of word/phrase or equivalent register to match Shakespeare's neologisms, his dialect words, lexical sets from aspects of Elizabethan life and trade, etc. It is not intended to argue that the Voß Shakespeare version is perfect. We have identified various points in the individual texts analysed which are not adequate - more so in the translations of Heinrich than in those of his father.[8] But it remains true that the Voß *Shakespeare* is one of the few German Shakespeare versions, and

certainly the first, that even begins to tell what is happening in Shakespeare's dramas while capturing the rhetorical tension, the varying degrees of register, the poetic diction of the original works.

But what about this translation as a performable dramatic text? Only once has any comment come to light which indicates that Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß ever considered their German *Shakespeare* as a translation for the stage, and even then, the comment is qualified. Heinrich refers to the Voß *Shakespeare* in a letter to Cotta as 'eine *selbst* Bühnen willkommene Verdeutschung in geistig aufgefaßter Form und in einer frischen wahrhaft Shakspearischen Sprache'(my italics).[9] This qualification strongly suggests that the stage was not their primary consideration when working on the Shakespeare translation. We may have established in our analyses that by rendering the alien movement of Shakespeare's metrical and rhetorical organisation Johann Heinrich in particular (*Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet* and the *MSND* extracts) succeeded in echoing many of the patterns of physical gesture of the original for the German actor; we may have seen how many of their renderings of Shakespeare's wordplay not only illustrated a remarkable command of the intricacies of Shakespeare's English, but also achieved equivalence of effect; and yet in its very closeness to Shakespeare's original, in its extensive use of language, language levels and syntax foreign to the poetic German of the day, the Voß translation could hardly have been used on the stage in its completely original state. Access to a critical apparatus, as Heinrich willingly admits and diligently supplies, is essential for the reception of the Voß *Shakespeare*.

Yet, perhaps precisely because of their faithfulness to a dramatic original, the Voß translations do seem to have been readily adaptable for the stage. Not all the results were happy; Heinrich had already experienced what happened to translations before they became 'performances' when his *Othello* was staged in 1804: it was subjected to extensive adaptation, both in content and in language and style. But in Vienna, where there was a flourishing theatrical tradition, the story was very different. Heinrich's translations of *Lear*, *Othello* and *Henry IV* were also produced by J. Schreyvogel at the Burgtheater in 1822, 1823 and 1828 respectively. All plays were adapted, 'but the grandest achievement, possibly of Schreyvogel's whole tenure at the Burgtheater, was his production of *King Lear*, first seen on 28 March 1822 ... The strength of Schreyvogel's ad-

aptation ... is the unusual completeness of the text'.[10] Schreyvogel appears to have much favoured Heinrich's translations to have 1) used well over three-quarters of Heinrich's text in his adaptation of *Lear* and 2) used Heinrich's *Henry IV*, where Schlegel's rendering of the two parts had long been available.

This stageworthiness should be borne in mind alongside the fact that translations worked to principles such as those of Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß were appreciated by few of their contemporaries; and more must be said on this presently. Heinrich even anticipated the reception of their Shakespeare translation: 'Lessing dachte 1780 an das Jahr 1819, so müssen wir jetzt an das Jahr 1860 denken, und so schreiben, wie unsere Enkel vielleicht erst ganz billigen werden'.[11] This ties in with what Goethe maintains of the third phase of translation: 'der Übersetzer, der sich fest an sein Original anschließt, gibt mehr oder weniger die Originalität seiner Nation auf, und so entsteht ein Drittes, wozu der Geschmack der Menge sich erst heranbilden muß'. But even in our day, the value of such methods and principles is rarely recognised by critics.[12] E. Fitzgerald, advocate of the free translation for the contemporary reader, claims 'better a live Sparrow than a stuffed Eagle'[13]: but what use a sparrow, no matter how alive, if you wish to know the eagle?

However, the Voßs' approach to translation is not simply outdated. There are modern writers who champion the translation which renders in the target language the 'otherness' of the original. José Ortega y Gasset sees the necessity for translations 'gerade, insoweit sie verschieden von uns sind, und die Übersetzung muß ihren fremden und abgelegenen Charakter betonen, indem sie ihn als solchen verständlich macht'.[14] There is much merit generally in his claim when discussing German translations of his own works that 'auf diese Weise sich der Leser mühelos geistige Gebärden ausführen (sieht), die in Wirklichkeit spanisch sind. Er erholt sich so ein wenig von sich selbst, und es belustigt ihn, sich einmal als ein anderer zu fühlen'.[15] In this respect, the Voß *Shakespeare* offers a wealth of potential.

W. Schadewaldt also adheres to the principle that it is not the function of a translation to be a substitute 'für den der anderen Sprache Unkundigen oder Lesehilfen für den Ungeübten ... Indem wir der Übersetzung von vornherein den Anspruch aberkennen, das Original

zu ersetzen, billigen wir ihr zugleich den nicht geringeren Anspruch zu, das Vorbild gleichsam fortzusetzen, als Zeugin nämlich seiner lebendigen Fortwirkung in fremdem Geist'.[16] This is the way in which English readers can receive the Voß Shakespeare translation. But then, they are familiar with the English original; 'der der anderen Sprache Unkundige' has different views on the function of a literary translation. Ortega's vision of the German public may be ideal, but he does describe the kind of readership/audience the Voßs' work calls for:

> Es ist klar, daß das Publikum eines Landes eine im Stile seiner eigenen Sprache gehaltene Übersetzung *nicht* besonders schätzt, denn das besitzt es im Überfluß in der Produktion der einheimischen Autoren. Was es schätzt, ist das Gegenteil, daß die dem übersetzten Autor eigentümliche Ausdrucksweise in einer Übersetzung durchscheint, in der die Möglichkeiten der eigenen Sprache bis zur äußersten Grenze der Verständlichkeit ausgenutzt wurden'.[17]

Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß also sought 'das Vorbild gleichsam fortzusetzen'. The Voßs, too, saw translation not so much merely as a means to make foreign texts available to the German reader/audience, but understood it rather in terms of the original text's capacity to survive, and the translator's task as a perpetual renewer of this original text.

However, not only did their *Shakespeare* no longer exist for the German public after Abraham Voß's death in 1842, When it was brought back to notice in 1876 in the Johann Heinrich Voß biography[18], it tended to be dismissed by literary historians in a sentence; and this trend still continues today: for example, in *Die Zeit*, Nr. 29- 12. Juli (1991), Michael Buselmeier writes on 'Ein Mann wie Voß' in der Reihe 'Profile der Aufklärung'. In a full page appraisal of Johann Heinrich Voß, the title of which is supplemented with the words 'Er übersetzte Homer und die Marseillaise, kämpfte gegen die Leibeigenschaft in Deutschland und gegen die Volkstümelei der Romantiker - und wurde vergessen, verdrängt von einem Land, dem die "nationale Identität" wichtiger wurde als Freiheit und Menschenrecht: Johann Heinrich Voß', one sentence is dedicated to the Shakespeare translation: 'Er [Voß] beteiligte sich auch an der Shakespeare-Übertragung seiner Söhne Heinrich und Abraham, die sich allerdings gegenüber der Schlegel-Tieck'schen nicht behaupten konnte'.

Since negative contemporary reaction was so strong, although the Voß translations had their considerable merits, it seems likely that different criteria for translation played at least some part. We must therefore consider contemporary reception of the Voß *Shakespeare* in more detail.

ii) Contemporary reception and polemic

We have already seen in Chapter Two, ii), that even Heinrich Voß's friends, Solger and Abeken, and advisor (Abeken), were initially doubtful a) about the wisdom of translating Shakespeare plays that Schlegel had already rendered in German and b) about the suitability of the Voß translation theories and practice as applied to the original works of Shakespeare. But then Abeken does not consider Shakespeare to be a 'Verskünstler', and feels that in the Voß translation

> Man könnte da ... in der Uebersetzung fast zu viel tun. Über die häufige Voranstellung des Verbums, habe ich Dir schon einmal geschrieben; ich für meine Person kann mir nicht helfen, ich finde, daß unserer Sprache dadurch Gewalt geschieht ... Manchmal scheint mir die Uebersetzung auch etwas derber als das Original, fast wie im Widerspruch gegen Schlegels Glätte. [1]

This shows that even Rudolf Abeken, who stood by Heinrich and his Shakespeare endeavours in word and deed from the very first rendering of *Othello* to Heinrich's death in 1822, doubted the wisdom of "challenging" Schlegel's rendering. And his disapproval was widely shared. Matthäus von Collin, editor of the Vienna *Jahrbücher der Literatur* writes to Ludwig Tieck on 18 November 1818:

> Wenn A. W. Schlegel endlich seinen Shakespear vollenden wollte, wäre es eine schöne Sache. Ich sehe nicht ein, wie ihm beym Anblicke des Voßischen nicht die Pflicht klar wird, was er begonnen, auch hindurch zu führen.[2]

And Zelter remarks in a letter to Goethe dated 14 January 1821 that the Voß Shakespeare merely demonstrated how 'unverwüstlich' Shakespeare was.[3] Tieck polemicises in the preface to his annotated edition of Schlegel's Shakespeare (1825) on the 'hölzernen Gesellen'

and the pedantic word for word translation which the Voß family had produced. A.W. Schlegel, too, responded in 1825, in polemic which rivalled that of Heinrich Voß on Schlegel:

> Drei Söhne zeugte Voß, Heinrich Johann der Große;
> Drei Übersetzer auch bereits im Mutterschoße.
> Erst Heinrich, Abraham, dann Adam noch zuletzt:
> Selbvierte haben die den Shakespeare übersetzt.
> Sie übersetzten fort, tot oder noch am Leben.
> Durch Abraham wird jetzt der Rest herausgegeben. [4]

Yet, since they rarely make specific reference to aspects of the Voßs' translation it is difficult to tell how accurate and well-grounded these appraisals were. The terms of censure are not what one would expect (e.g. 'hölzern' for 'otherness', 'strength', even 'crudity'), and there is also an odd sort of inaccuracy in Schlegel's personal polemic: the wrong number of sons may have been the carelessness of a polemic mood, but inventing Adam is strange.

Positive appraisals, though very few, were better informed and more thoughtfully worded. On receiving the first two volumes of the complete Shakespeare, Jean Paul writes to Heinrich on 30 August 1818:

> An Deines Vaters Übersetzung hab' ich die alte Gediegenheit bewundert, die Silber in das kleinere Gold für den engeren Raum umsetzt. Nur müssen bei seinem Grundsatze, daß Text und Übersetzung sich mathematisch decken sollen, Härten vorkommen, zumal bei Shakespearischer Knospenhärte statt der Blätterweiche. Herrlich benutzt und bereichert er die Sprache ...Ich freue mich unendlich auf das Fortfahren. [5]

On 10 March 1819, having received the third volume of the Voß Shakespeare, Jean Paul remarks:

> Eurere [sic] Tadler, die ihn [Shakespeare] fließend im Deutschen haben wollen, vergessen, daß er ja selber im Englischen für die Britten ein Strom voll drängendes Treibholz ist; besonders in den Versen, für welche die Kürze Deines Vaters eben recht paßt ...In Wortspielen gewinnst Du gegen jeden Übersetzer das Spiel. (P.72)

This enthusiasm persisted. Some months later (26 November 1819), having read Johann Heinrich Voß's paper on his great friend Leopold Graf von Stolberg's conversion to Catholicism, *Wie ward Fritz Stolberg ein Unfreier*, Jean Paul comments:

> Auch hier ist die Vossische Prosa ein Goldbarren für den deutschen Sprachschatz, so wie euer Gesammt-Shakespeare uns ihn und die Sprache zugleich erneuert. Durch eure Keckheit, den einsilbigen Britten in einen einsilbigen Deutschen zu verwandeln, gewinnt unsere Sprache wahrhaft, deren Wasser andere so wenig, wie das physische, einer Zusammendrückung fähig halten. (P.87)

And, when, on 6 August 1822, Jean Paul informs Heinrich of Tieck's plan to edit the new edition of Schlegel's Shakespeare, his preference for the Voß rendering is again explicit:

> Tieck - wider welchen ich des glattzüngigen, alle Shakspearischen Alpen nur umschiffenden, nicht ersteigenden Schlegels Übersetzung verwarf gegen eure treudeutsche und deutschtreue, was Clodius schon gezeigt - will eine neue Rezension Shakspear's geben. (P. 142)

A further example of positive reception is the review 'Shakspeare's Schauspiele von J.H. Voß und dessen Söhnen, Shakspeare's Romeo und Julia von J.H. Voß' which C.A.H. Clodius wrote on the first volume of the Voß complete Shakespeare. [6] Up to now, only he has based his comprehensive review of the Voß Shakespeare translations (concentrating mainly on the contents of volume one: *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Tempest* and *Romeo and Juliet*, with a brief mention of *Much Ado about Nothing*) on a careful comparison of source text and translated text. This was done not in order to identify individual mistakes and deviations, but to discuss the Voß *Shakespeare* and its *Treue zum Werk*, also in comparison with the Schlegel renderings. The Voß *Shakespeare* is set in a context of past and contemporary approaches to literary translation and the corresponding reception of these approaches. Clodius then divides his discussion into analysis of the different levels of translation and aspects of Shakespeare's style, always providing the original text. Speaking, for example, of the way in which Johann Heinrich and Schlegel approach Shakespeare's wordplay, and here specifically from *Romeo and Juliet*, Clodius remarks:

> In der Stelle übersetzt, wie auch in der Regel Herr Voß der ältere immer, weit treuer, als Herr Schlegel, und auch weit glücklicher. (105)

When discussing the metre and rhythm of the translations Clodius takes Heinrich to task:

> Vermutlich ist es Bescheidenheit, daß der Vorredner [Heinrich] hier vom großen metrischen Vorzuge Voß'ens, des Vaters, in seinen Uebersetzungen vor der Schlegel'schen Uebersetzungsweise schweigt ... Aber bemerkt muß dieser Vorzug werden, weil selbiger dem Ohre gewöhnlicher Leser und der oberflächlichen ästhetischen Orakel, die in Lesezirkeln und auch wohl in öffentlichen Blättern häufig das Wort führen, leicht entgehen und man alsdann eben so leicht ungerecht gegen diese Vossische Kürze im Klopstockischen, wahrhaft lyrischen Tone werden kann, die sich darum nicht allemal so prosaisch fließend lesen läßt, als die unmetrische, aber gewöhnlichen Lesern bequeme Schlegel'sche Breite. (113f.)

Clodius does criticise Johann Heinrich's frequent use of 'Provinzialismen', particularly in wordplay; he must, however, concede that often 'das Wort ... in niederdeutscher Bedeutung ganz dem Worte des Originals (entspricht) ... und allemal deutlicher, treuer verdeutschend (ist), als wenn Herr Schlegel sagt, etc. ...' and that also often 'der unkundige Leser sich's selbst zuzuschreiben (hat), wenn er sie [die Provinzialismen] nicht versteht, wo sie äußerst passend, und unserer alten Volkssprache angemessen sind.' (122). Similarly in the case of Johann Heinrich's and Heinrich's use of "altdeutsche Kernwörter": not only are they explained and their source quoted in Heinrich's notes, 'auch stellen sie Shakspeare's eignes englisches Alterthum treffend dar, und überhaupt, was sollen die Dichter sich aus Furcht, bey dem unkundigen Publikum anzustoßen, den reichen Schatz ihrer Sprache nehmen lassen?' (122)

Sommernachtstraum is considered by Clodius to be the best of Johann Heinrich's translations in the first volume of the Voß complete *Shakespeare*:

> Sommernachtstraum ... in welchem Vater Voß den Triumph seiner Dichterverdeutschungskunst gefeyert, und mit allem Zauber der ihm zu Gebote stehenden volltönenden, metrischen,

> und gedrängt reichhaltigen, kurz wahrhaft dichterischen Sprache, (die nur in Deutschland von der gewöhnlichen Lesewelt zu wenig verstanden und gefühlt wird), bewirkt hat, daß jene einzig originelle liebliche humoristische Phantasie des brittischen Genius von nun an auch zu den unsterblichen klassischen Werken deutscher Literatur gehört ... Zwar auch hier finden sich einige Derbheiten, die ein glattzüngiger, oberflächlicher Geschmack eben so leicht ausgewittert, als gemildert hätte, die aber gewöhnlich der Treue, seltener der Voß'ischen selbsteigenen Manier in seiner ländlichen Dichtkunst zuzuschreiben sind ... Dies verdient um so mehr Bemerkung, jemehr bisher bey vielen Lesern der Schlegel'sche Sommernachtstraum für das gelungenste unter den Schlegel'schen Uebersetzungsversuchen aus Shakespeare, wohl gar für ein *non plus ultra* gegolten hat. (135f.)

The above quotations may convey the impression that this Clodius review was biased. This is, however, not the case; his appraisal is objective and extremely well-founded: the Voß Shakespeare rendering is by no means left unscathed. For example, Voß's close rendering of 'Shakspeare'sche Zweydeutigkeiten' is not approved of (108). 'Derbheiten' in plays such as *Romeo and Juliet* or *The Tempest* do not, in Clodius's opinion, match the overall 'Lieblichkeit' of these plays. But even then, he must admit that

> [...]sich wenigstens der Sommernachtstraum im Ganzen, und zum Theil auch Der Sturm, oder Romeo und Julia im Einzeln, unendlich poetischer, reichhaltiger, vor allem treuer, treffender, musikalischer (wenn auch nicht allemal so passend für den Geschmack neuerer Leser) übersetzen (ließ). Was man an Schlegel's Uebersetzungsart in den gelungensten seiner Uebertragungen, (Romeo und Julia, und Sturm) lobend herausheben kann, ist eine gewisse ästhetische Glätte, anständige, leichte Grazie im Ausdruck, der sich Shakespeare's mehrere Jahrhunderte alte geniale Rauhigkeit und Schroffheit zum Besten einer gewißen fließenden Lesbarkeit für moderne, bequeme Leser selbst fügen muß, als wäre Shakspeare ein Metastasio. Allein dieses Lob schmilzt gewaltig, wenn man genauer hinsieht, wie es öfter erreicht wird, nämlich durch Weitschweifigkeit und Breite in Wendungen, die mehr und längere Verse macht, und dennoch den poetischen Reichthum des Originals, seine Gedankenfülle, wie seine Kraft vermin-

> dert. Seines Originals reichhaltige Kürze möchte hierbey Hr. Schlegel aufopfern, weil er umschreibend übersetzt: - allein er verkennt hierdrin auch die poetische Kraft der deutschen Sprache selbst (126).

Although the Clodius review is mainly concerned with Johann Heinrich Voß's translations in volume one of the complete *Shakespeare*, he does include a brief comparison of Heinrich's first translation of *Lear* and *Othello* and his later revision of these. Clodius observes on Heinrich's translation of Lear's opening speech in III, ii, 1-9:

> Man sieht, daß Hr. Heinrich Voß im frühern Lear noch nach Schlegel'scher Manier übersetzte, die er für ideal hielt. Darum die weiblichen kraftlosen Schlußfälle ... darum die Weitläufigkeit, nach welcher er einen ganzen Vers mehr im Deutschen erhielt, als das Original. Diese frühere Weitläufigkeit bey Hrn. Heinr. Voß d. j. ist auch aus seiner in der Vorrede zum Othello geäußerten Ansicht zu erklären ... daß die englische Sprache wegen ihrer einsylbigen Worte einer Kürze fähig ist, vor welcher die deutscher Sprache verstummen müsse. Allerdings sind in dieser Hinsicht manche Stellen Shakspeare's unübersetzlich. Aber so sehr verstummen und sich schämen braucht doch unsere Sprache nicht, wenn wir sie mit Klopstock's lyrischem Auge betrachten, oder vielmehr - sie kann verstummen und doch reden. In der zweyten Uebersetzungsprobe ... hat sich nun das alles geändert, und es liegt die Uebersetzungsweise von Voß, dem Vater, zu Grunde - alles kraftvoll zusammengedrängt, für prosaischen Sinn vielleicht minder fließend, lauter zehnsylbige Jamben mit männlichen Ausgängen, und nicht mehr Verse als im Original. (129)

The fact that Clodius even includes a comparison of original translation with later revisions in the case of Heinrich is a further indication of the thoroughness of his investigation and the substance of his criticism. This review is exceptional for its time in its meticulousness and conscientiousness. Clodius did not consider the Voß practice of introducing aspects and dimensions to literary translation unacceptable to the traditional German literary canon as "anmassend" or worthy only of dismissal in a few sentences.

Quantitatively, however, the negative contemporary reception of the Voß Shakespeare far outweighs the positive. 'Pedantic', 'wooden', 'mechanical', 'undeutsch', or simply a total rejection of any Shakespeare other than Schlegel's are representative of responses across the board. Jean Paul's voice was not heard until 1833 (if then), when Abraham Voß published Jean Paul's correspondence with Heinrich. By that time, Dorothea Tieck and Graf Baudissin were nearing completion of the 'Schlegel-Tieck' Shakespeare which was to oust the Voßs' Shakespeare, and others besides for many decades to come. For all its merits, the Voß *Shakespeare* was considered incompatible with contemporary taste, whereas Schlegel's conformed with it.

Viewed in the context of standard practices in translation reviews/criticism from the early 19th century up to today, this negative reception of the Voß *Shakespeare*, the polemic, also appears explicable. With the exception of close-analytical philological discussion of translation, where the foreign rendering is compared critically with the original text, the reviewer-critic responds to a foreign literary text in exactly the same way as the reader or the audience, i.e. by applying the standards of the target language (which is usually his own).[7] Although this is an acceptable response towards literary translation on the part of the monolingual reader or audience, for the critic it is hardly an adequate basis upon which to evaluate literary translation. Yet in early 19th century it was a very powerful factor in forming public and critical responses and apparently still continues to do so. W. Wilss, for example, maintains that the 'Beiläufigkeitscharacter' inherent in (early) 19th century translation criticism still prevails in the field of translation today.[8] The early 19th century 'discussion' of translations was aphoristic and constituted an appendage following a detailed review of the *original* work. In order to convey the impression to the reader that the reviewer was basing his comments on a more detailed analysis of the translation, or indeed on a comparison with the original text, 'mistakes' were quoted (albeit without the same quote from the original text), together with their location in the translation.[9] A typical example: 'Die deutsche Uebersetzung, die natürlich statt des Alexandriners die fünffüßige Jambe wählen mußte, ist durchgängig klar, gewandt, lebhaft. Ein Fehler wie folgender S. 13: *O Bruder, denke, daß wir alle beide/Mit einem Blut die Schwerter einst* <u>*betauchten*</u> *[...]* kommt nur einmal vor'.[10] Superficiality was the order of the day. Readability and conformity with German lan-

guage standards of the day were the criteria applied for the assessment of a translation, as one critic's comment shows:

> 'Das werthlose Gewäsch tischt man uns in flüchtigen Uebersetzungen auf, die dem deutschen Publikum um so weniger Freude machen können als die Uebersetzer gewöhnlich auch nicht das Geringste thaten, um das Fremde auch dem Geiste der deutschen Sprache und des deutschen Volkes näher zu stellen'.[11]

In April 1830, A. Wagner reviewed all nine volumes of the Voß *Shakespeare* in the manner typical of the day: brief, superficial and, as was always the case in criticism of German Shakespeare translations at this time, viewed side by side with the Schlegel translations. The overall opinion of the Voß *Shakespeare* can be condensed to Wagner's adjectives 'hölzern', 'anmaßend'.[12] Positive criticism came to light in 1833 when Abraham Voß published Jean Paul's letters to Heinrich. After this, no public mention was made of the translation until 1876 by Johann Heinrich Voß's biographer, Wilhelm Herbst. Herbst was no exception as far as traditional standards and practices were concerned in the field of translation review and criticism. It is not surprising, therefore, that Herbst can claim in all certainty that the Voß Shakespeare is 'eine ... Arbeit, [die] versunken und vergessen (ist) und [die] nur wie eine litterarische Curiosität in der Geschichte deutscher Uebersetzungskunst dasteht'.[13] His brief appraisal of the translation evinces all the qualities of the traditional translation review: conformity with German literary language standards as his yardstick, only a fleeting acquaintance with the translation (as his dating of Johann Heinrich Voß's involvement in the work has already shown (Chapter Two, iii)). As the translation is given only a more or less passing mention in an otherwise very substantial biography, it is doubtful whether he ever submitted the Voß *Shakespeare* to any form of comparison with Shakespeare's original text. Herbst condemns:

> Das Archaische in Wortwahl und Satzbau ... Das Bekenntniss des alten Voss, dass man den Shakespeare durchaus wie einen alten Classiker behandeln müsse ... Die Arbeit ist ... gescheitert an dem Irrthum ihres Prinzips, an der pedantisch angestrebten Buchstabentreue. Die häufige Anwendung der Inversion, geschraubte Wortstellung überhaupt ...hemmen den raschen Genuss ...sprachgrübelnd.[14]

Herbst not only disagrees with Voß's principle of translation - he mistakes its nature and denigrates it as mere pedantry.

The effect of Herbst's 'resurrection' of the Voß *Shakespeare* was paradoxical: a) literary historians and critics began to take an interest in the translation, but b) it began a tradition of magisterial pronouncements which were based on a second-hand view. Not only was he considered an authority on Johann Heinrich Voß's life and work, but also obviously on Shakespeare translations. The entry on Johann Heinrich Voß in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (1896) continues to propagate these prejudices:

> Sprachgrübelnd und buchstabentreu, wie wenn er es mit einem altklassischen Epiker oder Lehrdichter zu tun hätte, aber unendlich schwerfällig und pedantisch leblos, durch archaistische Wendungen und geschraubte Stellungen überall gehemmt, verdeutschte Voß 13 Stücke.[15]

This surely does not represent an independent, considered judgement, but a literary historian's short-cut to literary appraisal, the misfortune being that this appraisal appears in a work of reference.

Four years after Herbst's assessment, in 1880, Vincke comments in his comparison of Heinrich Voß's early *Othello* rendering (1806) with the later revision for the complete Voß *Shakespeare*:

> Wer diesen ersten Druck mit dem späteren in der Gesammtübersetzung vergleicht, der überzeugt sich auf den ersten Blick, daß letzterer durch allzuenges Anschmiegen an den englischen Text um Vieles *undeutscher* und schlechter geworden ist. Vielleicht hatte der alte Johann Heinrich, als er sich an dem Übersetzungswerk der Söhne betheiligte, ihnen zur Pflicht gemacht, daß seine Grundsätze, die im Laufe der Zeit pedantischer geworden waren, überall auch für sie maßgebend sein müßten; denn so erklärt sich wenigstens die jetzt hervortretende peinliche Wort- und Satztreue, *auf Kosten der deutschen Sprache*. (My italics)[16]

Again, the principles by which the Voßs translated are not appreciated and their work is simply dismissed as pedantry.

The only two studies on the Voß Shakespeare translation which can lay claim to any sort of analytical - though not empirical - basis are those of Karl Holtermann (1892) and Heinrich Egbring (1911). Each deals with one drama only, and each compares Voß unfavourably with the Schlegel-Tieck rendering of the play. Each employs the 'mistake-spotting' method, with single words or one- and two-liners taken out of context, although the English text is supplied in each case. Neither study has an analytical framework and neither bears close examination. Holtermann concludes his comparison[17] of the Schlegel rendering of *Romeo and Juliet* with that of Johann Heinrich Voß with the words:

> [Das Voß] Werk leidet an zu vielen Unvollkommenheiten und *Unebenheiten*, als daß es auf den Namen einer *guten Verdeutschung* auch nur im entferntesten Anspruch haben könnte; es ist eine Karikatur Shakespeares. Voß scheint ... nicht einmal das Englische in hinreichendem Maße beherrscht zu haben ... Auch war ... die Natur Vossens zu nüchtern = verständig, um alle Feinheiten und Tiefen des Shakespeareschen Geistes völlig durchdringen zu können. (My italics)[18]

This goes a stage further. Shakespeare is now not the English writer, but the writer created by Schlegel. This may explain why many of the inadequacies in Holtermann's own study are due to his not having understood the original text. Not only does his judgement thus appear ignorant and arrogant; it did nothing to further proper appreciation of Voß. Egbring is less arrogant but no more helpful. He praises the diligence with which Heinrich Voß went to work on his *Macbeth* rendering, cites, however, as reasons for its (in Egbring's opinion) inferiority to the 'Schlegel' translation:

> [Voß war] seiner Aufgabe nicht gewachsen. Nur ein Mann, der mit gründlichem philologischen Wissen tiefes künstlerisches Empfinden vereinigte, konnte den Macbeth "*deutsch machen*". Und an beidem gebrach es Voß ... Auch war er des Englischen nicht Herr genug, um nicht in zu große Abhängigkeit vom Originale zu geraten. (My italics)[19]

Egbring bases his analysis on Heinrich's 1810 version of *Macbeth* and comments, without further examples, on the later version which was included in the complete *Shakespeare*:

> Die spätere Übersetzung in der Gesamtausgabe ... ist nach den pedantischen Grundsätzen des Vaters erfolgt; sie ist viel wörtlicher, klammert sich viel zu eng an den englischen Text an und ist dadurch *undeutscher*, schwerfälliger geworden. (My italics)[20]

As in the case of Holtermann, both of these comments lack any form of acceptable scientific substantiation. Ultimately, both studies represent longer exercises in the 'traditional' translation review deplored by Wilss and Appel. Neither critic seems to recognise the contradiction in their argument: the Voßs' poor knowledge of English takes their translation too close to the English text.

Two 20th-century examples of documented reception come from Ludwig Bäte (1925) and Margaret Atkinson (1958). Bäte, editor of the letters of Johann Heinrich Voß's wife, Ernestine, echoes Herbst in pronouncing the Voß *Shakespeare* 'im ganzen gesehen ein verfehltes Werk'.[21] For Atkinson, 'the stiff angular [Shakespeare] version by J.H. Voss and his two sons ... brings home to us by contrast the excellence of Schlegel's achievement'.[22] This time we are dealing with two different forms of assessment (brief review and analytical study); but both base their 'findings' on the German literary quality of the translated text.

Nowhere are the Voß' theories and methods of translation, their language of translation, given a moment's consideration. That is why critics could, and can, so often attribute the close reflection in German of the original Shakespeare text to an inadequate command of the English language; why words such as 'pedantisch', 'uneben' and, above all, 'undeutsch', occur so frequently. Certainly, the later bias was initiated by Herbst for whom the Classical/Romantic Schlegel Shakespeare was unrivalled, the Voß translation merely an act of polemic against the Romantics.[23] The *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* perpetuates this bias. The more detailed studies of Holtermann and Egbring hindered rather than furthered any perception that the aim of Johann Heinrich and Heinrich Voß was precisely *not* to make Shakespeare sound like a 19th century German poet, but to convey the essence of an alien work; and that any departures from conventional literary German are intentional and represent an attempt not to reduce the sense of otherness in the text.

'Übersetzungskritik' as practised in German literary journals and exercised by the critics of the Voß *Shakespeare* is a grave misnomer. It is the duty of a translation critic/reviewer not only to assess the literary quality of a translated text, but also the quality of the translation process itself. The fact that 'Übersetzungskritik' exhausts itself in identifying mistakes and deviations from the original text, once the literary quality of the translated text has been approved - or not -, is indicative of the status of literary translation. A greater appreciation of the work of a translator (the fact that Herbst can conceive of anyone translating 12 Shakespeare dramas simply to polemicise, is symptomatic) would improve the quality of popular translation criticism (and that of the translated text).

It is all too understandable that Clodius' review could prompt W. Grimm to write to A. von Arnim on 22 February 1819 that 'manches wahre darin gesagt [ist]', but nonetheless reassert a preference for Schlegel: 'Diese Voßische Übersetzung ... wird die Schlegelsche nicht verdrängen, obgleich diese manches aus jener benutzen sollte.'[24] Something must now be said about the translation which eclipsed the Voßs' achievement so absolutely and for so long in the public mind.

iii) The domination of Schlegel/Tieck

It has already been noted that the Schlegel Shakespeare translations represent one of the factors responsible for the negative reception of the Voß Shakespeare translation. Suerbaum goes so far as to make the Schlegel-Tieck translation responsible for the inadequacy of modern German Shakespeare translations: 'Das sichtbarste Hemmnis für einen Neuansatz ist die Schlegel-Tieck Übersetzung, deren Einfluß so stark ist, daß wohl die meisten unbefangenen Leser einen Großteil der modernen Übersetzungen nicht ins 20. Jahrhundert datieren würden'.[1]

This would seem to suggest that the Schlegel-Tieck *Shakespeare* is a translation impervious to the passage of years, a version which cannot be superseded. There is some degree of justice in this view, given that none of the inordinate number of German translations of Shakespeare which has since professed to have reflected the original

text more closely than Schlegel has succeeded in doing so.

The immediate positive reception of Schlegel's Shakespeare renderings at the beginning of the 19th century is not difficult to explain. Apart from trends in public and critical taste considered in the previous section, it was the first verse translation of Shakespeare, and, as Schlegel himself deliberated in retrospect, the time had come to introduce (blank) verse drama onto the stage again.[2] Prose drama had had its run, thanks to Lessing[3], and Shakespeare was known by the German public only in prose. Therefore, 'the constellation of the [literary] target system at the appropriate point in time'[4], as Toury puts it, was conducive to the reception of Shakespeare in verse.

It is not disputed that Schlegel's achievement during the first decade of the 19th century was very considerable. He termed his Shakespeare 'originalgetreu', which it was, insofar as he did not translate in prose. Reichert suggests that 'Schlegel gegen die Sturm-und-Drang-Tradition anzuübersetzen hatte'.[5] Certainly, the overall realisation of Schlegel's *Shakespeare* contrasts greatly with the dynamic, the sensual and the undisciplined language and style of the *Sturm und Drang* drama. But this does not make it more accurate. Schlegel's *Shakespeare* in fact evinces all the qualities of the dominant poetics of his day: 'mittlere gewählte Sprache'[6], 'gefällige Glättungen'[7], qualities which are not to be found in Shakespeare's original text, but in the standards which governed the target language drama of the day. Canaris observed that plays produced on the basis of older translations are in danger of being under a greater obligation to the translation than to what was the original text. He adds in this connection:

> 'Das klassische Beispiel dafür ist die berühmte, unbestritten großartige und als eigenes Kunstwerk zu betrachtende Shakespeare-Übersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, die sich auch bedeutende Verdienste für das Theater erworben hat, weil sie auf wesentliche Weise Shakespeare auf die deutsche Bühne gebracht hat; aber es ist eben eine Übersetzung aus dem Geist der deutschen Romantik, und so wie wir heute denken, ist Shakespeare alles andere als ein romantischer Autor'.[8]

Toury maintained that where there is similarity in norms governing the formulation of translation and those governing the corresponding target language genre, the translation will resemble an original and there may not even be evidence of any cultural difference between the two texts. This is indeed the case with the Schlegel Shakespeare dramas. They bear all the qualities of an 'eigenes Kunstwerk'. When we recall under what conditions a translation is positively received by the German public, i. e., when it sounds like a German original, then the reasons for the immediate acceptance of the Schlegel translation are patently obvious.

Opinions differ as to the quality of the Shakespeare versions contributed by Dorothea Tieck and Wolf Graf Baudissin to the Schlegel-Tieck *Shakespeare*. [9] Gisela Hoffmann speaks of the 'relative Einheitlichkeit des Schlegel-Tieckschen Übersetzungswerks'. Margaret Atkinson stresses Baudissin's 'gift of effecting a nice balance between the demands of his own language and those of the foreign text, and so producing versions which have a characteristically German ring'. On the other hand, however, where Ferdinand Freiligrath refused to touch the Shakespeare plays already rendered by Schlegel, he was not averse to re-translating the plays already rendered by Tieck and Baudissin. W. Wetz is of the opinion that 'Dorothea's Arbeit ganz oder teilweise wegfallen müsste'.[10]

But whatever the opinions, the 'Schlegel-Tieck' is still 'Shakespeare' for the greater part of the German public even today, largely because this Shakespeare version has been a constant favourite with the theatre. Suerbaum attributes this partly to the greater latitude offered by the "smoothing out" of Shakespeare's idiosyncracies: 'Nicht nur aus Qualitäts- oder Traditionsgründen, sondern wohl auch deshalb, weil man mit diesen Texten freier verfahren kann'[11], and partly to the fact that the Schlegel-Tieck Shakespeare range of language has been perpetuated by later translators: 'Die moderne Shakespeare-Übersetzung arbeitet mit dem gleichen begrenzten und nur teilweise angemessenen sprachlichen Instrumentarium. Sie ist im ganzen eine Fortsetzung von Schlegel, Baudissin und Tieck mit deren eigenen Mitteln'.[12] And one can see what he means by looking at the work of Erich Fried. Fried's Shakespeare translations constitute a refined and improved, occasionally modernised, version of the Schlegel-Tieck *Shakespeare*, and enjoy considerable popularity on the contemporary German Shakespeare stage. Fried is of the opinion that

> es ganz falsch wäre, Schlegel völlig beiseite zu lassen. Erstens hat er zahllose großartige Lösungen gefunden, und zweitens ist nicht zu leugnen, daß das deutsche Assoziationsklima in Sachen Shakespeare von Schlegel geprägt ist. Das Assoziationsklima gegenüber einer Dichtung einfach zu ignorieren, bedeutet einen Mangel an Sensibilität gegenüber der Kultur in der man lebt.[13]

It seems remarkable that a poet/translator who can produce an outstanding metaphrastic German rendering of Dylan Thomas's *Under Milk Wood* should speak of the predominance of 'das deutsche Assoziationsklima gegenüber einer Dichtung' over the original text, when speaking of his own approach to Shakespeare translation. Is it simply a case of resignation? Acceptance of the fact that for the German public , Schlegel-Tieck *is* Shakespeare?

Experience has shown in public and private readings of both the Schlegel-Tieck and the Voß *Shakespeare*, that the former is immediately accepted as Shakespeare (the 'sound' of Shakespeare), and the latter immediately rejected as 'un-Shakespearean'. [14] Critics who are familiar with the original Shakespeare, however, reject the Schlegel-Tieck 'sound' of Shakespeare:

> Uns sind diese Verse [Schlegel-Tieck-Baudissin] so vertraut, daß wir, ohne das zu merken, Shakespeare ständig wie durch Milchglas sehen und hören; wenn etwa im 'Lear' diese Alten über die nächtliche Heide tapern, dann verstört uns das fast gar nicht.[15]

In his discussion of the Fried Shakespeare translation, Reichert too is perplexed by Fried's ambivalent attitude to translating. When considering Fried's conservative attitude towards Shakespeare translation, he reminds us:

> Ich brauche nicht zu sagen, daß diese Einstellung zur Tradition mehr Probleme aufwirft als löst, ist sie doch damit einer bestimmten Rezeptionsgeschichte mehr verpflichtet als dem elisabethanischen Zeitalter. Es wäre, umgekehrt, denkbar, gerade gegen eine bestimmte, mithin typisch deutsche Tradition anzuübersetzen, ... um so vielleicht einen neuen oder anderen Shakespeare zu begründen. Es wäre anzuübersetzen gegen die Einschüchterung durch eine bestimmte Spielart

von Klassizität. [16]

'Einschüchterung', 'deutsche Assoziationsklima in Sachen Shakespeare' would seem to be the only basis of the continuing success story of the Schlegel/Tieck *Shakespeare*. How right (and reactionary) Atkinson was when she wrote in 1962/63: 'Nothing can now rob the Schlegel-Tieck-Baudissin translation of its place both in literary history and, more important, in German speech and writing. Nothing can now alter the fact that one generation after another has come to know and love Shakespeare in this form.'[17] This is not, however, the same as knowing Shakespeare. Unfortunately, 'Einschüchterung' seems on the other hand to have generated rebellion against the "classic" German Shakespeare in the case of translators like Handke: his *Wintermärchen* is a transformation of Shakespeare from the 'sublime' Classic/Romantic version of Dorothea Tieck to the 'ridiculous' distortion of Shakespeare's original text. Handke may be an iconoclast in the history of German Shakespeare translation, but his *Wintermärchen* represents neither a knowledgeable appraisal nor accuracy. However, there are signs that this hegemony of Schlegel/Tieck is coming to an end; and that the dissatisfaction expressed by Vollmer and Reichert is spreading as a rather different attitude to translation gains ground. Some of this opinion was considered in general terms in the Introduction above [pp. 7 to 17]. We should now be able to consider in more detail its implications for the reception of Shakespeare's work and of the Voßs' translation.

iv) The persistence of controversy in German Shakespeare translation

In 1991, the Gate Theatre in London put on Corneille's *Polyeucte Martyr* in the translation of N. Clark. The performance was given a blistering review in the *Times Literary Supplement* by E. Korn, not because of the acting, but because of the translation. [1] Clark remains faithful to the original text on every level apart from the metrical level (rhyming pentameters instead of alexandrines). Korn criticises this approach to translation in general and Clark's retaining the original language level in particular ('high-flown', 'grandiloquent'). Clark replies to this review through a letter to the Editor of the *Times Literary Supplement* in 26 lines of rhyming pentameters, designed, amongst other things, to defend his methods of translating:

'Corneille, yes, had "passages of great strength"
Though modern critics cavil at their length.
So some translators, keen to win assent,
Feel free to cut, adapt or else invent.
Strange tongue! An unknown play! The author dead?

Why bother to translate? Transmute instead!
If infidelity involves divorce -
What harm? Who's going to consult the source?
But if the alien classic's worth recall,
Should we not introduce it, warts and all?'[2]

This example is an apt testimony to the fate of a close translation, particularly where the original drama goes back to the late sixteenth/mid-seventeenth century. It also reflects the continuing controversy in German Shakespeare translation, particularly for the stage. Producers and critics of Shakespeare for the German stage can be broadly divided into two groups: those who unreservedly support a translation for which the principal criterion has been fidelity to the original text on every level and a manifestation of this on stage and, as Clark says, those who 'cut, adapt or else invent' either around the original text, i.e. have a new translation done for the modern stage, or, around an old translation, to obtain a version which they consider suitable for today's theatre.

In his appraisal of the 'German Shakespeare' (in which no mention is made of the Voß translation), Ulrich Suerbaum discusses the nature of Shakespeare's English and its consequences for the German translator.[3] Suerbaum maintains that in spite of the extreme complexity of Shakespeare's poetic language, it is easier to translate than many a text, such as the novel, which contains the set functional communicative categories of normal speech, and fixed metaphors.[4] He basically sees only two sources of problems for the translator of Shakespeare: allusions to late 16th-century and early 17th century English politics, religion and literary connotations in Shakespeare's prose text, and Shakespeare's rhymes.[5] Otherwise, the translator has equally rich and diverse resources of language at his disposal as Shakespeare had at his, and, just as Shakespeare was released from the bonds of conventional language, so the translator has the same right to employ every possible means of expression in his rendering.[6] In a nutshell, Suerbaum maintains:

> Wir können die Übersetzbarkeit Shakespeares auf die Formel bringen, daß in [Shakespeares] Werk die übersetzungsgünstigen Faktoren der poetischen Sprache potenziert, die übersetzungshemmenden reduziert auftreten ...Shakespeares Sätze sind keine vorgefertigten Einheiten, die als ganze parallelisiert werden müssen, sondern sie sind wirklich aus einzelnen Bedeutungsträgern komponiert und können viel eher Wort für Wort übersetzt werden.[7]

Although Suerbaum omits to discuss as part of Shakespeare's complexity the role of the phonological level of Shakespeare's language in the achievement of his overall stylistic effect, or the strategic matching of quality and quantity of syllable to measure of metrical foot and its importance for expression, he is basically arguing in favour of an 'originalnahe Nachbildung'[8] which is what the Voß *Shakespeare* represents. Suerbaum's approach to translating Shakespeare is unusual but pragmatic; he cites no examples of Shakespeare versions which have come close to this approach, although those of both Friedrich Gundolf and Rudolf Alexander Schröder, albeit fashioned to constrasting ideologies and poetics, tend in this direction. But neither is there anything ambiguous about Suerbaum's decree on the fate of a translation carried out to his suggested principles:

> Originalgetreu zu übersetzen bedeutet eine Mutprobe und erfordert überdies, daß der Übersetzer eine gespaltene Haltung einnimmt: Dem Autor des Originals muß er als Dienender, Untertaner, auf das Wort Gläubiger begegnen, dem Publikum muß er als kompromißloser, mitunter anmaßender Anwalt einer fremden Sache gegenübertreten. Die Qualität eines Übersetzers hängt daher stärker von seiner Bereitschaft und Fähigkeit zur Vertretung dieser zwiespältigen Position ab als von seinem sprachtechnischen und sprachkünstlerischen Vermögen. Ein Übersetzer ist im Grunde so gut, wie er sich zu sein getraut - und wie sein Publikum ihm zu sein erlaubt.[9]

Despite Schadewaldt's reasoned view that a translation should function neither as a substitute for those who do not understand a foreign language, nor as a crib, it is in fact precisely the reader/audience with no command of the language of the original text that has to rely on translation and therefore has firmer views about what is required. Ortega believed that the recipient will welcome

the 'otherness' of the translated text; in appraising this translation, the reader/audience will respond to it in exactly the same way as they respond to a literary text in their own language. But although the reader/audience will tolerate deviations from the norms of language and literature in an original work, the translator is expected to present a foreign work in terms with which the reader or the audience is familiar. Where, for example, the original work of an Ernst Jandl, Arno Schmidt, of a James Joyce, Dylan Thomas or Sean O'Casey is received as the literature of a genius, in a translation anything odd, unconventional, transliteral, neologistic, is immediately often chalked up against the translator as inadmissible. [10]

Suerbaum describes the 'successful' (i.e. 'successful from the point of view of the average reader/audience) German Shakespeare translator as translator and commentator in one, and the 'acceptable' translation as one which 'die innersprachliche Übertragung in die anderssprachige Version (einbaut)'. [13] This means, in the words of Dryden, 'the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplified'. [14] This is necessary, Suerbaum claims, since 'Jede Leserschaft lehnt kommentierte Übersetzungen ab, obwohl sie nichts gegen kommentierte Ausgaben einzuwenden hat'. [15] What the German public demands is a Shakespeare who speaks 'that kind of [German] which he would have spoken had he lived in [Germany], and had written to this age' [16], everything, in fact, which the Voß Shakespeare is and does *not*. The implication is that for Shakespeare to occupy a position in the target literary system similar to that which his original plays enjoy(ed), then he must be 'adjusted' to suit the horizon of expectations in that target literary system. For Vollmann, as he explains in his well-founded criticism of any German verse translation of Shakespeare, 'adjusted' means 'Shakespeare bereinigt ... Shakespeare bühnenanständig und literaturwürdig'. [17] Because Shakespeare was unique in the history of European literature, because there was no comparable German original drama, 'bereinigter' Shakespeare was, for the German public, *Shakespeare*. For the authority on Shakespeare's original texts, however, Shakespeare 'adjusted' to the poetics of the day is and remains Shakespeare in the guise of *Sturm und Drang*, German Classicism, Naturalism (Gerhart Hauptmann), or whatever the literary period may be in which the text is translated and received. Shakespeare 'originalgetreu' in Voß's definition of the word can only have a place on the German stage, and a position and status as

a reading text in the target literary system 'wenn wir den Leser von seinen sprachlichen Gewohnheiten losreißen und ihn zwingen, sich in die des Autors zu versetzen'.[18] Only under these conditions can a text such as the Voß *Shakespeare* be appreciated, appreciated as '[Shakespeares] lebendige Fortwirkung in fremdem Geist'.[19]

When he speaks of *Shakespeare* 'bereinigt', Vollmann is not merely referring to the extents to which contemporary German producers will 'adjust' Shakespeare in translation for the stage. We have already seen in the Introduction examples of the dramaturgical adjustments made by Canaris, Zadek, et. al.; transmutation as compensation for what they consider the untranslatable. When discussing the problems of copyright involved in "tampering" with a drama translation ('Streichungen und Umstellungen'), Canaris emphasises how necessary it in fact is 'einen literarischen [Übersetzungs] Text, vor allem wenn er älter ist, zu verändern', and readily admits that this is done not only with texts no longer bound by copyright: 'Ich plaudere ... keine Geheimnisse aus, wenn ich sage, daß wir mit Übersetzungen, an die wir formal gebunden bleiben, versuchen, auf dem Theater im Sinne von Theater umzugehen.'[20] Nies, on the other hand, severely criticises even the practice of 'Aktualisierung [urheberrechtlich nicht meht geschützter Übersetzungen] auf Deubel-komm-raus', and remonstrates with the guilty who believe that 'es sich doch dadurch anhand alter Stücke wunderschön demonstrieren (läßt), daß auch sonst die Welt seit Jahrhunderten gleich geblieben ist.'[21]

Some of the Shakespeare productions which have opened the 1992/93 theatre season in Germany are such flagrant examples of these practices that one can only conclude that the German Shakespeare text, and indeed the original text, are of purely secondary significance. A. Eichholz reports in his review of C. Trantow's production of *Romeo and Juliet* in the Rothe translation at the *Stadttheater* in Weilheim (Upper Bavaria) that '[Trantow] todesmutig [Rothes *Shakespeare*] noch einmal (auskratzt) und von der allertraurigsten Liebesgeschichte gerade noch einen Rest Handlung erkennen (läßt), neben den letzten Statements lebensgefährlich zusammengestrichener Personen.'[22] F. Castorf's production of *Lear* on the *Volksbühne* in what was East Berlin and J. Flimm's production of the same play at the *Thalia Theater* in Hamburg both give cause for the reviewer, B. Henrichs, to lament 'Shakespeare, armer Shakespeare!' In Berlin, *Lear* has been transformed into 'Antitheater ... so wild,

so unflätig, so zerrissen... eine Welttragödie als Alltagsfarce'; in Hamburg: 'Flimm bringt das denkwürdige Unkunststück fertig, Shakespeares Geschichte zugleich zu verkleinern und diffus zu verwischen.'[23]

In all three cases, the German drama text has been adapted to transport a political message and/or distorted in order to introduce (base) elements which are either thought by the producer to support the message or simply to have appeal to the modern audience. The mature Juliet of Shakespeare's original play (she does, after all, develop into a resolute character who has more awareness of the practicalities of the situation than Romeo) is portrayed in Trantow's production as 'beinfrei strampelnde Ungeduld' for which Romeo's sexuality is no match. The political elements are 'invented' and represented at the end of the play when Prior Laurence preaches in front of the whole cast against killing children and (re-)building (Berlin) walls.[24]

In the case of the *Lear* productions, Henrichs reports: 'Selbstverständlich durften wir vor den Premieren in Hamburg und Berlin wieder mal hören, was für ein irrsinnig zeitgenössisches Stück der "König Lear" doch sei. Der Einsturz des sozialistischen Weltreiches, die Massaker auf dem Balkan.' In Castorf's production of *Lear* 'zerbricht keine Welt. Ein muffiger Kleinstaat geht unter. Welcher wohl?' The play closes with the cast smashing a boiled whole cabbage (*Kohl*kopf!) to smithereens with a hammer as a symbol of 'die [ostdeutsche] Vernichtungswut auf das neue, fette Deutschland.' In Flimm's production, scenes alternate between 'spannungslose Isolation' and 'pseudodramatische Handgemenge', between 'Fadheit und Gewaltsamkeit'. Whether this represents a political comment on Eastern European issues or not was not even clear to the critic. The one thing he was certain of was that both productions could be summed up as 'Shakespearewahnsinn ...Shakespearevernichtung oder Mein Theater ist sinnlos!'[25]

It is Nies's opinion that '[man] einem alten Stück durch keine noch so gewaltsame Umprägung das Aussehen eines Textes (wird) geben können, der von hier und heute stammt ... Wir sollten mehr Mut haben, Fremdheit - auch zeitliche Fremdheit - nicht wegzumanipulieren, sondern sie zu sehen als Provokation, als Faszination, als Chance zur befruchtenden Auseinandersetzung.' [26] This view is shared by C. Stückl, 30 year-old producer at the *Schauspielhaus an der*

Maximilianstraße in Munich. He opened his 1992/93 season with a performance of *Much Ado*, had chosen Shakespeare because 'da alles perfekt gebaut (ist) - anders als bei vielen Gegenwartsautoren!' And since he so admired the structure of Shakespeare's original plays, Stückl put on an almost unabridged, completely unadapted German version of the play in the translation of Heinrich Voß in the 1818 revision. When asked whether he considered producing 'eine fast ungestrichene alte Übersetzung' a provocation (this, and the fact that there was no pop-music, no socio-political message was considered quite extraordinary for so young a producer), Stückl indicated that this had not been his only motivation: 'Ich habe eben alle Übersetzungen gelesen und die Voß'sche hat mir am besten gefallen.' Apparently he was not alone in this opinion.[27] Although Stückl does not dispute that the brutality in Shakespeare's tragedies may have some relevance for the violence of our time, what fascinates him more is 'daß Shakespeare alle Grundmuster menschlichen Verhaltens reflektiert ... gerade im Allgemeingültigen liegt der Wert der Stücke. Auf die politische Gegenwart kann das Theater eh' nicht so schnell reagieren'.[28] This is one of the isolated cases where the original Shakespeare text and the German rendering of the text is of primary importance: it must reflect Shakespeare in all of his facets, on all of the levels. It is, however, significant that this German Shakespeare performance in the Voß translation had its success in a small studio theatre. Here the producer can venture what in the meantime has become a revolutionary step - a staging of Shakespeare 'unbereinigt'.

If these trends continue, German approaches to the translation and performance of Shakespeare are likely to change radically, in ways very much furthered by and favourable to a better-informed reception of the Voß translations.

NOTES

I. Introduction

i) Modern concepts of translation

[1]See Cicero, 'Right and Wrong', in M. Grant (ed.), *Latin Literature* (Harmondsworth, 1978), pp. 42-43. Cicero, *De optimo genere oratorum*, Loeb Classical Library, transl. by H.M. Hubell (London, 1959). Horace, *On the Art of Poetry*, in *Classical Library Criticism* (Harmondsworth, 1965), pp. 77-97. See also H. Friedrich, 'Zur Frage der Übersetzungskunst', in *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaft. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* (Heidelberg, 1965), 3. Abhandlung, pp. 87 and 88. See also S. Bassnett-McGuire, *Translation Studies* (London and New York, [3]1987), pp. 43-45.

[2]H. Torczyner (Hrsg.), *Die Heilige Schrift*. Neu ins Deutsche übertragen (Frankfurt/M, 1937), p. viii.

[3] W. Wilss, *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Probleme und Methoden* (Stuttgart, 1977), p. 156.

[4]See K. Reiss/H.J. Vermeer, *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* (Tübingen, 1984), p. 128f. *Linguistische Arbeiten* 147.

[5]Ibid, p. 128.

[6]A. Lefevere catalogues: phonemic translation, literal translation, metrical translation, poetry into prose, rhymed translation, blank verse translation and interpretation. See S. Bassnett-McGuire, op. cit., pp. 81-82.

[7]S. Bassnett-McGuire, op. cit., p. 82.

[8]Ibid, p. 25.

[9]Adherents of the linguistic approach to translation theory include R. Jakobson, 'Linguistische Aspekte der Übersetzung', in W. Wilss (Hrsg.), *Übersetzungswissenschaft* (Darmstadt, 1981), pp. 189-198, A. Popovic, *A Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation* (Edmonton, Alberta, 1976), J.C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Trans-*

lation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics (London, 1965), P. Newmark, 'Twenty-three Restricted Rules of Translation', in *The Incorporated Linguist*, 12 (1), 1973, pp. 9-15.

[10]See W. Koller, 'Die literarische Übersetzung unter linguistischem Aspekt. Bedeutungsfaktoren der Übersetzung am Beispiel Henrik Ibsens', in H. Kittel (Hrsg.), *Die literarische Übersetzung. Stand und Perspektiven ihrer Erforschung* (Berlin, 1988), pp. 64-91. Göttinger Beiträge zur internationalen Übersetzungsforschung 2.

[11]W. Wilss, *Kognition und Übersetzen. Theorie und Praxis der menschlichen und der maschinellen Übersetzung* (Tübingen, 1988), p. 18. Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft 41. See also S. Bassnett-McGuire, op. cit., p. 1.

[12]L. Barchudarow, *Sprache und Übersetzung. Probleme der allgemeinen und speziellen Übersetzungstheorie* (Moskau und Leipzig, 1979), p. 9.

[13]W. Wilss, *Übersetzungswissenschaft*, op. cit., p. 131f.

[14]See Y. Tobin, *Semiotics and Linguistics. The Saussurian Sign Revolution That Might Have Been* (London and New York, 1990).

[15]K. Reiss/H.J. Vermeer, op. cit., p. 101.

[16]Ibid, p. 112.

[17]Ibid, p. 87.

[18]Ibid, p. 57.

[19]Ibid, p. 91.

[20]H.J. Vermeer, Review of L. Wollin/H. Lindquist (eds.), *Translation Studies in Scandinavia* (Lund, 1986), in *TEXTconTEXT* 2 (1987), p. 170. R. Jakobson clearly distinguishes this type of translation from both intralingual translation (rewording) and from interlingual translation (translation proper). See R. Jakobsen, 'Linguistische Aspekte der Übersetzung', in op. cit., pp. 189-198, here p. 190.

[21]H.J. Vermeer, op cit., p. 170. Bretthauer himself is rather more cautious. He supplies the word *Übersetzung* with inverted commas and

uses the subjunctive mood in defining his transmutation: 'Die Übersetzung wäre in diesem Fall eine graphische Arbeit'. P. Bretthauer, 'Der Übersetzer als Kulturexperte', in *TEXTconTEXT* 2 (1987), pp. 216-226. Here p. 223.

[22]J. Holz-Mänttäri, *Translatorisches Handeln. Theorie und Methode* (Helsiniki, 1984), p. 78. Annales Academiae scientiarum fennical B 226.

[23]M. Ammann, Review of J. Albrecht et al (Hrsg.), *Translation und interkulturelle Kommunikation* (Frankfurt/M und Bern, 1987), in *TEXTconTEXT* 4 (1989), pp. 106-129. Here p. 108.

[24]See J.C. Sager, 'Die Übersetzung im Kommunikationsprozeß der Übersetzer in der Industrie', in M. Snell-Hornby (Hrsg.), *Übersetzungswissenschaft - eine Neuorientierung. Zur Integrierung von Theorie und Praxis* (Tübingen, 1986), pp. 331-347. Here p. 331.

[25]G. Toury, 'A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies', in T. Hermans (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation* (London and Sydney, 1985), pp. 16-41. Here p. 20.

[26]Ibid, p. 19.

[27]Ibid, p. 21f.

[28]G. Toury, 'The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation', in J.S. Holmes/J. Lambert/R.v.d. Broeck (eds.), *Literature and Translation. New Perspectives in Literary Studies* (Leuven, 1978), pp. 83-100. Here p. 90f.

[29]G. Toury, 'Translation, literary translation and pseudotranslation', in E.J. Shaffer (ed.), *Comparative Criticism*, Vol. 6 (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 73-84. Here p. 76.

[30]S. Bassnett-McGuire, op. cit., p. 7.

[31]M. Snell-Hornby, 'Dimension and Perspective in Literary Translation', in W. Wilss/G. Thome (Hrsg.), *Die Theorie des Übersetzens und ihr Aufschlußwert für die Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschdidaktik (Translation Theory and its Implementation in the Teaching of Translating and Interpreting)*. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums der

Association de Linguistique Appliquée (AILA), Saarbrücken, 25.-30. Juli 1983 (Tübingen, 1984). *Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik* 247, pp. 105-113. Here p. 105. Snell-Hornby continues here: 'Within the discipline of translation studies, literary translation tends to enjoy an exclusive status of its own ... Both the theory and practice of literary translation have been largely immune to objective analysis'.

[32]G. Steiner, 'On an Exact Art (Again)', in *Lingua e Litteratura* 2 (1984), pp. 13-25. Here p. 13.

[33]E. Etkind, *Un Art en Crise* (Lausanne, 1982), p. 13.

[34]Ibid, p. XV.

ii) Modern concepts of translating drama in general and Shakespeare particular

[1]J. Levy, *Die literarische Übersetzung. Theorie einer Kunstgattung* (Frankfurt/M und Bonn, 1969), p. 158.

[2]G. Mounin, *Die Übersetzung. Geschichte, Theorie, Anwendung* (München, 1967), p. 139.

[3]R. Kloepfer, *Die Theorie der literarischen Übersetzung* (München, 1967), p. 86. *FreiburgerSchriften zur Romanischen Philologie* 12.

[4]Shakespeare used the proverb not only as what, for the Elizabethan audience, was still an authoritative truth, but also as a literary device. Thus, like the pun, the proverb works on two levels: it can relate directly to the context in which it is spoken, but it also has a more general meaning. Cf. Lady Macbeth in III, ii, 12: 'What's done is done'. Here she endeavours to draw a final line under the numerous derivations of the play's keyword 'do', derivations which have always connoted with Duncan's murder. Her use of the proverb 'What's done cannot be undone' in V, i, 66, is of a more general nature. As authoritative truths, the audience was all too familar with proverbs. Thus, a mere allusion to the proverb was often all that the Elizabethan audience required to recognise the significance of its application in the drama. Cf. *Hamlet*, III, ii, 334f: 'Ay,

but, "While the grass grows" - the proverb is something musty'. The unspoken conclusion , "the horse starves", refers back to lines 93-94 of the same scene, where Hamlet says 'I eat the air'. Then we have the poeticised proverb where, for example, 'Murder will out' is expressed as 'For murder, though it have no tongue, will speak/With most miraculous organ'(*Hamlet*, II, ii, 589f). See H. Weinstock, *Die Funktion elisabethanischer Sprichwörter und Pseudosprichwörter bei Shakespeare* (Heidelberg, 1966).

[5]Shakespeare's quibble 'arms/arms', for example, in *Hamlet* V, i, 28-37, is rendered by H. Rothe as a jingle: 'Aber die allervornehmsten Leute sind die Gärtner und Totengräber, denn sie bleiben bei Adams Beruf!/Hat Adam einen Beruf?/Den schönsten der Welt! Wozu ist einer berufen, der vornehm ist?/Zum Nichtstun'. A.W. Schlegel attempts a translation with a semantically closer jingle using 'armi(e)rt' and 'Arme', but in doing so sacrifices all of the wit and humour of the passage: 'War der [Adam] ein Edelmann?/Er war der erste, der je armirt war./Ei, was wollt er!/Was? bist ein Heide? Wie legst du die Schrift aus? Die Schrift sagt: Adam grub. Konnte er ohne Arme graben?'

[6]G. Mounin. Cit. K. Reiss, *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik. Kategorien und Kriterien für eine sachgerechte Beurteilung von Übersetzungen* (München, [3]1986), p. 51.

[7]G. Mounin, *Die Übersetzung. Geschichte, Theorie, Anwendung* , op. cit.,p. 137.

[8]See H.G. Carlson, 'Problems in Play Translation', in *Educational Theatre Journal* 16 (1964), pp. 55-58: 'When writing dialogue, a playwright must be conscious of the rate and clarity of delivery his actors are capable of rendering and his audience is capable of understanding' (p. 55). See also M. Gravier, 'La Traduction des Textes Dramatiques', in *Etudes de Linguistique Appliquée* 12 (1973), pp. 39-49: 'D'autre part, le traducteur doit saisir et essayer de restituer la musicalité propre au texte original' (p. 44). See also S. Bassnett-McGuire, 'Translating Spatial Poetry: An Examination of Theatre Texts in Performance', in J.S. Holmes/J. Lambert/R. v.d. Broeck (eds.), *Literature and Translation*, op. cit., pp. 161-176: 'In a well-written play, it seems to me, there are basic undertextual rhythms ... for a translation to succeed the translator must be aware of these rhythms and, if they cannot be translated, adapt them

into equivalents' (p. 165).

[9]See S. Bassnett-McGuire, 'Translating Spatial Poetry', op. cit., p. 163.

[10]S. Bassnett-McGuire, *Translation Studies*, op. cit., p. 122.

[11]See E. Sander, 'Vom Übersetzen ins Deutsche', in H.-A. Koch (Hrsg.), *Sprachkunst und Übersetzung. Gedenkschrift Hans Sander* (Bern, Frankfurt/M. und New York, 1983), pp. 45-71: 'Übersetzen - das ist das Nachschaffen, das Nocheinmalschaffen eines Wortkunstwerks in und aus einem andern Sprachmaterial' (p. 47). See also O. Fischer, 'Vom Übersetzen dichterischer Werke', in *Philologica pragensia* 26 (1983), pp. 65-80: 'Ein dichterisches Werk übersetzen bedeutet: es in ein anderes Material übertragen; in ein Material, das sich teilweise seine eigenen neuen Bedingungen diktiert, und das folglich auch die notwendigen Abweichungen von der Vorlage begründet' (p. 72).

[12]B. Haas, *Dramenübersetzung. Sprachtheoretische und Dramaturgische Aspekte, dargestellt am Beispiel des Schauspiels 'Sommergäste' von Maksim Gor'kij*, Diss., Hamburg 1982, p. 12.

[13]Haas goes so far as to say: 'Eine erschöpfende Dramenanalyse [which also implies the analysis of a translated play] kann nur am inszenierten Text vollzogen werden' (ibid., p. 26). This seems to me a little exaggerated, particularly since each single, different production of a play is already an interpretation of the text.

[14]H. Sahl, 'Zur Übersetzung von Theaterstücken', in R. Italiaander (Hrsg.), *Vorträge und Beiträge vom internationalen Kongreß literarischer Übersetzer in Hamburg 1965* (Frankfurt/M. und Bonn, 1965), p. 104f.

[15]From the manuscript of a recorded interview with V. Canaris, later entitled 'Literaturübersetzen aus der Sicht des Theaters', in F. Nies/A.-R. Glaap/W. Gössmann (Hrsg.), *Ist Literaturübersetzen lehrbar?* (Tübingen, 1989), p. 63.

[16]A. Ubersfeld sees any intervention on the part of the producer in the translating process, or indeed in 'translating' the 'conventional' literary drama translation into stage language as dangerous,

as the text acquires a higher status than the performance of the text. In her opinion, only the translator can produce a text suitable for the stage. See A. Ubersfeld, *Lire le theatre* (Paris, 1978), pp. 15-16.

[17]V. Canaris, op. cit., p. 63.

[18]Ibid.

[19]U. Suerbaum, 'Der Deutsche Shakespeare', in E. Kolb/J.Hasler (Hrsg.), *Festschrift Rudolf Stamm* (Bern, 1969), p. 78f. It should be mentioned here that as early as 1858 F. Dingelstedt set down a plan to have Shakespeare translated especially for the German stage. In his opinion, Schlegel's 'vielfach undeutsche' translation no longer met the needs of the theatre. He argued then that Shakespeare's text should be 'mundgerecht' and 'bühnengerecht'. F. Dingelstedt, *Studien und Copien nach Shakespeare* (Budapest, Wien und Leipzig, 1858), pp. 1-28. Cit. W. Schoof, 'Dingelstedts Plan einer neuen Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, Bd. 76, (Weimar, 1940), p. 138. See also S. Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage. Volume 1: 1586-1914* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 153-161.

[20]J.W. Goethe, 'Shakespeare und kein Ende', in *Goethes Werke*, Hamburger Ausgabe, Bd. XII, hrsg. von E. Trunz (München, [7]1973), p. 296.

[21]U. Suerbaum, 'Shakespeare auf deutsch - Eine Zwischenbilanz', in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* (West), 1972, p. 62.

[22]Ibid.

[23]F. Nies, 'Ältere Literatur Frankreichs verdeutschen: Sinn und Ziel?', in F. Nies/A.-R. Glaap/W. Gössmann (Hrsg.), *Ist Literaturübersetzen lehrbar?*, op. cit., p. 84.

[24]U. Suerbaum, 'Shakespeare auf deutsch', op. cit., p. 62.

[25]Ibid.

[26]U. Suerbaum, 'Der Deutsche Shakespeare', op. cit., p. 79.

[27]V. Canaris, op. cit., p. 66.

[28]See U. Suerbaum 'Shakespeare auf deutsch', op. cit., p. 50. See also M. Brauneck, *Theater im 20. Jahrhundert* (Reinbek, 1982), p. 309ff.

[29]N. Greiner, 'Darauf ein Bier an der Ecke. Peter Handke hat "Das Wintermärchen" übersetzt, in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 10. Juni 1991.

[30]See *Kieler Nachrichten*, 27. Oktober 1988 and 20. September 1991.

[31]See F. Nies, 'Ältere Literatur Frankreichs verdeutschen: Sinn und Ziel?', op. cit., p. 85. See also U. Suerbaum, 'Shakespeare auf deutsch', op. cit., p. 62.

[32]V. Canaris, op. cit., p. 69.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Ibid., p. 68.

[36]U. Suerbaum, 'Shakespeare auf deutsch', p. 42.

[37]M. Bogdanov's production of *Romeo und Julia* in the 1990/91 season of the *Deutsches Schauspielhaus* in Hamburg (première 21 December, 1990) was based on the translation by E. Fried, a traditional rendering based in turn on Schlegel's *Romeo und Julia*. It was a "modernised" staging with incidental musical accompaniment (rock music). "Authenticity" of setting went so far as to introduce bikes, motorbikes, mopeds, scooters and an Alfa Romeo Spider onto the stage. Visual representation and the "intrusion" of the music detracted considerably from the spoken word.

[38]U. Suerbaum, 'Shakespeare auf deutsch', op. cit., p. 43.

[39]Amongst other authors, Handke has translated into German Florjan Lipus, Emmanuel Bove, René Char, Walter Percy and Aeschylus.

[40]Suhrkamp blurb to *William Shakespeare 'Das Wintermärchen'. Deutsch von Peter Handke*, op. cit.

[41]N. Greiner, 'Darauf ein Bier an der Ecke. Peter Handke hat "Das Wintermärchen" übersetzt', op. cit.

[42]Quoted in the blurb to Handke's *Wintermärchen*.

[43]Ibid.

[44]U. Suerbaum, 'Shakespeare auf deutsch', op. cit., p. 43.

[45]All of these Shakespeare translations are to be published by the Francke Verlag in Tübingen.

iii) The tradition of German Shakespeare translation within which the Voß family worked

[1]Caspar Wilhelm von Borck, *Versuch einer gebundenen Uebersetzung des Trauer-Spiels von dem Tode des Julius Cäsar. Aus dem Englischen Wercke des Shakespear*, (Leipzig, 1741).

[2]P. Handke, *Das Wintermärchen*, op. cit.

[3]See K.E. Larson, 'The Origins of the "Schlegel-Tieck" Shakespeare in the 1820s', in *German Quarterly*, 60 (1987), pp. 19-37.

[4]See note 19) in Section I, ii.

[5]N. Delius, *Shakespeares Werk* (Leipzig, 1854-1861).

[6]See, for example, the Shakespeare translations edited by F. Bodenstedt, 38 volumes produced between 1867 and 1871 and those edited by H. Ulrici (12 volumes) during exactly the same years.

[7] A. Brandl adopted the same approach as Bernays in his Shakespeare translation (*Shakespeares Dramatische Werke - übersetzt von Aug. Wilh. von Schlegel und Ludwig Tieck* (Leipzig und Wien, 1897, [2]1922-23), ten volumes. Brandl also, however, provided a critical glossary and commentary.

[8]*Shakespeare in deutscher Sprache - Neue Ausgabe in sechs Bänden*. Herausgegeben/Zum Teil neu übersetzt von Friedrich Gundolf (Berlin, 1908-1918), ten volumes, extended new edition 1920-1922, six volumes.

[9]These plays are published in Volume VII of R.A. Schröder, *Gesammelte Werke* (Frankfurt/M., 1963).

[10]H. Rothe, *Der elisabethanische Shakespeare* (Baden-Baden, 1955-1959), nine volumes, revised in four volumes (München, 1963-1964).

[11]*Shakespeare: Neu übersetzt von Richard Flatter* (Wien, Bad Bocklet und Zürich, 1952-1955), six volumes.

[12]R. Schaller, *Shakespeares Werke* (Weimar und Berlin, 1960-1967), four volumes.

[13]E. Fried, *Shakespeare-Übersetzungen. Romeo und Julia, Julius Caesar, Hamlet* (München, 1968). This volume was later supplemented by a further 12 plays (Berlin, 1969-1974) in seven volumes.

[14]*Shakspeare's Othello und König Lear*, übersetzt von Dr. Johann Heinrich Voß, Professor am Weimarischen Gymnasium. Mit Compositionen von Zelter, (Jena, 1806).

[15]*Schauspiele von William Shakspeare übersetzt von Heinrich Voß und Abraham Voß* (Tübingen, 1810-1815), three volumes.

[16]*Shakspeare's Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß und dessen Söhnen Heinrich Voß und Abraham Voß*. Bd. I - III (Leipzig, 1818 and 1819), Bd. IV - IX (Stuttgart, 1822-1829).

[17]See R. Wittmann, *Ein Verlag und seine Geschichte. Dreihundert Jahre J.B.Metzler Stuttgart* (Stuttgart, 1982), p. 454.

[18]The manuscript of this letter - Autographenverzeichnis 399 C243 - is preserved in the Sammlung KAUFFMANN in the Stadtarchiv der Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart.

[19]A. Voß (Hrsg.), *Briefe von Heinrich Voß* (Heidelberg, 1833), Bd. I, 'Briefwechsel zwischen Heinrich Voß und Jean Paul', p. 54.

[20]J. Schreyvogel included Heinrich's rendering of *Lear* in the 1822 repertoire, of *Othello* in the 1823 and of *Henry IV, 1 and 2* in 1828.

[21]The only detailed discussion of any of the Voß Shakespeare translations that has come to light is a comparison of Heinrich's first *Lear* translation (1806) and the later revision of this play for the Complete Shakespeare. See K. Larson, 'Pro und Contra Schlegel', in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* (West), 1989, pp. 113-133.

II The Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries

Chapter One: German concepts of translation in this period

[1]C. Wolff, 'Die Worte sind Zeichen der Gedanken'. *CW, Vernünftige Gedanken von den Kräften des menschlichen Verstandes und ihrem richtigen Gebrauche in Erkenntnis der Wahrheit*, hrsg. von H.W. Arndt, in *CW. Gesammelte Werke*, 1. Abt. Deutsche Schriften Bd. 1 (Hildesheim, 1965), p. 151. See also J.G. von Eckard's edition of *Godofr. Guilielmi Leibnitii Collectanea Eymologica* (1717), from which Leibniz's *Unvorgreifliche Gedancken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der Deutschen Sprache* was printed in full in Gottsched's *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit*, Bd. 1, 1732: 'Es ist aber bey dem Gebrauch der Sprache, auch dieses sonderlich zu betrachten, daß die Worte nicht nur der Gedanken, sondern auch der Dinge Zeichen seyn, und daß wir Zeichen nöthig haben, nicht nur unsere Meynung andern anzudeuten, sondern auch unsern Gedanken selbst zu helfen ... Daher braucht man oft die Worte als Zifern, oder als Rechen-Pfennige, an statt der Bildnisse und Sachen, bis man stufenweise zum Facit schreitet, und beym Vernunftschluß zur Sache selbst gelangt'. P. 370.

[2]J.H. Winckler, §108 *Gedanken Von der Schönheit der Sprache überhaupt*, in JHW, *Der Deutschen Gesellschaft in Leipzig Eigene Schriften und Uebersetzungen in gebundner und ungebundener Sprachen überhaupt* (Leipzig, [2]1735), first edition 1730.

[3]*Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit*, 1736, St. 14, p. 320. See also J.C. Gottsched, 'Von den Uebersetzungen', in *Ausführliche Redekunst* (Leipzig, [5]1759), pp. 413-452.

[4]J.C. Gottsched, *Handlexikon oder kurzgefaßtes Wörterbuch der schönen Wissenschaften* (Leipzig, 1760), column 1584f.

[5]G. Venzky, 'Das Bild eines geschickten Uebersetzers', in *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit*, 1734, St. 9, pp. 59-114.

[6]Ibid, p. 64.

[7]Ibid, p. 110.

[8]Ibid, p. 64f.

[9]J.J. Breitinger, 'Von der Kunst der Uebersetzung', in J.J.B.; *Critische Dichtkunst*, Bd. 2 (Zürich, 1740). Faksimile, Stuttgart, 1965, p. 144.

[10]Ibid, p. 139.

[11]Ibid, p. 147.

[12]Ibid, p. 172.

[13]G.E. Lessing, *Briefe die neueste Litteratur betreffend*, hrsg. von W. Bender (Stuttgart, [2]1979), 39. Brief, p. 99.

[14]G.E. Lessing, *Literaturbriefe*, op. cit., 4. Brief, p. 11.

[15]*G.E. Lessings Werke*, hrsg. von F. Bornmüller (Leipzig/Wien, n.d.), Bd. 5, p. 243.

[16]Ibid, p. 244.

[17]This work included a compilation of dialect and/or archaic words from *Friedrichs von Logau Sinngedichte*, published 1759 and extensive work on an etymological dictionary from 1758 to approximately 1775 (See C.D. Vail, *Lessings Relation to the English Language and Literature* (New York, 1936; reprint 1968), p. 70ff.) Lessing's critical work included discussion of the Steinbach and the Adelung dictionaries and detailed analysis and vindication of archaic grammatical and lexical forms in the works of his contemporaries.

[18]G.E. Lessing, *Literaturbriefe*, op. cit., 332. Brief, p. 325.

[19]J.N. Meinhard, *Versuche über den Charakter und die Werke der besten italienischen Dichter* (Braunschweig, 1763, 1764), 2 Bände.

[20]G.E. Lessing, *Literaturbriefe*, Beschluß des 332. Briefes, op. cit., p. 330.

[21]J.G. Hamann, 'Vermischte Anmerkungen über die Wortfügung in der französischen Sprache', in J.G.H., *Schriften zur Sprache*, hrsg. von J. Simon (Frankfurt/M., 1967), p. 104.

[22]J.G. Hamann, 'Aesthetica in Nuce', loc. cit., p. 116.

[23]Ibid.

[24]E.A. Blackall, *The Emergence of German as a Literary Language 1700-1775* (Cambridge, 1959), p. 431. See also S-A. Jorgensen, *Hamann, Bacon and Tradition*. Orbis Litterarum, Tom 16 (Copenhagen, 1961).

[25]J.G. Hamann, 'Biblische Betrachtungen', in *J.G.H.: Sämtliche Werke*, hrsg. von J. Nadler Bd. I (Wien, 1949), p. 230.

[26]Ibid, p. 229.

[27]Ibid, p. 157.

[28]See R. Kloepfer, *Die Theorie der literarischen Übersetzung. Romanisch-deutscher Sprachbereich* (München, 1967), p. 48f.

[29]J.G. Hamann, 'Geschichte der Übersetzungskunst' (1770), in *J.G.H.: Sämtliche Werke*, op cit., Bd. IV (1952), p. 357.

[30]J.G. Herder, 'Ueber die neuere deutsche Litteratur. Zwote Sammlung' (1767), in J.G.H., *Sämmtliche Werke*, hrsg. von B. Suphan Bd. 1 (Berlin, 1877), p. 274.

[31]See A. Senger, *Deutsche Übersetzungstheorie im 18. Jahrhundert (1734-1746)* (Bonn, 1971), p. 87.

[32]For example, H.B. Wenck published his *Versuch einer Uebersetzung der Ilias des Homers [1. Gesang]*, Darmstadt, 1770, followed by the 2. Gesang in 1772, both in rhythmic prose. K.A. Kütner presented a prose translation of the *Iliad* and G.A. Bürger an iambic rendering of same in 1771. Klopstock began to translate the *Iliad* in hexameters in 1776, as did F.L. Graf von Stolberg, but in iambic verse. J.H. Voß translated the *Odyssey* in German hexameters between 1776 and 1781.

[33]Z.B.L. von Heß, *Einleitung in die Übersetzungskunst* (Hamburg, 1766), pp. 2 and 4.

[34]See K.L. Schneider, *Klopstock und die Erneuerung der deutschen Dichtersprache im 18. Jahrhundert* (Heidelberg, 1965). See also E.A. Blackall, op. cit., pp. 314-350.

[35]F.G. Klopstock, *Sämmtliche Werke*, hrsg. von H.L. Back und A.R.C. Spindler, Bd.XIII (Leipzig, 1835), pp. 55-56.

[36]F.G. Klopstock, op. cit., Bd. IV (1826), p. 1ff.

[37]See K.A. Schleiden, *Klopstocks Dichtungstheorie als Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Poetik* (Saarbrücken, 1954). Wieland's *Der geprüfte Abraham* (1753) represents one of the many *Patriarchaden* written in imitation of the *Messias*, whereas Schönaich countered the *Messias* with *Hermann* (1751) and *Heinrich der Vogler* (1757), epics whose subjects were drawn from Germanic history.

[38]F.G. Klopstock, op. cit. Bd. XIII, p. 56.

[39]See F. Schlegel's definition of 'progressive Universalpoesie' in *Athenaeum* I, 2 (Darmstadt, 1960), p. 195) and Novalis' *Blütenstaub-fragment* in *Athenaeum* , op. cit., p. 88f. See also S. Bassnett-McGuire, *Translations Studies*, op.cit., p. 65 and R. Haym, *Die Romantische Schule* (Darmstadt, 1961), p. 784f.

[40]*Athenaeum* , op. cit., p. 89.

[41]O.F. Walzel, *Friedrich Schlegels Briefe an seinen Bruder August Wilhelm*, (Berlin, 1890), Bd. VII, p. 228.

[42]*Athenaeum* , II, 2, p. 280.

[43]Ibid, p. 282.

[44]A.W. Schlegel, 'Dante - Über die Göttliche Komödie' (1791) in, A.W.S.: *Kritische Schriften und Briefe*, hrsg. von E. Lohner, Bd. I (Stuttgart, 1962), p. 86.

[45]Ibid.

[46]*Athenaeum* , I, 2, op. cit., p. 88.

[47]*A.W. Schlegel's Vorlesungen über schöne Litteratur und Kunst*, hrsg. von J. Minor (Stuttgart, 1884), Bd. II, 64f.

[48]F. Schleiermacher, 'Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens' (1813), in *Schleiermacher: Sämtliche Werke*, 3. Abth., 2 Bd. (Berlin, 1838), p. 215. See also: Schleiermacher, 'Über den Begriff der Hermeneutik mit Bezug auf F.A. Wolfs Andeutungen und Asts Lehrbuch', in H-G. Gadamer/G. Boehm (Hrsg.), *Philosophische Hermeneutik* (Frankfurt/M., [2]1979), p. 136f.

[49]F. Schleiermacher, 'Hermeneutik', in *Philosophische Hermeneutik*, op. cit., p. 156.

[50]F. Schleiermacher, *Sämtliche Werke*, op. cit., p. 217.

[51]Ibid., p. 226f.

[52]Ibid. p. 231.

[53]Ibid.

[54]J.W. Goethe, *Werke* (WA), 1. Abt., 42. Bd., p. 251.

[55]J.W. Goethe, *Werke* (WA), 1. Abt., 36. Bd., p. 329f.

[56]W. V. Humboldt, Introduction to his translation of Aeschylos' *Agamemnon* (1816), in W. v. H.: *Gesammelte Schriften* (Akademieausgabe), 8. Bd., (Berlin, 1909), pp. 117-146.

II Chapter Two: Concepts of drama and of translation of dramatic texts

[1]J. C. Gottsched, *Die Deutsche Schaubühne nach den Regeln der alten Griechen und Römer eingerichtet, und mit einer Vorrede herausgegeben* (1741-1745), 6 vols., containing 16 translations and 22 original plays.

[2]J.C. Gottsched, 'Anmerkungen über das 592. Stück des Zuschauers', in *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie*

und Beredsamkeit. Hrsg. von einigen Liebhabern der deutschen Litteratur. 8. Bd., 29. Stück (Leipzig, 1742), pp. 160-162 and 171.

[3]J. E. Schlegel, 'Abhandlung, daß die Nachahmung der Sache, der man nachahmet, zuweilen unähnlich werden müsse', in *J.E.S. Werke*, hrsg. von J.H. Schlegel (Kopenhagen, Leipzig, 1761-70), Bd. 3, p. 143f.

[4]J. E. Schlegel, 'Vergleichung Shakespears und Andreas Gryphs bey Gelegenheit des Versuchs einer Uebersetzung von dem Tode Julius Caesar, aus den Englischen Werken des Shakespear', in *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit [...]*, Bd. 7, 28. Stück (Leipzig, 1741), pp. 540-572.

[5]J. E. Schlegel, 'Gedanken zur Aufnahme des dänischen Theaters', in *J.E.S. Werke*, op. cit., Bd. 3, pp. 259-298

[6]F. Nicolai sees the effect of tragedy exclusively in 'Erregung der Leidenschaften' and subordinates all other dramatic elements to this. In doing so, he finally turns his back completely on classical rules and the imparting of moral truths as the aim of tragedy. See F. Nicolai, 'Briefe über den itzigen Zustand der schönen Wissenschaften in Deutschland. Eilfter Brief' (1755), hrsg. von G. Ellinger, Berliner Neudruck III, 2, (Berlin, 1984), pp. 82 - 94 and F. Nicolai, 'Abhandlung vom Trauerspiele' (1756), in *Lessings Jugendfreunde*, hrsg. von J. Minor (Berlin und Stuttgart, n.d.).

[7]G.E. Lessing, 'Das Neueste aus dem Reiche des Witzes' (1751), in *G.E. L., Gesammelte Werke*, hrsg. von P. Rilla, Bd. 3 (Berlin/Weimar, 1968), pp. 331 - 385.

[8]'Brief über das Trauerspiel' from Lessing to Nicolai, 13 November 1756 in *G.E. L., Sämtliche Schriften*. Hrsg. von K. Lachmann. Dritte aufs neue durchgesehene und vermehrte Auflage, besorgt durch F. Muncker. Bd. 17 (Stuttgart, 1904), pp. 64 - 68.

[9]G.E. Lessing, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, 20. Stück in *Lessings Werke*, hrsg. von F. Bornmüller, op. cit., Bd. 4, p. 90.

[10]Ibid, p. 91.

[11]Both the *Briefe die neueste Literatur betreffend* and the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* illustrate the extent of Lessing's intensive

study of English drama, poetry and literature of ideas, from Chaucer to authors of his own time.

[12]G.E. Lessing, 'Von Johann Dryden und dessen dramatischen Werken', in *Lessings Werke. Vollständige Ausgabe in fünfundzwanzig Teilen.* Hrsg. von J. Petersen und W. von Olshausen, Bd. 12 (Berlin, 1927), pp. 344 - 384.

[13]See Lessing, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, 14. Stück, op. cit., Bd. 4, pp. 63 - 67.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Diderot's obtrusive concern with moralising often prevented him from distinguishing between genuine emotion and sentimental bombast. See C. Sherman, *Diderot and the Art of Dialogue* (Geneva, 1976).

[16]Lessing, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, 59. Stück, op. cit., Bd. 4, p. 265.

[17]See Emil Staiger, *Stilwandel* (Zürich, Freiburg, 1963), p. 58f. Staiger perceives Lessing's first successful portrayal of emotion in his character Gräfin Orsina (*Emilia Galotti*, 1772). Staiger maintains: 'Manchmal kann sie es noch nicht lassen, sich selber zu kommentieren. Indes, sie ist ja Philosophin ... Im vierten Akt [werden wir] Zeugen, wie es im Gemüt der Gräfin arbeitet und wühlt, wie sie, bei aller Intelligenz, nach Worten ringt, sich unterbricht, jäh eine andere Richtung einschlägt und ebenso plötzlich wieder aufgibt'.

[18]Lessing's more detailed references to Shakespeare occur in *Briefe die neueste Literatur betreffend*, 17. Brief, in 'Laokoon', Kapitel XXIII, and in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, 5., 11., 12., 15. and 37. Stück

[19]Lessing, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, 70. Stück, op. cit., Bd. 4, pp. 311 - 315

[20]Ibid.

[21]Lessing, *Literaturbriefe*, 17. Brief, op. cit., p. 50.

[22]See J.G. Robertson, *Lessing's Dramatic Theory* (Cambridge, 1939), pp. 44- 47 for statistics on the repertoire of the Hamburg *Nationaltheater*: 70 plays translated from the French, 40 German originals, 5 plays translated from the Italian, 4 from the English and 1 from the Dutch.

[23]With the exception of C. W. von Borck's rendering of *Julius Caesar* (1741) and S. Grynäus' translation of Garrick's adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet* (1758).

[24]To both Dryden and Pope it seemed self-evident that if nature was to be imitated (and this was the aim of drama), then there must be rules for imitating nature rightly. Even Johnson in his Shakespeare *Preface* (1765) betrays some of the limitations which affected his Shakespeare-criticism. On the other hand, we have the influence of an Edward Young or Edmund Burke, who appealed to the authority of Longinus in their treatises (and expansion beyond Longinus' meaning) on the 'sublime', a term used to describe those great effects which could not be accounted for in terms of Rules and correctness.

[25]Letter from Wieland to W.D. Sulzer, 1758, in E. Stadler, *Wielands Shakespeare* (Straßburg, 1910), p. 9.

[26]Wieland's epilogue to the Shakespeare translations in *C.M.W. Gesammelte Schriften*, Akademie-Ausgabe, 2. Abteilung: *Übersetzungen*, hrsg. von E. Stadler (Berlin, 1909-1911), Bd. III, p. 566.

[27]*Shakespear Theatralische Werke*. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt von Herrn Wieland. Mit Königl. Poln. u. Churfürstl. Sächs. allergn. Privileg. Zürich, bey Orell Geßner, und Comp. 1762-1766. 8 Bände.

[28]See for example H.W. Gerstenberg, *Briefe über Merkwürdigkeiten der Litteratur*, 14.-18. Briefe (1766), hrsg. von A. von Weilen (Stuttgart, 1890), pp. 107-166, p. 107f in particular.

[29]C.M. Wieland, 'Vorankündigung der Eschenburgschen Shakespear-Ausgabe', in *Der Teutsche Merkur*, Bd. 3, 2. Stück (Weimar, 1773), p. 188.

[30]Ibid. Cf. also G. Leuca, 'Wieland and the Introduction of Shakespeare into Germany in *The German Quarterly*, Vol. XXVIII, 1955, pp. 247-255.

[31]*Neue Ausgabe von William Shakespeares Schauspielen*. Von Joh. Joachim Eschenburg. 12 Bde. u. 1 Erg. Bd. Zürich 1775-1777 und 1782.

[32]A.W. Schlegel, 'Etwas über William Shakespeare bei Gelegenheit Wilhelm Meisters' (1796), in E. Lohner (Hg.), *AWS, Kritische Schriften und Briefe*, Bd. 1, 'Sprache und Poetik' (Stuttgart, 1962), p. 99.

[33]*Über W. Shakspeare*. Von Joh. Joach. Eschenburg, Herzogl. Braunschw. Lüneb. Hofr. u. Prof. am Collegio Carolino in Braunschweig. Mit Shakspears Bildniß. Zürich, bey Orell, Geßner, Füßli und Comp. 1787, pp. 173 and 194f.

[34]This is echoed in the wealth of theoretical discussion: H.P. Sturz, *Brief über das deutsche Theater* (1767), J.M.R. Lenz, *Anmerkungen übers Theater* (1774), H.L. Wagner's translation of Mercier's treatise *Du théatre ou Nouvel essai sur l'art dramatique* (1773) (*Neuer Versuch über die Schauspielkunst*, 1776) and *Briefe, die Seylersche Schauspielergesellschaft betreffend* (1779). F. Schiller, *Die Schaubühne als moralische Anstalt betrachtet* (1784). We can also include here J.W. Goethe's theatre discussion in *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung* (begun 1776) and in K.P. Moritz's *Anton Reiser* (1785-1790).

[35]J.G. Herder, 'Shakspear' (1773), in *Sämtliche Werke*, op. cit., Bd. V, Berlin, 1891, p. 218f.

[36]J.W. Goethe, 'Zum Shakspeares-Tag', in *Goethes Werke*, (HA), Bd. XII, p. 224.

[37]See E. Staiger, op. cit., p. 63ff.

[38]J.M.R. Lenz, 'Anmerkungen übers Theater' (1774) in *J.M.R.L., Werke und Schriften*, hrsg. von B. Titel und H. Haug (Stuttgart, 1966), Bd. I, p.362.

[39]J.M.R.Lenz, *Götz* review in op. cit., p. 378.

[40]J.M.R.Lenz, 'Anmerkungen übers Theater', in op. cit., p. 362.

[41]Ibid, p. 361.

[42]J.M.R. Lenz, 'Über die Veränderung des Theaters im Shakespear', in op. cit., p. 364. this is most probably an echo of Mercier's postulated 'unité d'intérêt'.

[43]See G. Erken, 'Die Deutschen [Shakespeare] Übersetzungen', in I. Scharbert (Hrsg.), *Shakespeare-Handbuch* (Stuttgart, 1978), p. 900.

[44]S. Bassnett-McGuire, *Translation Studies*, op. cit., p. 120.

[45]K. Kauenhowen, *Gottfried August Bürgers Macbeth-Bearbeitung*. Diss., Königsberg, Thür., 1915 and D. Hoffmeier, 'Die Einbürgerung Shakespeares auf dem Theater des Sturm und Drang' in *Schriften zur Theaterwissenschaft*, 3/II (Berlin, 1964), pp. 56-68.

[46]G.A. Bürger, 'Von der Popularität der Poesie', in *G.A.B., Sämtliche Werke*, hrsg. von W. von Wurzbach (Leipzig, n.d.), Bd. 3, p. 20.

[47]See G.A. Bürger, 'Gedanken über die Beschaffenheit einer deutschen Übersetzung des Homer, nebst einigen Probefragmenten' (1771) in *B., Sämmtliche Werke*, hrsg. von A.W. Bohtz (Göttingen, 1835), Bd. 4, pp. 17 - 19. His aim is to produce a translation which reads like an original text and in which Homer expresses himself as he would have done had he been a German.

[48]F. Schiller, 'Über Bürgers Gedichte', in *SA*, XVI, p. 233.

[49]F. Schiller, 'Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet' (1784) in *SA*, XI, p. 89.

[50]F. Schiller, 'Die Räuber. Vorrede', in *SA*, XVI, p. 15.

[51]F. Schiller, 'Über das gegenwärtige teutsche Theater' in *SA*, XI, p. 81.

[52]F. Schiller, 'Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet', in *SA*, XI, p. 89.

[53]F. Schiller, 'Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung', in *SA*, XII, p. 183.

[54]F. Schiller, 'Über den Gebrauch des Chors in der Tragödie', in *SA*, XVI, p. 126.

[55]Ibid.

[56]F. Schiller, 'Macbeth', in *SA*, IX, pp. 1-116.

[57]F. Schiller, 'Über die tragische Kunst' (1791), in *SA*, XI, p. 163.

[58]Ibid.

[59]L. Tieck's comedy *Prinz Zerbino* and his *Märchendramen Ritterblaubart* and *Der gestiefelte Kater* had by this time also been published (1798 and 1799).

[60]Nonetheless, see R. Paulin, *Ludwig Tieck. A Literary Biography* (Oxford, 1985), p. 124: 'Translation, the ultimate in stylistic adaptability and the evidence of a certain selflessness, belongs to the great Romantic efforts. This is not to deny that they bear the stamp of their own age and its range of expression'.

[61]Insofar, it has a lot more affinity with Schiller's idealist aesthetic than one might initially think.

[62]F. Schleiermacher, 'Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens', op. cit., p. 210.

II Chapter Three: German Shakespeare translation before the Voß

[1]This was conducted by J.E. Schlegel in his 'Vergleichung Shakespears und Andreas Gryphs', op. cit., and by Gottsched in his 'Anmerkungen über das 592. Stück des Zuschauers', loc. cit.

[2]See letter to Wieland from W.D. Sulzer, 14 January 1759, 'Soweit ich gekommen bin, ist kein Drama, das man ganz übersetzen dürfte. Man würde nur den Plan derselben durchgehen, die Scenen oder Stellen aber, welche wirkliche Schönheit besitzen, auszeichnen und alles auf eine kritische Manier verrichten'. *Briefe von Wolfgang Dietrich Sulzer, weiland Stadtschreiber von Winterthur*. Hrsg. von G. Geilfus (Winterthur, 1866), p. 8.

[3]C.M. Wieland, 'Theorie und Geschichte der Red-Kunst und Dicht-Kunst'. Anno 1757, in *Wielands Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. 4, 'Prosaische Jugendwerke'. Hrsg. von F. Homeyer und H. Bieber (Berlin, 1916), pp. 389-392.

[4]See 'Gespräche mit Chr. M. Wieland in Zürich. Mitgetheilt von Heinrich Funck', in *Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte*, Bd. 13 (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 485-497.

[5]See E. Stadler, 'Wielands Shakespeare', in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte*, 107 (Straßburg, 1910), pp. 75-94 and B. Seuffert, *Prolegomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe*, Bd. III (Berlin, 1905), p. 6.

[6]See *Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte*, hrsg. von F. Schnorr v. Carolsfeld, Bd. 7 (Leipzig, 1885), p. 492.

[7]Shakespear, 'Das Leben und Tod des Königs Lear', in C.M. Wieland, *Shakespear. Theatralische Werke*, neu herausgegeben nach der ersten Zürcher Ausgabe von 1762-1766 von H. und J. Radspieler, 2. Bd. (Nördlingen, 1986), p. 15.

[8]*Auswahl denkwürdiger Briefe von C.M. Wieland*, hrsg. von Ludwig Wieland, I (Wien, 1815), p. 15.

[9]Wieland, 'Theorie und Geschichte der Red-Kunst und Dicht-Kunst', op. cit., p. 392.

[10]See E. Stadler, op. cit., p. 7.

[11]Wieland, 'Der Geist Shakespears', in *Wielands Gesammelte Schriften*, 1. Abt., Bd. 26, loc.cit., p. 671.

[12]G.E. Lessing, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, 15. Stück, op. cit., pp. 67 - 71. J.W. Goethe, 'Dichtung und Wahrheit'. 11. Buch (HA), IX, p. 493.

[13]*Ueber W. Shakspeare*. Von Joh. Joach. Eschenburg, etc., op. cit., p. 507.

[14]*William Shakespeare Schauspiele* von Johann Joachim Eschenburg, neue ganz überarbeitete Ausgabe, Bd. 8 (Zürich, 1802), p. 495. All

of the original extracts are taken from the *Arden* Shakespeare.

[15]J.J. Eschenburg, *Ueber W. Shakspeare*, op. cit., p. 157.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Ibid.

[18]J.G. Herder, 'Stimmen der Völker in Liedern', *Volkslieder*, 1/2, Nr. 11-13, pp. 75-78. I/3, Nr. 3-5, 21, 23, pp. 121-124 and 149-158. Hrsg. von H. Rölleke (Stuttgart, 1975).

[19]Ibid, p. 150f.

[20]J.M.R. Lenz, 'Anmerkungen übers Theater' (1774), in op. cit., pp. 329 - 363. Lenz further illustrated his congenial understanding of Shakespeare in fragmentary translations of *Coriolanus* and *Pericles*, both with a purely deictic function.

[21]K.H. Clarke, 'Lenz' Übersetzungen aus dem Englischen' in *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, X (1896), p. 150.

[22]J.M.R. Lenz, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Hrsg. von L. Tieck. Bd. 2 (Berlin 1828), p. 249f.

[23]J.W. Goethe, 'Dichtung und Wahrheit', p. 520.

[24]A.W. v. Schlegel, *Shakspeare's dramatische Werke*, Th. 1-9 (Berlin 1797-1810).

[25]See W. Schulz, 'Der Anteil des Grafen Wolf Baudissin an der Shakespeareübersetzung Schlegel-Tiecks', in *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie*, 159 (1935), pp. 52-67 and G. Hoffmann, 'Zur Shakespeare-Übersetzung Dorothea Tiecks', in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* (West), 1971, pp. 69-84.

[26]H. Lüdeke, 'Zur Tieck'schen Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* 55 (1919), pp. 1 to 29.

[27]H. Egbring, *Johann Heinrich Voss der Jüngere als Übersetzer des Macbeth von W. Shakespeare* (Münster: Westfälische Vereinsdruckerei, 1911), p. 76.

[28]M.C. Lazenby, *The Influence of Wieland and Eschenburg on Schlegel's Shakespeare Translation*. Diss. Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1942, p. 9.

[29]U. Suerbaum, 'Der Deutsche Shakespeare', in E. Kolb und J. Hasler (Hrsg.), *Festschrift Rudolf Stamm* (Bern, 1969), p. 76.

[30]A.W. Schlegel, 'Etwas über William Shakespeare [...], op. cit., pp. 101 and 116ff. See also M. Bernays, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Schlegelschen Shakespeare* (Leipzig, 1872).

[31]J.J. Eschenburg, *Ueber W. Shakspeare*, op. cit., chapters VII and VIII.

[32]Letter from Wieland to Gessner, 29.1.1797, in B. Seuffert, 'Wielands, Eschenburgs und Schlegels Shakespeare-Übersetzungen', in *Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte*, Bd. 13 (Leipzig, 1885), p. 231.

[33]See *Shakspeare's dramatische Werke. Uebersetzt von August Wilhelm von Schlegel, ergänzt und erläutert von Ludwig Tieck*, 9 vols. (Berlin, 1825-1833). See also Erich Fried, *Shakespeare-Übersetzungen: Romeo und Julia, Julius Caesar, Hamlet* (München, 1968), p. 303f.

[34]R. Schostack, 'Shakespeare sklavisch ergeben', in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 5. January 1988. See also Erich Fried, loc. cit., p. 303f, and A. Schröder, *Gesammelte Werke* (Frankfurt/M., 1963), II, pp. 235-237.

[35]R. Vollmann, 'Shakespeare, durchs Milchglas betrachtet', in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 5 December 1989. See also Erich Fried, loc.cit., p. 305 and M.E. Atkinson, *August Wilhelm Schlegel as a Translator of Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1958), p. 7f.

[36]A.W. Schlegel, 'Etwas über William Shakespeare [...],op. cit. The numbers in brackets in the text refer to the pages here.

[37]M.E. Atkinson, op. cit., p. 8.

[38]H. Rothe, *Shakespeare als Provokation* (München 1961), p. 357.

[39]A.W. Schlegel, 'Etwas über William Shakespeare [...]', op. cit., p. 118. See also AWS, 'Abfertigung eines unwissenden Recensenten',

in *AWS. Werke*, hrsg. von E. Böcking (Leipzig, 1847), XII, p. 139.

[40]The fact that Goethe commissioned Schiller with a translation of *Macbeth* and encouraged Heinrich Voß to translate *Othello* and *Lear*, as well as commissioning him to adapt Schlegel's *King John* for the Weimar stage suggests that this was the case. See also L. Tieck, 'Briefe über Shakspeare' (1800), in L.T., *Kritische Schriften*, I (Leipzig, 1848); photomechanischer Nachdruck (Berlin, New York, 1974), pp. 133-184.

[41]F. Schiller, 'Macbeth', op. cit., p. V.

[42]Quoted in H.G. Gräf, *Goethe und Schiller in Briefen von Heinrich Voß dem jüngeren* (Leipzig, 1895), p. 35.

[43]K.A. Böttiger, in *Journal des Luxus und der Moden*, Jahrg. 1800, XV, p. 309f. Quoted in Gräf, op. cit., p. 35f.

[44]*K.W.F. Solger. Nachgelassene Schriften und Briefwechsel*, hrsg. v. L. Tieck und F. von Raumer. Faksimiledruck nach der Ausgabe von 1826 (2 Bände), (Heidelberg, 1973), Bd. I, p. 7.

III: THE VOßs' CONTRIBUTION

Chapter One: Their theories of translation and their translation practice

i) Johann Heinrich Voß

[1]*Johann Heinrich Voß. Briefe nebst erläuternden Beilagen*, hrsg. v. Abraham Voß. Reprografischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe Halberstadt 1830. (Hildesheim, 1971), Bd. I, p. 105.

[2]In his close association with the *Hainbund*, G.A. Bürger initially had a considerable influence on Voß's notions of language and translation. Cf. G.A. Bürger, 'Gedanken über die Beschaffenheit einer deutschen Übersetzung des Homer, nebst einigen Probefragmenten' (1771) in *B., Sämmtliche Werke*. Hrsg. v. A.W. Bohtz (Göttingen, 1835), Bd. 4, pp. 17-19. The way to achieve the Homeric tone in translation is to render him 'in der Sprache entwischener Zeiten', with the archaism of the *Minnesang* or of poets and writers from Luther to Opitz. The translator should be 'despotisch' with this language 'als ein zweiter Shakespeare oder Klopstock', and not be hesitant in the use of neologisms. When, however, Bürger rejects the hexameter as a metre uncongenial with the German language and renders his own Homer in iambic verse (which he considered to be as natural for the German language as the hexamater for Greek), he is clearly aiming at an equivalent effect which 'bei dem Leser um ein großes die Illusion befördern [wird], in welcher dieser vergißt, daß das, was er liest, Übersetzung sei, und in den süßen Wahn gerät, daß Homer ein alter Deutscher gewesen und seine Ilias deutsch gesungen habe'. This is the point at which Bürger and Voß diverge in their perceptions of translation.

[3]Letter to Brückner dated 24 February 1773 in *Voß, Briefe*, op. cit., Bd. I, p. 130f.

[4]Ibid, p. 130.

[5]Letter to Brückner dated 7 March 1773, op. cit., p. 138.

[6]Ibid, p. 133.

[7]J.H. Voß, 'Über Klopstocks grammatische Gespräche und Adelungs Wörterbuch', in *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 1804, Nr.

24-26 and 39-43.

[8]Ibid, Nr. 25, p. 200.

[9]Ibid, Nr. 24, p. 192.

[10]Ibid, Nr. 25, p. 196. See also J.C. Adelung, 'Sind es die Schriftsteller, welche die Sprache bilden und ausbilden?', in *Magazin für die Deutsche Sprache*, I (1782), 3, pp. 45-57, and all of his publications which contain numerous refutations of this theory.

[11]J.H. Voß, 'Über Klopstocks [...]'op. cit., Nr. 39, p. 308f.

[12]Ibid, Nr. 24, p. 186.

[13]Letter to Brückner, 7 March 1773, in *Voß, Briefe*, op. cit., Bd. I, p. 135.

[14]Letter to Brückner, 24 February 1773, in *Voß, Briefe*, op.cit., Bd. I, p. 132.

[15]*Untersuchung über Homers Leben und Schriften, aus dem Englischen übersetzt* (Leipzig, 1776).

[16]J.H. Voß, whose French was already very good when he went to Göttingen, gave French lessons to Hölty in return for English lessons. (See W. Herbst, *Johann Heinrich Voß* (Leipzig, 1872), Bd. 1, p. 75ff). As Boie was responsible for the pastoral care of students from England at Göttingen University, Voß was in regular contact with the spoken language. He spent much time with one of Admiral, Baron George Bridges Rodney's sons, and with a Major John André, on whose departure from Göttingen in November 1772, Voß wrote the ode 'An einen jungen Britten' (*JHV, Sämtl. Gedichte* (Königsberg, 1825), Bd. II, p. 6ff), to which André replied on 13 June 1773 with the poem 'Parting'. (See Herbst, op. cit., Bd. I, p. 80). Throughout his period of studies at Göttingen, Voß makes constant reference to his lessons and progress in English in letters to Brückner.

[17]See E. Dahinten, *Studien zum Sprachstil der Iliasübertragungen Bürgers, Stolbergs und Vossens unter Berücksichtigung der Übersetzungstheorien des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1956), pp. 163-212 and G. Häntschel, 'Johann Heinrich Voß. Seine Homerübersetzung als

sprachschöpferische Leistung', Zetema, Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 68 (München, 1977) for detailed analyses of J.H. Voß's language of translation and of modifications in the 1793 version of his *Odyssey* translation.

[18]J.H. Voß, *Zeitmessung der deutschen Sprache* (Königsberg, 1802).

[19]*Voß, Briefe*, op. cit., Bd. III, p. 161f.

[20]Letter to Gleim, 5 January 1787, in *Voß Briefe*, op. cit., Bd. II, p. 282.

[21]J.H. Voß, *Über des Virgilischen Landgedichts Ton und Auslegung* (Altona, 1791), p. 8f.

[22]Letter from J.H. Voß to Klopstock, May 1799, printed in J.H.V., *Zeitmessung der deutschen Sprache mit Zusäzen und einen Anhang verm. Ausgabe*. Hrsg. v. Abraham Voß (Königsberg, [2]1831), p. 256.

[23]J. C. Adelung, *Ueber den Deutschen Styl*, quoted from edition Berlin, [2]1787, Bd. 2, pp. 403f.

[24]Ibid, Bd. 1, pp. 297-300. See also Adelung, *Umständliches Lehrgebäude der Deutschen Sprache, zur Erläuterung der Deutschen Sprachlehre für Schulen* (Leipzig, 1782), Bd. 2, pp. 507-514.

[25]J.C. Adelung, *Ueber den Deutschen Styl*, Bd. 2, pp. 263ff.

[26]T. Heinsius, *Theoretisch-praktisches Lehrbuch des gesammten Deutschen Sprachunterrichts* (Berlin, [3]1817), Bd. I, p. 392f.

[27]G.S. Fälbe, for example, did not complete his Horace and Virgil translations, even though he had already published a considerable number of specimen renderings, after he had seen the 'Vossische Meisterwerke'. *Neuer Teutscher Merkur*, 1807 (2), p. 217.

[28]*Neuer Teutscher Merkur*, 1805 (3), p. 11.

[29]*F.H. Sämtliche Werke*. Hrsg. v. F. Beissner. Bd. 6, hrsg. v. A. Beck (Stuttgart, 1954), p. 152.

[30]J.W. Goethe, 'Noten und Abhandlungen zu besseren Verständnis des West-östlichen Divans', (1816) (HA), II, p. 256.

[31]*W. v. Humboldt. Gesammelte Schriften*, I. Abt., Bd. 8 (Berlin, 1909), p. 131f.

[32]See F. Schleiermacher, 'Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens', in op. cit., pp. 222 and 233, and K.W.F. Solger, *Des Sophokles Tragödien, übersetzt* (Berlin, 1808), *Vorrede*, Teil 1., p. LVII.

[33]See Goethe's letter to J.H. Voß, 6 December 1796, in *JWG. Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe, 4. Abt., Bd. II, p. 278.

[34]See Ernestine Voß, 'Über Vossens Verhältnis zu Schiller und Goethe', in *Voß, Briefe*, op. cit., Abt. 2, Bd. III, pp. 43-68.

[35]See A. Kelletat, *Voß und die Nachbildung antiker Metern in der deutschen Dichtung*, Teil II: Vossens Wirkungen auf die deutsche Dichtung. Diss., (Tübingen, 1949).

[36]*AWS. Sämtliche Werke*, hrsg. v. E. Böcking (Leipzig 1846), Bd. X, pp.15ff.

[37]See H.J. Störig (Hrsg.), *Das Problem des Übersetzens*, Wege der Forschung. Bd. VIII (Darmstadt, [2]1969), p. XXX. See also A. Huyssen, *Die frühromantische Konzeption von Übersetzung und Aneignung* (Schlieren, 1969), R-R. Wuthenow, *Das fremde Kunstwerk. Aspekte der literarischen Übersetzung* (Göttingen, 1969); J. Levy, *Die literarische Übersetzung. Theorie einer Kunstgattung* (Frankfurt/ M., 1969), particularly p. 84 where Schlegel's Shakespeare is advanced as the first ever German 'originalgetreue Übersetzung'. See also P. Gebhardt, *A. W. Schlegels Shakespeare-Übersetzung. [...]*, op. cit.

[38]A.W. Schlegel und Fr. Schlegel, *Charakteristiken und Kritiken*, Bd. 2 (Königsberg, 1801), p. 192.

[39]J.H. Voß, *Antisymbolik*, 2 Bde. (Stuttgart, 1824-26).

[40]See letter from A.W. Schlegel to publisher Georg Reimer, 16 June 1828, in *A.W.S. Kritische Schriften und Briefe*, hrsg. v. E. Lohner (Stuttgart, 1974), VII, p. 182.

[41]A.W. Schlegel und Fr. Schlegel, *Charakteristiken und Kritiken*, op. cit., p. 192.

[42]See letter from Friedrich to A.W. Schlegel dated 25 March 1798 in *Friedrich Schlegels Briefe an seinen Bruder August Wilhelm*. Hrsg. v. O.F. Walzel (Berlin, 1890), p. 379.

[43]J.H. Voß, *Über des Virgilischen Landgedichts Ton und Auslegung*, in which Voß details his translation of Virgil's more artistically structured hexameters.

[44]Apparently the most widely used *Odyssey* translation in schools today is that of W. Schadewaldt, *Homer, Die Odyssee*. Übersetzt in deutscher Prosa (Hamburg, 1958).

ii) Heinrich Voß

[1]'Vorrede' to *Shakspeares Othello und König Lear*, übersetzt von Dr. Johann Heinrich Voß, Professor am Weimarischen Gymnasium. Mit Compositionen von Zelter (Jena, 1806). Page numbers from this preface are given in the text in brackets and in lower case Roman numerals. This 'Vorrede' took the form of a letter to C.W. Iden, an old friend from the Voß days in Eutin, to whom Heinrich had also dedicated his *Othello* translation.

[2]'Vorrede' to *Shakspeare's Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß und dessen Söhnen Heinrich Voß und Abraham Voß*, Bd. I (Leipzig, 1818). Page numbers from this preface are given in the text in brackets in upper case Roman numerals.

[3]e.g. 'Vor allem behalte man die Begrifsstellung bei ... Begrifsstellung ist Seele der Poesie ... selten ist sie unwesentlich bei einem Dichter wie Shakspeare'. 'Briefe von Heinrich Voß an Friedrich Diez', hrsg. von A. Tobler, in *Preußische Jahrbücher*, 51, 1883, p. 16.

[4]J.C.L. Niemeyer, 'Schiller im häuslichen Leben und Sterben', in *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*, 26 (1826) Nr. 21 und 22. See also K. Larson, 'Pro und Contra Schlegel', in op. cit., pp. 113-133, for a discussion of Heinrich's first translation of *Lear* and the later

revision which appeared in the Voß complete Shakespeare.

[5]*Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung*, Num. 292, 21 December 1811, pp. 546-555.

[6]'Briefe von Heinrich Voß an Friedrich Diez', op. cit., p. 19.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid.

III Chapter Two: Their Shakespeare Translations

i) Source texts, aids and resources

[1]Heinrich Voß, 'Vorrede' to the Voß complete Shakespeare, p. LXXI.

[2]Ibid. p. LXXII.

[3]*Katalog der Bibliothek von Johann Heinrich Voß, welche, vom 9. November 1835 an, in Heidelberg öffentlich versteigert werden soll*, Heidelberg, 1835. Catalogue preserved in the library of the University of Marburg.

ii) The early stages

[1]Heinrich was a teacher of Classics at the Weimar grammar school and, thanks chiefly to the reputation of his father, a regular guest in the homes of Goethe and Schiller between 1804 and 1806, even after Schiller's death.

[2]Bernhard Rudolf Abeken (1780-1866) studied theology and philology in Jena where he met Heinrich Voß at the turn of the century. They remained very close friends right up to Heinrich's death in 1822. Abeken was very much involved in Heinrich's and Abraham's contributions to the Voß complete Shakespeare, in that he read through their translation manuscripts, offered advice on any particularly difficult points, or even alternative suggestions for translations with

which he did not agree. Their correspondence, the bulk of which is unpublished, was devoted to a great extent to the discussion of the Voß Shakespeare translation and Shakespeare's original plays. Heinrich's letters are preserved in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dresden in the Nachlaß B.R. Abeken, Bd. 1. and 2; Abeken's letters are in the Goethe und Schiller-Archiv, Weimar, in the Nachlaß Heinrich Voß.

[3]Quoted in Gräf, op. cit., p. 134.

[4]'Vorrede' to *Shakspeares Othello und König Lear*, op. cit. The source of further quotations from this 'Vorrede' are given in the text in brackets.

[5]Letter from Schiller to Heinrich Voß, dated January 1805, quoted in Gräf, op. cit., p. 148.

[6]See *Nachlese zu Schiller's Werken nebst Variantensammlung*. Aus seinem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Karl Hoffmeister, Bd. III (Stuttgart, 1858). p. 290f. Gisbert Freih. Vincke, 'Schillers Bühnenbearbeitung des Othello' in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, 15 (Weimar, 1880), pp. 222-229. It is also interesting to note that fourteen years previously, Schiller, although he had initially defended Goethe's *Römische Elegien* as verses which offended 'zwar eine konventionelle, aber nicht die wahre und natürliche Dezenz', finally advised his friend to withdraw those verses.

[7]Quoted in Oscar Fambach, 'Der Romantische Rückfall 1806-1815' In *Ein Jahrhundert deutscher Literaturkritik (1750-1850)*, Bd. V (Berlin, 1963), p. 87.

[8]See letter from Heinrich to K.W.F. Solger, November 1805, quoted in Gräf, op. cit., p. 97.

[9]Vincke, op. cit., p. 224.

[10]See Note 4) in III,ii.

[11]In a letter to Cotta dated 4 February 1809, Heinrich reports how Schlegel called Heinrich 'seinen braven Mitwerber'. This would seem to describe Heinrich's status as a translator of Shakespeare more suitably. Quoted in Maria Fehling (Hrsg.), *Briefe an Cotta. Das*

Zeitalter Goethes und Napoleons. 1794-1815 (Stuttgart, 1925), p. 308.

[12]K. Larson, 'Pro und Contra Schlegel', in op. cit., p. 114.

[13]A.W. Schlegel, 'Etwas über William Shakespeare [...]', op. cit., p. 115.

[14]See M.E. Atkinson, op. cit., chapter on 'Verbal Sound', pp. 26-51.

[15]G. Häntschel, 'Die Wirksamkeit von Johann Heinrich Voß auf die deutsche Sprache und Kultur' in Chr. D. Hahn (Hrsg.) *Johann Heinrich Voß. Leben und Werk* (Husum, 1977), p. 65f.

[16]Johann Heinrich Voß revised his translation of the *Odyssey* four times, in 1801, 1806, 1814 and 1821, each time reflecting the original Greek text more closely.

[17]Letter from Heinrich to Abeken, quoted in Gräf, op. cit., p. 69.

[18]Letter quoted in Gräf, op. cit., p. 35.

[19]Letter quoted in Ludwig Bäte (Hrsg.), 'Kranz um Jean Paul'. *Schriftenreihe der Akademischen Mitteilungen Heidelberg*, hrsg. von Friedr. Lautenschlager und Hermann Mitgau. 3. Heft (Heidelberg, 1925), p. 8f.

[20]Letter quoted in Gräf, op. cit., p. 118f.

[21]Ibid., p. 119.

[22]From the original manuscript, Autographenverzeichnis e97, Bd. 1, Nachlaß des Literaturhistorikers Bernhard Rudolf Abeken (1780-1866), preserved in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dresden. Manuscript number 35, Bd. 1. The approximate date of this letter is suggested by the fact that Heinrich also makes mention of his brother's near-completion of *Cymbelin*, and Heinrich offers both *Macbeth* and *Cymbelin* to Cotta for publication in a letter dated 4 February 1809. See M. Fehling (Hrsg.), *Briefe an Cotta. Das Zeitalter Goethes und Napoleons 1794-1815* (Stuttgart, 1925), p. 308.

[23]Heinrich Voß, 'Rezension des Richard III, übersetzt von A.W. Schlegel', in *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, Num. 292, 21. December, 1811, pp. 546-555.

[24]From the original manuscript, Nachlaß B.R. Abeken, manuscript number 58, Bd. 1.

[25]*Schauspiele von W. Shakspeare*, übersetzt von Heinrich Voß und Abraham Voß. (Tübingen, 1810-1815), 3 Bde.

iii) The development of the project

[1]From the original manuscript, Nachlaß B.R. Abeken, manuscript number 77, Bd. 2.

[2]This information is taken from various unpublished letters from the above manuscripts and from Abeken's unpublished letters to Heinrich.

[3]Letter from Abeken to Heinrich dated 26 December 1815, manuscript No. LXI. See also letter from Heinrich to Abeken dated 2 March 1809 from the original manuscript Nr. 38, Bd. 1 'Gern glaube ich, daß in Cymbelin noch manches unvollkommen ist; aber sobald die Ferien kommen, werde ich mit meinem Bruder den Cymbelin noch Zeile für Zeile durchmustern'.

[4]Letter from G.A. Reimer to A.W. Schlegel, 16 May, 1812, quoted in O. Fambach, op. cit., p. 106.

[5]Personal insults such as those quoted below are typical and an integral component of Heinrich's complex reaction towards A.W. Schlegel as a translator of Shakespeare. They contrast greatly with the carefully worded comments/criticism of Schlegel's *work* which were meant for publishing. For example, in an unpublished letter (fragment) from Heinrich to Jean Paul, estimated to have been written after 30 August 1818 (my estimation: probably beginning May 1819): 'Schlegel macht das größte Haus in Bonn. Um sieben Uhr Abends speist er zu Mittag, um 10 Uhr beginnen seine Thees: wer dahin geht, nennt es 'an den Hof gehen'. Drei Bedienten (sic) sind seinen Winken gehorsam. Einer trägt ihm das Buch auf den Katheder, er hohlt es ab, feierlich vor ihm durch das Auditorium schreitend. Sein Katheder ist

mit rothem Saffian überzogen; während dem Lesen steht zur rechten ein Glas Mandelmilch, zur linken eine Tasse mit Gelee. Überall hat er in Bonn erzählt, seine Frau würde eine Kammerjungfer u. eine Haushälterin mitbringen.' Heinrich delights in this sort of ridicule whenever he has the chance. Letter (fragment) preserved in the Boie-Voß-Nachlaß in the Landesbibliothek Schleswig-Holstein, Kiel. For example, in a letter to Friedrich Diez, dated 6 July 1819: 'Nichts kann treffender sein für A.W. Schlegel als der Ausdruck kalte Kapaun-Schlegel, man mag nun auf Schlegels Ehe sehn, die schon im Beginn ein furchtbares Ende nahm, oder auf seine nervlose Shakspeareübersezung, die leider auch mir noch sehr gefiel, als Männer wie Stolberg, Göthe und Schiller ihr Antliz auf ewig von ihr gewandt hatten.' Adolf Tobler, 'Briefe von Heinrich Voß an Friedrich Diez' in op. cit., p. 27.

[6]Quoted in Maria Fehling, op. cit., p. 344.

[7]From the original manuscript, Nachlaß B.R. Abeken, No. 77, Bd. 2

[8]Letter from Heinrich to Cotta dated 16 January 1817, quoted in Maria Fehling, op. cit., p. 339.

[9]R. Wittmann *Ein Verlag und seine Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1982), p. 452

[10]See R. Wittmann, op. cit., p. 452f: 'An seiner [Cotta's] Stelle griff Friedrich Brockhaus zu, der sich vom Vossischen Übersetzerruhm viel versprach und bot ihm 1818 einen Kontrakt zu sehr günstigen Bedingungen an'.

[11]See R. Wittmann, op. cit., p. 425ff.

[12]See W. Herbst, *Johann Heinrich Voß* (Leipzig, 1876), Bd. II, 2. Abtheilung, p. 167f.

[13]From the original manuscript, Autographenverzeichnis C244 der Sammlung KAUFFMANN, preserved in the Stadtarchiv der Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart. Underlining and punctuation as per manuscript.

[14]K.W.F. Solger, *Nachgelassene Schriften und Briefwechsel*, hrsg. von Ludwig Tieck und Friedrich von Raumer, Faksimiledruck nach der Ausgabe von 1826 (Heidelberg, 1973), Bd. I, p. 535.

[15]Letter from Abeken to Heinrich dated 25 March 1819, Manuscript Number LXXIII.

[16]Manuscript No. 70, Bd. 1

[17]See note on this in *Love's Labour's Lost*, ed. R.W. David, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London, New York, [4]1983), p. 77: 'To explain the logical connection of Holofernes' lines may be a piece of pedantry worthy of the man himself; but they are not pure nonsense, and II. 59 and 60 follow the actual course of the shoot - the baying of the hounds that starts the game moving, and the jeers of the bystanders when an archer misses, and fails even to wound. I am not sure whether in the next line a second yell greets a successful shot, or whether Holofernes has by this time fallen to quibbles merely of mathematical typography.'

[18]From the manuscript Nachlaß Heinrich Voß, Number LVIII.

[19]From the manuscript Nachlaß B.R. Abeken, No. 77, Bd. 2.

[20]*Shakspeare's Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß und dessen Söhnen Heinrich Voß und Abraham Voß*, Bd. II (Leipzig, 1818), p. 468.

[21]From the manuscript Nachlaß B.R. Abeken, No. 59, Bd. 1.

[22]*The Winter's Tale*, IV, iii, 1-12. From the manuscript, Nachlaß B.R. Abeken, No. 37. Bd. 1, dated 1 March 1809.

[23]Heinrich's translation in the complete *Shakespeare*: 'Doch mich zu stellen/Ein festes Bildnis für die Zeit des Hohns/Zu deuten mit kaum regem Finger drauf'. Bd. 7, erste Abtheilung, (Stuttgart, 1825), p. 118. Letter dated 12 July, 1822 from Heinrich to Abeken. Manuscript Nachlaß B.R. Abeken, No. 102, Bd. 2.

[24]From the manuscript Nachlaß Abeken, No. 98, Bd. 2.

III Chapter Three: Analysis of selected passages and aspects of style

ii) Selected passages

a) Rhetoric, argument, multiple significance

Macbeth

[1]*Shakspeare's Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß und dessen Söhnen Heinrich Voß und Abraham Voß*, Bd.9, Abtheilung 2 (Stuttgart, 1829).

Hamlet

[1]*Shakspeares Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß und dessen Söhnen, etc.*, Bd. 8, 1. Abtheilung (Stuttgart, 1827).

[2]The whole speech comprises 39 lines. From line 17 onwards, Claudius addresses himself to matters of the day, namely the relations with Norway.

[3]Voß translates line 19: 'Und glaubend, durch des theuren Bruders Tod'. Here he has omitted to translate the word 'late', which upsets the function of this line, too.

[4]Cf. *Romeo and Juliet*: 'green in earth', IV,iii,42 = just buried.

[5]Cf. Schlegel and Flatter: '..Herzen zu trauren ziemte'
Schaller: 'Trauer von Herzen ziemte'
Fried: 'unserm Herzen Trauer geziemt'

[6]Cf. Schlegel: 'Urtheil'; Schaller: 'Einsicht'; Fried: 'Verstand', although Fried does reflect the allegorical level aptly by juxtaposing 'Verstand' and 'Natur' without articles: 'Doch hat Verstand Natur so weit bekämpft'.

[7] Gertrud is not 'Erbin' of the state as, for example, Schlegel and Fried translate. Any suggestion of legitimacy in connection with this marriage would conflict with Hamlet's accusation of usurpation in III, iv, 99-101 and V, ii, 65.

b) Lyrical intensity

Romeo and Juliet

[1]*Shakspeare's Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß und dessen Söhnen, etc.*, Band I (Leipzig, 1818).

[2]Schlegel, for example, translates: 'Sieh den neid'schen Streif, / Der dort im Ost der Frühe Wolken säumt'; similarly R.A. Schröder: 'Schau, Lieb, welch neidisch Licht / Im Osten dort den Spalt der Wolken säumt'.

[3]For the modern reader, the verbal noun 'Verziehn' must be explained in its present-day realisation 'Verzug'. The intransitive verb 'verziehen' has undergone such change that it is now synonymous with 'weggehen'.

[4]Karl Holtermann, 'Vergleichung der Schlegelschen und Voßschen Übersetzung von Shakespeares "Romeo and Juliet"', in Peter Münch *Vierzigster Jahresbericht über das Realgymnasium zu Münster i.W.* (Münster, 1892), 30.

c) Delicacy and wit

A Midsummer Night'sDream

[1]*Shakspeare's Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß and dessen Söhnen, etc.*, Bd. I (Leipzig, 1818)

iii) Selected aspects of style

a) Wordplay: double entendre/semantic wordplay, homonyms/homophones, jingles

[1]See 'Bauer'; second definition in Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1854), Bd. I, p. 1175f.

[2]See 'Kaper' in J. Grimm und W. Grimm, op. cit. (Leipzig 1873), Bd. 5, p. 183. Johann Heinrich Voß is cited specifically as using this word for the more usual 'Kapern'.

[3]See Schlegel: "Fragt morgen nach mir, und Ihr werdet einen stillen Mann an mir finden". *W. Shakespeare's dramatische Werke*. Übersetzt von E. Ortlepp (Stuttgart, 1842), Bd. 3.

[4]Johann Heinrich Voß translates *Twelfth Night*, I, v, 22f:

'...butI am resolved on two points.
That is one break, the other will hold.'

'...Dochhaft' ich an zwei Heften.
Daß, wenn eins bricht, das andere halte.'

'Heften does not reflect the primary meaning here of 'points'.

[5]See 'longer Notes' in *Hamlet*, ed. H. Jenkins, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London, New York, [4]1986), p. 473f.

[6]See Schlegel: 'Er war der erste, der je armiert war... Die Schrift sagt: Adam grub. Konnte er ohne Arme graben?'
See R. Schaller's translation: 'Er war überhaupt der erste, der ein Wappen führte ... Die Schrift sagt: "Adam grub". Konnte er ohne Spaten graben? Und woher hat ein Wappen sonst seine Form als von einem Spaten?'
R. Schaller, *Shakespeares Werke. Hamlet Prinz von Dänemark* (Berlin, 1968).

[7]See note 80-4 in IV, ii, of *Love Labour's Lost*, ed. R.W. David, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London, New York, [9]1983), p. 79f.

b) Song texts

[1]It cannot be the adjective 'drall' which has undergone a functional shift here as it means only 'plump', 'buxom', 'strapping' or 'chubby'.

[2]See *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. H.F. Brooks, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London/New York, [5]1988), p. 44, note 11.

[3]See *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, op. cit., p. 45, note 20 and *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. B. Gibbons, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London, New York, [3]1988), p. 110, note 62.

[4]In the second stanza of the song, and later in the same scene, more explicitly: 'I'll be with you at your sheep-shearing too: if I make not this cheat bring out another, and the shearers prove sheep, let me be unrolled, and my name put in the book of virtue!' (lines 115-118).

[5]See *The Winter's Tale*, ed. J.H.P. Pafford, *The Arden Shakespeare*, (London, New York, [11]1982), p. 80, note 7.

[6]This is not, however, the opinion of a reviewer (Jariges in the *Jenaer Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, no date) of Heinrich's first version of *Wintermärchen*, published in volume two of *Schauspiele von W. Shakspeare, übersetzt von Heinrich Voß und Abraham Voß* (Tübingen, 1810-1815), three volumes, as Heinrich informs Abeken in an unpublished letter dated 17 July, 1812: 'Ich sage im Grünerliede des Autol[ycus]: Die Leinwand weiß auf grünem Bleich/Wetzt mir den Mausezahn sogleich. Doth set my pugging tooth an edge. Er [Jariges] weiß nicht, was to set an edge heißt, schlägt nach und findet = stumpfen. Gleich schlägt er die Änderung stumpft vor. Daß tooth dabei steht kümmert ihn nicht, der Sinn vollends nicht. To set an edge heißt eine prickelnde Empfindung hervorbringen, und dies medicinisch auf Zähne angewandt mag meinetwegen aufs Stumpfen hinführen, aber das ist die abgeleitete Bedeutung. Der Sinn des Shakspear ist bestimmt k[ein] anderer, als die Leinwand auf der Bleiche macht nur den Diebesmund wässern ... Nun war ich an Mausezahn gebunden, u. was bleiben mir Worte übrig, um Shakspeares Ideen auszudrücken, als schärft oder wezt? - Aber dem Jariges ist das Kritteln angeboren.' (Manuscript from the Nachlaß Abeken, number 63, Bd. 1).

[7]See *The Winter's Tale*, ed. cit., p. 79, note 2,6,10.

[8]See unpublished letter from Heinrich to Abeken, dated 30 October 1811: 'Die Stelle, [Heinrich writes out the second stanza in English], wußte Pickford nur nicht recht zu erklären; doch meinte er, wegen avouch könnte Stocks kaum als Stock, Fußblöcke u. de[r]gl[eichen] bedeuten. Nun denk' ich so: "Wenn Keßler", sagt Autolycus, halb lustig und launig, halb frech und hezig [?] "mit ihrer Handthierung frank und frei im Lande leben'(Keßler heißt Gau-

ner lt. Adelungs Lexikon), so darf ich auch von meiner Handthierung (my traffick is sheets) frei Rechenschaft ablegen, und wenn ich auch in den Stock geworfen werde, so kann ich mich verdefendieren". Mit einem Wort: "ich der Leinwandshändler bin ein eben so guter u. ehrlicher Mensch, als einer aus der Keßlerzunft".' (Manuscript from the Nachlaß Abeken, number 59, Bd. 1).

[9]*Shakespeare's dramatische Werke übersetzt von August Wilhelm von Schlegel und Ludwig Tieck*, hrsg. von R. Gosche und B. Tschischwitz, (Berlin, 1874), Bd. 6, p. 294

c) Plain dramatic dialogue

Othello

[1]*Shakspeare's Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß, etc.,* Bd. 7, 1. Abtheilung (Stuttgart, 1825).

[2]*Shakespeare's dramatische Werke übersetzt von August Wilhelm von Schlegel und Ludwig Tieck*, op. cit., Bd. 7. Baudissin began his *Othello* translation in August, 1831 (Cf. W. Schulz. 'Der Anteil des Grafen Wolf Baudissin an der Shakespeareübersetzung Schlegel-Tiecks', in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 59 (1935), p. 53), which means that he had at his disposal both the 1806 and this, the later Voß translations of *Othello*. Indeed, in Baudissin's rendering, lines 2, 13, the first half of line 16, lines 20, 26, 17 and 33, plus the word 'Scheune' for 'grange' corresponds exactly with the rendering of these lines in the 1806 translation by Heinrich. Line 4, the first half of line 5, line 9 (with the exception of the word 'Glocke'), lines 10 and 11, the second half of line 17, lines 22 and 23 correspond with these lines from Heinrich's later translation. What Baudissin retained of Heinrich's two *Othello* translations amounts to a good third of the passage. It is interesting to note that this includes a) none of the bluntest of Iago's lines and b) none of the lines which express the escalation of Brabantio's anger, presumably because in Heinrich's later rendering the former is a blunt and crude reflection of blunt and obscene original lines, and the latter an (adequately) vivid display of anger.

[1]*Shakspeare's Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß, etc.*, Band 7: erste Abtheilung (Stuttgart, 1825), pp. 186-189.

[2]See H. Granville-Barker, *Prefaces to Shakespeare* (Princeton, 1947), II, p. 351.

[3]See P. Ure (ed.), *Shakespeare: 'Julius Caesar': A Casebook* (London 1969): in here M. Hunter, 'Brutus and the Political Context', pp. 195-206 and E. Schanzer, 'The Tragedy of Brutus', pp. 183-194.

[4]See Note 5, p. 33 in T.S. Dorsch (ed.), *Julius Caesar. The Arden Shakespeare* (London/New York, [10]1983).

[5]See Note 44, p. 35 in T.S. Dorsch (ed.), *Julius Caesar*, op. cit.

IV Conclusion

i) The Voßs' achievement

[1]See W. Jost, 'Stilkrise der deutschen Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift*, Bd. XXXV, 1961, pp. 1-43.

[2]Throughout the history of Shakespeare in Germany, his characters and fables have formed the basis of the original works of many authors of different genres. It was not, however, until the end of the 19th century, when previous notions of his work were no longer compatible with contemporary literary trends, that writers began to use him as a source for parody, or as a traditional complex which could serve to throw contemporary social and political messages into a clear and unfamiliar light. Although this change began in 1889 with the novella *Papa Hamlet* by Arno Holz and Johannes Schlaf, continued by, amongst others, Robert Neumann, *Parodien mit fremden Federn* (Bd. I, 1927), Gerhart Hauptmann with *Hamlet in Wittenberg* (1935), Alfred Döblin *Hamlet oder die lange Nacht nimmt ein Ende* (1956), culminating in Heiner Müller's *Die Hamletmaschine* (1977), it was in the work of Bertolt Brecht that this phenomenon was most firmly established. See R.T.K. Symington, *Brecht und Shakespeare*, Studien zur Germanistik, Anglistik und Komparatistik, (Bonn, 1970), Band 2 and P. Kussmaul, *Bertolt Brecht und das englische Drama der Renaissance*, Britische und Irische Studien zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur, (Bern und Frankfurt, 1974), No. 2. See also H. Hultberg, 'Bert Brecht und Shakespeare', in *Orbis Litterarum*, 14, (1959), pp. 89-104.

[3]Wilhelm Herbst, *Johann Heinrich Voß*, (Leipzig, 1876), Bd. II, 2. Abtheilung, p. 167f.

[4]Cf. K. Holtermann, 'Vergleichung der Schlegelschen und Voßschen Übersetzung von Shakespeares 'Romeo and Juliet', in op. cit., p. 30. Cf. also H. Egbring, op. cit., p. 76.

[5]For example, the lack of substance in Heinrich's translation of Macbeth's vision in the analysis and the forfeit of significant medial caesuras in this passage. Compare also the blank verse renderings of Jago's prose in the *Othello* extract. Also here: as Heinrich reproduces only one of the seven metrically irregular lines of the Brabantio/Jago dialogue tension is lost, as is much of the sense

of urgency and crudity of the passage (and characterisation of Jago) through the omission of Jago's expletives. We should not, however, forget that Heinrich was a pioneer in the verse translations of these plays.

[6]Letter from Heinrich to Friedrich Diez, 4 January 1819. 'Briefe von Heinrich Voß an Friedrich Diez', hrsg. von A. Tobler in *Preußische Jahrbücher*, 51 (1883), p. 17.

[7]Heinrich Voß, 'Anhang' to the Voß *Shakespeare*, p. 220. Originally published in *Hermes*, 1818.

[8]Letter to Diez dated 4 January 1819 in op. cit., p. 15.

[9]Letter from Heinrich to Cotta dated 31 January 1817 in M. Fehling (Hrsg.), op. cit., p. 344.

[10]S. Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage. Volume I: 1586 - 1914*, (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 115 and 116. Strangely, there is no mention at all in either published or unpublished letters from Heinrich of the *Lear* performance in Vienna, which took place six months before his death.

[11]Letter from Heinrich to Diez dated 4 January 1819, op. cit., p. 15.

[12]See K. Reichert, 'Die Herausforderung des Fremden', in *Erich Fried*, Text + Kritik, 91, 1986, pp. 85-87.

[13]Quoted in R.A. Brower, 'On Translation', *Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*, 23 (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), p. 276f.

[14]José Ortega Gasset, 'Glanz und Elend der Übersetzung', in H.J. Störig (Hrsg.), *Das Problem des Übersetzens*, Wege der Forschung, Bd. VIII, (Darmstadt, 1969), p. 320.

[15]Ibid, p. 321.

[16]W. Schadewaldt, 'Das Problem des Übersetzens' in H.J. Störig (Hrsg.), op. cit., p. 235.

[17]J. Ortega y Gasset, op. cit., p. 321.

[18]W. Herbst, op. cit., pp. 166-168.

ii) Contemporary reception and polemic

[1]This criticism follows Abeken's reading of the first volume of the Voß *Shakespeare*, i.e., he was referring mainly to the three Johann Heinrich translations. Letter dated 6. September 1818 from the Manuscript No. LXIX, Nachlaß Heinrich Voß.

[2]Quoted in O. Fambach *Der Romantische Rückfall*, op. cit. p. 108.

[3]See Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Zelter III, 170, 380ff.

[4]A.W. Schlegel, 'Übersetzer-Familie' in *Musenalmanach von Wendt*, Leipzig 1832, in A.W. Schlegel, *Werke*, hrsg. von E. Böcking, op. cit., Bd. II, p. 215. It would appear from a letter dated 2 February 1825 from A.W. Schlegel to G.A. Reimer, however, that these lines were already written by 1825: 'Nur unter Freunden erlaubte ich mir zu scherzen, ich könne nicht mit diesem [Johann Heinrich Voß] wetteifern, der nicht bloß Übersetzungen, sondern Übersetzer in seinen Söhnen ans Licht schaffe.' Quoted in *Briefe von und an A.W. Schlegel*, gesammelt und erläutert durch J. Körner (Zürich, Leipzig, Wien, 1930), Bd. I., p. 423.

[5]A. Voß, *Briefe von Heinrich Voß*, (Heidelberg, 1833), I, 'Briefwechsel zwischen Heinrich Voß und Jean Paul', p. 54. The reference for further quotations from these letters is given in the text in brackets.

[6]C.A.H. Clodius, 'Shakspeare's Schauspiele von J.H. Voß und dessen Söhnen, Shakspeare's Romeo und Julia von J.H. Voß', in *Hermes oder kritisches Jahrbuch der Literatur*, 1. Stück für das Jahr 1819 (Leipzig, 1819), pp. 87 - 141. The form of the Clodius review in *Hermes*, is unusual for its day. It is 54 pages long and provides the original Shakespeare text of the translated extracts under review. Clodius discusses on the different levels of translation (metre, metaphor, sound, verse, etc.) and comments on examples of these from the Voß *Shakespeare*, sometimes with a comparison from the Schlegel translation. In its analysis, the Clodius review almost anticipates the approach of today's scientific translation criticism.

[7]See U . Suerbaum, 'Shakespeare auf deutsch - Eine Zwischenbilanz', in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft (West)*, 1972, pp. 45-47.
The same can also apply to (publishers) readers of translated literature. See Elisabeth Borchers, 'Übersetzer und Lektor', in *Ist Literaturübersetzen lehrbar?*, hrsg. von F. Nies, A-R. Glaap, W. Gössmann. *Transfer* 1 (Tübingen, 1989), pp. 45-61.

[8] See W.Wilss, *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Probleme und Methoden* (Stuttgart, 1977), p. 281. Cf. also W. Koller, *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft* (Heidelberg, 1979), p. 192 and B. Bösser, 'Die Übersetzer und ihre Kritiker' in R. Italiaander (Hg.), *Übersetzen. Vorträge und Beiträge vom internationalen Kongreß literarischer Übersetzer in Hamburg 1965*, (Frankfurt M/ Bonn, 1965), pp. 74-76. See also F. Appel, *Literarische Übersetzung*, (Stuttgart, 1983), p. 35. Appel also claims that the only difference between translation criticism in 19th-century Germany and popular translation criticism in Germany today is that there is now a greater range of stereotype review terms: 'Mit Beurteilungen wie gut, schlecht, sorgfältig, liederlich oder mit dem gern gebräuchlichen *kongenial*, so wie mit der üblichen angehängten Liste von sogenannten Übersetzungsfehlern, die der Stolz jedes Rezensenten ist, wird weder dem Leser noch den Übersetzern geholfen'.

[9] L[udwig]. R[o]b[er]t [?] in *Literatur-Blatt* 72, 14.7.1830, p. 288.

[10] *Leipziger Literatur-Zeitung*, 79, 2.4.1832,Sp. 628.

[11]'Die deutsche Bühne und die Romantik', in *Mitternachtszeitung* 4 (4.1.1834), pp. 13 - 15, here p. 14. This is an extract from comments on the standards of drama translations undertaken at the end of the 1820s and beginning of the 1830s.

[12]A. Wagner, 'Shakspeare's Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß und dessen Söhnen, Heinrich Voß und Abraham Voß. Mit Erläuterungen! in *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*, Nro. 61/3, (Berlin 1830).

[13]W. Herbst, op.cit, p. 168.

[14]Ibid.

[15]*Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, (Leipzig, 1896), Band 40, p. 348.

[16]G. Freih. Vincke, 'Schiller's Bühnenbearbeitung des Othello', in op. cit., p. 224.

[17]Holtermann divides his collection of mistakes into two sections, those from the Voß *Romeo und Julia*, and those from Schlegel's translation. In the (longer) Voß section, Holtermann without exception provides alongside the Voß mistake what he considers to be the correct, viz. Schlegel, rendering. When discussing the Schlegel mistakes, Holtermann nowhere offers Voß's correct translation as a better rendering.

[18]K. Holtermann, 'Vergleichung der Schlegelschen und Voßschen Übersetzung von Shakespeares 'Romeo and Juliet', in op. cit., p. 30.

[19]H. Egbring, *Johann Heinrich Voss der Jüngere als Übersetzer des Macbeth von W. Shakespeare*, op. cit., p. 76.

[20]Ibid. Footnote 2), p. 8.

[21]L. Bäte (Hg.), *Vossische Hausidylle. Briefe von Ernestine Voß an Heinrich Christian und Sara Boie (1794-1820)*, (Bremen, 1925), p. 203.

[22]M. Atkinson, *August Wilhelm Schlegel as a Translator of Shakespeare*, op. cit., p. 51.

[23]W. Herbst, op. cit., p. 168.

[24]Quoted in O. Fambach, *Der Romantische Rückfall*, op. cit., p. 118

iii) The domination of Schlegel/Tieck

[1]Suerbaum is probably referring here mainly to the Shakespeare translation of Erich Fried. Theatre and stage translations produced since 1972 differ considerably from the language, style and rhythm of the Schlegel-Tieck version.

[2]A.W. Schlegel, 'Zusatz zum neuen Abdruck von "Etwas über William Shakespeare bei Gelegenheit Wilhelm Meisters" (1796)', 1827, in op. cit., p. 121.

[3]Ibid, p. 119 and 120.

[4]G. Toury, 'Translation, literary translation and pseudotranslation', in op. cit., p. 77.

[5]K. Reichert, 'Die Herausforderung des Fremden', in op. cit., p. 88.

[6]U. Suerbaum, 'Shakespeare auf deutsch - Eine Zwischenbilanz', in op. cit., p. 58.

[7]Ibid, p. 60.

[8]V. Canaris, 'Literaturübersetzen aus der Sicht des Theaters', op. cit., p. 63.

[9]See G. Hoffmann, 'Zur Shakespeare-Übersetzung Dorothea Tiecks', in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* (West), 1971, p. 84, and M. Atkinson, 'Wolf Baudissin: Translator', in *German Life and Letters*, Vol. XVI, 1962-63, p. 171.
See also letter to Heinrich Koester, Summer, 1867, quoted in W. Schoof, 'Dingelstedts Plan einer neuen Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, Bd. 76, Weimar, 1940, p. 147.

[10]W. Wetz, 'Zur Beurteilung der sog. Schlegel-Tieck'schen Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *Englische Studien*, 28, 1900, p. 365.

[11]U. Suerbaum, 'Shakespeare auf deutsch - Eine Zwischenbilanz', in op. cit., p. 50.

[12]Ibid, p. 60.

[13]E. Fried, 'Übersetzen oder Nachdichten?', in *Ist Literaturübersetzen lehrbar?*, op. cit., p. 42.

[14]This was my own experience whenever I gave papers on the Voß *Shakespeare* and included comparative readings from different plays, i.e. Shakespeare's original followed by the Voß and the Schlegel

version of this. This occurred when I gave a paper at the Johann Heinrich Voß-Kolloquium der Winckelmann-Gesellschaft in Penzlin (former GDR) in March 1987 and in my lecture at the Eutiner Landesbibliothek in September 1988.

[15]R. Vollmer, 'Shakespeare, durchs Milchglas betrachtet', in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Nr. 282, 5 December 1989, p. L11.

[16]K. Reichert, 'Die Herausforderung des Fremden', in op. cit., p. 88.

[17]M.E. Atkinson, 'Wolf Baudissin: Translator', in op. cit., p. 172.

iv) The persistence of controversy in German Shakespeare translation

[1]E. Korn, 'Cap-the-couplet' in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 21 June, 1991, p. 15.

[2]N. Clark, 'Polyeuct', 'Letters to the Editor' in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 26 July, 1991, p. 13.

[3]U. Suerbaum, 'Der deutsche Shakespeare', op. cit., pp. 61-80.

[4]Ibid, p. 65.

[5]Ibid, p. 67 and 68.

[6]Ibid, p. 66 and 67.

[7]Ibid, p. 68 and 69.

[8]Ibid, p. 69.

[9]Ibid, p. 70

[10]On the attitude of the recipient to literary translation worked according to principles similar to those of Voß, see also K. Reichert, 'Die Herausforderung des Fremden', in *Erich Fried*, Text + Kritik, 91, July 1968, pp. 83-93.

[11]See Heinrich's comments *passim*, both unpublished and published papers, letters.

[12]Letter from Heinrich to Fr. Diez, 4 January 1819 in 'Briefe von Heinrich Voß an Friedrich Diez', hrsg. v. A. Tobler, in *Preußische Jahrbücher*, 51, 1883, p. 15.

[13]U. Suerbaum, 'Der deutsche Shakespeare', op. cit., p. 70.

[14]John Dryden, *Of Dramatic Poesy and other Critical Essays*, ed. G. Watson, Vol. I (London, 1962), p. 268.

[15]U. Suerbaum, 'Der deutsche Shakespeare', op. cit., p. 70.

[16]John Dryden, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 154.

[17]R. Vollmann, 'Shakespeare, durchs Milchglas betrachtet', op. cit.

[18]J. Ortega y Gasset, 'Glanz und Elend der Übersetzung', op. cit., p. 316.

[19]See note 17 in section IV, i.

[20]V. Canaris, 'Literaturübersetzungen aus der Sicht des Theaters', in op. cit., p. 70.

[21]F. Nies, 'Ältere Literatur Frankreichs verdeutschen: Sinn und Ziel', in op. cit., p. 83.

[22]A. Eichholz, 'Wie Julia sich Romeo unter den Nagel reißt', in *Die Welt*, 26 August 1992.

[23]B. Henrichs, 'König Bier, König Leer: Shakespearefälschung, frech und bieder', in *Die Zeit*, 23 October 1992.

[24]A. Eichholz, op. cit.

[25]B. Henrichs, op. cit.

[26]F. Nies, op. cit., p. 85.

[27]In her review of Stückl's production of *Much Ado*, A. Bachmair describes the Voß rendering of this play a 'wunderbar zierliche

Übersetzung ... Die Sprache ... ist auch bei weitem das schönste in der Inszenierung': A. Bachmair 'Es wird gelitten und gestritten', in *Hessische Niedersächsische Allgemeine*, Nr. 233, 6. Oktober 1992.

[28]W. Höbel, 'Shakespeare inszenieren ist Knochenarbeit: Gespräch mit Christian Stückl über "Viel Lärmens um Nichts"', in *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 16. Oktober 1992.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Schauspiele von W. Shakspeare, übersetzt von Heinrich Voß und Abraham Voß, Tübingen, 1810-1815, 3 Bände.
Shakspeares Othello und König Lear, übersetzt von Dr. Johann Heinrich Voß, Professor am Weimarischen Gymnasium. Mit Compositionen von Zelter, Jena, 1806.
Shakspeare's Schauspiele von Johann Heinrich Voß und dessen Söhnen Heinrich Voß und Abraham Voß, Bd. I - III, Leipzig, 1818 & 1819, Bd. IV - IX, Stuttgart, 1822-1829.
The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare, accurately printed from the text of the corrected copies, left by the late Samuel Johnson, George Steevens, Isaac Reed, and Edmond Malone, Leipsic, 1822.
The Arden Shakespeare, London/New York: H.F. Brooks (ed.), *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ^{3}1988, T.S. Dorsch (ed.), *Julius Caesar*, ^{6}1983, B. Gibbons (ed.), *Romeo and Juliet*, ^{3}1988, H. Jenkins (ed.), *Hamlet*, ^{4}1986, F. Kermode (ed.), *The Tempest*, ^{11}1980, J.M. Lothian/Craik, T.W. (eds.), *Twelfth Night*, ^{6}1984, K. Muir (ed.), *Macbeth*, ^{10}1986, J.H.P. Pafford (ed.), *The Winter's Tale*, ^{11}1982, M.R. Ridley (ed.), *Othello*, ^{14}1985.

Manuscript Sources:

Weimar, Goethe und Schiller-Archiv, Nachlaß Heinrich Voß.
Kiel, Landesbibliothek Schleswig-Holstein, Boie-Voß-Nachlaß.
Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Nachlaß B.R. Abeken.
Stadtarchiv der Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart, Sammlung KAUFFMANN.

Other Johann Heinrich Voß and Heinrich Voß sources consulted:

Tobler, A. (Hrsg.), 'Briefe von Heinrich Voß an Friedrich Diez', in *Preußische Jahrbücher* 51 (1883), p-30.
Voß, A. (Hrsg.), *Briefe von Heinrich Voß*, Heidelberg, 1833, 2 Bände.
Voß, A. (Hrsg.), *Johann Heinrich Voß. Briefe nebst erläuternden Beilagen*, Hildesheim, 1971, Bd. I - III. Reprographischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe Halberstadt 1830.
Voß, H., 'Rezension des Richard II, übersetzt von A.W. Schlegel', in

Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung, Num. 292 (21. Dezember 1811), 546-555.
Voß, J.H., *Antisymbolik*, Stuttgart, 1824-1826, 2 Bde.
Voß, J.H., *Kritische Blätter nebst geografischen Abhandlungen*, Stuttgart, 1828, 2 Bde.
Voß, J.H., *Sämtliche Gedichte*, Königsberg, 1825.
Voß, J.H., *Über des Virgilischen Landgedichts Ton und Auslegung*, Altona, 1791.
Voß, J.H., 'Über Klopstocks grammatische Gespräche und Adelungs Wörterbuch', in *Jenaische Allgemeine Literaturzeitung*, (1804), Nr. 24-26 and 39-43.
Voß, J.H., *Zeitmessung der deutschen Sprache*, Königsberg, 1802.

Secondary Sources:

Studies on Johann Heinrich Voß and Heinrich Voß, jr.:

Allgemeine *Deutsche Biographie*, hrsg. durch die historische Commission bei der königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Leipzig, 1896, Bd. 40.
Bäte, L. (Hrsg.), *Vossische Hausidylle. Briefe von Ernestine Voß an Heinrich Christian und Sara Boie (1794-1820)*, Bremen, 1925.
Böttiger, K.A., 'Bemerkungen über die Vossische Übersetzung der Ilias', in *K.A.B., Literarische Zustände und Zeitgenossen*, hrsg. von K.W. Böttiger, Leipzig, 1838, Bd. I, 81-87.
Buselmeier, M., 'Ein Mann wie Voß', in *Die Zeit*, Nr. 29, 12. Juli 1991.
Clodius, C.A.H., 'Shakspeare's Schauspiele von J.H. Voß und dessen Söhnen, Shakspeare's Romeo und Julia von J.H. Voß', in *Hermes oder kritisches Jahrbuch der Literatur*, 1. Stück für das Jahr 1819, Leipzig, 1819, 87-141.
Crämer, H., 'Die stilistische Eigenart der Homerübersetzungen von Bürger und Voß, am I. Gesang der Ilias erläutert', in *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht*, 12 (1898), 174-193.
Defraudas, M., 'Johann Heinrich Voß traducteur d'Homère', in *Revue de Littérature Comparée* 46 (1972), 248-255.
Düntzer, H., *Aus Goethes Freundeskreis. Darstellungen aus dem Leben des Dichters*, Braunschweig, 1868.
Egbring, H., *Johann Heinrich Voß der Jüngere als Übersetzer des Macbeth von W. Shakespeare*, Münster, 1911.
Goeßling, E.W., *Johann Heinrich Voß' Stellung zu religiösen und*

politisch-sozialen Fragen, in Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte der Goethezeit. Diss., Illinois, 1958.

Goeßling, E.W., 'Johann Heinrich Voß' Verhältnis zur Romantik', in *Festschrift für Detlev W. Schumann* , hrsg. A.R. Schmitt, München, 1970, 221-229.

Gräf, H.G. (Hrsg.), *Goethe und Schiller in Briefen von Heinrich Voß dem Jüngern*, Leipzig, 1896.

Gräf, H.G., 'Voß der Jüngere und sein Verhältnis zu Goethe und Schiller', in *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 17 (1896), 75-104.

Häntschel, G., 'Die Wirksamkeit von Johann Heinrich Voß auf die deutsche Sprache und Kultur', in Chr. D. Hahn (Hrsg.), *Johann Heinrich Voß. Leben und Werk*, Husum, 1977, 79-98.

Häntschel, G., *Johann Heinrich Voß. Seine Homer-Übersetzung als sprachschöpferische Leistung*, München, 1977. Zetema. Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 68.

Herbst, W., *Johann Heinrich Voß*, Leipzig, 1872-1876, 2 Bde.

Katalog der Bibliothek von Johann Heinrich Voß, welche vom 9. November 1835 an, in Heidelberg öffentlich versteigert werden soll, Heidelberg, 1835. Catalogue preserved in the library of the University of Marburg.

Kelletat, A., *Voß und die Nachbildung antiker Metern in der deutschen Dichtung*. Diss., Tübingen, 1949.

Kuhlmann, C., *J.H. Voß als Kritiker und Gelehrter in seinen Beziehungen zu Lessing. Eine stilgeschichtliche Studie*, Straßburg, 1914. Freie Forschungen zur deutschen Literatur-Geschicht, 2.

Metelmann, E., 'Johann Heinrich Voß und Goethe', in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 62 (1937), 145-163.

Müller-Seidel, W., 'Goethes Verhältnis zu Johann Heinrich Voß', in *Goethe und Heidelberg*, hrsg. von der Direktion des kurpfälzischen Museums, Heidelberg, 1949, 240-266.

Muncker, F., 'Johann Heinrich Voß', in *ADB*, Bd. 40, 334-349.

Schubert-Riese, B., *Das literarische Leben in Eutin im 18. Jahrhundert*, Neumünster, 1975. Kieler Studien zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte, 11.

Schulze, A., *Johann Heinrich Voß' Auseinandersetzung mit Friedrich Leopold Stolberg und Vertretern der jüngeren Frühromantik*, Diss., Potsdam, 1956.

Schwentner, E., 'Vossens Wortschatz unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Niederdeutschen', in *Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch* 44 (1918), 51-56.

Studies on Shakespeare:

Beneke, J., *Metaphorik im Drama. Dargestellt an Shakespeares 'Pericles' und 'Cymbeline'*, Bonn, 1975.

Blake, N.F., *Shakespeare's Language. An Introduction*, London, [3]1985.

Bremer, C., 'Podiumsgespräch über Theater und Forschung im Dienste Shakespeares', in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* (West), 1967, 9-14.

Charney, M., *Style in Hamlet*, Princeton, 1969.

Clemen, W., 'Wo stehen wir in der Shakespeare-Forschung?', in *JbDSG* (West) 100 (1964), 135-148.

Draper, J.W., *The Tempo-Patterns of Shakespeare's Plays*, Heidelberg, 1957. Anglistische Forschungen, heft 90.

Ehrl, C., *Sprachstil und Charakter bei Shakespeare*, Heidelberg, 1957.

Haas, R., 'Über die Gefahren der Aktualisierung Shakespeares. Jan Kotts *Shakespeare heute*'. in *Archiv für neuere Sprachen* 204 (1968), 124-133.

Hussey, S.S., *The Literary Language of Shakespeare*, London/New York, [2]1984.

Knight, G.W., *Shakespearean Production*, London, [3]1964.

Kott, J., *Shakespeare our Contemporary*, London, 1965.

Lindtberg, L., 'Podiumsgespräch über Theater und Forschung im Dienste Shakespeares', in *JbDSG* (West), 1967, 20-28.

Mahood, M.M., *Shakespeare's Wordplay*, London/New York, [4]1988.

Mehl, D., 'Zugang zu Shakespeare', in P. Rieger (Hrsg.), *Shakespeare-Verständnis heute*, Göttingen, 1969, 20-35.

Müller-Schwefe, G., 'Shakespeare im Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts', in *Schulwarte* 14 (1961), 513-522.

Nutall, A.D., *A new Mimesis. Shakespeare and the Representation of Reality*, London/New York, 1983.

Oppel, H., 'Podiumsgespräch über Theater und Forschung im Dienste Shakespeares', in *JbDSG* (West), 1967, 14-20.

Partridge, E., *Shakespeare's Bawdy*, London, 1968.

Rothe, H., *Shakespeare als Provokation*, München, 1961.

Sprague, A.C./J.C. **Trevin**, *Shakespeare's Plays Today*, London, 1970.

Spurgeon, C.F.E., *Shakespeare's imagery and what it tells us*, Cambridge, 1952.

Schabert, I. (Hrsg.), *Shakespeare-Handbuch* , Stuttgart, 1978.

Smith, C.G., *Shakespeare's Proverb Lore*, Cambridge, Mass., 1963.

Trussler, S., *Shakespearean Concepts*, London, 1989.

Weimann, R., 'Theater und Gesellschaft in der Shakespeare-Kritik.

Methoden und Perspektiven der Forschung', in *Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst*, Nr. 1 (1970), 3-25.
Weinstock, H., *Die Funktion elisabethanischer Sprichwörter und Pseudosprichwörter bei Shakespeare*, Heidelberg, 1966. Annales Universitatis Saraviensis, Bd. F 6.
Williams, S., *Shakespeare on the German Stage. 1586-1914*, Cambridge, 1990.

Studies on Shakespeare Translation:

Atkinson, M.E., 'Wolf Baudissin: Translator', in *German Life and Letters*, Vol. XVI (1962-63), 164-173.
Atkinson, M.E., *August Wilhelm Schlegel as a Translator of Shakespeare*, Oxford, 1958.
Bernays, M., *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Schlegelschen Shakespeare*, Leipzig, 1872.
Borgmeier, R./U. **Suerbaum**, 'Shakespeare-Übersetzungen. Text und Bochumer Diskussion', in *Poetica* 4 (1971), 82-119.
Daly, P.M., 'Probleme der Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *Der Deutsche Shakespeare* (*Theater unserer Zeit* 7, 1965), 45-57.
Daly, P.M., 'Die Schlegel-Tieck-Übersetzung von "Hamlet"', in op. cit., 75-93.
Engler, B., *Rudolf Alexander Schröders Übersetzungen von Shakespeares Dramen*, Bern, 1974.
Flatter, R., 'Auf den Spuren von Shakespeares Wortregie', in *JbDSG* 84/86 (1950), 93-96.
Fried, E., 'Übersetzen oder Nachdichten', in *Ist Literaturübersetzen lehrbar?*, hrsg. von F. Nies/A.R. Glaap, W. Gössmann, Tübingen, 1989, 29-44.
Gebhardt, P., *A.W. Schlegels Übersetzung: Untersuchungen zu seinem Übersetzungsverfahren am Beispiel des Hamlet*, Göttingen, 1970, Palaestra 257.
Genée, R., *Geschichte der Shakespeare'schen Dramen in Deutschland*, Leipzig, 1870.
Gnekow, H., 'Plädoyer für Rothe, in *Theater heute* 6 (1963, 29.
Haugk, D., 'Ich lese, vergleiche, wäge und verzweifle', op. cit., 28-29.
Helmensdorfer, U., 'Wielands deutscher Shakespeare', in *Der deutsche Shakespeare* (*Theater unserer Zeit* 7, 1965), 59-74.
Heun, H.G., 'Shakespeares Wortspiele - deutsch', in *Carolinum* 39

(1972), Nr. 64/64, 28-33.
Heun, H.G., *Shakespeare in deutschen Übersetzungen*, Berlin, 1957.
Hoffmann, G., 'Zur Shakespeare-Übersetzung Dorothea Tiecks', in *JbDSG* (West), 1971, 69-84.
Hoffmeier, D., 'Die Einbürgerung Shakespeares auf dem Theater des Sturm und Drang', in *Schriften zur Theaterwissenschaft*, 3/II, Berlin, 1964, 9-266.
Holtermann, K., 'Vergleichung der Schlegelschen und Voßschen Übersetzung von Shakespeares "Romeo und Juliet"', in P. Münch, *Vierzigster Jahresbericht über das Realgymnasium zu Münster i.W.*, Münster, 1892, 1-30.
Hultberg, H., 'Bert Brecht und Shakespeare', in *Orbis Litterarum* 14 1959, 89-104.
Jost, W., 'Schwierigkeiten der Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *JBDSG* 92 (1956), 168-174.
Kauenhowen, K., *Gottfried August Bürgers Macbeth-Bearbeitung*, Diss., Königsberg, 1915.
Koyro, H.G., *August Wilhelm Schlegel als Shakespeare-Übersetzer. Der sprachlich-stilistische Charakter seiner Übertragung, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Julius Caesar*, Diss., Marburg, 1966.
Kussmaul, P., *Bertolt Brecht und das englische Drama der Renaissance*, Britische und Irische Studien zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur, No.2, Bern/Frankfurt/M., 1974.
Larson, K.E., 'The Origins of the "Schlegel-Tieck" Shakespeare in the 1820s', in *German Quarterly* 60 (1987), 19-37.
Larson, K.E., 'Pro und Contra Schlegel', in *JbDSG* (West), 1989, 113-133.
Leuca, G., 'Wieland and the Introduction of Shakespeare into Germany', in *The German Quarterly*, Vol. XXVIII (1955), 247-255.
Lüdeke, H., 'Zur Tieck'schen Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *JbDSG* 55 (1919), 1-29.
Müller-Schwefe, G., '*Romeo und Julia* in der Sprache der Gegenwart. Rudolf Schaller zum 80. Geburtstag', in *JbDSG* (West), 1971, 128-148.
Schoof, W., 'Dingelstedts Plan einer neuen Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *JbDSG*, Bd. 76, Weimar, 1940, 137-160.
Schramm, E., 'Zum Problem der modernen Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *Hamburger Akademische Rundschau* 2 (1947/8), 355-361.
Schröder, R.A., 'Zur Frage einer neuen Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *R.A.S.: Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. 2: *Die Aufsätze und Reden*, Frankfurt/M., 1952, 231-236.
Schücking, L.L., 'Shakespeare's Stil als Übersetzungsproblem', in *JbDSG* 84-86 (1950), 69-74.

Schulz, W., 'Der Anteil des Grafen Wolf Baudissin an der Shakespeareübersetzung Schlegel-Tiecks', in *ZsfdPh* 159 (1935), 52-67.

Stadler, E., 'Wielands Shakespeare', in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte* 107 (Straßburg, 1910), 75-94.

Stamm, R., 'Der elisabethanische Shakespeare?', in *Der deutsche Shakespeare* (*Theater unserer Zeit* 7, 1965), 128-140.

Stamm, R., 'Erich Fried als Shakespeare-Übersetzer. Bemerkungen zum ersten Band seines Übersetzungswerkes', in *JbDSG* (West) (1971), 23-34.

Stamm, R., 'Probleme der Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *Shakespeare und die Schweiz*, Bern, 1964.

Stamm, R., 'Rudolf Alexander Schröder als Shakespeare-Übersetzer', in *Der deutsche Shakespeare* (*Theater unserer Zeit* 7, 1965), 121-125.

Stricker, K., 'Dorothea Tieck und ihr Schaffen für Shakespeare', in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, Bd. LXXII (1936), 79-92.

Suerbaum, U., 'Bericht der Arbeitsgruppe zum thema "Probleme der Shakespeare-Übersetzung"', in *JbDSG* (West) (1971), 11-17.

Suerbaum, U., 'Der Deutsche Shakespeare', in E. Kolb/J. Hasler, *Festschrift Rudolf Stamm* , Bern, 1969, 61-80.

Suerbaum, U., 'Shakespeare auf deutsch - Eine Zwischenbilanz', in *JbDSG* (West) (1972), 42-66.

Symington, R.T.K., *Brecht und Shakespeare* . Studien zur Germanistik, Anglistik und Komparatistik, Bonn, 1970, Bd. 2.

Vincke, G., Freiherr von, 'Zur Geschichte der deutschen Shakespeare-Übersetzungen', in *JbDSG* 16 (1881), 254-273.

Wetz, W., 'Zur Beurteilung der sog. Schlegel-Tieck'schen Shakespeare-Übersetzung', in *Englische Studien* 28 (1900), 363-378.

Wieland, C.M., 'Vorankündigung der Eschenburgschen Shakespeare-Ausgabe', in *Der Teutsche Merkur*, Bd. 3, 2. Stück (Weimar, 1773).

Wittlinger, K., *Hans Rothes Neuer Shakespeare*, Diss., Freiburg, 1950.

Studies on the theory of translation:

Albrecht, J. *Linguistik und Übersetzung*, Tübingen, 1973.

Ammann, M., Review of: J. Albrecht et al (Hrsg.), *Translation und interkulturelle Kommunikation* , Frankfurt/M./Bern, 1987, in *TEXTconTEXT* 4 (1989), 106-129.

Appel, F., *Literarische Übersetzung*, Stuttgart, 1983.

Barchzdarow, L., *Sprache und Übersetzung. Probleme der allgemeinen*

und speziellen Übersetzungstheorie, Moskau/Leipzig, 1979.

Bassnett-McGuire, S., 'Translating Spatial Poetry: An Examination of Theatre Texts in Performance', in J.S. Holmes/J. Lambert/R. v.d. Broeck (eds.), *Literature and Translation. New Perspectives in Literary Studies*, Leuven, 1978, 161-176.

Bassnett-McGuire, S., *Translations Studies*, London/New York, [3]1987.

Bednarz, K., *Theatralische Aspekte der Dramenübersetzung: Dargestellt am Beispiel der deutschen Übertragungen und Bühnenbearbeitungen der Dramen Anton Czechovs*, Diss., Wien, 1969.

Benjamin, W., 'Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers', foreword to Charles Baudelaire, *Tableaux Parisiens*, Nördlingen, 1963.

Bösser, B., 'Die Übersetzer und ihre Kritiker', in R. Italiaander (Hrsg.), *Übersetzen. Vorträge und Beiträge vom internationalen Kongreß literarischer Übersetzer in Hamburg 1965*, Frankfurt/M./Bonn, 1965, 74-76.

Bretthauer, P., 'Der Übersetzer als Kulturexperte', in *TEXTconTEXT* 2 (1987), 216-226.

Brower, R.A., *On Translation*, Cambridge, Mass., 1959. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 23.

Canaris, V., 'Literaturübersetzen aus der Sicht des Theaters', in F. Nies/A.-R. Glaap/W. Gössmann (Hrsg.), *Ist Literaturübersetzen lehrbar?*, Tübingen, 1989, 63-72.

Carlson, H.G., 'Problems in Play Translation', in *Educational Theatre Journal* 16 (1964), 55-58.

Cicero, *De optimo genere oratorum*, Loeb Classical Library, transl. by H.M. Hubbell, London, 1959.

Cicero, 'Right and Wrong', in M. Grant (ed.), *Latin Literature*, Harmondsworth, 1978.

Etkind, E., *Un Art en Crise*, Lausanne, 1982.

Filipec, J., 'Der Äquivalenzbegriff und das Problem der Übersetzbarkeit', in A. Neubert/O. Kade (Hrsg.), *Neue Beiträge zu Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft*, Leipzig, 1973, 81-87.

Fischer, O., 'Vom Übersetzen dichterischer Werke', in *Philologica pragensia* 26 (1983), 65-80.

Fränzel, W., *Geschichte des Übersetzens im 18. Jahrhundert*, Leipzig, 1913.

Friedrich, H., 'Zur Frage der Übersetzungskunst', in *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaft. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse*, Heidelberg, 1965, 3. Abhandlung.

Gorjan, Z., 'Über das akustische Element beim Übersetzen von Bühnenwerken', in R. Italiaander (Hrsg.), *Übersetzen*, Frankfurt/M., 1965, 88-89.

Gottsched, J.C., 'Von den Uebersetzungen', in *Ausführliche Redekunst*, Leipzig, [5]1759, 413-452.

Gravier, M., 'La Traduction des textes dramatiques', in *Etudes de linguistique appliquée* 12 (1973), 39-49.

Güttinger, F., *Zielsprache, Theorie und Technik des Übersetzens*, Zürich, [2]1963.

Haas, B., *Dramenübersetzung. Sprachtheoretische und dramaturgische Aspekte dargestellt am Beispiel des Schauspiels 'Sommergäste' von Maksim Gorkij*. Diss., Hamburg, 1982.

Haas, R., 'Übersetzungsprobleme im Feld deutsch-englischer Literaturbegegnung', in *Die Neueren Sprachen* NS7 (1958), 366-378.

Heß, Z.B.L., *Einleitung in die Übersetzungskunst*, Hamburg, 1766.

Holz-Mänttäri, J., *Translatorisches Handlen. Theorie und Methode*, Helsinki, 1984. Annales Academiae scientiarum fennical B 226.

Horace, 'On the Art of Poetry', in *Classical Literary Criticism*, translated with an introduction by T.S. Dorsch, Harmondsworth, 1965, 77-94.

Huber, T., *Studien zur Theorie des Übersetzens im Zeitalter der deutschen Aufklärung 1730-1770*, Meisenheim, 1968.

Huyssen, A., *Die frühromantische Konzeption von Übersetzung und Aneignung*, Schlieren, 1969.

Hamburger, M., 'Übersetzen fürs Theater', in *Theater der Zeit* 4 (1974), 30-31.

Jakobson, R., 'Linguistische Aspekte der Übersetzung', in W. Wilss (Hrsg.), *Übersetzungswissenschaft*, Darmstadt, 1981, 189-198.

Kemp, F., 'Das Übersetzen als literarische Gattung', in *Sprache im technischen Zeitalter* 21 (1967), 45-58.

Kloepfer, R., *Die Theorie der literarischen Übersetzung. Romanisch-deutscher Sprachbereich*, München, 1967.

Knufmann, H., 'Das deutsche Übersetzungswesen im 18. Jahrhundert im Spiegel von Übersetzer- und Herausgebervorreden', in *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 9 (1969), 491-572.

Koller, W., 'Die literarische Übersetzung unter linguistischem Aspekt. Bedeutungsfaktoren der Übersetzung am Beispiel Henrik Ibsens', in H. Kittel (Hrsg.), *Die literarische Übersetzung. Stand und Perspektiven ihrer Erforschung*, Berlin, 1988. Göttinger Beiträge zur internationalen Übersetzungsforschung 2.

Koller, W., *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*, Heidelberg, 1979.

Levy, J., *Die literarische Übersetzung: Theorie einer Kunstgattung*, Frankfurt/M., 1969.

Mounin, G., *Die Übersetzung: Geschichte, Theorie, Anwendung*,

München, 1967.

Neubert, A., 'Invarianz und Pragmatik: Ein zentrales Problem der Übersetzungswissenschaft', in A. Neubert/O. Kade, *Neue Beiträge zu Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft*, Leipzig, 1973, 13-26.

Nies, F., 'Ältere Literatur Frankreichs verdeutschen: Sinn und Ziel?', in F. Nies/A.-R. Glaap/W. Gössmann (Hrsg.), *Ist Literatur lehrbar?*, Tübingen, 1989, 79-86.

Pohling, H., 'Zur Geschichte der Übersetzung', in *Studien zur Übersetzungswissenschaft* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift *Fremdsprachen* IV, 1971), 125-162.

Reichert, K., 'Die Herausforderung des Fremden', in *Erich Fried. Text + Kritik* 91, Juli 1968, 83-93.

Reiss, K./H.J. **Vermeer**, *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*, Tübingen, 1984. Linguistische Arbeiten 147.

Reiss, K., *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik: Kategorien und Kriterien für eine sachgerechte Beurteilung von Übersetzungen*, München, 1971.

Reiss, K., 'Überlegungen zu einer Theorie der Übersetzungskritik', in *Linguistica Antverpiensia* II (1968), 369-383.

Rüdiger, H., 'Wilhelm von Humboldt als Übersetzer', in *Imprimatur* 7 (1937), 79-86.

Sager, J.C., 'Die Übersetzung im Kommunikationsprozeß der Übersetzer in der Industrie', in M. Snell-Hornby (Hrsg.), *Übersetzungswissenschaft - eine Neuorientierung. Zur Integrierung von Theorie und Praxis*, Tübingen, 1986, 331-347.

Sahl, H., 'Zur Übersetzung von Theaterstücken', in R. Italiaander, *Übersetzen*, Hamburg, 1965, 104-105.

Sander, E., 'Vom Übersetzen ins Deutsche', in *Sprachkunst und Übersetzung. Gedenkschrift Hans Sander*, hrsg. von H.-A. Koch, Bern/Frankfurt a.M./New York, 1983, 45-71.

Sdun, W., *Probleme und Theorien des Übersetzens in Deutschland vom 18. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, München, 1967.

Senger, A., *Deutsche Übersetzungstheorie im 18. Jahrhundert (1734-1746)*, Bonn, 1971.

Snell-Hornby, M., 'Dimension and Perspective in Literary Translation', in W.Wilss/G. Thome (Hrsg.), *Die Theorie des Übersetzens und ihr Aufschlußwert für die Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschdidaktik* (*Translation Theory and its Implementation in the Teaching of Translation and Interpreting*). Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums der Association de Linguistique Appliquée (AILA), Saarbrücken, 25.-30- Juli 1983, Tübingen, 1984. Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 247, 105-113.

Steiner, G., 'On an Exact Art (Again)', in *Lingua e Litteratura* 2 (1984), 13-25.

Störig, H.J. (Hrsg.), *Das Problem des Übersetzens*, Darmstadt, 1973. Wege der Forschung 33.

Tobin, Y., *Semiotics and Linguistics. The Saussurian Sign Revolution That Might Have Been*, London/New York, 1990.

Toury, G., 'A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies', in T. Hermans (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*, London/Sydney, 1985, 16-41.

Toury, G., 'The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation', in J.S. Holmes/J.Lambert/R. v.d. Broeck (eds.), *Literature and Translation. New Perspectives in Literary Studies*, Leuven, 1978, 83-100.

Toury, G., 'Translation, literary translation and pseudotranslation', in *Comparative Criticism*, Vol. 6, ed. E.J. Shaffer, Cambridge, 1984, 73-84.

Turk, H., 'Konventionen und Traditionen. Zum Bedingungsrahmen der Übersetzung für das Theater oder für die Literatur', in *Literatur und Theater*, Bd. 4, Tübingen, 1990, 73-77.

Ubersfeld, A., *Lire le théâtre*, Paris, 1978.

Vensky, G., 'Das Bild eines geschickten Uebersetzers', in *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit* 9 (1734), 19-114.

Vermeer, H.J., Review of: L. Wollin/H. Lindquist (eds.), *Translation Studies in Scandinavia*, Lund, 1986, in *TEXTconTEXT* 2 (1987),

Wilhelm, J., 'Zum Problem der literarischen Übersetzung', in *Interlinguistica. Sprachvergleich und Übersetzung. Festschrift für M. Wandruszka*, Tübingen, 1971, 617-627.

Wilss, W., *Kognition und Übersetzen. Theorie und Praxis der menschlichen und der maschinellen Übersetzung*, Tübingen, 1988. Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft 41.

Wilss, W., *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Probleme und Methoden*, Stuttgart, 1977.

Wonderley, W.L., 'Crib, Transposition and Dynamic Equivalence', in *The Bible Translator* 19 (1968), 6-13.

Wotjak, G., 'Zu einigen Fragen der Äquivalenz bei der Übersetzung', in *Fremdsprachen* (1969), 257-263.

Wuthenow, R.-R., *Das fremde Kunstwerk. Aspekte der literarischen Übersetzung*, Göttingen, 1969. Palaestra 252.

Other secondary sources:

Adelung, J.C., *Deutsche Sprachlehre zum Gebrauch der Schulen in den preußischen Ländern*, Berlin, 1781.

Adelung, J.C., 'Sind es die Schriftsteller, welche die Sprache bilden und ausbilden?', in *Magazin für die Deutsche Sprache* I (1782), 45-57.

Adelung, J.C., *Ueber den Deutschen Styl*, Berlin, 1785-1786. Three volumes, revised in two volumes Berlin, 1787.

Adelung, J.C., *Umständliches Lehrgebäude der Deutschen Sprache, zur Erläuterung der Deutschen Sprachlehre für Schulen*, Leipzig, 1782. Two volumes.

Adelung, J.C., *Versuch eines vollständigen Grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuches der Hochdeutschen Mundart*, Leipzig, 1774-1786. Five volumes. Revised in four volumes Leipzig, 1793-1801.

Auerbach, L. *Kleines Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache nach Joh. Chr. Adelung's größerem Wörterbuche*, Sulzbach, 1828.

Bachmair, A., 'Es wird gelitten und gestrittten', in *Hessische Niedersächsische Allgemeine*, Nr. 233, 6. Oktober 1992.

Bäte, L., *Kranz um Jean Paul*, Heidelberg, 1925. Schriftenreihe der Akademischen Mitteilungen Heidelberg, hrsg. von F. Lautenschläger und H. Mitgau. 3. Heft.

Barzun, J. *Classic, Romantic and Modern*, Chicago/London, 1975.

Blackall, E.A.,*The Emergence of German as a Literary Language 1700-1775*, Cambridge, ^{2}1966.

Borcherdt, H.H., 'Geschichte des deutschen Theaters', in W. Stammler (Hrsg.), *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß*, Berlin ^{2}1962, Bd. 3, 1099-1244.

Both, L.W., 'Bühnenrepertoire Frankreichs, Englands und Italiens in Verdeutschungen. Berlin: Cosmar und Krause 1830', in *Der Komet. Literaturblatt* 33 (20.8.1830),Sp. 264.

Brauneck, M., *Theater im 20. Jahrundert*, Reinbek, 1982.

Breitinger, J.J., *Critische Dichtkunst*, Zürich, 1740. 2 Bände. Faksimiledruck nach der Ausgabe von 1740 mit einem Nachwort von Wolfgang Bender. Deutsche Neudrucke. Reihe Texte des 18. Jahrhunderts.

Clark, N., 'Polyeuct', Letters to the Editor in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 26 July 1991, 13.

Bürger, G.A., *Sämmtliche Werke*. Hrsg. von W.v.Wurzbach, Leipzig,n.d.

Carolsfeld, Freiherr Schnorr von., (Hrsg.), *Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1885, Bd. 7.

Clarke, K.H., 'Lenz' Übersetzungen aus dem Englischen', in

Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte X (1896), 147-154.

Dahinten, E., *Studien zum Sprachstil der Iliasübertragungen Bürgers, Stolbergs und Vossens unter Berücksichtigung der Übersetzungstheorien des 18. Jahrunderts*, Diss. Göttingen, 1956.

Dryden, J., *Of Dramatic Poesy and other Critical Essays*, ed. G. Watson, London, 1962, Vol. I.

Eichholz, A., 'Wie Julia sich unter den Nagel reißt', in *Die Welt*, 26. August 1992.

Eschenburg, J.J., *William Shakespeare Schauspiele*, neue ganz überarbeitete Ausgabe, Zürich, 1802.

Fambach, O., *Der Romantische Rückfall 1806-1815*, Berlin, 1963. *Ein Jahrhundert deutscher Literaturkritik (1750-1850)*, Bd. V.

Fehling, M. (Hrsg.), *Briefe an Cotta. Das Zeitalter Goethes und Napoleons. 1794-1815*, Stuttgart, 1925.

Fried, E., *Shakespeare-Übersetzungen: Romeo und Julia, Julius Caesar, Hamlet*, München, 1968.

Funck, H. (Hrsg.), 'Gespräche mit Chr. M. Wieland in Zürich, Mitgetheilt von Heinrich Funck', in *Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte*, Bd. 13, Leipzig, 1885, 485-497.

Gaehde, C., *Shakespeares Werke nach der Übersetzung von Schlegel - Tieck - Baudissin*, Leipzig, n.d., Bd. IX and X.

Geilfus, G.(Hrsg.), *Briefe von Wolfgang Dietrich Sulzer, weiland Stadtschreiber von Winterthur*, Winterthur, 1866.

Goethe, J.W. von, *Werke*. Hrsg. im Auftrag der Großherzogin Sophie von Sachsen. Fotomech. Nachdruck der Ausgabe Weimar, Böhlau 1887-1919. München, 1987.

Goethe, J.W. von, *Werke*. Hamburger-Ausgabe. Hrsg. von E. Trunz, München, [7]1973.

Gosche, R. und B. **Tschischwitz** (Hrsg.), *Shakespeare's dramatische Werke übersetzt von August Wilhelm von Schlegel und Ludwig Tieck*, Berlin, 1874. 6 Bände.

Gottsched, J.C., 'Anmerkungen über das 592. Stück des Zuschauers', in *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit*, 8. Bd., 29. Stück, Leipzig, 1742.

Gottsched, J.C., *Die Deutsche Schaubühne nach den Regeln der alten Griechen und Römer eingerichtet, und mit einer Vorrede herausgegeben*, Leipzig, 1741-1745, 6 volumes.

Gottsched, J.C., *Handlexicon oder kurzgefaßtes Wörterbuch der schönen Wissenschaften*, Leipzig, 1760.

Greiner, N., 'Darauf ein Bier an der Ecke. Peter Handke hat "Das Wintermärchen" übersetzt', in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 10. Juni 1991.

Hamann, J.G., *Sämtliche Werke*. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe, hrsg. von J. Nadler. I-VI, Wien, 1949-57.

Hamann, J.G., *Schriften zur Sprache*, hrsg. von J. Simon, Frankfurt/M., 1967.

Handke, P., *Das Wintermärchen*, Frankfurt/M., 1991.

Haym, R., *Die romantische Schule*, Darmstadt, 1961.

Heinsius, T., *Theoretisch-praktisches Lehrbuch des gesammten Deutschen Sprachunterrichts*, Berlin, ^{3}1817.

Henrichs, B., 'König Bier, König Leer: Shakespearefälschung, frech und bieder', in *Die Zeit*, 23. Oktober 1992.

Herder, J.G., *Sämmtliche Werke*, hrsg. von B. Suphan. Bd. 1, Berlin, 1877, Bd. 5, Berlin, 1891.

Höbel, W., 'Shakespeare inszenieren ist Knochenarbeit', in *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 16. Oktober 1992.

Hölderlin, F., *Sämtliche Werke*, Bd. 6, hrsg. von A. Beck, Stuttgart, 1954.

Hoffmeister, K., (Hrsg.), *Nachlese zu Schiller's Werken nebst Variantensammlung*, Stuttgart, 1858.

Humboldt, W. von., *Gesammelte Schriften* (Akademieausgabe), 8.Bd., Berlin, 1909.

Jorgensen, S.-A., *Hamann, Bacon and Tradition*. Orbis Litterarum. Tom. 16, Copenhagen, 1961.

Kieler Nachrichten, 27. Oktober 1988 and 20. September 1991, 'Wie spricht Shakespeare deutsch?'.

Klopstock, F.G., *Sämmtliche Werke*, hrsg. von H.L. Back/A.R.C. Spindler, Leipzig, 1823-1839.

Körner, J., (Hrsg.), *Briefe von und an A.W. Schlegel, gesammelt und erläutert durch J. Körner*, Zürich/Leipzig/Wien, 1930.

Korn, E., Cap-the-couplet', in *TLS*, 21 June 1991, 15.

Leibniz, G.W.F. v., *'Unvorgreifliche Gedancken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der Deutschen Sprache'*, in *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit*, Bd. 1, Leipzig, 1732, pp. 356-384.

Lenz, J.M.R., *Werke und Schriften*, hrsg. von B. Titel und H. Haug, Stuttgart, 1966.

Lessing, G.E., *Briefe die neueste Literatur betreffend*, hrsg. von W. Bender, Stuttgart, ^{2}1979.

Lessing, G.E., *Gesammelte Werke*, hrsg. von P. Rilla, Bd. 3, Berlin/Weimar, 1968.

Lessing, G.E., *Sämtliche Schriften*, hrsg. von K. Lachmann. Dritte aufs neue durchgesehene und vermehrte Auflage, besorgt durch F. Muncker, Bd. 17, Stuttgart, 1904.

Lessing, G.E., *Werke*. Hrsg. von J. Petersen und W. von Olshausen,

Bd. 12, Berlin, 1927.

Lessing, G.E., *Werke*, hrsg. von F. Bornmüller, Bd. 4 and 5, Leipzig/Wien, n.d..

Martersteig, M., *Das deutsche Theater im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, Leipzig, [2]1924.

Meinhard, J.N., *Versuche über den Charakter und die Werke der besten italienischen Dichter*, Braunschweig, 1763, 1764. 2 Bände.

Minor, J. (Hrsg.), *A.W. Schlegel's Vorlesungen über schöne Litteratur und Kunst*, Stuttgart, 1884.

Neuer *Teutscher Merkur*, 'Erinnerung an Herrn Hofraths Voß Uebersetzung der Odyssee' 1805(3) 'Vossische Meisterwerke', 1807(2).

Niemeyer, J.C.L., 'Schiller im häuslichen Leben und Sterben', in *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*, 26 (1826), Nr. 21 and 22.

Paulin, R., *Ludwig Tieck. A Literary Biography*, Oxford, 1985.

Robertson, J.G., *Lessing's Dramatic Theory*, Cambridge, 1939.

Schiller, F., *Schillers Sämtliche Werke. Säkular-Ausgabe*, hrsg. von E. v.d. Hellen, Stuttgart/Berlin, 1904-05. Bd. IX, XI, XII and XVI.

Schlegel, A.W./F. **Schlegel**, *Charakteristiken und Kritiken*, Königsberg, 1801, Bd. 2.

Schlegel, A.W., *Kritische Schriften und Briefe*, hrsg. von E. Lohner, Stuttgart, 1962- 1965. 4 Bde.

Schlegel, A.W., *Sämtliche Werke*, hrsg. von J. Minor, Stuttgart, 1884, Bd. II.

Schlegel, J.E., *Werke*, hrsg. von J.H. Schlegel, Kopenhagen/Leipzig, 1761-70.

Schleiermacher, F., 'Über den Begriff der Hermeneutik mit Bezug auf F.A. Wolfs Andeutungen und Asts Lehrbuch', in H.-G. Gadamer/G. Boehm (Hrsg.), *Philosophische Hermeneutik*, pp. 129-172.

Schneider, K.L., *Klopstock und die Erneuerung der deutschen Dichtersprache im 18. Jahrhundert*, Heidelberg, 1965.

Schostack, R., Shakespeare sklavisch ergeben', in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 5. Januar 1988.

Seiffert, B., *Prolegomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe*, Berlin, 1905, Bd. III.

Sherman, C., *Diderot and the Art of Dialogue*, Geneva, 1976.

Sickel, K.-H., *Johann Cristoph Adelung. Seine Persönlichkeit und seine Geschichtsauffassung*, Leipzig, 1933.

Solger, K.W.F., *Des Sophokles Tragödien, übersetzt*, Berlin, 1808.

Solger, W.F., *Nachgelassene Schriften und Briefwechsel*, hrsg. von L. Tieck und F. v. Raumer. Faksimiledruck nach der Ausgabe von 1826, Heidelberg, 1973.

Steiger, E., *Stilwandel*, Zürich/Freiburg, 1963.

Tieck, L., *Kritische Schriften*. Zum erstenmale gesammelt und mit

einer Vorrede herausgegeben von Ludwig Tieck, Leipzig, 1848-1852. 3 Bände. Photomechanischer Nachdruck, Berlin/New York, 1974.

Torczyner, H. (Hrsg.), *Die Heilige Schrift*. Neu ins Deutsche übertragen. Frankfurt/M., 1937.

Vail, C.C.D., *Lessing's Relation to the English Language and Literature*, New York, ^{2}1968.

Vincke, G. Freiherr von, 'Schillers Bühnenbearbeitung des Othello', in *JbDSG* 15 (Weimar, 1880), 222-229.

Vollmann, R., 'Shakespeare durchs Milchglas betrachtet', in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 5. Dezember 1989.

Walzel, F., *Friedrich Schlegels Briefe an seinen Bruder August Wilhelm*, Berlin, 1890.

Wieland, C.M., *Gesammelte Schriften* (Akademie-Ausgabe), Berlin, 1909-1911.

Wieland, C.M., *Shakespear. Theatralische Werke*, neu herausgegeben nach der ersten Zürcher Ausgabe von 1762-1766 von H. und J. Radspieler, Nördlingen, 1986.

Wieland, L. (Hrsg.), *Auswahl denkwürdiger Briefe von C.M. Wieland*, Wien, 1815.

Winckler, J.H., '*Gedanken Von der Schönheit der Sprachen überhaupt*, in J.H.W., *Der Deutschen Gesellschaft in Leipzig Eigene Schriften und Uebersetzungen in gebundener und ungebundener Schreibart*, Leipzig, ^{2}1735.

Wittmann, R., *Ein Verlag und seine Geschichte*, Stuttgart, 1982.

Wolff, C. von, *Gesammelte Werke*, hrsg. von H.W. Arndt, Hildesheim, 1965, 1. Abt. Deutsche Schriften Bd. 1.