

## **Shakespeare Translation in France and Germany in the 1950s: a Comparison**

*Matthias Zach (Université de Paris 3-Sorbonne Nouvelle; Universität Tübingen)*

The present article addresses the literary and cultural side of 1950s' Europe by examining Shakespeare translation in France and the two Germanys during that decade. Given the role of translation for cultural development in general and Shakespeare's position as a cultural icon in particular, focusing on the paths Shakespeare translation takes in 1950s' France and Germany represents a significant element in the attempt to understand how cultural identities were rebuilt after the war. Rather than analyse individual translations, the article will establish a tableau of the various manifestations of Shakespeare translation in the 1950s, drawing on different materials concerning Shakespeare translation on the stage and the page as well as its critical reception. It will appear that the differences between France and the two Germanys are in fact far greater than those between East and West Germany (which is why the term 'Germany' is frequently used as an abbreviation covering both German states), and it will be argued that the dissimilar Shakespearean traditions in France and Germany, and especially the roles Shakespeare played in the two countries in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and during the Second World War, help account for these differences.

For a number of reasons, the 1950s present the opportunity for a fresh start in Shakespeare translation both in France and in the two Germanys. The Third Reich had seen a climax of German nationalism and a low point in translation activity.<sup>1</sup> Given this immediate historical background as well as Germany's strong Shakespearean tradition, a renewed interest in Shakespeare translation could have been one way both of critically reflecting on the German past and of rebuilding a German identity. In France, the dialogue with Shakespeare had intensified in recent decades, with the publication of revised older<sup>2</sup> as well as new Shakespeare translations,<sup>3</sup> but the need and scope for a more thorough engagement with Shakespeare was still felt and expressed (cf. the quotes by Poirier and Bonnefoy below). The present article will therefore also assess in which ways these opportunities were (or were not) seized.

## Shakespeare in France: Creativity and Renewal

It is often pointed out that, especially when compared to its German neighbour, France has always had a somewhat difficult relationship to Shakespeare.<sup>4</sup> Significantly, a number of important cultural figures in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century still thought that the cultural possibilities inherent in Shakespeare were far from being fully exploited in France. In his introduction to a special volume of the scholarly journal *Études anglaises* on Shakespeare, published in 1960, Michel Poirier calls it ‘almost stupefying’ that ‘the greatest dramatist of all times’ should not have been more appreciated in a nation where the theatre is so important. Significantly, Poirier then calls the ‘history of Shakespeare’s fortune in France’ a ‘long process of assimilation [...] which still cannot be considered complete’.<sup>5</sup>

The main reason for the difficulties in the French Shakespeare reception is the strong contrast between Shakespeare’s plays and French Classicist drama, especially with its strict rules concerning (an interpretation of) the Aristotelian unities of action, place and time and its insistence on *bienséance* (propriety, decorum), i.e. rules of what was and what was not suitable to be shown on stage. This made Shakespeare, with his plots that take place in different countries and sometimes span over several decades, with his clown figures in otherwise tragic plays like *Macbeth* or *King Lear* (an inadmissible mixture of genres, from the perspective of French classicism) and with his language that uses every register from the noble to the vulgar seem unfit for the French stage.

In spite of these differences, the ‘long assimilation process’ Poirier evokes is characterized by numerous contacts with Shakespeare throughout French cultural history. In fact, the opposition between Shakespearean drama and the core of the French tradition itself had already made Shakespeare especially attractive to the French Romantics in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in particular (as attested, for example, by the adaptation of *Le More de Venise* by Alfred de Vigny in 1829 and that of *Hamlet* by Alexandre Dumas and Paul Meurice in 1847<sup>6</sup>). The dialogue with Shakespeare intensifies in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in important theatre productions like those of Jacques Copeau as well as translations by directors and actors like Copeau and Suzanne Bing or by creative writers such as André Gide.<sup>7</sup>

In the 1950s, the dialogue with Shakespeare becomes even more important. In a nation that had been humiliated by its military defeat in 1940 and during the

Occupation, turning to Shakespeare was one way of rebuilding a cultural identity after the war. This is all the more true because stage productions of Shakespeare were one way in which resistance against the Occupier could be expressed, at least up until 1943.<sup>8</sup> This role played by Shakespeare productions in occupied France provided a basis upon which post-war French cultural agents could build. This was manifest, first of all, in a renewal in Shakespeare productions in the theatre,<sup>9</sup> especially in the provinces – the decentralisation of French cultural life after the war sees a proliferation of Shakespeare productions away from Paris, such as Jean Vilar’s *Macbeth* in Avignon in 1954 or Roger Planchon’s *Henry IV* in Villeurbanne in 1957. A significant number of these productions used new French translations of the Shakespearean text. Vilar, for example, relied on the translations of the writer, professor and translator Jean-Louis Curtis for his *Richard II* (1947), *Henry IV* (1950) and *Macbeth* (1954), and Jacques Charon revived Jules Supervielle’s translation of *As you like it*, first staged in 1934, for a production at the *Comédie Française* in 1951.<sup>10</sup>

Perhaps paradoxically, whilst the growing importance of Shakespeare in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century as well as the role of Shakespeare production during the Occupation provided the background for the French dialogue with Shakespeare in the 1950s (not least because most 1950s’ translators first encountered Shakespeare in the 1930s and 40s), another reason for dealing with Shakespeare in the 1950s, invoked by artists themselves at the time, lay precisely in the relative weakness of the French Shakespeare tradition. Artists saw this as a chance which gave them room for manoeuvre.

This concerns in particular the field of Shakespeare translation. Even if there were of course a significant number of previous translations, the most well known of which is the 19<sup>th</sup> century translation by François-Victor Hugo (the son of the Romantic poet), there is no French Shakespeare translation which, in terms of its cultural influence – and, hence, of its potentially inhibiting effects –, gets anywhere near the importance of the Schlegel-Tieck translation in Germany. In an essay entitled ‘Shakespeare and the French Poet’, published in 1959, the contemporary poet Yves Bonnefoy asserts that

it is probably an advantage that we have no French translation comparable to that of Schlegel and Tieck – a ‘classic,’ beautiful and powerful enough to constrict us within the limited perfection of its own particular vision.<sup>11</sup>

Like Bonnefoy, many other artists and translators in the 50s appear to have seen the lack of a canonical French translation as an incentive for their own work. As far as Shakespeare publications in France in the 1950s are concerned, there certainly were re-editions of previous translations, most importantly those of François-Victor Hugo (for example the editions published by Arc-en-Ciel or by Lemerre at the beginning of the 1950s<sup>12</sup>) but there were also a number of new translations, in particular by young creative writers who then went on to shape French literary history in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Although its original publication goes back to 1938, the re-edition of Shakespeare's *Complete Works* in the prestigious *Pléiade* edition, with a preface by André Gide, constitutes a first example for this creative dialogue with Shakespeare in the 1950s.<sup>13</sup> Whilst this edition, which is republished several times in the course of the 1950s, relies to a considerable extent on old translations (mainly those by François-Victor Hugo), it also uses a number of more recent versions, for example a joint translation by the theatre director Georges Pitoëff and the poet Pierre Jean Jouve (this dates back to the 1920s) or translations by the important Shakespeare translator Pierre Leyris. This goes to show that, even in the most prestigious French edition, there was (at least limited) room for new Shakespeare translations, which was much less true of 1950s' Germany.

However, a much more significant enterprise which demonstrates the dynamism characteristic of Shakespeare translation in 1950s' France is the edition of Shakespeare's *Complete Works* in the *Club français du livre*.<sup>14</sup> The *Club français du livre*, which had been founded as the first French book club right after the war, assigned the supervision of this project to Pierre Leyris. In his preface, entitled 'Pourquoi retraduire Shakespeare?' ('Why retranslate Shakespeare?'), Leyris criticizes a number of older French Shakespeare translations and insists on the importance of a new Shakespeare translation. What is needed, Leyris asserts, are 'contemporary translations adapted to our vision.'<sup>15</sup>

The particularity of the *Club français du livre* edition consists in the number and the quality of original authors involved as translators, including authors who were already well-known in the 50s but also, and especially, young writers who were to gain major importance in the decades to come. Even central pieces from the Shakespeare canon such as *Hamlet* or *King Lear* were translated by up-and-coming authors and not by well-established professional translators or academics.

The author perhaps most well-known at the time who was involved in this edition was Pierre Jean Jouve, whose earlier version of *Romeo and Juliet* was one of the few translations that was not specifically written for this edition but was taken over from a previous publication, though with major revisions. Jouve also translated *Macbeth* and was originally designated for the *Sonnets*, but the editors disapproved of his version and therefore ended up giving this translation to Henri Thomas, a young French poet living in London, who also translated *Antony and Cleopatra* as well as several other plays for this edition. Jouve nonetheless published his translations of the *Sonnets* in the mid-1950s. In spite of their controversial nature, they do constitute an important example of how a major French writer turns to Shakespeare in the 1950s and establishes a dialogue which renews the way in which Shakespeare is presented in France and also allows the author to develop his own poetic concerns.

Other authors involved in the edition in the *Club français du livre* included Michel Butor, one of the most important representatives of the *Nouveau Roman*, who translated *All's well that ends well*; the French-Uruguayan poet Jules Supervielle, who contributed to the translation of *A Midsummernight's Dream*; Armand Robin, a young, polylingual poet from Brittany who translated *Othello* and *King Lear*; André du Bouchet, who translated two of the narrative poems as well as *Pericles* and *Henry VIII*; and, finally, Yves Bonnefoy, a writer in his early thirties who had earned some notoriety with the publication of his first major volume of poetry in 1953 and who translated *Hamlet* and *The Winter's Tale* in particular.

In stark contrast to the situation in Germany, which will be discussed in the second part of this article, the critical reception of these new translations was quite open-minded and often very positive. To cite but one example, in a review of French translations of *Hamlet* from the 18<sup>th</sup> century up to the 1950s, published in the issue of *Études anglaises* already quoted above, Christian Pons calls Bonnefoy's translation of *Hamlet* by far the best French translation to date.<sup>16</sup>

In general, the large number of important French authors involved in the Shakespeare edition in the *Club français du Livre* points to perhaps the most interesting way in which Shakespeare translation plays a role in the renewal of French cultural identity in the 1950s, not least because many of these writers take Shakespeare translation as a starting point for their own creative work. Armand Robin's poetry, for example, is based to a large extent on his experience as a translator and on the interplay between different languages. Older poets like Jouve

and Supervielle develop their poetic concerns in their Shakespeare translations. Along with other writers, two of the contributors to the edition in the *Club français du livre*, André du Bouchet and Yves Bonnefoy, later publish the journal *L'Éphémère* together, which had a central influence in French literary life in the late 60s and early 70s. Yves Bonnefoy is certainly the poet for whom the importance of Shakespeare translation is most evident and most far-reaching. Since he started to translate Shakespeare in the 1950s, Bonnefoy has turned Shakespeare translation into a central pillar of his work over the past five decades, and Shakespeare is almost omnipresent in Bonnefoy's writings, from his essays explicitly dedicated to questions of Shakespeare interpretation and Shakespeare translation to his own poetry, which abounds with intertextual references to Shakespeare. Therefore, when Bonnefoy becomes a professor at the prestigious *Collège de France* in the early 1980s, he quite naturally discusses not only Baudelaire, Mallarmé and Rimbaud but also devotes a significant number of his seminars and lectures to Shakespeare.<sup>17</sup>

Hence, on the different levels I have evoked, Shakespeare translation in 1950s' France constitutes a starting point both for French Shakespeare reception and for the development of French cultural identity in general. Shakespeare translation in the 1950s, and the enterprise in the *Club français du Livre* in particular, helps launch a renewed interest in Shakespeare in the following decades and contributes to the construction of a strong Shakespearean tradition in France. The 1950s, therefore, trigger and anticipate an ever-intensifying dialogue with Shakespeare, whose results are evident in new theatrical experiments in the 1970s and 80s – by directors Patrice Chéreau and Ariane Mnouchkine, for example – and also in yet another attempt at a new translation of Shakespeare's *Complete Works*, currently undertaken for the *Pléiade* collection by Jean-Michel Déprats. Hence, in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Shakespeare has after all become a central figure in the French cultural landscape and helps shape French cultural history itself.<sup>18</sup>

### **Shakespeare in Germany: Continuity and Criticism**

If Shakespeare translation in 1950s' France is thus a seat of dynamism and creativity, a rather different picture emerges when Shakespeare translation in Germany during that decade is examined. Whereas some of the most important creative minds in the French literary sphere collaborate to work on the edition in the *Club français du livre* in particular, there are only isolated attempts at new Shakespeare translations in

Germany, and the situation is above all characterized by an almost tenacious insistence on the superiority of the Romantic Schlegel-Tieck translation.

As a background to the role Shakespeare translation played in both East and West Germany during the 1950s, it is important to recall the strong link between the German Shakespearean tradition and German nationalism: ever since Lessing, who advocated Shakespeare as an example for German literature and culture which he opposed to the tradition of French classicism, Shakespeare had a decisive influence on German culture, to the point that he was soon adopted as the ‘third German classic’ alongside Goethe and Schiller.<sup>19</sup> The 19<sup>th</sup> century scholar Georg Gottfried Gervinus, for example, goes as far as saying that ‘Shakespeare has become a German poet almost more than any of our native writers’.<sup>20</sup> On the textual level, Shakespeare’s appropriation as a German classic was closely linked to the Schlegel-Tieck translation<sup>21</sup>, which soon imposed itself as the standard translation in Germany and had considerable influence on German literary language itself. In its Schlegel-Tieck guise, Shakespeare had thus ceased to be ‘other’ in Germany, an important difference from the situation in France.

The link between Shakespeare and Germany reached new, and dangerous, heights in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, with the nationalist appropriation of Shakespeare during the Third Reich. The institutional side of this appropriation is discussed in Ruth von Ledebur’s book on the *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, which demonstrates that national socialist and anti-semitic ideology played a decisive role for the Shakespeare Society in the years of the Weimar Republic and, even more so, during the Third Reich.<sup>22</sup> Ledebur also shows how the *Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* tried to use Shakespeare research as an ideological ‘weapon’ against England and as means to further the ‘Wiedergeburt des germanischen Geistes’.<sup>23</sup> This nationalist appropriation represents the intellectual backdrop to the German dialogue with Shakespeare in the 1950s, which is even more important because many of the people who played important roles in the period examined by Ledebur were still around in the 1950s.

After the collapse of Nazism and the defeat of Nazi Germany in the Second World War, the ostentatious exhibition of the link between German nationalism and Shakespeare was no longer possible. Nonetheless, Shakespeare translation in the 1950s, as well as the way in which translations were received, continued to function according to long-established patterns. In fact, in the 1950s, a great number of publications using the Schlegel-Tieck versions continue to dominate the book market:

in the course of this decade, there are more than ten editions of Shakespeare's complete dramatic works in the Schlegel-Tieck translation (for example the editions in the West German *Tempel-Verlag*<sup>24</sup> or the East German *Aufbau-Verlag*<sup>25</sup>), as well as a large number of editions of individual plays using that translation, among them the very popular *Reclam* editions of Shakespeare's works.<sup>26</sup>

Whilst the Schlegel-Tieck translation was thus dominant on the book market, a few individual translators worked on new German versions of Shakespeare. The most important names here are Hans Rothe, Richard Flatter and, in East Germany, Rudolf Schaller. All three were born in the 1890s already, so they certainly cannot be considered to be among the young cultural avant-garde of post-war Germany, but they do translate Shakespeare widely and attempt a renovation of the Shakespearean text in German. Both Rothe and Flatter began their Shakespeare translations in the 1920s and 1930s and continued to work on them in the 1950s, after their return from exile.<sup>27</sup> Their translations are frequently played on the West German stage during the 1950s. The same is true in East Germany for Schaller's translations.<sup>28</sup> Hence, although, in terms of directors and actors but also of the way in which Shakespeare was staged, Shakespeare on the German stage in the 1950s is above all characterized by continuity<sup>29</sup>, the theatre nonetheless constitutes a place of at least limited renewal in its use of these more recent translations.

What is more characteristic of the German situation, however, is the very critical reaction to these translations, coupled with an insistence on the superiority of the Schlegel-Tieck translation. This attitude was voiced forcefully in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, more or less the official organ of German Shakespeare scholarship since 1864, which addresses Shakespeare translation regularly throughout the 1950s, most extensively in a volume specifically dedicated to Shakespeare translation in 1956.<sup>30</sup> However, this interest in matters of Shakespeare translation did not combine with open-mindedness towards new translation enterprises, as was the case in France. If Wilhelm Hortmann notes in passing that a representation of *All's Well That Ends Well* directed by Gustav Gründgens in 1954 'occasioned yet another outcry against the Rothe translation',<sup>31</sup> this is only one particular instance of a general attitude.

In fact, it was Rothe who was criticized particularly severely. These criticisms go back to the 1930s, where the issue had culminated in the banning of Rothe's translations by Goebbels himself.<sup>32</sup> Leading figures in the *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* renewed the polemics in the 1950s.<sup>33</sup> For example, an article in the 1959



*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* bears the revealing title ‘In Sachen Shakespeare contra Rothe’ (‘As to Shakespeare against Rothe’). This article is signed by no less than five people, including some of the most prominent Shakespeare scholars and translators as well as the editors of the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* (Rudolf Alexander Schröder, Hermann Heuer, Wolfgang Clemen, Levin Ludwig Schücking and Rudolf Stamm) and is thus emblematic for the negative reaction of the established Shakespeare critics to Rothe’s translation. From today’s perspective, the interesting point about this violent debate concerns less the question of the intrinsic value of Rothe’s translation but the fact that the establishment should feel such a need to defend Shakespeare against what was perceived as a usurper. In other words, the article encapsulates a general tendency in 1950s’ Germany, which continued to view new translations of Shakespeare as almost a sacrilege both against the German tradition and, as the title ‘Shakespeare contra Rothe’ indicates, against Shakespeare himself. Symptomatically, again, an article in the 1956 *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* runs the headline: *Why the Romantic Shakespeare translations are still to be preferred.*<sup>34</sup>

Even in a generally positive review of a translation by Richard Flatter (who was himself a regular contributor to the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*), the reviewer cannot refrain from referring back to the Schlegel-Tieck translation:

It shall only be noted in passing that the reviewer greatly misses many a familiar passage in the Romantic translation. Such limitations must be accepted; one should not measure the value [of a new translation; M. Z.] by comparing it with other masterpieces and should therefore not weigh up every single line with Schlegel. Here, one needs [...] to lay claim [...] to the fact that Schlegel and the Romantics are in some ways unsurpassable after all.<sup>35</sup>

In spite of the cautious formulation, which contrasts with the way in which Hans Rothe was attacked, it is obvious that the reviewer of Flatter’s translation continues to view the Romantic Shakespeare translation as an ideal which all contemporary attempts at Shakespeare translation have to live up to. This is all the more true since, in spite of what he declares in the passage just quoted, the reviewer then goes on to argue for the superiority of Schlegel-Tieck concerning a particular passage from *The Taming of the Shrew* and *King Lear*, where he ‘really cannot see’ why Flatter should have diverted from the Schlegel-Tieck solution (‘vermag der Rezensent wirklich nicht einzusehen’).<sup>36</sup>

Hence, the ‘spirit of restoration’ which Wilhelm Hortmann detects in German Shakespeare performances during the 1950s<sup>37</sup> finds its equivalent in the continued dominance of the Schlegel-Tieck translation, both on the book market and in the minds of the critics, although actually less so on the stage itself. In addition, while there are numerous original writers in 1950s’ France who work with the Shakespearean text and for whom Shakespeare translation becomes a springboard for their own creative work, there is no comparable phenomenon in Germany. At the most, there are original plays which use Shakespeare as a cultural reference point – for example Heinar Kipphardt’s social satire *Shakespeare dringend gesucht* from 1953 – or, of course, Brecht’s adaptation of *Coriolanus*, on which Brecht worked at the beginning of the 1950s, although the play was not staged until the beginning of the 1960s. In this project, which continues a long line of Brechtian adaptations of other Shakespeare plays as well as plays by Sophocles, Marlowe, Molière and others, Brecht reads Shakespeare against the grain and tries to bring out the role of the people against that of the nobleman Coriolanus. This Brechtian refiguration of the Shakespearean text is preceded by a partial retranslation of *Coriolanus*. With respect to Shakespeare in 1950s Germany, it is perhaps not a coincidence that Brecht works in East Germany, where the official anti-fascist ideology may have allowed for more of a critical distance to the German national tradition. But even there, Brecht constitutes an exception, and his *Coriolanus* was not staged until well into the 1960s, after Brecht’s death and in a version reworked by two of Brecht’s collaborators. As if to prove the continued difficulties of newer Shakespeare translations in Germany, they did not use Brecht’s adaptation but Tieck’s translation.<sup>38</sup>

In fact, it is only in the 1960s that important creative writers begin to translate Shakespeare into German again, among them Erich Fried, who translates a wide selection of Shakespeare’s plays, and also Paul Celan, whose translations of the *Sonnets* partake in his own attempts to renew the German language after the Shoah (and who lived in Paris since 1948, which situates Celan at the crossroads of the German and the French Shakespearean traditions). Interestingly, it is thus mostly people who were persecuted and / or in exile during the Third Reich and thus at a distance from the ‘official’ cultural heritage (as incarnated by the *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, for example), who proposed novel translations in the 1950s and, especially, in the 1960s.<sup>39</sup>

## Conclusion

The opportunity to turn Shakespeare translation into a laboratory for critical reflection with which to contribute to a new cultural beginning after the war was not seized in the same way in Germany and France. In the 1950s, French Shakespeare translation represents a seat of creativity and cultural renewal, whereas, in the two German states, it appears as an instance of cultural continuity between the Third Reich and the post-war era. More case studies, examining other sources of translation, will need to follow in order to establish whether these results are indeed representative of a general attitude concerning translation (and, by extension, towards what is alien and ‘other’). Nonetheless, it is significant that, throughout the 1950s, German Shakespeare translation continues to be enmeshed in the past in so far as it combines numerous re-editions of the Schlegel-Tieck versions with critical texts that continue to argue for the superiority of that translation. Like in many other areas of German politics and culture, there is no *Stunde Null* in this field: Germany’s strong Shakespearean tradition casts its shadow over the 1950s and appears to issue in an inability to propose new and innovative Shakespeare translations up until the 1960s. As opposed to the collaborative efforts characteristic of French Shakespeare translation in the 1950s, there are only isolated translation enterprises in Germany, often by individuals who were at the margin of main-stream cultural life or who had been forced into exile during the 3<sup>rd</sup> Reich.

In contrast, in France, there is a new beginning of the dialogue with Shakespeare, which is carried in particular by a group of young, up-and-coming author-translators for whom Shakespeare translation represents a way of advancing both their own work and French culture at large. Prepared by the growing importance of Shakespeare in France throughout the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Shakespeare translation in the 1950s has great creative potential and it involves people who were (or who were to become later) key agents on the cultural scene. Shakespeare translation thus constitutes both an instance of and a motor for the general transformation of French post-war culture. As a sequel to the present study, more detailed textual analyses, both of individual translations and of original works by author-translators engaged in Shakespeare translation in the 1950s, are called for. Through such analyses, a clearer picture will emerge of how the intercultural dialogue analysed in the present paper plays out in practice and of how the groundwork laid

through Shakespeare translation in the 1950s later disseminated into French culture at large.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Wolfgang Rössig, *Literaturen der Welt in deutscher Übersetzung: eine chronologische Bibliographie* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1997), p. 7. Rössig speaks of an ‘intellectual paralysis’ during the Third Reich, resulting in a ‘need to catch up on world literature’ after the war. (‘Unbestechlich dokumentieren die bibliographischen Einträge zwischen 1933 und 1945 die geistige Lähmung in der NS-Zeit und den weltliterarischen Nachholbedarf der Nachkriegszeit.’) In spite of its selective nature, Rössig’s bibliography is a very valuable starting point for studying the history of translation into German. Significantly, the book lists only three new Shakespeare translations for the 1930s and 1940s, and other, more comprehensive bibliographical tools (such as the *Gesamtverzeichnis des deutschsprachigen Schrifttums*) confirm the scarcity of new Shakespeare translations during the Third Reich in particular.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. François-Victor Hugo’s 19<sup>th</sup> century translation of Shakespeare’s plays, revised by Christiane and René Lalou and published in several volumes by the Parisian *Éditions de Cluny* in the late 1930s and 40s.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Pierre Messiaen’s new translation of the *Comedies* and the *Tragedies*, published by Desclée de Brouwer in 1939 and 1941, respectively.

<sup>4</sup> For an overview concerning Shakespeare’s fate in France, see for example Isabelle Schwartz-Gastine, ‘France’, in *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. by Michael Dobson and Stanley Wells (Oxford: OUP, 2005), pp. 151-154. See also *Shakespeare et la France, études réunies par Patricia Dorval* (Paris: Société Française Shakespeare, 2000).

<sup>5</sup> Michel Poirier, ‘Introduction’, *Études anglaises*, 13 (1960), 101-105 (pp. 101-102). (‘Il est presque stupéfiant que le plus grand dramaturge de tous les temps n’ait pas été mieux apprécié d’une nation pour qui le théâtre représente depuis des siècles l’une des formes les plus vivantes et les plus goûtées de l’activité littéraire. Schématiquement, l’histoire de la fortune de Shakespeare en France apparaît comme un long processus d’assimilation qui [...] ne saurait être considéré comme achevé à l’heure actuelle’. Emphasis mine, M. Z.)

<sup>6</sup> Isabelle Schwartz-Gastine, ‘France’, p. 153.

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Michel Poirier, 'Introduction', pp. 101-2, and Henri Fluchère, 'Shakespeare in France: 1900-1948', *Shakespeare Survey*, 2 (1949), 115-125.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Nicole Fayard, *The Performance of Shakespeare in France Since the Second World War: Reimagining Shakespeare* (Lewiston, NY; Queenston, ON: The Edwin Mellon Press, 2006), pp. 8-9.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 24: 'This increase [in Shakespeare productions; M. Z.] was particularly marked after 1950, with a total of forty-one productions performed between 1950 and 1957, as against twenty-four in the whole of the preceding decade.'

<sup>10</sup> Jean Chatenet, *Shakespeare sur la scène française depuis 1940* (Paris: Minard, 1962), p. 32. For further examples, cf. the table on Shakespeare productions in France from 1940 to 1957 in *ibid.*, pp. 104-113.

<sup>11</sup> Yves Bonnefoy, *Shakespeare & the French poet*, ed., trans. and with an introduction by John Naughton (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2004), p. 213. ('[...] en un sens, il vaut sans doute mieux qu'il n'y ait pas eu trop tôt dans notre pays une traduction comparable à celle de Schlegel et Tieck, une traduction "classique" imposant par la force même de sa beauté une perspective à la fois indépassable et partielle.' Yves Bonnefoy, *Théâtre et poésie: Shakespeare et Yeats* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1998), p. 173).

<sup>12</sup> *Œuvres complètes* (Paris: Arc-en-Ciel, 1949-1951); *Œuvres complètes* (Paris: A. Lemerre, 1950 (vol. VII) and 1951 (vol. X)).

<sup>13</sup> *Théâtre complet*, avant-propos d'André Gide (Paris: Gallimard, 1938). This 2-volume edition was republished in 1950, 1952 and 1959.

<sup>14</sup> *Oeuvres complètes de Shakespeare*, [...] sous la direction de Pierre Leyris et Henri Evans [...], 7 vols (Paris: Formes et reflets (Le Club Français du Livre), 1954-1961).

<sup>15</sup> Pierre Leyris, 'Pourquoi retraduire Shakespeare', in *Œuvres complètes de Shakespeare* (Paris: Formes et Reflets (Le Club français du livre)), vol. I (1954), [I-V] (p. [II]). (« Nous avons donc besoin, surtout pour une comédie humaine aussi polyvalente, de traductions contemporaines accommodées à notre vue. »)

<sup>16</sup> Christian Pons, 'Les Traductions de Hamlet par des écrivains français', *Études Anglaises*, 13 (1960), 116-131 (p. 126-127). (« La traduction de Bonnefoy [...] l'emporte [...] d'assez loin sur toutes celles qui l'ont précédée. »).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Yves Bonnefoy, *Lieux et destins de l'image: un cours de poétique au Collège de France (1981-1993)* (Paris: Seuil, 1999).

---

<sup>18</sup> Apart from the critical texts cited in this section, I have used the following bibliographical works: Marie Horn-Monval, *Les traductions françaises de Shakespeare: à l'occasion du quatrième centenaire de sa naissance 1564-1964* (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1963 [sic]). – Marie Horn-Monval, *Répertoire bibliographique des traductions et adaptations françaises du théâtre étranger du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle à nos jours*, vol. v (*Théâtre anglais; Théâtre américain*) (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1963). – *Index Translationum*, New Series (Paris: Unesco, 1949–). – La Librairie Française, *Catalogue général des ouvrages parus du 1<sup>er</sup> janvier 1946 au 1<sup>er</sup> janvier 1956: tables décennales. Première Partie: Auteurs et Anonymes L à Z*. (Paris: Cercle de la librairie, [n. d.]). – La Librairie Française, *Tables décennales (auteurs J à Z): catalogue général des ouvrages parus en langue française entre le 1<sup>er</sup> janvier 1956 et le 1<sup>er</sup> janvier 1966*. (Paris: Cercle de la Librairie, 1968).

<sup>19</sup> For overviews on Shakespeare in Germany, cf. Werner Habicht, 'Germany', in *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*, pp. 161-163.– Hansjürgen Blinn; Wolf Gerhard Schmidt, 'Einleitung: Zur Geschichte der Shakespeare-Übersetzung in Deutschland', in Blinn; Schmidt, *Shakespeare-deutsch: Bibliographie der Übersetzungen und Bearbeitungen* (Weimar; Berlin: Schmidt, 2003), pp. 9-14. – Günther Erken, 'Deutschland' and 'Die deutschen Übersetzungen', in *Shakespeare-Handbuch*, ed. by Ina Schabert, 4<sup>th</sup> edn (Stuttgart: Kröner, 2000), pp. 635-660 and pp. 832-854.

When published, the final volume of the encyclopedia on translation studies, *Übersetzung – Translation – Traduction*, ed. by Harald Kittel and others, 3 vols (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004–), will make a valuable addition to Shakespeare scholarship: as the table of contents indicates, the third volume will contain an entire section on Shakespeare translation (and, in particular, a chapter on German Shakespeare translations in the 20<sup>th</sup> century).

<sup>20</sup> Quoted from Roger Paulin, *The Critical Reception of Shakespeare in Germany, 1682-1914* (Hildesheim; Zürich; New York: G. Olms, 2003), p. 1.

<sup>21</sup> One critic rightly refers to Schlegel's translation as part of a 'Verdeutschungskampagne', a 'campaign of Germanization' concerning Shakespeare. Cf. Jürgen Wertheimer, "'So macht das Gewissen Feige aus uns allen': Stufen und Vorstufen der Shakespeare-Übersetzung A. W. Schlegels", in *Das Shakespeare-Bild*

---

in *Europa zwischen Aufklärung und Romantik*, ed. by Roger Bauer, Bern: Lang, 1988, pp. 201-225 (p. 201).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Ruth von Ledebur, *Der Mythos vom deutschen Shakespeare: Die Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft zwischen Politik und Wissenschaft 1918-1945* (Köln; Weimar; Wien: Böhlau, 2000).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. 'Die "Wiedergeburt des germanischen Geistes" (1933-1943)', in Ledebur, *Der Mythos vom deutschen Shakespeare*, pp. 192-204.

<sup>24</sup> *Werke*, ed. by Levin Ludwig Schücking, 6 vols (Berlin: Tempel, 1955).

<sup>25</sup> *Sämtliche Werke in drei Bänden*, ed. by Anselm Schlösser (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1956).

<sup>26</sup> For East Germany in particular, a list of Shakespeare publications in the GDR up until 1964, published in the journal *Marginalien*, is revealing. Among the eight complete editions cited, there is only one which does not use the Schlegel-Tieck translation, and this dates from the mid-60s: *Werke in drei Bänden*. Neu übersetzt und erläutert von Rudolf Schaller (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1964). Among the 25 individual editions cited, only three are not translated by Schlegel or one of his collaborators, and only the translation of the *Sonnets* by Hans Hübner, first published in 1949, dates from the 20<sup>th</sup> century. (Anneliese Schmitt, 'Bibliographie der Shakespeare-Ausgaben in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik', *Marginalien*, 16 (1964), 59-64).

<sup>27</sup> Hans Rothe, *Der Elisabethanische Shakespeare. Das dramatische Werk*, 9 vols (Baden-Baden; Genf: Holle, 1955-1958); Richard Flatter, *Shakespeare in 6 Bänden* (Wien; Bad Bocklet; Zürich: Krieg, 1952-1955).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Blinn; Schmidt, 'Einleitung: Zur Geschichte der Shakespeare-Übersetzung in Deutschland', pp. 13-14, and Erken, 'Die deutschen Übersetzungen', pp. 849-851.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Wilhelm Hortmann, *Shakespeare on the German Stage: the 20th century* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), p. 181.

<sup>30</sup> This volume also saw the first of Hans Georg Heun's bibliographies on Shakespeare translation, which continued to be published in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* in irregular intervals over the following decades. Cf. Hans Georg Heun, 'Probleme der deutschen Shakespeare-Übersetzung (I-VIII): eine Bibliographie', *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* (from 1964: *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft West. Jahrbuch*), 1956-1980.

---

In addition, Heun also published a short book juxtaposing different German translations of various Shakespeare passages: *Shakespeare in deutschen Übersetzungen*, bearbeitet von Hans Georg Heun (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957).

<sup>31</sup> Hortmann, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*, p. 185.

<sup>32</sup> Ledebur, *Der Mythos vom deutschen Shakespeare*, p. 213.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Ledebur, *Der Mythos vom deutschen Shakespeare*, p. 214. Incidentally, the history of the *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* is a further example of the parallelism in the Shakespeare reception in both German states throughout the 1950s: the *Gesellschaft* continued to function as one institution throughout the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s, splitting up into an East and a West German branch in 1963.

<sup>34</sup> K. G. Kachler, 'Warum immer noch die Shakespeare-Übertragungen der Romantiker vorzuziehen sind', *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, 92 (1956), 90-95. An analogous example comes from a volume on German translations of *Hamlet*, published in 1965: Urs Helmsdorfer, 'Schlegel bleibt unerreicht', in *Der deutsche Shakespeare*, mit Beiträgen von Walter Muschg u. a. (Basel; Hamburg; Wien: Basilius Presse, 1965), pp. 141-145.

<sup>35</sup> Wolfgang Stroedel, 'Shakespeare – neu übers[etzt] von Richard Flatter', *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, 91 (1955), 353-355 (p. 354). My translation. ('Nur am Rande möge vermerkt werden, daß der Referent manche vertraute und in der romantischen Übersetzung bewunderte Stelle schmerzlich vermißt. Solche Einschränkungen müssen in Kauf genommen werden; man soll nicht den Wert im Vergleichen mit anderen Meisterwerken messen und daher in einem solchen Fall nicht jede einzelne Zeile gegenüber Schlegel abwägen. Hier muß [...] in Anspruch genommen werden, [...] daß [...] Schlegel und die Romantiker in manchem eben doch unübertrefflich sind.')

<sup>36</sup> 'Warum allerdings – um ein einzelnes Beispiel herauszugreifen – das bei Shakespeare zweimal vorkommende *Go to thy cold bed, and warm thee* (*Widerspenstige*, Vorspiel, [I, 10] und *König Lear* III, 4, 48), das Baudissin in beiden Fällen *Geh in dein kaltes Bett und wärme Dich* bringt, Flatter lediglich wiedergibt *Geh in dein Bett und wärme Dich*, vermag der Rezensent wirklich nicht einzusehen.' (Ibid.) The point is not that the reviewer should criticize the Flatter translation here: of course it is perfectly permissible to disapprove of the omission of the adjective 'cold' in Flatter's translation. However, it is revealing that the reviewer should feel the need



---

to secure his criticism by referring back to the Schlegel-Tieck translation, as if dealing with Flatter's translation on its own grounds were not enough.

<sup>37</sup> Hortmann, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*, p. 186.

<sup>38</sup> For an overview, with further literature, cf. Antony Tatlow, 'Coriolanus', in *Brecht-Handbuch*, ed. by Jan Knopf, 5 vols (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2001-2003), vol. I, 585-591.

<sup>39</sup> In addition to the critical texts cited in this section, I have used the following bibliographical tools: Hansjürgen Blinn; Wolf Schmidt, *Shakespeare-deutsch: Bibliographie der Übersetzungen und Bearbeitungen* (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 2003).– Hansjürgen Blinn, *The German Shakespeare = Der deutsche Shakespeare: an annotated bibliography of the Shakespeare reception in German-speaking countries...* (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1993).– *Index Translationum*.– Deutsche Bücherei, *Deutsches Bücherverzeichnis: 1951-1955* (Leipzig: Verlag für Buch- und Bibliothekswesen, 1960).– Deutsche Bücherei Leipzig, *Deutsches Bücherverzeichnis: 1956-1960* (Leipzig: Verlag für Buch- und Bibliothekswesen, 1967).– *Gesamtverzeichnis des deutschsprachigen Schrifttums (GV): 1911-1965*, hrsg. v. Reinhard Oberschelp... München: Saur, 1980.