

LA PERRUQUE IN A RENTED APARTMENT:
REWRITING SHAKESPEARE IN FINLAND

Sirkku Aaltonen

University of Vaasa
Finland

Although the history of the Finnish language and literature is some five centuries old, they only really were combined and developed in the nineteenth century. The Finnish Shakespeare tradition must be seen against this background. In this essay I propose to contextualise it in the historical background of Finnish culture and theatre. The readings of Shakespeare's plays on the Finnish stage have in the second half of the twentieth century completed a cycle, and come near to where they started some 150 years previously. In Finland, theatre texts, as well as drama in general, are not published for general readership, and my emphasis will therefore be largely on theatre texts and their use as an element in productions.

Shakespeare was first chosen for the Finnish stage by foreign theatre troupes because he offered good stageable stories with good parts for star actors. Similarly, the first translation into Finnish of a Shakespeare play—*Macbeth*—was shaped to read as a good narrative. The Romantics in the newly established Finnish national theatre, however, chose Shakespeare as an author and genius whose poetics were superior to anything that Finland could offer, and they used

Ilha do Desterro	Florianópolis	nº 36	p.141-159	jan./jun. 1999
------------------	---------------	-------	-----------	----------------

Shakespeare's plays to measure the sophistication of the domestic idiom. The third phase of Shakespeare readings started in the 1960s and 1970s when artistic directors undertook to mould Shakespeare to meet (what they perceived) as the needs of their contemporary audiences. This phase, which still continues, highlights the director and the production: Shakespeare as an author is of secondary importance to his subject matter, and the director is the new co-author.

The title of my essay comes from a French philosopher, Michel De Certeau (24-25) who has described as *la perruque* the art of practice which makes it possible to take distance from the institutionalised, fixed models that reign from top to bottom. Just as workers may do their own work in the workplace and disguise it as being done for the employer, borrowing the tools or the time allocated to do a job, so translations can become the translators' *perruque*, their own work disguised as that of the "employer", i.e., a superior culture and its superior author, Shakespeare.

In the cycle of Finnish Shakespeare readings, we can see evidence of the inferior turning the tables to her own advantage. It is no longer a measure of sophistication to be able to take on a Shakespeare play as it is offered in an existing translation, but it can be bent to suit your own needs. Thus the celebration of freedom in extending the trajectories of plays has shifted the focus once more on to good stageable stories, and Shakespeare has been subverted to raise contemporary issues in guerrilla warfare against traditional readings and productions.

De Certeau's metaphor (xxi - xxii) of a text as a rented apartment is very effective here. Mutations, as the readers poach on the text, transport into it and pluralise themselves in it, transforming another person's property into a space borrowed for a moment by a transient. Tenants make comparable changes in an apartment; they furnish it with their acts and memories, and so do translators insert both the messages of their native tongue and, through their own turns of phrase, their own history into their translation. Today the text comes no longer from a literary tradition but is imposed by the generation of a

productivistic technocracy. It is no longer a referential book, but a whole society made into a book, into the writing of the anonymous law of production.

During the two centuries of its existence, Finnish theatre translations have subverted and rewritten Shakespeare to serve the demands of contemporary theatre practitioners and audiences. The apartment which was rented some two hundred years ago has been refurbished and renovated according to the needs of its successive tenants.

Historical Background

The Finns lived under the Swedish crown for nearly seven hundred years, from 1155 to 1809, and were then annexed to Russia for another hundred years until 1917. An economic and cultural revival started as late as 1500 when Latin began to lose its status within the church, and some translation activity into Finnish was undertaken by scholars. The first Finnish book to appear in print was an ABC-book from around the mid-sixteenth century, a few years before the translation of the New Testament into Finnish.

The history of Finnish literature is bilingual, although Finnish has mostly been in the shadow of Swedish. During the Swedish period of jurisdiction, only 174 books were printed in the Finnish language, and even in the eighteenth century only 20% of the books were in Finnish, while Swedish and Latin accounted for 40% each. Neither novels nor short stories or drama were published in Finnish (Laitinen 105). Even as late as the mid-nineteenth century, Swedish works outnumbered Finnish ones; in the 1870s they were neck and neck, and by 1905, Swedish titles had gone down to 30%. Although the first translation of a novel into Finnish, the German *Goldmacherdorf* by Heinrich Zschokke was completed in 1834, it was not until the 1860s that Finnish prose works began to emerge. The first Finnish novel appeared in 1870 (Laitinen 206).

Finnish Theatre

The inauguration ceremony for the first Finnish university in 1640 was the context for the first theatre performance in Finland, and the play was a translation into either Swedish or Latin. The first production of a play in Finnish followed some ten years later, but audiences had to wait nearly two hundred years for the first play originally written in Finnish to be put on stage. All these performances were given by students, whose theatrical activities were first encouraged by the Swedish Crown, and later tolerated by the Russian censorship laws.

It was, however, not the students, but foreign theatre troupes, who introduced Shakespeare to Finnish audiences. For nearly up to a century, 1760-1860, Finland formed the backyard of Swedish, German, and Russian professional theatres. The Finnish nobility saw French, English, German, and Swedish drama both in the "original" and as "adaptations", "translations" and "travesties". It was typical of the repertoires to make no distinction between originals and translations, and texts could be changed from a poem or novel into a play, then into a play with music or opera, and into a pantomime (Tiusanen 59).

After the 1840s there was further acting in the Finnish language, and by 1872, the supporters of a Finnish national theatre were able to offer 88 plays either written in Finnish or translated into Finnish, either in printed form or as theatre scripts, to justify their demands for a Finnish stage. Finland got her National Theatre, and its repertoire included in the first year classics such as Holberg, Goethe and the Finns Kivi and Topelius. Some five years later, plays by Molière, Beaumarchais, Hugo, Sheridan, Schiller, Holberg, and Oehlenschläger were put on stage. At the establishment of the Finnish theatre, domestic drama accounted for about a quarter, and later, from 1890-91, some third of the plays in each year (Tiusanen 554).

Theatre as an institution has established itself firmly in Finland. There are main theatres and fringe theatres, theatre companies, puppet theatres, dance theatres, summer theatres, and student theatres. Finnish

and Swedish theatres exist side by side in bilingual regions. Of the repertoires in Finnish theatres, a substantial part are still translations, and, for example, in the theatrical season 1995-1996, Finnish plays accounted for 38%, American plays for 20%, English plays for 12%, Swedish 5%, and German, Hungarian, and French drama for 3% each of sold theatre tickets.

As Shakespeare productions in Finland fall roughly into three broad categories, in what follows, I will analyse the characteristics of the three approaches to the plays. The time span covered by the analysis extends from their introduction to the stage in the eighteenth century to their most recent reception by contemporary theatres and their audiences.

Early Shakespeare: Plays for the Stage

Shakespeare first came to Finland through foreign theatre troupes, who performed the plays either in Swedish or in German. The earliest performance is believed to have been the 1768 production of *Romeo and Juliet* by the Seuerling theatre company. Seuerling, who was the first theatre director to perform Shakespeare in Sweden too, performed the play in Ducis' melodramatic version¹. The following productions took place under Russian rule, and in 1819 *Hamlet* was performed in Turku (which was the capital at that time). The performance is known to have been repeated the following year (Hirn 258). The text was a revised version of the Swedish translation by P.A. Granberg, a relatively free prose translation, with many omissions and much moralising which had been further adapted by the director, and, after the production in Sweden, revised by the translator (Smidt 101). *Hamlet* was also performed by C. W. Westerlund's company in Helsinki in 1831, by a German company in 1837, and by Pierre Deland's group in 1840.

Macbeth was first performed in Helsinki in 1838 by Torsslow's theatre company in Hinrik Sandström's translation into Swedish, which was based on the German version of the play by Schiller.² Up until the

second half of the eighteenth century, however, the Swedish-speaking cultural élite in Finland showed relatively little interest in Shakespeare, and his plays were even accused of shapelessness, which reflected the prevailing French classicism (Salosaari 72).

The first Finnish Shakespeare translation was completed by J. F. Lagervall in 1834. He rewrote and reset the play in Finland, basing his version on the Swedish translation of the play by Geijer, whose text owed a great deal to Schiller (Hirn 260). Lagervall made *Macbeth* a Finnish play and called it *Ruunulinna*. His translation acculturated its source text by using the traditional *Kalevala* meter of Finnish folk poetry, as well as alliteration, another characteristic of the Finnish national epic. The play was reset in Finland, with Finnish characters and allusions: *Macbeth* became a general in the Finnish army who fought under the Finnish king. The Finnish *Macduff* was a famous guerrilla leader of the eighteenth century. *Lady Macbeth* became a strong-willed but evil Finnish woman whose persistent yearning for power was not innate but suggested by the witches. The witches themselves embodied, both in name and behaviour, afflictions such as pain, hardship and worldliness, and, true to character, they deliberately plotted destruction. The positive powers of Nature and Love, who appeared as forces opposed to the afflictions and their mistress, could not prevent the disaster. The witch scene was made prominent and it had links with Finnish mythology (Aaltonen 1997: 60-61; Paloposki 136).

The sleep-walking scene of *Lady Macbeth*, which became important as a dramatic fragment in the Finnish theatre some forty years later, was omitted in this first translation of the play, and, in consequence, her madness was edited out. She met her fate in trying to close the gate in order to stop the supporters of *Macduff* from entering: she was crushed under their feet.

In his Afterword, Lagervall explained why he had chosen to reset the play in Finland. According to him, as the story by Shakespeare obviously did not happen in Scotland (and he quotes Walter Scott in support of this claim), it could just as well have taken place in Finland.

Lagervall had therefore made the necessary adjustments, and added that even Scott would not be able to dispute any of the details of the relocation. Lagervall explained that he had chosen for the play the dialect which was most commonly used and most easily understood throughout Finland, but which was at the same time best suited to the metre. He had modified the spelling according to the pronunciation, and for the vocabulary chosen words from Finnish proverbs, sayings, poems and rhymes which he considered beautiful, if not necessarily very familiar (Aaltonen 1997: 61).

The front page of Lagervall's play already gives an indication as to how the translation relates to its source: it shows a man – a look alike of Elias Lönnrot, the creator of the Finnish national epic – dressed in loose fitting trousers, a shirt and a small cap. The man is depicted against a background of some stretch of water, playing the *kantele*, a traditional Finnish stringed instrument. *Macbeth* has become a Finnish play (Aaltonen 1996: 2).

Lagervall's translation of *Macbeth* was never performed on stage, although he had expressed a wish to that effect (Aspelin-Haapkylä 4). His own plays were never performed either, which suggests that, although he was one of the keenest spokesmen for the Finnish theatre, he was not very familiar with the needs of the theatrical system. Lagervall offered his translation for publication as well, and it would have been accepted with some linguistic and orthographic corrections, but he refused to make them, and had to have the play printed at his own expense.

In all the early Shakespeare productions the focus was on the stories that the plays told. The companies had suitable actors for the roles (for example, Carl Seuerling as well as Pierre Deland were actors themselves and so was Deland's brother and Seuerling's wife) and their characteristic acting styles affected the choice of plays. It was thus not so much Shakespeare who attracted the theatres, but rather the subject matter.³ The translations were stage-oriented. The English source texts played no part or a very subordinate one in them, and

Finland received her Shakespeare through the major cultural powers in Europe. The main inspiration came from Germany, sometimes mediated through Swedish. The translations were either in prose or verse, but all were characterised by their simplification of the action through omissions and the rearrangement of scenes. The relocation of *Macbeth* in Finland must also be viewed against the background of other early translations of plays. It was typical of the early Finnish theatre texts to Finnicise foreign plays, and this was done for example in Holberg's *Erasmus Montanus* and *Jeppe på Berget* (Hellman 480).

Romanticism: Shakespeare for the Stage

The second phase introduced the Romantic view of the author-genius and his poetics, and the focus shifted to the literary merits of the source texts. In Finland, Romanticism dominated in theatre into the second half of the nineteenth century, and only gradually gave way to Realism which started with the introduction of Ibsen's plays in the 1880s. This phase includes the fragments of *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* performed in the newly established Finnish national theatre, the translation of *Macbeth* in 1864, the first complete set of Shakespeare's 36 plays by Paavo Cajander, and the up-dating of seven of these by Yrjö Jylhä in the 1930s.

Up to the 1930s, the translations were seen as a test for both the domestic idiom and the Finnish stage. The prevalent acting style was pompous and declamatory; it was produced for effect rather than to give an illusion of reality. The domestic idiom had to bend before the English one. Shakespeare was translated for the stage rather than for the page, although the translations were published in printed form as well.

Shakespeare's first appearance on the stage of the newly established National Theatre was in two fragments. In the first theatrical season in 1873-74, the star actress of the time, Ida Ahlberg, performed Lady Macbeth's sleep-walking scene, and later in the same year another

fragment, when Ahlberg appeared in the mad scene of Ophelia from *Hamlet*. Both scenes were obviously chosen because the actress was available to act in them. The fragments continued to appear on stage at regular intervals, which was typical of other European countries as well.⁴ The mad scene of Ophelia was probably translated for the fragment alone, whereas *Macbeth* had been translated in its entirety in 1864.

In order to celebrate the tercentenary of Shakespeare's birth on the 23 April 1864, the society set up for the advancement of Finnish literature had announced a prize for the best translation of a Shakespeare play. The announcement produced *Macbeth*, translated by Kaarlo Slöör-Santala. The play was hailed as an important milestone in Finnish verse literature, in particular as it had been translated from the "original" and, as opposed to the first Finnish *Macbeth* in verse (Aspelin-Haapkylä 31-32, 41). However, presumably, only the above-mentioned fragment of it was ever staged.

The publishing business in Finland only started when the first big publishers established their position from 1872 onwards. It has been suggested that as the publishers were usually Swedish speakers, translations were not monitored very effectively. There were not enough translators and their pay was very low. In consequence, the translations were usually "low in quality" (Hellman 427). This should not, however, be overly generalised, as already in 1858, the literary society had announced a prize for the best play, either a Finnish original or a translation. The prize was given to a Finnish play, but also the translations of plays by Eugene Scribe and Schiller were recognised as being of such a high quality that a decision was taken to publish them (Aspelin-Haapkylä 39). In order to do this, the society set up a series for drama and published sixteen plays in it between 1861 and 1867. Two of these were Finnish originals while the rest were translations. One of the plays was the new *Macbeth* by Slöör-Santala.

Slöör-Santala's *Macbeth* moved the Finnish Shakespeare tradition towards the Romantic respect for the original and the author.

Romanticism had brought a preference for tragedies and histories, and the Finnish theatre audience had been introduced to them through the Romantic icon of the Scottish queen in, for example, Björnstjerne Björnson's *Maria Stuart in Scotland*, as well as Schiller's *Maria Stuart*.⁵ These and some other plays paved the way for translations of Shakespeare, and towards the 1880s, a contemporary poet, Paavo Cajander undertook to translate Shakespeare's entire production into Finnish. Cajander had close links with the contemporary stage, and had translated for it before. His translation work had also received general recognition when he had been honoured for his translation of J. J. Wecksell's *Daniel Hjort* by the literary society in 1877 (Hellman 427). Although Cajander's translations were also published in printed form, he chose the plays for translation largely according to the needs of the theatre, as can be seen from the following table:

On stage:	Printed & published
1881 <i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	1879 <i>Hamlet</i>
1882 <i>Merchant of Venice</i>	1881 <i>Romeo and Juliet</i>
1883 <i>Taming of the Shrew</i>	1882 <i>King Lear</i>
1885 <i>Hamlet</i>	1884 <i>Julius Caesar</i>
1886 <i>King Lear</i>	1884 <i>Othello</i>
1887 <i>Macbeth</i>	1887 <i>Macbeth</i>
1889 <i>Othello</i>	1887 <i>Coriolanus</i>
1889 <i>Julius Caesar</i>	1891 <i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i>
etc.	etc.

(*The Taming of the Shrew* was not Cajander's translation, which appeared only in 1912).

Some of the plays were translated and staged in the same year, whereas others, like *Hamlet*, had to wait longer for their stage appearance, or, like *The Merchant of Venice*, had to wait for their publication in printed form. The list continues with the publication of the rest of the plays, ending with *Titus Andronicus* in 1912. The theatre was able to use its best actors, which contributed to making the plays commercially successful (for example, *Romeo and Juliet* was performed 29 times, *The Merchant of Venice* 24 times, *Hamlet* 45 times, *King Lear* 22 times, *Macbeth* 13 times and *Othello* 12 times) (Hirn 266).

The second phase of Finnish Shakespeare translations clearly shows the shift of emphasis to the source text. Pride is taken in the fact that the translations follow their **English** source carefully, and that they are carried out directly from it without the mediation of another translation. Cajander aimed at shaping the Finnish language to follow the thought of the foreign tongue (Pennanen 159), and coined new words where there were none in his own language. His metre was—like that of the source text—generally blank verse in iambic pentameter, which is not easily applicable to Finnish, as in Finnish the stress always falls on the first syllable of the words.

No distinction between stage and page translation was noticeable at this time, which follows the trends elsewhere (Kruger 3). The golden age for Shakespeare translation also coincided with the publishers' interest in printing drama, which has since then gradually decreased.

Cajander's translations have been canonised as the representative of Shakespeare in Finland, and they have remained the general stock in Finnish libraries. However, theatre in particular began to demand modernised versions of Shakespeare in the 1930s, and seven of his plays were translated by Yrjö Jylhä, who may have based his translations on those by Cajander. These were published later in the 1950s, and were the last set of Shakespeare plays to interest Finnish publishers.

Modern Shakespeare and The Practices of Everyday Life

The third phase in Shakespeare readings in Finland started in the 1960s and can still be seen to continue. When theatres began to celebrate great directors in Europe as well as in Finland towards the 1970s, the focus shifted to the multiplicity of readings rather than to any one way of looking at the plays. The plays were written in contemporary domestic idiom, and clarity was prioritised over decoration. In some cases, the text became important only as a source of inspiration. Shakespeare was recognised as the author, but with the director emerging as his co-author. The exhilaration of being able to impose new readings on plays whose “meanings” had been fixed for so long suggested a rebellion against the models passed down by Romanticism. The subject matter increased in importance, and its usefulness for contemporary issues became decisive. Productions also drew new meanings out of the plays with exceptional costumes, make-up, sets, lights, and, sometimes most importantly, by their casting. Only a few of these translations have been published in printed form, which emphasises their stage-orientation.

The new phase of Shakespeare readings began to emerge with the visits of foreign stage directors in the 1970s in particular. Finnish audiences saw Peter Brook’s *King Lear* and Georgij Aleksandrovic Tovstonogov’s *Henry IV Part 1*. These visits inspired Finnish stage directors to new readings of the classics, based on revised translations. Some translators specialised in certain types of plays: Esko Elstelä concentrated on the comedies and Matti Rossi on the tragedies, whereas others like Eeva-Liisa Manner translated both early and later Shakespeare. The translation work became nobody’s exclusive right as it had been during Romanticism and, in the 1990s, in particular, translations began to become disposable commodities made for particular productions and particular casts and then forgotten. Some of the translations were made on the basis of old translations, and thus came into existence through mediation. Towards the end of the twentieth

century, the readings of Shakespeare extended well beyond the traditional confines of the source text, and Shakespeare became the property of student stages, summer theatres and fringe groups, that is, the less powerful in the theatrical system. The disregard for the English "original", as well as their design for particular teams of actors, brought the productions close to the performances of Shakespeare by the early theatre troupes.

Matti Rossi's translation work epitomises the third phase of Shakespeare translations in Finland. Rossi has translated five of the plays, starting with *Richard III* in 1967, and revising most of his translations twice, *Macbeth* three times. Rossi has also translated other classics such as Wecksell, Schiller, Molière, Puskin, and Lessing. When the status and significance of the artistic director began to increase in the 1960s, directors wanted to impose their own readings on the plays. This usually involved a tailor-made translation for each production, which was a noticeable feature in Rossi's work as well, as he always worked in cooperation with a strong director. For example, Rossi's first Shakespeare translation, *Richard III*, was for a well-known Finnish director, Kalle Holmberg, who specialised in powerful scenes with big casts. Rossi recalls as one of the requirements for this translation that his text had to be "loud". Rossi's most recent work, the revision of his *Macbeth* for Helsinki Town Theatre in December 1997 for a Russian director Kama Ginkas, called for a translation which, in many places, rewrote his earlier translation from 1972. This time he had to create a translation which gave the text much of the metre which had been lacking in the earlier translation.⁶ In 1972, it had been important for the play to be close to the colloquial language that people would recognise as theirs, whereas Ginkas, from the Russian dramatic school, demanded unbroken metre and would refuse to accept anything else. Acting, as well as set design and music in the production were unusual: the actors directed some of their key lines to the audience, and used ritualistic choreography; old Finno-Ugric music was performed in the

background with traditional instruments, and the stage resembled a large artistic installation.

Rossi's work has always been characterised by strong language, which, before the 1960s, had been unthinkable in a Shakespeare play in Finland. A contemporary theatre critic commented on his *Richard III* that it had given a new and exceptional reading of the play. New scenes, new dramatic figures and songs had been written in, and the social implications of the text had been clarified and emphasised in places. In *King Lear*, the underlying approach to the play was grotesque, coming close to absurdity, which had been made possible by Matti Rossi's dialogue. He had not hesitated to use words once considered "low" (Suur-Kujala 203-207).

In line with his predecessor Lagervall, Rossi's *Macbeth* from 1972 also had an Afterword. However, it was very different from the one Lagervall had added to his translations. Rossi did not discuss his *Macbeth* as a series of translational choices, but analysed it in its own right from a directorial point of view. He described at length the difficulties in enacting supernatural events such as the witches on stage, and explained how some Finnish stage directors had solved this problem. *Macbeth*, according to Rossi, was not structurally one of Shakespeare's masterpieces: it was full of illogical blunders, inconsistencies, mistakes with timing and clumsy scenes. The dramatic figures were more like shadows than real people. However, as a poem, Rossi concluded, the play was spectacular, rumbling, shaking, flashing, smoking, burning, roaring and spluttering, all dark and strong and unbelievable (121).

From the 1980s onwards, Finnish theatre audiences have also witnessed a more experimental approach to Shakespeare, by theatre companies in summer theatres as well as other experimental productions, both in institutional theatres and on fringe stages. *Hamlet* was set in a Finnish restaurant milieu in a TV version of the play, the student theatre in Tampere took experimental modern versions of *The Tempest* and *Othello* in their repertoire, and summer theatres put

revised versions of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Love's Labour's Lost* on stage.

All these gave up the Romantic view of Shakespeare, and celebrated their freedom to rewrite the plays by using old texts only as a source of inspiration. The subject matter left the author (and in many cases also the actors) in the shadows. In *Love's Labour's Lost* (Theatre company Beowulf, summer 1995) the director estimates that he used only some 30% of the "original" play. The texts are in (sometimes rhythmic) prose, often written on the basis of old existing translations and never performed after their initial production. They are not available through the theatre library⁷ either, and the translators do not have copyrights over their work.

Some productions have used old translations but done it in an exceptional way. For example, the production of *Hamlet* in Hämeenlinna town theatre in the autumn 1997 rewrote the play for three actors who move amongst videoscreens and a cinematic musical background. The translation chosen for the production was the old text by Cajander, but the performance started from the chaos following the peripeteia and only then returned to the beginning of the play. One of the three actors played the role of Hamlet, while the other two played all the other roles.

All these productions have recast the role Shakespeare had for Finnish readership and theatre audiences during Romanticism, and have gradually assimilated his works to the Finnish theatrical system. Romanticism had established a model of reading Shakespeare which was independent of theatre practitioners and audiences. Now the tables were turned, and the doers marched forth. The texts have been refurbished with contemporary readings for their new tenants. The productions are of Shakespeare but the texts have become the workers' *perruque* when theatre practitioners and audiences have filled them with their own meanings.

The cycle has closed. Translation is less a way of introducing a foreign text and more a way of legitimising a distinct ethnological and political entity.⁸

Conclusion

Nothing has meaning in isolation. Translation always takes place in a particular socio-cultural context at a particular point in time. Translation, like all (re)writing, is never innocent. There is always a context in which the translation takes place, always a history from which a text emerges and into which a text is transposed (Bassnett and Lefevere 11). The relationship between languages and entire cultures is significant, and so are the motivations behind the undertaking as well as the consequences of “cultural exchange”. In Finland, the early productions saw Shakespeare’s plays as good stageable stories suitable for a particular cast. Romanticism changed this and focused on a superior culture and a playwright genius; the literary merits and poetics of Shakespeare’s works were highlighted. Developments in the theatre since the 1960s have now turned the tables again to the advantage of theatre practitioners and their audiences. The examples illustrate the way that translation may embody both submission and rebellion, and gradually shift from one to the other. The Finnish theatrical system, but also the less powerful members in it, have created themselves a place and found ways of using the constraining order of a superior culture and one of its most prominent icons.

Notes

- 1 Halttunen-Salosaari 1967: 71, Tiusanen 1969: 53, Smidt 1993: 100-101. Romy Heylen has described Ducis’ *Hamlet* in her book *Translation, Poetics and the Stage* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), p.28, by saying that Ducis did not speak English but based his translation on a prose synopsis. He rearranged the plot, cut down the list of players, and imposed an unbroken playable text, written

in Alexandrines with all the appearance of a classical tragedy. I am assuming that his *Romeo and Juliet* followed largely the same pattern.

- 2 Hirn 1916: 260; Salosaari 1967: 80. Schiller's translation versified the old Wieland prose translation using blank verse but no passages of prose; but he had also taken into account the theatrical aspect says Wolfgang Ranke in his article 'Shakespeare Translations for Eighteenth-Century Stage Productions in Germany: Different Versions of *Macbeth*', in Delabastita and D'hulst, *op. cit.* pp. 166-167. According to Smidt (1993: 101-102), Schiller did not follow the source text in all details, and omitted passages of obscenity and horror. He revised the conversation part of the Porter scene and omitted three and half lines of the witches' incantation as well as the whole of the murder scene in Macduffs' castle.
- 3 This point of view was also suggested by Michael Windross in the round table discussion of early Shakespeare translation in Europe in Delabastita and D'Hulst, *op. cit.*: 238.
- 4 This has also been found by Brigitte Schultze ("Shakespeare's Way into the West Slavic Literatures and Cultures" in Delabastita and D'hulst, *op. cit.*: 57) in Poland and Bohemia where fragmentary translations continued to be carried out and staged far beyond the 1840s. One of the virtuoso scenes there included the mad scene of Ophelia.
- 5 The first tragedy to be mentioned in the Finnish theatre history (Aspelin-Haapkylä, *op. cit.*: p.18) was the performance of *Die Sühne* by Th Körner in 1865.
- 6 He had written his earlier translation in verse as well, but adjusted the metre to the needs of the Finnish language.
- 7 There is only one theatre library in Finland to cater for the needs of individual stages.
- 8 Annie Brisset quoted in Gentzler: 118.

Bibliography

Aaltonen, Sirkku. "Acculturation of the Other. A Doctoral Address" in *Teaching and Learning. Working Papers in English Studies from the University of Joensuu*. Number Two, Autumn 1996.

- . "Macbeth in Finland" in *In Other Words* winter/spring 1997, no 8/9.
- Aspelin-Haapkylä, Eliel. *Suomalaisen teatterin historia I*. Helsinki: SKS, 1906.
- Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere, eds. *Translation History and Culture*. London and New York: Pinter Publishers, 1990.
- de Certeau, Michel. *Practices of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1984.
- Delabastita, Dirk and Lieven D'hulst; eds. *European Shakespeares. Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1993.
- Gentzler, Edwin. "Translation, Counter-Culture, and *The Fifties* in the USA" in Álvarez, Roman and M. Carmen-África Vidal (eds) *Translation Power Subversion*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters, 1996.
- Halttunen-Salosaari, Elina. "Litterääri kuva." in *Juhlakirja Kauko Kyyrön täyttäessä 60 vuotta 24.11.1967*. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto, 1967.
- Hellman, Jarl. "Suomen kirjallisuus" in *Suomen kirjallisuus VIII, Kirjallisuuden lajeja*. Helsinki: SKS and Otava, 1970.
- Hirn, Yrjö. "Shakespeare in Finland" in *Finsk Tidsskrift LXXX* Helsinki, 1916.
- Kruger, Alet. "'Bless thee, Bottom! bless thee! Thou art traslated!' The Shakespearean Phase in South Africa." Unpublished paper, read at the conference "Translators' Strategies and Creativity" in Prague, 25-27 September 1995.
- Laitinen, Kai. *Suomen kirjallisuuden historia*. Helsinki: Otava, 1981.
- Paloposki, Outi. *Translation Discourse in Early 19th Century Finland* (an unpublished Licentiate Thesis), University of Tampere, 1997.
- Pennanen, Esko. "Shakespearen kielestä ja sen suomentamisesta" in *Juhlakirja Kauko Kyyrön täyttäessä 60 vuotta 24.11.1967*. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto, 1967.
- Rossi, Matti. "Mies joka murhasi unelman" in Shakespeare, William. *Macbeth*. Trans. Matti Rossi. Helsinki: Love kirjat, 1972.

Smidt, Kristian. "The Discovery of Shakespeare in Scandinavia." *European Shakespeares*. 91-104.

Suur-Kujala, Anneli, ed. *Kohti elävää teatteria. Maija Savutien teatteriarvosteluja 1935-85* (Valtion painatuskeskus: Teatterikorkeakoulu, 1986.

Tiusanen, Timo. *Teatterimme hahmottuu*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä, 1969.