

TRANSLATION AS THE UNFOLDING OF AN INTERTEXTUAL EVOCATIVE RELATION: FUNCTIONS OF ‘INTERPOLATED’ SEQUENCES IN ION BARBU *RICHARD III*¹

Emma TĂMĂIANU-MORITA
Akita University, Japan

Abstract: Carried out in the framework of Eugenio Coseriu’s hermeneutic text linguistics, this analysis focuses on an exotic form of translation, defined and experimented by the Romanian poet Ion Barbu on Shakespeare’s *Richard III*. Programmatically aimed at rendering the “dynamic schemata” of the original, Ion Barbu’s undertaking does not treat the source text as a self-consistent whole, but breaks it apart and then reconstructs it in alien material, in an endeavour to recapture the semantic process that led to the construction of the original. To this end, Barbu consistently applies a strategy of ‘interpolation’: while the total length of each dramatic (sub)unit is faithfully maintained, sequences with no overt correspondent disrupt all surface parallelism with the original. We aim to demonstrate that the main function of this strategy is to unfold and develop an intertextual evocation of the source text, thus positing the translation as a *reconstruction* of ‘missing parts’ in the original. This process also reinforces and justifies a typological transformation of Shakespeare’s text, along the lines of Barbu’s own hermetic poetry.

¹ This research was supported in part by a grant of Akita University within the «Researchers Overseas Transfer Program 2012», for the project “Sense-constitutive sign functions and their relevance for a typology of poetic texts – a contrastive approach”, carried out in March-September 2013 at the University of Almería, Spain.

Keywords: *Ion Barbu*, “*Richard III*”, *Eugenio Coseriu*, «*integral*» *text linguistics*, *evocation*, *intertextuality*

1. Introduction: the text

1.1. Towards the end of his life, Ion Barbu² began to work on what might be considered a “supreme” and highly exotic form of translation. I use the term “supreme” by analogy with Barbu’s own formulation “supreme mathematics”, which he held to be the proper denomination of those branches in 20th century mathematics which go beyond “higher mathematics”³, such as topology and non-Euclidian geometry – a field in which he himself brought noteworthy original contributions⁴.

This form of translation he defined from a theoretical perspective through a systematic contrast with the ordinary process of translation, in critical analyses of other translators’ work. He himself also experimented it on Shakespeare’s *Richard III*. Ion Barbu’s version covers: Act I – full text; Act II - partially (only scenes 1 to 3) and Act III, scene 1. The poet died, leaving

² Pen name of Dan Barbilian (1895-1961), Romanian mathematician and poet, known especially for his hermetic poetry, characterized by striking linguistic innovations that fully exploit the virtualities of the Romanian language system. For a detailed analysis of these linguistic strategies, see Coseriu 1948.

³ Cf. Barbu 1958/1984: 270.

⁴ For a historical presentation and an evaluation, see Boskoff and Suceavă 2006 and 2007.

unfinished a work which, in his own evaluation, “comprises the only verse of genius I have ever produced, the strife being my own, and the genius - of the great Will”⁵.

In many ways, the translation of *Richard III* can be considered an acme or a focal point in Ion Barbu’s poetic corpus as a whole, as it bears remarkable connections, through evocative relations, to his hermetic poetry and – to a smaller extent – to his Balkanic cycles.

1.2. Ion Barbu’s crucial criticism to ordinary Shakespearean translations⁶ is their “elemental” character. The translator’s endeavor, he says, goes in the direction of “rendering Shakespeare element by element, staying faithful to him in the details”, like “the strife of miniature painters”⁷ (Barbu 1964: 297). This orientation is questionable, Barbu feels, because it places excessive emphasis on “the accident [=accidental

⁵ “închide singurele versuri geniale ce am comis vreodată, osîrdia fiind a mea, iar geniul, al marelui Will” (excerpt from a letter published in the review “Ramuri” (August 15, 1965), quoted by Dinu Pillat in the *Introduction* to Barbu 1984:xxxvii; the translation into English of all Romanian quotations is mine – E.T.-M.).

⁶ The statements are quoted here from the Addenda “[Despre traduceri din Shakespeare]” of the 1964 volume edited by Romulus Vulpesco. Page numbers, given in brackets, refer to this edition.

⁷ “[...] «elementar» numește aici [...] direcția în care se poartă efortul traducătorului, preocupat a reda, element cu element, pe Shakespeare, a-i rămîne credincios în detaliu”; “osîrdii de miniaturişti”.

features] of Shakespeare's work"⁸ (307), failing to grasp its "spirit" or "atmosphere", given that "in a qualitative order, the whole does not always equal the sum of its parts"⁹ (297).

The aim, when translating Shakespeare, should be, instead, to trigger in the reader the same "imaginative rapture"¹⁰ (297) that the original produces, a "rapture" that should be absolute, because, in Barbu's view, the essence of Shakespeare's work is not theatrical. Beyond its organization, on a surface level, according to the parameters of the dramatic genre, it instantiates something closer to pure poetry:

"Taking matters to paradox, we could say that Shakespeare's theatre is not spectacle, for it is not addressed to a contemplative subject. More similar, rather, to some musical experiences, to the vigils of condemned men, it acts directly upon the real man, like the swerved hand of a different time, engulfing him into its catastrophe, lasting with him: *making him older*."¹¹

(Barbu 1964: 306)

⁸ "accidentalul operei shakespeareiene".

⁹ "suflul textului shakespeareian"; "în ordinea calitativă, întregul nu egalează totdeauna suma părților".

¹⁰ "răpire imaginativă".

¹¹ "Am putea spune, împingînd lucrurile la paradox, că teatrul lui Shakespeare nu e spectacol, întrucît nu se adresează subiectului

Consequently, the act of translation must be in itself an act of absolute creation along the force lines of the original, “a labour of art” which transcends “casual motivations” and “occurs in the loneliness of great achievements”¹² (296). To be sure, this «supreme» form of translation, beyond the reach of ordinary translators, will remain the privilege of uniquely gifted artists:

“To translate [Shakespeare’s work] in a valid way does not mean to translate [it] in a «stage-worthy» fashion, or «fluently», or «poetically» or «faithfully» – or all of these at the same time. It means [...] – by prolonged familiarity with the text, by its complete assimilation, cultivating a lucid enthusiasm, and for a brief moment carried away by the Shakespearean soul – *to try to translate with genius.*”¹³ (Barbu 1964: 307)

contemplator. Apropiat mai degrabă de unele experiențe muzicale, de vechile condamnăților, el acționează direct asupra omului real, ca un braț abătut al unei alte durate, încorporându-l catastrofei ei, durînd împreună: îmbătrînindu-l.”

¹² “un lucru al artei”; “îndemnul întîmplător”; “se petrece în singurătatea marilor înfăptuiri”.

¹³ “A-l traduce valabil nu înseamnă a-l traduce «scenic» sau «cursiv» sau «poetic» sau «fidel» - sau toate la un loc. Înseamnă [...] - printr-o prelungită familiaritate cu textul, prin asimilarea lui completă, cultivînd un entuziasm lucid, și cîștigat un scurt moment de suflul shakespeareian - *să încerci să traduci cu geniu.*”

Interpreted from the point of view of the technique of translation, this *profession de foi* implies that the translator first “assimilates completely” the (English) source-text, and then assumes the hypostasis of an absolute creator¹⁴ with the expressive means of the target language (Romanian), in order to re-constitute, from the assimilated textual nuclei and their semantic articulations, ‘the same’ Shakespearean text, striving asymptotically towards the ideal goal of *the text that Shakespeare would have necessarily written, had he written in Romanian around the middle of the twentieth century*.

1.3. True translation should therefore faithfully observe the “succession of force fields” in a play, “the impulse, the circuit of discourse”, “the mutual relations” and “inner tensions” between a play’s “materials” (306), the “dynamic schemata” of speeches¹⁵ (307). These general semantic requirements are specified through several parameters which regard all the structural layers of the text, from the phonetic to the semantic, including the cultural connotations of linguistic units. A detailed discussion of the rules that define this exponential form of translation was undertaken in

¹⁴ For the definition of the subject of an act of poetic creation as an “absolute subject”, see Coseriu 1971/1977.

¹⁵ “succesiuni de câmpuri de forțe”; “zvićnirea, circuitul discursului”; “reciprocitățile”, “tensiunile interioare” dintre “materialele pieselor”; “schema dinamică a tiradelor”.

Tămâianu 1994¹⁶ and 2001 (esp. pp. 150-154). Within the limits of the present paper, I shall focus on Barbu's first parameter, *dimensional identity* between original and translation, with its associated strategy of *interpolation*. In order to highlight the functions of interpolation, one fragment in particular will be taken into account: the sequence of Clarence's dream (I:iv, 1-83). For easier reference, the text is given in the *Appendix* in three versions: the original, Ion Barbu's translation and, for purposes of comparison, Dan Duțescu's excellent 'orthodox' translation¹⁷.

2. Dimensional identity and interpolation

2.1. The first obligatory parameter of translation, in Barbu's view, is the "strict observance of the dimensions of the original"¹⁸, as a direct and necessary consequence of the principle of conveying "the impulse, the circuit of discourse" (Barbu 1964: 306).

This requirement is first implicitly suggested in a critical comment to another translation ("First, the dimensions. For 10

¹⁶ In this paper I proposed the denomination "homologic translation", drawing upon the term's acceptance in biology, due to its close correspondence with the process Barbu has in mind: "having *the same evolutionary origin*, but different functions", opposite to "analogous" (Cf. *CDE*, s.v. *homology*; emphasis mine – E.T.-M.).

¹⁷ Illustrations from Clarence's dream are referred to only by line number (in brackets). Examples taken from elsewhere in the play have full references (Act: scene, line number).

¹⁸ "respectarea strictă a dimensiunilor originalului".

Shakespearean verses we have [Y's] 15.”¹⁹), and then insistently explicated in the strong formulation quoted above, with the further motivation:

“Those who do otherwise take greater liberties than they imagine vis-à-vis Shakespeare’s text. Not only does their translation lack conformity, being inappropriate to form, which wouldn’t even be so serious a problem, but it also goes against the text’s essence, which it distorts by adding emotional states (assuming, of course, that they have rendered the original ones in the first place), induced by their excedentary cadencies, in excess of those intended by Shakespeare.”²⁰ (Barbu 1964: 306-307)

One cannot help noting an apparent contradiction with Barbu’s first and foremost principle of translation, that of conveying the “dynamic schemata” of the text rather than the surface manifestation of those schemata, i.e. rather than “the accident of Shakespeare’s work”. If this parameter of dimensional identity were to be understood as a static correspondence between units,

¹⁹ “Mai întâi dimensiunile. Pentru 10 versuri shakespeareiene avem 15 ale [lui Y]” (Barbu 1964: 302).

²⁰ “Cei care fac altfel își iau mai mari libertăți cu textul shakespeareian decât își închipuie. Traducerea lor nu e numai neconformă, nepotrivită formei, ceea ce n-ar fi prea grav, dar merge împotriva fondului pe care-l denaturează adăugînd (admițînd că au redat pe cele din original) stări emoționale, induse de cadențele lor excedentare, peste cele voite de Shakespeare.”

in form and content, then the criticism of “elemental” would apply to it too. An examination of the way in which this requirement is dealt with in Barbu’s own translation will serve as a good starting point in the present discussion about the issue of interpolations.

2.2. From the standpoint of the material organization of textual expression, the fragment taken into account here, Clarence’s dream, is made up of subunits represented by Clarence’s speeches, segmented by Brakenbury’s interventions²¹. These are ranged into two thematic sequences, the frontier between which is established by the death-within-the-dream, marked by the threshold moment of the failed awakening (lines 42-43).

Dan Duțescu’s version, taken here as a term of comparison, presents a flawless parallelism with the original, in both form (dimensions) and content, at all compositional levels, from scene and subscene down to the syntactic subunits inside each verse.

How does Ion Barbu’s version present itself from this point of view?

Faithful to the principle described above (2.1.), Barbu’s translation too tends towards dimensional identity with the

²¹ For a possible explanation of the alternation Brakenbury / Keeper in this scene, see *R III*, pp. 14-15 (*Introduction*).

original, displaying a correspondent number of lines in each dramatic (sub)unit (i.e. a character's speech, a (sub)scene, an act) *taken as a whole*. However, the lines and line-fragments are dissimilar not only in length but also in content, well beyond what may reasonably be considered inevitable in the process of passing from the structuring of the original language to the structuring of the target language. It is this phenomenon that we can describe as **interpolation** of text-constitutive units: lexical units, syntagms or full lines. As all surface parallelism with the original – in a comparison “element by element” – is disrupted, these interpolations call for special attention.

In Barbu's version, the first dissimilarity as regards the number of lines occurs in Clarence's second speech (lines 9-33 in the original): the translated text has one line less, although it contains a full interpolated line (15: “Ghirlande grele, corbi ce se întorc”²²). Equality is re-established in Clarence's next speech, by inclusion of another interpolated line (38: “La marea-a doua, dincolo de ape”²³).

²² ‘Heavy garlands, returning ravens’. For the benefit of readers who do not know Romanian, English glosses will be provided to all quotes from Barbu, observing as closely as possible the innovative use of lexemes and the morpho-syntactic ambiguities that constitute the trademark of his hermetic style.

²³ ‘To the second sea, beyond the waters’.

The second part of the dream stands out, in Barbu's translation, with two extra lines (64-65). Although these final lines of the section are not, strictly speaking, interpolated, their content effects an important typological shift from the original, which will later be discussed in detail (*infra*, 5.2.). Where does the inequality stem from? First, the subcomponents of lines 50-51 are reorganized in three lines (50-52) in the translation. Second, the subcomponents of lines 55 and 57 are reorganized as lines 56, 58, 59, through a process of the type of «permutation»: the sentences of the original are not kept as a whole, as units of discourse, but are instead decomposed into lexemes (sometimes in turn de-composed into semes) and/or phrases, which are then treated as a finite set of elements that can give rise to ever-new patterns through permutation, being re-inserted at different points in the text²⁴. To be exact, in the latter case, the technique of permutation motivates an instance of interpolation: the line “Seize on him, Furies! Take him unto torment!” (57) becomes “Îl închide / Horă de clocot, drepte Eumenide!”²⁵ (58-59), where “închide” and “horă” echo the semes of /enclosure/ and /movement of closing in/ from the lexical unit “environ'd

²⁴ For a detailed account of this technique, with numerous examples, see Tămăianu 1994: 284-285.

²⁵ “Enclose him/ Seething circle, right[ful] Eumenides”. “Horă” is a traditional dance of ritual origin, where the participants hold hands, forming a moving circle.

me” which appears in a subsequent sentence of the original (line 59).

2.3. It thus becomes evident that, for Barbu, “observing the dimensions of the original” does not signify establishing a static relation of commensurability between original and translation *as finished products*. Rather, it means unfolding the process of translation after having “completely assimilated” the original, moved by a “lucid enthusiasm”, by virtue of a dynamics of *dimensional calibration*, aiming at *equilibrium* with the original rather than simple material equality. The mechanism through which this is carried out is **interpolation**: the systematic insertion of fracture points in the translated version – points where all surface parallelism with the original is suspended. The reader is thus prompted to look for a justification hidden behind appearances, so that, in fact, these very points will reveal most clearly the devices specific of the translation of the text’s “dynamic schemata”.

3. Functions of interpolation: perspectives of analysis

3.1. When dealing with the relationship between a text and its translated version(s), one framework that offers useful suggestions is G. Genette’s model of transtextual relations, in particular the fine differentiation of hypertextual practices, among which translation is viewed as one of the most

important forms of “transposition” (“serious transformation”)²⁶. This model allows for a unitary description of the cluster of diverse operations by which a hypertext is connected to its hypotext, being therefore particularly relevant when we confront a translation that also involves other major transformations, as is the case with *R III/I.B.*

Interpolation may result in the quantitative transformation of “augmentation” – i.e. in a version whose component parts are arranged in a “more or less symmetrical order” with the original, but at a different scale (pp. 228-229). Strictly speaking, however, this is not the case here, because Barbu assumes the full text of the original play and insists on “identity” of dimensions. Nevertheless, one form of augmentation might be relevant in some instances: “extension”, which is an augmentation by “addition” (p. 254). The operation that most closely captures the formal characteristics of Barbu’s strategy of interpolation is “addition + suppression = substitution” (p. 269), which accounts, in purely material terms, for the almost-equal length of the translation, but with (sometimes markedly) different content.

To this we can associate an observation Genette makes regarding “supplements”: even some hypertexts which present

²⁶ Cf. Genette 1982/1997: 212-214.

themselves as “simple interpolations”, and thus as *complementary* to their hypotext from the standpoint of form, can in fact be “*substitutive* by their content, because by means of this interpolation they bring about a *transmutation of meaning and value in their hypotexts*” (p. 205; emphasis mine – E.T.-M). As will be shown in section 5., this is indeed the case with Barbu’s translation, where the interpolations effect a transmutation of meaning by a radical typological reinterpretation of the original.

3.2. The analysis can be carried one step further by exploring the justification for interpolation as a “substitutive” practice in Barbu’s text. Rather than mere substitution, it appears that Barbu attempts a *restitutio*: the recovery and poetic development of ‘absent’ parts of the original. This strategy can be interpreted by applying Eugenio Coseriu’s (1987a) account of the functioning of “expression gaps” (*Ausdruckslücke*): textual fragments perceived as missing from the text’s constitution, but necessary by virtue of their function in the overall semantic articulation of the text, and retrievable on the basis of expression clues actually present in the text. Like the reader, the translator also needs to recover the missing parts, as a rationally preliminary step to interpretation / translation, but the recovery can only be performed through an intuition of the global

sense of the text, with its internal organization. Technically, the reconstitution of missing parts (“das Nicht-Gesagte”, ‘the not-said’) is attempted by establishing meaningful connections (correlation, opposition etc.) with sense-units that do have a material expression in the text (Coseriu 1987a: 376, 381).

3.3. Such semiotic connections can best be understood as part of what Coseriu defines as “evocative functions (relations)” of the sign actualized in discourse²⁷ – essential strategies for the constitution of textual sense²⁸, which engender a type of semantic plurivalence not to be seen simply as “vagueness”, but rather as “enrichment” of language (Coseriu 1981: 102). Out of the numerous types of evocative relations systematized by Coseriu, two will be of special relevance for the present analysis: (a) relations of the sign in the text with other signs (relations with individual signs from the same text, with groups of signs and with entire sign systems) and (b) relations of the sign in the given text with signs from other texts (repeated discourse, evocation of well-known texts, recognizable in the linguistic and cultural tradition of a community).

²⁷ For a classification, definitions and illustrations, see Coseriu 1971/1977: 202, 1981: 68-101, 1987b: 25-29.

²⁸ A tentative list of «text-constitutive units and procedures» and their relation with «sense units» in the framework of integral text linguistics is proposed in Tămăianu(-Morita) 2001: 124-133, 2002: 126-150, 2007, 2012, 2013.

3.4. Finally, Mircea Borcilă's typology of poetic texts will be used for comparing the original and the translation from a typological point of view. This model proposes, as a primary criterion for the categorization of poetic texts, the "general intention" or "orientation" (finality) of the process of discursive *poesis*. By applying two more "primary criteria" (the "existential-axiological principle" that governs the process of *poesis* and the "model of referential construction" in the text), Borcilă (1981, 1987, 1996, 1997a, 1997b) defines two major orientations, reinterpreting Lucian Blaga's distinction between "plasticizing (depicting)" vs. "revelatory" metaphors:

- (a) the "plasticizing" (depicting) finality: to enhance and 'revolutionize' perception and re-construct the world in its salient details, be they heterogeneous and seemingly incompatible, according to an iconic-diagrammatic principle; the world thus created is ontologically mono-layered, since in it the essence is identical to the (perceived) manifestation;
- (b) "revelatory" finality: to reveal an essence unseen behind appearances and indeed obscured by perceivable manifestations; the world thus created will be independent from the structure and laws of the empirical world, and phenomena will only serve to signal or symbolize the existence of a mysterious ontological plane of essences.

Each finality is subdivided, by the application of secondary criteria, into two further subtypes, thus resulting in a total of four situations, illustrated through the work of several 20th century Romanian poets: A1 – plasticizing syntactic, with textual coherence preserved (ex. Tudor Arghezi); A2 – plasticizing asemantic-asyntactic, with textual coherence collapsed (ex. avant-garde poetry); B1 – revelatory semantic (symbolic-mythic) (ex. Lucian Blaga); B2 – revelatory semantic-syntactic (symbolic-mathematic) (ex. Ion Barbu).

Thus, Ion Barbu's work is a prototypical example of subtype B2, defined through *revelatory* orientation of the process of discursive *poesis*, according to a *semantic-syntactic* existential-axiological principle, and a *symbolic-mathematic* model of referential construction²⁹. Characteristic of this sub-type is the fact that idiomatic units are first “de-semanticized”, i.e. detached from their ordinary referential content and their cultural evocations, and then treated like abstract “terms” on which axiomatic rules operate, in a direction of symbolic-mathematical re-semanticization. Barbu's translation can be ranged within the same subtype as his original work.

On the other hand, the corresponding segments of Shakespeare's play illustrate subtype A1, defined by “plasticizing” orientation, “syntactic” axiological principle, and

²⁹ Cf. Borcilă 1981: 29-30 and 1987: 188, 190-191, 193.

“diagrammatic” model of referential construction, with semantic coherence maintained.

4. Interpolation for «greater accuracy»: intra-textual evocation

4.1. One immediately apparent function of interpolation can be explained by analogy with the representation of geographical territories in a “homolographic projection”, which is “a map projection of the world in which the oceans are distorted to allow for greater accuracy in representing the continents”³⁰. On a macro-textual level, Ion Barbu’s translation represents a “homolographic projection” of the original, in which some areas are distorted in order to picture others more accurately. In concrete terms, certain constitutive semantic vectors or dimensions of the textual world from the original are ‘unfolded’ in accentuated form. In this sense, the “atmosphere of the Shakespearean text” is conveyed not through symmetry “element by element”, but through a magnified display of the inner “tensions” that generate it.

4.2. Let me begin by analyzing the justification for numerous interpolated lexical units that exacerbate the evocation of darkness in Barbu’s translation.

³⁰ Cf. *CDE*, s.v. *homolographic*.

The nocturnal nature of Clarence's oneiric experience, expressed in 5 occurrences of the nouns "night" (2, 5, 47, 77, 77), and, correspondingly, "noapte" (2, 5, 47, 79, 79), placed in contrast with "(happy) days" (6), and respectively "zile (limpezi)" (6), unfolds gradually on three levels of sense:

(1) Night is a catalytic environment for the experience of the dream-death (2, 5).

(2) The experience itself is an incursion into "the kingdom of perpetual night" (47).

(3) The equation «dream – death» throws the subject into a disturbing world, where the natural order of time is overthrown: "makes the night morning, and the noontide night"(77).

In Barbu's translation, the configuration of this three-step progression is faithfully rendered, but its *amplitude* is significantly magnified through interpolated units, in particular a whole series of lexemes which either denote directly or suggest the colors "negru" ('black') vs. "alb"('white').

(1') The point of departure remains symmetrical (2, 5), but the semantic synergy /*aquatic*/ > < /*temporal*/, present in the original only later, in Brakenbury conclusive reflections, through the lexical unit "noontide" (77), is already textualized in Clarence's introductory speech: "mările de zile limpezi" (6, 'seas of clear days')³¹.

³¹ Cf. "a world of happy days" in the original.

(2') The passage towards "pămînturile nopții" ('the lands of night'), with their "domnie negru-ntemeiată" (lit. 'black-founded monarchy')³², in the second section of the dream is anticipated in the first section by the interpolated series of the contrast black vs. white. Clarence no longer finds himself on a ship (cf. "[I] was embark'd", 10), but is drifting away ("Pluteam în larg, în cercul mult al undei", lit. 'Afloat was I in the open, in the plenteous circle of the wave') in a chimeric infernal contraption of "funii, căngi, *catran*" (11, 'amongst ropes, harpoons, *tar*') – where the color black is suggested by designative association through the interpolated unit "catran". The frightful memories of the war between Lancaster and York, "a thousand *heavy* times/.../ That had *befall*'n us" (14, 16), are first conveyed by an analogous metaphor of mass, - one dynamic, the other qualitative (14-15, "*bătuți* de gânduri multe/ - Ghirlande *grele*", lit. 'hit by thoughts too many/ - *Heavy* garlands'), and then become messengers who anticipate the passage to the land of eternal darkness, being "*corbi* ce se întorc" (15, 'ravens returning') from "o Anglie de *var*" (13, 'a *whitewashed* England'). Among the nightmarish underwater sights there appear "prore *negre*" (24, 'black prows') (cf. "fearful wrecks") contrasting with "*albitele* relicve" (31, 'whitened relics') (cf.

³² Cf. "dark monarchy" (51).

“dead bones”, 33). In the second part of the dream, the vectorial amplification is effected by the fact that the ghostly apparitions are presented as coagulations of darkness: “din *cenuși* de *seri*/ Crescu înaltă dunga unui înger” (53-54, ‘from *ashes* of *dusk*/ Grew high the sliver of an angel’).

(3’) Finally, the universal dimension of the disequilibrium produced by the death-dream, expressed in the original as a rupture in the rhythms of normal human life (“Sorrow breaks seasons and reposing hours/ Makes the night morning, and the noontide night”, 76-77), is transposed in Barbu’s version onto the level of the world’s constitutive essences (“Adînc, un chin clinește *ceasuri*, *timbruri*:/ *Miez* alb, din *noapți*; și *noapte*, albe *timpuri*”, 78-79, lit. ‘Deep, a torment disjoins *hours*, *timbres*: / White *core*, from *nights*; and [into] night, white *times*’). The phrase “clinește *ceasuri*” fulfills this function by virtue of an intertextual evocative relation with the metaphor of the disjointment of time in *Hamlet*: “The time is out of joint [...] I was born to set it right” (*Ham.*, I:v, 189-190).

What justifies this magnified rendering of the textual “force-field” of darkness? I believe the strategy bears an anaphoric relation with a text-constitutive unit present elsewhere in the same text. The experience to which Clarence is subjected by Richard, at all levels and with all its components

(imprisonment, oneiric drowning, death) is defined globally by Richard himself, in the immediately preceding scene, as a projection into darkness: “Clarence, whom I, indeed, *have cast in darkness*” (I:iii, 327).

4.3. Let us now turn to another example, where the interpolations effect a ‘dialogic’ transformation, so that the translation appears to function as a retort or counterpoint to the original.

Clarence’s keen awareness of the dream’s illusory nature is expressed in the original by a consistent repetitive series of “methought(s)”, which introduces every episode of Clarence’s report of the dream visions, with 7 occurrences (9, 18, 21, 24, 36, 45, 58), echoed by Brakenbury / Keeper (65). In Duțescu’s translation, the series is almost perfectly preserved, through 6 occurrences of “părea”, “parcă” and “se făcea” – all equivalents of approx. ‘it seemed [that]’ (9, 19, 24, 36, 41, 58). On the other hand, this modalization of the experience as illusion or appearance is annulled in Barbu’s version, where the dream-world is presented, instead, as having ontological reality, and the effects of the experience as having changed Clarence’s inner nature beyond recovery.

(a) First, all expressions of modalization in the sense of cognitive distancing from the dream disappear, and the two modalizers of this type, “pesemne” (35, approx. ‘so it seems’)

and “se poate” (66, approx. ‘it may well be so’), perform in fact the role of confirming the reality of the experience. However, “methought” generates an interpolated series of “gînd” (‘thought’), with 3 occurrences as such (14, 22, 85), one of them potentiated by a metaphorical elaboration (15, “Ghirlande grele, corbi ce se întorc”, ‘Heavy garlands, returning ravens’).

(b) Second, as far as lexical expressions of appearance are concerned, “Why *looks* your Grace so heavily today” (1) becomes “Greu ca pămîntul *sînteți* astăzi” (1, ‘Heavy as earth you *are* today’), and “Could not *believe* but that I was in hell / Such terrible *impression* made my dream” (62-63) becomes an emphatic “Încît să știi, *am fost* la cei de jos...” (65, ‘You can *be sure* I was in [= I went to] the realm of the lowly ones...’).

(c) The third and most important element is the underlying generative nucleus of the text. In the case of the original text, it can be formulated in the “plasticizing” equation «the dream is a dream of/about death», where «death» is the content contemplated in the dream: “*sights* of ugly death” (23) (cf. the very precise “hîde *arătări* de moarte” in Duțescu’s version), “dead men’s skulls” (29), “dead bones” (33), “the time of death” (34). In Barbu’s translation, however, «death» becomes a term in the revelatory equation «the dream *is* death» : “*trezit* din moarte” (64, ‘having woken from death’).

4.4. To be sure, this radical transformation is in consonance with Ion Barbu's type of poetry, which presupposes, by virtue of its *revelatory* finality and *semantic-syntactic* axiological principle, an ontologic split of reality into a level of "phenomena" and a level of "essences", the dream thus representing one of the "access gates towards the second ontological level"³³ (of essences) (Borcilă 1981: 23, 1987: 188-191). But can we easily dismiss so systematic and pervasive a textual strategy as nothing but a personal idiosyncrasy on Barbu's part?

It is true that the corresponding segments of the original instantiate the "plasticizing syntactic" type. However, if we examine the overall sense of the dream sequence, which results from its integration into the play as a whole, the following elements immediately become apparent: at the time of the dream, Clarence's impending death is already a certainty, and when it is carried out in the immediately following sequence, death through drowning is reverberated in a cynical key, in the form of a threat to be drowned in wine should the dagger blow fail: "If all this will not do,/ I'll drown you in the malmsey-butt within" (I:iv, 259-260). And in fact, Clarence's ghost emerging in Richard's nightmare before the final battle presents itself as killed by drowning, not by stabbing: "I, that was *wash'd to death* with

³³ "căile de acces spre planul ontologic secund".

fulsome wine,/ Poor Clarence” (V:iii, 132-134), in contrast, for instance, to the case of Prince Edward’s ghost: “Think how thou *stab’st me*” (V:iii, 120).

Thus, in both cases discussed under 4.2. and 4.3., the translation process unfolds an evocation present elsewhere in the original text, but suspended before its full development. True to his theoretical commitment, the poet Ion Barbu assumes the “spirit of the text” and endeavors to create a version more faithful to Shakespeare’s signifying ‘intentions’ than the original text itself.

5. Interpolation and typological transformation: intertextual evocation

5.1. In the present discussion, special attention must be given to those constitutive units from the translation which have no overt correspondent at all in the original text, so that, in an “elemental” perspective, they appear to sacrifice not only the surface symmetry of the text, but also very sense of the original, not unlike a type of excessively “free” translation that Ion Barbu repudiates in this theoretical passages:

“[Y] is the only one of us, until now, who conceives the relation between translator and text more freely. Perhaps too freely. It is true, [Y]’s concern is to give personality to his translation, to express the whole before its parts.

His manner is royal. Over the skeleton of the Shakespearean drama he throws the fluid cloak of his language. Very often, however, this mantle does not adhere, but flutters on the axis like an astral body. The embodiment does not occur. We remain disappointed.”³⁴

(Barbu 1964: 297)

It is also these ‘absolute’ interpolations that most poignantly instantiate Ion Barbu’s poetic type, the revelatory symbolic-mathematical, whereas the corresponding sequences of the original instantiate the plasticizing syntactic type. So once again we have to ask ourselves if this *trans-formation* (typological mutation) is in fact a deviation from the “dynamic schemata” of the original, dictated by the accident of the translator’s personal disposition, or, on the contrary, unfolds textual nuclei interpreted through the lens of “prolonged familiarity” with the source text, “complete assimilation” of its meaning, and the impulse of “the Shakespearean soul”.

5.2. Clarence’s dream is constructed as a human experience of psychological splitting (the conscious ego gives way to an oneiric

³⁴ “[Y] e singurul dintre noi, pînă acum, care concepe mai liber raportul dintre traducător și text. Poate prea liber. E adevărat, [Y] e preocupat de a da personalitate traducerii sale, de a-și înfățișa întregul înaintea părilor. Maniera sa este împăratească. Peste scheletul dramei shakespeareiene aruncă haina fluidă a limbii sale. Dar foarte adesea această mantie nu aderă, ci flutură pe axă ca un corp astral. Întruparea întîrzie. Suntem dezamăgiți.”

coagulation of his deeper psyche), followed by immersion and an initiatic journey of self-recognition, catalyzed by the aquatic element. The confrontation with the ghostly materializations of his own unconscious produces the awakening, the psychic reunification through the self-understanding gained during the dream, and the reaffirmation of the character's superior humanity³⁵.

Thus, throughout the oneiric experience, Clarence remains what he claims to be from the very beginning: "a man" (4). The actions of his oneiric hypostasis are, without exception, those of a human being: "embarked" on a ship (10), he "walks" on (12) or "paces along" (16) the deck, he feels the "pain" of drowning (21), his sensory organs are overwhelmed by perceptions in the underwater world ("What dreadful noise of waters in my *ears*;/ What sights of ugly death within my *eyes*!", 22-23), he agonizes on the verge of death ("often did I strive/ To yield the ghost", 36), is surrounded by diabolic apparitions whose frightening howl resounds in his ears ("a legion of foul fiends/ Environ'd me, and howled in mine *ears*", 59-60); he hopes to appease with prayers a vengeful God, and, if forgiveness for his sins can no longer be granted, then he offers to sacrifice himself

³⁵ For an analysis of this initiatic path with all its components, in *Richard III* and five other Shakespearean plays, see Tămăianu 1992.

in order to ensure that his innocent wife and children are protected (“if my deep prayers cannot appease Thee,/.../ Yet execute Thy wrath in me alone;/ O spare my guiltless wife and my poor children.”, 69, 71-72). The environment in which this whole experience unfolds is a hallucinatory potentiation of the natural world: the sea with its “billows” (20), the “empty, vast and wand’ring air” (39), England left behind (13), Burgundy ahead, with its promise of freedom (9-10).

On the other hand, in Ion Barbu’s text we encounter a Clarence whose human nature is frail from the very beginning: line (4), which corresponds to his self-definition as a “Christian man”, is omitted and replaced with an interpolated line which only sets the temporal frame of the dream’s narration and evokes Christianity: “și-acum că ziua cade spre vecernii” (‘and now that the day falls towards vespers’). The dream of *this* Clarence is one “fără de apel” (‘without [the possibility of] appeal’, 7): an experience which, like the one in the original text, reveals his innermost nature; however, this revelation does not remain on a purely cognitive level, but transforms Clarence into *what he really is*: an impersonal, non-human entity, moving in a world of abstract essences.

He drifts in the plenteous circle of the wave (“Pluteam în larg, în cercul mult al undei”, 9), sectioning it with his trajectory

(“tăind către Burgundii”, ‘cutting towards Burgundies’, 10). Drowning (“înecare”, 23) follows: during it, Clarence exists only as thought (“gînd”), hearing (“auz”, 22) or sight to which a hoard of faces (“popor de chipuri”, 23) presents itself, that is, as a de-personalized manifestation of perceptive faculties as such. It is not he himself who strives to yield his soul, but the vital energy moves by its own autonomous power: “umbra-mi tot lupta să iasă” (‘my shadow strived to get out’, 35). The second ghostly apparition emerges as a non-figurative geometric essence (“crescu înaltă dunga unui înger”, ‘Grew high the sliver of an angel’, 54), and the third one as a topologic disturbance: the seething circle (“hora de clocot”) of the right / straight Eumenides (“drepte Eumenide”) encloses (“închide”) Clarence in its contour (58-59). The prayer is directed towards a geometric divinity (“O, Doamne drept”, ‘O, right/straight God’, 73), and takes the form of dynamic interaction, whose potential result is disintegration: “De nu ajung să sparg/ Cu iutea-mi rugă surda ta mînie, / [...] *repede-o* numai mie”, ‘If I cannot reach to break / With my *swift* prayer your deaf wrath, / [...] *hurl it* only to myself’ (71-73). What is at stake in this clash of forces is to spare the ‘family’, whose substance remains indefinite, of the entity Clarence (“pe-ai mei îi cruță, și cuprinsul lor”, ‘spare mine, and what they encompass’, 74). The surprising presence in this

context of the word “cuprinsul” (lit. ‘the contents’, what is ‘comprised’), which cannot be used with reference to – or in relation with – human beings, signals that Clarence’s family (cf. “my guiltless wife and my poor children”, 72) is also transformed into non-personal and, further on, non-human abstract entities.

The environment of the experience is no longer analogous to the macroscopic world of mundane experience, but is set at the level of the physical foundations of reality, inaccessible to human perception (“unda”, ‘the wave’), of contrived spaces (“Burgundies”, “a whitewashed England”). This environment is organized according to a non-Euclidian geometry: the sky is an inverted ‘deep’, ‘a second sea, beyond the waters’ (“adîncul [...] aer”, “marea-a doua, dincolo de ape”, 39, 38). The dream does not last simply for “a night”, in a unilinear duration: after the emergence Clarence asks the Keeper to stay besides him “înc-un timp” (‘for another time’, 75), because the dream has produced a fault line in the temporal and energetic structure of the world: “Adînc, un chin clinește ceasuri, timbruri / Miez alb, din nopți; și noapte, albe timpuri” (‘Deep, a torment disjoins hours, timbres: / White core, from nights; and [into] night, white times’, 78-79).

5.3. Despite the appearance of total disjunction from the original, Barbu’s version does translate a sense-constitutive dimension,

experimenting with **an intertextual evocation** of the source-text. The reader cannot avoid associating Clarence's oneiric immersion with the late play focused on an initiation through immersion and (hypnotic) sleep, *The Tempest*. Here, the sequences related to drowning are not constructed according to a "plasticizing" typological principle, but belong to the "revelatory" type³⁶, just as Barbu's own poetry. This interpretation is backed up by the following textual features:

(a) The sinking of the ship is metaphorically equated with the cleavage of the self: "We split, we split, we split" (*Tp.*, I:i, 65-66).

(b) The ship and the human participants in the event are viewed as non-personal biological entities defined only by a maternal-foetal relation: "A brave *vessel*/ Who had, no doubt, some noble *creature* in her" (*Tp.*, I:ii, 6-7).

(c) The dimensions of space and time are intricately configured where the spirit can travel freely "in the dark *backward* and *abysm* of time" (*Tp.*, I:i, 50) or into fault lines in the texture of reality: the sunken ship comes to rest "safely in harbour" "in the *deep nook*, where once/ Thou call'dst me [Ariel]

³⁶ As far as the model of referential construction is concerned, they appear to be closer to the "symbolic-mythic" subtype.

up at midnight to fetch dew/ From the still vex'd *Bermoothes*"
(*Tp.*, I:ii, 26, 27-29).

(d) The all-encompassing synergy of the world's constitutive elements (earth, fire, air, water, melodic vibrations) signals their ultimate unitary essence: "The *sky*, it seems, would pour down stinking pitch, / But that the *sea...*/ Dashes the *fire* out" (*Tp.*, I:ii, 3-5); "I would / Have sunk the *sea* within the *earth*" (*Tp.*, I:ii, 11), "This *music* crept by me upon the *waters*, / Allaying both their fury and my passion / With its sweet *air*" (*Tp.*, I:ii, 391-393).

In this scene, drowning is revealed by Ariel in its authentic nature, namely that of **substantial transmutation** from transitory human being into an elemental entity:

“Full fathom five thy father lies;
Of his bones are coral made;
Those are pearls that were his eyes:
Nothing of him that doth fade
But doth suffer a sea-change
Into something rich and strange.” (*Tp.*, I:ii, 396-401)

This function of drowning is fully convergent with the one consistently expressed in Barbu's hermetic poetry. Striking examples can be found, from the cycle *Joc secund* (*Second Game*), in the poems [*Din ceas, dedus...*] (*[From time,*

inferred...J), and especially *Înecatul* (*The Drowned*), *Margini de seară* (*Edges of dusk*) with the evocation of alchemic transmutation (“Fii aurul irecuzabil greu!”, ‘Be the irrecusably heavy gold’) in the medium ‘of the general, calm water’ (“apei calme, generale”), and *Edict* (*Edict*) (“Știu drumul Slăbitelor Fețe,/ Știu plînsul apos din eter”, ‘I know the way of the Weaning Faces,/ I know the watery weeping from the ether’).

The intertextual evocative relation with *Tp.* which Ion Barbu chose to develop in his translation of *R III* does not simply derive from thematic similarity, but has an explicit basis within the span of Clarence’s dream, in the image of the transmutation of eyes into pearls (lines 26-31 in the original, 26-32 in *R III/I.B.*).

5.4. What needs to be emphasized here, from a text-typological point of view, is that whereas in *R III* we are dealing with the “plasticizing” operation of ‘replacement’, i.e. pearls creep into the skulls “where eyes did once inhabit”, in *Tp.* the “sea-change” is an actual transformation into “something rich and *strange*”: a qualitative mutation from personal into impersonal, from human into non-human, from definite into indefinite, from knowable and understandable according to current experience, into mysterious and rich in virtualities. This transmutation is indicated in *Tp.* and briefly illustrated in Ariel’s speech, but then it is left entirely to

the reader's imaginative powers to interpret in what way such a transformation can occur and how far-reaching its consequences are. In intertextual response to this textual "gap" in *Tp.*, Clarence's drowning undoubtedly becomes, in Barbu's version, the full textualization of "a sea-change / Into *something* rich and strange". In this sense, the translation proposes the recovery of a "gap" in Shakespeare's work viewed as a global text, i.e. the unfolding of a semantic nucleus announced and 'named' ("a sea-change") by the original author, but suspended before its full textual development.

There is reason to believe that, had Barbu been able to translate the play in its entirety, Clarence's transformation after death would have been carried to its extreme consequences, namely to dissipation into (i.e. substantial unification with) the aquatic element. Thus, the role of lethal catalyst played by the aquatic element in Clarence's death-dream ("the envious flood/ Stopp'd in my soul", 37-38), is rendered in the form "O undă-mi *sta pe duh*" (37, 'A wave *sat on my soul*'). This structure relates cataphorically to one of the leitmotifs of the curse uttered by Clarence's apparition (along with other ghosts of Richard's victims) when Richard is, in his turn, subjected to a death-dream: "Let *me* sit heavy on/in thy soul tomorrow" (V:iii, 119, 132, 140). Through this intra-textual evocative relation, an underlying

equation «Clarence = undă ('wave')» is established. Due to the fact that the lexeme “undă” is used in Barbu’s poetic work with predilection precisely on account of its twofold designative potentiality (wave of water, as in everyday language, and the scientific acceptance of energy manifestation, as in the terminology of quantum physics), the transmutation becomes equivalent to a shift from corporeal matter to pure energy, a highly symbolic result with which the text’s typological *transformation* through the lens of the “revelatory” finality comes full circle.

6. Conclusions

The text-constitutive strategies analyzed here derive from the general principle of what I have termed “homologic” translation, where the object of translation is not the source-text considered as a finished product, but the process of creation that led to its original constitution. This type of translation is, therefore, the poetic expression of an intuition about the mechanisms of a previous poetic act. The relation between translation and original is no longer “elemental”: instead of isolated evocation of some units, or partial engulfment of fragments, it becomes a genuine type of dynamic integration at all structural levels. As a consequence, the analysis of sense-

articulation strategies in Ion Barbu's *Richard III*, and, more widely put, the process of interpretation must be pursued beyond the material limits of this individual text, up to the higher textual unit it forms with the original and with Ion Barbu's poetic work as a whole.

Broadly speaking, three main functional motivations for the textual strategy of interpolation could be identified:

(a) First, interpolation may serve to intensify or enhance the constitution (semiotic expression) of the text, in an endeavor to 'over-express the already expressed', as in the cases discussed in section 4.

(b) Second, the interpolations may propose a re(con)stitution of fragments perceived as 'absent' or 'missing' from the original, as in the cases discussed in section 5.: fragments announced but not developed by the original author, clearly implied through clues present in the text, but left in a latent or virtual state.

(c) Finally, in the case of a translator of exceptional creative caliber, such as Ion Barbu, the interpolations effect a typological shift of the text towards the revelatory symbolic-mathematic type of his own poetic discourse – a transformation rooted, perhaps, in his conviction that this type comes closest to the quintessence of authentic poetry.

Major references

- BARBU, Ion (1958/1984): “Direcții de cercetare în matematicile contemporane” (*Tribuna*, May 17, 1958), republished in: Barbu 1984, pp. 269-275
- (1964): “[Despre traduceri din Shakespeare]”, Addenda in: *R III/I.B.*, pp. 295-307
- (1984): *Versuri și proză*, edited by Dinu Pillat, București, Minerva
- BOSKOFF, Wladimir G. and SUCEAVĂ, Bogdan D. (2006): “The history of Barbilian’s metrization procedure”, arXiv:math/0607106 (Cornell University), <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0607106> (accessed Aug. 15, 2013)
- (2007): “Barbilian spaces: The history of a geometric idea”, in: *Historia Mathematica*, 34, pp. 221–224
- BORCILA, Mircea (1981): “Types sémiotiques dans la poésie roumaine moderne”, in: Miclău, Paul / Marcus, Solomon (eds.), *Sémiotique roumaine*, București, Universitatea București, pp.19-35
- (1987): “Contribuții la elaborarea unei tipologii a textelor poetice”, in: *Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, XXXVIII, 3, pp.185-196
- (1996): “Bazele metaforicii în gândirea lui Lucian Blaga”, in: *Limbă și literatură*, XLI, 1, pp. 28-39
- (1997a): “Între Blaga și Coșeriu. De la metaforica limbajului la o poetică a culturii”, in: *Revista de filosofie*, XLIV, 1-2, pp. 147-163
- (1997b): “The Metaphoric Model in Poetic Texts”, in: *Szöveg és stílus. Szabó Zoltan köszöntése*, Cluj-Napoca: Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai, pp. 97-104
- CDE (1979/1985): *Collins Dictionary of the English Language*, London and Glasgow, Collins

- COSERIU, Eugenio (1948): “La lingua di Ion Barbu (con alcune considerazioni sulla semantica delle lingue ‘imparate’”, in: *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese*, I, Dec., pp. 3-8
- (1971/1977): “Tesis sobre el tema ‘lenguaje y poesía’”, in: E. Coseriu, *El hombre y su lenguaje. Estudios de teoría y metodología lingüística*, Madrid, Gredos, pp. 201-207
- (1981): *Textlinguistik. Eine Einführung*, Tübingen: Narr
- (1987a): “Die Ausdruckslücke als Ausdrucksverfahren (Textlinguistische Übung zu einem Gedicht von Kavafis)”, in: *Stuttgarter Arbeiten zur Germanistik*, 189, “Sinnlichkeit in Bild und Klang”. *Festschrift für P. Hoffman zum 70. Geburtstag*, pp. 373-383
- (1987b): “Acerca del sentido de la enseñanza de la lengua y literatura”, in: *Innovación en la enseñanza de la lengua y la literatura*, Madrid, Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, pp. 13-32
- GENETTE, Gérard (1982/1997): *Palimpsests. Literature in the second degree*, translated by Channa Newman & Claude Doubinsky, Lincoln and London, Univ. of Nebraska Press
- TĂMĂIANU, Emma (1992): “Chaos and Void - Textual Vectors in Six Shakespearean Plays”, in: “*Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai*”, *Philologia*, XXXVII, 4, pp. 101-114
- (1994): “A Contrastive Analysis of Clarence’s Dream (Ion Barbu’s Translation of Richard III)”, in: *The First National Conference of the Romanian Society for British and American Studies*, II, Cluj-Napoca, Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai, pp. 282-294
- (2001): *Fundamentele tipologiei textuale. O abordare în lumina lingvisticii integrale*, Cluj-Napoca, Clusium
- TĂMĂIANU-MORITA, Emma (2002): *Integralismul în lingvistica japoneză. Dimensiuni - impact – perspective*. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium
- (2007): “Strategies of Sense-Construction in a Transidiomatic Text. A Linguistic Perspective”, in: S.-A.

Manolache and G. Măciucă (eds.): *Inter Litteras et Terras* (I). *Proceedings of the International Conference on Comparative Literature, Contrastive Linguistics, Translation and Cross-Cultural Studies*, Suceava, Editura Universității “Ștefan cel Mare”, pp. 312-321

— (2012): “Rethinking Coseriu’s Notion of ‘Unit of Textual Meaning’ (*Sinneinheit*)”, in: *Analecta Malacitana, special issue «Eugenio Coseriu (1921-2002) en los comienzos del siglo XXI»*, II, pp. 187-206

— (2013): “Towards a Definition of «Textual Constitution» in the Framework of Integral Linguistics”, in: E. Bojoga, O. Boc and C. Vîlcu (eds.), *Coseriu: Perspectives contemporaines*, II, Cluj-Napoca, Presa Universitară Clujeană (in print)

The plays

Ham. William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, (The Arden Shakespeare), edited by Harold Jenkins, London & New York, 1986

Tp. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (The Arden Shakespeare), edited by Frank Kermode, London & New York: Methuen, 1987

R III William Shakespeare, *King Richard III* (The Arden Shakespeare), edited by Antony Hammond, London & New York: Methuen, 1981/1987

R III/D.D. William Shakespeare, *Richard al III-lea* (translation by Dan Dușescu), in: *Opere complete*, edited by Leon Levițchi, vol. I, București, Univers, 1982

R III/I.B. William Shakespeare, *Viața și moartea regelui Richard al III-lea. Echivalențe românești de Ion Barbu*, edited by Romulus Vulpescu, București, Editura pentru literatură, 1964

Appendix: Analysed texts

Original	Translation (Ion Barbu)	Translation (Dan Duțescu)
<p>1 <u>Keep</u>. Why looks your Grace so heavily today?</p> <p>2 <u>Clă</u>. O, I have pass'd a miserable night, 3 So full of fearful dreams, of ugly sights, 4 That, as I am a Christian faithful man, 5 I would not spend another such a night 6 Though 'twere to buy a world of happy days, 7 So full of dismal terror was the time.</p>	<p>1 <u>Brak</u>. Greu ca pământul sînteți astăzi, lord.</p> <p>2 <u>Clă</u>. O, ce trecui fu noaptea lui Irod: 3 Afunde vise, silnice vedenii; 4 Și-acum că ziua cade spre vecernii 5 Mă frîng la pragul vreunei nopți la fel, 6 Ce n-ar plăti-o mările de zile limpezi. 7 O, vis în cumpeni, fără de apel!</p>	<p><u>Brak</u>. De ce atît de-mpovărat, milord?</p> <p><u>Clă</u>. O, cruntă noapte am trecut; atîtea Vedenii hîde, vise-nspăimîntate, Încît, pe legea mea de bun creștin, N-aș vrea să trec o altă noapte-asemeni De-ar fi un veac de aur să-mi plătesc, Atît de greu de groază a fost răsîmpul.</p>
<p>8 <u>Keep</u>. What was your dream, my lord? I pray you tell me.</p> <p>9 <u>Clă</u>. Methoughts that I had broken from the Tower, 10 And was embark'd to cross to Burgundy; 11 And in my company my brother Gloucester, 12 Who from my cabin tempted me to walk 13 Upon the hatches: thence we look'd toward England, 14 And cited up a thousand heavy times, 15 During the wars of York and Lancaster, 16 That had befall'n us. As we pac'd along 17 Upon the giddy footing of the hatches, 18 Methought that Gloucester stumbled, and in falling, 19 Struck me (that thought to stay him) overboard, 20 Into the tumbling billows of the main. 21 O Lord! Methought what pain it was to drown: 22 What dreadful noise of waters in my ears; 23 What sights of ugly death within my eyes! 24 Methoughts I saw a thousand fearful wrecks; 25 Ten thousand men that fishes gnaw'd upon; 26 Wedges of gold, great anchors, heaps of pearl, 27 Inestimable stones, unvalu'd jewels, 28 All scatter'd in the bottom of the sea. 29 Some lay in dead men's skulls, and in the holes 30 Where eyes did once inhabit, they were crept - 31 As 'twere in scorn of eyes - reflecting gems, 32 That woo'd the slimy bottom of the deep,</p>	<p>8 <u>Brak</u>. Spuneți-mi visul, reaua piază rumpeți.</p> <p>9 <u>Clă</u>. Pluteam în larg, în cercul mult al undeii, 10 Din turn scăpat, tîind către Burgundii, 11 Cu Gloster printre funii, cîngi, catran. 12 De-acolo el mă ridică pe punte, 13 Cu fața către-o Anglie de var. 14 Privîrăm lung, bătuți de gînduri multe 15 - Ghirlande grele, corbi ce se întorc - 16 Din vremea luptei Lancaster și York. 17 Și cum treceam văzduhul de podețe 18 Ce leagă-nalt catargul, de catarg, 19 Gloster căzu; și vrînd să-l țîn îmi dete 20 Brînci jos, în munca verde unde sparg 21 Valuri ca turnuri. O, ce vis uruz! 22 Ce chin în gînd! Ce roiri în auz 23 E înecarea! Ce popor de chipuri: 24 Cetățî de proro negre, din nisipuri; 25 Pești pășunînd mîi trupurile-n bancuri; 26 Teascuri de perle, aur, crîng de ancori... 27 Ce focuri reci, ce forfotă, ce glorii, 28 Ce scump sipet, în pîntecel mării! 29 Erau mari geme rătăcite-n țigve 30 De om, ca un mai viu și ager ochi, 31 Rîs scăpărînd albitelor relieve; 32 La galben mîl, smintitul lor deochi.</p>	<p><u>Brak</u>. Dar ce-ați visat? rîvnesc să-mi povestiți.</p> <p><u>Clă</u>. Părea că-s mîntuit, fugit din Turn, Și spre Burgundia pluteam pe-o navă: De soț l-aveam pe Gloucester, al meu frate, Ce m-a-mbiat pe punți să ne plimbăm: De-acolo ne uitam spre Englitera, Vorbînd de-nfricoșate întîmplări Din luptele-ntrre Lancaster și York, Prin cîte am trecut. Și cum pășeam Prin amețita călcătură-a punții, Se-mpleticește Gloucester; și-n cădere Mă zvîrle, se făcea, cînd dau să-l țîn În clocotul talazurilor apei. O, Doamne, Doamne - am zis - ce chin e-necul! Ce zgomot spart al apei în urechi! Ce hîde arătări de moarte-n ochi! Părea că văd puzderii de epave Și oameni mii, amușinați de pești; Icui de aur, ancure, mormane De perle, nestemate, giuvaeruri Fără de preț zăceau pe fundul mării. În țigve unele-odîhneau; intrase În golul unde ochi au locuit, De ochi rîzîndu-și, parcă, geme-aprinese Ce se chiorau la mîlul din afîncuri,</p>

<p>33 And mock'd the dead bones that lay scatter'd by. 34 <u>Keep</u>. Had you such leisure in the time of death 35 To gaze upon the secrets of the deep?</p> <p>36 <u>Cla</u>. Methought I had; and often did I strive 37 To yield the ghost, but still the envious flood 38 Stopp'd in my soul, and would not let it forth 39 To find the empty, vast, and wand'ring air, 40 But smother'd it within my panting bulk, 41 Which almost burst to belch it in the sea.</p> <p>42 <u>Keep</u>. Awak'd you not in this sore agony?</p> <p>43 <u>Cla</u>. No, no; my dream was lengthen'd after life. 44 O, then began the tempest to my soul: 45 I pass'd, methought, the melancholy flood, 46 With that sour ferryman which poets write of, 47 Unto the kingdom of perpetual night. 48 The first that there did greet my stranger-soul 49 Was my great father-in-law, renowned Warwick, 50 Who spake aloud, 'What scourge for perjury 51 Can this dark monarchy afford false Clarence?' 52 And so he vanish'd. Then came wand'ring by 53 A shadow like an angel, with bright hair 54 Dabbled in blood; and he shriek'd out aloud, 55 'Clarence is come: false, fleeting, perjur'd Clarence, 56 That stabbed me in the field by Tewkesbury! 57 Seize on him, Furies! Take him unto torment!' 58 With that, methoughts, a legion of foul fiends 59 Environ'd me, and howled in mine ears 60 Such hideous cries, that with the very noise 61 I trembling wak'd, and for a season after 62 Could not believe but that I was in hell, 63 Such terrible impression made my dream. 64 <u>Keep</u>. No marvel, lord, that it affrighted you; 65 I am afraid, methinks, to hear you tell it.</p>	<p>33 <u>Brak</u>. Avut-ai timp în ceasul de răscruce 34 Să-ntrebi a mării taină unde duce?</p> <p>35 <u>Cla</u>. Pesemne. Umbra-mi tot lupta să iasă, 36 Dar grea, de piatră și pizmătăreață 37 O undă-mi sta pe duh, ca să nu scape 38 La marea-a doua, dincolo de ape: 39 Adîncul, adiat-ușorul aer. 40 Ci, înceștat și tremurînd din baeri, 41 Da trunchiul umbra s-o borască mării.</p> <p>42 <u>Brak</u>. Te-ai deșteptat din toate-aceste-osînde?</p> <p>43 <u>Cla</u>. Nu, visul mult în moarte se întinde. 44 Aici începe drumul de apoi: 45 Mîhnitul fluviu, luntrea ca un sloi, 46 Luntrașul mut, pe care-l zic poezii! 47 Cu el călcai pămînturile nopții. 48 Întîi ivit străinei mele umbre 49 Fu socru-meu Warwick, vestitul între 50 Războinici, lung chemînd: "Ce bici, ce hoardă, 51 Domnia-aceasta negru-ntemeiată 52 Păstrează, Clarence, vitrigei vînzări?" 53 Apoi pieri. Și din cenuși de seri 54 Crescu înaltă dunga unui înger, 55 Cu părul de poleiuri și de sînge, 56 Strigînd: "Caiafa iat-o că veni, 57 Ce m-a străpuns în cîmp la Tewkesbury, 58 Fugarul, falsul Clarence. - Îl închide 59 Horă de clocot, drepte Eumenide!" 60 Ca la un semn, urdii și legioane 61 De draci, armați cu glas de lighioane, 62 Suiți pe tronuri, din alămuri sparte 63 Sunară! Și-acest huiet mai departe 64 Trezit din moarte, îl aud întors. 65 Încît să știi, am fost la cei de jos...</p>	<p>Bătîndu-și joc de oasele din jur. <u>Brak</u>. Ați mai avut răgaz, la ceas de moarte, Să iscodiți adîncul și-a lui taine?</p> <p><u>Cla</u>. Părea că da; și mult m-am poticnit Să-mi dăruie duhul; dar pizzașa undă Mi-l stăvilea, ne-ngăduind să zboare Spre golul, plimbătorul larg văzduh, Ci-l năbușea în pieptu-mi gîfîind, Ce parcă se spărgea să-l verse mării.</p> <p><u>Brak</u>. Nu v-ați trezit de-acest cumplit canon?</p> <p><u>Cla</u>. Vai, nu, s-a ntins și peste viață visul; Atunci mi se pormi furtuna-n suflet, Și tristul rîu trecut-u-l-am cu-acei Funest vislaș de care scriu poezii, Spre-mpărăția veșnicelor bezne. Dintîi mi-a-ntîmpinat stingherul duh, Măritu-mi socru, Warwick cel vestit, Strigînd: "Ce chin acest tărîm al nopții I-a pregătut lui Clarence cel hain?" Și a pierit; apoi trecu prin preajmă O umbră de heruv cu păr bălai În sînge năclăit, țîpînd: "Venit-a Sperjurul, schimbăciosul, calpul Clarence Ce m-a străpuns în cîmp la Tewksbury: Luați-l, Furi, caznelor îl dați!" Și se făcea că-o hoardă de strigoi M-a-mpresurat, urlîndu-mi în urechi Cu-asemeni zbierăt înfiorător, Că m-am trezit în tremur, și-n răstimp Nu mă-ndemnam să cred că nu-s în iad, Așa-mpîlnțat mi-era în cuget visul.</p>
--	--	---

<p>66 <u>Cla.</u> Ah, Keeper, Keeper, I have done these things, 67 That now give evidence against my soul, 68 For Edward's sake: and see how he requites me. 69 O God, if my deep prayers cannot appease Thee, 70 But Thou wilt be aveng'd on my misdeeds, 71 Yet execute Thy wrath in me alone; 72 O spare my guiltless wife and my poor children. 73 Keeper, I prithee sit by me awhile: 74 My soul is heavy, and I fain would sleep.</p> <p>75 <u>Keep.</u> I will, my lord; God give your Grace good rest.</p> <p>76 <u>Brak.</u> Sorrow breaks seasons and reposing hours, 77 Makes the night morning, and the noontide night. 78 Princes have but their titles for their glories, 79 An outward honour for an inward toil; 80 And for unfelt imaginations 81 They often feel a world of restless cares: 82 So that between their titles, and low name, 83 There's nothing differs but the outward fame.</p>	<p>66 <u>Brak.</u> Se poate, lord. Un vis, să te cufunzi! 67 Te înfioari când numai îl auzi. 68 <u>Cla.</u> O, paznice, aceste grele fapte 69 Ce-n cumpănă, la iad, afită trag, 70 Le săvârșii pentru Edward; iar plata 71 E turnul orb! - De nu ajung să sparg 72 Cu iutea-mi rugă surda Ta minie, 73 O, Doamne drept, repede-o numai mie; 74 Pe-ai mei îi cruță, și cuprinsul lor! 75 Stai, temnicere, înc-un timp, cu mine, 76 Mi-e sufletul de plumb, aș vrea să dorm.</p> <p>77 <u>Brak.</u> Stau, doamne. Somnul mult ușor vă fie!</p> <p>78 Adînc, un chin cîntește ceasuri, timbruri: 79 Mieș alb, din nopți; și noapte, albe timpuri. 80 Doar chipul fericirii ține prințul: 81 Cînstit e numele, mult-jalnic insul. 82 Și pentru palizi umbre, fără ființă, 83 Înfruntă lumi de spaime, de căință: 84 Încît, la mare nume ori de rînd, 85 Nepotrivirea-i dincolo de gînd.</p>	<p><u>Brak.</u> Minune nu-i că v-a spăimat, milord. Vă-neredîințez, mi-e groază să-l aud. <u>Cla.</u> O, Brakenbury - am făptuit păcate Ce martori împotivă-mi stau, de dragul Lui Eduard; și privește-a mea răsplată! De nu pot să te-mbun cu rugă, o, Doamne, Ci vrei pe-a mele fapte să-ți răzbuni, Mînia doar asupra-mi să-ți reverși: Soția-mi, pruncii fără vină, cruță-i! Stai, blînde temnicere, te rog, cu mine; Mi-e sufletul de plumb și-aș vrea să dorm.</p> <p><u>Brak.</u> Rămîn, milord; și-ți fie somnul dulce.</p> <p>Mîhnirea vremea somnului o-ncurcă, Ea face noaptea zi, namiaza noapte. N-au prinții alte glorii decît herbul. Pe dinafară slavă - cazne-n piept. Pentru plăceri pe care nu le gustă, Pe ei îi rod adesea lumi de griji: Între blazon și numele de rînd Nu-i alt hotar decît pospaiul faime</p>
--	--	--

REVIEWS
AND
INTERVIEWS

