

**To be, or not to be Translated:
An Investigation of Translational Challenges in Danish Translations
of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1623)**

by

Felix Larsen Stenderup

A Master's Thesis

Submitted to the Department of English

Aalborg University

Aage Hill-Madsen

4. August 2025

Abstract

This thesis is about the translational challenges associated with translating Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1623), and it uses the three different Danish translated versions of *Hamlet* by three different Danish translators. The research question is: **What are the translational challenges when translating Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1623), and how do the Danish translations of *Hamlet* by Ole Sarvig, Johannes Sløk and Niels Brunse reflect these challenges?** The theory covers some of the core theoretical concepts that are significant when translating Shakespeare including words on; drama translation, the retranslations hypothesis, source text ambiguity, and translating antiquated language. The methodology introduces some of Chesterman's translations strategies, as well as a few original ones created based on the theory. The analysis finds that there are many unique translation challenges in Shakespeare's works, including ambiguity created by the lack of a single source text, and also shows three quite different approaches to the Danish translation of the work. The discussion covers how the three different texts do not adhere to the concept put forth by the retranslation hypothesis, as they are very different, and each have their own unique relationship with the source text. The conclusion is that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* contains several translational challenges, which are not quite solved by contemporary translation theory, as a result translator's end up in relatively unpredictable translation patterns, which might prove interesting for further analysis, as these present unique insights into the development of language and our understanding of translation.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Theory	3
Intro to Theory	3
The Ambiguity of the ST	3
Types of Drama Translation	5
Re-Translation in Drama.....	8
<i>Hamlet's</i> Translation Challenges	11
Elements of Style	13
Methodology	16
Analysis.....	26
Archaic Language	28
Stage Direction.....	40
Version Variance	51
Discussion	55
Conclusion	61
Bibliography	65

Abbreviations

ST: Source text

TT: Target text

SL: Source language

TL: Target language

TR: Target reader

TP: Target Play

Q1: The first quarto

Q2: The second quarto

F1: The Folio

G1: Literal translation

G2: Loan, calque

G3: Transposition

G4: Unit shift

G5: Phrase structure change

G6: Clause structure change

G7: Sentence structure change

G8: Cohesion change

G9: Level shift

G10: Scheme change

S1: Synonymy

S2: Antonymy

S3: Hyponymy

S4: Converses

S5: Abstraction change

S6: Distribution change

S7: Emphasis change

S8: Paraphrase

S9: Trope change

S10: Other semantic changes

D1: Archaic language use

D2: Drama adjustment

D3: Version variance

Introduction

The languages of the world are in a constant state of evolution, and as the world changes, so too do the many languages we use. While the nature and speed of these changes can vary greatly from language to language, it is well established that all languages change and evolve with time. These changes to the nature of language affect many different aspects of society, but as society becomes more globalised, and communication is established between more languages and cultures, bridging this gap in communication between languages becomes more and more central. The scientific discipline of translation studies has developed significantly over the years, made apparent through different theoretical developments in aspects such as the definitions of what constitutes a source text as well as the translational methods and strategies used in translating works of drama.

Shakespeare's works are regarded as contemporary literary classics and are widely renowned for their unique use of the English language and their iconic stories. In this situation, the modern acclaim these works enjoy is not only related to their plot and characters but is also closely tied to the iconicity of Shakespeare's writing style. Based on this, the works have historically not been edited to align with modern writing styles and grammar, and due to this, they hold a very unique position in the literary tradition. Since Shakespeare's works hold this unique position, they are likely to function differently from other works when looking at them through the lens of translation. Normally, a modern translation will seek to align the translated text with the contemporary literary tradition and will, as such, introduce the work to a new reading audience. However, with Shakespeare's works, part of their iconicity is related to the old language used in the original work, which poses a unique challenge to the translator, as they have to make a choice in their translations between maintaining some of the original iconicity or adjusting it to a more contemporary language and style. Another challenge is the nature of the works, as a lot of Shakespeare's iconic works are his plays, and while these are popular as performances, his works are also

incredibly popular as literary works. Due to this, there is more than one way to go about translating his works. The processes behind the translations of such important works hold many insights into how language and translation have and continue to evolve.

There have been several Danish translations over the years, and because of the unique challenges that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1623) presents to translators, and the work's significance to the literary tradition in general, this makes it very significant to study in a translational context. As such, this is my research question:

What are the translational challenges when translating Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1623), and how do the Danish translations of *Hamlet* by Ole Sarvig, Johannes Sløk and Niels Brunse reflect these challenges?

Theory

Intro to Theory

Because of the unique nature of the work, there are many different aspects to consider when looking at the translations of *Hamlet* (1623). Given that the linguistic stage during which the text was written was so many centuries ago, the language used will inevitably have seen a wide array of significant and historical linguistic developments, which also play a central role during translation. While the contemporary English reader might expect the archaic style of the original Shakespeare text, expectations can differ when it comes to translation. Generally, when a modern translation is created, it is expected to follow modern grammatical structures, yet, as the iconicity of Shakespeare's works in part originates from the unique language style he utilised, it becomes essential to consider several potential challenges that can occur when translating *Hamlet* and simultaneously investigate how a translator might overcome these challenges.

The Ambiguity of the ST

When dealing with translation and translation studies, one of the most important aspects is the regard a translator has for the source text (ST), as this can drastically alter how a translator might approach the given text, and also dictate how they subsequently translate it.

However, such considerations are not exactly possible when it comes to *Hamlet*, as there exist multiple versions of *Hamlet*, all written by William Shakespeare, and all with differing content. Kathleen O. Irace introduces these as the *first quarto* (Q1), the *second quarto* (Q2), and the *first folio* (F1), which describe how these different versions have ambiguous origins. While the various versions are undoubtedly connected, it is not clear which of them, if any, is the definitive version. Additionally, some scholars speculate that certain versions might be drafts that allowed the production of the others, with Q1 being the

first draft, while others speculate that they could be reconstructions of the original play (Irace ix-1).

Regardless of the fundamental origins of the play, this situation entails that there are multiple potential STs to deal with, each with its own slightly different composition and content. As such, the determination of how closely something adheres to the ST becomes significantly more difficult. Due to this, it becomes essential to consider what potential versions the translators might be drawing from, although this is not always a simple endeavour, as the translator's intent and method are not easily gleaned from a superficial analysis. Furthermore, many revised versions of the play have been made over the years, incorporating elements of prior versions of the play to create versions that reflect all of the source material. Because of this, it is also possible that the translators have used only one of the many revised versions as the ST for their translation, and as such, the idea of *Hamlet* as a singular ST starts to unravel.

Frequently, translations tend to concern themselves with only one ST, which typically makes it simpler to make direct comparisons between different translations of the same text. However, the concept of the ST and its significance has long been widely discussed within the discipline and also raises many philosophical questions about the nature of writing and translation. One of the philosophers covering this is Jacques Derrida, who speaks about how the core meaning of a text conforms to the conditions in which it is regarded, and as such does not adhere directly to textual elements alone. The consequence of this idea arises from the text's state becoming independent of the language in which it is written, and it is thus able to exist as a piece that can be validly interpreted in multiple ways (Derrida 19). From this perspective, it means that it is not necessarily the ST that alone holds all the answers, and that the concept of the ST might not actually exist. On this, Derrida further writes:

In the limits to which it is possible, or at least *appears* possible, translation practices the difference between signified and signifier. But if this difference is

never pure, no more so is translation and for the notion of translation we would have to substitute a notion of *transformation*: a regulated transformation of one language by another, of one text by another (Derrida 20).

Here, he further expands on the general ambiguity of the ST and the resulting consequence this has on translation. He explains how it is not possible to have a pure connection between ST and TT, due to the meaning of the ST being in a state of flux, resulting in the translation becoming a form of transformation of one text to another. These concepts also harmonize well with *Hamlet* and its three ambiguous versions, as this unique work is actually in a state of interpretative flux, where the “definitive” versions that are crafted of the work have to draw on and interpret different meanings and word, which transforms the three STs into a combined ST. From an analytical perspective, it is worth considering how meaning is transferred between ST and TT, and how the unique quirks of *Hamlet*’s ST challenge the translators and the ways they engage with the ST, and these considerations might be important during the analysis.

Types of Drama Translation

While many of the works written by William Shakespeare carry a great deal of significance as literary works, they were initially written as plays and thus fall within the genre of other theatrical productions and drama. Based on this, the fundamental nature of the works differs from regular literary works, as there are different considerations to be made when translating works of drama, which ultimately creates translation differences when compared to other literary works. When it comes to drama, there is not always a very clear distinction between what is written in the script and how the script is performed on stage, and this lack of distinction can be a cause of contention within drama. Relating to this, Marvin Carlson talks about how some theorists posit that performance should strictly be a communication of a script, and nothing more, and that even the gestures and movements of the actors on the stage could upset the balance which the author has meticulously thought out, and thus spoil the

creative vision and genius of the play (Carlson 5-7). This restrictive view echoes some of those within translation studies, which advocate for the sanctity of the source text, and as such denounces changes or restrictions made in the reinterpretations, as these could upset the creative vision. This view is also echoed by Andrew Chesterman, who argues that the preservation and quantifiability of quality in translation is achieved through established translation norms and theoretical adherence, rather than continuous reinvention of methodology (2017, 295-297). Carlson further describes how other theorists have pushed back against this approach, by saying that it is more appropriate to see the script, and the performance of the script, as “two different communication systems between which certain messages might be ‘translated’”, (7-8) and as such marking that both ways of performing the script can be deemed as valid interpretations of the same work (Carlson 7-8). This view then creates a new notion of how meaning and intent can be translated and communicated in the new versions of the ST. The result of this is, that a translator potentially has multiple considerations to make when translating drama, since it is not only important to transfer meaning from ST to TT, but also very important to ensure that it will be possible to transfer the important dramaturgic elements from the TT to an actual stage performance.

However, given that there are split opinions about the sanctity and importance of the script compared to the performance, it becomes apparent that a potential drama translator could have certain opinions and perspectives on how a translation should be carried out. It then becomes increasingly relevant to consider what the possible intentions of the translators could be, and how these intentions might manifest in the translated texts that are to be investigated here. For this purpose, it becomes important to look at what specific needs and expectations translators are trying to fulfil when doing drama translations, and what repercussions this has for the TT that the translator produces. Sirkku Aaltonen describes three different types of drama translations: *Introductory translation*, *gloss translation* and *performance translation*. An introductory translation casts a wide net in terms of the audience

it is meant to capture. Rather than being tailored to one specific performance, it is targeted towards a large audience of readers and practitioners of theatre, and the translation is less likely to become outdated with time. Gloss translations, on the other hand, are targeted towards a much smaller audience, as these translations are made for directors meant to use the translation as a framework from which to craft the final expression of the play. This method has received criticism because the linguistic elements of the translation are no longer intended to become a fixed piece of literature. As a result, the theatrical elements of the work take precedence in the production, and the lifespan of the TT becomes virtually non-existent, as it is only created to be revised. Performance translation concerns itself with translations that are made with a specific theatrical production in mind and is linked closely to the specific scope and goals of the given production. Here, the lifespan of the translation can vary, depending on the length of the theatrical run, or whether the production becomes particularly popular and thus becomes an introductory translation in the future (Aaltonen 147-148, 107).

All three forms demonstrate how drama translations can assume different roles in the TL, depending on the specific needs they fulfil during translation. Since a script's performance is a form of translation, there will inevitably be a need for a translation that will align itself with the script's intended interpretation. This further means that re-translations of drama pieces might not necessarily follow the common trends that are seen with the re-translation hypothesis, as the inadequacies in the older translation will be more subjective, resulting in re-translations that will seek to alter the translation strategy into something the producer thinks will work better for their specific performance (Aaltonen 150). In this manner, theatre translations are more flexible and can therefore be more easily retrofitted into the literary traditions of the TL, as the translations, in some cases, can be requested with a specific goal in mind for the final product.

Itamar Even-Zohar speaks about how translated works act as their own part of the literary *polysystem* within the TL, and when translated, they then become adopted into the literary tradition of the TL (Even-Zohar 46-47). Here, polysystem refers to the pool of literary works a given language has, and how both translated and original works exist together and influence each other.

Based on this, drama translations would be even better equipped to be adopted as part of the literary polysystems of the TL if they are constructed as Gloss translations or Performance translations, as these are specifically tailored to be adaptations or adaptable to meet the expectations set forth by playwrights in the TL. In this manner the effect the TT of those two types of translations would have on the literary polysystem would likely be diminished a bit, as the interpretations that are put forth are more so tailored to fit within the established dramaturgic tradition of the TL rather than introducing new structures which have yet to be discovered. While the translations used in this investigation seem to have been crafted for use as both literary work and drama performance, these concepts will assist in crafting the methodology around identifying when and how the text is modified for the purposes of drama.

Re-Translation in Drama

When analysing several different translations all based on the same ST it is important to consider how the existence of the previous translations might affect the production of new translations. When new translations are produced, they will invariably have to compete with prior translations and, at least to some degree, show how they differ from previous generations of translations, for the translator to justify the existence of their translation. In the field of translation studies, these questions are generally categorised under the retranslation hypothesis, which posits that retranslations of the same ST will adhere to certain changes in translator strategy and will generally follow specific trends within the field of translation studies.

Andrew Chesterman has discussed several aspects of this hypothesis, including how the general retranslation hypothesis posits that later translations of an ST tend to be closer to the original than the earlier translation. In this case, “being closer” refers to there being more adherence to the form and content of the ST (Chesterman 2017, 134). Here, there is some ambiguity in what is meant by and can be defined as “closer”, yet generally the broadest conclusion would be a decrease in paraphrasing translation and an increase in direct translation of form and content.

Chesterman then goes on to describe some of the reasons why this hypothesis could be true: He mentions how translators tend to assume a critical stance towards earlier translations and desire to improve upon them, that the existence of earlier translations will affect the reception of the new one and translators are aware of this fact, how language development allows the translator more freedom when translating and also that translation norms have changed, becoming more relaxed and allowing for greater adherence to the ST. However, despite these potential explanations, it is not yet apparent which holds the most weight, or even if these are always applicable (Chesterman 2017, 133-134). This ambiguity in retranslation trends also symbolises that the forces governing retranslations are not necessarily motivated solely by a desire for greater textual accuracy in translation, but rather a combination of different factors which relate to the specific cultural contexts in which the text is produced.

Another who comments on this distinction is C. Luke Soucy, who talks about how people tend to have much faith in a translator’s ability to overcome language barriers, and thus overestimate how much “truth” a translation produces. As a result, when faced with a retranslation of a work, it would be uncomfortable for the translators to identify how different they truly were. In this case, variations can, of course, originate from a translators desire to create something new and different, yet it is more often that these variations originate from the fact that a literary text can hold multiple meanings, and this will be even more true for

older texts which have withstood years of academic scrutiny, as there will already be a wealth of opinions and discussion about the core meanings of the ST and how best to transfer this content to other languages and cultures (Soucy). In this way, the retranslations will not only be beholden to an expectation that a retranslation will need some form of greater accuracy to justify its existence, but they will likely also have to adapt to modern readings and analyses of the ST when choosing how to convey meaning in the retranslation. This is further discussed by Soucy, who notes that every translation is, to some degree, an interpretation, and over time, a new generation of interpreters will emerge, along with new priorities for translation and who will conduct them (Soucy).

When analysing retranslations, there is also the question of the purpose of the translations and whether or not a translation can become outdated. Relating to this, it might be prudent to consider Lawrence Venuti's concepts of *domestication* and *foreignization*, as they relate to translation. Domestication is the act of decontextualising a ST through detaching it from the original language contexts and recreating a comparable set of contexts within the target language and thus transforming the text quite significantly. Foreignization, on the other hand, seeks to retain the feeling of foreignness in the TT, so that the reader can still identify the foreign elements in the text and more directly consider and engage with them. Regarding foreignization, it is not possible for a translation to avoid using domestication to some degree, as the cultural content and forms still have to be adapted to the new language medium and communicated through it (Venuti XIII-XIV). These concepts become very relevant when looking at the retranslation hypothesis, as it presents the hypothesis that later translations will be closer to the ST than the ones preceding it. In this regard, an earlier translation is hypothesised to be more domesticating in its translation, while newer translations will tend towards being more foreignizing.

This is also addressed by Outi Paloposki and Kaisa Koskinen, who write about the fact that there is uncertainty on the topic of first translations becoming dated, as it is ambiguous

whether or not it is all first translations that become dated, or if it is only domesticating first translations which become dated, and thus later need foreignizing translations. Alternatively, this could also be explained through language development, and that translations become dated because knowledge of the source languages increases, or that language as a whole evolves to a point where updating is needed. While both explanations have valid points, the first explanation seems to align itself well with the retranslation hypothesis itself, while the other one seeks explanations elsewhere in the discipline (Paloposki, Koskinen 28-29). These various elements illustrate some of the nuances present when dealing with retranslations, and as such it is important to consider how these different elements manifest themselves when looking at the different translations, and whether or not the retranslation hypothesis can provide additional context for some of the translational decisions that are made in the texts.

Hamlet's Translation Challenges

When examining works written by Shakespeare, there are a multitude of different elements to consider in terms of the ST and how it has been treated up until the point it is used for a translation. Firstly, due to a lot of Shakespeare's works being dramas, it is important to consider how the scripts have been committed to text in the first place, and what implications this has when conducting readings of said texts. With Shakespeare's plays, there are several different versions of the script from when the plays were initially performed, and these are typically used to create a single version of the text, yet this creates a problem in terms of consistency, as the texts themselves differ, and sometimes to a great degree. Cedric Watts wrote that *Hamlet* has many inconsistencies in the textual basis of the play. The first quarto, the second quarto and the folio, which provide the basis for all subsequent versions, differ significantly from one another, and it is common practice for editors of the texts to construct a new text, editing it to create a high-quality text, which may create the image of a stable and fixed text. However, this fails to account for the fact, that in its early days, the script for *Hamlet* was a living body of text and was likely being edited and tinkered with actively as it

was performed. Some versions of the script also eliminate characters, and sometimes the play is not performed in its entirety, and some of the narrative elements within the play never come to fruition. In this manner, it seems that Shakespeare himself might have never really reached the point where he could say he had a final and/or perfected version of the *Hamlet* script (Watts 10-15). Because of these factors it becomes increasingly important to look at and compare how the different translations of *Hamlet* have been made and edited, and what potential versions of the ST the translators might have had access to, and subsequently what effect this has on the translators ability to edit the text in their translation, or if the translation itself suffers because of editing or alterations.

The Danish translator Johannes Sløk, comments that with *Hamlet* specifically, there are a significant number of elements which are either added to the text or removed from the text in the second and third editions of the work. The second edition, despite its length, contained a large number of mistakes and omissions, and was likely printed in a hurry. This means that, despite the second edition being semi-official, it is still not complete. Because of these divergences in the different editions of the text, it is essential to consider which version one prefers when working with the play, and it will likely be necessary for modern editions of the play to fuse the two editions to some degree. Johannes Sløk used the Cambridge version of the play but mentions that he still deviates from that version several times throughout his translation (Sløk 184-185). This shows that different translators may use different versions of the play as a reference in their translations, but also that the version used is not deterministic for what content the translation will contain, as the translator can, and likely will, deviate from any singular version of the play, considering instead all of the available versions when crafting their translations.

Another translator named Johannes Valdemar Østerberg, also comments about how the stage direction in *Hamlet* differs from the original versions. He mentions how the list of characters and their roles have been crafted afterwards by publishers, and that no such list

existed in Shakespeare's original versions. Furthermore, the list ascribes certain roles and professions to the characters, when in the play itself, these roles are not made explicit. In addition to this, later editions also divide the play into acts, which are also not present in the original play, and these are now mostly followed in modern editions out of convenience. In the original play, only the scenes were indicated in the script (Østerberg 186-187). All of this illustrates the need to consider each translated text a new reading and interpretation of the disjointed whole that is the original *Hamlet* scripts.

This means that, when comparing different translations of *Hamlet*, it is important to consider not only the differences in translation strategies between the texts, but also the content differences, and how these play into the formulation of the translated work as a whole. Since the content source for the translations is variable, so is the foundations for the translations, which will invariably lead to the new translations not only illustrating how translation strategies have changed over the years, but also how the interpretations of the *Hamlet* STs have changed, and what different translators prioritize. This also illustrates the importance of incorporating the concept of different versions into the methodology.

Elements of Style

Another challenge when translating Shakespeare is the matter of style, as the restrictions of the linguistic elements which Shakespeare made use of, such as the iambic pentameter, create a specific linguistic effect in the texts, which translators have to make active decisions to either attempt to replicate, or to replace with different literary constructions or solutions. In relation to the question of style, there have been a lot of different approaches throughout the years. Werner Habicht speaks about how the German translator August Wilhelm Schlegel, largely disregarded Shakespeare's stylistics when translating his works, and instead opted for a more aesthetic approach. By doing this Schlegel sought to transform several of the historical elements into more timeless ones, to avoid having the translation be dated, but in doing so he created a translation which contained very few of the unique metrical and

linguistic quirks, all of which could be considered essential to the historicity of the works, and as such affect their artistic value (Habicht 46-47). This indicates that there are also consequences with regard to translations which take too many liberties with the content of the source text, as there is a very real chance that some of the artistic characteristics of the original are lost, and if the general structure of the ST is erased, the work might take on a different character. The consequence of this is also further established by Habicht, when he describes how Schlegel managed to gain accreditation as a “German Shakespeare”⁴⁷, and as such his translation took on the characteristics of being an “improvement”⁴⁸ on the original works of Shakespeare, rather than simply being a translation. Yet in spite of this, other translators in the nineteenth century aligned their focus elsewhere and instead sought to bring greater equivalence to their translations as a response to Schlegel’s translation (Habicht 47-48). In this manner, the development seems slightly aligned with the retranslation hypothesis, as these later translations seemingly respond to the unique characteristics of the previous translation and seek to rectify and revise some of the perceived faults of the original translation. In more recent times, there are also many new perspectives in regard to style when translating Shakespeare, specifically in relation to the considerations between writing for the stage and writing for the reader. One translator who addresses this is Niels Brunse, he writes how Shakespeare’s punctuation in his scripts is almost impossible to discern, as scribes and compositors had their own ideas of what was correct in those times, and as such the use of punctuation in Shakespeare’s works is very inconsistent. What can be deduced from this is that Shakespeare considered punctuation as something only meant for the page, and that when he wrote for the stage productions, he trusted in the actors to figure out the best phonetic phrasing themselves (Brunse 65). In this manner, it is apparent that the primary audience which the script was stylistically intended for was the performers, and that Shakespeare, in his writings, tailored the scripts for that purpose. What this then means is that a potential translator also has to consider the audience to whom they are writing when

crafting a translation, as they will likely have to revise the punctuation in their translation, if they wish for the text to be meant for readers. This is also addressed by Brunse, who explains that he himself has chosen to provide guidance for readers and actors in his translations, rather than adhere to grammatical fastidiousness, and by doing this you remove the technically correct punctuation, in favour of one which is more congruent with the way it is lyrically in the ST (Brunse 63-65). This provides a modern reference for what considerations are being made during translations, as the distinction between the stage and the written works carries a lot of significance. By making the choice to ignore the rules of grammar in the TL, to preserve the lyrical characteristics of the ST, you are in a way also creating a translation which is closer to the ST. When talking about style there is also the question of archaic language use and how this element is represented in the translations. Given that the ST is several centuries old, there are bound to be antiquated language constructions, and word uses which are not wholly compliant with the style of modern-day English. In this case this introduces another choice for the translators to make, as they will need to decide if they translate the text into a more modern vernacular, and as such transfers the text directly into a modern language context, or if they wish to preserve the characteristics of the older language traits, and represent these by making a TT in a language style which imitates the language constructions of the SL in the historical context of the TL. Similar to this, Bill Findlay discusses how “Informed creative choices have to be made within the opportunities provided by one’s medium in order to achieve a text which is also dramatically effective – that is, which has certain literary qualities shaped by the translator.” (Findlay 40). This was stated in relation to translating dialects, but some of the challenges dialect translations face are also emblematic of the problems with archaic language use. The archaic translation is domineered by the understanding, that by preserving the antiquated sentence constructions, there is some form of greater adherence to the ST, yet it can also be argued that the central problem is transferring meaning, and that a certain adherence to archaic structures in the TL will

inherently create some form of greater transference of meaning between the SL and the TL. As such, while one could consider archaic language use to be a form of direct transference, it is important to make the distinction in the analysis between archaic language use and direct translation.

Methodology

In summation, the constellation of potential translation problems in *Hamlet* necessitates specialised methodological tools to categorise and analyse the translation strategies of different *Hamlet* translations, highlighting their differences. These tools will likely need to be adapted from existing methodologies and tailored to some of the specific problems that have been covered so far, as there are several different aspects which complicate the translation processes, such as: multiple ST versions, different language styles, and the difference between drama and literary translation. First thing to cover is the different strategies a translator might use and how these will come into play in a translation. Generally, translation strategies are divided into two broad categories, one is described as the broad strategy for the whole translation, and the other is described as the more minor strategies which target specific textual problems or challenges. Wolfgang Lörscher describes translation strategies with the following: “a translation strategy is a potentially conscious procedure for the solution of a problem which an individual is faced with when translating a text segment from one language to another” (Lörscher 76). What is meant here by “potentially conscious” is that using a strategy can be either a conscious decision by the translator when translating, or it can be done unconsciously in the course of the translation, but in either case it can still be classified as a strategy as long as the problem it solves can be clearly defined. The different strategies have also been widely defined by many different translators and theorists, but generally translation strategies are divided into two groups of strategies, which each operate at different axis in relation to the translation. This distinction is also paralleled by the translator Anne Schjoldager, who defines two separate categories: macrostrategies and

microstrategies. For macrostrategies, Schjoldager proposes two different options, those being a source-text oriented macrostrategy which focuses on the effect of the content and form of the ST, or a target-text oriented macrostrategy, if they wish to focus on the effects of the TT (Schjoldager 71). These distinctions also parallel Venuti's concepts of foreignization and domestication. What this means is that a translator will need to select whether they wish to focus on the form of the ST and still maintain the general framework of the original work, thus creating a work which might not be completely in line with the SL, yet which still maintains the general content and form of the original. Alternatively, they will have to choose to focus delivering the message of the text and thus focus on creating a similar effect as the ST had in the TT, through interpreting the content in their translation. Schjoldager also further describes these macrostrategies by saying that a source text oriented macrostrategy is typically recommended for an "overt translation", meaning, a translation where it is apparent that the text has been translated, and a target-text oriented macrostrategy is recommended if one wishes to do a covert translation, whereby it might be less apparent that a translation has been conducted (Schjoldager 72). These models are, however, not necessarily universally prescriptive, and there are also other theorists who present different takes on general strategies in translation. One such translator and theorist is Andrew Chesterman, who introduces a parallel concept to Schjoldager's concept of "Macrostrategy", which he refers to as "global strategies", in which the problem to be solved by the translation is; how does one translate this specific text, or this kind of text. He further specifies that an example of a global strategy could be related to the translator's initial decision about what an appropriate relation between the general nature of the ST and TT could be, and about how freely one should translate a text, similar to the question of ST or TT orientation, and what sorts of intertextual resemblance should be prioritized. Lastly, he speaks about how global strategies can delve into decisions relating to whether or not an older source text should be historicized or modernised in their translations (Chesterman 2016, 88). These distinctions help show that in

terms of analysing the differences between translations, it is important to distinguish and consider what the general differences between the global strategies, or macrostrategies, in the translations are. With several different potential ST's of *Hamlet*, and the clear distinction between translating a text for the stage, and translating a literary text, there are some clear potential differences in the general form of the translations which it will be beneficial to pinpoint. This might allow one to identify the specific literary differences of the ST's the translators might have been working with and the effects these have on translation. Additionally, it will likely be prudent to identify what potential use the ST has been produced for, and how this also affects the global strategies used in the translation.

Aside from the general significance of the global strategies, there is also much to be gleaned from the more specific strategies, or microstrategies (Schjoldager), local strategies (Chesterman). With regard to specific strategies, here one can look back to Lörscher's definition of "potentially conscious" once again, as specific strategies are much more likely to be internalised by a translator and as such employed subconsciously. What this also means is that the classification of specific strategies is a much more complex endeavour, as different languages will pose different problems for a translator during the course of a translation, as it can be tricky to map and define all potential strategies. Schjoldager describes how microstrategies deal with specific textual problems at the micro level. More specifically, these are used primarily when dealing with single words, sentences or phrases (89). While there are many different ways in which one might classify translation strategies, Schjoldager also presents her own taxonomy for microstrategies (Schjoldager 92). And while these microstrategies are very helpful in identifying the general processes of translation and illustrating how words and meanings are altered and transferred, they are not specific enough in regard to this specific investigation. Because of the unique traits of drama translation, it is important to consider more detailed nuances, such as grammar and structure, when comparing Shakespeare translations, and as such some of these microstrategies lack some of

the specificity needed for this investigation. Another theorist who has set out to create a taxonomy for translation strategies is Andrew Chesterman, who has crafted a rather comprehensive set of classifications for “local translation strategies”. There are three general categories of strategies: *Syntactic strategies*, *semantic strategies*, and *pragmatic strategies*. Syntactic strategies are those strategies which purely revolve around different forms of syntactic changes, and these primarily manipulate form. Semantic strategies are those strategies which “manipulate nuances of meaning” 91 and are primarily used to manipulate clause meanings and lexical semantics. Pragmatic strategies are those strategies which concern themselves with what information is selected to be a part of the TT and can be said to manipulate the message itself (Chesterman 2016, 91-104). This structure, while comprehensive, still has some blind spots in relation to some of the specific translational challenges of translating Shakespeare’s dramas, as the challenges relating to things like lyrical constructions are very nuanced, and as such are tricky to distinguish with the aforementioned definitions. As such, based on some of the strategies that have been discussed and the theory that has been presented, I propose the following methodology for classifying and distinguishing the translation strategies in the three translations of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*: This methodology will be composed of the following of Chesterman’s strategies:

Syntactic strategies: G1 Literal translation, G2 Loan, calque, G3 Transposition, G4 Unit shift, G5 Phrase structure change, G6 Clause structure change, G7 Sentence structure change, G8 Cohesion change, G9 Level shift, G10 Scheme change.

Semantic strategies: S1 Synonymy, S2 Antonymy, S3 Hyponymy, S4 Converses, S5 Abstraction change, S6 Distribution change, S7 Emphasis change, S8 Paraphrase, S9 Trope change, S10 Other semantic changes.

In addition, this methodology will also include the following three strategies which have been created based on the theoretical background of the potential translational challenges *Hamlet*

contains. They are as follows: D1 Archaic language Use, D2 Drama adjustment, D3 Version variance

Literal translation (G1) refers to the act of translating something as close to the source language as possible, while still being grammatically correct in the target language. As opposed to a lot of other strategies, literal translation typically preserves both content and structure and is often seen as a default approach compared to the other strategies described in this investigation (Chesterman 2016, 91-92). An example of literal translation:

ST: Until we see them again

TT: Indtil vi ser dem igen

[A very close translation]

Loan, calque (G2) refers to the act of borrowing a word or sentence structure directly from the ST and transferring it unedited to the TT. In this manner the translated item is either loaned, and used accordingly in the TT, thus creating an assumption of the ST item still being understandable in the TT or deeming the item untranslatable. (Chesterman 2016, 92-93)

ST: The hype for this event is incredible

TT: Der er utroligt meget hype for dette event

[The word hype is directly transferred/loaned from the ST to the TT]

Transposition (G3) refers to the act of changing the word class of a translated item, and typically also involves other structural changes in the translated unit. (Chesterman 2016, 93)

ST: She moved the light red box

TT: Hun flyttede den røde kasse let

[the adjective “light” is changed to the adverb “let”]

Unit shift (G4) is one of the more common strategies which are used and refers to what happens when an ST unit gets translated into a different TT unit. The units include; “morpheme, word, phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph”. (Chesterman 2016, 93)

ST: We are under fire, bring forth the shields.

TT: Vi bliver beskudt. Bring skjoldene frem.

[One sentence becomes two, and the English clause becomes a Danish sentence]

Phrase structure change (G5) refers to a group of strategies which covers several types of changes at the phrasal level, including the modification of mood, tense and person on verb phrases, and definiteness, modification and number in the noun phrases. (Chesterman 2016, 93-94)

ST: The merchandise on display is immaculate.

TT: De udstillede produkter er fantastiske.

[Singular word “merchandise” becomes plural word “produkter”, and goes from being non-countable to being countable]

Clause structure change (G6) refers to the strategy of altering the clause structure by manipulating the constituent phrases of the clause. The subclasses of this strategy includes changing constituent orders, non-finite vs. finite structures, passive vs. active voices and intransitive vs. transitive. (Chesterman 2016, 94)

ST: The dog attacked Jim

TT: Jim blev angrebet af hunden

[English active voice becomes Danish passive voice]

Sentence structure change (G7) refers to the strategy of altering the structure of the clause units within the sentence. Included here are changes between the status of the main-clause and the sub-clause, as well as changes to the types of sub-clauses used. (Chesterman 2016, 95)

ST: As I have indicated, this improvement is groundbreaking

TT: Som jeg har indikeret så er denne forbedring banebrydende

[English main clause becomes Danish sub-clause plus main clause]

Cohesion change (G8) refers to the strategy of changing something which affects the use of connectors, ellipsis, substitution, repetition, pronominalization and intra-textual reference.

(Chesterman 2016, 95-96)

ST: As can be seen here, the deep-water aquarium will be changing their opening hours

TT: Som vi kan se her, så kommer dybvandsakvariet til at skulle ændre akvariets åbningstider

[The English text does not repeat *akvariet* when talking about the “opening hours”, likely due to the proximity between the two. In the TT version there is a bit more of a gap, and so clarification is added]

Level Shift (G9) refers to the strategy of shifting the modes of expression of a textual item, these shifts can occur between syntax, lexis, phonology and morphology. (Chesterman 2016, 96)

ST: They had to shut down their ore refinery

TT: De blev nødt til at lukke deres malmraffinaderi

[Goes from an English relative clause to a compound noun]

Scheme Change (G10) refers to the strategy of changing or maintaining rhetoric schemes from the ST to the TT. These schemes can include repetition, alliteration, parallelism and metrical rhythms. Here there are a few options, a translator can choose to preserve a scheme from the ST to the TT, they can choose to substitute the ST scheme with another scheme which serves a similar effect in the TL or they might remove the scheme entirely.

(Chesterman 2016, 97-98)

ST: The very vivacious vipers sought vengeance against the vast void

TT: De meget livlige hugorme søgte hævn mod det store tomrum

[The alliteration scheme in the ST is completely dropped in the TT]

Synonymy (S1) refers to the strategy of selecting a synonym or a near-synonym instead of selecting the most obvious TL equivalent (i.e. a G1 solution). (Chesterman 2016, 99)

ST: They had just received the newest issue

TT: De havde lige fået den nyeste magasin.

[The obvious word “udgivelse” is not chosen in favour of the near-synonym magazine]

Antonymy (S2) refers to the strategy of choosing an antonym and combining it with a “negation element”. (Chesterman 2016, 99)

ST: All the animals were brought aboard, but the tigers were excluded

TT: Alle dyrene blev bragt ombord, men tigrene var ikke inkluderet

[The antonym of excluded is selected for the TT and combined with a negation element]

Hyponymy (S3) refers to the strategy of selecting a hyponym in the translation. This strategy can refer the act of making a term more specific or less specific in the target text.

(Chesterman 2016, 100)

ST: The fish swam in the ocean along with all the other fish

TT: Makrellen svømmede I havet sammen med alle de andre dyr.

[The word “fish” is translated into a superordinate word, and the other “fish” is translated into the hyponym “dyr”]

Converses (S4) refers the strategy of expressing the same situation from a different viewpoint, such as *giving* something or *receiving* something. (Chesterman 2016, 100)

ST: John had just given his gift to Julie

TT: Julie havde lige modtaget sin gave fra John

[The verbal structures are expressing the same actions viewpoint is changed from “giving” to “receiving”]

Abstraction change (S5) refers to the strategy of making something more concrete or more abstract in the translation. (Chesterman 2016, 100)

ST: We will sail freely across the blue waves

TT: Vi vil sejle frit over havene

[The TT is more concrete in referring to the oceans rather than the more abstract “blue waves”]

Distribution change (S6) refers to the strategy of altering the distribution of semantic components over more or fewer literary components. (Chesterman 2016, 100-101)

ST: It is very important that everything is made much more simple

TT: Det er meget vigtigt at det hele simplificeres

[Here the last section is compressed into a much simpler form]

Emphasis change (S7) refers to the strategy of changing the focus of the text or altering the emphasis. (Chesterman 2016, 101)

ST: They were discriminated against

TT: De blev udsat for *grov* diskrimination

[The emphasis is increased in the TT version]

Paraphrase (S8) refers to the strategy of translating very loosely, often ignoring different semantic components, and instead focusing on the whole clause. This strategy is often used in the translation of idioms, especially if no corresponding idiomatic expression exists within the TL. (Chesterman 2016, 101).

ST: Good teachers are a dime a dozen

TT: Det er svært at finde gode lærere

[The structure and content of the ST is altered, and the idiom is not preserved]

Trope change (S9) refers to the strategy of changing the rhetorical tropes of the ST in different ways, these include preserving the trope in the TT, changing to a slightly different trope or removing the figurative element completely. (Chesterman 2016, 101-103)

ST: Nothing could quench his thirst for knowledge

TT: Intet kunne tilfredsstille hans længsel efter viden

[The trope of the ST is removed in the TT, as the figurative expression is not preserved]

Other semantic changes (S10) refers to the strategy of changing deictic direction or the changing of sense (Chesterman 2016, 103-104)

ST: The performance was very noteworthy

TT: Forestillingen var meget nævneværdig

[There is a change from a visual sense to an oral sense]

Archaic Language Use (D1) refers to the act of using an older version of the target language to imitate the archaic language used in a source text. Examples of this include, but are not limited to, using antiquated words which are no longer commonly used in the TL, using sentence structures which are no longer employed by the TL and not having the TT adhere to current rules of punctuation. An example of archaic language use:

ST: I am but a stranger

TT: Jeg er en fremmed blot

[The antiquated sentence composition is mirrored in the TT, as the adverb separated from the verb, and as such not in accordance with modern TL grammar]

Drama adjustment (D2) refers to the act of modulating certain aspects of the source text so as to make the lines of the play more idiomatic for the performers. This can be achieved by a translator by ignoring contemporary punctuation/spelling and instead removing or altering the text in the TT to be more easily performed. An example of drama adjustment:

ST: Now we can poison him, while he is sleeping

TT: Nu kan vi forgifte ham, nu mens han sover

[The comma which would normally be present after “nu” is removed to make the sentence more idiomatic for a performer to read aloud]

Version Variance (D3) is a bit ambiguous as a dedicated strategy, as it refers to a very broad range of decision made by the translators, and the strategy in itself is also fairly unique in regard to the amount of works it can even be applied to. This strategy refers to the fact that there are multiple versions of some drama works, as the plays are sometimes edited and/or revised over time, and as a result, there is a great deal of ambiguity in regard to which version, if any, is the definitive one. As such, this strategy concerns itself with the specific decision made by the individual translator in certain spots where the content is different between versions, and what interpretation the translator has chosen to adopt in their TT. An example of version variance (Text specific example):

ST: O, that this too too solid/sullied flesh would melt (Shakespeare 48)

TT: Å, gid mit alt-alt-alt for faste kød dog vilde smelte (Sarvig 17)

[The different versions have both *solid* and *sullied*, and the translator has made a specific decision in regard to which version to base their translation on, in this instance they have selected *solid* in their translation]

Analysis

In regard to the analysis of Hamlet it is my evaluation that there should be 3 separate subcategories in the way the translation is classified, due to the unique textual and content structure of the drama. The first category is archaic language, which concerns the text sections which contain a lot of archaic language use. The second category is stage direction, which concerns itself with the specific directions and descriptions which are given as part of the visual and prescriptive directions of the play. This category will take up a smaller section of the analysis. The third category is version variance, s that have to do with different versions of the ST and differently translated items. This category will be used to reflect on

the specific choices made by the translators in regard to the versions of the original play they used and how these changes affect the framing and form of the play in the final translation.

Another consideration which must be made before analysis can be conducted is the effect of archaicizing language in the TTs, as these will invariably affect the manner in which the translations are conducted. At its core, the use of macrostrategies when translating Shakespeare have a significantly more pronounced effect, as the dated language of Shakespeare's works have become a signature feature of his stories and has served as a draw for the old plays, rather than something to be updated. For some translators this then introduces a, perhaps subconscious, need for preserving some of that unique effect. This can result in a translator using archaicizing language in their translation, and as such recreating a language structure and effect which does not adhere to modern lexical and grammatical usage. Because of this, there might be instances where there will be stark differences between the translations which have been selected, and as such it is important to distinguish between which changes are related to the development of language norms, and which are the result of the translator intentionally using archaicizing language. As such, this is one additional consideration which must be made during the analysis of these different translations.

Another important preface is that the analysis will be referencing the sets of translation strategies which are written in the methodology. However, these strategies are only used to describe the nature of the changes the translators make. When writing that X translator has made use of Y strategy, it is not meant to imply that the translator made a conscious choice to use that strategy, it is merely meant to illustrate and hypothesise what potential decisions the translators might have made, either intentionally or unintentionally and the ramifications of those decisions.

The direct implications of differences in translation techniques would normally not always be immediately obvious to a potential reader, and even when analysed it can be challenging to properly identify the precise effect that a specific literary construction has on

the manner in which a work or a line is interpreted and understood. However, due to the nature of drama and drama translation there are some instances where even small alterations can have significant ramifications for the stage direction and flow of a literary piece.

Archaic Language

Because drama relies so heavily on the spoken word, there is a greater need for lines to contain evocative imagery, which can assist the actors in engaging the audience in the story world they seek to create. However, when conducting translations, imagery is not always preserved from the ST to the TT, as sometimes the images created in the ST can be either amplified in the TT or dulled/changed in the TT. One section which illustrates this, is a small part of Hamlet's soliloquy in act. 1, scene 2, line 139-142 wherein Hamlet speaks of his father.

Act. 1, scene 2, line 139-142	
<p>So excellent a king, that was to this Hyperion to a satyr; so loving to my mother, That he might not beteem the winds of heaven Visit her face too roughly. (Shakespeare 48)</p>	<p>Så fin en konge – ja imod denne som Hyperion mod en Satyr; elskede min mor, ja elsked' hende, så selv ikke blæsten fik lov at gøre hendes kinder røde. (Sarvig 17-18)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>så stor en drot; han var mod denne som Hyperion mod en satyr; god mod mor, han tålte ikke, himlens vinde blæste for hårdt mod hendes ansigt. (Johannes Sløk 18-19)</p> <p>-----</p>

	så strålende en konge, han var en solgud mod den satyr her, så kærlig mod min mor, at han forbød den frie himmels blæst at slå for hårdt mod hendes ansigt. (Niels Brunse 15-16)
--	--

In the first line of this segment there are three different examples of the S1 synonymy strategy, as all three translators use words which are synonymous adjectives to what Hamlet uses to describe his father with. In the segment “So excellent a king” the adjective “excellent” is replaced with the words “fin = fine” by Sarvig, “stor = grand” by Sløk and “strålende = radiant” by Brunse. All three of these are synonymous or near-synonymous to the adjective used in the ST yet still serve to create slightly different imagery. Here in the first section, there is also an example of the D1 archaic language strategy, as Sløk has the word “drot” in his TT which is an antiquated version of the word “konge = king”, and as such serves to make the text appear more dated than it is. In the next segment, both Sarvig and Sløk make use of the G1 literal translation strategy, as they directly translate the segment “that was to this Hyperion to a satyr”.

Taking a different approach Brunse neglects to use the name of Hyperion and instead opts to use the S5 abstraction change strategy, as he changes the concrete name of the god of the sun Hyperion and instead uses more broad terminology with the section “han var en solgud mod den satyr her”, thereby changing from a concrete individual to a more abstract entity. Despite this move, it is important to note that this change also creates more perspective with regard to a previous alteration, as the decision to use “strålende = radiant” in the previous segment makes the imagery of the two segments line up with each other, as “strålende” compliments “solgud” more naturally when it is written explicitly, rather than

when the deity is named. In the next segment, the line “so loving to my mother” contains only a few minor discrepancies.

With Sarvig, he has made use of the S6 distribution change strategy as he stretches the content of this segment to two separate segments by writing “elskede min mor, ja elsked’ hende”, and thus stretching the single semantic components of “loving” across more than one segment. The effect of this is that the emphasis of the father’s love is amplified, and as such, the repetition serves to reinterpret and reinforce the strength of the feelings between the king and his wife. Brunse makes use of G1 literal translation, and Sløk uses S1 synonymy by using “god = good” instead of “kærlig = Loving” like Brunse did.

The next segment is slightly longer and reads as follows “That he might not beteem the winds of heaven Visit her face too roughly.”. Here, “beteem” is intended to mean *allow* and this segment carries a lot of translational differences in the different TTs. In Sarvig’s TT, this segment is translated using a couple different strategies, firstly Sarvig uses the S4 converses strategy as the ST construction “he might not beteem” becomes “blæsten fik lov”, and as such it changes from “he might not allow” to “the wind was not allowed”, or to put it more simply, it changes from “not allowing” to “was not allowed” and as such it changes the focus from the king himself to the wind. Aside from S4, the G7 sentence structure change strategy has also been used, as the wind goes from being the direct object in the ST to being the subject in the TT. In addition to this, Sarvig also made use of the S9 trope change strategy, as “visit her face too roughly” is changed to “gøre hendes kinder røde”, which is a new literary trope which is adjacent to the ST trope, yet not quite the same from an imagery standpoint.

Sløk’s approach also makes some alterations in the agency of the king, as his TT says “han tålte ikke”, and as such, he makes use of the S1 synonymy and S7 emphasis change strategies simultaneously, as the text changes from “he might not allow” to “he did not

tolerate”. In the TT the “might” is no longer present, and as such the element of uncertainty is gone, which also supplements the more forceful synonym “tålte = tolerate”.

Brunse also has a slightly different approach to this segment as he writes “at han forbød den frie himmels blæst at slå for hårdt mod hendes ansigt.”. Here, Brunse uses the S2 antonymy strategy, because instead of writing “not allow” he chose instead to use “forbød = forbid” thus choosing an antonym and removing the negation element, thus making the king’s authority seem more powerful and decisive. The remaining segment mostly follows the G1 literal translation strategy, although he does use the S9 trope change strategy for the imagery of “visit” as it becomes “slå = hit”, thus making the wind itself seem a more forceful entity, which would then likely also supplement the modified imagery of the king being mightier in Brunse’s TT.

Overall, the imagery generated in the three TTs is quite varied, as the different approaches highlight certain aspects of the ST and make it more central to each different TT version. The repetition of “elskede” in Sarvig’s TT gives a stronger impression of affection, and the change of the imagery to “røde kinder = reddened cheeks” is also somewhat consistent with this, as reddened cheeks could also indicate blushing or the like. On the other hand, Brunse’s TT emphasises other aspects of the passage, namely the king himself. As he is described with words like “strålende”, and the fact that he “forbød = forbade” the winds to hit her face, thus crafting a stronger image of the king in this specific TT. The effect of Sløk’s translational decisions are more subtle than the others in this particular segment, as here it is mostly a matter of Sløk using Archaic language, and as such creating a TT which is not overly dissimilar to the ST, and also uses a small amount of writing which is not consistent with the time period which makes the TT appear more dated.

One crucial part to observe in the following passages from *Hamlet* is how the translators use imagery and vocabulary, and what sort of textual expression such choices lead to. One example of this is in this short passage, wherein Polonius says goodbye to Laertes, and uses very stern words and evocative imagery to lead Laertes on his way seabound. This section lends itself to similarly interesting TTs, as how the three translators transfer these

images and verbiage from the ST to the TT is equally fascinating. The section is act. 1, scene 3, line 55-58:

Act. 1, scene 3, line 55-58	
<p>Polonius: Yet here, Laertes? Aboard, aboard for shame!</p> <p>The wind sits in the shoulder of your sail, And you are stayed for. There – my blessing with thee, And these few precepts in thy memory See thou character. Give thy thoughts no tongue, Nor any unproportioned thought his act. (Shakespeare 53)</p>	<p>Polonius: Laertes, er du rigtigt klog? Om bord!</p> <p>De har hejst sejlene og venter på dig. Her, tag så min velsignelse igen og mærk dig endnu et par faderlige ord: Tænk, men tal ikke, og gør intet halvt gennemtænkt. (Ole Sarvig 24)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Polonius: Laertes, her endnu? Ombord for skam!</p> <p>Vind sidder nu på skuldren af dine sejl, man venter dig. – Her er min velsignelse; [lægger hånden på Laertes' hoved] og læg dig disse få formaninger på sinde. – Giv aldrig tanken tunge og ingen ubesindig tanke handling, (Johannes Sløk 24)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Polonius: Laertes, er du her? Skynd dig ombord!</p> <p>Nu fylder vinden dine højeste sejl, man venter.</p> <p>Så, tag min velsignelse og indprent et par regler i dit sind: Giv ikke alle dine tanker mæle og ingen overilet tanke handling. (Niels Brunse 23)</p>

The first line of this section contains several interesting facets. The line “Yet here, Laertes? Aboard, aboard for shame!” shows an exasperated Polonius fretting over the fact that Laertes

has not yet boarded the vessel. In Sarvig's TT he initially makes use of the S8 paraphrase strategy as he changes the text to "Laertes, er du rigtigt klog?", which transfers some of the underlying meaning by increasing the exasperation of Polonius, but still changing the content to a mode of meaning which has a higher degree of admonishment, thus increasing the evocativeness of the imagery TT. The following section "Om bord!" is both an S6 distribution change strategy, as the same meaning is expressed across fewer semantic components, and an S7 emphasis change strategy as the removal of the repeating *Aboard* reduces the emphasis on the phrase. In this manner, it could be argued that the increased emphasis in the first half and the decreased emphasis in the second half serve to somewhat even out if one looks at the section in its entirety.

Sløk has a fairly different approach to this particular line, as he writes "Laertes, her endnu? Ombord for skam!". Here, Sløk makes use of the G1 literal translation strategy in the first section, as the section is translated very closely, however, the utterance itself is a verbless clause and as such does not exactly conform to modern writing norms but might be more appropriate for the stage.

The following section differs slightly, as Sløk, like Sarvig, employs both the S6 distribution change strategy and the S5 abstraction change strategy. By removing the repeated "Aboard," he alters the section's emphasis. For the rest of the section, Sløk has used the G1 literal translation strategy, however, he has also used the D1 Archaic language use strategy, as the phrase "Ombord for skam" is not congruent with modern Danish word use. This means that, while the general sentence seems to be very directly translated, it is in reality not quite congruent with what one would expect from a modern translation. Brunse leads his translation of this segment with "Laertes, er du her? Skynd dig ombord!", which is more neutral than the other segments, and, as opposed to the others, this section is in accordance with modern Danish writing norms.

Here it seems Brunse has made slight use of the S4 converses strategy, because the “yet here” part implies a time related problem, as Laertes is indicated to be late, yet the TT says “er du her = are you (still) here”, which implies a position related problem, and as such slightly shifts the thematic focus. This seeming ‘focus change’ is not covered under any of the strategies included in the methodology, and as such represents a potential blind spot in the method. The second part uses the S8 paraphrase strategy, as it changes the direct instruction from him boarding the ship, to Polonius urging Laertes to hurry aboard.

It should be noted, however, that although the temporal element is removed from the first section, a new temporal element is then introduced in the second half of the section, and as such it could be argued that these elements balance out when considering the general imagery the scene evokes in the audience, so that it is still similar in its imagery to the ST.

The next section has some fascinating imagery, as the ST says, “The wind sits in the shoulder of your sail, And you are stayed for.”. With this section, Sarvig makes some interesting decisions in his translation “De har hejst sejlene og venter på dig.”. Here, Sarvig makes use of the S9 trope change strategy, as the metaphor for the wind being at Laertes’ back is removed completely and instead substituted for a more literal description of the boat’s sails being unfurled. In addition to this, Brunse also makes use of the G7 sentence structure change strategy, as the English main clause and sub clause are changed to a singular Danish main clause in the TT.

In this section, Sløk writes, “Vind sidder nu på skuldren af dine sejl, man venter dig.”, which is a more ST-oriented wording than Sarvig. In the first section, Sløk used the G1 literal translation strategy, as the content is very closely translated and also preserves the imagery which is present in the ST. In the second section, the content is also closely translated. However, here Sløk has made use of the D1 archaic language use strategy, as the section “man venter dig” is more of an older language construction, because the impersonal pronoun

“man” is not typically used in this context in modern Danish. The next section “There – my blessing with thee, And these few precepts in thy memory”, has some very significant details which vary greatly across the three translations. Sarvig’s approach “Her, tag så min velsignelse igen og mærk dig endnu et par faderlige ord:”, has many different complicated facets, as the translation employs a multitude of different strategies. The first part is mostly in accordance with a G1 literal translation strategy, however, the use of the word *igen* also shows the use of an S7 emphasis change strategy, as the word implies that a blessing has been previously given, although such a scene is not present in the ST. The result of this is that the emphasis could both be considered lowered, as the repetition of a blessing could lessen its significance, or considered elevated if one sees it as though the multiple blessing increases their significance. In both cases, it is a significant change in the intensity of the scene and the and the impressions it makes on the audience and shows different approaches to crafting this emotional scene between father and son. The next section sees the use of two more strategies, as an S8 paraphrase strategy is used to alter the ST meaning of “precepts = forskrifter/instrukser”, to the TT meaning of “faderlige ord = fatherly advice”. This construction in the TT serves to create a new set of imagery, as the prescriptive instructions of an authority figure instead become a set of more empathetically given advice between father and son. Lastly, the section “mærk dig” shows the use of a D1 archaic language use strategy, as this is an antiquated Danish idiom, and as such serves to artificially make the text appear dated. In this section, Sløk makes use of some very significant alterations, as he writes “Her er min velsignelse; [lægger hånden på Laertes’ hoved] og læg dig disse få formaninger på sinde.”. The first section is relatively simple, as it follows the G1 literal translation strategy, however, the following section illustrates a very unique approach. Here Sløk has made use of the D2 drama adjustment strategy to manufacture a stage direction for Polonius and Laertes which did not exist in the ST at all, and was, at most, maybe an implied action which could be taken by the actors. In this manner, Sløk is making the act of conferring a

blessing much more literal, and the resulting effect this will have on the stage will be incredibly significant. If one was to compare a performance of the ST to one of this TT or even one of the other TTs, then based on this addition the performance and its visual expression could be completely altered, as a change as large as this also changes the visual context for all of the rest of the lines in the accompanying TT. The next section uses an S8 paraphrase strategy, as it slightly alters the visual expression through the use of “på sinde = in mind” instead of “in thy memory”, however, these are minor changes and are mostly in accordance with each other in terms of imagery. Brunse’s approach to this section is a little more uneventful than the others, “Så, tag min velsignelse og indprent et par regler i dit sind:”. Here Brunse uses the G1 literal translation strategy for the first half, and just like Sløk, Brunse also uses the S8 paraphrase strategy to change *memory* to *sind*, which maintains the general imagery of the line. The final line of this section contains a bunch of fairly elaborate sentences “See thou character. Give thy thoughts no tongue, Nor any unproportioned thought his act.”. Here Sarvig approaches this section with “Tænk, men tal ikke, og gør intet halvt gennemtænkt.”, which is an excellent example of the S8 paraphrase strategy, as it loosely translates the section, but maintains the general meaning and uses modern language rather than attempt to emulate the elaborate structures of the ST. On this section Sløk has a somewhat different approach “Giv aldrig tanken tunge og ingen ubesindig tanke handling.”. Here it can be seen that Sløk has opted to not translate the first section “See thou character”, aside from this, Sløk mostly uses the G1 literal translations strategy for this section, yet he also uses the D1 archaic language use strategy, as the sentence structure “Giv aldrig tanken tunge” is not congruent with current Danish language use. Although there is an argument to be made for the fact that D1 was used, it equally seems that the strategy could just as well be described as a G1 strategy, because the content is simply transferred directly. The result of this is that, while the TT seems closer to the ST in its content and structure, it still comes at the cost of the understandability of the translated text. The solution Brunse has reached in this

section is almost identical to that of Sløk, as his TT “Giv ikke alle dine tanker mæle og ingen overilet tanke handling.”, also follows the same strategies, with the G1 literal translation strategy being the predominant one, and similarly the section “Giv ikke alle dine tanker mæle” is also a borderline example of the D1 archaic language use strategy, as the word “mæle” is a somewhat dated expression. The second half is also pretty much G1 literal translation. This last line illustrates how close some of these texts can come to each other, while still making small alterations and choices which slightly differentiate them. Despite this, the problems they all face seem to be relatively consistent, as the antiquated language of Shakespeare can be particularly tricky to deal with in certain situations, sometimes more so than others.

Some sections of dialogue within the play often evokes very powerful imagery, and there are many nuances to be found within such sections. In this particular section Laertes mourns the loss of Ophelia, and his lamentations over her succumbing to a watery grave conjures quite the elaborate visual expression, which is tackled in very different ways by the translators. The section is act. 4, scene 7, line 185-188:

Act. 4, scene 7, line 185-188	
<p>Too much water has thou, poor Ophelia, And therefore I forbid my tears; but yet It is our trick, nature her custom holds, Let shame say what it will. (Shakespeare 131)</p>	<p>For meget vand blev dit, Ophelia kære, og derfor kæmper jeg mod denne byge; men den vil frem! Naturen har sin lov uanset skam. (Sarvig 127)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>For meget vand blev dig til del, Ophelia, så jeg vil ikke græde. Nej alligevel. sådan er vi, naturen kræver sit,</p>

	hvad skammen så vil sige (Sløk 108) ----- Arme Ofelia, du fik nok af vand, så mine tårer holder jeg tilbage. og dog det har den art: naturens løb kan ikke standses, hvad end skammen siger. (Brunse 87)
--	---

For the first section, it is described how Ophelia lost to the water, as she drowned, and this is approached in several different ways by the translators. “Too much water has thou, poor Ophelia,” is translated by Sarvig with “For meget vand blev dit, Ophelia kære,”. Here Sarvig uses the S8 paraphrase strategy, as the meaning is largely transferred between the ST and the TT, changing the meaning from her having too much water, to her gaining too much water, and also “poor Ophelia = stakkels Ophelia” is translated to “Ophelia dear = kære Ophelia”. This ultimately changes the general expression of the text from describing Ophelia with pity in his voice, to instead referring to her with an expression of affection, which slightly changes the general expression of the line. In this line Sløk also makes some curious choices, “For meget vand blev dig til del, Ophelia,”, as here we see an initial G1 literal translation strategy for the initial section, yet for the second part he uses an S8 paraphrase strategy as his translation completely removes the *poor* from his TT, and as such there is no indication of pity or any other particular emotion. In this particular section of dialogue, it is not a matter of contention whether or not Laertes is grieving the loss of Ophelia, yet the manner and degree by which he mourns her passing is very significant to the general experience of the play and would likely seem as such to a reader/audience member if they were to compare. Brunse’s approach is also unique and goes as follows: “Arme Ofelia, du fik nok af vand,”, here it is observable that Brunse makes use of the G7 sentence structure change strategy to shift around

the clauses of the sentence and thus make “poor Ophelia” the first clause rather than the last. For this first clause a simple G1 literal translation strategy has been used for the text, yet the effect of the clause switch is significant, as it shifts the initial focus of Laertes’ lamentations towards Ophelia from the beginning, and as such his sympathetic response seems to be amplified by the revised ordering. The second Clause was a case of an S8 paraphrase strategy as the “du fik nok af vand = you had enough of water”, is largely in line with the ST visual effect. One minor detail to note is that Brunse has opted to write her name as *Ofelia*, which does not have the *ph* consonant combination which is uncommon for Danish names. This could be argued to be a D2 drama adjustment strategy, as the effect and significance of this alteration is mostly a pragmatic issue, and as such pretty much only significant for the people who have to read the script in Danish. This could be something that was done to make things more simple for potential actors, and as such it could very well be considered a use of the drama adjustment strategy, or it might simply be pragmatic. Regardless of how the emotion of the previous section was modulated by the translators, it will become explicit in the play that Laertes is very much shaken by a flood of emotion, which can be seen with the line “And therefore I forbid my tears;”. Sarvig approaches this section a bit more metaphorically with “og derfor kæmper jeg mod denne byge”, and here it can be seen that he makes use the S9 trope change strategy, as he introduces a metaphor into the TT which does not exist in the ST, going from *tears* to “byge = downpour”, making the crying metaphorical and simultaneously boosting its visual severity. In addition to this, he also makes use of the S8 paraphrase strategy, as he changes the content from *forbid* to “kæmper ... mod = fight against”, and as such it appears Laertes is actively fighting off his own emotions, rather than just suppressing them, leading to a more extreme and vivid image. Sløk has a slightly simple approach to this section with “så jeg vil ikke græde.”, here using the S8 paraphrase strategy, and modifying it slightly so that it is a desire not to cry rather than a desire for suppression. Brunse is similar to Sløk here as “så mine tårer holder jeg tilbage.”, also uses the S8 paraphrase strategy, and, in a

similar vein, also lowers the emphasis on forbidding himself to feel, and rather showing how he is struggling to keep back his tears. The final lines are similar in their translation and their expression across all three translations.

Stage Direction

In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, there are several instances wherein stage directions of the ST take on different forms in the TTs, and one such instance of change occurs in the very beginning of the play. The following table shows the ST section and its accompanying translations by Ole Sarvig, Johannes Sløk and Niels Brunse, to illustrate the structure, composition and changes rendered in their TTs. This section from the act. 1, scene 1, line 1-15 will be used to illustrate some of the fundamental differences between the translation strategies used as well as the ramifications of the use of these strategies, and thus help establish elements of the translator's style.

Act. 1, scene 1, line 1-15	
Barnardo: Who's there?	Barnardo: Hvem dør?
Francisco: Nay answer <i>me</i> . Stand and unfold yourself.	Francisco: Svar <i>mig</i> . Kom, vis mig, hvem du er!
Barnardo: Long live the King!	Barnardo: Kongen leve!
Francisco: Barnardo?	Francisco: Er det Barnardo?
Barnardo: He.	Barnardo: Nemlig.
Francisco: You come most carefully upon your hour.	Francisco: Du er vel nok præcis.
Barnardo: 'Tis now struck twelve. Get thee to bed, Francisco.	Barnardo: Det' midnat. Sengetid for dig, Francisco.
Francisco: For this relief much thanks. 'Tis bitter cold, And I am sick at heart.	Francisco: Takker skyldigst; for det er hundekoldt, jeg er helt skidt tilpas.
Barnardo: Have you had quiet guard?	Barnardo: Var alting roligt?
Francisco: Not a mouse stirring.	Francisco: Så ikke halen af en mus.
Barnardo: Well, good night.	Barnardo: Så godnat. Ser du Horatio og Marcellus som skal på vagt med mig, så bed dem skynde sig!
If you do meet Horatio and Marcellus,	Francisco: Jeg tror, jeg hører dem.

The rivals of my watch, bid them make haste.

Enter Horatio and Marcellus.

Francisco: I think I hear them. – Stand ho, who is there?

(Shakespeare 20)

Stands, holdt! Hvem der?

(Horatio og Marcellus *kommer ind*.)

(Ole Sarvig 7-8)

Barnardo: Hvem dér?

Francisco: Nej, svar mig. Stands, giv dig til kende.

Barnardo: Må kongen leve længe!

Francisco: Barnardo?

Barnardo: Ham selv.

Francisco: Du kommer sandelig præcist til tiden.

Barnardo: Den slog just tolv; gå du i seng, Francisco.

Francisco: Den afløsning skal du ha' tak for; det er så bittert koldt, og jeg er syg om hjertet.

Barnardo: Har vagten været rolig?

Francisco: Ja, ingen mus har rørt sig.

Barnardo: Godt, godnat.

Og hvis du ser Horatio og Marcellus, Der også skal på vagt, så bed dem skynde sig.

[Horatio og Marcellus *ind*].

Francisco: Jeg tror, de kommer. Stands, hallo, hvem dér?

(Johannes Sløk 9)

Barnardo: Hvem der?

Francisco: Nej, svar I *mig*. Giv jer til kende. Stands!

Barnardo: Vor konge længe leve!

Francisco: Barnardo?

Barnardo: Ja.

	<p>Francisco: I kommer jo præcis på klokkeslettet.</p> <p>Barnardo: Ja, det er midnat. Gå til ro, Francisco.</p> <p>Francisco: Stor tak for den afløsning; det er koldt, og jeg er tung om hjertet.</p> <p>Barnardo: Var alting roligt på din vagt?</p> <p>Francisco: Ikke en mus har rørt sig.</p> <p>Barnardo: Godt, så godnat.</p> <p>Og hvis I ser Horatio og Marcellus, som deler vagten med mig, skynd så på dem.</p> <p>Francisco: Det er nok dem, jeg hører.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Horatio og Marcellus ind.</i></p> <p>Holdt, hvem der?</p> <p>(Niels Brunse 5-7)</p>
--	--

In this initial section, there are many places where the content of the translations overlaps and is quite similar. Yet, this section also introduces many points of divergence between the translators. The second line, “Francisco: Nay answer *me*. Stand and unfold yourself.”, is a relatively simple sentence which follows the “who’s there” of the first line, yet the translators have multiple different takes on this sentence.

Sarvig has translated with “Francisco: Svar *mig*. Kom, vis mig, hvem du er!”, here it is observable that Sarvig employs an S7 emphasis change strategy, because, while the emphasis is preserved “*me – mig*”, the removal of the initial word “Nay” means that there is a greater emphasis on the word “*mig*”. This is because instead of saying no and marking that Francisco is the one who should be answered, Francisco makes a direct demand of Bernardo. Sløk also uses emphasis change, but here it is the opposite effect, with him saying “Francisco: Nej, svar mig. Stands, giv dig til kende.”, the emphasis on “*mig*” is dropped by Sløk and is not preserved in the TT.

Brunse’s TT carries some similarities to both yet still goes in a different direction “Francisco: Nej, svar I *mig*. Giv jer til kende. Stands!”. Here, the emphasis is preserved, yet

there is one key difference from the ST and the TT, and that is the addition of the “I” in the TT. In Shakespeare’s time, this would be used as a formal form of address, and as such, this is an example of the D1 Archaic language use strategy. What this means is that, as opposed to the ST, where the characters are initially regarded with suspicion, Brunse makes the decision to add the formal “I”, indicating a certain level of formality, which creates a slightly different interpretation of what is happening on the stage. This also affects the general tone of the text, as the level of formality creates a different tone in the dialogue. This interpretation of the ST affects some of the later lines, however, seeing as the interpretation is consistent, these discrepancies will not be noted when talking about further differences in the translations.

The next part of the sentence is “stand and unfold yourself”, and in this sentence, there are also numerous discrepancies. Here, it seems a metaphor has been used, as “unfold yourself” in this instance is likely a call for the individual to declare their identity and purpose. In this instance, Sarvig employs an S9 trope change strategy, replacing the literary trope with a concrete one, rather than a metaphorical trope. With “kom = come”, he is ignoring “stand = stå (frem)” in the ST and instead of demanding that Bernardo stand and identify, he instead comes closer and shows who he is. The function of both of these is essentially the same, yet on a stage, these directions might create very different effects depending on the positioning of the actors on the stage and the stage layout. Sløk also removes the literary trope in his TT, yet he restates the non-metaphorical meaning of the phrase with “giv dig til kende”.

Brunse’s version is almost identical to Sløk’s in terms of word use, yet there is a significant difference between the two when it comes to composition. In Brunse’s TT we see an example of G7 sentence structure change strategy, as the main clause of the ST is instead divided into two separate TT clauses. Unlike Sløk, Brunse has decided not to make “stands = stop” a sub-clause to the main clause by placing it as the first word and has opted to divide the clauses instead and orient “stands” at the back of the sentence. This decision drastically

changes the general tenor of the sentence and can potentially also affect the stage direction which the sentence seeks to create.

In this instance, even though Brunse and Sløk's TT are more similar in their word use, Brunse and Sarvig are closer in terms of how their translations direct the actors on the stage. With Sarvig, the actor is urged to move closer before identifying themselves, and as such has more of an opportunity to walk farther onto the stage. With Brunse, the declaration for Bernardo to stop is only made at the end of the sentence, rather than in the middle of the sentence, thus allowing an actor to move further forward before being made to stop. In addition to this, there is also an instance of using the S7 emphasis change strategy for both Sarvig and Brunse, as they both use "!" exclamation marks at the ends of the sentence. In contrast, the ST lacks emphasis, resulting in an element of finality to the declarations when used on stage. In this way, it could also be argued that Sløk's version, which does not contain any emphasis, has a lesser degree of finality, which might allow the actor to keep moving forward quietly, despite being ordered to stop, as the degree of emphasis of the order is left up to the interpretation of the actor.

The following three lines of dialogue contain relatively simple verbal constructions and the solutions to these are fairly consistent between the three translators, although not identical: "Barnardo: Long live the King!", "Francisco: Barnardo?" and "Barnardo: He.". Here, the answer "He = Ham" might not work properly in a Danish TT as this type of reply is relatively uncommon, yet this issue is also addressed in quite a simple fashion by all three translators. Sarvig used the simple "nemlig = that is right" and Brunse used "Ja = yes" to indicate the same level of confirmation, where both of these are likely S8 paraphrase strategy changes, as they retain the fundamental intention behind the reply in a manner that is different from the ST. In his TT, Sløk used "ham selv = himself" which more so seems to be an S1 synonymy strategy, as this construction is close to the ST "he = ham" but not quite the same, as it could also be argued to be an explication of the word.

The next section starts with “Francisco: You come most carefully upon your hour.”, in which Sløk and Brunse have used G1 literal translation and written this to mean that the replacement guards are arriving very precisely upon the allotted hour. Sarvig, however, has employed what appears to be an S6 distribution change strategy, as he expresses more or less the same semantic components over fewer items by mentioning only *præcis* and not remarking on the time, thus making it implicit in the TT. The effect this has is that instead of remarking upon the standard guard change, he is implicitly being praised for arriving so precisely.

The next line has some significant deviations between the TTs, “Barnardo: ‘Tis now struck twelve. Get thee to bed, Francisco.” Here, Sarvig writes “Det’ midnat. Sengetid for dig, Francisco.”, which contains a D2 drama adjustment strategy, as instead of writing out “det er = it is” he instead writes “Det’” which preserves the abbreviation “‘Tis” from the ST, thus representing how *Det’* would be pronounced in modern Danish. These constructions more so represent spoken language rather than proper written language, and as such, this translation shows a prioritisation of maintaining some of the drama elements.

Aside from this, there are two uses of S4 converses strategy in this section, as struck twelve is changed to “Det’ midnat = it’s midnight”, and “Get thee to bed” is “sengetid for dig = it is your bedtime”, as the verbal structures express the same things as the TT is making the statements more matter of fact, rather than decrees to follow.

In terms of meaning, these alterations are minor, but they affect the imagery of the work. In the case of Sløk, he primarily used the G1 literal translation strategy, as evident in his writing, “Den slog just tolv; gå du i seng, Francisco.” This translation closely mirrors the ST, although it does not retain the abbreviated “‘Tis” from the ST. Brunse does mostly the same as Sarvig in the first line, as he also changes it from “struck twelve” to “midnight” as can be seen in “Ja, det er midnat. Gå til ro, Francisco.”. Aside from this, Brunse uses “Gå til

ro = go rest” instead of going to bed, and as such, introduced yet another new literary trope in his construction of his TT. Here, the three translations vary in interesting ways, as the first interpretation is very matter-of-fact, the second is more compassionate, and the third is more calming, the primary words being bedtime, bed and rest, respectively.

The next sections go as follows, “For this relief much thanks. ‘Tis bitter cold, And I am sick at heart.”. Here, Sarvig solved this sequence with the following “Takker skyldigst; for det er hundekoldt, jeg er helt skidt tilpas.”. Here, we see several strategies being employed in sequence. The initial sequence is an S8 Paraphrase strategy, as the meaning is very loosely transferred, and instead of thanking Barnardo for the relief, he instead uses the word “skyldigst = obliged”. Furthermore, *hundekoldt* is an example of the S9 trope change strategy, as there is a change from *bitter cold* to the Danish-only expression *hundekoldt*, thus inserting an everyday language trope which was not previously present.

Lastly, Sarvig employs the S5 abstraction change strategy, as evidenced by the change from “sick at heart” to “jeg er helt skidt tilpas = I am not feeling well”, which makes the TT less concrete about Francisco’s condition. With Sløk, this section is more straightforward, “Den afløsning skal du ha’ tak for; det er så bittert koldt, og jeg er syg om hjertet.”, the first section Sløk makes use of the D2 drama adjustment strategy as he writes spoken language into his TT, as seen with “ha’”, which is a shortened version of “have = have”. Otherwise, the rest is in accordance with a G1 literal translation strategy. Brunse is similarly also mostly using the G1 literal translation strategy in his segment, “Stor tak for den afløsning; det er koldt, og jeg er tung om hjertet.”. There are, however, two minor deviations in this segment; this can be seen with “det er koldt = it is cold” as here he has used the S7 emphasis change strategy and removed the “bitter = bitter” when translating, thus reducing emphasis on the cold. Further, he has also used the S5 abstraction change strategy, as “sick at heart” becomes “tung om hjertet = heavy at heart”. Here the change in focus places less emphasis on the cold and rather focuses on the physical condition of the speaker. The next line “Have you had

quiet guard?” is mostly translated using the G1 literal translation strategy, with some minor differences in composition.

The following line, “Not a mouse stirring.”, is approached differently by the translators. Sarvig makes use of the S9 Trope change strategy, as his segment “Så ikke halen af en mus” changes the literary trope of “stirring”, to a more Danish-sounding construction. This is achieved by selecting a slightly different literary trope for the TT, which in the SL would be closer to “saw neither hide nor hair”. On the other end, Sløk used D2 drama adjustment, as he added a “ja = yes” to his sentence “Ja, ingen mus har rørt sig.”, to directly answer the previously posed question of the play, the rest was done more or less using G1 literal translation. Brunse used G1 literal translation for the entire segment with “Ikke en mus har rørt sig.”, which is a very close translation of the ST.

The following section contains an important set of dissimilarities, which go to illustrate the very different approaches the translators have used, and the subsequent effects these choices have on the literary and performative qualities of the play, in the section “Barnardo: Well, good night. If you do meet Horatio and Marcellus, The rivals of my watch, bid them make haste. ... *Enter Horatio and Marcellus.* ... Francisco: I think I hear them. – Stand ho, who is there?” (Shakespeare 20), the reader is introduced to Horatio and Marcellus in an entrance which mirrors Barnardo’s own, yet in the translations, there are once again differences in how the material is adapted in the TTs.

Sarvig’s translation sounds as follows, ”Barnardo: Så godnat. Ser du Horatio og Marcellus som skal på vagt med mig, så bed dem skynde sig! ... Francisco: Jeg tror, jeg hører dem. Stands, holdt! Hvem der. ... (Horatio og Marcellus *kommer ind.*)”. Here, the initial part spoken by Barnardo is largely translated using the G1 literal translation strategy, as the literary constructions are relatively standard.

However, in the next part, there is a fairly large discrepancy between the ST and the TT as Sarvig has opted to move the stage direction, which describes the entrance of Horatio and

Marcellus, to after Francisco has spoken his line, and as such, Francisco urges them to stop before they even have a chance to enter the stage. In this way, if this translation were to be performed on a stage, a viewer might likely interpret this as Horatio and Marcellus ignoring what Francisco has said to them. On the other end of the spectrum is Sløk, who writes, "Barnardo: Godt, godnat. Og hvis du ser Horatio og Marcellus, Der også skal på vagt, så bed dem skynde sig. ... [*Horatio og Marcellus ind*]. ... Francisco: Jeg tror, de kommer. Stands, hallo, hvem dér?" (Sløk 9). Here, it is apparent that Sløk has also used a G1 literal translation approach in this instance, although he has also entirely maintained the original structure of the lines and stage direction from the ST in his TT. Towards the middle of both of these approaches, we find that Brunse has employed a third option in his approach to this part of the ST his section is as follows: "Barnardo: Godt, så godnat. Og hvis I ser Horatio og Marcellus, som deler vagten med mig, skynd så på dem. ... Francisco: Det er nok dem, jeg hører. ... *Horatio og Marcellus ind*. ... Holdt, hvem der?" (Brunse 6). Here, the stage direction has been spliced in between Francisco's lines, and as a result, a natural pause is created between Francisco hearing them come in and him ordering them to halt. The effect of this is similar to some of the previous uses of stoppage, as this splicing gives time for the actors to enter further onto the stage before being halted. However, this also means that there is an unnatural break in Francisco's lines, which might be confusing to potential readers and/or performers, as they have to identify the continuance of the line after the stage direction.

While the first section of Brunse's TT mostly makes use of the G1 strategy like the two others, there is one instance where Brunse instead makes use of the D1 archaic language strategy, as he uses the sentence structure "skynd så på dem" instead of simply saying "så sig at de skal skynde sig", which is the standard Danish sentence structure for that type of clause. This type of sentence construction is indicative of a desire to replicate some of the older

language, which is present in the ST, yet does not conform to the current common language norms of Danish speakers.

In one section of Hamlet there is a scene that illustrates very clearly how the different translators approach stage direction for important scenes. In act. 5, scene 2, line 263-272:

Act. 5, scene 2, line 263-272	
[<i>Trumpet sounds</i> Hamlet: Come on, sir. Laertes: Come, my lord. [<i>They fence</i> Hamlet: One! Laertes: No. Hamlet: Judgment? Osric: A hit, a very palpable hit [<i>They break off; the kettle-drum and trumpets sound, and a cannon-shot is heard.</i> Laertes: Well, again. (Shakespeare 148)	Hamlet: Kom an! Laertes: Ja, kom! (<i>De fægter.</i>) Hamlet: Et stød! Laertes: Nej. Hamlet (<i>til</i> Osric): Du er dommer! Osric: Et stød! Afgjort et stød! Laertes: Så kom igen! (Sarvig 151) ----- Hamlet: En garde! Laertes: En garde, Deres Højhed! [<i>De fægter</i>] Hamlet: Ét! Laertes: Nej. Hamlet: Dommer? Osric: Et stød, afgjort et stød. Laertes: Godt, kom an igen. (Sløk 126) ----- <i>trompeter imens.</i> Hamlet: Kom an. Laertes: Kom an, min herre. <i>De fægter.</i> Hamlet: Én. Laertes: Nej. Hamlet: Dommer? Osric: Touché, en ganske tydelig touché.

	Laertes: Kom igen. (Brunse 102-103)
--	--

This section is introduced by the stage direction “*Trumpet sounds*”, and here both Sarvig and Sløk have made use of the D2 drama adjustment strategy, as they have removed this particular stage direction from their TTs. The result of this is that the formality and official nature of the duel is slightly diminished, as the fanfare is no longer present. Brunse makes use of a G1 literal translation strategy here and makes a direct transference of the stage direction. In the next two lines Sarvig makes use of two strategies, one is the S6 distribution change strategy, as the semantic components are preserved but the titles are dropped, and thus the general tonality of the exchange becomes slightly diluted. The second strategy is S7 emphasis change as “!” are added to both of their utterances. In these two lines Sløk went in a very different direction, as he used the G2 loan strategy, by using the French expression “*En garde*”. While this term is typically associated with dueling, it might seem slightly out of place compared to the rest of the utterances. Brunse mostly used a G1 literal translation strategy, although he did also use a bit of S6 as the title of Laertes is dropped from Hamlet’s line. For the next line everyone used a G1 literal translation strategy for the stage direction “*they fence*”. For the next two lines, all three of them use a G1 literal translation strategy, with the exception of Sarvig, who for “One!” has used an S5 abstraction change strategy, as he writes “*Et stød!*”, and thus makes his TT slightly more explicit. The next line “Judgment?” has been approached in very different ways by the translators. Sarvig writes “*Hamlet (til Osric): Du er dommer!*” and thereby makes use of a D2 drama variance strategy, as his direction for Hamlet is to address the judge directly. In addition, he makes use of a S4 converses strategy, as the statement goes from a question requesting judgment, to a firm demand for a declaration from Osric. The effect of using these strategies is that Hamlet appears much more angry and forceful, and the addition of the S7 “!” also further reinforces this image of him. In this line Sløk and Brunse have opted for the same solution, using an S1

strategy to translate the question “Judgment?” into a similar question “Dommer?”, which largely have the same meaning, but does place a bit more emphasis on the judge’s character. The next line “A hit, a very palpable hit” is translated using a G1 strategy by both Sarvig and Sløk. For this line Brunse used a G2 loan strategy as he writes “Touché, en ganske tydelig touché.”, thereby loaning the French word “Touché” which in fencing means “hit”. In the next line something interesting happens, as the stage direction “*They break off; the kettle-drum and trumpets sound, and a cannon-shot is heard.*” is completely absent from all three translations. Here all three of them have made use of the D2 strategy, as they have moved the stage direction further down in the text. The effect of this is that there are no interruptions during the full length of the duel, and as such the first exchange of swords can pass by uninterrupted by the noise until they have said the final line. The last line is translated similarly between the three translators, with only varying degrees of emphasis. Yet the intriguing part of this section, despite the high number of G1 solutions, is the way intensity is amplified in the TTs of all three translators. Sarvig changes the stage direction so that Hamlet’s outburst at the judge is more intense, Sløk introduces “En garde” as a way to amplify suspense before they clash swords, and Bruse uses “Touché” to amplify the notion of a hit. And furthermore, they all moved the final stage direction lower so that it did not interrupt before they had said their last lines.

Version Variance

So far, the strategies used have not borne too many signs of some of the more advanced translation issues which are emblematic of drama translation and more specifically Shakespeare translations. Yet there is one point in the beginning acts which serves as an excellent example of some of the complicated intricacies of translating Shakespeare, that being Hamlet’s first monologue, and this section of text illustrates how very different these translators have chosen to render the content of the ST in their constructions of their TTs. The section is found in act. 1, scene 2, line 129-132 of text are as follows:

<p>O, that this too, too solid flesh would melt, Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew, Or that the Everlasting had not fixed His canon 'gainst self-slaughter! (Shakespeare 48)</p>	<p>Å, gid mit alt-alt-alt for faste kød dog vilde smelte, tøj, opløse sig i dugg, eller at Evighedens Herre ikke havde forbandet selvmord i den grad (Sarvig 17-18)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>O, ville dette kød, der er så snavset, blot smelte, tøj og flyde ud som dug, og havde evighedens Gud blot aldrig sat forbud op mod selvmord. (Johannes Sløk 18-19)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Åh, gid dog mit alt, alt for faste kød ku smelte bort, opløses som en dugg, eller der intet lovbrud var mod selvmord fra Gud, den evige. (Niels Brunse 15-16)</p>
--	--

The first major translational problem in this segment comes from the first part of line 1 and 2 “O, that this too, too solid flesh”, as this section has some very different possible interpretations, as the Q1 and Q2 versions of the text use the word “sallied” and the F1 version of the play uses the word “solid”, thus making the original intention and ability to evoke imagery ambiguous. For Sarvig he uses the following sentence “Å, gid mit alt-alt-alt for faste kød”. Here multiple strategies are used, with the first letter Sarvig employs the G1 literal translation strategy, as he directly transfers the exclamation “O” which in writing would be written “Oh” in the modern day and substituting it with the Danish equivalent in “Å” which comes from “Åh”. After this Sarvig writes “alt-alt-alt” which is a unique example of the S7 emphasis change strategy, as the STs “too, too” gains another repetition in the TT,

and thus gains a greater level of emphasis in the TT. This use of S7 emphasis change likely also resulted in Sarvig using the D2 drama adjustment strategy, as the comma is removed in the ST, likely done to accommodate the lengthened string of words. After this Sarvig writes the word “faste kød” which would be an example of the D3 version variance strategy, as Sarvig utilised one of the two possible interpretations from the original manuscripts. After this Sarvig makes use of the D1 Archaic language use strategy twice in the section “dog vilde smelte, tø, opløse sig i dugg”, this can be seen here through his use of spelling with the words “vilde” and “dugg”. Here it is simply a case of him using the antiquated spellings of the words, while maintaining modern grammatical composition, and the result of this is that the text feels antiquated, yet a modern reader is like to be confused by such spellings, especially with a word like “vilde” as that spelling of the word also has another meaning in the target language. In this same first sentence Sløk takes a rather different approach in his TT, as he produced the line “O, ville dette kød, der er så snavset”. Here the initial letter is directly transferred from the ST to the TT, and while morphemes which indicate sound are relatively universal, it could be argued that the G2 calque strategy was employed here, as the word “Åh” and subsequent shortened morpheme is more in line with Danish language use. Aside from this, Sløk makes use of the D3 version variance strategy in his translation, as he has elected to use the Q1 and Q2 versions of *Hamlet* and has thus opted for using “sallied” instead of “solid” when translating this section. Since he has written “snavset” it is likely then that he has interpreted “sallied” to mean sullied and translated the text accordingly. This section is particularly significant, as this difference in translation shows how there is a certain amount of ambiguity in the ST. Additionally, the imagery which the lines conjure are very different, and give a very different take on what exactly Hamlet is going through. The next section of line 1 is also significant as the section “melt, Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew”, gets translated by Sarvig using the S9 trope change strategy, as Sarvig translates “resolve” as “flyde”, which are two descriptors that are somewhat at odds with each other. When referring

to dew, one typically refers to small droplets of condensation, and as such is slightly at odds with the verb “flyde = flow” as dew typically settles on plants and objects, rather than flowing onto/along them like rain would. In this initial section Brunse stands out at several points with the TT “Åh, gid dog mit alt, alt for faste kød”. Here Brunse employs the G1 literal translation strategy as the exclamation “O” becomes the Danish exclamation “Åh”. Aside from this, Brunse preserves the structure and punctuation of “too, too solid flesh” with “alt, alt for faste kød” using G1 literal translation, in addition to the D3 version variance strategy, which shows that he has elected to use the word “solid” in his translation resulting in his TT including the word “faste” just like Sarvig did. In the next section this line however, Brunse crafts the segment “ku smelte bort, opløses som en dugg,”. In this section Brunse makes use of the D2 drama adjustment strategy, as he shortens the word “kunne” to “ku” which is spoken language written out, instead of writing out the entirety of the word itself. This is likely done as a result of the piece’s status as a play, as this modification is a representation of what is intended to be spoken aloud by the performer rather than writing out the word. In addition to this, Brunse, like Sarvig, also makes use of the D1 archaic language use strategy here, as he also uses the no longer idiomatic spelling “dugg” and instead of using the modern spelling, thus fabricating the effect of reading an older text. Sentence number 2 sees very similar interpretations between all three of the translators, and the general translation and imagery is largely the same, yet it is important to note that they all made use of the S7 emphasis change strategy in their translations, as they all removed the “!” mark from their translations and as a result some of the emphasis is removed from line 3, which in turn dulls the effect of Hamlet’s lamentation against the moral illegitimacy of suicide. With this it is apparent that there are many differences between the three translations in this section, yet there are also many places where they overlap with each other, yet rarely all three overlap at once. This illustrates some of the complicated aspects of these types of translations, as the strategies D1-D3 show a very distinct range of intent at different points in

the translations, as the nature of the work makes some of the translational problems more pronounced than others.

Discussion

When looking at the general trends used by each individual translator, one finds that there is a great level of inconsistency between the strategies that they use and when they use them.

Additionally, there are several instances where simple constructions are altered in odd manners, or where words are composed in a very different manner. What this indicates is that the translators have very different things they focus on, as there are several spots where the pool of words between the three translations is largely the same, but the composition and structure of the sentences themselves are very different.

There are many elements of style which could come into play during the translation, and the intention and era could also have an effect. Small differences could arise because if the translations they craft are too close to a previous translation of the same work, then there would be little perceived justification or perceived necessity to even craft the translation in the first place. In order to break this down further, one might first look at the use of imagery by each of the three translators, as here there are a slew of differences which illustrate some of the fundamental differences between the individual texts.

The primary trends can mostly be gleaned from the analysis of act. 1 scene 3 and act. 4 scene 7. Here it is apparent that Brunse generally makes a little less use of lyrical constructions, and instead opts for more simple and contemporary language “Laertes, er du her? Skynd dig ombord!” (23), Sløk generally uses sentence constructions that are more lyrical in nature, such as “For meget vand blev dig til del, Ophelia” (108), and generally plays more with the structure and content of the drama in his translation. Sarvig is similar to Brunse in that his constructions are generally simpler in nature, yet his language generally has a fairly consistent hint of archaic, as seen with “eller at Evighedens Herre ikke havde forbandet selvmord i den grad” (17). This trait is likely also a result of his translation being the oldest

one. Aside from these general trends, all three of the translators use some form of archaic language, version variance and drama adjustment, but these are typically not used in the same spots. These very erratic differences can likely be attributed to the many different elements a translator has to juggle, and as such they likely have to piece together several complicated solutions at once to sufficiently solve the textual challenges. Another possibility is that, due to the large amount of translations that have already been made, it becomes harder for subsequent translations to break new ground and find new interpretive angles.

One of the most significant points of contention within this investigation is the ST, or more specifically the D3 version variance strategy and what it represents from an analytical and theoretical standpoint. Typically, when working with translation and translation theory the ST is the foundation upon which most analysis is built, as it is through the relationship between ST and TT that parallels can be drawn and conclusions can be made. This, however, becomes much harder to do with *Hamlet* because of the existence of Q1, Q2 and F1, as these represent three different STs, three different styles and interpretations of the same story. As can be seen in act. 1 scene 2, the distinction between “solid” and “sallied” is not an insignificant one, and represents two very different types of evocative imagery, which the translator is given the agency to determine the significance of. This also lines up with what Jaques Derrida argues, as here the concept of a source text is slowly eroding and being replaced by an expectation of the translators to decode and interpret the authors intentions (Derrida 19-21). This concept is then further muddled, as there is also the chance that the translator has made use of an already compiled and edited version of *Hamlet* for their translation. The result of this is that a translation could potentially also be made based on a specific version and interpretation of the STs, and therefore, that interpretation would be reinforced by the translator. This serves to slightly problematise the concept of an ST, as the concept of a definitive ST, in this context, is disintegrating, and seemingly unreachable.

If one looks back to the retranslation hypothesis, one will find a theory that describes that a new or subsequent translation of the same work will see the translator moving towards creating a TT which is closer to the ST, thus indicating a desire for newer translations to become a more precise and definitive version of the original. However, this view is somewhat challenged in this investigation, as is seen with the very apparent challenges created by the fact that there are more than one ST, the archaic language and the nature of drama. With regard to Shakespeare, his works are an immensely influential part of the British canon, and the resulting effect of this is that the works have achieved a level of renown which has made almost every part of these pieces iconic. This does, however, create a challenge for translators, as they now have to somehow emulate/replicate that particular iconicity, and the considerations to be made when translating the rather unique and fairly antiquated English within these works is manifold. One of the primary ways this problem manifests itself is seen through the use of archaicizing language by the translators, as they seek to emulate the unique dated nature of the work by utilizing older vocabulary which in turn allows them to reproduce some of the original identity carried by the originals in the SL. Here there can be some deviation between translators, as the intended readability might not be the same for all the translators. For Brunse he mentions that he typically disregards technically correct punctuation to increase readability (Brunse 2023, 63-65), which in turn also shows that it is difficult to directly compare regular literary translation, to drama translation, as the lyrical elements have quite a large significance in the ways text is translated. Translation generally aims to create a bridge between ST and TT and thus allow for comprehension from the target readers. However, if archaic language is used in place of language which is more congruent with contemporary speech, then it might be more difficult for the TT to find a place in the contemporary polysystem, if it does not fit in with other contemporary works, or appeal to contemporary readers. Looking back to the retranslation hypothesis, the situation suddenly becomes somewhat paradoxical, as the use of archaicizing language actually somewhat

follows the retranslations hypothesis' core principle of bringing the TT closer to the ST, and it could even be argued that a translation that uses archaicizing language would be considered even closer to the ST. In this way, it might be said that someone who uses a lot of archaicizing language is in some way trying to bring their TT closer to that of Shakespeare's original, yet the effectiveness of this approach will vary in effectiveness depending on which audience the translator is making the translation for.

Another factor which puts the retranslation hypothesis into question with regard to Shakespeare's works is the existence of version variance. When talking about closeness in terms of translation, one typically refers to how close the ST is to the TT, yet this point is completely obfuscated by the existence of three different version of *Hamlet*, as this suddenly brings into question which text is really the ST: is it any single one of them? Is it none of them? Is it a compiled version of all three of them? If so, how does one create such a compiled version? Despite this multitude of questions, the answer is relatively simple for the translators, as all they need to do is decide on which version(s) they will use, and what parts they will use for their TT. In this manner, there is a fundamental loss of closeness to the ST, as the ST exists in a state of constant flux between the different translators. In the same way that *Hamlet* gets new translations, so too are English scholars compiling and edit new versions of *Hamlet* in the SL, and as such the concept of the ST is malleable, both to scholars of the SL but also the translators from different TL's who seek to create translations of *Hamlet*. As Chesterman describes, the retranslation hypothesis describes how later translation tend to be closer to the ST (Chesterman 2017, 134). Ultimately, this means that the retranslation hypothesis does not hold up with those of Shakespeare's works which have more than one ST, as the existence of these other versions means that the translator also assumes more of an interpreter role with regard to these specific translations, as they can consider all of the ST versions and potentially incorporate them into their TT's. The observable effect this has, as seen in the analysis, is that there is a very poignant shift in how

the different translators create their imagery, as the different versions of the ST will inevitably lead them to make certain choices in regard to how they interpret certain parts of the ST. “Solid flesh” may give rise to a very corporeal image, and the frustration of being trapped in a vessel which serves as a reminder of the cruel fate one is witnessing. “Sullied flesh”, while also creating a very corporeal image, can also create an image of a man who feels dirty at the thought of being related to the ones who would blaspheme against their family and God. Both of these interpretations can illustrate Hamlet’s frustrations and disgust with the actions of his mother, one image expresses Hamlet’s feeling of frustration at being trapped in his body, while the other conveys powerful feelings of disgust. Both of these images might be equally correct, as they simply represent a split in translator opinion with regard to which version to use and interpret, and as such it is practically impossible to distinguish whether or not one is closer to the ST than the other, as both interpretations of the ST’s can be considered equally valid.

Because the work itself is a drama, yet is still appreciated as a piece of literature there is bound to be a division between audiences, as Shakespeare’s works have become both widely renowned plays and beloved pieces of literature, and as such there is a target audience of readers and another target audience of actors and playwrights. Unlike the written mode, which in most cases has a static form and as such is not affected by the content of the literature when it comes to how the story appears on the page, the stage is fundamentally different. Performances will undoubtedly contain differences depending on props, venue, stage size, cast size and many other factors, and can therefore have different implications. As Aaltonen mentioned, the scope and goals of theatrical productions can vary greatly, and typically the stage directions will be made to fit that scope (147-148 + 107). If one looks simply at the way the words are structured in the first act and first scene of Shakespeare, one will quickly realise that the ordering of the words as they are spoken on stage is of tremendous significance, as these, along with the stage directions, serve to directly influence

how the actors move on the stage. The ways in which the translators have altered the stage directions between the ST and the TT poses several new questions, as the stage directions stand somewhat separate from the script, as its role is more so a guide for the actors rather than necessarily being a prescribed set of immutable decrees the actors have to follow to the letter. When coordinating the logistics of a play one must balance the written instructions and the logistics of how something will play out on the stage, as Marvin Carlson mentions, there are differing opinions on how one might interpret a script, sometimes it should be followed to the letter, other times it might have more room for interpretation (Carlson 5-7). Sometimes it can be necessary to make implicit actions explicit, so as to better illustrate and emphasize the weight and gravity of the actors' performance. This principle further makes it complicated to apply the retranslation hypothesis, due to the fact that translators have to make several concessions in terms of how they transfer written material, and as such there is a break with the concept of closeness, as can be seen in the analysis of act 1 scene 1, wherein the stage directions are sectioned differently, leading to different types of flow in the conversations. Similarly, act 7 scene 2 showed a scene where stage directions were left out completely, which allowed for the generation of more intensity in the duel. This also means that the translators have to make more broad and significant changes to balance out the alterations they make to accommodate the "for the stage" elements in their TT.

Ultimately, all of these different factors serve to show, why these translations, despite being made in such close proximity to each other and being made from the same drama, do not adhere to the prediction set forth by the retranslation hypothesis. Drama translation in itself introduces a whole host of issues in terms of how much one can change, as stage direction, both explicit and implicit, can introduce a whole new dimension of potential changes, and as such a translator's actions when translating drama can have fairly different effects based on small alterations, as seen in the analysis of act.1 scene 1. This is further reinforced by the lack of a "definitive version" allows for the translators to freely pick and

choose what they want to keep in there and how they want to interpret differences in the texts when crafting their TT. Lastly, the legendary status of Shakespeare's works actually serves to complicate the relationship between ST and TT, as the legendary status of the original plays and the language they use, causes translators to implement a sort of false closeness with the text, as the use of archaicizing language ends up bringing the translation closer to the diction of Shakespeare by emulate some of the diction. However, as Habicht mentioned, there is a fine line between translation and improvement, and there is a fine line between equivalence and rewriting (Habicht 47-48). Because of this, while it is true that the different ST version mean that each translator is essentially creating their own interpretation of the drama, the translations are still rooted in the source material to a significant degree.

Conclusion

To summarize and conclude, it can be seen that the answer to the research question, **what are the translational challenges when translating Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1623), and how do the Danish translations of *Hamlet* by Ole Sarvig, Johannes Sløk and Niels Brunse reflect these challenges**, has many different facets, and is as such not simple to answer.

The primary issue when it comes to translating Shakespeare is that the work itself is in a very unique literary position, as the status of the work itself is, uniquely, not insignificant to the way translators approach the work. One of the primary reasons newer translations of works are conducted, is so that a work can be updated and introduced to a new audience of readers, and this kind of translation requires that the language used follows suit, so that there is minimal confusion about the content on the readers' part.

However, when it comes to Shakespeare the works themselves are, in a way, iconic for the unique language they contain, and due to their immense renown, this is not something which is simply overlooked when a translation is conducted. The mere presence of archaic language in a modern translation strongly indicates that there is a desire from the translator to maintain some of the iconic, but very aged, language from the original ST, even if it is at the

cost of the accessibility to new readers. Despite not being a very consistent strategy for the translators to use, the use of archaicizing language in the TTs of all three translators are still frequent enough to establish a semi consistent pattern in the way they construct their TTs.

Another facet which affects the translations in various manners is the fact that the ST is a play, and as such functions both as a set of theatrical instructions, but also as a literary work. The nature of theatre is such that almost all of the written content is in the form of dialogue, and as such is expected to be spoken aloud by an actor. The result of this is that a lot of the imagery is tied into the dialogue and can therefore be affected greatly by the translator's effort to effectively transfer the content from the ST, while still maintaining an awareness of the fact that the lines are still meant to be spoken aloud.

Furthermore, the way stage direction is communicated varies greatly between all three translators and can have incredibly significant ramifications for the way the play is performed, and the manner in which the audience interprets the play when performed. The final challenge arises from the fact that there exist three different versions of the play, and as such there is no definitive version of the ST, as the translators can freely study and use the different versions in their interpretations and subsequent translations. This leads to the TT's featuring wildly different interpretations of certain elements of the ST, and as a result, the imagery which is conjured can be very different depending on the interpretation which the translator has opted for.

Because of all of these complications, it now becomes a question of how these different translators approach these issues, and if there is some sort of recognizable pattern to the strategies they use. The retranslation hypothesis can sometimes be used to explain the types of differences one might see in subsequent translations of the same text, as this theory posits that later translations will be closer to the ST. However, due to the very unique problems of translating Shakespeare, and *Hamlet* in particular, this theory does not seem to apply to these three translations. For there to be an established closeness, one must establish a pattern of

behaviour, and for these translations, the general pattern of techniques used is very varied, and often very inconsistent between the three translations. One way to describe these patterns would be balanced variance, as the translators use a lot of different techniques, and often do not tackle their translation problems the same way, but they still end up using the same strategies or patterns of strategies, just at different points in their translations. This is not to say that there is no overlap between the translations, but rather that the translations have rather sporadic uses of certain strategies, which gives the impression that they are all affected by the same complicated issues of archaic language, drama translation and version variance, but are somewhat sporadic or selective in how and when they use certain solutions or make significant alterations.

All of this goes to say that the complicated nature of the work, and the desire of the translators to craft their own translations, lead them to make very complicated translation decisions, based on complex interpretive decisions depending on the STs they are working with. Although, they are all still affected by the status and nature of the original work, and as a result a lot of the strategies being used by the different translators stay relatively consistent between all three translations, despite the resulting TTs being very different. All of these observations are largely based on qualitative analysis and assessment of the ST and the resulting TTs, given the scope of this investigation this is adequate for investigating the overlying tendencies of translators of *Hamlet*, and the general challenges which one would face during such a translation. Yet, due to the very vast amount of potential content to assess in all three original versions of *Hamlet* and the later edited versions by scholars, there is much room for expansion in this field. Additionally, a more quantitative approach might also reveal some of the more nuanced patterns of translation strategies used by the different translators, and as such allow for a more nuanced and precise assessment of the intricacies of these translations and the decision being made by the translators.

In this investigation, my findings seem to indicate that there are certain texts that might not be beholden to established theories of translation, such as the retranslation hypothesis, and that external cultural factors, such as the status and nature of a literary work, can have an impact on the manner in which it is translated. A further contribution I have made to the discipline are the additional translation strategies version variance, archaic language use and drama adjustment, as these provide a new foundation for explaining uncommon types of translation changes. Through the addition of the concept of version variance, this investigation also puts the concept of the source text into question, as the existence of multiple STs and the textual variance this introduces further serves to obfuscate what the ST is and what its function in relation to the translators is. These foundations can likely also be expanded upon further in the future, given the popularity and renown of the literary work *Hamlet*, it is likely that there might be more translations in the future, which could reveal further intricacies which lie at the heart of this storied and revered work of literature.

Bibliography

- Aaltonen, Sirkku. "Retranslation In The Finnish Theatre." *Cadernos de Tradução*, vol. 1, no. 11, 2003, pp. 141–59.
- Brunse, Niels. Translator, "Hamlet". Shakespeare, William. Gyldendal, 2016.
- Brunse, Niels. *Stage or Page? A Momentous Choice*. In "Shakespeare in Succession : Translation and Time". 1st ed., McGill-Queens University Press, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780228016502>.
- Carlson, Marvin. "Theatrical Performance: Illustration, Translation, Fulfillment, or Supplement?" *Theatre Journal* (Washington, D.C.), vol. 37, no. 1, 1985, pp. 5–11, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3207181>.
- Chesterman, Andrew. "Memes of Translation : The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory." Revised edition., John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2016.
- Chesterman, Andrew. "Reflections on Translation Theory : Selected Papers 1993-2014." Edited by Andrew Chesterman, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2017.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Positions." Continuum, 2002.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." *Poetics Today*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1990, pp. 45–51, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1772668>.
- Finlay, Bill. *Translating Standard into Dialect. Missing the Target?*. In *Moving Target : Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation*. St. Jerome Publishing, 2000.
- Gambier, Yves, et al. "Conference Interpreting: Current Trends in Research." *Proceedings of the International Conference on Interpreting: What Do We Know and How?* 1st ed., vol. 23, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1997.
- Gambier, Yves, and Luc van Doorslaer. "Handbook of Translation Studies: Volume 1." 1st ed., John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010.

- Habicht, Werner. *The Romanticism of the Schlegel-Tieck Shakespeare and the History of Nineteenth-Century German Shakespeare Translation*. In “European Shakespeares : Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age”. 1st ed., J. Benjamins Pub. Co., 1993.
- Irace, Kathleen O. ED, Shakespeare, William. “The First Quarto of Hamlet.” Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Lörscher, Wolfgang. 1991. *Translation performance, Translation Process and Translation Strategies: A Psycholinguistic investigation*. Tübingen: Narr
- Paloposki, Outi, et al. “A Thousand and One Translations: Revisiting Retranslation.” *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*, vol. 50, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2004, pp. 27–38, <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.50.04pal>.
- Sarvig, Ole. Translator. “Hamlet”, Shakespeare, William. Gyldendal Teater, 1968.
- Schjoldager, Anne, et al. ”Understanding Translation.” 1st edition., Academica, 2021.
- Sløk, Johannes. Translator. “Hamlet”, Shakespeare, William. Berlinske, 1971.
- Soucy, C. Luke. “Retranslations.” *World Literature Today*, vol. 97, no. 6, 2023, pp. 8–9, <https://doi.org/10.1353/wlt.2023.a910249>.
- Venuti, Lawrence. “The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation.” 1st ed., Routledge, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315098746>.
- Watts Cedric ed. “Hamlet.” Shakespeare William. Wordsworth, 1992.
- Østerberg, Johannes Valdemar. Translator. “Hamlet.” Shakespeare, William. Gyldendal, 1921.