



DOI: 10.2478/abcsj-2019-0003

American, British and Canadian Studies, Volume 32, June 2019

Of “You” and “Thou,” Lips and Pilgrims
in the Translation of *Romeo and Juliet*’s “Shared Sonnet”:
A Hands-On Perspective

ANCA IGNAT

Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania
and

ALEXANDRU M. CĂLIN

University of Bucharest, Romania

Abstract

It is not a recent discovery in the field of language history that the address pronouns *thou* and *you* were not, in Shakespeare’s time, used indiscriminately. If the speaker did have a choice between the two forms, that choice was by no means random, idiosyncratic or arbitrary, but always dictated by the social, relational or attitudinal context of a speech act. Nonetheless, all 20th-century Romanian translations of *Romeo and Juliet* (and of other Shakespearean plays) – from Haralamb Leca’s rather loose rendering (1907) to Ștefan-Octavian Iosif’s and to Virgil Teodorescu’s more refined versions (1940 and 1984, respectively) – seem to ignore the difference in associative meaning between the two forms, which is sometimes essential for a correct assessment of the relationships between characters. The latest Romanian translation of the play, which we have jointly submitted for publication within the *Shakespeare for the Third Millennium* project (William Shakespeare. *Opere XIII*, 2018) acknowledges the importance of the various associative meanings that the two pronouns carry and strives to restore these meanings to the text, though not without difficulty, given the rather restrictive form of the original, i.e. iambic pentameters, often with strict rhyme schemes. Thus, focusing on the well-known “shared sonnet” as one of the most relevant instances of pronoun alternation in the play, our paper discusses the uses of *you* and *thou* in Early Modern English and sets out to assess how much is lost in 20th-century translations, to show how our own translation restores the associative meanings of the two pronominal forms and finally to exemplify how we managed to overcome translation difficulties entailed by the metrical and stylistic demands of the text.

Keywords: translation, associative meaning, *you*, *thou*, context, ambiguity.

It is in no way a recent discovery in the field of language history that “thou” and “you” – originally the singular and the plural forms, respectively, of the second-person personal pronoun, the plural being used, roughly from the 13th century, as a polite variant of the second-person singular, probably following the French model – were not, in Shakespeare’s time, used indiscriminately. If the speaker did have a choice between the two forms, that choice was by no means random, idiosyncratic or arbitrary, but always dictated by the social, relational or attitudinal context of a speech act. Nevertheless, all 20th-century Romanian translations of *Romeo and Juliet* (and, for that matter, of other Shakespearean plays) – from Haralamb Leca’s rather loose rendering (1907) to Ștefan-Octavian Iosif’s and to Virgil Teodorescu’s more refined versions (1940 and 1984, respectively) – seem to ignore the difference in associative meaning between the two forms, which is sometimes essential for a correct assessment of the relationships between characters. The latest Romanian translation of the play, which we have jointly undertaken within the *Shakespeare for the Third Millennium* project, coordinated by Professor George Volceanov, and signed in the latest (i.e. 13th) volume of William Shakespeare’s complete works in Romanian, i.e. *William Shakespeare: Opere* (Bucharest: Tracus Arte, 2018), acknowledges the importance of the various associative meanings that the two pronouns carry and strives to restore these meanings to the text, though not without difficulty, given the rather restrictive form of the original, i.e. iambic pentameters, often with strict rhyme schemes. Thus, focusing on the well-known “shared sonnet” as one of the most relevant instances of pronoun alternation in the play, the present article discusses the uses of *you* and *thou* in Early Modern English and sets out to assess how much is lost in 20th-century Romanian translations of the play, to show how our own translation restores the associative meanings of the two pronominal forms and finally to exemplify how we managed to overcome translation difficulties entailed by the metrical and stylistic demands of the text.

Theoretically speaking, the history of the coexistence of two distinct forms of the second-person-singular pronoun is well known and duly recorded in most authoritative accounts of the evolution of the English language. Also, the differences in associative meaning between “you” and “thou” have been perspicuously explained by linguists, language historians and Shakespeare scholars alike. Perhaps the most widely accepted definition and classification of “associative meanings” are those provided by Geoffrey Leech (in *Semantics: The Study of Meaning*), who identifies five types – “connotative,” “social,” “affective,” “reflected,” and “collocative” meaning, – of which we are particularly interested in the second and the third, i.e. the social and the affective meanings, defined as “what is communicated of the social circumstances of language use” and “what is communicated of the feelings and attitudes of the speaker/ writer” (Leech 23), respectively.

Even if the more “sophisticated” theories of address pronoun variation – such as R. Brown and A. Gilman’s power and solidarity model¹ of 1960 or their more recent application of P. Brown and S. Levinson’s politeness theory² to Shakespearean tragedies (1989)³ – were not yet known at the time of Haralamb Leca’s or of Ștefan O. Iosif’s translations of *Romeo and Juliet* into Romanian, and Sister Geraldine Byrne’s pioneering monograph on the uses of address pronouns in Shakespeare’s plays⁴ did not enjoy wide circulation in Eastern Europe, scholarly histories of English literature and language were readily available in both English and Romanian, clearly explaining the differences in associative meaning between the two pronominal forms. The following description of the social contexts in which they were used and of their respective emotional implications is excerpted from the *Pelican Guide to English Literature: The Age of Shakespeare*, one of those reference books usually included in the compulsory reading list for undergraduate students of literature:

In the plural, *You* [i.e. the entire group of forms: *you, ye, your, yourself, yourselves, yours*] was compulsory; it has never been possible to use *Thou* [i.e. the entire group of forms: *thou, thee, thy, thyself, thine*] as a plural. In the singular, however, there was a choice between *You* and *Thou*. Among the polite classes, *You* was the normal, neutral form by Shakespeare’s

time, while *Thou* was the form which carried special implications, either social or emotional. So *Thou* could be used to a social inferior, to a child, to an animal; but its use was not compulsory, and in many scenes in the drama a master addressing servants fluctuates between *You* and *Thou*, sometimes being more condescending, sometimes more peremptory. The inferior or the child, however, was obliged to reply with *You*, for to use *Thou* to somebody of greatly superior station was insulting.

Among upper-class intimates, the use of *Thou* signalled intimacy or affection, while *You* was more neutral; here again speakers often fluctuate, according to the warmth or coolness of their feelings. To use *Thou* to a stranger, however, was insulting, as when in *Twelfth Night* (III. ii) Sir Toby advises Sir Andrew to insult Cesario in his challenge by calling him *thou*. The artisan classes, however, normally used *Thou* to one another, even if not intimates, but were obliged to use *You* to a member of a higher social class. Contrary to what may be expected, God was always addressed as *Thou*; and under the influence of this (or perhaps under Latin influence) it was normal to use *Thou* in addressing a pagan god or goddess, an abstraction, or an inanimate object. So in *King Lear* Edmund addresses the goddess Nature as *Thou*; and in Jonson's *Volpone* Volpone addresses his gold as *Thou*.

It may be thought strange that there are two different emotional uses of *Thou*, one intimate and affectionate, the other hostile and insulting. The hostile *Thou* can in fact be used between intimates, as well as the affectionate *Thou*, but the context usually shows clearly which is intended. (Barber, in Ford 237-238)

The past two decades' uncontested authority on Shakespeare's language, David Crystal, has provided translators with an invaluable aid in their efforts to capture as much of the original meaning of Shakespeare's words as possible in their modern renderings of the Bard's plays and poems. In one of the tables included in their *Glossary and Language Companion* (*Shakespeare's Words*, 2002), David and Ben Crystal cogently explain and exemplify the ways in which the characters' use of *you* or *thou* reveals different types of social relationship, while fluctuations between the two pronouns betray changes of attitude towards the addressee. Also, they analyse a longer piece of dialogue from *Much Ado About Nothing* (IV.i.264-335) as an example of complex interaction between characters whose switches from *you* to *thou* and back indicate spontaneous emotional responses to what the characters take as encouragement, cold propriety or rebuff on the part of their interlocutors. Brown and Gilman call these “transient attitudes,” signaled by sudden

switches from *you* to *thou* or vice versa, explaining that such switches were “deviations from the norm” and that they usually expressed “feelings such as contempt (e.g. the use of *thou* between those who usually exchange *you*), irony or mockery (e.g. the use of *you* by a superior to an inferior), or estrangement (e.g. a switch to *you* when intimates argue)” (Brown and Gilman 1960 in Walker 41-42).

Thus, the singular form, *thou*, was “marked for affect, expressing positive (love and affection) or negative (anger and contempt) emotions” (43) in contexts where *you* was the “default pronoun,” while *you* became the stylistically marked form (used to mock, to ridicule, to rebuff the addressee or to discourage intimacy) in relationships where *thou* was expected. Nevertheless, despite so many attempts by researchers to formulate universally applicable models – the power/ solidarity (Brown and Gilman, 1960), polite/ impolite, marked/ unmarked (Quirk, 1974), norm/ deviance, social/ nonsocial (Hope, 1993) dichotomies – these prove insufficient when they are called upon to account for particular cases of pronoun switching, taking place “in response to the individual situational context” (Jucker in Walker 48). Therefore, more recent studies of the historical usage of the two pronouns (A.H. Jucker, “*Thou* in the history of English: a case for historical semantics or pragmatics?” – 2000 or Terry Walker, ‘*Thou*’ and ‘*You*’ in *Modern English Dialogues* – 2007) argue for (and adopt, in Walker’s case) a “more micro-pragmatically motivated perspective that focuses on the interactional status of the interactants and on the individual progression of specific conversations” (Jucker qtd. in Walker 48).

While a good translator of Shakespeare’s work need not necessarily be either a Shakespeare scholar or an expert in the history of language, s/he must be sensitive to the various associative meanings of words in context and strive to preserve those meanings in the target language. And even if these may not be readily perceived by 21st-century audiences – be they native or non-native speakers of English – translators have a moral and professional obligation to the text and to their own craft to recognize and duly reproduce them in their renderings. Nevertheless, while in theory all these things seem fairly straightforward and the logic of *you* and *thou* is not so difficult to decipher by the perceptive (and informed) reader or

translator, in practice – or rather in the practice of Romanian translations of Shakespeare’s work in the 20th century – there is little or no evidence of an awareness or understanding of the relevance of the various associative meanings of *you* and *thou*. It is a well-known fact that the most 19th-century and early 20th-century translations of Shakespeare’s plays into Romanian (including Leca’s and Iosif’s renderings) relied heavily on French or German intermediaries, such as François-Victor Hugo’s prose version (1852-1865) or the highly acclaimed Schlegel-Tieck translation (1839-1841), both of which evince an effort to preserve (albeit inconsistently) the two pronouns’ associative meanings. Inexplicably, all 20th-century Romanian translations of *Romeo and Juliet* seem oblivious to the different social and affective implications of each pronominal form, denying Romanian readers and theatregoers access to one of the essential indicators of status, a barometer of emotional and attitudinal change in the relationships between characters, which Early Modern English writers used to immediate effect as a means of characterization.

A complete account of the uses of *thou* and *you* in *Romeo and Juliet* would have to include lengthy discussions of what they reveal about the nature and evolution of each relationship (mother-daughter, father-daughter, husband-wife, nurse-mistress, servant-master, etc.), as well as more detailed, micro-pragmatic analyses of several relevant fragments of dialogue featuring emotionally significant switches between the two pronominal forms. For the purpose of our present endeavour, however, which is to demonstrate how much is lost in translations that fail to do justice to the associative meanings the two pronouns carry and how the latest (2018) Romanian version of the play strives to restore those meanings by conscientiously reproducing each character’s “pronoun style” as well as the occasional variations, usually expressing “transient moods and attitudes” (Brown and Gilman 253) – we shall confine our analysis to the most telling example of “complex interaction,”⁵ where social, affective and, as will be shown, rhetorical factors are involved in the characters’ choice of pronouns: i.e. the scene of Romeo and Juliet’s first encounter, commonly known among Shakespeare scholars as the “shared sonnet.”

A summary of the scene for one of those highly popular websites such as *Shakespeare Made Easy* or *No Fear Shakespeare*, designed for a general audience living in the digital age, would probably read as follows: Romeo sees Juliet at the costume party organized by the Capulets and instantly falls in love with her. He approaches her, takes her hand and begins to court her in rhymes. In the process, he metaphorically identifies her with a saint and his own lips with two pilgrims:

If I profane with my unworhiest hand
This holy shrine, the gentle sin is this:
My lips, two blushing pilgrims, ready stand
To smooth that rough touch with a gentle kiss. (1.5.92-95)

Thus far in his approach, young Montague avoids using any pronoun of address, for proper etiquette would have required the exchange of the reciprocal *you*, as was the norm among unrelated equals of the upper classes, but resorts, instead, to rhetoric, initiating the wonderful conceit (that his lips are pilgrims paying homage to the “holy shrine” of her hand and, consequently, that Juliet is a saint) which will henceforth enable him “to adopt the privilege of the lover” (Belsey 10) – i.e. that of calling her *thou* – and deftly inviting her to play along at the game of linguistic ambiguity. It is important to note, from the very beginning, that Romeo uses the word “pilgrims,” *in the plural*, with reference *not* to himself, but to his lips. When Juliet replies with “Good pilgrim, *you* do wrong *your* hand too much” (1.5.96, our emphasis), apparently observing the rules of polite social interaction between strangers of the same class, it is highly probable that both the noun “pilgrim” and the pronoun “you” refer ambiguously, at the same time, to Romeo and to his (pair of) lips.

This reading is supported by Juliet’s attitude towards Romeo: she does not refuse the verbal duel he challenges her to, but takes up the gauntlet and stands her ground trying to beat Montague at his own game, with his own rhetorical weapons. Moreover, the assumption that the words “pilgrim” and “you” refer to Romeo’s lips is more consistent with the conceit that Romeo proposes, around which the entire shared sonnet revolves. This interpretation, of course, does not rule out Romeo as another possible referent of the vocative “pilgrim” and of the subject

pronoun "you". On the contrary, the beauty of Juliet's rhetorical strategy is that it allows for both Romeo and his lips to be taken into account as possible referents of the vocative and of the second-person-plural pronoun. Juliet's first line, "Good pilgrim, you do wrong your hand too much," is nothing but a comment on an utterance. Since Romeo is the agent of this utterance and his lips are the instrument of it, both Romeo and his lips can be the addressees of this line. Our assumption is reinforced by the recurrence of the same equivocal use of *you* in the last line of the sonnet, when Juliet exclaims "*You* kiss by th' book" (1.5.109, our emphasis), upon being kissed by Romeo a second time. Even more than her first line – where grammar seems to stand in the way of an unproblematic demonstration of the pronoun's reference to Romeo's lips (since "pilgrim" is used in the singular) – her use of *you* in this last line, as well as the context in which it is uttered, openly invite this reading of *you* as being at once a true plural (its referent being Romeo's lips) and a singular of polite distance (used, in deference to social etiquette, to address the unexpected suitor).

The difficulty posed by the singular form of the noun in Juliet's first line, "Good *pilgrim*, you do wrong your hand too much" (our emphasis), however, can be surmounted by examining the problem more closely from a pragmatic, a cognitive, and a grammatical perspective. From a pragmatic point of view, a syntagm such as "good pilgrims" would be too forthright a solution, and therefore completely incongruous with the character's refined delicacy. By using the plural she would thematise Romeo's lips in too obvious a manner, which Romeo himself, the initiator of the conceit, is not bold enough to adopt when referring to Juliet's lips: as he invites her to "let lips do what hands do" (1.5.102), he cautiously avoids using the possessive adjective and, consequently, the danger of "getting too personal," in both the pragmatic and grammatical sense of the word. Furthermore, from the playwright's perspective, the plural form would deprive the syntagm of its splendid ambiguity, which the singular form manages to impart, in full consonance with the equivocal inherent in the pronominal form that follows, allowing for the attribution of a double reference.

From a cognitive point of view, it is relevant to note that entities forming natural pairs, such as body parts, for instance, are in many cultures perceived as both singular and multiple. Consequently, many languages spoken around the world, including Semitic languages, Proto-Indo-European and many of its descendants have or used to have – up to some point in their history – dual number. This grammatical number is used in addition to singular and plural to refer precisely to two of the entities designated by the noun. Significantly enough, Biblical Hebrew and Czech, which have lost dual number in the process of language change, continue to use it as a plural in nouns for paired body parts. On the other hand, in Finno-Ugric languages, including Hungarian and Finnish, speakers use the singular to refer to both eyes, lips, feet etc., while the single entity is designated by phrases that literally translate as “half eye,” “half lip,” “half foot” etc.

From a grammatical perspective, collective nouns like “pair,” “couple,” “group,” “trio” etc. or syntagms such as “a pair of lips” can trigger both singular and plural verbal agreement, depending on whether the speaker perceives the commonality of the entities or their individual identity as being more important. Thus, in “Good pilgrim, you do wrong your hand too much,” the vocative singular “pilgrim” is not inconsistent with the pronoun “you,” viewed as a true plural. The latter addresses lips as a multiple referent, while the former perceives them as a unit, and there is no referential contradiction between the two.

When it comes to translating the scene into another language, the sonnet form in which the scene is famously delivered further increases the difficulty of preserving this ambiguity in the target language. François-Victor Hugo, translating the play entirely in prose, takes advantage of the phonetic qualities of the French language – in which the singular and the plural forms of nouns almost always sound the same – to reproduce the playfulness and ambiguity of the exchange in his rendering:

ROMÉO, *prenant la main de Juliette*.

— Si j’ai profané avec mon indigne main — cette châsse sacrée, je suis prêt à une douce pénitence: — permettez à mes lèvres, comme à **deux pèlerins rougissants**, — d’effacer ce grossier attouchement par un tendre baiser.

JULIETTE.

— **Bon pèlerin**, **vous** êtes trop sévère pour **votre** main — qui n’a fait preuve en ceci que d’une respectueuse dévotion. — Les saintes mêmes ont des mains que peuvent toucher les mains des pèlerins; — et cette étreinte est un pieux baiser. (online, our emphasis)

For an audience hearing the text performed on the stage, there really is no telling whether the vocative “*bon pèlerin*” in Juliet’s reply is a singular or a plural. Consequently, the pronouns “*vous*” and “*votre*” may be interpreted as either courtesy plurals or true plurals. It is only the written text that remains unambiguous.

In Romanian, the difficulties posed by the prosodic constraints of the passage (a typical Shakespearean sonnet of iambic pentameter lines rhyming *abab cdcd efef gg* with an extra quatrain) are further compounded by the unwieldy length of the Romanian pronouns of polite address, i.e. “*dumneavoastră*”, “*dumneata*” and their cognates. These, however, are not impossible to overcome, thanks to the alternatives afforded by a highly inflected target language: in Romanian, there is always the option of using the second-person-plural forms of the verbs, together with the conveniently short objective and dative forms of the second-person-plural personal pronoun (“*vă*”, “*v-*”, “*vi*”). As regards the linguistic ambiguity of the text (wordplay, quibbles, and double entendres being Shakespeare’s rhetorical stock-in-trade), there are no ready-at-hand solutions in the language, but it lies with the translator to find, by trial and error, the safest avenues to semantic and stylistic equivalence. For example, a new (yet unpublished) version of the first two quatrains came up while we were writing the rough draft of this article, perfectly in line with our reading of Juliet’s “Good pilgrim” as having double reference, one which uses the feminine plural form of the noun – “*pelerine*,” instead of “*pelerini*” – which, in Romanian, is identical with the vocative form of the masculine singular, so that it remains forever uncertain to the reader whether Juliet is addressing two metaphorical lady pilgrims or just one metaphorical male pilgrim:

De-ar fi ca mâna-mi josnică să-ntine
Acest altar, păcatul nu-i prea grav.
Căci buzele-mi, roşinde *pelerine*,

Doresc să-l șteargă, cu-un sărut suav.

Nedreptățiți o mână, *pelerine*,
Ce doar un gest cucernic a făcut
Și sfinții-au mâini, ce se-mpreună bine
Cu mâini de pelerini, în sfânt sărut.

Despite the availability, in the Romanian language, of perfectly viable solutions, the three most authoritative 20th-century translations of the play rob the protagonists' lines of their seductive ambiguity and their first encounter of the linguistic markers of its social and affective context. The tables appended to this article – containing Haralamb Leca's, Ștefan-Octavian Iosif's, Virgil Teodorescu's, and our own Romanian versions of the "shared sonnet," alongside the original – will make it clear how important it is for a translation with any claim to meeting the fundamental principle of semantic equivalence that it should strive to preserve the associative meanings of the original, whether the translated text is destined for the page or for the stage. In Table 3 we have placed the in-text version of the shared sonnet (the volume provides two different versions – one appears in the body of the text, the other one in a footnote) side by side with the original to illustrate that a line-for-line translation, which consistently observes the uses of *you* and *thou* in the original and, at the same time, manages to preserve the ambiguity and the obliqueness of the exchange is both desirable and possible.

Table 1: Haralamb Leca's translation of the shared sonnet (in rhyming heptameter couplets and with the singular of familiarity as the invariable form of address) side by side with the original.

ORIGINAL	HARALAMB LECA (1907)
ROMEO	ROMEO (<i>Julietei, cu care apare</i>)
If I profane with my unworhiest hand	Da, te -am atins cu mâna-mi impură; da,
This holy shrine, the gentle sin is this:	e mare
My lips, two blushing pilgrims, ready	Păcatul meu, așa e. Dar astă profanare
stand	Sunt gata s-o răscumpăr cu-un dulce
To smooth that rough touch with a	sărutat
tender kiss.	Al ăstor buze, care acum au tremurat.
JULIET	JULIETA
Good pilgrim, <i>you</i> do wrong <i>your</i> hand	Nedrept ești , pelerine, cu a ta mână,

too much,	care
Which mannerly devotion shows in this,	Pe-a mea nu a atins-o, decât drept închinare.
For saints have hands that pilgrims' hands do touch,	Și-apoi, tu poți atinge chiar mâna unui sfânt,
And palm to palm is holy palmers' kiss.	Nu ca o sărutare, ci ca un legământ.
ROMEO	ROMEO
Have not saints lips and holy palmers too?	Dar n-au și sfinții buze?
JULIET	JULIETA
Ay, pilgrim, lips that they must use in prayer.	Au, pentru rugăciune.
ROMEO	ROMEO
O then, dear saint, let lips do what hands do -	Atunci, frumoasă sfântă, îndură-te și spune
They pray; grant thou , lest faith turn to despair.	În taină gurii tale , să facă ce fac eu Cu mâinile... (<i>împreunează mâinile, rugându-se</i>) ...și ruga să-mi îplinească.
JULIET	JULIETA
Saints do not move, though grant for prayer's sake.	Greu, Căci sfinții nu se mișcă, chiar dându-ne-ascultare.
ROMEO	ROMEO
Then move not while my prayer's effect I take.	Atunci, stai nemișcată, ca eu, c-o sărutare,
[<i>Kisses her.</i>]	Să vin să iau răspunsul, și-astfel al meu păcat
Thus from my lips by thine my sin is purged.	Să-l ispășesc. (<i>o sărută</i>)
JULIET	JULIETA (<i>rușinată</i>):
Then have my lips the sin that they have took.	Acum, păcatul eu l-am luat.
ROMEO	ROMEO:
Sin from my lips? O trespass sweetly urged!	Nimic mai lesne; dă -mi-l 'napoi.
Give me my sin again. [<i>Kisses her.</i>]	
JULIET	JULIETA:
You kiss by th' book.	Nu. L-iau cu mine.

Table 2: Ștefan-Octavian Iosif's and Virgil Teodorescu's versions of the "shared sonnet" (prosodically closer to the original, but completely oblivious to pronoun variation, as well as to the linguistic ambiguity of the exchange).

ȘTEFAN-OCTAVIAN IOSIF (1940)	VIRGIL TEODORESCU (1984)
ROMEO (<i>se apropie de Julieta și-i atinge mâna</i>)	ROMEO (<i>către Julieta, prinzând-o de mână</i>)
De-am pângărit cu mâna sfânta- ți mână, Să ierți acestor buze ale mele: Doi pelerini sfioși, și vor, stăpână, Cu un sărut păcatul să și-l spele.	De profanez cu mâna-mi mâna- ți sfântă, Voi ispăși cu buzele, căci ele – Doi pelerini sfiehnici – se avântă Cu-o sărutare vina mea s-o spele.
JULIETA	JULIETA
Scump pelerin, nu, mâna- ți vină n-are, Căci pelerinii mâinile de sfinți Le-ating și ei și-n loc de sărutare Se-închină-încet pe mâinile fierbinți.	Nu-i vinovată mâna, pelerine! Ești aspru. Pelerinii, dacă vor, Pot strânge-n palme mâinile divine. Strânsoarea asta e sărutul lor.
ROMEO	ROMEO
Au buze sfinții, au și pelerinii...	Dar pelerini sau sfinți, n-au buze, gură?
JULIETA	JULIETA
Doar pentru rugăciune, pelerine.	Da, pelerine, pentru rugăciune.
ROMEO	ROMEO
Te rog, atunci, icoană a luminii, Dă -i gurii focul să-și aline.	Mâini fie- ți , sfânto, buzele! Te -ndură! Căci altfel deznădejdea mă răpune.
JULIETA	JULIETA
Stau liniștiți de-a pururi sfinții, chiar Atunci când rugăciunea o rostesc.	Primind chiar ruga, sfinții stau pe loc.
ROMEO	ROMEO
O, sfânta mea, stai liniștită, dar, Spălându-mi vina, să mă-mpărtășesc, Și-al gurii tale har să ți -l sărute. [<i>O sărută</i>]	Stai! Împlini-voi ruga mea de foc! De gura ta păcatul meu se-anină. [<i>O sărută</i>]
JULIETA	JULIETA
Atunci păcatul gura mea îl poartă.	Și buzele-mi vor pătimi pe rug.
ROMEO	ROMEO
Păcatele iubirii-s cunoscute, O altă sărutare, și mă iartă. [<i>O sărută</i>]	Din vina alor mele? Dulce vină!
JULIETA	Dă -mi-o-ndărăt! [<i>O sărută încă o dată</i>]
JULIETA	JULIETA
Săruți ca după carte, pelerine!	Săruți cu meșteșug

Table 3: The shared sonnet in the latest Romanian version of the play, which restores the associative meanings of the two pronouns and manages to preserve the linguistic ambiguity of the original.

ORIGINAL	ANCA IGNAT & ALEXANDRU M. CĂLIN (2018)
ROMEO	ROMEO
If I profane with my unworhiest hand	Cu mâna-mi josnică de pângăresc
This holy shrine, the gentle sin is this:	Acest altar, aştept o dulce-osândă:
My lips, two blushing pilgrims, ready stand	Ai gurii pelerini, roşind, doresc
To smooth that rough touch with a tender	Să-l cureţe cu-o sărutare blândă.
kiss.	
JULIET	JULIETA
Good pilgrim, <i>you</i> do wrong <i>your</i> hand too	<i>Greşiţi</i> , această mână ponegrind,
much,	Când ea un gest cucernic a făcut.
Which mannerly devotion shows in this,	Şi sfinţii au mâini, pe care le
For saints have hands that pilgrims' hands	cuprind
do touch,	Cu mâna pelerinii-n sfânt sărut.
And palm to palm is holy palmers' kiss.	
ROMEO	ROMEO
Have not saints lips and holy palmers too?	N-au guri pioşii, n-au şi sfintele?
JULIET	JULIETA
Ay, pilgrim, lips that they must use in	Au, pelerine, pentru-a se ruga.
prayer.	
ROMEO	ROMEO
O then, dear saint, let lips do what hands	Păi, să se roage, -atunci, ca mâinile.
do -	Ai milă, sfânto, sau voi dispera.
They prey; grant thou , lest faith turn to	
despair.	
JULIET	JULIETA
Saints do not move, though grant for	Nu mişcă sfinţii, dar ne miluiesc.
prayer's sake.	
ROMEO	ROMEO
Then move not while my prayer's effect I	Nu te mişca, iertarea s-o primesc.
take.	
[<i>Kisses her.</i>]	(<i>O sărută</i>)
Thus from my lips by thine my sin is	Păcatul gurii mele-i izbăvit.
purged.	

JULIET	JULIETA
Then have my lips the sin that they have took.	Deci, gura mea acum a o să-l poarte.
ROMEO	ROMEO
Sin from my lips? O trespass sweetly urged!	Păcatul gurii mele? Ah, râvnit Păcat! Redă -mi-! (<i>O sărută</i>)
Give me my sin again. [<i>Kisses her.</i>]	
JULIET	JULIETA
<i>You</i> kiss by th' book.	<i>Sărutați</i> ca-n carte.

Notes:

¹ R. Brown and A. Gilman, "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," in T. A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, MIT Press, 1960, pp. 253-76.

² P. Brown and S. C. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

³ R. Brown and A. Gilman, "Politeness Theory and Shakespeare's Four Major Tragedies," in *Language and Society* 18/1989, pp. 159-212.

⁴ Sister St. Geraldine Byrne, *Shakespeare's Use of the Pronoun of Address; Its Significance in Characterization and Motivation*, Washington: Catholic University of America, 1936.

⁵ David and Ben Crystal's term for scenes in which characters switch from you to thou and back as their feelings, attitudes etc. towards their interlocutors change.

Works Cited

- Brown, R., and A. Gilman. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity." *Style in Language*. Ed. T. A. Sebeok. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1960. 253-276.
- Belsey, Catherine. *Romeo and Juliet: Language and Writing*. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2014.
- Crystal, David, and Ben Crystal. *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary and Language Companion*. London: Penguin, 2002.
- Ford, Boris, ed. *The New Pelican Guide to English Literature*. Vol. 2: *The Age of Shakespeare*. London: Penguin, 1982.
- Leech, Geoffrey. *Semantics: The Study of Meaning*. 2nd ed. London: Penguin, 1990.
- Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Rene Weis. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2012.
- . *Romeo et Juliette*. Trans. François-Victor Hugo. 1868. *Wikisource, la bibliotheque libre*. Web. 28 Nov. 2018.

- . *Romeo și Julieta*. Trans. Anca Ignat and Alexandru M. Călin. *William Shakespeare: Opere XIII*. Ed. George Volceanov. Bucharest: TracusArte, 2018. 50-178.
- . *Romeo și Julieta*. Trans. Ștefan-Octavian Iosif. Bilingual ed. Craiova: Fortuna, 2006.
- . *Romeo și Julieta*. Trans. Haralamb G. Leca. Ed. G. Săndulescu and Lidia Vianu. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature P, 2016.
- . *Romeo și Julieta. Shakespeare: Opere Complete*. Vol. 3. Trans. Virgil Teodorescu. Ed. Leon D. Levițchi. Bucharest: Univers, 1984. 9-107.
- Walker, Terry. *Thou and You in Early Modern English Dialogues: Trials, Depositions, and Drama Comedy*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2007.