JACLR

Journal of Artistic Creation & Literary Research

JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research is a bi-annual, peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access Graduate Student Journal of the Universidad Complutense Madrid that publishes interdisciplinary research on literary studies, critical theory, applied linguistics and semiotics, and educational issues. The journal also publishes original contributions in artistic creation in order to promote these works.

Volume 1 Issue 2 (December 2013) Article 2

Carlos Manrique Sastre

"Spanish Translations and Interpretations of *Hamlet*'s Soliloquy 'To Be or not to Be'"

Recommended Citation

Manrique Sastre, Carlos. "Spanish Translations and Interpretations of *Hamlet*'s soliloquy 'To Be or not to Be'" JACLR: Journal of Artistic Creation and Literary Research 1.2 (2013): 14-26 <https://www.ucm.es/siim/journal-of-artistic-creation-and-literary-research>
©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

This text has been blind peer reviewed by 2+1 experts in the field.

Abstract: To be, or not to be. To act, or not to act. To exist, or not to exist. To understand, or not to understand. To accept, or not to accept… What is the question? Which are the secrets beneath Shakespeare's famous soliloquy? How was it translated into Spanish? Where these translations accurate, or did they destroy Shakespeare's deep poetry? A first analysis of the meanings enclosed in the soliloquy will introduce the reader into the soul of the famous speech. When was it written and which literary figures appear are some of the questions whose answers serve as a preparation for the next step: the comparison of the original soliloquy to the Spanish translations. In this paper, several translations, some of them from more than two hundred years ago, are analyzed and compared with one and other and with the original. The last part of the study deals with adaptations of the text to the big screen. Most of the movies cut or adapted the text, but all of them included the famous soliloquy. The rhythm, the movements, the use of objects and the environment around Hamlet are semiotically taken into account in the final part of the paper.

Keywords: Hamlet, Interpretation, Semiotics, Soliloquy, Translation,

©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

Carlos MANRIQUE SASTRE

Spanish Translations and Interpretations of *Hamlet*'s Soliloquy 'To Be or not to Be'

0. Introduction

0.1. Description of the scene.

A clear description of the soliloquy to be analyzed appears in the book *Shakespeare's Soliloquies*, which describes it as the most famous of Shakespeare's soliloquies, indeed of all soliloquies, and also as the one for which the greatest number of interpretations have been offered. The characteristics of the scene and its text provide the actor with several methods to face its interpretation: he could talk with himself, speak directly to the audience making them his accomplices, or thanks to the technological advances, not saying a word as a recording of the speech goes on, as seen in the movie *Hamlet* directed by Michael Almereyda with Ethan Hawke as Hamlet or in the theatrical performance *Hamlet, retrato de familia* directed by Ximo Flores of this same year (2013). Its richness and depth offer also a high level of freedom when choosing the emphasis or the tempo. Hardly any of other of Shakespeare's soliloquies is that open and malleable. But before going any further, it is important to define the word soliloquy: the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language defines it as "A dramatic or literary form of discourse in which a character talks to himself or herself or reveals his or her thoughts when alone or unaware of the presence of other characters." Hamlet is often alone, although in many adaptations Ophelia, Claudius and Polonius are hidden in the same room, listening to his speech. For example, Lawrence Olivier's, Mel Gibson's, Emilio Gutierrez Caba's or Innokenti Smoktunovsky's soliloquies were performed in isolated places, whereas the ones by Derek Jacobi or Kenneth Branagh are heard by Ophelia, Claudius and Polonius.

The second definition for soliloquy in the dictionary mentioned above is "The act of speaking to oneself" just what Hamlet does in the scene. Hamlet manifests his thoughts in the soliloquy without fulfilling the main aim of most soliloquies, which is to reveal the intentions of the speaker. Instead of providing the audience with an answer for all the unsolved problems of the play, Hamlet raises new questions, infecting the listeners with his doubts. The use of the first person plural, "we," "ours," "us," throughout the whole speech shows that he is not referring to himself but to every human being. As questions show up, new doubts and objections appear before any clear solution is given and due to this chain of uncertainty the dilemma is never taken. At the end, all the possible solutions, which become visible just for a moment, are rejected by a mind that is always thinking beyond the moment and seeing the consequences of all actions.

1. Cultural Impact

"To be or not to be," probably the most famous line in the English literature is still used today and present in many daily conversations. The first sentence of the famous soliloquy has lost no attractiveness at all during the years. Perhaps some people ignore the origin of the interesting phrase, even if they understand its meaning. In Spain the same happens with the last sentence of Segismundo's soliloquy from Calderón de la Barca's *La Vida es Sueño*. Many young people use the sentence "que toda la vida es sueño, y los sueños, sueños son" [Life is but a dream, and dreams are only dreams] and know nothing about its origins. Returning to Hamlet's soliloquy, the famous sentence has spread not just in England but all over the world. The metaphysical level of the question is the key to its fame. A sentence like "shall I kill myself?" would have gone unnoticed. Shakespeare avoids giving clear answers or narrowing questions in order to make the soliloquy as open as possible, and including several double meanings and possible interpretations. This mystic atmosphere is what, after more than four hundred years, gives the soliloquy the fame and respect it has always deserved.

1.2. A Change in Place over Time

It is interesting to note that the placement of the soliloquy within the play has changed over time. At one point in history, Hamlet's famous soliloquy was placed earlier in the play than it is now. A year later it was changed to occur later, after Hamlet devises the play within the play. So, in the First Quarto (Q1), its first edition which appeared in 1603 called the "bad quarto," a shorter and altered 'To be, or not to be' soliloquy occurs before Hamlet has devised the incriminating play. In the 1604 and later versions, Second Quarto (Q2) and the famous First Folio, the speech comes emplaced in the order all books show nowadays. The particular evolution of the soliloquy through the three authorized texts could be appreciated in the attached image called *evolution*.

1.3. The Moral Question in Hamlet's Soliloquy - To be or not to be...

Far from the universal meaning of to choose life or to commit suicide, the soliloquy enclosed many other possible interpretations. *Hamlet*'s tragedy happens and the only one to blame is Hamlet himself: the continual and never-satisfied meditation on human destiny, his revision, again and again, of what to do makes that Claudius finally discovers him, and because of this, the King organizes the duel, the final trap, which ends in tragedy for all. Hamlet wastes too much time deciding if he has to seek for revenge for his father's death or live with his actual painful masquerade. He also misses the opportunity to kill Claudius by rationalizing that he has made peace with God and will go to Heaven in case of being stabbed. Hamlet's reason is his tragic flaw.

1.4. Main Idea of the Scene.

Hamlet thinks about the suicide as an exit, a personal choice in order to escape from his world. But this escape is rejected due to the fear the unknown "after Death" provokes.

1.5. Analysis of the Text.

"To be, or not to be- that is the question:"
Hamlet thinks of Death in comparison with Life. At that moment, Hamlet is confused and depressed, affected from what the ghost of his father told him, making this an important question, literally one of "life and death".

> "Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
> The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune
> Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
> And by opposing end them."

He thinks if it is necessary to go through the great difficulties that appear in life or, by the other hand, to face them and fight, with the risk of dying.

Hamlet combines images from the battlefield with abstract notions, suggesting, firstly, continuous threat and, secondly, the hopeless doomed battle against an all-powered enemy. With the word "nobler" Hamlet makes plain the alternatives, but at the same time the audience realizes that none of these courses is really viable, that there is still no escape. These four lines, in words of Ingeborg Boltz, "exemplify the dual effect of the soliloquy, appealing to the imagination as well as the intellect, and challenging the audience to active participation." (Ingeborg 164)

> "To die- to sleep-   No more;"

But to die could be the same as to sleep. The slashes mean pauses in Hamlet's speech, which means that he is thinking and making conclusions that are questioned with immediate doubts derived from this same conclusion.

> "and by a sleep to say we end
> The heartache, and the thousand natural shocks

That flesh is heir to. 'Tis a consummation
Devoutly to be wish'd."

If death was only a state of eternal sleep, a dream (not a nightmare), the fact of dying, although meaning the end of life, would be desirable because it would end all the pain and problems. The misery of life on earth in all its physical immediacy is expressed ("flesh is heir to").

"To die- to sleep.
To sleep- perchance to dream: ay, there's the rub!
For in that sleep of death what dreams may come
When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
Must give us pause."

The thoughts are advancing, but the progress is blocked, and the obstacle is indicated by the colloquial brusqueness of "ay, there's the rub". Hamlet immediately reflects on the fact that dying could be something more than a dream with no nightmares. The sleeping after death is something unknown, and that question could have as answer a bad dream, it could be also more painful and unpleasant than life itself, no matter how bad it was. It could be even worse than the worst of the nightmares, and this would be a never ending nightmare. This is why Hamlet did not decide to embrace death.

"There's the respect
That makes calamity of so long life.
For who would bear the whips and scorns of time,
Th' oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely,
The pangs of despis'd love, the law's delay,
The insolence of office, and the spurns
That patient merit of th' unworthy takes,
When he himself might his quietus make
With a bare bodkin?"

Hamlet presents some of the problems that represent the human being: the passing of time, the abuse of power, the unrequited love, the humiliations… although Hamlet, in his privileged position as a prince would hardly ever have been affected by these kinds of problems. He says that the suicide could be the easiest way to end them. In this second part, the inescapability of suffering prevails, and the inequity that man must daily endure is expressed. With "quietus" he refers to the suicide, by using a "bare bodkin". At this point, the audience realizes that Hamlet has reached the crux of his soliloquy but this last escape is also rejected, due to the question "what will happen after death?"

"Who would these fardels bear,
To grunt and sweat under a weary life,
But that the dread of something after death-
The undiscover'd country, from whose bourn
No traveller returns- puzzles the will,
And makes us rather bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of?
Thus conscience does make cowards of us all,
And thus the native hue of resolution
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
And enterprises of great pith and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry
And lose the name of action."

But this fear to the unknown, the question of what is after death, and the fact that no one has returned to life once again after dying, are the causes why men prefer to live their life, no matter if it is happy or not. This big doubt makes all men cowards, and therefore, conformists. Hamlet never gives the final piece of information which he would perhaps have given if Ophelia did not cause him to stop. Of course, Hamlet is Hamlet, a man psychologically confused, with a higher talent for thinking rather than for deciding and acting. Someone who waits too much before making his decision and, when he has decided something a new event occurs, making him go once again into his meditations.

1.6. Analysis of the Literary Elements

"To be or not to be" is a clear example of antithesis: "a rhetorical or literary device in which an opposition or contrast of ideas is expressed" (Oxford Dictionaries) The duality, one of the play's prominent themes, is presented like this at the very beginning.

A metonymy, a special type of metaphor that substitutes "the name of an attribute or adjunct for that of the thing meant" (Oxford Dictionaries) is used when Hamlet says "sleep" to talk about "death."

Metaphors are everywhere. Some examples are **"**slings and arrows" and "the whips and scorns of time" when referring to life's problems. Another interesting example is "pale cast of thought" meaning the fear of death.

In the enumeration of problems in order to try to create rhythm, Shakespeare uses a parallel structure that is the use of sentences with similar structure and same level of importance.

2. Translations and Interpretations

The translations that appear in this section have been extracted from the originals of the Biblioteca Nacional de España. Almost twenty different editions from 1798 to 1976 will be studied and compared, comparing the most hard or deep words the translators had to face with regards to the soliloquy. However, there are some editions that share the same translator, and others that copied parts from previous ones. Not all the translations made are studied. There are different kinds: from really accurate literal translations to free translations into hendecasyllabic verses. This variety of translations has made this study interesting enough. During the research some problems aroused dealing with dates and authors, so that a deeper investigation was needed in order to solve some mistakes. This is the case of Nicolás Fernández de Moratín. Some books state that he was the author of some translations, but after consulting and comparing several sources, the real author came up to be his son: Leandro Fernández de Moratín, also known by his pseudonym: Inarco Celenio.[1] It is important to remark this because the bibliography shows the name Nicolás, as it appeared in the original sources.

Hamlet was known in Spain before the first adaptation appeared. However, the main problem in this country was the delay in translations from English into Spanish.[2] It was not until 1772 that the first Hamlet appeared in Spain, when Ramón de la Cruz did a free, not very accurate, adaptation of the French version from Jean François Ducis (1770). This *Hamlet* could not be considered as a faithful translation, and for this reason many philologists considered Leandro Fernández de Moratín as the first translator of the Shakespearean play. Whereas French translations rejected the original version, and made adaptations for their own public and time, Leandro tried to follow the original the best he could. However, the lack of guidance provided by books on Shakespearean drama, available now but not then, makes Moratín's Hamlet (1798) obsolete. The pressure of religious

[1] Some sources consulted (see complete info in the Bibliography) are "Leandro Fernández de Moratín, Traductor y Adaptador Dramático.", "Hamlet en España en el siglo XIX", *Hamlet en España. Las cuatro versiones neoclásicas*. and *Hamlet, Edición Bilingüe* by Álvaro Custodio. All these works name Leandro as the real author.

[2] Milton's *Paradise Lost* was the first English literary work to be translated in 1754.

institutions is also felt throughout the pages. Many other translations have appeared after this first, particularly in recent years. For this reason, it is interesting to analyze some of them in what follows.

One of the more polemical passages has been the famous "to be or not to be," translated as "existir o no existir", or "ser o no ser." The oxford dictionary defines "be" as a verb used for present, past and future actions, among many other meanings, whereas "existir" in Spanish could suit perfectly with the definition of "exist." This choice was taken by Moratín (1798) and Cristóbal Cladera (1800). Cladera criticism of Moratín's translation is mentioned in the following lines, but in any case he chose the same words when translating the first sentence: "existir o no existir". This translation was quickly modified to "ser o no ser" in 1872, when Mateo Martínez y Artabeytia used both "Existir o no existir. Ser o no ser" (Martínez 13) in order to explain the second, which was less commonly used. Since then, the sentence was taken as correct by most of the future translators.

To get back to the soliloquy, the next word of interest is "question", from "that is the question". Translated as "punto/point" (Cladera 57), "problema/problem" (Méndez), "duda/doubt" (Blanco White), the recent and polemical "opción/option" (V. Molina)[3], "dilema/dilemma" (M.Á. Conejero), "alternativa/alternative" (G. MacPherson) or "cuestión/question" (B. Vallejo), this sentence has been decorated sometimes with words from the translators, like in the case of Martínez y Artabeytia who followed the sentence with "el gran problema de la vida/the big problem of life", in an attempt to explain better the meaning of that "question". The choice of the word "dilema/dilemma" is interesting because it means that the possible choices are contraries one from another, exactly what it means "to be, or not to be".

The next word is "mind", in "whether 'tis nobler in the mind", which has been translated into Spanish as "ánimo" (N. Moratín), "espíritu" (J. Roviralta), "mente" (J. Barroso) or "alma" (Cladera). "Mind" could mean "spirit" or "wish" in this part. The most literal translation is "mente," which means intelligence or brain, but this strong word destroys all the poetry within the original sentence, whereas "espíritu/spirit," or "alma/soul," suit better with the possible meanings. Some authors change this sentence like Jaime Navarra Farré "¿Cómo se comportará un hombre de temple? / How would a brave man act?" or directly omit it, like Martínez y Artabeytia, who summarized all sentences since "that is the question" until "to die, to sleep" with a simple word: "reflexionemos/let's think about it."

"Slings and arrows" are the following controversial words, being "Slings" the one that holds more difficulty when translating. Ramiro Pinilla simplified this sentence with the word "ataques/attacks" which is a good substitute, but too clear, without giving more meanings which was the main objective of Shakespeare during the whole soliloquy. "Tiros penetrantes/piercing shots" used by Moratín is also too much clear, not giving other possible readings to the sentence. Barroso Bonzón tried by translating literally: "Hondas y dardos," but again, did not achieve Shakespeare richness. There are other translations which define "slings" as "azotes," a richer word in Spanish which could be interpreted as the physical action but also as psychological shocks. It is interesting to mark also the cases when "Fortune" is translated as "Destino/fate." (J. Navarra)

Another sentence which was criticized by Cladera in Moratín's translation was his interpretation of the expression "to take arms" as "oponer los brazos/oppose the arms". "Arms" is misunderstood, avoiding the meaning "Weapons" and choosing the part of the body, committing a terrible mistake that was corrected in 1800 in Cladera's translation. Also, he reproach Moratín of using a sentence which in Spanish does not mean directly "attack" but just "defend," whereas Shakespeare was meaning a direct attack against that "sea of troubles", the following words to analyze.

"Piélago de males" (G. Mac-Pherson), "torrente de calamidades" (L. Moratín), "diluvio de penas," (C. Cladera) "Mar de angustias" (J. Méndez), "Mar de dificultades" (J. Barroso) or "mar de desventuras" (J. Clark) are the several translations that could be found. "Mar/Sea"

[3] More information: <http://elpais.com/diario/1990/09/05/cultura/652485602_850215.html>.

suits perfectly, but "Piélago/deep, open sea" provides the sentence with that depth Shakespeare was trying to transmit. "Diluvio/downpour" implies a different meaning compared to the one the original author gave, by saying that those "penas/difficulties or sorrows" are falling from the sky. "Trouble" could mean "difficulty/dificultad" or "disorder,"[4] all these things could provoque "penas/sorrow," or "angustias/anxiety." After finding so many different translations, it is not possible to point out objectively which one fulfils better the meaning of the powerful sentence "sea of troubles."

In the following sentence: "To die- to sleep- No more;" there are mainly two translations in the Spanish language: "Morir; dormir. Nada más" or "Morir es dormer. Nada más". Cristóbal Cladera was the first one to report the violation that Moratín did when he translate the sentence as "morir es dormir/to die is to sleep". Cladera states that the main point in Hamlet's soliloquy is the uncertainty, and explaining that death is the same as a sleep destroys all the mysteries of these lines. As it has been explained before, throughout the whole speech Hamlet just put problems after problems but no clear solution appears. Mateo Martínez y Artabeytia followed the path of Moratín but put it between question marks "morir… ¿es dormir?" which according to the analysis of Cladera seems a better choice. There are however more translations of this "to die- to sleep- no more;": in the case of Navarra Farré's translation, he decided to mix both parts "to die- to sleep- no more" and "To die- to sleep. To sleep- perchance to dream" in a sentence by saying "Morir… dormir… ¡dormir en paz! Sí, dormir… ¡y soñar también!/to die… to sleep… to sleep in peace! Ay, to sleep… and to dream too!" Barroso-Banzon added also that "Sí/Yes" in that part in his translation. These explanations are completely distant from the original soliloquy.

The next word is another interesting case of free adaptation. Since Moratín translated "thousand/mil, miles" from "thousand natural shocks" as "sinnúmero/countless, endless", many translators had followed his trail. Even when there was a suitable word for the translation, Spanish authors needed to increase the meaning of the original word by changing it for one with more emphasis.

In the case of "rub", "ay, there's the rub!," Moratín chose a really accurate word by translating it as "gran obstáculo," many other authors though, decided that "rub" could be understood as "la mayor de las dificultades/the biggest of all problems" (J. Navarra), "esto es lo que detiene/this is what stops" (C. Cladera), "sarcasmo/sarcasm" (J. Barroso), "tropiezo/stumble" (J Clark), "remora/obstacle" (G. Mac-Pherson), "escollo/hurdle" (A. Custodio), "daño/harm" (J.M. Blanco) or just a simple "obstáculo/obstacle." (R. Pinilla)

Moratín stayed in another case as the best example when translating "sleep of death" as "silencio del sepulcro/silence of the tomb." It is clear that both sentences have different meanings, but both contained that darkness and mystery that Hamlet was trying to transmit. It is in this kind of sentences where the power of Shakespeare's words seems to give the Spanish writers a freedom of translation that very few classical authors could afford. Not all the authors chose the same translation; the literal one "dormir de la muerte/sleep of death" appears in many versions.

There is a special case located in only two of all the translations studied for this paper, where an additional sentence appears after "must give us pause" adding a meaning that Shakespeare did not include at all in Hamlet's speech: "haciéndonos amar la vida/making us love life." (R. Martínez Lafuente[5] and Juan Alarcón Benito) This is another case of dangerous translations, which could distort the original meaning.

The next part of the soliloquy is a series of sentences which describe calamities and problems that all human being could suffer. This paper will not study in depth this part but will point out two interesting facts being the first one the order of these problems. In many translations like the ones done by Alarcón Benito, Martínez y Artebeytia, Moratín, Mac-Pherson and R. Martínez Lafuente the sentences appear in a different order, why? Once again Cristóbal Cladera harshly criticizes this translation, in this case made by Moratín,

---

[4] Definitions taken from: <http://oxforddictionaries.com/es/definicion/ingles/trouble?q=trouble>.
[5] More information about this mysterious author in <http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/1611/art/seron.htm>.

explaining that the aim of a translator is to translate a text faithfully and not to try to make it better, and not always succeeding, by freely altering it. It is also important to state that some of those translations where structured in hendecasyllabic verses[6], and altering the order could have been done so as to make the rhyme fits easier. The second point to analyze was the translation of the word "time/tiempo" in "the whips and scorns of time" which appears as "edad/age" (A. Buero Vallejo), "mundo/world" (J. Méndez) or "día/day" (C. Cladera). Again, Shakespeare gives a lot of freedom to translate the word "time" as its meaning could fit in all the translations given without losing identity, with the exception of Cladera's choice, which is more limited than the others.

The enumeration of problems finishes with the word "bodkin" which David and Ben Crystal defines as a "dagger [or other pointed weapon]"[7]. Guillermo Mac-Pherson translated this word as "punzón/punch" which is not a weapon itself but a tool. Jaime Navarra Farré chose "puñal afilado/sharp dagger", changing the meaning of "bare/desnudo, simple" which was the original adjective of "bodkin". This adjective is respected in the translation of José Roviralta Borrel who defines his bodkin as "sencillo/simple" but translates bodkin as "esquilete", a word hard to find nowadays among Spanish speakers, which have evolved into the word "estilete/stiletto" as it could be found in José Mendez's translation, more than sixty years later.[8] Another interesting translation was made by Cristóbal Cladera, who describes this bodkin as an "alfiler/stickpin" which, once again, could not be considered as a weapon. Finally, there is a remarkable change of person in the verb of the sentence "when he himself might" in the translation of Antonio Buero Vallejo, changing the impersonality present throughout the soliloquy with a first person plural "cuando podríamos/when we might". It could have been a lapse of concentration from the author, but anyway this mention to a first person plural puts aside all the universal feeling of the speech.

The following words are "weary life" which seem easy to translate, as the meanings for "weary" are few and all related. However, many Spanish translators have provided several meanings for this word: "enemiga/enemy" (R. Pinilla), "molesta/annoying" (L. Moratín), "afanosa/tough" (J. Roviralta) or "odiosa/hateful" (J. Clark) whereas others have came up with more faithful adjectives as "rendida de cansancio/exhausted of tiredness" (J. Barroso) or "tediosa/tedious." (J. Méndez)

The same problem as before arises with the words "undiscovered country." Whereas "country" shows more freedom when translating, "región/region" (G. Mac-Pherson), "país/country" (L. Moratín), "límites/limits" (J.M. Blanco) or the special translation by J. Navarro: "mundo del Más Allá/the world of the beyond", "undiscovered" seems quite clear, as its meaning is simple and does not hide many possible interpretations. Nevertheless, some Spanish translators described this "country" as "terrible/terrible" (R. Pinilla) or "ignorada/ignored" (A. Buero) while others chose a more loyal translation like "incógnita/unknown" (G. Mac-Pherson), "desconocido" (L. Moratín) or "ignota/unknown." (J. Clark)

The following expression is "puzzles the will." "Puzzle" acting as a verb could be defined as "confuse" or "frustrate" and "will" means "determination" "an emotion" "a purpose" "a desire" or "an inclination."[9] The meaning of the whole expression is quite clear but again the Spanish translators did their job with some freedom. Maybe the more literal translation is "confunde la voluntad/confuses the will" (J. Barroso), followed by "confunde al alma/confuses the soul" (J.M. Blanco). Remember how in the first lines "mind/mente" was translated as "soul/alma" in some cases, this kind of translation, which appears here again, seeks for a more powerful or complete meaning. There are, however, more free translations:

---

[6] Translations with hendecasyllabic verses: G. Mac-Pherson, Jaime Clark, A. Custodio, J.M. Blanco White and J. Méndez.
[7] <http://www.shakespeareswords.com/Glossary>
[8] Roviralta's book was printed in 1905 whereas Méndez's was printed in 1967. Also, the word "esquilete" does not appear in the RAE's dictionary.
[9] All meanings extracted from <http://www.shakespeareswords.com> and accurately contrasted with <http://oxforddictionaries.com> and <http://www.wordreference.com>.

©Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

"aniquila la voluntad/annihilates the will" (J. Navarra), "turbar el juicio/disturbs the good judgement" (G. Mac-Pherson), "embaraza en dudas/hinders with doubts" (L. Moratín), "poner trabas a la voluntad/obstructs the will" (J. Roviralta), "hace titubear/make us hesitate" (C. Cladera), "voluntad deja perpleja/the will gets puzzled" (J. Méndez) or "quiebra nuestra decisión/breaks our decision" (A. Buero).

The verb "fly" in the sentence "fly to others that we know not of?" is, at first sight and like the previous example, a word with a clear meaning. Getting away from the action that most birds do, this verb could mean "to run away" or "to move quickly"[10] but once again most translators fly from the literal meaning, "volar/fly" (J. Méndez) or "huir/run away" (C. Cladera), trying to express Shakespeare's intentions when he chose that verb. Some examples of these translations are: "enfrentarnos/confront" (R. Pinilla), "arrojarse/throw oneself" (J. Navarra), "ir a buscar/go and look for" (L. Moratín), "lanzarnos/leap on" (J. Roviralta) or "abordar/deal with." (J. Barroso)

Finally, the last expression to compare is "lose the name of action," considered in this paper as the end of the soliloquy. An action takes place or exists because it fulfills its aim; it is not possible to name something as an action if it is not acting as such, so when an action loses the name of "action" means that it does not occur. The literal translation "pierden el nombre de acción" may have sounded hard and too much clear for the Spanish translators who tried to impregnate their translations with that powerful meaning beneath that sentence. José Roviralta is the most loyal to the raw meaning by saying: "no llegan a tener el nombre de la acción/do not manage to get the name of action," which is quite similar to what Shakespeare wrote. Jaime Clark was also quite accurate with his "de hecho nombre pierden/actually lose the name". The first translation though, shows this sentence: "no se ejecutan y se reducen a designios vanos/do not execute and get reduced to vain plans" (L. Moratín) which was copied by several authors after. Other authors tried to explain the meaning of the sentence by using other words: "quedan en triste farsa/stay as sad masquerade" (R. Pinilla) "se evaporan en proyectos vanos/evapórate in vains projects." (J.M. Blanco)

Those were all the words and expressions which deserved special attention, it would have been interesting to compare a higher number of them and also to analyze question marks and punctuation marks, because it is not the same to put a coma after a word, than putting a colon: "Morir: dormer." (A. Buero) This information could be expanded in future papers. To finish off this section it is interesting and important to remark something that the reader may have already noticed: although Moratín's translation was made more than a hundred years ago, many translators took it as a guide and some of them copied it nearly exact, like the case of Juan Alarcón Benito, who copied Moratín's work word after word, with the exception of counted times and also the personal addition he made, which was analyzed before: "haciéndonos amar la vida", clearly influenced by the translator's ideology.[11] This devotion towards Moratín's translation is explained in the prologue by Juan Guerrero Zamora, where he defines this translation as "una imagen fiel y respetuosa de la creación shakespeareana/a faithful and respectful image of the Shakespearean creation." (J.Guerrero 14). There were some of the translations that showed a clear spirit of free translation and others showed some alterations due to the verse's complexity in Spanish.

3. Performances

There have been several Hamlets throughout history, uncountable actors and actresses from all over the world on the stages and an increasing number of actors on the screen. Hamlet has never stopped to fascinate the human being; his problems are still current today and the complexity of his character works as an inevitable magnet against every lover of the scenic arts. Richard Burbage (1568(?) - 1619) was the first actor that assumed the role of this

[10] All meanings extracted from <http://www.shakespeareswords.com> and accurately contrasted with <http://oxforddictionaries.com> and <http://www.wordreference.com>.

[11] Author of books about the Spanish right hand, civil war and Franco's dictatorship, and catholic themes, such as *Resumen político de la paz de Franco* or *El Quinto Evangelio*.

tragic character and his name appears in the First Folio of Hamlet, in the list of main characters. Many others will repeat the same lines after him: Joseph Taylor (? - 1652), T. Betterton (1635 - 1710) or the criticized David Garrick (1717 - 1779) who not only eliminated scenes from the original text, but he added some created by him. Edmund Kean (1787 - 1833) and the American Edwin Booth (1833 - 1893) were also very prestigious and loved by the audience. More information about these and more actors could be found in the book by Álvaro Custodio *Hamlet, Príncipe de Dinamarca* whose translation has been included in this paper.

Moving into cinema and television, this paper provides the readers with the extracted soliloquies from each of the adaptations that will be discussed. The first remarkable appearance of Hamlet on the big screen was the movie directed by Laurence Olivier with himself as the young prince. The Shakespearean scholars were expecting Olivier to adapt the complete text of Shakespeare, but his amputations, needed to film a movie neither too long nor too static, felt as a sad disappointment. However, Olivier's movie (1948) won four Oscars including best actor and best picture. His interpretation of the prince of Denmark has been qualified as soft and quiet (see Custodio *Hamlet, Príncipe de Dinamarca* 95). The soliloquy in this version takes place in a tower of the castle next to the cliffs. Hamlet is alone and sometimes he says the words for himself, without moving his lips. When he realizes that to sleep could mean to dream too, the music appears, being the first time in history when music appears within the soliloquy. Another interesting fact is the bodkin: he takes it with the sentence "And by opposing end them." whereas in most of the adaptations the bodkin appears with the sentence "bare bodkin," as it will be seen in the following movies.

In 1964 the Russian version *Gamlet* directed by Grigori Kozintsev appeared. This movie was admired by Laurence Olivier, John Gielgud and Kenneth Branagh, stating that it was the most accurate adaptation ever filmed. In the soliloquy of the Russian Hamlet, performed by Innokenti Smoktunovsky, the character is once again next to the sea, but this time he walks peacefully around the rocks on the shore. The whole soliloquy is thought, the character does not move his lips at any moment and he is alone. The bodkin is present in his hips but he does not take it.

The very same year, John Gielgud directed Richard Burton in a theatrical staging which was recorded. His Hamlet, opposite to Olivier's, shows desperation and energy in his unstable soliloquy, combining fast parts with slow ones, powerful emphasis with soft sentences, making clearer than ever the freedom that this soliloquy offers. He performs it inside the castle and is alone until Ophelia appears. The bodkin does not show up, but in the part where it is mentioned, "bare bodkin", Burton emulates the action of stabbing himself. It is interesting that this version is the fastest one of all the cinema performed soliloquies. Two minutes and ten seconds and there it is.

Franco Zeffirelli, a director who has taken several Shakespearean plays into the screen, directed the new version of Hamlet in 1990. With Mel Gibson as Hamlet, the soliloquy takes part in the catacombs of the castle and once again the actor is alone. The rhyme is unstable and, like in Burton's, the bodkin does not appear. Gibson's pauses frequently making this the largest of all of Hamlet's cinematic soliloquies; three minutes and thirty seconds, longer even than Olivier's super-slow version.

Six years later, in 1996, Kenneth Branagh pleases all the Shakespearean scholars by recording the entire text. His soliloquy takes place in a large salon with mirrors. Branagh's Hamlet is wondering around the room until he sees his reflection in one of the mirrors, then the soliloquy starts. Claudius and Polonius are hidden behind the mirror, so they hear the whole speech. Branagh takes his bodkin with the sentence "bare bodkin" and recites the text as he approaches the mirror, finishing it facing his own reflected face.

In the year 2000, a new and modern adaptation of Hamlet was filmed with Michael Almereyda directing Ethan Hawke as Hamlet. The story takes place in the year 2000 and Denmark is not a country but an important enterprise. The famous soliloquy first appears in a recording of the same Hamlet, holding a gun and pointing it to his head, but only the first sentence, "to be, or not to be", is heard. The whole speech combines again the use of the speaking mind and the actor saying the words, and it is said as Hamlet walks around a video club in his neighborhood. There are no bodkins, and Claudius, Polonius and Ophelia are absent, though there are people present in the video club who do not hear Hamlet's words.

The BBC produced several television versions of Hamlet. This paper will focus on two: Derek Jacobi's (1980) and David Tennant's (2009). The first performance is the most overacted of all the ones studied; not only in terms of movements, but because of the speech. It almost gets rid of every possibility of natural behavior. Claudius, Polonius and Ophelia hear Hamlet, hidden beneath the walls of the room. Jacobi takes the bodkin with the sentence "bare bodkin." Nearly thirty years later, David Tennant provides the audience with a tormented and modern Hamlet who recites the entire soliloquy leaning his head against a wall and moving nothing but his head. Robert McCrum yielded when he saw Tennant's talent, calling him "the greatest Hamlet of his generation"[12]. This Hamlet, who wears jeans and T-shirts, is alone, and the bodkin does not appear.

There was even an opera about the story of Hamlet. Composer Ambroise Thomas wrote it in 1868, and of course, he included parts of the soliloquy. The British baritone Simon Keenlyside played Hamlet (2003) and his "Être, ou ne pas être/to be or not to be" was largely amputated in order to fit to the musical necessities. There is no bodkin, and he is alone in a dark room.

Hamlet in Spain was first performed in 1772 following the poor and free interpretation of Ramón de la Cruz. This mutilated text, translated from the French version of J.F. Ducis, was a complete failure, not be staged until 1826. A more recently version of Hamlet was made by TVE's Estudio 1 with the famous actor Emilio Gutiérrez Caba as Hamlet (1970). In this adaptation, Hamlet is alone in a dark room and recites in close-up facing the camera. The bodkin does not appear and he does not move.

The power of this Shakespearean character has also engaged actresses from all over the world, being Sarah Siddons (1755-1831) the first known woman to have faced the role of Hamlet (1777). In Spain the most recent Hamlet woman did achieve a high reputation and respect. This actress was Blanca Portillo, and her Hamlet directed by Tomaz Pandur[13] was a great success in the Spanish stage. She performed her "to be or, not to be" completely naked, after waking up from her bed. She was alone and no bodkin appeared. For this performance she won best actress Max prize in 2010[14].

4. Conclusion

Hamlet is one of the richest, if not the most complex characters in the world of theatre. The problems and thoughts expressed in the soliloquy have importance and interest across time and space. However, the analysis of the translations has demonstrated that Shakespeare is hard to translate across cultures. The images that the soliloquy offers are so complex that many Spanish translators had trouble in finding the Spanish equivalents and being loyal to the original. Can a word that in English has five different and possible meanings have an equivalent term in Spanish? Those who state that Shakespeare could not be translated might be right. Or perhaps Spanish is not rich enough to cover all the author's meanings.

One clear example of these difficulties appears just before the soliloquy studied in this paper. When Hamlet argues with Ophelia, he shouts "to a nunnery, go" and this word "nunnery" has two meanings in English: a convent or, commonly in Elizabethan slang, a brothel. Spanish translators chose to translate this, most frequently, as "convento/convent," destroying second meaning. The lack of a word that includes these two meanings is a clear disadvantage in Spanish translations.

[12] Complete review: <http://www.theguardian.com/stage/theatreblog/2009/jan/09/david-tennant-hamlet>.

[13] It was not possible to get the DVD copy from the Centro de Documentación Teatral, but in youtube are several videos, including the beginning of this soliloquy: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4651gGaXTpE>.

[14]Available in: <http://www.premiosmax.com/dyn/conoce_los_premios_max/historia/ficha.php?id_seccion=12&id_edicion=13#categoria50>.

Such translation problems are not the only thing that changes the meaning of Shakespeare's words. All the movies also betray, in some way, Shakespeare's soliloquy and the drama of *Hamlet*. He did not include more stage directions than when a character enters or exits, so that every single *Hamlet,* in movies or stage productions, has been altered in some way or another. The famous bodkin could have never meant to be there, although many movies show it. So what is correct, fair and loyal, and what is a betrayal, a blasphemy or a stab in the back? The power beneath *Hamlet* and its soliloquy is always there, more or less present depending on the movie or translation, but if the reader or actor wants to get closer to the enigmatic character, it is necessary to dive deep in the original text and analyze it in detail, word after word, and meaning after meaning, in order to get to its darkest corners. Denis Rafter said once that feelings and emotions are universal, and languages lay in the background.[15] That is the effort that every actor who wants to be Hamlet must face. The last video included[16] contains a performance of the author of this paper performing the soliloquy in both English and Spanish, helped by several elements and interacting with the audience. It is up to the reader to do any further analysis.

Works Cited

Boltz, Ingeborg and Wolfgang Clemen (Eds.) *Shakespeare's Soliloquies*. London: Routledge, 2010. Digital.

Cañas Murillo, Jesús. "Leandro Fernández de Moratín, Traductor y Adaptador Dramático." *Anuario de Estudios Filológicos XXII.* Spain: Universidad Extremadura, 1999. 73 – 98. Digital.

Cladera, Cristóbal. *Examen de la Tragedia Intitulada Hamlet*. Madrid: Viuda de Ibarra, 1800. Print.

Gamlet. Dir. Grigori Kozintsev. Perf. Innokenti Smoktunovsky, Mikhail Nazvanov, Elza Radzina, Yuri Tolubeyev. Lenfilm Studio, 1964. DVD.

Hamlet. Dir. Laurence Olivier. Perf. Laurence Olivier, Jean Simmons, Basil Sydney, Eileen Herlie, Felix Aylmer. Rank Organisation, 1948. DVD.

Hamlet. Dir. John Gielgud. Perf. Richard Burton, Linda Marsh, Alfred Drake, Hume Cronyn, Eileen Herlie. Playbill, 1964. DVD.

Hamlet. Dir. Claudio Guerín. Perf. Emilio Gutiérrez Caba, María Luisa Ponte, Fernando Cebrián, Alfonso del Real, Gerardo Malla. Círculo Media Direct, 1970. DVD.

Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. Dir. Rodney Bennett. Perf. Derek Jacobi, Claire Bloom, Patrick Stewart, Eric Porter, Lalla Ward. British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), 1980. DVD.

Hamlet. Dir. Franco Zeffirelli. Perf. Mel Gibson, Glenn Close, Alan Bates, Paul Scofield, Ian Holm, Helena Bonham Carter. Warner Bros, 1990. DVD.

Hamlet. Dir. Kenneth Branagh. Perf. Kenneth Branagh, Derek Jacobi, Kate Winslet, Julie Christie, Michael Maloney, Charlton Heston, Billy Crystal. Castle Rock Entertainment, 1996. DVD.

Hamlet. Dir. Michael Almereyda. Perf. Ethan Hawke, Kyle MacLachlan, Sam Shepard. Miramax, 2000. DVD.

Hamlet – Ambroise Thomas. Dir. Patrice Caurier, Moshe Leiser, Toni Bargalló. Perf. Simon Keenlyside, Natalie Dessay, Beatrice Uria-Monzon. Gran Teatre del Liceu, 2003. DVD.

Hamlet. Dir. Gregory Doran. Perf. David Tennant, Patrick Stewart, Oliver Ford Davies. British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), 2009. DVD.

McCrum, Robert. The Guardian: "David Tennant is the greatest Hamlet of his generation". *http://www.theguardian.com*. 2013.
<http://www.theguardian.com/stage/theatreblog/2009/jan/09/david-tennant-hamlet>.

Molina Foix, Vicente. El País: "Ser o no ser, ésa es la opción" http://elpais.com. 2013. <http://elpais.com/diario/1990/09/05/cultura/652485602_850215.html>.

Oxford Dictionaries. *http://oxforddictionaries.com*. 2013. Web.

---

[15] Full interview: <http://elcultural.es/noticias/BUENOS_DIAS/2394/Denis_Rafter>.
[16] Also available on Youtube: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7GIqOKvo2Vs>.

<http://oxforddictionaries.com>

Perales, Liz. El Cultural: "Denis Rafter" *http://elcultural.es/*. 2013. Web. <http://elcultural.es/noticias/BUENOS_DIAS/2394/Denis_Rafter>.

Pérez Gállego, Cándido, et al. *Guía de Hamlet*. Madrid: espiral, 1988. Print.

Pujante, Angel-Luis and Keith Gregor (Eds.) *Hamlet en España. Las Cuatro Versiones Neoclásicas*. Spain: Ediciones Universidad Salamanca, 2010. Digital.

Real Academia Española. 2013. <http://www.rae.es/rae.html>.

Regalado Kerson, Pilar. "Hamlet en España en el siglo XIX: hacia un nuevo concepto de traducción shakespeariana." *AIH-Actas Irvine 92*, 1992. 53 – 62. Digital.

Serón Ordóñez, Inmaculada. "Portal de traducción ibérica y americana: 'Plagio y autoría en las obras de Shakespeare traducidas por R. Martínez Lafuente.'" 2013. <http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/1611/art/seron.htm>.

Shakespeare's words. 2013. <http://www.shakespeareswords.com>.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet, Príncipe de Dinamarca*. Trans. Álvaro Custodio. México: Ediciones Teatro Clásico de México, 1968. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Dramas Comedias, Volumen I*. Trans. Antonio Buero Vallejo. Barcelona: Nauta, 1969. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet, Príncipe de Dinamarca*. Trans. Guillermo Mac-Pherson. Madrid: Fortanet, 1879. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Tragedias*. Trans. J. Barroso-Bonzon. Madrid : Ediciones ibéricas, 1943. Print

Shakespeare, William. *Tragedias*. Trans. Jaime Clark. USA: Cumbre, 1979. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo y Julieta; Hamlet; Otelo; Macbeth; La Tempestad*. Trans. Jaime Navarra Farré. Barcelona: Bruguera, 1970. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet; Macbeth*. Trans. José Méndez Herrera. Madrid: Aguilar, 1969. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet, Príncipe de Dinamarca*. Trans. José Roviralta Borrell. Barcelona: La Renaixensa, 1905. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo y Julieta; Hamlet; Las Alegres Comadres de Windsor*. Trans. Juan Alarcón Benito. Madrid: Ediciones Alonso, 1976. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet.* Prologue by de Juan Guerrero Zamora. Trans. Leandro Fernández Moratín. Navarra: Salvat, 1970. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Trans. Leandro Moratín. Madrid: EDAF, 1977. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Trans. Nicolás Fernández de Moratín. Barcelona: Muntaner, 1944. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Dramas, Volumen I*. Trans. Nicolás Fernández de Moratín. Barcelona: Iberia, 1965. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet, Drama Trágico en Seis Actos y Ocho Cuadros*. Trans. Mateo Martínez y Artabeytia. Habana: La Propaganda Literaria, 1872. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet – Los Dos Hidalgos de Verona - Otelo*. Trans. R. Martínez Lafuente. Madrid: J. Perez del Hoyo, 1968. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Otelo; Romeo y Julieta; Hamlet; El Rey Lear; Macbeth.* Trans. Ramiro Pinilla. Bilbao: Moretón, 1973. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. London: Penguin Popular Classics, 2001. Print.

Bioprofile of the author: Carlos Manrique is interested in theatre and writing. Carlos graduated in English Studies from Complutense Univeristy and he is now a student of the Master of Theatre and Scenic Arts at the same university. He writes micro-narratives and poetry, both in English and in Spanish. He is also a contributor to the blog <www.fuck-the-sunset.blogspot.com> as well as one of the collaborators of the blog <www.hillcrestdr.blogspot.com>.

Contact: <c.manriques@gmail.com>