

RESEARCH OUTPUTS / RÉSULTATS DE RECHERCHE

Review of: The Breach and the Observance. Theatre retranslation as a strategy of artistic differentiation, with special reference to translations of Shakspeare's Hamlet (1777-2001) (Jan-Willem Mathijssen)

Delabastita, Dirk

Published in:
Target

Publication date:
2009

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for pulished version (HARVARD):

Delabastita, D 2009, 'Review of: The Breach and the Observance. Theatre retranslation as a strategy of artistic differentiation, with special reference to translations of Shakspeare's Hamlet (1777-2001) (Jan-Willem Mathijssen)', *Target*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 388-393.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

The Breach and the Observance

Theatre retranslation as a strategy of artistic differentiation,
with special reference to retranslations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1777-2001)

Schenden en volgen

Theaterhervertaling als een strategie van artistieke onderscheiding,
met speciale aandacht voor hervertalingen van Shakespeares *Hamlet* (1777-2001)
met een samenvatting in het Nederlands

The Breach and the Observance

Theatre retranslation as a strategy of artistic differentiation,
with special reference to retranslations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1777-2001)

Schenden en volgen

Theaterhervertaling als een strategie van artistieke onderscheiding,
met speciale aandacht voor hervertalingen van Shakespeares Hamlet (1777-2001)
met een samenvatting in het Nederlands

Proefschrift ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Utrecht op gezag van
de Rector Magnificus, Prof. dr. Willem Hendrik Gispen, ingevolge het besluit van het Col-
lege van Promoties in het openbaar te verdedigen

door

Jan Willem Mathijssen

Geboren op 4 september 1974 te Etten-Leur

Promotoren: Prof. dr. A.B.M. Naaijken
Prof. dr. P.J. de Voogd

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	6
Introduction	8
Chapter 1: Reasons for retranslation	16
1.1 Previous theories on retranslation: ageing texts and perfect translation	17
1.2 Retranslation as a norm conflict	17
1.3 Agents in (re)translation: commissioner, audience and translator	19
1.4 Retranslation in the context of the theatre	21
Chapter 2: Differing norms in theatre translation	24
2.1 Deducing norms from a translation	25
2.2 Theatre translation as a particular area of translation studies	25
Figure 1: Possible options of a theatre translator	26
Figure 2: Series of concretisations	33
2.3 The interplay between theatre maker and translator	32
2.4 The translator's material: length and the possibilities of rewriting	37
2.5 The domestic and the foreign	43
2.6 The audience's reaction to retranslation: debates as a sign of transgression	55
Chapter 3: Case studies of differentiation: Hamlet retranslations on the Dutch stage	58
3.1 General remarks on the production of Hamlet translations between 1777 and 2001	59
Figure 3: Hamlet in Dutch translation 1777-1882	59
Figure 4: Hamlet in Dutch translation 1882-1982	60
Figure 5: Hamlet in Dutch translation 1982-2001	60
3.2 1786 - Retranslation of Ducis's Hamlet by Zubli: propriety and patriotism	61
3.3 1882 - Burgersdijk's translation: the problems of staging a direct translation	68
Figure 6: Comparison between Burgersdijk's and Ducis's Hamlet	71
3.4 1907 - Van Looy's retranslation: director's theatre and commissioned translation	77
Figure 7: Comparison between Van Looy's and Burgersdijk's Hamlet	79
3.5 1957 - Bert Voeten's retranslation: passive retranslation as active differentiation	86
Figure 8: Comparison between Voeten's and Van Looy's Hamlet	88
3.6 1966 - Staging of Marowitz's Hamlet: theatre makers as co-authors of the text	97
3.7 1983 - Claus and Decorte's 'tradaptations': Belgian influence on the Dutch theatre	103
3.8 1986 - Komrij's retranslation: retranslation as a strategy and a trend	109
Figure 9: Comparison between Komrij's and Voeten's Hamlet	111
3.9 1991 - Boonen's retranslation: individuality as a reason for differentiation	118
Figure 10: Comparison between Boonen's and Komrij's Hamlet	121
3.10 1997 - Boermans's rewriting of Voeten's translation	125
Figure 11: Comparison between Albers's and Boermans's Hamlet	129
Figure 12: Comparison between Bindervoet and Henkes's and Albers's Hamlet	134
Conclusion	138
Figure 13: Choices in Hamlet retranslation 1777-2001	140
Appendix A: Translations of Hamlet in performance	148
Appendix B: Hamlet performances	158
Select bibliography	212
Index	226
Samenvatting	234
Curriculum vitae	238

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements

The first time I saw *Hamlet* in the theatre (Dirk Tanghe, 1991), I was seventeen years old. I remember people smoking on stage, blue light, hats, loud music, and the girl I was with. I also remember eagerly awaiting ‘To be or not to be’ and mouthing it when it was spoken. Most of all, however, I remember how I was carried away, thinking that if all theatre was like this, I should see more of it. The second *Hamlet* I saw (Theu Boermans, 1997) made the same impression on the girl who accompanied me. She said that if all theatre were like this, she’d been missing so much. I hope I have infused some of this enthusiasm into the work of scholarship you have before you; and invite theatre makers and translators to offer to upcoming generations the same magic that I have experienced.

For the existence of this dissertation I am most indebted to two people. It would not have been written without the invitation of Dr. Nelly Stienstra and it would not have been finished without the support of Professor Peter de Voogd, who put me back on track and kept me there. Professor Ton Naaijken has been a great support both by inspiring me and by giving me critical comments, a task which has also been executed with much diligence by Dr. Ton Hoenselaars.

I also have enjoyed the generous support of Tanja Holzhey (University of Amsterdam), Eva Mathijssen (actress/writer), Bart Dieho (Utrecht University), Rob Scholten (ATKA Amsterdam), Gerda Roest (Onafhankelijk Toneel), Ana and Aat Nederlof (actors), Don Duyns (director), Jan Joris Lamers (director), Carel Alphenaar (translator), Burt Lammaker (La Kei Producties), Josta Obbink (Theatergasthuis), Yardeen Roos (director), Els van der Perre (Dietsche Belfort & Warande), Marianne van Kerkhoven (dramaturge), Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes (translators), Gitte Brouwer (Mobile Arts/De Parade), Liesbeth Houtman (De Bezige Bij), Janine Brogt (dramaturge), Leonard Frank (director), Hugo Heinen (actor) and the staff of the Koninklijke Bibliotheek (The Hague), of the Theater Instituut Nederland (Amsterdam) and of the Vlaams Theater Instituut (Brussels). I wish to thank Lesa Sawahata, Alana Gillespie, Luisa Bieri, but most of all Dr. Aleid Fokkema for their editorial input and their kind remarks on both form and content. They straightened me out when I was wobbly.

If the fascination for what’s difficult has not completely dried out the sap of my veins, this is due to the unfledging support of Tessa Lavrijsen, of my friends (of whom Tirza Visser, Martijn Knol and Edwin van Houten deserve special mention, as they have helped shaping my ideas along the way) and of my loving parents Will van den Oever and Wim Mathijssen, to whom I dedicate this book.

(photograph cover: Pierre Bokma and Hans Croiset as Hamlet and Claudius, in the *Hamlet bij het Publiektheater*, directed by Gerardjan Rijnders, 1986. Photograph courtesy of Kees de Graaff)

Introduction

“Pitiable Englishmen! They will never be able to read their Bard as clearly as we can.”
– Frans Kellendonk¹

9

At the end of the nineteenth century the actor Louis Bouwmeester walks on stage, heaving and sighing profoundly. He is playing the Prince of Denmark, and in his grand style he seems to out-Hamlet Hamlet. He is in no way similar to Jacob Derwig, the twenty-first-century boy-next-door who watches CNN on television in the same play a century later. ‘Every age its own *Hamlet*,’ is a statement often heard in the theatre. This goes for any country: the English have produced performances of *Hamlet* that had very different angles on the play. And yet – in the Dutch version the very lines the actors speak are utterly different, although they are from the very same play. In fact, the selection of mirrors that the Dutch hold up to Shakespeare has a much wider range than English interpretations, for the Dutch have to perform the Bard in *translation*.

Notably, in neither version the Dutch audience is *surprised* they can understand what happens on stage, even though they are watching a very old play. This is the achievement of the translator who keeps the play’s *language* up to date. In fact, it is claimed that the development of the target language makes it necessary for a text to be translated again every fifty years.² In the case of *Hamlet*, however, the number of retranslations in the last hundred and twenty years has greatly exceeded the predicted three versions. Especially in the last two decades of the twentieth century, the production of retranslations has been voluminous.

Moreover, contrary to the translator’s alleged ‘invisibility’ (Venuti, 1995), the theatre translator has always been clearly present in the promotion and the reception of the play. This gives cause for the suspicion that in the theatre, retranslation stretches further than a merely practical update of language. According to Hamlet, some customs are more honoured “in the breach than in the observance” and apparently the same thought has struck those who cast available translations aside. This leads to questions like: What happens in the process of retranslation for the theatre? Who is behind the production of such a large quantity of new text? And why do people decide a retranslation should be made?

Retranslation is a particularly interesting area in translation studies, since it offers insights into the function of translation. Previous theories on retranslation either interpret the phenomenon as a target culture’s progress towards a ‘perfect translation’ or as a target culture’s attempt to make a more accessible version of the first translation.³ Pym (1998), however, offers a plausible alternative with his distinction between passive and active retranslation. Passive retranslation, according to Pym, occurs when the previous translation is outdated. Active retranslation is a symptom of conflicts between people or groups within the target culture. In his view, the target culture is not homogeneous but consists of different groups. These groups each have their own opinions about proper translation, which are expressed by ‘translational norms’ – or ‘poetics’. These norms, according to Lefevere (1992), are strongly influenced by the power that controls the text: in simpler terms, by the commissioner.

1 “Iedere vertaling is een spiegel die het oorspronkelijke Engels van weer een iets andere kant weerkaatst. Beklagenswaardige Engelsen! Ze zullen hun volksbard nooit zo helder kunnen lezen als wij.” Kellendonk (1985). Except where indicated otherwise, all translations from Dutch to English are mine.

2 See Bassnett (2000) and Pieters (2004).

3 See Bensimon (1990), Berman (1990), Rodriguez (1990), Gambier (1994).

Against this background, a host of questions arises. If a retranslation is an expression of a conflict, one should like to know who are involved in it. The translator is the first person likely to be a party in this conflict, but in the case of a retranslation of a theatre text, the theatre makers can be involved as well. Is the conflict actually different if a translation is made for the theatre? Does the fact that the translator is dependent on the creators of the performance for a production of his text, imply that he⁴ makes his new text for the director rather than for the spectators attending the play? Or is it the audience and changing fashions in taste that demand a retranslation? How important is a retranslation for a director? Does a director take recourse to the retranslation in any way, to support his interpretation of the play? Furthermore, what kind of conflict is actually expressed by the retranslation? To whom is the 'aggression' of a new text directed? Is it a case of one translator reacting to a previous translator? Does the conflict between two different versions involve the directors who use these two texts as well? Lastly, how is this conflict really expressed? Is the mere presence of a retranslation in itself a statement of defiance, or is the conflict to be found in the very fabric of the translation? Is a new text delivered by the translator, containing different norms? Are these norms really different for a theatre retranslation and a 'literary' retranslation? These questions lead to my major thesis:

Staging a retranslation is a strategy to differentiate a theatre production from previous theatre productions through the application of differing translational norms.

Retranslations can be studied from a synchronic or a diachronic point of view. Both have drawbacks of which one should be aware. A synchronic research – on a corpus of retranslations of more than one text, over a limited period of time – has the disadvantage that one cannot be sure whether the patterns that come to the fore are time-bound or universal. A diachronic research – on a corpus of retranslations of a single text, over an extended period of time – has the disadvantage that one cannot take into account all contextual changes that may have caused a retranslation to come about. Moreover, using a specific text might yield patterns that are only valid for that particular text and not for others. While bearing these limitations in mind, I have opted for the diachronic approach in this dissertation, so to follow retranslations of *one* text over a longer period of time. The necessary contextualisation is supplied by the copious background information in the extensive footnotes. In order to be better able to pinpoint contextual changes, the research is limited: in the first place to a specific country, a specific community, a specific use of the text, and a specific text, but also to a number of case studies in which the protagonists and their motives are identifiable.

My research focuses on retranslations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, since this is one of the plays most performed in the Netherlands. As one of the most familiar, as well as one of the most performed plays in the canon,⁵ *Hamlet* is the play *par excellence* for a study of the phenomenon of retranslation. In fact, *Hamlet* is one of the very few plays that are the theatrical equiv-

4 Wherever 'he' is used in this dissertation, 'she' is also implied.

5 *Hamlet* was the most staged Shakespeare play on the Dutch stage in the period 1882-2001: at least 53 productions. The runner up is *Macbeth* (45 productions). In the period 1986-2002 Shakespeare was the most staged author, followed by Chekhov.

alent of what in pop music is labeled 'greatest hit'. Throughout the entire twentieth century it caused audiences to react to 'To be or not to be' with expectation and delight. They eagerly waited for it to come and then mumbled along when these famous lines were finally delivered. It is clear from the remarks on Forbes Robertson's presentation in 1898⁶ to interviews in 1997 and 2001,⁷ that Dutch spectators were ready to devour any actor taking on the role of roles.

Moreover, *Hamlet* represents a major challenge to the expertise of both translator and theatre maker. *Hamlet* is a notoriously difficult play to stage. One might even argue that *Hamlet* in its original form is impossible to perform. It is a Renaissance play, written in the socio-cultural context of England at the turn of the sixteenth century. It is a play without a definite original; there are three manuscripts that present a very early version of the play, of which two are contestants for being closest to Shakespeare's intentions. And worse of all, it is too long to be staged in its entirety, contrary to a shorter play like *Macbeth*.⁸ There is evidence that the contents were reduced in the earliest Renaissance performance and although 'entire-

6 "Hamlet-kenners

Ze zaten hier en daar, tusschen de massa, de Hamlet-kenners die heel lang geleden, in hun latere schooljaren, misschien wel eens het stuk hadden doorgelezen omdat het zoo gek is als men het nooit gelezen had. Of anderen die het nooit gelezen hadden maar veel citaten hadden opgevangen en dus net zoo mooi uit Hamlet konden citeeren als Shakespeare zelf.

In de pauze schoten ze als vorens op elkaar af, gaven een handje hier, een knikje dáár, met een bonjourtje en een hoe-gaat-het, aller-charmanst babbelend over Robertson en dat hij toch zoo uitstekend was, juist alsof ze 't over een nieuwe koffiesoort hadden.

En dan, gedurende het spelen, de historische, beroemde, groote passages! Als er zoo'n vermaard woord door de zaal trilde, dat zich door de souvereine macht zijner wijde beteekenis een eeuwigdurend gebied in den menschelijken geest heeft afgedwongen... dan keken ze elkaar aan, links en rechts, en ze grijsden en knikten tevreden: Hoor je wel, daar heb je 't nu... Frailty, thy name is woman... Something is rotten in the State of Denmark... Alas, poor Yorick!... Prettig, om zich zo goed thuis te vinden in de wereldberoemdheden.

Vooraf dat zien aankomen van den grooten monoloog. Hè, wat werd je daar zenuwachtig van, zoo bibberig in de knieën, als je die fameuse woorden zoo zag aankomen en als je bij elken grooten stap van Robertson dacht: Daar komt het. Maar dan kwam het toch weer niet, zoodat men haast in de verzoeking kwam om, met een herinnering aan Zwarte Kardoos – och waarom niet?... comédie is maar comédie – uit te roepen: Skiet ôf!

Eindelijk- daar had je 'm, hoor: To be or not to be... jawel, net zoo als 't in Shakespeare staat. Aardig wanneer men zijn citaten zoo officieel hoort bevestigen!... En ze gleden welvoldaan wat onderuit in hun fauteuils of hun stoeltjes om verder maar half te luisteren naar den monoloog. 't Kwam er nu niet veel meer op aan. To be or not to be, dat was the quæstie.

Alleen, in 't begin, waren een paar Hamlet-kenners het oneens. Wat hadden ze daar nu gehoord: Something is rotten...? Wel neen: Something is wrong. Verbeeld je: rotten! Ajakkes, rotten, zoo iets ordinairs zou Shakespeare niet zeggen. – Wrong! – Neen, rotten, 't was bepaald geen rotten geweest. – Och kom!...

Maar ten slotte gingen ze toch allemaal zeer voldaan naar huis, voldaan namelijk over den verbazenden kunstzin dien zij door 't bijwonen van de voorstelling toch hadden betoond.

'Een eminent knappe kerel toch, die Shakespeare, hè?'

'Dat zal waar zijn! Een kraan, hoor! Bonsoir!'" Cekaë, 'Hamlet-kenners', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 31-3-1898.

7 "[Eric Schneider:] 'Annemarie Polak heeft gezegd: Hamlet spelen is een soort bar mitswa doen. Het is volwasen worden, ook in je vak. Het is als het beklimmen van de Mount Everest. Iedereen moet je helpen. Het is ongeloofelijk ingrijpend. Je vraagt je af: Hoe maak ik het in vredesnaam waar. Het is een kwelling om te doen, maar tegelijk heeft het ook iets geils. Ze zitten allemaal te wachten op "To be or not to be" (...)'

[Pierre Bokma:] 'Vanaf het begin van de voorstelling ligt een prospectus klaar: let op de volgende monologen, die zijn door die en die zo en zo gedaan. Dus: let goed op hoe hij het gaat doen. Dat maakt het ingewikkeld, daar kom je niet los van. Daarom heb ik expres het begin van "To be or not to be" onverstaanbaar gedaan.'

[Eric Schneider:] 'En dat vond ik nou zo jammer. Ik was erg benieuwd hoe jij het zou doen.'" Television show *De Plantage*, broadcast 14-9-1997, on the occasion of the Kenneth Branagh *Hamlet* film.

Shakespeare translator Jan Jonk: "Waarom Hamlet dan toch zo immens populair is dat er telkens weer nieuwe vertalingen van blijven verschijnen? Dat is de herkenning. Zodra 'to be or not to be' weerklinkt, zie je iedereen in de zaal opleven en elkaar aanstoten. Dat vindt men lekker." Tvdb, 'Nieuwe Hamlet-vertaling', *VPRO-Gids*, 25-1-2001.

8 According to most editors the Folio text of *Hamlet* is still longer than what we can suppose was played at the Globe. Nevertheless, Urkowitz (1992: 266-270) has made plausible that Elizabethans were well used to going to plays that lasted three hours or more. See also: Holderness, Graham and Bryan Loughrey (1993: 179-91), Werstine (1988: 1-26) and Dover Wilson (1934 and 1935).

ties' have occasionally been staged, performing the full text takes at least four hours.⁹ This forces both translators and directors to take far-reaching decisions: the greater the challenge, the more outspoken the decisions. This, in turn makes it easier to see when a dilemma has presented itself.

The starting point of this dissertation is the relation between the various translations and performances. The choice for a separate community is motivated by the idea that retranslation may have a different function when used in a different context. Here the theatre is chosen as a constant variable. Theatre retranslation is especially interesting as a subject, since the theatre translation differs from literary translation both in the requirements it has to meet and in the relation the text has with its audience. In his monumental history of Shakespeare in the Netherlands, written over two decades ago (1988), Leek treats translations and performances separately. Such an approach fails to show the interplay between directors and translators. This dissertation, besides offering information on the two decades after Leek's publication, aims to fill this gap.

The first performances of stage retranslations of *Hamlet* form the backbone of my research. Any research is limited for pragmatic reasons: the specific community of the professional theatre (as opposed to the publishing world) already represents one such delimiter, and a further restriction is in the choice for a specific country: the Netherlands. As a consequence, only those *Hamlets* are discussed that are performed in the Dutch language on a Dutch stage. Such retranslations as those by Roorda van Eysinga (1836), Nico van Suchtelen (1947) and Jan Jonk (1991), which were never performed on a professional stage, are therefore excluded. This also excludes the translation of fragments, like Willem Bilderdijk's single (1783) or Harry Mulisch's multiple translation of 'To be or not to be' (1987) and the translations of subtitles for films by Olivier (1948), Kozintsev (1963), Gibson (1990) and Branagh (1996). Because of the limitation to professional productions, one will also look in vain for amateur theatre performances of *Hamlet*,¹⁰ even famous ones like those in Diever (Loekema, 1950 and Rep, 1990); the student theatre companies ASTU and SARST are the only exception, since they constitute an overture to a permanent revolution on the Dutch professional stage. Also Dutch plays that may have been based on *Hamlet*, like Geeraerdts Brandt's *Veinzende Torquatus* (1643), offer little use for a study of retranslation. The choice for the Netherlands implies that most of the *Hamlets* staged in Belgium fall outside the scope of this research, including guest performances in the Netherlands. These regrettably include the performances of Courteaux's *Hamlet* (staged in Belgium in 1968 and 1971).¹¹ An exception is made for the *Hamlets* by Claus (1982) and Decorte (1985), since they may have represented a predecessor for Dutch productions that had commissioned Belgian translators. Both of these productions have been included in this research (Tanghe, 1991; Doesburg, 1999).

Based on these criteria, a number of case studies has been selected from a greater corpus of *Hamlet* performance in the Netherlands. Based on Leek's overview (1988), the per-

9 The BBC dramatization for an audio book (1993) lasted three and a half hours, Branagh's film (1996) lasts ca. 242 minutes, and translator Burgersdijk wrote in a letter to A.C. Loffelt in April 1880 that the reading out of the play, without naming the characters, lasted about five hours.

10 Professional productions before 1945 are taken as productions by actors who make a living out of acting in front of a public, paying audience, and after 1945 those productions by theatre companies that are subsidised by the Dutch government.

11 Probably also in 1964, although the Belgian VTI does not give this information.

formance database of Theater Instituut Nederland (TIN), and the reviews of performances collected by TIN and found in the Koninklijke Bibliotheek (KB), a list of productions of *Hamlet* has been drawn up that can be found in Appendix B. It includes the dates and places of the performances, the translation used, the people involved in the production and the reviews of that production as given by these sources. Complementary to this list, a survey has been made of the Dutch translations of *Hamlet* that were published in print, together with the performances in which they were used. This survey can be found in Appendix A. The case studies selected for this study are all first productions of a *Hamlet* translation. Some are not been treated as extensively, since their fates ran along similar lines as other more thoroughly discussed translations. Thus the performances of other adaptations than Marowitz's *Hamlet* (like Heiner Müller's *Hamletmaschine*), are only touched upon; and Carel Alphenaar's translation of *Hamlet* for children is incorporated in the section on Boonen's translation.

In the search for the cause for a stage retranslation, it is vital to know who has been responsible for them. We therefore have to know how the director and the translator divided their tasks, since this determines how much hold the director has had on the outcome of the translation process and how much was done on the translator's own initiative. Subsequently, we have to know the intentions of translator and director with text and performance, as these indicate whether translator and theatre maker want to distinguish themselves overtly from their predecessors, and whether the director's interpretation of the play and the method of translation share a common ground.

In order to evaluate the intentions of translators and directors, research has been done in **paratextual evidence**. This includes the reviews, posters and programmes of the various performances as collected by TIN, the introductions to the published translations, occasional interviews and publications on the translators, directors and theatre companies. Moreover, the division of responsibilities as voiced by programme, translation, play text or by the people involved, has been used to indicate the theatre makers' hold on the outcome of the translation process.

Furthermore, a textual analysis is part of this study too. This is required to determine whether a retranslation represents an actual breach or merely is an update of a preceding translation, but also to decide whether the translator's strategy actually coincides with the translator's intentions and with the director's interpretation of the play.¹²

This textual analysis is based on previous theories of theatre translation, which have yielded an inventory of characteristics of the dramatic text. The first characteristic is the fact that the dramatic text is used in a performance, which represents a greater whole of different sign languages that are used according to certain time-bound conventions. The second characteristic of the dramatic text is the nature of its language. Since the dramatic text consists of dialogues it is much like spoken language, but in essence it is an artificial and literary language. The third is the fact that a play addresses a world inside the play as well as a world outside it. A theatre maker can choose to honour the organic whole of the play, but he may also choose to speak across the play to the audience.

As a result of these characteristics, the theatre translator runs into a number of dif-

12 In fact, Toury (1995: 65-66) argues that normative pronouncements are partial and biased, and should be treated with every possible circumspection.

difficulties. The first dilemma he faces is how to honour the value of the dramatic text as part of a performance text. Dependent on his judgment, he deals differently with the possibilities of adaptation: retaining, reducing, emending or rewriting the text of the original. This also depends on his consideration of his relation to the original author: he can make himself subservient to the latter, or he can use his text as mere material. Secondly, the dilemma of the artificial nature of the dramatic text lies in the fact that a playwright's rhetorical tools change in the course of time. Again, a translator has to make a decision to preserve the original's literary features or to adapt them to the expectations of a contemporary audience. The incongruity between the two worlds of the performance causes a third dilemma. These two types of communication reflect a more general dilemma of translation: the choice between foreignising versus domesticating,¹³ that is, either retaining the historical and exotic features of the text, or translating them into the frame of reference of the audience.

Last but not least, the reactions of the spectators are presented. If a retranslation is an expression of a conflict between groups, it is possible that the receivers of the text belong to different groups as well. In that case the critics' expectancy norms are likely to disagree, with the translator's and the director's products and/or with each other. When voiced in debates regarding the translations and productions, these disagreements offer a grip on the variation of reactions and are indications of prevailing opinions. They are used to measure the direct impact of the retranslation, by checking whether the audience took notice of the differences in the new text. They are also used to decide whether retranslations corresponded to the expectations of the audience or are considered a transgression. Moreover, they are used to investigate whether theatrical audiences can be considered as a group sharing common norms regarding translation. Finally, they are analysed to determine whether the audience may have motivated the creation of a retranslation.

The analysis of reviews should not be taken as an attempt to write a reception history of *Hamlet*. Studying the influence of translations and performances would result in another book. To cut losses for scholarship, however, the footnotes of this dissertation profusely offer leads for further research. They also offer a variation of voices to cast further light and different perspectives on the subject at hand. Moreover, the original text of reviews, interviews, letters, and other documents is always given in the footnotes.

The choice both for a single play and for case studies furthermore excludes all but tentative statements on a general development of translational norms. Any statement will concern *Hamlet* only. The events that have caused norms to take shape or that have put people in particular positions shall be outlined where necessary for the understanding of the background, but are not in themselves the subject of this dissertation. A presentation of chronology is nevertheless inevitable: a retranslation is a retranslation because of a previous translation and the new translation is seen in relation to this predecessor. Our concern here is how the staging of a retranslation *reacts to* a tradition and not any tradition *per se*.

This dissertation consists of three sections. The first is a discussion of retranslation and posits my hypotheses regarding theatre retranslation. The second is a discussion of the characteristics of the theatre text and points out which relationships are possible between the

13 See Venuti (1995).

production crew and the translator, and which dilemmas a theatre translation will generally come across. The third is an analysis of the case studies. Here, each section is divided in two parts. The first discusses the breach of a particular *Hamlet* performance with its predecessor. The second treats the observance of succeeding performances to the new translation's norms, which is not to say that some productions made in the wake of a new translation **do not also** constitute pivotal points, or have not raised a major debate. All important productions in this respect have been granted the necessary space. **The only exception is the last section of the third chapter, which discusses the debate raised by a single performance that resulted in two consecutive retranslations.**

The sequence of case studies starts off in 1786, when Ambrosius Justus Zubli challenges the De Cambon-Van der Werken translation of Ducis's French adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. It comprises the German-influenced *Hamlet* of 1882, by L.A.J. Burgersdijk and De Vereeniging Het Nederlandsch Tooneel; the symbolist *Hamlet* of 1907, by Jac. van Looy and the revolutionary director Eduard Verkade; the contemporary *Hamlet* of 1957, by Bert Voeten and Paul Steenbergen; the staging of the Marowitz *Hamlet* in 1966; Hugo Claus's and Jan Decorte's tradaptations of *Hamlet* in the early 1980's; the Publickstheater farewell production *Hamlet* of 1986, by Gerrit Komrij and Gerardjan Rijnders; the young *Hamlet* of 1991, by Johan Boonen and Dirk Tanghe. The series ends around the turn of the twentieth century, when Theu Boermans' prose version of *Hamlet* (1997) provokes two consecutive retranslations of the play. Armed with the searchlights of theoretical background and textual analysis, we should be able to discern whether translators and directors actually teamed up to breach the Dutch *Hamlet* tradition.

1

Reasons for retranslation

1.1 Previous theories on retranslation: ageing texts and perfect translation

17

This dissertation is concerned with the question of ‘retranslation’, a phenomenon that still lacks a detailed or systematic study, as Susam-Sarajeva (2003) has pointed out. Why are texts translated again? In answering this question, it will be assumed that retranslation is a means of artistic differentiation, originating in the target culture as a result of conflicts between the norms of different people.

The term ‘retranslation’ refers to “subsequent translations of a text or part of a text, carried out after the initial translation that introduced this text to the ‘same’ target language” (Susam-Sarajeva, 2003: 2). Generally, retranslations are associated with the ‘ageing’ of translated texts. The Dutch publisher Mark Pieters (2004) claims that after fifty years a translation can be considered obsolete. Bassnett (2000) argues that the period for the ‘ageing’ of texts expires sooner in drama translation than in any other type of text:

It is commonly held that plays require retranslating at regular intervals, usually every 20 years or so. There is no adequate explanation of this assumption, but it does seem that spoken language ages at a faster rate than written language, and since a play is essentially a transcript to be spoken, it follows that the ageing process will be more marked in a play translation than in other types of written text. (2000: 99)

Retranslation is usually related to canonical literary texts. Retranslations are said to exist because ‘great translations’ of these texts are so few. Although translation is usually characterised by an ‘essential lack of accomplishment,’ one can occasionally succeed in creating a definitive translation by translating the text again. In this line of thought the retranslation will be an improvement on the previous translations. Critics differ, however, in explaining the nature of such an improvement. For those who believe that initial translations tend to reduce the ‘otherness’ of the source text (e.g. Bensimon, 1990; Berman, 1990), a retranslation is considered to be more efficient in conveying the previously assimilated ‘otherness’ of the foreign material, because the target audience will have become acquainted with the text through the ‘introduction-translation.’ Others will note, however, how retranslations render the source text more accessible to the reader of the day (Rodriguez, 1990; Gambier, 1994). Hence an emphasis on the time factor: there is a continuous necessity for retranslation because earlier translations need to be updated. At first sight, the latter hypothesis – closely connected to Bassnett’s hypothesis on the ageing of texts – seems to be better suited to explain the repeated creation of retranslations, as they would follow the market of a changing target culture.

1.2 Retranslation as a norm conflict

Both these notions are refuted, however, by Susam-Sarajeva (2003, who points out that retranslations may come about within a very short time span. She argues that retranslation is not necessarily connected to the canonical status of the text, nor to the ageing of a translation, or to the adaptive or literal nature of the translation. Rather, the reasons for retranslation must be sought in the target culture: “Retranslations may have more to do with the needs

and attitudes within the receiving system than any inherent characteristics of the source text which make it 'prone to' retranslations. After all, to grant a multiple entry visa to a foreigner is totally at the discretion of the receiving authorities." (2003: 5)

Susam-Sarajeva shares this focus on the target culture with Gideon Toury (1995), a translation scholar who maintains that translations are "a fact of the culture which hosts them" (1995: 24) and proposes therefore to leave it up to the target culture to determine what are (so-called 'assumed') translations. According to Toury, a translation is a text in a certain language; it occupies a position, or fills "a slot, in the appropriate culture, or in a certain section thereof" (1995: 56). He argues that the introduction of a translation into a target culture always entails some change of the latter, and he claims that "alternative translations are not even likely to occupy the exact same position in the culture which hosts them even if they all came into being at the same point in time" (1995: 27).

Susam-Sarajeva observes that retranslation "may also emerge as a result of a synchronous struggle in the receiving system" in the case of her study of philosophical texts, "to create the target discourse into which these translations will be incorporated" (2003: 5). The idea of a 'struggle' being the cause of a retranslation is also embraced by Pym (1998), who introduced the concept of *active retranslation*. Pym argues that a more likely reason for retranslation is in "disagreements over translation strategies." In other words, the cause for retranslation is related to the *norms* for translation. This is especially valid "when the text is complex enough to admit widely divergent versions." Pym excludes, however, certain retranslations from this hypothesis, such as periodical retranslations (again the 'ageing of translations'), or those retranslations separated by synchronic boundaries (geopolitical or dialectological), that constitute no conflict. These so-called "passive retranslations" reflect the changing attitude of (a large part of) the target culture and may confront the beliefs of two cultures set apart in time or geographical space, whereas "active retranslation" is a symptom of conflicts between people or groups within the target culture:

A comparison between two or more passive retranslations (...) would tend to provide information about historical changes in the target culture (...). Quite apart from being often redundant (the information thus revealed could have been obtained without doing translation history), such a procedure can only affirm the general hypothesis that target-culture norms determine translation strategies. The comparative analysis of active retranslations, however, tends to locate causes far closer to the translator, especially in the entourage of patrons, publishers, readers and intercultural politics (although clearly not excluding monocultural influences from any side). The study of active retranslations would thus seem better positioned to yield insights into the nature and workings of translation itself, into its own special range of disturbances, without blindly surrendering causality to target-culture norms. (Pym, 1998: 82-84)

Many translation scholars have argued that the causes for translation should be sought in the cultural group the translator belongs to. Even-Zohar (1990) offers a vision of culture as a dynamic and heterogeneous structure, in which seemingly irreconcilable elements constitute alternative systems of concurrent options. The systems in such a "polysys-

tem” are not equal, but in a permanent struggle for dominance. Lefevere (1992) claims that the ‘poetics’ of a translation (i.e. its translational norms) are socially or culturally constituted, and hence subject to change. According to Hermans (1996: 36) a cultural product is embedded in different systems and involves different groups of people, each with different interests. Agreement on the nature of a ‘good’ translation is therefore rather unlikely. The fact of simultaneous retranslations proves that the target culture is not homogeneous, for, as Toury argued, if a translation is made to fill merely one single slot in the target culture, any other translation would be superfluous,.

With the concept of group conflicts, Susam-Sarajeva, Pym, Even-Zohar and Hermans all suggest a context in which a retranslation is by necessity an act of defiance against a previous translation, containing some form of aggression. The question is whether this is necessarily the case. If there are indeed different groups within the target culture, they just as well might live in peaceful coexistence. Brownlie (2003: 137), for instance, particularizes Hermans’ theory in such a way that the groups of ‘publishing’ and ‘academia’ constitute two separate but not conflicting worlds, which still explains the differences in translation. The conflict that Susam-Sarajeva mentions, however, takes place *within* a single discipline (in her case philosophy). This means that even within a discipline we can distinguish between groups.

1.3 Agents in (re)translation: commissioner, audience and translator

In order to understand group conflicts, one should know about the nature of the groups involved. Within the target culture and the subset of the subculture, translation scholars have distinguished three types of agents that constitute a potential group.

Lefevere stresses the influence of external factors on the translator, most importantly of patronage. Patronage is understood as “the powers (persons, institutions) that can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature” (1992: 15). As a regulatory body, such as individuals, groups, institutions, a social class, a political party, publishers, the media, etc., patronage sees to it that the literary system does not fall out of step with the rest of society. Patronage is predominantly related to ideology, described by Lefevere as the dominant concept of what society should “be allowed to be” (1992: 14), and as “the conceptual grid that consists of opinions and attitudes deemed acceptable in a certain society at a certain time, and through which readers and translators approach texts” (1998: 48). The patron ensures the translator’s livelihood, as long as he or she agrees to remain within certain ideological limits (1983: 22). The translation strategy then is not solely determined by the ideology of the translator, but by the patron’s imposed ideology as well (1992: 41). A potential group therefore includes, for Lefevere, at least both the translator and the person(s) he depends on for a living. These include, in the first place, the translator’s commissioner(s) – publisher or theatre company – but also authorities providing subsidy for the translation, and the audience paying for a book or production.

A distinction between professional norms and expectancy norms is made by Chesterman (1993). The first emerge from competent professional behaviour and govern the accepted methods and strategies of the translation process. Expectancy norms “are established

by the receivers of the translation, by their expectations of what a translation (of a given type) should be like, and what a native text (of a given type) in the target language should be like" (1993: 9). According to Chesterman, a translator will attempt to conform to the expectancy norms of a particular community as well as to the professional norms of that community at one and the same time. Expectancy norms appear to rank higher for Chesterman, as it is the reader's (or audience's) expectations that govern the translators' norms: "A professional translator (...) seeks to design a target text in such a way that it will meet the expectancy norms pertaining to it" (1993: 10). The target audience of the translation must therefore be included in the definition of 'group.' Retranslation as the result of group conflict then is due to the audience's changed expectations.

Pym, however, calls for more differentiation in the various causes for a translation and emphasises the role of the translator himself. In mentioning conflicts "between people or groups within the target culture," he suggests that the individual translator is not accountable for a norm conflict alone, as more agents may be involved in determining the outcome of the translation process. The fact that he mentions "the entourage of patrons, publishers, readers and politics" suggests that Pym, like Lefevere, believes that a translation comes into being possibly because of the network relations of the translator to other social agents, although he does not appear to adhere to Lefevere's claim that "rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power" (Lefevere, 1992: xi).

Pym is in fact critical of translation scholars such as Even-Zohar (1990), for whom the reason for a new translation can be explained only with reference to its position in the target culture: "systemic empiricism tends to place all causes on one level" (Pym, 1998: 146). He finds fault in the systemic approach for neglecting the *human dimension* of translation and opposes the suggestion that a translation comes about merely to fill in a gap in the target culture: "A certain evasion of hard thought [...] leads to idealist assumptions that markets, clients and translators are in some kind of fundamental agreement" (1998: 152-3). Pym asks rhetorically what might happen "when these three factors are in contradiction with each other?" (Pym, 1998: 154). A case of such a conflict that was presented by Richard Todd (1992) may be cited in support of Pym's objections.¹⁴ Further complications for the systemic approach are raised by his observation that causation can also be material (i.e. as a result of developments in the source text material) and formal (i.e. as a result of historical norms allowing a translation to be accepted as such), as well as final (i.e. determined by the purpose of the text). Translation theory has tended to propose the *a priori* dominance of only one type of cause, i.e. mainly the final cause (1998: 144). A fourth cause for the translation (which he calls 'efficient') is therefore proposed by Pym, namely the motives of the translator himself. Causation then may take place on a personal rather than a collective level. For Pym, a group conflict can therefore consist of a conflict between translators alone.

14 Todd (1992) demonstrates that translator (Marnix, Lord of St Aldegonde) and 'patronage' (the National Synod of 1586) disagreed about the revision of the former's translation of a vernacular psalter. Todd locates the cause for the revision in the translator's desire to create a philologically more accurate version, but the cause for the patron's wish to have such a revision was in the desire to have a text that was more useful, i.e. easier to chant. The revised psalter did appear in 1591, but the privilege of it was granted – contrary to the 1586 Synod's stipulations – to Vulcanius, who had supported (and inspired) Marnix's philological approach. Todd's case not only proves that patronage and translator can have conflicting opinions, but also suggests that the translator needs support to have his translation reach an audience (in this case, to be printed).

The starting point for this dissertation is formed by two basic assumptions inferred from the theories mentioned above. Firstly, retranslations will be considered as expressions of (translational) norms. Secondly, it will be assumed that the translator does not operate in a vacuum; his work can be related to the values of other people. These two assumptions will serve to assess whether the metaphor of a *struggle* between *conflicting groups* actually is applicable to the phenomenon of retranslation.

In order to understand the nature of the group, it is necessary to determine the context of the translation in the target culture. In the case of the present dissertation, the context for translations is formed by the Dutch theatre. As such, the theatre constitutes a special category within the literary field, because of the role and nature of different communities such as theatre companies, dramatic schools, and so on. These communities, rather than mere 'literary' texts, will provide the focal point for this thesis.

The theatre translation is a translation made to be performed on stage. Thus it is dependent on people who desire to stage it in order to reach an audience. This is unlike the case of literary texts (novels, poems) where both the person of the translator and the primary customer, the publishing house, usually act as the 'invisible' intermediaries so as to create the impression that the author is communicating directly to the reader (Venuti, 1995). In the theatre, the customer of the translation, i.e. the theatre company, tends to make itself very visible. Whereas in the publishing world the author's name and reputation is an important factor in sales, it is, in the world of the theatre, also the quality of the theatre company that attracts audiences. Susam-Sarajeva spoke about retranslation as instruments in a struggle to create a target language discourse. She showed how retranslations proposed alternative versions for the same philosophical concepts. The aim of the performing artists is quite different, however. There is no real need to achieve consensus or to argue cases in the theatre. What matters is interpretation. A performance is a showcase of several artistic intentions, where the original author's play, the director's vision, and the actor's approach to the role meet. The visibility of the commissioners, in the case of the theatre, is likely to have an effect on the relation between translator, commissioner and audience. We may therefore assume that in any conflict the theatre makers will play a visible part.

The visibility of commissioners complicates Chesterman's notion of expectancy norms. Chesterman implies that the readers (or audience) of the translation have expressed expectancy norms that in turn shape the form of the translation. The changing market calls for a new translation and the translator caters for this new audience. If a retranslation clashes with a previous retranslation, this must be seen as the expression of conflicts between groups in the audience. In the case of the theatre, it is the question whether these expectancy norms still are dominant when the intermediate party positions itself as an active determining factor in the interpretation of the text. The creators of a performance are indeed the first audience of the translation, with expectancy norms of their own. Do not they, rather than the spectators in the theatre, establish the norms for the translation?

Both the theatre maker and the translator then are likely to be involved in the norm conflicts expressed by the retranslation. The relation between these two people and *their* relation with the audience will be the starting point of this thesis. This gives ample space to

discover the personal motivations of both, before tying their fates to the destiny of a 'target culture'. I venture the hypothesis that in retranslating for the theatre, the translator teams up with the theatre maker(s) to distinguish themselves from their mutual predecessor(s).

Assuming that a theatre translation is made on the basis of norms, I suppose that retranslation is an indication of a conflict of norms between those responsible for the earlier translation and those responsible for the consecutive translation. I will argue that a new translation always strategically expresses a norm conflict, based on the hypothesis that a theatre retranslation always expresses a fundamental norm that represents a breach with at least one of the norms of the previous theatre translation.

On the basis of the context of the theatre translation, I further hypothesise that the director's interpretation and the translator's text share at least one norm which is an alternative to a norm of the previous translation. The retranslation forms an intrinsic part of the director's interpretation. If the director has commissioned the translation, the main characteristics of the translator's strategy will concur with his interpretation of the play. In other words, the director supports the norm change that is fundamental to the retranslation.

The paradox of theatre translation is that the intended target audience of the theatre translation is, in the first place, the director (rather than the spectators). This is only the case if the director of a play (or more in general the theatre makers) is involved with the interpretation of the play (and it should be stressed that this is a fairly modern convention). Thus I question Chesterman's assumption that professional norms are governed by expectancy norms in general, for I will argue that the retranslation does not aim to comply to all norms of an audience at a certain point of time, but rather appears to go against the grain of some of them. The director uses the retranslation as a means to position his interpretation of a play *vis-à-vis* the interpretations of other directors. The more important the role of the director in creating the concept of a new play, the greater the need to emphasise its novelty or uniqueness. Retranslation is one of the means to create this effect.

Moreover, a retranslation will have to deal with the fact that each text creates its own tradition. A view Eiselt (1995) shares with Haag (1984) is that each new translation adds new levels of (metaphoric) meaning to the text. Previous translations have already generated new meanings, and the new translation refers to both the source text and to earlier translations. Thus retranslation is not merely a conflict between people or groups, but a conflict within the context of the text's tradition. The impact of retranslation as a statement is concomitant to the tradition of the theatre text.

The intimate connection between the poetics of the translator and the director's vision of the play could be a major explanation for the tremendous number of *Hamlet* (re)translations. The use of retranslation as a means of differentiation for a director, especially after the canonisation of this particular play, could also explain the very visible role the translator has in the production of the play. First, however, the question of how a retranslation might take up arms against the force of tradition should be addressed. This involves a study of the kind of poetics a translator can adopt, and of the part played by theatre makers and the audience with regard to these norms.

2

Differing norms in theatre translation

2.1 Deducing norms from a translation

The aim of this chapter is to design a working model for assessing the hypothesised norm breach that a retranslation represents. This chapter will outline the choices the theatre translator has to deal with, as well as the ways he can possibly rank them. If the resulting hierarchy is different from his predecessor's, it will be assumed that the new translation represents a *norm breach*. Further, this chapter is also concerned with the relationship of director and translator and with the impact on the audience of the norms expressed in the translation.

In the field of Descriptive Translation Studies, translation is considered as norm-based behaviour. *Norms* are considered a form of socio-cultural constraint: they are intersubjective factors that are anchored between the two poles of relatively absolute *rules* on the one hand, and pure *idiosyncrasies* on the other (Toury, 1995: 54). Toury (1995: 58-61) posits that norms are active when a particular text is chosen for translation (*preliminary norm*), when the translator decides on his translational strategy (*initial norm*) and also during the act of translating itself (*operational norms*). The operational norms, those governing the active translation process, can be divided into *matricial norms* and *textual-linguistic norms*.¹⁵

In this chapter, I will propose a perspective on norms that are active in three different phases: prior to and during the process of translating a theatre text, as well as during the reception of the text. This approach reflects an attempt to combine Toury's basic distinction of norms with the findings of previous scholarship. It should be stressed here that my views are also very much informed by the findings that will be presented in the third chapter. The practical application of the different possibilities inferred from the translations that were studied in that chapter has determined the attention that I have given to the various particularities of theatre translation.

Figure 1 gives a rough outline of the possible options for the theatre translator. All aspects that I consider to be crucial in theatre translation have been given a certain position between source text and target culture. Although by necessity a simplification, the graph serves to visualise how the translator may have breached the norms of his predecessor. It will be used to act as an indicative summary of the translators' norms.

Before turning to the theatre translator's practical options with regard to the preliminary, matricial and textual-linguistic norms, the findings of previous scholarship will be discussed in order to appraise the choices a theatre translator encounters in his work, as well as the underlying poetics they can be related to.

2.2 Theatre translation as a particular area of translation studies

Drama translation is a separate field of study within translation studies that has developed from the idea that for a translation to be theatrical, the theatrical characteristics are to be transferred into the other language (George Mounin, 1967; Klaus Bednarz, 1969; Jiri Levy, 1969).

15 Hermans (1996) inserts an additional option between the preliminary and the initial norm: the choice to translate the text or to use another form of transfer (summary, adaptation, and quote).

Van den Broeck (1986) calls the theatrical text dual in the sense that it is both a poetic-literary text and a text pertaining to the theatre.¹⁶ According to him, the translator of a play is faced with the choice to either translate the play as a literary text, thereby identifying it with a single medium, the printed word, or to perceive it as a theatrical text in the context of a theatrical production. In that case, the text is polymedial because it is identified with both text and with performance. He calls the first option ‘retrospective translation’ and the second ‘prospective translation.’ Hence it is possible to distinguish *literary translations* of a play from *theatre translations*. If the translator makes the choice to create a theatre translation, *and only then*, he will also have to consider the features that are typical of a theatre text. The notions of adequacy and acceptability (Toury, 1978) should therefore be understood in terms of the medium: a translation that is acceptable as a literary text can be different from a translation that is considered acceptable as a dramatic text; the impossibility of using footnotes on stage being the most obvious example.

As a result of the idea that a theatre text is essentially different from a literary text, theatre translation theorists have identified a number of properties that are characteristic of theatre texts. Several studies centre on the notion of theatrical pragmatics as the key char-




Figure 1: Possible options of a theatre translator
This diagram presents the options a translator has to consider when making a translation for the stage. The translator has to take a stance with regard to his attitude towards the original author ('initial norm', treated in section 2.3), what part of the original text he means to translate ('matricial norms', treated in 2.4), the extent to which he domesticates the socio-cultural contents of the original ('situation', treated in 2.5.2) and the extent to which he respects the literary construction of the original ('intertext', treated in 2.5.1). The attitudes in each category presented above are positioned on a gliding scale between the intention to be faithful to the source text and the intention to make a text that will fit in the target culture. The diagram is not exhaustive, as it is based only on the case studies in this dissertation and the findings of previous theory.

16 See also Williams (1968: 170); Bassnett (1985: 90) and Anderman (1998: 71).

acteristic of a dramatic text. Hofmann (1980) proposes a trichotomous model for drama translation, distinguishing between an expressive, content and pragmatic level. For him, the variable of pragmatics, i.e. effectiveness on stage, is raised to an invariable. Assimakopoulos (2002), departing from the idea that translation is an act of communication, takes up Hofmann's hypothesis and applies relevance theory (Gutt, 2000) to drama translation. He concludes that: "the choices to be made during the actual translation of a play are left to the translators themselves and their understanding of what is optimally relevant to their audience." (2002: 36-7) A problematical aspect of relevance theory is that the translator is supposed to communicate the translated 'intention' of the original author, which in the case of Shakespeare is very difficult to know.

One major characteristic of theatrical pragmatics is the immediacy of the text.¹⁷ As Crystal has noted, "in drama, there is no narrative framework other than that provided by the language of the characters and by the visual setting in which they act. (...) The dialogue must do everything." (1997:75) In this respect, Assimakopoulos argues that

An important aspect of [...] a view of drama as a single-oriented act of communication is the simultaneity of communication between the performance on stage and the audience. The audience of a play cannot take its time to clarify or ponder upon what they have just listened to. Above all that, in a case where the members of the audience need to clarify something, they cannot intervene in the play and address the performers. It is therefore clear that the drama translator cannot resort to clarifying techniques that are accessible to other common types of translation practice [like the aforementioned footnotes]. (2002:23)

The pragmatic dimension of the theatre translation affects the acceptability of the translation within the context of the target culture differently from that of a literary translation. As a result of the immediacy of the text, the audience needs to recognise the culture-specific elements that are contained in a play; if not, they will suffer so-called "cultural gaps" (Assimakopoulos, 2002: 19).

The theatre translation is not only measured by socially and culturally determined expectations in general, but also by expectations of the theatrical text in particular (Bassnett, 2000: 101-3). The effect of the performance text depends greatly on how theatrical codes and conventions are dealt with. According to Wellwarth (1981), the translator's job is to "recreate the original language's meaning in the socially accepted style of the target language."¹⁸ The encoded message of the play is not picked up when other, stronger codes are at work. For instance, the translator may see himself forced to subvert a play's meaning and style in order to adapt it to a desired paradigm of entertainment (Fotheringham, 1984). Aaltonen (2000), in fact, claims that:

Theatre texts, perhaps more than any other genre, are adjusted to their reception, and the adjustment is always socially and culturally conditioned. Theatre as an art

17 See Mounin (1969: 92) on drama as an act of single-oriented communication.

18 See also Schultze (1990).

form is social and based on communal experience; it addresses a group of people in a particular place at a particular time. (2000: 53)

28

As a result of the communal nature of the theatre, theatre translators will be especially prudent in their treatment of taboos, like sexually charged or politically delicate words and phrases.

The expectancy norms can therefore have a strong impact on the translator's choices. Thus, it has been argued that the parameters of translation are not fixed once and for all (Heylen, 1993). Translation then is "a socio-historical activity of a profoundly transformational nature," and the translator can choose to maintain most of the original or rather to try and find "the best ready-made poetic models through which to represent the foreign text in the receiving literature." (Heylen, 1993: 9) Heylen follows Even-Zohar (1978) in that this choice is dependent on the position and function of the translated text. A primary translation in the definition of Even-Zohar introduces innovations to the target culture repertoire and breaks with (elements of) established conventions. For Heylen, 'primary' activity is presumed to be that activity which takes the initiative when it comes to the creation of new items and models in literature; it represents the principle of innovation. When a translation takes up a primary position, Heylen argues, the chances that a translation will be close to the original in terms of adequacy are greater than otherwise. In her study of French *Hamlet* translations, Heylen proposes that translation is a form of cultural negotiation; translation mediates in supplying the target culture with a new poetics.

Within the field of Shakespeare studies much research has been dedicated to the interplay of literary poetics, the reception of Shakespeare and the choices in translation (among others Delabastita and D'hulst, 1993; Heylen, 1993; Delabastita, 1998), and to the role of Shakespeare translation in the formation of new cultural identities (Brisset, 1990, 1996). Essays that cover the gamut of the problems facing Shakespeare translators as well as the interpretative implications of their choices can be found in Hoenselaars (2004b) and Carvalho Homem and Hoenselaars (2004).

On a more practical level, the translator has to deal with the codes of the theatrical text. In the light of the fluctuating nature of the accepted theatre text, this 'nature of the theatre text' can only be posited very tentatively. Nevertheless, it can safely be maintained that the performative aspect constitutes a major characteristic of the dramatic text. As stated above, drama extends the single medium of the written text, which is merely one code amongst a set of other codes (Ubersfeld and Veltrusky, 1978).¹⁹ As Bassnett notes, "far from being complete in itself, like a novel or a poem, [the text of a play] is arguably only part of the total equation that is the play in performance." (2000:96)

As a complication of this variety in codes, there is the interesting fact that the performance of a play is often metaphorically likened to the act of translation. In this respect, it is helpful to call Jakobson's distinction between different acts of translation to mind (1959: 113-118). *Intralingual translation* or *rewording* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language. *Interlingual translation* or *translation proper* is an in-

19 Cited in Bassnett (1992: 120ff), but also Snell-Hornby (1984).

terpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language. *Intersemiotic translation* or *transmutation* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems. The theatre offers a space in which various semiotic systems interact in such a way that an amalgam of semiotic space is formed. Different sign languages, such as text, bodily expression, the actor's external appearance, the playing space (including lighting and scenery) and non-spoken sounds form together the comprehensive language of the performance (Kowzan, 1975:52-80, summarised in Bassnett 1985:88).

For this reason, Bassnett (1985) and Pavis (1992) distinguish between dramatic text and performance. The literal text, the *dramatic text*, is "the verbal script which is read or heard in a performance." (Pavis, 1992: 24) The performance is the *mise en scène* of the text, the *performance text*, which belongs to the theatrical system of communication. It can be called 'text', for it is a "strukturiertes Zusammenhängen von Zeichen" (Fischer-Lichte, 1979). The dramatic text is written by a writer. It is interpreted by the director, in order to transform it into a *mise en scène*, created on stage by the performers. This final performance text is experienced or 'read,' as it were, by the audience.²⁰

Some theorists (Übersfeld 1978, Bassnett 1983, Totzeva 1995) attempt to identify those textual elements in the dramatic text that would inform the theatrical performance. They wish to determine what constitutes the latent *theatrical potential* of the dramatic text or the "blueprint" (Bassnett, 2000: 96) that facilitates the other theatrical characteristics and which a translator should be careful to translate.²¹

This type of research focuses in particular on the notions of 'performability,' 'playability' or 'speakability' that would account for the differences between a normal text and a text in performance. Jiri Levy's demands of functionality on the stage, speakability and understandability (1969) have influenced later theorists who attempt to distil those logical distinctive structural features that make a text performable. The meaning of these notions and the importance attached to them is rather fluctuating, however. If, for instance, Zuber-Skerritt argues that the translated play must be speakable, meaning that "if anything destroys an audience's interest in a play it is a dialogue that sounds translated" (Zuber-Skerritt, 1984: 15), speakability for Bassnett merely implies "that the text is more accessible to actors, that it has a quality that enables it to be performed more effectively." (Bassnett, 2000: 97) Clues for 'playability' or "Spielbarkeit" are in the rhythmic pattern of a play, or those factors which determine the sequence of textual elements, including the changing of scenes, variations in style of discourse (prose/verse) and in rhythm, pauses and repetitions (Snell-Hornby, 1984). "Theatrical potential" is also found in keywords, in innuendo, in the tension between what

20 See Rabkin (1985). With regard to performance text, Pavis (1992: 25) distinguishes between a performance, "all that is made visible or audible on stage, but not yet perceived or described as a system of meaning" and the *mise en scène*, 'the confrontation of all signifying systems, in particular the utterance of the dramatic text in performance.' In our text, we shall make no such distinction on the basis of interpretation. Both performance text and *mise en scène* will be considered as a confrontation of signifying systems as opposed to the purely textual dramatic text.

21 Bassnett argues that the written text is one code, one system in a complex set of codes that interact together in performance. The translator therefore has to work on a text that is, as Anne Übersfeld defines it, *troué*, not complete in itself. In creating a text for performance in the target language, the translator necessarily encounters an entirely different set of constraints in terms of the target language conventions of stage production. In this context every dramatic text is an incomplete entity that must be "translated" by being put on the stage. Adaptation is, therefore, only an extreme version of the reworking that takes place in any theatrical production. See Susan Bassnett (1983: 94).

is said and what is not, and in the heightened deictic content of the text. The gestural aspect of rhythm, sounds and keywords recurs in Hamburger (2004). The notion of ‘performability’ was first embraced by Bassnett, (1978), who approached the dramatic text as a form of dramatic action, considering the lines spoken as (verbal) actions of the characters. In a later stage, Bassnett rejects the notion of “performability,” since the audience’s expectations are by no means universal (Bassnett, 2000: 98).

In another publication, Bassnett (1985) focuses on the subtext, the play’s hidden meaning, in looking for the characteristics of the theatre text. The deixis, a term that refers to those elements of the text that point to objects and persons on stage, is one of the instruments offered by Bassnett as a means to discover the play’s subtext and its gestural language. In line with this, Snell-Hornby (1984) agrees that “deictic means” constitute the dominant variable of the dramatic text. Fifteen years later, Bassnett (2000) notes that in practice the combination of translational units and deictic units “rarely happens.” Still, she points out that time is a central problem in drama translation: the length of the performance, silences and speech rhythms (as for example in verse), as well as the units of time (as laid down in scenes and the placement of the interval), are all dependent on the cultural expectations of the audience (Bassnett, 2000: 98).

The theatrical potential that is present in the dramatic text has also been studied by Totzeva (1995), who states that drama is a very frugal art form as everything that needs no words to be expressed, is not expressed in words. She names a number of structures of reduction: *empty places* (syntactic and semantic gaps), *ellipsis* (grammatical gaps), *indefiniteness* (semantic gaps) and *breaks* (semantically and syntactically marked changes in the direction of the dialogue). To economise on the distribution of information, the dramatic text also *implies* and *presupposes*: the spectator can reconstruct information by what is implied (or speculate about it or be puzzled by it). Besides these structures of reduction, Totzeva distinguishes isotopic structures, which strengthen the meaning of the drama by means of the recurrence of certain semantic themes. The most important isotopic structure is what she calls the *Ansatzwort*, a recurring class of keywords, which in its strongest form works on different levels of communication (situation, character, exterior).

The whole idea of theatrical potential is contested, however, by Pavis (1992).²² Pavis refuses to consider the performance text merely as a translation of the dramatic text into visual signs. The *mise en scène* is a system of meaning with its own dynamics: “*mise en scène* is not the reduction or transformation of text into performance, but rather their confrontation.”²³ He proposes a different relation between dramatic text and *mise en scène*, for which he advances the concept of *mise en jeu*. For Pavis, the *mise en jeu* is the confrontation of the text with the bodily gesture of the actor, as the translator imagines it when reading the source text. He tries to find equivalents for both verbal and object presentations in the target situation, producing a mental image, an imaginary target culture *mise en jeu*. The translator transcribes this imaginary target culture *mise en jeu*, in turn, into a purely verbal system. The actual staging of this text, when it is placed in a theatrical context in front of an audience, is the *mise en scene*.

22 It is peculiar that the concept of playability or theatrical potential does not recur in the debates concerning theatre translations of *Hamlet* except in terms of ‘intelligibility’ and ‘rhythm.’

23 See Patrice Pavis (1992: 24-47), in particular pp. 26-29.

Pavis suggests, in other words, that a translator does not translate just the text, but imagines the *mise en jeu* of the text as well, reconstructing it from the original dramatic text.²⁴

To be able to specify another characteristic of the performative aspect, Pfister (1982), Hess-Lütich (1985) and Fischer-Lichte (1998: 45-6) distinguish two levels of communication on which the theatrical text operates: the interior and the exterior system of communication. Within the play, characters communicate with each other by way of dialogue. On this level language is used to convey a message or provoke some action on the part of another character. On the level of exterior communication, the author and the director speak to their audience through the play. Thus, Esslin notes how

All speech in drama (...) produces meaning on several levels. While communicating a given meaning from one character to another, the same sentence will, in addition, convey another, and perhaps, dramatically more important meaning to the audience. (...) The words spoken between the characters always contain another charge of meaning for the audience. (1987: 82)

Since the theatrical text functions on these two levels, most theorists consider semantic complexity one of the prime characteristics of the theatrical text.²⁵ Totzeva (1995) elaborates the division between interior and exterior communication, discerning within the level of interior communication the context of *situation* (i.e. the events in the scenes, which shape, and are shaped by, the information in the text) and that of *character* (i.e. the characters who are shaped by the language they use).²⁶ This is seemingly not very different from other narrative text, except that the exterior communication takes place in a much more direct manner (an actor might actually converse with a member of his audience).

Another general characteristic of the dramatic text is that it shares aspects with both literary texts and spoken language.²⁷ According to Crystal “drama is neither poetry nor novel. It is first and foremost dialogue in action.” (1997: 75) Snell-Hornby (1984), however, specifies that even in modern plays dialogue is, despite its resemblance to everyday discourse, foremost an artificial language that is similar to spoken language, but not the same. The greater part of the text of a play, with the exception of monologues and stage directions, is formed by dialogue between the characters, and so on the level of interior communication it functions as spoken language. On the level of exterior communication the play is a literary text that speaks to an audience. This dichotomy in language has been taken by Hofmann (1980) as the basis of his study of redundancy and equivalence in German translations of *Hamlet*.

Although drama translation is said to have received scant attention (Lefevere, 1980: 78; Pavis, 1992: 136; Anderman, 1998: 71; Bassnett, 2000: 96), translation theorists have succeeded in drawing up an inventory of characteristics that are typical of the dramatic text in performance. These characteristics involve a number of pitfalls and dilemmas for the translator, mainly concerned with cultural gaps, sociocultural expectations, the immediacy of the

24 See Pavis (1992: 136-159).

25 See Levy (1969), Haag (1984), Eiselt (1995: 36) and Snell-Hornby (1984: 222).

26 She also studies the function of stage directions.

27 Hence also Bassnett (2000) explaining the ‘ageing’ of the theatre text with the ageing of spoken language.

text, the text as part of a performance, ‘performability’ features, interior versus exterior communication and dialogue versus artificial language. In this respect, the translator’s decisions are normative rather than idiosyncratic, because they affect the dramatic characteristics of the theatre text. In the case of a retranslation, therefore, a norm breach occurs when a translator decides to differ markedly from predecessors in the choices he makes that concern these characteristics. The impact of these characteristics on the operational options the translator has at his disposition will be treated shortly. First, however, we must turn to the most important consequence of the fact that a dramatic text is part of a larger performance text: the translator cannot bring his text to the stage all by himself – he is dependent on a production crew. His role within the production of a play is the subject of the following section.

2.3 The interplay between theatre maker and translator

Prior to the translator’s decision on how to deal with translating a play like *Hamlet*, somebody has determined that *Hamlet* should be translated. This decision also involves appointing a translator and reasoning why a (re)translation is needed. The *what*, *who* and *why* precede and greatly influence the *how*. Apart from in Pavis (1992), little mention is made of the relation between the production crew and the translator,²⁸ whereas – as I will argue – it is crucial in the creation of a theatre translation.

The selection of text and translator depends on two kinds of relationships and the hierarchy between them, namely the relationship between the translator and the original author, and that between the director (or performance crew) and the translator. The latter relationship is typical of a theatre translation. The hierarchy between the two relationships is determined by the way translator and director divide the responsibility for the text. The outcome of the translation process is significantly determined by the type of commitment felt by both parties to the original and to the performance. The norms of both parties affect a decision to give precedence to either the original text or to the performance text.

During the process of creating a performance, a dramatic text passes through four phases on the way to becoming a performance text: the concept phase, the text phase, the rehearsal phase and the production phase.²⁹ In each of these phases different people are involved. First, a new production is initiated by a director or, in the case of a collective, by (a member of) the troupe, by deciding what will be the starting point for a new production. This may be expressed as the wish to do a particular play, but it can also include a theme that should be broached by the new production or a style to be explored.³⁰ Secondly, once the initial idea is launched, comes the phase for selecting the appropriate material. The director, sometimes together with the dramaturge, determines what text is to be played. The director also confers with the set designer and other persons involved in the production about

28 With the exception of historical studies like Heylen (1993), who regrettably fails to make a general statement about it and the unpublished Hogendoorn (1988), who only slightly goes into it.

29 See Stephanie Arnold (2001: 378-391). This presentation is mostly valid for twentieth century theatrical practice.

30 Director Ivo van Hove, for example, declared: “Ja *Hamlet* doe je omdat je een *Hamlet* hebt.” Eddy Geerlings (1993: 6-9).

the other 'signs' that will constitute the eventual performance, like set design, lighting and costumes. Thirdly, the chosen text is used as a basis for the phase of rehearsals, in which the director works on the material together with the actors. Finally, the rehearsals lead up to the fourth phase of production: the actual performance, in which set design, costumes, lighting, sound, music and choreography are united with the actors' spoken text.

In this process, the text's content is affected in a series of four concretisations (Figure 2). Pavis (1992) proposes the following distinction. First comes the selection and/or creation of the text (*textual concretisation*), second the modification of the text before rehearsals (*dramaturgical concretisation*).³¹ Both take place in the second or text phase described above. Third comes the modification of the text during (and sometimes after) rehearsals (*stage concretisation*). Finally, in the *receptive concretisation*, the text arrives, as it were, at its endpoint and is received by the spectator. At this point, it is the audience that attaches meaning to the performance in the way they experience it.

In each of these phases (with the exception of the last) a different type of translation takes place, which can be better understood with the help of Jakobson's distinction between interlingual, intralingual and intersemiotic translation (1959). Although originally not devised for drama translation, they offer a useful tool for describing the way a text is transformed in the sequence of different concretisations.

The translator is involved in the phase of *textual concretisation*. He makes an *interlingual* translation of the dramatic text by the original author, from the language of the original into the language of the production. In this dissertation a translator is taken to be the person who has translated a text *from another language*. If afterwards he takes other actions (e.g. adapts the text), he is still referred to as the translator.




Figure 2: Series of concretisations

From Pavis (1992: 139). In theatre translation, the original text (T0) is affected in a number of concretisations, before being received by the target culture audience during the performance of the text (T4). The text is translated from another language (T1), it is prepared for the performance by a director and/or a dramaturge (T2) and it is presented on stage in a *mise en scène* (T3). Note that Pavis places the series of concretisations neither in the source culture nor in the target culture, but in an intermediary position.

During the phase of *dramaturgical concretisation*, the translated text can be adapted. If so, the adapter takes the translation as the starting point for a new dramatic text. This is a form of intralingual translation, i.e. translation that takes place within a language. The adapter changes the translation into a text that is more suitable for performance.³²

During the phase of *stage concretisation* the director is responsible for the third type of translation, the intersemiotic translation or the translation from one sign system into another. Through the *mise en scène*, the purely linguistic dramatic text is turned into a polymedial performance text. In the end, all these translations are preparatory. What is experienced by the audience as the play proper is a combined total, comprising actors performing and speaking their lines in a playing space, supported by sound and other effects.

Thus, making theatre is always a form of rewriting, with different co-authors for each phase. The performance text is co-authored by the deliverers of the text (the translator and adapter) and by the creators of the performance (the director and production crew). All are involved in a form of translation, be it interlingual, intralingual or intersemiotic. Traditionally, this *plural authorship* in the theatre has been left implicit.³³ Traditional staging suggests that what we see is the original author's text, conveyed by translator, director and production crew each with specific and clearly specified tasks. In truth, however, the text is rewritten in several stages by these parties, who therefore all may lay claim to authorship.

As said before, the theatre translator finds himself in a pivotal position between the original author and the production crew. For this reason it is proposed here to adapt Toury's notion of the *initial norm* (1995: 56). The *initial norm* refers to the basic choice of subscribing to the norms of the source text, its language and culture, or to the norms systems of the target culture. The initial norm moves between adequacy (subservience to the original author) and individual expression (subservience to the interpretation of the translator). Irrespective of the demands or position of the production crew, the translator of a source text takes up a certain position with respect to the source text. It may be his goal to be instrumental to an authentic rendering of the text. In that case, he is subservient to the original author. Alternatively, the translator has the view that he is on the same level as the original author. Then, he feels that he can only reproduce the literary qualities of the source text by addressing his own poetic gifts. A third position involves making the original author subservient to the translator's own inspiration as a playwright or poet, in which case the source text is considered as material for his new text and the translator truly is a *rewriter*. And fourthly, the translator can opt to extract specific material from the text, guided perhaps by a partial point of view. These are attitudes that can be encountered in any type of text and are not particular to the dramatic text. Still, since they are normative choices, they have been included in the working model.

The translator of a play can of course choose *not* to make a theatre translation at all. The independence of his work is asserted by the publication of his translation. Offering it to a reading audience is one of the indications that a separate tradition exists of 'literary' translations, as opposed to 'theatrical' translations. A publication of a drama translation without any (explicit) reference to a performance indicates that the text can be read as a reading transla-

32 Patrice Pavis (1992: 140-1).

33 For this reason, scholars Martha Woodmansee and Peter Jaszi (1994) point out the "misrepresentation of a collaborative process as a solitary, originary one".

tion as well.³⁴ Of course, this does not apply to publications that are explicitly connected to a particular performance and are offered as its supplement to the audience. In this respect, Van den Broeck's (1986) assumptions about so-called 'retrospective' translations are also worth considering. The aim of a 'retrospective' translation is a maximum reconstruction of the linguistic, stylistic and textual properties of the original drama text in the new linguistic and literary medium. Van den Broeck speaks of a reproduction, in the sense that the result looks like the original (like a reproduction of a painting).³⁵ The translator will actually have in mind a pre-existing performance of the text. This is why according to Van den Broeck this method applies mainly to canonical performances and canonical texts.

In the theatre, however, the initial norm also moves between subservience to the text (either the original author's or the translator's) and subservience to the interpretation of the theatre makers. At the production end, the production crew has the final say on how the text is delivered on stage. In this phase, the translator is dependent on the crew for decisions concerning the integrity of his text. The extent of suggested changes depends on the production crew's view on the relation between dramatic text and performance text: do the performers feel that the dramatic text contains all the theatrical potential that only requires further developing, or is the dramatic text merely one of more sources for a production that is created by the crew? In other words: is precedence given to the dramatic or to the performance text?

It should be noted here that such precedence is also dependent on the question whether the source text is suitable for the dramatic conventions of the target culture. The closer the source text to the (theatrical) target culture, the smoother its transition, whereas greater distance in time and space implies that if source text conventions are retained, they may come across as unexpected or (in some cases) as inadmissible.

It is not abnormal for the production crew to feel that the original text – which can be both the source text and its assumed translation – must be amended. As additional 'authors' of the performance text (not only the director, but also the dramaturge and the actors), they generally feel a greater responsibility towards the performance than towards the original author. From their point of view, it is essential that the dramatic text suits their performance. A typical feature of this kind of rewriting is the fact that the rewritten text is not published with the exception of the occasional publication accompanying a production. All rewriting is geared towards the final goal, a performance text.

For understanding (re)translation, it is vital to know at what stage the idea for a production occurred, whether it *followed* or *preceded* the transfer from the source language into the target language. The time sequence determines whether the text is adapted to the ideas on the production, or whether these ideas are fed into the translation of the play.

If the theatre makers make use of an existing translation, all decisions concerning the phase of textual concretisation have already been taken. The changes that are felt to be necessary are performed on the existing text. The theatre makers will no longer bother to

34 Many translations of *Hamlet* have been published without any reference to a performance (Burgersdijk 1884, Van Looy 1907, Voeten 1957/1964/1974, Komrij 1989, Boonen 1991) or without explicit reference to one (Alphenaar 1997, Albers 1999, Bindervoet & Henkes 2001).

35 Totzeva (1995) adds that the translations that were intended to be read are characterised by expansion on a micro-structural level, since the translator aims to fill in the gaps that should have been filled in by other 'signs'. The text will still contain references to phenomena of a different semiotic system, but these will relate to a referent prior to the text.

look at the original (foreign language) text; the responsibility for the interlingual translation is fully granted to the translator, and the text is treated as just any existing (native language) text. If the translation is considered as authentic, any changes in the translation might be said to subvert not only the integrity of the translation, but the norm of authenticity as well, i.e. the norm of wanting to present the text as the original author wrote it.

Rewriting can take place both before and during rehearsals, that is, in the phase of dramaturgical concretisation or in that of stage concretisation. Before rehearsals, during the dramaturgical concretisation, the existing translation is usually prepared to suit the concept of the performance. Dramaturgical rewriting can involve several people. The translator himself can make a dramaturgical adaptation of his own translation. In this case, he makes a clear distinction between translation and acting version, between retrospective and prospective translation. In the retrospective translation, he tries to make a complete translation of the dramatic text. For the prospective translation, the requirements of the theatre call for a different text than an integral translation. In fact, for a performance it is not necessary to have an integral text at all. By making a dramaturgical adaptation, the translator acquires another function; he takes up the role of the dramaturge. In other cases the rewriter is provided by the production crew. This can be the director, but when a dramaturge is available, he usually is involved in this process as well. This means that the theatre makers take control of the delivery of text. For some directors and dramaturges this means tailoring the text to the pragmatics of the performance. Other directors wish to express their own vision in the text.³⁶

The changes during rehearsals (and probably during the performances) are limited to the actors rephrasing or ad-libbing, if director or translator have indeed decided in advance on the text of the performance. In this stage the director may reconsider the length of the play and eliminate some lines. Other directors (or the troupe as a collective) prefer to develop their concept through the input of the actors. This style of directing, *concept-development*, entails that the outcome of the rehearsals can be substantially different from the text as it was presented to the group by the director and dramaturge.³⁷

The ideas about a production can also *precede* the translation process. In that case, the translator makes a translation with a particular performance in mind. He creates a text – a ‘prospective translation’ in Van den Broeck’s terminology (1986) – that is acceptable to the target culture as a play and renounces the autonomy of the written text; he accepts that the text is only one of many semiotic systems used in the performance. The concept for the performance usually comes from the production crew, but the translator can also make suggestions for the interpretation of the text.

There are two ways of suiting the translation to the performance. A translation or adaptation can be commissioned by the director. Even if no specific requirements are specified, the commissioner influences the outcome of the translation process in choosing the person who will make the translation. For the director, for example, it can be of major importance whether the translator is subservient to the original or rather prefers to express himself through the text. The director can also explicitly state the requirements the new text has to meet as part of the commission. An *explicit commission* is made to ensure that the pro-

36 International examples are Grotowski and Robert Wilson, as given by Arnold (2001).

37 Elizabeth LeCompte’s The Wooster Group works in this way, as described by Arnold (2001).

duction concept of the commissioning director or dramaturge is reflected in the text. If that is the case, the usual notion of responsibilities is further complicated, since the translator is given, in effect, part of the role of dramaturge; not as two separate tasks, but as a combination of both. In a production with a commissioned translation, therefore, we may expect that the role of the dramaturge is reduced.³⁸

This means that the discussion of authorship – whether or not the text may still be called the original author's when another author's (i.e. the director's) personal interpretation has interfered with it – extends to these translations. This is not to say the translation cannot be very faithful to the original, if that is the director's wish.

Alternatively, no translation is commissioned that is to suit the company's ideas, and the production crew (dramaturge or director) decide to carry out the translation-cum-adaptation themselves. In these cases there is usually³⁹ no need for an intralingual adaptation, for the necessary changes will already have been incorporated in the text during the textual concretisation. By making his own translation, a director, relying on his own knowledge of the source language, takes full control of his material, and shapes it accordingly. Where a translator may be expected to oscillate between adequacy and acceptability, a dramaturge or director has no necessity to adhere to some kind of fidelity to the original. Thus, 'translation' becomes a very arbitrary notion and the question of whether the text is the original author's or the director's becomes all the more poignant.

What is the effect of this kind of interplay on normative behaviour? Even when the translator himself has taken the initiative of producing a text, the end product on stage is totally at the discretion of the production crew. In all other cases, the translation is delivered by order of the production crew. It is probable, therefore, that the norms of the production crew are reflected in the text of the translation.

2.4 The translator's material: length and the possibilities of rewriting

During the operation of translating (and afterwards, when preparing the play for performance), a number of decisions needs to be taken on how and what part of the material will be used. The choices that are made in adapting⁴⁰ the original text of the play are a reflection of what Gideon Toury calls the "matricial norms" (1995: 58-61). These apply both to adaptations of the source text and to adaptations of its assumed translation. Matricial norms are the norms that govern the presentation of target-language material that acts as a substitute for

38 Dramaturgy is never absent from theatre translation. As George Mounin notes: "a playable theatre translation is the product, not of linguistic, but rather of a dramaturgical act." George Mounin (1963: 14). Pavis argues that any translation helps the preparation of a text for an audience: "Hence a paradox: Shakespeare is easier to understand in French or German translation than in the original, because the work of adapting the text to the current situation of enunciation will necessarily be accomplished by the translation." Pavis (1992: 142).

39 This is apart from the changes made during rehearsals. Creating a performance text is always an ongoing process.

40 Here, adaptation is considered in its broadest sense, as everything that deviates from the original in its entirety. This includes texts in which parts of the original have been omitted, to which elements that do not belong to the original have been added, and parts of the original that have been changed, either in form or in place. See the discussion in Fishlin and Fortier (2000: 2-4). Adaptation has a reductive ring to it, but remains the only term both broad enough to cover the entire field and common enough to be accepted. See also Bassnett (2000: 100-1) on the discussion of 'adaptation'.

corresponding source-language material, including the distribution of source material in the target text, (i.e. the location of source material in the target text), and textual segmentation. The matricial norms have to do with the extent to which omissions, additions, changes of location and manipulations of segmentation occur in the translated text. As Merino (2001) points out, both omission and addition are particular to acting versions of plays. Both breach a norm of *completeness*.

With regard to theatre adaptations, Ruby Cohn (1976: 3-4) makes a distinction between reduction/emendation, adaptation and transformation. The first practice, according to her, is found in almost every professional production: the production crew modifies the text, usually by cutting lines and/or emending words. She uses 'addition' to distinguish reduction/emendating from adaptation. Invention is the basis for the third group, transformation. Regrettably, Cohn does not elaborate on the category of reduction/emendation, "because reduction/emendations are properly considered as theatre history more than literary alteration." Moreover, Cohn has been criticised for being too rigid (Fishlin and Fortier, 2000).⁴¹ Nevertheless, Cohn's distinction offers a helpful starting point in detecting norm changes.

For a research on norms, the variety of textual manipulations should be related to the norms they are based on. I will therefore propose three categories of 'matricial changes,' guided by the three options a director of an historical dramatic text is faced with. According to Erenstein, the director (responsible for the adaptation) can try to present the original as faithfully as possible, he can choose to present those parts of the original that are relevant to a contemporary audience, or, thirdly, he can turn the play into a personal and contemporary performance (1991: 37-40).

The first matricial strategy is *reduction*, a method that tries to respect the integrity of the translation by choosing to omit without altering the contents of the lines. It can be said to respect textual integrity, by keeping the lines as they are, but not matricial integrity, because some lines are cut. The second category is a strategy of *emendation*, which differs from the strategy of reduction in the sense that it tries to alter the text in search of its essence, instead of respecting the integrity of the translation. It can be said to respect neither matricial integrity nor textual integrity, i.e. it does not keep in all the lines and changes these lines as well. This category includes adaptations made during the dramaturgical concretisation as well as 'translations' that prepare the ground for the dramaturgy in the text itself. The third category, that for lack of a better term will be called *addition*, combines Cohn's categories of adaptation and transformation in all aspects. Contrary to the previous two categories, this category adds content to the text that is absent in the original. In order to distinguish between the work of a translator/adaptor and an adaptor/dramaturge/director, a distinction should be made between the phase of textual concretisation and dramaturgical concretisation, in order to assess those translations that introduce inventions. The three categories represent the three major ways of dealing with a classic text, besides the logical fourth, namely making no alterations whatsoever.

41 With exactly the same lines as the original, but by changing the order of these lines and assigning them to different people, Marowitz succeeded in presenting an entirely different *Hamlet*. Scholars Fishlin and Fortier (2000: 3) reject the categorization of Ruby Cohn's *Modern Shakespeare Offshoots* as inadequate on the basis of her not including this manner of adaptation, which seems a little exaggerated, since it is merely one technique that she had not encountered in her study. It only goes to show that lists can never be truly exhaustive.

The most basic of adaptation techniques is *reducing* the amount of (original) text. As is argued in the introduction to this dissertation, *Hamlet* is far too long to be performed in its entirety. Moreover, the conventions of the theatre can take up a great deal of space and time. For stage adaptation, therefore, the *pragmatics* of performance, like the length of the play and the number of players that are available to the company, are the first and foremost delimiter of possibilities.⁴² Reduction involves using omissions to deal with the limitations in time or in the number of actors. In order to accelerate the action of the play, the adapter gets rid of a number of what he considers 'inessentials'.⁴³ *Sociocultural conventions*, furthermore, may induce cuts to avoid certain taboos.

Reduction can take place on a micro-level, i.e. on the level of lines and replicas.⁴⁴ It occurs across the board and involves a range of possibilities for omissions. Cuts may occur in lines that explain the action (*exposé*) so as to let the action speak for itself. Maxims and dated humorous passages may be cut, as well as asides and monologues, leaving the audience to find out for themselves what the characters are thinking. Text that is evident from the action may be considered superfluous too, including *acted speech*, in which the literary form of the text prescribes the precise action, and activity, the dialogue and stage directions that prescribe the stage actions in a general way (both terms coined by Williams, 1968).⁴⁵

Reduction can also take place on a macro-level. These changes concern characters and scenes that are omitted or reduced. This type of reduction removes particular passages and plotlines from the play.⁴⁶ The macro-level omissions either start from the reduction of *roles*, or from the reduction of (part of) *scenes*. This can have a pragmatic reason. With a smaller number of actors most end up playing a double role, but the consequence may also be that minor roles are removed from the play.

The omission of characters entails that dialogues and sometimes entire scenes disappear. In *Hamlet*, the first of these minor roles to disappear are the ambassadors (Cornelius and Voltemand, 1.2, 2.2),⁴⁷ the soldiers (Barnardo, Francisco and Marcellus, 1.1 and 1.2),⁴⁸

42 See Hans van Dam (1996: 123).

43 Interestingly, they are mostly features that slow down the action and are inessential for knowing the plot of the story. Apparently, most theatre makers decide that these features belong to a different dramatic structure, and with contemporary, *visual* theatre practice they have become largely redundant.

44 A term coined by Raquel Merino (2001) to indicate the utterance of a character in combination with the name designating this character.

45 Hugo Claus remarks: "De humor en de grappen van Shakespeare zijn over het algemeen nogal melig. Bovendien zijn ze van een bedenkelijke kwaliteit. Daar moet je ook weer iets voor vinden: als je dat gewoon vertaalt, zinkt dat als een baksteen. Humor is gebonden aan tijd en ruimte. Wat tien jaar geleden een grap was, is het nu niet meer. Wat voor ons grappig is, is voor de Fransen plat. Waar de Engelsen om moeten lachen, ontgaat de Polen. Je moet proberen om de kleur te behouden maar de geestigheid ofwel een beetje aan te scherpen ofwel te verzwakken. Dat ligt aan de taal en aan het feit dat humor aan zeer concrete omstandigheden gebonden is." Niedzwiecki (1987: 17).

46 One should note that, from the start, the Dutch translators worked on a conflated *Hamlet*. Such differences between the Folio and the Second Quarto that produce different interpretations of the play (Werstine, 1988: 1-26) have never had any effect on Dutch *Hamlet* texts and neither has there been a tradition of an 'actor's text' based on one version, as there was in England (Glick, 1969: 17-35).

47 Amongst others in De Leur (1882), De Moor (1983), Rijnders (1986) and Coltof (1996).

48 Amongst others in Rijnders (1986), Coltof (1996) and Boermans (1998).

Polonius's servant (Reynaldo, 2.1),⁴⁹ and the Sailors handing Horatio Hamlet's letter (4.6).⁵⁰ Other likely candidates are the Captain (4.4) and the Priest (5.1).⁵¹ Curiously, Fortinbras (4.4 and 5.2) – who functions as an active foil to the passive Hamlet – is sooner omitted than the foppish courtier Osric (5.2), who functions as a type of comic relief.⁵² The entire Norway plot with Fortinbras is often absent.⁵³ Of the scenes, one of the most popular candidates for reduction is the first, in which Horatio first encounters the Ghost.⁵⁴ This turns the focus of the play towards the world of the court.⁵⁵ Most reduction takes place after the death of Polonius in the fourth act.⁵⁶ Sometimes scenes are also joined together.⁵⁷

2.4.2 Emendation

In the matricial strategy of *emendation*, directors, dramaturges and translators change the original text in order to make the play more accessible, more palatable, without harming what they consider the essence. On the one hand, the play has to have an immediate effect on the audience, so the text must be understandable in its entirety. On the other hand, the text must be so much like the source text that it can still be regarded as written by the original author. The emendations often transform those parts of the text that are considered too obscure for a modern-day audience into passages that are still similar, but more transparent. The result is a performance that shows the timeless aspects of the drama; if slanted, it will be towards the present.

Emendation involves a gamut of strategies apart from omission. The action can be sped up by summarising previous events in characters' speeches. It may be decided to replace

49 Amongst others in De Leur (1882), De Moor (1983), Coltof (1996) and Boermans (1998).

50 Amongst others in De Leur (1882), De Moor (1983), and Rijnders (1986).

51 The Captain amongst others in De Leur (1882) and Coltof (1996); the Priest in Coltof (1996). Typically, the Gravedigger and his companion are never omitted, although they constitute an intermezzo in the development of the action. They are essential since they build up to the moment Hamlet picks up a skull and says: 'Alas, poor Yorick.' This represents the archetypical image of Hamlet, as demonstrated by its visual quotation even in the Arnold Schwarzenegger vehicle *Last Action Hero* (1993).

52 Osric is absent in Coltof (1996). His lines are taken by Horatio.

53 Conspicuously so, from such different productions as De Leur (1882), Verkade (1908) and Coltof (1996).

54 It is omitted from many productions, from De Leur (1882), to Rijnders (1986) and Boermans (1998).

55 Especially if the apparition of the Ghost takes place in the same room (Boermans, 1998), or if this happens in combination with the deletion of the Fortinbras plot (De Leur, 1882).

56 Where the Arden *Hamlet* has seven scenes, Burgersdijk's adaptation only contains two. Burgersdijk had joined the scenes following the death of Polonius and ending with Hamlet's departure for England to the closet scene of the third act, niftily omitting the second of them (4.2). He leaves out the scene outside "on a plain", where Hamlet encounters Fortinbras' army (4.4), since he has left out all reference to Fortinbras; he also omits the scene in which Horatio is notified of Hamlet's return (4.6). Burgersdijk just as easily could have reduced the act to its absolute minimum: De Moor (1983) joined the remaining two scenes, which portray Ophelia's madness and death and Laertes's anger and complicity to the poisoning of Hamlet (4.5 and 4.7). Both 4.5 and 4.7 are very different in the Folio and Second Quarto versions of the play, which Frank Albers (1999) took as an occasion to omit much material in both scenes. This joining of scenes has consequences for the position of the interval. Joining the scenes leading up to Hamlet's departure for England to the closet scene (3.4) entails that the interval takes place as Hamlet leaves for England, which **emphasises that he comes back a different man**. This is a choice made by Burgersdijk and De Leur (1882), but also by Voeten and Croiset (1976). The other option for the interval – suggested by the scene division in most English editions and translations – is the end of 3.4, which is the first moment Hamlet has come into action with the infelicitous death of Polonius; which is more like the classical cliffhanger ('What happens next to Hamlet?').

57 Hamlet's encounters with the Ghost in 1.4 and 1.5 are merged by Croiset (1976) and Coltof (1996). Likewise, in De Leur's production (1882), there is no scene change to introduce the exchange between Laertes, Polonius and Ophelia (scenes 1.2 and 1.3).

poetical language with a more communicative type of language, which extends to paraphrasing and clarifying complex metaphors, summarising repetitions and complex conceits into a single phrase, rewriting verse into prose, updating humorous passages, and adding interjections in dialogues to make it more like spoken language. Another type of emendation is concerned with modernising the setting of the play by omitting typical references to the source culture, replacing outdated concepts and invectives with valid counterparts in the present, modernising forms of address, or rewriting descriptive passages to match what is actually played out on stage. As in the case of reduction, emendation can also stretch to (sexual or political) taboos.

During the phase of dramaturgical concretisation, the adaptor can decide to emend in an originally metrical translation, for example for reasons of grammatical consistency. In that case, a verse drama is transformed into a verse form that is closer to free verse or prose. Thus the organic whole the translator had tried to create may be disturbed. Such a stylistic clash can be avoided by exercising the different types of emendation directly in translation. When a single person makes the text, the chances are that it becomes more coherent. Emendation is usually applied by translators who do not take the line as the measure for translation. For many Shakespeare translators the number of verse lines of the translation will largely correspond to that of the original. If the number of lines of the translation differs significantly from that of the original, this signifies that the translator has a different interpretation of coupled pairs (i.e. the target text segments that replace the source text segments).⁵⁸ This means that he does not respect the norm of matricial integrity. If the translator does not work on the level of the line but on that of the verse paragraph, some form of condensation is likely to occur. This style of translation, dubbed *shorthand* in this study, is a compendious form of rewriting the original. Alphenaar's single sentence translation for a problematic sixteen-line passage of Shakespeare provides an extreme example (the numbers indicate what Alphenaar retained):

So (1), oft it chances *in particular men* (3)
 That for some vicious mole of nature in them,
 As in their birth, wherein they are not guilty
 (Since nature cannot choose his origin),
 By their o'ergrowth of some complexion,
 Oft breaking down the pales and forts of reason,
 Or by some habit, that too much o'erleavens
 The form of plausible manners — that these men,
 Carrying, I say, the stamp of one defect,
 Being Nature's livery or Fortune's star,
 His virtues else, be they as pure as grace,
 As infinite as man may undergo,
 Shall in the general censure *take corruption* (4)
 From *that particular fault* (2). The dram of evil

58 See Toury (1995: 89).

Doth all the noble substance often dout
To his own scandal. (1.4.23-38)⁵⁹

42

Zoals (1) een enkle kwaal (2) een heel persoon (3) verpest (4)

Shorthand omission is but one in a wide range of options the translator can apply to make the text more accessible. As we shall see, both the normalisation of heightened language and the modernisation of the text bring it closer to the audience, in a way similar to the dramaturgical strategy of emendation.

2.4.3 Addition

The category of *addition* includes all texts that explicitly are not the original author's (i.e. "naar [after] Shakespeare", "Aats Hamlet"), although many texts that belong to this category do not state it in such clear terms. The idea of adding something to the text disrespects two key concepts of translation, namely the integrity of the text as a whole and the authenticity of the text as a creation by a single original author. When additions are made during the phase of dramaturgical concretisation, precedence is given to the performance text; when additions are made during the phase of textual concretisation, precedence is given to the newly created text. In both cases, the concerns of the new author(s) interfere(s) with the original text.

On the whole, additions indicate the different perspective added on by the adapter. This can be a *dramatic*, *personal* and/or a *confrontational* perspective. There is an emphatic difference between adaptations that take the audience's knowledge of the original for granted, and those that can be enjoyed without knowing the original. If the original is not known to the audience, the translator uses addition to have the contents of the original story meet the requirements of the contemporary stage. The original play as it is, either is not sufficiently suitable as a theatre text (since it does not fit a desired 'paradigm of entertainment' (Fotheringham, 1984)), or the translator/adapter just thinks he can do a better job himself.

If the original is known, the audience will experience both the original text and sense that it is placed 'under erasure.' Through the means mentioned below, the adapter enters into play with the original author. The original author becomes one agent amongst others, as his text is either presented together with the text(s) of other writer(s), or reorganised so as to invert conventional interpretation (Lefevere, 1993: 200). This occurs occasionally as an effect of *estrangement*, to call attention to the fiction the spectator is watching. When it happens on a regular basis, but without a polemic edge, the rewriter is *co-authoring* the new play and drawing on the original author's material to gain purchase upon the modern world. When it is done with a polemic edge, one can expect that the rewriter is seeking to *confront* the original in order to subvert common interpretations or the authority of the text.⁶⁰

59 References to lines in *Hamlet* are based on Jenkins (1982).

60 Adaptation clashes with the idea of originality as opposed to derivation. Fishlin and Fortier (2000) give an enlightening comment: "When [adaptation] has been the object of consideration, it has often been judged and understood in opposition to a criterion of 'originality' – often, paradoxically, to the assumed originality of Shakespeare. Moreover, adaptation has been found lacking in 'fidelity' to the original work of whichever

The adapter disposes of a number of means to create these effects during the phase of dramaturgical concretisation. He can add scenes (by adding, transforming or shuffling the original scenes), he can change roles (by creating doubles, by changing speech assignments or by adding improvisations) and he can change lines (by repeating and deleting lines, by adding stage directions, or by adding quotes). In many adaptations additions are accompanied by a large amount of omissions. There is no need to present the entire text, since there is no intention to be faithful to it. Furthermore, parodic, subversive or inventive and imaginative adaptations only need present a minimum of scenes to warrant recognition of the original text.

The dramaturgical concretisation, however, is not the only phase in which the norms of authenticity, integrity and the precedence of text over performance can be subverted. Delabastita (2004: 114) coins the notion of the *postmodern model* of (Shakespeare) translation, in order to pinpoint an attitude that “systematically challenges the notion of textual cohesion, and the conventional logical and narrative patterns which it implies.” I would like to add that above all it challenges not (only) the narrative patterns that convention has given us, but the patterns as laid down by the author. It is the author and *his* construction that is most directly under attack. “The juxtaposition of different translation techniques” (e.g. hyperliteralism, non-translation, free adaptation) is mentioned by Delabastita (ibid.) as one of the key features of the postmodern translation. Moreover, and this is why I think the notion of the postmodern is enlightening, not only are translation techniques juxtaposed, the different *worlds* of text clash as well. In the first place, the combination of source text and target culture input flaunts the text’s plural authorship (of original author and translator/rewriter), as it de-centres the source text (Lefevere, 1993: 220). In the second place, the world of the play and the world of the audience collide, which is akin to postmodern fiction’s dramatising of different ontological levels (McHale, 1987: 10).

Some of the techniques used by rewriters in this category are common to dramaturgical adaptations in general. The more specifically textual nature of other techniques means that they are only applied in rewriting the play. They include the use of exaggeration to parody situations from the original play, the addition of (phonetic) puns, the change of characters through a change in their characterisation, and the change of the action through the change of descriptions.

2.5 The domestic and the foreign

All decisions regarding textual-linguistic strategies are founded on the decision to move the text either towards the domestic or towards the foreign (Venuti, 1995). This fundamental distinction gives some insight in the basic options for translation, although their application in an analysis of a translation can be problematic. As a matter of fact, it is as rare for a trans-

canonical figure is being adapted. Critical understanding, in these instances, remains bound by the concept of the authorship, supported by such notions as originality in creation in translation and fidelity in interpretation. (...) The idea of originality, however, posits an independence where none exists – or where only a limited invention is possible. Shakespeare in his own work was not original in the way these judgements seem to presume” (2000: 4). Of course, the history of literature also knows a different tradition, that considers adaptation in the light of *emulatio*.

lation to be completely ‘foreignising’ as it is to be completely ‘domesticating.’ In practice, a translator makes decisions with regard to these two essential modes on separate levels.

One of the main contributions of translation theorist Holmes (1978) is the idea that distinct features of the source text can be approached separately. With regard to the translations of poetry, Holmes suggests the ‘planes’ of *context* (linguistic features), *intertext* (literary context), and *situation* (socio-cultural features). The translator, Holmes suggests, strives after coherence within the plane, but not necessarily in the conjunction of all planes. Moreover, according to Holmes, in the case of all but the most contemporary of poems, these choices may be “complicated by series of choices on another axis, that of ‘historicising’ versus ‘modernising.’” (1978: 47-48)

The following two sections make use of Holmes’ classification. I suggest some modifications, however, to make it more suitable for the retranslations examined for the purpose of this study. Firstly, there is not a single translation in the present corpus that bears evidence of a choice to ‘domesticate’ without modernising, or to historicise without ‘foreignising.’ These choices have not presented themselves to the translators in question and without practical application to *Hamlet*, they have no actual relevance here. Secondly, the distinction between linguistic context and socio-cultural situation is more often than not impossible. The ‘language’ itself has never been completely translated into a historical counterpart (like ‘Vondel-Dutch’). All linguistic means that the translator has at his disposal – even those that might sound outdated and old-fashioned – are those of the living, natural language of the target culture. Furthermore, the category of “situation” calls for a subdivision, for it might be that a translator chooses to translate some elements of the socio-culture with retention of the original’s situation, while he modernises other elements.

For these reasons, the textual-linguistic features of the theatre translations have been divided into two sections, one on *heightened language*, which investigates the treatment of intertext in the language of the play, and another on *modernisation*, which shows the attempts of the translators to move the situation of the play towards the present (or the past).

2.5.1 The dilemma of heightened language: between communicating content and interpreting style

As previous scholarship has pointed out, the language of dramatic text is dual in nature. The dramatic text is similar to oral speech in that it refers to a certain situation and to objects on stage (deixis), makes occasional use of reduced language (e.g. gaps, half sentences) and shares lexical characteristics with spoken language (e.g. anacolutha, corrections, interjections). At the same time, however, it has an aesthetic function that spoken language lacks. The language of drama is always artificial (Mary Snell-Hornby, 1984: 101-116) and, as such, an exceptional variant of spoken language. It is written to be spoken, yet never identical to the spoken word.

How can this two-fold nature of the dramatic text be analysed? The Prague School⁶¹ offers a useful distinction in terms of the function of language. Mukarovsky (1964) distinguishes between communicative and poetic language. According to him, the function of communicative language is to express a reality outside language, whereas poetic language tends to foreground itself. While communicative language uses standardised linguistic rules, poetic language foregrounds the utterance, that is, it disturbs the standardised relation between sign and signifier. Both features are manifest in the dramatic text. The text resembles spoken language and contains features of communicative language, but since it is essentially an aesthetic text, it will also by necessity foreground itself.

The notion of communicative language sheds more light on the requirements of speakability demanded of the theatre text by translation theorists (Levy 1969, Zuber-Skerritt 1984). The demand for an understandable text entails a focus on communicative aspects at the expense of some of the foregrounding features. As such, the choice to create a “speakable” text is merely one of the possible choices in theatre text translation. A translator may just as well decide to make a less “speakable” or communicative text, in order to preserve certain features of poetic language.

The conventions for the aesthetic function of text change from period to period. William Shakespeare worked within the conventions of the Elizabethan theatre. For the aesthetic function of his plays, he used what Thompson calls “heightened language”:

Shakespeare’s language is in some ways very like everyday language, and (...) there is a kind of continuum which allows it to rise from the colloquial level to the ‘slightly heightened’ and then to the ‘very heightened’. (2001: 7)

Heightened language can be explored by focusing “on the basic distinction between the literal and the figurative use of words, defining figurative in the broadest sense to include any meaning other than the literal.”⁶² Part and parcel of this heightened language is rhetoric, which in treatises is often divided in two types of figures of speech: “*tropes*, or figures of thought, which ‘translate’ words from their normal sense or usage, and *schemes*, or figures of sound, which create ornamental patterns with words through repeating or transforming letters, syllables, or words.”⁶³ I propose to use prosody, tropes and schemes as the starting point for an analysis of the poetic features of *Hamlet* translations.⁶⁴

It is important to note that it is not a question of either/or: a dramatic text will *always* be both a spoken text *and* a literary⁶⁵ text. Since both the communicative and the aes-

61 According to Jan Mukarovsky (1964: 31 ff).

62 Thompson (2001: 8).

63 Lynne Magnusson (2001: 21).

64 The translation of heightened language, especially of prosody (the figures of sound) has an additional importance in the theatre. Namely, “Kunstsprache” is not the only key feature of a performance text. Many scholars concerned with theatre translation have looked into the (complex) notion of ‘playability.’ This has often been tied to the patterns enclosed in the text. Among the more hidden ways that a playwright is alleged to bring his message across are listed: (*variation in*) *rhythm* (Bassnett, 1978; Snell-Hornby, 1984); *deixis* (Snell-Hornby, 1984; Bassnett, 1985); *reduction* (Snell-Hornby, 1984; Totzeva, 1995) and *recurring patterns of thematic words* (Snell-Hornby, 1984; Totzeva, 1995). All of these textual aspects recur in heightened language, either in the prosody, schemes and tropes (*rhythm* in prosody, *thematic words* in networks of metaphors) or in spoken language elements (*deixis* and *reduction*).

65 ‘Literary’ here means something different from the ‘literary’ translation as mentioned by Raymond van den

thetic function are inherent in the dramatic text, neither can be discarded in advance by the translator, but his choices may cause a shift in balance. Translators show a tendency in their choices to favour either the aesthetic function of the play text (i.e. in terms of the conventions of Elizabethan drama) or its communicative function. Moreover, decisions for or against the aesthetic function of language are made at a number of levels, independently from each other. Since the nature of the dramatic text does not exclude one function in favour of the other, it can happen that decisions taken on one level run contrary to those taken on another.

The common denominator of tropes is that they all make figurative use of the word. Each trope foregrounds utterance in a different manner. In the case of a *metaphor*, one aspect (the tenor) is expressed in terms of another (the vehicle) with which it shares a common ground. Not all metaphors foreground language: only active metaphors are 'poetic' in the sense that they foreground language (Black, 1962).⁶⁶ A *pun* however always foregrounds language (Delabastita, 1993).⁶⁷ In the case of a *proverb*, the fixed combination of a number of words carries a fixed meaning that differs from the sum of the single words. A recognised proverb arguably never foregrounds language. Rather, it presents a piece of automated information: it calls up an entire frame of thought with a combination of words recognized by the audience as a cluster of meaning. However, like metaphors, proverbs can be made active.

The first difficulty in translating tropes is recognising them. Many tropes are lost in translation as a result of the absence of critical background information,⁶⁸ which can result in a translator choosing but one of possible meanings.⁶⁹ The next difficulty is recognising the tropes for what they are. Were they common parlance at the time of writing or were they invented for the play? The editor's information here is crucial as well.⁷⁰ A further problem in

Broeck (1986). There it regarded the function of the text, which could either be used for a performance or for a printed edition, the latter being a 'literary' (reading) translation. The distinction between poetic ('literary') and communicative language is, as we shall see, also valid in a translation for a performance and concerns the choice of what features of the original text to translate.

66 The dormant metaphor is one that is not readily recognised, but understood as a metaphor only when explained (like "a slip of the tongue"). The active metaphor "needs the receiver's cooperation in perceiving what lies behind the words used". Black (1962: 19-43).

67 What makes the translation of wordplay so problematic is that the components participate in at least two contexts. (Delabastita, 1993: 180). Delabastita hypothesises that the status of the pun correlates to the degree to which language is perceived as an autonomous semiotic structure, since it "[foregrounds] structural properties of language and texts instead of suppressing them." (Delabastita, 1993: 262).

68 In 1907 translator Jac. van Looy pondered long on a passage that later in the Arden Shakespeare (1982) would be explained ("all that lives must die, passing through nature to eternity"). To his commissioner, Eduard Verkade, he said: "Nu echter denk ik dat dit door de spontane koningin gesprokene wel eens napraterij kan zijn van een geëikt gezegde, zooals 't familiere woord van domine's [sic] worden onthouden en te pas gebracht." In fact, Arden states that "[t]his sentiment, to be amplified in the King's next speech, is a traditional commonplace of consolation.

69 An example of the effect of interpreting something as a trope or not, are the translations of Polonius's remarks to Reynaldo in *Hamlet*, 2.1.73: "Let him ply his music." According to the Arden edition, this is probably serious advice that Reynaldo must give to Laertes. The translators' choices range from literal translation: "En laat hij zijn muzikles niet vergeten" [Courteaux] to an interpretation of the remark as figurative language: "Laat hem uitrazen." [Komrij].

70 According to recent critics, "puns play a larger role [in *Hamlet*] than in any other Shakespearean drama". Conducive to this insight, critical editions of the play give ample attention to wordplay. In older editions, however, a large number of what are now considered puns were regarded as textual cruxes. See Sulick (1977: 132) cited in Delabastita (1993: 249). In the case of the proverbs, the translator has to know whether the proverb existed in Elizabethan England, and if it did, whether it existed in precisely that form. Tilly (1950) counts 140 proverbs in *Hamlet*, whereas the editor Charles G. Smith (1963) counted only 54. Such interpretations have a large impact on the translator's own interpretation, since they rely on the efforts of these same editors for their knowledge of Elizabethan standard language. It makes a difference whether Shakespeare coined a phrase or whether he used somebody else's stock. In 1.3 Polonius uses the image of a brokenwinded horse to comment on his

foregrounding language with regard to tropes is the risk of exaggeration. Rhetoric may slip into bombast if language is foregrounded to such an extent that it becomes plainly silly.⁷¹ This also depends on the way heightened language is appreciated in the target culture. A target culture whose theatrical conventions do not involve a great deal of tropes is more likely to consider heightened language as bombast. The same is true for schemes. Lastly, the (non) acceptability of puns in particular and their possibly bawdy implications can also play a role in the translator's considerations (Delabastita, 1993: 253-312).

Schemes include syntactical patterns and prosody. Syntax is considered a rhetorical instrument based on the complexity of phrase structure; prosody is the combination of metre and rhyme.⁷² As Holmes (1988) argued, the choice for a prosodic scheme must come very early in the sequence of translational decisions, because most other textual decisions depend upon it.⁷³ The translation of the syntactical structures, on the other hand, can vary from line to line.

Tropes and schemes can also be considered in terms of register. In general, they belong to a high register, whereas colloquial language belongs to the other end of the axis. The difference in register provides yet another way for analysing the dual nature of theatrical language, for spoken language can also be interpreted as 'colloquial language,' which then is no direct opposite of 'poetical language.'

The addition of spoken language elements may cause the dramatic text to resemble actual spoken language even more. Spoken language features include the use of the vernacular, invectives, bawdiness, deixis and ellipsis. These elements can help making the speaking characters more real. Many performances are built on the illusion that one sees actual people on stage and this illusion is enforced when these people are speaking in a recognisable, contemporary language. Some spoken language elements (deixis, ellipsis) have the added value of linking speech to action or scenery, either through indication or through suggestion. This helps to support the illusion of reality on stage.

Like the appreciation of heightened language, the approval of the colloquial very much depends on its general appreciation in the target culture's theatrical conventions. In the course of theatre history, the dramatic text has vacillated between being very close to spoken language and further removed from it. Adding colloquial language then does not imply that the text loses its poetic function; rather, it replaces one *style* ('heightened language') with another (e.g. 'realism'). In this sense, it is a form of modernisation. Conversely, in times where

abundant use of the word "tender": "not to crack the wind of the poor phrase, running it thus." The translator Burgersdijk considers this a common expression and translates with a paraphrase of its signification: "'k laat nu 't spelen met woorden varen". His colleague Voeten interprets it as an active metaphor and translates it accordingly: "'t arme woord raakt buiten adem als ik het zo opjaag."

71 See Sylvia Adamson (2001: 31-50) on detecting bombast. One of the scholarly cruxes in Hamlet is whether the *praecepta* of Polonius to Laertes in 1.3.59-80 are used to ridicule the former, or whether they are meant to present him as a caring father. Translating Polonius's advice as a series of proverbs would inevitably turn into a laughing matter, for it is over the top to our modern taste. Hugo Claus (1982, 1986) makes grateful use of them: "En denk aan de gouden regels: A. Hou je gedachten voor jezelf. B. Als je een idee hebt brengt het alleen ten uitvoer als het niet meer kwakkelt. C. Wees vriendelijk maar niet te familiair" (etcetera on to K).

72 The nature of rhyme in Shakespeare is closely related to the metre. Except for the instances of songs, plays and poems within the play, rhyme usually delivers the final words of a scene. Final rhyming couplets are the most artificial elements in Shakespeare's use of rhetoric; the use of rhyme highlights the two lines in which it is used. Their artifice makes us conscious of the actor's playing a part, reminding us of the Elizabethan convention of the play, foregrounding the literariness of the language. See Berry (1993).

73 Holmes (1988: 25).

the target culture's theatrical audiences find fault with colloquial language, the removal of spoken language elements is likewise a form of domesticating.

The opponents of the domesticating translation object to the loss of the 'material' aspects of language, i.e. the words, the order of the words and even their sounds. Bronzwaer (1996) claims:

A poetical use of language is in that sense 'magical' that the poetical is tied up with the authentic signs, their materiality, and is lost in translation. The poetical is foregrounded by the signs.⁷⁴

Berman (1984) posits what he calls the *trial of the foreign*. This type of translation (Steiner calls it literalism)⁷⁵ foregrounds the aesthetic function of the text as contained in the original, without attempting to rationalise or clarify it.⁷⁶ According to him, a good translation respects the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text by developing a "correspondence" that "enlarges, amplifies and enriches the translating language."⁷⁷ He mentions a number of deforming tendencies in domesticating translation, which have a direct bearing on the treatment of heightened language. They include the loss of poetry, rhythm, sentence structure, networks of signification, original expressions and idioms.⁷⁸ Based on the combined ideas of the Prague School and Berman, the options for translating tropes and schemes can be related to a general tendency.

Berman is resolute in his dislike of both *clarification* and *rationalisation*. He is opposed to the tendency for clarification because it implies "cancelling the original's movement towards the indefinite." When a translator clarifies, he rids the text of multiple meanings, choosing to fix the text in just one of possible meanings. Communication is improved by a shift towards standard language at the expense of poetic language. In order to clarify the tropes, the translator can leave out information or choose to render it more straightforwardly, without the poetical form of the trope. Paraphrases are at the expense of the original construction but communicate the content originally intended. They are not therefore worded in poetic language, in the sense of the trial of the foreign or of functional poetry, but in standard language.⁷⁹ According to Delabastita (1993), in the case of a pun, the translator can opt for a

74 Bronzwaer (1996: 38), my translation: "Ook poëtisch taalgebruik is in die zin 'magisch' dat het poëtische kenmerk aan de authentieke tekens, aan hun materialiteit, gebonden is, en verloren gaat bij vertaling. Het poëtische wordt door de tekens 'present' gesteld."

75 Steiner (1975, 1998: 332).

76 Berman (1985: 285).

77 Berman (1995: 94), translation by Venuti.

78 Berman (1985) notes twelve deforming tendencies in domesticating translation in total. (1) Rationalisation: the text is rearranged towards a regular discursive order; (2) clarification: the translation cancels the original's movement towards the indefinite; (3) expansion; the translation is longer than the original; (4) ennoblement and popularisation: the translation is either more elegant, or more 'slangy' than the original; (5) qualitative impoverishment: poetry and prose are lost; (6) quantitative impoverishment: lexical loss in lexical chains; (7) the destruction of rhythm; (8) the destruction of underlying networks of signification: networks of major signifiers are lost; (9) the destruction of linguistic patternings: style in sentence structure is lost; (10) the destruction of vernacular networks: the link between prose and the vernacular in which it is rooted is lost; (11) the destruction of expressions and idioms: we have proverb consciousness, so we are aware when something is an expression in another language - equivalents do not translate this; (12) the effacement of the superimposition of languages: the heterology of languages is lost and squashed into a single style.

79 When the metaphor is a conventional one, the common practice for the translator is to first attempt to use a phrase that is conventional, and not to translate it with a metaphor at all cost – for this would mean pulling

“selective non-pun,” namely, one of the several meanings of the original pun. A logical connection to the context thus is retained, but again, this is *not* foregrounding language. Clarification can also mean discarding hendiadys.⁸⁰ This type of ‘superfluity’ is reduced by many translators. The two components of the hendiadys are turned into a single word that expresses both, so that we may speak of a ‘selective metaphor.’ The absence of the hendiadys makes the message much clearer (one message, one image) and therefore heightens the communicative function, but lessens the original’s rhetorical impact.

Rationalisation is the rearrangement of the text towards a regular discursive order. For example, the function of heightened language is translated, but adapted to a form that the translator expects will be better understood by the audience. Rationalisation means that language is foregrounded – and this is why in Figure 1 it is placed closer to literalism than clarification – although the material aspects of the original are not retained, in order to convey the sense as well as the trope. It implies losing the vehicle to be able to express both tenor and grounds intelligibly. In order to render the poetical function of a trope, a translator can choose to replace one type of trope with another, or to create a new version of the original, if he feels that the new version better conveys the original meaning. Using a similar expression is a type of foregrounding that signals the fact of a play with language in the original, with an aesthetic effect similar to that proposed in the translation. The material aspects of the words and the original vehicle are discarded, however. Proverbs, then, are translated with another proverb; puns replaced by another pun. In the case of a metaphor or a proverbial expression, the translator can also coin a new, uncongenial metaphor of his own. In this kind of foregrounding, the vehicle is replaced by a new one and the translator brings his own poetic instincts to the fore. Lastly, the specific type or construction of a trope may be altered in translation, with, for instance, a rhyming pun standing in for a proverb. Depending on the trope that replaces the other, this involves either foregrounding or communicating.⁸¹

The option of ‘foreignising’ entails retaining the material aspects of the text at the expense of intelligibility. If a translator does not want to clarify nor to rationalise the features of heightened language, he can choose to follow the original tropes as literally as possible.

something from the field of ordinary language (using its communicative function) to the field of literary language (underlining its expressive function).

80 “[T]he status of this figure is often uncertain, since it usually cannot be established that the paired words actually express a single idea.’ Kermode, in his essay on the language of *Hamlet* (2001), states that doubling is the principal characteristic of *Hamlet* (see even character doubles like Rosencrantz and Guildenstern or The Gravedigger and the Other), and that its literary expression is in fact the hendiadys. An example of hendiadys is “proof and bulwark against sense”.

81 Some metaphors have vehicles that appear throughout the play. Levy (1969: 128-159) claimed that translators should look to these *Leitmotivs* with “differenzierte Genauigkeit”, to treat them with specific care. In fact, Totzeva (1995) in her study ranks them under the *Ansatzwörter*. *Ansatzwörter* are words in which semantic themes recur, used to strengthen the meaning of the drama, which function on different levels of the play. According to her, these belong to the major characteristics of the dramatic text. Many studies have been written on the imagery in *Hamlet*, such as Caroline Spurgeon’s *Leading Motives in the Imagery of Shakespeare’s Tragedies* (1930), Clemen’s *The Development of Shakespeare’s Imagery* (1951) and Mack’s ‘The World of *Hamlet*’ (1952). These are classics in their own right. All three of them stress that *Hamlet* is haunted by recurring images of sickness. The translators’ strategies with regard to metaphor influence the occurrence of *Leitmotivs*. A translator transposing all words literally from the original, as in the trial of the foreign, includes all *Leitmotivs*. Translators wishing to foreground less, discard them when using a paraphrase. Translators who try to avoid vehicles that have become outdated also lose links of the chain if their metaphor uses a different vehicle. On the other hand, the consistent use of these vehicles helps to bring about a text that is poetic in its insistence on certain themes.

In the case of a metaphor or a proverb, such a literal translation with a fresh combination means that a new concept is introduced in Dutch. This is called transference.⁸² In the case of a metaphor, the vehicle is retained, possibly at the expense of the ground. If a proverb has no literal equivalent in the other language and is translated word for word, it is as hard to grasp for the audience as a metaphor. Since it offers the audience less information, its aesthetic (foregrounding) value increases. In both cases, the foregrounding consists in efforts to convey the original trope to the audience, even at the expense of intelligibility.

A similar distinction can be made for schemes and prosody. The translator will attempt to move the pattern of sound towards either the communicative or the poetic pole of language. In the case of prosody, Armin Paul Frank (1991) distinguishes four options: the same prosodic schema as the original, another prosodic schema, a variety of free verse, and prose translation.⁸³ From the second to the last type the translation is on a gliding scale away from the original poetic structure towards the communicative function of language. It can be argued that the second and third type reflect a rationalising solution, whereas a prose translation is an outright clarification. Only the first category can be said to respect the claims of literalist translation; the rest is 'qualitative impoverishment' (Berman, 1985) – loss of poetry and prose.

In the treatment of syntax, the translator can show a preference for observing either complexity or simplification, depending on what he finds important: the rhetorical style of a play or clarity of speech. A translator can favour the poetic structure by retaining the syntactical structure at all costs. He can also favour communication, by choosing to present a progression of information that is easy to understand and not hampered by the complexities of phrase and relative pronoun. Such a 'destruction of linguistic patternings' is severely criticised by Berman (1985).

A literalist phenomenon similar to transference – the deliberate retention of a metaphor or proverb at the expense of understanding the original contents – occurs in syntactical patterns when a translator follows the word order of the foreign language in a word for word translation. The translator forces his coupled pairs into the same position as they hold in the original, which will often cause him to upset the target language syntax. As with transference, this type of foregrounding the aesthetics of the original does not only involve keeping the rhetorical pattern per se, but also signals an attempt to match the original's soundscape as exactly as is possible.

82 Another term is *calque*, which denotes a special kind of borrowing whereby a language borrows an expression from another, but then translates literally each of its elements. See Vinay and Darbelnet (1958, 1995: 84-93).

83 Armin Paul Frank (1991: 115-140). Frank was following Holmes (1988: 23-33).

In general, modernisation implies suiting something to the taste, style, or demands of the modern age (i.e. the present). It is another term for 'domesticating' as opposed to 'foreignising' with regard to the socio-cultural situation. In the community of the theatre, the term 'modernisation' is closely related to the concept of actualisation (Dutch: "actualiseren"), which refers to the decision to adapt to the actual or topical present.

The theatrical experience can be imagined as a combination of two 'universes,' two separate, but colliding worlds. The one universe is the world of the *play*, in which characters are related in certain ways to each other and are confronted with the events that happen to them. The other universe is the world of the *performance*, in which a director has a play text performed by a company of actors in order to amuse, enlighten, move or provoke an audience. Each world has its own present and past; and its own frame of reference.

What, then, is modernisation in a theatrical context? In general, modernisation has to do with referring to the world of the performance instead of to the world of the (non-contemporary) play. There is an inherent incongruence between the world of the play and the world of the performance. In the theatre this incongruence can be placed either between the audience and the (more or less) congruous world of the play, or between the audience and setting on the one hand and the text on the other, or within the text, in which case it contains both elements of the original and of modernisation.

By dint of the performance in front of an audience, staging a play is in itself already a form of modernisation. Spectators watch the story of characters in another universe, but will interpret it in terms of what it means to *them* about *their* situation; and a director will stage a play because he believes that in some way it is relevant (in the broadest sense) to the *present*. If theatre makers or an audience explicitly state their desire that a play must speak about their situation, this can be dubbed a norm of *relevance*.

The team of theatre maker and translator can respect the coherence of the world of the play, by retaining historical elements in setting and text. By signalling temporal distance they can even flaunt the incongruence between the world of the play and the world of the audience. According to Aaltonen, the foreign is held in esteem and respected when reverence characterises the mode of translation (2000:64). In this respect Jean-Michel Déprats (2004) speaks of *archaisation* in (Shakespeare) translation. This is in fact an imaginary construct which builds up a certain image of the past. The translation is pawned off as authentic by using rhetorical processes like heightened language and rare words, and by dispensing with normal syntax. The intended effect is to reproduce the relationship of a present-day English speaker to a work that antedates him/her by four centuries.⁸⁴

There are several strategies for modernising a play. The theatre maker can decide to bring the play closer to the audience by modernising its setting. As a consequence of the simultaneous nature of the theatrical performance, the director can juggle with theatrical elements in order to give the universe of the play some undertones (or overtones) of the present. With this method the two worlds are deliberately confronted. It is used when there

84 On both archaising and modernising, see the highly valuable essay of Jean-Michel Déprats (2004: 65-78).

is no intention to create a performance with the illusion of verisimilitude. This will induce the audience even more to read the performance in a modern key, to reflect on the relevance of the classic play, or to identify more with the characters and events on stage.

But there is an obvious task for the translator, too, in modernising a play. Translations may be modernised to help create an image of freshness and direct accessibility. Modernisation then:

can be applied to fill the physical and mental gap that separates the public from the actors, and the text from its readership. (...) The text that is presented to be heard or read must give the impression that it is written today. The historicity of the original text has been occluded and short-circuited.⁸⁵

Apart from this, a translation may also have an alternation of both retention and modernisation. It does not choose for one period or the other, but considers the world of the play *upward compatible*: the Elizabethans cannot be expected to understand the concept of the computer, but we can (partly) be expected to have knowledge of instruments, ideas and concepts from the past. Thus, a translator may choose to use both the historic “stadsomroeper” (for “town crier”) as the present “mitrailleur” (“machine gun,” for “murdr’ing piece”). These translators, more than those who modernise the text in a straightforward manner, expose the incongruence between the world of the play and the world of the performance. Such incongruence can be flaunted through conspicuous modernisation, but it can also be *masked*: through the use of elements (setting, language) that are on common ground, being common both in the world of the play and in the world of performance. This search for a ‘common ground’ can be considered a form of modernisation. From the point of view of the source text, it replaces strictly source culture features with features shared by both source and target culture, changing the original text, domesticating it towards the world of the performance.

Modernisation in translation can occur in different areas, such as in the use of realia, imagery, forms of address, or style. *Realia*⁸⁶ are the material expression of the world of the play. When they are literally translated, they will indicate the particular surroundings of the characters in the play by maintaining the historical setting. This shall be called a *retentive* translation, since it retains the features that are specific to the source culture. These features specific to the source culture can also be subtly edited away, to detach the characters from all too specific surroundings. This ‘neutral’ translation ‘on common ground’ can refer both the world of the original and to the world of the target culture. Where a retentive translation is slanted towards the world of the play, and the neutral chooses not to choose, the *modernising* translation explicitly positions itself in the world of the performance. In practice, each translator who allows for modernisations uses the principle of upward compatibility to a certain extent. It should be noted that such translators do not shun the use of historical, i.e. *not* neutral realia as well.⁸⁷ Those translators that include adaptation in their translation can also

85 Déprats (2004: 72).

86 For a study of realia, see for example Pekka Kujamäki (2001).

87 There is one category of realia that deserves an explicit mention; these are topical references that are explicit

add elements from the present world to show how both worlds of source and target culture are present in the text.

The use of *imagery* in modernising translations shows a similar range of possibilities as that of the *realia*. With regard to metaphor, Kittay and Lehrer (1981) have introduced the concept of recipient field, the semantic field of the concept that is expressed in terms of another (in classic metaphor theory the *tenor*); and the donor field, the semantic field that 'lends' the lexemes the structure the recipient is expressed in (the *vehicle*). In general, donor fields that have not changed in the course of time do not present a particular problem, but even the most straightforward imagery can pose problems: the image of an unweeded garden remains as vivid today as it was during the reign of Elizabeth I, but has lost the connotation of nature as a threat. In general, we see that those translators who do not refrain from modernisation with regard to concrete objects, do not hesitate to modernise donor fields as well. On the other hand, amongst those translators who mostly stay faithful to the concrete historical situation, there are some who try to remain neutral by using either paraphrase or the same image, and some who take recourse to the principle of upward compatibility. In the case of the latter, inconsistency is a symptom of a sensibility for the different layers of meaning and incongruous worlds of the theatrical.

Where *realia* and *imagery* situate the setting of the play in a specific (or sometimes not so specific) time and space, the *forms of address* are the expression of the relationships of power and solidarity within the play and do more to reflect the social situation of the play. They reflect the relationships between the characters and indicate how these change in the course of the play.

Shakespeare uses two forms of address: 'you' and 'thou'. 'Thou' was the form of familiar address to a single person; at that time 'you' was the singular of reverence and of polite distance. The Dutch language also has two forms of the second person singular, the informal 'jij' and the formal 'u'. At first sight, it might seem obvious to translate 'thou' in Dutch by 'jij' (in Flemish and Dutch dialect also 'gij'), and 'you' by the polite 'u'. This is not the case,

in the original. In *Hamlet* they take the form of references to the theatre. When the actors arrive at the court of Elsinore, Hamlet speaks with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern about the reason why these actors are no longer popular in their home town; Rosencrantz explains they suffer from competition from an "eyrie of little eyases"; every contemporary of Shakespeare is supposed to know that this is a reference to Shakespeare's rivals of the Blackfriar's theatre, the Children of the Chapel (Jenkins, 1982: 1-2). I shall give one example of how this can be translated, that speaks for itself:

HAMLET – Welk gezelschap is het?

ROSENCRANTZ – Dat wat je vroeger zo mooi vond. Van de schouwburg. (...)

ROSENCRANTZ – Nee, ze zijn nog net zo goed als altijd. Maar er is net een nest jonge honden uitgebreed, van die kleine schreeuwleijkerds die alles en iedereen overschreeuwen en daar ooverdovend voor worden toegejuicht. Die zijn nu in de mode en gaan zo tekeer tegen wat zij de "gevestigde gezelschappen" noemen, dat iedereen wijselijk zijn mond houdt, ook al vindt men het niks.

HAMLET – Waar heb je het nou over? Jonge honden? Waar leven die dan van?

ROSENCRANTZ en GUILDENSTERN – Subsidie.

HAMLET – Krijgen die ook al subsidie? Ben benieuwd hoe lang die nog blijven schreeuwen. Ik vraag me af, of die later als ze zelf gevestigd zijn – wat zeer waarschijnlijk is, als ze geen betere manier vinden om hun brood te verdienen – nog steeds vinden dat alles wat jong en nieuw is tekeer moet gaan tegen zijn eigen toekomst. Maar hebben ze wel succes, die jonge honden?

ROSENCRANTZ – En hoe, tot in de kleinste zaaltjes van het land. [Boermans]

It is possible in the same text to have no conspicuous modernisation, but still a reference to modern theatre. In this case these remarks have to be taken as an aside to the rest of the performance, a momentary exit from the world of the play, which shows an awareness that the fourth wall is but an illusion.

however.

54

Brown and Gilman⁸⁸ distinguish between two contexts in which the pronouns of address were used. They propose a connection between social structure and the semantics of the pronoun. The first semantic they distinguish is the *semantic of power*: the noble principals say 'thou' (they suggest the general term T) to their subordinates and are given 'you' (V) in return. This non-reciprocal power semantic only prescribes usage between superior and inferior. The second dimension is called *solidarity*. The solidarity semantic is symmetrical: similarities like the same education, the same parents, the same profession, cause speakers to use a reciprocal T. From the reign of this two-dimensional semantic T derives its common definition of pronoun of either condescension or intimacy and V its definition as the pronoun of reverence or formality.

In Shakespeare's days the power semantic was dominant and T and V were exchanged according to the rules of one's position in society.⁸⁹ *Hamlet* follows the power semantic, in that 'you' is used for a person higher in rank and 'thou' for a person lower in rank.⁹⁰ Within a family, children are addressed with 'thou', and they return a 'you'.⁹¹ According to the rules of courtesy, women are normally addressed with 'you'.⁹² In the Netherlands, the rules of decorum changed in the course of time in favour of the solidarity semantic. As a result, if a translator chooses to modernise the forms of address, the outcome will be different depending on the moment of translation.

In each separate relationship, the translator can make individual decisions on whether he will follow the pronouns of power and solidarity of Shakespeare's days, or whether he will change the relationship according to the target culture counterparts.⁹³ At one extreme, translators adopt the semantic of solidarity in its widest possible sense. They prefer a very casual setting; in fact, so casual that it might represent only the context of relationships within the theatre. With such a decision they discard the aim of a life-like, realistic performance in favour of a form of performance that speaks more directly to the emotions of the audience.

88 Brown and Gilman (1968: 254).

89 Sometimes the choice of pronouns clearly violates group norms and perhaps the customary practice of the speaker. As there have been two great semantic dimensions governing T and V, so there have also been two principle kinds of expressive meaning. The *thou of contempt* is usually introduced between persons who normally exchange V, but it can, of course, also be used by a subordinate to a superior. One example of the *thou of contempt* is the relationship between Hamlet and the King; as his mother is married to Claudius, Hamlet has become Claudius' son. However, the King does not dare to use 'thou' with Hamlet, except when Hamlet is completely in his power, i.e. when he is taken prisoner as a murderer. Besides the 'thou' of contempt we notice also a *thou of pity*. A case in point is the remarks Laertes makes to his mad sister. According to Jespersen (1946) the English 'thou' and 'you' (or 'ye') were more often *shifted* to express mood and tone than were the pronouns of the continental languages. An example of shifts and norm-breaking is the 'nunnery scene' in *Hamlet* 3.1. Throughout the interchange Ophelia remains polite to the Prince, and addresses him with 'you'. At first Hamlet reacts with phrases that are just as polite; but when she has said "You made me believe so," he reacts that he loved her not. After her reaction at this ("I was the more deceived") he starts to rant. According to English producers in general, this is not yet the point at which he discovers her father there. (Hapgood, 1999: 180-182). However, with this speech Hamlet starts to address Ophelia with a *thee of contempt*. Added to the alleged reference to a brothel with "nunnery" he is in fact very rude to her here. Interestingly, he changes back to 'you' in the question "Where is your father?" - which brings him perhaps back to a calmer and more decent state of mind.

90 *Thou*: King Claudius to Polonius and Horatio; Prince Hamlet to the Gravedigger; student Horatio to soldier Marcellus; *you*: everyone to King Claudius.

91 Polonius, Laertes and Ophelia; the Queen and Hamlet.

92 With the notable exception of when he sees her mad, Laertes speaks to his sister with 'you'. Even the King uses it both to his own wife and to Ophelia — where Laertes and Polonius are both referred to as 'thou'.

93 Note that the modernisation of forms of address is closely related to the modernisation of invectives and the use of colloquial language (see also previous section).

They choose for immediacy instead of for verisimilitude. This is more a form of theatre that presents the interior of a mind rather than the exterior of society. At the other extreme, there are translators who consistently translate 'thou' into 'jij' and 'you' into 'u.' Shifts in forms of address can then be observed and the ancient atmosphere is recreated by respecting more of the etiquette of Shakespeare's days. Such translations are most faithful to the semantic of power. Situated in between are those translators who choose to modernise at least some of the relationships as expressed by the forms of address in the play.⁹⁴

2.6 The audience's reaction to retranslation: debates as a sign of transgression

The audience can also express norms with regard to a translation. Whereas the professional norms are actively applied in the translation process, expectancy norms can only produce approval or disapproval of the translator's work once it is finished. Historical research of an audience's reaction is by necessity limited to those reactions that were committed to paper. The range of reactions can only be grasped through the debates or consensus of contemporary theatre critics as an indication of prevailing opinion.⁹⁵

The reactions to the matricial choices of performances constitute an example of how audiences may deal with textual norms. The norm of *matricial integrity*, i.e. only the full text of *Hamlet* is 'the real thing' (although today no critic would assume a complete *Hamlet* is actually possible) is latently present in the reactions of critics who think that the play is authentic for the very reason that it retains at least most of the original text,⁹⁶ or who condemn a production for the fact that it tampers too much with the original. The opponents to the norm of *matricial* and/or *textual integrity* embrace the idea that it is possible to "reduce the original to its essence."⁹⁷ Convinced that a theatre maker should in the first place produce

94 With the rise of the semantic of solidarity, emotion plays a more important role in differences of address. Sometimes shifts are imperative: an angered man has to change his form of address into the discourteous variant ('jij'). Adding to Shakespeare, rather than translating him literally, is the way a shift in address is employed to give expression to Hamlet's madness, which is not present in the original. It is not present, at least, in the way he addresses Polonius; the translator may have sought a way to give more force to Hamlet's (supposed) state of mind, which he could not have expressed by simply translating what he says. In the same vein ancient forms of address can be used by way of dynamic equivalence; rather than having a more old fashioned language for the play within the play — where the language of Hamlet itself is already old-fashioned to a modern audience — a subtle change in the form of address ('ge' instead of 'u') can evoke a world within a world. Voeten does the former in his translation, Komrij the latter.

95 It might have been possible to trace the reactions of the audiences to the performances of the last decades, but they would have been biased as a result of later performances. Using reviews as historical documents to indicate the opinions of the audience, even in the case of recent history, should give a much clearer idea of the contemporary reactions.

96 For example: [Hamlet, Het Raamtheater, 1987] "Dat alles komt naadloos voort uit de door Pavel Kohout ingekorte en hier en daar wat omgegooide tekst die het origineel recht doet, want we krijgen een behoorlijk complete en lange Hamlet te zien." Martin Schouten, 'Vlamingen maken van Hamlet gitaarprins', *Volkskrant*, 8-1-1987. [Hamlet, O.T., 1996] "Is dit geen heiligschennis, denkt een Shakespeare-aanbiddende tekstfanaat als ikzelf al gauw. Dat blijkt mee te vallen. De tekst is grotendeels gehandhaafd, er wordt slechts op gepaste momenten gezongen, en ook de Engelse uitvoering vormt door de nauwkeurig vertaalde boventiteling geen bezwaar." Tineke Straatman, 'Hamlet als heetgebakerde danser', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 26-1-1996.

97 For example: [Hamlet, Genesisus, 1983] "De Hamlet van Genesisus is blijven steken in het idee, omdat Genesisus zich niet heeft gerealiseerd dat knippen in een bestaande tekst niet automatisch hetzelfde is als het tot de essentie terugbrengen, ook al blijft een vrij logische verhaallijn nog wel intact." Hanny Alkema, 'Genesisus met interpretatie van Hamlet te ambitieus', *Volkskrant*, 16-4-1983. [De kleine prins van Denemarken, 1985] "De grote waarde van deze voorstelling ligt hierin: Teneeter is erin geslaagd *Hamlet* tot de essentie terug te brengen en er een voor kinderen boeiende en spannende voorstelling van maken." Ruud van Kamphoven, 'Hamlet in

a play that is dramatically convincing,⁹⁸ many a critic has judged adaptations only by their failure to achieve a dramatically convincing result.⁹⁹

The relative value of translators' decisions and the impact of the director's statement are best assessed by debates. In a debate the transgression of the norms of the previous translation is most apparent:

The nature of functional norms is to be invisible except in cases of their transgression, and transgression is mostly the cause of debate. Debates can thus provide some useful shortcuts to the transgressions. Further, since a given textual pattern is often compatible with several aims or modes of reasoning, straight observation of the pattern is not likely to reveal the reasons why it was adopted, defended or attacked. The analysis of theories and criticism, if understood as debates, should reveal the values at stake in the particular historical conjuncture concerned. Thus, although past theories should never become gospels, they can provide very good indications of what kind of norms were important in a particular historical field. (Pym, 1998: 129)

Each time a retranslation is subject to debate, the new text apparently offers a cardinal departure from the textual norms of its predecessor. This is why in the case studies of this dissertation ample space will be dedicated to the debates that centred on new *Hamlet* productions.

This chapter was concerned with the range of norms and resulting options that theatre translators have at their disposal. Their actual application in the case of *Hamlet* productions in the

korte broek', *Brabants Dagblad*, 11-12-1985; "Lucas Borkel, bewerker en regisseur, heeft de prachtige vertaling van Bert Voeten ingeklonken tot een voorstelling van nog geen anderhalf uur." Hans Oranje, 'Hamlet op kinderniveau oogt bijzonder volwassen', *Trouw*, 5-2-1986. [Hamlet, Het Raamtheater, 1987] "De bewerking van Pavel Kohout, hier in een verrassend buigzame vertaling van Hugo Claus van Hamlet, slaagt er op een intrigerende manier in een zekere distantie te combineren met de wezenlijke elementen van deze tragedie van Shakespeare." Harry Huizing, 'Frisse Hamlet met rockmuziek', *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 5-3-1987.

98 For example: [Prince Hamyl, 1977] "Sterk bekort dus. Ja, want van de bijna vier uur Shakespeare blijft in Korea anderhalf uur over. Dat is in elk geval winst wat dramatisering betreft." Ko van Leeuwen, 'Hamlet uit Korea boeit door eigen theater-idioom', *IJmuider Courant*, 13-4-1977. [Hamlet, Onafhankelijk Toneel, 1977] "Er is bekort in de tekst: dat had wellicht nog sterker gekund, maar het stuk heeft in elk geval al veel aan dramatische spanning gewonnen." Ko van Leeuwen, 'Hoogtepunt in favorietenserie Onafhankelijk Toneel.' *IJmuider Courant*, 3-5-1977; Jan Paul Bresser, 'Kaalgeschoren Hamlet komt doeltreffend over', *Volkskrant*, 16-5-1977; "De tekst is gesneden op z'n directe zeggings-kracht en soms summier en heel venijnig (de scènes over en met de toneelspelers bijvoorbeeld) aangevuld of van een veelzeggende draai voorzien." Jan Paul Bresser, *Volkskrant*, 16-5-1977. [Hamlet, Het Raamtheater, 1987] "De bewerking (...) wijkt ook na het begin af van Shakespeare's originele tekst. Veel scènes zijn geschrapt of ingekort, andere hebben een nieuwe plaats in het stuk gekregen. Dat werkt, wonderlijk genoeg, uitstekend. Het drama heeft nu een ongelooflijke directheid en toont alleen waar het werkelijk om gaat." Robert Grijsen, 'Het Raamtheater laat Shakespeare swingen', *Gooi- en Eemlander*, 16-3-1987.

99 For example: [Hamlet, Discordia, 1987] "Het idee erachter is dat Shakespeare / De Vere met de Hamlet zijn autobiografie heeft geschreven. En binnen dat keurslijf pas ook de beschikking van de scènes, zodat het einde van de voorstelling midden in het oorspronkelijke stuk valt. (...) [H]et aangekondigde 'ware Shakespeare'-verhaal [bleef] steken in een veelheid van puzzelstukken die zich maar niet tot een echt patroon wilden voegen." Tineke Straatman, 'Was Shakespeare geen gewone jongen?', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 3-6-1987. [Hamlet, Onafhankelijk Toneel, 1996] "Regisseuse Mirjam Koen heeft een wonderlijke selectie gemaakt van tekstflarden die bewaard mochten blijven, waaronder fragmenten die in een reguliere Hamlet meestal geschrapt worden (...) en heeft veel wat onmisbaar is voor het verband van het verhaal geschrapt. Het Shakespeare-onkundig deel van het publiek kon dan ook geen enkele greep krijgen op de dramatische lijn. Heel wat verzen kwamen ook op verkeerde plaatsen in de handeling terecht." Hans van den Bergh, 'Hamlet rommelig allegaartje', *Parool*, 26-1-1996.

Netherlands will form the subject of the next chapter. It will demonstrate how retranslations have been staged to differentiate a theatre production from its predecessors. The role of applying different translational norms in retranslations will also be discussed, as well as the influence of the theatre makers on the creation of retranslations and the response of audiences.

3

Case studies of
differentiation:
Hamlet retranslations
on the Dutch stage

3.1 General remarks on the production of *Hamlet* translations between 1777 and 2001

59

What happens when *Hamlet* is staged in a new translation? What is the motivation for a new translation, who are the interested parties? Who, in other words, are involved? A general impression of what happened to consecutive translations of *Hamlet* in production is given by the following three graphs.

The graphs presented here are limited to productions. They would in fact have had another form if literary retranslation had been included (as they are in Appendix A, which lists both produced and published translations). It is noticeable that some translations have never been used on stage. It is also noticeable that those translations that actually were staged were staged in the same year as their publication, so that no *Hamlet* text was ever selected by a director that was not a stage text in the first place. This suggests a division in two subgroups within the target culture, literature and theatre.

The graphs of *Hamlet* in production (Figures 3, 4 and 5) present three consecutive trends. 1777-1882 is a long period of *Hamlet* performances in indirect translation. The moment of retranslation (1786) is conspicuously close to the creation of the first translation (1777), especially considering the success of the retranslation (which was used for nearly a century!).




Figure 3: *Hamlet* in Dutch translation 1777-1882

The first of three graphs that represent the number of performances of *Hamlet* in either a new or existing translation. The graphs are based on the inventory of performances presented in Appendix B, including only professional Dutch productions. The versions are divided into four categories, i.e. translation directly based on the original text, translation based on an intermediate text (e.g. a Dutch translation of the French adaptation of the English original), collage (using fragments of the *Hamlet* text together with fragments of other plays) and direct theatrical adaptation. The last category includes all productions that mention an adapter without mentioning a translator. This, however, might indicate actual direct adaptation across language, but also the adaptation of an unknown existing translation. Only in the first two categories it is possible to distinguish between first and consecutive performance of the text, since in the collage and the direct theatrical adaptation each version has been unique. In this first period only translations based on an intermediate text are performed. The period ends when the first translation of the original text is performed.




Figure 4: *Hamlet* in Dutch translation 1882-1982
The second of three graphs that represent the number of *Hamlet* performances in new or existing translation. This period contains several translations of the original text and consecutive performances, as well as a production of the translation of an intermediate text.




Figure 5: *Hamlet* in Dutch translation 1982-2001
The third of three graphs that represent the number of *Hamlet* performances in new or existing translation. This is a relatively short period, compared to the previous two, but as a result of its extraordinary nature, it has been granted a graph of its own. In this period the number of *Hamlet* performances per year peaks at eight, whereas the previous two centuries it peaks at two. Moreover, all particular types of translation-in-performance have been known to occur. In the previous two graphs the format was a stacked area chart. For clarity's sake, the information of this period is given in a column chart.

After 1882 a second period starts in which *Hamlet* is performed in direct translation *only*. Compared to the duration of the previous text, the frequency of retranslation in this period is high. The retranslations alternate every 25 to 50 years, so that more or less each generation has its own translation. These texts may be considered passive retranslations, i.e. informed by the passing of time.

The third period starts in the 1980s, when the impetus for retranslations is no longer in the passing of time or the arrival of a new generation. The presence on stage of 'active retranslations,' i.e. more or less contemporary retranslations, points to a *raison-d'être* for the new text other than a language update. At the same time, there is a general rise in new and different forms of dealing with text, varying from collage technique to direct theatrical adaptation and the translation of intermediate texts. Almost every production can be said to have its own individual text.

On the basis of the changes from stage adaptations to direct translation and back to adaptations, a major norm change can be hypothesised with regard to the precedence of the dramatic text (in the middle period) and the precedence of the performance text. Either the source text fitted the dramatic conventions of the target culture less in the first and last period than in the second, or those responsible for the staged retranslation thought it more important to honour the original author in the second period. As we shall see, both are the case.

Moreover, all retranslations, with the exception of Voeten (1957), were staged around the same year as a performance of the preceding translation. This implies that it is plausible that the retranslations are to a certain extent *active* translations.

3.2 1786 - Retranslation of Ducis's *Hamlet* by Zubli: propriety and patriotism

Hamlet in its original shape is impossible to stage. Such was the public opinion in the 1770s, both in the Netherlands and in France. The first Dutch critics who read the play deplored its combination of tragedy and comedy, as well as its supernatural elements.¹⁰⁰ The French – in particular the Académie Française, which could veto plays staged at the Comédie Française – demanded that the text be suited to the conventions of French neoclassicism. As Heylen (1993) points out, these were *bienséance* (good taste), *ordre* (unity of action, place and time, but also balance and symmetry) and *vraisemblance* (verisimilitude).¹⁰¹ Shakespeare's *Hamlet* ran contrary to all three.

The only way to stage the story of *Hamlet* was to give precedence to the requirements of performance by adapting it to the theatrical conventions of the day. This was done by Jean-François Ducis in Paris in 1769, who presented *Hamlet tragédie imitée de l'anglois* to a Parisian audience. Ducis made his adaptation in the French tradition of free dynamic translations known as *les belles infidèles* that "were increasingly expected to conform to the literary conventions of the day and to provide target texts which are pleasant to read (...) in a form which was dictated by current French literary fashion and morality."¹⁰² Ducis's intention

100 See for the reaction of Justus van Effen in 1717, Penninck (1936:35)

101 Heylen (1993: 30).

102 See Myriam Salama-Carr (1998: 411).

was to emulate the original author, “fitting him into the straitjacket of existing neoclassical rules, (...) to make him more canonical” (Hoenselaars, 2004a: 7). In a letter to the English actor David Garrick, considered by many of his contemporaries the latter-day embodiment of Shakespeare¹⁰³ and moreover responsible for a far-reaching *Hamlet* adaptation,¹⁰⁴ Ducis explained why he had made a new play. Ducis, who did not understand a single word of English and had based his text on a prose synopsis by La Place, never claimed to have reproduced Shakespeare:

I imagine, sir, that you must have found me extremely rash to put a play such as *Hamlet* onto the French stage. Without even mentioning the irregularities which abound throughout, the ghost, which I admit plays a large part, the rustic actors and the swordplay, seemed to me to be devices which are absolutely inadmissible on our stage. However, I deeply regretted not being able to introduce the public to the fearsome spectre that exposed the crime and demands vengeance. So I was forced, in a way, to create a new play. I just tried to make an interesting character of the paricidal queen and above all to depict the pure and melancholic Hamlet as a model of filial tenderness.¹⁰⁵

This is not to say that it was actually possible to stage *Hamlet* as Shakespeare had written it. The text of the original *Hamlet* remains a mystery, since the very origins of the text are uncertain. In 1603 the first version of *Hamlet* appeared in print, the so-called First Quarto (Q1). Of the Quarto that followed, the Second (Q2), some copies are dated 1604 and some 1605; the third substantive version of the play is the First Folio (F) of 1623, which was published only after Shakespeare’s death. Q1 is generally recognised as a ‘bad’ quarto. There is some evidence that it is a pirate version. Q2 was evidently intended to supersede Q1. The character of the text supports the assertion that it comes from an authentic manuscript, and it is usually held that this manuscript was the author’s own foul papers (Jenkins, 1982: 37). F was printed in 1623, but it is based on a different manuscript from the one from which Q2 was printed. Many believe that it was set from a scribal transcript (Jenkins, 1982: 64), possibly from a promptbook prepared while Shakespeare was still active in the company. Although there is no certainty to what extent changes from Q2 into F reflect Shakespeare’s own intentions, it is widely accepted that of the two, F is the closest to the theatrical practice of the play.

In all versions, nonetheless, Shakespeare’s is a story which develops in various locations and between all kinds of characters, high and low, through scenes that are not always tragic, but at times also supernatural or comic, most *unlike* the *Hamlet* presented in Paris. The requirements of the French theatre did not allow for comical interludes, graveyard scenes, foppish courtiers, madwomen and wicked mothers. Ducis’s version centres on four protagonists (Hamlet, Claudius, Gertrude and Claudius’ daughter Ophelia), who each have their

103 A 1752 poem exclaimed “SHAKESPEARE revives! In GARRICK breathes again!” (“A Poetic Epistle from Shakespeare in Elysium to Mr. Garrick”). Quotation from: Robert Hapgood (1999: 17).

104 See Glick (1969).

105 Romy Heylen (1993: 29).

own confidante and who in the span of twenty-four hours all pass through the antechamber of Elsinore castle, thus restoring *ordre* to the play. More virtue is bestowed on Hamlet's mother to comply with the norm of *bienséance*. Although an accomplice to her husband's murder, Gertrude repents at the last minute and tries to warn the king of the impending danger. She initially planned to marry Claudius, but suffers regret and does all she can to assure the coronation of her son instead. Ducis conceived a happy ending: Hamlet succeeds in stabbing Claudius, but not before Claudius has killed Gertrude. Hamlet considers suicide, but tells Ophelia he will live on for his people. The speech assignments of the Ghost of Hamlet's father are conspicuously absent, so that not only the characters are more virtuous, but the story loses much of its supernatural content as well.

As a result of the strong cultural influence of France on the Netherlands both with regard to translations and to the theatre at that time,¹⁰⁶ Jean-François Ducis's version of the *Hamlet* play was the most likely candidate for a theatre translation into Dutch. In 1777 Margareta Geertruid De Cambon-Van der Werken took the initiative of translating the play, "the work of the stranger Shakespeare and Mr Ducis,"¹⁰⁷ for the audience of the Rotterdam theatre, which greeted it with enthusiasm. The translator thanked "her players" ("myner vertooneren") for the success of the play.¹⁰⁸ There is no indication that it was a commissioned translation, so we may assume it was De Cambon-Van der Werken's own initiative, perhaps because she had noticed the success of the play in France and had offered her translation to the theatre's board of governors with the prospect of earning some extra money.¹⁰⁹

Like Ducis, De Cambon-Van der Werken tampered with the text. She added material from Shakespeare (the contemplation of suicide in the 'To be or not to be' monologue) and claimed a role for the Ghost in the cast. In moving the play more towards the English original, she redirected it from the exemplary towards the supernatural.

Despite the joint efforts of Ducis and De Cambon-Van der Werken, the question whether *Hamlet* qualified as suitable entertainment still was raised. A critique in the *Hedendaagsche Vaderlandsche Letter-oefeningen* of February 1778 rejected a play "so full of despicable characters, vicious plans and cruel scenes, without any useful instruction, that it in no part is suited to offer readers or spectators moving entertainment."¹¹⁰ It was argued that

106 See Theo Hermans (1998: 397) and Hans de Leeuwe (2003: 283-288).

107 "Ik hebbe het geluk niet Hamlet *mijn* te heten: hij is het werk van den bevreemden Schakespear [sic] en van den heer Ducis." M.G. De Cambon-Van der Werken, 'Nareden', *DC1779*

108 "Voor het overige is het aan my niet te beoordeelen of dit toneelstuk een *aandoenlyk vermaak* of (om my geschikter naar de aard van het treuspel uit te drukken) een vermaakelyke aandoening kan veroorzaken; ik onderwerpe my in deze aan de oneenzydige kennen van den Rotterdamschen Schouwburg, aan wie ik de hulde hadde gedaan van myne vertaaling, en teffens aan de toneelkundigen der Amstelstad, waar men tans de vertoning van dit stuk heeft gelieven toe te staan. Indien ondertusschen de uiterlyke algemeene toejuichinge, waar mede de eerstgemelde my gunstiglyk hebben vereert, en die ik mogelyk ook veel te danken hadde aan de weergalooze uitvoering myner vertooneren, een bewys is van genoeg, hebbe ik dubbel reden my te verheugen over mynen vlyt." M.G. De Cambon-Van der Werken, 'Nareden', *DC1779*. When her *Hamlet* is performed in The Hague, she writes a *Toejuiching* to the actors (Penninck, 1936: 262).

109 Korpel (1993: 6) and Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen, Porteman, Coutennier and Van Gemert (1997: 67-70, 604) suggest that female translators in general, and De Cambon-Van der Werken in particular, translated to support their households.

110 "een stuk, zoo vol haatlyke characters, kwaadaartige raadslagen, en wreede bedrijven, zonder eene wezenlyke nutte leering te behelzen, dat het in geen deele geschikt zij om Lezers of Aanschouwers een *aandoenlyk vermaak* te leveren." *Hedendaagsche Vaderlandsche Letter-oefeningen*, 7 (Amsterdam, A. van der Kroe, 1778), p. 96.

a gentler subject would have better suited a female pen.¹¹¹ In fact, the Dutch version of the play met with more rebuke than the French version. The French adaptation was a hit and did not suffer from such critical reactions (Heylen 1993: 35). In a later reaction, the Dutch critics claimed that Shakespeare's contemporaries might have liked the play, but that it was a far cry from the softer constitution of the Dutch nation.¹¹² It is noticeable that these critics assumed the text was translated directly from the English original and ignored the French, intermediary text. It appears, in any case, that the translator's (professional) norms did not match the (expectancy) norms of this group of critics.

Mrs De Cambon-Van der Werken did agree with the reviewer's opinion that a play should offer useful instructive and moving entertainment, but she was convinced that these criteria were met in *Hamlet*. She defended the play by stressing that all characters are *virtuous*. According to her, Hamlet was driven by a child's love. Even though he had a cruel confrontation with his mother, he never decided to kill her. His character had to be seen as a King, as a Judge of his people, and not as an ordinary citizen. Gertrude, despite her despicable past, was now a remorseful mother. Ophelia found herself torn between her loyalties as daughter, bride, and subject. The only exception was Claudius, but, De Cambon-Van der Werken wrote, without a villain a play would lack dramatic interest. The fact that she also stressed the

111 "Zachten tooneelen zouden, naar het hun voorkomt, beter geschikt zijn voor ene vrouwelijke pen." *Ibid.* De Cambon-Van der Werken reacted: "Zachter tooneelen zouden, naar het hun voorkomt, beter geschikt zijn voor eene vrouwelijke pen. [...] als een vrouwelijke pen, die bevreest is voor het verschrikkelijke, 't welk eene tooneelachtige tegenstrijd van deugt en ondeugt in het verheven Treurspel noodzakelyk te wege moet brengen, beter doet nooit het treurspel ten onderwerp te kiezen, en dat het ook teffens aan eene mannelyke geen roem kan baaren een stuk vol haatlyke karacters, kwaadaardige raadslagen en wreede bedrijven voort te brengen. Zulke eene onderscheiding dunkt my doet weinig eer aan de eene noch aan de andere kunne." M.G. De Cambon-Van der Werken, 'Nareden', DC1779. To which the *Vaderlandsche Letter-oefeningen* reacted: "Geen soortgelyke goede gedachte, die wy tot nog van de schoonen kunne gevoed hebben, heeft ons doen schryven:/ zachter tooneelen zouden, naar 't ons voorkomt, beter geschikt zyn voor eene Vrouwlyke pen/ de schroom Mejuffrouw De Cambon dit niet moge toestaan, kunnen wy egter, om haaren wil, die goede gedachte nopens haare Sexe in 't algemeen niet opgeeven. 't Strekt, zo wy meenen, haarer sexe ter eere, tederer van hart te zyn, dan de Mannen; en dit is haar, hoewel 'er zig nu en dan een ander voorbeeld moge opdoen, zo op den beminnyken aart der Kunne gegrond, voor waarheid te houden. Schoon dan een Treurspel van die natuur, als wy *Hamlet* beschouwen, ook geene Manlyke penne geen roem mogte baaren, neemt dit egter niet weg, dat het ons nog vreemder toeschynt, dat een vrouwlyke pen een stuk in 't Nederduitsch overbrengt. Intusschen zouden wy hiermede het Jufferschap in geene deele het Treurspel willen afraaden; 'er is en blyft te over gelegenheid, om haare bevallige en aandoenlyke talenten, ook in dit opzigt werkstellig te maaken, al is het, dat zy stukken van die natuur, als *Hamlet*, niet tot een onderwerp haarer oefening verkiezen." *Hedendaagsche Vaderlandsche Letter-oefeningen*, 7 (Amsterdam, A. van der Kroe, 1778), p. 319-320. De Cambon-Van der Werken was certainly not the first woman to translate for the stage in that period. Catharina Questiers, Katharina Lescaillie and Katharina Johanna de With among others were all well-known female translators. See Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen (1997: 67-70). Nevertheless, both her literary debut and the success of Young Grandisson are remarkable. See Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen (602-607).

112 "Het doet ons niet vreemd, dat Shakespear in zyn tyd zodanig een onderwerp verkoos, en dat de Engelsche Natie daarin een welgevallen kon hebben; maar 't geen toen en daar gepast geoordeeld mogt worden, is daarom niet altijd en overal even zo goed geschikt. Het komt ons voor, dat het te ver afwykt van de tegenwoordige zagtere gesteldheid der Hollandsche Natie, en dus niet geschikt is om aan dezelve vrij algemeen welvallig te zijn. Mogelyk tasten wy hier mis; maar 't zou ons spyten, te moeten erkennen, dat wy te gunstig over de Natie geoordeeld hebben; waaraan we ons egter nog liever schuldig zouden vinden dan dat men ons te laste lei, van de Natie te verdenken, dat ze vermaak had in 't beschouwen van wreedheid." *Ibid.* The reaction of the *Hedendaagsche Vaderlandsche Letter-oefeningen* corroborates Heylen's suggestion, that the Ducis adaptation introduced bourgeois drama to the neoclassical stage "through the back door": "Ducis's translation process largely reflects a code-abiding activity in that it preserves the neoclassical French tragic model. However, his translation decisions also introduce innovative themes since *Hamlet* uses elements of a non-canonised genre, the bourgeois melodrama, which had been rejected by the literary milieu of the Comédie Française as lacking in aesthetic value while remaining wildly popular on the boulevards (...) By means of a manipulative rewriting of a foreign classic, Ducis managed to circumvent the Comédie Française's traditional resistance to new forms of drama." Heylen (1993: 41).

favourable reception of the play by the ‘kennenren’ and ‘tooneelkundigen’ (connoisseurs of the theatre) in her second edition, although a commonplace in such postscripts, still indicates a *theatrical* audience that is different from the literary critics of the *Hedendaagsche Vaderlandsche Letter-oefeningen*.

The expectations of the latter audience appear to have informed the next translation of the Ducis *Hamlet*. Ambrosius Justus Zubli crafted this retranslation in 1786. Zubli explained in the preface to his translation that it was different from the one made nine years before.¹¹³ He pointed out that his readers would look in vain for the monologue ‘To be or not to be’ that had been present in Mrs De Cambon-Van der Werken’s version. More importantly, Zubli emphasised that he had striven “to banish everything unnatural, incredible and therefore offensive from the stage.” Zubli was so confident that the play was written in good taste, that he assumed it would inspire poems that would serve to propagate virtue.¹¹⁴

The alleged unsuitability of the play may have constituted the motive for its retranslation. With Zubli’s intervention, the text had adopted a strategy for being more ‘proper.’ Delabastita (1993c) points out that the two Dutch translators took a different attitude “vis-à-vis the innovative character of the Ducis play.”¹¹⁵ According to Delabastita, “Zubli’s translation was apparently written as a reaction against [De Cambon-Van der Werken’s] and even Ducis’s neglect of the rules of pre-Voltairean tragedy, i.e. as an attempt to rewrite *Hamlet* as a more ‘properly’ classical tragedy.” This entailed removing all references to the Ghost, both in the list of characters and in the text itself. Moreover, “in various stage directions he is clearly at pains to emphasise that the ghost is merely a delusion of Hamlet. For instance, Ducis’s direction “Voyant l’ombre de son père” (...) becomes “de schim zyns vaders *wanende te zien*” (... [Delabastita’s italics]), i.e. “imagining that he sees his father’s ghost.” Thus the rule of verisimilitude was applied by Zubli. The removal of the monologue on suicide can moreover be considered a further gesture towards good taste. However, Zubli also justified his changes with a claim to fidelity to the French original. Not only does he cut the added monologue, he also defends his choice to turn the ghost into a delusion by stating that this was suggested in Ducis’s text.

Still, Zubli might also have had a more personal reason for offering an alternative to De Cambon-Van der Werken’s translation. The movement of the Dutch patriots, who opposed the reign of the stadholder William V, had started to gain force since the beginning of the Fourth English War in 1780. By 1786 they had a strong control of the city councils of Utrecht, Rotterdam and Amsterdam. William V stopped the imminent revolution in its

113 “Mogelyk zal men in dit stuk zoeken naar de alleenspraak van Hamlet, uit het Engelsch, voorkomende in de vertaling van den HAMLET, door mevrouw M.G. De Cambon, geb. Van der Werken; doch, daar dezelve in het Fransche stuk niet gevonden word, heeft men geoordeeld die hier ook geen plaats te moeten geven.

Al wat onnatuurelyk, ongelooflyk, en derhalve aanstotelyk is, van het tooneel te verbannen, is met reden door het gezond verstand goedgekeurd. Niet alleen de verschyning, maar inzonderheid ook het spreken van het spook in het Fransche stuk, volgende de eerste samenstelling (Acte IV, Scene VI.) behoort daaronder; hierom zal men, in deze overzetting, het spook alleen in de verbeelding van Hamlet zien bestaan, tot welke schikking de Fransche dichter zelf aanleiding gegeven heeft, door zyne veranderde eindiging des vierden bedryfs, gelijk de kundigen naar kunnen zien.” Ambrosius Justus Zubli, ‘Voorbericht’, Z1786.

114 “Mag dit stuk eenig genoegens verschaffen, het zal lichtelyk wel aanleiding geven tot het leveren van meerdere dichtwerkjes, die ten voortplanting van deugd en goede zeden kunnen verstrekken, op welk oogmerk dit treurspel zich met recht beroemen kan.” *Ibid.* Although this was a commonplace, Zubli acts on it in his translational choices.

115 Delabastita (1993c: 225-226).

tracks by marching into the Republic with an army of Prussian soldiers (Kossmann, 1976: 9-33). In these unsettled times, M.G. de Cambon-Van der Werken was a fierce Orangist and wrote an epic and several poems in support of the stadholder (De Groot, 1976). Zubli was in the opposing camp, however, and was banished in 1787 for being a patriot (Ter Laan, 1941). In 1795 Dutch revolutionaries and French armies took over control and created the Batavian Republic. From that date nothing is known about De Cambon-Van der Werken and it is suggested she may have fled the country, like other Orangists (De Groot, 1976: 37). In the same year, Zubli became member of the board of governors of the Amsterdam Stadsschouwburg (De Leeuwe, 2003: 133). A contrary political opinion may have induced Zubli to make a new translation of Ducis's *Hamlet* in the year the patriot movement was growing strong. The fact that France was the country that supported Zubli's camp may have impelled him to pay closer attention to the French text. The theme of removing a usurper from the throne may even have constituted an additional motive for the selection of the play.¹¹⁶ Since the evidence is all circumstantial – Zubli mentions nothing of the kind, and the retranslation betrays no patriotic sentiments – there is nothing conclusive to say about clear-cut causes for this translation. As we shall see, however, the fact and form of a retranslation are not always purely determined by expectancy norms.

*

The Ducis *Hamlet* was the only accepted stage version of the story for nearly a century (1786-1882). Both the first translation and A.J. Zubli's retranslation were made for the stage and were in fact the only *Hamlet* texts to be used on stage for a century. Judging by their frequent performance, these *Hamlet* texts met with huge popularity. The Dutch translations of the Ducis *Hamlet* were performed on average once every 4.5 seasons.¹¹⁷ The title role was played by the country's main actors – Marten Corver, Reinier Engelman, Johannes Jelgerhuis, Anton Peters and Louis B. Moor.

Other translations were made, but these were never staged. Three other translators published *Hamlets* that were based either on a relatively faithful German translation or on the original English text – an anonymous one as early as 1778,¹¹⁸ P. Ph. Roorda van Eysinga's in 1836¹¹⁹ and A.S. Kok's in 1860 and 1873.¹²⁰ These were literary translations, not meant for the stage, or at least not considered suitable for it. Despite some debate on the possibility of staging Shakespeare's *Hamlet* rather than Ducis's, the supporters of the original *Hamlet*

116 Political allegories were not new to the orangists and republicans. See Van der Haven and Holzhey (in preparation).

117 See Appendix B.

118 These anonymous translators involve themselves in the propriety debate between the *Hedendaagsche Vaderlandsche Letter-oefeningen* and M.G. De Cambon-Van der Werken by ridiculing the 'gentler constitution of the Dutch nation': "onze natie is zekerlijk van alle tijden zagtzinnig geweest; en is het thans bij uitstek. – Dan, onder het schrijven, beginnen wij te twijffelen – van alle tijden zagtzinnig geweest? Toen den Amsteldamschen Glazemaaker Jan Vos zijn *Aran en Titus* omtrent daaglijks voor een ontzagchelijke schaare vertoond werd, dan ook? – thans bij uitstek zagtmoedig?... Als men de Fransche *Béverlei* van Saurin, dat den Engelschen van Ed. Moore, zo veel in wreedheid overtreft, om strijd gaat beschouwen?... Is dat bij uitstek zagtmoedig zijn?" *De Vertaalers aan den Lezer*, A1778, Dl. I. See Penninck (1936:76-77). The anonymous translators translated mostly from the German prose translation by J.J. Eschenburg (1777).

119 Roorda van Eysinga nevertheless had aspirations as a playwright. See Leek (1988: 71-72).

120 A.S. Kok made a prose translation of the complete Shakespeare in which the publisher had little faith. According to Leek (1988: 83-85) this might have been the reason it was eclipsed by Burgersdijk's translation.

failed to convince the theatre makers.¹²¹ In literary circles Shakespeare was read in the original language, privately or at gatherings,¹²² which confirms the existence of separate theatrical and literary traditions.

The conditions for rejecting the Ducis text and the norms on which it was based developed gradually. The reading translations constitute a very early alternative norm, that of a complete text made in subservience to the original author. On stage, the norms of French neoclassicism had begun to wane since the 1810s-1820s to the advantage of bourgeois prose drama.¹²³ The reintroduction of the 'To be or not to be' monologue in the fifth edition of Zubli's translation and its appearance in a prompter's edition from 1845 are indications that the disdain with which some of the first spectators had greeted the play was gradually making room for its appreciation in the theatre. Moreover, writers like Feith,¹²⁴ Bilderdijk,¹²⁵ Tollens¹²⁶ and Van Lennep¹²⁷ made it clear they valued Shakespeare's *Hamlet* very highly. This all may have silenced those who voiced objections to certain 'inappropriate' aspects of the play. In the 1840s some members of the theatrical audience expressed their dissatisfaction with the Ducis text. Judging from occasional criticism of the "bungled rewrite," these critics favoured a coherent and more complete *Hamlet*, presented in its original form.¹²⁸

A theatrical alternative to the Ducis adaptation was suggested by visiting German theatre companies. These companies, hosting such star actors as Von Linden-Retowski, Devriendt, Dawison and Weisé in the 1850s and 1860s and Barnay, Possart and Mitterwurger in the 1880s, were regular visitors to the Dutch stage in the second half of the nineteenth century. They introduced another kind of performance and a different perspective on interpretation and translation.

Since the 1770s, one of the chief assets of the German national stage was formed by Shakespeare in direct translation, first by Wieland (1766) and Eschenburg (1777), and later by A.W. Schlegel (1798). New German plays were written on a Shakespearean model, Shakespearean characters formed an important factor in the staff organisation of the theatre and Shakespeare performances were the keystone of the reputation of both directors and actors. The German "graphic postures" ("plastische standen") that idealised nature¹²⁹ presented the hallmark of a romantic *Hamlet*. The Dutch critics admired the German performances

121 Barbaz supported Ducis in 1808: "Wat dan ook de partijdige aanbidders van Shakespeare mogen zeggen, het stuk voldoet altijd bij ons ten tooneele, en, zo ik den geest van ons publiek wel ken, geloof ik niet, dat de stukken van den Engelschen dichter, woordelijk overgezet, naar deszelfs smaak zouden zijn. Ten zij het bij de kermis representatiën, om eens hartelijk te lagchen, mocht wezen." A.L. Barbaz, *Amstels schouwtooneel* (Amsterdam, 1808), p. 348. Cited in Penninck (1936: 264). Others propagated the use of Shakespeare in the original form, like N.G. van Kampen in his *Verhandeling* as early as 1807 (Penninck, 1936: 175-6).

122 C.W. Schoneveld (1987b: 40-64).

123 See Post (1996).

124 See Penninck (1936: 115-121).

125 See Penninck (1936: 135-145). Bilderdijk had translated 'To be or not to be' as early as 1783.

126 Tollens translated 'To be or not to be' in 1816 (Penninck, 1936: 279).

127 See Penninck (1936: 248-252).

128 A comparison between the Dutch *Hamlet* by Anton Peters and the English *Hamlet* by William Macready, solicited the following remark: "De heer Ducis, heeft van dit stuk even als van vele der meesterstukken van den Bard van den Avon, eene verbroddelde omwerking gegeven, enkele tooneelen van den Hamlet geheel uit hun verband gerukt, en dezen in den vorm der klassieke Fransche school gewrongen, waaruit dan ook een zoogenaamd treurspel naar Shakespeare ontstaan is, dat sedert eene reeks van jaren op alle schouwburgen in Nederland wordt opgevoerd." Review of *Hamlet* starring Anton Peters 29-1-1848 or 1849, TIN.

129 According to a review of *Hamlet* starring Devriendt, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 7-3-1864.

and praised their poetic or philosophical interpretation.¹³⁰ Many a reviewer followed Goethe's reading of Hamlet as "a lovely, pure and most moral nature, [that] without the strength of nerve which forms a hero, sinks beneath a burden which it cannot bear and must not be cast away." Since the first German performances, critics had been puzzled by the question of Hamlet's character and his procrastination.¹³¹ Moreover, Hamlet's soul and its mysterious depth were used as a benchmark for theatrical productions.

Despite the changing norms on the part of the audience, it still took several decades before an 'original' *Hamlet* was actually staged, due perhaps to the lack of interest in tragedies on the part of the lower middle class audiences.¹³² In the end, it took a different class of theatre makers to introduce a *Hamlet* on stage that was translated from the original.

3.3 1882 - Burgersdijk's translation: the problems of staging a direct translation

1882 was the last year the Ducis *Hamlet* was staged by a professional company. In the preceding three years, the established company of Daan van Ollefen, Louis B. Moor and Louis Jacques Veltman had been playing in the capital's main theatre, the Stadsschouwburg.¹³³ In 1882 however, the year that Van Ollefen and Moor took the Ducis *Hamlet* on tour,¹³⁴ the recently established company De Vereeniging Het Nederlandsch Tooneel staged *Hamlet* in a new translation by Leendert Alexander Johannes Burgersdijk.¹³⁵ Simultaneously staging a play carried the mark of competition, similar to the various *Othellos* staged two years earlier.¹³⁶ In 1882, Van Ollefen and Moor had to yield control of the Stadsschouwburg to De Vereeniging, as this company had impressed the city council with the quality of its productions and had consequently been invited to play that prestigious stage. This was indeed a telling symbol of a take-over.

The major bone of contention between the two groups was formed by the quality of professional theatre. It was thought that the absence of a true Shakespeare was symptomatic of the dreadful state of the stage. As Leek (1988) argues, the rise in productions of Shakespeare's plays coincided with the improvement in education of the Dutch middle classes.¹³⁷ Both the translator and the theatre company were exponents of this development. Burgersdijk belonged to circles where Shakespeare was not only passionately admired, but where the value of education was also stressed. The Hogere Burgerschool in Deventer, at which

130 Some critics would have liked to see a philosophical Hamlet in Dutch performances as well: "Met een in hoofdzaak filosoferende held kan Bouwmeester zich niet vereenzelvigen." Mendes da Costa, cited in Simon Koster (1973: 147).

131 "het raadselachtigen beeld van den weifelenden Hamlet, die door het noodlot met eene taak, te groot, te zwaar voor zijnen geest belast is." In: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 14-7-1856 (TIN), about the *Hamlet* by Hendrichs.

132 See Hunningher (1949: 9-39), who relates it to economics: the lower middle classes preferred spectacles and melodrama over tragedy and the intellectuals preferred French opera to Dutch plays altogether.

133 See Albach (1957: 190).

134 On Tuesday the 29th of August 1882 they played at the fair in Alkmaar.

135 Before doing *Hamlet*, De Vereeniging produced a number of Shakespeare plays in Burgersdijk's translation, starting with the successful *Romeo and Juliet* (1879) under the direction of J.H. Rössing, and establishing their fame with *The Merchant of Venice*, starring Louis Bouwmeester (1880).

136 See Leek (1988: 101). The Rotterdam theatre staged *Othello* in the translation by A.S. Kok in 1879, Van Ollefen, Moor and Veltman staged the same play in the translation by Van Lennep in 1880, as did De Vereeniging.

137 Leek (1988: 83).

Burgersdijk was a teacher and eventually director, had been founded in 1863 to provide the middle classes with a better education in the sciences and modern languages. The Dutch theatre went through a phase of modernisation in the 1870s. A drama school was founded, as well as a new theatre company, De Vereeniging,¹³⁸ to give students of the school a place to work. The new theatre enthusiasts voiced their opinions in the magazine *Het (Nederlandsch) Tooneel*, arguing in favour of quality plays and verse drama.¹³⁹ They complained about the barbaric state of the Dutch theatre, which lacked a proper Shakespeare tradition.¹⁴⁰ The mission of the theatre company De Vereeniging was to edify the theatre audiences, as much as to entertain them. From this point of view, staging an original Shakespeare was a benchmark of professionalism.¹⁴¹

The first 'original' *Hamlet* was staged due to the efforts of three individuals: L.A.J. Burgersdijk, A.C. Loffelt and J.H. Rössing. Burgersdijk was not exactly a theatre professional, but was bent on getting the text *performed*, and consequently made his Shakespeare translations on his own initiative (Schoneveld 1988 and 1990). Together with the influential scholar A.C. Loffelt, he tried to move the Vereeniging to perform his still unpublished translations.¹⁴² The founder of De Vereeniging, H.J. Schimmel, objected however because he felt that the audience was not ready yet for an original Shakespeare.¹⁴³ With the intervention of the company's patron, the banker A.C. Wertheim, whose help was called in by J.H. Rössing, the company's secretary, Schimmel was eventually persuaded.¹⁴⁴

138 The association for actors and directors, Het Nederlandsch Tooneelverbond, was founded in 1870, the drama magazine *Het Nederlandsch Tooneel* in 1871, the drama school De Tooneelschool in 1874, the theatre company De Vereeniging Het Nederlandsch Tooneel in 1876 and in 1881 De Vereeniging was allowed to carry the title "Koninklijke" (Royal).

139 "De Vereeniging Het Nederlandsch Tooneel gaf den Romeo en leverde daarmede het bewijs, dat het publiek wel degelijk goede stukken wil zien, die goed gegeven worden. Zelden zag men zulk een woede om plaats te krijgen." "Het Tooneel in de Hoofdstad", *Het Nederlandsch Tooneel* 9 (4), 15-11-1879. "Is het te veel gevraagd, dat elk jaar minstens eene tragedie worde gespeeld? Vreest men de kosten niet goed te maken?" *Het Tooneel* 7, 1-2-1882, p. 128.

140 "Verleden zaterdag zal dagteekenen in de geschiedenis van ons Tooneel, omdat toen, te Amsterdam, voor het eerst hier te landen de Hamlet van Shakespeare in de landstaal werd opgevoerd. Onze ontwikkeling op ander gebied in aanmerking nemende, zou menig vreemdeling verbaasd staan, wanneer hij zulk een merkwaardig staaltje van achterlijkheid vernam. Wij vergenoegden ons tot voor enkele jaren met den Hamlet van Ducis, een treurige verminking, die Shakespeares naam dan ook niet draagt en die in Frankrijk reeds in het begin dezer eeuw werd afgeschaft. Op den hoogen trap, waarop sommige takken onzer literatuur en van ons tooneel staan, kunnen we ons dus niet beroemen." A.C. Loffelt, 'Het Tooneel', *Het Vaderland*, 26-1-1882. "Het mag bij deze gelegenheid [a performance of Macbeth] misschien nog wel eens herinnerd worden, dat op een Nederlandsch letterkundig congres, in 1868, de grondslag gelegd werd van dat Nederlandsch Tooneelverbond, waarin zich de weder ontwakende belangstelling in het Nederlandsch tooneel uitte, en dat het middelpunt werd, waarom zich sedert dien tijd de vrienden van het tooneel in ons vaderland hebben geschaard. Wie toen voorspelt had, dat binnen twintig jaar verschillende meesterstukken van Shakespeare een vaste plaats op het repertoire van den Amsterdamschen Schouwburg zouden innemen, zou voor een idealist zijn uitgekreten. Kon er uit iets zoo onbeholpens, zoo plats als het Hollandsch tooneel dier dagen iets goeds voortkomen? Het was immers een onbegonnen werk dien Augias-stal te willen reinigen?" J.N. Van Hall, 'Dramatisch Overzicht', *De Gids* 51 (4), 1887, p. 178.

141 In one of his first letters to Burgersdijk (12-1-1878), Loffelt wrote: "Hoe gaarne ik met u zou wenschen, dat de door u vertaalde stukken op ons repertoire kwamen... indien de benoedigde dramatischen krachten bij onze toneelgroep voorhanden waren, zoo geloof ik, helaas! dat u daaromtrent geen illusieën moet maken." In the prospectus for his translation, Burgersdijk wrote that translation had been beneficial to German literature and that it could work "als een verfrissend en versterkend bad" with regard to Dutch literature (Schoneveld, 1988). Banker Wertheim argued in his letter to Burgersdijk of 21 January 1882: "Gij laat Engeland zijn meesterstuk behouden en giet het om door uw frisse vertaling tot een meesterstuk der Nederlandsche Letterkunde. Daar ginds niet armer, hier oneindig veel rijker!"

142 Reported by J.H. Rössing (1900: 110-112).

143 See Paul Post (1996b: 483).

144 Although he had been a slow starter (Schoneveld, 1988), Rössing took pride in his part: "De opdracht vind ik

This entire generation was marked by its admiration for the German productions. An interest in Goethe's interpretation was shared by Burgersdijk, the translator, and A.C. Loffelt, the scholar.¹⁴⁵ Later, J.H. Rössing was to follow the interpretation by the German Freiligrath ("Hamlet is Germany"), which coloured *Hamlet* with nationalist overtones.¹⁴⁶ For the director of De Vereeniging, De Leur, the German style was a standard.¹⁴⁷ The influence of the romantic *Hamlet* they created was so great, that future generations worked hard to break away from it. In fact, as we shall see, the history of later *Hamlet* performances can be interpreted in this key, from Verkade's *Hamlets*, via Steenbergen's (1957) up to and including Rijnders' (1986) and Ritsema's (2001).

It is not surprising, therefore, that Burgersdijk's translation had a German role model as well.¹⁴⁸ The most important of these models was A.W. Schlegel's Shakespeare translation. Schlegel had translated *Hamlet* in 1798 and his translation was the basis of most German *Hamlet* productions in the Netherlands. He had delivered a translation that, contrary to the Ducis text, attempted to be faithful to the original. According to Koster (2002), Schlegel's Shakespeare translation offered a blueprint for the romantic translational poetics, with an emphasis on the original as an organic form of art and as the expression of the individual.¹⁴⁹ Closely connected to this norm is Schleiermacher's influential axiom of "moving the reader towards the writer" (1813).

As illustrated by Figure 6, the new translation strongly differentiated itself from the preceding Dutch stage *Hamlet*. Burgersdijk's desire to be faithful to the source text ran contrary to the translations by De Cambon-Van der Werken and Zubli, both of whom had had no qualms about translating an intermediary text that had been adjusted to the requirements of the present stage.¹⁵⁰ Burgersdijk's translation thus heralded the end of a convention

zeer gelukkig. Een verzoek daaromtrent. U de geschiedenis der Shakespearevoorstellingen aan, in dat brokje geschiedenis heb ik een leeuwenandeel. Ik bleef achter de schermen, maar heb met beleid het zover gedreven. Een enkele vermelding in de opdracht van mijn naam als daarin aandeel hebbende, zou mij zeer aangenaam zijn. Het is niet uit ijdelheid, maar ik stel er een groote eer in." *Letter to Burgersdijk*, 2-1-1882.

145 Goethe's remarks return in Burgersdijk's notes to his *Hamlet* translation. Burgersdijk moreover includes Prof. Loening's interpretation: according to him Hamlet has a melancholy character with occasional choleric streaks. Burgersdijk also consulted the most influential Dutch interpreter of Shakespeare, namely A.C. Loffelt (1890). Loffelt agreed with Goethe that Hamlet is crushed by his burden to avenge his father as a result of too much thinking, but adds more emphasis to the role of Hamlet's environment, the "rotten" state of Denmark. According to him, Hamlet is not a coward: "Kracht, hartstocht, vuur, moed, Hamlet bezit ze allen in hoge mate, maar hij is er een slecht rentmeester over. Alleen in een onbewaakt oogenblik weet hij ze tot daden te bezigen, en dan tot verkwistens toe. Heeft hij tijd tot nadenken, dan wordt alles door de macht der gedachte overvleugeld, of liever vindt de hartstocht uiting in de gedachte... Daarin schuilt Hamlets ziekte." Later reviewers in this period often quoted Goethe's interpretation as well as interpretations by Brandes ("Hamlet is always modern – a idealist spirit in a worthless world") and Turgenev ("Hamlet is an egoistic disbeliever").

146 "Een iegelijk, in wien de Germaansche geest levende is, - een iegelijk, die flauw begrip heeft van het Germaansche wezen, zal zich met de bewerking van Shakespeare's Hamlet, door Alexandre Dumas en Meurice, evenmin kunnen verenigen als met de Sarah-Bernhardt-achtige declamatie van Hamlet, door den Fransch-Rumeenschen tooneelspeler M. de Max." J.H. Rössing, *Nieuws van den Dag*, 10-10-1904.

147 Two years before Willem Pieter de Leur directed *Hamlet*, Amsterdam had been visited by the Meininger Company. This German group presented Shakespeare's plays in sweepingly spectacular, historical sceneries that attracted large audiences and strongly inspired director De Leur. De Leur concerned himself only with the external features of the production, leaving the actors to determine the performance. See De Leur (1906) and De Leeuwe (1959: 107-128).

148 Burgersdijk was open about this. See C.W. Schoneveld (1990: 258-259).

149 Cees Koster (2002: 8).

150 With regard to literary translation, Burgersdijk explicitly rejected the prose translation by A.S. Kok (1860): "erbarmelijker knoeiwerk kan men zich haast niet denken (...) Ik geloof dat het wel goed zou wezen, als het Nederl. publiek eens vernam, dat was door Funke [Kok's publisher] voor Sh. wordt opgedischt zo veel op Sh. lijkt, als een paard uit een kinder ark op een paard uit het Parthenon." *Letter to A.C. Loffelt*, 17-12-1877.




Figure 6: Comparison between Burgersdijk's and Ducis's *Hamlet*

This is the first in a series of figures that indicate the differences between the norms of the *Hamlet* translations presented in the case studies. In each figure, the differences are mapped on the diagram presented in Figure 1. Burgersdijk's translation and Ducis's adaptation of *Hamlet* differ in two respects. They apply a different norm with regard to the attitude towards the original author ('initial norm') and with regard to the extent to which the original text is translated ('matricial norm'): Burgersdijk is subservient to the original author and intends to translate the complete text (in understandable Dutch, hence the term 'rationalisation'); Ducis wants to create a new text and adds his own material to the parts of the original that he uses. Note that Burgersdijk's reaction is to the Ducis version of *Hamlet*, rather than to the achievements of either De Cambon-Van der Werken or Zubli as translators of the Ducis text. Note also that the term 'retention' for Ducis means a neoclassical setting different from Shakespeare's Denmark, that is nevertheless not present-day Paris or Rotterdam.

of intermediary translation, and the beginning of a tradition of retranslations for the stage based directly on the original, a tradition that would last for over a century.

Judging by the introduction and the end-notes, the references to contemporary scholarship and the modesty of presentation, Burgersdijk's translation was intended to be instrumental to an authentic rendition of the source text. In other words, he was a subservient translator,¹⁵¹ who does not appear to have felt any necessity to 'improve' on Shakespeare. Interestingly, the tenet of unity of form and content that was advocated by Schlegel was stressed by Burgersdijk too (Schoneveld, 1990):

There is, in my conviction, in great poets, and particularly in Shakespeare, such an intimate connection between the content and the form of their creations, that the translator is obliged not only to render the content faithfully, but to retain the form

¹⁵¹ Burgersdijk used the Furness edition for his translation (*A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare*, edited by Horace Howard Furness, 1877): "Mijn tekstvertaling van den *Hamlet* is gereed (23 Jan. – 21 April); ik heb het stuk aan mijn vrouw en oudste kinderen voorgelezen en ik geloof dat het geheel goed is; het is geheel in 't net geschreven, wat, vooral voor de prozagedeelten altijd van veel belang is, want deze worden nog wel gewijzigd bij 't overschrijven, de verzen uiterst zelden. Ik ga het stuk nu nog met Furness kritisch door, en begin dan aan de Tooneelbewerking; ik hoop dat ik de helft ongeveer zal kunnen kappen, want het voorlezen van 't stuk, zonder noemen van personen, duurt omstreeks 5 uur!" Letter of L.A.J. Burgersdijk to A.C. Loffelt, 23-4-1880.

as much as possible too, if in his work he is to give approximately the same impression as the original.¹⁵²

72

He believed that a translator should convey the peculiarities of the source text as faithfully as possible. The text should give the same pleasure as the original had done to the original audience, including the line of thought, the choice of words and the music of sounds. Thus, Burgersdijk specified in the introduction to his translation of Shakespeare's sonnets (1879) that a translation should express the poet's peculiarities in thought and expression in order to render the colour and smell of the original poems.¹⁵³ A literalist (word for word) translation of Shakespeare was inappropriate, however, and he mentioned three requirements that outweighed the norm of adequacy: the rules of proper Dutch grammar, the conventions of good taste and the fluency of the lines. His translation of *Hamlet* was guided by these principles. Burgersdijk was, in other words, a rationalising translator, since he 'rearranged the text towards a regular discursive order.'

To illustrate what he meant, Burgersdijk took recourse to the metaphor of painting. A literalist translator who renders a text with jarring sentences is like a painter who makes a portrait of someone and tries to render every wrinkle and pockmark. This, however, is (according to Burgersdijk) characteristic for the realm of photography, but is inappropriate in the art of painting.¹⁵⁴ A translation should not betray itself as such, and Burgersdijk mentioned a number of ways in which it does, such as using a distorted syntax, placing words in the wrong position, maiming words by breaking them off at the end of the line, using imperfect rhyme and a disharmonious succession of sounds.¹⁵⁵ This did not mean that the translator should use only contemporary everyday language, which for Burgersdijk was "gibberish" ("brabbeltaal"). Rather, the translator should dispose of the entire range of language. He should not hesitate to use rare words, to coin neologisms, or to create new compounds¹⁵⁶

152 In: *B1884 Translation* by C.W. Schoneveld (1990).

153 "Dat iedere vertaling een zoo getrouw mogelijk beeld moet geven van het origineel, is onbetwifelbaar; zij is bestemd om den lezer het genot te verschaffen, dat de / (xvii) lezers van het oorspronkelijke, die de taal volkomen machtig zijn, kunnen smaken; maar zij is niet uitsluitend bestemd voor de lezers, die de vreemde taal niet verstaan, daar ook de overigen, voor een groot deel, in hun moedertaal den gang der gedachten, de juiste woordenkeus de muziek der klanken meer onmiddellijk zullen opvatten en waardeeren. Zij moet getrouw zijn in den vollen zin des woords, dat is, niet alleen den zin van het oorspronkelijke volkomen teruggeven, maar ook de eigenaardigheden van den dichter, zoowel in denkwijze, als in uitdrukking, zoodat de tint en geur der gedichten niet verloren gaan." Burgersdijk (1879: xvi-xvii).

154 "Dat juist door aan deze eischen te voldoen, de vertaling vaak minder woordelijk zal zijn, dan wanneer men zich met knutselwerk tevreden stelt, spreekt wel van zelf; wanneer men bij de boven geschetste ware getrouwheid nog de woordelijke getrouwheid kan voegen, is dit natuurlijk na te streven, maar aan de laatste de eerste op te offeren, zou een vergriep zijn tegen de kunst. Menige bijzonderheid moet men zelfs opofferen, om de hoofdzak des te beter te doen uitkomen, zooals een schilder bij het maken van een portret niet ieder rimpeltje of pokputje zal nabootsen, maar de trekken in het juiste licht zal trachten te plaatsen, het oog te doen spreken, in stede van de nauwkeurigheid eener photographie na te streven." Burgersdijk (1879: xviii).

155 "Toch moet de vertaling niet verraden dat zij eene vertaling is; als de vertaler zijne moedertaal zoo weinig machtig is, dat hij deze geweld aandoet, door een gewrongen zinsbouw, door het verkeerd plaatsen, of verminken van woorden, door het afbreken der woorden aan het eind der regels, door valsche rijmen, door onwelluidende opeenvolging van klanken, verradt, hoe moeilijk het hem viel de gedachten van het oorspronkelijke weer te geven, wanneer hij, aldus, bij al zijn streven naar woordelijke getrouwheid, de schoonheden er van onkenbaar maakt, dan weet men waarlijk niet, waarom hij zich van den metrischen vorm bedient." Burgersdijk (1879: xvii).

156 "Men leide uit het gezegde niet af, dat de taal den lezer niet meer of minder vreemd zou mogen voorkomen, dat de vertaler zich uitsluitend zou moeten bedienen van de woorden en de woordvoeging, die ons voor de brabbeltaal van het dagelijksch leven voldoende zijn, dat een gedicht uit lang vervlogen tijden in de ooren zou moeten klinken als een modern dichtstuk; neen, de vertaler moge over den geheelen taalschat beschikken,

in order to render the poetic function of the original.

The idea that a translation should not betray its status as a translation was not uncontested, however. The very A.C. Loffelt who helped Burgersdijk to have his translation performed, disagreed, arguing that this strategy would cause the flavour of the other country and the other age to disappear.¹⁵⁷ Burgersdijk's repeated defence of non-literalist translations must be seen in the light of this discussion.¹⁵⁸ He was emphatic about not wishing to aim for a word for word translation, for the original had been praised for its mellifluousness – something he tried to emulate by reading aloud to his wife and children all the passages he had translated¹⁵⁹ – and this general impression could not be conveyed with the brusque style that is the consequence of a word for word translation.¹⁶⁰

The second exception to the norm of faithfulness to the source text was formed by propriety. Because of the elevated status of Shakespeare, the debate on the good taste of the play as a whole had become obsolete. A translator should still, however, take care to censor expressions that at the time of writing had caused no alarm, but that now had become objectionable, since they detracted from the enjoyment of the whole. Apparently, the objections shared by Ducis, De Cambon-Van der Werken and Zubli had not disappeared entirely. Again, Burgersdijk used the metaphor of painting to illustrate his point: instead of highlighting the portrayed person's wart, the painter had better draw attention to this person's eyes.¹⁶¹

The disagreements within De Vereeniging on staging an original Shakespeare demonstrate that his plays were by no means accepted theatre texts. Burgersdijk's predecessors had translated a text that more or less fitted the requirements of the contemporary theatre, but a gap loomed in Burgersdijk's Shakespeare translations between the Elizabethan and the contemporary stage conventions. This caused conflicts even within the group of those who propagated a professional theatre.

hij schrome niet, zelfs weinig gebruikelijke woorden te bezigen en des noods nieuwe te smeden (vooral een Shakspeare-vertaler moet dit durven wagen, om ook in stoutheid van taal zijn model eenigszins na te streven), van de gewone woordvoeging af te wijken, om zijne gedachten en gewaarwordingen scherper, duidelijke, zinrijker, (xviii) krachtiger uit te drukken, dan hem anders mogelijk zou zijn, maar steeds moeten zijne uitdrukkingen zoo met den aard der taal overeenstemmen, dat het gedicht zijnen uitheemschen oorsprong niet verraadt, dat het een kunst-, geen knutselwerk blijft. Alleen op deze wijze kan men het oorspronkelijke werk getrouw teruggeven." Burgersdijk (1879: xvii-xviii).

157 Reported in C.W. Schoneveld (1990: 253).

158 A similar discussion appeared in the pages of *De Nederlandsche Spectator*, see Schoneveld (1990: 253-254).

159 Reported in C.W. Schoneveld (1990).

160 "De vraag, waarom ik hier en daar niet woordelijker heb vertaald, is hiermede beantwoord; ik wil er nog slechts bijvoegen, dat de sonnetten (...) wegens hunnen zoetvloeiendheid werden geroemd en dat reeds daarom eene zich angstig aan de woorden bindende, stroeve vertaling moest worden verworpen." Burgersdijk (1879: xx).

161 "[S]omwijlen moet men zich zelfs grootere afwijkingen van het origineel veroorloven. Het kan zijn, dat in oude gedichten uitdrukkingen voorkomen, waaraan in den tijd des oorspronkelijken dichters zich niemand ergerde, maar die in onzen tijd/ (xix) niet toegelaten zijn, en door hare vreemdheid alle aandacht, ja ergernis zouden wekken en het geheele gedicht zouden bederven. Die deze uitdrukkingen met zorg in zijne vertaling overnam, zou handelen als een schilder die, bij het maken van een portret, door de verlichting eene wrat op de wang van zijn model zeer deed uitkomen en met alle zorg schilderde, zoodat de beschouwer van het portret genoopt werd, eer op dit deel, dan b.v. op de uitdrukking der ogen te letten; de schilder had een meer gelijkend portret geleerd, als hij de wrat had weggelaten. Juist ter wille van de ware getrouwheid der vertaling, juist om met deze denzelfden indruk op de lezers te kunnen maken, als het origineel op 's dichters tijdgenooten uitoefende, meen ik dat uitdrukkingen als de bedoelde moeten verzacht, of, in den geest des dichters, moeten vervangen worden, al zijn ook anderen van meening, dat het ongepast is, Shakspeare voor onze eeuw pasklaar te maken." Burgersdijk (1879: xviii-xix).

Burgersdijk distinguished (and note that this was the first time that such a distinction had to be made) between literary and theatre translation. He made an “acting version” of *Hamlet* “for the contemporary stage” which was published in 1882 on the occasion of the production of *Hamlet* – to gauge the potential interest of the public in a complete Shakespeare¹⁶² – and later published a translation of Shakespeare’s complete works. Burgersdijk’s separate acting version was notable, since it admitted a medial difference, i.e. it marked a dichotomy between a reading translation for a literary audience and a play text as a performable work for the theatre. It catered to two different audiences, with two different sets of norms.

The reading audience wanted to peruse as much of the text as possible. The theatre people wanted two other things: a text that was both easy to speak and short enough to be performed in the time span of a regular theatre performance. The length of the play and its heightened language represented two features of the source text that deviated from the theatrical conventions. In fact, time and again these two aspects of the play would present translators and theatre makers with dilemmas.

With regard to the difficulty of language, Burgersdijk did not budge. According to Schoneveld (1990), Burgersdijk probably interfered with the rehearsals. If so, he must have encountered the resistance of the actors to his text. They complained “they could not learn Burgersdijk’s language, they broke their teeth on it.” Later on, they admitted however that “the language was so pithy, that it remained like iron in their memory once they had memorized their text.”¹⁶³

Burgersdijk, however, did take the limitations of time into account. In his acting version, he gave precedence to the requirements of the stage over the norm of matricial integrity, placing his adaptation within the context of the theatrical performance.¹⁶⁴ Burgersdijk felt nonetheless that it was commendable to do as much of *Hamlet* as is possible and therefore chose to apply *reduction*, the least far-reaching adjustment for the stage (as opposed to emendation and addition).¹⁶⁵ He omitted Fortinbras, several of Polonius’s scenes and the first appearance of the Ghost. Probably as a result of the requirement of propriety, Burgersdijk not only cut passages that included bawdy references, but also the extensive ‘horror stories’ like the reference to suicide in 1.4 and the description of the effect of the poison in the Ghost’s story.¹⁶⁶ When Burgersdijk published the text of his stage *Hamlet*, he felt it necessary

162 Reported by J.H. Rössing (1900: 110-112).

163 “De tooneelstenen werkten in den aanvang niet mee. Zij verklaarden ‘de taal van Burgersdijk niet te kunnen leeren, zij braken er hun tanden mee.’ Later erkenden zij, dat de taal toch beter was dan die van Jakob van Lennep’s *Romeo en Julia*; dat de taal zóo kernachtig was, dat, als zij de rol eenmaal kenden, die dan ook ijszervast in hun geheugen stond.” J.H. Rössing (1900: 110-112).

164 In a later letter, Burgersdijk suggests that the shortening of a play could be necessary: “Bekorting blijft ondertusschen wenselijk en Shak. geeft er, zooals meestal, ook hier gelegenheid toe, omdat hij heeft het zwak, zijn bron vaak al te getrouw uit te schrijven en ook weinig beteekenende bijzonderheden op te nemen. Die kan men laten vervallen, zonder zijn stuk in het minst te verminken.” Letter to Chrispijn on *Julius Caesar*, 10-7-1899.

165 Curiously, even this debate about the treatment of Shakespeare on the contemporary stage was along the same lines as a German discussion. A review of Burgersdijk’s complete translation in 1884 refers to a difference in opinion between Goethe and Schiller on the one hand, and Tieck on the other about the possibilities of omission. J.N. Van Hall, ‘Letterkundige kroniek’, *De Gids* 48, (4), 1884, pp. 529-542.

166 According to Schoneveld, Burgersdijk consulted the stage version of the German Meininger Company production. He also possessed a copy of the prompt book of the *Hamlet* played by Emil Devriendt. Burgersdijk did not only cut, but also added stage directions, that give us a good impression of the performance. He describes how Hamlet notices Polonius peeping through the curtain when he is speaking with Ophelia (“*Hamlet wendt zich plotseling af en ontwaart Polonius, die juist door een reet gluurde en bij deze beweging de*

to apologise for the various cuts he had made to facilitate the production, but he argued that they had been necessary for the performance:

75

I am well aware that many, with regret, will miss particular things; the one will miss this, the other that, but a play as extensive as *Hamlet* requires a great deal, a very great deal of cuts indeed to make a performance at all possible.¹⁶⁷

Burgersdijk's professional pragmatism clashed with the audience's expectations. Despite the apologies, some critics, among them again his supporter A.C. Loffelt, thought Burgersdijk had failed in presenting the real play, but rather had given 'some scenes from *Hamlet*'.¹⁶⁸ Loffelt and Burgersdijk both thought that the translator should be subservient to an authentic rendition of the original, but disagreed over the hierarchy of text and play. For Loffelt, *Hamlet* was in the first place a poetic composition. Since it had been composed as a whole, it could only be appreciated fully if performed *as a whole*, and that was what he expected the production to do:

What does a poet profit from the harm done by the promotion of insufficient scenes? What becomes of a well-composed painting when one saws off some of the edges since the frame is too small?¹⁶⁹

*

The newly introduced translational norms held sway for 26 years. Burgersdijk's *Hamlet* translation was used for five *Hamlet* productions between 1882 and 1908 (directed by De Leur, Vos, and Erfmann).¹⁷⁰ The first reaction to Burgersdijk's stage *Hamlet* was Royaards's adapta-

gordijnen snel weder laat vallen. Hamlet: 'Ik niet; neen zeker, nooit heb ik u iets gegeven.'") and how the King recomposes himself when he sees people enter. ("De Koning loopt in gemoedsbeweging op en neer, maar neemt dadelijk een rustige houding aan, zoodra Guildenstern en Rosencrantz binnentreden.")

167 "Ik weet zeer goed, dat velen met leedwezen, de een dit, de ander dat zullen missen, maar bij een Tooneelwerk, zoo uitgebreid als de *Hamlet* is, moet veel, zeer veel gekapt worden om de opvoering mogelijk te maken. Wat tegen elke der kappingen te zeggen is, zal ik grootendeels mijzelven reeds gezegd hebben, eer ik er toe overging. Zoo ging het mij aan het hart, de later verhaalde en niet volstrekt onontbeerlijke eerste verschijning van den geest weg te laten; zoo had ik aan het eind van het stuk Fortinbras gaarne laten optreden, maar dan had hij ook midden in het stuk, mijns inziens, moeten verschijnen; gaarne had ik de rol van Polonius minder besnoeid, doch het behouden b.v. der lessen aan zijn zoon maakt ook het behouden van het tooneel met Reinoud noodig, en ontziet men hier het gebruik van het kapmes, dan moet men het stuk op eene andere wijze bekorten en b.v. de reis naar Engeland, den opstand onder Laërtes wegwerken, de rol van koning Claudius te zeer besnoeien, enz." Burgersdijk, Introduction to *B1882*. See also Schoneveld (1990).

168 A.C. Loffelt, 'Het Tooneel', *Het Vaderland*, 26-1-1882. "Waarlijk, zooals 't stuk nu gedecimeerd was, mocht het wel geannonceerd worden als 'Eenige tafereelen uit Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.'" 'Het Tooneel in de Hoofdstad', *Het Tooneel*, 1-2-1882. According to the latter article, in the performance many more scenes had been cut, that had been present in Burgersdijk's adaptation, like the conversation of Polonius and Ophelia (1.3), the King's interrogation of Hamlet (4.3) and the plotting done by the King and Laertes (4.7), which in fact does not contribute to the intelligibility of the plot.

169 "De heer Burgersdijk vermoedt in de voorrede zijner tooneelbewerking, dat men aanmerkingen maken zal op de besnoeiingen en stelt zelfs andere voor, die in sommige opzichten misschien minder kwaad zouden hebben gedaan. Er moest echter gekapt worden, verzekert hij, om bij onze tooneelinrichting de voorstelling niet te lang te rekken. Ik geloof gaarne in dit geval, dat de beste stuurlii aan wal staan, maar doet men den dichter een dienst met zijn invloed te schaden door de bevordering van onvoldoende vertooningen? Wat komt er van een goed aangelegde schilderij terecht, wanneer men er ter wille van een veel te kleine lijst eenige kanten afzaagt?" A.C. Loffelt, 'Het Tooneel', *Het Vaderland*, 26-1-1882.

170 De Vereeniging produced two *Hamlets*, directed by W.P. De Leur. Two others were done by Rotterdam-based

tion (1892), which marked the first time an original translation of *Hamlet* was reshaped to suit the interpretation of a theatre maker. Actor Willem Royaards had been so enthusiastic about the role of Hamlet, that his company's director, Jan C. Vos, decided to stage the play. Royaards thought that most previous actors had not understood the character of Hamlet.¹⁷¹ The actor himself made a new stage version of the play, for which he consulted both Burgersdijk and A.C. Loffelt.¹⁷² Among others, Royaards reinstated much of the part of Polonius, which had been 'atrociously mutilated' in Burgersdijk's adaptation.¹⁷³

The source text orientation of translation and setting eventually raised questions about the relevance of the play to the target audience. A review by 'N.H.W.' of the last performance of Burgersdijk's translation of *Hamlet* in 1908 raised the question that would haunt directors and actors for the entire twentieth century: 'What does *Hamlet* mean to us? Can it still have meaning for modern people?'¹⁷⁴ A similar remark – "*Hamlet* is a tiresome and outdated melodrama" – provoked a reader of a newspaper to exclaim that *Hamlet* should not be cast as easy entertainment. He stressed that the immediate impact of the play was less important than the spiritual reward of the audience's efforts in understanding it. Thus, he adhered to the norm of edification that had been De Vereeniging's incentive to stage the play.¹⁷⁵ Both (competing) norms were challenges for the first half of the twentieth century: Eduard Verkade's *Hamlet*.

director Jan C. Vos. The last was directed by Joseph van Lier. After Louis Bouwmeester, Willem Royaards played the starring role, both for W.P. De Leur and for Jan C. Vos. Vos continued to stage *Hamlet* with Eberhard Erfmann, who played Claudius in the last *Hamlet* in Burgersdijk's translation, in 1908. Nevertheless, Burgersdijk remained a benchmark for a longer time, judging by its appearance in the amateur circuit (Diever, 1950), the reaction to Voeten's new translation by Schaik-Willing (1957) and Willy Courteaux's reference to him as benchmark as late as 1988.

- 171 "Ach, volgens mijn oordeel, door de meeste toneelkunstenaars zoo geheel of gedeeltelijk verkeerd begrepen karakter (...)" **Letter of Willem Royaards** to A.C. Loffelt, 20-12-1891.
- 172 Since Royaards had been lyrical about A.C. Loffelt's Shakespeare comments, Vos invited him over to the dress rehearsal, so that he could make some final remarks. See the letter of Jan C. Vos to A.C. Loffelt, 1-4-1892.
- 173 His director remarked: "Voor de rol van Polonius is in Royaards' bewerking in ere hersteld. De gruwelijke verminkingen van dien rol waren soms ook ergerlijk." **Letter of Jan C. Vos** to A.C. Loffelt, 28-9-1891.
- 174 A review by 'N.H.W.' (TIN) spoke of a *Hamlet* of the old school, by Hermann Schwab and Erfmann (1908), and called it a melodrama, for it did not call up an immediate response in a contemporary audience: "*Hamlet* is voor ons die aan het moderne tooneel gewoon zijn, niet meer dan een kijkstuk, een fatsoenlijke draak. O, ik weet wel, dat ik door dit te zeggen de Shakespearianen tegen mij in het harnas jaag; maar waar zelfs een Forbes Robertson door zijn subliem spel mij destijds zelfs al de dolken, gifdranken, vergifigde degens en meer dergelijk ontuig niet kon besparen, - waar zijn *Hamlet* ten slotte denzelfden weg opging als al de overige dooden in dit drama, - kon ik mij thans, nu de heer Schwab '*Hamlet*' was, evenmin vrij maken van de gedachte, dat aan het slot van het negende tafereel de soefleur zou komen vertellen: dat 'het stuk niet vèrder zou worden gespeeld, want dat alle hoofdpersonen dood waren...' Een dergelijke profane gedachte krijgt men niet bij een stuk dat men meeleeft. En - ik herhaal: - *Hamlet* als drama is voor ons, modern-voelenden, niet meer mee-te-leven!"
- 175 "Ja, vermoeiend, zooals nu eenmaal het bestijgen van een bergtop vermoeiend is; zoo'n beetje kuieren op vlakke wegen is minder zwaar. [...Shakespeare] dwingt u de vlakke velden te verlaten en op te stijgen naar omhoog, boven de wolken, waar is de eeuwige sneeuw en de altijd blauwe hemel. (...) Is het tooneel nog iets meer; komt het ons ook goed voor dat het tooneel ons helpt de rotsen te beklimmen waaruit de stroom ontspringt die in Shakespeare's werken bruischt, en zoo deelachtig te worden de geestelijke weelde te genieten die hij ons kon schenken?" Contribution to a newspaper, 3-1-1909, TIN.

3.4 1907 - Van Looy's retranslation: director's theatre and commissioned translation

77

Eduard Verkade was a revolutionary director and an important figure in the rise of director's theatre. The directors who preceded Verkade limited themselves to positioning characters on stage and dictating their movements. Verkade, however, wished to leave the mark of his *ideas* on the production, and imposed what we would now call a 'concept' on it.

Verkade introduced a new kind of theatre to the Dutch stage, one inspired by the Frenchman Lugné Poë and the Englishman Edward Gordon Craig (Verkade-Cartier van Dissel, 1978). Both favoured symbolism instead of realism and preferred evoking the imagination to using optical illusions.¹⁷⁶ In 1906, Verkade had met Craig in Berlin. Craig inspired him to create a magical art with room for mystery and rituals. He used a bare and suggestive stage to awaken the imagination of the audience with sobriety,¹⁷⁷ instead of the conventional romantic stage that was crammed with props. Verkade found an ally for his theatrical vision in the poet-painter Jac. Van Looy, who had written an introduction to the translation of Eduard Gordon Craig's *The art of the theatre* (1905).¹⁷⁸

The audience received Verkade's early *Hamlet* (in hindsight) as innovative, a rebuttal of melodramatic stagings. As Albert van Dalsum remembered it later:

1908. The *Hamlet* of Eduard Verkade in Theatre Odeon.(...) It stands out in my memory as a resistance against mouldy tradition. Against dead-end realism and hollow romanticism. (...) The scenery more austere and devoid of imitation of reality, curtains instead of illusionist side wings; a number of unmistakable props and indications drawing all attention to the spiritual work of the actor.¹⁷⁹

In December 1907, Eduard Verkade announced that he would be playing Hamlet:

Like all plays, *Hamlet* belongs on stage. Nevertheless, this drama has not been played in the Netherlands for many years. Moreover, the poetic translation by Jacobus van Looy has only recently come into being. The saddening fact of the absence of per-

176 See Verkade-Cartier van Dissel (1978: 87).

177 See Verkade-Cartier van Dissel (1978: 99-100).

178 In his preface to *Macbeth*, Jac. van Looy had already argued against realism in Shakespeare productions, that, according to him, ruled out the spectator's fantasy: "Al wat de decoratie hoort te doen, is in hoofdzaak te zijn 'duiding' en eene voortdurende houding aan te nemen die stom meewerkt en méér doet als 't kan: die draagt. En ik geloof niet duidelijk genoeg gezegd te hebben dat ik die voortdurende houding der decoratie enz. bepaald zag door de 'kleur'." Jac. Van Looy, *Shakespeare's Macbeth*, (Amsterdam), p. 7, published in 1898 in *De Nieuwe Gids*. In Verkade's first *Macbeth* and *Hamlet*, Verkade was executing what Van Looy had suggested: a particularly non-realist performance, with colours that indicated the character's emotions.

179 "1908. De *Hamlet* van Eduard Verkade in Odeon. Als een schok springt het uit mijn herinnering, als een verzet tegen stoffige traditie. Tegen doodgelopen realisme en holle romantiek. Geen 'jeune premier' meer met behaaglijke maniertjes, maar een bijtend protest van jeugd tegen 'een vervuilde tuin die schoot in 't zaad', het maatschappelijke bestel, waar ze mee geconfronteerd wordt. De magie van het toneel benaderd met een vlijmscherpe, bijna spottende analyse, een haast kuise schaamte voor het gevoel, een versmading van rhetorische effecten der taal, een intellectuele twijfel. Dit was mijn eerste ontmoeting met de toneelkunstenaar Verkade, toen nog niet onder hem werkend, maar als toeschouwer in het kleine zaaltje van Odeon op het Singel bij het Koningsplein. Het toneelbeeld versoberd, en ontdaan van realiteitsnabootsing, gordijnen in plaats van illusionistische coulissen; enkele onmiskenbare requisieten en aanduidingen, alle aandacht concentrerend op het geestelijk werk van de toneelspeeler." Albert van Dalsum, 'Eduard Verkade 75 jaar. Magie van het toneel benaderd met analyse.' *Het Parool*, 13-6-1953.

formance and the joyous appearance of the translation by Van Looy have made me decide to try to represent the protagonist Hamlet, who attracts me very much, as well as I can.¹⁸⁰

In his announcement, Verkade conveniently forgot to mention that he himself had asked for this translation in the previous year.¹⁸¹ Through this give-and-go between translator and director, Verkade could subtly draw attention both to the new text and to his new performance.

As a coordinating director, Eduard Verkade used retranslation as a deliberate tool to distance himself from the previous generation. For Verkade neither the director nor the actor of the previous generation's *Hamlets* had been satisfactory. De Leur lacked subtlety¹⁸² and Bouwmeester belonged to the past.¹⁸³ The previous translation was equally faulty; Burgersdijk's *Hamlet* lacked the drive of Shakespeare.¹⁸⁴ Verkade never mentioned that he considered Burgersdijk's translation outdated. The new translation functioned not as a passive, but as an active retranslation.

Verkade was responsible for the first commissioned *Hamlet* translation on the Dutch stage. Previous stage translations had all been made on the initiative of the translators themselves; it was the driving force of translator Burgersdijk that ensured that De Vereniging broke with the Ducis tradition. From 1907 onwards this belonged to the past. Instead of the translator himself, it now was the commissioner who took the initiative for a new version. The motive for the translation was no longer located in the personality of the translator but in the needs of his patron.

The symbolist theatre productions by Verkade used a translation based on highly romantic premises, an anachronism in the international scene.¹⁸⁵ Jac. van Looy was a member

180 "Gelijk alle tooneelwerken behoort 'Hamlet' op het tooneel. Nu is echter dit drama sinds vele jaren niet in Nederland gespeeld; bovendien bestaat pas sedert kort de dichtelijke vertaling door Jacobus van Looy. Het bedroevende feit der niet-opvoeringen en het verheugende, de verschijning der vertaling van Van Looy, hebben mij doen besluiten te trachten de hoofdfiguur Hamlet, die mij ten zeerste aantrekt, zoo ver mogelijk uit te beelden." *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant*, 7-12-1907.

181 Five years before, in 1902, Eduard Verkade had received his first acting lessons from Van Looy's wife, the actress Titita van Looy-Gelder. The text they used for practice had been her husband's translation of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* – a text that Van Looy had made to increase his knowledge of Shakespeare. Verkade had liked the text so much that he had asked Van Looy to translate *Hamlet* as well. See Verkade-Cartier van Dissel (1978: 134); see also Ton Anbeek (1984) and Chris Will and Peter J.A. Winkels (1987). Verkade even helped Van Looy to solve some translational cruxes (Verkade-Cartier van Dissel: 562-564).

182 "Ik krijg hier een uitstekende indruk hoe Ibsen gespeeld moet worden. Och, och, wat is 't bij ons beroerd, behalve de Vos. (...) Ik zie er tegen op, dat de Leur met grove vingers er in zal wroeten en de fijnheid niet zal snappen... (...) Eigenlijk vind ik Nederland een beroerd klein land en kleine luidjes op enkele reuzen als de Van Looy's na. Bij ons zijn de toestanden zoals hier voor 60 jaar zoo ongeveer." Letter of Eduard Verkade to Joh van Wulfften Palthe, cited in Verkade-Cartier van Dissel (1978: 87).

183 Bouwmeester was furious in his letter of 25 March 1920 to Kees Franse, when he was in England on tour together with Verkade: "ditmaal heb ik de Engelschen laten zien, wat wij vermogen, en niet de koekebakker [Eduard Verkade]. Mijn hart loopt over van vreugde dat ik dien ellendeling, die al de rampen veroorzaakt heeft, bewezen heb dat ik volgens zijn brutaal schrijven 'houder ben van het verleden', maar: van het heden mij toch ook nog een stuk toebetrouw. Aan hem, de toekomst, zegt hij, dan toch zeker niet in onze kunst."

184 There has been some discussion about whether Burgersdijk missed out on the (linguistic) revolution of the generation of Tachtigers (Kellendonk, 1985 and Leek, 1988: 88), or whether he paved the way for them (Schoneveld, 1990: 264-267). If the latter is the case – as Schoneveld argues very convincingly – Van Looy, as a member of the generation of Tachtigers, still considered it necessary to have his own *Hamlet*, that differed in some respects considerably from Burgersdijk's. For Verkade there was no question of using his predecessors' text. He decided to have his own text, made by a member of his own group of like-minded people.

185 See Anbeek (1990: 37-38) and Leek (1988: 88) about the late arrival of romanticism on the Dutch literary




Figure 7: Comparison between Van Looy's and Burgersdijk's *Hamlet*

Van Looy's *Hamlet* differs from Burgersdijk's in two respects. The two translators apply a different norm with regard to the attitude towards the original author ('initial norm') and with regard to the heightened language: Van Looy addresses his own poetic qualities and wants to transpose the sound of the original to the Dutch language ('literalist translation'), whereas Burgersdijk is subservient to the original author and intends to make a text of which the poetic function is intelligible to its audience.

of the generation of Tachtigers, that had Percy Bysshe Shelley as one of their great examples. The Tachtigers believed in the unity of content and form,¹⁸⁶ just as Burgersdijk had done. But they also propagated the individuality of the poet's expression¹⁸⁷ and believed strongly in the importance of sound rather than meaning.¹⁸⁸ The latter norms clashed with the translational keynotes of Burgersdijk, as is illustrated by Figure 7.

Contrary to Burgersdijk, Van Looy translated Shakespeare like a poet. In the first half of the twentieth century a discussion took place whether it is the scholar or the artist who makes the best translation.¹⁸⁹ Van Looy belonged in the artist's camp, for whom there was a crucial relation between poetry and the norm of *originality*. The question then is whether a faithful translation, being reproductive in nature, can have the qualities of a literary text. Shelley argues in his *Defence of Poetry* (1840) that translation is impossible, since "the plant must spring again from its seed or it will bear no flower".¹⁹⁰ This stance emphasises the value

scene.

186 Frontman of the generation of Tachtig, Willem Kloos, proudly stated in his introduction to the poems of Jacques Perk that "form and content are one." See Anbeek (1990: 23).

187 Kloos argues that "art should be the most individual expression of the most individual emotion". See Anbeek (1990: 31).

188 Kloos: "Een gedicht is een brok gevoelsleven der ziel, weêrgegeven in geluid." See Anbeek (1990: 30).

189 See Koster and Naaijken (2002: 11-13).

190 "Sounds as well as thoughts have relations both between each other and towards that which they represent, and a perception of the order of those relations has always been found connected with a perception of the order of the relations of thoughts. Hence the language of poets has ever affected a certain uniform and harmonious recurrence of sound, without which it were not poetry, and which is scarcely less indispensable to the

of a work of art as something *original*, in the sense of ‘inventive’ and ‘creative,’ as opposed to ‘derivative.’ Translating the source text obsequiously would mean losing the spirit. Poet translators claimed considerable freedom (‘poetic licence’) to recreate the original, not from the original, but from “its seed,” the spirit of the work as conceived by the original author. In this line of thought, the original author and the translator work on the same footing. Each poet expresses the spirit of the original through the means he has at his disposal at the time of writing.¹⁹¹

Van Looy claimed that he became almost possessed by the spirit of Shakespeare in recreating the text in his own language. The process of translating awakened his own capacities. He experienced the drive “the poet” must have had when he worked; the urge that the original provoked in him was the rhythm he listened to when translating. Thus he imagined characters and scenes, and according to this drive, he recreated them.¹⁹² Note that this is very much like what Pavis (1992) described as the translator recreating a *mise en jeu* of the source text in the target language, an approach we will encounter in later theatre translators as well. Since Van Looy was not a subservient translator, but rather a poetic one, he made no references to scholarship or sources whatsoever, nor did he include an introduction or notes.¹⁹³

Also contrary to Burgersdijk, Van Looy made a literalist translation. Burgersdijk explicitly rejected Van Looy’s literalist translations, calling them “madhouse readings” (“dolhuis lectuur”),¹⁹⁴ for his ‘trial of the foreign’ translation went against the grain of Dutch grammar and melliflence. Van Looy’s translation of the line “Stand and unfold yourself” may serve as an example of his non-rationalising, literalist approach. Considered a conventional metaphor by nearly all *Hamlet* translators, this phrase is translated accordingly with something close to ‘make yourself known.’ Jac. Van Looy, however, does not. He turns it into “halt, en ontdek uzelf,” translating the compound ‘un-fold’ with a compound that includes the same elements (ont-dek). A similar form of literalism is seen in the following translation of schemes:

communication of its influence, than the words themselves, without reference to that peculiar order. Hence the variety of translation; it were as wise to cast a violet into a crucible that you might discover the formal principle of its colour and odour, as seek to transmute from one language into another the creations of a poet. The plant must spring again from its seed or it will bear no flower – and this is the burthen of the curse of Babel.” Percy Bysshe Shelly, ‘A Defense of Poetry’ In: Donald H. Reiman and Sharon B. Powers (eds.), *Shelley’s Poetry and Prose. Authoritative Texts. Criticism*. (New York and London, W.W. Norton & Company, 1977), p. 484.

191 The issue at stake here is different from the *non verbum e verbo, sed sensum de sensum* discussion present in translation studies since St. Jerome. The ‘invisible’ translators can also take poetic license. The point is rather that the justification of the translator’s liberties lies in the fact that he – as a poet – has a right to take them. The translator considers it his primary task to recreate a literary text, as well as reproducing the original. The poetic license grants him the necessary elbow-room.

192 “Om een in vreemde taal geschreven dichtwerk in mij op te nemen, te weten wat er staat, er mij rekenschap van te geven, is het voor mij bijna noodzakelijk het te vertalen. Geldt het werk als van Shakespeare, dan boeit het mij bijna oogenblikkelijk, mijn eigen vermogens komen er spoedig door aan den gang ; ik maak mij voorstellingen ; onderga den drang dien de dichter moet hebben gehad toen hij werkte en eer ik het zelf goed weet, tracht ik het te benaderen. Al krabbelend, lezend, kom ik zoo tot de geheele ziening, neem de samenstelling in mij op en wanneer ik dan geregeld ben begonnen, beeld ik het over naar de aldus verkregene ziening, handhavend mijne voorstelling van personen, of die veranderend van meet af aan, wanneer het mij bleek niet goed te hebben gezien, doch altijd werkend onder den drang dien het oorspronkelijke niet naliet in mij over te storten, hoorende dat voornamelijk als hêt bewegende rythme.” Jac. van Looy (2002: 67-68). See also Jacobs (1945: 84-93).

193 It may be assumed Van Looy used a conflated text that moves between the Second Quarto and the Folio edition. The Gentleman speaks with the Queen in the dialogue in 4.5. (in Q2), but the crux in 1.2 (‘solid/sallied flesh’) is translated according to the Folio (“vaste vleesch”). The reference to the “little eyases” (absent from the Q2) is given as well as the monologue “How all occasions do inform against me” (absent from F).

194 See Schoneveld (1990: 267).

I like him not, nor stands it safe with us
 To let his madness range. Therefore prepare you.
 I your commission will forthwith dispatch,
 And he to England shall along with you.
 The terms of our estate may not endure
 Hazard so near 's as doth hourly grow
 Out of his brows. (3.3.1-7)

'k Mag hem niet lijden, en ook, 't is voor ons
 Niet veilig, als zijn waanzin vrij kan razen.
 Daarom, maakt u gereed ; ge ontvangt terstond
 Uw lastbrief, en hij moet met u naar Eng'land.
 De staatszorg kan zoo groot gevaar niet dulden,
 Als door zijn vlagen, uur op uur geduchter,
 Ons dreigt. [Burgersdijk, 1882]

Hij lijkt mij niet: en 't is niet veil'g voor ons,
 Hem gek te laten dolen. Maakt u vaardig ;
 Ik zal op stond uw volmacht laten schrijven,
 Hij reist in uw gezelschap mee naar England.
 De staat van onzen rang kan niet verdragen
 Een kans zoo hachelijk als elk moment
 Kan groeien uit zijn maanzucht. [Van Looy, 1907]

Van Looy's lines are difficult because he forces his coupled pairs – words replacing the meaning of the original – into the same position as they hold in the original, which causes him to frustrate the Dutch syntax. Especially the last two lines show his tendency to a word for word translation. As with transference, this type of foregrounding the aesthetics of the original does not focus on the rhetorical pattern – compare Burgersdijk's translation which observes metre and a long syntactical period of three sentences contained in seven lines – but instead on the exact succession of sound and information of the original.¹⁹⁵

Van Looy explicitly relates his choice to the requirements of the theatre. He admits that a literal translation is no publishing material. On stage, however, he feels that the words of the play carry the performance.¹⁹⁶ The close adherence of Van Looy to the rhythm of the original suited his commissioner Eduard Verkade.¹⁹⁷ Verkade wanted a text that was

195 As a result of the difficulty of language and of his use of rare words, Van Looy gives the impression of being more of an archaising translator than Burgersdijk. Indeed, one critic has remarked: "Enkele vroeger-eeuwsche tusschenwerpsels klinken wat bedacht." *Nieuws van de Dag*, 24-10-1908.

196 "Zelfs indien het woordelijk vertalen van een in gebonden vorm geschreven werk geen onmogelijkheid ware, is mijns inziens, deze wijze van overzetting voor het toneel nog zoo kwaad niet. De heer Verkade heeft mij meer dan eens gezegd, te hebben bemerkt dat zijn medespelers ook, zich door de woorden voelden gedragen. En dat moet wel zoo zijn, daar die woorden de voorstellingen droegen die ik mij maakte. Bij Shakespeare staat elke aanleiding tot uitbeelding eener rol in den tekst ; hoogere of bewogener gevoelens schieten vleugels aan bij wijze van spreken; soms komt met een vaak verwonderlijke juiste breuk, het proza den versgang vervangen." Jac. van Looy (2002: 68).

197 For further information about the relationship of Verkade-Van Looy, see Verkade-Cartier van Dissel (1978: 153-

appropriate for the theatre, for which the “heartbeat” of Shakespeare was the most necessary ingredient:

82

I did not like the translation by Burgersdijk. Why? Because, when one speaks it, one almost automatically falls into a monotone. Maybe the translation by Van Looy seems a little hard. To read, it is as hard as the English text, but this is not so great a problem on stage. When one speaks this text with understanding, one automatically has the right intonations.¹⁹⁸

The translation may have neatly fitted the requirements of the commissioner; but the dramatic value of Van Looy’s translation was not equally appreciated by all. The theatre critics praised Van Looy’s translation for its subtlety, its poetry, its baroque quality, its conciseness, its ruggedness, its chromatism, its freshness, its muscularity and true Shakespearean spirit, as well as for its use of popular language.¹⁹⁹ The critics noted the distinctly *poetic* qualities of the translation. However, such qualities appear to have caused a loss of dramatic tension. As the author Carry van Bruggen observed, it was: “a poet’s translation in which the drama sometimes is lost.”²⁰⁰

Sharing the regret A.C. Loffelt had expressed twenty-five years earlier about De Vereeniging’s failure to stage a complete *Hamlet*, Eduard Verkade wanted to produce a *Hamlet* as long as was practically possible on a regular theatre night.²⁰¹ He took great pains to create the technical possibilities for a run-on presentation of the scenes. Although Verkade benefited much from the fact that as a commissioner he was able to suggest changes to the translator, he still had to adapt the text for the stage.²⁰² Van Looy did not want anything to do with it;

158).

198 “Die Burgersdijksche beviel me niet. Waarom? Omdat, als je die zegt, je haast van zelf in een dreun valt. Mischien lijkt u die van Van Looy wat moeilijk. Om te lezen wel, zo goed als de Engelsche, maar voor het toneel valt dat mee. Als je deze met begrip zegt, heb je van zelf de juiste accenten.” Interview of 22-8-1908, Eduard Verkade with De Hofstad. See also: “Bij mijn voordrachten gebruik ik de Shakespeare-vertalingen van Van Looy en dat vormt driekwart van mijn succes. Want bij de andere vertalers is de hartslag van de tekst te loor gegaan.” Interview with Verkade by Rido, *Telegraaf*, 21-10-1950. See also “Eduard Verkade. Shakespeare en wij.”, *Groene Amsterdammer*, 5-10-1935.

199 “De fijne, dichterlijke, weleens barokke Hamletvertaling van Jac. Van Looy” (V[an] B[ruggen], *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 11-12-1907); “Een verdienstelijke interpretatie van de Hamlet-figuur, nu verlevendigd door het kernachtige, stoere Nederlandsch van Van Looy” (*Nieuws van den Dag*, 12-12-1907); “Zijn soepel vers, zijn kleurig woord, de aardige equivalenten, die hij weet te vinden voor niet te vertalen woordspelingen, maken zijn werk frisch” (J.N. Van Hall, *De Gids*, 1908, p. 167); “Jac. Van Looy, wiens meesterlijke vertaling minstens evenveel bewondering vroeg als de voordracht van den acteur. Gespierde taal doortrokken van den echten Shakespeareschen geest.” (Barbarossa, *Telegraaf*, 11-12-1907); The translation “is ons voorgekomen als vooral verdienstelijk in het ruigere, het pittige van volkstaal, het eigendommelijk-kragtige. Een genot was dat, als bij een onzer groote zeventiende-eeuwers te vinden.” (*Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 1-1-1908); “Maar met dezen eenvoud kwam het menscheijk eruit tot ons. Het menscheijk van Hamlet’s lijden door de gebeurtenissen. De taal die men hoorde, versterkte dezen indruk. Enkele vroeger-eeuwsche tuschenwerpsels klinken wat bedacht, verder is het de kragtige, beeldende, ruige taal van Van Looy. Hoofsch lijkt zij minder dan de Engelsche.” (*Nieuws van de Dag*, 24-10-1908).

200 “een dichtersvertaling, waarin het drama soms verliest. Ook bevat zij vele duistere plaatsen of perioden van zoo karakter- of stijllooze woordenkeus, dat de vertooner er hinder van ondervindt in zijn spel.” (Van B[ruggen], *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 8-9-1908).

201 In this period, the audience’s expectation of what they would see in terms of length or completeness, returned in the announcements of the play. In general, it said: “Hamlet, a tragedy in five acts”, but often it also presented the number of scenes, which could vary from 16 to 20. By lack of a prompt copy, I assume that Verkade did not join scenes, judging by his attempt to end up with performing “all 20 scenes”.

202 One can judge by the number of scenes listed in the programmes. Verkade’s first ensemble production (1908) listed 16 scenes, his last (1948) 20.

contrary to Burgersdijk he probably considered this the theatre maker's task.²⁰³ Verkade's first ensemble production (1908) listed 16 scenes, his last (1948) had 20. This goes to show that the first, pragmatic adaptation called for the omission of entire scenes, probably combined with the deletion of redundant lines.²⁰⁴ For his jubilee *Hamlet*, Verkade proudly boasted that he had attempted to recreate a stage with all the technical possibilities of the Shakespearean stage, which enabled the players to play *all twenty scenes* of *Hamlet* without interruption.²⁰⁵

Verkade's interpretation of the play did not meet all expectancy norms. The romantic archetype of Hamlet still was an important touchstone. Many critics found that Verkade's Hamlet did not fit their standard for the Prince of Denmark, since it lacked depth, nobility, contemplation and studiousness. During the first decades of Verkade's 'reign,' most critics concurred that the play should provoke a sensation of timeless sublimity, rather than saying something particular to the modern sensibilities.²⁰⁶ Depth, to be achieved by meticulous study, was required if the character of Hamlet were to have this sublime, mystic-heroic effect. The character should have "the profundity (...) of a scholar, who has read all comments on Shakespeare."²⁰⁷ It was only in the 1920s that this intellectual image of *Hamlet* started to disappear.

*

The reign of the duo of Eduard Verkade and Jacobus van Looy held sway from 1907 up to 1957.²⁰⁸ In that period no other translation than Van Looy's was staged by a professional theatre company, and there was hardly any production that did not bear the mark of Verkade, either as actor²⁰⁹ or as director.²¹⁰ In the period 1907-1931 Verkade's *Hamlet* was not for more

203 "Ja, ik begrijp dat het kappen u danige hoofdbrekens kost. Ik ben wel benieuwd hoe ge dat redden zult en geloof niet u daarin eenigszins van dienst te kunnen zijn." Letter of Jacobus van Looy to Eduard Verkade, Fall 1907.

204 For, if both Burgersdijk (1882) and Voeten (1976) used micro-level reduction, why would Verkade not?

205 "Bij deze jubileumvoorstelling is getracht een toneelbouw te reconstrueren, welke dezelfde mogelijkheden biedt, die het Shakespeare-podium indertijd voor zijn bespelers bezat. En in die toneelbouw, met de huidige belichtingsmogelijkheden, kunnen de twintig taferelen van HAMLET achter elkaar gespeeld worden, zonder dat enige onderbreking van het spel om technische redenen noodzakelijk wordt." Eduard Verkade in the programme to *Hamlet*, Haagsche Comedie, 1948.

206 In the first place, a performance should be noble, one should hear "royal language" (*Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 1-1-1908) and see the "Prince of Denmark" (Van Bruggen, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 9-1908). Moreover, according to critic J.H. Rössing, "*Hamlet* was the tragedy of mankind" (*Nieuws van de Dag*, 8-4-1913); for his colleague Henri Berol it contained a mystical element, since it was full of "unseen powers" ("doorhuiverd van ongeziene machten", review 20-12-1914, TIN). Frans Mijnssen said it should have the "poetic-heroic of romanticism" ("verdicht-heroïsche der romantiek", 9-1915, review TIN). Verkade's Hamlet lacked all of these: "Een Hamlet, die den toeschouwer niet zelf aan het mijmeren brengt, in des toeschouwers gemoed zelf niet den tweestrijd doet ontbranden – is geen Hamlet." *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 12-12-1907.

207 "de diepzinnigheid (...) van een philoloog, die alle Shakespeare-commentaren las." Van Bruggen, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 9-1908.

208 There is no relation whatsoever between the primary or secondary model and the foreignisation or domesticating of the translation, as Heylen (1993) argued: the first half of the twentieth century was dominated entirely by an outright exoticised version of the Prince of Denmark. Some directors have felt more comfortable with a foreignising translation than others. The main reason for domesticating is more closely related to the theatrical demands of the individual theatre maker commissioning the new translation, than to any place in the target culture.

209 "Zoo lang ik het tooneel in ons land volg, heeft alleen Eduard Verkade Hamlet gespeeld." J.B. Schuil, 11-11-1940.

210 "Eduard Verkade is op het oogenblik een der weinige onder de Nederlandsche regisseurs, die op een groote ervaring inzake Shakespeare kan bogen." Review Centraal Tooneel, January, 1941. Apparently, no theatre maker felt the need to present an alternative *Hamlet* – maybe no theatre maker wanted to do *Hamlet*, period. At the time theatre had to be self-supporting. When one cannot rely on subsidies for an income, it is harder

than three consecutive years off the repertory.²¹¹ This state of affairs was to last until 1943 when director Johan de Meester Jr. tried his luck with a different *Hamlet*.

However, Verkade himself introduced a new norm shift with another version of *Hamlet*, although still in Van Looy's translation. 1925 marks the moment that *Hamlet*, for the first time in Dutch theatre history, was presented in a modernised setting. Although this version did not meddle with the text, it represented a first attempt to bring the play closer to the frame of reference of a contemporary audience.

In the previous decades, modernity had not been a quality that critics associated with the classics. If something modern was praised in *Hamlet*, it was in the universal appeal of a sense of humanity, with comments like "a human being (...) in the fullest sense of the word,"²¹² a sense of "the life of the soul,"²¹³ and people with "real blood flowing through their veins."²¹⁴ The link with modern times, however, was only latently present in this universal humanity. Verkade's first productions freed the play from a specific context (a romanticised version of medieval Denmark) by yielding to its acknowledged "universal appeal" with a symbolic setting.²¹⁵ In the 1920s, however, this was not considered sufficient: "It is not enough to bring the brilliant father of modern tragedy a traditional salute now and then; one has to attempt to approach him with understanding, if one wants to highlight his significance for our time with clarity."²¹⁶

This norm of relevance was met in the production of the English director Barry Jackson in London in November 1925, better known as the "Hamlet in plusfours." Jackson had argued that traditional costumes put a "veil" between the audience and the play, abetting the "sublime unnaturalness" of the verse. Jackson replaced the "superstitious awe" impressing the spectator of a traditional production with an "understanding that he has been witnessing a real conflict of credible human beings."²¹⁷

Verkade repeated the experiment in the same month. It constituted a further step in his response to the German *Hamlet* (and W.P. De Leur's in the preceding century) by "trying to eliminate all vestiges of romanticism, which Shakespeare does not need on account of his

to start competing with an established production. In the early days, Verkade himself had relied on favourable comments like the following by Carry van Bruggen to secure audiences at the box office: "Behoeft het gezegd, dat ik zéér aanraadt de besproken voorstelling te gaan zien? Zonder de publieke belangstelling kunnen proeven als deze niet worden voortgezet en vruchtdragend gemaakt. Men neme dus in de bedenkingen der critiek [sic] geen aanleiding thuis te blijven." (Van Bruggen, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 9-9-1908). The only real competition did not come from other theatre makers, but from the rise of the cinema.

211 As one of the plays with which Verkade established his success, he frequently returned to *Hamlet* on important occasions. Examples are the farewell performance before leaving for the Dutch East Indies in 1911 and another for England in 1920, his silver jubilee in 1931 and his farewell performance in 1947. On March 11, 1922 he played the Prince of Denmark for the 250th time.

212 Giovanni, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 1-4-1898.

213 J.H. Rössing, *Nieuws van de Dag*, 10-10-1904.

214 "Wat is Hamlet als tragedie toch grandioos, wat hebben al die menschen levend bloed in hun aderen. Shakespeare; dat is toch maar kunst voor alle tijden; Hamlet kon vroeger, kon ook in deze tijd geschreven zijn (...) Is het niet zwaar van menselijkheid, die nooit verandert?" F.M., *Nieuws van de Dag*, 31-3-1898.

215 "Deze grote soberheid in de lijn van het speeltooneel (...) was van een voortreffelijke werking. Het heele dramatische gebeuren werd daardoor opgeheven uit onrustige alledags-werkelijkheid in een sfeer van groot, episch stijl-rhythme. En zoo kreeg het geweldige drama nog meer de kracht van iets dat van alle tijden is, dan er reeds door Shakespeare aan is gegeven." *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 23-3-1914.

216 "Het is niet voldoende, den genialen vader van het moderne treurspel nu en dan een traditioneel eere-salutt te brengen; men moet trachten hem ook begrijpend te benaderen, wil men zijn beteekeenis voor onzen tijd duidelijk in het licht stellen." The critic Habitué in a review from 1922, collection TIN.

217 See Robert Hapgood (1999: 62-64).

greatness.”²¹⁸ The reception of the critics was divided. J.B. Schuil expressed his surprise that “it becomes more and more clear that Shakespeare’s work can suffer the modern costume! For many it will have been a revelation yesterday: how much Shakespeare’s work is of all ages, how ‘modern’ his *Hamlet* is!”²¹⁹ For critic Maurits Uyldert, however, it was an inartistic deed. His main objection concerned the action of the play, which became strange and senseless because it was presented in modern instead of historical costumes. He maintained that the psychology of modern people is different from that represented in *Hamlet*.²²⁰ Since action and psychology should be coherent, if one is changed, the other should be modified as well.²²¹ However, changing the action would imply that the play ceased to be Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*:

Our conclusion cannot be but that through editing it in a modern way – outstanding as it is, as such – the psychological basis of Shakespeare’s work is subverted, that one harms the inner structure of the drama, that one gives the characters a different personality from what the one they have in Shakespeare, so that one overstrains and maims the spirit of the work.²²²

The reactions show that the critics had been used to perceive *Hamlet* in terms of a classic, distant in time and place from the present audiences. The shock of seeing *Hamlet* in modern clothes brought them to the realisation that the story had a universal appeal; moreover, for the first time, they considered it in terms of its modernity.

In the 1930s, the voices that considered studiousness a characteristic of *Hamlet* were more and more muffled. After the experiment of 1925, critics mostly applauded the dramatic qualities of the play in Verkade’s subsequent *Hamlet* productions, although they still reprehended the director for not showing the nobility of the protagonist. To many, psychological and critical comments in scholarship and programme notes were a burden to the play and should best be left unread, for Hamlet should be presented as a living being.²²³ This increasing rejection of scholarship is remarkable. In the 1880s, Burgersdijk, an outsider to the theatri-

218 “De bedoeling van deze voorstelling is, het experiment, dat in Londen genomen werd, hier te lande te herhalen: Hamlet in modern costume te geven en daarmede te trachten alle overblijfselen van romantiek, die Shakespeare door zijn grootte niet behoeft, uit te schakelen. (...) Het is niet het voornemen Hamlet voortaan alleen op deze nieuwe wijze te geven. De laatste opvoeringen van Hamlet hebben hier een zeker burgerrecht verkregen en ‘t is geenszins onmogelijk, dat de nieuwe opvoering een aantal effecten niet zal bezitten, die de vroegere wel had.” Programme note, 1925.

219 “tot onze grote verrassing werd het ons hoe langer hoe meer duidelijk, dat Shakespeare’s werk het moderne costume volkomen kan verdragen! Voor velen zal het gisteren een openbaring zijn geworden, hoe zéér Shakespeare’s werk van alle tijden, hoe ‘modern’ zijn Hamlet is!” J.B. Schuil, *Haarlems Dagblad*, 21-11-1925.

220 “Zij bewegen zich in een andere gedachtenwereld. Het leven van de menschen uit dezen tijd heeft niet slechts een anderen vorm, doch ook een anderen inhoud gekregen. Alles is een beetje anders dan anders.” Maurits Uyldert, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 29-11-1925.

221 Uyldert – convinced that a play should contain only realistic action – suggests modern people would summon ghosts in séances.

222 “Onze conclusie kan dus geen andere zijn dan dat men door een moderne monteering – hoe voortreffelijk deze op zichzelf ook is – den psychologischen grondslag van Shakespeare’s werk ondermijnt, dat men den innerlijken bouw van het drama geweld aan doet, den figuren een ander karakter verleent dan zij bij Shakespeare hebben, dat men dus den geheelen geest van het werk forceert en verminkt.” *Ibid*.

223 “De Hamletvertooning door Eduard Verkade (...) is een der allerbeste Hamlet-opvoeringen die ik van hem ken. Omdat hij de Hamlet-figuur weer voor ons heeft gesteld niet als een litterair raadsel, maar als een warmbloedig volkomen mensch, dien we begrijpen. Ik zou daarom willen aanraden alle letterkundige en psychologische beschouwingen voorschans ongelezen te laten, vooral ook die uit het programma, en alléén maar de Hamletvertolking van Verkade op zich te laten inwerken: de allerbeste cursus over Shakespeare en zijn Hamlet-figuur.” L.v.d.B., *De Tijd*, 14-12-1931.

cal community, had introduced a translation of the original on stage, but was castigated by the reviewers for not appreciating the full literary value of the complete text. The following generation judged Verkade's productions on the basis of philology: theatre was considered as a form of literature. After 1922, however, reviews expressed a disdain for scholarship, marking a new dichotomy between literary and theatrical circles, now with the reviewers siding clearly with the theatre.

3.5 1957 - Bert Voeten's retranslation: passive retranslation as active differentiation

Johan De Meester Jr. was the first to break with Verkade and his austere productions. In 1943, De Meester presented a full-blown romantic *Hamlet*,²²⁴ starring Paul Steenbergen, with the expressed desire to "thrash the calm, the death, the somnolence out of it."²²⁵ The *Hamlets* performed during the War manifested a relevance to the present, especially in references to Englishmen²²⁶ and the "rotteness" of the "state."²²⁷ De Meester subtly underscored such relevance in his programme notes.²²⁸

Still, Steenbergen asked Verkade, by then a grand old man of Dutch theatre, to direct his silver jubilee *Hamlet* in 1948,²²⁹ but many a critic pointed out its shortcomings. Verkade's direction was too cold and complicated²³⁰ and Van Looy's translation was too contorted to be intelligible.²³¹ When by the end of the War the English influence had replaced the German,²³² the English emphasis on action rather than contemplation (both on the part

224 In a review of January 1943, Luc Willink mentioned "een baaiend aan driften, smarten, onheilen, fluisteringen en bazuinstooten".

225 "de kalmte, den dood, den slaaplust eruit zou ranselen." 'Arena: Hamlet,' 1944, TIN.

226 The TIN database reports about Centraal Tooneel (1940): "De dialoog van Hamlet met de Eerste Grafmaker gaf avond aan avond een extra opwinding in de zaal. Het antwoord op de vraag, waarom Hamlet naar Engeland werd gestuurd: 'Wel, omdat ie gek was; hoe moet zijn verstand daar terug zien te krijgen', had steeds een enorm applaus tot gevolg. De opmerking 'daar zijn de mensen even gek als hij', bracht drie of vier N.S.B.'ers in de zaal tot actie. Terwijl na de zin van de stervende Hamlet: 'Ik zal het Engelsch nieuws niet meer vernemen', de zaal vijf minuten lang niet stil te krijgen was van het lachen."

227 "Een nieuwe Prins van Denemarken heeft ons gistermiddag doen meebelevan, dat er iets rots was in zijn staat." 'Gijsbert Tersteeg verover Den Haag', *Het Vaderland*, November 1940.

228 He quoted Anatole France: "Gij zijt van alle tijden en van alle landen. Gij zijt geen uur ouder geworden in drie eeuwen. Uw ziel is zoo oud als de ziel van elk onzer. Wij leven met U, prins Hamlet, en gij zijt wat wij zijn, een mensch temidden van al het leed der wereld." Programme note, 1943.

229 Verkade applied himself to his trademark, the staging. In the programme "E.V." made special mention of it: "Bij deze jubileumvoorstelling is getracht een toneelbouw te contrueren [sic], welke dezelfde mogelijkheden biedt, die het Shakespeare-podium indertijd voor zijn bespelers bezat." Programme note.

230 "Steenbergen heeft op een miraculeuze manier zijn eigen warme trant en in eenvoud glanzende vorm hervonden. Door het verstrijken van de tijd luwde merkbaar de schadelijke invloed van Verkade op deze geheel anders gearde acteur." 'Paul Steenbergen als Hamlet. Mooie persoonlijke prestatie in bedompte voorstelling.' *Algemeen Handelsblad*, November 1948.

231 "Het is wel heel jammer, dat men de vertaling van Jacobus van Looy gebruikt, want diens gewrongen en dikwijls zeer onfraaie, even onuitsprekelijke als onverstaanbare tekst ondermijnt het goed begrip, laat staan de gevleugelde schoonheid in vaak onoverkomelijke mate. De meeste medewerkers wisten er dan ook geen weg mee." 'Paul Steenbergen als Hamlet. Mooie persoonlijke prestatie in bedompte voorstelling', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, November 1948.

232 After the end of the War, England had established itself firmly as the beacon for *Hamlet* productions. The great examples from the 1850s up to the Second World War had nearly all been German *Hamlets*. It will cause little wonder that during the German Occupation Moissi's *Hamlet* – which had visited the Netherlands in 1923 – was praised alongside Verkade's, ('Gijsbert Tersteeg verover Den Haag', *Het Vaderland*, November 1940) not only as a result of the German presence, but also as a consequence of their continuing influence. However, along with the victory of the English in 1945 the Dutch started to look westward for inspiration with regard to the Bard. Some critics were even of the opinion that the English outshone every Shakespeare production

of actors and on the part of scholarship)²³³ was shared by many a Dutch critic, who consequently rejected Verkade's intellectual approach to the play.²³⁴

In 1957, Steenbergen finally directed a new *Hamlet* in which he embraced a corresponding interpretation:

I have bothered little with the libraries of existing interpretations. I want to perform the play as a man of the stage.²³⁵

Steenbergen did not want to follow De Meester's romanticism, nor Van Looy's difficult translation or Verkade's cerebral interpretation. Steenbergen intended his *Hamlet* to be "austere, clear, and human, above all human."²³⁶ Instead of using Van Suchtelen's literary translation that had been published a mere ten years earlier, Steenbergen commissioned Bert Voeten to make a new translation²³⁷ – which again illustrates the separate traditions of, on the one hand, literary translation and translation for the theatre on the other. With Steenbergen's *Hamlet* in 1957, director, text and protagonist were different from Verkade's. The next generation was finally free from his influence.

Voeten's translation was made fifty years after Van Looy's and can, therefore, be considered a passive translation. Nevertheless, Voeten applied a set of norms that was very differ-

made in the Netherlands, contrary to what was thought two decades before. "Ten onzent hebben de beste menschen aan Shakespeare's werk hun krachten beproefd en meermalen met respectabel resultaat, maar wij meenen, dat niemand ons zal kunnen tegenspreken, als wij zeggen, dat de Engelschen al deze vertooningen hebben overtroffen, in de eerste plaats door het gave, stijlrijke geheel, in de tweede plaats door de individueele spelprestaties." (*Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant*, 14-12-1946). Compare this with: "Ik ben van meening dat Shakespeare in Duitschland en Nederland oneindig veel beter wordt gespeeld dan in het land zijner geboorte. Het zien van deze opvoering heeft mij in die meening opnieuw versterkt." (Frederik van Monsjou, *De Kunst*, 11-7-1925).

233 The English actors who played Hamlet generally gave a more active and less contemplative interpretation of the title role than their Dutch (and German) colleagues. Several English *Hamlets* visited the Dutch stage: the English Arts Theatre Company in 1946, The Old Vic Theatre Company in 1950 and The Youth Theatre in 1960. The visiting English 1946 Hamlet had "overwegend lyrische en romantische trekken, waarin het beschouwelijke evenals bij Paul Steenbergen teruggedrongen werd door het persoonlijk doorleefde, maar zonder dat aan de ruimere bezinning en overdenking geweld werd aangedaan." (*Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant*, 13-12-1946) In the *Hamlet* of 1950, Michael Redgrave made a much livelier impression than his Dutch counterparts. Critic Anton Koolhaas compared Redgrave's *Hamlet* to the film version by Laurence Olivier (1948), both of which emphasised the (thriller-like) dramatic action of the play at the cost of elevation (A. Koolhaas, *De Groene*, 24-6-1950). Moreover, the dramatic action in the play was also emphasised by the two then most influential English scholars. John Dover Wilson's *What Happens in Hamlet?* (1935) brought out the significance of each part of the complex action in Shakespeare's dramatic art. Harley Granville-Barker's five series of *Prefaces to Shakespeare* (1927-48) were a contribution to Shakespearean criticism that analysed the plays from the point of view of a practical playwright with firsthand stage experience. Later versions of Burgersdijk's *Complete Works* (B1944) already included the remarks by John Dover Wilson (1934 and 1935) and Harley Granville-Barker in the introduction to Hamlet. Steenbergen presented Granville-Barker's comment on the play – "Shakespeare made Hamlet's insanity the dramatic symbol of his tragedy, which is a tragedy of a spiritual revolution" – in the programme to both his 1948 and his 1957 productions. Both sources were used by Voeten for his new translation.

234 "De bijzondere verdienste van Paul Steenbergen schuilt in zijn streven naar openbaring van het algemeen-humane. Zijn Hamlet vertoont zich ontdaan van de stof van drie eeuwen tegenstrijdige litteratuur. Hij ging uit van een naakte rol, geschreven voor een schitterende toneelspeler." 'Paul Steenbergen als Hamlet. Mooie persoonlijke prestatie in bedompte voorstelling', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, November 1948.

235 "Ik heb me weinig bekommerd om de bibliotheken van interpretaties, die er bestaan. Ik wil het stuk opvoeren als man van het toneel." Manuel van Loggem, 21-10-1957.

236 "sober, helder en menselijk, vooral menselijk." Reported in 'Haagsche Comedie glorieert met een menselijke "Hamlet"', 19-10-1957.

237 Voeten had already produced a translation of a play by Christopher Fry for the Haagsche Comedie. Later, he became the in-house translator of the theatre company. See Voeten (1994).




Figure 8: Comparison between Voeten's and Van Looy's *Hamlet*
Voeten's *Hamlet* differs from Van Looy's in three respects. The two translators apply a different norm with regard to the attitude towards the original author ('initial norm'), towards modernisation and towards heightened language: Voeten is subservient to the original author, intends to modernise the text in its forms of address and makes the text more communicative ('clarification'), whereas Van Looy brings his own poetic qualities to the fore, respects the socio-cultural situation of the text and the soundscape of its literary language.

ent from Van Looy's approach, as is illustrated by Figure 8. This suggests that the retranslation was not only informed by a change in language, but also by a change in translational norms. Typically, the shortcomings of Van Looy's translation (i.e. that it was not a *dramatic* text) had been expressed by his audiences from the very beginning. It must be concluded, therefore, that the new form, like the old, was the result of a deliberate decision of both commissioner and translator.

It was Voeten's intention to meet the critics' objections to the tortuousness of Van Looy's text. He wanted to rid the text of the dust of ages, stating a desire for clarity:²³⁸

One of my critics has written that I apparently meant to “shed light through” the text of *Hamlet*. I am grateful for this term, for it precisely covers my intention. An argument to “leave obscure things obscure” (...) in my opinion is not in the least convincing with regard to a *Hamlet* translation in our times. All kinds of hints that without a doubt had been clear for an audience in Shakespeare's day call for further explanation – if they are not totally superfluous. (...) As for the rest, I made fitting use of the possibilities of clarification offered to me by the context.²³⁹

238 An interesting parallel is found in Heylen (1993: 77-91): André Gide valued his *Hamlet* translation (1946) in terms of clarity, modernity and rhythm.
239 “Een van mijn critici heeft geschreven, dat het kennelijk mijn opzet is geweest de tekst van *Hamlet* ‘door te lichten’. Ik ben hem voor deze term erkentelijk, want hij dekt precies mijn bedoeling. Een argument om “t is maar beter om duistere dingen duister te laten” (om een bekende regel van A. Roland Holst te variëren), is naar mijn mening ten aanzien van een *Hamlet*-vertaling in onze tijd, allerminst steekhoudend. Allerlei toespelingen

He clearly disagreed with Van Looy's tendency to keep the obscurities of the text mysteriously unintelligible. What counted was the message. This reflected the needs of Voeten's commissioner, who wished to tell a dynamic and dramatically interesting story and wanted the audience to empathise with the characters as if they were their fellow human beings.

How did Voeten succeed in achieving such clarification? In the first place, he used paraphrase instead of the original metaphor, expression or hendiadys. Compare the following passages (3.4.38):

Versperd, verschanst is tegen elk gevoel [Burgersdijk]
 Voor gevoel omschanst is en omstaald [Van Looy]
 Het zich veilig weet voor elk gevoel [Voeten]

The paraphrase communicates the content of what is meant at the expense of the original metaphor. Likewise, Voeten frequently resorted to the selective non-pun. A single meaning was selected for the translation of the puns in "I am too much in the sun" (1.2.67) and "Do you think I meant country matters?" (3.2.115):²⁴⁰

Tè veel sta 'k in de zon [Voeten]
 Denkt u, dat ik een grove toespeling maakte? [Voeten]

Moreover, Voeten modernised at least some of the relationships expressed by the forms of address in the play, in order to bring *Hamlet* closer to a present audience (and possibly also as a result of a change in decorum). He thought it impossible, for instance, to have a King address a young woman (Ophelia) with a too-formal 'u'. Neither did he think he should translate changes in the form of address as a result of a change in situation, as when the King shifts from 'thou' to 'you' when he is threatened by Laertes. Sometimes, Voeten also added deictics, words that indicate objects or persons by addressing them directly. Deictics connect the speaker to the person or object that he indicates, tying up text and action on stage. They make the texts livelier, since they emphasise the text's relation to what is present on stage (3.4.137):

My father, in his habit as he lived!
 Mijn vader! Dààr! Gekleed als bij zijn leven! [Voeten]

The reactions to Voeten's translation were divided; it was not the ideal text for each and every critic. Some critics, like Jeanne van Schaik-Willing, hailed Voeten's text as a sensation. The new translation was applauded, since it created no opportunities for a romantic

die voor het publiek in Shakespeare's dagen zonder meer duidelijk waren, behoeven – voor zover zij niet volstrekt overbodig zijn – een nadere omschrijving. Het is opvallend, dat vele van deze in de quarto's voorkomende 'topical allusions' in de folio zijn geschrapt, omdat zij toen reeds hun actualiteit verloren hadden. En nu zwijg ik nog over het probleem van de corrupte passages en de varianten. (...) Voor het overige heb ik van de mogelijkheden tot verheldering die mij de context bood een gepast gebruik gemaakt." Bert Voeten, 'Verantwoording.' In: VO1959, pp. 206-7.

240 According to Jenkins (1982: 435-6) there are three intentions underlying the remark, i.e. a melancholic preference for the shade, a hint at the King's royal presence (the sun being a royal emblem) and the pun on 'son'.

interpretation.²⁴¹ The world on stage seemed to be the continuation of the present-day world, immediate, alive, and contemporary, much like Verkade's modern-dress *Hamlet* had appeared on stage, but now in the text:

Let me start with the foundation, the word. We owe the greatest thanks to the translator Bert Voeten, who has achieved the impossible. All the dust of ages has been blown away and thus (...) a text can be listened to: direct, to the point, devoid of all rhetoric and meretricious writing, like life caught in the act and solidified into words. Those who noticed that a certain distance separated them from Shakespearean English, a distance that is only to be bridged by dictionaries and glossaries (and are there people for whom this is not the case?), are liberated from the stateliness, the aged contours, the movements of a Burgersdijk, as if they have always been shortsighted and now are given glasses. The main sensation is, that people who had been presented to us at a venerable distance, ready to be admired as great classic characters, suddenly appear next to you, as your brothers, friends and daily cronies. All bashfulness is lost in this continuation of the contemporary world, but in such perfection! Truthful, deeply probing, and scornful of all conformism.²⁴²

As Schaik-Willing pointed out, the text was much more 'direct' than the previous translations. Translations like Burgersdijk's and Van Looy's, which had been praised for their poetic achievement, had sometimes been considered difficult to play, because the actors 'broke their teeth on it' or because the text was 'a poet's translation, in which the drama is sometimes lost.' It is striking that a text like Voeten's, which according to critical opinion did not suffer from sins against "speakability," was not praised in those terms but in terms of its *presence*. Critical appreciation involved references to immediacy, realism and contemporariness. Somehow, the actors playing in a less rhetorical text seemed to be more alive. The combination of clarification and modernisation gave the play this sense of immediacy.

Some of Voeten's critics took a more extreme stance with regard to modernisation. Although the clarity of the text and the young actor on stage represented a more modern *Hamlet*, some thought this did not go far enough: "This performance (...) had something half-hearted as a result of director Paul Steenbergen's grafting the desired rejuvenation onto a traditional design. This made the whole thing resemble an old lady who had subjected herself

241 "Zij beheerste door haar uitgesproken moderne karakter de ganse opvoering en ontnam haar – wat ook Steenbergen's bedoeling geweest moet zijn – zelfs iedere schijn van kans tot romantische interpretatie." 'Haagsche Comedie glorieert met een menselijke Hamlet', 19-10-1957.

242 "Laat ik beginnen met het fundament, het woord. De allergrootste dank zijn wij verschuldigd aan de vertaler Bert Voeten, die het ongelofelijke heeft verricht. Alle stof van de tijd is weggeblazen en zo is daar uit de door Shakespeare's tijdgenoten clandestien opgetekende kopieën van 's werelds schoonste tragedie – in casu uit de tweede kwarto-uitgave aangevuld met wat de folio nog extra vermeldt – een tekst te beluisteren, direct, raak, van elke retoriek en mooischrijverij ontdaan, als op heterdaad betrapt in woorden gestold leven. Zij die zich door een zekere afstand gescheiden voelen van het Shakespeare-Engels, een afstand, die slechts met woordenboeken en glossaria is te overbruggen (en bestaan er wel bij wie dit niet het geval is?) hebben, verlost van de deftigheid, de verouderde omtrekken, de bewegingen van een Burgersdijk, de gewaarwording alsof ze altijd bijziende zijn geweest en nu een bril hebben gekregen. De voornaamste sensatie is, dat de mensen, die op de gepaste afstand van de klassiciteit ter bewondering waren voorgedragen, plotseling naast u staan, uw broers, vrienden en dagelijkse trawanten zijn geworden. Alle bedremmeldheid valt weg bij deze voortzetting van de eigentijdse wereld, maar in hoe waarachtige, diep peilende, alle conformisme versmadende volmaaktheid!" Van Schaik-Willing, 'Bravo, Coen Flink!', *De Groene*, 26-10-1957.

to a successful 'face lift.'²⁴³

On the other hand, the clarity of the production did not find favour with all critics. Again, the expectancy norms of the audience did not concur. Some reviewers criticised the performances from De Meester (1943) to Steenbergen (1957) along the same lines: they regretted the loss of the sublime. According to them, it was impossible to pluck out the heart of *Hamlet's* mystery – which they thought part of the spiritual wealth of the play – and they argued that through the focus on action much of the depth of thought was lost.²⁴⁴ This was a fault found particularly in Voeten's translation:

With the gain of intelligibility [of Voeten's translation] comes a certain popularisation that is not without dangers. The *Hamlet* drama touches the deepest mysteries of mankind and, at first hearing, Voeten's translation seems to detach these puzzles from their mysterious grounds. One could be led – unintentionally on the translator's part – to think that one knows the story of *Hamlet*. However, the sublime meaning of this tragedy is that we can never know. *Hamlet* is as inexplicable as man can be.²⁴⁵

In his review, Ton Elias pointed out that the clarity of Voeten's translation seems to detract from the sensation of the sublime that *Hamlet* causes. Apparently, he felt the poetic function of Shakespeare's original (i.e. the specific norm to which Voeten had explicitly refused to comply) in some way caused elevation; he objected to the rearrangement of the text towards a regular discursive order (rationalisation) and the cancellation of the original's movement towards the indefinite (clarification).

There had been one director before 1957 who had also supported the poetic function. Eduard Verkade had compared the dramatic text to a musical score, in considering the *rhythmical* qualities in Van Looy's translation more important than the intelligibility of the text. This was a different reason for favouring the poetic function: Verkade would dislike the

243 "De vertaling van Bert Voeten bracht Shakespeare's tekst dichterbij; de vertolking van de titelrol door de jeugdige acteur gaf de gevoelsatmosfeer van het stuk een hedendaags accent. Maar juist deze kwaliteiten versterkten het frustrerende effect dat Hamlet eigen is en dat bij vroegere opvoeringen door ingewikkeldheid van taal en statigheid van declamatie nogal eens werd verbloemd. Bovendien had deze voorstelling iets halfslachtigs doordat regisseur Paul Steenbergen de nagestreefde verjonging had geënt op een traditionele vormgeving, zodat het geheel soms deed denken aan een bejaarde dame die zich aan een geslaagde 'face lifting' [sic] had onderworpen." H.A. Gomperts, *Parool*, 2-10-1957.

244 "Intussen schuilt bij dit alles een gevaar: indien men namelijk bij een opvoering, en ook in de vertaling van het stuk, dat steeds ruimte geeft aan nuanceren, teveel de nadruk gaat leggen op de verklaarbaarheid van de gang van zaken, dan zal dit weliswaar nooit tot gevolg hebben dat 'Hamlet' een soort superieur detectieverhaal wordt, doch dan gaat van de levenswijsheid, waarvan dit meesterwerk doortrokken is, veel verloren." R. Blijstra, *Vrije Volk*, 21-1-1957. A similar remark was made as early as 1944 on Johan de Meester Jr's *Hamlet*: "Welnu, plaatsen we ons eens op het standpunt van een bezoeker, wiens eigenlijk kennis viel samen te vatten in de wetenschap: Hamlet is de prins van Denemarken. Hij zal zich bij en na de voorstelling hebben afgevraagd, wat er in 'Hamlet' dan toch eigenlijk allemaal voor geheimzinnigs zou schuilen, want het is toch duidelijk genoeg en het vraagt niet eens zooveel inspanning, om er waarlijk door geboeid te worden. Het kenmerkt het eenzijdige karakter der vertooning en haar waarde." 'Arena: Hamlet', 1944.

245 "Met deze winst aan verstaanbaarheid gaat echter ook een zekere popularisering gepaard, die niet geheel zonder gevaren is. Het Hamletdrama raakt de diepste raadselen van de mens en zo op het eerste horen tendert Voetens vertaling er ietwat naar deze raadselen los te maken van hun geheimzinnige gronden. Men zou er ongetwijfeld zonder dat dit ook maar enigszins de bedoeling van de vertaler is geweest – toe kunnen komen te denken, dat men nu wel weet hoe het met die Hamlet zit. De sublieme betekenis van deze tragedie is echter, dat we dit nu juist net niet weten. Hamlet is zo onbegrijpelijk als een mens maar zijn kan." T[on] E[lias], *De Tijd*, 21-10-1957.

qualitative impoverishment (loss of poetry) and the destruction of linguistic patterning in Voeten's text. Like-minded directors in later years similarly held that the material value of the text, i.e. the text as a rhythmical succession of consonants and vowels, can be favoured over clarity of meaning. In the 1960s, for example, the director Erik Vos criticised Voeten's translations for their lack of rhythm.²⁴⁶

The 1957 *Hamlet* marked a watershed in its emphasis on the immediacy of the text. A norm had changed. The play should be relevant and it should provoke a direct reaction: the audience should empathise with the characters and understand what they say. The debate on Voeten's translation represents a turning point between source text orientation (the translator leaves the combination of form and content intact and moves the spectator in the direction of the author) and target text orientation (the translator transforms the characters of the play into our contemporaries and thus moves the author towards the spectator in a context of changed aesthetic conventions). If Voeten rejected Shakespeare as a poet, he embraced him as a playwright, suiting the word to the action.

*

Immediacy was the key norm for the next twenty-nine years. From 1957 until 1986, Voeten's *Hamlet* was the only text theatre makers used. The last production with Voeten's translation was staged as late as 1993, and even in 2002 a production was staged that was based on a revised version of this translation.²⁴⁷ Steenbergen's successors felt that no retranslation was needed, for Voeten's version served them well. In their interpretations, they embraced the same desire as Steenbergen to turn *Hamlet* into a contemporary human being.

The focus of the large scale productions that employed Voeten's text increasingly concentrated on social and political relevancy. This corresponded with developments in the international scene. In 1964 the English translation of Jan Kott's *Shakespeare our contemporary* had been published, which posed Shakespeare (and *Hamlet*) in the light of the Soviet totalitarian regime. Kott, who proved to be influential on the international scene,²⁴⁸ made explicit the norm of relevancy:

An ideal *Hamlet* would be one most true to Shakespeare and most modern at the

246 Seven years after Voeten's *Hamlet* translation, director Erik Vos declared he missed a number of things in Voeten's clear Shakespeare translations. He mentions the emotional impact of characters that reply in lines that repeat the other's syntax, or that complete each other's half lines. He points at wordplays on sound similarities. He castigates translators for using diminutives and for using everyday language, both of which help to kill the sublime in Shakespeare. Finally, he likens Shakespeare to Bach, in making variations on a theme, through the recurrent use of words. See Vos (1964: 421). See for the musicality of language, as contained in the metre, rhyme and the use of letters, Cicely Berry (1993) and Ike Smitskamp (1997), and also Leek's lecture (1988b). See for a (Brechtian) interpretation of gestic language in relation to metre, sound and keywords, Maik Hamburger (2004: 117-128).

247 In a re-run of Boermans' *Hamlet* (1997).

248 In 1964, a Russian film version of *Hamlet* by Kosinzev was released, "certainly the most contemporary interpretation of Shakespeare for the screen", in which, according to the director, 'Hamlet is tormented by what is happening in the prison state around him' ("Financial Times cited in Daniel Rosenthal, 2000: 27). By 1965 Peter Hall took on *Hamlet* in a production for the English Royal Shakespeare Company that revolved around the idea that his was to be a *Hamlet* for the 1960s: "For our decade I think the play will be about the disillusionment which produces an apathy of the will so deep that commitment to politics, to religion or to life is impossible". Programme note.

same time. Is this possible? I do not know. But we can only appraise any Shakespearian production by asking how much there is of Shakespeare in it and how much of us. (...) Costumes do not matter. What matters is that through Shakespeare's text we ought to get at our modern experience, anxiety and sensibility.²⁴⁹

The increasing desire for relevancy led to modernising the production. In 1966, director Richard Flink called *Hamlet* "a Provo (i.e. 'beatnik') from 1602, who has no time for prevailing opinions and rejects the establishment, since its founding principles are rooted in an unreliable past."²⁵⁰ The Prince of Denmark was interpreted as a hero whose task it was to uncover corruption. "*Hamlet* was turned into a 'human' play, in which the young prince was no demi-god nor a symbol of virtue and the others at the Danish court no horrible villains either. Thus Hamlet was less pitted against symbols of evil, than against representatives of a certain mentality."²⁵¹ Like Steenbergen, Flink sought to rid the play of all romantic excess²⁵² and of all obscurity. One of the consequences of de-romantisation was the change in setting, which did not refer to any particular period, but to all ages, in the sense that the characters could have hailed from both the Middle Ages and the future.²⁵³

Further modernisation, however, led to the critique that such performances constituted historical falsifications. In 1976, director Hans Croiset tried his hands on a modern *Hamlet* by emphasising violence in the contemporary world.²⁵⁴ Hamlet now was the symbol of freedom, pitted against an anonymous force of power.²⁵⁵ Croiset geared his modernisation, which in the case of Flink had remained general and universal, to a display of various types of present-day totalitarianism in the setting of the play.²⁵⁶ Although Croiset collaborated with the translator Voeten to adapt the text for the *mise en scène*, it is remarkable that the translation was not modernised.²⁵⁷ It is worth noting that Croiset left it to Voeten to change the

249 Kott (1968: 197).

250 "een provo uit 1602, die geen rust kan vinden bij de gangbare meningen, geen erkenning mogelijk acht van het bestaande gezag, omdat de uitgangspunten van meningen en gezag wortelen in een onbetrouwbaar verleden." As reported in Jan Hein de Groot, *De Havenbode*, 24-11-1966.

251 "Hamlet werd nu een 'menselijk' stuk, waarin de jonge prins geen halfgod, geen symbool van deugdzaamheid was en waarin de andere personen van de Deense hofhouding geen afschuwwekkende schurken waren. Hamlet kwam zo veel minder te staan tegenover symbolen van het kwaad als wel tegenover vertegenwoordigers van een mentaliteit." B.S., *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 19-11-1966.

252 "De zienswijze van regisseur Richard Flink Shakespeare's Hamlet in deze tijd te spelen ontgaan van alle romantische ballast, ontgaan ook van alle vaagheid, is bijzonder juist gebleken." Jan Hein de Groot, *De Havenbode*, 24-11-1966.

253 "Wat de kostumering aangaat, hadden Flink en Nico Wijnberg een aankleding gekozen, die in zoverre tijdloos was, dat zij zowel uit de middeleeuwen als uit de toekomst kon stammen. Fantasie-militaire kostuums enerzijds, Hamlet in leren broek en bruine trui, sommige hofdignitarissen in een soort marsmannenpak. Zo werden het jaar 1602, waarin het stuk voor het eerst werd opgevoerd, het jaar 1966 en de toekomst met elkaar verbonden." C.J. Wisse, *Het Vrije Volk*, 19-11-1966.

254 See 'Voorstelling mislukt door gebrek aan visie. Hamlet de mist in.' *Algemeen Dagblad*, 3-12-1977.

255 See Jan Paul Bresser, 'Hamlet van een mateloze matheid', *Vrije Volk*, 13-12-1977.

256 "Het was te verwachten dat Hans Croiset zijn betrokkenheid bij de wereld van vandaag zou gebruiken om de actualiteit van Hamlet opnieuw te signaleren. Hij isoleert het stuk niet als een tijdgebonden koningsdrama, maar verbindt het met de politieke realiteit van vandaag. (...) De kracht van de voorstelling is de verbreding van dit perspectief: overal doemt de angstaanjagende werkelijkheid op. Van het Derde Rijk van Hitler tot en met de onmenselijke operette-dictaturen van Amin en Pinochet. In het algemeen: de valsheid achter een grootse schijn, de laagheid en leegheid achter een uiterlijk machtsvertoon." Jan Paul Bresser, *Volkskrant*, 13-12-1977.

257 In the preceding large scale *Hamlet* – Flink's in 1966 – one critic had noted that "some undue liberties – possibly for reasons of actuality – were taken with the translation by Bert Voeten." *Trouw*, 19-11-1966. This was not mentioned in 1976.

contents of the lines, as he apparently considered this the task of the translator.²⁵⁸

An interesting detail is that Voeten chose to translate 'nunnery' in the 'nunnery-scene' (3.1.90-163) with another of its two meanings, namely 'bordeel' ('brothel'), after a hint from John Dover Wilson. This choice reflects a change in the norm of propriety towards more licence: it was the direct effect of the sexual revolution that had taken place in the Netherlands between 1967 and 1970.²⁵⁹

In reaction to this production, critic Wim Noteboom, like Maurits Uyltred in 1925, argued that actualisation ("actualisatie") is a way of falsifying history. According to Noteboom, actualisation relies on two unsolvable conditions. He expressed the first as follows:

To actualise is inevitably to falsify, since the actualiser relies on the overexposure of what is already known and the denial of the unknown, which is in the first place the aesthetic structure of the work, since it is precisely this which offers the most resistance when the material is looted. The bizarre consequence is that a play is actualised which in reality never existed in the first place.²⁶⁰

Noteboom argued that the adaptation of parts of the performance destroys the coherence of the whole; in a proper production the world of the play should not suffer interference from the world of the performance. He upheld the norm of integrity, i.e. the world of the play both in setting and in text should be presented as a whole. Noteboom's alternative was to make a historical production of the historical play. He continued with his second objection:

The second contradiction is more important, if not deadly. One may have the intention of demythologising a classic through actualisation. Actualisation however, if applied to the classics, always relies on a conception of art that can be called mythological. It concerns the vulgarised nineteenth-century conception of art that all art has a timeless power of expression.²⁶¹

Noteboom argued that the ideology behind modernisation contains the idea that

258 "Deze uitgave bevat de *gespeelde* versie van mijn Hamlet-vertaling, dwz. een tekst met vrijwel alle voor de opvoering gemaakte coupures. Maar ook op andere punten wijkt de tekst af van die van de 9^e druk (De Bezige Bij, 1974). Behalve dat ik hem opnieuw heb herzien – en bij deze vijfde revisie zal het niet blijven – moest hij met het oog op de uitgangspunten van de regie en de aard van de encensering dikwijls worden aangepast of bewerkt. In een paar, soms cruciale, gevallen heb ik voor de *gedrukte* tekst aan eigen oplossingen vastgehouden. Hamlet is de derde Shakespeare waarin ik met regisseur Hans Croiset heb gewerkt. (...) Aan zijn stimulerende kanttekeningen en suggesties heb ik ook ditmaal weer zeer veel gehad." Preface to VO1976. Voeten made the same distinction as Burgersdijk, only this time most changes were suggested by director Croiset.

259 According to the website of the NVSH (Dutch Society for Sexual Reform).

260 "Wie actualiseert, moet vervalsen omdat hij is aangewezen op de overbelichting van het toch al herkenbare en de miskenning van het niet-herkenbare, de esthetische structuur van het werk in de eerste plaats, aangezien juist deze de grootste weerstand biedt bij de roef van de stof. De bizarre consequentie is dat een stuk geactualiseerd wordt dat in werkelijkheid nooit heeft bestaan." Wim Noteboom, 'Hamlet is niet van deze tijd', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 16-3-1977.

261 "De tweede tegenspraak is zwaarwegender, zo niet dodelijk. Weliswaar kan men de intentie hebben een klassiek stuk te ontmythologiseren door het te actualiseren. Het actualiseren echter, althans aangewend op de klassieken, berust altijd op een kunstopvatting die mythologisch te noemen is. Het betreft de geactualiseerde negentiende-eeuwse kunstopvatting dat alle grote kunst een tijdloze zeggingskracht bezit." *Ibid.*

all great art is timeless and universal. In other words, the meaning (or message) of *Hamlet* speaks across the ages and can survive numerous transformations to boot. In this conviction, a play is considered as the expression of something greater. In a sense, the entire work of art resembles the vehicle of a metaphor, which can undergo various transformations without affecting the meaning of the metaphor, if only the tenor remains the same.²⁶² A similar idea (using the seed instead of the flower) is at the basis of a poet's translation of a play. According to Noteboom, then, this is a fallacy.

Actualisation was indeed a critical bone of contention. A month later, critic J.C. van der Waals defended actualisation on the grounds that Shakespeare had also used material from another era and culture. Additionally, he remarked that actualisation gives more attention to the general human condition ("algemeen menselijke") and referred to Verkade's modernising *Hamlet* in 1925. Van der Waals countered Noteboom's first condition with another paradox:

To strive after an authentic *Hamlet* is by all means defensible as a historical problem, but the goal is never achievable since that performance comes about partly as a result of our interpretation.²⁶³

Due to the fact that the perspective of the audience has changed, the interpretation of the production is always partial. Since a contemporary audience is not like the Elizabethan, a truly authentic performance can never be presented, since the audience would interpret the performance in an entirely different light. The cultural differences of the foreign text can only be communicated in domestic terms, which is also the paradox of translation.²⁶⁴

Thus, Van der Waals suggested that:

[t]here is no reason at all to recommend striving after authenticity and at the same time condemning the justification for actualisation. (...) One can demand, however, that modernisation is not restricted to the external presentation, but involves the translation or adaptation as well, so as to detach oneself from a non-topical, exuberant (Shakespearean) language, and avoid that it be dragged on the boards.²⁶⁵

Van der Waals pointed out that it is (also) the language of the play that made *Hamlet*

262 For some theatre makers, the universality is a condition for dramatic effect. In Christiane Nord's words, "cultural distance is incompatible with the appellative function." (cited in Lappihalme Tiva (2000: 160). It seems hard to combine a foreignising strategy with a performance that has to speak directly to the hearts of the audience. However, this goes for most, but not for all types of theatre. The theatre company Onafhankelijk Toneel, for one, prided itself on its intellectuality. See 'Je kunt bij ons je hersens niet aan de kapstok laten hangen', *De Waarheid*, 13-5-1977.

263 "Het streven naar een authentieke Hamlet is als historisch probleem alleszins te verdedigen, maar het doel is nooit bereikbaar omdat die op- of uitvoering mede door onze interpretatie tot stand komt." J.C. van der Waals, 'Hamlet toen en nu en overal', *Financieel Dagblad*, 15-4-1977.

264 See for a discussion Venuti, 'Translation, Community, Utopia.' In: Venuti (2000: 468-88).

265 "Er is geen enkele reden om bij een aanbeveling voor het streven naar authenticiteit tegelijk de rechtvaardiging voor een aktualisering te verketteren. (...) Wel kan men eisen, dat bij een modernisering niet alleen de uiterlijke aankleding wordt aangepast maar ook in de gebruikte vertaling of tekstbewerking afstand wordt genomen van de niet actuele, exuberante (Shakespeare-)taal zodat die niet over het voetlicht komt geslepend." J.C. van der Waals, 'Hamlet toen en nu en overal', *Financieel Dagblad*, 15-4-1977.

seem outdated, and argued in favour of adapting the heightened language to a more contemporary idiom. Others also argued that it was better to unveil the actuality of the play through a more in-depth investigation into the text itself, and questioned the idea of transposing the performance to a modern setting. Adapting the *form* of the play was considered by some to create more obstacles to the universality of the original, rather than providing the means for invoking a universal appeal.²⁶⁶ The suggestion to achieve modernisation by working through the text would be adopted by translators in the 1990s.

Although the Noteboom discussion pointed out its potential inconsistencies, the politicised interpretation that *Hamlet* is about (contemporary) power and corruption held sway. Until 1988, the theatre companies De Haagse Comedie and De Appel mentioned or quoted Jan Kott in their programmes. Like Hans Croiset, director Guido de Moor saw *Hamlet* in the light of its actuality.²⁶⁷ Critics regularly pointed out that *Hamlet* “reflects our time,”²⁶⁸ that “in *Hamlet* Shakespeare turns against dictatorship, corruption and collaboration.”²⁶⁹ In general, *Hamlet* was considered a political play²⁷⁰ about power and corruption.²⁷¹

In those reviews that found fault with these productions, however, Noteboom's remarks would be the inevitable companion to these productions.²⁷² By the mid-1980s, the Dutch theatre audiences, amongst whom the influential critic Martin van Amerongen, grew tired of ideological interpretations.²⁷³ This would induce theatre makers to show the story

266 “Ik geloof dat het veel zinniger is de Hamlet niet naar ons toe te willen halen, maar de actualiteit ervan te zoeken in een diep doordringen in de tekst zelf. De aanpassing van de vorm is eerder een beletsel voor de universaliteit ervan.” Pierre H. Dubois, review TIN.

267 Croiset in the preface to VO1976: “Dat dit stuk volgestouwd is met corruptie, spionage, bedrog, vals gedrag, impulsief stom gedrag, onvolwassen handelen, moord, hinderlagen, hovaardij, hysterie, lafheid, hoeft op zichzelf de geldigheid voor onze dagen niet te bewijzen. Er zijn zoveel toneelstukken volgestopt met deze componenten. *Die roepen echter niet de noodzaak op, houdingen te wijzigen.* Hamlet wel, bijvoorbeeld.” De Moor in the preface to VO1983: “Hamlet zie ik niet als de traditionele historische heldentragedie, maar als een aktueel, modern stuk. Een toneelstuk dat vandaag geschreven had kunnen zijn.” Tiesema in the preface to VO1988: “steeds weer blijkt de bijna vier eeuwen oude tekst van Hamlet in staat een brug te slaan naar onze tijd.”

268 “De Hamlet is zo gebruikt, dat het stuk onze tijd weerspiegeld.” Jac Heijer, ‘Weerspiegeling van de crisis in Hamlet’, *NRC*, 2-6-1982.

269 “In Hamlet keert Shakespeare zich tegen dictatuur, corruptie, meeloperij.” Ko van Leeuwen, ‘Hans Hoes knap als Hamlet. Haagse Comedie op gespannen voet met Shakespeare’, *Haarlems Dagblad*, 27-12-1977.

270 “Wat ik wel aardig vond was de nadruk op de politieke aspecten van het stuk”, Tineke Straatman, ‘Hamlet als rockmuzikant’, *Haarlems Dagblad*, 7-1-1987.

271 “Het is langzamerhand wel bekend dat Hamlet een toneelstuk is dat over macht en corruptie gaat”, Ko van Leeuwen, ‘Puur entertainment in gedurfde Hamlet’, *Haarlems Dagblad*, 14-1-1984.

272 For example in Loek Zonneveld, ‘Wreek die moord!’, *De Groene*, 25-1-1984; and later, in reviews of De Trust (Loek Zonneveld, ‘Hamlet, tijdgenoot?’, *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 21-1-1997). Noteboom's article was republished in *Dietsche Warande & Belfort*, December 2000, 6, pp. 685-690 on the occasion of the *Hamlet* by 't Barre Land (2001).

273 According to Van Maanen (1997: 146), the storm of Aktie Tomaat subsided in the early 1980s. See also Riëks Bos and Hans van Maanen (1994: 66). The period was marked by a fatigue of innovation at all cost. On the whole, the theatrical community rejected simple solutions, a direction in which intellectuals like Noteboom and Martin van Amerongen had led the way. See also Martin van Amerongen, *Vrij Nederland*, October 1983, with regard to *Richard III*. The small stage productions were not automatically applauded for their novelty anymore. In 1988, a production by Discordia meant “to speak, as so often, about themselves and about the theatre” was considered ‘superfluous’. (Hanny van der Harst, ‘Discordia's Hamlet is overbodig’, *Trouw*, 5-6-1987) And the Hageman *Hamlet* that intended to ‘decondition’ made some critics wonder “what is the use of this director's theatre?” (Peter Zonderland, ‘Een opmerkelijke en snelle Hamlet’, *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 14-6-1989). By 1983, *Genesis* was reprimanded for being too similar to “educational theatre” (Hanny Alkema, ‘Genesis met interpretatie van Hamlet te ambitieus’, *Volkskrant*, 16-4-1983). A similar critique was given to a Belgian *Hamlet* by Het Raamtheater: “[De voorstelling is] blijven steken in een theoretisch idee en het gevolg is een opgeplakte interpretatie, die het publiek met zó'n hardnekkigheid door de strot geduwd krijgt, dat het hele Hamlet-verhaal verder overbodig wordt.” (‘Belgische Hamlet blijft in theorie steken’, *Trouw*, 8-1-1987)

with some distance,²⁷⁴ instead of preaching the Kottian interpretation of *Hamlet*. Noteboom's most influential review was one of the first to express the audience's rejection of both modernisation and its ideological foundation.

3.6 1966 - Staging of Marowitz's *Hamlet*: theatre makers as co-authors of the text

At this point in the sequence of *Hamlet* case studies we take a step back to the 1960s. This decade saw the rise of a group of theatre makers whose principles for the theatre deviated from those described in the previous section. These principles are of importance, even though they have not directly caused new translations of *Hamlet*. In the first place, their presence indicates that artistic conflicts are not necessarily fought out by means of retranslation or the translation of an intermediate text (as in the case of the Ducis *Hamlet*). In the second place, these theatre makers gave the initial impetus to a new attitude towards the source text, which would later result in a new approach to translation. This development comes most clearly to the fore in the events surrounding the first Dutch performance of a *Hamlet* adaptation made by the Englishman Charles Marowitz.

Up to 1966, all *Hamlet* productions had been produced more or less in succession, either rebelling against or continuing in the tradition of their predecessors. The only simultaneous stagings (in 1882 and 1907-1908) had represented pivotal moments in which one group took over from their predecessors. Since the staging of the Marowitz *Hamlet*, however, the Dutch audience was offered a series of concurrent versions of *Hamlet*.

On the one hand, there were such companies as Het Publiektheater and the Haagse Comedie, who felt it to be their role to produce traditional repertory.²⁷⁵ They followed and expanded the interpretations of 'Shakespeare as our contemporary' as voiced by Steenbergen (1957), Flink (1966), Croiset (1976) and De Moor (1983). On the other hand, small theatres like Mickery, Shaffy and De Brakke Grond staged productions that were more experimental in nature,²⁷⁶ challenging, as it were, the traditional companies. These alternative *Hamlets* were made at first by students and later by the small companies that came to the scene as a result of Aktie Tomaat.²⁷⁷ In a belated reaction to a revolution on the international

274 As early as 1983, Ko van Leeuwen argued that Shakespeare productions in the 1980s called for distance, for putting things into perspective, and not for merely dressing up in modern costumes. (Ko van Leeuwen, 'Haagse Comedie op gespannen voet met Shakespeare', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 27-12-1984). Although some found fault with De Haagse Comedie for having a "vague concept of direction" (Ruud Gortzak, 'Hamlet is bezienswaardig ondanks vaag regieconcept', *Volkskrant*, 28-12-1983), others admired it for presenting "renewal without destruction" (Peter Liefhebber, 'Hans Hoes fascinerend als Hamlet', *Telegraaf*, 7-12-1983). In 1988 Erik Vos chose to show Shakespeare's most famous play to the audience on its own merits. This was a conscious choice of the director, who did not wish to underline any possible new interpretation (Karen Welling, 'Shakespeare's Hamlet als stuk van alle tijden', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 16-1-1989).

275 "De kracht van het Publiektheater in het woelige Amsterdamse theaterlandschap van de jaren zeventig lag in de theateervoortzetting, niet in theatervernieuwing. Het bracht met zijn grote kwaliteit aan spelers een aantal indrukwekkende, gedurfde klassiekers, waarin heel consciëntieus aan de actuele zeggingskracht werd gewerkt." De Kock (1996).

276 The same black box theatres were visited by foreign experimental companies that also occasionally presented their *Hamlets*. The Yugoslavian Atelje 212 in Mickery (1972), the English Open Space Theatre in a tour organized by WIKOR and Mickery (1972), the Korean Dong Nang in Mickery (1977), the American Stuart Sherman's Theatre of Mistakes in Mickery (1981) and the Belgian Het Trojaanse Paard in De Kleine Komedie (1982).

277 They include: Onafhankelijk Toneel, 1977; Theaterunie, 1979; Genesius, 1983; La Luna, 1984; Theaterwerkp-laat, 1985; De Kolonie, 1985; Het Raamtheater, 1986; Stichting Wereldpremières, 1988; Independence, 1989;

scene,²⁷⁸ Dutch theatre makers and theatre scholars had called for innovation and change in the theatrical system. The starting point of this so-called “Aktie Tomaat”²⁷⁹ was the hurling about of tomatoes to disturb a performance of Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, presented by the Nederlandse Comedie on the 9th of October 1969. The main focus of the critique was that the theatrical establishment did not leave any space for new initiatives and failed to attract larger, more diverse audiences.

The small-scale companies applied distinctly different norms to the interpretation of classical plays. The first (*Hamlet*) experiment was undertaken with the staging of Charles Marowitz’s adaptation of *Hamlet* in 1966-1967 by the student theatre companies ASTU and SARST. Its textual norms made a head-on collision with those of the simultaneous staging by director Richard Flink, who had respected the text of the translation and had attempted to modernise the meaning of the play by placing it in a meaningful setting. Marowitz instead found meaning in a *disrespectful* treatment of the text.

With his *Hamlet* adaptation, Charles Marowitz²⁸⁰ had wished to debunk the attitude of intellectuals who denounced what happened in Vietnam, spoke out against the regime in Greece or against the racial conflict in the United States, and believed that by the intensity of their convictions they could bring about a change.²⁸¹ According to Marowitz, these disreputable values derived much of their respectability from such works as *Hamlet*. He had made a “collage” – a technique of ‘addition’, cutting and pasting lines and fragments, changing speech assignments, shuffling the plotline of *Hamlet* – to make contact with the essence of the play. According to Marowitz, the original play, in the structure and order Shakespeare had given to it, no longer had any meaning. Marowitz defended his (confrontational) type of adaptation in the following manner:

Ultimately, [my] kind of re-interpretation has little to do with ‘new slants’ on traditional material (...) It is nothing more nor less than a head-on confrontation with the intellectual substructure of the play, an attempt to test or challenge, revoke or destroy the intellectual foundation which makes a classic the formidable thing it has become.²⁸²

Marowitz’s approach, sometimes accused of being ‘(too) intellectual’,²⁸³ assumed

F ACT, 1989.

278 Brockett (2002: 529) argues that the year 1968 represents a watershed on the international theatre scene: “the concern for aesthetic values was largely replaced by the demand that theatre serve as a weapon in exposing and fighting outmoded values and practices both political and civil.” In Great-Britain, censorship was abolished, which also gave impetus to fringe groups. In the United States, off-off-Broadway companies like the Living Theatre denigrated texts that could not be transformed into an argument for anarchy or social change and downgraded language in favour of Artaudian techniques (Brockett, 2002: 537). The Holland Festival of 1969 presented a *Troilus and Cressida* by the RSC that presented a bleak vision of humanity.

279 For more information on Aktie Tomaat, see Dennis Meyer (1994).

280 Marowitz’s original *Hamlet* adaptation had been made during the Theatre of Cruelty season at the Royal Shakespeare Company (1964), which Peter Brook and Marowitz co-directed. Brook suggested they try to get across the essence of a play without relying on narrative, and they decided to experiment with *Hamlet*, which became a 28-minute version in their hands.

281 Reported in *Het Vaderland*, 19-10-1972.

282 Marowitz (1978: 24).

283 For example: [Open Space Theatre, 1972] “Het is een vernuftig intellectualistisch spelletje.” André Rutten, *De Tijd*, 19-1-1972. “Mijn persoonlijke bezwaar is dat de Marowitz-Hamlet zo’n cerebraal bedenksel blijft.” Jac

knowledge of the intertextual framework of the adaptation. He wished to question the values embedded in this classic. The audience was not only supposed to know the play, but also to have formed an opinion of it that coincided with the canonised interpretation. Marowitz meant to thwart the audience's expectations through a change in the play's structure. The shock between what they thought they knew of the original and what they actually saw, would put their knowledge into a new perspective and would generate new interpretations.

The upshot of the Dutch opening of Marowitz's play was a debate. The Dutch Shakespearean scholar A.G.H. Bachrach dismissed the performance as a "caricature" in 1967.²⁸⁴ He argued that the whole of *Hamlet* is the "essence," so that it is impossible to isolate essential elements from it. Bachrach stated that an ideal production is one in which the intentions of Shakespeare himself, seen in the light of the ideas and sensibilities of his day and age, form the basis for direction and performance. Other critics supported his critique in rejecting the new version because of its incoherence.²⁸⁵

Critic Guus Rekers, on the other hand, applauded the production, since it attacked the very structure of the sanctimonious original.²⁸⁶ Contrary to Bachrach, Rekers only considered the content to be the 'essence' of the play, and the technical form ("the Elizabethan structure") its time-bound manifestation. His argument ran along the following lines: since the rules of the genre of drama change with time, the structure of the plays that are performed should follow these genre changes. In support of these adaptations, Rekers claimed that it had always been common practice for theatre makers to change the text, as opposed to the present struggle with the "holy, integral original."²⁸⁷

Rekers' stance was in line with the conviction of a large group of theatre makers: the old theatrical language no longer sufficed. These views echoed the revolutionary ideas of two theatre makers, Antonin Artaud and Bertold Brecht. Artaud's stance against literary masterpieces and his conviction that once an expression or form is used it has no more use and begs for another to be found,²⁸⁸ as well as the effects of estrangement and adaptation of Brecht's epic theatre, represented a theatrical legacy with which the small-scale productions all tried to come to grips.²⁸⁹

If the only problem was the dramatical structure, one would expect a new incarnation of Ducis to come to the stage to make a proper contemporary adaptation of *Hamlet*,

Heijer, *IJmuiden Courant*, 19-10-1972. [Hamlet, Stuart Sherman, 1981] "Je zit hier toch meer met je hersens te kijken dan met je fantasie of je gevoelens." Jac Heijer, 'Stuart Shermans Hamlet als cerebraal spel met objecten,' *NRC*, 3-6-1981; "Shermans opvatting van de Deense prins doet (...) inderdaad meer denken aan een cerebrale quiz dan aan een traditionele toneeluitvoering." Renske Heddema, 'Sherman toont Hamlet als quiz', *Volkskrant*, 4-6-1981.

284 The lecture has been reported by H.W., *De Tijd*, 9-2-1967; by Van Hoboken, 'Geslaagd Hamlet-festival van R'damse studenten,' *Trouw*, 9-2-1967; and in *NRC*, 9-2-1967.

285 'Oude en nieuwe Hamlet in Utrecht ten tonele,' *NRC*, 24-11-66; W.B., 'Hamlet,' *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 9-2-67; 'Hamletdag van Rotterdamse en Utrechtse studenten,' *NRC*, 9-2-1967.

286 "De inhoud biedt alle actuele aanknopingspunten, maar de manier waarop die vanuit de structuur van het werk wordt opgediend is volkomen overzichtigelijk; en dus uit de tijd." Guus Rekers, 'Mythe geprofaneerd,' *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 3-12-1966.

287 "[Brecht en Shakespeare] maakten in de ruimte, die de heilige inhoud van het voorbeeld hun bood, een nieuwe structuur en bereikten zodoende een aanspreekbaar arrangement van typisch tijdgebonden en eeuwige zaken." Guus Rekers, 'Mythe geprofaneerd,' *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 3-12-1966.

288 Antonin Artaud (1968: 56-63).

289 The great examples of the period, Jerzy Grotowski and Peter Brook, also tried to combine the ideas of both in order to come up with a new type of theatre (Kalb, 1998: 106).

one that would do for another stretch of time. This was not the case, however. The present required contemporary theatrical forms out of “a need for re-evaluation of all things that are considered self-evident.”²⁹⁰ As a consequence, one was time and again expected to present a new interpretation of a play.²⁹¹ This attitude often led to favourable comments on alternative versions²⁹² and castigated productions that lacked “vision” or “innovation.”²⁹³ This was a far cry from the expectancy norms voiced a decade earlier by the critic who did not wish for a new *Hamlet*, but for the same *Hamlet*, as a role steeped in tradition.²⁹⁴ As stated by Marowitz:

The question is not, as it is so often put, what is wrong with Shakespeare that we have to meddle with his works, but what is wrong with us that we are content to endure the diminishing returns of conventional dramatic reiteration; (...) not to realise that there is nothing so insidious as art that perpetuates the illusion that some kind of eternal truth is enshrined in a time-space continuum called ‘a classic.’²⁹⁵

Along with the need for a continuous renewal of the dramatical structure, the attention shifted from the original writer to the interpretation of the performers. Contrary to the generation of De Meester and Steenbergen,²⁹⁶ theatre makers and theatre scholars expressed the necessity of having ‘their own Hamlet.’ In this way the theatre makers introduced the norm of partiality, the bias that was of necessity part of their individual interpretation.

The company Onafhankelijk Toneel expressed the uniqueness of their performance (1977) in their brochure: “Everyone knows the story of the classic of the same name, but no one knows the *Hamlet* by Onafhankelijk Toneel.”²⁹⁷ This statement undermined the notion that there is but one *Hamlet* (i.e. by Shakespeare). Instead, it proposed not only that Onafhankelijk Toneel’s *Hamlet*, but in effect each theatre company’s *Hamlet* was a new version. This meant that a production of *Hamlet* was only valid in the moment of performance. One did not try to play ‘the’ *Hamlet* anymore, but ‘a’ *Hamlet*, in other words, to advance a personal, topical interpretation of the old play.²⁹⁸ This was already widely accepted in 1966: “It

290 Guus Rekers, *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 26-11-1966.

291 For example: “zij heeft op het stuk en de titelrol een nieuw licht geworpen, en dat is naar mijn gevoel wél zo belangrijk,” Daniël de Lange, *Volkskrant*, 4-11-1966.

292 “Hamlet is door de Haagse Comedie opgevoerd als op een hoofdweg die al enige tijd verlaten is. Die van La Luna gaat langs een bospad, reeds gebaad, maar toch nog vol risico’s. Juist de kleerscheuren maken de voorstelling zo interessant.” Jac Heijer, ‘Hamlet: prikkelend spektakel bij La Luna,’ *NRC*, 16-1-1984.

293 “Van Hans Croiset (...) mocht een nieuwe visie verwacht worden. En van Eric Schneider een andere Hamlet.” ‘Voorstelling mislukt door gebrek aan visie. Hamlet de mist in,’ *Algemeen Dagblad*, 3-12-1977.

294 “Nu kan men spreken van een nieuwe, een ‘onbevangen’ Hamlet, van een acteur die met een schone lei begint. Maar bij een rol met drie eeuwen toneelgeschiedenis achter zich, is dat onzin. Wij willen geen nieuwe Hamlet. Wij willen Hamlet opnieuw.” *Haagse Post*, 17-10-1957.

295 Marowitz (1978: 25).

296 Paul Steenbergen and his teacher Johan de Meester Jr. both thought that the director and the actor should be the servant of the author. See Heijer (1989).

297 From the depliant for *Hamlet*, Onafhankelijk Toneel (1977): “‘hamlet’ van william shakespeare – het stuk dat iedereen kent- iedereen kent het verhaal van de gelijknamige classic, van citaten, van de film, uit boeken, beschrijvingen en toneelkritieken. iedereen kan er alles uithalen en instoppen: een politiek, filosofies, psychologies of klassiek drama, een misdaad of ridderroman, een spannend jongensboek met slechte afloop, een familietragedie, een bloedige fabel, een historische kroniek en wat u maar wilt. maar niemand kent nog de hamlet van onafhankelijk toneel.”

298 See Van Kerkhoven (2000).

is unmistakably true that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is of all ages. The resulting reasoning, that every age, every actor and every director has its or his own *Hamlet* has slowly become one of the stalest platitudes".²⁹⁹ In this manner the norm of textual precedence – the performance should follow the dramatic structure of the text – was replaced by the norm of performance precedence – the text should follow the dramatic requirements of the theatre maker.

*

After Marowitz's *Hamlet*, the Dutch were treated to a range of foreign productions that incorporated the combined ideas of Brecht and Artaud in *Hamlet*. These foreign *Hamlet* adaptations came in several forms. The first was theatrical, questioning, on behalf of the performers, any author's rights on the text. *Hamlet u podrumü*, *Prince Hamyul* and Stuart Sherman's *Hamlet* did not contain rewritten lines, but the theatre makers changed the title of the play as an indication of the departure from traditional stagings that was made in the *mise en scène*. The point was that the theatre makers were accountable for the performance text. It was *their Hamlet*.

This form of adaptation was the first to be imitated by several Dutch theatre companies. Jan Joris Lamers, the director of Onafhankelijk Toneel, still was interested in the text of the classics, but tried to detach it from traditional interpretations by means of Brechtian techniques.³⁰⁰ Apart from a presentation meant to distance the audience from the grandiloquent classical repertory,³⁰¹ a twist was given to the plot through addition. The lines of the Ghost were given to Horatio, which turned Hamlet's friend into the agent of his downfall. For the company La Luna (1984), the text was not as important as the originality of the performers. Shakespeare's work was treated as if it were the "spiritual property of all of us"³⁰² and the company members were like authors of their own *Hamlet*. This attitude entailed that the performing artist was at liberty to express himself through the text. In fact, the original text could be bypassed to a great extent. More than a basis for the production, the source text was a source of inspiration for the performance. La Luna's performance was based on improvisations on the original.

The second form of adaptation took the shape of new plays, 'additions' to the matter of the original. Their titles were different from the original, although they contained a reference to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The author was not Shakespeare, but Marowitz, Stoppard or Müller. These playwrights had no intention of being original in the choice of their subject matter, but wrote a new text based on Shakespeare's story, just as Shakespeare had done with stories he may have found in Saxo Grammaticus and Belleforest. Like Ducis's *Hamlet*, they

299 "Het is een waarheid als een koe, dat Shakespeare's Hamlet van alle tijden is. De daaruit voortvloeiende redenening, dat elke tijd, iedere acteur en iedere regisseur een eigen Hamlet kent, is zo langzamerhand een van de mufste gemeenplaatsen geworden." B.S., *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 19-11-1966.

300 "Shakespeare werd gespeeld 'als was het Brecht', met allerlei 'vervreemdingseffecten'. De moeilijkste, diepzinnigste teksten werden losjes 'langs de neus weg' uitgesproken. (...) 'We wekken dan ook geen enkele illusie. Als die opgebouwd wordt vernietigen we hem meteen weer, hup boem!'" Ko van Leeuwen, 'Je kunt bij ons je hersens niet aan de kapstok laten hangen,' *IJmuider Courant*, 13-5-1977.

301 "Het Onafhankelijk Toneel [neemt] soms nogal resoluut en in ieder geval inventief en geestig afstand van stijlen en patronen waarmee het grote klassieke repertoire is opgescheept." Jan Paul Bresser, 'Kaalgeschoren Hamlet komt doeltreffend over,' *Volkskrant*, 16-5-1977.

302 See Jac Heijer, 'Hamlet: prikkelend spektakel bij La Luna,' *NRC*, 16-1-1984.

were translated into Dutch like original contemporary plays.

Among these new contemporary adaptations of Shakespeare's story were some well-made plays, like those of the English writer Tom Stoppard. Stoppard wrote a number of *Hamlet* versions, of which *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* was the most successful.³⁰³ Stoppard's play had a coherent plot and incorporated the story of *Hamlet* – and scenes from the play – in a text built around other, minor characters from the original play.

In the early eighties, two Dutch productions followed suit. The Genesius theatre company (1983) staged the story of *Hamlet* with a frame tale about a theatre company performing the play. The original lines were retained, but were framed in a story of actors with problems of their own, in an experiment to bring new relevance to the old text. A similar experiment was staged by theatre maker Peter Lintelo's *Osrice* (1985).³⁰⁴

Other foreign new plays were written in a completely different theatrical language, in an attempt to destroy the traditional rationalist and psychological ideas about *Hamlet*. Marowitz's *Hamlet* was constructed along these lines, as well as Heiner Müller's *Hamletmaschine* (1977). The East-German playwright's play was by far the most influential *Hamlet* adaptation on the Dutch stage after Ducis's, judging from the number of times it was performed in Dutch translation.³⁰⁵ *Hamletmaschine* was informed by the conviction of "the end of history."³⁰⁶ The utopias envisaged by the generation of revolutionaries no longer seemed attainable, and the idea of progress was considered obsolete. Müller was also strongly influenced by the anti-rationalist attitude of Artaud and his concept of the death of the Author. By writing a play that alluded to *Hamlet* and a great variety of other texts, Müller tried to "destroy" *Hamlet*.³⁰⁷

These new experiments did not pose immediate problems for the translator.³⁰⁸ However, the challenge to the author by the performers – the starting point of most of these

303 Tom Stoppard enjoyed international success with *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are dead* (1967) – a revision of the one-act play *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Meet King Lear*, written in 1964 – and with his *The (Fifteen Minutes) Dog Troupe's Hamlet* (1976), which was combined with *Dogg's Our Pet* to become *Dogg's Hamlet* (1979).

304 Lintelo took the minor character of the foppish courtier and made him reminisce the events that have taken place in the play as we know it, as he awaits his fate at the hands of the Norwegian troupes. Lintelo's intention was to show the effect of big events on small people, along the same line as Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* had done.

305 Globe (1982), Het Trojaanse Paard (1982), Globe (1985), F ACT (1989), Henri van Zanten (1990), Grand Theater Producties (1992), Wolfsmond (1993), Universiteitstheater (1995), De Gasten Komen (1995), and Bronks (1996).

306 See Höfele (1992).

307 "For thirty years I have been obsessed with Hamlet. That's why I wrote a short text, *Hamletmaschine*, with which I attempted to destroy Hamlet." (Petersohn, 1993: 81). This could not be taken entirely seriously, since it produced the paradox of an author producing a drama that maps the failure of a drama to take place. The death of drama, like the death of the Author, was a myth to Müller. This fiction he tried to exploit as 'material,' just like the Stalinist violence, Teutonic myth and much else, that popped up in quotes in the play text. See also Kalb (1998: 104-126) and Hortman (1998: 236).

308 Because they were based on quotations, the new plays presented no particular difficulties. Marowitz's *Hamlet* is a good case in point, since it consists of nothing but quotations. For a translator, this meant recurring to lines of a previous translation, just like Marowitz recurred to the original text. The Dutch edition of Marowitz's *Hamlet* limited itself to publishing Buddingh's revision of Burgersdijk's translation and highlighting the lines Marowitz had used. Bert Voeten was asked to translate Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* in 1968. The play was first staged in Dutch translation in 1968 (opening night: 1 January in The Hague), under the direction of Paul Steenbergen for De Haagse Comedie. The theatrical adaptations usually used (parts of) Voeten's translation, although part of their freedom entailed that they did not always acknowledge this: "Eén ding moet me van het hart. Blijkbaar is hier voornamelijk de vertaling van Bert Voeten gebruikt, maar zijn naam ontbreekt vervelend genoeg in het programma." Jac Heijer, 'Hamlet: prikkelend spektakel bij La Luna,' NRC, 16-1-1984.

experiments – did have a bearing on the role of the translator. If the theatre no longer respected the original author, then why should the translator still be faithful to the source text? This norm shift may have provided a new impetus to translators, who, as part of the theatrical team, felt they could take more liberties with regard to emendation, modernisation and communicative adaptation.

3.7 1983 - Claus and Decorte's 'tradaptations': Belgian influence on the Dutch theatre

Two of the most vital experiments with regard to *Hamlet* in Dutch translation were never performed on the Dutch stage. Through intermediaries, however, they still had an impact on the scene in the Netherlands. Since the 1970s, Belgian artists had become an increasing influence on Dutch theatrical life:³⁰⁹ many Belgian productions were brought to the Dutch stage,³¹⁰ some Belgian theatre makers ended up by working for Dutch theatre companies,³¹¹ and many of the translations used by Dutch companies were made by Belgians.³¹² In the 1990s, Belgian translators would constitute a major presence on the Dutch stage. This meant that Belgian attitudes towards text would automatically have a great impact on Dutch productions.

Two Belgian adapters were the first to question the need to be faithful to the source text. Hugo Claus's translation of *Hamlet* for the Flemish group NTG (1982, presented in the Netherlands in a changed form in 1986)³¹³ and Jan Decorte's adaptation *In het kasteel* (1985) represented a new orientation on the role of the translator, introducing the concept of "her-taling" (tradaptation) to the play. At this moment in the history of *Hamlet* translations, as Hoenselaars (2004b:12-16) has argued, the translator rethought his "traditionally subservient role" and aimed at the "re-creation of the theatrical experience embodied [in the source text]" or, through adaptation, at "subvert[ing] the canonical status of Shakespeare."

Hugo Claus did not translate Shakespeare for lack of existing translations. The Flemish translator Willy Courteaux had published his Shakespeare translations in the 1960s

309 See Van den Dries (1996).

310 In the case of *Hamlet*, there were Het Trojaanse Paard with *De Hamletmachine* (1982), Nieuw Ensemble Raamtheater with *Hamlet* (1986), 't Gebroed with *Ik heb het gezien* (1995), Bronks with *Het Hamletmaschien* (1996), Het Toneelhuis with *Amleth* (2001).

311 In the case of *Hamlet*, Dirk Tanghe for S.I.P., Ivo van Hove for Het Zuidelijk Toneel.

312 Willy Courteaux by Stichting Wereldpremières, 1988; Johan Boonen by S.I.P., 1991; Hugo Claus by De Regentes, 1997; Frank Albers by Het Nationale Toneel, 1999.

313 Claus's version of *Hamlet*, made for the NTG in 1982, was never performed as such on the Dutch stage. The text that was performed in 1986, was an adaptation by Pavel Kohout, which omitted much of the parody. Director Walter Tillemans added translations of his own to create the *Hamlet* he wanted. Tillemans moreover emphasised the parallel between the actors' profession and the events in the play. (See Pavel Kohout, introduction to C1986). Quite conspicuously, so this was not the play Claus had made. As a possible consequence, none of the Dutch critics really objected to Claus's method, and – ironically – even praised it for its fidelity to Shakespeare. "Ik heb ook genoten van de vertaling van Hugo Claus, die met de van hem bekende woordenrijkdom prettig uitpakt en Hamlet zichzelf een maffe slungel laat noemen." (Tineke Straatman, 'Hamlet als rockmuzikant', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 7-1-1987); "Dit alles komt naadloos voort uit de door Pavel Kohout ingekorte en hier en daar wat omgegooid tekst die het origineel behoorlijk recht doet, want we krijgen een behoorlijk complete en lange *Hamlet* te zien. De taal met zijn binnnenrijmen, stafrijmen, cascades en andere lekkernijen voor het oor is van Hugo Claus - swingend en 'soulful' als het Engels van Shakespeare." (Martin Schouten, 'Vlamingen maken van Hamlet gitaarprins', *De Volkskrant*, 8-1-1987.)

and they had been performed several times.³¹⁴ Claus made an active retranslation³¹⁵ specifically for the theatre. Although Hugo Claus allegedly used a basic text before adapting it,³¹⁶ he chose to publish³¹⁷ his adaptation instead of the actual translation. This was a sign that Claus favoured the more performable text:

I do not transfer a scientific equivalent of the existing text into another language. I have to allow for the sensibilities of the contemporary spectator who must be able to experience such a text without constantly being confronted with erudite worries, which cause the impact of the play to be lost [...] There are translations enough anyway. Shakespeare wrote his plays to be played and to receive a direct response. I want to achieve the same. That is why I cannot copy Shakespeare's material indiscriminately, for that will not make sense to anyone, anymore.³¹⁸

As a rewriter,³¹⁹ Claus contested Shakespeare's authority as the writer of the play. He thought it possible to improve on the original if this better suited the audience's expectations, a stance also adhered to by Ducis. Thus, Claus broke with the norm of invisibility held by his predecessor Courteaux:³²⁰

I do not think that a play belongs to somebody just because he happens to have written it. I think an adapter or translator has every right to do as he pleases, as long as he makes a *performable* play, suited to his own environment. So he can do whatever he likes with it and in some cases I would indeed prefer him to transform it completely.³²¹

314 Courteaux has been staged only twice in the Netherlands (once in a Flemish guest performance and once in a small-scale production). As stated in the introduction, his translation falls outside the scope of this dissertation. The relation between Claus' *Hamlet* and Courteaux's version, however, deserves some investigation within the context of the history of Flemish theatre translation. Here it suffices to say that Courteaux's text was used in at least in two performances (by NTG during the season 1968-1969, directed by Kris Betz; and by KVS during the season 1971-1972, directed by Senne Rouffaer). After that date, no production of *Hamlets* was known to the Vlaams Theater Instituut until the staging of Claus's translation.

315 Although in the sequence of the retranslations treated here it is a passive retranslation, since it hails from another geographical area.

316 Niedzwiecki (1987: 17).

317 This needs to be qualified: Hugo Claus's *Hamlet*, as he delivered it for the theatre company NTG, was not published, but the text is available at the TIN. It was, however, published in a different format when the company Het Raamtheater published Pavel Kohout's adaptation; in this form it was used by Guusje Eybers for De Regentes (1997). Nevertheless, the adaptation is the only published text available, contrary to the alleged translation.

318 "Ik breng geen wetenschappelijk equivalent van een bestaande tekst over naar een andere taal. Ik moet rekening houden met de gevoeligheid van de hedendaagse toeschouwer die zo'n tekst moet kunnen ondergaan zonder doorlopend geconfronteerd te worden met erudiete bekommernissen, waardoor de impact van het stuk verloren gaat. (...) Er zijn overigens al vertalingen genoeg. Shakespeare schreef zijn stukken om gespeeld te worden en een directe weerklank te vinden. Ik wil hetzelfde bereiken. Daarom kan ik het materiaal van Shakespeare niet klakkeloos overnemen, want dat zegt niemand nog iets." Niedzwiecki (1987: 17-18).

319 Translation/adaptation is just one way in which Claus rewrites older material. Important in Claus's prose and plays are the classical myths that he adapts and places in a contemporary context. He is also known for his tendency to rewrite existing works. See Ton Anbeek (1984). In his analysis of Claus's treatment of Greek classics, scholar Paul Claes states that Claus used the old models to elaborate his own vision. He is not concerned with giving a rendition that honours the intentions of the original playwrights (Claes, 1984: 325). According to Claes, Claus's adaptations are both autonomous texts and critical reactions to the originals. (Claes, 1984: 329). In both cases, the principal authority is the new writer, and not the original author.

320 Courteaux explicitly stated the following in the preface to his complete Shakespeare translation (1966): "Het onderdrukken van de eigen persoonlijkheid is de eerste plicht die de vertaler zich oplegt." (CO1987: VII).

321 "Ik vind niet dat een toneelstuk aan iemand behoort toevallig omdat hij het geschreven heeft. Ik vind dat een

Like the critic Rekers, Claus buttressed his view with an interpretation of Shakespeare as a playwright who had also reshaped his material to conquer his audience:³²²

I prefer to translate ‘inferior masterpieces’, works that contain errors, because I can make a new piece of work out of it, based on previous material, as Shakespeare himself did.³²³

105

Although this type of translation was primarily intended for the stage, the initiative lay with the rewriter, who did not subject himself to the wishes of the director, but determined himself what the performance should look like. For the first production (1982) Claus delivered a performable text (a division of responsibilities comparable with Burgersdijk’s and Voeten’s work as stage adapters), but for the second (1983) he co-directed the play.

A similar adapter-cum-director, Jan Decorte, gave no dramatic reason for his adaptations, but declared that it was no use performing them unless he could make them expressive of himself or “autobiographical”:

I consider it an outdated phenomenon to consider a text, no matter whether old or new, as a whole that is to be respected. I have to do ‘my thing’ with it and that usually goes very far. I really cut out the words, sentences and little things, that I consider ‘appealing’ or useful. (...) What’s important is that one sees the artist talking about himself, through himself.³²⁴

This did not mean that he turned the character he played into a figure he could relate to. Rather, he turned himself into the character and gave himself the lines he liked. Thus, he was more interested in expressing himself than in really expressing the text.³²⁵

What was unique³²⁶ about the efforts of the two Belgians was their attempt to ap-

bewerker, vertaler, alle rechten heeft, als hij maar een *speelbaar* stuk maakt in zijn eigen milieu. Dus hij mag er mee doen wat hij wil en in sommige gevallen, ja, zou ik er zelfs de voorkeur aan geven dat hij het totaal transformeert.” Radio interview with Claus by Roland Opbroeck (De zeven kunsten, 9-1-1971), cited in Claes (1984: 328).

322 One can also consider the title of Jan Decorte’s *Hamlet*, *Amllett* (2001), as a reference to Saxo Grammaticus’ version of the story, called *Amlæth*. By referring to the fact that Shakespeare rewrote his sources as well, Decorte claims considerable freedom. The fact that the name is different shows that his version is a new play.

323 “Ik vertaal bij voorkeur ‘inferieure meesterwerken’, werken waar fouten in zitten, omdat ik dan een nieuw werkstuk kan maken gebaseerd op vroeger materiaal, zoals Shakespeare zelf deed. Of neem Brecht, die zijn hele leven lang geen drie zinnen schreef die van hem waren. Hij heeft alleen maar gestolen en met de buit iets gemaakt. Zij zijn mijn meesters in deze materie.” (Niedzwiecki, 1987: 17). Note that both Rekers and Claus refer to Brecht in their defense of dramatic restructuring.

324 “[Ik] vind het een vooroorlogs fenomeen om een tekst, oud of nieuw, dat doet er niet toe, te beschouwen als een te respecteren geheel. Ik moet er ‘het mijne’ mee kunnen doen en dat is gewoonlijk heel ingrijpend. Ik snijd er echt de woorden, zinnestukjes en dingetjes uit, die ik ‘mooi’ vind of bruikbaar. Een goeie tekst laat dat ook toe. Hij moet worden gepersonaliseerd voor je hem kan spelen. Autobiografisch gemaakt. Gelaagd. Gepoëtiseerd. En poëzie, dat wist Shakespeare al, is een zaak van simpelheid en chaos, niet van rechtlijnigheid en serieus. Dat zijn ook de noden van de tijd. Snel, grappig en poëtisch. Persoonlijk ook. Dat je ziet dat de artiest over zichzelf praat en liefst door zichzelf.” (Decorte, 1991: 70).

325 Still, adaptor Jan Decorte sketches his mission thus: “De grote, ‘geïstitutionaliseerde schouwburgen probeerden een hap van de markt (?) binnen te halen en lieten hun eigenlijke opdracht, nl. het bewaren en aktualiseren van het literair/tekstueel erfgoed, verder verwateren. Met het verbijsterende gevolg dat een groepje als HTP (Het Trojaanse Paard) het tot zijn taak heeft moeten rekenen de grote klassiekers af te stoffen in de eerste fase van zijn bestaan.” Decorte (1991).

326 In the case of *Hamlet*, of course, and for the Dutch and Flemish stages.

ply methods of (dramaturgical) adaptation to a project of translation, i.e. to adapt across language. Instead of sustaining the dichotomy between translation and performance text so carefully heeded by Burgersdijk and Voeten, Claus and Decorte cut across language in order to appropriate and rewrite the material as their own texts.³²⁷ Claus and Decorte themselves had a track record of previous classics they had treated in a similar manner.³²⁸ Their approach presented the critics with a problem, however.³²⁹ Their text was both too close to the original to be considered an autonomous text and too arbitrary in what was translated to be considered a real translation. For this reason the terms “hertaling” (tradaptation)³³⁰ and “verwerking” (reworking)³³¹ were coined.

However, Claus and Decorte not only undermined the traditional division of roles between the faithful translator and the production-oriented dramaturge, but the very basis of their dramaturgy was subversive. They both deconstructed the text during the process of translation. Since they made the translation, they were able to choose counterparts for the source text material that were and were not equivalents. This type of translational iconoclasm, which altered and added to the texts to extract new meanings, was new to Dutch *Hamlets* and shook the confidence in the authority of the text.

Claus skillfully balanced on the tight-rope between translation and transgression. In the original opening scene of *Hamlet* there is some initial confusion among the watchers about who is approaching, which is cleared up by the newcomer (Horatio) making himself known. Claus's adaptation provides a similar confusion, but ends with Barnardo shooting in the dark and Horatio coming on the scene on hands and feet. The effect is that what in the original works to build up the tension and highlight the game of reality and illusion, is plainly funny in Claus's text, since his comic exaggeration breaks down the built up tension. Taking a liberty in translating the whole (i.e. confusion on the terrace between the watchers) rather than the particulars, Claus was able to change the effect. This effect is enhanced if one knows the original, for it is easy to see, in juxtaposition, how close to silly the original situation is – it only needs a single push to tip over the edge. This use of anticlimax is one of

327 Decorte used what he understood of the English text, to write the text for his performance, *Amlett*. Decorte: “[De bewerking] heb ik op papier gezet. De Engelse tekst lag naast me, terwijl ik bezig was, die keek ik niet in, ik heb het uit het hoofd gedaan. Zo heb ik in een paar dagen het verhaal van Hamlet neergeschreven. Op die momenten daalde de heilige geest neer.” Karin Veraart, ‘Hamlet’, *De Volkskrant*, 11-1-2001.

328 Claus's first revolutionary rewriting of a classic was *Thyestes*, as early as 1966. After *Thyestes* followed, among others, *Oedipus* (1971, based on the *Oedipus*-translation by Ted Hughes), *Orestes* (1976), *Het Huis van Labdakos* (1977, based on the myths regarding this family), and *Phaedra* (1980), before turning to Shakespeare, first with *Een winters verhaal van William Shakespeare* (1981, based on *A Winter's Tale*), and later with *Hamlet*. Jan Decorte also had a predilection for the classics. He directed *Medea* (1977), the *Bacchantes* (1977), *Prometheus bound* (1979), *Cymbeline* (1980), *Torquato Tasso* (1982), and *King Lear* (1983). Decorte did *Hamlet* four times: he directed it in 1978 for the KVS and Heiner Müller's *Hamletmaschine* in 1981, he adapted *Hamlet* in 1983 for Het Trojaanse Paard as *In het kasteel*, and he adapted it again in 2001 for Het Toneelhuis as *Amlett*.

329 The Belgian audience's reactions to *In het kasteel* were divided. Some thought it was funny, without any underlying meaning, others thought it a useless waste of subsidies. See ‘Jan Decorte in het kasteel. Hamlet is stout geweest,’ *De Standaard*, 19-6-1985; Dirk van den Eede, ‘Jan Decorte: “Ik ben gek,”’ *De Morgen*, 21-6-1985; M. Ostyn, ‘Alles op zijn kop,’ *Knack*, 17-7-1985; Edward van Heer, ‘Twee procent Shakespeare,’ *Knack*, 26-6-1985. When the Dutch finally had a chance to see one of the Flemish experiments, they demonstrated different norms from those of the makers. Jan Decorte, had claimed that he had done a classical and complete *Hamlet*, albeit in his own language. (www.to-be-or-nor-to-be.be *DeToneelgazel*, III, 6, 26-1-2001). Critic Hans Oranje refused to follow Decorte in calling it *Hamlet* but considered it “a dramatic poem in which Decorte had put his love and fascination for Shakespeare,” (Hans Oranje, ‘Amlett als een schijterd die de zot uithangt’, *Trouw*, 29-2-2001).

330 A term coined by Michel Garneau for a combination of translation and adaptation. See Lieblein (2004).

331 Used on the title page of Claus's *Hamlet* for NTG (TIN).

the trademarks of parody and can turn a tragedy into farce. Moreover, the clash between the original *Hamlet* and Claus's addition flaunts the play's plural authorship. It represents a visible collision between the original and Claus's interpretation, and as such can be said to represent a *postmodern translation*.

The use of exaggeration was one of many subversive techniques used by both Claus and Decorte. They changed characters and scenes: Claus's Ghost speaks to Horatio directly, pokes fun at his glasses and his encyclopedias. At the end of the scene, the Ghost turns out to be Hamlet himself. Furthermore, Claus used deliberate anachronisms: he makes Claudius remember that he was once given a football. This reference to the present-day makes the character more prosaic and less stately, but most of all, it subverts the idea of a cohesive Shakespearean world on stage. Moreover, Claus introduced a lot of (phonetic) puns in his translation. These additions may have been caused by the nature of a performance text,³³² but also by a parodic intent, since they deflate the tragical part of the tragicomedy. Even the storyline of the original was not sacred. By shuffling the plotlines thoroughly in his *In het kasteel* (1985),³³³ Decorte changed the motivations of the characters, the development of their emotions and even their actions. In his later adaptation *Amlett* (2001), Decorte also deflated the rhetorics of the famous 'To be or not to be' monologue:

Tisof
Tisnie
Daddist
(Tisor
Tisnt
Thatsit)

The deflation of tragic elements was a recurring element in both artists' poetics. Both Claus and Decorte refused to draw a line between comedy and tragedy. Hugo Claus searched for the burlesque in serious scenes.³³⁴ Likewise, one of the intentions of Decorte's

332 Delabastita comes up with the interesting hypothesis that the awareness of the functionality of phonetic puns on stage influenced Claus's strategy (Delabastita, 1993: 291). "Hoewel wij verstandelijk, bij lezing, geneigd zijn die woordspelingen het hoogst aan te slaan waarin een klankovereenkomst twee uiteenliggende begrippen zinvol verbindt, terwijl we veelal het zinloze woordspel tot de 'flauwe' grappen rekenen [...], blijkt die waarderingsschaal heel anders te liggen, wanneer we alleen op de komische uitwerking in de schouwburg letten, waar nu eenmaal geen tijd is voor reflectie en waar het verstandelijk element eerder storend dan bevordelijk werkt op de spontane lachlust." (Van den Bergh, 1972: 177-78, cited in Delabastita, 1993: 291). "It is worth noting that many of Claus's 'new' puns, i.e. cases of NON-PUN > PUN and ZERO > PUN translation, are explicitly based on purely phonetic associations. The reason for this is sought in Claus's own poetics: 'De klankspeling speelt ongetwijfeld een grote rol bij het associëren: aangezien de narratieve en logische lijn in 'atonale' poëzie ontbreekt, fungeert de klank er als een middel om syntagmatische verbanden te creëren.'" Claes (1984: 54). This predilection for free verbal association and punning is also adduced by Delabastita (2004) as a method of the "postmodern translator".

333 The plot of *In het kasteel* (1985) is as follows: Hamlet takes the audience with him to watch a play. We see the murder of Hamlet's father. The king is furious and walks away. Hamlet pretends someone is watching him, but nobody is. Only two players are playing at billiards. The queen frets about her son and about two obnoxious clowns present at court. Ophelia is nervous as well. Hamlet thinks of a joke: he drags a corpse around. He thinks of a joke to play on his mother: he will pretend to die in a duel with his stepfather and maybe she will drop dead. This happens. The two clowns take over the throne. The two players continue playing at billiards.

334 "Eén van de moeilijkheden en ook één van de plezieren van het werk van Seneca is dat je door allerlei mythische rommel moet waden om er hier en daar een kleine bloem uit te pikken, en dan herleid ik zijn nogal bombastische en retorische aanpak tot iets heel armoedigs, iets heel simpels, wat een burlesk effect heeft.

theatre was to erase genre distinctions.³³⁵ Comedy overtakes tragedy in his *Hamlet* adaptations.³³⁶ Decorte presented the (canonical) figure of Hamlet as a silly creature, close to himself.³³⁷ In the later production *Amlett*, he explicitly called Hamlet a “ninny” (“snotvent”).³³⁸ The influence of Artaud is obvious in these acts of breaking down a canonical play in order to ridicule it, and ridiculing translation in the process. His ideas were indeed important for both artists.³³⁹ However, such irreverence also reflected a widespread attitude in the Flemish theatre of those days, dubbed “hilarious theatre” by Blokdijs (1988),³⁴⁰ with characters driven by perversion, ambition and destruction, their moral stature diminished.³⁴¹ The adaptations of the two Belgians show how much they wanted to make their own version; their intention was not to discard the previous text in favour of theirs, but to create a highly individualised version of the play alongside the traditional one. This individual approach was to be the maxim for the following decades.

*

In the last fifteen years of the twentieth century, Dutch theatre makers followed Marowitz, Müller and Decorte in combining the old text with new material. This new approach to text (alongside the old) represents a new phase in the history of *Hamlet* in translation. The directors chose to rewrite Shakespeare’s text themselves – an innovative approach to theatre making, perhaps also motivated by the cost efficiency of ‘Do It Yourself.’ In most cases, the new title for the production indicated its independent status. Some of these directors, following the example of Tom Stoppard, made a play around the story of *Hamlet*. Kriek’s play *Hamlet* (1997), subtitled “het mes in de klassieken” (putting the knife in the classics), was more like a reflection on the figure of Hamlet, whom Kriek thought to be a young man haunted by depression. Another adaptation, theatre maker Don Duyn’s *Aats Hamlet* (Aat’s Hamlet, 2000),

(...) Men heeft altijd de neiging dit soort passages serieus te spelen en volgens mij moet daar een beetje een clowns-effekt inzitten.” Interview in *Knack* 17-9-1980, quoted in Claes (1984: 301-2).

335 Decorte (1991: 65).

336 “Wij [Het Trojaanse Paard] maken tegenwoordig publieksvriendelijke, snelle en komische voorstellingen omdat we hebben ontdekt dat het cynisme gerecupereerd is.” (Decorte, 1991: 19).

337 “Dat je geen Hamletje kunt neerpoten [als acteur] zonder schizofreen of manisch-depressief te zijn, tot maanden nadien. Ik heb Hamlet gespeeld en hij leek precies op mij. Net hetzelfde maar wel met een kommuniepakje en blinkende schoentjes aan. En een raar brilletje. No sweat. Maar ik had dan ook een pluchen konijn bij om me gezond te houden. Zijn of niet zijn, dat is het konijn. Dat bedoel ik ook met ‘autobiografisch.’” (Decorte, 1991: 79).

338 “Shakespeare was een schrijver die over alles tegelijk schreef. En dat vind ik prachtig. Dat dat dan gekanaliseerd wordt in het verhaal van een snotvent, eigenlijk, want Hamlet is een snotvent, iemand die niet weet wat te doen de hele tijd.” *De Toneelgazer*, III, 6, 26-1-2001.

339 The themes from Artaud’s “theatre of cruelty” are omnipresent in Claus’s own plays, whereas ritual obsessions and the language of dreams return in Decorte’s theatrical sketches. For a further discussion see DeCreus (1996).

340 The contributors to *Toneel Theatraal* discussed the influence of the Vlaamse Golf (Flemish Wave) and “hilarisch theater” (hilarious theatre) on Dutch theatre. Tom Blokdijs notes that the theatre makers want to expose the thickness, vanity, bigotry and arrogance of people in their productions and show the more ugly motives for their actions: perversion, ambition and destruction. He mentions Decorte, but also the Dutch director Gerard-Jan Rijnders as an example. In 1988 the “hilarious” period comes to an end, according to the Belgian Wim van Gansbeke. The Dutch saw only the last of the wave of groundbreaking productions. See Blokdijs (1988), Geerlings (1989), and Van Gansbeke (1989).

341 Other events added by Claus are a story of how the King stole Hamlet’s crown and how Polonius lusts after Ophelia. In Claus, these are subtexts that might possibly (although in the second case improbably) be deduced from the original, but do not actually appear there. By making them explicit, Claus lays bare possible underlying instincts in the main characters. Claus’s focus on primitive emotions is likely to be a direct influence of Artaud.

was built around improvisations on the character of Hamlet by the actor Aat Nederlof, who suffered from Down's Syndrome. Several other performances in the period made a collage from different texts, including *Hamlet*, but also texts by Sophocles, Stig Daggerman, Ivo Michiels, Frederik van Eeden, Luigi Pirandello, etc.³⁴²

In fact, these new adaptations and rewritings took many different shapes. The world of the present could be in head-on collision with the world of classic texts, but the two could also be neutrally juxtaposed. Such interplay conferred the authority of the text to the theatre makers, who by cutting-and-pasting created each time a new, postmodern text. This new dramatic convention greatly expanded the possibilities of text in the theatre.

3.8 1986 - Komrij's retranslation: retranslation as a strategy and a trend

Gerardjan Rijnders's *Hamlet* (1986), the farewell production of Het Publiektheater, was an individual theatre company's 'state of the union.'³⁴³ Although it was not intended as a reaction to previous *Hamlets*, it did contain strong statements of differentiation. Firstly, director Rijnders used a new translation by Gerrit Komrij, instead of Voeten's version. Rijnders's dramaturge Janine Brogt suggested that the translator worked in the tradition of the poet-translator Jac. van Looy. With no reference to Komrij's great predecessor Voeten (whose translation was a reaction to Van Looy's), such professed kinship implied that Komrij's translation was a counter-reaction to Voeten's work.

Secondly, Rijnders's *Hamlet* constituted a farewell to the tradition of Hamlet as 'our contemporary.' Rijnders took up the same stance as the critic Martin van Amerongen, who had pleaded for 'more distance' in a Shakespeare performance. Contrary to Steenbergen (1957), Flink (1966), Croiset (1976) and De Moor (1983), Rijnders considered that presenting life-like characters on stage was an outdated form of illusionist realism.³⁴⁴ One of Rijnders's concerns was to confront the audience with "people who, as a consequence of their existential urge to distinguish themselves, make a role of what they are, and thus theatralise themselves."³⁴⁵ Instead of an active and political interpretation of the role, he presented a 'thinking *Hamlet*,' discarding the theme of corruption in favour of the theme of (in)sanity. The production deviated from previous *Hamlets*, and especially from the romantic interpreta-

342 InDependence (*Hamlet en Elektra*, 1989) combined the stories of the protagonists of Sophocles' *Electra* and of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. F ACT (*Ophelia*, 1989) made a collage with texts by William Shakespeare, Heiner Müller, Stig Daggerman, Ivo Michiels and Frederik van Eeden. Henri van Zanten (*I Never Really Understood Hamlet Prince*, 1990) used Shakespeare and Heiner Müller. Het Verlangen (*Ophelia's Lied*, 1993) used William Shakespeare, Tom Stoppard and Luigi Pirandello. De Gasten Komen (*M.C. Wisecrack / Support Act Hamlet*, 1997) combined Shakespeare's with M.C. Wisecrack's own wisecracks.

343 "Elke Hamlet voorstelling is een onderdeel van een canon en reageert in die zin op voorgaande voorstellingen. Maar wij hebben ons nooit specifiek mee beziggehouden. Wij probeerden een voorstelling van Hamlet te maken die voor ons, met onze geschiedenis, onze theaterervaring, ons besef van de cultuurgeschiedenis en onze acteurs op dat moment actueel en waar was." Personal communication with Janine Brogt, 9-3-2006.

344 "Dat is namelijk het paradoxale van toneelspelen: geloofwaardigheid heeft niets te maken met realisme. Je kunt reëel bestaande figuren exact op het toneel kopiëren, het blijven typetjes en omgekeerd suggereren de kunstmatige oplossingen vaak de meeste realiteit. (...) Kijk naar de schilderkunst. Door het loslaten van het realisme kunt je opeens op honderd manieren een huisje tekenen, of de essentie van een huis weergeven, of wat dan ook." (Van Kerkhoven, 2000: 134-5).

345 "Met mensen die ten gevolge van hun existentiële distinctiedrift gaan spelen wat ze zijn, zichzelf gaan theatraliseren." (Blokdijk, 1988: 10).

We strived after a performance that in a certain sense used the same theatrical means as in Shakespeare's time. Of course that is impossible, for the performance was at night, in artificial light, in a nineteenth century theatre. But the idea of one décor, a focus on language, impressive dresses, and rhetorics instead of movement, referred to a tradition that was anti-nineteenth century and pro-Shakespeare.³⁴⁶

Rijnders's third stratagem was to cast Hans Croiset as Claudius, the irony being that Hans Croiset had directed the earlier *Hamlet* by the Publiekstheater in 1976. The actor Pierre Bokma played Hamlet. He had been previously employed by Toneelgroep Centrum and represented both an outsider and a new generation. Both actors figure on the cover of this dissertation, caught in the third act (third scene, 'Now might I do it pat'), as archetypes of one group finishing off the other. When at the end of the play Hamlet killed Claudius, this was nothing short of a symbolic gesture.³⁴⁷

Komrij's *Hamlet* was one in a series of commissions by Gerardjan Rijnders and his dramaturge Janine Brogt.³⁴⁸ At the same time, it was part of a 'Complete Shakespeare,' commissioned by publisher Bert Bakker, which also makes it a retrospective translation. In effect, Komrij's translation was made both as a literary and as a theatre translation, just like Burgersdijk's. Komrij intended to be a faithful translator and mentioned his source explicitly.³⁴⁹ In the tradition of Burgersdijk, Van Looy and Voeten, there was a straight division between the translation and the acting version.³⁵⁰ Janine Brogt, the dramaturge, made changes during rehearsals and omitted the lines she felt were irrelevant, according to the rules of reduction.

346 "Week de voorstelling af van de voorgaande Hamlets (die van Verkade, die van Flink, Croiset, De Moor), en waarom? Ja; wij streefden naar een voorstelling die in zekere zin toneelmiddelen gebruikte als in Shakespeare's tijd. Natuurlijk klopt dat niet, want de voorstelling was 's avonds, in kunstlicht, in een 19de eeuws theater. Maar het idee: 1 decor, focus op taal, indrukwekkende kostumering, retoriek i.p.v. beweging, verwees naar een traditie die anti-19de- eeuws en pro-Shakespeare was." Personal communication with Janine Brogt, 9-3-2006.

347 A similar method of casting was used in De Moor's *Hamlet* (1983) when Hans Hoes was introduced as an outsider to the company.

348 "Komrij's vertaling was een initiatief van het Publiekstheater, in overleg met Gerardjan Rijnders en mij. Wij hadden Komrij in onze periode bij Zuidelijk Toneel Globe (1978 - 1985) om vertalingen gevraagd van *Pericles*, *Troilus en Cressida* en *Richard III*. Voor ons was het een natuurlijke voortzetting van een opgebouwde samenwerking en het Publiekstheater ging met deze wens akkoord. Komrij was toen bezig aan een integrale Shakespearevertaling, die een opvolger moest worden van die van Burgersdijk, van 100 jaar tevoren. Dat project heeft onderweg schipbreuk geleden." Personal communication with Janine Brogt, 9-3-2006. Rijnders and Komrij had collaborated on more than one occasion. Apart from *Troilus and Cressida* (season 1980-1981 for Globe) and *Pericles* (1982), Rijnders directed two of Komrij's own plays, *Het chemisch huwelijk* (1982-1983) and *De redders* (1984-1985). By the time Rijnders did *Hamlet*, Komrij had delivered among others *Richard III* for Globe (1983), *Romeo and Juliet* for Haagse Comedie (1984), *As you Like it* for Publiekstheater (1986).

349 The Arden Shakespeare is mentioned in most publications of Komrij's Shakespeare translations that were published by Bert Bakker. The Arden Shakespeare conflates the Second Quarto and the Folio edition of *Hamlet*, with a preference for the Second Quarto variants.

350 "Het overleg was niet gemakkelijk, vooral omdat, naar ik mij herinner, Komrij veel te laat was met het inleveren van zijn vertaling. We zijn - maar mijn geheugen is verre van perfect - de repetitieperiode gestart met alleen een vertaling van de eerste twee bedrijven en de andere sjoepelden mondjesmaat binnen. Dat maakte het repeteren niet gemakkelijk. Er zijn nog wel veel faxen en telefoongesprekken op en neer gegaan over details - internet was er nog niet - maar het was voor ons op dat moment belangrijker de hele tekst in handen te krijgen dan Komrij met details te storen bij het voltooien van de vertaling. Op een aantal punten hebben wij eenvoudigweg wijzigingen voorgesteld." Personal communication with Janine Brogt, 9-3-2006.




Figure 9: Comparison between Komrij's and Voeten's *Hamlet*

Komrij's and Voeten's *Hamlet* differ in three respects. The two translators apply a different norm with regard to the attitude towards the original author ('initial norm'), towards modernisation and towards heightened language.

The norms of Komrij's translation fitted the requirements of the theatrical commissioners. A translation, according to Rijnders and Brogt, should:

not iron out the folds and suppress the cracks. We wanted to be presented with the difficulties of the text as a difficulty – in order to see what solutions we could offer in exchange. We preferred that to a translation that would have solved the problems for us in advance.³⁵¹

The predilection for multiple meanings coincided with a general shift in the treatment of text in the theatre from the philosophy of Antonin Artaud to that of Jacques Derrida (Vuyk, 1987: 11). Where Artaud draws attention to what is not said in the text, Derrida focuses on the link between what is said and what is not. Instead of destroying the text as a unity of meaning along the line of Artaud, it now became fashionable to lay bare the multiplicity of meaning and the interplay of significations. The coincidence of the rise of translation studies in the academic field with the growing focus on puns in Shakespeare studies and the host of new *Hamlet* translations since the mid-1980s all reflect this new interest in signification.

In rejection of Voeten's expedient of clarification, Komrij's own poetics prescribed that he should "not explain, but guard the secret."³⁵² Like Rijnders, Komrij had no intention

351 "Wij verlangden naar een vertaling die niet de vouwen gladstreek en de scheuren verdonkeremaande. Wij wilden graag dat wat er moeilijk was aan de tekst ook als moeilijkheid gepresenteerd krijgen - en zien wat we daar aan oplossingen tegenover konden stellen. Liever dat, dan een vertaling die de problemen al a priori voor ons had opgelost." Personal communication with Janine Brogt, 7-3-2006.

352 "Ontleed niet, maar adem. Verklaar niet, maar bewaar het geheim." Komrij on translating Hölderlin, cited in

of presenting his characters as real life creatures. He translated poetry, which meant translating an artificial language³⁵³ and maintaining its poetical function. He refused to resort to paraphrase or partial translation. Metaphors were translated (“dat we met een vroom gezicht / en met een devoot gebaar de duivel zelf / besuikeren”), and so were puns (“Verwant wellicht, maar licht niet wél verwant.”) and the figure of hendiadys (“dat het als citadel of schild gevoel weert”). Komrij’s *Hamlet*, in other words, markedly distinguished itself from the clarity achieved in Voeten’s version (see Figure 9).

Komrij reacted actively against the received image of Shakespeare in Dutch tradition. Brogt argued that Komrij’s translation was intended as a “wake up call,” that contested the ideas of the everlasting value of a translation and of Shakespeare as a means of edification that had been propagated a century earlier.³⁵⁴ Komrij was aggressive in three ways. In the first place, he retained the banalities of the original. He therefore rejected Burgersdijk’s opinion that supposedly objectionable elements, which would detract from the enjoyment of the whole, should be smoothed over or omitted. This reflected the changing appreciation of the banal in Shakespeare. Until Burgersdijk’s days, the banal was faulted and attributed rather to Shakespeare’s era than to Shakespeare himself. When Komrij made his translation, however, common expressions were praised and their presence defended by the argument that Shakespeare used them as well:³⁵⁵

Just like Shakespeare, [Komrij] stretches the limits of language to their utmost; Shakespeare put the entire gamut of expressions within the boundaries of his blank verse, from the most elevated to the most common and banal. When Shakespeare uses a rhyming stopgap, Komrij is the first to replace it with a Dutch stopgap that is equally cowardly.³⁵⁶

With the acceptance of the banal, the bawdy was hailed as Shakespearean as well, much more than in Voeten’s 1976 ‘brothel’ version. The following two passages (3.2.110–119) illustrate that Komrij was much more conscious than Voeten of innuendo, bawdiness and intimacy (or condescension) in Shakespeare. Komrij modernises the forms of address more than Voeten. Note the active use of ‘leggen’ (put, place), with the possible meaning of intercourse, the pun on ‘loops’ (in heat) and the reference to ‘deel’ (‘part’, but also ‘the vital parts’):³⁵⁷

Brogt (1986: 14).

353 In fact, Anbeek (1990: 258) stresses the anti-mimetic qualities of Komrij’s own poetry: Komrij has even argued that poems should murder nature.

354 “Komrij’s Shakespeare-vertalingen (...) zijn controversieel. (...) Aanvechtbaar. Brutaal. Agressief. Nadrukkelijk niet ontworpen voor de eeuwigheid en in die zin zeer hedendaags. Komrij’s vertalingen doorbreken de illusie dat Shakespeare’s teksten onaantastbaar zijn, ‘klassiek’. Ze schudden wakker en dat is goed, ook als het ontwakken soms pijnlijk is.” Brogt (1986: 12–13).

355 Note that he defends the heterology of language, praised by Berman, as part of the ‘trial of the foreign’ (1985).

356 “Net als Shakespeare spant hij de grenzen van de taal tot het uiterste; Shakespeare kreeg het hele spectrum van uitdrukkingsmogelijkheden binnen de perken van zijn rijmloze verzen, van de meest verhevene tot de meest alledaagse en banale. Als Shakespeare een stoplaprijm inlast, is Komrij de eerste om er in het Nederlands een even laffe stoplap voor in de plaats te zetten.” Brogt (1986: 12).

357 Leek (1988) rightly observed a norm change with regard to propriety in Shakespeare translations. Delabastita (1993) corroborates this. In his study of wordplay, he mentions a number of norms that lie at the basis of the appreciation of puns. Apart from the appreciation of mixed imagery, the appreciation of wordplay for Delabastita

- Hamlet Jonkvrouw, mag ik in *uw* schoot liggen?
(gaat aan de voeten van Ophelia liggen)
- Ophelia Nee, heer.
- Hamlet Ik bedoel, met mijn hoofd op *uw* schoot.
- Ophelia Dat wel, heer.
- Hamlet Denkt *u* dat ik een grove toespelings maakte?
- Ophelia Ik denk niets, heer.
- Hamlet Het moet heerlijk zijn, tussen de benen van een maagd te liggen.
- Ophelia Wat zegt *u*, heer?
- Hamlet Niets. [Voeten, 1957, italics mine]
-
- Hamlet (Gaat aan Ophelia's voeten liggen)
Dame, *leg ik me* in *je* schoot?
- Ophelia Nee, heer.
- Hamlet Ik bedoel: mijn hoofd op *je* schoot.
- Ophelia Ja, heer.
- Hamlet Dacht *je* dat ik iets *terloops* suggereerde?
- Ophelia Ik denk niets, heer.
- Hamlet Schoon is *ons deel* bij de gedachte tussen de benen van een maagd te liggen.
- Ophelia Wat is 't, heer?
- Hamlet Niets. [Komrij, 1986, italics mine]

The second act of aggression was in the fact that Komrij wished to avail himself of the entire range of Dutch expressions, which included Flemish words, uncommon words and English loan words.³⁵⁸ He shared this stance with Burgersdijk (although Burgersdijk would have frowned at the loan words). The differences in register went against the expectations of some critics³⁵⁹ and, more saliently, Hans Croiset, (Rijnders' predecessor as a director of *Hamlet* and Claudius in Rijnders' direction) objected to such a pell-mell of speech styles as well.³⁶⁰

is closely related to the concept of the noble hero, the mixing of drama and comedy, and the appreciation of the bawdy. (Delabastita, 1993: 253-312). The development that comes to a head in the 1980s was started by the reduction of the status of the Prince to the level of our contemporary since Verkade-Van Looy (1925) and Steenbergen-Voeten (1957).

358 "Woorden ontleend aan de rijke Vlaamse taal vinden in Komrij's Shakespeare-teksten een plaats (...). Zelden gebruikte woorden als 'bietenbouw' of 'suave' zijn direct, noch hedendaags. En wat te denken van 'Vergeef het, want je bent een gentleman.'" (Brogt, 1986: 13).

359 "[Op de vertaling van Gerrit Komrij] is naar mijn idee veel op aan te merken. Komrij heeft gekozen voor een vertaling met veel grotere niveaueverschillen dan Shakespeare heeft, van archaïsch taalgebruik, soms zelfs stijf schools ('Beklagenswaardige koningin, adieu') tot uitgesproken vulgarismen ('Ach, man, ze kwamen klaar bij dat soort werk' voor 'Why, man, they did make love to this employment'). Heel hinderlijk klonk voortdurend het 'heer' als aanspreektitel voor 'my lord'." Hans Oranje, 'Klassieker zet de toon', *Trouw*, 13-10-1986.

360 "Waarom is het te getuigen, op superman's voet van een kleine deel van het woord 'trut' te treuen meer van dat soort hedendaagse termen hebben, wanneer zij de stijl van de vertaling zouden bepalen? Mijn bezwaar zit 'm in de voortdurende afwisseling, wanneer 'trut' wordt afgewisseld met Burgersdijk-achtige woorden als 'mallotig', 'zilte hoon', 'harentwil', 'dommel'. Wanneer laat-Middeleeuwse spreekwijzen als 'vriendschap

The third act of aggression involved the use of anachronisms, again in defiance of the norm of stylistic uniformity.³⁶¹ Making good use of the upward compatibility of language, Komrij occasionally inserted modern imagery and realia like “kampen” and “mitrailleur” along with historical words like “bietenbauw” and “sou.” Apart from the Belgian experiments, this was the first time a translator explicitly used modern words. In a sense, Komrij took up the gauntlet offered by J.C. van der Waals’s suggestion that the modernisation of a play should take place in the text rather than in its setting. With an emphasis on artifice and aggressive inconsistencies, Komrij was sensible to a theatre that worked with different layers of meaning, and played around with both the world of the audience and that of the play.

Most critics hailed Komrij’s translations as “poetic.” Van Amerongen, who had asked for more distance in Shakespeare performances, voiced enthusiasm.³⁶² For some, however, the visual and rhythmical qualities of Komrij’s translation were not considered very “speakeable.”³⁶³ Perhaps this is a reaction generally induced by all overt poetry. Mukarovsky (1964) observes that ‘poetry’ foregrounds the utterance in a way that contrasts not only with standard language, but also with the traditional aesthetic canon. The critical tone in the reception of Komrij’s text (and of his alleged predecessor Van Looy’s) as “poetic,” perhaps illustrate that these translations were considered ‘outlandish’ and against the grain of contemporary dramatic language.

The harshest censure of Komrij’s translations came from critic Frans Kellendonk. Kellendonk claimed that half the work of translating Shakespeare, “with our tradition of a century,” amounts to amending the mistakes of “a series of often venerable predecessors.”³⁶⁴ Kellendonk suggested that Komrij should have looked more carefully to Burgersdijk’s translation, for he had made too many mistakes. Apart from faulting Komrij, Kellendonk reproached him for being a translator who is visible in the text. Komrij was an impostor, because “translating is dressing up,— and with what feathers can one prance more dazzlingly than with the feathers of the Swan?” Kellendonk likened the translator to a transvestite: “Through his labour he forgets his scraggy shoulders and his scrawny legs (that for someone else remain very visible) and he can imagine himself splendidly white and downy, every inch

zonder lijm van waasheid valt door dwaasheid snel uit elkaar’ (...) of ‘Een olifant heeft een lomp onderstel, hij gebruikt zijn poten om er op te lopen, maar niet voor een knieval’ (...) dan ook niet door moderne zegswijzen vervangen worden, raak ik als lezer én luisteraar in de war.’ Hans Croiset (1988), cited in Voeten (1988: introduction). Croiset refers to a translation of *Troilus and Cressida*, but his citations can neither be traced to Burgersdijk’s, nor to Voeten’s, nor to Komrij’s translation. Nevertheless, he still faults the fact that it uses differences in register.

361 “De ‘actualiteit’ zit om te beginnen in Komrij’s opzettelijke anachronismen in de nu al omstreden vertaling. Zich niets aantekkend van stijleenheid, paart hij archaïsche woorden aan terminologie uit de krant. Dat valt vooral op in de tekst van Claudius. Hij gebruikt zo’n oude formule als ‘dat is geheel contrarie onze wens’, om verderop woorden te kiezen als ‘profijt’ en ‘ontduiking’, die regelrecht uit het parlementaire jargon stammen.” Jac Heijer, ‘Een maatgevende Hamlet door verrassend ensemblespel,’ *NRC Handelsblad*, 13-10-1986.

362 Martin van Amerongen wrote: “Een enigszins verstandige minister van Cultuur was allang met Komrij in onderhandeling getreden over de vertaling van de complete Shakespeare. Het klinkt allemaal even fris, krachtig en poëtisch.” Reported in Kellendonk (1985).

363 “Bijna nog ernstiger vind ik dat veel zinnen wel volgens de grammatica, maar niet op het toneel lopen.” Hans Oranje, ‘Klassieker zet de toon,’ *Trouw*, 13-10-1986.

364 “Shakespeare vertalen [is] tegenwoordig, met onze vertaaltraditie van een eeuw, voor de helft niets anders dan noppen lezen uit de staart van een reeks vaak eerbiedwaardige voorgangers. Wanneer Komrij het Engels begrijpt vertaalt hij soms briljant, maar veel te vaak blijkt hij niet genoeg Engels te kennen om te begrijpen wat Burgersdijk tot zijn oplossingen heeft bewogen.” Kellendonk (1985).

the Swan.”³⁶⁵

Komrij countered that a scholar is unable to translate a poet. He commented that Kellendonk was exasperated that Komrij did not have a degree in English, as Kellendonk had, and thought Komrij had no right to translate for that reason.³⁶⁶ By word of his spokeswoman Janine Brogt, moreover, he asserted that his poetic gifts helped to recreate the original. Like Van Looy, he embraced the Shelleyan principle that poetry should be translated by a poet:

Poems do not allow for a translation by literally representing the imagery in another language. This leads to the exact product of scribes, but not to a poem. And the best translation of a poem is... a poem. A good translator knows when to cast aside the criteria of literalness and precision in order to remain faithful to the spirit, if fidelity to the word does not produce poetry.³⁶⁷

The discussion between Kellendonk and Komrij can be interpreted in two ways. In the first place, it is the conflict between the ‘invisible’ attitude of the scholar-translator and the ‘original’ attitude of the poet-translator. It seems a belated debate between Burgersdijk (by word of Kellendonk) and Van Looy (by word of Komrij), that could have taken place around 1907. In the second place, Komrij was conspicuously modest about his achievement. Although his translations were hailed as the new complete Shakespeare for the twentieth century,³⁶⁸ Komrij held that a new *Hamlet*-translation was due every ten years.³⁶⁹ The validity of translations was only temporary. By stressing sacrilege, evanescence and poetic license in his Shakespeare translations, Komrij argued that it is impossible to deliver a definitive translation ‘to end all translations.’

This new attitude towards translation, encountered already with the Belgian translators, marks a new means of differentiation that does not seek to replace the old text, but instead presents each text as the individual expression of an individual artist, connected to a particular theatre company or production.

365 “Vertalen is een verkleedpartij – en met welke veren kun je oogverblindender pronken dan met de veren van de Zwaan? Het is uitleggen, passen, meten, inspelden, vastrijgen, en tot slot een gedaanteverwisseling. De vertaler is een travestiet. Door zijn zwoegen vergeet hij zijn schonkige schouders en knokige benen (die voor een ander heel goed zichtbaar blijven) en kan hij zich schitterend wit en donzig wanen, op-en-top Zwaan.” Frans Kellendonk (1985).

366 “Hij stak zijn ergeis niet onder stoelen of banken over het feit dat ik geen Engels gestudeerd had en – nog groter schande – nooit bij hem of zijn collega’s in de Elizabethanistiek advies had ingewonnen. ‘t Leek een beetje op de verbijstering van de beroepsmusicologen zodra Vestdijk weer een artikel over muziek had durven schrijven. Een amateur! Elk woordje werd door mijn doctor tegen zijn doctorale licht gehouden en bij elk woordje had hij een alternatief waarop ik zelf ook wel was gekomen.” Gerrit Komrij (2003).

367 “Gedichten laten zich zeer slecht vertalen door het letterlijk weergeven van de aanwezige beelden in een andere taal. Dat leidt tot een exact produkt van schriftgeleerden, maar niet tot een gedicht. En de beste vertaling van een gedicht is... een gedicht. De goede vertaler weet wanneer hij zijn criteria van letterlijkheid en nauwgezetheid terzijde moet schuiven om getrouw te blijven aan de geest, als trouw aan de letter geen poëzie oplevert.” (Brogt, 1986: 14).

368 From the jacket blurb of Komrij’s Shakespeare translations (Bert Bakker, Amsterdam, 1989): “In ons land kent iedere eeuw zijn eigen Shakespeare-vertaler. In de achttiende eeuw ontstond een eerste volledige vertaling in het Nederlands en in de negentiende eeuw verscheen de klassieke uitgave van Burgersdijk. Nu, in de twintigste eeuw, neemt Gerrit Komrij opnieuw de uitdaging aan. Hij zal, net als zijn voorgangers, zijn krachten beproeven op een vertaling van de ‘complete Shakespeare.’”

369 As reported by Nico de Boer, *Noordhollands Dagblad*, 1-3-2001. Also: “De tijd heeft het origineel voorzien van een patina; de vertaler krabt het patina af en laat de krassen van zijn specifieke pen achter. Voor een helder zicht op het origineel moeten Shakespeare-vertalingen regelmatig ververs worden.” (Brogt, 1986: 5). Note that Brogt presents retranslation as a means of clarification.

Komrij's translation was the next in line of consecutive retranslations from Zubli to Voeten. Each of these translations had been the standard for at least several decades. The offspring of Komrij's translation, however, was not a range of productions, but a host of further retranslations. These, including Komrij's, can all be considered active retranslations, because the previous translation, Voeten's, was staged as late as 1993.³⁷⁰

Each new retranslation was made for a single production.³⁷¹ These retranslations were never staged again in other productions (as is illustrated by the graph at the beginning of this chapter).³⁷² The translational poetics underlying these retranslations applied, therefore, only to that single production – to the extent that these differed from preceding translations. The professional 'group' that produced each translation was therefore very small; the target culture of these translations was as narrow as the single *Hamlet* production (including the audience) for which they were made. These groups operated simultaneously, which implies that the claim that general expectancy norms dictate the shape of translation does not hold in this case, except perhaps for the manifest bias of director and translator.

The only general norm that these various translators and theatre makers had in common was in the liberal approach to the source text. The discussion between Komrij and Kellendonk took place at a moment in time in which *Hamlet* translators distanced themselves from the claim to an eternal translation, in favour of an ephemeral, time-bound text. Komrij, Kellendonk and Brogt all stressed that each new translation uncovers new aspects of the original. After Komrij, only 'partial' translators made translations of *Hamlet* for the theatre.

One of the main causes for the production of the host of retranslations was in the production of so many *Hamlets*. The start of the proliferation of new *Hamlets* coincided with a period of reorganisation in the Dutch theatre.³⁷³ At the end of the 1980s, the theatres be-

370 Nevertheless, some critics faulted the translation by Voeten, once praised for its modernity, for being "unnecessarily complicated." See Erik van der Velden, 'Een Hamlet die vragen achterlaat', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 7-9-1993; Huizing, 'Hamlet voor de jeugd: zonder concessies.' *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 6-1-1986.

371 Six new translations were staged on the Dutch stage. Gerrit Komrij (1986), Hugo Claus (by a Belgian company in 1986, by De Regentes in 1997), Johan Boonen (1991), Carel Alphenaar (1996), Frank Albers (1999), and Erik Bindervoet & Robbert-Jan Henkes (2001). Moreover, Courteaux's translation was staged for the first time on the Dutch stage (1988). As singular as the number of retranslations is the presence of adaptations. Four adaptations are made mentioning the basic text (usually Bert Voeten): STAN (1988), De Appel (1988), Het Zuidelijk Toneel (1993) and Maatschappij Discordia (1998). No less than twelve other adaptations have an unspecified provenance. These may have been made directly from the English, except for De Trust (1997) and De Regentes (1997): F ACT (1989 - a children's version), Henri van Zanten (1990), De Zweedse Sokjes (1992 - a children's version), Het Verlangen (1993), Onafhankelijk Toneel (1996 - an opera-adaptation), De Gasten Komen (1997), Huis aan de Werf (1997), Huis aan de Werf/Theater UP (2000), and the Belgian productions by 't Gebroed (1995) and Het Toneelhuis (2001) and this list does not even include the productions of Stoppard's and Müller's *Hamlet* adaptations.

372 The first exception (that falls outside the scope of this dissertation) is Bindervoet and Henkes's translation (2001) that was performed in 2005 by De Nomade and used in 2006 for a radio play by theatre company De Geest. Bindervoet and Henkes's text thus seems to be the first *Hamlet* for a new generation, like Burgersdijk's and Voeten's have been.

373 As a result of a change in Dutch government policy, many companies disappeared and new ones emerged: Toneelgroep Amsterdam (a merger between Centrum and Het Publiektheater, lead by Gerardjan Rijnders), Het Nationale Toneel (a continuation of De Haagse Comedie, lead by Hans Croiset), Het Zuidelijk Toneel (a continuation of Globe, lead by Ivo van Hove), De Trust (founded by Theu Boermans in 1988) and 't Barre Land (founded in 1990). The youth theatre was granted a separate subsidy by the national government. By 1985 the Dutch government decided that social relevance was no longer a sufficient enough criterion for subsidising a

came accountable for attracting larger audiences.³⁷⁴ One of the consequences of the ensuing market mechanism was the reintroduction of classical repertory.³⁷⁵ The government, in the figure of Elco Brinkman (the minister for Education and the Arts), was a staunch supporter of this idea; patronage, in the form of subsidies, can therefore be said to have prepared the grounds for the rising numbers of *Hamlets*.³⁷⁶

There was a Shakespeare revival in the Netherlands.³⁷⁷ The classics made a comeback in parallel to the return to textual theatre in the international scene.³⁷⁸ For example, the English director Peter Brook, working in France, demonstrated the importance of text by demanding a new translation for each Shakespeare play he directed.³⁷⁹ Even the most target audience-minded theatre makers from the side of educational theatre turned to the classics in their projects for children.³⁸⁰ *Parcival* (1984), *Teneeter* (1985) and *STAN* (1988) tried to introduce *The Prince of Denmark* to children, reducing the play to the problems of an adolescent who tries to come to terms with his mother's remarriage.

The repertory made its comeback in a different shape. The division between "eerste circuit" ('first circuit,' large companies playing at large theatres) and "tweede circuit" ('second circuit,' smaller companies playing the black box theatres) had blurred. Small innovative companies performed classical plays.³⁸¹ At the same time Rijnders' new large company Toneelgroep Amsterdam was the first to introduce experimental productions in the established theatre of the Amsterdam Stadsschouwburg.³⁸² Accordingly, the former divide between the (liberal) norms of 'alternative' productions and the (more strict) norms of large productions disappeared. As a consequence, each company had its own particular style.³⁸³

theatre company, and this marked the end of educational theatre ("vormingstheater"). See Rieks Bos and Hans van Maanen (1994: 67).

374 For this reason, the market mechanism, absent since 1945, was reintroduced in the theatre. The government started to 'interfere' with the companies' policies, by demanding that 15% of their income was earned by the companies themselves. (Policy of Minister D'Ancona in the period 1993-1996).

375 "In alle intentieverklaringen van artistieke leiders die aan de vooravond van een nieuw begin staan klinkt de zorg om het publiek door een groot verlangen een repertoiretoneel nieuw leven in te blazen." (Houtman, 1989: 13).

376 "Minister Brinkman van WVC kan tevreden zijn over deze oplossingen voor de 'diepe crisis' waarin het toneel zich naar zijn mening bevindt. (...) Het publiek moet teruggebracht worden en alhoewel hij zich niet in de artistieke discussie mengt is hem wel zoveel duidelijk geworden 'dat het klassieke repertoire zo gek nog niet is.'" (*Ibid*: 14).

377 "Shakespeare staat weer volop in de belangstelling. (...) Vrijwel op hetzelfde moment spelen vijf erg verschillende gezelschappen vijf erg verschillende stukken van Shakespeare." (Callens, 1983). "Shakespeare is weer 'in'. Als ik goed geteld heb, zijn er dit seizoen in ons land tien verschillende Shakespearevoorstellingen te zien geweest, kindertoneel en Belgische voorstellingen meegerekend, terwijl in het vorige Holland Festival King Lear en Macbeth al te zien waren en er op de televisie op onverwachte momenten ook wel eens Shakespeares worden vertoond." (De Jong, 1986). "Shakespeare. Dit seizoen werd hij vele malen gespeeld, zowel in Nederland als in België." (Bobkova and Houtman, 1987).

378 Jean-Michel Déprats, *Théâtre Public* 46-47, quoted by Johan Callens (1983) with regard to the Dutch situation in 1983.

379 Reported in Callens (1983).

380 See Meyer (1996: 832-839).

381 "De roep om eerherstel van tekst en vakmanschap in het repertoiretoneel sloeg (...) over naar het tweede circuit, dat eind jaren zestig ontstond als reactie op het vakkundig maar onpersoonlijk volgen van de auteur. De polarisatie uit die tijd is verwaterd en de toneelsituatie lijkt gelijke tred te houden met de schuivende panelen in de Nederlandse politiek." Houtman (1989: 16).

382 "De combinatie van klassieke teksten en theatraal onderzoek, die tot dan toe vooral binnen de beslotenheid van het kleine-zalencircuit te vinden was, verlegde Toneelgroep Amsterdam naar de grote zaal, terwijl in de kleine zaal een meer conventionele aanpak van de stukken plaatsvond." Houtman (1989: 16).

383 According to Van Maanen (1997), the new companies grappled with their relation to the other media (film, television). Some companies chose to stick to truly theatrical means, whilst others adopted the new media on stage.

In this period, the status of *Hamlet* as “the play of plays” entailed that it was used as a touchstone. A Shakespeare performance was like a manifesto, either or not intended as such by those involved.³⁸⁴ The self-referential nature of the play made it even more appropriate. *Hamlet*’s status as a manifesto was often reinforced by the festive occasions for which these *Hamlets* were made.³⁸⁵ For each new company, *Hamlet* became a statement that expressed their individual ideas about the theatre.

3.9 1991 - Boonen’s retranslation: individuality as a reason for differentiation

Dirk Tanghe’s *Hamlet* (1991) is symptomatic of such ‘partial’ productions. When the Belgian director staged the play at the invitation of the Utrecht Stadsschouwburg, he claimed that he did not pretend to do ‘the’ *Hamlet*, but merely ‘a’ *Hamlet*.³⁸⁶ The theatre maker admitted that he was only capable of showing what *he* had found important in Shakespeare’s play. Like the theatre makers of the 1960s and the 1970s, he flaunted the personal bias of his production. But where the 1960s producers took pride in their version, Tanghe had a modest, relativist stance: his *Hamlet* was but one of many.

In his individual interpretation, Tanghe found the play to possess “a beautiful simplicity,” so that he wondered why everyone (and this would include Gerardjan Rijnders) always had to make it so ponderous.³⁸⁷ The director claimed that by leaving out everything that no longer had any function, he had crafted an authentic Shakespeare “without bullshit.”³⁸⁸ This was unlike Claus or Decorte, who had made an authentic Claus and an authentic Decorte. Central to Tanghe’s approach was the idea that the audience should be able to relate to the events of the play and experience the emotional impact these events have on the protagonist(s). As *Hamlet*’s essence, Tanghe chose those events and emotions that were best recognised by his (young) audience. Tanghe: “Theatre for me has nothing to do with intellect. The dramatic text is no collection of meaningless phrases. Hamlet does not say ‘To be or not to be’ for nothing. He says: I haven’t been able to sleep for over a week, ladies and gentlemen;

384 “Shakespeare is de maatstaf van het toneel. Wie zijn werk speelt wil iets zeggen over toneelmaken en over de relatie tussen toneel en de dagelijkse werkelijkheid. Een Shakespeare-voorstelling heeft altijd iets, of de betrokkenen dat nou willen of niet, van een manifest. Als Shakespeare de maatstaf is, dan is Hamlet het ijkpunt.” Gerben Hellinga, ‘Shakespeare is meedogenloos voor regisseur Ivo van Hove’, *Vrij Nederland*, 11-9-1993.

385 Rijnders staged it as a farewell production for Het Publiektheater; Het Raamtheater and De Appel staged it to celebrate their new theatre; Tanghe staged it for the 50th anniversary of the Utrecht Stadsschouwburg; and Van Hove produced it for ‘93 Antwerp Cultural Capital of Europe.

386 Tanghe: “Ik hoef toch niet dè *Hamlet* te maken. Ik maak gewoon één van de vele. Niet die van Laurence Olivier. Dat was ook een schone *Hamlet*, maar dit wordt de mijne.” Anne-Rose Bantzinger, ‘De noten en magie van Dirk Tanghe,’ *Het Parool*, 12-9-1991.

387 “Een *Hamlet* zonder psychologisch geleuter, zonder moeilijk gedoe. Ik heb nooit begrepen waarom het stuk altijd zo’n zweem van zwaarwichtigheid mee moet krijgen. Voor mij is de kern van een prachtige eenvoud. Een zoon rekent af met zijn moeder, zonder dat die moeder in de gaten heeft wat haar zoon aan het doen is. Dit gegeven verwerkt Shakespeare in een thrillerachtig verhaal. Wie vermoordde de oude vader?” Eric van der Velden, ‘*Hamlet* zonder psychologisch gedoe,’ *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 15-1-1991.

388 “Wat jullie daar zien liggen [the prompt copies], begint Dirk Tanghe, ‘is een Shakespeare zonder bullshit. Alles wat ophoudt, alles wat nu niet meer werkt, ligt eruit. Maar we gaan geen rare dingen doen. Onze *Hamlet* wordt geen neger, en geen homofiel. Onze bewerking is authentiek, emotioneel en volstrekt organisch tot stand gekomen.’” Eric van der Velden, ‘Jullie zijn vogels, en jullie kunnen nu vliegen,’ *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 6-9-1991.

I have to puke, for who am I?"³⁸⁹ The actors should not speak their lines in verse but were to use 'normal' language, in order to avoid melodrama. The entire strategy for the translation was made to suit.

Tanghe's (also Belgian) translator Johan Boonen belonged to the category of idiosyncratic translators, a position he shared with Jac. van Looy and Gerrit Komrij. Characteristically, he did not mention his sources.³⁹⁰ By re-creating the original, Boonen wanted to bring the characters to life. He imagined the *mise en jeu*.³⁹¹

It is about penetrating the core of (in this case) the dialogues. They tell me almost everything about the character (his language – his emotions – his questions and answers – his fears – his happiness – his physique). The method that suits me best may not be exactly classical, but I find it efficient. Not only do I approach the text with technique, but with intuition as well. You could say: not just with reason but also with feeling. (...) In my translation, I try to think and act along with the character. And at the end I notice that I have been able to give each character his own idiom (which is a dream come true): suddenly people appear before me that speak a language that I know, and that live as though they exist today.³⁹²

Boonen expressed a fear that the structure of the text might have hampered his understanding of the characters – implying that all artifice stands in the way of knowing them truly – but in the end he resolved the aporia with an explanation reminiscent of Van Looy's understanding of poetry. For Boonen, the "texture" of prose, verse, and rhyme gave a rhythm to the entire "score." The tools of musical composition eventually helped him to clarify the text.³⁹³ However, where for Van Looy the 'musical' was concomitant to respect for all heightened language, for Boonen it had nothing to do with tropes or syntax, but only with metre and rhyme.

Following Tanghe's concern with normal language and the reduction of 'junk,' Boonen introduced a new method of translation. He used shorthand, a combination of several

389 "Theater heeft voor mij niets te maken met het intellect. De toneeltekst is toch geen verzameling holle woorden. Hamlet zegt toch niet zomaar: zijn of niet zijn. Hij zegt eigenlijk: ik kan al een week niet slapen, dames en heren, ik moet kotsen want wie ben ik eigenlijk?" Nicole Blik, 'Emotie op de eerste plaats', *AD*, 12-9-1991.

390 We may assume Boonen used *The Arden Shakespeare* (1982), or another conflated edition that favours the Second Quarto readings and not G.R. Hibbard's *The Oxford Shakespeare* (1987) that caused a scholarly riot by favouring the Folio edition. Boonen translates 'solid/sullied flesh' with "besmet" (sullied), and has a Gentleman ("Bediende") speak to the Queen in 4.5.

391 This corroborates Pavis' hypothesis about theatre translation (1992: 136-159).

392 "Het is er om te doen door te dringen tot de kern van (in dit geval) de dialogen. Zij leveren mij zo goed als alles over het personage (zijn taal – zijn emotie – zijn vragen en antwoorden – zijn angsten – zijn geluk – zijn fysiek). De methode die mij het best ligt is misschien niet meteen klassiek maar ik vind ze efficiënt: ik tast de tekst niet alleen met techniek af maar ook met intuïtie. Je zou kunnen zeggen: niet alleen met rede maar ook met gevoelens. Ik probeer in mijn vertaling met het personage mee te denken en te doen. En bij het einde merk ik dat ik elk personage zijn eigen idioom heb kunnen geven (wat de verwezenlijking van en [sic] droom is): voor mij staan er plots mensen die een taal spreken die ik ken en die leven alsof ze vandaag bestaan." 'Johan Boonen over Hamlet vertalen,' Programme to *Hamlet*, Dirk Tanghe, 1991.

393 "Ook de schrijftuur (in de zin van proza – verzen – rijm) ben ik de laatste jaren weer heel belangrijk gaan vinden. Het gaat om een element dat (dikwijls bijna onvoelbaar – maar toch) een ritme geeft aan de hele partituur. Schrijftuur heeft te maken met compositie – met verhelderen. De tijd dat ik vond dat structuur een belemmering zou zijn voor het intuïtieve is voor mij voorbij. Structuur en intuïtie samen maken de sterkste verwoordingen." *Ibid*.

techniques of *emendation*. Poetical features were reduced, imagery modernised, and words omitted. He cut everything that he felt had no immediate impact on the present-day audience, like references to Roman mythology and generally obsolete concepts (what Tanghe called “bullshit”). He clarified, omitted and paraphrased. He also modernised the forms of address much more than either Voeten or Komrij had done before. The characters were peers, lovers, or family members first, and only secondly King, Prince, or secretary of state. This choice helped in making the characters emotionally closer to the audience; it supported the immediacy of the text.

A good example of Boonen’s technique of shorthand in translation is the following passage (3.4.53-63):

Kijk naar die beeltenis, en dan naar deze;
De sprekende portretten van twee broeders.
Zie deze edele trekken, zie: het voorhoofd
Van Jupiter, de lokken van Apollo,
Het oog van Mars, vol dreiging en bevel;
Een houding als Mercurius, de heraut,
Juist neergekomen op een heuvel die
De hemel kust – een samenspel van schoonheid
En kracht, waarop de goden naar het scheen
Allen hun stempel drukten om de wereld
Het toonbeeld van een man te laten zien.
Dit was uw echtgenoot. [Voeten, 1974]

Kijk hier – naar dit portret – en dit: portretten
Van twee broers – geschilderd. Kijk – de ene:
Een gezicht dat adel uitstraalt. Haren – hoofd
– **gestalte van een god**. Verheven (op
een berg vlak bij de hemel). Ogen die
bedreigen en bevelen. Groots – alsof
veel goden samen hem boetseerden (en
de wereld toonden hoe een man moet zijn).
Hij is jouw man geweest. [Boonen, 1991]

Figure 10 illustrates how Boonen’s choices relate to his predecessor Komrij.

The fact that Boonen, in his role as a translator, applied emendation, went against the translational norm of completeness, upheld by all Boonen’s predecessors from Burgersdijk to Komrij. By applying these methods, moreover, Boonen did the preparatory work of the dramaturge, following the example of his fellow countrymen Claus and Decorte. As with their ‘tradaptations,’ the borderline between translation and adaptation was blurred.

It must be said here³⁹⁴ that three years before, Erik Vos’s company De Appel had

394 Since the production was not ground-breaking in that it applied these methods in translation like Boonen and did not cause as much debate as Boermans several years later (below), it has not been granted a separate




Figure 10: Comparison between Boonen's and Komrij's *Hamlet*

Boonen's *Hamlet* and Komrij's differ in three respects. The two translators apply a different norm with regard to the attitude towards the completeness of the translation ('matricial norm'), modernisation and heightened language. Boonen only translates those parts of the original he thinks his audience will understand ('emendation'), he modernises realia, imagery and forms of address and he focuses on the communicative language, whereas Komrij strives after a complete translation, uses realia and imagery both from the socio-cultural situation of the text and of the target culture ('upward compatibility') and tries to respect the construction of the original's literary language.

presented a conceptless³⁹⁵ and entertaining³⁹⁶ *Hamlet* (1988), with the play modernised on the level of text instead of in its setting. In this case, however, the much-applauded 'marked clarity'³⁹⁷ had been achieved by a far-reaching adaptation. Vos and his dramaturge not only omitted scenes, passages and half-lines from Voeten's translation, but rewrote it by remov-

section, but it still deserves mention.

395 "Appel-regisseur Erik Vos heeft eveneens een keus gemaakt: de keus om niet te kiezen voor zo'n eenduidige visie. In zijn opvoering van Shakespeares beroemdste stuk blijven alle raadsels intact, alle vragen open." Peter Liefhebber, 'Hamlet veelkantig, maar kraakhelder,' *Telegraaf*, 10-10-1988.

396 Sacha Bulthuis, the actress playing Horatio: "Wat betekent het nou helemaal, een nieuwe interpretatie? Ik zie meer één gelding criterium: boeit het, of boeit het niet." Peter Liefhebber, 'Actrice Sacha Bulthuis als Horatio in de 'Hamlet': "Boeit het of niet, dat is de kwestie"' *Telegraaf*, 7-10-1988. Aus Greidanus, the actor playing Hamlet: "Mijn doel was, zeg maar de filosofie weg te spelen. De basis is een mens die met een aantal gebeurtenissen geconfronteerd wordt en het gevecht dat hij daarmee levert." Marjo van der Meulen, 'De invloed van Einstein op Hamlet,' *Parool*, 17-1-1989.

397 "[De Appel] toont in een opvallende heldere vertaling en bewerking, dit beroemdste stuk van Shakespeare heel direct aan het publiek." Karen Welling, 'Shakespeare's Hamlet als stuk van alle tijden,' *Haarlems Dagblad*, 16-1-1989.

ing historical references,³⁹⁸ simplifying the syntax and changing short phrases.³⁹⁹ The role of rewriter that Croiset still reserved for the translator was claimed for themselves. What was particular to the case of Boonen, however, was that it was applied to a *retranslation*.

Director Tanghe gave the performance text precedence over the dramatic text and used intersemiotic translation to present the original story. In other words, he turned text into images. Much of the text was sacrificed in order to have a more visual and auditive performance. Instead of the first scene, he offered a dark image. Information about the characters was given in visual signals, in body language.⁴⁰⁰ By using the modern visual language of the 'videoclip' to tell his story,⁴⁰¹ Tanghe chose to apply a different dramatic structure to the play, which according to him was more in line with the expectations of his audience.

The adaptations of both translator and director – despite the reduction in the short-hand translation, Tanghe still found it necessary to kill off a large number of Boonen's pages⁴⁰² – consisted of cutting those parts of the original that were considered time-bound and outdated (the "bullshit"), in order to be left with a timeless story (the "essence"). The adapters suggested that they separated the play into two parts, namely, the 'essence' of the source text

398 Dramaturge Watze Tiesema had already worked with Guido de Moor on *Hamlet* in 1983. In that *Hamlet*, he had applied the same method of rewriting:

"Toen ik op mijn kamer zat te naaien, heer, / Kwam plotseling prins Hamlet binnen, blootshoofds, / Met open wambuis; zijn besmeurde kousen / Hingen als boeien om zijn enkels neer; / Wit als zijn hemd was hij, zijn knieën trilden" [Voeten, 1974].

"Terwijl ik op mijn kamer bezig was, / Kwam plotseling prins Hamlet binnen, / Zijn jas open, zijn kleren orde-loos; / Wit als zijn hemd was hij, zijn knieën trilden" [De Moor/Tiesema, 1983].

"'k Bevond mij op mijn kamer, vader, / en plotseling kwam prins Hamlet binnen, / het hoofd ontbloot, / zijn kleren loshangend, zijn kousen vuil, / als boeien hingen ze om zijn enkels neer, / bleek als zijn hemd was hij, zijn knieën trilden" [Vos/Tiesema, 1988].

399 A good example of the difference between Voeten's adaptation for Croiset (1976) and Vos-Tiesema's adaptation of Voeten (1988) are the following lines (3.4.107-111):

Hamlet	Komt u niet om uw trage zoon te laken Die tijd en drift verbeuzelt, en verzuimt Gevolg te geven aan uw streng bevel?
Geest	Vergeet het niet. Ik kom alleen maar om Je bijna bot geworden plan te scherpen. (Voeten, 1976)

Hamlet	Kom je om je trage zoon te manen? Ik verdoe mijn tijd, mijn drift leidt nergens toe. En ik verzuim Gevolg te geven aan je verschrikkelijk bevel. Zeg het.
Geest	Vergeet mij niet, ik kom om je aan te sporen – Wet je mes. (Voeten-Vos-Tiesema, 1988)

400 See Hana Bobkova, 'Onvergetelijke Hamlet van Dirk Tanghe', *Financieel Dagblad*, 2-12-1991.

401 From the website of De Paardenkathedraal (www.paardenkathedraal.nl, 2004): "Tanghe realiseert zich dat de beeldentaal van tegenwoordig veel sneller en anders is dan vroeger en daarom staat hij het ook toe om scènes te schrappen of om plotten te veranderen. Hij maakt een bepaalde versie van Hamlet (SIP, 1991) en niet de versie van Hamlet. Zijn doel is om van klassieke teksten, die makkelijk kunnen vervallen in holle pathetische zinnen, juist een bruisende voorstelling te maken. Hiervoor maakt Tanghe vaak gebruik van elementen uit de massacultuur, zoals popmuziek, film en videoclips. Doordat Tanghe zijn teksten vermengt met onderdelen van de eigentijdse cultuur trekt hij een breed publiek, dat voor een vrij groot deel uit jongeren bestaat. Hij regisseert voor de jeugd: "Ik wil weten wat de jonge mensen van nu voelen, wat hun ritme is, hun belangstellingspunten. Anders ben ik toch een ouwe zak." Tanghe wil de jongeren terug in het theater, ze mogen niet afgeschrikt worden door saaie, statige voorstellingen. Het is dan ook niet toevallig dat de onderwerpen in zijn voorstellingen vaak gaan over de verhoudingen tussen mensen en dan in het bijzonder tussen kind en ouder (nieuwe en oude generatie, verleden en toekomst). Familie is belangrijk voor hem en de verstoorde relatie tussen ouders en kind komt in veel van zijn voorstellingen naar voren."

402 "Tanghe gaat daarbij niet te werk volgens de kaasschaafmethode, maar hanteert het flink scherpe kapmes waardoor er heel wat pagina's uit de nieuwe vertaling van Johan Boonen sneuvelen." Wijnand Zeilstra, "Hamlet" in moderne beeldtaal, *Leidsch Dagblad*, 26-11-1991.

and a 'presentation.' In their line of reasoning, this 'presentation' is a dramatic structure in the source text that follows the norms of the Elizabethan theatre. This can be changed into a modern counterpart, without harming the essence. The addition of new material, *invention*, is not part of this strategy. In this respect, the method of adaptation is similar to that of *reduction*. However, the idea of redundancy in the original indicates that it was not practical limitations that called for the reduction of the text. It was rather a search for those parts of the text that really mattered. The selectivity involved in the search for the essence of the text distinguishes the method of Tanghe and Boonen from that of ordinary reduction.

Many critics reacted furiously. Tanghe was criticised for having "sacrificed the language to modern, visual culture,"⁴⁰³ having "made scantier Shakespeare's rich multi-dimensionality."⁴⁰⁴ The play had been stripped by a "great cheese slicer,"⁴⁰⁵ the flesh and bones of the play had been removed to the point that it did not deserve the name of *Hamlet* that it so hypocritically bore.⁴⁰⁶ The production was denounced because it did not live up to the critics' norm of faithfulness. In the first place, it was felt that the norm of integrity had been transgressed. In the second place, the play no longer felt like Shakespeare's. In this respect, the same arguments were used as with the scholars A.C. Loffelt in 1882 and A.G.H. Bachrach in 1967.

However, as a result of the new approach to text signalled above, a third norm was emphasised by the critics. This was the primacy of the (multi-dimensional nature of the Shakespearean) text. This was different from the critique in 1882, when critics wondered whether it was admissible to omit a number of scenes from the play, and unlike the discussion in 1967, which centred on the question whether a new play could play around with elements of an older one. Tanghe and Boonen rejected the combined norms of matricial and textual integrity – the notion of being truthful to the text's entirety *and* to all textual features – by applying emendation, but still stood by the authority of the original author. In plain English: they thought they could do a true Shakespeare without using all of the Shakespearean language.

Some critics referred to this production as an *introduction* to the play, as they did in reviews of other *Hamlets*.⁴⁰⁷ This is noticeable, since retranslation is often considered as

403 "Daarentegen is het weglaten van vele andere scènes minder makkelijk te rechtvaardigen. (...) Op dat soort momenten staat de bewerking van Tanghe gewoon tegen; er is al zoveel taal geofferd aan de moderne beeldcultuur." Wijnand Zeilstra, 'Hamlet in moderne beeldtaal,' *Leidsch Dagblad*, 26-11-1991.

404 "Ik bewonder, opnieuw, Tanghe's talent om vanonder een eeuwenoude schil nieuwe, frisse pitten tevoorschijn te toveren, zijn vermogen om spelers ertoe te brengen oude woorden onbevangen uit te spreken en vers te laten klinken. Maar deze keer zit daar een zekere verschraling aan vast van Shakespeare's rijke multi-dimensionaliteit, die me niet helemaal zint." Peter Liefhebber, 'Aardse Hamlet op mensenmaat,' *Telegraaf*, 16-9-1991.

405 "Kaal, dat is [ook het trefwoord voor] de bewerkte tekst van deze klassieker. Want wat is er over van al die beladen monologen en dialogen? Een paar velletjes hedendaagse poëzie. Het verhaal van de jonge prins die de moord op zijn vader wil wreken en behoorlijk verward raakt, is onder de grote kaasschaaf terecht gekomen, ontdaan van alle gewichtigheid en op smaak gebracht met woordgrapjes en taal van de straat." Robert Grijzen, 'Hamlet houdt wel van een lolletje,' *Gooi- en Eemlander*, 16-9-1991.

406 "Geruggesteund door ene Johan Boonen ontvleesde Tanghe het stuk en wierp ook nog een paar overbodige botten weg. Wat hier schijnheilig als Hamlet wordt gepresenteerd, verdient die naam dus niet." Peter Blom, 'Uit eigen keuken: doodsteek Hamlet,' *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 5-10-1991.

407 The integral text of the play can be understood better if one knows the storyline. The *Hamlets* made for children are the clearest examples of this kind of adaptation, for they introduce the play to an audience not able to grasp it in its entirety, but many adaptations for adults have had the same starting point. [Hamlet, Residentie Tooneel, 1944] "Ook voor de rijpere schooljeugd ware dit wellicht een geschikte voorstelling geweest: als

a means of introducing a (difficult) text to an audience unfamiliar with it (Susam-Sarajeva, 2003). There is an interesting parallel between Boonen's *Hamlet* and Carel Alphenaar's translation of the play for children for director Liesbeth Coltof.⁴⁰⁸ Parallel to Tanghe's assertion that he merely made 'a' *Hamlet*, Alphenaar stressed his partiality, by comparing *Hamlet* to a castle in which there is room for more people than himself alone, who can do with the play as they please.⁴⁰⁹ Thus, both underscored the assumption that a retranslation can act as an introduction to the play, in both cases for a *young* audience, once a (more difficult) full translation has been made.

The debates on Tanghe's and Coltof's *Hamlet* ran along similar lines as well. Both were castigated for their lenient treatment of textual elements, as well as their (and their directors') cut and paste method. Critic Loek Zonneveld reacted to Alphenaar's lack of fidelity and/or lack of completeness by stating that Alphenaar had rearranged the furniture a little bit too much.⁴¹⁰

In general, critical opinion varied on the question whether the directors' adaptations for their own purposes was admissible or not.⁴¹¹ Mostly, critics in the period accepted adaptations and many came to accept the relativity of authorship. Oranje's conclusion to his review of Decorte's *Hamlet* adaptation ten years later is telling: "Of course, it is fine if you want to

inleiding tot het tooneel en tot... Hamlet." P. Verdoes, TIN, 1944. [Hamlet, Raamtheater, 1987] "Deze Hamlet-bewerking is goed geconstrueerd en betekent een goede kennismaking vooral voor jeugdig publiek dat het stuk nog niet kent." Jac Heijer, 'Mediamieke Hamlet uit Antwerpen', NRC, 7-1-1987 [Hamlet, Tanghe, 1991] "Een Hamlet om je in Shakespeare te verdiepen of met hem kennis te maken." Eddy Geerlings, 'Hamlet van Dirk Tanghe geloofwaardig theater', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 17-9-1991; "Daarom is de bewerking van Johan Boonen sterk naar Hamlet toegeschreven. (...) Ik ga *Hamlet* verklaren, met dat doel heeft Tanghe deze voorstelling gemaakt." Hein Janssen, 'Tanghes Hamlet is een feest vol diepgang en plezier', *Volkskrant*, 17-9-1991.

408 Carel Alphenaar's *Hamlet* (1996), the first translation of the play for children, commissioned by director Liesbeth Coltof, was torn between two ideas: it had to be understood by an audience of children of 7 years and older, and at the same time it was to have "real Shakespearean language." The two main textual elements that Alphenaar regards as typical of Shakespeare – or at least important enough to mention – are metaphors and metre. Nevertheless, he admits he had to use some expedient of clarification with regard to the metaphors: "De versie moest toegankelijk zijn voor kinderen boven de negen jaar. Ik nam mij voor dit te bereiken door helderheid. Omdat er flink in het stuk gekapt moest worden, want de voorstelling mocht niet langer duren dan anderhalf à twee uur, kon ik ernaar streven uit de waaier van metaforen die Shakespeare in de mond van zijn figuren legt, telkens de duidelijkste te kiezen." (Alphenaar, 1996: 7). Alphenaar also had to simplify the metre: "Ik was er van het begin af van overtuigd dat deze versie de versvorm moest respecteren. Tegelijkertijd vond ik de vijf-jamben-in-een-versregel die het door Shakespeare gebruikte *blank verse* telt, zwaar voor een jong publiek. Ik besloot met viervoeters te gaan werken. Dit zou mij dwingen tot bondigheid, tot 'kort door de bocht' en tot verbanning van misbare adjectieven in het vers. Ik realiseerde mij dat dit voor de acteurs betekent dat zij scherpe overgangen moeten maken en dat de nagalm soms niet in de tekst wordt uitgedrukt. Maar dat hoeft niet altijd een bezwaar te zijn." (Alphenaar, 1996: 8). It is not Alphenaar's intention to "remove the warts from the portrait" – like Komrij, he does not feel that objectionable texts should be left out: "Ik heb ik elk geval niet de kapjes overgenomen die ik aantrof in een middelbare schooleeditie van Hamlet die ik sinds mijn zestiende in de kast heb staan. Kapjes in de vorm van schaamlapjes." (Alphenaar, 1996: 8). Apart from these changes, however, Alphenaar also considerably shortens the length of the play by applying shorthand. In Alphenaar's translation one sentence can be paired as a solution to the problem of the sixteen-line passage of Shakespeare.

409 "Hamlet is als een kasteel waar je als toneelmaker even in mag wonen. En als je het gebouw verlaat, hoef je het niet op te ruimen. Het staat altijd klaar voor nieuwe bewoners. (...) Mijn tijd in Kasteel Hamlet is om. Ik heb er met veel plezier in gewoond. Dadelijk trekt een ander erin om er een nog veel beter stuk van te maken." In the introduction to ALP1996: 7-9.

410 Loek Zonneveld, 'Hamlet schuift met het meubilair,' *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 30-10-1996.

411 Compare: "De titel Hamlet is teveel voor deze onaffe bewerking. Hamletmateriaal, meer is het niet, en dan nog aan de oppervlakkige kant." Eddy Geerlings, 'Kriek raakt spoor bijster met Hamlet,' *Algemeen Dagblad*, 16-5-1997, with: "Op het knip- en plakwerk, waarbij allerlei nevenintringes werden geschrapt en slechts zes personages overbleven, is op zich weinig aan te merken." Anneriek de Jong, "Een Hamlet die spuugt, schreeuwt en springt," NRC, 13-2-1995.

present the characters to the audience in this way, but it is not 'the' *Hamlet*. But then again, what performance is?"⁴¹²

3.10 1997 - Boermans's rewriting of Voeten's translation: retranslation as act of aggression

After the individualist, 'live and let live' *Hamlets* of the 1980s and 1990s, differentiations between productions became more insistent at the end of the twentieth century. In 1997, the socially engaged theatre company De Trust,⁴¹³ led by director Theu Boermans, tried their luck with a conspicuous "actualisation" in their production of *Hamlet*. The direct occasion for this *Hamlet* was the arrival of a new generation of actors. As a result, the generation conflict became one of the themes in Boermans's *Hamlet*. It was a revaluation: De Trust realised that the theatre was no longer about "how you saw the world as in the Seventies. In those days you concentrated on your father, on the position he held in the world. In these days of divorced parents, working mothers, passing partners, etcetera, other conflicts [came] to the fore. It [was] time to take different decisions."⁴¹⁴

Parallel to the generational change, Boermans noticed a change in rhetoric. Perhaps one must be imbued in heightened language in order to appreciate this form of dramatic structure. Boermans felt a different kind of rhetoric was called for:⁴¹⁵

Our ears and our actors are no longer used to the depiction of language. We cannot deny that we here suffer from a bad classical tradition. That is why we looked for a form in which the language could maintain a certain richness, while the themes would fit in with Jacob Derwig's [the actor playing Hamlet] generation.⁴¹⁶

Aiming for more matter and less art, he changed the text of the play. Theu Boermans, like Vos (1988) before him, did not translate *Hamlet*, but used Voeten's translation as

412 "Het is natuurlijk prima als je je publiek de personages zó wilt aanbieden, maar het is niet dé 'Hamlet.' Maar ja, welke voorstelling is dat wel?" Hans Oranje, 'Amlett als een schijterd die de zot uithangt,' *Trouw*, 29-2-2001.

413 See Peters (1998).

414 "Theu Boermans, artistiek leider en regisseur van De Trust, zag een paar jaar geleden dat de vaste groep medewerkers in een andere levensfase terecht kwam. 'Er werden kinderen geboren, er kwamen andere prioriteiten, dus wat mij betreft lag er een verjongingskuur in het verschiet. Niet alleen inhoudelijk, ook in generaties. Hamlet leek me een goed stuk om die kuur mee te doen. Behalve allerlei andere zaken, is daarin ook sprake van een generatieconflict. (...) Als je toneel beschouwt als een platform waarop je wilt laten zien wat er in de wereld gaande is, als een mogelijkheid om het 'lijden' transparant en begrijpelijk te maken, kom je op een goed moment tot het inzicht dat het niet langer alleen gaat om hoe je in de jaren zeventig over de wereld dacht. Toen concentreerde je je op je vader, op de posite die hij innam in de wereld. In deze tijd van gescheiden ouders, werkende moeders, voorbijgaande partners, etcetera, zijn andere conflicten aan de orde. Nu moeten andere beslissingen worden genomen.'" Peters (1998).

415 An argument that was corroborated by the un-metrical adaptations Tiesema (for De Moor, 1983 and Vos, 1988) and Tindemans (for Van Hove, 1993) had made of Voeten's metrical translation, and by the fact that even a translation like Voeten's, once praised for its clarity, was considered "unnecessarily complicated" ("de soms wat nodeloos ingewikkeld klinkende vertaling van Bert Voeten," Eric van der Velden, 'Een Hamlet die vragen achterlaat,' *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 7-9-1993).

416 "Boermans heeft voor een hedendaagse vorm van Hamlet gekozen omdat ook wat de retorica betreft de tijden zijn veranderd. 'Onze oren en onze acteurs zijn niet meer gewend aan het uitbeelden van taal. Wij hebben hier nu eenmaal een slechte klassieke traditie. Daarom heb ik gezocht naar een vorm waarin de taal een zekere rijkdom kon behouden terwijl de thema's zouden aansluiten bij de generatie van Jacob Derwig.'" Peters (1998).

basic text. His approach was revolutionary in that he rewrote the entire translation himself, instead of those passages that he considered irrelevant or hard to understand. The effect of this dramaturgical concretisation (i.e. preparing the text for a performance) came close to the effect of a commissioned translation. Boermans transformed the text in order to turn the classic play into a contemporary performance.

As we saw in the case of Boonen, the border between translator and dramaturge was blurred. Not only did translators at the end of the twentieth century take up part of the dramaturge's task (Claus, Decorte, Boonen, Alphenaar), but the production crew encroached on the translator's territory as well. The freedom with regard to the material had some side-effects. Like other directors - such as Çanci Geraedts and Guusje Eybers - Theu Boermans stated that he himself was responsible for the (adaptation of) the text, but forgot to mention who the actual translator was. It is not unlikely that the tendency to neglect mentioning the translator and asserting the director's responsibility for the text was not merely caused by the desire to transform the source text into a target vision, but had also to do with avoiding the costs of copyright. Whatever the intentions, the ease with which the translator's authority was discarded is a strong indication that the production crew felt that it was the sole authority with regard to the performance text.

Boermans normalised Voeten's lines, turning them into the language of today. His emendations, apart from speeding up the action, replaced the poetical with a more communicative type of language. Metrical lines were rewritten as prose, which changed the dramatic structure of the verse drama. Paraphrase and clarification were used as well. An example (3.4.82):

Opstandige hel,
Breng jij bedaagde botten aan het muiten, [Voeten]

Als de hel nog zo kan branden in het karkas van een oud wijf
[Boermans]

Boermans summarised repetitions and complex conceits into a single phrase, by choosing the most recognisable concepts and leaving out all variants and repetitions (3.4.139-141):

Hamlet: Het is niets anders dan een hersenschim.
 Waanzin is sterk in het bezweren van
 onstoffelijke dingen. [Voeten]

Hamlet: Je ziet spoken. Dat gebeurt als je gek bent. [Boermans]

He left out references to Renaissance culture, including religion, superstition, cosmology and imagery from Roman mythology (Voeten's translation is given on page 131):

Hamlet: Kijk naar dit portret, en dan naar dit:
 De afbeeldingen van twee broers.
 Kijk, deze prachtige trekken,

het samenspel van schoonheid en kracht:
Het toonbeeld van een man. [Boermans, 1997]

Jokes were not omitted but updated to make these passages humorous for a modern audience. He also added interjections (in italics) to liven up the dialogue and make it resemble contemporary spoken language more closely (Voeten's version is also given on pages 123-124):

127

Hamlet: Zal ik in uw schoot gaan liggen, juffrouw?
Ophelia: Nee.
Hamlet: Ik bedoel: met mijn hoofd in uw schoot.
Polonius: *Ophelia.*
Ophelia: Dat is goed.
Hamlet: Dacht u dat ik iets smerigs bedoelde?
Ophelia: Ik denk niets.
Hamlet: *O, nee, dat dacht ik eventjes...*

With Boermans's emendations the setting of the play was modernised by using modern realia. He also modernised the forms of address. In the following lines a son addresses his mother (3.4.63-65):

Dit was *uw* echtgenoot. En kijk nu hier:
Dit is *uw* echtgenoot – een zieke halm
Besmet zijn zuivere broeder. Hebt *u* ogen? [Voeten]

Dit was *je* echtgenoot.
En kijk nu hiernaar. Dit is *je* echtgenoot.
Een zieke, lelijke, vadsige lafbek. Heb *je* ogen? [Boermans]

Neither did Boermans hesitate to modernise his metaphors (5.2.184):

Hij maakte al complimenten tegen zijn moeders borst voor hij eraan ging zuigen.
[Voeten]

Mijn God, wat een hysterische nicht, zeg, wat een washand. [Boermans]

Furthermore, Boermans inserted references to the present.⁴¹⁷ He adapted the original descriptions to what actually happened on stage. So instead of armour, Hamlet spoke of the "gevechtstenu" that the Ghost is seen wearing. References to beards had gone as well, since none of the actors were bearded. Finally, Boermans adjusted the invectives to contemporary usage, by way of an update from Voeten's 1950s to Boermans's 1990s.

Boermans set out for the same target audience as Tanghe and Coltof. He aimed at

417 See the note on page 57.

creating a hyperrealist version of the drama. Like Voeten's *Hamlet* forty years earlier,⁴¹⁸ this implied that the prosaic language was perhaps "at the expense of the poetry, but it [did] help to create people of flesh and blood that turn the play into a *Hamlet* for everyone."⁴¹⁹

To complete their concern with the present, De Trust moved the setting to the White House of Bill Clinton, with TV screens showing CNN presenting the conflict in former Yugoslavia and security agents doing their rounds. Thus Boermans's *Hamlet* established a link with Verkade's 1925 production by making this drama relevant to a modern audience, through a contemporary setting. The only important difference between Verkade in 1925 and Boermans in 1997 was that the text was geared to support the performance by all means. The world of the play and the world of the performance were not in direct opposition, but one. And, just as in 1925 and in 1977, some (in this case critic Loek Zonneveld) would argue that neither world was Shakespeare's.⁴²⁰

*

Boermans's *Hamlet* did not break with tradition. The strategies for modernising the text that had been applied by Verkade, Voeten, Boonen and Alphenaar were merely taken to the extreme. He just continued a tradition of dramaturgical adaptation that had already been practiced by Vos (1988), Tanghe (1991) and Coltof (1996). The reactions to his *Hamlet*, however, begged to differ on these norms.

The objections to the modernisation of De Trust came, apart from the reviews by Loek Zonneveld, from the theatre professionals themselves. In the same year as the production by De Trust, the Belgian translator Frank Albers⁴²¹ made a translation for director Johan Doesburg's *Hamlet*. Doesburg's direction was not as emphatic as Boermans's. Like Erik Vos (1988) and Ivo van Hove (1993) before him, Doesburg staged *Hamlet* without interfering

418 "De stijl van deze voorstelling is hyperrealisme. Wat we zien is wurgend echt en heeft een buitengewone ge-laagdheid. De actie is meeslepend spannend en dramatisch, maar ook komisch, cynisch, ironisch, aangrijpend en ontroerend." Gerben Hellinga, *Vrij Nederland*, 3-1-1998.

"En toch of juist vanwege die bijna terloopse gewoonheid is deze Hamlet een triomf van psychologisch theater, die het stuk erg dichtbij brengt en er heel trefzeker en lucide de universele kracht van blootlegt. Voor antiek versleten wraakoefeningen en vermeend archaïsche verhoudingen tussen historische personages blijken ineens aannemelijk en springlevend. We zijn getuige van tijdloze generatie- en mentaliteitsconflicten, die niet ten onrechte op de spits worden gedreven door een verzenuwde held die onze buurtjongen had kunnen zijn." Pieter Kottman, *NRC Handelsblad*, 24-12-1997.

"Waar de actualiteit domineerde – zoals in Hamlet, het meest sprekende voorbeeld – daar liet het overwicht van de alledaagse taal op de verheven taal het drama naar de kant van het heden kantelen. De taal creëerde zo de dialectische eenheid vol tegenstellingen en schiep een universum dat aan het hedendaagse besef van complexiteit gehoor gaf." Bobkova (2000).

419 "Dat gaat ten koste van de poëzie, maar er ontstaan wel mensen van vlees en bloed die er een Hamlet voor iedereen van maken." Eddy Geerlings, 'Hamlet voor iedereen,' *Algemeen Dagblad*, 30-12-1997.

420 Loek Zonneveld, 'Hamlet, tijdgenoot?' *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 21 and 28-1-1998.

421 Before Hamlet, Albers had translated *All's Well that Ends Well* (1995) and *Titus Andronicus* (1997) for director Johan Doesburg. After Hamlet, he translated *King Lear* (2001) as well. Albers: "Het Nationale Toneel zal wellicht gedacht hebben dat geen enkele bestaande vertaling interessant genoeg was? Ik had natuurlijk al twee dingen voor hen gedaan (...). Het zal er ook mee te maken hebben dat deze *Hamlet* door Johan Doesburg werd geregisseerd. Met hem heb ik samengewerkt aan *Titus Andronicus* en het klikte. Over *Hamlet* hebben we eerst lang gepraat: over de visie, of je dat stuk vandaag ernstig moet spelen dan wel ironiseren... Een andere reden – dat was voor mij ieder geval een belangrijk element – was die versie van De Trust. Daarin werd de uitstekende vertaling van Bert Voeten compleet verhaspeld. Afgrijselijk. Ik had zoiets van: liever geen bewerking, niet proberen grappiger en slimmer te zijn dan Shakespeare, maar proberen een vertaling te maken die de tekst beluistert." Steven Heene, 'De prins en de paljas', *De Morgen*, 28-1-1999.




Figure 11: Comparison between Albers's and Boermans's *Hamlet*

Albers's *Hamlet* and Boermans's differ in two respects. The translator and the adapter apply a different norm with regard to the attitude towards the original author and the use of heightened language. Albers respects the original author, although he claims that truly faithful translation is impossible (only 'partial' translation) and presents his version of the original's heightened language, whereas Boermans claims all right on the text and rids the text of most features of literary language ('clarification').

much with the meaning of the play. In reaction to the White House *Hamlet*, Doesburg used a symbolic, neutral setting to stress the process of the play.⁴²² His *Hamlet* was less a family saga than "a political history of conscience and at the same time the history of our culture, of which Hamlet, just as we, the spectators, are part."⁴²³

Albers stressed his strong dislike of the previous *Hamlet* by calling the version by De Trust a "dreadful mangle."⁴²⁴ Albers did much to be different from Boermans, as is indicated by Figure 11. He named his various sources clearly,⁴²⁵ which implies a wish to remain faithful to the original. He wished to translate "as if using a stethoscope," the challenge was "to stay as close to the original as possible."⁴²⁶ Moreover, Albers gave an extensive introduction to the

422 "De nadruk ligt niet zozeer op de oplossing maar op het onontkoombare proces dat wordt blootgelegd." Hana Bobkova, 'Hamlets appèl op het geweten,' *Financieel Dagblad*, 16-1-1999.

423 "Deze Hamlet is allermint een familiegeschiedenis die zich afspeelt in een vrij beperkte, hoewel zeer concrete en van de realiteit doordrenkte levensruimte. De *Hamlet* van dit Haagse ensemble is een politieke geschiedenis van het geweten en tegelijkertijd de geschiedenis van onze cultuur, waarvan Hamlet net als wij, de toeschouwers, deel uitmaken." *Ibid*.

424 Hans Oranje, 'Een zinderende Hamlet,' *Trouw*, 4-1-1999; Gerben Hellinga, 'Hamlet,' *Vrij Nederland*, 9-1-1999. One critic even interpreted Hamlet's rejection of easy theatre in Hamlet's advice to the actors as a lash at Boermans. Marian Buijs, 'Doesburgs Hamlet dreigt als een natuurramp,' *Volkskrant*, 4-1-1999.

425 Mainly Arden (1982), but also Norton Critical Edition (1992) and Riverside Shakespeare (1974, 1997).

426 Albers: "Ik wou als het ware met een stethoscoop te werk gaan. *Hamlet* brengen als een hedendaags huiskamerdrama of als soap: we hebben dat al duizend keer gezien – de uitdaging was dit keer zo dicht mogelijk bij het origineel te blijven, althans: bij een van de drie bewaarde tekstversies die we kennen. Vertalingen die trouw zijn aan de strekking van een tekst – echt letterlijk vertalen is niet altijd mogelijk – lijken me over het algemeen moeilijker dan een bewerking." Steven Heene, 'De prins en de paljas,' *De Morgen*, 28-1-1999.

background, sources, interpretations and problems in translating the text. He frankly admitted to using some of the solutions of Burgersdijk, Voeten, Courteaux, and sometimes Komrij, typically concurring mostly with the least idiosyncratic translators.

Frank Albers himself emphasised the difficulty in translating puns and imagery. This suggests that the interaction between meaning and form mattered more to him than a literalist translation. A word for word translation would not function:

I believe that replacing the imagery often comes closer to ‘the’ meaning of ‘the’ text than a literal transposition, and therefore is preferable.⁴²⁷

Albers frequently rendered the poetical function of a trope, by replacing one trope with another, or by inventing a new version. In the case of a proverb, this meant translating with another proverb. The essential point of the popular Elizabethan proverb, “This lapwing runs away with the shell on its head” (5.2.183), is that, in ornithology, the lapwing is remarkable for leaving the nest within a few hours of birth and hence becomes the proverbial image of juvenile pretension.⁴²⁸ Albers translated this with the equally proverbial: “Kip zonder kop.”⁴²⁹ With regard to puns, he chose to replace one with another (1.2.67):

Ik, somber? Ik voel me eerder opgelicht. [Albers]

In reaction to Boermans’ prose *Hamlet*, Albers made a metrical translation in the same prosodic scheme of the iambic pentameter as the original, without ever recurring to the method of elision:

Wat is nu nóbelér: verdrágen dát [Albers]

However, Albers did apply clarification in his treatment of syntactical patterns. He turned nearly every subordinate clause into a sentence, which in the absence of relative pronouns, allows for greater immediacy (2.2.295-308):

Sinds kort ben ik, en hoezo weet ik niet, al mijn vreugde in het leven kwijt, geen lievelingsbezigheid trekt mij meer; en werkelijk, het is zo triest gesteld met mijn gemoed dat deze verheven bouw, de aarde, me een steriel voorgelichte lijkt, dit magistraal baldakijn, de lucht – kijk toch – dit machtig welvende firmament, dit majesteitlijke dak, ingelegd met gouden vuur, ach, het doet zich niet anders aan me voor dan als een stinkende en pestilente collectie dampen. [Komrij]

427 “Ik laat de koning daarom liever vragen: ‘Waarom kijk je nog steeds zo somber, Hamlet?’ Waarop Hamlet antwoordt: ‘Ik? Somber? ‘k Voel me eerder opgelicht.’ Ik geloof dat dergelijke vervangen beeldspraak ‘de’ betekenis van ‘de’ tekst vaak dichter benadert dan een letterlijke omzetting, en dus wenselijker is.” Introduction to ALB1998: 28.

428 See Jenkins (1982: 405).

429 Most translators state the proverb more or less literally to be able to relate it to what happens on stage: “De kievit is weggelopen met de eierschaal nog op zijn kop.” Albers uses another proverb, “Kip zonder kop,” which makes it possible for Hamlet to reply with a pun: “Mét hoed.”

Ik voel mij de laatste tijd zo futloos.
 Hoe dat komt weet ik niet.
 Er zit geen lijn meer in mijn leven.
 Ik neig naar grote somberte.
 Deze mooie aarde lijkt mij een kale rots.
 Dit majestueuze dak versierd met gouden vonken...
 wat stelt het voor?
 Niets, een waas, een stinkende wolk van dampen en schimmen.
 [Albers]

Clarification was also achieved by occasionally leaving out some information. Completeness was not the measure for this translator. Like Boonen and Alphenaar, he omitted several lines and even entire passages in his translation, justified by the word “bewerking” (adaptation) on the cover of the published edition. In fact, he stressed the fact that any translation is partial.⁴³⁰ He also used paraphrase (3.3.81):

met al zijn zonden rijp, geil als de Mei [Komrij]
 zijn zonden bloeiden in het gras in mei [Boonen]
 een ziel vol zonden [Boermans]
 zijn zonden niet vergeven [Albers]

and selective metaphor instead of hendiadys (3.4.38):

het als citadel en schild gevoel weert [Komrij]
 koel geworden is als staal – en niets meer voelt [Boonen]
 zo verhard is, dat er geen druppel gevoel meer in zit [Boermans]
 het immuun is voor emoties nu [Albers]

Like Boermans, Albers reinforced the elements of spoken language and modernised the text. With the addition of ellipses spoken language was also suggested: “dat je... dat julie... ook als ik wat raar doe –”⁴³¹ He presented his characters in modern dress (2.1.77-81):

Vader, ik deed wat naaiwerk in mijn kamer,
 Komt daar ineens prins Hamlet binnen. Hemd los,
 Geen hoed op, vuile, *afgezakke sokken*,
 Hij zag nog witter dan zijn *overhemd*,
 Met knikkende knieën [Albers]

430 Frank Albers summed it up neatly when he wrote: “Geen enkele lezing, vertaling of opvoering is definitief, alomvattend, onweerlegbaar. Integendeel, elke lezing, vertaling of opvoering lijkt altijd armer dan de tekst, omdat lezingen, vertalingen en opvoeringen het resultaat van keuzes en dus partieel zijn.” *ALB1998*: 29.

431 Empty places also imply that a speaker is cut off or turned speechless by another person or some frightful event, adding to the dramatic tension: “Ook hier, (...) hebben de mensen (...) zulke tekens gezien die erop wijzen dat de schikgodinnen – (*Geest op*).”

The words “afgezakke sokken” and “overhemd” recalled the present-time businessman rather than the garter-wearing Prince of Denmark. Albers applied modernisation in his metaphors too, as we have seen in the translation of “proof and bulwark against sense” above. Other examples are “windkracht tien”⁴³² and “dipsaus van de dood.”⁴³³

The critics rightfully thought that the text reacted to the extreme imitation of standard language in Boermans with a reintroduction of verse. This did not keep them from praising Albers’ translation for its determinacy to be clear. This helped, according to some, to create a rational character for Hamlet, or to give insight into the action on stage. The translation was also praised for having a clever, timeless mix of styles. Without further comment, it was noticed that this clarity was at the cost of the poetic effect that had been achieved by Komrij.⁴³⁴

*

A fierce reaction to both De Trust and Het Nationale Toneel came from the company ‘t Barre Land, who staged their own *Hamlet* in 2001 with director Jan Ritsema.⁴³⁵ Ritsema declared that this *Hamlet*, as he chose to call it, went against the grain of the *Hamlet* by De Trust, but also against those by Rijnders, Van Hove and Doesburg. The latter had been informed too much by the *Zeitgeist* that in turn had been determined by Goethe’s romanticism and Freud’s psychology.⁴³⁶ Ritsema argued that all previous directors had sought to present a *Hamlet* that was relevant in psychological terms, which indeed appears to have accounted largely for the

432 “Krankzinnig als de zee bij windkracht tien” for “Mad as the sea and wind when both contend / which is the mightier.”

433 “Een kwakzalver heeft hij een zalf verkocht, / heel efficiënt! De dipsaus van de dood! / Een mes waar dit aan zit... als je dat op / je huid krijgt ben je door geen kruidenkast / nog van de dood te redden. *Afgelopen.*” for “I bought an unction of a mountebank / so mortal that but dip a knife in it, / where it draws blood, no cataplasm so rare, / collected from all simples that have virtue / under the moon, can save the thing for death / that is but scratch’d withal.”

434 “Ten eerste de vertaling. Albers heeft minder dichtelijk dan Gerrit Komrij, maar wel een allerhelderst Nederlandse een verrassende tekst gemaakt. De vloeiende verzen bannen de laatste restjes van de lelijke prozatekst van de vorige ‘Hamlet’ bij de Trust uit het geheugen. Hij vertaalt veel minder dan zijn voorgangers naar de letter van de tekst, maar probeert de betekenis die de zinnen voor Shakespeare’s publiek hadden, voor ons over te zetten. Dat brengt ontzettend veel licht in het stuk.” Hans Oranje, ‘Een zinderende “Hamlet.” Het Nationale Toneel brengt het stuk der stukken in de voorstelling der voorstellingen,’ *Trouw*, 1999.

“[Acteur] Scholten van Aschat wordt sterk ondersteund door de capabele, goed bekende en goed lopende, “leuke” vertaling van Frank Albers, die van de filosoferende prins een vlotte causeur maakt, die strooit met bon-mots, oneliners en wisecracks.” Gerben Hellinga, ‘Nogmaals Hamlet,’ *Vrij Nederland*, 20-2-1999. “Het Nationale Toneel speelt in een nieuwe, speciaal voor de voorstelling gemaakte vertaling van Frank Albers, die zich aan het origineel houdt, de vorige vertalingen in aanmerking neemt, en naar begrijpelijkheid streeft. Gezien de dichtelijke verhevenheid betekent dit misschien een verarming, maar ook een enorme winst voor de toeschouwer in het verkrijgen van inzicht en het doorzien van samenhang. Albers zoekt naar een vervangende beeldspraak die ‘de betekenis van de tekst vaak dicht benadert dan een letterlijke, en dus wenselijker is.’ Het publiek wordt door deze begrijpelijkheid gedwongen om met volle concentratie te luisteren, want datgene wat je kunt begrijpen wil je niet missen.” Hana Bobkova, ‘Hamlets appèl op het geweten. “Vaak is een druppel kwaad genoeg om al het goede te vergifigen,”’, *Financieel Dagblad*, 16-1-1999.

435 Salient detail: this was the theatre company of Jacob Derwig, who had starred in De Trust’s *Hamlet*. For this reason, he did not perform in the production.

436 Jan Ritsema: “Deze Hamlet gaat in alle opzichten in tegen de versie van De Trust. Het probleem met Hamlet is dat de tijdgeest zich ervan meester heeft gemaakt. En de laatste 150 jaar is die tijdgeest bepaald door de romantiek van Goethe en de psychologie van Freud. Iedere regisseur zegt dat hij er iets nieuws mee wil zeggen, maar uiteindelijk komt het allemaal op hetzelfde neer. Kijk maar naar de Hamlet van Toneelgroep Amsterdam, De Trust, Het Zuidelijk Toneel en het Nationale Toneel. Ik vind ze verschrikkelijk. Oidipous-complexen, generatieconflicten, heel Freud wordt erop losgelaten. Weifelende Prins op Zoek Naar De Waarheid. Daar kun je je als toeschouwer aan laven: kijk eens, ik twijfel wel eens, maar het kan altijd nog erger. Ik pas voor dat soort biechtstoeltheater.” Wijbrand Schaap, ‘Een Hamlet van taal,’ *Algemeen Dagblad*, 19-1-2001.

‘universal appeal’ and the ‘humanity’ that twentieth century directors from Verkade to Boermans had been concerned with. Ritsema himself, however, abstained from such “confessional theatre.” Instead, he observed that the play was already actual because of the humanist doubt that pervaded it. Rather than either actualising or historicising, he tried to refrain from a univocal interpretation to the play, by leaving the construction intact and presenting *Hamlet* as an essay.⁴³⁷ Nevertheless, he had to admit that it was inevitable to make it relevant for the present audiences.⁴³⁸

Jan Ritsema wished to bring out the construction of the text which provides the spectator with an intellectual exercise on illusion and reality. He rejected the kind of psychological impact that is invited through clarification, but instead favoured a rational (and in the translation, a rationalising) approach:

The creators of this *Hamlet* proceed from the belief that whoever plays Shakespeare today has to ask all the questions again and not settle for traditional answers. This means trying to read again WHAT IT SAYS, without getting lost in psychological details or in the clichés handed down by the history of performances. One must try to analyse Shakespeare’s lucid thinking, to unfold his phenomenal construction full of cross-references.⁴³⁹

This construction is allegedly contained in the rhetorical patterns in *Hamlet*, because Ritsema explicitly commissioned his translators, Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes, to retain the intellectual construction of the text.⁴⁴⁰ Their sources, according to themselves, are “the most authoritative.”⁴⁴¹ Although the writing is tongue in cheek, there is no preten-

437 “Wat ons in Hamlet aantrekt, is niet de psychologie van de personages, noch de morele voorschriften die uit het stuk spreken. Voor ons primeert het snelle, beweeglijke denken dat Shakespeare zijn personages in de mond legt. We willen als het ware in het hoofd van Shakespeare doordringen en een poging wagen de structuur van zijn meesterwerk te ontvouwen.” Programme note, ‘t Barre Land, 2001.

438 “De makers van deze Hamlet willen noch actualiseren, noch historiseren. Zij willen vooral geen eenduidige interpretatie op het stuk kleven, maar proberen de constructie intact te laten. Overmijdelijk wordt er een soort ‘vernieuwbouw’ toegepast vanuit de hedendaagse inzichten, maar er worden geen nieuwe uithangborden aan de gevel gehangen. Het paradoxale van Hamlet is echter dat dit stuk actueel is, zonder dat men het hoeft te actualiseren. De houding van humanistische twijfel en onderzoek die Shakespeare zijn held laat aannemen bij het prille begin van de 17^{de} eeuw is een voor die tijd bijna voorbijgestreefde attitude. (...) Bij het begin van de 20^{ste} eeuw doet twijfel en subjectiviteit opnieuw hun intrede in de natuurwetenschappen. Zoals steeds zijn er weer decennia nodig geweest om deze verandering in intellectuele methode of standpunt te doen doordringen tot het niveau van de ‘dagelijkse’ praktische ervaringen van de mens. Een proces dat nog niet voltooid is, maar dat ons toch toelaat de begin-17^{de}-eeuwse Hamlet te herkennen als een verwant van zijn meer dan ooit door twijfel getekende 20^{ste}-eeuwse soortgenoot.” *Ibid*.

439 “[De] makers van deze Hamlet gaan ervan uit dat wie vandaag Shakespeares stuk speelt alle vragen opnieuw moet stellen en geen genoegen mag nemen met de antwoorden van de traditie. Opnieuw proberen te lezen WAT ER STAAT, zonder verloren te lopen in psychologische details of in de door de opvoeringsgeschiedenis overgeleverde clichés. Shakespeares scherpe denkwerk analyseren tot op de draad, zijn fenomenale constructie vol kruisverwijzingen openplooiën.” *Ibid*.

440 “Ritsema trok voor de metrische vertaling Erik Bindervoet en Robbert-Jan Henkes aan. In de bestaande Shakespeare-vertalingen trof hij veel slordigheden, ouderwetsheid en interpretaties aan. ‘Ik heb de vertalers expliciet gevraagd om aandacht te besteden aan Shakespeares rijke taal, aan zijn argumenten en redeneringen. En ik vroeg ook om geen leuke of gewiekste vertaling te maken, maar om dicht bij het origineel te blijven.’ Ritsema volgde de vorderende vertaling op de voet en gaf ‘soms commentaar, vaak niet.’” Arend Evenhuis, ‘Onze Hamlet is de tijdgeest te slim af,’ *Trouw*, 20-1-2001.

441 “De meest gezaghebbende bronnen,” from the cover of their *Hamlet* (2000). This would include *The Arden Shakespeare*, since that was used by Bindervoet and Henkes’ contemporary translators, but probably not as the only text, since they prefer the Folio variant “solid flesh” over the Second Quarto’s “sullied” (in the Arden edition). On the other hand they have a Gentleman converse with the Queen in 4.5. (as in the Arden edition,




Figure 12: Comparison between Bindervoet and Henkes's and Albers's *Hamlet*

Bindervoet and Henkes's translation represents a norm breach with Albers's version in all four categories. Bindervoet and Henkes regard themselves as subservient to the original text, intend to make a complete translation of the full text, retain most of the socio-cultural situation of the original (although they occasionally play with modern elements, hence the term 'upward compatibility') and rationalise all the heightened language, whereas Albers regards himself as a partial translator, reduces the text, modernises it and clarifies part of the heightened language, i.e. the schemes.

sion that the translators have a claim to poetical fame. They reserved their creative inspiration for a sixth act (included in the published edition of the translation), where a modernised, postmodern commentary on the play is presented.

Like their commissioner, Bindervoet and Henkes were eager to offer a version different from their predecessor Frank Albers's. They detested Albers's inappropriately "trendy" language.⁴⁴² He had been too affectedly "modern," in particular with the (inserted) pun on "dipsaus van de dood." Moreover, they did not accept his evasion of difficulties.⁴⁴³ Figure 12 illustrates how their version differed from Albers's.

and in the Second Quarto). Philip Edwards' *Hamlet* in the series of *The New Cambridge Shakespeare* (1985) is one of the few 'authoritative texts' that presents this combination (contrary to Arden (1982), Riverside (1974, 1997), Oxford (1985), Norton (1997) and Penguin (1980, 1996).

442 "Hamlet. O, dat ik nu iets goeds moest aanwijzen in de allerallerbelabberdsteberoerdste en -bezopenste vertaling die ons taalgebied heeft geteisterd! Albers! Een rat, een rat! Een lachertje, een gegrillde kip waar het vet van afdruipt, een pokkige popularisator, die met zijn nagelschaartje mijn regels wegnipt als het hem even te moeilijk wordt! Altijd bereid het publiek in te schmieren met zijn eigentijdse zonnebrand! Met zijn 'dipsaus van de dood'! Kan het platter? Alleen zijn miezerige typische jaren '90 gekloot rechtvaardigt al een nieuwe vertaling! Elke tijd zijn eigen Hamlet, u zegt het!" (BH2000: xvi).

443 They reiterated their rejection of simplification in translations in Henkes and Bindervoet (2005): "In Vertalië hecht men er namelijk de hoogste waarde aan dat de tekst volgens de regelen der kunst is vertaald, dat wil zeggen, het moet goed lopen, goed bekken, er mag nergens worden gestruikeld door de lezer, of zelfs maar nagedacht of getwijfeld. Orde en netheid moet er zijn, ook als daar in het origineel geen sprake van is." (2005: 19).

Komrij's translation was exemplary for Bindervoet and Henkes,⁴⁴⁴ since "he was faithful to the words, the syllables, and did not water down the text in order to please an illiterate crowd, or to actualise Shakespeare."⁴⁴⁵ Like Komrij, they considered the poetical function most important in their text, which would enable the theatre makers to present a layered text.

The translators did their best to avoid paraphrase in the translation of a trope, although they did not escape paraphrasing conventional metaphors. Most puns were retained, if necessary by using another pun (3.2.115):

Dacht je dat ik je voor een hooimijt aanzag? [Bindervoet & Henkes]
(literally: "Did you think I took you for a haystack?" with a pun on 'mijt' (stack)
– 'meid' (girl), for "Do you think I meant country matters?")

and translated the hendiadys as such (3.4.38):

Gestaald en gepantserd tegen gevoel [Bindervoet & Henkes]

Like Komrij, they used upward compatibility for their metaphors. On the one hand, they retained retentive words like "alsem" ("eisel"), "floret en beukelaar" ("foil and target"), but they also came up with words that are not particular to the historic setting: "prins carnaval" ("a vice of kings").

In their treatment of schemes, their stance was directly opposed to Albers's. In the rhetorical patterns they did not resort to clarification and favoured poetic structure over communication. Bindervoet and Henkes faulted Voeten for turning Shakespeare's poetry into "squashing prose" by letting the lines run into each other. Enjambment is used in *Hamlet*, but never by violating the smallest syntactical unit.⁴⁴⁶ Bindervoet and Henkes wanted to observe the synchronicity of breaks in syntax and in lines.⁴⁴⁷ However, their metre was identical

444 Bindervoet and Henkes: "'En jij vraagt je nu af: is dat nou nodig, een nieuwe Hamlet-vertaling.' Wij zeggen: 'Ja!' Die van Gerrit Komrij is na die van ons de allerbeste, maar voldoet niet meer. Hij heeft namelijk zelf gezegd dat er om de tien jaar een nieuwe Hamlet-vertaling moet komen. Onder het motto: elke tijd zijn eigen Hamlet." Maartje den Breeijen, "'Zijn of niet zijn" is geen dilemma,' *Het Parool*, 16-1-2001.

445 "Rosencrantz. Komrij blijft voor ons de beste. Hij hield zich aan de woorden – / *Guildestern*. En aan de lettergrepen – / *Rosencrantz*. – En deed geen water bij de wijn om in de smaak te vallen bij een ongeletterd publiek – / *Guildestern*. – Om Shakespeare weer te actualiseren of begrijpelijk te maken – / *Rosencrantz*. Of om de mensen weer tot lezen – / *Guildestern*. Of theaterbezoek zelfs – / *Rosencrantz*. Laat staan theaterbezoek – / *Guildestern*. – Aan te zetten." (BH2000: xv).

446 In Hamlet's 'To be or not to be' monologue the metre is not always regular. It contains initial inversion and other inversions of the regular metrical pattern. Nor are all lines in *Hamlet* end-stopped — i.e. not all the ends of sentences, clauses, or other syntactical units coincide with the ends of lines. Sometimes enjambment occurs; the pressure of an incompleted syntactic unit towards closure carries over the end of the verse-line. Nevertheless, in *Hamlet*, the enjambment does not surpass certain syntactic boundaries. It will never put a word like 'and' or 'that' at the end of a line, and a construction like "'tis a consummation devoutly / to be wished" will never be possible. The syntactic unit of the phrase in its smallest form is never violated. This is one of the instances in which English grammar is more practical to the purposes of poetry than Dutch, so that most translators see themselves forced to use lines like: "Wat is nu nobeler: verdragen *dat*" or "Van hartezen en de duizend pijnen *die*." It must be said that grammatically incomplete lines are always masculine, so that it would create the effect of enjambment when spoken on stage; this, however, is a choice in Shakespeare, but a necessity in most translations.

447 Compare for instance the position of 'die' in Bindervoet and Henkes: "(...) en gesteld dat slaap het eind is / Van hartezen en de duizend aardschokken / Die ons erfdeel zijn" and in Albers: "Als dan die slaap het einde is / Van hartezen en de duizend pijnen *die* / een mens moet dragen (...)"

in name only to iambic pentameter. Nearly every line contained about ten syllables, five of which were stressed (3.1.81-82):

136

Én je liever de pijn dúldt die je hébt
Dán te vlúchten naar één die je níet ként.

This is the only major point in which the translators – who claimed they were commissioned, amongst other reasons, because actors broke their teeth on Gerrit Komrij's translation⁴⁴⁸ – deviated from their favourite example.

The production *Hamlet*' focused on the quick thinking expressed by Shakespeare's characters. The theatre makers tried to lay bare the structure of Shakespeare's masterpiece, just as the translators focused on the (poetical) structure of the text. All actors had to learn the entire text; the lines were not spoken according to the different roles, but arbitrarily divided amongst the actors. The intended effect was that the text projected an image, as in a declamation of poetry: the real reconstruction or representation was not on stage but in the minds of spectators.⁴⁴⁹ This purely theatrical effect of estrangement was worthy of Brecht, although it did not convince all spectators.⁴⁵⁰

*

The three *Hamlet* performances discussed just above are emblematic for the history of *Hamlet* productions in the twentieth-century. There was a recurring argument between the professionals and the critics on the value of a true, poetic Shakespearean language and the (im)possibilities of modernisation. Moreover, retranslation was again used as a statement, in manifest response to each other. In fact, since the days of the Verkade-Van Looy translation, retranslation had not been used so aggressively as a conscious instrument of differentiation, bordering on a marketing device.

On the occasion of *Hamlet**, the article by Wim Noteboom on 'actualisation' was reprinted, which in light of the discussion on modernisation was an implicit, but further reaction to Boermans and Albers.⁴⁵¹ Doesburg's translator Albers took up the gauntlet in his reaction. He rejected the suggestion that 'actualisation is a falsification'. According to Albers, the notion of 'the problems and continuity' of a particular time is a simplification, and the question of whether a play is or is not part of a time continuum is based on senseless abstractions. Actualisation never has the destruction of the source text as condition:

448 As reported by Nico de Boer, *Noordhollands Dagblad*, 1-3-2001.

449 "Door één rol over meerdere acteurs te verdelen en door de rollen van scène tot scène te laten wisselen, hopen we dat de tekst als een imaginair object boven de hoofden van de acteurs komt drijven. Door het stuk met zijn allen te spelen, is er op de scène geen concrete situatie, geen concrete rol meer aanwezig. Er is alleen een globaal, maar imaginair tekstbeeld gevuld met drijfveren voor de toeschouwer. In dit stuk dat handelt over de schijn, wordt ook slechts 'schijnbaar op de scène geacteerd'; de werkelijke reconstructie gebeurt in het hoofd van de toeschouwer." Programme note.

450 Maartje Somers, 'Polyfone prins raakt de draad kwijt,' *Het Parool*, 19-01-2001; Hans Oranje, 'Zwevende "Hamlet" is een innemende mislukking,' *Trouw*, 25-01-2001.

451 *Dietsche Warande & Belfort* (2000, 6).

Actualisation starts from the assumption that the signification of a text is never finished, never given, never irrefutable. Actualisation is a negotiation (...) Put differently: *each production actualises*.⁴⁵²

Albers's reaction proves that all three productions were part of the same debate. This debate did not begin with the *Hamlet* by 't Barre Land, neither with Boermans, nor even with Croiset's actualisation and the subsequent reaction by Noteboom. The debate has been going on ever since the first critics questioned whether *Hamlet* still is relevant to our modern sensibilities. Always concomitant to this central question: 'Is it possible to stage *Hamlet* in its original form?'

In this discussion, the directors mostly did not voice their opinions directly. They made their statements through the translations they made or had made and used these to breach the image presented by their predecessor. With each new translation it was proved that it was possible to stage *Hamlet* for a 'modern' audience, by always reflecting yet another aspect of the play.

452 "Actualisatie heeft helemaal niet de vernietiging van de brontekst als voorwaarde: actualiseren gaat uit van de veronderstelling dat de betekenis van een tekst nooit af, nooit gegeven, nooit onbetwistbaar is. Actualiseren is onderhandelen, bemiddelen, pendelen, het is een complexe reeks transformaties waarvan het resultaat uiteraard niet identiek is aan de brontekst. Elke nieuwe regie, elke nieuwe vertaling is een palimpsest van een palimpsest van een palimpsest. Anders gezegd: *elke opvoering actualiseert*. Natuurlijk zijn sommige actualiseringën interessanter dan andere, en in die discussie zal – bijvoorbeeld – de verhouding tussen het herkenbare en het niet-herkenbare een belangrijk criterium zijn. Maar het besluit van Noteboom dat wat je actualiseert een stuk is dat 'in werkelijkheid nooit heeft bestaan' slaat nergens op. Het is alsof je aan iemand die net een beenamputatie heeft ondergaan zou zeggen dat hij onmogelijk geopereerd kan zijn omdat je nu eenmaal niet kunt worden geopereerd aan wat je niet hebt." Frank Albers, 'Is Hamlet nog van deze tijd? Misverstanden omtrent "actualisering,"' *De Standaard*, 11-1-2001.

Conclusion

They have never had the opportunity of seeing Shakespeare as clearly as the Dutch, nor of appreciating so many facets of his work. Each new translation is a looking-glass – as Frans Kellendonk has it – that mirrors the original from a different angle. Thus, each staged retranslation of *Hamlet* casts a different image of Shakespeare's play, reflecting an angle that was framed by a translator, executed by performing artists and received by an audience.

One of the outcomes of this research is the remarkable variety in such angles. Specific translational choices determine those angles for each new *Hamlet*. Theatrical retranslations did not only come about because spoken language ages at a faster rate than written language. Although 'updating language' is no negligible aspect, it turns out that retranslation comprehends reconsidering a range of translational norms. Each retranslation in this thesis is marked by the fact that it represents a different approach to the dilemmas of theatre translation. Even so-called 'passive retranslations' are not limited to updating, as is underscored by the case of Voeten's *Hamlet*.

My dissertation reveals that the choices particular to theatre translation are different from those suggested by Holmes for poetry, since they are related to the nature of the theatre text. The history of *Hamlet* in Dutch translation suggests a dichotomy between theatre-centred and book (or reading)-centred translations. In effect, the tradition of retranslation within the realm of the theatre largely runs its own course, independently from developments in literary translations. Retranslations that were not made for the stage remain unperformed. From the moment *Hamlet* was first staged in the Netherlands, there has been a particular textual tradition for the theatre, alongside translations for print.

The dilemmas of theatre translation are as such not novel to theatre translation theory, but the way they are interrelated to each other and related, in turn, to a general theory of norms, is presented here for the first time. They have proven most vital for the assessment of theatre translation and are therefore a fruitful starting point for further research. The main options for these norms in *Hamlet* translations are the following: Do the translator's norms bestow authority on the author, the translator or the performer? Does the translator uphold a norm of completeness or of essence? Does he opt for a norm of dramatic faithfulness or does he strive for dramatic innovation? Does he apply a norm of historical congruity or incongruity? Does he favour a norm of poetic or of communicative language?

The different choices made by the various translators studied in these pages are mapped in Figure 13. **The graph represents an arena of conflicting norms. No translation is in exactly the same location as another.** Translators differentiate their text from previous translations in at least one of the norms of theatre translation. In the case of *Hamlet* retranslations, three major themes are the recurring cause of conflicts between translators: the demands of propriety, heightened language and modernisation.

A concern with the play's inappropriate subject matter seems to have been particular to the first phase of *Hamlet* reception. The first translators had to deal with the necessity to translate a play that should educate as well as entertain, which in the case of *Hamlet* was questionable. The unsuitability of the text in the light of the contemporary 'paradigm of entertainment' is a possible reason for its first retranslation (1786). The indecencies – which included some puns – were translated in a chastened version. Only after the Dutch sexual




Figure 13: Choices in *Hamlet* retranslation 1777-2001
This graph is a summary of figures 6-12, mapped on the diagram of Figure 1. It represents the norms of the various translators presented in the case studies of Chapter 3. It also includes some other texts that have been presented in Chapter 3. It enables comparison between *Hamlet* translations beyond the norms of the immediate predecessors of the translators.

revolution, from Voeten’s 1976 edition and Komrij’s translation in 1986 onwards, did the translators make sure that most innuendoes were well understood. These changes run parallel to the rise of the semantic of solidarity in the forms of address. In terms of decorum on stage, this implies a shift from exemplary elevation to contemporary familiarity or even shocking confrontation. The most typical expression of this change in appreciation is the fact that translators before Komrij excused Shakespeare’s improper language by saying that he lived in such a rough age, and that Komrij and later translators defended their version by pointing out that Shakespeare did not censure his own work either.

Another moot point which returned time and again since Burgersdijk’s translation in 1882 was the treatment of Shakespeare’s poetic language. Even though the 20th century translators varied greatly in their attitude towards the norm of faithfulness to the source text, all of them, in their own way, considered prosody and poetry essential to the ‘true Shakespearean language.’ Burgersdijk believed that the poetic language had to be respected, because form and content should be one. The risk was in being too respectful, something that Burgersdijk managed to avoid by creating a text in fluent Dutch. His successor Jac. van Looy, however, opted for a literalist translation, to the effect that the reader or spectator would notice that the text was foreign, or not Dutch.

Jac. van Looy offered a remarkable reason for the ‘difficult’ form of his translation: he thought that the verse of Shakespeare contained a ‘thrust’ or ‘drive’ that was lacking in the translation by Burgersdijk. As a consequence the syntactical patterns in van Looy’s translation were adapted to suit. In fact, this appreciation of the rhythmical qualities of Shakespeare’s

verse returns throughout the twentieth century in the justifications of *Hamlet* translations. Rather than a purely technical form (i.e. prosody), Shakespeare's verse is regarded as something close to the Bard's poetic genius. Hence the prominence of verse in translations by those who consider themselves 'poets' in their own right *when translating* (Van Looy, Komrij, Boonen). Further research should be able to assess whether a relationship exists between the focus on the rhythm of the text and the concern of twentieth century theatre with subtext and the meaning of sounds.

Another important reason for the appreciation of the poetic characteristics of *Hamlet* is the fact that it invites multiple interpretations. Some of the translators in the 1980s and 1990s who were commissioned to emphasise the problematical 'folds' or the essay-like quality of the original, have given a great deal of attention to the details of tropes like metaphors and puns. A change in focus on the part of scholarship, both in language philosophy (Derrida) and in Shakespeare studies (the emphasis on puns in new editions) paved the way for these new renditions.

The reception of these retranslations indicates that they were transgressions of theatrical norms as much as they were poetical accomplishments. Noticeably, all translations that brought the poetical function to the fore were criticised at some point for being difficult to play, either because the text was unpronounceable, or because the result was simply 'dramatically unconvincing.' Apparently, these translations clashed with the audience's expectations of a theatrical text, probably because they hampered an easy understanding of the dramatic action.

Modernisation formed another contested point in both staging and translating *Hamlet* in the 20th century. Since 1925 it had become prevalent to search for ways of making the play relevant for contemporary audiences. This found its first expression in Verkade's attempt to modernise the play through the use of modern costumes, but later informed adjustments of the text as well. Voeten's translation (1957) was the first to use *text* to make the characters more contemporary. He achieved this by making the text less obscure, in the process taking leave of a number of poetic aspects of the original.

Further textual modernisation became the dominant phenomenon of the last decades of the 20th century. Modernising translations aimed at either making the characters more alive (Boonen), making the play accessible for children (Alphenaar) or facilitating a greater insight in the text (Albers). The provisional endpoint of this development was the *Hamlet* by Boermans (1997), which conflated most techniques of modernisation, including clarification. Boermans's argument in favour of clarification was that allegedly the ears of the present-day audience were no longer accustomed to the abstruse expression of language. Typically, most modernising performances ran counter to the more textual productions that favoured poetic language.

Both productions and retranslation that used modernisation transgressed theatrical norms, judging by the audience's reactions. Adapting costumes did not go far enough, since this was merely a superficial change and did not touch the play's psychology, or it was considered a falsification, since it tried to part the play from its historical context. Modernisation in translation did not always find favour either. The first reactions to a clarifying translation spoke of 'disconnecting' the original from 'its mysterious grounds,' and anachronisms or deliberately 'trendy' language made both critics and colleague translators frown.

As can be deduced from Boermans's defense of clarification, modernising retranslations were a reaction to poetically-oriented translations. In fact, the series of retranslations of *Hamlet* can be interpreted as a chain of reactions involving supporters of poetical language and supporters of modernisation, each with their particular interpretation of proper translation. Van Looy thought Burgersdijk had not been literal enough, Voeten thought Van Looy had been too complicated, Komrij thought Voeten had been too easy, Albers thought Boermans had gone too far in turning the play into prose and Bindervoet and Henkes thought Albers still used too many modernisations.

The findings of this thesis underline that these different positions are not arbitrary. They are the result of the translators' conscious decisions to differ from their predecessor in the way that they had solved a translational dilemma. **There was a personal motivation in making a different text; translators themselves felt the previous text would not do. This was a conflict of norms.** Time and again, these norms, such as they are mentioned above, were breached in new retranslations.

The different angles of the new texts were perceptible for everyone involved with the production, both on the producing and the receiving end. **The changes in translation were not made for the in-crowd of translators, but also for those watching the play; they formed part of a dialogue between producers and audience.** The vehement reaction of both retranslators and audiences to changes in the text underscores that norm changes struck close to home for theatrical Shakespeare-lovers. **They cannot, therefore, be considered mere idiosyncrasies.** These choices were understood as bearing on significant norms by all parties and could be used as important assets in the *Hamlet* productions. Because they would not pass unnoticed, they became powerful instruments of differentiation.

The fact that these norms were expressed by audiences indicates perhaps that the changed norms in the translations result directly from **the demands of the changing market;** they were not only perceived by the audience, but may have also **been determined by them.** However, the case of *Hamlet* suggests that translator, client and market were not all 'in fundamental agreement,' but suffered from internal contradictions.

In the first place, the heterogeneity of the target audience begs for the adjustment of Chesterman's claim that it is the expectancy norms that determine the professional norms. At particular moments in time, there were expectancy norms that governed the choices of translators and theatre makers, like the demands of propriety and decorum. These social conventions should be placed in the category of (binding) rules. They are of a different nature from decisions with regard to certain dilemmas that may have an **opposite solution in a consecutive retranslation.** With regard to the latter, the audience has seldom been unanimous on the success of a new *Hamlet* translation. This makes it impossible to speak of a homogeneous target culture, even within the community of the theatre. Professional norms observe the expectancy norms of one part of the audience, but they just as much breach those of another part of it.

This implies that the professionals just could not help transgressing the expectancy norms of part of the audience. When they tried to make the dramatic text part of the performance text, some critics – objecting to reduction – pointed at the dramatic whole of the original text. When the professionals tried to make a connection between the world of the stage and the world of the audience, some critics rejected the notion there was a difference be-

tween the world of the play and the world of the stage. The critique on simplification voiced a disapproval of the loss of the poetic features in the dramatic text, while it had been the intention of the theatre makers to highlight the features of spoken language that were present in the same text. The criticism on experimental stagings which allegedly turned *Hamlet* into a caricature pointed towards the dramatic whole of the text, whereas theatre makers had tried to reflect the changing needs of the theatre in terms of the text's structure. When room was made for the multiple authors of a *Hamlet* production, critics objected to the visible role translator or director had in the text, by referring to the clash of these other 'authors' of the performance text with Shakespeare's intentions.

Sometimes the professionals just were a lap ahead of the critics. The innovations of new productions and translations sometimes contributed to shaping new expectancy norms. The productions that introduced new norms⁴⁵³ more often than not became the benchmark for the next production, supplying conservative critics who disliked the successive performance with ammunition. It took a host of new versions of *Hamlet* for a critic to finally question whether 'the' actual Hamlet actually existed in 2001.

Granted, the audience often expressed a norm that the succeeding translator was to follow. Critique on the lack of propriety in De Cambon, on the tortuousness of Van Looy, on the lack of 'speakability' in Komrij, or the suggestion of Waals to include modernisation in the text were all voiced before a translation was crafted that would take the censure into account. This suggests that the expectancy norms at times suggested a new direction for retranslators.

However, changes in expectancy norms did not immediately cause a new retranslation. When it was clear Van Looy's translation would no longer do, it still took several years before it was replaced by Voeten's translation on stage; and ten years earlier a translation that did not suffer from most of Van Looy's defects had already been available. The expectancy norms created a climate that suggested that a new rendition would find a favourable reception, but it took a theatre maker with a much more personal motivation to make sure that a retranslation did in fact appear on the boards.

In theatre retranslation a central role is played by the mediator between text and audience: the director. In most of the cases presented in this research, the primary cause for a

453 The vicissitudes of *Hamlet* in theatre translation present a history of changing norms in theatre translation, that at the same time can be read as a history of the theatre text. If the history of *Hamlet* is any indication of the development of other (Shakespeare) plays in translation, the phases suggested by Hoenselaars (2004a) can be qualified further. The neoclassicist phase, 'fitting Shakespeare in a neoclassicist straightjacket,' is represented in the Netherlands by Mrs. De Cambon-Van der Werken and A.J. Zubli. They disagreed on the size of that particular straightjacket, the one leaving more room than the other for the madness of the original. The Romantic phase, which celebrated the poetic genius of the author in the unity of content and form, can be divided into two tendencies. The first is represented by Burgersdijk, which favoured a (melli)fluent Dutch text; the second by Van Looy, which sought the rhythm of the original in a 'trial of the foreign.' Even more interesting are the phases that follow, since they have been given but scant attention. From the 1920s onwards a third phase developed, that sought to speak more directly to the audience through various ways of modernisation. In the 1960s this evolved into a quest for political relevance. In the same decade the heritage of Artaud taught the theatre makers to destroy the text in the performance, which led to a (fourth) phase of experiments with performance. In a fifth phase, starting in the 1980s, these experiments with text continued (tradaptation). In the 1990s collage technique and cross-medial experiments bore the brunt of textual experiment. The late 1980s and 1990s represent two other tendencies, that took place during the same phase. One looked for the theatrical use of heightened language, and the other looked for modernisation in the text, as a heritage of the committed *Hamlets* of the 1960s, although rejecting its quest for political relevance.

new translation to be actually created is in the director's intention to give the old text a new angle. From the moment they interfered with the translation, the directors made sure they got their personal version. Alternative translations were from time to time available (Kok, 1860; Van Suchtelen, 1947; Buddingh', 1964; Jonk, 1991), but these were never used. Instead, most theatre makers commissioned a new text. Apparently the motive for these commissions was not – or at least not only – the ageing of a previous translation. The director specifically wanted *that* particular new text. Most retranslations, then, are active retranslations.

At the same time, the choices made in the text supported the director's interpretation. Both the translator's and the director's choices presented an element of renewal. In the case of a staged retranslation, the text hardly ever is the only new element and coincides generally with a different approach to other theatrical means which are also reflected in the choices made in the translation. Verkade sought 'thrust' for his symbolic theatre, Steenbergen wanted a clear text for a 'human' *Hamlet*, Rijnders desired 'folds' and 'cracks' in an investigation into Elizabethan rhetorics, Tanghe wanted a text that bore its emotions on the surface to excite a young audience, Ritsema looked for the intellectual construction in an essay-like performance.

The option of a retranslation only presented itself if the director wished to present a *Hamlet* that was different from that of his predecessor(s). Verkade broke with the illusionism of De Leur, Steenbergen with the intellectualism of Verkade, Rijnders with the commitment of Croiset and De Moor, Tanghe with the complications of Rijnders, Doesburg with the modernisation of Boermans and Ritsema with the psychology of *all* of his predecessors. Some directors were less aggressive in their positioning and chose to have a new text to heighten the individuality of their production, amongst whom Rijnders (1986) and Tanghe (1991). Others showed themselves more conscious of the force of retranslation as an instrument of differentiation, including Verkade (1907), Steenbergen (1957) and Ritsema (2001). These directors actually presented the new text as a farewell to their predecessors.

Of course, *Hamlet* offers more possibilities for differentiation than most other plays as a result of its unique status within the theatre. For Zubli it was still impossible to make a statement with his new *Hamlet*, since the play had not yet been canonised. Burgersdijk and the people of De Vereeniging were the first to be able to convey their views through a new Shakespeare. This development was continued throughout the twentieth century. In the case of *Hamlet*, this new orientation is conspicuously characterised by a desire to break with a Romantic interpretation of the play, throughout the twentieth century, by Verkade (in 1907 and 1925), Steenbergen (1957), Rijnders (1986) and Ritsema (2001). Since *Hamlet* has developed into a theatrical touchstone in the course of the twentieth century, the question remains whether retranslation has the same power of differentiation if it is applied to other texts. Further synchronic research should be able to shed more light on this matter.

The theatre maker's influence on translation must be put in historical perspective. My dissertation reveals that the director leaves his mark on the translation from the moment that he claims a role as co-author of the production. In the case of *Hamlet*, the influence of theatre makers on the performance text starts around the turn of the 20th century. Eduard Verkade, the first Dutch director in the modern sense, commissioned a retranslation in 1907. From that moment on, most retranslations deployed on stage were commissioned texts. The text began to represent a choice rather than an invariable to theatre makers, and translation

became a joint venture. This must not be taken to mean that the translator had no influence on the production – translators from Van Looy to Bindervoet and Henkes deliberated with the theatre makers about their versions of *Hamlet* – but the end responsibility for the retranslation as used in the production could not but rest with the director alone.

Not only did the theatre makers have an increasing influence on the translation, the audience came to see the translator as a part of the production team as well. This is especially the case with academic critics. Loffelt already disagreed with Burgersdijk's decision to cut parts of the play, and Bachrach and Kellendonk even castigated the 'caricature' and 'travesty' of the work of Marowitz and Komrij. In defense, the translators appealed to their (anti-academic) inspiration as a theatre maker or as a poet.

After the rise of the director's theatre, the influence of theatre makers on the text reached a next turning point in the 1960s, when inspiration was let to precede the play and the original's material was adapted, as in the days of Ducis, into a performance that met the conventions of the present theatre. The Dutch production of Marowitz' *Hamlet* (1966) was the first to reject the dramatic structure of the by then fully canonised play. Instead of untouchable sanctities, Shakespeare's texts, stories and characters were considered 'the spiritual property of all of us'. Partly as a result of this change of focus, the call for the adaptation of the dramatic structure increased. This however did not constitute a return to Ducis, but a continuation of the (Romantic) idea that an artist expresses himself in form and content. This time, however, the artist was not Shakespeare, but the theatre maker.

This introduced further norm changes with regard to theatre translation. Individual interpretation – as diverse as *Hamlet* 'as Provo (beatnik)' (Flink), 'as obnoxious liberal' (Marowitz), 'as fighter against contemporary violence' (Croiset) or 'as Brecht' (Lamers) – at first was realised through other non-textual theatrical means, but at the moment when the changed theatre climate asked for more distance, the stamp of a particular performance extended to the translation itself. From the mid-1980s onward, theatre makers had an increasing hold on the text, on the one hand through explicit commissioning of translators (requests for 'rhetoric', 'emotion', 'for children', 'distance', 'as an essay'), on the other hand by making far-reaching adaptations of the text themselves. No longer was the action suited to the word, but the word was suited to the action. As a result, the production of retranslations was accelerated. From the 1990s onwards almost any production had its individual translation or adaptation. Theatre makers had come to realize the potential of retranslation as a statement of differentiation.

In a parallel to the emancipation of the theatre maker, the translator distanced himself more and more from the norm of unity of form and content to meet the demands of the modern stage. Van Looy had voiced the idea (not particular to theatre translation) that in the case of translating a poet like Shakespeare, a technical translation was an impossibility. Only a poet could reproduce the work of such a genius. On the same level as the original author, the translator was free to treat the original with some license, on the basis of his own inspiration. Several decades later this attitude resulted in the tradaptation experiments of Claus (1983) and Decorte (1985). Claus was the first to question to role of the faithful translator for a performance text; both he and Decorte, be it for dramatic or personal reasons, rewrote the original into a new play. They did not put themselves on the same level as the original author, but felt superior to him. The introduction of another norm on the level of the initial norm

(‘to what authority will the translator submit himself’), had widely ramifying consequences for changing the performance text. After these experiments, even those translators who strove after some kind of faithfulness emphasised that their version could not but be an individual rendition of the original.

Retranslation can transcend a single theatre maker’s desire to be different from his immediate predecessor. It may also serve to express a new and distinct direction for an entire group. Thus, a group around one retranslation generally shares other differing norms or ideas as well in distinction to other groups around preceding texts. De Cambon’s Orangism and Zubli’s patriotism may be a remarkable coincidence, but De Vereeniging’s dislike of the barbaric state of the Dutch theatre, Verkade’s rejection of dead-end realism and hollow romanticism, the Aktie Tomaat-inspired collective contempt for the diminishing return of conventional dramatic reiteration, and Rijnders’s and Komrij’s dislike of realism all relate a retranslation to a conflict that is fought on more than one front.

An unanswered question is whether the ‘group’ extends to those people who used the retranslation after the commissioners. Can a series of directors be considered a group just because they subscribe to the same poetics of the same translation? Without a new text Royaards still distanced himself from De Leur, and De Meester Jr. from Verkade. A previous interpretation can be breached even though the norms of the preceding translation are observed. The clearest ‘group’ in the history of *Hamlet* is formed by those who used Voeten’s translation and at the same time embraced Kott’s interpretation of *Hamlet* as our contemporary. It is ironical that these productions were made in a period that expected a new interpretation of each performance.

The retranslations discussed in this dissertation may all have had a claim on the perfect translation – they were all intended as the right translation at the right time, at least for one production. Sometimes they aimed at introducing a difficult text, but all can be considered instruments of differentiation, tools that enabled the theatre makers to bring across their own vision on a play and on the theatre in general. We may safely conclude that some kind of conflict was at the basis of these retranslations. Translation may be undertaken in the service of power (i.e. depending on the relation to the commissioner), but it is also an *instrument* of power, to be used as a means to (re)define oneself.

Hamlet in its ‘original form’ is perhaps impossible to perform. In the face of a multitude of dilemmas, a translator cannot but fail somewhere. It is easy to say that theatre translations are adaptations, or even falsifications, since they meddle with the contents, structure, text or world of the original. The reason for this is simple: all performance is translation and all translation is falsification, or better: negotiation. Rather, it is the achievement of the translators in this history that they have offered new angles for a playable text and have given life to it time and again. For a play that even in its original shape is as protean and elusive as its protagonist, this might just be the most worthy tribute.

A

Translations of *Hamlet*
in performance

This is an overview of the translations of *Hamlet* in the Dutch language for the Dutch audience and the professional Dutch productions they were used in. It is likely that translations of (fragments of) a highly canonical text like *Hamlet* (the 'To be or not to be' monologue being a case in point) have found their way into a multitude of books, poems and plays, let alone letters and otherwise unpublished private writings. The inventory includes only those versions of *Hamlet* that have been published as Dutch translations of *Hamlet* or as Dutch translations of foreign adaptations of *Hamlet* and those versions that have remained unpublished, but have been used in professional theatrical productions of *Hamlet* on the Dutch stage.

The references are marked by the year the translator published his translation (or when he made it public through a performance, in the case of the unpublished translations). When a translator has made his own revision of the text, the year of the revision is given as well. The years and places of the (professional) performances given are the years and places of the opening night. Consecutive performances and other details of the performances can be found in Appendix B. Since both the director and the protagonist of the performance are often used to refer to a production, these names are included in this overview as well.

1778, Margareta Geertruid De Cambon, geboren Van der Werken (mostly translation of a foreign adaptation)

Publication:

Hamlet, treurspel, gevolgt naar het Fransch, en naar het Engelsch, door M.G. De Cambon. Geb. Van der Werken (The Hague, Isaac du Mee, 1778, 1779)

[translation from the French by Jean-François Ducis and the English by William Shakespeare]

DC1779

Performance:

1777, The Hague, Rotterdam (Hamlet: Marten Corver)

1778, The Hague, Amsterdam

1779, Amsterdam (Hamlet: Alexander Hilverdink)

1780 (Hamlet: Alexander Hilverdink)

Translation of the monologue starting with 'To be or not to be' reportedly added to the following performances of Zubli's translation (see below):

1829, Amsterdam (Hamlet: Reinier Engelman)

1841, Amsterdam (Hamlet: Anton Peters)

1849, Amsterdam, Koninklijke Hollandsche Tooneelsten (Hamlet: Anton Peters)

1867, Rotterdam, directed by J. Ed. de Vries

1867, Amsterdam, directed by D. van Ollefen and J.H. Albregt

1778, Anonymous

Publication:

William Shakespear. Tooneelspelen. Met de bronwellen, en aantekeningen van verscheide beroemde schrijveren. Naar het Engelsch en Hoogduitsch vertaald en met nieuw geïnventeerde kunstplaten versierd. (Amsterdam, 1778-1782)

A1778

Performance:

Never performed

1783, Willem Bilderdijk

Publication:

'Hamlets bekende alleenspraak, na Shakespeare's Engelsch gevolgd.' Published in: IV. Mengeldichten. Hamlets bekende alleenspraak, na Shakespeare's Engelsch gevolgd. (Amsterdam, 1776-1829). [Translation of the monologue 'To be or not to be']

Performance:

Never performed.

1786, Ambrosius Justus Zubli (translation of a foreign adaptation)

Publication:

Hamlet, treurspel (Amsterdam, J. Helden and A. Mars, 1786)
[translation from the French by Jean-François Ducis]
Z1786

Performance:

1786
1792 (Hamlet: Ward Bingley)
1796 (presumably Zubli's translation)
1811 (Hamlet: Andries Snoek)
1816
1821, Amsterdam
1825, Amsterdam
1827, Amsterdam
1829, Amsterdam (Hamlet: Reinier Engelman)
1831, Amsterdam (Hamlet: Reinier Engelman)
1832, Amsterdam
1833, Amsterdam
1835, Amsterdam, Zomergezelschap J. Majofski
1841, Amsterdam (Hamlet: Anton Peters)
1842, Amsterdam
1843, Amsterdam (Hamlet: Anton Peters)
1845, Amsterdam
1849, Koninklijke Hollandsche Tooneelsten (Hamlet: Anton Peters)
1850, Amsterdam
1867, Rotterdam
1867, Amsterdam, Ver. Tooneelsten
1867, Amsterdam., Tooneelsten van de Rotterdamsche Schouwburg Vereeniging, directed by D. van Ollefen and J.H. Albregt (Hamlet: Louis Moor)
1875, Amsterdam, Albregt & Van Ollefen, (Hamlet: Louis Moor)
1878, Amsterdam, Tooneelsten Pot & Kistenaber
1882, Alkmaar, Van Ollefen, Moor en Veltman (Hamlet: Louis Moor)

1836, Philippus Pieter Roorda van Eysinga

Publication:

William Shakespeare. Hamlet: treurspel. uit het Engelsch, in den vorm van het oorspronkelijke vert.
door P.P. Roorda van Eysing (Kampen, W.J. Tibout, 1836)

Performance:

Never performed

1860, 1873, Abraham Seyne Kok

Publication:

William Shaksper. Hamlet, Prins van Denemarken: treurspel. Naar het Engelsch door A.S. Kok, onder
toezicht van J. van Vloten (Haarlem, A.C. Kruseman, 1860)

Performance:

Never performed

1882, Dr. Leendert Alexander Johannes Burgersdijk

Publication:

William Shakespeare. Hamlet Prins van Denemarken. Vertaald en voor het hedendaagsch tooneel be-
werkt door Dr. L.A.J. Burgersdijk ('s Gravenhage, A. Rossing, 1882).
B1882

De Werken van William Shakespeare, Vertaald door. XII vols. (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1884-88)
B1884

De complete werken van William Shakespeare in de vertaling van Dr. L.A.J. Burgersdijk. Bewerkt en van een inleiding voorzien door Prof. Dr. F. De Backer, hoogleraar aan de universiteit te Gent en Dr. G.A. Dudok, privaat-docent aan de Gem. Universiteit te Amsterdam. (Leiden, 1944, A.W. Sijthoff)
B1944

De werken van William Shakespeare. Vertaald door L.A.J. Burgersdijk (Utrecht, Het Spectrum, 1983)

Performance:

- 1882, Amsterdam, Koninklijke Vereeniging Het Nederlandsch Tooneel, directed by Willem Piter de Leur (Hamlet: Louis Bouwmeester)
- 1891, Rotterdam, Tivoli Schouwburg, directed by Jan C. Vos (Hamlet: Willem C. Royaards)
- 1895, Koninklijke Vereeniging Het Nederlandsch Tooneel, directed by Willem Pieter de Leur (Hamlet: Willem C. Royaards)
- 1900, De Vos & Van Korlaar, directed by Jan C. Vos (Hamlet: Eberhard Erfmann)
- 1908, Gezelschap Van Lier, directed by Joseph van Lier (Hamlet: Herman Schwab)
- 1998, Maatschappij Discordia, directed by Jan Joris Lamers [fragments]

1907, Jacobus van Looy

Publication:

- Shakespeare's Hamlet (Amsterdam, 1907)
- Treurspelen van William Shakespeare. Vertaald door Jac. Van Looy en geïllustreerd door Rie Cramer (Utrecht, De Haan, 1922)

Performance:

- 1907, Amsterdam, Eduard Verkade (solo), directed by Eduard Verkade
- 1908, Amsterdam, De Hagespelers, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1911, Amsterdam, De Hagespelers, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1913, Amsterdam, N.V. De Tooneelvereniging, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1914, The Hague, Die Haghespelers, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1915, Rotterdam, Rotterdamsch Tooneelgezelschap, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1917, Amsterdam, Die Haghespelers, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1919, Amsterdam, Koninklijke Vereeniging Het Nederlandsch Tooneel, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1922, Amsterdam, De Hagespelers in 't Voorhout, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1924, Rotterdam, Vereenigd Tooneel, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1925, Amsterdam, Vereenigd Tooneel, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1926, Frankendaal, Vereenigd Tooneel, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1931, Rotterdam, Gezelschap Verkade, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1940, Amsterdam, Centraal Tooneel, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Gijsbert Tersteeg)
- 1943, The Hague, N.V. Het Residentie Tooneel, directed by Johan de Meester (Hamlet: Paul Steenbergen)
- 1944, N.V. Het Residentie Tooneel, directed by Johan de Meester (Hamlet: Paul Steenbergen)
- 1945, N.V. Het Residentie Tooneel, directed by Johan de Meester (Hamlet: Paul Steenbergen)
- 1946, Amsterdam, Centraal Tooneel, directed by Eduard Verkade
- 1947, Amsterdam, Eduard Verkade (spectacle coupé), directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Eduard Verkade)
- 1948, The Hague, De Haagsche Comedie, directed by Eduard Verkade (Hamlet: Paul Steenbergen)
- 1954, The Hague, Paul Steenbergen (solo), directed by Paul Steenbergen (Hamlet: Paul Steenbergen)

1924, dr. B.A.P. van Dam

Publication:

William Shakespeare. *Hamlet*. Vertaald door B.A.P. van Dam (Maastricht, 1924)

Performance:

Never performed

1947, Nico van Suchtelen

Publication:

William Shakespeare. *Het treurspel van Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken*. Uit het Engels vertaald door Nico van Suchtelen. (Amsterdam/Antwerp, Wereldbibliotheek, 1947)

Performance:

Never performed

1958, 1968 Bert Voeten

Publication:

William Shakespeare. *Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken. Tragedie in vijf bedrijven in de vertaling van Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1958, 1959)

VO1958

William Shakespeare. *Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken. Tragedie in vijf bedrijven in de vertaling van Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1958, 1964)

William Shakespeare. *Hamlet. Vertaling van Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1958, 1964, 1974) [In 1968 the translation was revised, postscript by Bert Voeten] VO1974

William Shakespeare. *Hamlet. Vertaling Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam, Publiektheater, 1976) [introductions by Bert Voeten and Hans Croiset] VO1976

William Shakespeare. *Hamlet. Vertaling Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam, International Theater Bookshop/Haagse Comedie 1983) [introduction by Guido de Moor] VO1983

Hamlet van William Shakespeare op basis van de vertaling van Bert Voeten (Den Haag, De Appel, 1988) [introduction by Watze Tiesema] VO1988

William Shakespeare. *Hamlet. Vertaling Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam/Eindhoven, International Theatre & Film Books/Het Zuidelijk Toneel, 1994) [introduction by Klaas Tindemans]

Performance:

1957, The Hague, De Haagse Comedie, directed by Paul Steenbergen (Hamlet: Coen Flink)

1966, Rotterdam, Nieuw Rotterdams Toneel, directed by Richard Flink (Hamlet: Eric Schneider)

1976, Amsterdam, Publiektheater, directed by Hans Croiset (Hamlet: Eric Schneider)

1977, Haarlem, Onafhankelijk Toneel, directed by Jan Joris Lamers (Hamlet: Edwin de Vries)

1978, Amsterdam, Frederik de Groot (solo), directed by Frederik de Groot (Hamlet: Frederik de Groot)

1979, Amsterdam, Frederik de Groot (solo), directed by Frederik de Groot (Hamlet: Frederik de Groot)

1983, Utrecht, Genesisius, directed by Nancy Gould

1983, The Hague, De Haagse Comedie, directed by Guido de Moor (Hamlet: Hans Hoes)

De kleine prins van Denemarken, 1985, Nijmegen, Teneeter, directed by Lucas Borkel (Hamlet: Jan Hoek)

1988, Amsterdam, Theatergroep Duizel, directed by Andy Daal (Hamlet: Laurens Umans)

1988, The Hague, Toneelgroep De Appel, directed by Erik Vos (Hamlet: Aus Greidanus)

1993, Eindhoven, Het Zuidelijk Toneel, directed by Ivo van Hove (Hamlet: Bart Slegers)

Hamlet-scene, 1998, Maatschappij Discordia, directed by Jan Joris Lamers [fragments]

Used, but without reference to the translator:

1984, Vlaardingen, Theater La Luna, directed by Çanci Geraedts (Hamlet: Titus Tiel Groenestege)

1997, Amsterdam, De Trust, directed by Theu Boermans (Hamlet: Jacob Derwig)

1964, *Cees Buddingh'* (adaptation of L.A.J. Burgersdijk)

Publication:

William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken. Vertaling Dr. L.A.J. Burgersdijk. Bewerkt door C. Buddingh' (Rotterdam, Nationale Uitgeverij, 1964)

Gerda van Kranendonk and Drs. Jop Spiekerman (eds.), Hamlet. The Marowitz collage version presented in the Shakespeare context. With a parallel translation by C. Buddingh'. (Wikor Drama Library 32, 1972)

Performance:

Never performed

[translation was used to accompany the Open Theatre performance of the Marowitz Hamlet, 1972]

1965, *Willy Courteaux*

Publication:

William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Ingeleid en vertaald door W. Courteaux. Klassieke galerij , nr. 73 (Amsterdam, Wereldbibliotheek, 1965, 1976, 1983)

William Shakespeare. Verzameld werk. Vertaald en ingeleid door Willy Courteaux. (Kapellen, Pelckmans, 1987).

CO1987

Performance:

1989, Amsterdam, Stichting Wereld Premières, directed by Harrie Hageman (Hamlet: Cornelis Scholten)

1968, *Bert Voeten* (translation of a foreign adaptation)

Publication:

Tom Stoppard, Rosencrantz en Guildenstern zijn dood. Toneelspel in drie bedrijven. Nederlandse tekst Bert Voeten (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1968).

Performance:

1968, The Hague, Haagse Comedie, directed by Paul Steenbergen and Dolf de Vries

1976, The Hague, Haagse comedia, directed by Bernard Goss

1989, The Hague, De Appel, directed by Aus Greidanus sr.

1992, Amsterdam, ELS theater, directed by Jochem van der Putt

1973, *Harry Mulisch*

Publication:

Harry Mulisch, Woorden, woorden, woorden (Amsterdam, Bezige Bij, 1973,1983) [Translation in several styles of the monologue 'To be or not to be']

Performance:

Never performed

1974, *Anonymous*

Publication:

William Shakespeare, Hamlet. Illustrated Classics, nr. 58 (Classics, 1974) [Comic book version, translation from an American original]

Performance:

Never performed

1977, *Aart Clerkx*

Publication:

Publication playtext: 'Speciaal ter gelegenheid van de opvoering van hamlet door onafhankelijk toneel heeft aart clerkx een nieuwe classic getekend van dit stuk dat ieder kent.'

Performance:

Never performed, but made in occasion of 1977, Haarlem, Onafhankelijk Toneel, directed by Jan Joris Lamers (Hamlet: Edwin de Vries)

1982, Hugo Claus

Publication:

Hamlet van William Shakespeare in een bewerking van Pavel Kohout en een vertaling van Hugo Claus (Dedalus and Exa, 1986) [Op 19 september 1986 creëerde Nieuw Ensemble RaamTeater VZW - van William Shakespeare in een bewerking van Pavel Kohout en een vertaling van Hugo Claus, Dedalus en Exa dankzij de medewerking van AVIA-Belgomazout n.v., 1986. Voorwoorden van Pavel Kohout, Walter Tillemans en nawoord van H. Van Engelen.
[prompt copy NTG, 1982, is unpublished]
C1986

Performance:

Used, but without reference to the translator:

1997, The Hague, De Regentes, directed by Guusje Eijbers (Hamlet: Bing Wiersma)

1982, Martin Hartkamp (translation of a foreign adaptation)

Publication:

Heiner Müller, Kwartet : (Mauser, De Hamletmachine, Kwartet, Hartstuk). Nederlandse tekst [uit het Duits van] Martin Hartkamp (Eindhoven, Globe, 1982).

Performance:

1982, Eindhoven, Globe, directed by Gerardjan Rijnders
1995, Rotterdam, De Gasten Komen, directed by Henri van Zanten [uncertain translation]

1985, Sam Bogaerts (unpublished translation of a foreign adaptation)

Performance:

Hamletmachine/Egofiel, Globe, Tilburg, directed by Sam Bogaerts

1986, Gerrit Komrij

Publication:

William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaald door Gerrit Komrij (Amsterdam, International Theatre Bookshop/Publiekstheater, 1986) [with an introduction by J[anine] B[rogt]]
William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaald door Gerrit Komrij (Amsterdam, Bert Bakker, 1989).
William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaald door Gerrit Komrij (Amsterdam, Bert Bakker, 1997). [republished in occasion of the film Hamlet by Kenneth Branagh.]

Performance:

1986, Amsterdam, Publiekstheater, directed by Gerardjan Rijnders (Hamlet: Pierre Bokma)

1991, Johan Boonen

Publication:

W. Shakespeare: Hamlet. Vertaling: J. Boonen (Leuven/Amersfoort, Acco, 1991).

Performance:

1991, Utrecht, Stichting Speciale Internationale Producties, directed by Dirk Tanghe (Hamlet: Wim Danckaert)

1991, Jan Jonk

Publication:

William Shakespeare. Hamlet: kroonprins van Denemarken. Vertaald door Jan Jonk (Heijen/AlphaTech, 1991)

Performance:
Never performed

1992, Hans Keijzer and Yardeen Roos (adaptation of unknown translation)

Publication:
Unpublished [no translator indicated]

Performance:
1992, Amsterdam, De Zweedse sokjes, directed by Yardeen Roos (Hamlet: Hans Keijzer)

1992, Marcel Otten (unpublished translation of a foreign adaptation)

Performance:
Hamletmachine / Hartstuk , Groningen, Grand Theater Producties, directed by Peter H. Propstra

1993, Wolfsmund (unpublished translation of a foreign adaptation)

Performance:
Trilogie: Hamletmachine: Dodendans: Omnibus, 1993, Amsterdam, Wolfsmund, directed by Ramón Gieling

1995, Daniël Cohen (translation of a foreign adaptation)

Publication:
Willem's Hamlet en Shakespeare's Hamlet. Idee: Gert den Boer ; William Shakespeare. Vertaling: Daniël Cohen. Bewerking: Tom Stoppard.

Performance:
1995, Vught, La Kei producties, directed by Erik Koningsberger (Hamlet: Gert den Boer)
1997, The Hague, La Kei producties, directed by Erik Koningsberger (Hamlet: Gert den Boer)

1996, Joke Elbers and Sabine Oprins (translation of a foreign adaptation)

Publication:
Tom Stoppard, Hamlet in vijftien minuten (Amersfoort, NCA Nederlandse Vereniging voor Amateurtheater, 1996)

1996, Carel Alphenaar

Publication:
William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaling en bewerking Carel Alphenaar. In opdracht van Huis aan de Amstel (Amsterdam, IT&FB, 1996).
ALP1996

Performance:
1996, Amsterdam, Huis aan de Amstel, directed by Liesbeth Coltof (Hamlet: Peter van Heeringen)
1997, Zaandam, Huis aan de Amstel, directed by Liesbeth Coltof (Hamlet: Peter van Heeringen)

1996, 1997 Mirjam Koen (unpublished translation)

Performance:
1996, Rotterdam, Onafhankelijk Toneel, directed by Mirjam Koen (Hamlet: John Taylor)
1997, Rotterdam, Onafhankelijk Toneel, directed by Mirjam Koen (Hamlet: John Taylor) [revised edition]

1997, Henri van Zanten (unpublished adaptation)

Performance:

MC Wisecrack / Supportact Hamlet, 1997, Rotterdam, De Gasten Komen, directed by Henri van Zanten

1997, Jeroen Kriek (unpublished adaptation)

Performance:

1997, Maarssen, Huis aan de Werf/ Stichting Growing Up in Public, directed by Jeroen Kriek (Hamlet: Niels Horeman)

1998, Frank Albers

Publication:

William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaald, bewerkt en ingeleid door Frank Albers (Amsterdam/Antwerpen, Atlas, 1998, 2001)
ALB1998

Performance:

1999, The Hague, Het Nationale Toneel, directed by Johan Doesburg (Hamlet: Gijs Scholten van Aschat)

2000, Don Duyns (unpublished adaptation)

Performance:

Aats Hamlet, 2000, Utrecht, Huis aan de Werf, Stichting Up, directed by Don Duyns (Hamlet: Aat Nederlof)

2000, Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes

Publication:

W. Shakespeare. De tragedie van Hamlet, prins van Denemarken. Geheel opnieuw, compleet en naar de meest gezaghebbende bronnen vertaald door Erik Bindervoet & Robbert-Jan Henkes en op verzoek van velen klassiek geïllustreerd met de tekeningen van vele jaren geleden door Aart Clercx (Amsterdam, De Harmonie, 2000) BH2000

Performance:

Hamle't, 2001, Utrecht, 't Barre Land/Kaaithheater, directed by Jan Ritsema

2000, Jan Decorte (adaptation)

Publication:

Decorte, Jan, amlett (Antwerpen, Het Toneelhuis, 2000)

Performance:

Never performed as a Dutch production [Belgian production: amlett, 2001, Maastricht, Het Toneelhuis, directed by Jan Decorte (Hamlet: Jan Decorte)]

2001, Annelene Lintelo (unpublished adaptation)

Performance:

2001, Zoetermeer, Dwarf, directed by Annelene Lintelo (Hamlet: Nick Mulder)

B

Hamlet performances

In the following pages an inventory is given of all theatrical *Hamlet* performances on the Dutch stages, including those based on part of the text of *Hamlet* (but excluding radio, television and film performances). I have attempted to register all professionals who occupied themselves with each *Hamlet* performance, both professional and in the audience. The occasional *Hamlet* performances by amateurs or theatre students have also been included, where registered by my sources. The sources for these performances have been the inventory of the Theater Instituut Nederland (TIN), reviews mentioning the performances, the information of Penninck (1936), Verkade-Cartier van Dissel (1978) and the inventory made by Robert H. Leek (1988). In the case where Leek gives information that is different from the information of TIN, Leek is preferred and information by TIN is indicated by *. Performances up to and including 1986 not indicated by Leek are marked by ♦.

The years are divided in seasons. The year given is the year of the opening night of the production in that season. If not indicated otherwise, the author as presented by the theatre company is "William Shakespeare". The title is given, where the poster or programme did not use the exact title "Hamlet". Where information is missing in the inventory, no information was found, neither in Leek, nor in TIN, nor in Verkade-Cartier van Dissel, nor in Penninck. The inventory is partly macaronic, as the general categories are in English, whereas particular divisions of tasks ('decoratiën'), or names of theatre companies ('Koninklijke Hollandsche Tooneelsten onder directie van Anton Peters'), and annotations as found in the sources mentioned above are given in Dutch. The name of the producer of the production is given in **bold**. An actor playing a double role is indicated by (d). Reviews of uncertain provenance, found in TIN, are indicated by the source "TIN". They can be found in the archives of the Theater Instituut Nederland, Herengracht 168, Amsterdam.

1777 Performances in: Rotterdam
 Author: Jean-François Ducis and William Shakespeare
 Translation by M.G. de Cambon-van der Werken

1778 ♦ Performances in: Amsterdam, The Hague
 Author: Jean-François Ducis and William Shakespeare
 Translation by M.G. de Cambon-van der Werken

 Cast: Hamlet: Marten Corver / Geertruid: Molster

1779 Performances in: Amsterdam
 Author: Jean-François Ducis and William Shakespeare
 Translation by M.G. de Cambon-van der Werken

 Cast: Hamlet: Alexander Willem Hilverdink

1780 ♦ Performances in: Amsterdam
 Author: Jean-François Ducis and William Shakespeare
 Translation by M.G. de Cambon-van der Werken

 Cast: Hamlet: A. Hilverdink

1786 Author: Jean-François Ducis and William Shakespeare
 Translation by A.J. Zubli

1786 Opening night: 4 October, Amsterdam
 Country of origin: Germany
 Translation: presumably the adaption made by Schröder (1777) of **Wieland's translation**

 Cast: Hamlet: Loehrs

- 1792 ♦ Cast: (Hamlet? :) Ward Bingley / (Geertruida?:) Johanna Cornelia Wattier-Ziesenis
Source: Penninck (1936: 165)
- 1796 ♦ Opening night: 30 January, Stadsschouwburg, Amsterdam.
Followed by: Een ballet. Teunis en Teuntje, Tooneelspel met Zang.
Cast: Geertruida: Johanna Cornelia Wattier-Ziesenis
- 1811 ♦ Cast: Hamlet: Andries Snoek
Source: Penninck (1936: 266)
- 1814 **Penley & Jones**
Opening night: 23 May, Hoogduitsche Schouwburg, Erwtmarkt, Amsterdam
Country of origin: United Kingdom
Version: presumably the version by J.P. Kemble (1814, 2533,5 lines). See Glick (1969).

Cast: Charles Kemble, Marie Therese Kemble
- 1816 ♦ Opening night: Rotterdam
Source: Penninck (1936: 264)
- 1821 ♦ Opening night: 27 November, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
- 1825 ♦ Opening night: 29 January, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
(other known performances: 23/4/1825)
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
- 1826 Opening night: Engelse Schouwburg (i.e. Hoogduitsche Schouwburg), Amsterdam
Country of origin: United Kingdom
Version: presumably E. Kean (1818, 2467 lines). See Glick (1969).

Cast: Hamlet: S. Chapman / Ghost: Mr Bond / Gertrude: Miss Emery / Polonius: Mr Newcombe / Ophelia: Ms Grossett / Horatio: Mr Hield

Review: B.S. Nayler, *A Review of the English performances, which have taken place in Amsterdam* (Amsterdam, 1826)
- 1827 ♦ Opening night: 3 November, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli

- 1829 Performances in: Amsterdam
Country of origin: United Kingdom
Version: presumably E. Kean (1818, 2467 lines) See Glick (1969).

Cast: Hamlet: W. Abbott / Ophelia: Harriet Smithson
- 1829 2 May, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
(other known performances: 26/9/1829, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam)
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
With added translation of To Be or Not To Be by De Cambon-Van der Werken.
Cast: Hamlet: Reinier Engelman
- 1831 ♦ Opening night: 2 October 1831, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
(other known performances: 22/10/1831; 24/12/1831; 11/2/1832)
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli

Cast: Hamlet: Reinier Engelman *Evers / Claudius: Johannes Jelgerhuis / Gertrude: Ms Kamphuizen / Ophélie: Christina van Ollefen-da Silva

Reviews: 'Gezien', 11/6/1831; *De Atlas*, 26/6/1831.
- 1832 ♦ Opening night: 8 December, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
- 1833 ♦ Opening night: 14 September 1833, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
- 1835 ♦ **Zomergezelschap, J. Majofski**
Opening night: 25 April 1835, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
(other known performances: 17/3/1836; 9/7/1836, Den Helder)
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
- 1841 Opening night: 28 August Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
With added translation of To Be or Not To Be by De Cambon-Van der Werken.

Cast: Hamlet: Anton Peters / Ophélie: Christina van Ollefen-da Silva

Reviews: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 1/9/1841

- 1842 ♦ Opening night: 22 Januari, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
(other known performance: 12/1/1843)
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
- 1843 ♦ Opening night: 11 May, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam

Cast: Hamlet: Anton Peters

Reviews: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 12/5/1843
- 1845 ♦ Opening night: 11 April 1845, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
(*Théâtre Français together with the production *La Mari à la campagne*)
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
- 1845 ♦ Opening night: 15 November, Théâtre Français Amsterdam
Hamlet – roi de Danemark. Tragédie en 5 actes
Country of origin: France
Author: Jean-François Ducis
- 1849 **Koninklijke Hollandsche Tooneelsten (onder directie van Anton Peters)**
Opening night: 24 January, Hoogduitse Schouwburg Amsterdam
Hamlet. Kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
With added translation of *To Be or Not To Be* by De Cambon-Van der Werken.

Cast: Hamlet: Anton Peters / Claudius: Van Ollefen / Gertrude: Ms Hoedt / Ophélie: Christina van Ollefen-Da Silva

Reviews: *Nieuw Rotterdamsche Courant*, 28/1/1849; document TIN, 29/1/1848 or 1849; document TIN.
- 1850 ♦ Opening night: 4 May 1850, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
- 1854 **Neues Hochdeutsches Theater (Dir. D.L. Goldammer)**
Opening night: 2 October, Théâtre Français; *Neues Deutsches Theater, Amsterdam
(other known performances: 10/10/1854)
Country of origin: Germany
Hamlet, Prinz von Danemark: großes Schauspiel in 5 Akten
Translation by A.W. Schlegel

Cast: Hamlet: Von Linden-Retowski

- 1856 Opening night: 12 July, Grand Théâtre des Variétés, Amsterdam
(other known performances: 15/7/1856)
Country of origin: Germany
Translation: presumably by A.W. Schlegel

Cast: Hamlet: Herman Hendrichs / Ophelia: Ms Rosahl

Reviews: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 14/7/1856
- 1862 ♦ Opening night: 23 February, Grand Theatre, Amsterdam
Translation: presumably by A.W. Schlegel

Cast: Hamlet: dhr. Schönfeldt / Ophelia: Frl. Eichenwald / Other roles: Schelper, Satzger, Carlmüller, Kramer

Reviews: Mylans (TIN), 24/2/1862
- 1864 **Deutsches Theater in der Arinststrasse (dir C. van Lier)**
Opening night: 14 March, Grand Théâtre des Variétés, Amsterdam
(other known performances: 21/3/1864, id.; 14/4/1864, Utrechtsche Schouwburg, 20/4/1865, id.; according to review: Thursday and Saturday before 7/3,13/3; 30/4/1864, Grand Theatre)
Country of origin: Germany
Hamlet Trauerspiel in 6 Akten und einem Zwischenspiel
Translation by A.W. Schlegel

Cast: Hamlet: Emil Devriendt (guest) / Ophelia: Meergarté-Wahlman / Other roles: Führrohr, Martinelli, d'Haibé, Hirthe, Gleissenberg

Reviews: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 7/3/1864; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 12/3/1864; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 2/5/1864
- 1864 ♦ **Hoftheater van Saksen / Deutsches Theater des Arinststrasse (dir. C. van Lier)**
Opening night: 3 November 1864, Grand Théâtre des Variétés, Amsterdam
Country of origin: Germany
Hamlet Trauerspiel in 6 akten und einem Zwischenspiel
Translation: presumably by A.W. Schlegel

Cast: Hamlet: Bogumil Dawison / Ophelia: Frl. Clara Meijer

Reviews: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 5/11/1864
- 1867 ♦ Opening night: 7 February 1867, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
(other known performances: 16/2/1867)
Hamlet, kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli

1867 ♦

Ver. Tooneelsten (dir. J. Ed. de Vries)

Opening night: 5 March 1867, Rotterdamsche Schouwburg Rotterdam
 (other known performances: 8/3/1867; 11/3/1867, Utrecht; 21/3/1860, Frascati Amsterdam; 29/3/1860, id.)
 Hamlet Kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
 Author: Jean-François Ducis
 Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
 With added translation of To Be or Not To Be by De Cambon-Van der Werken.

1867

Tooneelsten van de Rotterdamsche Schouwburg-Vereeniging onder directie van D. van Ollefen en J.H. Albregt

Opening night: 27 September, Grand Théâtre Amsterdam
 (other known performances: 1/4/1868, lokaal 'De Vereeniging, Rotterdam; 3/4/1868, 9/4/1868, Rotterdamsche Schouwburg Rotterdam. Hollandsche Voorstelling. Followed by: De Vrouwen-Soldaten of de Slecht verdedigde Vesting. Blijspel met zang in 1 bedrijf.)
 Hamlet Kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 Bedrijven. Gevolgd door:
 De weg naar het hart, blijspel met zang in 1 bedrijf
 Author: Jean-François Ducis
 Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
 With added translation of To Be or Not To Be by De Cambon-Van der Werken.
 Note: performance 27/9/1867 "ter Benefice van den Heer L.B.J. Moor"

Cast: Hamlet: Louis Moor / Claudius, eerste prins van den bloede: hr. J. Haspels / Gertrude: Mw. Götz-Scheps / Polonius, vertrouwde van Claudius: Hr. Spoor / Ophelia, dochter van Claudius: Mej. Fuchs / Norcestes, Deensch edelman: hr Le Gras / Voltimand, hoofdman der lijfwacht: Hr. Faassen / Elvire, vertrouwde van Geertruide: Mw. Gartman

1868 ♦

Opening night: 4 April 1868, Grand Théâtre des Variétés, Amsterdam
 Country of origin: Germany
 Translation presumably by A.W. Schlegel
 Farewell performance A. Weisé

Cast: Hamlet: A. Weisé / Gertrude and Ophelia: Ms Lehman and Ms Giers / Laertes: Mr Petzold

Reviews: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 5/4/1868

1870

Performances in: Grand Théâtre Amsterdam
 Country of origin: Germany
 Translation presumably by A.W. Schlegel

Cast: Hamlet: Felicita von Vestvali (female protagonist)

1875 ♦

Albregt & Van Ollefen

Opening night: 4 February, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
 (other known performances: 20/2/1875, id.; 3/8/1876, Odeon, Zwolle)
 Hamlet Kroonprins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven
 Author: Jean-François Ducis
 Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli
 Note: "in een geruimen tijd niet vertoond".
 Daarna: 's Naasten Huisvrouw. Blijspel in 3 bedrijven

Cast: Hamlet: Hr. Moor / Claudius: Hr. van Ollefen / Gertrude: Mw. Götz-Scheps / Polonius, vertrouwde van Claudius: Hr. van Schoonhoven / Ophélie, dochter van Claudius: Mej Fuchs / Norcestes, Deensch edelman: Hr. de Leur / Voltimand, hoofdman der lijfwacht: Hr. Brakkee / Elvire, vertrouwde van Geertruida: Mej. Ruffa

Reviews: *De Gids*, 5, 1875.

1876

Ernesto Rossi met zijn Italiaansch gezelschap

Opening night: 22 March, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague
(other performances: Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam)

Country of origin: Italy
Hamlet. Treurspel in 6 bedrijven en 10 taferelen
Author: William Shakespeare
Translation by Carlo Rusconi

Cast: Hamlet: Ernesto Rossi

1878 ♦

Toonelisten o. dir. v. Pot & Kistenaber

Opening night: 23 February, Frascati, Amsterdam
(other known performances: 24/2/1878)

Hamlet. Treurspel in vijf bedrijven
Author: Jean-François Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli

1881

Deutsches Theater in der Arinststrasse (dir. C. van Lier)

Opening night: 8 November, Grand Théâtre, Amsterdam
(other known performance: 21/11/1881, Utrecht; 22/11/1881, Grand Theatre, Amsterdam)

Country of origin: Germany
Translation presumably by A.W. Schlegel
Hamlet. Trauerspiel in 6 Akten und einem Zwischenspiel
Directed by Lederer
Annotation: This is known as the *Meiningen Hamlet*.

Cast: Hamlet: Ludwig Barnay

1882

Koninklijke Vereeniging Het Nederlandsch Tooneel

Opening night: 21 January, Grand Théâtre Amsterdam
(other known performances: 22/1/1882, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague; 14/4/1895, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam; 19/4/1895 Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague)

Hamlet. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven of 14 taferelen
Directed by Willem Pieter de Leur
Translation by Dr. L.A.J. Burgersdijk

Cast: Hamlet: Louis Bouwmeester / Polonius: Mr Ising / Ophelia: Josephine de Groot / Horatio: Oscair Tourniaire

Reviews: A.C. Loffelt, 'Het Tooneel in de Hoofdstad' *Het Tooneel*, 1-2-1882; A.C. Loffelt, 'Het Tooneel' *Het Vaderland*, 26-1-1882.

1882 ♦

Deutsches Theater des Arinststrasse (dir. C. van Lier)

Opening night: 11 February, Grand Théâtre Amsterdam

(other known performances 20/2/1889, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague; 1889, Grand Théâtre, Amsterdam)

Translation presumably by A.W. Schlegel

Directed by Lederer, 1889: *A. Saalborn

Cast: Hamlet: Ernest Possart

1882

Van Ollefen, Moor en Veltman (v.d. Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam)

Opening night: 29 August 1882, Kermis Alkmaar (Paardenmarkt naast Gasfabriek), Alkmaar

HamletKoning van Denemarken. Groot beroemd treurspel in vijf bedrijven

Author: Jean-François Ducis

Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli

Cast: Hamlet, koning van Denemarken: Hr. Moor / Claudius, eerste prins van den bloede: Hr. Veltman / Gertrude, weduwe van den overleden Koning, moeder van Hamlet: Mevr. Ellenberger / Polonius, Deensche edellieden: Hr de Vries / Ophelia, dochter van Claudius: Mej. A. Fuchs / Norcestes, Deensche edelliden: Hr Ellenberger / Voltimand, hoofd van de lijfwacht: Hr. Groebe / Elvire, vertrouwde van Geertruida: Mevr. Coerdes

1885

Berliner Residenz Ensemble

Opening night: 14 October, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague

(other known performances: 6/10/1885, The Hague)

Hamlet Prinz von Dänemark. Trauerspiel in 5 Akten und einer Zwischenspiel

Directed by Felix Lüpschütz

Translation by A.W. Schlegel

Note: performance ended at 0.30

Cast: Hamlet: Ludwig Barnay / Claudius: Werner / Gertrude: Frl. Winkler / Polonius: Lüpschütz / Laertes: Eritropel / Ophelia: Frl. Schmidt / Horatio: Bergmann-Elimar / Erste Schauspieler: Possin / Gravedigger: Door

Reviews: *Amsterdams Weekblad*, 7/10/1885

1889

Performances in: Amsterdam

Country of origin: Germany

Translation presumably by A.W. Schlegel

Cast: Hamlet: Friedrich Mitterwurzer

1890/91 ♦

Deutsch Gesellschaft Gebr. A. van Lier

Performances in: Grand Theatre, Amsterdam

Hamlet Prinz von Dänemark. Trauerspiel in 12 Bildern

Directed by Felix Lüpschütz

Translation by A.W. Schlegel

Cast: Hamlet: Friedrich Mitterwurzer

1892

V.a. Tivoli Schouwburg dir. De Vos & Van Korlaar

Performances in: Tivoli Schouwburg Rotterdam

(other known performances: 5/1892, *9/4/1892, Grand Theatre Amsterdam)

Hamlet Prins van Denemarken. Treurspel in vijf bedrijven

Directed by Jan C. de Vos

Translation by L.A.J. Burgersdijk

Stage adaptation: W.C. Royaards

Cast: Hamlet: Willem C. Royaards / Claudius: Jan C. de Vos

Reviews: A.G. van Hamel, *Het Tooneel*

1894 ♦

De Hollandse Opera (dir. De Groot)

Opening night: 31 August 1894, Paleis voor Volksvlucht Amsterdam

In honour of the new theatre Paleis voor Volksvlucht

Presumably the opera Hamlet by Ambroise Thomas (1868)

Cast: Hamlet: Maurits de Vries / Claudius: Schmier / Ghost: Ebbeler / Gertrude: Vermeeren / Laertes: Cauveren / Ophelia: Stella de la Mar / Marcellus: De Leeuwe

Music: orkest o.l.v. De la Fuente / Choreography: mej. Reggia, balletdanseressen

Reviews: *Echo*, 9/9/1894; *Eco*, 1/9/1894; *Het Vaderland*, 1/9/1894; *Nieuwsblad van Nederland*, 4/9/1894

1895 ♦

Performances in: Parkschouwburg

Presumably the opera Hamlet by Ambroise Thomas (1868)

Cast: Hamlet: Maurits de Vries / Claudius: Bordeneuve / Gertrude: mevr. Laville Ferminet / Laertes: Salrack / Ophelia: Mevrouw de Vries

Music: orkest o.l.v. dhr. Warnotz

Reviews: *Asmodée*, 23/3/1895

1895

Koninklijke Vereeniging Het Nederlandsch Tooneel

Directed by Willem Pieter de Leur

Translation by L.A.J. Burgersdijk

Cast: Hamlet: Willem Royaards

1898

Lyceum Theatre, London, o.d.v. Forbes Robertson m.m.v. Mrs. Patrick Campbell

Opening night: 28 March, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam

(other known performances: 2/4/1898 (id.))

Country of origin: United Kingdom

Hamlet. Tragedy in five acts

Version: presumably Forbes-Robertson (1897, 2601 lines). See Glick (1969).

Cast: Hamlet: Forbes Robertson / Gertrude: Miss Cecil Cromwell / Polonius: J.H. Barnes / Laertes: Berte Thomas / Ophelia: Mrs Patrick Campbell / Osric: Roy Horniman / Gravedig-

ger: Charles Dodsworth

Stage manager: Frederick Louw / Musical director: Carl Armbrusti

Reviews: Rössing, 'Engelsche Tooneelspelers in den Stadsschouwburg te Amsterdam', *Nieuws van de Dag*, 29/3/1898; Gio, 'Forbes Robertson als Hamlet', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 29/3/1898; Giovanni, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 1/4/1898; Rössing, 'Stadsschouwburg. Engelsch Tooneelgezelschap van Mr. Forbes Robertson', *Nieuws van de dag*, 30/3/1898; F.M., *Nieuws van de Dag*, 31/3/1898; Gio, 'Afscheid van Forbes Robertson', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 3/4/1898; Cekaë, 'Hamlet-kenners', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 31/3/1898; *Nieuws van de Dag*, 5/4/1898

1899 ♦

Mme. Sarah Bernardt et sa compagnie du Théâtre Sarah Bernardt de Paris

Opening night: 27 September, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague
(other known performance: 30/9/1899, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam)

Country of origin: France

La tragique histoire d'Hamlet. Prince de Danemark, drame en 12 tableaux

Translation by: traduction en prose de M.M. Eugène Morand et Marcel Schwob

Set design by Mons. Rovescalli / Costumes by v/h Théâtre Sarah Bernardt de Paris / Music: Musique de Scene de M. Gabriel Piesné

1900

De Vos & Van Korlaar

Performances in: Tivoli Rotterdam

Directed by Jan C. de Vos

Translation by L.A.J. Burgersdijk

Cast: Hamlet: Eberhard Erfmann / Claudius: Holkers / Ghost: Mulder / Gertrude: mej. Van Berkel / Polonius: Pilger / Laertes: Brondgeest / Ophelia: mevr. Brond-geest-De Vries / Horatio: Morriën / Gravedigger: Van Warmelo

Reviews: *Nieuw Rotterdamsche Courant*, 1900 (TIN)

1904

De Max & Ventura (impresario: Jacques Fermo)

Opening night: 7 October, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam

Country of origin: France

Hamlet, Prince de Danemark. Drame en 5 actes

Adapted by: adaptation française: Mrs. Alexandre Dumas et Meurice

Cast: Hamlet: M. de Max / Claudius: Mr. Xavier Thierry / Gertrude: Mme. Pauline Patry / Laertes: Leon Segond / Ophelia: Mlle. Ventura / Horatio: Mr. Jean Laurent

Costumes by Maison Muelle de Paris

Reviews: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 8/10/1904; *Nieuwsblad*, 8/10/1904; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 7/10/1904; *NRC*, 7/10/1904; *Nieuws van de Dag*, 7/10/1904; *NRC*, 8/10/1904; Rössing, 'Hamlet in het Fransch,' *Nieuws van de Dag*, 10/10/1904

1907

Eduard Verkade

Opening night: 10 December 1907, Concertgebouw Amsterdam

Hamlet (voordracht)

Directed by Eduard Verkade

Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Annotation: "Solo-voordracht Eduard Verkade. Meermaals hernomen tot na de Tweede Wereldoorlog. M.n. vanaf oktober 1933 regelmatig. Tijdens de oorlogs-jaren zeer regelmatig: in de winter van 1943/44 hield Verkade tachtig voordrachten. Na Dolle Dinsdag (5 september 1944) werden deze voordrachten in zgn. 'zwarte voorstellingen' bij de mensen aan huis, gegeven voor één familie met onderduikers en evacués."

Cast: Eduard Verkade (all rolls)

Set design by Eduard Verkade / Costumes by Cato Neeb

Reviews: Van Bruggen, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 11/12/1907; *Telegraaf*, 11/12/1907; *NRC*, 12/12/1907; *NRC*, 1/1/1908; *NRC*, 7/12/1907; *Wereldkroniek*, 14/12/1907; *Nieuws van de Dag*, 12/12/1907; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 8/3/1908; *NRC*, 4/12/1907; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 24/1/1908

1908

Gezelschap Van Lier

Opening night: 9 April 1908, Grand Théâtre Amsterdam

Hamlet. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven

Directed by Joseph van Lier

Translation by L.A.J. Burgersdijk

Occasion: Ere-avond Hermann Schwab

Cast: Hamlet: Hermann Schwab / Claudius: Erfmann / Ghost: De Veer / Gertrude: Car. Heye-Van Dommelen / Ophelia: Mien Erfmann-Sasbach

Reviews: N.H.W., 1908 (TIN)

1908

De Hagespelers o.l.v. Eduard Verkade

Opening night: 7 September, Odeon Amsterdam

(57 performances in seasons 1908-1909, 1909-1910, and 1910-1911, among which 7/10/1908, 11/10/1908, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam; 12/10/1908, Schouwburg Dordrecht; 8/12/1910, 13/5/1911 Hollandsche Schouwburg, Amsterdam; 2/11/1908, Schouwburg Haarlem)

Hamlet. In 5 bedrijven (16 taferelen)

Directed by Eduard Verkade

Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade / Claudius: Hendrik van Noort / Ghost: Coenraad Hissink / Gertrude: Mien Schuijlenburg - Helen Desmond / Polonius: Gerard Nijhuis - Joh.W. Broedelet / Laertes: Louis de Bree - Pierre Mols / Ophelia: Lily Green - Alice Plato / Players: Toneelkoning: Julius Brongers / Gravedigger: Anton Verheij-en / Other roles: Louis de Bree, Julius Brongers, Henri van Heeswijk, Coen Hissink, Hendrik en Karel van Noord, Jart van Staalduijnen

Set design by Eduard Verkade / "decoratiën" Frans Cleton / Costumes by Cato Neeb / Music: Klarinet en fluit onder pantomime van de toneelspelers

Reviews: Frans Coenen, *Haarlemse Courant*, 11/9/1908; H. van Loon. 'Bij Eduard Verkade'. *Hofstad*, 22/8/1908; Maria Viola, 'Twee Vertooningen.' *Van Onze Tijd*. Jaargang VIII, p. 264; V. Bruggen, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 8/9/1908; *Volk*, 9/9/1908; J.H. Rössing, *Nieuws van den Dag*, 9/9/1908; *Telegraaf*, 8/9/1908; *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 24/10/1908; R. Rolk. 9/9/1908; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 3/1/1909; *Amsterdam*, 13/9/1908; Rössing, *Nieuws van*

den Dag, 14/9/1908; V[an] B[ruggen], *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 8/10/1908; *Nieuws van den Dag*, 24/10/1908; *NRC*, 8/1/1909; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 31/7/1909; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 9/12/1909; *Haarlems Dagblad*, 10/3/1908; *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 19/9/1909.

1911

De Hagespelers

Opening night: April 1911

(other known performances: 16/5/1911, Farewell performance of De Hagespelers before they went to the Dutch Indies, followed by numerous speeches, among others one by Titia van Looy-van Gelder. Performed 5 times in the Dutch Indies, during the season 1911-1912)

Directed by Eduard Verkade

Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Annotation: New scenery: see J.W.F. Werumeus Buning, *Het Tooneeldecor*. (Rotterdam, 1923), p.18.

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade / Claudius: Adriaan van der Horst *Hermann Schwab / Ghost: Hermann Schwab (d) / Gertrude: Pine Belder / Polonius: Rienk Brouwer / Laertes / Maurits de Vries / Ophelia: Enny Vrede (d) / Horatio: Paul de Groot / Rosencrantz: Alex Frank / Guildenstern: Sophie Hermse / Osric: Enny Vrede (d) / Gravedigger: Julius Brongers

Reviews: V[an] B[ruggen], *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 1/4/1911; Barbarossa, *Barbarosserie*. Amsterdam, 59/60.; V[an] B[ruggen], *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 26/4/1911; J.H. Rössing, *Nieuws van de Dag*, 25/10/1910 and 21/3/1911; V[an] B[ruggen] *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 19/3/1911; J.B. Schuil, *Haarlems Dagblad*, 1/4/1911; V[an] B[ruggen], *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 17/5/1911; Van Moerkerken, *Amsterdammer*, 18/5/1911; *Nieuws van de Dag*, 17/5/1911; *NRC*, 17/5/1911; J.H.R[össing], *Nieuws van de Dag*, 26/4/1911; V[an] B[ruggen], *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 26/4/1911; Schuil, 'De afscheidsvoorstelling van de Hagespelers', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 17/5/1911.

1913

N.V. De Tooneelvereniging

Opening night: 7 April 1913, Grand Théâtre van Lier, Amsterdam

Hamlet. Treurspel in vijf bedrijven

Directed by Eduard Verkade

Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade / Claudius: Louis van Gasteren / Ghost: Coen Hissink / Gertrude: Else van Duyn / Polonius: Constant van Kerckhoven / Laertes: J. v.d. Poll / Ophelia: Enny Vrede / Horatio: Jan Degens / Rosencrantz: Petro Breukman / Guildenstern: Herman Kloppers / Fortinbras: Herman Kloppers (d) / Voltimand: Petro Breukman (d) / Cornelius: Hans Brüning / Marcellus: Anton Verheyen / Barnardo: Anton Verheyen (d) / Francisco: Anton Verheyen / Osric: Carel Rijken / Reynaldo: Anton Verheyen / Players: 1e toneelspeler: Coen Hissink, 2e Carel Rijken (d), 3e Anton Verheijen (d), 4e P. Geerts / Gravedigger: Anton Verheyen / Gravedigger's companion: Hans Brüning (d) / Priest: Carel Rijken (d)

Reviews: *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 6/4/1913; *Volk*, 7/4/1913; *Telegraaf*, 6/4/1913; Schuil, 'Twee premieres bij De Toneelvereniging (Hamlet en Silvia Silombra)', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 8/4/1913; Rössing, *Nieuws van de Dag*, 8/4/1913; V[an] B[ruggen], *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 6/4/1913; *Nieuw Rotterdamsche Courant*, 7/4/1913

1914

Die Haghespelers

Opening night: 22 March, Heerengracht (later called: Theater Verkade), The Hague

Directed by Eduard Verkade
 Translation by Jacobus van Looy
 Annotation: On the 8 December 1914 the 100th *Hamlet* performance

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade / Claudius: Paul de Groot / Ghost: Daan van Ollefen / Gertrude: Helen Desmond / Polonius: Cor Ruys / Laertes: Dirk Verbeek / Ophelia: Enny Vrede / Horatio: Philip La Chapelle / Rosencrantz: Van Ees / Fortinbras: Coen Hissink / Osric: Wijnobel / Other roles: "Andere rollen in oude bezetting"
 Set design by Chris Lebeau

Reviews: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 23/3/1914; *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant*, 23/3/1914; Borel, *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant*, 20/12/1914

1915

Rotterdamsch Tooneelgezelschap

Opening night: October *18 September 1915, Rotterdamse Groote-schouwburg, Rotterdam

Directed by Eduard Verkade
 Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade / Claudius: dhr. Tartaud / Ghost: Herman Schwab / Gertrude: mevr. Tartaud / Polonius: Jules Verstraete *Cor Ruys / Ophelia: Enny Vrede

Reviews: Eduard Verkade, *Mémoires*: 'Niettemin werd dit de zwakste opvoering van Hamet, die we ooit hebben gegeven.' Frans Mijnsen, 'De nieuwe Hamlet-voorstel-ling van Eduard Verkade', 9/1915; A.v.V., 19/9/1915

1917

Die Haghespellers

Opening night: 19 March 1917, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
 (other known performances: 22/3/1917, Stadsschouwburg, Amsterdam)

Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven.

Directed by Eduard Verkade
 Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade / Claudius: Louis van Gasteren / Ghost: Coen Hissink / Gertrude: M. Schmidt - Crans / Polonius: Cor Ruys / Laertes: Dirk Verbeek / Ophelia: Enny Vrede / Horatio: Ph. la Chapelle / Rosencrantz: Henri van Ees / Guildenstern: Henri Eerens / Voltimand: Eug. Gilhuys / Cornelius: B. de Vries / Marcellus: Henri van Ees (d) / Barnardo: Kommer Kleyn (d) / Francisco: Henri Eerens (d) / Osric: Kommer Kleyn / Reynaldo: B. de Vries (d) / Players: 1e Coen Hissink (d); 2e B. de Vries (D); 3e Dirk Verbeek (d); 4e P. Geerts / Gravedigger: Henri Eerens (d) / Priest: Eug. Gilhuys (d) / Captain: Eug. Gilhuys (edelman) (d)

Set design by H. Th. Wijdeveld

1919

Koninklijke Vereeniging Het Nederlandsch Tooneel

Opening night: 29 November 1919
 (other known performances: 17/2/1919; 1/6/1920, farewell performance of Verkade before leaving for England)
 Directed by Eduard Verkade
 Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade - Jacques Reule / Claudius: Albert van Dalsum / Ghost: Henri Eerens (d) / Gertrude: Fie Carelsen / Polonius: Paul Huf / Laertes: Kommer Kleyn / Ophelia: Else Mauhs, Jannie van Oogen / Horatio: Jacques Reule (d) / Fortinbras: Henri Eerens (d)

Set design by H. Th. Wijdeveld / Costumes by Mej. H.A. van Embdem / Light-concept: Eduard Verkade / Music: Alex de Jong (director: Willem Pijper)

Reviews: V[an] B[ruggen] *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 29/10/1919; 'Afscheidvoorstelling' *Nieuws van den Dag*, 2/6/1920; *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* 2/6/1920; *Telegraaf*, 2/6/1920; Barbarossa, *De Telegraaf*, 18/12/1919.

1922

De Haghespelers in 't Voorhout

Opening night: 29 April 1922

(other known performances: 2/5/1922, Amsterdam (?), 3/5/1922, Groote Schouwburg, Rotterdam; 5/5/1922, open air performances in July and August in Valkenburg, Schouwburg Utrecht; 25/9/1922, Stadsschouwburg Haarlem; 8/11/1922, Stads-schouwburg Haarlem; 9/11/1922, id.; 1922/1923, Stadsschouwburg Utrecht, Kunst aan het Volk, Delft

Re-runs in the seasons 1922/23 (known performances: 10/3/1923; 11/3/1923 (the 250th Hamlet performance); 16/3/1923, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam) and 1923/24 (known performances: 9/1/1924, Rotterdam; 2/5/1924, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam; 12/7/1924, Hoboken)

Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven.

Directed by Eduard Verkade

Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade / Claudius: Albert van Dalsum / Ghost: Hans van Meerten / Gertrude: Elly Reicher / Polonius: Eugène Gilhuys / Laertes: Kommer Kleyn / Ophelia: Else Mauhs - Nel Stants / Horatio: Johan de Meester Jr. – Ben Groeneveld / Rosencrantz: Cees Laseur - Dick van Veen / Guildenstern: Dio Huysmans / Fortinbras: Johan de Meester Jr. / Voltimand: Dick van Veen (Utrecht: Frits van Dijk) / Cornelius: Frits van Dijk (d) (Utrecht: T. Sterneberg) / Marcellus: Johan de Meester Jr. (d) - G. Meuwesen / Barnardo: Dio Huysmans / Francisco: Frits van Dijk / Osric: Dick van Veen (d) / Reynaldo: Frits van Dijk (d) / Players: 1e Frits van Dijk (d), 2e Dick van Veen (d) - T. Sterneberg, 3e Kommer Kleyn (d) / Gravedigger: Dick van Veen (d) – Cees Laseur / Priest: Hans van Meerten / Captain: Frits van Dijk - G. Meuwesen / Other roles: Edelman: Dick van Veen (d)

Set design by Frans van der Kooy / Costumes by Rie Cramer, vervaardigd door H. van Lubden / Music: Alex de Jong, o.l.v. de componist

Reviews: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 23/5/1922; J.B. Schuil, *Haarlems Dagblad*, 24/5/1922; L.W., *Vaderland*, 16/4/1922; H.B., *Vaderland*, 1/5/1922; J.B. Schuil, *Haarlems Dagblad*, 26/9/1922; Elout, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 30/4/1922; Top Naeff, *Dramatische Kroniek*, Amsterdam. IV. pp. 159-60; J.B. Schuil, *Haarlems Dagblad*, 9/11/1922; *Nieuws van de Dag*, 3/5/1922; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 3/5/1922; *Nieuw Rotterdamsche Courant*, 23/9/1922; *Nieuw Rotterdamsche Courant*, 11/5/1922; *Haarlems Dagblad*, 26/9/1922

1923

Hugo Helm

Opening night: 10 February 1923, Hollandsche Schouwburg Amsterdam (*1929)

(other known performance: 18/2/1923, Groote Schouwburg, Rotterdam; 1922-23,

Koninklijke Schouwburg, The Hague)

Country of origin: Germany

Hamlet. Prinz von Daenemark. Trauerspiel.

Directed by Alexander Moïssi
Translation by A.W. Schlegel

Cast: Hamlet: Alexander Moïssi / Claudius: Von Winterstein / Gertrude: Hedwig von Winterstein / Polonius: Emil Rameau / Ophelia: Annie Mewes / Horatio: Werner Kepich / Rosencrantz: Paul Biensfeldt / Gravedigger: Paul Biensfeldt (d)

173

Reviews: *NRC*, 12/2/1929 (TIN)

1924 ♦

Vereenigd Tooneel (dir. Ed. Verkade en Dirk Verbeek)

Opening night: 20 September, Stadsschouwburg Rotterdam

It ran for four seasons (other known performances: 20/9/1924; 4/7/1925, Landgoed Frankendaal Amsterdam, in the open air; 22/8/1926, id.; 23/9/1926, id.; 25/8/1926, id.; 1927/1928, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam)

Hamlet Prins van Denemarken. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven

Directed by Eduard Verkade

Translation by Jac. Van Looy

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade / Claudius: Albert van Dalsum / Ghost: D.J. Lobo - Frits van Dijk / Gertrude: Louise Kooiman - Sarah Heyblom / Polonius: Eugène Gilhuys – Paul Huf / Laertes: Kommer Kleyn / Ophelia: Nel Stants / Horatio: Hans van Meerten / Rosencrantz: Carpentier Alting - Fr. Sterneberg / Guildenstern: Dio Huysmans / Fortinbras: Dio Huysmans (d) / Voltimand: L. Wensing / Cornelius: Ru Mulder / Marcellus: Gerard Meussen / Barnardo: Dio Huysmans / Francisco: Ru Mulder (d) / Players: 1e Frits van Dijk (d), 2e Gerard Meussen (d), 3e Sara Heyblom, 4e Piet Geerts / Gravedigger: Gerard Meussen (d) / Priest: L. Wensing (d) / Other roles: Een edelman: Frits van Dijk

Music: Alex de Jong uitgevoerd door leden van het Concertgebouworkest onder leiding van de componist

Reviews: Van Monsjou, 'De Kunst', 11/7/1926

1925

Vereenigd Tooneel Verkade-Verbeek

Opening night: 20 November 1925, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam

(other known performances, 23/11/1925)

Directed by Eduard Verkade

Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade / Claudius: Albert van Dalsum / Ghost: Hans van Meerten / Gertrude: Louise Kooiman / Polonius: Paul Huf / Laertes: Kommer Kleyn / Ophelia: Nel Stants / Horatio: Henri Erens / Rosencrantz: Carpentier Alting / Guildenstern: Ferd. Sterneberg / Fortinbras: Dirk Verbeek / Marcellus: Dio Huysmans / Barnardo: G.J.G. Pilger / Players: 1e D.J. Lobo, 2e Dio Huysmans, 3e Sara

Heyblom, 4e Piet Geerts, pantomime: Hans van Meerten, Herman Kloppers, Dora Wallant / Gravedigger: Willem Hunsche / Priest: Lucas Wensing / Other roles: Een edelman: Dio Huysmans

Music: Pantomimemuziek gecomponeerd en uitgevoerd o.l.v. Alex de Jong / Choreography pantomime: Herman Kloppers

Reviews: Schuil, 'Hamlet in Modern Costuum', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 21/11/1925; Maurits Uylt. 'Hamlet in Modern Costuum', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 22/11/1925; *Nieuwe Rot-*

1931

Gezelschap Verkade

Opening night: 13 November, Groote Schouwburg Rotterdam

(other known performances: 12/1931, Rika Hopper Theater, Amsterdam, 8/4/1932, Silver Jubilee of Verkade)

Directed by Eduard Verkade

Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade / Claudius: Paul Huf / Ghost: Frits van Dijk / Gertrude: Rika Hopper / Polonius: Cor Hermus / Laertes: Hans van Meerten / Ophelia: Nel Stants / Horatio: Willem van den Veer / Rosencrantz: Bob van Iersel / Guildenstern: Jan Teulings / Fortinbras: Frits van Dijk (d) - Hans van Meerten / Marcellus: Jan Teulings (d) - Julius Brongers / Barnardo: Bob van Iersel (d) / Francisco: Manjoe Jäeger (d) / Osric: Ben Aerden / Players: Frits van Dijk (eerste acteur) (d) Hans van Meerten (tweede acteur) (d) Ben Aerden (derde acteur) (d) Piet Geerts (vierde acteurs) / Gravedigger: Frits van Dijk (d) / Priest: Cor Hermus (d) / Other roles: Edelman: Manjoe Jäeger - Julius Brongers (d) / Page: Ank van der Moer / Page: Bertie van Eerem / Hofdame: Péronne Hosang / Hofdame: Henr. v.d. Kop

Costumes by Rie Cramer “uitgevoerd door Mevrouw Mar. den Hertog”

Reviews: C.M.V., ‘Hamlet bij Verkade. Belangrijke Shakespeare-vertooning’, 14/12/1931, TIN; 1931, TIN; 14/11/1931, TIN; *NRC*, 8/4/1932; *Nieuwe Arnhemse Courant*, 30/11/1931; *De Maasbode*, 14/11/1931; Van den Aardweg, 12/1931, TIN; Arntzenius, *De Telegraaf*, 12/1931; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 14/12/1931; *NRC*, 14/12/1931; *De Tijd*, 14/12/1931

1940

Centraal Tooneel

Opening night: 8 November 1940, Centraal Theater Amsterdam

Directed by Eduard Verkade

Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Annotation: “De voorstellingen worden gegeven onder auspiciën van Het Nederlands Toneelceum. Er worden in januari zes voorstellingen gegeven in de Rotterdamse Kleine Comedie, drie middag en drie avondvoorstellingen.”

Cast: Hamlet: Gijsbert Tersteeg / Claudius: Eduard Verkade - Cees Laseur / Ghost: Jacques Snoek / Gertrude: Elly van Stekelenburg / Polonius: Dick van Veen / Laertes: Ko van Dijk / Ophelia: Adrienne Canivez / Horatio: Arend Hauer / Rosencrantz: Carel Briels / Guildenstern: Gerard Rekers / Voltimand: Pierre Myin / Marcellus: Jan Teulings / Osric: Ben Aerden / Players: Adolphe Hamburger (Eerste tooneelspeler) / Gravedigger: Matthieu van Eysden

Set design by Arend Hauer / Costumes by firma A. Serné & Zonen / Make-up by H. Fa. Michels (kapwerk) / Photography by De Spaarnestad N.V., Wiel van der Randen

Reviews: *Eindhovens Dagblad*, December 1940; Schuil, *Haarlems Dagblad*, 25/11/1940; *Handelsblad*, 1940; Schuil, *Haarlems Dagblad*, 11/11/1940; *Het Vaderland*, November 1940

1943

N.V. Het Residentie Toneel

Opening night: 1 January 1943, Prinsesse Schouwburg The Hague

It ran for three seasons (other known performances: 1/1/1943, Prinsesse Schouwburg, The Hague; 9/1/1943, id.; 18/9/1943, id.; 19/9/1943, id.; 15/1/1944, Theater Krom, West-Kruiskade; 15/1/1944, Theater Arena, West-Kruiskade; 9/1/1943, Prinsesse Schouwburg, The Hague; 16/9/1945, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague; 30/10/1944, id.; 31/10/1944,

id.; 1/11/1945, id.)
 Directed by Johan de Meester
 Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Cast: Hamlet: Paul Steenbergen / Claudius: Richard Flink / Ghost: André van Zandbergen / Gertrude: Fie Carelsen / Polonius: Dirk Verbeek / Laertes: / Jan Retèl / Ophelia: Enny Meunier / Horatio: Henk Rigters / Rosencrantz: Jan van der Linden / Guildenstern: Guus Oster / Fortinbras: Eric van Ingen / Voltimand: Bob Schoote-meijer / Cornelius: Evert Burema / Marcellus: Eric van Ingen (d) / Barnardo: Lou Steenbergen / Osric: Jack Grimberg (Osrick) / Players: Jan Retèl (1e toneelspeler) (d), Lou Steenbergen (2e toneelspeler) (d), Eric van Ingen (3e toneelspeler) (d), Tanny de Groot (4e toneelspeler) / Gravedigger: Jan van der Linden (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Evert Burema (d) / Priest: André van Zandbergen (d) / Captain: Lou Steenbergen (d) / Other roles: Edelman: André van Zandbergen (d)

Set design by Johan de Meester / Costumes by fa. A. Serné & Zn. / Make-up by Fa. Wv.d. Rhee, The Hague / Music: Hein 's-Gravesande

Reviews: Willink, January 1944, TIN; Verdoes, *Het Residentie Toneel*, 1944, TIN

1946

The English Arts Theatre Company (dir. Alec Clunes) / The British Council

Opening night: 19 December, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague (on tour through the Netherlands; other known performances: 13/12/1946, Luxor Theater, Rotterdam)

Country of origin: United Kingdom
 Directed by Judith Furse

Cast: Hamlet: Alec Clunes / Claudius: Jack Hawkins / Ghost: Peter Streuli / Gertrude: Fay Compton / Polonius: Harold Scott / Laertes: Geoffrey Keen / Ophelia: Valery Hanson / Fortinbras: Edward Jewesbury / Gravedigger: Newton Blick

Set design by Michael Warre / Costumes by Moise Meitlenjohn

Reviews: *NRC*, 14/12/1946

1946 ♦

Centraal Tooneel N.V.

Opening night: 9 November, Centraal Theater Amsterdam
 (other known performance: 19/11/1940, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague)

Directed by Eduard Verkade
 Translation by Jacobus van Looy
 Set design by Arend Hauer

1947 ♦

Eduard Verkade

Opening night: 28 May, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
 Annotation: Spectacle coupé in occasion of Verkade's 40 year jubilee: De Gezellen (Arthur Schnitzler), Macbeth (1.7, 2.1., 2.2., 5.1, 5.5) en Hamlet (1.5, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4) and Een ideale echtgenoot (Wilde, 3e bedrijf)
 Directed by Eduard Verkade

Cast: Hamlet: Eduard Verkade / Claudius: Paul Huf / Ghost: Henri Eerens / Gertrude: Fie Carelsen / Polonius: Dirk Verbeek

1948

Haagsche Comedie (dir. Cees Laseur)

Opening night: 23 October 1948, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague

(other known performances: 25/10/1948, Rotterdamsche Schouwburg, Rotterdam; 13/4/1949, Grand Theatre Gooiland, Hilversum; 27/10/1948, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam, 25-jarig jubileum Paul Steenbergen; 13/4/1949, Grand Theatre Gooiland, Hilversum)

Hamlet. Treurspel in 5 bedrijven, 20 taferelen

Directed by Eduard Verkade

Translation by Jacobus van Looy

Note: Cees Laseur had asked Eduard Verkade to direct the performance. It was Paul van Steenbergen's silver jubilee.

Cast: Hamlet: Paul Steenbergen / Claudius: Cees Laseur / Ghost: Arend Hauer / Gertrude: Ida Wasserman / Polonius: Henri Eerens / Laertes: Jan Retèl / Ophelia: Elisabeth Andersen / Horatio: Pim Dikkers / Rosencrantz: Gerard Hartkamp / Guildenstern: Peter Holland / Fortinbras: Lou Steenbergen / Voltimand: Hent van der Horst / Cornelius: Piet Eelvelt / Marcellus: Charles Mögle / Barnardo: Wim Hoddes / Francisco: Koos Simonis - Hen van Buuren / Osric: Bob van Leersum / Reynaldo: Jan Boveland / Players: 1e Jan van der Linden, 2e Nel van Arem, 3e Wim Hoddes (d) / Gravedigger: Jan van der Linden (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Paul de Jong / Priest: Charles Mögle (d) / Captain: Arend Hauer (d)

Set design by Eduard Verkade, executed by Willem Deering / Costumes by "Costumes naar ontwerpen van Marga, vervaardigd op eigen atelier en van de Firma A. Serné & Zn., Amsterdam" / Make-up by Firma D.H. Michels

Music: Jurriaan Andriessen "door leden Residentie Orkest, opnamen o.l.v. de componist / Choreography: Pantomime ingestudeerd door Yvonne George"

Reviews: *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 25/10/1948; *Haarlems Dagblad*, November 1948; *Handelsblad*, November 1948; *De Amsterdammer*, 27/10/1948; *Handelsblad*, 25/10/1948; Brugmans, *Volkskrant*, 28/10/1948; *Maasbode*, 28/10/1948; Van Eysselsteijn, 16/9/1948

1950 ♦

Opening night: Diever

Non-professional theatre

Directed by L.D. Broekema

Translation: L.A.J. Burgersdijk

1950

The Old Vic Theatre Company

Opening night: 15 June 1950 (Holland Festival 1950)

Country of origin: United Kingdom

Directed by Hugh Hunt

Cast: Hamlet: Michael Redgrave / Claudius: Mark Dingham / Gertrude: Wanda Rotha / Polonius: Walter Hudd / Laertes: Peter Copley / Ophelia: Yvonne Mitchell / Horatio: Michael Aldridge

Costumes by Laurence Irving / Music: Hubert Menges

Reviews: De Groot, *NRC* 1950; Koolhaas, *De Groene*, 24/6/1950

1954 ♦

D'Egelantier (non-professional theatre)

Opening night: 1 May, Diligentia The Hague

Directed by Peter van der Linden
Author: Jean Francois Ducis
Translation by Ambrosius Justus Zubli

Reviews: *NRC*, 1/5/1954; Katan, *Het Parool*, 17/4/1954; Kamphoff, 'Amateurgroep D'Egelantier speelde Franse "Hamlet",' 1/5/1954

177

1954 ♦ Opening night: 11 October, Diligentia The Hague
Fragmenten uit Hamlet
Directed by Paul Steenbergen
Translation by Jac. van Looy
Adapted by: Paul Steenbergen

Cast: Hamlet: Paul Steenbergen (solo)

Reviews: P.H.D., 'Paul Steenbergen als Hamlet. Onmiddellijk contact door grote gevoeligheid', *Het Vaderland*, 12/10/1954

1957

Haagse Comedie

Opening night: 19 October, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague
(other known performances: 6/11/1957, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam; 23/11/1957, Stadsschouwburg Haarlem; school productions (initiative Haagse Kunststichting voor de jeugd): nr. 215 9/1/1958, nr. 217 8/3/1958, nr. 218 14/3/1958, 13.30, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague; 23/11/1957, Stadsschouwburg Haarlem; 1/12/1957, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam)

Hamlet Tragedie in 5 bedrijven, 18 taferelen
Directed by Paul Steenbergen
Dramaturgy: Nel Bakker
Translation by Bert Voeten

Cast: Hamlet: Coen Flink / Claudius: Frans van der Lingen / Ghost: Joris Diels / Gertrude: Elisabeth Andersen / Polonius: Albert van Dalsum / Laertes: Jules Croiset / Ophelia: Do van Stek / Horatio: Max Croiset / Rosencrantz: Bas ten Batenburg / Guildenstern: Frans Vorstman / Fortinbras: Broes Hartman / Voltimand: Henk van Buuren / Cornelius: Joop van der Donk / Marcellus: Wim de Haas (d) / Barnardo: Gerard Groot / Francisco: Joop van der Donk (d) / Osric: Luc Lutz / Reynaldo: Frans Zuidinga / Players: 1e: Joris Diels (d); 2e Karen-Else Sluizer; 3e Broes Hartman (d); 4e Gerard de Groot (d); 5e Frans Zuidinga (d) / Gravedigger: Henk van Buuren (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Gerard de Groot (d) / Priest: Wim de Haas / Captain Gerard de Groot (d) / Other roles: (een zeeman): Frans Zuidinga (d)

Production: Jan ten Katen - Henk Huyser / Set design by Lou Steenbergen (Décors vervaardigd op eigen atelier o.l.v. Guus Korrubel) / Costumes by Harry Wich (Kostuum-accessoires: Lisette van Meeteren. Kostuums vervaardigd door het atelier: Henny van Dam-Simons. De zwart zijden pumps, gedragen door Mevrouw Elisabeth Andersen, zijn geleverd door N. Smit's Schoenhandel N.V. Bally Chaussures, Den Haag) / Make-up by Fa. D.H. Michels / Music: Jurriaan Andriessen, uitgevoerd door leden van de Koninklijke Militaire Kapel o.l.v. de Directeur Rocus van Yperen (opname) / Choreography: Albert Mol

Reviews: Gomperts, *Het Parool*, 21/10/1957; Blijstra, *Vrije Volk*, 21/10/1957; *Handelsblad*, 21/10/1957; Van Eysselsteijn, *Maasbode*, 21/10/1957; *Haagse Post*, 24/10/1957; Ros, 'Haagse Comedie glorieert met een menselijke "Hamlet"', *De Linie*, 26/10/1957; *NRC*, 7/11/1957; Dubois, *Het Vaderland*, 21/10/1957; L.H., 'Coen Flink: intelligente en jonge hoofdfiguur',

Haagse Courant, 21/10/1957; Spierdijk, *Telegraaf*, 21/10/1957; *NRC*, 21/10/1957; Van Schaik-Willing, 'Bravo, Coen Flink!', *De Groene*, 26/10/1957; Elias, 'Nieuwe Hamlet', *Nieuwe Eeuw*, 26/10/1957; T[on] E[lias], *De Tijd*, 21/10/1957

1958 ♦

Puck

Opening night: 6 September 1958, Stadsschouwburg Utrecht
(other known performance: 29/11/1958, Stadsschouwburg Haarlem)

De Hamlet van Stepney Green comédie in mineur

Directed by Egbert van Paridon

Author: Bernard Kops

Translation by Rosey E. Pool

Cast: Essie: Ellen de Thouars / David: Wim van den Heuvel / Solly Segal: Sylvain Poons / Chava: Jeannette van der Heyden / Alf Stone: Bob Verstraete / Milly Stone: Diny Sprock / White: Leen Jongewaard / Black: Piet Römer / Green: Eric van der Donk / kinderen uit de buurt.

Set design by Roger Chailloux / Music: Bernard van Beurden

Reviews: Hijmans, *Vrij Volk*, 8/9; Gomperts, *Parool*, 8/9; Van Schaik-Willing, *Groene Amsterdammer*, 13/9; Van der Lugt Melsert, *Elsevier*, 20/9; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 8/9; *De Telegraaf*, 8/9

1960

The Youth Theatre

Opening night: 19 April, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague

Country of origin: United Kingdom

Directed by Michael Croft

Annotation: All boy cast

Cast: Hamlet: Richard Hampton / Claudius: Kenneth Farrington / Ghost: Colin Farrell / Gertrude: Michael Butcher / Polonius: Neil Stacy / Laertes: David Ross / Ophelia: Hywell Bennett / Horatio: Peter Lee - Michael Johnson / Rosencrantz: Simon Ward / Guildenstern: Alan Allkins / Fortinbras: John Nightingale / Voltimand: Michael Johnson / Jemery Harrison / Marcellus: Michael Cadman / Barnardo: John Pemble / Francisco: Colin Wilson / Osric: John Pemble (d) / Players: 1e: Derek Clarke; 2e Geoffrey Archer; 3e Peter Doyle / Gravedigger: William Peirce / Gravedigger's companion: Cranville Hawkins / Priest: Brian Eatwell / Captain: Michael Cadman (d) / A sailor: Michael Crook / Other roles: Jeremy Harrison (d); Colin Wilson (d); Jeremy Rowe; Roger Edwards; Kith Secombe; Brian Eatwell (d); Frank Urion; Clive Kirk

Set design by Michael Croft / Costumes by Shakespeare Memorial Theatre

Reviews: Waller, 'Engelse scholieren in een opmerkelijk toneel-experiment', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 12/9/1959; Gomperts, *Parool*, 20/11/1960; Van S[schaik]-W[illing], *Groene Amsterdammer*, 21/4/1960

1964 ♦

Theaterschool

Opening night 16/3/1964, Toneelschool, Amsterdam

Als het ware een spiegel (Shakespeare herdenking)

Discipline: school theatre

Directed by Krijn der Braak

Annotation: fragments from 14 plays

1964

Koninklijke Vlaamse Schouwburg

Opening night: 1 May, Stadsschouwburg Haarlem

Country of origin: Belgium

Hamlet Toneelspel in 5 bedrijven

Directed by Jo Dua

Translation by Willy Courteaux

Annotation: Shakespeare year 1964

Cast: Hamlet: Senne Rouffaer / Claudius: Bert Struys / Gertrude: Jeanne Geldof / Polonius: Luc Philips / Laertes: Jef Demedts / Ophelia: Denise Deweerdt / Horatio: Etienne Dujardin

Set design by Guido Cobbaert / Costumes by Ferry Barendse

Reviews: Gomperts, 'Knappe titelrol van Senne Rouffaer', *Het Parool* 2/5/1964; B.S., 'Langdurige Hamlet van Brusselse Schouwburg', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 2/5/1964; Spierdijk, 'Respectabele Hamlet', *Nieuws van de Dag*, 2/5; *Trouw*, 2/5/1964.

1966

Nieuw Rotterdams Toneel

Opening night: 18 November, Rotterdamse Schouwburg Rotterdam

(other known performances: 7/2/1967, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague; 10/2/1967, Stadsschouwburg Arnhem; 19/10/1967, Stadsschouwburg Arnhem; 11/2/1967, Stadsschouwburg Groningen, 70 in total)

Hamlet Prins van Denemarken

Directed by Richard Flink

Translation by Bert Voeten

Cast: Hamlet: Eric Schneider / Claudius: Ko van Dijk / Ghost: Wim Hoddes (d) / Gertrude: Lies Franken / Polonius: Luc Lutz / Laertes: Bas ten Batenburg / Ophelia: Martine Crefcoeur / Horatio: Eli Blom / Rosencrantz: Pieter Lutz / Guildenstern: Edmond Classen / Fortinbras: Wim Hoddes / Voltimand: Cees Pijpers / Cornelius: Hans Polman / Marcellus: Piet Hamelink / Barnardo: Jan Kruijk (d) / Francisco: Henk Uterwijk / Osric: Jack Horn / Reynaldo: Frans Zuidinga / Players: Adolf Rij-kens; Henk Uterwijk (d); Fred Vaassen; Rick Frank / Gravedigger: Gerard Hartkamp / Gravedigger's companion: Jan Lemaire / Priest: Cees Pijpers (d) / Captain: Henk Uterwijk (d) / Other roles: Een edelman: Jan Kruijk; Een bode: Hans Polman (d); Een dienaar: Fred Vaassen (d); Een matroos: Frans Zuidinga (d)

Set design by Nicholaas Wijnberg / Costumes by Nicholaas Wijnberg / Light: Nicholaas Wijnberg / Music: Otto Ketting

Reviews: De Groot, *De Havenloods*, 24/11/1966; Wisse, *Het Vrije Volk*, 19/11/1966; B.S., *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 19/11/1966; De Lange, *Volkskrant*, 21/11/1966; Koster, *Haarlems Dagblad*, 19/11/1966; Spierdijk, *De Telegraaf*, 21/11/1966; NRC, 19/11/1966; *Elseviers Weekblad*, 3/12/1966; Bos, *De Nieuwe Linie*, 24/12/1966; Koster, 'Hamlet, nieuwe stijl', 2/2/1967; 'Ovatie in Koninklijke Schouwburg voor "Hamlet" van Eric Schneider', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 7/2/1967; 'Eric Schneider als Hamlet', *Haagsche Courant*, 4/2/1967; 'Peter Scharoff. "De beste Hamlet die ik ken"', *De Tijd*, 11/2/1967; *Het Parool*, 16/12/1966; *Algemeen Dagblad*, 21/11/1966; Van den Bergh, *Het Parool*, 19/11/1966; Rekers, *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 26/11/1966; Ruivenkamp, *Haagsche Courant*, 19/11/1966; Rutten, *De Tijd*, 19/11/1966

1966 ♦

SARST (St. Algemeen Rotterdams Studententoneel)

Opening night: 23 November, Utrecht

(other known performances: A *Hamlet* day with a lecture by Prof. dr. A.G.H. Bachrach: 8/2/1967, Sociëteit Asker, Piccolo Theater, Rotterdam, combined with a visit to the Hamlet by Nieuw Rotterdams Toneel)

Hamlet-Festival

- De bestrafte Broedermoord (ASTU)

Directed by Ferenc Schneiders (Broedermoord)

Cast: Hamlet: Hugo Heinen / Claudius: Bruno Raeven / Gertrude: Ria Dalmeijer

- Marowitz Hamlet (ASTU)

Author: Charles Marowitz

Directed by Leonard Frank

Cast: Hamlet: Hugo Heinen / Laertes: Cees van Ede / Ophelia: Hanneke Kockx

Discipline: Studenttheatre

Reviews: 'Utrechtse studenten met Hamlet-programma', *De Tijd*, 24/11/1966; Oude en nieuwe Hamlet in Utrecht ten tonele', *NRC*, 24/11/1966; Rekers, 'Mythe geprofaneerd', *Groene Amsterdammer*, 3/12/1966; 'W.B. 'Hamlet', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 9/2/1967; 'Hamletdag van Rotterdamse en Utrechtse studenten', *Nieuw Rotterdamsche Courant*, 9/2/1967.

1967 ♦

Bristol Old Vic Company

Opening night: 5 July, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague (Holland Festival 1967)

Country of origin: United Kingdom

Directed by Val May

Cast: Hamlet: Richard Pasco / Claudius: John Franklyn Robbins / Ghost: Christopher Burgess / Gertrude: Madge Ryan / Polonius: Frank Middemass / Ophelia: Barbara Leigh-Hunt / Horatio: Frank Barrie / Gravedigger: Desmond Stokes

Production by Patrick Crea / Set design by Graham Barlow / Costumes by Audry Price

Reviews: Boswinkel, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 6/7/1967; Koster, 'Holland Festival', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 6/7/1967; Van den Bergh, *Parool*, 6/7/1967; Deering, *Algemeen Dagblad*, 7/7/1967; De Lange, 'Volks sentiment benadrukt', *De Volkskrant*, 6/7/1967; Ruivenkamp, *Haagsche Courant*, 6/7/1967; *NRC*, 6/7/1967; Van Hoboken, *Trouw*, 7/7/1967; *De Tijd*, 6/7/1967; Spierdijk, *De Telegraaf*, 6/7/1967; T.B., *De Waarheid*, 6/7/1967

1968 ♦

Haagse Comedie

Opening night: 1/1/1968, Koninklijke Schouwburg, 's-Gravenhage

Rosencrantz en Guildenstern zijn dood

Author: Tom Stoppard

Translation: Bert Voeten

Directed by Paul Steenbergen and Dolf de Vries

Scenography: Hep van Delft / Choreography: Albert Mol (pantomimes / mouvements) / Music: Jurriaan Andriessen / Costumes: Has Noordhoek Hegt /

Cast: Rosencrantz: Kees Coolen / Guildenstern: Wim van Rooij / Player: Eric van Ingen / Alfred: Guus Hoes / Tragedians: Roelof den Ambtman, Manfred de Graaf, Gerard de Groot, Jacques Luyer / Hamlet: Jaap Wieringa / Ophelia: Marijke Merckens / Claudius: Leo de Hartogh / Gertrude: Anny de Lange / Polonius: Gijsbert Tersteeg / Captain: Dick Top / Fortinbras: Reinier Heidemann / Horatio: Dick Top (d) / Messengers: Manfred de Graaf (d), Jacques Luyer (d)

1969 ♦

Geert Groteschool (non-professional theatre)

Opening night: 28 March, Geert Groteschool Amsterdam

Discipline: School theatre

Reviews: *Vrij Nederland*, 29/3/1969

181

1971 ♦

Prospect Theatre Company / British Council

Opening night: 20 May Nederlands Congresgebouw The Hague

Directed by Roger Chetwyn

Cast: Hamlet: Ian McKellen / Claudius: Ronald Lewis / Gertrude: Faith Brook / Polonius: James Cairncross / Laertes: Stuart Wilson / Ophelia: Susan Fleetwood / Horatio: Julian Curry / Rosencrantz: William Ellis / Guildenstern: Simon Prebble / Fortinbras: Terence Wilton / Voltimand: Richard Beale / Marcellus: Terence Wilton (d) / Barnardo: Tom Pigott-Smith / Osric: Russell Hunter (d) / Reynaldo: Duncan Preston / Players: 1st: Tom Pigott-Smith (d); Q: Nicholas Grace; L: Stephen O'Rourke / Gravedigger: James Cairncross (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Nicholas Grace (d) / Priest: Richard Beale (d) / Captain: Duncan Preston (d) / First Sailor: Stephen O'Rourke (d) / Ladies of the Court: Clare Shenstone, Marcia Warren / Other roles: Jonathan David, Kit Jackson, Colin Kaye, Christopher Walsh

Set design by Michael Annals / Costumes by Michael Annals / Light: Michael Outhwaite / Music: Marc Wilkinson

Reviews: *Vaderland*, 21/5/1971; *Volkskrant*, 21/5/1971; *Trouw*, 22/5/1971; *Haagse Courant*, 21/5/1971

1972 ♦

Koninklijke Vlaamse Schouwburg

Opening night: 26 January, Stadsschouwburg Eindhoven

Country of origin: Belgium

Directed by Senne Rouffaer

Translation by Willy Courteaux

Set design by Serge Creuz / Costumes by Serge Creuz

1972 ♦

Atelje 212 (Belgrado)

Opening night: 4 July, Mickery Workshop Amsterdam (Holland Festival 1972)

(other known performances: 5/7/1972; 6/7/1972; 7/7/1972; 8/7/1972; 9/7/1972, id.)

Country of origin: Joegoslavië

Hamlet in de kelder [Hamlet u podrumu]

Directed by Slobodanka Aleksić

Adaptation by Slobodanka Aleksić

Translation into Croation by Sima Pandurovic en Laza Kostić

Cast: Four men and one girl for all parts

Set design by Fodor Lalicki / Costumes by Divna Popović / Music: A. Milicević

Reviews: Bresser, *Volkskrant*, 30/6/1972; Heijer, *Typhoon*, 30/6/1972; *Haarlems Dagblad*, 30/6/1972; Engeland, *Groene Amsterdammer*, 4/7/1972, Bos, *Nieuwe Linie*, 5/7/1972, Bromet, 'Hamlet als een boosaardig sprookje', *Nieuw Rotterdamsche Courant*, 30/6/1972, Hermans, *Courant Nieuws van de Dag*, 30/6/1972, Rutten, 'Hamlet lekker in de kelder', *De Tijd*, 30/6/1972, Meijer, *Het Parool*, 1/7/1972

1972

The Open Space Theatre (London)

Opening night: 16 October, Orpheus Apeldoorn

(other known performances: Wikor-tour: 18/10/1972, HOT, The Hague, on various places until 24/10/1972)

The Marowitz Hamlet

Directed by Charles Marowitz

Authors: William Shakespeare/Marowitz

Adapted by Charles Marowitz (1964, 1967)

Annotation: Brought to the Netherlands by Mickery and Wikor for secondary schools.

Cast: Hamlet: David Schofield / Claudius: Walter Brown / Ghost: Malcolm Storry / Gertrude: Petronella Ford / Polonius: Michael O'Donoghue / Laertes: Robin Sachs / Ophelia: Candida Fawsitt - Kay Barlow / Rosencrantz: Tony Milner / Guildenstern: Neil Cunningham / Fortinbras: Philip Marchant / Clown: Michael O'Donoghue (d)
Set design by Robin Don / Costumes by Robin Don

Reviews: Rutten, *De Tijd*, 19/10/1972; Boswinkel, *Nieuw Rotterdamsche Courant*, 19/10/1972; Hermans, 'Verknijpte Hamlet voor scholieren', *Telegraaf*, 10/10/1972; *Trouw*, 19/10/1972, Ruivenkamp, *Haagse Courant*, 19/10/1972; *Vaderland*, 19/10/1972; Heijer, *IJmuider Courant*, 19/10/1972; De Lange, *Volkskrant*, 18/10/1972; Van den Bergh, *Parool*, 19/10/1972

1976

Haagse Comedie

Opening night: 10/9/1976, HOT, 's-Gravenhage

Rosencrantz en Guildenstern zijn dood. Toneelspel in drie bedrijven

Author: Tom Stoppard

Translation: Bert Voeten

Directed by Bernard Goss

Scenography: Harry Wich / Music: Jurriaan Andriessen / Costumes: Has Noordhoek Hegt

Cast: Rosencrantz: Gaston van Erven / Guildenstern: Jules Royaards / Player: Eric van Ingen / Alfred: Martin de Smet / Tragedians: Lucas Dietens, Johan Simons / Hamlet: Reinier Heidemann / Liesbeth Celis: Ophelia / Claudius: Carl van der Plas / Gertrude: Anne-Marie Heijligers / Polonius: Gijsbert Tersteeg / Captain: Lucas Dietens / Horatio: Johan Simons (d) / Fortinbras: Martin de Smet (d) / Messenger: Lucas Dietens (d)

1976

Publiektheater

Opening night: 10 December, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam

Directed by Hans Croiset

Translation by Bert Voeten

Adapted by Bert Voeten and Hans Croiset

Cast: Hamlet: Eric Schneider / Claudius: Ton Lutz / Ghost: Ton Lutz / Gertrude: Sigrid Koetze / Polonius: Max Croiset / Laertes: Wim van der Grijn / Ophelia: Josée Ruiter / Horatio: Hans Boswinkel / Rosencrantz: Johan Ooms / Guildenstern: Jan van Royen / Fortinbras: Franck van Erven / Voltimand: Albert Abspoel / Marcellus: Henk Reijn / Barnardo: Hugo Koolschijn / Francisco: Wick Ederveen / Osric: Chiem van Houwenige - Herman van Elteren / Players: Celia Nufaar, Frank van Erven (d), Hugo Koolschijn (d), John Kraaykamp Jr. / Gravedigger: Albert Abspoel (d) / Gravedigger's companion: John Kraaykamp jr. (d) / Priest: Herman van Elteren (d) / Captain: Wick Ederveen (d) / Other roles: John Kraaykamp jr. (d), Hans van den Berg (d), Maarten Zeegers (d)

Assistant director assistentie: Lyn Wolsely / Set design by Frank Raven / Costumes by Frank Raven / Make-up by atelier STA: Wim Verheyen, Eric Sluys / Music: collage by Bob Logger

Reviews: 'Hamlet de mist in. Voorstelling mislukt door gebrek aan visie', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 13/12/1976; De Groot, 'Hamlet van een mateloze matheid', *Vrije Volk*, 13/12/1976; Bresser, 'Eric Schneider opnieuw onvergetelijk. Hamlet van Publieks-theater erg onthullende ervaring', *Volkskrant*, 13/12/1976; Dubois, 'Hamlet bij Publiekstheater boeiend, niet overtuigend', *Alkema*, 'Levenloze Hamlet bij Publiekstheater', *NRC*, 12/12/1976; Van den Bergh, 'Eric Schneider intrigeert als Hamlet', *Parool*, 13/12/1976; Van Leeuwen, 'Voorstelling munt uit in helderheid. Hamlet overrompend', *Haagsche Courant*, 13/12/1976; Eric Schneider speelt Hamlet als Iwanow, *Uitkrant*, December 1976; Ruivenkamp, 'Eric Schneider sterke Hamlet in te verdeelde opvatting', *Haagsche Courant*, 11/12/1976; Spierdijk, *Telegraaf*, 14/12/1976; Willem Jan Otten, *Vrij Nederland*, *TIN*; Noteboom, 'Hamlet is niet van deze tijd', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 16/3/1977

1977

Dong Nang Repertoiregezelschap van het Koreaans Theatercentrum in Seoul

Opening night: 12 April, Mickery Amsterdam

Country of origin: Korea

Prins Hamyul

Directed by Min-Soo Ahn

Adapted by Min-Soo Ahn

Cast: Moo Song Chun, Soon-Ki Shin Hyung, Soo Ahn, Ae-Ju Lee Cho e.a.

Costumes by Chang-Soon Byun / Music: Yong-Man Kim

Reviews: Heijer, 'Weloverwogen stilering in Koreaanse Shakespeare', *NRC* 14/4/1977; Spierdijk, 'Hamlet op z'n Koreaans uitgebeeld in Mickery', *Telegraaf*, 14/4/1977; Van den Bergh, 'Hamlet als fraai oosters theater', *Parool*, 13/4/1977; Bresser, 'Hamlet fascinerend op z'n Koreaans', *Volkskrant*, 14/4/1977; Rutten, 'Oosterse theaterverbeelding van een Westers gegeven', *Trouw*, 23/4/1977; Dubois, 'Hamlet als motief in Koreaans theater', *Vaderland*, 11/5/1977; Van Leeuwen, 'Hamlet uit Korea boeit door eigen theater-idioom', *IJmuiders Courant* 13/4/1977; Van der Waals, 'Hamlet toen en nu en overal', *Financieel Dagblad*, 15/4/1977.

1977

Onafhankelijk Toneel

Opening night: 11 May, De Toneelschuur Haarlem

Directed by Jan Joris Lamers

Translation by Bert Voeten

Annotation: appeared as number 6 in the series De Favorieten: a version of a play that the Publiekstheater was performing, rehearsed in 14 days and performed

Cast: Hamlet: Edwin de Vries / Claudius: Fred v.d. Hilst / Ghost: Jan Joris Lamers / Gertrude: Truus te Stelle / Polonius: Gerrit Timmers / Laertes: Kees Hulst / Ophelia: Mirjam Koen / Horatio: Jan Joris Lamers / Rosencrantz: Matthias de Koning / Guildenstern: Matthias Maat (d) / Marcellus: Matthias Maat (d) / Players: Kees Hulst; toneelkoningin: Matthias Maat / Gravedigger: Ditha v.d. Linden / Gravedigger's companion: Matthias Maat (d)

Set design 'Uit eigen atelier'

Reviews: Jac Heijer, 'Onafhankelijk Toneel vertilt zich aan eigengereide Hamle', *NRC Handelsblad*, 13/5/1977; "Je kunt bij ons je hersens niet aan de kapstok laten hangen". In De Favorieten speelde Onafhankelijk toneel Hamlet als was het Brecht', 18/5/1977; Van Leeuwen, 'Hoogtepunt in favorietenserie Onafhankelijk Toneel. Hamlet zonder pathetische ballast', *IJmuiders Courant*, 13/5/1977; Bresser, 'Kaalgeschoren Hamlet komt doeltreffend over. Stuk

kan verder uitgediept', *Volkskrant*, 16/5/1977; De Groot, 'Bestaan of niet bestaan daar gaat het om', *Vrije Volk*, 13/5/1977; Rutten, 'Een Hamlet van het Onafhankelijk Toneel. Minimum aan uiterlijkheden', *Trouw*, 14/5/1977.

- 1978 ♦ Performances in March, De Suikerhof Amsterdam
Solovoordracht Frederik de Groot
Directed by Frederik de Groot
Translation by Bert Voeten

Cast: Hamlet: Frederik de Groot
- 1979 **Theaterunie**
Opening night: 22 March, De Brakke Grond Amsterdam
(other known performances: De Groot was available for try-outs from 8 to 17/3/1979 and from 25/3 to 31/5 for performances.)
Hamlet Alleen
Translation by Bert Voeten
Adapted by Frederik de Groot

Cast: all roles: Frederik de Groot
Reviews: Houtman, 'Cynische Hamlet', *Trouw*, 23/3/1979; Van Leeuwen, 'Hamlet als solotoneel in ambivalente stijl', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 23/3/1979; Koopmans, 'Jonge Hamlet geheel alleen op het podium. Frederik de Groot in de Brakke Grond', *Haagsche Courant*, 23/3/1979.
- 1979 **Young Vic**
Performances in September
Country of origin: United Kingdom
Discipline: Youth theatre
Directed by Michael Bogdanov

Cast: Hamlet: Antony Milner
- 1980 ♦ Country of origin: Poland
Directed by Henryk Tomaszewsky
- 1981 ♦ **Theatre of Mistakes**
Opening night: 4 June, Mickery Amsterdam. (Holland Festival 1981)
(other known performances: until 20/6, Amsterdam)
Country of origin: United States of America
Directed by Stuart Sherman
Author: Stuart Sherman
Cast: 6 actors

Reviews: Justensen, 'Vivisectie Hamlet' *Parool*, 4/6/1981; Heddama, 'Sherman toont Hamlet als quiz', *Volkskrant*, 4/6/1981; Somers, 'Hamlet als raadsel in beeldtaal', *Telegraaf*, 9/6/1981; De Haan, 'Hamlet in doodskist', *Haagsche Courant*, 3/6/1981; Olde Monnikhof, 'Shermans Hamlet als kryptogram', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 4/6/1981; Van Leeuwen, 'Stuart Sherman op zoek naar Hamlets twijfels', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 5/6/1981; Heijer, 'Stuart Shermans Hamlet als cerebraal spel met objecten', *NRC Handelsblad*, 3/6/1981.

1982 ◆

Globe

Opening night: 20 April, De Bergruimte, Eindhoven
 (other known performance: 16/4, The Hague; 17/4, The Hague; 18/4, The Hague; 20/4, Eindhoven; 21/4, Eindhoven; 23/4, Brussel, 24/4, Uden; 26/4, Middelburg; 27/4, Helmond; 28/4, Tilburg, 29/4, Tilburg; 30/4, Groningen; 2/5, Maastricht; 5.5, Haarlem; 6/5, Eindhoven; 7/5, Eindhoven; 8/5, Eindhoven; 11/5, Den Bosch; 12/5, Den Bosch; 13/5, Tilburg; 14/5, Breda; 15/5, Breda; 17/5, Hilversum; 18/5, Utrecht; 19/5, Utrecht; 20/5, Rotterdam; 21/5, Rotterdam; 25/5, Amsterdam; 26/5, Amsterdam; 27/5, Amsterdam; 28/5, Amsterdam; 29/5, Amsterdam)

Kwartet: Mauser/De Hamletmachine/Kwartet/Hartstuk

Directed by Gerardjan Rijnders

Dramaturgy by Rob Klinkenberg

Author: Heiner Müller

Translation: Martin Hafkamp

Cast: Hamlet: Theo de Groot / Ophelia: Moniek Kramer / Horatio/Polonius: Theu Boermans / Koor van vrouwen: Ton Selter / Claudius/Hamlet: Huib Rooijmans / De Madonna met de borstkanker: Elisabeth Anderson

Costumes by Paul Gallis

Reviews: Van Toorn, 'Een wisselvallig kwartet van Heiner Müller', *Vrij Nederland*, 29/5/1982; Sternheim, 'Globe speelt vals', *Haagse Post*, 15/5/1982; Bobkova, "'Kwartet" van Heiner Müller: contrasten', *Financieel Dagblad*, 4/6/1982

1982

Steven Berkoffs London Theatre Group

Opening night: 12 May, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague

Country of origin: United Kingdom

Cast: Hamlet: Steven Berkoff / Other roles: six men (amongst whom David Auker, Matthew Scurfield) / two women (amongst whom Linda Marlowe)

Reviews: Jac Heijer, 'Krachtige Hamlet van Steven Berkoff', *NRC Handelsblad*, 15/5/1982.

1982

Compagnia del Collettivo del Teatre Due, Parma

Opening night: 1 June, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague (Holland Festival 1982)

Country of origin: Italy

Amleto

Directed by the collective

Cast: Roberto Abbati / Paolo Bocelli / Gigi Dall'Aglia / Giorgio Gennari / Tania Roccheta / Marcello Vazzoler

Set design by Nica Magnani / Costumes by Nica Magnani / Light: Giuliano Viani

Reviews: Jac Heijer, 'Weerspiegeling van de crisis in Hamlet', *NRC Handelsblad*, 2/6/1982

1982 ◆

Het Trojaanse Paard

Opening night: 8 June, Kleine Komедie Amsterdam. (Holland Festival 1982)

(other known performances: 8 to 12/6, Amsterdam)

De Hamletmachine
 Directed by Jan Decorte
 Author: Heiner Müller

1983

Genesisius

Opening night: 13 March, RASA Utrecht
 (other known performances: 11/3/1983, Het Kruithuis, Groningen)
 Directed by Nancy Gould
 Author: William Shakespeare; added lines by Vonne van der Meer
 Translation by Bert Voeten
 Annotation: third performances in the series: 'angst, agressie en apathie'

Cast: Marlies de Waard / Renze Arnold / Kitty Polderman / Huib Ouwehand

Production: Diane Nijweide / Set design by Hans van Buuren and Bert Bornebroek / Costumes by Tessa Lute

Reviews: Alkema, 'Genesisius met interpretatie van Hamlet te ambitieus. Gekunsteld dubbelverhaal oppervlakkig', *Volkskrant* 16/4/1983; Van der Harst, 'Hamlet vol onzekerheid in magere uitvoering', *Trouw*, 16/4/1983

1983

Haagse Comedie

Opening night: 23 December, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague
 (other known performances: 4/1/1984, Amsterdam; 5/1/1983, Amsterdam; 10/1/1983, Venray; 11/1/1983, Kerkrade; 12/1/1983, Sittard; 17/1/1983, Roermond; 18/1/1983, Amstelveen; 19/1/1983, Eindhoven; 20/1/1983, Rotterdam; 21/1/1983, Utrecht; 22/1/1983, Utrecht; 24/1/1983, Hasselt (Belgium); 26/1/1983, Apeldoorn; 1/2/1983, Rotterdam; 2/2/1983, Rotterdam; 7/2/1983, Breda; 8/2/1983, Nijmegen; 9/2/1983, Leeuwarden; 14/2/1983, Den Bosch; 16/2/1983, Haarlem; 22/2/1983, Utrecht)
 Directed by Guido de Moor
 Translation by Bert Voeten
 Adapted by Guido de Moor and Watze Tiesema

Cast: Hamlet: Hans Hoes / Claudius: Jules Croiset / Ghost: Paul Steenbergen's voice / Gertrude: Trins Snijders / Polonius: Carl van der Plas / Laertes: Jim Berghout / Ophelia: Guusje Eybers / Horatio: Gaston van Erven / Rosencrantz: Reinier Heidemann / Guildenstern: Kees van Lier / Fortinbras: Guido Jonckers / Marcellus: Wim van den Heuvel / Barnardo: Guido Jonckers (d) / Francisco: Jan Nonhof / Osric: Peter Hoeksema / Players: Wim van den Heuvel (toneelkoning) (d), Roos Blauboer (toneelkoningin), Jules Royaards (Lucianus) (d), Peter Hoeksema (d), Guido Jonckers (d), Jan Nonhoff (d) / Gravedigger: Jules Royaards (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Guido Jonckers (d) / Priest: Wim van den Heuvel (d) / Captain: Jan Nonhoff (d)

Assistent director: Guido Jonckers / Production: Georges Lambrecht / Set design by Guido de Moor / Costumes by Guido de Mooir / Make-up by André Mouth / Hair dresser: André Mouth / Light: Hans Boerhoop, Gerard Schinkelshoek / Sound: Croese geluidstechniek b.v. / Music: Juriaan Andriessen / Stage fight: Cor van der Valk

Reviews: Jac Heijer, 'Hamlet van Hans Hoes is een moderne cynicus', *NRC Handelsblad*, 27/12/1983; Ruivenkamp, 'Hamlet op video', *Haagsche Courant*, 25/1/1984; 'Première bij Haagse Comedie uitgesteld', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 27/9/1983; Van den Bergh, 'Hamlet: levend, aards en eigentijds', *Parool*, 30/12/1983; Van Leeuwen, 'Haagse Comedie op gespannen voet met Shakespeare', 27/12/1983; Zonneveld, 'Wreek die moord!' *Groene*, 25/1/1984; Bobkova, 'Hamlet niet 'sluitend' gemaakt, daardoor actueel van beleving', *Financieel Dag-*

blad, 21/1/1984; Gortzak, 'Hamlet is bezienswaardig ondanks vaag regieconcept', *Volkskrant*, 28/12/1983; 'Diep-menselijke Hamlet bij de Haagse Comedie', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 27/12/1983; De Haan, 'IJzersterke Hamlet houdt publiek in wurggreep', *Haagsche Courant*, 24/12/1983; Vroom, 'Nuchtere en licht cynische Hamlet', *Waarheid*, 29/12/1983; Liefhebber, 'Hans Hoes fascinerend als Hamlet', *Telegraaf*, 27/12/1983

1984

Cambridge Experimental Theatre

Country of origin: United Kingdom

1984

Theater La Luna (in collaboration with Theaterunie Amsterdam)

Opening night: 12 January, Stadsgehoorzaal Vlaardingen

Directed by Çanci Geraedts

Cast: Hamlet: Titus Tiel Groenestege / Claudius: Fred Vaassen / Gertrude: Marieke van Leeuwen / Ophelia: Yolande van Ede

Music: Bavo Galama

Reviews: Jac Heijer, 'Hamlet: prikkelend spektakel bij La Luna', *NRC Handelsblad*, 16/1/1984; Van Leeuwen, 'Puur entertainment in gedurfde Hamlet. Vitale heldere Shakespeare-opvoering', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 14/1/1984; 'Goed georganiseerde chaos', *Waarheid*, 16/1/1984; Gortzak, 'La Luna's Hamlet zit vol fouten maar is toch interessant', *Volkskrant*, 14/1/1984; Justessen, 'Çanci Geraedts raast door Hamlet', *Parool*, 13/2/1984; Monnikhof, 'Avontuurlijke en blote Hamlet bij La Lune', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 14/1/1984; Van der Harst, 'Spelersmateriaal uitstekend gebruikt in beproefde Hamlet. Çanci Geraedts haalt kwaliteit uit onbedorven acteurs', *Trouw*, 16/1/1984; De Haan, 'Hamlet met een knipoo', *Haagsche Courant*, 13/1/1984

1984 ♦

Clownspoppentheater Parcival

Opening night: 19 January

Directed by Willem Parcival

1985 ♦

Toneel Werkplaats

Opening night: 21 January, Vrij Theater aan de Noordwal, The Hague

Known performances: 15/1/1985; 22-23/1/1985, HOT, The Hague

Osric. Een theaterstuk voor solo-acteur, geluidsband en stemmen

Directed by Peter Lintelo and Arda Brokmann

Author: Peter Lintelo

Cast: Osric's mother: Marlies van Alcmaer / Hamlet: Hans Hoes / Gravedigger: Wim de Haas / First voice: Arend Bulder / Second voice: Bart Kiene / Last voice: Peter Lintelo

Set design and costumes: Leni Lintelo / Sound: Studio Hero Wouters / Make-up: Vicnent van den Dungen

Reviews: 'Kleine man groeit in kast' *Uitkrant*, 16-1-1985, 'Veel verschillend toneel in het HOT', *TIN*, "'Toneel Werkplaats" met Ton van der Velden', *Streekblad Zoetermeer*, 16-1-1985; Wim Gijsen, 'Nadruk in Osric te veel op tekst', *TIN*, Wim Bouwens, 'Osric vergt veel concentratievermogen', *Groot Voorburg*, 23-1-1985; Henze Pegman, 'Osric krankjorum maar wel intrigerend', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 23-1-1985; Renée de Haan, 'Osric verstrikt in krullen', *Haagse Krant*, 21-1-1985; Paul Korenhof, 'Barokke overdaad bij Lintelo', *Leidsch Dagblad*, 22-1-1985; 'Osric in HOT', *NU*, 1-1-1985; John Niemans, 'Uitstekende Osric', *Haagsche Courant*, 7-1-1985; 'Ton van der Velden en Peter Lintelo geven figuur van Shake-

speare nieuwe dimensie', *TIN*.

1985 ♦

Teneeter

Opening night: 29 September, Stadsschouwburg De Vereniging Nijmegen
(other known performance: 29/9, 20/10 Schouwburg; Nijmegen; 8/12, Hofpleintheater Rotterdam; 22/12, Schouwburg Arnhem; 5/1, De Kolk Assen; 19/1/1986, De Blauwe Zaal, Utrecht; 26/1, Nieuwpoorttheater Gent; 2/2, De Meervaart Amsterdam)

Hamlet, kleine prins van Denemarken (Hamlet, from 10 years)

Discipline: Youth theatre

Directed by Lucas Borkel

Dramaturgy: Lucas Borkel

Translation: Bert Voeten

Adapted by Lucas Borkel

Cast: Hamlet: Jan Hoek / Claudius: Rinus Knobel / Ghost: Rinus Knobel (d) / Gertrude: Baja Lombaers / Polonius: Jouke Kruijer / Laertes: Hiske van der Linden / Ophelia: Lucia Bomert / Barnardo: Tessa du Mée / Francisco: Hiske van der Linden (d) / Osric: Jouke Kruijer (d) / Gravedigger: Tessa du Mée (d)

Set design by Hartwig Dobbertin / Costumes by Elly Haegemans / Light: Lichtontwerp: Hartwig Dobbertin and Bart Vaessen / Music: Pako. Executed by Coby Bol / Photography by Bas Mariën

Reviews: Marcel de Groen, 'Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken', *Skript*: Nr. 01 (February 1986); p. 25-26; Kamphoven, 'Hamlet in korte broek', *Brabants Dagblad*, 11/12/1985; Van Hest, 'Hamlet is dood, nu patat', *Parool*, 31/1/1986; Oranje, 'Hamlet op kinderniveau oogt bijzonder volwssen', *Trouw*, 5/2/1986; Huizing, 'Hamlet voor de jeugd: zonder concessies', *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 6/1/1986; Wiersinga, 'Hamlet van Teneeter goed kindertheater', *Waarheid*, 11/11/1985; Van Leest, "Te klein of niet te klein, dat is de vraag", *Ede-stad*, 7/10/1985; 'Theater voor de jeugd', *A.D.*, 28/11/1985; Van Schaik, 'Hamlet in korte broek wil niet echt overtuigen', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 20/01/1986; Verdonshot, 'Teneeter vertilt zich zwaar aan 'Hamlet'', *Gelderlander*, 30/9/1985; 'Eenzame kleine prins', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 26/9/1985.

1985 ♦

De Kolonie

Opening night: 31 October 1985, Shaffy Theater Amsterdam

(other known performances: until 9/11)

De droom, de golf, het bedrog

Discipline: Mime

Directed by the collective

Author: "naar William Shakespeare, Heiner Müller, Peter Handke et al"

Cast: Marion van Wijk / Fried Mertens / Trudie Lute / Ariëla Legman / Martha Peters / Anneke Bonnema

Set design by De Kolonie / Costumes by De Kolonie

Reviews: Welling, 'Mime in Shaffy, een avondje lachen', *De Waarheid*, 11/1985

1985 ♦

Globe

Opening night: 1 November, Stadsschouwburg Tilburg
Hamletmachine/Egofiel

Directed by Sam Bogaerts
 Dramaturgy: Reinhilde de Wit
 Author: Heiner Müller, Sam Bogaerts
 Translation by Sam Bogaerts

Cast: Hamletvertolker: Wim van der Grijn / Vrouw: Chris Nietvelt / Man met bril: Flip Ceulemans / Man met masker/Danser/Fortinbras: Gijs de Lange / Danseres/Mammoet: Sjaanet Luyt / Accordeonist: Sjeff Werrens
 Production: Gert Meijer / Set design by Hedy Grünewald / Costumes by Hedy Grünewald / Make-up by Valentine Kempynck / Hair dresser: Valentine Kempynck / Music: Frédéric Chopin, Anette Peacock / Photography by Paul F. Dubois

1986

Publiekstheater

Opening night: 11 October, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
 Directed by Gerardjan Rijnders
 Dramaturgy: Janine Brogt
 Author: William Shakespeare
 Translation by Gerrit Komrij

Cast: Hamlet: Pierre Bokma / Claudius: Hans Croiset / Ghost: Titus Muizelaar / Gertrude: Petra Laseur / Polonius: Henk Rigters / Laertes: Hugo Koolschijn / Ophelia: Margo Dames / Horatio: Laurens Spoor / Rosencrantz: Wigbold Kruyver / Guildenstern: Bert Bunschoten / Fortinbras: Frans Spek / Voltimand: Frans Vorstman / Cornelius: Frans Spek (d) / Marcellus: Hans van den Berg / Barnardo: Joost Boer / Francisco: Hans van den Berg (d) / Osric: Joost Boer (d) / Frans Spek (d) / Players: Frans Vorstman (Lucianus) (d), Titus Muizelaar (koning) (d), Frans Spek (koningin) (d) / Gravedigger: Titus Muizelaar (grafdelver) (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Wigbold Kruyver (d) of Bert Bunschoten (d) / Priest: Hans van den Berg (bisschop) (d) / Captain: Hans van den Berg (d)

Assistent director: Celia Nufaar / Production: Bob Logger / Set design by Jon Dekker / Costumes by Rien Bekkers / Make-up by eigen atelier: Wim Verheyen, Leonie Barendse, Suzette van Rooyen, Erik Sluys / Light: Henk van der Geest, installatie V.A. Lights / Sound: Stemvorming: Ernst Boreel, installatie Fa. Croese b.v. / Stage fight: Cor van der Valk / Photography by Kees de Graaff

Reviews: Jac Heijer, 'Een maatgevende Hamlet door verrassend ensemblespel', *NRC Handelsblad*, 13/10/1986; L.Oomes, 'Hamlet zonder kracht. Publiekstheater niet opgewassen tegen hoge eisen', *A.D.* 13/10/1986; Peter Liefhebber, 'Hamlet van Bokma is geen hoofdrol', *De Telegraaf* 13/10/1986; Martin Schouten, 'Intelligente Hamlet als kostuumstuk', *De Volkskrant* 13/10/1986; Hans Oranje, 'Klassieker zet de toon. Hamlet bij Publiekstheater werd schitterende toneelmanifestatie', *Trouw*, 13/10/1986; Per Justessen, 'Hamlet: de verbazing slaat toe', *Het Parool* 13/10/1986

1987

Nieuw Ensemble RaamTeater VZW

Opening night: 6 January, Brakke Grond Amsterdam
 (other known performances: 6/1/1987-10/1/1987, De Brakke Grond Amsterdam; 29/1, Middelburg; 4/2, Leiden; 5/3, Heerenveen; 7/3, Drachten. Belgian opening night: 19 September 1986, Raamtheater op 't Zuid, Antwerp)
 Country of origin: Belgium
 Directed by Walter Tillemans
 Translation by Hugo Claus
 Adapted by Pavel Kohout

Cast: Hamlet: Karel Vingerhoets / Claudius: Roger Van Kerpel / Gertrude: Julienne de

Bruyn / Polonius: Bert André / Laertes: Eric Kerremans / Ophelia: A'leen Cooreman / Horatio: Jean Verbert / Rosencrantz: Yves Bombay / Guildenstern: Eric Kerremans / Fortinbras: Yves Bombay (d) / Osric: A'leen Cooreman / Players: Lucianus: Karel Vingerhoets (d); Proloog: Eric Kerremans; Koning in het stuk 'de Muizeval': Eric Kerremans; Koningin in het stuk: Yves Bombay; Muzikant bij de toneelspelers: Jean Verbert / Gravedigger: Bert André (d) / Gravedigger's companion: A'leen Cooreman (d) / Priest: Yves Bombay (d) / Captain: Jean Verbert (d) / Other roles: edelman: Julianne De Bruyn (d)

Assistant director: Mien Augustijnen / Costumes by Bob Verhelst. Executed by Erna Siebens, Gitt Bolsens, Colette / Masks: Herman Vingerhoets / Props: Gitt Bolsens / Light: Walter Tillemans. Executed by: Rob Van Ertvelde, Chris van Voethem / Sound: Luk Daens / Music: Jan Leyers / Stunts: Benny de Wit / Stage fight: Rudy Delhem

Reviews: Schouten, 'Vlamingen maken van Hamlet gitaarprins', *Volkskrant*, 8/1/1987; Van Galen, 'Hamlet blijft steken in vondsten', *Waarheid*, 8/1/1987; Heijer, 'Mediamieke Hamlet uit Antwerpen', *NRC Handelsblad*, 7/1/1987; Straatman, 'Hamlet als rockmuzikant', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 7/1/1987; Grijsen, 'Het Raamteater laat Shakespeare swingen', *Gooi en Eemlander*, 16/3/1987; Huizing, 'Frisse Hamlet met rockmuziek', *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 5/3/1987; Zeilstra, 'Vlaamse 'Hamlet' helder, maar kil', *Leidsch Dagblad*, 5/2/1987; Nijssen, 'Hamlet: wat je ziet, dat ben je zelf', *PZC*, 29/1/1987; Liefhebber, 'Hamlet aangepast aan huiskamerformaat', *Telegraaf*, 9/1/1987; Goedbloed, 'Belgische Hamlet blijft in theorie steken', *Trouw*, 8/1/1987; Oomens, 'Moralistische Hamlet van Raamteater', *Algemeen Dagblad* 9/1/1987

1987

Maatschappij Discordia

Opening night: 2 June, Shaffy Theater Amsterdam
(other known performance: until 20/6/1987, Shaffy Theater, Amsterdam)

Author: William Shakespeare / "Edward de Vere"

Roles: Hamlet / Edward / Claudius / Elizabeth / Anne
Actors: Jan Joris Lamers / Matthias de Koning / Annet Kouwenhoven / René Eljon / Frieda Pittoors / Titus Muizelaar / Gerrit Bons

Reviews: Van der Harst, 'Discordia's Hamlet is overbodig', *Trouw*, 5/6/1987; Straatman, 'Was Shakespeare geen gewone jongen?' *Haarlems Dagblad*, 3/6/1987

1988

STAN/Jeugdtheatergroep Duizel

Opening night: 22 April, Polanentheater Amsterdam
De Prins van Denemarken
Directed by Andy Daal
Dramaturgy: Andy Daal
Translation by Bert Voeten
Adapted by Andy Daal

Cast: Hamlet: Laurens Umans / Claudius: Jan Anton den Rooyen / Ghost: Jan Anton den Rooyen (d) / Gertrude: Margreeth Ploeger / Polonius: André Sipkes / Laertes: Robbert van Ark / Ophelia: Carolien van Dalsum / Horatio: Robbert van Ark (d) / Rosencrantz: Margreeth Ploeger (d) / Guildenstern: Carolien van Dalsum (d) / Gravedigger: André Sipkes (d)

Set design by Thomas Coltof / Costumes by Harriët van den Bosch / Make-up by Maaike van Gelder / Hair dresser: Maaike van Gelder / Light: Jan Ploeger, Jeroen Glas / Photography by Bas Marriën

Theater Het Hof

Opening night: 16 September, Schouwburg Arnhem

Vanavond noch Hamlet (Heute weder Hamlet)

Directed by Judith Brokking (begeleiding)

Dramaturgy: Pieter Vrijman

Author: Rainer Lewandovski

Translation by Josee van der Linden, Thomas Verbogt

Adapted by: Joop van der Linden

Cast: Johan van Straten, Joop van der Linden

Set design by Ed Smit / Light: Ad van Hassel, Ernst Soetekouw / Sound: Ernst Soetekouw, Ad van Hassel / Photography by Bart Groenendijk

Toneelgroep De Appel

Opening night: 7 October, Appeltheater The Hague

Directed by Erik Vos,

Dramaturgy: Watze Tiesema (assistant Loes Heyligers)

Translation by Bert Voeten

Adapted by Watze Tiesema and Erik Vos

Cast: Hamlet: Aus Greidanus / Claudius: Carol Linssen / Ghost: Carol Linssen (d) / Gertrude: Geert de Jong / Polonius: Willem Wagter / Laertes: Alexander van Heteren / Ophelia: Carline Brouwer / Horatio: Sascha Bulthuis / Rosencrantz: Aafke Bruining / Guildenstern: Stef Feld / Fortinbras: René Vernout / Marcellus: René Vernout (d) / Barnardo: Stef Feld (d) / Francisco: Henk Votèl / Osric: Stef Feld (d) / Henk Votèl (d) / Players: Henk Votèl (Toneelkoning) (d), Loes Wouterson (Toneelkoningin), René Vernout (Lucianus) (d), Alexander van Heteren (d), Jeroen van der Hoff, Justa de Jong, Bernadette Kijzers (overige toneelspelers) / Gravedigger: Henk Votèl (eerste clown (doodgraver)) / Gravedigger's companion: Willem Wagter (tweede clown (de ander)) / Priest: René Vernout / Captain: René Vernout (hopman) / Other roles: René Venout (boodschapper)

Production: Fred van de Schilde (assistent: Christopher Marcus) / Set design by Tom Schenk (assistent: Richard Brouwer) / Costumes by Tom Schenk. Executed by Marrit van der Burgt, Bernadette Kijzers, Corina Weeda, Hester Wensveen / Light: Lex Caboort / Sound: Henry van Niel / Music: Jeroen van der Hoff (slagwerk), Henk Votèl (uitvoering muziek) / Stage fight: Kasper Kardolus / Photography by Pan Sok

Reviews: Stupers, 'Ijdelheid en spiegels bij Hamlet van De Appel', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 10/10/1988; Janssen, 'Circus De Appel brengt Hamlet met Freud en tromgeroffel', *Volkserant*, 10/10/1988; Oomens, 'Hamlet: man van de daad', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 10/10/1988; Broekman, 'De Appel benadrukt Hamlets tijdloosheid', *De Waarheid*, 1/11/1988; De Haan, 'Hamlet blijft in de ruimte hangen', *Haagsche Courant*, 8/10/1988; Liefhebber, 'Hamlet veelkantig, maar kraakhelder', *Telegraaf*, 10/10/1988; 'Ook Hamlet houdt een 'Dodendans', *Haagsche Courant* 28/9/1988; Liefhebber, 'Actrice Sacha Bulthuis als Horatio in de 'Hamlet': 'Boeit het of niet, dat is de kwestie', *Telegraaf*, 7/10/1988; Van der Meulen, 'De invloed van Einstein op Hamlet', *Parool*, 17/1/1989; Welling, 'Shakespeare's Hamlet als stuk van alle tijden', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 16/1/1989; Koolhaas, 'Shakespeare's Hamlet', *Vrij Nederland*, 21/1/1989; 'De Appel brengt publiek zelf naar 'Hamlet'', *Haagsche Courant*, 31/12/1988; Freriks, 'Hamlet: een detective over de schijnheiligheid', *NRC Handelsblad*, 10/10/1988; Freriks, 'Ik bied een kijkje achter de schermen', *NRC Handelsblad*, 1/6/1989; Zeilstra, 'Ruimteverkenning in 'Hamlet'', *Leidsch Dagblad*, 10/10/1988; Verdonshot, 'Degelijk toneel maar ook flets', *Gelderlander*, 10/10/1988; Van den Bergh, 'De Appel speelt Hamlet magnifiek', *Parool* 10/10/1988

Stichting Wereld Premières

Opening night: 15 March 1989, Shaffy Amsterdam (Teatro Fantastico 1989)

(other known performances: 1/3, Witte Theater IJmuiden; 9/3, LAK Theater Leiden; 14/3, Shaffy Theater Amsterdam; 15/3-25/3, Shaffy Theater Amsterdam; 14/4, Provadja Alkmaar; 22/4, Schouwburg Arnhem; 27-29/4, Corso Theater The Hague; 6/5, Kruithuis Groningen; 11-13/5, Lantaren Rotterdam; 18/5, 042 Nijmegen; 20/5, BIS Theater Den Bosch; 25/5, Effenaar Eindhoven; 31/5, Witte Theater IJmuiden; 17-19/6, Festival Theater a/d Werf Utrecht)

Directed by Harrie Hageman

Dramaturgy: Gemma van Zeventer

Translation by Willy Courteaux

Adapted by: Harrie Hageman

Note: a mere 16 sentences are omitted, as stated by the programme

Cast: Hamlet: Cornelis Scholten / Claudius: Anke Jansen / Ghost: Henriette Remmers / Gertrude: Henriette Remmers (d) / Polonius: Annemieke Rigter / Laertes: Stefan Louman / Horatio: Ivo ten Hagen / Fortinbras: Harrie Hageman / Voltimand / Ottolien Boeschoten / Marcellus: Ottolien Boeschoten (d) / Barnardo: Petra van Hartskamp / Francisco: Anke Jansen (d) / Osric: Petra van Hartskamp (d) / Players: Toneelspeler Lucianus: Cornelis Scholten (d), 1ste toneelspeler, toneelkoning: Ottolien Boeschoten (d), Toneelkoningin: Stefan Louman (d) / Gravedigger: Ottolien Boeschoten (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Petra van Hartskamp (d) / Priest: Annemieke Rigter (d) / Captain: Annemieke Rigter (d) / Other roles: Gezant: Annemieke Rigter (d), Edelman: Ottolien Boeschoten (d), 1ste Zeeman: Ottolien Boeschoten (d)

Set design by Harrie Hageman / Costumes by Harrie Hageman / Light: Kees van de Lage-
maat / Music: Jacques Offenbach, Stunt / Photography by Bob van Dantzig, Harry Huider

Reviews: Freriks, 'Harrie Hageman over zijn Hamlet: verbaal geweld', *NRC Handelsblad* 28/6/1989; Janssen, 'Men is extreem voor of extreem tegen', *Volkskrant* 21/3/1989; Junge, 'Het gaat om de muzikaliteit, het ritme van de voorstelling', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 14/3/1989; Nolte, 'Jong talent in sobere Hamlet', *Uitkrant*, 3/1989; Freriks, 'Een witte vorm vol holle woorden, woorden, woorden', *NRC Handelsblad* 16/3/1989; Van den Bergh, 'Hamlet voor de huiskamer', *Parool*, 20/3/1989; Oranje, 'Hageman maakt van 'Hamlet' superkitsch', *Trouw*, 29/3/1989; Zonderland, 'Hagemans Hamlet heeft gedateerd soort modernisme', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 18/3/1989; Welling, 'Hageman brengt Hamlet tot minimale essentie terug', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 20/3/1989; Zeilstra, 'Hamlet in turbo-dreun', *Leidsch Dagblad*, 10/3/1989; Hoenderdaal, 'Witte voorstelling met rode accenten', *Gelderlander*, 24/4/1989; Vleugel, 'Water', *HP*, 15/4/1989; Arian, 'Een dubbel-snelle Hamlet', *Groene*, 29/3/1989; Huizing, 'Een snelle Hamlet', *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 9/5/1989; Zonderland, 'Een opmerkelijke en snelle Hamlet', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad/NZC*, 14-21/6/1989

Theaterwerkplaats InDependance, Theater aan de Rijn

Opening night: 20 April, Schouwburg Arnhem

(other known performances: 20-23/4/1989, Theater aan de Rijn, Arnhem, 1/6/1989 O42 Nijmegen, 3/6/1989, Schouwburg Arnhem)

Hamlet en Elektra

Directed by Jaap de Knegt

Dramaturgy: Pieter Vrijman

Author: Wim de Knegt

Cast: Hamlet: Wannie de Wijn / Electra: Barbara Gozens

Production: Liesbeth Holleman / Set design by Gertjan van Kamp / Grafic design: Gea Grevink / Light: Ed Smit / Sound: Jan Willem Gelsing / Photography by Wim de Knecht

Reviews: Straatman, 'Hamlet en Elektra: modieuze liefdesrelatie', *NRC Handelsblad*, 26/4/1989; Verbeeten, 'Brutaliteit is de sleutel', *Gelderlander*, 13/4/1989; 'Tragedie', *Gooien Eemlander*, 12/4/1989; 'Een opmerkelijk stel', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 20/4/1989; Geerlings, 'Hamlet als goochelaar', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 24/4/1989; Hoederdaal, 'Hamlet en Elektra van InDependance', *Gelderlander*, 21/4/1989; 'Laatste Hamlet en Electra', *Gelderlander*, 2/6/1989

1989

De Appel

Opening night: 26 May, Appelstudio The Hague
 Rosencrantz en Guildenstern zijn dood
 Directed by Aus Greidanus
 Dramaturgy: Watze Tiesema
 Author: Tom Stoppard
 Translation by Bert Voeten

Cast: Hamlet: Aus Greidanus / Claudius (on film): Carol Linssen / Gertrude: Geert de Jong / Rosencrantz: Wim Wagter / Guildenstern: Henk Votél / Players: 1e toneelspeler: Stef Feld, 2e toneelspeler: René Vernout, 3e toneelspeler: Ernst Löw

Set design by Tom Schenk / Costumes by Tom Schenk / Choreography: Pauline Schenck-Leich / Photography by Pan Sok

1989

De Haagse Zomer, De Stijle Want

Opening night: 21 June (De Haagse Zomer 1989)

1989

FACT

Opening night: 23 September, Theater Lantaren/Venster Rotterdam
 Ophelia
 Directed by Jos van Kam
 Dramaturgy: Rob Klinkenberg
 Author: "naar William Shakespeare, Heiner Müller, Stig Daggerman, Ivo Michiels, Frederik van Eeden"

Cast: Ophelia: Lieke Rosa Altink, Elsie de Brauw, Tineke Schrier / Man: Arjan Kindermans / Koor: J.C. Banning, Reginaldo Dutra, Peter Kamphorst, Harjono Roebema, Jan Zobel, Borut Kocar

Production: Marjan Croese / Set design by Johan Simons / Costumes by Gerwin Smit / Light: Johan Simons, Joop Spies / Sound: Peter van Bekhoven / Music: Peter Vermeersch / Musicians: Jean-Luc Plouvier, Jean-Paul Dessy, Thierry de Mey, Eric Schleichim, Dirk Descheemaeker, Peter Vermeersch / Choreography: Feri de Geus

1989

Leicester Haymarket Theatre

Opening night: 11 December, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam
 (other known performances: 11-14/11, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam)
 Country of origin: United Kingdom
 Directed by Joeri Ljoebimov

Annotation: Dedicated to Vladimir Vysotsky. The same interpretation as that by Taganka Theater, Moskou, 1971-1980 with Vysotski starring as Hamlet (Russian translation: Boris Pasternak)

Cast: Hamlet: Daniel Webb / Claudius: Andrew Jarvis / Ghost: David Gant / Gertrude: Anne White / Polonius: Richard Durden / Laertes: Lloyd Owen / Ophelia: Veronica Smart / Horatio: Martin McKellan / Rosencrantz: Michael Brazier / Guildenstern: James Nesbitt / Marcellus: Malcolm Jacobs / Barnardo: Joao de Sousa / Osric: Michael Brazier / Players: Player King: David Gant (d); Musician and Player: James T Ford / Player and Prompter: Sonia and Prompter Player: Richard Strange Player: Malcolm Jacobs Player Queen: Elizabeth Rider: Player: Joao de Sousa (d) / Gravedigger: Richard Strange(d) / Gravedigger's companion: James Nessbitt (d) / Soldier: Malcolm Jacobs (d) / Soldier: Joao de Sousa (d)

Assistant director: Michael Wasserman, David O'Shea / Set design by David Borowsky / Light: Krystof Kozlowski / Sound: Paul Bull / Music: Yuri Butsko and James T Ford / Choreography: Chiang Ching

Reviews: Bolkestein, 'Op naar de grote zaal', *TIN*; Van der Velden, 'Aarde van Vysotsky's graf in 'Hamlet' van Ljoebimov', *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 2/12/1989; Van der Velden, 'Een Russische Hamlet op zijn Engels gebracht', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 2/5/1989; 'Exclusieve Hamlet vervangt Roberto-première', *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 25/11/1989; De Ruijter, 'Visuele hoogstandjes in Engels-Russische Hamlet' *Telegraaf*, 11/12/1989; Buijs, 'Macraméwerk van een reus', *Volkskrant*, 20/11/1989; Bobkova, 'Engels-Russische voorstelling met Hamlet boven de catacomben', *Financieel Dagblad*, 30/12/1989; Hellinga, *Vrij Nederland*, 23/12/1989; Duyns, 'Te weinig stilte in wollen Hamlet', *Parool*, 12/12/1989; Freriks, 'In Ljoebimovs Hamlet is de dood oppermachtig', *NRC Handelsblad* 11/12/1989; Van der Meulen, 'Handvol Russische aarde in Ophelia's graf', *Parool*, 9/12/1989; Van der Harst, 'Een rol voor het gordijn', *Trouw*, 6/17/1989; Huizing, 'Monumentale Hamlet', *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 8/12/1989; Zonneveld, 'Een icoon vol verre stemmen', *Groene Amsterdammer*, 6/12/1989; De Haan, 'Ljoebimov doet zweven tussen hemel en aarde', *Haagsche Courant*, 9/12/1989; 'Russische Hamlet in Amsterdam', *Volkskrant*, 8/11/1989; 'Ljoebimovs Hamlet in Amsterdam', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 9/11/1989; 'Hamlet', *Gooi- en Eemlander*, 22/11/1989

1990

Henri van Zanten

Opening night: 15 February, Theater Lantaren/Venster Rotterdam
(Circuit du Theatre 1990)

I Never Really Understood Hamlet Prince

Author: Heiner Müller, William Shakespeare

Cast: Henri van Zanten

Photography by Deen van Meer

Reviews: *TIN*

1991

De Toneelvereniging Diever (Non-professional theatre)

Opening night: Diever

Directed by Wil Rep

Translation: Emmy Wijnholds

**Impresariaat Jacques Senf & Partners, Stichting Speciale Internationale Producties,
Koninklijke Vlaamse Schouwburg**

Opening night: 14 September, Stadsschouwburg Utrecht
(Festival Groeten uit Vlaanderen)

(other known performances, 9-18/9, Stadsschouwburg Utrecht; 20-25/9, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam; 27/9, Schouwburg De Kring Roosendaal; 2/10, Stadsschouwburg Middelburg; 3/10, De Metropole Almere; 4/10, De Lawei Drachten; 5/10, Stadsschouwburg Concordia Breda; 8/10, Stadsschouwburg Eindhoven; 9-11/10, Stadsschouwburg Antwerpen; 12/10 CC Hasselt; 17/10, CC Kortrijk; 18-19/10, Stadsschouwburg Arnhem; 21/10, Theater 't Spant Bussum; 22/10, Rijswijkse Schouwburg Rijswijk; 24-25/10, Stadsschouwburg Heerlen; 28-31, Stadsschouwburg Brugge; 4/11, Stadsschouwburg Utrecht; 7/11, Stadsgehoorzaal Vlaardingen; 8/11, Schouwburg Het Park Hoorn; 12/11, CC Amstelveen; 13/11, Stadsschouwburg Nijmegen; 14-17, Koninklijke Schouwburg The Hague; 20/11, Schouwburg Hengelo; 21/11, Schouwburg Amphion Doetinchem; 23-24/11, Stadsschouwburg Groningen; 26/11, Leidse Schouwburg Leiden; 29/11, De Maaspoort Venlo; 30/11, Schouwburg Tilburg; 1-2/12, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam; 7-9/1/1992, Stadsschouwburg Casino Den Bosch; 10-12/01/1992, Stadsschouwburg Rotterdam; 14/01, CC Geert Teis Stadskanaal; 15/1, Schouwburg Orpheus Apeldoorn; 17/1, CC De Schakel Waregem; 18/1 CC, De Vest Alkmaar; 21/1, Stadsschouwburg Haarlem; 23/1, Stadsschouwburg Velsen Ijmuiden; 24/1, Lochemse Schouwburg Lochem; 25/1, Stadsgehoorzaal Kampen; 28-31/1, KVS Brussel; 1-23/2 (m.u.v. 3, 10, 17), KVS Brussel; 25/2, CC De Warande Turnhout; 26-27/2, Vrijthof-theater Maastricht; 28-29/2, Stadsschouwburg Utrecht

Country of origin: Belgium

Directed by Dirk Tanghe

Translation by Johan Boonen

Adapted by Johan Boonen, Dirk Tanghe, Jan-Eric Hulsmann

Occasion: the 50th anniversary of Stadsschouwburg Utrecht.

Note: adapted for television by Dirk Tanghe and Berend Boudewijn,

Broadcast: Nederland 1 (KRO) 25/8/1993, 20.27 uur; 24/11/2001, 18.30, Utrecht Kanaal 9

Cast: Hamlet: Wim Danckaert / Claudius: Jef Demedts / Gertrude: Sien Eggers / Polonius: Dré Vandaele / Laertes: Henk Elich / Ophelia: Marie Louise Stehns / Horatio: Karel Deruwe / Rosencrantz: Ad Bastiaanse / Guildenstern: Michel Krot / Other roles: Klaas Bolhuis, Joost Demmers, Hans van Hechten, Jasper Jacobs, Wilco Maas, Ger Mendel, Wim Mönnich, Juan Muñoz, Dick Noppe, Cees Roodnat, Gerard Slot, Bas Sträter, Gerard Veen, Mitra van der Wielen

Set design by Dirk Tanghe / Costumes by Mirjam Pater / Make-up by Sjoerd Didden / Hair dresser: Sjoerd Didden / Light: Uri Rapaport / Stage fight: Kees Wolfers / Photography by Pan Sok, Kors van Bennekom, Roy Beusker

Reviews: TIN; Max Arian, 'Bitter lachend op weg naar de dood', *Toneel Theatraal*: Jrg. 112, Nr. 9 (november 1991), p. 46-47; Van der Velden, 'Tanghe's 'Hamlet' maakt mogelijk geschiedenis', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 4/9/1991; Grijsen, 'Theater', *Gooi en Eemlander*, 20/3/1991; Van der Velden, 'Een Hamlet zonder psychologisch [...]', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 15/1/1991; Wellings, 'Hamlet als Michael Jackson-clip', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 18/11/1992; Van der Wal, 'Hamlet in handen van Dirk Tanghe', *Arnhem* October 1991, 'Je bent jong en je wilt Hamlet spelen', *Kiosk*, 11/1991; Bantzinger, 'De noten en magie van Dirk van Tanghe', *Parool*, 12/9/1991; 'Succesvolle jubileumproductie Hamlet terug in Utrecht', 11/1991; Blom, 'Uit eigen keuken: doodsteek Hamlet', *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 5/10/1991; Van der Harst, 'Een heldere 'Hamlet'', *Trouw*, 17/9/1991; Zeilstra, 'Hamlet' in moderne beeldtaal', *Leidsch Dagblad*, 26/11/1991; Grijsen, 'Hamlet houdt wel van een lolletje', *Gooi en Eemlander*, 16/9/1991; Bresser, 'Hamlet als marionet', *Elsevier*, 21/9/1991; Van der Velden, 'Jullie zijn vogels, en jullie kunnen nu vliegen' *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 6/9/1991; 'Hamlet als verjaardagscadeau', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 6/9/1991; Soetenhorst, 'Dirk Tanghe durft veel met

'Hamlet', *Haagsche Courant*, 16/4/1991; Van den Bergh, 'Hamlet als videoclip met doffe plekken', *Parool*, 16/9/1991; Zonneveld, 'Publieksgeile Hamlet', *Groene Amsterdammer*, 2/10/1991; Blik, 'Emotie op de eerste plaats', *AD*, 12/9/1991; Geerlings, 'Hamlet van Dirk Tanghe geloofwaardig theater', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 17/9/1991; Janssen, 'Tanghes Hamlet is een feest vol diepgang en plezier', *Volkskrant*, 17/9/1991; Nijssen, 'Ze zijn de spiegel en de kroniek van hun tijd', *PZC*, 3/10/1991; Bobkova, 'Onvergetelijke Hamlet van Dirk Tanghe', *Financieel Dagblad*, 2/12/1991; Verbeeten, 'Eigenwijs en recht-toe-recht-aan', *Gelderlander*, 18/9/1991; Liefhebber, 'Aardse Hamlet op mensenmaat', *Telegraaf*, 16/9/1991; Freriks, 'Dirk Tanghe encenseert een buitenkant en mist de ziel', *NRC Handelsblad*, 16/9/1991; Hellinga, 'Hamlet' meeslepend als een clip en een verwarrende 'Tartuffe', *Vrij Nederland*, 2/10/1991

1992 ♦

The New Triad Theatre Company

Opening night: 5/2/1992, Theater Zuidplein, Rotterdam

Rosencrantz & Guildenstern are dead

Country of origin: Great-Britain

Directed by John Strehlow

Author: Tom Stoppard

Cast: Debbie Radcliffe and others

1992 ♦

ELS theater

Opening night: 6/3/1992, Amphitheater, Amsterdam

Rosencrantz & Guildenstern zijn dood

Author: Tom Stoppard

Directed by Jochem van der Put

Translation: not stated, presumably by Bert Voeten

Dramaturgy: Mia Meijer

Scenography: Jochem van der Putt / Costumes: Jochem van der Putt / Video: Wineke van Muiswinkel / Production: André Bos / Photography: Gijs Haak / Light: Jos ten Brink

Cast: Bram Bart / Job Redelaar / Wimie Wilhelm

1992

Hogeschool voor de Kunsten Arnhem

Opening night: 12 June, Pebrem-gebouwtje Arnhem

Ophelia & Hamlet

Discipline: Student theatre

Adapted by: Manja Topper, Kuno Bakker

Cast: Manja Topper, Kuno Bakker

1992

Itim Theatre Ensemble

Opening night: 23 June, Theater Bellevue Amsterdam (Holland Festival 1992)

Country of origin: Israël

Directed by Rina Yerushalmi

Translation by Avraham Shlonksi

Reviews: TIN; Loes Gompes, 'Wachten op de messias : een queeste naar het Israëlish theater', *Toneel Theatraal*: Jrg. 113, Nr. 6 (June 1992)

1992

Grand Theatre Producties

Opening night: 30 November, Grand Theatre Groningen

Hamletmachine / Hartstuk

Directed by Peter H. Propstra
Author: Heiner Müller
Translation by Marcel Otten

Cast: Koos Kregel / Ron van Lente / Rina Sikkema

197

Set design by Peter H. Propstra / Costumes by Peter H. Propstra / Light: André Pronk /
Sound: André Pronk / Photography by Wessel van der Heijden

1992

De Zweedse Sokjes

Opening night: 23 December, Polanentheater Amsterdam

Discipline: Youth theatre

Directed by Yardeen Roos

Adapted by Hans Keijzer and Yardeen Roos

Cast: Hamlet: Hans Keijzer / Claudius: Petra Morel / Gertrude: Petra Morel (d) / Polonius:
Hans Keijzer (d) / Laertes: Hans Keijzer (d) and Petra Morel (d) / Ophelia: Petra Morel (d)
/ Horatio: Petra Morel (d)

Set design by Ben Huisink / Costumes by Hiltje Huisink (assistant: Riny Janssen) / Light:
Jaap Kramer / Photography by Marco Bakker

Reviews: Dirkmaat-Planting, 'Hans Keijzer brengt Hamlet voor de jeugd', *NRC Handelsblad*,
22/10/1992

1993

Muziektheatergroep Het Verlangen

Opening night: 31 March, Schouwburg Arnhem

Ophelia's Lied

Discipline: Music theatre

Directed by Loes Wouterson, Andrea Fiege

Author: "Ton Theo Smit, naar: William Shakespeare, Tom Stoppard, Luigi Pirandello"

Cast: Hamlet: Wim Bouwens / Laertes: Erik van Soelen / Ophelia: Andrea van Beek / Hora-
tio: Erik van Soelen (d)

Set design by Marianne Burgers / Costumes by Annelies de Ridder / Make-up by Astrid
Stortelder / Hair dresser: Astrid Stortelder / Light: Wilbo Kouwenhoven / Sound: Joep Everts
/ Music: Johannes Brahms, executed by Erik van Soelen (piano) / Photography by Wim de
Knegt

Reviews: TIN

1993

Hogeschool Eindhoven

Opening night: 6 May, THeks Tilburg

Discipline: student theatre

Directed by Anita Uitdehaag, Minou Bosua

Cast: Minou Bosua

1993

Amsterdamse Hogeschool voor de Kunsten

Opening night: 13 June, De Engelenbak Amsterdam.
(Internationaal Theaterschool Festival 1993)

Discipline: student theatre
 Directed by Henk Jansen
 Authors: William Shakespeare, Ischa Meijer, Irene Scheltes

Cast: Toneelgroep Europa

Set design by Alexander van der Woel, Johan van der Woel / Costumes by Ina Alberts

1993

Koninklijk Vlaams Conservatorium

Opening night: 16 June, De Brakke Grond Amsterdam
 (Internationaal Theaterschool Festival 1993)

Country of origin: Belgium

Discipline: student theatre

Directed by Jan Joris Lamers

Cast: Inge Büscher / Dietrich Muylaert / Benjamin Verdonck / Luc Nuyens / Robby Cleiren
 / Sara de Bosschere / Tom van Dijck

1993

Clay Martin's Puppettheatre

Opening night: 2 July, Drukkerij Geuze Dordrecht (Internationaal Micro Festival 1993)

Country of origin: United States of America

Discipline: puppet theatre

Cast: Clay Martin

1993

Opening night: 14 August 1993, Horst (Limburgs Straattheater Festival 1993)

Country of origin: Russia

Shakespeare's Hamlet

Discipline: Mime, street theatre

Cast: Michail Vertlin

1993

Glej Theatre

Opening night: 21 August, Stadsschouwburg Eindhoven
 (Eindhoven Festival 1993)

Country of origin: Slovenia

Hamlets N' Roses

Discipline: Dance

1993

Het Zuidelijk Toneel. Antwerpen 1993 Culturele Hoofdstad van Europa

Opening night: 4 September, Stadsschouwburg Eindhoven (Eindhoven Festival 1993)

(Belgian opening night: 12 June, Bourschouwburg Antwerpen; other known performances: 10/6-13/6 and 15-19/6/1993, Boerlaschouwburg, Antwerpen; 3/9, Stadsschouwburg, Eindhoven; 6-8/9, Stadsschouwburg, Eindhoven; 9/9 Drachten, De Lawei; 10/9, Tiel De Agnietenhof; 14-17/9, Amsterdam, Stadsschouwburg; 18-19/9, Tilburg, Schouwburg; 22-23/9, Turnhout, De Warande; 24/9, Oss, De Lievekamp; 25/9 Roosendaal, De Kring; 28-29/9 Arnhem, Schouwburg; 30/9 Breda, Concordia Stadsschouwburg; 1-2/10 Breda, Concordia Stadsschouwburg; 4/10, Leuven,

Stadsschouwburg; 5-6/10 Den Bosch, Casino Theater; 7/10 Middelburg, Stadsschouwburg;

8/10 Maastricht, Theater a/h Vrijthof; 9/10 Bergen op Zoom, De Maagd; 12/10 Venlo, De Maaspoort; 13/10 Hoorn; Stadsschouwburg Het Park; 15-17/10 Rotterdam, Schouwburg; 20-23/10, Vooruit Gent; 26-27/10 Brugge; Stadsschouwburg; 28/10, Hasselt, Cultureel Centrum; 29-30/10 Groningen, Stadsschouwburg; 2-3/11, Utrecht, Stadsschouwburg; 5-7/11, The Hague, Koninklijke Schouwburg; 8/11 Nijmegen, Stadsschouwburg; 10/11 Kortrijk Cultureel Centrum; 13, Eindhoven, Stadsschouwburg

Directed by Ivo van Hove

Dramaturgy: Klaas Tindemans

Translation by Bert Voeten

Adapted by Klaas Tindemans and Ivo van Hove

Cast: Hamlet: Bart Slegers / Claudius: Willem Nijholt / Ghost: Adrian Brine / Gertrude: Viviane de Muynck / Polonius: Henk van Ulsen / Laertes: Erik de Visser / Ophelia: Loes Wouterson / Horatio: Peter van den Eede / Rosencrantz: Rafaël Troch / Guildenstern: René Eljon / Fortinbras: Michael Pas - Antonie Kamerling / Voltimand: Fons Merkies / Cornelius: Laus Steenbeeke / Marcellus: Laus Steenbeeke (d) / Barnardo: Fons Merkies (d) / Francisco: Pol Pauwels / Osric: Pol Pauwels (d) / Players: Frank Focketyn, Dirk Tuypens, Steven van Watermeulen (Cie. de Koe) / Gravedigger: Fred Vaassen / Gravedigger's companion: Fons Merkies (d) / Priest: Laus Steenbeeke (d) / Captain: Pol Pauwels (d)

Directors play-within-the-play: Cie. de Koe / Assistant director: Jan Peter Gerrits / Production: Gert Meijer / Production assistant: Simone Scholts / Set design by Jan Versweyveld / Assistant set designer: Jan Ros, Bart de Sitter / Costumes by Jan Versweyveld, Tessa Lute / Assistant costumer: Frank Willems van Dijk, Nel van Espen / Make-up by Willem Rutgers / Hair dresser: Willem Rutgers / Light: Jan Versweyveld / Photography by Keoon

Reviews: Hein Jansen: 'Tussen pret en doodsangst : Hamlet en Othello', *Nederland Toneel* : Nr. 5 (1993), pp. 8-9; Joost van Krieken: 'Loslaten en opnieuw beginnen. Van Ulsen en modern toneel', *Toneel Theatraal* : Jrg. 114, Nr. 10 (1993), pp. 8-11; Eddie Vaes, 'Onze tijd is uit zijn voegen. De Hamlet van het Zuidelijk Toneel.', *Excetera* : Jrg. 11, Nr. 43 (1994), pp. 44-45; Bobkova, 'Hamlet. Een lamlendige, bezeten en spottende [...]', *Financieel Dagblad*, 4/10/1993; Kottman, 'Regievondsten hinderen het meeslepende spel in Hamlet', *NRC Handelsblad*, 15/6/1993; Blik, 'Hamlet wil geen meeslepend drama worden', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 15/6/1993; Liefhebber, 'Hamlet als zwetser, een romp z[...]', *Telegraaf*, 14/6/1993; Schouten, 'Een Hamlet met de diepte van een televisie-spot', *Volkskrant*, 14/6/1993; Verbeeten, 'Een jongen die eisen leert stellen', *Gelderlander*, 14/6/1993; Bresser, 'Hamlet als botsauto', *Elsevier*, 19/6/1993; Oranje, 'Prachtig theatrale 'Hamlet' bij Het Zuidelijk Toneel', *Trouw*, 16/6/1993; Somers, 'De Koe mag Hamlet eens flink verstoren', *Het Parool*, 14/9/1993; Blom, 'Zuidelijke Hamlet als aflevering van Wrekers', 10/9/1993; Hellinga, 'Shakespeare is meedogenloos voor regisseur Ivo van Hove', *Vrij Nederland*, 11/9/1993; Geerlings, 'Bert Slegers' Hamlet is gerijpt', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 29/10/1993; Verpaalen, 'De dood weer deel van het leven in Van Hove's Hamlet', *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 3/9/1993; Liefhebber, 'Hamlet' zonder geblaas en dus méér wol', *Telegraaf*, 6/9/1993; Jansma, 'Ten Hove's Hamlet blijft lappendeken', *Haagsche Courant*, 6/9/1993; Snel, 'Afscheid nemen', *Magazijn*, 228, 10/1993; Van der Velden, 'Een Hamlet die vragen achterlaat', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 7/9/1993; Havens, 'Heldere Hamlet met schoonheidsfouten', *Eindhovens Dagblad*, 14/6/1993; Van den Bergh, 'Hamlet als blaag', *Parool*, 17/6/1993; Zonneveld, 'Hamlet met cliffhanger', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 22/9/1993

1993

Theatre Set-Up

Opening night: 27 September, Nieuwe Kerk Amsterdam
(other known performances: 27/9; 28/9)

Country of origin: United Kingdom

Directed by Wendy MacPhee, co-director Frank Jarvis

Cast: Hamlet: Tony Portacio / Claudius: Iain Armstrong / Ghost: Iain Armstrong (d) / Gertrude: Wendy MacPhee / Polonius: Frank Jarvis / Laertes: Chris Pavlo / Ophelia: Charlotte Ruthven / Horatio: Daniel Hunt / Rosencrantz: Matthew Rixon / Guildenstern: Chris Pavlo (d) / Fortinbras: Matthew Rixon (d) / Marcellus: Matthew Rixon (d) / Barnardo: Chris Pavlo (d) / Francisco: Wendy MacPhee (d) / Osric: Frank Jarvis (d) / Gravedigger: Frank Jarvis (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Charlotte Ruthven (d) / Priest: Matthew Rixon (d)

Set design by Andrew Field (rostrum, chairs), Andrew Fisher (masks, crowns) / Costumes by Wendy MacPhee, David Hughes, Suhaila Manna, Faiza Manna, Gulderun Manna, Eira Mead, Karen Schuck, Lyndsey Brandolese, Charlotte Ruthven, Kevin Philips / Sound: Chris Pavlo / Stage fight: Lindsay Royan, Chris Pavlo, Tony Portacio, Derek Ware / Photography by Michael Gains, Graham Sergeant

Reviews: Oranje, 'Shakespeare in verstilde 'kathedraal'', *Trouw*, 29/9/1993; Somers, 'Hamlets magie in de Nieuwe Kerk', *Parool*, 27/9/1993; Van Gelder, 'Hamlet in de Nieuwe Kerk', *NRC Handelsblad* 20/9/1993

1993

Wolfsmond

Opening night: 26 November, Westergasfabriek Amsterdam
Trilogie: Hamletmachine: Dodendans: Omnibus
Directed by Ramón Gieling
Author: Heiner Müller
Translation by Wolfsmond
Adapted by Wolfsmond

Cast: Hamlet: Xander Straat (Hamletvertolker) / Ophelia: Joy Hoes

Set design by Christien Greven / Costumes by Judith Cortèl / Make-up by Mariël Hoevenaars / Hair dresser: Mariël Hoevenaars / Light: Ramón Gieling, Jaco Vreken / Photography by Christien Greven

1994

Theaterschool

Opening night: 22 April, Schouwburg Casino 's-Hertogenbosch
(Jeugdtheaterfestival Den Bosch 1994)
Shakespeare voor jongen (Laboratorium)
Discipline: youth theatre, student theatre
Directed by Allan Zipson
Note: not clear whether actually *Hamlet* was played

Cast: Baruch Schwartz / Bas Hoeflaak / Sebastiaan Labrie / Tjitske Reidinga / Gustav Borremann / Roeland Fernhout / Ad Knippels / Audrey Langguth / Olaf Pieters / Rutger le Poole / Thekla Reuten / Galassia Riccieri / Léon Roeven / Demme Treurniet

1995

't Gebroed

Opening night: 10 February, Toneelschuur Haarlem
Country of origin: Belgium
Ik heb het gezien
Author: "naar Hamlet"
Directed by Jan Maillard, Stany Crets
Adapted by Jan Maillard

Cast: Hamlet: Jan van Hecke / Claudius: Dimitri Dupont / Gertrude: Chris / Polonius: Luk d'Heu / Ophelia: Antje de Boeck / Horatio: Pieter Embrechts

Production: Martine Raeymakers / Set design by Jan Maillard, Stany Crets / Costumes by Greet Prové / Light: Jan Maillard i.s.m. Stany Crets / Photography by Annemie Augustijns

1995

Stichting Amsterdam Chamber Theatre

Opening night: 28 March, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam

Playing with Shakespeare

Author: "naar: William Shakespeare"

Annotation: Not clear whether they played Hamlet.

Cast: Gráinne E. Delany, Forest Naylor

201

1995

Universiteitstheater

Opening night: 9 May, Universiteitstheater Amsterdam

Hamlets totaal-machinerie

Discipline: student theatre

Directed by Natasja de Vries

Dramaturgy: Erin Coppens

Author: "naar Heiner Müller"

Cast: Hamlet: Cock Dieleman (Hamlet, de schrijver) / Elmar Düren (Hamlet, de acteur) / Ophelia: Eva Fontaine / Other roles: Wiet Tulner, Gabriele Rodrigues Pereira, Carly Mays (achtergrondkoor)

Production: Martien Swart / Set design by Patritia de Vries, Valentijn Fit, Kees van Lent, Jeroen de Nooijer, Luuk Vierhout

1995

La Kei Producties

Opening night: 3 October, Cultureel Centrum De Speeldoos Vught

Willem's Hamlet en Shakespeare's Hamlet

Discipline: music theatre, clownerie

Directed by Erik Koningsberger

Concept: Gert den Boer

Dramaturgy: Elsina Jansen

Adaptation by Tom Stoppard

Translation by Daniël Cohen

Cast: Hamlet: Gert den Boer / Claudius: Rick Schreuder / Ghost: Marc van Griensven / Gertrude: Burt Lamaker / Polonius: Louis Roeland / Laertes: Marc van Griensven (d) / Ophelia: Burt Lamaker (d) / Horatio: Louis Roeland (d) / Barnardo: Louis Roeland (d) / Francisco: Marc van Griensven (d) / Other roles: Gert den Boer (kikker) (d)

Set design by Arno Bremers, Marieline van Wely / Costumes by Arno Bremers, Marieline van Wely / Make-up by La Kei Producties / Hair dresser: La Kei Producties / Light: Diederik van der Zee / Sound: Diederik van der Zee / Music: La Kei Producties, The Turtles, Led Zeppelin, Franz Schubert, Sheila Chandra, Kate Bush, arrangementen: Rudy Pijfers / Photography by Marc Bolsius

1995

De Gasten Komen i.s.m. Stichting Who Is Afraid of Ballet

Opening night: 6 November, Schouwburg Rotterdam

(other known performances 6/1/1995, 7/11/1995, Rotterdamse Schouwburg; 8-

11/11/1995, 14/11-18/11/1995, Felix Meritis Amsterdam; 10/12/1995, Effenaar Eindhoven)

Hamletmaschine

Discipline: theatre and dance

Directed by Henri van Zanten

Author: Heiner Müller

Cast: Dina Ed Dik, Jan Zobel

Choreography: Jan Zobel

1996

Onafhankelijk Toneel

Opening night: 24 January, Schouwburg Rotterdam

(other known performances: 18/1, De Meerse Hoofddorp; 23-25/1, Rotterdamse Schouwburg Rotterdam; 30-31/1, De Toneelschuur Haarlem; 2-3/2, Theater a/h Spui, The Hague; 5/2, Stadsschouwburg Maastricht; 6/2, Schouwburg Utrecht; 7/2, Stadstheater Zoetermeer; 15-17/2, Grand Theater Groningen; 21-29/2 and 1-2/3, De Brakke Grond Amsterdam)

Discipline: modern dance, music theatre, opera

Directed by Mirjam Koen

Translation by Mirjam Koen

Adapted by Mirjam Koen

Cast: Hamlet: John Taylor / Claudius: Robert-John van den Dolder / Ghost: Frans Fiselier / Gertrude: Amy Gale / Polonius: Scott Blick / Laertes: Marcelo Evelin / Ophelia: Marie-Josée Joore / Horatio: Ton Lutgerink / Rosencrantz: Juan Kruz Diaz de Garaio / Guildenstern: Gabriëlle Uetz / Osric: Gabriëlle Uetz (d) / Gravedigger: Scott Blick (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Juan Kruz Diaz de Garaio (d)

Set design by Marc Warning / Costumes by Carly Everaert / Light: Paul van Laak / Sound: Peter Gerretsen / Music: Harry de Wit, saxofoon/klarinet: Marco Blauw, trompet/Tibetaanse hoorn Melvin Poore, tuba/Tibetaanse hoorn: Marieke Bakker, cello: René Verbeeck, contrabas Willem Brink, gitaar Tim Satink, percussie Alan Belk, stem Lasca ten Kate, Harry de Wit / Choreography: Ton Lutgerink / Photography by Ben van Duin, Erik Lint, Bas Czerwinski

Reviews: Buijs, 'Hamlet roept soms ontroering op, ondanks te ambitieus concept', *Volkskrant*, 26/1/1996; Van Schaik, 'Onafhankelijk Toneel vertilt zich aan een te ambitieuze Hamlet', *Trouw*, 26/1/1996; Straatman, 'Hamlet als heetgebakerde danser', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 26/1/1996; Geerlings, 'Een Hamlet van grote allure', *Algemeen Dagblad* 26/1/1996; Hellmann, 'Het vermogen van de tekst in Hamlet', *NRC Handelsblad* 25/1/1996; Bijkerk, 'Mooie Hamlet, dankzij Shakespeare', *Rotterdams Dagblad*, 25/1/1996; Van den Bergh, 'Hamlet rommelig allegaartje', *Parool*, 26/1/1996; Baart, 'Dansopera Hamlet ondanks gebreken toch indringend', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 26/1/1996

1996

Fryske Toaniel Stifting Tryater

Opening night: 1 March, Sociaal Cultureel Centrum De Lawei Drachten

Hamlet Prins fan Denemarken

Directed by Jos Thie

Translation by Bouke Oldenhof into Frisian

Adapted by Bouke Oldenhof

Cast: Hamlet: Hilbert Dijkstra / Claudius: Jan Arendz / Ghost: Marcel Faber / Gertrude: Klaasje Postma / Polonius: Romke Toering / Laertes: Marcel Faber (d) / Ophelia: Tamara Schoppert / Horatio: Pieter Stellingwerf / Rosencrantz: Sikke van der Vaart

/ Guildenstern: Marcel Faber (d) / Fortinbras: Sikke van der Vaart (d) / Osric: Peter Sijbenga / Players: Jan Arendz (d), Klaasje Postma (d), Tamara Schoppert (d), Romke Toering (d), Marcel Faber (d), Pieter Stellingwerf (d), Sikke van der Vaart (d), Peter Sijbenga (d) / Grave-digger: Romke Toering (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Tamara Schoppert (d) / Priest: Sikke van der Vaart (d) / Captain: Pieter Stellingwerf (d)
 Set design by Ghislaine van de Kamp / Costumes by Hadewych ten Berge / Light: Daniël Noest, Henk van der Kooi / Sound: Klaas Ploegh / Music: Peter Sijbenga / Photography by Henk van Dam

1996

Bronks

Opening night: 27 April (Jongerenfestival De Opkomst 1996)

Country of origin: Belgium

Het Hamletmachien

Discipline: youth theatre

Author: Paul Peyskens

Cast: Sara Brewaeyts / Lien Kneepkens / Sofie Segebarth / Tone de Cooman / Bram Smeyers / Bram van Paesschen / Pieter Luypaert / Mout Uyttersprot / David de Decker / Steven van Herreweghe / Kor Caenepeel / Pepijn Caudron

Set design by Michel van Beirendonck

1996

Ex Machina , Le Manege , Hebbel Theater , KunstenFESTIVALdesArts , Helsinki Festival , Internationalen Kulturfabrik Kampnagel

Opening night: 26 September, Schouwburg Rotterdam (R96 De Nieuwe Verleiding 1996)

Country of origin: Canada

Elsinore

Directed by Robert Lepage

Adapted by Robert Lepage

Cast: Robert Lepage / Pierre Bernier

Set design by Carl Fillion / Props: Manon Desmarais / Multimedia: Jacques Collin / Wigs: Rachel Tremblay / Light: Alain Lortie, Nancy Mongrain / Music: Robert Caux

1996

Huis aan de Amstel

Opening night: 26 October, Jeugdtheater De Krakeling Amsterdam

(Kinderfestival DeBuut 1996)

(other known performances: 20/10, Stadsschouwburg Nijmegen; 21/10,

Stadsschouwburg Arnhem; 24-26/10, De Krakeling Amsterdam; 1/11, Vlissingen Arsenaal-theater; 3/11, Schouwburg Rotterdam; 8-9/11, Toneelschuur Haarlem; 13/11, Theater a/d Parade Den Bosch; 17/11, Stadsschouwburg Arnhem; 23/11, CC De Stoep Spijkenisse; 24/11, CC De Werf Aalst (B); 1/12, De Blauwe Zaal Utrecht; 4/12, De Kunstmin Dor-drecht; 7/12, Theater Markant Uden; 8/12, CC De Velinkx Tongeren (B); 12/12, Stadsschouwburg Tilburg; 13/12, Leidse Schouwburg; 14/12, De Krakeling Amsterdam; 15/12, Chassétheater Breda; 22/12, Stadsschouwburg Groningen)

Discipline: youth theatre

Directed by Liesbeth Coltof

Translation by Carel Alphenaar

Adapted by Carel Alphenaar

Cast: Hamlet: Peter van Heeringen / Claudius: Adri Overbeek / Ghost: Thomas Coltof / Gertrude: Julia Henneman / Polonius: Har Smeets / Laertes: Koen Jantzen / Ophelia: Tessa du Mée / Horatio: Kyra Macco

Set design by Liesbeth Coltof, Tryntsje Bakkum, Thomas Coltof, ROMA / Costumes by Tryntsje Bakkum. Executed by Marianka Halters / Make-up by Atelier Sjoerd Didden, Sjoerd Didden, Harold Mertens / Hair dresser: Atelier Sjoerd Didden, Sjoerd Didden, Harold Mertens / Light: Henk van der Geest / Sound: Ton van Riesen / Stage fight: Ger Visser / Weaponry: Henk Hortentius / Photography by Sanne Peper

Reviews: Twaalfhoven, 'Een Hamlet dicht bij', *Trouw*, 5/11/1996; Zonneveld, 'Hamlet schuift met het meubilair', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 30/10/1996; Van der Jagt, 'Serieuze Hamlet in bont spektakel', *Volkskrant*, 31/10/1996; Rooyackers, 'Hamlet kijken met walk-man op', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 11/11/1996; Eiselin, 'Een actuele Hamlet voor kinderen', *NRC*, 30/10/1996

1997

Huis aan de Werf Productie, i.s.m. Stichting Growing Up in Public

Opening night: 24 May, UTD Loods Maarssen.

(Jongerenfestival De Opkomst 1997, Festival aan de Werf 1997)

Directed by Jeroen Kriek

Adapted by Jeroen Kriek

Cast: Hamlet: Niels Horeman / Claudius: Sal Kroonenberg / Gertrude: Andrea ter Avest / Polonius: Paul van Soest / Laertes: Henk Huisman / Ophelia: Liesje Knobel / Horatio: Job Raaijmakers / Rosencrantz: Aafke Buringh / Guildenstern: Onyema Onwuka

Production: Mirjam Jesse / Set design by Marianne Burgers / Light: Quirijn Smits / Sound: Quirijn Smits / Photography by Gijs Haak

1997

Alley Theatre, Change Performing Arts

Opening night: 28 June, Het Muziektheater Amsterdam (Holland Festival 1997)

(other known performance: 30/6/1997 Muziektheater Amsterdam)

Country of origin: United States of America, Italy

Hamlet A Monologue

Directed by Robert Wilson

Cast: Robert Wilson

Costumes by Frida Parmeggiani / Light: Robert Wilson, Andreas Fuchs / Music: Hans Peter Kuhn / Photography by T. Charles Erickson

Reviews: Oranje, 'Hamlet, een ijdele monoloog', *Trouw* 30/6/1997; Geerlings, 'Wilson kan ook toveren als acteur', 30/6/1997; Somers, 'Technisch perfect, dat wel', *Parool*, 30/6/1997; Straatman, 'Wilsons Hamlet is gladgeslepen stuk graniet', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 30/6/1997; Liefhebber, 'Bob Wilson zie je niet over 't hoofd', *Telegraaf*, 23/6/1997; Kottman, 'Wilson ontroert met Hamlet-verhaal', *NRC Handelsblad*, 30/6/1997; Buijs, 'Wilson fascinerende Hamlet wanneer hij traag beweegt', *Volkskrant*, 30/6/1997; Oster, 'Het syndroom van Oster', *HP*, 11/7/1997

1997

La Kei Producties

Opening night: 11 July, De Luxe, Zuiderpark The Hague.

Reizend Festival De Parade 1997, Internationaal Straattheater Festival Noordwijk 1999

Hamlet, de verkorte versie

Directed by Erik Koningsberger

Author: William Shakespeare, Tom Stoppard

Cast: Hamlet: Gert den Boer / Claudius: Rick Schreuder / Ghost: Stefan Papp / Gertrude: Burt Lamaker / Polonius: Wim Brok / Laertes: Stefan Papp (d) / Ophelia: Burt Lamaker (d) / Horatio: Wim Brok (d) / Barnardo: Wim Brok (d) / Francisco: Stefan Papp (d) / Players: Burt Lamaker (d), Wim Brok (d), Manuel Segond von Banchet / Gravedigger: Wim Brok (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Manel Segond von Banchet (d) / Other roles: Zeeman: Rick Schreuder (d), Burt Lamaker (d), Manuel Segond von Banchet (d); Kikker: Gert den Boer (d); Moeder: Gert den Boer (d); Shakespeare: Burt Lamaker (d)

Set design by Marieline van Wely / Costumes by Marieline van Wely / Light: Erik Koningsberger / Music: Franz Schubert, Led Zeppelin / Guitar: Rick Schreuder / Percussion/flute: Stefan Papp / Guitar/melodica: Gert den Boer

1997

Onafhankelijk Toneel

Opening night: 15 September, Studio's Onafhankelijk Toneel Rotterdam

Discipline: modern dance, music theatre, opera

Directed by Mirjam Koen

Translation by Mirjam Koen

Adapted by Mirjam Koen

Note: revised version of 1996

Cast: Hamlet: John Taylor / Claudius: André Gingras / Ghost: Frans Fiselier / Gertrude: Amy Gale / Polonius: Scott Blick / Laertes: Marcelo Evelin / Ophelia: Marie-Josée Joore / Horatio: Andreas Denk / Rosencrantz: Wiebe Gotink / Guildenstern: Richard Zook / Osric: Wiebe Gotink / Gravedigger: Scott Blick (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Richard Zook (d)

Production: Tineke Verheij / Set design by Marc Warning / Costumes by Carly Everaert / Light: Paul van Laak / Sound: Peter Gerretsen / Music: Harry de Wit / Musicians: Harry de Wit, Frans Fiselier, Scott Blick, Richard Zook, Marie-Josée Joore, Wiebe Gotink / Choreography: Ton Lutgerink / Photography by Ben van Duin, Erik Lint, Bas Czerwinski

Reviews: Bots, 'Onafhankelijk Toneel, een intrigerende symbiose', *Carnet*, June/July 1998

1997

Stichting Theater De Regentes

17 October, De vuilverbranding The Hague

Directed by Guusje Eijbers

Dramaturgy: Rob Scholten

Adapted by Guusje Eijbers and Rob van Dalen

Cast: Hamlet: Bing Wiersma / Claudius: Bart Poulissen / Ghost: Herman Schartman, David Vos, Wim Gerritsen / Gertrude: Caroline Beukman / Polonius: Piet van der Pas / Laertes: Ramses Graus / Ophelia: Maja van den Broecke / Horatio: Rogier Philipoom / Rosencrantz: Paulien Scholtens / Guildenstern: Liëla Rigter / Osric: Anke Engels, Sandra den Dulk / Players: Anke Engels (d), Sandra den Dulk (d), Ramses Graus (d) / Gravedigger: Piet van der Pas (d)

Set design by Evert Crols / Costumes by Judith Cortèl / Make-up by Dienneke Pel / Hair dresser: Dienneke Pel / Light: Rian Brak / Sound: Rian Brak / Choreography: Martino Müller / Photography by Peter van Oosterhout

1997

Huis aan de Amstel

Opening night: 1 October, Schouwburg Zaandam

(other known performances: 3/10/1997, De Vest Alkmaar; 4/10, De Krakeling Amsterdam; 10/10, Schouwburg Enschede; 15/10, Schouwburg Sittard; 17/10, Schouwburg Heerlen;

19/10, Figitheater Zeist; 22/10, Schouwburg Apeldoorn; 23/10, CC De Bussel Oosterhout; 24/10, De Muzeval Emmen; 31/10, Odeon Zwolle; 6/11, De Leeuwenbrug Deventer; 7/11, Munttheater Weert; 12/11, Schouwburg Utrecht; 14/11, Posthuis theater Heerenveen; 16/11, De Metropole Almere; 21/11, De Lawei Drachten; 23/11, De Veste Delft; 27-29/11, De Krakeling Amsterdam)

Discipline: youth theatre
Directed by Liesbeth Coltof
Translation by Carel Alphenaar
Adapted by Carel Alphenaar

Cast: Hamlet: Peter van Heeringen / Claudius: Adri Overbeeke / Ghost: Thomas Coltof / Gertrude: Tessa du Mée / Polonius: Roel Adam / Laertes: Stefan Louman / Ophelia: Kyra Macco / Horatio: Martijn Fischer

Set design by Liesbeth Coltof, Tryntsje Bakkum, Thomas Coltof / Costumes by Tryntsje Bakkum. Executed by Marianka Halters, Anita Scheurwater / Make-up by Atelier Sjoerd Didden, Sjoerd Didden, Harold Mertens / Hair dresser: Atelier Sjoerd Didden/Harold Mertens / Light: Henk van der Geest / Stage fight: Ger Visser / Photography by Sanne Peper

1997

De Gasten Komen

Opening night: 6 November, Nighttown Rotterdam
M.C. Wisecrack / Support Act Hamlet
Discipline: music theatre, performance art
Directed by Henri van Zanten
Concept: Henri van Zanten
Dramaturgy: Henri van Zanten
Authors: William Shakespeare, M.C. Wisecrack
Adapted by: Henri van Zanten

Cast: Hamlet: Henri van Zanten (Hamlet/M.C. Wisecrack) / Gertrude: Ruth Moreno Esparza / Ophelia: Milena Fehér

Set design by Henri van Zanten, P.G. d'Angelino Tap / Costumes by Chris Heijens / Light: Niko van der Klugt / Sound: Andries de Marez Oyens / Music: Andries de Marez Oyens, Lucid Terror / Choreography: Milena Fehér / Mimography: Henri van Zanten / Photography by Stefan Heydendael

1997

De Trust

Opening night: 23 December, Trusttheater Amsterdam (Het Theaterfestival 1998)
Directed by Theu Boermans
Dramaturgy: Rezy Schumacher, Dorine Cremers
Adapted by Theu Boermans

Cast: Hamlet: Jacob Derwig / Claudius: Jaap Spijkers / Ghost: Jappe Claes / Gertrude: Anneke Blok / Polonius: Harry van Rijthoven / Laertes: Waldemar Torenstra / Ophelia: Halina Reijn / Horatio: Harpert Michielsen / Rosencrantz: Tijn Docter / Guildenstern: Vincent Moes / Fortinbras: Robin van der Velden / Voltimand: Bert Geurkink / Osric: Mike Reus / Reynaldo: Daan Schuurmans / Players: Bert Geurkink (d) / Gravedigger: Jappe Claes (d) / Other roles: Jeroen van Koningsbrugge, Stefan Rokebrand, Désirée Snackey, David Bernard, Manon Ebens, Elles de Bont, Emar van Geest, e.a.

Production: Edith den Hamer, Jolanda van Dijk / Set design by Marlène Willemsen, Carolien Broersen / Costumes by Catherine Cuykens / Make-up by Pilo Pilkens / Hair dresser:

Pilo Pilkens / Light: Henk van der Geest / Stage fight: Jeroen Lopes Cardozo / Photography by Raymond Mallentjer

Reviews: Van den Bergh, 'Superieure Hamlet in anonieme lounge', *Het Parool*, 29/12/1997; Zonneveld, 'Hamlet, tijdgenoot? (1)', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 21/1/1998; Zonneveld, 'Hamlet, tijdgenoot? (2)', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 28/1/1998; Geerling, 'Hamlet voor iedereen', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 30-12-1997; Smith, 'Eigentijdse Hamlet stelt kernvraag van opstandige jongeren', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 31/12/1997; Smith, 'Hamlet als opstandige jongere van nu', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 27/12/1997; Schaap, 'Hamlet als generatieconflict', *Algemeen Dagblad*; Kottman, 'De Trust speelt geactualiseerde Hamlet. Een mooie triomf van psychologisch theater', *NRC Handelsblad*, 24/12/1997; Liefhebber, 'Knisperende Hamlet bij De Trust', *De Telegraaf*, 30/12/1997; Oranje, 'Gelukkig blijft ook de Hamlet van Jacob Derwig ongrijpbaar', *Trouw*, 27/12/1997; Anthonissen, 'Een Hamlet met vele regisseurs. Shakespeare luidt koerswijziging in bij De Trust', *De Morgen*, 29/12/1997; 'Hamlet van De Trust wint prijs Theaterfestival', *Volkskrant*, 14/9/1998; Verreck, 'En dan tenslotte: alle ballen verzamelen', *Parool*, 11/9/1998; 'Over Hamlet gesproken', *HP*, 16/10/1998; Hellinga, 'De oerkracht van Hamlet', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 3/1/1998; Bobkova, 'Nietsonziende beeld dwang. Trust schitterend in belangwekkende Hamlet', *Financieel Dagblad*, 2/2/1998; Prinssen, 'Jacob Derwig overtuigt in rol der rollen. Onevenwichtige Hamlet bij De Trust', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 24/12/1997; 'Een puber van alle tijden', *HP*, 2/1/1998

207

1998

Maatschappij Discordia

Opening night: 17 December, Monty Antwerpen (Belgium)

Hamlet scène

Directed by Maatschappij Discordia

Dramaturgy: Maatschappij Discordia

Translation by Bert Voeten, L.A.J. Burgersdijk, Jan Joris Lamers

Adapted by Jan Joris Lamers

Cast: Hamlet: Jorn Heijdenrijk / Polonius: Annet Kouwenhoven / Rosencrantz: Matthias de Koning / Guildenstern: Maarten Boegborn / Players: Jan Joris Lamers

Set design by Maatschappij Discordia / Costumes by Maatschappij Discordia / Light: Maatschappij Discordia / Sound: Maatschappij Discordia

1999

Stichting Toneelschuur Producties

Opening night: 1 January, Toneelschuur Haarlem

De ongelukkige Hamlet/Boabdil

Discipline: music theatre

Directed by Javier López Piñón

Author: Abdelkader Benali

Note: Based on 'De ongelukkige' by Louis Couperus and 'Hamlet' by William Shakespeare.

Cast: Boabdil, koning van Granada: Sabri Saad el Hamus / Ali, troubadour: Ali Çiftci / Aisja, moeder van Boabdil: Marino Westra / Moraima, echtgenote van Boabdil: Jörgen Tjon A Fong / Isabella van Castilië: Annemarie Wisse

Set design by Rieks Swarte / Hair dresser: Jacqueline Stallmann / Music: Eric Vaarzon Morel, Saskia de Haas / Photography by Ben van Duin

Reviews: Schaap, 'Botsing van culturen rond Oosterse Hamlet', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 4/1/1999; *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 6/1/1999; Alkema, 'Abdelkader Benali zorgt voor mirakels spektakel', *Trouw*, 4/1/1999; *Haarlems Dagblad*, 23/12/1998; *De Standaard*, 22/1/1999; *De Telegraaf*,

1/1/1999; *NRC Handelsblad*, 29/12/1999; *De Telegraaf*, 4/1/1999; *Het Parool*, 29/12/1998; *Trouw*, 31/12/1998; *NRC Handelsblad*, (5/1/1999; *Haarlems Dagblad*, 11/2/1999; *Haarlems Dagblad*, 4/1/1999; *De Volkskrant*, 4/1/1999; *Het Parool*, 4/1/1999

1999

Het Nationale Toneel

Opening night: 1 January, De Regentes The Hague

Directed by Johan Doesburg

Dramaturgy by Martine Manten

Translation by Frank Albers

Cast: Hamlet: Gijs Scholten van Aschat / Claudius: Rik van Uffelen / Gertrude: Wil van Kralingen / Polonius: Johan Ooms / Laertes: René van Zinnicq Bergmann / Ophelia: Angélique de Bruijne / Horatio: Hylke van Sprundel / Rosencrantz: Roelant Radier / Guildenstern: Esgo Heil / Fortinbras: Francis Broekhuysen / Voltimand: Vincent Linthorst / Cornelius: Michiel de Jong / Marcellus: Ids van der Krieke / Barnardo: Francis Broekhuysen (d) / Francisco: Lidewij Benus / Osric: Ids van der Krieke (d) / Players: Jérôme Reehuis (1e toneelspeler), Ids van der Krieke (d), Vincent Linthorst (d), Michiel de Jong (d), Lidewij Benus (d) / Gravedigger: Esgo Heil (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Roelant Radier (d) / Priest: Jérôme Reehuis (d) / Captain: Vincent Linthorst (d), Michiel de Jong (d) / Other roles: Lidewij Benus (hofdame) (d)

Production: Fred van de Schilde / Set design by André Joosten / Costumes by Dinorah Jorio / Light: Reinier Tweebeeke / Stage fight: Jeroen Lopes Cardozo / Photography by Pan Sok

Reviews: Smith, 'Verbetenheid én weifeling bij Hamlet', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 04/01/1999; Jansma, 'Fascinerende Hamlet', spannende thriller', *Haarlems Dagblad*, 05/01/1999; 'Hamlet in het Haagje', *HP/De Tijd*, 08/01/1999; Hellinga, 'Hamlet', *Vrij Nederland*, 20/02/1999; Liefhebber, 'Vormvaste 'Hamlet' bij Nationale Toneel', *De Telegraaf*, 04/01/1999; Oosterhoff, 'Hamlet', *De Volkskrant*, 07/01/1999; Somers, 'Balans zoek op duister Elseneur', *Het Parool*, 04/01/1999; Bobkova, 'Hamlets appèl op het geweten', *Financieele Dagblad*, 16/01/1999; Geerlings, 'Zandbak als familiegraf in Haagse Hamlet', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 04/01/1999; Freriks, 'Omlijst' komt Hamlet beter tot zijn recht', *NRC Handelsblad*, 17/02/1999; Buijs, 'Doesburgs Hamlet dreigt als een natuurramp', *De Volkskrant*, 04/01/1999; Hellinga, 'Nogmaals Hamlet', *Vrij Nederland*, 09/01/1999; Freriks, 'Haagse Hamlet als perpetuum mobile van het noodlot', *NRC Handelsblad* 04/01/1999; Oranje, 'Een zinderende 'Hamlet'', *Trouw*, 04/01/1999; 'Een heer als Hamlet', *HP/De Tijd*, 31/12/1998

1999

Figurentheater Wilde & Vogel

Opening night: 18 June, Schouwburg Kunstmin Dordrecht.

(Internationaal Micro Festival 1999)

Country of origin: Germany

Exit, een Hamletfantasie

Discipline: puppetry

Directed by Frank Soehnle

Concept: Michael Vogel

Cast: Michael Vogel

Music: Charlotte Wilde

1999

Meno Fortas

(in cooperation with La Bâtie, Zürcher Theaterspektakel, Hebbel Theater, Teatro Festival Parma, Aldo Miguel Grompone)

Opening night: 5 October, Stadsschouwburg De Vereniging Nijmegen

Country of origin: Lithuania

Directed by Eimuntas Nekrosius

Cast: Andrius Mamontovas

Reviews: *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 08/10/1999; *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 06/10/1999;
Financieele Dagblad, 06/01/2001

2000

Sint Petersburg Ballet Theater Boris Eifman

Opening night: 20 February, Chassé Theater Breda

Country of origin: Russia

De Russische Hamlet

Discipline: dance

Cast: Tsarina: Walentina Wassiljewa / Paul: Alexandr Melkajew / Favoret: Albert Galitschanin / Nathalia: Alina Solonskaja, Natalia Posdniakowa / Geest: Alexandr Ratschinsky, Andreij Iwanow, Oleg Markow / Tsarina: Jelena Kuzmina, Wera Arbusowa, Igor Markow, Juri Sme-kalow

Set design by Wiatcheslaw Okuniew / Costumes by Wiatcheslaw Okuniew / Music: Lud-wig van Beethoven, Gustav Mahler / Choreography: Boris Eifman

Reviews: *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 10/03/1999; *Het Parool*, 16/03/1999; *NRC Handelsblad*, 11/03/1999; *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 12/03/1999; *De Volkskrant*, 13/03/1999; *De Telegraaf*, 04/03/1999; *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 23/02/2000; *De Telegraaf*, 17/02/2000; *De Volksk-rant*, 24/02/2000; *Het Parool*, 26/02/2000; *De Telegraaf*, 25/02/2000; *NRC Handelsblad*, 28/02/2000; *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 23/02/2000

2000

Huis a/d Werf Productie, Stichting Theater UP

Opening night: 20 May, Huis a/d Werf Utrecht (Festival a/d Werf 2000)

(other known performances: 20-27/5, Huis a/d Werf, Utrecht; 26-30/9, Brakke Grond, Am-sterdam)

Aats Hamlet

Directed by Don Duyns

Concept: Don Duyns

Author: Don Duyns

Cast: Hamlet: Aat Nederlof / Claudius: Chris Vinken / Gertrude: Nelly van den Hoek / Polonius: Alex Klaasen / Ophelia: Carice van Houten / Horatio: Juda Goslinga

Set design by Pieter Tabachnikoff-Smit / Costumes by Helma Miltenburg

Reviews: Bosman en Nauta, 'De tijd is ziek, ik maak haar beter', *Trouw*, 23/05/2000; Somers, 'Aat Nederlof is een gedroomde Hamlet', *Het Parool*, 22/05/2000; Embregts, 'Def P speelt actrice naar de zijlijn', *De Volkskrant*, 24/05/2000; Den Breejen, 'Hamlet is een popster met verf in zijn haar', *Het Parool*, 18/05/2000; Roos, 'Geweldige authenticiteit' and Smith, 'Gevoelig ingekeerde Aat's Hamlet', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 25/05/2000; Hellmann, 'Hamlet als popster en een engel in de woestijn', *NRC Handelsblad*, 22/5/2000; Schut, 'Bombast en ontroering in Festival a/d Werf' *Telegraaf*, 22/5/2000

2001

't Barre Land, Kaaithheater

Opening night: 23 January, Theater Kikker Utrecht

(other known performances: 17/1 Kaaithheater Brussel; 23-26/1, Utrecht RASA; 1 -3/2, Gent; 10/2, De Lieve Vrouw Amersfoort; 13-17/2, Brakke Grond Amsterdam)

Hamlet

Directed by Jan Ritsema

Dramaturgy Marianne van Kerkhoven

Translation by Erik Bindervoet, Robbert-Jan Henkes

Cast: Vincent van der Berg / Margijn Bosch / Anoek Driessen / Peter Kolpa / Ingejan Ligthart Schenk / Martijn Nieuwerf / Czeslaw de Wijs

Production by Sanneke van Hassel, Simone Schots and Ellen Walraven / Set design by Herman Sorgeloos and Michiel Jansen / Costumes by Elizabeth Jenyon and Helen van der Vliet / Light: Herman Sorgeloos/ Technique: Luc Schaltin / Photography by Herman Sorgeloos and Margi Geerlinks

Reviews: Janssen, 'Hamlets drama zakt weg in verbaal geweld', *Volkskrant*, 19/01/2001; Somers, 'Polyfone prins raakt de draad kwijt', *Parool*, 19/01/2001; Oranje, 'Zwevende 'Hamlet' is een innemende mislukking', *Trouw*, 25/01/2001; Takken, 'Spannend woordspel in Hamlet voor gevorderden', *NRC Handelsblad*, 24/01/2001; Den Breejen, 'Zijn of niet zijn is geen dilemma', *Parool*, 16/01/2001; Schaap, 'Een Hamlet van taal', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 19/01/2001; Smith, 'Geheel nieuwe benadering van Hamlet', *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 17/01/2001; Veraart, 'Hamlet' *Volkskrant*, 11/01/2001; Evenhuis, "Onze Hamlet is de tijd-geest te slim af" *Trouw*, 20/01/2001; Liefhebber, 'Hamlet verdwaalt in mist van woorden' *Telegraaf*, 12/02/2001; Van Amerongen, 'Achtenveertig uur Hamlet', *Groene Amsterdammer*, 3/02/2001; Zonneveld, 'Huiverend ritueel' *Groene Amsterdammer*, 17/2/2001; Bobkova, 'Hamlet niet centraal', *Financiële Dagblad*, 10/03/2001; TvdB, 'Nieuwe Hamlet-vertaling', *VPRO-gids*, 25/1/2001; Nico de Boer, 'Komrij "bekt" niet lekker', *Noord-Hollands Dagblad*, 1/3/2001

2001

Amsterdamse Toneelschool&Kleinkunstacademie

Opening night: 11 May, Theaterschool Amsterdam

De Hamletmachine

Discipline: student theatre

Directed by Mark Colijn

Dramaturgy: Gerardjan Rijnders

Author: Heiner Müller

Translation by Marcel Otten

Cast: Fred Greebe / Joppe van Hulzen / Kim van Kooten / Sytze van der Meer

Production: Ben Hansen / Light: Ton Davids

2001

Stichting Toneelschuur Producties, Artery i.s.m. Dreamthinkspeak

Opening night: 6 June, Toneelschuur Haarlem

Who Goes There?

Country of origin: United Kingdom

Directed by Henk Schut, Tristan Sharps

Author: "naar William Shakespeare"

Cast: Hamlet: Angus Hubbard / Claudius: Tristan Sharps / Ghost: David Jarvis / Gertrude:

Joanne Howarth / Polonius: Neil Salvage / Laertes: Ralf Higgins / Ophelia: Nicola Barber

Light: Stichting Toneelschuur Producties / Soundscape: Ted van Leeuwen

Reviews: *De Volkskrant*, 8/6/2001

2001

Krzysztof Warlikowski

Opening night: 28 June, Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam (Holland Festival 2001)

Country of origin: Poland

Directed by Krzysztof Warlikowski

Translation by Stanislaw Baranczak

Cast: Jacek Poniedzialek / Marek Kalita / Mirosław Zbrojewicz / Omar Sangare / Adam Woronowicz / Maria Seweryn / Jolanta Frąszyńska / Robert Kosinski / Robert Wieckiewicz / Piotr Mostafa

Set design by Małgorzata Szczęśniak / Music: Pavel Mykietyn / Musicians: Pavel Kykietyn / Monika Szulinska / Ewa Kowalweska / Jakub Rutkowski / Choreography: Saar Magal

Reviews: *Het Parool*, 29/06/2001; *Trouw*, 30/06/2001; *De Telegraaf*, 02/07/2001; *Het Parool*, 28/06/2001

2001

Het Toneelhuis

Opening night: 15 February, Theater aan het Vrijthof, Maastricht (Het Theaterfestival 2001)

(Belgian opening night: 2 February, Bourlaschouwburg, Antwerpen (Belgium); other known performances: 2,3,4,6-10/2, 24/3, Antwerpen Bourlaschouwburg, 16-17/2, Rotterdamse Schouwburg, 27/2, Haarlemse Schouwburg, 28/2, Stadsschouwburg Utrecht)

Country of origin: Belgium

Amlett

Directed by Jan Decorte

Dramaturgy: Kurt Melens

Author: William Shakespeare

Adapted by Jan Decorte

Cast: Hamlet: Jan Decorte (Amlett) / Claudius: Koen de Bouw (King) / Ghost: Koen de Bouw (Etspook) (d) / Gertrude: Sigrid Vinks (Queen) (d) / Polonius: Denise Zimmermann / Laertes: Eva Schram / Ophelia: Charlotte vanden Eynde (Ophélie) / Natali Broods / Other roles: Jan van Hecke (Denene), Sumalin Gijsbregts (Denandere)

Production: Mien Muys / Set design by Jan Decorte, Johan Daenen, Jus Juchtmans / Costumes by Jan Decorte, Sigrid Vinks, Sophie d'Hooze / Light: Jan Decorte, Luk Perceval, Mark van Denesse / Photography by Herman Sorgeloos, Dimitri van Zeebroeck

Reviews: Oranje, 'Amlett als een schijterd die de zot uithangt', *Trouw*, 29/2/2001

2001

Dwarf

Opening night: 15 September, CKC-Theater Zoetermeer

Directed by Annelene Lintelo

Dramaturgy: Annelene Lintelo

Adapted by Annelene Lintelo

Cast: Hamlet: Nick Mulder / Claudius: Mark Spijkers / Gertrude: José Vuijk / Polonius: Peter Lintelo / Laertes: Ivo Brandt / Ophelia: Renate Mamber / Rosencrantz: Peter Sterke / Guildenstern: Ivo Brandt / Players: Mark Spijkers (d), José Vuijk (d), Nick Mulder (d), Ivo Brandt (d), Renate Mamber (d), Peter Lintelo (d), Peter Sterke (d) / Gravedigger: Peter Lintelo (d) / Gravedigger's companion: Peter Sterke (d) / Other roles: Leger: Mark Spijkers (d), José Vuijk (d), Nick Mulder (d), Ivo Brandt (d), Renate Mamber (d), Peter Lintelo (d), Peter Sterke (d)

Set design by Leni Lintelo / Costumes by Leni Lintelo / Light: Roel Wijnands / Sound: Edu Metz / Music: Nick Mulder

Select bibliography

- Aaltonen, Sirkku, *Time-Sharing on Stage: Drama translation in Theatre and Society*. (Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 2000).
- Adamson, Sylvia, 'The grand style' In: S. Adamson, L. Hunter, L. Magnusson, A. Thompson and K. Wales (eds.), *Reading Shakespeare's Dramatic Language. A Guide*. (London, Arden, 2001).
- Addenbrook, David, *The Royal Shakespeare Company: The Peter Hall Years* (London, Kimber, 1974).
- Albach, Ben, *Het huis op het plein. Heden & verleden van de Amsterdamse Stadsschouwburg* (Amsterdam, Stadsdrukkerij van Amsterdam, 1957).
- Albers, Frank, *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaald, bewerkt en ingeleid door Frank Albers* (Amsterdam/Antwerpen, Atlas, 1998).
- Alexander, Nigel, *Poison, Play and Duel* (London, Routledge, 1971).
- Alexander, P. (ed.), *William Shakespeare. The Complete Works* (1951).
- Alphenaar, Carel, *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaling en bewerking Carel Alphenaar. In opdracht van Huis aan de Amstel* (Amsterdam, IT&FB, 1996).
- Amerongen, Martin van, *Vrij Nederland*, 10-1983,
- Anbeek, Ton, e.a. (eds.) *Nederlandse Literatuur na 1830* (Teleac, 1984).
- , *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse literatuur tussen 1885 en 1985* (Amsterdam, Arbeiderspers, 1990).
- Anderman, Gunilla, 'Drama Translation', In Baker, M. (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. (London/New York, Routledge, 1998), pp. 71-74.
- Andric, Dragoslav, 'Das Übersetzen moderner Bühnenwerke und einige Ansichten über das schöpferische Übersetzen im Allgemeinen'. In: I.J. Citroen (ed.), *Ten Years of Translation. Proceedings of the Fourth Congress of the International Federation of Translators, Dubrovnik 1963*. (Oxford, 1967), pp. 79-82.
- Anonymous, 'Eduard Verkade 75 jaar. Magie van het toneel benaderd met analyse' In: *Parool*, 13-6-1953.
- , 'Gerardjan Rijnders.' In: *TM* October 2000, pp. 20-22.
- , 'Vertaler treedt terug na 'hufterig' gedrag' *Trouw* 16-10-2001.
- Armstrong, W.A., 'Actors and theatres' In: *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15 (1964), pp. 191-204.
- Arnold, Stephanie, *The creative spirit. An introduction to theatre* (London/Toronto, Mayfield Publishing Company, 1998, 2001).
- Artaud, Antonin, 'No More Masterpieces' In: Antonin Artaud, *Collected Works, 4* (London, Clader and Boyars, 1968), pp. 56-63.
- Assimakopoulos, Stavros, 'Drama Translation and Relevance' (under review)
- Bakker, Matthijs and Ton Naaijken, 'A Postscript: Fans of Holmes.' In: Kitty M. van Leuven-Zwart and Ton Naaijken (eds.), *Translation Studies. The State of the Art. Proceedings of the First James S Holmes Symposium on Translation Studies*. (Amsterdam/Atlanta, Rodopi, 1991), pp. 193-208.
- Bakker, Matthijs, 'Metasporg en wetenschap: een kwestie van discipline.' In: Dirk Delabastita and Theo Hermans, *Vertalen historisch bezien. Tekst, metatekst, theorie*. (The Hague, Stichting Bibliographia Neerlandica, 1995), pp. 141-162.
- Bassnet-McGuire, Susan, 'Translating Spatial Poetry. An Examination of Theatre Texts in Performance.' In: James Holmes (ed.), *Literature and Translation*. (Leuven, Acco, 1978), pp. 161-176.
- , *Translation Studies*. (London, Methuen, 1980).
- , 'Ways through the Labyrinth. Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts'. In: Hermans, Theo (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. (London, Croon Helm, 1985), pp. 87-102.
- Bassnett, Susan, 'Translating for the Theatre – Textual Complexities'. In: *Essays in Poetics* 15:1 (1990), pp. 71-83.
- , 'The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies'. In: Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere (eds.), *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation* (Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 1992), Topics in Translation 11, pp.123-140.
- Bednarz, Klaus, *Theatralische Aspekte der Dramenübersetzung. Dargestellt am Beispiel der deutschen Übertragungen und Bühnenbearbeitungen der Dramen Anton Cechovs*. (Vienna, 1969).
- Benali, Abdelkader, *De Ongelukkige. Toneel* (Amsterdam, Vassallucci, 1999).
- Benjamin, Walter, 'The Task of the Translator', In: Lawrence Venuti, *Translation Studies Reader* (London and New York, Routledge, 2000), pp. 15-25.
- Bensimon, Paul, 'Présentation' In: *Palimpsestes* 4 (1990), pp. ix-xiii.
- Bergh, Hans van der, *Konstanten in de komedie. Een onderzoek naar komische werking en ervaring*. (Amsterdam, Moussault, 1972).
- Berman, Antoine, 'La retraduction come espace de la traduction' In: *Palimpsestes* 4 (1990), pp. 1-7.

- , *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne* (Paris, Gallimard, 1995).
- , 'Translation and the Trials of the Foreign' (1985), In: Lawrence Venuti, *Translation Studies Reader* (London and New York, Routledge, 2000), pp. 284-5.
- Berry, Cicely, *The Actor and his Text*. (London: Virgin Books, 1987, 1991).
- Berry, Ralph, *On directing Shakespeare* (London, Hamilton, 1989).
- Bindervoet, Erik and Robbert-Jan Henkes, *W. Shakespeare. De tragedie van Hamlet, prins van Denemarken. Geheel opnieuw, compleet en naar de meest gezaghebbende bronnen vertaald door Erik Bindervoet & Robbert-Jan Henkes en op verzoek van velen klassiek geïllustreerd met de tekeningen van vele jaren geleden door Aart Clerckx* (Amsterdam, De Harmonie, 2000).
- , *Finnegancyclopedie* (Amsterdam, Athenaeum-Polak & Van Gennep, 2005).
- Black, Max, 'Metaphor' In: Max Black, *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1962, 1976).
- , 'More about Metaphor', in: Orton, Andrew, (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 19-43.
- Blackmore Evans, G, H. Baker, A. Barton, F. Kermode, H. Levin, H. Smith, M. Edel (eds.), *The Riverside Shakespeare. Second Edition. The complete works*. (Boston/New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997) [referred to as Riverside]
- Blokdijk, Tom, 'Een ingedamde dijkdoorbraak' In: *Toneel Theatraal* (October 1988), pp. 10-13.
- Blom, Onno, *Het fabeldier dat Komrij heet. Schrijversprentenboek* (Den Haag, Letterkundig Museum, 2004).
- Bloom, Harold, *The invention of the human* (London, Fourth Estate, 1999).
- , *Hamlet. Poem Unlimited* (Edinburgh, Canongate, 2003)
- Bobkova, Hana en Dirkje Houtman, "Op elke rol staat: Speel mij". Shakespeare bewerkingen in het afgelopen seizoen' *Theaterjaarboek 1986/1987* (1987), pp. 5-9.
- Bobkova, Hana, 'Het ruimtelijke theater van De Appel' In: Erenstein, Rob, Watze Tiesema, Loes Heijligers (eds.), *Twintig jaar De Appel*, (Amsterdam: Bis, 1991), pp. 12-24.
- , 'De voorstellingen van de Trust' In: Rezy Schumacher and Kikki Stoffels (eds.), *Waar je stappen zet, wordt het grond. De Trust 1988-2000* (Amsterdam, International Theatre & Film Books, 2001), pp. 216-222.
- , 'Er was de vraag naar wat het is om mens te zijn. Het Zuidelijk Toneel en de ontwikkelde speelstijl' In: Dieleman, Cock, Max van Engen and Bart Van den Eynde (eds.) *Het Zuidelijk Toneel 1990 2000* (Amsterdam, International Theatre & Film Books, 2001).
- Boer, H. de, 'Het Hamlet-probleem van Verkade.' In: *Nieuwe Gids*. (1908), pp. 389-421.
- Boermans, Theu, 'Dat was dat' In: Schumacher, Rezy and Kikki Stoffels, *Waar je stappen zet, wordt het grond. De Trust 1988-2000* (Amsterdam, International Theatre & Film Books, 2001), p. 21.
- , De Trust, *Hamlet* [prompt copy, TIN, 1998]
- Boonen, Johan, 'Een stel zachtzinnige aforismen' In: Carel Alphenaar, Rob Erenstein, Jaak van Schoor, Ingrid van der Veken, Eva Cossee (eds.), *De goden van het theater. 22 Nederlandse en Vlaamse toneelschrijvers aan het woord*. Westbroek, Harlekijn Uitgeverij, 1983).
- , *W. Shakespeare: Hamlet. Vertaling: J. Boonen* (Leuven/Amersfoort, Acco, 1991).
- Bordewijk, Cobi, 'Het moderne repertoire' In: Erenstein, Rob, Watze Tiesema, Loes Heijligers (eds.), *Twintig jaar De Appel* (Amsterdam: Bis, 1991), pp. 97-100.
- Bos, Riëks and Hans van Maanen, 'Maatschappelijk engagement wordt uitgangspunt. Toneelbeleid voor en na Tomaat' In: Dennis Meyer (ed.), *Tomaat in perspectief. Theater vernieuwing in de jaren '60 en '70*. (Amsterdam, Theater Instituut Nederland, 1994), pp. 55-67.
- Bots, Pieter, 'Onafhankelijk Toneel, een intrigerende symbiose' In: *Carnet, internationaal theatertijdschrift van Theater Instituut Nederland en het Vlaams Theater Instituut* (June/July 1998).
- Bourdieu, Pierre and J.C. Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. (London and Beverly Hills, Sage, 1977).
- Bradley, A.C., *Shakespearean Tragedy* (London, Macmillan, 1904, 1974).
- Brans, Hans, 'De persoonlijke objectiviteit van Jan Decorte' In: *Toneel Theatraal 106:1* (January 1985)
- Brockett, Oscar G. and Franklin J. Hildy, *History of the Theatre. Ninth edition*. (Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1999, 2002)
- Broeck, Raymond van den, 'The concept of equivalence in translation theory: some critical reflections', in: J.S. Holmes, J. Lambert, R. Van den Broek (eds.), *Literature and Translation. New perspectives in literary studies*. (Leuven, Acco, 1978), pp. 29-47.
- , 'Translating for the Theatre' In: *Linguistica Antwerpiensia* (1986), pp. 96-110.
- Bronzwaer, W. 'De onvertaalbaarheid van het poëtisch icoon' In: *Armada 3* (June 1996), pp. 36-51.

- Brook, Peter *The empty stage*, (London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1971).
- , *Shifting Point*, (New York, 1987).
- Brown, Martin E., 'English Hamlets of the Twentieth Century' In: *Shakespeare Survey* 9 (1956), pp. 16-23.
- Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman, "The pronouns of power and solidarity", in: Fishman, J.A. (ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language*, (The Hague, Mouton, 1968), pp. 252-275.
- Brownlie, Siobhan, 'Investigating explanations of translational phenomena. A case for multiple causality' In: *Target* 15 (2003), 115-152.
- Brisset, Annie, 'Alterity in Translation: An Overview of Theories and Practices' In: Susan Petrilli (ed.), *Translation translation*, (Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 2003), pp. 101-132.
- Brogt, Janine, 'Aantekeningen bij een nieuwe vertaling van Shakespeare's Hamlet' In: *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaald door Gerrit Komrij* (Amsterdam, International Theatre Bookshop/Publicktheater, 1986), pp. 5-15.
- Brommer, Cecile, 'De Trust en de noodzaak om toneel te spelen' In: Rezy Schumacher and Kikki Stoffels, *Waar je stappen zet, wordt het grond. De Trust 1988-2000* (Amsterdam, International Theatre & Film Books, 2001), pp. 224-228.
- Buijs, Marian, 'Een Haagse straatjongen maakt toneel. Johan Doesburgs fascinatie voor de beul als slachtoffer' In: *Toneel Theatraal* 2 (1993), pp. 4-8.
- Burgersdijk, L.A.J., 'Inleiding'. In: *Shakspere's sonnetten (vertaald door Dr. L.A.J. Burgersdijk)*. (Utrecht: J.L. Beijers, 1879), pp. vii-xx. Cit. in 'Burgersdijk over Shakespeares sonnetten' In: Cees Koster, *De Hollandse vertaalmolen. Nederlandse beschouwingen over vertalen, 1820-1885* (The Hague, Stichting Bibliographia Neerlandica, 2002), pp. 116-121.
- , *William Shakespeare. Hamlet Prins van Denemarken. Vertaald en voor het hedendaagsch tooneel bewerkt door Dr. L.A.J. Burgersdijk* ('s Gravenhage, A. Rossing, 1882).
- , *De Werken van William Shakespeare, Vertaald door*. XII vols. (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1884-88)
- , *De complete werken van William Shakespeare in de vertaling van Dr. L.A.J. Burgersdijk. Bewerkt en van een inleiding voorzien door Prof. Dr. F. De Backer, hoogleeraar aan de universiteit te Gent en Dr. G.A. Dudok, privaat-docent aan de Gem. Universiteit te Amsterdam*. (Leiden, 1944, A.W. Sijthoff).
- , *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken. Vertaling Dr. L.A.J. Burgersdijk. Bewerkt door C. Budingh* (Rotterdam, Nationale Uitgeverij, 1964)
- Burke, Peter, *Ik vertaal, dus ik ben. Vertalers en vertalingen in vroegmodern Europa* (Amsterdam/Den Haag, Bert Bakker/Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 2005).
- Bzzzlettin* 269 (October/November 1999).
- Callens, Johan, 'Hoe speelt men Shakespeare' In: *Etcetera* 1 (1983), pp. 2-5.
- Cambon-Van der Werken, M.G. de, *Hamlet, treurspel, gevolgt naar het Fransch, en naar het Engelsch, door M.G. De Cambon. Geb. Van der Werken*. (The Hague, Isaac du Mee, 1779).
- Canaris, Volker, 'Literaturübersetzen aus der Sicht des Theaters.' In: Fritz Nies et al. (eds.), *Ist Literaturübersetzen lernbar?* (Tübingen, Narr, 1989), pp. 63-72.
- Chavannes, Marc, 'Twintig jaar achter de wijde jas van Erik Vos: reis naar het einde van de ziel' In: Erenstein, Rob, Watze Tiesema, Loes Heijligers (eds.), *Twintig jaar De Appel*, (Amsterdam, Bis, 1991), pp. 25-27.
- Chesterman, A., 'From 'is' to 'ought': Laws, norms and strategies in translation studies' In: *Target* 5:1 (1993), pp. 1-20.
- Claes, Paul, *De mot zit in de mythe: Hugo Claus en de oudheid* (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1984).
- Claus, Hugo, *NTG. Hamlet* [prompt copy, TIN, 1983]
- , *Hamlet van William Shakespeare in een bewerking van Pavel Kohout en een vertaling van Hugo Claus* (z.p., Dedalus and Exa, 1986).
- Clemen, Wolfgang, 'The Imagery of Hamlet.' (1951) In: John Jump (ed.), *Shakespeare. Hamlet. A Casebook*. (London, Macmillan, 1968), pp. 64-77.
- Cohn, Ruby, *Modern Shakespeare Offshoots* (New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1976).
- Courteaux, Willy, *William Shakespeare. Verzameld werk. Vertaald en ingeleid door Willy Courteaux*. (Kapellen, Pelckmans, 1987).
- , 'Burgersdijk en de worsteling met Shakespeare', (lecture, typescript in Stadsarchief Deventer, 1988)
- Craig, E. Gordon, *The Art of the Theatre* (Edinburgh-London, 1905).
- Crystal, David, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language (Second Edition)*. (Cambridge, CUP, 1997).
- Dam, Hans van, *Theater in gebruik. Handboek voor toneel*. (Amsterdam/Antwerpen, Atlas, 1996).
- Dawson, Anthony B., *Hamlet*. (Manchester: Manchester U.P., 1995).
- Decorte, Jan, *Portrait de théâtre. 1985-1990*, (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 1991).

- , *amlett* (Antwerpen, Het Toneelhuis, 2000).
- Decreus, F., 'Claus regisseert Thyestes by Toneel Vandaag. Vlaanderen en Artaud' In: R.L. Erenstein, *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1996), pp. 738-743.
- , 'Jan Decorte regisseur King Lear. Dwarse behandeling van het klassieke repertoire. 1983' In: R.L. Erenstein, *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1996), pp. 820-825
- Delabastita, Dirk and Lieven D'Hulst (Eds.), *European Shakespeares. Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1993b).
- Delabastita, Dirk, 'A False Opposition in Translation Studies: Theoretical versus/and Historical Approaches'. In: *Target* 3 (1991), pp. 137-152.
- , *There's a double tongue : an investigation into the translation of Shakespeare's wordplay, with special reference to Hamlet* (Amsterdam/Atlanta, Rodopi, 1993a).
- , 'Hamlet in the Netherlands in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries. The Complexities of the History of Shakespeare's Reception' In: Delabastita, Dirk and Lieven D'Hulst (eds.), *European Shakespeares. Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age. Selected papers from the conference on Shakespeare Translation in the Romantic Age*, Antwerp, (1993c), pp. 219-234.
- , "Shakespeare Translation," in Mona Baker (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (London and New York, Routledge, 1998), pp. 222-26.
- , 'Notes on Shakespeare in Dutch Translation: Historical Perspectives' In: Rui Carvalho Homem and Ton Hoenselaars (eds.), *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century* (Amsterdam/New York, Rodopi, 2004), pp. 99-116.
- Delisle, J. and Judith Woodsworth (eds.) *Translators through history. The emergence of national literatures*. (London/New York, John Benjamins, 1995).
- Dentith, Simon, *Parody. The new critical idiom* (London, New York, Routledge, 2000).
- Déprats, Jean-Michel, 'Translation at the Crossroads of the Past and Present' In: Rui Carvalho Homem and Ton Hoenselaars (eds.), *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century* (Amsterdam/New York, Rodopi, 2004), pp. 65-78.
- Dieleman, Cock, Max van Engen and Bart Van den Eynde (eds.) *Het Zuidelijk Toneel 1990 2000* (Amsterdam, International Theatre & Film Books, 2001).
- Dietsche Warande & Belfort* 6 (December 2000), pp. 685-690 (in the occasion of the *Hamlet* by 't Barre Land).
- Dobson, Michael, 'Shakespeare performances in England' In: *Shakespeare Survey* (2001), p. 182.
- Dollimore, *Political Shakespeare*. (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1985).
- Doorman, Maarten, *De Romantische orde* (Amsterdam, Bert Bakker, 2004).
- Dover Wilson, John, *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's "Hamlet" and the problems of its Transmission*. (Cambridge, 1934).
- Dover Wilson, John, *What happens in Hamlet?* (Cambridge, 1935).
- Dries, L.. van den, 'Première van *Mistero Buffo* in *De Munt: ontgrenzing van het Vlaams-Nederlands theatergebied*.' In: R.L. Erenstein (ed.) e.a., *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden: tien eeuwen drama in Nederland en Vlaanderen* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1996), p. 768-775.
- Duyns, Don, *Theater Up. Aat's Hamlet* [private prompt copy, 2000]
- Edwards, Philip (ed), *Hamlet. Prince of Denmark* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985, 1999) in the series Philip Brockbank (founding ed.), *The New Cambridge Shakespeare* [referred to as Cambridge]
- Eiselt, Marianne G., 'Bühnentexte als Übersetzungsproblem: Georg Büchners Woyzeck'. In: *Babel* 41 (1995)
- Eliot, T.S., 'The opening scene of Hamlet (1951)' In: John Jump (ed.), *Shakespeare. Hamlet. A Casebook*. (London, Macmillan, 1968), pp. 118-121.
- Engen, Max van, '21 oktober 1993. Theu Boermans wordt als artistiek leider van De Trust onderscheiden met de Prins Bernhard Fonds Theater Prijs. De jongste generatie theatermakers.' In: Rob Erenstein en Dirk Coigneau, *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden: tien eeuwen drama en theater in Nederland en Vlaanderen* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1996), p. 866.
- Erenstein, Rob, 'De Appel en de klassieke tragedie', In: Erenstein, Rob, Watzte Tiesema, Loes Heijligers (eds.), *Twintig jaar De Appel*, (Amsterdam, Bis, 1991), pp. 37-40.
- Esslin, Martin, *The Field of Drama: How the signs of drama create meaning on stage and screen*. (London, Methuen, 1987).
- Even-Zohar, Itamar, *Polysystem Studies. Poetics Today* 11:1 (Spring 1990).
- Ewbank, Inga-Stina, 'Shakespeare translation as cultural exchange' In: *Shakespeare Survey* 48 (1995), pp. 1-36.

- Eybers, Guusje and Rob van Dalen, *De Regentes. Hamlet*, [prompt copy, TIN, 1996]
- Fischer-Lichte, Erika, *Bedeutung. Probleme einer semiotischen Hermeneutik und Ästhetik*. (München, 1979).
- , *Soziale und theatralische Konventionen als Problem der Dramenübersetzung* (Tübingen, Narr, 1988).
- Fishlin, Daniël and Mark Fortier, *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present* (Oxford, Taylor & Francis, 2000).
- Foakes, R.A., 'The reception of Hamlet' In: *Shakespeare Survey* 45 (1993), pp. 1-13.
- Fotheringham, Richard, 'The Last Translation. Stage to Audience'. In: Ortrun Zuber-Skerritt, *Page to Stage. Theatre as Translation*. (Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1984), pp. 29-39.
- Frank, Armin Paul, 'Translating and Translated Poetry. The Producer's and the Historian's Perspective' In: Kitty M. Van Leuven-Zwart, and Ton Naaijken (eds.), *Translation Studies. The State of the Art*. (Amsterdam/Atlanta, Rodopi, 1991), pp. 115-140.
- Freriks, Kester, 'Honderd maal Hamlet' In: *Bzzzlettin* 269 (October/November 1999), pp. 35-39.
- Gambier, Yves, 'La retraduction, retour et détournement' In: *Meta* 39:3 (1994), pp. 413-417.
- Gansbeke, Wim van, 'Geen Vlaamse golf maar Hollandse schande' In: *Toneel Theatraal* (February 1989), pp. 22-24.
- , 'Waar is Tsjechov. (Zelf)vernietiging: een repertoire en een registijl.' In: Dieleman, Cock, Max van Engen and Bart Van den Eynde (eds.) *Het Zuidelijk Toneel 1990 2000* (Amsterdam, International Theatre & Film Books, 2001).
- Garvin, Paul L., *The Aesthetics of Language, Prague School Reader on Aesthetics, Literary Structure and Style* (Washington, 1964).
- Geerlings, Eddy, 'Op zoek naar een warm kloppend hartje', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 19-10-1988.
- , 'Staande sterven' In: *Toneel Theatraal* (February 1989), pp. 20-22.
- , 'Ivo van Hove houdt niet van klagen. Grensoverschrijdende kruisbestuivingen bij het Het Zuidelijk Toneel.' In: *Toneel Theatraal* 6 (1993), p. 6-9.
- Genette, Gerard, *Palimpsestes* (Paris, Seuil, 1982).
- Gieling, Lia, 'De Appel. Twintig jaar in vorm: terugblik via direct betrokkenen' In: Erenstein, Rob, Watze Tiesema, Loes Heijligers (eds.), *Twintig jaar De Appel*, (Amsterdam: Bis, 1991), pp. 65-68.
- Glick, Claris, 'Hamlet in the English theater – acting text from Betterton (1676) to Olivier (1963)' In: *Shakespeare Quarterly* 1 (1969), pp. 17-35.
- Graaf, Rob de, 'De tragedie geïmiteerd. Het Zuidelijk Toneel speelt O'Neill's Rouw siert Electra' In: *Toneel Theatraal* (May 1989), p. 35.
- Granville-Barker, Harley, *Prefaces to Shakespeare* (London, Batsford, 1927-48, 1968).
- Greenblatt, Stephen, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katharine Eisaman Maus (eds.), *The Norton Shakespeare. Based on the Oxford edition* (New York/London, W.W. Norton & Company, 1997). [referred to as Norton]
- Greg, W.W., 'Hamlet's Hallucination'. In: Dover Wilson, John, *What Happens in Hamlet*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1935, 1964).
- Groeneboer, Joost, '4 september 1880. Bij de Vereniging "Het Nederlandsch Tooneel" gaat Shakespeare's *De koopman van Venetië* in première, met Louis Bouwmeester als Shylock. Het fenomeen Bouwmeester belicht', In: Rob Erenstein en Dirk Coigneau, *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden: tien eeuwen drama en theater in Nederland en Vlaanderen* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1996), pp. 474-479.
- Groot, J.P.M., 'Voorlopige biografie van M.G. de Cambon-Van der Werken', In: *Documentatieblad werkgroep 18e eeuw*, 30 (1976), pp. 10-37. 'Nawoord' by P.J. Buijnsters.
- Haag, Ansgar, 'Übersetzen fürs Theater: Beispiel William Shakespeare.' In: *Babel* 30 (1984), pp. 218-224.
- Hall, J.N. Van, 'Letterkundige kroniek' In: *De Gids* 48:4 (1884), pp. 529-542.
- , 'Dramatisch Overzicht' In: *De Gids* 51:4 (1887), p. 178.
- Hamberg, Lars, 'Some Practical Considerations concerning Dramatic Translation'. In: *Babel* 15 (1969), pp. 91-94, 100.
- Hamburger, Maik, "'If it be now': The Knocking of Fate" In: Rui Carvalho Homem and Ton Hoenselaars (eds.), *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century* (Amsterdam/New York, Rodopi, 2004), p. 117-128.
- Hapgood, Robert, *Hamlet. Shakespeare in production* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Haven, Kornee van der and Tanja Holzhey, 'Tieranny van Eigenbaat (1679). Staatsgezinde propaganda in de Amsterdamse schouwburg.' (in preparation).
- Heijer, Jac, 'Zonder Geheimen. Gerardjan de Sfinx' In: Nico van Rossen, *De roes en de rede. Over Gerardjan Rijnders* (Amsterdam, Parade, 1992), pp. 79-95.
- , 'Paul Steenbergen 1907-1989', *NRC Handelsblad*, 10-5-1989.

- Hellinga, Gerben, 'Ik ben geen jongetje dat zomaar wat aan toneel doet. Theater uit pure noodzaak' In: *Vrij Nederland*, 1-8-1998.
- Henkes, Robbert-Jan and Erik Bindervoet, *De kunst van het niet-vertalen* (Hoorn, Hoogland & Van Klaveren, 2005).
- Hermans, Theo (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. (London, Croon Helm, 1985).
- , 'Translation Studies and a New Paradigm' In: Hermans, Theo (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. (London, Croon Helm, 1985), pp. 7-15.
- , 'Norms and the Determination of Translation: A Theoretical Framework'. In: Alvarez, Roan and Africa Vidal (eds.), *Translation, Power, Subversion*. (Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 1996), pp. 25-51.
- , 'Dutch tradition', In: Mona Baker (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (London/New York, Routledge, 1998), pp. 392-400.
- , 'Descriptive Translation Studies'. In: Mary Snell-Hornby, Hans G. Hönl, P. Kußmaul, P. Schmitt (eds.), *Handbuch Translation*. (Tübingen, Stauffenburg Verlag, 1998), pp. 96-100.
- Hess-Lütich, Ernest W.B., 'Dramatic Discourse'. In: T.A. van Dijk, *Discourse and Literature*. (Amsterdam, Benjamins, 1985), pp. 199-214.
- Heylen, Romy, *Translation, Poetics, and the Stage. Six French Hamlets* (London/New York, Routledge, 1993).
- Hibbard, G.R., Hamlet. The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1987, 1998) in the series: Stanley Wells (ed.) *The Oxford Shakespeare*. [referred to as Oxford]
- Hoenselaars, Ton (ed.), *Armada 9:33* (December 2003).
- , "'There is Tremendous Poetry in Killings". Traditions of Shakespeare Translation and Adaptation in the Low Countries.' In: Rui Carvalho Homem and Ton Hoenselaars (eds.) *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century* (Amsterdam, New York, Rodopi, 2004a), p. 79-98.
- (ed.), *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation*. (London: Thomson Learning, 2004b).
- Höfele, Andres, 'A Theatre of Exhaustion? "Posthistoire" in Recent German Shakespeare Productions', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43 (1992), 80-6.
- Hofmann, Norbert, *Redundanz und Äquivalenz in der literarischen Übersetzung: dargestellt an fünf deutschen Übersetzungen des 'Hamlet'* (Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1980).
- Hogendoorn, W., 'De vertaler en het toneel' (lecture, typescript in Stadsarchief Deventer, 1988).
- Holland, Peter, 'Shakespeare performances in England', In: *Shakespeare Survey* (1995), p. 194.
- , *English Shakespeares. Shakespeare on the English stage in the 1990s*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 1999).
- Holmes, James, José Lambert and Raymond van den Broeck, *Literature and Translation. New Perspectives in Literary Studies*. (Leuven, Acco, 1978).
- Holmes, James S., 'Rebuilding the Bridge at Bommel: Notes on the Limits of Translatability, 1972, In: James S. Holmes, *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. (Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1988), pp. 45-52.
- , 'Describing Literary Translation: Models and Methods', 1978, In: James S. Holmes, *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. (Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1988), pp. 81-92.
- , *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. (Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1988)
- , 'Forms of Verse Translation and the Translation of Verse Form', in: James S. Holmes, *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. (Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1988), pp. 23-33.
- Holderness, Graham and Bryan Loughrey, 'Text and Stage: Shakespeare, Bibliography and Performance' In: *New Theatre Quarterly* 9:34 (1993), p. 179-91.
- Homem, Rui Carvalho and Ton Hoenselaars (eds.) *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century* (Amsterdam, New York, Rodopi, 2004).
- Hortman, Wilhelm, *Shakespeare on the German stage* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Houtman, Dirkje, 'Schuivende panelen in het theater. Terugblik op het afgelopen seizoen.' In: *Theaterjaarboek* 88-89 (1989), p. 13-14.
- Hove, Ivo van, 'De vijver leeg maken om de vissen te hebben' In: Carel Alphenaar, Rob Erenstein, Jaak van Schoor, Ingrid van der Veken, Eva Cossee (eds.), *De goden van het theater. 22 Nederlandse en Vlaamse toneelschrijvers aan het woord*. (Westbroek, Harlekijn Uitgeverij, 1983).
- Howard, *Shakespeare Reproduced*. (New York/London, Methuen, 1987).
- Hunningher, B., *Een eeuw Nederlands toneel* (Amsterdam, Querido, 1949).
- Hupperetz, Karel, 'Regie in het theater. Het fenomeen regisseur in het theater van de 20^e eeuw' In: *Skript* (October 1995), pp. 28-30.

- Hutcheon, Linda, *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth Century Art Forms* (New York, Methuen, 1985).
- Jacobs, Maria Augusta, *Jacobus van Looy en zijn literair werk* (Brugge/Brussel, De Kinkhoren, 1945).
- Jackson, Russell, 'Shakespeare Performed', In: *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 45:2 (1994), p. 335.
- Jagt, Marijn van der, 'Brecht revisited', In: *Theaterjaarboek 1989*, pp. 11-17.
- Jakobson, Roman, 'Linguistics and Poetics'. In: *Style in Language*. (Cambridge/Mass., MIT Press, 1960), pp. 350-377.
- , 'On linguistic aspects of translation'. 1959, In: Lawrence Venuti, *Translation Studies Reader* (London and New York, Routledge, 2000), pp. 113-118.
- Jānis, M., 'What Translators of Plays think about their Work' In: *Target* 8:2 (1996), pp. 341-361.
- Jans, Erwin, 'Oefeningen in het zien van het andere', In: *Toneel Theatraal* 113:4 (April 1992), pp. 9-11.
- , 'De boekhouder en het dwaallicht. Tien jaar het Zuidelijk Toneel: een geschiedenis.' In: Dieleman, Cock, Max van Engen and Bart Van den Eynde (eds.) *Het Zuidelijk Toneel 1990 2000* (Amsterdam, International Theatre & Film Books, 2001).
- Jenkins, Harold (ed.), *Hamlet. The Arden edition of the works of William Shakespeare*. (Methuen & Co, 1982, Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1997) in the series: Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson and David Scott Kastan (general eds.), *The Arden Shakespeare*. [referred to as Arden]
- Jespersen, Otto, *Growth and structure of the English language* (Oxford, 1946).
- Jones, Ernest, 'Hamlet and Oedipus.' In: John Jump (ed.), *Shakespeare. Hamlet. A Casebook*. (London, Macmillan, 1968), pp. 51-63.
- Jong, Theo de, 'Shakespeares povere populariteit' In: *Toneel Theatraal* 6 (June 1986), pp. 36-38.
- Kaal, Ron, 'Het leven als cliché. Rijnders de acteur', In: Nico van Rossen, *De roes en de rede. Over Gerardjan Rijnders* (Amsterdam, Parade, 1992), pp. 55-77.
- Kalb, Jonathan, *The Theater of Heiner Müller* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Kellendonk, Frans, 'De veren van de Zwaan. Shakespeare van Burgersdijk tot Komrij.' *NRC Handelsblad*, 11-1-1985.
- Kennedy, Dennis (ed.), *Foreign Shakespeare* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Kerkhoven, Marianne van, 'Het opengebroken repertoiretheater' In: Janine Brogt, Paul Gallis, Dirkje Houtman, Gerardjan Rijnders (eds.), *Liefhebbers. 13,5 jaar Toneelgroep Amsterdam* (Amsterdam, International Theatre and Film Books, 2000), pp. 134-5.
- Kerkhoven, Marianne van, 'William zesmaal seizoenopener. Een "spons" voor deze tijd' In: *Et cetera* 16 (1987), pp. 10-13.
- Kaindl, Klaus, 'Die Übersetzung als Inszenierung' In: *Target* 8:2 (1997), pp. 341-361.
- , 'Let's have a party – Übersetzungskritik ohne Original?' In: *Target* 9:2 (1997), pp. 115-126.
- Kermode, Frank, *Shakespeare's Language* (London, Penguin, 2001).
- Kinney, Arthur F. (ed.), *Hamlet. New Critical Essays* (New York/London, Routledge, 2002).
- Kittay, Eva F. and Adrienne Lehrer, 'Semantic Field and the Structure of Metaphor' In: *Studies in Language* 5.1 (1981), pp. 31-63.
- Knack*, 17-9-1980 (Interview with Hugo Claus)
- Kock, Petra de, '15 december 1979. Het Publiektheater speelt een opmerkelijke Lucifer van Joost van den Vondel. Traditie en vernieuwing bij de grote repertoiregezelschappen in Amsterdam' In: Rob Erenstein en Dirk Coigneau, *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden: tien eeuwen drama en theater in Nederland en Vlaanderen* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1996), pp. 806-813.
- Koen, Mirjam, *OT Hamlet* [private prompt copy, 1997]
- Komrij, Gerrit, *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaald door Gerrit Komrij* (Amsterdam, International Theatre Bookshop/Publiektheater, 1986).
- , *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaald door Gerrit Komrij* (Amsterdam, Bert Bakker, 1989).
- , *Demonen* (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1993).
- , 'Een en ander', *NRC Handelsblad*, 22-9-1993.
- , *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaald door Gerrit Komrij* (Amsterdam, Bert Bakker, 1997).
- Konijn, Elly, *Acteurs spelen emoties*, (Amsterdam, 1994).
- Korpel, Lucretia Geertruide, *In Nederduitsch gewaad. Nederlandse beschouwingen over vertalen 1760-1820* (The Hague, Stichting Bibliographia Neerlandica, 1993).
- Kossman, E.H., *De Lage Landen 1780-1940. Anderhalve eeuw Nederland en België* (Amsterdam/Brussel, Elsevier, 1976).
- Koster, Simon, *De Bouwmeesters. Kroniek van een Theaterfamilie*. (Assen, Van Gorcum, 1973)
- Koster, Cees (ed.), *De Hollandsche vertaalmolen. Nederlandse beschouwingen over vertalen, 1820-1885* (The

- Hague, Stichting Bibliographia Neerlandica, 2002)
- Koster, Cees and Ton Naaijken (eds.), *Een vorm van lezen. Nederlandse beschouwingen over vertalen, 1885-1946* (The Hague, Stichting Bibliographia Neerlandica, 2003)
- Kott, Jan, 'Hamlet of the Mid-century.' In: John Jump (ed.), *Shakespeare. Hamlet. A Casebook*. London: Macmillan, 1968. Pp. 196-209.
- Kranendonk, Gerda van and Jop Spiekerman (eds.), *William Shakespeare/Charles Marowitz. Hamlet. The Marowitz collage version presented in the Shakespeare context. With a parallel translation by C. Buddingh'* (Wikor Drama Library, 1972).
- Kriek, Jeroen, *Growing Up in Public. Hamlet naar William Shakespeare* [private prompt copy, 1997]
- Kujamäki, Pekka, 'Finnish comet in German skies. Translation, retranslation and norms' In: *Target* 13:1, (2001), pp. 45-70.
- Laan, K. ter, *Letterkundig Woordenboek voor Noord en Zuid* (1941).
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors we live by*. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1980).
- Lamers, Jan Joris, 'Het toneel helemaal leegruimen' In: *Toneel Theatraal* 113: 4 (1992), pp. 36-40.
- Lavaudant, Georges, 'Un défi à toutes les interprétations', in the programme for *Hamlet*, Comédie-Française (1994), p. 17 (cited and translated by Peter Holland, *English Shakespeares*, 1997, p. 265),
- Leek, Robert H., *Shakespeare in Nederland*, (Zutphen: De Walburg Pers, 1988).
- , 'Burgersdijk en Shakespeares muziek' (lecture, typescript in Stadsarchief Deventer, 1988).
- , 'Bless thee, bottom, bless thee! Thou art translated!' The Bard and his Dutch interpreters' In: Bart Westerman and Theo D'Haen (eds.), *Something Understood* (Rodopi: Amsterdam-Atlanta, 1990), pp. 139-170.
- , 'November 1887. Burgersdijk voltooit de vertaling van Shakespeare's verzameld werk. Shakespeare in ons taalgebied: problemen rond vertalen en bewerken.' In: Rob Erenstein en Dirk Coigneau, *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden: tien eeuwen drama en theater in Nederland en Vlaanderen* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1996), pp. 496-503.
- Lefevre, André and Susan Bassnett, 'Where are we in translation studies?'. In: Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevre (eds.), *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation* (Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 1998), Topics in Translation 11, pp.1-11.
- , 'Introduction: Proust's grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The 'Cultural Turn' in Translation studies'. In: Bassnet, Susan and André Lefevre (eds.), *Translation, History and Culture*. (London and New York, Pinter Publishers, 1990), pp. 5-17.
- Lefevre, André, 'Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm' In: T. Hermans (ed.) *The Manipulation of Literature* (London, Croom Helm, 1983).
- , *Essays in Comparative Literature: A Systems Approach*. (Calcutta, Papyrus, 1988).
- , *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. (London and New York, Routledge, 1992a).
- , *Translating Literature. Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*. (New York, Modern Language Association, 1992b).
- , 'Mother Courage's Cucumbers. Text, system and refraction in a theory of literature'. 1982, In: Lawrence Venuti, *Translation Studies Reader* (London and New York, Routledge, 2000), pp. 233-249.
- Leppihalme, Ritva, 'Foreignizing strategies in drama translation. The case of the Finnish Oleana' In: Chesterman, Andrew, Gallardo, N. & Gambier, Yves (eds) *Translation in Context: Selected papers from the EST Congress 1998*. (Amsterdam, Benjamins, 1998), pp. 197-206.
- Leeuwe, H.H.J. de, *Meeningen en Nederland* (Groningen, 1959).
- , '23 oktober 1811. Napoleon ziet in Amsterdam Wattier in de rol van Fedra. Het bloeiend toneelbedrijf aan het begin van de negentiende eeuw.' In: Rob Erenstein en Dirk Coigneau, *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden: tien eeuwen drama en theater in Nederland en Vlaanderen* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1996), pp. 366-373.
- , *De Amsterdamse Schouwburg in 1795. Het eerste jaar der Bataafse vrijheid* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1997).
- Leur, W. P. de, *Tooneelherinneringen* (Amsterdam, 1906).
- Leuven-Zwart, Kitty M. van, *Vertaling en origineel. Een vergelijkende beschrijvingsmethode voor integrale vertalingen, ontwikkeld aan de hand van Nederlandse vertalingen van Spaanse narratieve teksten* (Dordrecht, Foris Publications, 1984).
- , *Vertaal/Wetenschap. Ontwikkelingen en perspectieven*. (Muiderberg, Coutinho, 1992).

- Levy, Jiri, 'Translation as a Decision Process.' In: *To Honor Roman Jakobson 2*. (The Hague, Mouton, 1967), pp. 1171-1182.
- , 'Die Übersetzung von Theaterstücken.' In: Jiri Levy, *Die Literarische Übersetzung Theorie einer Kunstgattung* (translated from Czech by W. Schamschula), (Frankfurt am Main/Bonn, Athenäum Verlag, 1969), pp. 128-159.
- Lewis, *Method or Madness*, (New York, S. French, 1958, 1986).
- Lewis, Philip E., 'The Measure of Translation Effects' In: Lawrence Venuti, *Translation Studies Reader* (London and New York, Routledge, 2000), pp. 264- 283.
- Lieblein, Leanoire, 'Cette belle langue'. The 'tradaptation' of Shakespeare in Quebec' In: Ton Hoenselaars (ed.), *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation*. (London, Thompson Learning, 2004), pp. 255-269.
- Loffelt, A.C., 'Het Tooneel in de Hoofdstad' In: *Het Nederlansch Tooneel*, 15-11-1879.
- , *Uren met Shakespeare* (Amsterdam, 1890).
- Looy, Jacobus van, *Shakespeare's Macbeth* (Amsterdam) [published in 1898 in *De Nieuwe Gids*].
- , *Shakespeare's Hamlet* (Amsterdam, 1907)
- , *Treurspelen van William Shakespeare. Vertaald door Jac. Van Looy en geïllustreerd door Rie Cramer* (Utrecht, De Haan, 1922)
- , 'Een praatje over "vertalen" met eenige vertaalde fragmenten,' In: *De Nieuwe Gids*, feb. 1912, pp. 252-265. quoted in Cees Koster and Ton Naaijkens (eds.). *Nederlandse beschouwingen over vertalen, 1885-1946* (The Hague, Stichting Bibliographia Neerlandica, 2002), p. 66-70.
- , *Wie dronk toen water!* (Amsterdam, 1975).
- Maanen, Hans van, *Het Nederlandse toneelbestel van 1925 tot 1995*. (Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, 1997).
- Mack, Maynard, 'The World of *Hamlet*.' In: John Jump (ed.), *Shakespeare. Hamlet. A Casebook*. (London, Macmillan, 1968), p. 86-107.
- Madariaga, Salvador de, *On Hamlet*. (London, Cass & Co, 1948, 1964).
- Magnusson, Lynne, 'Style, rhetoric and decorum' In: S. Adamson, L. Hunter, L. Magnusson, A. Thompson and K. Wales (eds.), *Reading Shakespeare's Dramatic Language. A Guide*. (London, Arden, 2001).
- Marowitz, Charles, *The Marowitz Shakespeare*, (London, Marion Boyars, 1978).
- McAuly, Gay, 'Introduction' In: *Translation and Performance. About Performance. Centre for Performance Studies. University of Sydney. Working Papers 1*. (Sydney, University of Sydney, 1995).
- McHale, Brian, *Postmodern fiction* (London and New York, Routledge, 1987).
- Merino, Raquel, 'Drama translation strategies: English-Spanish (1950-1990), In: *Babel 46:4* (2001), pp. 357-365.
- Meyer, Dennis (ed.), *Tomaat in perspectief. Theater vernieuwing in de jaren '60 and '70*. (Amsterdam, Theater Instituut Nederland, 1994).
- , 'Ifigeneia Koningskind'. In: Rob Erenstein en Dirk Coigneau, *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden: tien eeuwen drama en theater in Nederland en Vlaanderen* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1996), pp. 832-839.
- Mijnssen, Frans, *De Hamlet-voordracht van Eduard Verkade*. (1908), pp. 159-165.
- Moerkerken, P.H. van, *Over Jacobus van Looy. Geschenck*. (Amsterdam, 1933)
- Mounin, Georges, *Problèmes théoriques de la traduction* (Paris, Gallimard, 1963).
- , 'Die Übersetzung für die Bühne'. In: Georges Mounin, *Die Übersetzung. Geschichte, Theorie, Anwendung*. (München, Nymphenburg, 1967).
- Mukarovskij, Jan, 'Standard Language and Poetic Language' In: Paul L. Garvin, *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style* (Washington, 1964), pp. 17-30.
- Mulisch, Harry, *Woorden, woorden, woorden* (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1987).
- Müller, Heiner, *Hamletmachine and Other Texts for the Stage*, translated by Carl Weber (1984, PAJ Publications).
- , *Gesammelte Irrtümer I* (Frankfurt a.M, 1986)
- Naaijkens, Ton, *De slag om Shelley en andere essays over vertalen* (Nijmegen, Vantilt, 2002).
- Niedzwiecki, Patricia, 'Hugo Claus: "De humor en de grappen van Shakespeare zijn over het algemeen nogal melig"', In: *Etcetera* 16, 1987, p. 17.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Birth of Tragedy*. In: Philip Edwards (ed.), *Hamlet. Prince of Denmark*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Oosterhoff, Tonnus 'Kritiek' In: *De Volkskrant* 7-1-1999.
- Opbroecke, Roland, *De zeven kunsten*, 9-1-1971 (Radiointerview with Hugo Claus)
- Oranje, Hans, 'Berg op berg af. 14 jaar Publiektheater' In: *Theaterjaarboek 1986/1987*, pp. 22-28.

- Ouweneel, Willem J., *William Shakespeare. De tragedie van Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken. Vertaald, ingeleid en geannoteerd door Willem J. Ouweneel* (Soesterberg, Aspekt, 2004)
- Palopski, Outi and Riitta Oittinen, 'The domesticated foreign' In: Andrew Chesterman (ed.), *Translation in context. Selected contributions from the EST Congress, Granada 1998* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1998), pp. 373-389.
- Pavis, Patrice, 'Problems of Translation for the Stage: Interculturalism and Postmodern Theatre.' In: Scolnikov, P. Holland (eds.), *The Play out of Context. Transferring Plays from Culture to Culture*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 25-44.
- , *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture* (London and New York, Routledge, 1992).
- (ed.), *The Intercultural Performance Reader* (London/New York, Routledge, 1996).
- Penninck, Renetta, *Nederland en Shakespeare. Achttiende eeuw en vroege romantiek*. (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1936).
- Peters, Steven, 'De verjongingskuur van De Trust' In: *Terugblik Theaterfestival 1998* (Theaterfestival, Amsterdam).
- Petersohn, Roland, *Heiner Müllers Shakespeare-Rezeption. Texte und Kontexte* (Frankfurt, 1993).
- Pfister, Manfred, *Das Drama*. (München, Fink, 1982).
- Phiddian, Robert, *Swift's Parody* (Cambridge/New York, Cambridge University Press, 1995)
- Pieters, Mark, 'De heruitgever' In: *Filter. Tijdschrift over vertalen*. 11, 2, (2004), pp. 35-42.
- Plantage*, 14-9-1997 (Television show in the occasion of the Kenneth Branagh *Hamlet* film)
- Popovic, Anton, 'The Concept "Shifts of Expression" in Translation Analysis'. In: J.S. Holmes (ed.), *The Nature of Translation. Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*. (Den Haag/Paris, Mouton, 1970), pp. 78-90.
- Post, Paul, '1827. De schilder-acteur Johannes Jelgerhuis begint de publikatie van zijn boek *Theoretische Lessen over de Gesticulatie en Mimiek*. De naweën van de classicistische speeltrant' In: Rob Erenstein en Dirk Coigneau, *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden: tien eeuwen drama en theater in Nederland en Vlaanderen* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1996a), pp. 396-405.
- , '1881. Koning Willem III verleent de Vereniging 'Het Nederlandsch Tooneel' het predikaat Koninklijk.' In: Rob Erenstein en Dirk Coigneau, *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden: tien eeuwen drama en theater in Nederland en Vlaanderen* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1996b), pp. 480-487.
- Prosser, Eleanor, *Hamlet and Revenge*. In: Philip Edwards (ed.), *Hamlet. Prince of Denmark*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- Pym, Anthony, *Method in Translation History*, (Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, 1998).
- Quiller-Couch, Arthur and John Dover Wilson (eds.) *Cambridge University Press New Shakespeare, Hamlet*. Reprinted in the series *The Wordsworth Classics* (Ware, Wordsworth Editions, 1992). [referred to as Wordsworth]
- Raad, Marianne de, '1970. Peter Oosthoek ontvangt de Anne Frankprijs. De opkomst van de Nederlandstalige toneelschrijfcultuur.' In: Rob Erenstein en Dirk Coigneau, *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden: tien eeuwen drama en theater in Nederland en Vlaanderen* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1996), pp. 792-799.
- Rabkin, G., 'Is there a Text on this Stage?' *Performing Arts Journal* 9, 2-3 (1985), pp. 142-159.
- Reiß, Katharina, *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik*, (München, 1986).
- , 'Decision making in translation', 1971, In: Lawrence Venuti, *Translation Studies Reader* (London and New York, Routledge, 2000), pp. 160-171.
- Rido, *Telegraaf*, 21-10-1950 (Interview with Verkade)
- Rijghard, Ron, 'Hiep-hiep-hoera, ik hoef niet meer te vergaderen. Gerardjan Rijnders.' In: *TM* (October 2000), pp. 20-22.
- Ritsema, Jan, 'Het overkomt ons niet.' In: *Etcetera* 51:13 (August 1995), pp. 4-5.
- Robbers, Herman, *Levensbericht van Jac. Van Looy (1855-1930). Handelingen en Levensberichten van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde. 1930-1931*.
- Rodriguez, Liliane, 'Sous le signe de Mercure, la retraduction' In: *Palimpsestes* 4 (1990), pp. 63-80.
- Rose, Margaret, *Parody/Metafiction: An Analysis of Parody as a Critical Mirror to the Writing and Reception of Fiction* (London, Croom/Helm, 1979).
- , *Parody: Ancient, Modern and Post-Modern* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Rosenthal, Daniel, *Shakespeare on screen*, (London, Hamlyn, 2000).
- Rossen, Nico van, *De roes en de rede. Over Gerardjan Rijnders*. (Amsterdam, Parade, 1992).
- , 'De roes en de rede. Rijnders als regisseur', In: Nico van Rossen, *De roes en de rede. Over Gerardjan Rijnders*

- (Amsterdam, Parade, 1992), pp. 9-52.
- Rössing, J.H., 'Dr. L.A.J. Burgersdijk. Geboren 11 Maart 1828-Overleden 15 januari 1900.' In: *Eigen Haard* 17:2 (1900), pp. 110-112.
- Roy van Zuydewijn, H.J. de, *William Shakespeare. Julius Caesar. Hamlet. Vertaald en van commentaar voorzien door H.J. de Roy van Zuydewijn* (Amsterdam/Antwerp, De Arbeiderspers, 2003).
- Salama-Carr, Myriam, 'French tradition' In Mona Baker (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (London and New York, Routledge, 1998), pp. 411-412.
- Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen, M.A. (ed.), *Nederlandse Literatuur, een geschiedenis* (Groningen, Martinus Nijhoff Uitgevers, 1993).
- Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen, Riet, Karel Porteman, Piet Coutennier and Lia van Gemert (eds.), *Met en zonder lauwerkrans. 1550-1850: van Anna Bijns tot Elise van Calcar* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1997).
- Schleiermacher, F. 'Über die verschiedene Methoden des Übersetzens'. In: F. Schleiermacher, *Sämtliche Werke*, 2, (Berlin, 1883), pp. 207-245.
- Schoneveld, C.W. (ed.) *Miscellanea Anglo-Belgica* (Leiden, Sir Thomas Browne Institute, 1987a)
- , 'Pioneering in the Propagation of English Letters: B.S. Naylor's Teaching Career in Holland, 1820-1848' In: C.W. Schoneveld (ed.) *Miscellanea Anglo-Belgica* (Leiden, Sir Thomas Browne Institute, 1987b), pp. 40-64.
- , 'Het ontstaan en de verspreiding van Burgersdijks vertaling van Shakespeare', In: *Deventer Jaarboek* (Deventer, Arko Boeken, 1988), pp. 62-71.
- , 'Transmitting the Bard to the Dutch. L.A.J. Burgersdijk's principles of translation and his role in the reception of Shakespeare in the Netherlands to 1900' In: Bart Westerweel and Theo D'Haen (eds.), *Something Understood* (Amsterdam/Atlanta, Rodopi, 1990).
- Schultze, Brigitte, 'Theorie der Dramenübersetzung – 1960 bis heute. Ein Bericht zur Forschungslage'. In: *Forum Modernes Theater* (Tübingen, Narr, 1987), pp. 5-17.
- (ed.), *Literatur und Theater: Traditionen und Konventionen als Problem der Dramenübersetzung* (Tübingen, Narr, 1990).
- , 'Highways, Byways, and Blind Alleys in Translating Drama: Historical and Systemic Aspects of a Cultural Technique'. In: *Translating Literatures. Translating Cultures. New Vistas and Approaches in Literary Studies*. (Erich Smidt Verlag, 1998), Göttinger Beiträge zur Internationalen Übersetzungsforschung (17), pp. 177-196.
- Schumacher, Rezy and Kikki Stoffels, *Waar je stappen zet, wordt het grond. De Trust 1988-2000* (Amsterdam, International Theater & Film Books, 2001).
- Schumacher, Claude, *Artaud on Theatre* (London, Methuen, 2001).
- Shurbanov, Alexander, 'The Translatability of Shakespearean Texts into an Unrelated Language/Culture' In: Rui Carvalho Homem and Ton Hoenselaars (eds.), *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century* (Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, 2004), pp. 51-65.
- Smallwood, Robert, 'Shakespeare performances in England' In: *Shakespeare Survey* 1997, p. 201.
- , 'Shakespeare performances in England' In: *Shakespeare Survey*, 1998, p. 243.
- , 'Shakespeare Performances in England' In: *Shakespeare Survey*, 2000, p. 253.
- Smith, Charles G., *Shakespeare's Proverb Lore* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1963).
- Smitskamp, Ike, 'Over de muzikale dimensie van Shakespeares taal' In: *Folio*, 4.2 (1997).
- Snell-Hornby, Mary, 'Sprechbare Sprache – Spielbarer Text: Zur Problematik der Dramenübersetzung.' In: R.J. Watts, U. Weidman (eds.), *Modes of Interpretation*. (Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1984), pp. 101-116.
- , *Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach*. (Amsterdam, Benjamins, 1995).
- Spencer, T.J.B. (ed.) *Hamlet. With an introduction by Anne Barton*. (London, Penguin Books, 1980, 1996) in the series T.J.B. Spencer (ed.), *New Penguin Shakespeare*. Used and recommended by the Royal Shakespeare Company. [referred to as Penguin]
- Spurgeon, Caroline, *Leading Motives in the Imagery of Shakespeare's Tragedies* (1930) In: John Jump, *Shakespeare: Hamlet. Casebook Series* (London, Macmillan, 1968), pp. 41-3.
- Stanislavsky, Constantin, *My Life in Art* (London, 1924)
- , *Stanislavsky on the art of the stage* (London, Faber and Faber, 1967).
- Steiger, Klaus Peter, *Die Geschichte der Shakespeare-Rezeption* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1997).
- Steiner, George, *After Babel* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1975, 1998)
- Sternheim, Joost, 'De machtige troost en de ordening die kunst heet. Jan Joris Lamers, theatermaker.' In:

- Toneel Theatraal* (november 1991), pp. 6-10.
- Stienstra, Nelly, *YHWH is the Husband of His People. Analysis of a Biblical Metaphor with Special Reference to Translation* (Kampen, Kok, 1993).
- Stoppard, Tom, *Rosencranz and Guildenstern are dead* (London, Faber & Faber, 1967).
- , *Rosencrantz en Guildenstern zijn dood. Toneelspel in drie bedrijven. Nederlandse tekst Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1968).
- Stuivenberg, Richard, 'Ik wil best falen, maar binnen dat falen wil ik serieus genomen worden' In: *TM*, december 2001, p. 13-14.
- Suchtelen, Nico van, *William Shakespeare. Het treurspel van Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken. Uit het Engels vertaald door Nico van Suchtelen*. (Amsterdam/Antwerp, Wereldbibliotheek, 1947)
- Sulick, M., *Hamlet in Translation: André Gide and Boris Pasternak*, Ph. D. Thesis City University New York (1977).
- Susam-Sarajeva, Sebnem, 'Multiple-entry visa to travelling theory. Retranslations of literary and cultural theories.' In: *Target 15:1* (2003), pp. 1-36.
- Temmink, Theo, 'Zondagmiddagfilosoof. Gerrit Komrij over Shakespeare, recalcitrantie en Nederlandse vochtigheid.' In: *Elsevier* 23-12-1989.
- Tielemans, Johan, 'King Lear. Decortres obsessief gevecht met teksten. De nar waagt toch nog de waarheid te piepen' In: *Etcetera* 3 (1983), pp. 5-8.
- , 'De vlucht van de verbeelding. Het controversiële theater van Jan Joris Lamers' In: *Theatermaker* (December 1997), pp. 14-19.
- , 'De kracht van muziek. Performance en muzikaliteit in het werk van Ivo van Hove' In: Dieleman, Cock, Max van Engen and Bart Van den Eynde (eds.) *Het Zuidelijk Toneel 1990 2000* (Amsterdam, International Theatre & Film Books, 2001).
- Thompson, Ann, 'Heightened language' In: S. Adamson, L. Hunter, L. Magnusson, A. Thompson and K. Wales (eds.), *Reading Shakespeare's Dramatic Language. A Guide*. (London, Arden, 2001), pp. 5-16.
- Tiesema, Watze, 'Speelstijl of methode van regisseren?' Erenstein, Rob, Watze Tiesema, Loes Heijligers (eds.), *Twintig jaar De Appel*, (Amsterdam, Bis, 1991), pp. 117-140.
- Tigges-Drewes, Grietje and Hans Groot, 'Een eeuw kleine Grandisson: 1782-1885' In: *Documentatieblad werkgroep 18e eeuw*, 45 (1980), pp. 21-64.
- Tilley, Morris Palmer, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. (Michigan, 1950).
- Tindemans, Klaas and Lieven de Cauter, 'Toneelspelen is marginaal sinds de Romeinen.' In: *Etcetera* 27 (1989), pp. 40-46.
- Tindemans, Klaas, 'Een Hamlet: Klaas Vingerhoets' In: *Etcetera* 16 (1987), p. 14.
- , 'Rijnders' Hamlet: "Ik moet weer gek doen"' In: *Etcetera* 16 (1987), p. 15.
- Tiva, Lappihalmé, 'Foreignizing Strategies in Drama Translation,' In: Chesterman, N. San Salvador, Yves Gambien (eds.), *Translation in Context* (John Benjamins, Adam/Philadelphia, 2000), p. 153-162.
- Todd, Richard, 'Politics versus poetics: the granting of the *privilege* of Marnix' revised vernacular psalm translation of 1591 to Vulcanius' In: C.C. Barfoot and Richard Todd (eds.), *The Great Emporium. The Low Countries as a cultural crossroads in the Renaissance and the eighteenth century* (Amsterdam/Atlanta, Rodopi, 1992), pp. 29-42.
- Totzeva, Sophia, *Das Theatrale Potential des dramatischen Textes: Ein Beitrag zur Theorie von Drama und Dramenübersetzung*. Forum Modernes Theater 19. (Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1995).
- Toury, Gideon, 'The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation.' In: J.S. Holmes, J. Lambert, R. Van den Broek (eds.), *Literature and Translation. New perspectives in literary studies*. (Leuven, Acco, 1978), pp. 93-100.
- , *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. (Tel Aviv, Porter Institute, 1980).
- , 'A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies'. In: Hermans, Theo (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. (London, Croon Helm, 1985), pp. 7-15.
- , *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. (Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Pub. Co., 1995).
- TvdB, 'Nieuwe Hamlet-vertaling', *VPRO-Gids*, 25-1-2001.
- Übersfeld, Anne, *Lire le théâtre*. (Paris, Editions sociales, 1978).
- Urkowitz, Steven, 'Back to Basics: Thinking about the *Hamlet* First Quarto,' In: *The Hamlet First Published (Q1, 1603): Origins, Form, Intertextualities*, ed. Thomas Clayton (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992), pp. 257-291.
- Venuti, Lawrence, *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. (London and New York, Routledge,

- 1995).
- , *Translation Studies Reader* (London and New York, Routledge, 2000).
- , 'Translation, Community, Utopia', In: L. Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, (London and New York, Routledge, 2000b), pp. 468-88.
- Verbeeten, Ton, 'Johan Doesburg: Je kunt mij afrekenen op wat ik toon' In: *Theatermaker* 2:9/10 (1998), pp. 10-13.
- Verkade, Eduard, Shakespeare en wij. In: *Groene Amsterdammer* 12-10-1935.
- , *Shakespeare's Hamlet als leesdrama. Volière-reeks no. 7.* (1944)
- , *Uit het dagboek van Horatio* (Jacob van Kamper, Amsterdam, 1947)
- Verkade-Cartier van Dissel, E.F., *Eduard Verkade en zijn strijd voor een nieuw toneel* (Zutphen, De Walburg pers, 1978)
- Verstegen, Peter, 'Some Critical Notes on Holmes' Cross'. In: Kitty M. van Leuven-Zwart and Ton Naaijken (eds.), *Translation Studies. The State of the Art. Proceedings of the First James S Holmes Symposium on Translation Studies.* (Amsterdam/Atlanta, Rodopi, 1991), pp. 49-54.
- Vermeer, H.J. 'Skopos and commission in translational action' In: Lawrence Venuti, *Translation Studies Reader* (London and New York, Routledge, 2000), pp. 221-232.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet, 'A Methodology for Translation' (1958/1995), In: Lawrence Venuti, *Translation Studies Reader* (London and New York, Routledge, 2000), pp. 84-93.
- Voeten, Bert, *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken. Tragedie in vijf bedrijven in de vertaling van Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1958, 1959)
- , *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Prins van Denemarken. Tragedie in vijf bedrijven in de vertaling van Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1958, 1964)
- , *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaling van Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1958, 1964, 1974) [In 1968 the translation was revised, postscript by Bert Voeten]
- , *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaling Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam, Publiektheater, 1976) [introductions by Bert Voeten and Hans Croiset]
- , *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaling Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam, International Theater Bookshop/Haagse Comedie 1983) [introduction by Guido de Moor]
- , *Hamlet van William Shakespeare op basis van de vertaling van Bert Voeten* (Den Haag, De Appel, 1988) [introduction by Watze Tiesema]
- , *William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Vertaling Bert Voeten* (Amsterdam/Eindhoven, International Theatre & Film Books/Het Zuidelijk Toneel, 1994) [introduction by Klaas Tindemans]
- , *Neem je bed op en wandel* (Amsterdam, De Bezige Bij, 1994).
- Vos, Erik, 'Ritmische aspecten bij het vertalen' In: *De Gids*, 127:5 (May 1964), pp. 420-436.
- , *De vos en de broedende vogel. Improvisatie-oefeningen* (Bussum, De Toneelcentrale, 1984, 4th edition).
- Vuyk, Kees, 'Een nieuwe theatrale omgang met text' *Theaterjaarboek* 86-87 (1987), p. 11.
- Weber, Marcus, 'Sprechtheater' In: Mary Snell-Hornby, Hans G. Hönig, P. Kußmaul, P. Schmitt (eds.), *Handbuch Translation.* (Tübingen, Stauffenburg Verlag, 1998), pp. 253-258.
- Wells, Stanley, 'Shakespeare Productions in England in 1989' In: *Shakespeare Survey* 2, (1990), p. 183.
- Wellwarth, George E., 'Special Considerations in Drama Translation'. In: M.G. Rose (ed.), *Translation Spectrum.* (Albany, State University of New York Press, 1981), pp. 140-146.
- Werstine, Paul, 'The Textual Mystery of Hamlet' In: *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39:1 (1988), pp. 1-26.
- Wertsch, James V., *Language and cognition.* (Washington D.C., 1982).
- West, Rebecca, *The Court and the Castle.* (London, Macmillan, 1958).
- Westerweel, Bart and Theo D'Haen (eds.), *Something Understood* (Rodopi: Amsterdam-Atlanta, 1990).
- Will, Chris and Peter J.A. Winkels, *Jacobus van Looy. Schrijversprentenboek* 26 (The Hague, Nederlands Letterkundig Museum en Documentatiecentrum, 1987).
- Williams, Raymond, *Drama in Performance* (Harmondsworth, 1968).
- Wilson Knight, G., *The Wheel of Fire.* (London, Routledge, 1930, 2001).
- Woodmansee, Martha and Peter Jaszi (eds.), *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature* (Durham, Duke University Press, 1994).
- Zonneveld, Loek, 'Gerardjan Rijnders en de tekens van zijn tijd' In: *TM* oktober 2000, pp. 23-25.
- Zuber-Skerritt, Ortrun, *Page to Stage. Theatre as Translation.* (Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1984).
- , 'Towards a Typology of Literary Translation: Drama Translation Science'. In: *Meta* 33:4, (1988), pp. 485-490.

Index

A

Aaltonen, Sirkku : 29, 53.
Aats Hamlet : 44, 111.
 Académie Française : 63.
 Adamson, Sylvia : 49.
 Aktie Tomaat : 98, 99, 100, 148.
 Albach, Ben : 70.
 Albers, Frank : 36, 42, 105, 118, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 143, 144.
Algemeen Dagblad : 95, 102, 121, 126, 130, 134.
Algemeen Handelsblad : 13, 69, 70, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 95, 101, 103, 166, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 176, 180, 181, 182.
 Alkema, Hanny : 57, 98.
 Alphenaar, Carel : 15, 36, 43, 118, 126, 128, 130, 133, 143.
 Amerongen, Martin van : 98, 111, 116.
 Amin, Idi : 95.
Amleth : 107.
Amleth : 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 127.
 Amsterdam Stadsschouwburg : 68, 71, 119.
 Anbeek, Ton : 80, 81, 106, 113.
 Anderman, Gunilla : 28, 33.
 Appel, De : 98, 118, 120, 123.
 Aran en Titus : 68.
Arden Shakespeare : 48, 112, 121, 131, 135.
 Arnold, Stephanie : 34, 38, 42.
 Artaud, Antonin : 100, 101, 103, 104, 110, 113, 145.
 Assimakopoulos, Stavros : 29.
As you Like it : 112.
 Atelje 212 : 99.

B

Bacchantes : 108.
 Bachrach, A.G.H. : 101, 125, 147.
 Bakker, Bert : 112, 117.
 Barbarossa : 84.
 Barbaz : 69.
 Barnay, Ludwig : 69.
 Bassnett, Susan : 11, 19, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 39, 47.
 Batavian Republic : 68.
 Bednarz, Klaus : 27.
 Belleforest, François de : 103.
 Bensimon, Paul : 11, 19.
 Bergh, Hans van den : 58, 109.
 Berman, Antoine : 11, 19, 50, 52, 114.
 Berol, Henri : 85.
 Berry, Cicely : 49, 94.
 Betz, Kris : 106.
Béverlei : 68.
 Bilderdijk, Willem : 14, 69.
 Bindervoet, Erik : 36, 118, 135, 136, 137, 144,

146.

Black, Max : 48.
 Bliëk, Nicole : 121.
 Blijstra, R. : 93.
 Blokdijk, Tom : 110, 112.
 Blom, Peter : 125.
 Bobkova, Hana : 119, 124, 130, 131, 134.
 Boer, Nico de : 117, 138.
 Boermans, Theu : 17, 41, 42, 55, 94, 119, 123, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 138, 139, 143, 146.
 Bokma, Pierre : 13, 112.
 Boonen, Johan : 15, 17, 36, 105, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 130, 133, 143.
 Borkel, Lucas : 57.
 Bos, Riëks : 98, 119.
 Bouwmeester, Louis : 11, 70, 78, 80.
Brabants Dagblad : 57.
 Branagh, Kenneth : 13, 14.
 Brandes, Georg : 72.
 Brecht, Bertolt : 94, 101, 103, 107, 138, 147.
 Breeijen, Maartje den : 137.
 Bresser, Jan Paul : 58, 95, 103.
 Bresser, Jean Paul : 58, 95, 103.
 Brinkman, Elco : 119.
 Brisset, Annie : 30.
 Brockett, Oscar G. : 100.
 Broeck, Raymond van den : 28, 37, 38.
 Brogt, Janine : 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118.
 Bronks : 104, 105.
 Bronzwaer, W.J.M. : 50.
 Brook, Peter : 100, 101, 119.
 Brown, Roger : 55.
 Brownlie, Siobhan : 21.
 Bruggen, Carry van : 84, 85, 86.
 Buijs, Marian : 131.
 Bulthuis, Sacha : 123.
 Burgersdijk, Leendert Alexander Johannes : 14, 17, 36, 42, 48, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 88, 89, 91, 92, 96, 104, 107, 108, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 122, 132, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147.

C

Callens, Johan : 119.
 Cambon-Van der Werken, Margareta Geertruid de : 17, 65, 66, 67, 68, 72, 75, 145.
 Carvalho Homem, Rui : 30.
 Centraal Tooneel : 85, 88.
Chemisch huwelijk, Het : 112.
 Chesterman, Andrew : 21, 23, 24, 144.
 Chrispijn, Louis Hendricus : 76.

Claes, Paul : 106, 107, 109, 110.
 Claus, Hugo : 14, 17, 41, 49, 57, 105, 106, 107,
 108, 109, 110, 118, 120, 122, 128, 147.
 Clemen, Wolfgang : 51.
 Clinton, Bill : 130.
 CNN : 11, 130.
 Cohn, Ruby : 40.
 Coltof, Liesbeth : 41, 42, 126, 129, 130.
 Comédie Française : 63, 66.
 Corver, Marten : 68.
 Costa, Mendes da : 70.
 Courteaux, Willy : 14, 48, 78, 105, 106, 132.
 Croiset, Hans : 42, 95, 96, 98, 99, 102, 111, 112,
 115, 116, 119, 124, 139, 146, 147.
 Crystal, David : 29, 33.
Cymbeline : 108.

D

Daggerman, Stig : 111.
 Dalsum, Albert van : 79.
 Dam, Hans van : 41.
 Darbelnet, Jean : 52.
 Dawison, Bogumil : 69.
 Decorte, Jan : 14, 17, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110,
 120, 122, 126, 128, 147.
 Decreus, Freddy : 110.
Defense of Poetry, A : 82.
 Delabastita, Dirk : 30, 45, 48, 49, 50, 67, 109,
 115.
 Déprats, Jean-Michel : 53, 54, 119.
 Derrida, Jacques : 113, 143.
 Derwig, Jacob : 11, 127, 134.
 Devriendt, Emil : 69, 76.
Dietsche Warande & Belfort : 98, 138.
 Doesburg, Johan : 14, 130, 131, 134, 138, 146.
 Dong Nang : 99.
 Dover Wilson, John : 13, 89, 96.
 Ducis, Jean-François : 17, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68,
 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 80, 99, 101, 103, 104,
 106, 147.
 Dumas, Alexandre : 72.

E

Edwards, Philip : 136.
 Eede, Dirk van den : 108.
 Eeden, Frederik van : 111.
 Effen, Justus van : 63.
 Eiselt, Marianne : 24, 33.
 Elias, Ton : 93.
 Engelman, Reinier : 68.
 English Arts Theatre Company : 89.
 Erenstein, Rob : 40.
 Erfmann, Eberhard : 77, 78.
 Eschenburg, J.J. : 68, 69.

Esslin, Martin : 33.
 Even-Zohar, Itamar : 20, 21, 22, 30.
 Evenhuis, Arend : 135.
 Eybers, Guusje : 106, 128.

F

F ACT : 100, 104, 111, 118.
 Feith, Rhijnvis : 69.
Financial Times : 94.
Financieel Dagblad : 97, 124, 131, 134.
 Fischer-Lichte, Erika : 31, 33.
 Fishlin, Daniel : 39, 40, 44.
 Flink, Coen : 92.
 Flink, Richard : 95, 100.
 Forbes Robertson : 13, 78.
 Fortier, Mark : 39, 40, 44.
 Fotheringham, Richard : 29, 44.
 France, Anatole : 88.
 Franse, Kees : 80.
 Freiligrath, Ferdinand : 72.
 Freud, Sigmund : 134.
 Fry, Christopher : 89.
 Funke, G.L. : 72.
 Furness, Horace Howard : 73.

G

Gambier, Yves : 11, 19.
 Gansbeke, Wim van : 110.
 Garneau, Michel : 108.
 Garrick, David : 64.
 Gasten Komen, De : 104, 111.
 Gebroed, 't : 105, 118.
 Geerlings, Eddie : 34, 110, 126, 130.
 Gemert, Lia van : 65.
 Geraedts, Çanci : 128.
 Gibson, Mel : 14.
 Gide, André : 90.
 Gids, De : 71, 76, 84.
 Gilman, Albert : 55.
 Giovanni : 86.
 Glick, Clarice : 41, 64.
 Globe : 13, 104, 112, 119.
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang : 70, 72, 76, 134.
 Gomperts, H.A. : 93.
Gooi- en Eemlander, De : 58, 125.
 Gordon Craig, Edward : 79.
 Grammaticus, Saxo : 103, 107.
 Grand Theater Producties : 104.
 Granville-Barker, Harvey : 89.
 Greidanus, Aus : 123.
 Grijzen, Robert : 58, 125.
Groene Amsterdammer, De : 84, 96, 98, 101, 102,
 126, 130.
 Groot, Jan Hein de : 68.

Grotowski, Jerzy : 38, 101.
Grotowski, Jerzy : 38, 101.
Gutt, Ernst-August : 29.

H

Haag, Ansgar : 24, 33, 88.
Haagse Comedie : 85, 89, 92, 98, 99, 102, 104, 112, 119.
Haagse Post : 102.
Haarlems Dagblad : 58, 87, 98, 99, 105, 123.
Habitue : 86.
Hageman, Harrie : 98.
Hall, J.N. van : 71, 76, 84, 94.
Hall, Peter : 71, 76, 84, 94.
Hamburger, Maik : 31, 94.
Hamlet : passim.
Hamlet en Elektra : 111.
Hamletmaschine, (Die) : 15, 104, 108.
Hamlet u podrumü : 103.
Hapgood, Robert : 56, 64, 86.
Havenbode, De : 95.
Heddema, Renske : 101.
Hedendaagsche Vaderlandsche Letter-oefeningen : 65, 66, 67, 68.
Heene, Steven : 130, 131.
Heijer, Jac : 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 116, 126.
Hellinga, Gerben : 120, 130, 131, 134.
Hendrichs : 70.
Henkes, Robbert-Jan : 36, 118, 135, 136, 137, 144, 146.
Hermans, Theo : 21, 27, 65.
Hess-Lütich, Ernest W.B. : 33.
Heylen, Romy : 30, 34, 63, 64, 66, 85, 90.
Hibbard, G.R. : 121.
Hitler, Adolf : 95.
Hoenselaars, Ton : 30, 64, 105, 145.
Höfele, Andres : 104.
Hofmann, Norbert : 28, 33.
Hogendoorn, W. : 34.
Hogere Burgerschool : 70.
Holderness, Graham : 13.
Holland Festival : 100, 119.
Holmes, James : 46, 49, 52, 141.
Hortman, Wilhelm : 104.
Houtman, Dirkje : 119.
Hove, Ivo van : 34, 105, 119, 120, 127, 130, 134.
Huis aan de Werf : 118.
Huis van Labdakos, Het : 108.
Huizinga, Harry : 57, 118.
Hunningher, Ben : 70.

I

Ibsen, Henrik : 80.

InDependance : 100.
I Never Really Understood Hamlet Prince : 111.
In het kasteel : 105, 108, 109.

J

Jackson, Barry : 86.
Jacobs, Augusta : 82.
Jakobson, Roman : 30, 35.
Jaszi, Peter : 36.
Jelgerhuis, Johannes : 68.
Jenkins, Harold : 44, 54, 64, 91, 132.
Jespersen, Otto : 56.
Jong, Anneriek de : 126.
Jong, Theo de : 119.
Jonk, Jan : 13, 14, 146.

K

Kalb, Jonathan : 101, 104.
Kamphoven, Ruud van : 57.
Kellendonk, Frans : 11, 80, 116, 117, 118, 141, 147.
Kerkhoven, Marianne van : 102, 111.
Kermode, Frank : 51.
King Lear : 104, 108, 119, 130.
Kittay, Eva : 55.
Kleine Komedie, De : 99.
Kloos, Willem : 81.
Kock, Petra de : 99.
Koen, Mirjam : 58.
Kohout, Pavel : 57, 105, 106.
Kok, A.S. : 68, 72, 146.
Komrij, Gerrit : 17, 36, 48, 57, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 121, 122, 126, 132, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 141, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148.
Koninklijke Vlaamse Schouwburg : 106, 108.
Koolhaas, Anton : 89.
Korpel, Luc : 65.
Kosinzev, Grigory M. : 94.
Kossmann, Ernst : 68.
Koster, Cees : 70, 72, 81.
Koster, Simon : 70.
Kott, Jan : 94, 95, 98, 99, 148.
Kottman, Pieter : 130.
Kowzan, Tadeusz : 31.
Kriek, Jeroen : 111, 126.
Kujamäki, Pekka : 54.
Kunst, De : 89.

L

Laan, Ter : 68.
Lamers, Jan Joris : 103, 147.
Lange, Daniël de : 102.
Last Action Hero : 42.

LeCompte, Elizabeth : 38.
 Leek, Robert H. : 14, 68, 70, 80, 94, 115, 117.
 Leeuwe, Hans de : 65, 68, 72.
 Leeuwen, Ko van : 58, 98, 99, 103.
 Lefevere, André : 11, 21, 22, 33, 44, 45.
 Lehrer, Adrienne : 55.
 Leidsch Dagblad : 124, 125.
 Lennep, Jacob van : 69, 76.
 Lescaijle, Katharina : 66.
 Leur, Willem Pieter de : 41, 42, 72, 77, 80, 86, 146, 148.
 Levy, Jiri : 27, 31, 33, 47, 51.
 Lieblein, Leanore : 108.
 Liefhebber, Peter : 99, 123, 125.
 Lier, Joseph van : 78.
 Linden-Retowski, Von : 69.
 Lintelo, Peter : 104.
 Living Theatre, The : 100.
 Loening, Richard : 72.
 Loffelt, A.C. : 14, 71, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 84, 125, 147.
 Loggem, Manuel van : 89.
 Looy, Jac. (Jacobus) van : 17, 36, 48, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, 121, 138, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147.
 Looy-Gelder, Titia van : 80.
 Loughrey, Brian : 13.
 Lugné Poë, Aurélien : 79.
 Luna, La : 99, 102, 103, 104.

M

M.C. Wisecrack / Support Act Hamlet : 111.
 Maanen, Hans van : 98, 119, 120.
 Maatschappij Discordia : 58, 98, 118.
Macbeth : 12, 13, 71, 79, 80, 119.
 Mack, Maynard : 51.
 Macready, William : 69.
 Magnusson, Lynne : 47.
 Marnix, Lord of St Aldegonde : 22.
 Marowitz, Charles : 15, 17, 40, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 110, 147.
 McHale, Brian : 45.
Medea : 108.
 Meester Jr., Johan de : 86, 88, 89, 93, 102, 148.
 Meininger Company, The : 72, 76.
 Merino, Raquel : 40, 41.
 Meulen, Marjo van der : 123.
 Meurice, Paul : 72.
 Meyer, Dennis : 100, 119.
 Michiels, Ivo : 111.
 Mickery : 99.
 Mijnsen, Frans : 85.
 Mitterwurzer : 69.
 Moïssi, Alexander : 88.

N

Monsjou, Frederik van : 89.
 Moor, Guido de : 41, 42, 98, 99, 111, 112, 124, 127, 146.
 Moor, Louis B. : 68, 70.
 Moore, Ed. : 68.
Morgen, De : 108, 130, 131.
 Mounin, George : 27, 39.
 Mukarovsky, Jan : 46, 116.
 Müller, Heiner : 15, 103, 104, 108, 110, 111.
 Naaijken, Ton : 4, 81.
 Nationaal-Socialistische Beweging (N.S.B.) : 88.
Nationale Toneel, Het : 105, 119, 130, 134.
Nederlandsche Spectator, De : 75.
Nederlandsch Tooneel, Het (ook Het Tooneel) : 17, 70, 71, 77.
 Nederlandsch Tooneelverbond, Het : 71.
 Nederlandse Vereniging voor Seksuele Hervorming : 96.
 Nederlof, Aat : 111.
New Cambridge Shakespeare : 136.
 Niedzwiecki, Patricia : 41, 106, 107.
Nieuwe Gids, De : 79.
Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant : 80, 84, 85, 89.
Nieuwsblad van het Noorden : 57, 118, 125.
Nieuws van de Dag : 83, 84, 85, 86.
 Nomade, De : 118.
Noordhollands Dagblad : 117, 138.
 Nord, Christiane : 97.
Norton Critical Edition : 131.
 Noteboom, Wim : 96, 97, 98, 138, 139.
NRC Handelsblad : 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 116, 126, 130.
 NTG : 105, 106, 108.

O

Odeon : 79.
Oedipus : 108.
 Old Vic Theatre Company : 89.
 Olivier, Laurence : 14, 89, 120.
 Ollefen, Daan van : 70.
 Onafhankelijk Toneel : 57, 58, 97, 99, 102, 103, 118.
 Opbroecke, Roland : 107.
 Open Space Theatre : 99, 100.
 Orangists : 68.
 Oranje, Hans : 57, 108, 115, 116, 126, 127, 131, 134, 138.
Orestes : 108.
Osric : 104.
 Ostyn, M. : 108.
Oxford Shakespeare : 121, 136.

P

Parcival : 119.
Parool, Het : 58, 79, 93, 120, 123, 137, 138.
 Paul Frank, Armin : 52.
 Pavis, Patrice : 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 82, 121.
 Penninck, Renate : 63, 65, 68, 69.
 Pericles : 112.
 Perk, Jacques : 81.
 Peters, Anton : 68, 69, 127.
 Peters, Steven : 68, 69, 127.
 Petersohn, Roland : 104.
 Pfister, Manfred : 33.
 Pieters, Mark : 11, 19.
 Pinochet, Augusto : 95.
 Pirandello, Luigi : 111.
 Place, Antoine de la : 64.
 Porteman, Karel : 65.
 Possart, Ernst : 69.
 Post, Paul : 69, 71, 102.
 Powers, Sharon B. : 82.
Prince Hamyul : 57, 103.
 Publikstheater, Het : 17, 99, 111, 112, 119, 120.
 Pym, Anthony : 11, 20, 21, 22, 58.

Q

Questiers, Catharina : 66.

R

Raamtheater, Het : 57, 58, 98, 100, 105, 106, 120, 126.
 Rabkin, Gerald : 31.
 Redgrave, Michael : 89.
 Regentes, De : 105, 106.
 Reiman, Donald H. : 82.
 Rekers, Guus : 101, 102, 107.
 Rep, Wil : 14.
 Residentie Tooneel : 125.
Richard III : 98, 112.
 Rido : 84.
 Rijnders, Gertjan : 17, 41, 42, 72, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 119, 120, 134, 146, 148.
 Ritsema, Jan : 72, 134, 135, 146.
Riverside Shakespeare : 131.
 Rodriguez, Liliane : 11, 19.
 Roland Holst, Adriaan : 91.
Romeo and Juliet : 70, 76, 112.
 Roorda van Eysinga, P. Ph. : 14, 68.
 Rosenthal, Daniel : 94.
 Rössing, J.H. : 70, 71, 72, 76, 85, 86.
 Rotterdam Schouwburg : 65.
 Rouffaer, Senne : 106.

Royaards, Willem : 77, 78, 148.
 Royal Shakespeare Company : 94, 100.
 Rutten, André : 100.

S

S.I.P. : 105, 124.
 Salama-Carr, Myriam : 63.
 Saurin, Bernard Joseph : 68.
 Schaik-Willing, Jeanne van : 78, 91, 92.
 Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen : 65, 66.
 Schiller, Friedrich : 76.
 Schimmel, Hendrik J. : 71.
 Schlegel, August Wilhelm : 69, 72, 73.
 Schleiermacher, Friedrich Daniel Ernst : 72.
 Schneider, Eric : 13, 102.
 Schoneveld, C.W. : 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 82.
 Schouten, Martin : 57, 105.
 Schuil, J.B. : 85, 87.
 Schultze, Brigitte : 29.
 Schwab, Hermann : 78.
 Seneca : 110.
 Shakespeare, William : *passim*.
 Shelley, Percy Bysshe : 81, 82.
 Sherman, Stuart : 99, 101, 103.
 Smith, Charles G. : 48.
 Smitskamp, Ike : 94.
 Snell-Hornby, Mary : 30, 31, 32, 33, 46, 47.
 Somers, Maartje : 138.
 Sophocles : 111.
 Spurgeon, Caroline : 51.
 St. Jerome : 82.
 Stalin, Joseph : 104.
 STAN : 118, 119.
Standaard, De : 108, 139.
 Steenberg, Paul : 17, 72, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 99, 102, 104, 111, 146.
 Steiner, George : 50.
 Stichting Wereldpremières : 100, 105.
 Stoppard, Tom : 103, 104, 111.
 Straatman, Tineke : 57, 58, 98, 105.
 Suchtelen, Nico van : 14, 89, 146.
 Sulick, M. : 48.
 Susam-Sarajeva, Sebnem : 19, 20, 21, 23, 126.

T

Tachtigers : 80, 81.
 Tanghe, Dirk : 14, 17, 105, 120, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 129, 130, 146.
Telegraaf, De : 84, 99, 123, 125.
 Teneeter : 57, 119.
 Tersteeg, Gijsbert : 88.
 Theater Instituut Nederland : 15, 69, 70, 78, 85, 86, 88, 98, 106, 108, 126.

Theater UP : 118.
 Theatre of Mistakes : 99.
Théâtre Public : 119.
 Thompson, Ann : 47.
 Thyestes : 108.
 Tiesema, Watze : 98, 124, 127.
Tijd, De : 87, 93, 101.
 Tillemans, Walter : 105.
 Tilly, Morris Palmer : 48.
 Tindemans, Klaas : 127.
Titus Andronicus : 130.
 Tiva, Lappihalme : 97.
 Todd, Richard : 22.
 Tollens, Hendrik : 69.
Toneelgazet, De : 110.
 Toneelgroep Amsterdam : 119, 134.
 Toneelgroep Centrum : 112.
 Toneelhuis, Het : 105, 108, 118.
Toneel Theatraal : 110.
 Tooneelschool, De : 71.
 Torquato Tasso : 108.
 Totzeva, Sophia : 31, 32, 33, 37, 47, 51.
 Toury, Gideon : 15, 20, 21, 27, 28, 36, 39, 43.
Troilus and Cressida : 100, 112, 116.
 Trojaanse Paard, Het : 99, 104, 105, 107, 108, 110.
Trouw : 57, 95, 98, 101, 108, 115, 116, 127, 131, 134, 135, 138.
 Trust, De : 98, 118, 119, 127, 130, 131, 134.
 Turgenev, Ivan : 72.

U

Ubersfeld, Anne : 30, 31.
Utrechts Nieuwsblad : 57, 98, 118, 120, 127.
 Utrecht Stadsschouwburg : 120.
 Uyldert, Maurits : 87, 96.

V

Vaderland, Het : 71, 77, 88, 100.
 Velden, Erik van der : 118, 120, 127.
 Veltman, Louis Jacques : 70.
 Veltrusky, Jiri : 30.
 Venuti, Lawrence : 11, 16, 23, 45, 50, 97.
 Veraart, Karin : 108.
 Verdoes, P. : 126.
 Vere, Edward de : 58.
 Vereeniging Het Nederlandsch Tooneel, de : 17, 70, 71, 72, 75, 77, 78, 80, 84, 146, 148.
 Verkade, Eduard : 17, 42, 48, 72, 78, 79, 80, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 93, 97, 112, 130, 135, 143, 146, 148.
 Verkade-Cartier van Dissel : 79, 80, 83.
 Verlangen, Het : 111.
 Vestdijk, Simon : 117.

Vinay, Jean-Paul : 52.
 Vlaams Theater Instituut : 14, 106.
 Voeten, Bert : 17, 36, 42, 49, 57, 62, 78, 85, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 104, 107, 108, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 122, 123, 124, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 137, 141, 143, 144, 145, 148.
Volkskrant, De : 57, 58, 95, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 105, 108, 126, 131.
 Vos, Erik : 68, 77, 78, 80, 94, 99, 123, 124, 127, 130.
 Vos, Jan C. : 68, 77, 78, 80, 94, 99, 123, 124, 127, 130.
Vrije Volk, Het : 93, 95.
Vrij Nederland : 98, 120, 130, 131, 134.
 Vulcanius : 22.
 Vuyk, Kees : 113.

W

Waals, J.C. van der : 97, 98, 116, 145.
 Weisé : 69.
 Welling, Karen : 99, 123.
 Wellwarth, George E. : 29.
 Werstine, Paul : 13, 41.
 Wertheim, A.C. : 71.
 Wieland, Christoph Martin : 69.
 WIKOR : 99.
 Will, Chris : 80.
 Williams, Raymond : 28, 41.
 William V (stadholder) : 67.
 Willink, Luc : 88.
 Wilson, Robert : 13, 38, 89, 96.
 Winkels, Peter J.A. : 80.
Winter's Tale, A : 108.
winters verhaal, Een : 108.
 Wisse, C.J. : 95.
 Wolfsmond : 104.
 Woodmansee, Martha : 36.
 Wooster Group, The : 38.
 Wulfften Palthe, Joh van : 80.

Y

Youth Theatre : 89.

Z

Zanten, Henri van : 104, 111, 118.
 Zeilstra, Wijnand : 124, 125.
 Zonneveld, Loek : 98, 126, 130.
 Zuber-Skerritt, Orrtrun : 31, 47.
 Zubli, Ambrosius Justus : 17, 63, 67, 68, 69, 72, 75, 118, 145, 146, 148.
 Zuidelijk Toneel, Het : 105, 112, 119, 134.
 Zweedse Sokjes, De : 118.

Samenvatting

Dit proefschrift onderzoekt het verschijnsel hervertaling als fenomeen binnen de wereld van het theater aan de hand van tien op het Nederlandse toneel opgevoerde hervertalingen van *Hamlet*.

Voorgaande theorieën beschouwen hervertaling hetzij als een nieuwe poging om de perfecte vertaling te maken, hetzij om de originele tekst meer toegankelijk te maken voor de doelcultuur. De meest recente theorieën stellen echter dat hervertaling het resultaat is van een conflict binnen de doelcultuur, waarbij verschillende, conflicterende groepen zich uiten door een nieuwe versie van een tekst te gebruiken. De vraag – centraal in hoofdstuk 1 – is welke personen hierbij betrokken zijn en, meer specifiek, welke rol vertaler, opdrachtgever en publiek hierin vervullen.

Eén van de meest interessante bevindingen van deze studie is het feit dat elke nieuwe tekst opnieuw kiest voor een andere benadering van de dilemma's die een vertaler voor het toneel moet oplossen. De hoeveelheid gezichtspunten op één enkel stuk is daarmee indrukwekkend te noemen. Op basis van eerdere theorieën, de bevindingen uit het *Hamlet* onderzoek en het raamwerk van de normtheorie van Gideon Toury is in hoofdstuk 2 een overzicht opgesteld van de mogelijkheden die de toneelvertaler heeft.

Deze mogelijkheden komen voort uit een aantal eigenschappen die kenmerkend zijn voor een toneeltekst. Omdat deze tekst gebruikt wordt in een opvoering, is het slechts één tekensysteem te midden van andere (beweging, geluid, etc.). Bovendien zijn er bij de opvoering meerdere mensen betrokken, die hun eigen stempel op de productie drukken: de oorspronkelijke schrijver, maar ook de regisseur en de acteurs. Daarnaast wordt er op meerdere niveaus gecommuniceerd: de tekst wordt door de personages gebruikt om met elkaar te spreken, maar vanuit het totale stuk wordt er ook gecommuniceerd met het publiek. Tenslotte is de tekst een literaire constructie, die gepresenteerd wordt als dialoog, die om die reden verwant is aan spreektaal.

Als gevolg hiervan loopt de toneelvertaler in concreto tegen vier keuzes aan. In de eerste plaats moet hij zijn verhouding ten opzichte van de oorspronkelijke schrijver bepalen: maakt hij zich daaraan ondergeschikt, gelooft hij dat zoiets niet mogelijk is en laat hij zich leiden door een bepaalde focus bij de benadering van de tekst, brengt hij zijn eigen poëtische kwaliteiten in het geweer of maakt hij zelf een nieuwe tekst op basis van het materiaal van het origineel. In de tweede plaats kiest hij hoeveel hij van de oorspronkelijke tekst wil vertalen: gebruikt hij alles, verwijdert hij een deel vanwege praktische beperkingen van het toneel, houdt hij alleen datgene over dat het publiek zal begrijpen of voegt hij zelf nieuwe elementen toe. In de derde plaats kiest hij of hij alle socio-culturele elementen uit het origineel zal behouden, of besluit hij om bepaalde onbekende elementen te verwijderen, te moderniseren, of om een combinatie van modernisatie en retentie in te zetten. Tenslotte moet hij een beslissing nemen over de literaire vorm van het origineel: behoudt hij deze in klank en vorm, vertaalt hij deze naar een constructie die een vergelijkbaar effect heeft op het publiek, of versoepelt hij het begrip van de tekst door het poëtische taalgebruik te verminderen.

In hoofdstuk 3 komen de casus aan de orde. De serie begint met de hervertaling van de Franse bewerking van *Hamlet* door Ducis door Ambrosius Justus Zubli (1786), een reactie op de vertaling van Margareta Geertruid de Cambon-Van der Werken (1777). Een eeuw later volgt de eerste directe *Hamlet* vertaling die op het toneel vertoond wordt, van de hand van L.A.J. Burgersdijk (1882). Deze wordt vervangen in 1907 door de *Hamlet* die Jac. van Looy in opdracht van regisseur Eduard Verkade maakt. Vijftig jaar later maakt Bert Voeten een nieuwe vertaling in opdracht van regisseur Paul Steenbergen (1957). De volgende casus is de opvoering van in het Nederlands vertaalde *Hamlet* bewerking van Charles Marowitz door een studentengezelschap. Deze wordt gevolgd door de Belgische *Hamlet*-hertalingen van Hugo Claus (1982) en Jan Decorte (1985). Na deze twee excursus is de volgende hervertaling aan de beurt, die van Gerrit Komrij (1986) voor Gerardjan Rijnders. Na Komrij komt de vertaling van Johan Boonen (1991) voor Dirk Tanghe, waarbij de kindervertaling van Carel Alphenaar (1996) voor Liesbeth Coltof ook aan de orde komt. Het tableau wordt afgesloten met twee hervertalingen die reageren op de *Hamlet*-bewerking van Theu Boermans (1997), namelijk de *Hamlet* van Frank Albers voor Johan Doesburg (1999) en die van Erik Binder-voet en Robbert-Jan Henkes voor Jan Ritsema en 't Barre Land (2001).

In de verschillende hervertalingen tekent zich een duidelijk patroon af met betrekking tot de verschillende normen. Enerzijds is er een continue afwisseling tussen de poëtische en de communicatieve vertalers. Jac. van Looy reageert op Burgersdijk, omdat hij vindt dat deze niet poëtisch genoeg vertaalt; Voeten reageert op Van Looy, omdat hij niet vindt dat je het duistere duister moet laten; Komrij reageert (impliciet) op Voeten, want hij wil het geheim bewaren; ook Bindervoet en Henkes weigeren water bij de wijn te doen om in de smaak te vallen bij een ongeletterd publiek, zoals volgens hen hun voorgangers Boermans en Albers deden.

Anderzijds is er een steeds sterkere neiging tot modernisering. Terwijl in de oudste versies de discussie nog is of de tekst met zijn hatelijke karakters, kwaadaardige beraadslagingen en wrede taferelen wel geschikt is voor het toneel, en Burgersdijk poogt de onwettelijkheden weg te poetsen als ware het een wrat in een portret, komt daar vanaf de vertaling van Voeten verandering in. Voeten is de eerste die de aanspreekvormen moderniseert; na de seksuele revolutie benadrukt hij zelfs een aantal schunnige elementen in het origineel. Komrij gaat hierin een stap verder. In de jaren negentig tenslotte vindt er op alle fronten modernisering plaats: niet alleen van grofheden,

maar ook op het gebied van beeldspraak en zelfs de realia. Dit gebeurt hetzij om de personages levender te maken (Boonen), de gebeurtenissen meer aan te laten sluiten bij de leefwereld van kinderen (Alphenaar), of omdat 'onze oren niet meer gewend zijn aan het uitbeelden van taal' (Boermans). Met dit laatste argument knoopt Boermans de twee tendensen samen: de modernisering van het stuk kan óók betekenen dat het literair taalgebruik moet worden aangepast aan het taalgebruik van onze tijd.

Met de constatering dat de hervertalingen zich op een normatief niveau van elkaar onderscheiden, hebben we echter nog niet duidelijk wat de oorzaken van deze hervertalingen zijn. De vertalers zelf hebben klaarblijkelijk een andere visie over wat de juiste manier van vertalen is en maken met hun eigen tekst een statement ten opzichte van de tekst van hun voorganger of voorgangers. Op het toneel echter zijn het niet de vertalers alleen die bepalen dat er een nieuwe tekst op de planken komt. Sterker nog, zij hebben daar vaak niets over te zeggen.

Ons beeld van de vertaalpraktijk op het toneel behoeft nodig bijstelling. Zoals blijkt uit dit proefschrift zal bij bestudering van een theatervertaling veel meer gelet moeten worden op de rol van de opdrachtgever van de vertaling. De artistieke visie van de opdrachtgever blijkt namelijk in veel gevallen bepalend voor de vorm van de vertaling.

De rol van opdrachtgever wordt aan het begin van de twintigste eeuw opgeëist door de regisseur. Op het moment dat de regisseur een beeldbepalende rol in de productie van een voorstelling gaat spelen, benut hij de tekst van het stuk als een instrument om zijn concept te dragen. Verkade is de eerste regisseur die zich op zo'n manier van een tekst bedient. Na hem zijn het altijd de regisseurs die het initiatief nemen tot het maken van een toneelvertaling. Hiermee tekent zich een sterk onderscheid af tussen toneel en literatuur (die overigens ook al zichtbaar was ten tijde van de opvoeringen van de Ducis *Hamlet* – deze gold namelijk als standaard voor het toneel, terwijl er andere versies op de boekenplank stonden). Over het algemeen kiest de regisseur niet een voorradige nieuwe tekst, als hij ervoor kan zorgen dat er een speciaal voor hem gemaakte versie komt. Hij drukt zijn stempel niet alleen op de tekst in de keuze voor een vertaler (en impliciet diens vertaalnormen), maar vaak ook geeft hij deze een expliciete opdracht mee (zoals regisseur Coltof aan vertaler Alphenaar en Ritsema aan Bindervoet en Henkes).

Tijdens de jaren zestig maakt de rol van de regisseur een ontwikkeling door die hem nog meer invloed geeft op de tekst. Terwijl voor die tijd de uitvoerders zich veelal ten doel stellen de bedoelingen van de oorspronkelijke schrijver tot uitdrukking te brengen, wordt de nadruk na de jaren zestig veel meer gelegd op de visie van de theatermakers. Geïnspireerd door Brecht en Artaud drukken theatermakers in de eerste plaats zichzelf en de tijd waarin ze leven uit in de tekst. Bovendien proberen sommigen de tekst in een nieuwe vorm te presenteren. Deze houding leidt tot experimenten met *Hamlet* als die van Marowitz en Müller, die in vertaling ook in Nederland komen (1966 en 1982), en tot experimenten met adaptatie over de grenzen van taal heen als die van Claus en Decorte in België, die de nieuwe benaming 'hertaling' krijgen. Deze nieuwe, vrije benadering van het oorspronkelijke materiaal inspireert regisseurs om zich minder gebonden te voelen aan de oorspronkelijke tekst en geeft een sterke impuls aan vrijzinnige vertalingen en bewerkingen.

De hervertaling waar de regisseur opdracht toe geeft sluit aan bij de normen van de voorstelling. Verkade vraagt Van Looy om de stouw van Shakespeare te behouden, Voeten levert Steenbergen een sobere en menselijke *Hamlet*, Rijnders' verzoek om de vouwen en plooiën in Shakespeare niet uit te vlakken wordt door Komrij gehonoreerd, Tanghes verlangen om echte mensen op toneel te brengen komt terug in Boonens tekst en Bindervoet en Henkes' *Hamlet* geeft Ritsema de aanknopingspunten om de structuur van het meesterwerk te ontvouwen. Zo is de vertaling de expressie van de visie van de regisseur op zijn individuele voorstelling.

Sommige regisseurs gaan echter verder dan dat. Tegelijk met hun persoonlijke visie nemen ze stelling tegen de vertalingen en opvoeringen van hun voorgangers. Verkade, bijvoorbeeld, reageert op de 'houders van het verleden' (De Leur en Bouwmeester) en de monotone tekst van Burgersdijk, Albers reageert met regisseur Doesburg op de verhaspelde *Hamlet* van Boermans en Ritsema is verklaard tegenstander van het biechtstoeltoneel van zijn voorgangers Rijnders, Boermans en Doesburg. Zo wordt de hervertaling niet alleen een instrument voor differentiatie, maar zelfs een wapen in een artistiek of zelfs politiek conflict.

Hoewel deze conflicten niet altijd expliciet benoemd worden in de presentatie van de hervertaling, speelt deze in veel gevallen wel op de achtergrond mee. De hervertaling van Zubli van de Ducis *Hamlet* hoort mogelijk bij de patriotten, waar die van De Cambon-Van der Werken bij de aanhangers van de stadhouder hoort; Burgersdijks vertaling hoort bij een beweging die het bestaande toneel wil verheffen met Shakespeare; Verkades revolutionaire theater wil afrekenen met de Duits-geïnspireerde romantiek; het studenten- en later vlakke-vloertheater in de jaren zestig en zeventig vindt dat de structuur van de stukken die de grote gezelschappen spelen, niet meer 'van deze tijd is'. Alleen in de jaren tachtig en negentig worden de voorstellingen individualistischer en hoort een vertaling minder bij een beweging dan bij een groep theatermakers.

In de zoektocht naar oorzaken voor hervertalingen mogen de toeschouwers niet vergeten worden. Het feit dat elke nieuwe *Hamlet* vertaling bij het publiek tot heftige discussies heeft geleid, bewijst dat de normen van

zo'n nieuwe tekst geen persoonlijke willekeur zijn, maar gebaseerd zijn op al dan niet gedeelde (vertaal)normen.

Elke poging om dit publiek vervolgens als geheel te categoriseren, struikelt echter over haar heterogeniteit. Slechts in een enkel geval heeft het corps recensenten zich unaniem tegen een vertaling uitgesproken, omdat de tekst (inmiddels) niet meer voldeed. De recensenten zijn dan ook zelden in volledige overeenstemming, hetgeen een definitie van 'de verwachtingsnormen van *het* publiek' onzinnig maakt.

Er bestaat wel een dialoog tussen de leden van het publiek en de professionals. Op het moment dat een recensent uitspreekt wat hem niet zint in een bestaande vertaling, creëert hij het perspectief op een nieuwe weg die de theatermakers én de vertalers in kunnen slaan. J.C. van der Waals' suggestie om modernisering in de tekst te zoeken werd bijvoorbeeld wel nagevolgd. Dit werd echter niet meteen toegepast in de eerstvolgende opvoering, maar pas op het moment dat een regisseur een nieuwe visie op *Hamlet* neer wilde zetten. Alleen als het belang en de visie van de opdrachtgever overeenkomen met de ideeën van het publiek, wordt er actie op ondernomen.

Dit proefschrift toont aan dat de motivatie voor een hervertaling op het toneel niet alleen gezocht moet worden in de belangen van het publiek, noch alleen in de zoektocht van de vertaler naar de perfecte vertaling. Hervertaling is een middel dat gebruikt wordt in een artistiek conflict. Met de hervertaling maken de opvoerders van de nieuwe tekst zichzelf zichtbaar, met hun visie op het oude stuk. In de analyse van een hervertaling zal dus bijzondere aandacht besteed moeten worden aan de wijze waarop de nieuwe versie, door toepassing van afwijkende vertaalnormen, de theatervoorstelling waar zij in gebruikt wordt, onderscheidt van eerdere voorstellingen.

Curriculum vitae

Jan Willem Mathijssen werd op 4 september 1974 geboren te Etten-Leur. In 1993 behaalde hij zijn diploma ongedeelde VWO met Grieks aan het Newman College te Breda, om vervolgens Algemene Letteren te gaan studeren. Naast Algemene Letteren studeerde hij in 1999 af in de studies Engelse Taal- en Letterkunde en Italiaanse Taal- en Letterkunde, de laatste twee *cum laude*. Terwijl hij zijn brood verdiende bij achtereenvolgens Uitgeverij Intertaal, Bruna.nl en Bruna en met het geven van cursussen Italiaans, werkte hij in zijn eigen tijd aan zijn proefschrift, voltooide in samenwerking met drs Emilin Lap een integrale vertaling van Shakespeares *Much Ado About Nothing*, vertaalde hij voor toneelschoolproducties Sarah Kanes *Phaedra's Love* en delen uit Shakespeares *Othello* en *All's Well That Ends Well* en vertaalde hij *Cassandra* en *Bombshell* van toneelschrijfster Eva K. Mathijssen naar het Engels, voor producties in Brno (Theaterfestival) en York (Pilot Theatre).

