

III. Шекспірівський дискурс

DOI: 10.32782/2225-479X-2023-36-37-7

УДК: 82.111Шек: 81'255.2:8

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0606-8658>

Vyroubalová Ema
(Dublin, Ireland)

Translating Shakespeare's Untranslatable Histories

Вирубалова Ема. Труднощі перекладу історичних хронік Шекспіра.

У порівнянні з трагедіями та комедіями, історичні хроніки Шекспіра рідше ставляться за межами англомовних країн, оскільки вважається, що історична специфіка робить їх менш зручними в плані мовної й культурної адаптації. У цій статті аналізуються приклади трьох театральних постановок, які всупереч згаданій тенденції були успішно здійснені в останню чверть ХХ століття в країнах континентальної Європи: чехословацька прем'єра «Генріха V» (1971–1975) у Чеському національному театрі режисера Мірослава Махачека, «Теп Oorlog» (адаптація двох Генріад голландською та французькою мовами) Тома Ланое і Люка Персеваля (1997) та французька прем'єра «Генріха V» за перекладом Жана Мішеля Денра й режисурою Жана-Луї Бенуа на Авіньйонському фестивалі (1999).

У всіх трьох випадках привабливість театральних вистав для переважно неангломовної аудиторії можна пояснити тим, що найсерйозніші проблеми транслінгвістичної й транскультурної адаптації перекладачам і режисерам вдалося перетворити на головні переваги цих інноваційних постановок. Вистава «Теп Oorlog» («На війні») об'єднала вісім історичних п'єс Шекспіра у захоплююче десятигодинне видовище, де послідовність і безперервність оповіді переважала над історичною достовірністю. Чеський «Генріх V» використав часову відстань між середньовічною Англією й тоталітарною Чехословаччиною, щоб створити ефективний у драматургічному й лінгвістичному плані елемент політичної провокації. Французькому «Генріху V» вдалося вирішити протиріччя, яке властиве перекладу антифранцузької п'єси, написаної сумішню

III. Шекспірівський дискурс

єлизаветинської англійської та спотвореної французької мов, змінивши співвідношення між мовами та представивши сценарій у комбінації сучасної французької мови з невеликою кількістю рядків. виголошених спотвореною англійською.

Ключові слова: історичні хроніки Шекспіра. «Генріх V», «Тен Оорлог», транслінгвістична й транскультурна адаптація, Мірослав Махачек, Том Ланое.

In his foreword to *Shakespeare's History Plays*, Dennis Kennedy quotes the Belgian writer Tom Lanoye, who observes that to Belgian audiences these plays are “a baffling series of conspiracies, marriages, murder, and battles” while “Richmond and Kent are not historical figures or geographical place names, they are cigarette brands.”¹ Although it is certainly true that Shakespeare's Histories pose special challenges to theatre-goers outside of the British Isles, Manfred Pfister has criticized Kennedy's choice of the quote by the co-creator (along with the theatre director Luk Perceval) of *Ten Oorlog* (At War), an epic ten-hour Dutch-French version of Shakespeare's two Henriads, as a “willfully self-defeating move in the argument” for transferability of the plays into non-Anglophone settings.² But does not Kennedy's choice of the quote (as do the essays that follow his foreword in the volume) rather testify to the immense complexity of the whole process of transferring dramatic texts rooted strongly in the original country and language of production into other linguistic and cultural milieus? Lanoye encapsulates perfectly the multifaceted conundrum presented to translators and theatre directors alike by elements such as proper names, which are an integral part of the original text and its meaning but which at the same time usually cannot be easily translated into another language: their potential to confuse foreign audiences; the notion that these features may render the text as a whole somehow untranslatable; and the paradox that when the text surrounding them is translated, these elements will often acquire meanings and

¹ Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad / ed. Ton Hoenselaars. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 3.

² Pfister M. Review of Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad. *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 2006, V. 57 (1), P. 91–96. The review is otherwise mostly positive.

associations not present in the original nor explicitly intended by the translator(s). This essay looks at examples of three approaches to translating and adapting Shakespeare's history plays, which can be considered, in each case for different reasons, as extreme, but which were simultaneously theatrically successful: Lanoye's and Perceval's *Ten Oorlog* from 1997; the Czechoslovak premiere of *Henry V* directed by Miroslav Macháček at the Czech National Theatre in Prague between 1971 and 1975; and the French premiere of *Henry V* directed by Jean-Louis Benoît at the Avignon Festival in 1999.

Kennedy quoted Lanoye from the marketing text on the cover of the *Ten Oorlog* three-volume set, but the Belgian writer and translator had also resorted to the seemingly facetious cigarette brand analogy in a newspaper article published shortly before the production's Belgian premiere in order to argue that the potential for loss and confusion incurred by translating the histories is outweighed by a sense of freedom and possibility not quite available to directors of the histories' Anglophone versions:

To us, Kent is a pack of cigarettes or somewhere something in England, but to the English it is a historical icon. To us Gloster [sic] is something way more abstract than to the English, and also more exotic. Having discovered this, I started feeling more free, I started playing with it. All of a sudden I realized that I could leave the historical perspective behind to look what lies beneath.³

That Lanoye and Perceval's instincts about the dramatic potential of the histories in translation were correct is borne out by the overwhelmingly favorable reception of *Ten Oorlog*.⁴ Two years later it was even translated into German and staged, again with considerable acclaim, at a number of venues across Germany

³ Laurens de Kreyzer: "Als een ruïne die je opgraaft." *De Standaard* 24. October, 1997. I am quoting from the translation on p. 11 of Inneke Plaschaert's MA thesis, published electronically at (Plaschaert I. Contemporary adaptations of Shakespearean drama: the language use in and reception of *Ten Oorlog* by Tom Lanoye and Luk Perceval. 2010–2011. URL: http://lib.ugent.be/fulltxt/RUG01/001/786/574/RUG01-001786574_2012_0001_AC.pdf).

⁴ *Ten Oorlog* (At War) transforms Shakespeare's eight histories into shorter six more closely interconnected plays. It was well attended and positively reviewed by both theatre critics and literary scholars. It premiered on November 22, 1997 in Kunsten Centrum Vooruit in Ghent. For a detailed account of the reception, see de Kreyzer's thesis cited above (Plaschaert I. Op. cit. P. 14–25).

III. Шекспірівський дискурс

and Austria.⁵ Although Lanoye himself claimed, probably with some hyperbole, that he was completely confused by the plots of the original eight plays, when he first encountered them, the extensively adapted translation he crafted was to the Belgian and Dutch (and later in the German version German and Austrian) audiences much more than the baffling maze that their translator and adapter initially saw them as.⁶

The peculiar resilience of characters' names, which refuse both to yield to a translation and to continue signifying as they did in the original text, is part of the tricky logistics involved in translating the linguistically, historically, geographically, and culturally determined realities of the plays. The problem extends to all proper names as well as to expressions of difference between languages such as words, lines, or entire passages either in dialects of the plays' original language or in a different language altogether. In a translation, these elements will inevitably stand apart from the rest of the play text since they will either be left untranslated or they will have to be accommodated through various resourceful translating moves. The issue is naturally more urgent in performance as printed play-texts can bypass many of the problems with the aid of paratextual devices such as footnotes or endnotes, typographic distinctions like italics, or explanations included in the prefatory matter. Yet the question of how to accommodate these translation-resistant elements is far from a purely technical one. The problem is closely linked to the meanings communicated by the history plays themselves and to their status as works in which the past and the present come together to provide the audience with a novel perspective on both.

As Romeo and Juliet find out, there is power in names. Similarly, the device of linguistically "othered" speech is deployed to express power relations between the characters involved. Dirk Delabastita points out in his discussion of Shakespeare's use of translation as a dramatic device that "using a certain language, or using it in a certain way, will place you inside or outside a social

⁵ The German version was entitled *Schlachten* (Battles) and opened at the Salzburg Festival on July 25, 1999. The text was translated into German by a team of translators headed by Klaus Reichert.

⁶ Plaschaert I. Op. cit. P. 11.

group and earn you a relative position of status and superiority, or one of vulnerability.”⁷ The relationship between linguistic difference and various forms of power, both in literary texts and real life, has been identified and theorized by thinkers including Jacques Derrida and Pierre Bourdieu.⁸ A translator confronted with one of the translation-resistant elements needs to do something else than find a lexically and syntactically suitable equivalent for it. Whether this element consists of one or many words, the translator has to come up with a dramaturgically convincing solution that will effectively communicate to the audiences the power dynamics implicated in the translation-resistant element in the original text.

Shakespeare's history plays repeatedly enlist linguistic difference in the service of dramatizing the political, military, and interpersonal conflicts they depict. The plays in fact feature linguistic difference in all the major incarnations possible from an Anglophone perspective: native mainstream (i.e., non dialectal) English, regional dialects of English, English spoken imperfectly by non-native speakers, languages other than English spoken by their native speakers as well as (usually imperfectly) by English characters. While in *All's Well That Ends Well* Paroles has to fear only for a brief moment that he “shall lose [his] life for want of language” (4.4.70), in the worlds of the history plays the ability or a lack thereof to speak a particular language or dialect generally comes with more serious repercussions for the speakers.

Ten Oorlog embraces this dimension of the plays, despite the logistical difficulties that inevitably accompany the process of translating an already multilingual text. On the one hand, Lanoye approached some of the challenging passages by simply eliminating them: for instance, the whole Welsh subplot from *Hendrik Vier* (the part of the cycle corresponding to the two

⁷ Delabastida D. Translation as a dramatic device. *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation* / ed. Ton Hoenselaars. London : Arden Shakespeare, 2004. P. 34.

⁸ Some of the most relevant texts include: Derrida's *Monolingualism of the Other or, The Prosthesis of Origin*, trans. Patrick Mensah (Stanford University Press, 1998), originally published in French in 1996, and *The Ear of the Other: Otobiography, Transference, Translation* (University of Nebraska Press, 1988), originally published in French in 1982; and Bourdieu's *Language and Symbolic Power* (Harvard University Press 1999), the original French essays translated in the English volume were published between 1977 and 1982.

III. Шекспірівський дискурс

Henry IV plays) is cut, along with its need for lines of improvised Welsh spoken (and sung) by Glendower and his daughter. The intricate geopolitical landscape of Shakespeare's two Henriads is also streamlined: almost all the foreign wives of English characters featured in *Ten Oorlog* are French (e.g. the wives of Richard II and Mortimer, who in Shakespeare's versions are of composite Spanish/Czech and Welsh origins respectively) and all the rebellions, taking part in the original plays across different parts of the British Isles, are concentrated into Ireland.⁹

Yet Lanoye crafts for each of the plays in his cycle a distinct linguistic signature, which draws on the same dramatic techniques as do the originals' bilingual scenes, many of which he eliminated. This linguistic signature emanates from each play's respective monarch and not only helps set the tone for the plot but in a sense becomes part of the action, as if providing a parallel running commentary on the unfolding events. Henry V's equivalent in *Hendrik de Vijfden* speaks in a straightforward and almost colloquial Dutch interspersed with Flemish words, which forges a strong association between him and the ordinary Flemish-speaking soldiers and at the same time brings his speech closer to the language spoken by the Flemish audiences for whom the play was originally written. After the victory at Harfleur, the French Princess (and Hendrik's future wife) sings the same Flemish song sung by the English king and by the soldiers earlier in the play. These dramaturgical choices imaginatively convey the play's interest in language as a tool of both conquest and leadership as well as its particular take on the relationship between language and power, namely that a popularization of language can operate as part of a ruling strategy. In *Richaar Deuzième* the monarchical language is an archaically flavored Dutch with frequent French interpolations, spoken by the king and his adherents but gradually

⁹ Plasschaert discusses the adjustments to the plots and the languages of the play on p. 26–87 of her thesis (Plasschaert I.). There are only two published works specifically dealing with *Ten Oorlog*: Hoenselaars T. Two Flemings at War with Shakespeare. *Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad* / ed. Ton Hoenselaars. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 244–261; Vos de J. Shakespeare's History Plays in Belgium: Taken Apart and Reconstructed 'Grand Narrative'. *Four Hundred Years of Shakespeare in Europe* / eds. Ton Hoenselaars and Stanley Wells. Newark : University of Delaware Press, 2003. P. 211–222.

limited only to Richaar himself and supplanted by the more contemporary Dutch spoken by Bolingbroke's equivalent Hendrik Vier. The translator announces his particular take on the connection between political power and language as "Richaar", the phonetically rendered Flemish pronunciation of Richard, and "Deuzième", the spelt-out French ordinal following it, morph into the hapless king's bilingual appellation that also lends its name to the play's title. The bifurcation implied in both the play's and the king's titles as well as in Richard's unnaturally hybrid speech feeds into the divisions and breakdowns that eventually lead to the Richaar's deposition and demise.

Although it was clearly not the sole factor, at least some of the success of *Ten Oorlog* can be attributed to the linguistic difference already present in the original plays being adopted and adapted as an integral part of the translation's design. A coincidental but convenient alignment between the multilingual dynamic in Shakespeare's plays and in the linguistic milieu into which they were transplanted would have facilitated the complex process. French is by far the most prominent of the foreign languages featured in Shakespeare's histories. Even in *Richard II*, where the language per se does not make an appearance, the king is directly associated with France when he is referred to, through his foreign birth place, as "Richard of Bordeaux". Similarly, in Lanoye's and Perceval's home-base, the Flemish-speaking part of Belgium, French is the most commonly present second language and as such it also carries a strong political charge.¹⁰ French thus offered itself readily (along with the differences between Dutch and Flemish and more sporadic use of other languages and dialects, including British and American English) as a productive tool in the dramatization of the relationship between language and power in *Ten Oorlog*.

While the extreme nature of *Ten Oorlog* lies in its ambition to cover all of the eight continuous history plays, combine them into a single production with a varied but continuous sense of political and linguistic power dynamic, the Czechoslovak premiere

¹⁰ French was Belgium's only official language until 1898. Tensions between the Dutch and French-speaking parts of the country are deep-rooted and official delineation of the country into Dutch and French speaking regions is granted in the 1970 constitution.

III. Шекспірівський дискурс

of *Henry V* directed by Miroslav Macháček between 1971 and 1975 for the Czech National Theatre in Prague embraced another kind of extreme. This production ventured to use Shakespeare's play in Czech translation as a tool of political resistance and enlisted a particular feature of the play's multilingual power dynamic for this purpose.¹¹ The early 1970s in Czechoslovakia were in the spirit of a repressive Soviet-backed regime, put in place after the invasion of the country by the armies of the Warsaw Pact in August 1968. Although the atmosphere was not in the least conducive to any semblance of freedom of artistic expression, elements of political dissent can be found in every type of cultural production from this time, from theatre and film through visual arts and music to literature. Repercussions for creators of the subversive art often followed but they varied greatly in their severity and consistency. As had been the case at other points in Czech history, Shakespeare's plays provided a useful vehicle for some of this dissent.¹² From the perspective of the totalitarian regime, Shakespeare's panopticon of characters from diverse social, economic, and cultural backgrounds and their various interactions and conflicts could virtually always be read as depicting some form of class struggle and were hence amenable to some degree of Marxist re-interpretation, as was at least nominally expected of all cultural production at the time. Ironically, artists saw in that same dramaturgical variety of the plays a vast repository of opportunities for sometimes less sometimes more covert political dissent.

Macháček must have sensed this potential too when he made the choice (and succeeded in obtaining the requisite approval) to not only direct the Czech premiere of *Henry V* but to do so at the country's most prestigious performance venue, the main scene of the National Theatre in Prague. To the authorities, the play must have initially looked innocuous enough as one of Shakespeare's more obscure pieces, dramatizing an episode from military history

¹¹ The production is described briefly by Martin Hilský in the documentary *Shakespeare v Čechách (Shakespeare in Bohemia)*, directed by P. Palouš, 2001.

¹² For a discussion and overview of this phenomenon, see Procházka M. *Shakespeare and Czech Resistance. Shakespeare: World Views* / ed. H. Kerr, R. Eaden, M. Mitton. Newark : University of Delaware Press, 1996. P. 44–69.

that had happened in a distant corner of medieval Europe. Yet the parallel between the play's theme of England's invasion and political takeover of France and the recent Soviet invasion and ongoing occupation of Czechoslovakia would have been hard to miss for anyone who understands that drama set in a time and place distant from one's immediate reality can still be politically relevant. And the production did not leave it at this broad parallel only. The play was performed in a modern Czech translation by the renowned translator Břetislav Hodek, commissioned especially for the performance, but Macháček and Hodek, who were co-credited as the dramaturges of the production, also made a number of unscripted changes to the official translation. The most notable of these alterations concerned one of the play's multilingual passages – the scene with the English, Welsh, Irish, and Scottish captains speaking to one another in their respective English dialects (3.2). The main challenge this scene presents to any translator is whether and how to render the respective English dialects from the different corners of the so-called Celtic periphery in a language other than English. The official published version of Hodek's translation replaced the Irish, Scottish, and Welsh dialects with an assortment of Czech dialects, which had by then become relatively obsolete, and the audiences, if they were familiar with them at all, would have known them from historical literature and films rather than from real life.

However, in the performances, Fluellen's lines were rendered in a Czecho-Slovak patois that sounded suspiciously similar to the speech of the First Secretary of the Czechoslovak communist party Gustáv Husák, who replaced Alexander Dubček in the post after the Soviet invasion and so became a living symbol of the repression that followed. Both Dubček and Husák were Slovak, but unlike his predecessor, Husák on official occasions sometimes chose to speak Czech, into which he liberally mixed vocabulary from his native Slovak, sometimes to an unintended comical effect. Given the political climate at the time, imitating (and implicitly mocking) the language of any figure from the country's political leadership would have been patently dangerous in any kind of public venue. In this case the transgression was

III. Шекспірівський дискурс

aggravated by the specifics of the context in which it was carried out: that of a major production mounted at the country's most important theatre; the offending lines were incorporated into an explicitly comedic scene; both the scene and the character concerned deal with the topic of ineffective leadership. Moreover, the colonial subtext of Shakespeare's original scene, which negotiates the uneven relationship between England with its early colonial ambitions and the lands of the so-called Celtic periphery, helped evoke the on-going Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia.

The subversive Fluellen proved very popular with theatre-goers, who frequently interrupted the performances with impromptu applause and cheering. Macháček was eventually forced to switch the Welsh Captain's lines back to the obscure Czech dialect originally scripted in Hodek's translation but the run of *Henry V* was allowed to continue and even in this "sanitized" version the play continued to attract audiences. By the time it closed in 1975, it had been performed over one hundred times, which made it into one of the most successful Czech productions of Shakespeare. In his biography Macháček describes how he defended himself from accusations of creating anti-socialist art, by insisting that he "had the best intentions of producing a play with a clear and straightforward anti-war theme" and that it was not his fault that the spectators were seeing unintended parallels and references in the play-script.¹³ Macháček's punishment was relatively lenient as he was banned from working for film, television, and radio but allowed to continue to work in the less socially influential medium of theatre, although even in this capacity he was subjected to periodic harassment from the authorities, which eventually led to a major nervous breakdown and a lengthy stay at a psychiatric hospital in the mid 1970s. The (mis)fortunes of Macháček's *Henry V* show how the connection between language and political power, already implicit in the plots of Shakespeare's histories, can be further amplified and re-appropriated through a textually and technically relatively simple intervention, such as a strategic tweaking of the lines of a minor

¹³ These events are outlined in his short autobiography: Macháček M. *Zápisky z blázince* (Notes from a Madhouse). Prague : Český spisovatel, 1995.

character like Fluellen. A production with its strategic linguistic quirks could thus empower its creators in the sense of arming them with a vocal weapon against a political reality on which they could otherwise have little impact. Given the extreme imbalance of powers that defines a totalitarian political climate, the authorities could of course easily strike back, as they did when they half-silenced Macháček's artistic career.

My final example of successfully translating Shakespeare's histories into seemingly inhospitable linguistic and cultural contexts, deals with an extreme technical challenge: translating Shakespeare's arguably most French play, *Henry V*, into French. As Jean-Michel Déprats has observed:

Over and above the more common difficulties of Shakespearean translation, *Henry V* confronts one with specific linguistic problems and oddities that baffle the French translator, leaving him at many points with little choice but to adapt, transpose, recreate, 'undertranslating' in some instances ... or leaving it to the actors to translate the untranslatable.¹⁴

Déprats is speaking here from his own experience: he has authored both the French version of the screenplay for the dubbing of Kenneth Branagh's *Henry V* and the French translation of the play used in the historic performance of *Henry V* in Avignon in 1999. The precariousness of the task of translating *Henry V* into French is not merely due to the logistical issue of having to render what is essentially a bilingual English-French text (compounded further by dialectal and non-standard features), into French. A political dimension of course contributes to the challenge even though the politics involved are very different and less extreme than the situation faced by Macháček's Czech *Henry V* in the totalitarian Czechoslovakia of the 1970s.

When visiting Versailles, Samuel Johnson jocularly proposed a production of *Henry V* in its new Opera Theatre. Yet it took over two more centuries for a performance of the play to see the light of

¹⁴ Déprats J. M. A French *History of Henry V*. Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad / ed. Ton Hoenselaars. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 76.

III. Шекспірівський дискурс

day in France.¹⁵ Ariane Mnouchkine had considered taking it on with Théâtre du Soleil in the 1980s as part of a longer Plantagenet-themed cycle but eventually abandoned the idea. Even the *Henry VI* plays, which contain both anti-French sentiment and technically challenging bilingual elements, had their French premieres before the globally more popular and better-known *Henry V*.¹⁶ That the premier of a French *Henry V* on the French soil eventually took place as the inaugural show of the country's most prestigious annual performing arts festival seems to amount to an implicit acknowledgement that a production of it was indeed long overdue but overdue for good reasons.

Déprats describes the process of crafting the translation for this occasion in terms of being forced to pick the least unsatisfactory option from a set of inevitably imperfect choices. He talks about the decision which any Francophone rendering of *Henry V* will require at the outset – choosing between retaining Shakespeare's (idiosyncratic, often unidiomatic, and now also dated) French and translating it into modern French along with the rest of the lines – as deciding between “two perhaps equally failing alternatives.”¹⁷ The third option of translating the whole play into Renaissance or medieval French is theoretically also possible but naturally not attractive to contemporary audiences. These three basic templates can be further hybridized and adapted: in the translation by Geneviève and Daniel Bournet from 1992, Shakespeare's French is translated into medieval French, in an effort to put the play's historical context in the service of a dramatically viable recreation of the original's language dynamic. Déprats dismisses this arguably original solution as “crazy inventiveness”.¹⁸ Although his harsh call seems to betray a sense of professional rivalry with the Bournets, it underscores the

¹⁵ The anecdote from Johnson's visit to the theatre was recorded by Hester Piozzi and is cited in: Dr Johnson on Shakespeare / ed. W. K. Wimsatt. Harmondsworth : Penguin Books, 1969. P. 121.

¹⁶ For more information on Mnouchkine's history cycle planned in the 1980s but never realized and Stuart Seidl's *Henry VI* productions in 1995, see: Goy-Blanquet D. Shakespearean History at the Avignon Festival / Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad / ed. Ton Hoenselaars. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 229–230.

¹⁷ Déprats J. M. Op. cit. P. 79. The decisions summarized in the rest of my paragraph are discussed in detail on pages 78–89 of the same article.

¹⁸ Ibid. P. 81.

difficulty of reproducing the linguistic, political, and dramatic dimensions of Shakespeare's text all at the same time.¹⁹ The relationship between power and language which emerges out of the conundrum of a French *Henry V* seems to centre on the powerlessness of the translator.

Yet a closer look at Déprats' engagement with *Henry V* reveals the translator exercising a large degree of agency to create dramaturgically viable, commercially successful, and critically acclaimed products. He tailored each of his translations to the respective medium: in the case of Branagh's film he opted to keep most of Shakespeare's French since he deemed its unidiomatic anglicized flair a good fit with the British actors portraying the French characters; in the case of *Benoît's* Avignon production he chose to translate Shakespeare's French lines into modern French along with the rest of the play, recreating the multilingual dynamic of the original by retaining a selection of simple and sometimes garbled English lines from moments in the text such as the Language Lesson Scene or the Wooing Scene, which would be readily comprehensible to most French spectators.

The challenges that Shakespeare's history plays present to those who seek to translate and adapt them into non-Anglophone linguistic and cultural contexts have to do less with the ability of other languages to capture the nuances of Shakespeare's language as the ability of the translated text to capture the cultural freight of those moments in which Shakespeare's "English" text itself enlists elements of foreign languages and depends on them for its poetic and dramaturgical effectiveness. These polysemic elements in the original texts ultimately compel translators to craft creative solutions that actively draw on the specificity of the languages and contexts into which they are translating the plays.

References:

Delabastita D. Translation as a dramatic device. *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation* / ed. Ton Hoenselaars. London : Arden Shakespeare, 2004.

¹⁹ Shakespeare W. Théâtre Complet, 4 vols / trans. Daniel and Geneviève Bourmet. Lausanne : L'Age d'Homme, 1992.

III. Шекспірівський дискурс

Déprats J. M. A French *History of Henry V*. Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad / ed. Ton Hoenselaars. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 75–90.

Dr Johnson on Shakespeare / ed. W. K. Wimsatt. Harmondsworth : Penguin Books, 1969.

Goy-Blanquet D. Shakespearean History at the Avignon Festival / Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad / ed. Ton Hoenselaars. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 228–243.

Hoenselaars T. Two Flemings at War with Shakespeare. Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad / ed. Ton Hoenselaars. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 244–261.

Macháček M. *Zápisky z blázince* (Notes from a Madhouse). Prague : Český spisovatel, 1995.

Pfister M. Review of Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad. *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 2006, V. 57 (1), P. 91–96.

Plaschaert I. Contemporary adaptations of Shakespearean drama: the language use in and reception of *Ten Oorlog* by Tom Lanoye and Luk Perceval. 2010–2011. URL:http://lib.ugent.be/fulltxt/RUG01/001/786/574/RUG01-001786574_2012_0001_AC.pdf.

Procházka M. Shakespeare and Czech Resistance. *Shakespeare: World Views* / ed. H. Kerr, R. Eaden, M. Mitton. Newark : University of Delaware Press, 1996. P. 44–69.

Shakespeare W. *Théâtre Complet*, 4 vols / trans. Daniel and Geneviève Bournet. Lausanne : L'Age d'Homme, 1992.

Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad / ed. Ton Hoenselaars. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Vos de J. Shakespeare's History Plays in Belgium: Taken Apart and Reconstructed 'Grand Narrative'. *Four Hundred Years of Shakespeare in Europe* / eds. Ton Hoenselaars and Stanley Wells. Newark : University of Delaware Press, 2003. P. 211–222.