As Shakespeare’s conception of man and of the world is timeless and universal, his literary works are appropriated by different cultures and generations, which understand, interpret and respond to them according to their own parameters. Translation into another language is an important part of the process of appropriation, as it is not only a simple linguistic transcoding (Delabatista and D’Hulst: 21) but also an intercultural activity. In translation there is an interplay not only of linguistic but also of socio-cultural factors. The role of translators as both recipients of the source text—and thus interpreters—and writers of the target text is crucial in configuring the way in which the source text will reach the ultimate receivers. Translators recreate a literary work influenced by and at the same time influencing the culture in which they live, and conditioned by their own individual interpretation and the constraints imposed by the target language.

Each time a literary work is translated into another language, the product will be different no matter how many preceding translations there are. So many factors are involved: the social, historical and cultural context, the translators’ conception of translation, their aims and
decisions, their knowledge of the source language, their interpretation of
the original text, as well as their creativity and ability to make use of
the resources of the target language, that it is impossible that two
different translators arrive at the same result, except, obviously, in case of plagiarism.

This essay examines some significant aspects of Spanish translations of Shakespeare’s dramatic works. Following the general tendency in present-day translation studies, translations have been explored in their historical context. I will thus first provide a general survey, taking into account their reception in the changing cultural and political circumstances of our century. In particular, the peculiarities of the Spanish cultural and linguistic background, where several languages coexist, and the functions of Shakespeare translations in the receiving culture will be looked into.

The importance of the socio-literary tendencies in the receiving culture cannot be ignored, but it does not have to be overrated either, since it obviously influences but does not determine the individual translators’ behaviour, who may well have different criteria and take different decisions. The aims translators have in mind when they set out to translate a given text, that is their initial decisions, will determine their future ones and the type of correspondences found in their translations. When confronted with the initial decision of how to reproduce the source text, the translator may opt to stay close to the original text, trying to recreate its linguistic and aesthetic characteristics as closely as possible (adequate translation) or to conform to the conventions of the target culture and language and adapt the source text to it (acceptable translation). Spanish translations, as will be seen, when analysed chronologically, show a shift towards the pole of adequacy.

Two essential aspects in relation to Shakespeare’s plays will be foregrounded: whether translators have taken into account that their work was written to be performed, rather than read, and whether they
have preserved the alternation between verse and prose, which is so full of significance in Shakespeare’s plays.

In dealing with such a broad subject—Spanish translations of Shakespeare’s plays—a selection must be made. In limiting the scope of any study, there are always certain aspects that have to be laid aside and, as in any selection, something will necessarily be lost. This paper will not be an exhaustive bibliographical study since the mere enumeration of all the translations would have prevented me from any further comment. I have not aimed at a detailed description or an accumulation of data, but rather a selective analysis and criticism of some of the most relevant Spanish translations of Shakespeare’s dramatic production, trying to see what is beyond the individual translations and whether tendencies or common traits can be established. My approach will be descriptive, with the purpose of analysing Spanish translations of Shakespeare’s literary works in their historical context in order to understand and explain their characteristics, not to evaluate them subjectively in terms of good or bad. It cannot be forgotten that the critics’, as well as the translators’, understanding of a text is necessarily subjective, and that it is impossible to strictly define the notion of faithfulness. In dealing with complex texts such as those of Shakespeare, which are open to multiple interpretations and with so many elements to be considered, I have tried to avoid operating with preconceived criteria about translation and evaluating them according to our modern standards.

There is no “correct” way of translating a text, as there is no one-to-one correspondence or equivalence of units. In translation, only rarely will the target language exactly match the semantic and formal characteristics of the source language, and the translator will always have to sacrifice something. Even when a translator opts for an adequate translation, how can he convey all the richness of Shakespeare’s language, his puns and wordplays, the ambiguity of some of his passages, his imagery, his different style levels, the musicality of his verse? To reproduce all the semantic, textual, stylistic and dramatic
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elements of his literary works is an impossible task. If a translator wishes to favour the retention of verse in the target text, this may imply the distortion of the syntax of the target language, or the loss of equivalence at other levels. Formal qualities are, on the other hand, often sacrificed in order to privilege semantic content. Priorities are always set at the expense of some loss, and the translator will have to select one alternative among several possible ones.

If in translation there cannot be an ideal reproduction or recreation of the source text, and translators’ decisions can always be open to controversy, in rendering Shakespeare’s plays one of the first difficulties translators have to face is that there is no “real” script. Shakespeare, who wrote for the stage, did not seem to be worried at all about fixing his texts, which he revised in accordance with the reaction of the audience (Delabatista and D’Hulst 10). As a result of the fact that Elizabethan plays were not accurately published either, we have no definitive text. The various editions may present significant differences, especially in some cases such as Hamlet or King Lear. In contrast to this earlier indifference, annotated critical editions have tried to fix the “true” variants. However, the “real” script cannot be fully reconstructed because it no doubt varied in the different stage performances.

This poses a great obstacle for Shakespearean translators. So, when Spanish translators are confronted with textual variants—no doubt a source of concern for any translator—they adopt two different attitudes: either they choose a specific critical edition or they question the existing ones, and undertake the task of editors and researchers. This is the position taken by the latest Spanish translators, those of the team “Instituto Shakespeare”, and of Pujante, who has written: “El traductor de un Virgilio o Shakespeare habrá de ser un traductor-investigador”5 (1989: 135).

Brief Historical Survey of Translations into Spanish

Spain is not a linguistically homogeneous country. Besides Castilian Spanish—usually known as Spanish—other languages are
spoken in different areas: Catalan in Catalonia, Basque in the Basque Country, and Galician in Galicia. This fact has to be taken into account because Shakespeare’s works have been rendered not only into Spanish but also into the other languages. In addition to some obvious common traits arising from their cultural and linguistic closeness--except for Basque, a non-Indo-European language, the rest are all Romance--there are also differences among them due to their literary backgrounds and in the status of the minority languages, which often depends on political circumstances. Thus, there have been, for example, significant differences in the aims and conditions for translating Shakespeare’s works into various languages.

Spain’s interest in Shakespeare is relatively recent. Whereas the first English translation of Don Quijote, for example, was published in the early seventeenth century, alongside many other translations of Spanish literary works, it was not until 1772 that a Shakespeare play, Hamlet,6 was translated by Ramón de la Cruz into Spanish. It was a second-hand translation, however, based on the French version by Ducis. A few years later Leandro Fernández de Moratín translated the same play directly from English, and in spite of his Neoclassical ideas, shown in the prologue to his translation and in his notes, he followed the source text. First published in 1798, it went through numerous editions throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Serrano: 29).

In the nineteenth century a significant number of Spanish translations were based on the French ones by Laplace, Ducis, Le Tourneur or Larroche. But especially in the second half, growing interest in Shakespeare’s work was expressed in the form of many diverse studies7 and direct translations from English. Two Englishmen living in Spain, Jaime Clark and William Macpherson, attempted to translate the complete works,8 keeping the differentiation between verse and prose. However, Clark could only translate ten plays before he died9 and Macpherson translated twenty-three10. Clark’s translations, based on The Globe Edition, attempted to follow the original text and its rhythm faithfully, but his use of the hendecasyllabic verse forced him
to alter the original. Macpherson also aimed to convey the original text faithfully, although in the prologue to his translation of *Macbeth* he wrote:

*Como en todos los dramas de Shakespeare, huelgan sin duda escenas enteras en Macbeth, abundan puerilidades, frases que se refieren a circunstancias del momento y “Gongorismos” de mal gusto y de difícil inteligencia.*

In his translations, which reflect the rhetorical conventions of the late nineteenth century, a modern audience might, in addition, miss some of Shakespeare’s metaphors and sound effects and notice some additions as well as omissions. Matías de Velasco also translated some of Shakespeare’s literary works, including sonnets and poems, but although he shows deep respect and admiration for Shakespeare and a sound philological grounding in his introduction and notes, his translations do not fully convey the original and miss its poetry. At the close of the century, Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo translated four plays in prose and José Arnaldo Márquez eight (also in prose). These translations have gone through several editions in our century, especially in the 1960s and 1970s. Those by Menéndez Pelayo are still reedited in the 1990s, although he reduced passages of the source text and omitted bawdy undercurrents. The Spanish writer Jacinto Benavente translated *Twelfth Night* in 1899 and *King Lear* in 1911.

It is in the twentieth century, however, and especially in the second half, that there has been a significant increase in the number of new translations and new editions of Shakespeare’s plays, in agreement with the general trends which point to general high translation activity. Thus, the present percentage of translated works in Spain is 20 per cent (Vega: 355), whereas in other European countries the proportion is lower. It must be borne in mind, too, that the translations which have been published since the end of the nineteenth century are not only in Spanish but also in Catalan, Basque and Galician.
The interest which Shakespeare’s literary works arouses in the twentieth century also has to be borne in mind. The number and the quality of studies devoted to Shakespeare have greatly increased over the course of the last forty-five years, with the gradual introduction of Departments of English in Spanish universities. The present interest in Shakespeare, however, cannot be equated with the popularity that his plays had in Elizabethan England. With the passage of time, our understanding and perception of Shakespeare’s works is substantially different from that his contemporaries had, and Shakespeare is no longer considered a commercial script-writer (Bassnett: 110). As a classic writer and a cultural myth, he now mostly appeals to a wide but educated audience.

In the history of Shakespeare translations into Spanish three individual translators, Astrana Marín, Valverde and Pujante, and a team of translators, the “Instituto Shakespeare” at Valencia University, have to be necessarily mentioned. Astrana Marín and Valverde’s translations are in prose, while Pujante’s and those of the “Instituto Shakespeare” keep the distinction between verse and prose.

In the first part of the twentieth century, Luis Astrana Marín succeeded in rendering Shakespeare’s complete works into Spanish (1929). He attempted a literal translation of the original text, which he often had to expand. Although occasionally his interpretation of the original is too subjective, his aim of semantic fidelity led him to sacrifice the original formal difference between verse and prose and other stylistic features. His translations, clearly aimed at readers, not at a theatrical audience, have gone through a large number of editions to these days. The widespread acceptance of his translations can also be shown by the fact that some passages from his versions are quoted in José Manuel González Fernández de Sevilla’s study El teatro de William Shakespeare hoy (66-67). However, the fact the publishing house Espasa Calpe has decided to replace Astrana Marín’s translations by the more recent ones by Pujante will probably mean the end of the popularity of these translations.
In the 1960s José Mª Valverde translated all of Shakespeare’s plays in prose. His aim was to make Shakespeare’s works known among his contemporary Spanish readers in a natural, standard Spanish, giving preference to content over stylistic features. Sound effects such as alliteration or repetition are sometimes missing in his versions, as well as Shakespeare’s variety of style, but he succeeded in fully conveying the semantic content of the plays.

It is in the last two decades of our century that Spanish university professors of English Philology, with extensive knowledge of Elizabethan English, literary criticism, and of the textual problems involved in Shakespeare’s plays have undertaken the task of translating Shakespeare’s drama. The aims of their translations are stated in the prologues and in scholarly articles commenting on their work. The “Instituto Shakespeare”, directed by Manuel Ángel Conejero, was formed in Valencia in 1978 with the aim to translate the whole Shakespearean dramatic corpus into Spanish and produce annotated critical editions. Their first translation was that of King Lear published in 1979. One of the distinctive characteristics of these translations is that this is a collective project, carried out by a team of translators, actors and academics, who before writing the final version, thoroughly discuss all the problems involved in the plays, ranging from the selection of textual variants to semantic difficulties. The preservation of the theatrical dimension of the plays is, however, their main priority; in Conejero’s words: “the choice of words ought to be in the service of theatrical and not poetic effectiveness” (1980: 262).

Ángel Luis Pujante also takes the stage very much into account in his translations of Shakespeare’s plays. He has explicitly stated (1995: 11) that he aims at a triple fidelity: to the dramatic nature of the plays, to Shakespeare’s language and to the target language. His translations, which are also for the stage and not only meant to be read, retain all the expressive elements of the original: Shakespeare’s verse and rhythm, his figurative language, his acoustic effects, and his ambiguities using, when possible, polysemic words which keep the double sense of the
original and produce the same effect.26 He also states that a translator of Shakespeare’s plays must be a researcher in addition to translator, to be able to solve textual problems27 as well as semantic difficulties. Scholarly as his translations are in the sense of precision, they still preserve the poetic effectiveness of Shakespeare’s texts.

Shakespeare in Catalonia, Basque Country and Galicia

Shakespeare’s works, as was stated before, have also been translated into other languages spoken in Spain. Their reception has to be connected to a literary and linguistic context in need of literary works of prestige which could contribute to their development. Political and historical circumstances, in particular the Spanish Civil War (1936-39) and the revival of these languages from the 1970s on, also had an effect on the performance and publication of the plays.

Shakespeare’s influence in Catalonia began in the early twentieth century, and the number of translations into Catalan that appeared at that time was so remarkable that it has been called “First Catalan period” by Ángeles Serrano (37). Up to this moment Shakespeare had been known in Catalonia through Spanish and French translations and Italian operas, but the cultural and linguistic circumstances of this period strongly favoured the translation of foreign texts in general and of Shakespeare in particular into Catalan and their integration into this culture. The cultural movement existing at this period, known as “Noucentisme”, sought to renew aesthetic norms by drawing on classic sources, and translations were seen as a way of filling the lack of a well-developed literary tradition. There was also a strong interest in English literature, a reflection of the “elegant anglofilia”, of the period (Fuster). At the same time, the Catalan language was undergoing a process of standardisation, which involved the selection of learned lexical items. It is in this context, where Shakespeare translations were considered to contribute to the Catalan language and literature28 that we can place the numerous translations of this period,29 among them
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those by Artur Masriera (*Hamlet*); Salvador Vilaregut (*Julius Caesar*); Didac Ruiz (*Macbeth*); Cebrià de Montolíu (*Macbeth*); Josep Carner (*A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *The Tempest*); Magí Morera i Galícia (*Coriolanus*, *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Macbeth* (unpublished) and *Julius Caesar* (unpublished) and a part of the *Sonnets*); Anfós Par; Cèsar August Jordana (*Macbeth*, *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *The Tempest*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Timon of Athens*, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Othello*); Carme Montoriol (*Sonnets*, *Cymbeline* and *Twelfth Night*).

The most outstanding of the Catalan translators of the first half of the twentieth century, however, was Josep Maria de Sagarra. Sagarra, a well-known Catalan writer, probably began his translations in 1941. He translated twenty-seven plays, although in his corpus of Shakespearean translations *Hamlet* is, perhaps surprisingly, missing. He started under the patronage of wealthy Catalan citizens and this may explain why the first translation he finished was *Timon of Athens*. Owing to the low status of the Catalan language in post-war Spain, his translations were first published without the publisher’s imprint and with the false date of 1935 (Vidal Alcover: 83).

In his translations Sagarra sought to convey faithfulness to the “concepts” rather than to the details, which he did not hesitate to change to bring them nearer to the pole of acceptability in the target culture. His own style as a playwright can also easily be detected in his translations, excelling in the comedies and popular scenes. Sagarra recreates Shakespeare’s most colloquial and vulgar features and may even also lower Shakespeare’s high style. In spite of some shortcomings, and of the publication in the 1980s of Salvador Oliva’s translations, carried out with great precision, he has been considered “the” Catalan translator of Shakespeare and his translations have been noted as “one of the best services to the Catalan language and culture” (Palau i Fabre: 68).
Oliva’s translations were intended to subtitle and subsequently dub the British series *The BBC Television Shakespeare*, shown on Catalan TV. In addition to the requirements that dubbing brings, Oliva’s initial norms were to stay close to the text “Cuanto más nos apartemos de Shakespeare, más difícil será conseguir traducir su capacidad dramática” (202). However, he does not seek a literal translation, rendering Shakespeare word by word. Puns, for example, are conveyed by equivalent ones, which can produce a similar effect, and *you* and *thou* are translated according to the contemporary Catalan code, not that of Shakespeare’s time. He aims to convey the full potential of the original words and arouse in the receiver sensory and mental reactions similar to those produced by the source text. Similar sensory effects are produced by the sound of words and the rhythmic units they produce, mental ones by denotation and connotation. In the translation of proper names, a significant detail which reveals the translators’ criteria to place their translations nearer the pole of adequacy to the source text or acceptability in the target culture, he chooses in most cases—and is sorry not to have done so in all of them—to leave them as they are in the source text, except in the case of transparent comical names which reveal a character’s features. In fact, this is an issue that worries him, and he detects a clear trend in the decisions taken by translators, which have changed in the last thirty years. Although translators’ decisions are not always consistent, there is now a tendency to leave proper names as they are in the original, except when they are transparent. The earlier Catalan translations, those by Carner or Sagarra, for example, on the other hand, do not translate emblematic names.

Shakespeare’s plays have also been translated into Basque and Galician. In the 1950s Bedita Larrakoetxea began the systematic translation of Shakespeare plays into Basque with the aim of enriching the Basque language and literature with classical models. Some of his first translations were published in the 1950s in the magazine *Euzko Gogoa*, but the complete works appeared in the 1970s (1974-1976). Shakespeare’s plays probably reached a larger audience in the 1980s.
when the BBC series was dubbed into Basque and broadcasted. Some of the plays, most of them translated by Xabier Mendiguren, were also published by Antzerti, the Basque Dramatic Centre.

Shakespeare translations into Galician are generally closely connected with their stage performances. Shakespeare was first translated into Galician in the 1920s, when Antón Vilar Ponte adapted *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, which was staged by the “Escola Dramática Galega”. Nearly fifty years had to pass before F. Pérez Barreiro published his translation *A traxedia de Macbeth* (1972) into Galician and Manuel Lorenzo translated and staged *Macbeth* (1975).40 At the end of the 1980s Miguel Pérez Romero translated *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *The Merchant of Venice*.41 More recently, he has translated *Hamlet*. Finally, Eduardo Alonso (theatre director) and Manuel Guede have adapted *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*.42 *King Lear* was also translated by Eduardo Alonso and Cándido Pazó in 1990.

**Stage and Page-oriented Translations**

After this general survey of the most relevant translations published, I now focus on the translators’ decisions concerning one of the essential characteristics in the translation of plays: the preservation of the dramatic dimension of the original.

Most critics, I think, would subscribe to the following words by Palau i Fabre (65):

> Per traduir Shakespeare [...] cal[ia] ni sols un bon traductor, 
en el sentit de fidelitat a l’original, no sols un bon poeta, sinó
> un bon poeta dramàtic, coneixedor del teatre.43

The latest translators are acutely aware that Shakespeare wrote his plays to be performed on stage and that dramatic effectiveness cannot be lost in translation. Consequently words have to be chosen
taking into account that actors will pronounce them, that they have to reach the audience and produce the appropriate effect on them.

A written script is an essential part of the play, but it is only part of it, which becomes real in the stage performance. It could be compared to a still photograph, whereas the performance would be real life, integrating text, sounds, light, gestures and movement. In Shakespeare’s plays, however, words are all-important, they generate all sorts of theatrical images and are the clue that will allow us to go beyond them. Battles and tempests, actions and landscapes, feelings and states of mind are evoked by words, by their choice and by their concatenation. Words may also convey “hidden hints to the actors” (John Barton: 7), which translators should try to discover. For this reason, it is important that translators select the words in the target language bearing in mind that a word that is the nearest semantic equivalent in the target language may not be the best choice. Formal characteristics of the words, their musicality, their rhythmic patterns, the conciseness of language or the highlighting of certain words may be crucial on stage.

Josep M. de Sagarra, himself a playwright, is, among the translators of the first part of the century the one who excels in keeping the dramatic elements of Shakespeare’s texts. He took very much into account the fact that plays are to be recited on a stage, and he recreated Shakespeare’s language keeping its musicality, vividness and dramatic potential. His translations are still frequently staged in Catalonia.44

The most recent translations, those by Pujante and by the “Instituto Shakespeare” into Spanish, and by Oliva into Catalan, differ from many earlier translations in preserving the dramatic effectiveness of Shakespeare’s plays. They share a strong interest in keeping the features of theatrical language: its orality, euphony and fluency, as well as linguistic compactness and density. As for another essential dramatic element, stage directions, many Spanish translations keep those which were added form the eighteenth century onwards (Pujante 1993: 232), and do not distinguish between original and added ones. The newer
translations, on the other hand, offer those which, in the light of recent revisions, are thought to reflect the author’s intentions more accurately.

By contrast, as has already been mentioned, there are translations which are not meant for the stage; the translations into Spanish by Astrana Marín, the Catalan versions by Morera i Galicia’s or the Basque ones by Larrakoetxea are perhaps the clearest examples. They lack the above-mentioned characteristics, which would make them appropriate for the stage. The analysis that I have carried out, however, has shown that a strict dichotomy between stage-oriented and page-oriented translations cannot be established. Sagarra’s translations first appeared in bibliophile numbered editions. Those by Pujante and by the “Instituto Shakespeare” are both published and performed. Oliva’s Catalan dubbing version of the BBC series has also been printed. There are also translations carried out for a particular staging which are at the same time published (Publicaciones del Centro Dramático Nacional, Publicacions de l’Institut del Teatre, publications by Antzerti, the Basque Dramatic Centre).

**Verse/Prose**

The distinction between page and stage-oriented translations is usually linked to the translator’s choice between opting for prose or for keeping Shakespeare’s distinction between verse and prose. Valverde’s attitude, when a theatre company asked him to translate *Twelfth Night* in verse, after having translated Shakespeare’s works in prose, is illustrative: he versified his own translation in prose without reading the original again (Valverde 191).

The criteria of Spanish translators as to the convenience of maintaining Shakespeare’s differentiation in this aspect are also different. Next to Astrana Marín’s words, who opted for prose:

*Hay varias opiniones sobre si se debe traducir o no a un poeta en verso. Puede asegurarse que ninguna versión en verso es*
There are also the following opinions:

_una traducción shakespeariana [...] ha de ser por necesidad en verso_ (Conejero 1993:182).  

or

_Una traducción en prosa, por muy fiel que sea, pierde lo esencial_ (Molina Foix 1993: 219).

The earliest Spanish translators that used verse, Macpherson or Clark, for example, rendered Shakespeare’s plays in hendecasyllabic verses. This rigid formal framework compelled them to make lexical changes and to distort the syntax of the target language. It was probably for this reason that Astrana Marin opted for prose. Valverde, who also translated Shakespeare’s plays in prose, however, had a different reason. He was aware that it was better to keep the verse, and in fact he had tried to translate Shakespeare’s plays in verse, using the hendecasyllabic blank verse. But this task would have taken him a long time, and he could not go on with this project for lack of funding. Even so, he tried to listen to the tone of the text and recreate its musicality.

Free verse, where metre depends on the rhythm needed in the passage, however, is given preference to by most contemporary translators, who do not want to give up the musicality and rhythm of Shakespeare’s verse. It is generally considered the most satisfactory
solution to convey the flexibility of Shakespeare’s verse, since it does not impose a fixed pattern. Pujante also keeps the rhyming couplets and the sonnets of the original. And being aware of the importance of music in Shakespeare’s plays, he translates the songs adjusting them to the original tunes, and including the score.

Once translators have decided to keep Shakespeare’s verse, they are usually confronted with the problem that words in Romance languages are generally longer than English words. Sagarra, who opted for verse, acknowledges in the preface to his translations that it is easier to render Shakespeare’s verse into Catalan than in any other Romance language, since in Catalan there are more monosyllabic words than in Spanish and it is easier to reproduce Shakespeare’s rhythm:

veia clarament que era molt més factible traduir un vers blanc en Shakespeare dins un vers blanc català, que no fer-ho en qualsevol altra llengua parenta de la nostra. La prova la tenim en el fet que les millors traduccions franceses i les espanyoles i italianes de darrere hora són gairabé totes en prosa.51

Yet, even in Catalan words generally have more syllables than in English and this compels Sagarra to write more verse lines than in the original. Macpherson had to reduce the text. Valverde, who was also aware of this problem, had the intention to transfer some syllables to the following verse. However, Pujante has proved that a good many original verse lines can be rendered into verse of identical length. Dubbing has also compelled Oliva to maintain the same number of verse lines as the source text.

**Conclusion**

My survey of Shakespeare translations in Spain confirms that the earliest translations were nearer the acceptability pole than that of adequacy, but there has been a gradual approach to the adequacy pole.
Comparing the first Spanish translations, adapted to the neoclassical norms, and the latest translations by Pujante, “Instituto Shakespeare” or Oliva, a clear trend from acceptability towards adequacy can be observed. Translation norms have changed and, whereas the earliest translations were either second-hand ones—which are rejected by contemporary standards—or closely connected to the conventions and norms of the receiving culture, the most modern ones aim to reproduce the source texts in present-day Spanish as accurately as possible.

Macpherson’s translations were considered to be excellent by his contemporaries, but they reflected the Spanish dramatic conventions of Post-Romanticism. Menéndez y Pelayo, whose aim was to convey his own interpretation of Shakespeare’s plays “in the style of our century”, cut out passages and omitted what he considered to be vulgar. Sagarra, according to his own words, pursued the strongest fidelity to the “concepts”, but adapted Shakespeare to the Catalan cultural context and to his own register as a writer. Astrana Marín also aimed to be faithful to the original, but did not keep the distinction between verse and prose and omitted the dramatic elements. Valverde’s prose translation also lost other important characteristics such as the variety of style, but his interpretation of the content of the plays is more precise than that of Astrana Marín.

Contrasting with the spontaneity that Valverde confesses in his translations (189), the translations of the “Instituto Shakespeare” and of Pujante are based on research and erudition. In the light of their own findings and of the latest innovations in the modern editions of Shakespeare’s plays, they aim at an adequate translation which is suitable for the stage in a natural, fluent Castilian. Pujante’s preservation of the form and poetic dimension of the plays also has to be highlighted. Their purpose to reproduce Shakespeare’s text accurately using the resources of the target language is also shared by Oliva in his translations into Catalan.

As for the permanence of translations, whereas some of them have really grown old, others are still reedited or staged. Macpherson’s
versions, to cite one example, are no longer staged. Sagarra’s translations, however, still staged in Catalonia fifty years after they were carried out, show that translations, in the same way as literary works, can also become classic.

**Notes**

1 The author wishes to thank Ángel Luis Pujante, Julio César Santoyo, Eva Espasa, Pilar Zozaya, Rosa González, Anna Poch and Joseph Hilferty.


3 Ángeles Serrano (1993) has compiled an extensive Shakespearean bibliography in Spain from its beginnings to the year of the publication of her study.

4 My study will also be limited to Shakespeare’s textual reception since I will not deal with stage performances. Adaptations that take Shakespeare’s texts as a basis and greatly alter the original text will not be covered either.

5 Trans: The translator of Virgil or Shakespeare will have to be a researcher-translator.

6 *Hamlet* is still one of best-known and most popular plays in Spain, along with *Romeo and Juliet*.

7 Alcalá Galiano, Eduardo Benot, Matías de Velasco Rojas, Benito Pérez Galdós, Eduardo Benot, Pedro Antonio de Alarcón, Sánchez de Castro or Menéndez Pelayo, among others.

8 The editor Francisco Nacente published *Los grandes dramas de Shakespeare* in 1872, a collection of translations of most of Shakespeare’s literary works, carried out by different translators, many of whom used French versions.


11 Trans: As in all Shakespeare’s plays, whole scenes in *Macbeth* are unnecessary, there are too many puerilities, sentences which make reference to circumstances of that moment and vulgar euphuisms, which make for difficult comprehension.


14 *Dramas*, Barcelona: E. Doménech y Cía, 1883-84.

15 *Henry V* and *Richard III* have also been translated into Asturian (by Milio Rodríguez).

16 The following early twentieth-century studies on Shakespeare deserve special mention: Julià Martínez, Anfós Par, Juan Mascaró, Ramón Esquerra, Salvador de Madariaga, R. Ruppert, J. De Entrambasaguas, Luis Astrana Marín.

17 More recent studies are those by Esteban Pujals, Cándido Pérez Gallego, Manuel Ángel Conejero and the team “Instituto Shakespeare”, Ángel-Luis Pujante, Rafael Portillo, Ángeles Serrano, José Manuel González Fernández de Sevilla, Aránzazu Usandizaga, Pilar Zozaya, Eva Espasa, Josep M. Fulquet.

18 Other translators have rendered individual plays into Spanish. Among them, the following have to be mentioned: Vicente Molina Foix (*Hamlet, The Merchant of Venécia*); José Estruch (*King John*); Albert Manent (*Romeo and Juliet*); Enrique Llovet (*Measure for Measure, Antony and Cleopatra*), Jenaro Talens (a member of “Instituto Shakespeare”, *Antony and Cleopatra*).

19 Among other translators, I would mention Rafael Martínez Lafuente who in 1915 rendered most of Shakespeare’s plays into Spanish; however, they were not direct translations, but made from Victor Hugo’s French versions; and Antonio Blanco Prieto whose translations of *King Lear* (1911) and *Cymbeline* (1911) went through several editions in the 1960s and 1970s.


22 They have also translated Macbeth into Catalan.

23 They have also translated The Merchant of Venice, As You Like It, Othello, Macbeth, Romeo and Juliet, Twelfth Night, Hamlet, The Tempest, Richard II.

24 Although this is a collective work, the name of the translators involved in the writing of the final version is given. In the last translation published, that of Richard II, however, only appears the name of the scholars who wrote the introduction and the notes.

25 He has so far published the translations of Corolianus, Julius Caesar, Othello, The Merchant of Venice, As You Like It, King Lear, Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet, Macbeth, A Midsummer Night’s Dream, Twelfth Night, The Tempest and Richard II. That of The Winter’s Tale is forthcoming.

26 Many other translators (Menéndez Pelayo or Astrana Marín, for example) keep only one of the senses.

27 Taking one of the numerous textual problems in King Lear as an example, whereas most Spanish translations are based on Theobald’s 1733 hybrid edition, Pujante (1992) opted for not combining the Quarto (1608) and the First Folio (1623) texts. He based his translation on the Folio text and put the omitted passages in the appendix. The edition of the New Cambridge Shakespeare (1992) based on the 1623 version also places the omitted passages in the appendix.

28 Cebrià de Montoliu, who translated Macbeth in 1907, saw Shakespeare translations as a way of filling the lack of a Catalan classic theatre. Josep M. de Sagarra wanted to include the plays of the greatest dramatist ever in the Catalan theatre (Palau i Fabre, 1973:73).

29 The “Biblioteca Popular dels Grans Mestres” published sixteen translations by different translators.

30 His translation Lo Rei Lear (1912) into Catalan is full of archaisms, as translating a classical work into modern Catalan seemed to him an anachronism.

31 Santiago Martí and Felix Millet.

32 He translated the word porridge, for example, as escudella, a kind of soup eaten in Catalonia.
33 Among other Catalan translations of the second half of the twentieth century, those of *Hamlet* by Terenci Moix, *Macbeth* by Jordi Pujol Cofán, and *Macbeth* by “Instituto Shakespeare” could be mentioned.

34 By Elena Posa, the director of the 1994 Barcelona dramatic Greek Festival.

35 His translations have been reedited in the 1980s both in paperback (Popular de teatre clàssic universal) and leather binding (Biblioteca perenne. Editorial Selecta).

36 Trans: The more we move away from Shakespeare, the more difficult it will be to translate his dramatic capacity.

37 Prologue to his translation of *The Merchant of Venice*.

38 Before Larrakoetxea’s translations, an adaptation of *Macbeth* was written by the playwright and theatre director Toribio Alzaga (1926) and Bingen Ametzaga translated *Hamlet* (1956).


43 Trans: To translate Shakespeare [...] it is necessary not only to be a good translator, in the sense of fidelity to the original, and a good poet, but a good dramatic poet, somebody who knows the stage.

44 In the year 1995-96, for example, *King John, Much Ado About Nothing, Macbeth, All’s Well That Ends Well and. Love’s Labour Lost*. 
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45 The following Pujante’s translations have been staged: The Merchant of Venice, As You Like It, A Midsummer Night’s Dream, Twelfth Night and Richard II. The latter play, directed by Adrián Daumas (as was also Twelfth Night) was staged for the first time in Spain at the Cáceres Festival de Teatro Clásico in June 1998. Macbeth, King Lear, As You Like It or Romeo and Juliet are among the Instituto Shakespeare’s versions which have been staged.

46 By Vicens-Vives.

47 “El Talleret de Salt”.

48 Trans: There is a variety of opinions as to whether or not a poet has to be translated in verse. It can be ascertained that there is no good verse translation [...] The reason is that sometimes the metre and other times the rhythm prevent the translator form being faithful to the author.

49 Trans: A Shakespeare translation [...] must necessarily be in verse.

50 Trans: A prose translation, faithful as it may be, loses its essential characteristics.

51 Trans: I clearly saw that it is much more feasible to translate a Shakespearean blank verse into a Catalan blank verse than into any other language related to ours. The fact that nearly all the best latest French, Castilian and Italian translations are in prose proves it.
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