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SHAKESPEARE IN THE NETHERLANDS

PART TWO

INTRODUCTION
TO A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF
DUTCH SHAKESPEARE TRANSLATORS
FROM BURGERSDIJK TO THE PRESENT DAY
IN THE LIGHT OF
GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PROBLEMATIC
FEATURES OF THEIR TASK

ROBERT-H. LEEK
CHAPTER XIV

STRUCTURE:
TRANSLATORS' APPROACHES TO SYNTACTIC FIDELITY.

Structural differences between Dutch and English. - As is known, English and Dutch are historically closely related, having originated from the tongues of neighbouring West Germanic tribes; and their kinship is still clearly recognizable in many shared syntactic and etymological features. However, their divergent development since the early middle ages, in which English was strongly modified by the language of the Norman invaders while Dutch continued to adhere to the Germanic pattern, has resulted in a number of structural differences, a few of which must be pointed out in order to clarify some of the problems a Dutch Shakespeare translator is faced with. In most of these a close correspondence between Dutch and German can be observed.

On the first- and second-rank level - that of sentence and clause construction, and the relationship between them - the most salient point of difference is the behaviour of the predicat. The basic structures of α clauses are the same in Dutch as in English, with the proviso that the P position in an SPC, SPA or SPCA structure can only be occupied by one, finite verb form; if an α clause contains a complex predicat or a set of catenated predicats, the non-finite items will usually be separated from the finite verb by complement(s) and/or adjunct(s).

Julius Caesar, III,ii,121: I will not do them wrong - 'k Wil hun geen onrecht doen (Fleerackers)

Macbeth, III,iv,109: You have displaced the mirth, - Je hebt de vreugd verdreven, 't feest vergaald (Diels)

1 As these problems arise from the formal patterns of verbal expression rather than from the basic syntactic relationships underlying them, the discussion will be limited to features of surface structure. In the course of this, some important differences between the transformational processes of Dutch and English - in the formation of interrogative and negative clauses, the use of the passive voice and of non-finite dependent clauses, to name a few - will become clear. (Re. terminology: see INTRO. p.viii)

2 The text and the line numbering throughout this chapter and the subsequent ones, unless specified otherwise, is that of The London Shakespeare, ed. John Munro, London, 1958.
This does not mean that non-finite verb forms always assume the final position in an α clause; in some cases a prepositional adjunct, or even the prepositional qualifier of a complement may either precede or follow a Pnf:

King Lear, II,iv,204-206: ...and choose
To wage against the enmity o' th'air,
To be a comrade with the wolf and owl, -

and rankshifted complements, in both α and dependent clauses, are normally placed after a Pnf:

The Tempest, III,i,76-79: ...Wherefore weep you? -
- At mine unworthiness, that dare not offer
What I desire to give; and much less take
What I shall die to want. ...

The normal sequence of subject and predicator is SP(f); but when an α clause is preceded by a β clause or opens with (an) optional adjunct(s) other than a linking particle, the Pf and S change places:

Twelfth Night, III,iii, 2-3:
But since you make a pleasure of your pains,
I will no further chide you.

Romeo and Juliet, II,i,93:
Henceforth I never will be Romeo.

As in English, β clauses and optional adjuncts are sequence-free; but adjuncts are rarely placed between S and Pf in an α clause, and never unless their sequence is reversed:

A Midsummer Night’s Dream, II,i,253:
There sleeps Titania sometime of the night,..

Complements and obligatory adjuncts enjoy a considerable degree of positional freedom - in so far as any one of them may assume the initial position in an α clause, if emphasis should make this desirable; but such a structural shift is strictly conditional to: a) the absence of a preceding β clause or an opening adjunct other than a linking particle; b) the inversion of S and Pf; and c) the retention of their basic structural positions by any other elements present.
Richard III, III, iv, 10: We know each other's faces:... Elkaar gezichten kennen wij:... (Roland Holst)

Hamlet, I, i, 112: A mote it is to trouble the mind's eye. Een stofje is 't, dat het oog kwelt van de geest. (Courteaux)

Subject to the same conditions, even a Pnf may assume the initial position in an α clause:

Julius Caesar, III, ii, 70:
I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him. Begraven kom ik Caesar, niet hem loven. (Verkade)

As all these examples suggest, in Dutch the finite verb is invariably the second thought in an affirmative or negative indicative sentence. However, in dependent clauses the Pf is placed after C and A elements (see the examples from The Tempest and Twelfth Night on p. 284: Wat ik zo diep verlang (lit.: "What I desire so deeply") and: ..nu gij uit die moeite vreugde u schep..). In:

Hamlet, V, ii, 222-223:
That I have shot my arrow o'er the house, And hurt my brother.

the position of the adjunct: over 't huis is a somewhat forced poetic liberty; Voeten's solution exemplifies the "normal" construction:

Dat ik mijn pijl deed vliegen over 't huis, En zoo mijn broeder trof. (Burgersdijk)

dat 'k slechts mijn pijl over het huis heenschoot...

When a Pnf occurs in a β clause the Pf precedes or follows it immediately; in the case of catenative verbs, the Pf - if an auxiliary - is contiguous with its own headword:

Measure for Measure, II, ii, 92-93:
If the first that did th'edict infringe Had answered for his deed.

The Winter's Tale, I, ii, 316-317:
(and thou,/ his cupbearer)... - might'st bespice a cup

To give mine enemy a lasting wink;...

(a very free translation; lit: "You would have offered my enemy a cup to drink, which would have caused his desire" (or: "appetite") "to perish for all eternity". Note the peculiarity here that, in Dutch, the first past participle has the form of an infinitive.)
Coriolanus, III, i, 6-8: They are worn, lord consul, so
That we shall hardly in our ages see
Their banners wave again.

Zij zijn zóó vermoeid,
Dat wij in onze tijd hun vaan wel niet
Meer zullen wuiven zien. (Koster)

For the sake of the metre, the translator here allowed himself a slight anomaly - normally, the order would have been: zullen zien wuiven. - The only exception to this rule of a terminal predicator cluster in dependent clauses is the unparticled conditional clause where, as in English, the Pf precedes the subject:

Romeo and Juliet, II, i, 99: Had I it written...
Had ik ze op schrift.. (Wermueus Buning)

A Midsummer Night's Dream, III, ii, 147:
If you were civil and knew courtesy...
Waart gij beschadfd en wist wat hoofscheid was.,
(Van Looy)

This is the only type of finite dependent clause in Dutch that does not require a binding element of some kind. As such elements are often omitted in English, they have to be inserted in the translation if the same dependent structure is used:

Much Ado About Nothing, I, i, 119-121: I tell him
we shall stay here at least a month; and he heartily prays some occasion may detain us longer.

Ik heb hem gezegd, dat wij hier tenminste een maand zullen blijven, en... hij wenscht vurig, dat er iets gebeure om ons nog langer hier te houden.
(Van Burgersdijk)

Non-finite dependent clauses are less commonly used in Dutch than in English - particularly Shakespeare's English. Hence, translators tend to commute these into finite structures:

Hamlet, I, ii, 17-24:
... young Fortinbras,
Holding a weak supposal of our worth,
Or thinking by our late dear brother's death
Our state to be disjoint and out of frame,
Colleagued with this dream of his advantage,
He hath not failed to pester us with message
Importing the surrender of those lands
Lost by his father, with all bands of law...

("... the young Fortinbras, / Who rates our worth low, or supposes, / That our late dear brother's death / Has dislocated the state and wrenched it out of joint, / And who conspires with this dream of chance, / Has not failed to harrass us with letters / In which he demands restitution of the territory, / Which was
lawfully forfeited by his father..." - The only syntactic heterodoxy in Van Dam's rendering is the position of vraagt in 1.23: one would have expected to find that word at the end of the line, after "gebied"). Jac. van Looy, however, has characteristically retained most of the non-finite features in his version of this passage - and committed, in the process, some of the sins against Dutch grammar that tend to make his translations so awkward:

"...the young Fortinbras,
Thinking too little of our worth,
And supposing (that) our state remained...behind
Dislocated...after the death of our dear brother,
Too familiar with (?) "vertrouwd", past part. of vertrouwen: "to trust", possibly meant to convey the sense of vertrouwend op: "relying on") his dream of advantage,

As has been pointed out above, the omission of the binding particle dat ("that") in 1.19, though not uncommon, is anomalous; a finite construction was inevitable here, as the accusative & infinitive construction ("our state to be") cannot be used in Dutch. The "Hij" in 1.22 is not only redundant - as it is in the original - but also misplaced (see above: PfS); and the absence of an equivalent for importing is responsible for a rather ungainly effect in 1.23. - The Van Looy sample, however, serves the purpose of illustrating a few structural features of non-finite dependent clauses in Dutch: nominal complements and adverbial adjuncts precede a Pnf, rankshifted complements follow it; many prepositional adjuncts may either precede or follow it (in 11.18 and 24 "te nietig denkend over onze waarde" and:
"rechts-wettelijk door zijn vader verloren" would have been grammatically acceptable alternatives; but **"denkend te nietig over onze waarde" and **"verloren rechts-wettelijk door zijn vader" would not pass muster.

Rankshifted infinitive clauses can be accommodated in Dutch, with or without the particle om ("in order"):

Macbeth, II,iii,110-112: Who could refrain,
That had a heart to love, and in that heart
Courage to make's love known?

Wie, die een hart
Vol liefde had en moed om haar te tonen,
Had zich bedwongen? (Koster)

Yet this type of construction is frequently converted into a prepositional group with, for its headword,
a noun containing the sense of the verb:

Die liefde in 't hart had, en in 't harte moed
To liefdesuiting, hield zich in? (Burgersdijk)

That had love in his heart, and in that heart courage
For an expression of love, would restrain himself?

("Who,"

The same choice of constructions is resorted to for the rendering of catenated infinitives:

Romeo and Juliet, I,v,53-55:

Come hither, covered with an antic face,
To fleer and scorn at our solemnity?

(Courteaux:)

Durf die schelm het aan,
Hier met groteske tronie te verschijnen,
Om met ons feest te spotten, ons te honen?

(Van Looy:)

Wat, die hond
Waagt 't hier te komen door een mom bedekt,
Tot hoon en spot van onze feestelijkheid?

In the third rank - group structure - most important differences between Dutch and English are again those affecting verbal groups. Both the progressive and perfective aspects of English usage present problems in translation. The former, relatively rarely found in Shakespeare, has for its nearest Dutch equivalent the simple present or preterite, or a paraphrase:

Richard II, I,iii,285: And thou art flying to a fresher clime.

..en gij naar reiner lucht ontwijkt. (Burgersdijk)

The Merry Wives of Windsor, III,iii,84: Your husband's coming hither,

Uw man is op weg ("is on his way") hierheen,...

(Voeten)

The perfective aspect, if indicating an action continuing into the present, is also best translated by a simple present, with or without a clarifying adjunct:

Richard II, III,iii,72-73:
We are amazed, and thus long have we stood
To watch the fearful bending of thy knee,

(Wij zijn verbasaad, en wachten hier reeds lang
Op de eerbiedvolle buiging van uw knie...

Burgersdijk is more conscientious in the observance of this peculiarity of the English perfective than most of his successors:

Macbeth, I,vii,16-18:
Hath borne his faculties so meek, hath been
So clear in his great office,

(Burgersdijk:)
Bovendien is Duncan

(Van Suchtelen:) Bovendien
Zoo zacht in 't oef'nen zijner macht, zoo vlekk' loos. Heeft Duncan zo zachtmoedig en zo zuiver
In zijn verheven ambt... Zijn hoge taak vervuld...

Here, the latter, perfective rendering implies - in Dutch - that Macbeth already thinks of Duncan as dead, or at least at the end of his reign. For the Dutch perfective construction (i.e.: the auxiliaries hebben or zijn with the past participle) often conveys the sense of the English preterite:
The Tempest, I,ii,9: Poor souls, they perished! Wee hen, zij zijn vergaan. (Nijhoff)

As for the passive voice: the situation is clear-cut in modern English, where the use of the present and the preterite of the verb to be + Vn invariably signifies the present and simple past tense, rendered in Dutch by the corresponding forms of worden + past participle; and this construction is common enough in Shakespeare:
The Merchant of Venice, II,vii,26: (Koster:)
If thou be'st rated by thy estimation... Als gij geschat wordt naar uw goeden naam...

but many examples can be found in the plays where to be + Vn is used - without being clearly commuted from a CH into a PCI combination - in cases which would require have/has or had been + Vn in modern usage, offering the translator a sometimes difficult choice between worden + past participle (present, imperfective passive) and zijn + past participle (+ geworden): (perfective passive):
As You Like It, II,vii,99: (Burgersdijk:)
Till I and my affairs are answer'd. Eer ik en mijn nooddrift zijn voldaan.

Macbeth, I,iii,100-101: (Courteaux:)
We are sent, Om u zijn koninklijke dank te brengen;
To give thee, from our royal master, thanks;

In these cases, the translator must, as in the above examples, establish the time factor from the context.
In general, English affords a wider application of the passive voice than Dutch, in which only the direct object of an action (Ce') can become the subject of a corresponding passive clause. Other constructions require paraphrasing in translation:
Julius Caesar, II,ii,119: (Courteaux:)
I am to blame to be thus waited for. 't Is niet behoorlijk, dat ik u laat wachten.
("It is not seemly that I let you wait.")
Nor does Dutch easily accommodate a passive construction when there is no agent indicated or clearly understood; in such cases, a reflexive construction may offer the right solution:

*A Midsummer Night's Dream,* II,i,97:
And crows are fatted with the murrion flock;

*(Van Looy:)*
En kraaien melen zich met 't schurftig vee.

Often translators prefer an active construction with the impersonal pronoun *men* ("one") to the passive voice:

*Henry IV, I, I,iii,170:*
Shall it for shame be spoken in these days..

*(Voeten:)*
Moet men er nu vol schande over spreken..

Although Shakespeare's application of *shall* and *will*, *should* and *would* has puzzled some translators, where it departs from modern usage, most of the English a-class modal and future-tense auxiliaries present no real structural problems; a proximate or indefinite, and a conditional future tense can often be expressed in Dutch by the simple present and preterite verb forms, respectively. The only problematic a-class auxiliary is the verb *to do*, when used for negative, interrogative and - as frequently in Shakespeare - expletive or emphatic affirmative constructions, for which Dutch has no structural equivalent:

*Hamlet,* I,iii,11:
For nature crescent *does not* grow alone
In thews and bulk;

*(Courteaux:)*
Want de natuur die wast wint niet alleen
Aan kracht en omvang;

*Julius Caesar,* I,i,50:
And *do* you now *strew* flowers in his way..

*(Fleerackers:)*
En strooit ge thans uw bloemen voor den man,

*Much Ado About Nothing,* V,iv,1:
Did I not *tell* you she was innocent?

*(Burgersdijk:)*
Zeide ik u niet, dat Hero schuldlos was?

*The Taming of the Shrew,* III,ii,179:
But so it is, *my* haste *doth* call me hence,

*(Van den Berg:)*
maar het zit zo: dringende zaken roepen
mij elders..

The laws governing Dutch separable verbs are similar to those of German. In an α clause the particle or nominal element is placed after the complement(s); if an unparticled infinitive or a participial Pnf occurs, it is prefixed to that. In a β clause it remains attached to the headword, whether this be a Pf or a Pnf:

*Troilus and Cressida,* III,ii,108: I love you now..

*Ik heb u lief...* *(Voeten)*
Cymbeline, V,v,166-167: ...the qualities that man Loves woman for...  (Andreas:)  ...de gaven waar een man een vrouw om liefheeft...
(N.B.: "love" (unparticled infinitive): liefhebben; "to love" (particled infinitive): lief te hebben)

Richard III, III,ii,10-11: ...that this night He dreamt the boar had rased off his helm...  (Burgersdijk:) ...dat hij van ‑nacht een droom had, Dat de ever hem de helm had afgestopten;...

Richard III, III,ii,43: I'll have this crown of mine cut from my shoulders, Men sla mij deze kroon af van mijn schouders, (N.B.: the unparticled infinitives of the verbs used are: afstoten ("rase") and afslaan ("cut off"))

Adverbial groups pose no generalizable structural problems; and the only unusual feature of Dutch prepositional groups is that positional prepositions, if used directionally, are placed at the end of the group:

Cymbeline, III,iii,10-11:
Now for our mountain sport. Up to yond hill! Your legs are young: I'll tread these flats. (Burgersdijk:) En nu ter bergjacht! Gij hebt jonge beenen; Den heuvel op! ik blijf in 't dal.

("And now to the mountain-hunt! You have young legs; / Up (to) the hill! I stay in the valley." - Up on the hill" would have been: "Op de(n) heuvel"; "Into the valley": "Het dal in".)

The translation of "mountain sport" by "bergjacht" in the above example, as well as that of "dream of his advantage" from the Hamlet passage on pp.286-287 by "kansdroom" (Van Dam) and "voordeelsdroom" (Van Looy), and Burgersdijk's use of "liefdesuiting" ("utterance" or "expression of love") in the passage from Macbeth at the top of p.288 illustrate the most notable characteristic of Dutch nominal groups: the amalgamation of noun headwords with their modifiers and/or rankshifted qualifiers into compound nouns. This process is often, though by no means always, a matter of choice on the part of the translator: a nominator, as "mountain" above, is normally prefixed to the noun, as are many genitival determiners; hence Richard's "almshman's gown" (Richard II, III,iii,149) becomes a "boetlingspij", and "my honour's pawn" (Richard II, IV,i,55 and 70): "mijn erepand". Compounds incorporating prepositional qualifiers are found more frequently in the work of the older than that of recent translators - a symptom of the shift away from a synthetic towards a more analytic structure of Dutch in the course of this century:

Macbeth, III,iv,105-106: ...protest me The baby of a girl.  (Burgersdijk:) ...noem mij vrij  (Diels:) ...scheld me vrij  Een meijsjespop!  voor zuig'ling van een wicht!
Similarly, in the various versions of

_Hamlet, I,i,117-118: As stars with trains of fire and dews of blood, / Disasters in the sun..._

one finds compounds like _vuurestaartsterren_ (Van Looy), _bloeddauw_ and _zonstorenissen_ (Van Dam); but Voe-ten only retains _staartsterren_ ("tail-stars"), and faithfully renders Shakespeare's analytic groups in _dauw van bloed_ and _de zon vol vlekken_, and Courteaux has:

_Een ster met vuur'ge staart, bloedige dauw,
De zon vol vlekken._

Nevertheless, compounds remain a common feature of even the most modern Dutch translations.

Another unusual nominal construction, which occurs from time to time, is that featuring a genitival qualifying adjective, where English has something, _nothing, anything, much that is, all that is_ + an un-inflected adjective, or _a thing of + a noun:

_Macbeth, III,iv,96-97: Think of this, good peers, _ (Koster:)_ Beschouwt dit, waarde pairs,
But as _a thing of custom..._ Slechts als iets heel gewoons:...

Apart from some specific situations where Dutch, unlike English, requires the use of a definite article ("Christendom" - _de Christenheid_; "the river Trent" - _de (rivier de) Trent_; "Mount Olympus" - _de (berg) Olympus_; "White-Friars" - _de Karmelieten_), other minor peculiarities of the Dutch nominal group need not be discussed here.

At the fourth rank, a translator faced with the limitations of the iambic pentameter encounters his greatest obstacle in the prevalence of syllabic inflectional endings. All attributive adjectives, most verbs and many nouns take plural endings (-e, -en); attributive adjectives often have an -e ending in the singular as well; the preterite of weak verbs is extended by the suffix -de(n) or -te(n); the past participle of all verbs except those which already have an unstressed prefix (such as _ver-_ or _be-_ ) takes the initial syllable _ge-_, and that of most strong verbs the suffix _-en_ as well. In the translations of the following passages, all the instances where the Dutch has syllabic inflections that have no counterpart in the English text, have been italicized:

_The Merchant of Venice, I,iii,70-80:_

When Laban and himself were compromised
That all the eanlings which were streaked and pied

(Burgersdijk:

Toen tusschen hem en Laban de afspraak was,
Dat al 't geplekte en zwarte van de lamm'ren
Should fall as Jacob's hire, the ewes, being rank,
In th'end of Autumn turned to the rams:
And when the work of generation was
Between these woolly breeders in the act,
The skilful shepherd pilled me certain wands,
And, in the doing of the deed of kind,
He stuck them up before the fulsome ewes,
Who, then conceiving, did in eaning time
Fall parti-coloured lambs, and those were Jacob's.

Als Jakobs loon zou gelden, en de herfsttijd
Weer de oollen met de rammen samenbracht
En 't wolveel welig aan het paaren ging,
Toen nam de ervaren herder poppelroeden
En schilde ze met strepen en hij leif ze,
Wanneer de dieren paarden, op de drinkplaats,
Voor de oogen van de ritsige oollen neer,
Die, zoo ontvangend, in den lammertijd
Geplekte jongen wierpen, Jakobs deel.

Since we are only concerned with the highlighted feature of syllabic inflections, no metaphrases of the above and the following passages will be supplied. However, it should be noted that Burgersdijk, like many of his successors, continued to observe the old poetic usage of apocope of unstressed final -e before the initial vowel of a following word, due to which the inflectional endings of "geplekte" in 1.71 and "ritsige" in 1.78 can be regarded as mute. The apostrophe in "lamm'ren" (1.71) is an example of vowel syncope applied to the penultimate syllable of a bisyllabic inflectional suffix (singular: "lam", plural: "lammeren"); and "lei" (1.76) is a generally accepted contracted inflectional suffix, arrived at by consonant syncope, of the weak preterite "legde" (leggen - "lay"). The ending -end of "ontvangend" and the medial syllable -mer- in the compound "lammertijd" (1.79), although both inflectional, have not been italicized because they correspond with the -ing endings of "conceiving" and "eanning".

Othello, I,iii,155-163:

I did consent,
And often did beguile her of her tears
When I did speak of some distressful stroke
That my youth suffered. My story being done,
She gave me for my pains a world of sighs.
She swore, in faith, 'twas strange, 'twas
passing strange;
'Twas pitiful, 'twas wondrous pitiful.
She wished she had not heard it, yet she wished
That heaven had made her such a man...

(Voeten:)

Ik stemde toe,
en meer dan eens ontlokte ik haar tranen
als ik gewaagde van een harde slag die
mijn jeugd getroffen had. Na 't laatste woord
beloonde zij mijn moeite met een wereld
van zuchten; en zij zoëer mij dat het vreemd was,
vreemd en aangrijpend, wonderlijk aangrijpend;
zij wenste dat zij 't niet had aangehoord
en tegelijk, dat God haar als zo'n man
geschaan had...

The full syllabic ending of "ontlokte" (1.156) is only one example of Voeten's departure from the habit of contraction still so prominent in the preceding Burgersdijk passage; the result is a more open and articulate type of verse. However, the feature of contraction will be dealt with at greater length later
in this, and in the next chapter.

Henry IV, II, III, i, 4-14:

How many thousand of my poorest subjects
Are at this hour asleep! O sleep, O gentle sleep,
Nature's soft nurse, how have I frighted thee,
That thou no more wilt weigh my eyelids down,
And steep my senses in forgetfulness?
Why rather, sleep, liest thou in smoky cribs,
Upon uneasy pallets stretching thee,
And hushed with buzzing night-flies to thy slumber,
Than in the perfumed chambers of the great,
Under the canopies of costly state,
And lulled with sound of sweetest melody?

These three examples will suffice to illustrate the problem Dutch translators are faced with in accommodating such a pervasive feature as the syllabic inflexional affix within the bounds of the ten- or eleven-foot iambic pentameter.

So far, however, only regular grammatical features of English, and their relationship to Dutch, have been discussed. But Shakespeare's poetry, particularly that of his later plays, is marked by irregularities of an elliptic nature, not all of which can be retained in Dutch; so translators tend to complete or reorganize such constructions:

King Lear, I, i, 221-223:
If for I want that glib and oily art
To speak and purpose not, since what I well intend,
I'll do't before I speak -

("if it be only because I / want the glib dexterity of (the) speaking / Without (the) doing, since I do" (i.e.: "execute") "a good intention / Before I speak -")

Macbeth, III, ii, 32-33:  
Unsafe the while that we
Must lave our honours in these flattering streams,

(Koster:)
Onveilig is onze eer zoolang wij haar
Nog wassen in den stroom van vleierij..

("Unsafe is our honour as long as we
Still wash it in the stream of flattery"..)

(Courteaux:)
Hoevelen van mijn need'verigste onderdanen
Zijn thans in slaap! O slaap, o zoete slaap,
Natuurs verpleger, hoe verjoeg ik u,
Dat gij mijn ogen niet meer dicht wil drukken,
Mijn zinnen domp'len in vergetelheid.
Wat ligt gij liever in beroorde hutten,
Op 't harde, prikkend strobed uitgestrekt,
Door 't nachtgezoem der muggen ingedommeld,
Dan in het geurig slaapvertrek van groten,
Door rijke baldakijnen overweld,
En ingesust door zachte melodieën?

(Roland Holst:) als 't alleen is omdat ik
De gladde handigheid mis van het spreken
Zonder het doen, wijl ik een goed voornemen
Doe vóór ik speak -

(Unsafe the while that we
Must lave our honours in these flattering streams,

(Van Suchtelen:)
Want, onveilig nog,
Vergt onze macht nog hulp van vleierij..

("For, unsafe still,
Our power still requires the aid of flattery"..)
Antony and Cleopatra, II,vii,73-74:
'Tis not my profit that does lead mine honour; Mine honour, it.
("Self-interest" (baatzucht: "love of profit") "must not show my honour the way; / My honour be a guide to it.")
(Burgersdijk:)
De baatzucht mag mijn eer den weg niet wijzen, Mijn eer zij haar ten gids.

The Tempest, I,ii,447-449: 0, if a virgin, And your affection not gone forth, I'll make you The Queen of Naples.
("O, if you are a virgin / And is your heart still free, (then) I'll make you / The queen of Naples!")
(Nijhoff:)
0, zijt gij een maagd En is uw hart nog vrij, dan maak ik u Tot Napels' koningin!

Troilus and Cressida, I,iii,287-288: And may that soldier a mere recreant prove, That means not, hath not, or is not in love!
("And every soldier may prove a coward, / That does not wish to be, not was (= has been), nor is in love!")
(Buddingh:)
En iedere krijger moge een lafaard blijken, Die niet verliefd wil zijn, 't niet was, noch is!

Structural fidelity and its bearing on the quality of translations. - From the above examples it will be evident that line-for-line (let alone, word-for-word) structural fidelity is an ideal unattainable for even the most scrupulous Dutch Shakespeare translator; not only is there a considerable amount of syntactic divergence between the two languages, but even where corresponding constructions do exist - perceptive aspect, passive voice, analytic future tense, participial verbal groups, to name a few - they are not necessarily functionally equivalent.

Therefore, the question arises whether close structural correspondence is necessarily a feature of a good translation; for, if this century's many Dutch Shakespeare interpreters were to be judged by the degree to which their work reflects the original syntactic structure, Jac. van Looy would probably rate highest, since with him the most frequent instances can be found where the word order of the original has been retained almost exactly:

Macbeth, II,i,42:
Thou marshall' st me the way that I was going;...
Gij schikt den weg mij dien ik al was gaande;...

Macbeth, III,iv,136-137:
I am in blood / Stepped in so far...
Ik ben in bloed / Gestapt zoo ver er in ...

Hamlet, III,iv,155:
0 Hamlet, thou hast cleft my heart in twain.
0 Hamlet, je hebt gekloofd mijn hart in tweëen.
Romeo and Juliet, II, ii, 32: What early tongue so sweet saluteth me?
Wat vroege mond zoo hupsch komt groeten me?

As You Like It, I, ii, 195: I would thou hadst told me of another father.
Ik wou gij had gemeld mij 'n ander vader.

Unfortunately the results of Van Looy's compliance with Shakespearean syntax are alien to the Dutch ear - so much so, that at times his verse degenerates into cryptic nonsense. If the quoted samples were to be normalized, they would run as follows: "Gij schikt (Germanism) mij den weg dien ik al gaande was" (N.B.: apart from the additional adjunct "al" ("already"), the only departure from the original line: "den weg mij" was meant to correct the metre; the progressive "was gaande", even in the correct order, is not a usual Dutch construction (see p. 288)); - "Ik ben zo ver / In bloed gestapt" - "O Hamlet, je hebt mijn hart in tweeeën gekloofd" - "Wat (voor) vroege mond komt me zo hupsch groeten?" -.

Besides, it appears that Van Looy did not allow himself these liberties with Dutch syntax merely in deference to the structure of Shakespeare's verse; his translations are riddled with grammatical (and idiomatic) eccentricities that have no basis in the original:

Macbeth, II, i, 57-58: for fear / Thy very stones prate of my whereabout,..
uit vrees / Dat raatlen zullen uwe steenen 't waar-naar-toe,..
(disregarding the idiom, the word order would normally be:"uit vrees / Dat uw(e) steenen 't waar-naar-toe zullen raatlen");

Macbeth, II, ii, 15: I heard the owl scream - Ik hoorde schreeuwen de uil ("Ik hoorde de uil schreeuwen")

Macbeth, III, ii, 58: But in them nature's copy's not eterne.
't Onsterflijk niet geschreven in hun natuur is.
("'t Onsterflijk is niet in hun natuur geschreven.")

Macbeth, III, iv, 37: Meeting were bare without it 't Bijeenzijn droog is zonder ("Zonder dat is 't biezenzijn droog")

Macbeth, III, iv, 135-136: For mine own good / All causes shall give way..
Naar wat voor mij is goed / Zal alles schikken zich:..
("Naar wat voor mij goed is / Zal alles zich schikken:"")

As You Like It, I, iii, 76: she is banished - verbannen ze is ("ze is verbannen" or "verbannen is ze")

As You Like It, II, vii, 44: Thou shalt have one. - - It is my only suit,.,
Gij zult er hebben een. - - 't Is juist wat past me...
("Gij zult er een hebben: - - 't Is juist wat me past..."

These oddities even extend to the stage directions, such as the ones in Romeo en Julia, I,iv: Doende een masker voor ("Een masker voordoende" -: Putting on a mask) and I,v: Kussend haar ("Haar kussend" -: Kissing her).

This feature of Van Looy's work is symptomatic of his association with De Taal-tigare (see Ch.XI, p.187); it is most pronounced in his first translation, Macbeth (1900), and becomes less obtrusive with the passage of time; in his version of A Midsummer Night's Dream, published in 1925 as part of his "spiritual memoirs" De Wonderlijke Avonturen van Zebedeus ("The Strange Adventures of Zebedeus"), Volume III, it has all but disappeared.

One other, much more recent translator, the poet J. W. F. Werumeus Buning (1891-1958), occasionally took similar liberties with the language; several of them may be observed in his version of the opening lines of A Midsummer Night's Dream, quoted before (see Ch.XI, p.180). Another example from the same play follows below:

Act II,i,88-90:  
Therefore the winds, piping to us in vain,  
As in revenge, have sucked up from the sea  
Contagious fogs;...  
(Werumeus Buning:)  
Daarom de winden, fluitend ons vergeefs,  
Als ware 't wraak, joegen op uit de zee  
Kwalijke damp,..

where the normal word order would be: "Daarom joegen de winden, vergeefs (naar, voor) ons fluitend, / Als 't ware (in) wraak, kwalijke damp / Uit de zee op,..."

At this point one might well argue that Shakespeare's plays teem with instances of unorthodox syntax and word order. However, that we find unacceptable in his translators what we do not deem disturbing, and often even consider highly effective in the original, is not simply a matter of quod licet Iovi non licet bovi; in fact, many translators, from Burgersdijk to Courteaux, have allowed themselves considerable licence with their language - but usually on occasions where this makes poetic or dramatic sense, while in the examples quoted above the effect is merely maladroit. At the other end of the scale, slavish compliance with grammatical orthodoxy on the part of a translator often proves to be as deadly to the poetic quality of his work as Van Looy's and Werumeus Buning's pedantic mannerisms.

The original question still remains: how important is an approximation of structural fidelity for the
quality of a translation? Theoretically the answer may be that a translator ought to attempt to follow the syntax of the original as closely as his own language and the demands of the iambic pentameter permit, if only in order to ensure as similar a distribution of elements and, particularly, stress patterns as possible. On the other hand, the natural stress rhythm of Dutch differs considerably from that of English (particular attention will be paid to this feature in the next chapter); a word need not necessarily be situated at the same point of a verse line to receive the same amount of emphasis. A good example of this is Verkade's rendering of the second line from Mark Antony's forum speech, quoted on p. 285: "Begraven kom ik Caesar, niet hem prijzen", in which the chiastic distribution of the infinitives attains a much more effective stress pattern than the orthodox word order used by other translators ("Ik kom Caesar begraven, niet hem prijzen"), which is, strictly speaking, "closer" to Shakespeare's line: "I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him."

Our conclusion therefore must be that, in practice, rhythm and stress often prove to be of greater importance than the closest possible syntactic equivalent. Yet this should not blind us to the particular merit of a translator who manages to observe both these factors successfully, nor make us less critical of one who habitually disregards the structural factor and goes his own way entirely. A few examples will illustrate the different approaches to syntactic correspondence of ten different translators.

*Measure for Measure*, III, i, 61-73:

Clau. Is there no remedy? -  
Is. None, but such remedy as, to save a head,  
To cleave a heart in twain. - Clau. But is there any? -  
Is. Yes, brother, you may live.  
There is a devilish mercy in the judge,  
If you'll implore it, that will free your life,  
But fetter you till death. - Clau. Perpetual durance? -  
Is. Ay, just; perpetual durance, a restraint,  
Though all the world's vastidity you had,  
To a determin'd scope. - Clau. But in what nature? -  
Is. In such a one as, you consenting to 't  
Would bark your honour from that trunk you bear,  
And leave you naked. -

Burgersdijk:  
- Is er dus geen redding? -  
- Geen and're, dan die, om een hoofd te redden,  
Een hart door midden klieft. - Er is dus redding?  
- Ja, broeder, gi'k kunt leven; ja, er woont  
Een duivelsch medelijken in den rechter;  

Andreus:  
- Kan niets mij redden? -  
- Nee, niets. Behalve als, om een hoofd te redden,  
en een hart gekloofd wordt. - Maar is er een kans? -  
- Ja, broer, je kunt in leven blijven;  
Heer Angelo kent een duivels soort genade;
Roept gij het in, dan redt u dit het leven,
Maar boeit u tot den dood. — Dus eeuw'ge hecht-
'nis? —

Juist, eeuw'ge hecht'nis, ja een dwang, die u,
Al lag de wijde wereld voor u open,
Steeds drukt en kluistert. — Doch op welke wijs?
Op zulk een wijs, dat, zoo gij er in toestemt,
Zij al wat eer is, afschilt van uw stam,
U naakt laat staan.

("—So is there no salvation? —
— No other but that which, to save a head,
Will cleave a heart through the middle. — So there is salvation?
— Yes, brother, you may live; yea, there dwells
A devilish compassion in the judge;
Implore it, then this will save your life,
But fetter(s) you till death. — So perpetual confinement?
— Exactly, perpetual confinement, yea a restraint which,
Through the wide world lay open to you,
Continually will press and shackle you. — But in what way?
— In such a way that, if you consent to it,
It will peel all that is honour from your trunk,
Will leave you standing naked. —")

Neither of these two versions is anywhere near ideal, but it will appear at a glance that Burgersdijk's contains considerably fewer structural shifts and changes than Andreus', and the majority of those are justifiable; several of them (dus in 11.61 and 67, ja in 11.64 and 68) are metrical line-fillers; the changes in 11.63 and 71 are inevitable conversions of non-finite into finite dependent clauses, that in 11.68-70, an acceptable rendering of an unusual type of group: a NG with an inserted dependent clause between headword and rankshifted qualifier, which cannot be reproduced in Dutch. The only unwarranted — if slight — changes are that of a particled into an unparticled conditional clause in 1.66, without apparent advantage; and the use of the indicative instead of the subjunctive mood in 11.70, 72 and 73. For "But is there any?" in 1.73 the nearest Dutch equivalent is: "Maar is er een?" — which, however, presup-
poses a count-noun referent; and the word "redding" ("salvation, deliverance, rescue") in this context cannot be regarded as such; so both Burgersdijk's and Andreus' renderings are justifiable. None of the paraphrastic liberties Andreus takes in 11.61, 65, 70, 72 and 73 contribute to a greater poetic quality of his version; 1.73 is decidedly awkward. - There are no structural oddities in the Dutch of either version; the stress pattern in Burgersdijk's is a little better than in Andreus', but on the balance, the former's repeated contractions "eeuw'ge hecht'nis" (11.67, 68) are unduly cumbersome. Rhymed couplets add a further complication to the translator's task:

_A Midsummer Night's Dream_,

III, ii, 145-154:

O spite! O hell! I see you all are bent  
To set against me for your merriment:  
If you were civil and knew courtesy,  
You would not do me thus much injury.  
Can you not hate me, as I know you do,  
But you must join in souls to mock me too?  
If you were men, as men you are in show,  
You would not use a gentle lady so;  
To vow, and swear, and superpraise my parts,  
When I am sure you hate me with your hearts.

Van Suchtelen:

O smaad, o hel! Ge drijft het dus daarheen,  
Dat ge allen saamsprant tegen mij alleen?  
Had ge begrip van hoofshheid en fatsoen,  
Ge zoudt mij nimmer zulk een onrecht doen.  
Kunt ge mij dan niet haten zonder spot,  
Zonder te lachen om mijn bitter lot?  
Waar ge echte mannen, niet slechts naar de schijn,  
Besparen zoudt ge een vrouw zo wrede pijn,  
En mij niet kwellen met verliefd gepraat,  
Terwijl ik weet dat ge in uw hart mij haat.

("O scorn, o hell! So you are bent on it  
(lit.: "drive it to that")

That you all conspire against me alone?  
Had you a notion of courtesy and civility,  
You would never do me such an injustice.  
Can you not hate me then without mockery,  
Without laughing at my bitter fate?  
Were you real men, not merely in show,  
You would spare a woman such cruel pain,

Verspoor:

_Dit is het toppunt! Bah, jullie! Bevredigd als je me stuk voor stuk maar meer bedigt!  
Häd je de hoofshheid vaar je mee wilt geuren  
je zóu je niet zo door het slijk heen sleuren!  
Haat me dan, maar dan goed, en zonder spot,  
sonder getreiter met mijn wrange lot!  
O, wanneer jullie echte mannen waren

wist je tenminste een weereelse te sparen!  
Dat maakt het hof, dat sart mij om de beurt  
en met een haat die mij het hart verscheurt!  
("This is the limit! Pah, you (two)! Satisfied when you but one by one insult me more!  
Had you the courtesy which you wish to show off  
you would not drag me through the mire that way!  
Hat me then, but then properly, and without mockery,  
without teasing (me) with my sour fate!  
O, if you were real men.

at least you would know how to spare a defenseless (person)!
And not torment me with infatuated banter,
While I know that you hate me in your heart."

They pay their court, they bait me by turns
and with a hatred that tears my heart to pieces!"

It is interesting to observe how Van Suchtelen appears to have attempted to retain, where possible, the structure of at least one line of every couplet, adjusting the other one to the rhyme; he has also preserved the exclusively masculine verse of the passage, whereas Verspoor has used feminine rhymes in six of the ten lines. The latter's approach to the task of translating is evidently diametrically opposed to Van Suchtelen's: not only his syntax, but also his idiom and verse rhythm are entirely his own. However, it would be incorrect to conclude, on the basis of the above examples, that this difference in attitude merely distinguishes the older from the more recent translators; the work of several present-day Shakespeare interpreters is marked by considerable structural fidelity:

King Lear, I,ii,1-9:

Thou, Nature, art my goddess; to thy law
My services are bound. Wherefore should I
Stand in the plague of custom, and permit
The curiosity of nations to deprive me,
For that I am some twelve or fourteen moonshines
Lag of a brother? Why bastard? Wherefore base?
When my dimensions are as well compact,
My mind as generous and my shape as true,
As honest madam's issue?

Roland Holst:

Natuur, gië, mijn godin, uw wet bepaalt
Mijn diensten. Waarom der gewoonten sleer
Te dragen en te dulden dat de gril

Der menigt' mij onterft - omdat ik twaalf
Of veertien gangen van de maan mijn broeder
Ten achter was? Een bastaard? Een verlaagde?
Terwijl ik even stevig ben gebouwd
En edemoeid ben en waar als 't kroost
Der eerbare edelvrouw?

("Nature, you, my goddess, your law determines
My services. Why...bear the humdrum of customs,

Of the multitude disinherits me - because I...

Or fourteen courses of the moon...behind

Straat:

Jij bent, natuur, mijn godheid. Aan jouw wet
blijf ik gehoorsaam. Ja, waarom zou ik
besmet zijn met de pest van de conventie,
en preutsheid van een volk veroorloven
mij te onterven - omdat ik zo'n twaalf
of veertien maneschijnen achter een broer
aanlaken? Waarom een bastaard, waarom vals,
terwijl mijn lijf gebouwd is even hecht,
miijn geest zo vruchtbaar, mijn gezicht zo gaaf
als bij de spruiten van een nette vrouw?

("Thou art, nature, my divinity. To thy law
I remain obedient. Yes, wherefore should I
be tainted with the plague of convention,
and permit the prudery of a nation
to disinherit me - because I...came some twelve

or fourteen moonshines after a brother?"
... my brother? A bastard? A debased one?
While I am as solidly built
And am generous and true as the issue
Of a respectable noblewoman?

... Wherefore a bastard, wherefore false,
while my body is built as firmly,
my mind as fertile, my face as sound (=unblemished)
as with the offspring of a decent woman?

Both these translators have chosen to redistribute their text over the verse here and there in preference to making drastic changes in the syntactic structure - Roland Holst, at the expense of some elements of content (1.8), Straat, at that of expanding into an extra line. Due to this, the latter has been able to preserve more of the meaning, and achieved a more felicitous stress pattern than his predecessor - particularly in 1.1 ('Jij - na'tuur - 'wet), 1.2 ('ik), 1.6/7 ('bastaard - 'vals), 1.7/8 ('hecht) and 1.8/9 ('geest - 'vruchtbaar - 'gaaf); one might only, perhaps, object to the displacement of the predicate group in 1.8 ("terwijl mijn lijf even hecht gebouwd is"), but departures from regular word order are very rare in Straat's work, and usually - as here - metrically or rhythmically justifiable. The analytic structure of 1.9 used by both translators is due to the fact that, in Dutch, a genitival determiner can only be used if it is not sub-modified - so if it occurs in English, it has to be converted into a possessive qualifier.

Like Straat, Willy Courteaux generally aims at structural fidelity; it is the only trait these two recent translators share, for Straat's often drastically modern and colloquial idiom lends his work a character totally different from that of his moderately conservative, occasionally archaicizing Flemish colleague.

**Julius Caesar, IV, i, 12-23:**

*Ant.* This is a slight unmeritful man,
Meet to be sent on errands. Is it fit,
The three-fold world divided, he should stand
One of the three to share it? — *Oct.* So you thought him,
And took his voice who should be pricked to die
In our black sentence and proscription.

*Ant.* Octavius, I have seen more days than you.
And though we lay these honours on this man,
To ease ourselves of divers sland'rous loads,
He shall but bear them as the ass bears gold,
To groan and sweat under the business,
Either led or driven as we point the way;...

**Marcellus:**

- *Die vent is onbekwaam en waardeloos,*
Geschikt voor dienen slechts. Moet hij dan nu
Met ons gelijk staan en zijn aandeel krijgen,

**Courteaux:**

- Een zwak en onbeduidend man is dat,
Geschikt als loopjongen. Gaat het dan op,
Als de driedubb'le wereld wordt verdeeld,
Marcellus (pseudonym for Dr. P. W. Merkes), who published his *Julius Caesar* privately in 1908, is a good example of an exegetic translator: he frequently added explanatory lines of his own to the text and made use of spaced and bold print, italics and other typographical devices to drive his interpretation home. The passage above shows him at his most faithful to the text; mass-expansion is a very common feature in his work. Courteaux has also felt obliged to expand, spreading the content of 11.14-17 into five lines; but except for 1.12, where the S-Ci inversion does not contribute anything important to the translation ("Dit is een zwak en onbeduidend man" would have been an exact replica of the original structure, and metrically faultless), most of his structural changes would have been hard to obviate. The conversion of 1.14 into a finite structure is inevitable; that of 1.22 has the advantage of preserving the original word order. 1.13: "Meet to be sent on errands" is reproducible in Dutch, but would be difficult to accommodate in verse: "Geschikt om op boodschappen uitgestuurd te worden"; and a literal translation of "he should stand / One of the three to share it?" would be equally awkward: "dat hij één van de drie zou zijn om haar te delen"; the same applies to 1.16.
In a generally less obtrusive way than Marcellus, Bert Voeten also has a tendency to reformulate the text in a paraphrastic way. This aspect of his work will be dealt with more fully in Ch.XVII; a brief sample will suffice to illustrate his free approach to Shakespeare's syntax this involves:

_Troilus and Cressida_, II,iii, 147-153:

**Ul.** Achilles will not to the field to-morrow. —

**Ag.** What's his excuse? — Ul. He doth rely on none,
But carries on the stream of his dispose
Without observance or respect of any,
In will peculiar and in self-admission. —

**Ag.** Why will he not, upon our fair request,
Untent his person, and share th'air with us? —

**Buddingh':**

- Achilles wil niet naar het strijdveld morgen. —
- Wat is zijn verontschuldiging? — Geen enkele;

Hij volgt de stroom slechts van zijn eigen stemming,
Vol eigenschijnlijk, aan niets zich storend,
Naar niemand luisterend dan naar zichzelf. —
- En waarom komt hij, op ons vriendelijk vragen,
Zijn tent niet uit, bij ons in de open lucht? —

("- Achilles will not to the battle-field to-
morrow. —

- What is his excuse? — None ("not any");

He merely follows the stream of his own dis-
position,
Full of self-will, heeding nothing,
Listening to nobody but (to) himself. —
- And why does he, upon our friendly asking,
Not come out of his tent, with us in the open air?")

**Voeten:**

Achilles stelt zich morgen niet beschikbaar. —
- Waar steunt die weigering op? — Op niets, mijn vorst;

Hij volgt alleen de stroom van zijn humeur,
Zonder op iets of iemand acht te slaan,
Ijdel en eigenschijnlijk. — Waarom komt hij
Niet uit zijn tent, als wij het hoffelijk vragen,
Waarom ontwijkt hij ons? —

("- Achilles will not make himself available to-
morrow. —

- On what does that refusal rest? — On nothing,
my prince;

He merely follows the stream of his temper,
Without paying heed to anything or anybody,
Vain and self-willed. — Why does he
Not come out of his tent, when we politely ask it,
Why does he avoid us? —")

As the quoted passages have demonstrated, comparisons of syntactic fidelity are easy enough to make; it is rather more difficult to draw decisive conclusions from them. In the above example, for instance, Buddingh' undeniably displays more respect for the original than Voeten does; yet, as a passage of Dutch verse, Voeten's translation with its effective, occasionally syncopated stress pattern (1.150: 'zonder op 'iets of 'iemand...; 1.151: 'ijdel en ,eigen'zinnig. 'Waarom 'komen hij...; 1.153: 'waarom ont'wijkt hij ,ons?) is the more lively and pleasing to the ear of the two; it is not surprising that his versions
are popular in the theatre. Yet at times his unorthodox treatment of structure fails to have any positive dramatic impact; in an article in De Gids\(^1\), director Erik Vos (see Ch.XIII, p.269) rightly drew attention to the adverse effect of Voeten's rearrangement of structural features in the first dialogue between Petruchio and Kate in The Taming of the Shrew, II,i, while Onno van den Berg, by adhering closer to the original, has caught the spirit of the exchange much better\(^2\). Much the same applies to Verspoor's Droom van een Midsomernacht; although the example quoted on p.300 - alongside Van Suchtelen's more orthodox rendering - does not bear this out, the rhythmic qualities of his verse are often appealing (see next chapter), yet just as often the power of the original is dissipated in self-indulgent modernisms. So far we have sampled representative passages from the work of only ten of the twenty-odd translators studied; however, this study is not designed to deal exhaustively with every aspect of the efforts of all these men in turn; besides, it might be possible to quote another set of passages where Voeten, Verspoor, Andreus and Roland Holst display great structural fidelity, and where Straat, Courteaux, Van Suchtelen and Buddingh would appear to have taken unwarranted syntactic liberties. The aim of this exercise has been to display a range of alternative approaches, and the passages chosen are as characteristic of the respective translators as any one ten- or twelve-line excerpt from a play can be. There will be ample scope, in subsequent chapters, to gain a more detailed impression of these and other translators' merits.

**Accommodation of structure within the verse line; contraction and expansion.** - Inequality in mass seems to be one of the inevitable stumbling blocks of verse translation, if an integral, faithful reproduction of the original is aimed at. Some of the reasons why this apparently general rule applies to the rendering of Shakespeare in Dutch have emerged in the course of this chapter: the rendering of the progressive and perfective aspect and future tense by the simple present or preterite forms, the absence of an equivalent auxiliary for *to do* in interrogative, negative and emphatic affirmative verbal constructions, and the compound-noun substitution for complex NGs often entails a reduction in mass; the conversion of non-finite into finite dependent clauses, the complementation of elliptic structures and the prevalence of

---


\(^2\) Excerpts of these translations will be quoted and discussed in Ch.XVI.
syllabic inflectional affixes are responsible for increases in mass, - and as a rule, the latter outbalance the former.

There are two ways in which translators have attempted to cope with this problem, and examples of both have already been met with in this chapter: the excerpt from Burgersdijk's version of The Merchant of Venice quoted on pp.292-293 demonstrated the use of contraction - particularly of the traditional final -e apocope, of which six instances occur in those eleven lines. Burgersdijk, Koster and a few other early twentieth-century translators still applied this rule of poetic diction (see Ch.XIX) consistently; Van Looy, confusingly, adhered to it most of the time, but occasionally chose to disregard it:

Hamlet, I,v,39:  
The serpent that did sting thy father's life  
De adder, die uws vaders leven stak

Hamlet, III,iii,11:  
The single and peculiar life is bound  
Reeds 't enkle en bizondere leven moet

It is still used arbitrarily, as one of the least obtrusive syllable-saving devices, by most modern translators:

Hamlet, IV,vii,111:  
But that I know love is begun by time,  
maar liefde is iets dat metteltijd ontstaat,  
(Voeten)

Love's Labour's Lost, II,i,13:  
Good Lord Boyet, my beauty, though but mean,  
Mijn schoonheid, Heer Boyet, hoe arm ze ook is,  
(Courteaux)

There are, however, a number of other methods for the disposal of unstressed syllables whose presence would interfere with the length and the metre of a verse line; the two passages below demonstrate the most commonly applied of these:

Othello, IV,ii,111-113:  
(Iag. What is your pleasure, madam? How is't with you?  
Des. I cannot tell. Those that do teach young babes  
Do it with gentle means and easy tasks. ..)

(Burgersdijk:)
- Wat wenscht gij, eed*le vrouw? hoe gaat het u? -
- Ik kan^'t niet zeggen. Kind*ren onderricht men  
Met zachte midd*len, lichten arbeid. ..

Julius Caesar, III,i,197-200:  
Shall it not grieve thee dearer than thy death  
To see thy Antony making his peace,

(Koster:)
Zal^'t u niet grieven, heev*ger dan uw dood  
Te zien hoe uw Antonius vrede sluit,
Shaking the bloody fingers of thy foes,  
Most noble! in the presence of thy corse?

"eed'le", "kind'ren", "midd'len" all feature vowel syncope of unstressed medial e ("edële", "kindëren", "middëlen"); "heev'ger" and "bloed'ge", of unstressed medial i ("hevi ger", "bloedëge"). "'t" Is the standard contraction, by aphaeresis, of "het" ("it" or "the" (neuter article)), just as "'k" is of "ik" ("I") and "'n" of "een" ("a(n)"). "Antoniës" shows an instance of synaeresis, and "moorders" is arrived at by an unusual type of consonant syncope, from "moordenaars".

A Midsummer Night's Dream, I,i,71-73:
For aye to be in shady cloister mewed,  
To live a barren sister all your life,  
Chanting faint hymns to the cold fruitless moon.

Here, "kloosterschaûw" illustrates a more common kind of consonant syncope, that of an intersyllabic d: "kloosterschadûw" ("cloister-shadow"). A number of these contractions, still marked as such by some of the older translators, have become colloquial usage in modern Dutch: "weer" for "weder" ("again", or "weather"), "neer" for "neder" ("down"), "mee" for "mede" ("along (with)", as in "meelij" for "medeli- den": "compassion"), "broer" for "broedër" ("brother") and "armoe" for "armoëde" ("poverty"). Vowel syncope of unstressed medial a can be observed in "onvrucht'b're" ("onvruchtbare": "sterile"); "lied'ren" belongs to the same category as "eed'le" and "kind'ren" above: "liedëren" ("songs, hymns"). The degree to which vowel-elisions of this nature are acceptable depends, of course, largely on the pronounceability of the resultant consonant cluster.

Although present-day translators, particularly those concerned primarily with stage versions, eschew vowel syncope and apocope to a greater extent than their predecessors, the apparent sparsity of contractions in their texts is often misleading, due to the change in orthographic conventions: where most of the older translators would apostrophize an elision, the modern ones tend to leave the dropping of a vowel from an ostensibly hypersyllabic line to the reader or actor:

The Merry Wives of Windsor, III,iv,7-8:
Besides these, other bars he lays before me,  
My riots past, my wild societies; ...

(Voeten:)  
Nog andere hinderpalen
Legt hij mij in de weg; hij heeft het over
Mijn vroegere braspartijen, hij verwijt mij
Dat ik in woest gezelschap heb verkeerd; ...
Others simply incorporate the elision in their spelling; Verspoor, for instance, writes "trug" for "terug" ("back") and "gloven" for "geloven" ("believe"). This practice was introduced by Van Looy, whose use of contractions went well beyond that sanctioned by poetic tradition - particularly in his earliest translations, which teem with oddities such as "koong" for "koning" ("king"), "kwaalk" for "kwalijs" ("ill"), "veilg" for "veilig" ("safe"), "vroomk" for "vrolijk" ("merry"), dropped -en suffixes of plural nouns and verb forms, and contracted pronouns and articles, often resulting in unmanageable consonant clusters:

_Naebth_, V,iii,1-10:

Bring me no more reports; let them fly all.

Till Birnam wood remove to Dunsinane
I cannot taint with fear, What's the boy Malcolm?
Was he not born of woman? The spirits that know
All mortal consequences have pronounced me thus:
'Fear not, Macbeth; no man that's born of woman
Shall e'er have power upon thee.' Then fly, false
Thanes,

And mingle with the English epics.
The mind I sway by and the heart I bear,

Shall never sag with doubt nor shake with fear.

Hidden contractions in this passage are the plural _s_ in "tijdings" instead of the normal _-en_, in 1.1: ("tijding(en)": report(s), tiding(s), message(s)) and the genitival one of "Birnams" in 1.2: an unmodified postpositional genitive is not used in Dutch ("'t Birnams bosch" or: "'t bosch van Birnam"); the elision of the final _e_ of "zwaarte" ("heaviness") in 1.10, which, spelt this way, would be homophonous with "zwaard" ("sword"). Confusing is also the mixture of conventions adopted by Van Looy: the metre indicates that "hebben ooit" in 1.7, "verbroeder u" in 1.8 and "twijfel" in 1.10 are meant to be contracted, yet the "'n" in 1.6 is evidently syllabic.

About the other method used to deal with the problem of extra syllables - that of expansion - we can be brief; the excerpt from Voeten's translation of _The Merry Wives of Windsor_ on p.307, those from Marcellus' and Courteaux's versions of _Julius Caesar_ on pp.302-303 and Straat's, of _King Lear_, on p.301 are all good examples of it. The most inconspicuous way of spreading is that of filling out a hemistich, as can
be seen in Koster's rendering of *Macbeth*, III,ii,32 on p. 294; or that of alternatingly condensing and expanding, as Burgersdijk's translation of the *Merchant* excerpt on pp.292-293 shows: - in which 11.70-75 have been rendered in five lines, and 11.76-80 take up the remaining six.

The older and some of the more conservative recent translators display a great concern with mass-correspondence: Burgersdijk, Van Looy, Van Suchtelen and Buddingh' generally adhere closely to the line count of the original; along with Koster and Courteaux, who are a little more liberal about the odd extra line, they resort to contraction more often than "stage-version" translators such as Voeten, Verspoor, Straat and Andéus, who appear to consider expanding the lesser of two evils - even though their reasons for using extra lines differ according to their principles as translators. Straat, as we have seen, usually aims at a compromise between syntactic and conceptual fidelity and an easily speakable, modern-sounding verse; Verspoor, on the other hand, needs twenty-one lines instead of the original sixteen for Puck's curtain speech only to round off his personal view of Puck.

Amongst the older translators, Remko ter Laan freely extends the mass of his text - in some scenes of his *Winteravondsprookje* by as much as ten percent. of the original line count; his approach is occasionally very free and exegetetic, as in the example quoted on p.285, but as often as not his reason for expanding is the same as Straat's:

**The Winter's Tale**, II,iii,137-141:

(Leon.)

..If thou refuse
And wilt encounter with my wrath, say so:
The bastard brains with these my proper hands
Shall I dash out.

Go take it to the fire;
For thou set'st on thy wife. - *Ant.* I did not, sir.

(Ter Laan:)

..En weigert gij
en wilt mijn toorn trotseeren, zeg het dan
en met mijn eigen handen zal ik 't brein
uit dezen bastaard hier te pletter slaan.
Ga! werp het kind in 't vuur: gij zijt het, die
haar op mij aangezet hebt. -- 'k Deed dat niet:..

("...And if you refuse / and will defy my wrath, say so" ("say it then") / and with my own hands I'll...
.. dash the brain / of this bastard here...to pieces. / Go! throw the child in the fire: you are the one who / has incited her against me. -- I did not do that:...")

Although even the most mass-conscious translators tend to take the stops off in prose passages, where they are no longer checked by the constraint of the iambic pentameter, spreading is not really a serious problem, since an increase of wordage beyond ten percent. is the exception rather than the rule, even with translators such as Verspoor. In performance the difference would be hardly noticeable, since heavi-
ly contracted lines will take more time to articulate than the easy-flowing verse that is the usual result of expansion.

As the examples quoted and referred to indicate, expansion and contraction entail more than considerations of syntax and verse structure; in subsequent chapters, further attention will be devoted to the effect of contractions on the sound of the verse, and that of expansion on the accommodation of meaningful content.
CHAPTER XV

THE SOUND AND RHYTHM
OF SHAKESPEARE'S VERSE IN DUTCH TRANSLATIONS.

How fit an instrument is the Dutch language for creating an aesthetic equivalent of that unique musical quality, which is such an important, and yet so undefinable a feature of Shakespeare's verse? Unfortunately a fully satisfactory answer to this question cannot be given, in so far as the perception of linguistic euphony is, to a considerable extent, culturally subjective; what may sound impressive or agreeable to a native speaker of English may be grating or insipid to a Dutch ear, and vice versa. So an English listener, when confronted with a Shakespeare play on a Dutch stage, may well react unfavourably to its sound, while an indigenous theatre-goer may find the same aesthetically pleasing; only a person with a clear grasp of both languages as well as a highly developed sensibility for their different phonic and rhythmic qualities will be able to arbitrate whether or not the translator in question has successfully exploited sound and rhythm to evoke, in his own language, responses corresponding to those aroused by the original in a British reader or listener. And even the validity of such a judicious verdict remains, to some extent, subject to a diachronical factor: just as an English audience of the 1970's might be put off by an attempt to perform Shakespeare in the language as it was spoken in his own day, a modern Dutch audience undoubtedly does not hear a Burgersdijk translation the way it was heard ninety years ago - if only because of the way the conventions of theatrical diction have changed in the course of this century.

Phonological differences between English and Dutch. - The not uncommon observation that Dutch is a "guttural" language - because its sound spectrum contains the velar fricatives (χ) and (γ) (i.e. the oh\(^1\) and voiced and voiceless g), and because a fairly high proportion of Dutch speakers use the uvular (R) and (χ) instead of the alveolar (r) and (r̆) of Dutch R.P. - is about as apt as it is for a Dutchman to say that "one must have a lisp to speak English properly", because the dental fricatives (θ) and (δ) occur in

\(^1\) oh that follows a post-nuclear s in the pre-1930 spelling of many Dutch words (e.g.: "bosch"), and which still occurs in the adjectival suffix -isch (e.g.: "medisch": "medical") is not sounded.
that language. These, and the bilabial (w) (which corresponds to the voiced labiodental (u) in Dutch) are, in fact, the only consonants and the one semi-vowel standard Dutch and standard English do not share. The pronunciation of consonants is much the same in both languages, with the exception that initial voiceless plosives are not aspirated in Dutch as they are in English.

Much more important are the differences between the vowel sounds of the two languages: Dutch features an unchecked (e*) (e, ee in lenen, leen\(^1\)) as well as (o*) (o, oo in lopen, loop), (y*) (u, uu in hazaan, immuun), (ø*) (eu in deeu), (oe) (u in daan), (ee*) (eu in deeur), and the diphthongs (æi) (ei, ij as in rein, rijk), (o-i) (ooi as in mooi), (u-i) (oei as in boet), (yi) (ui as in muis), (yi) (ui as in muil\(^2\)), (ya) (u, uu as in duren, daar), (e-u) (eeuw in leeuw), (i-u) (ieuw in nieuw) and (y-u) (aw as in dwaw) which are all unfamiliar to English; besides, a clear distinction is made between the allophones (ai) (a(i) as in emaai) and (a-i) (aaai as in haai), and (au) (aw, ou as in gauw, goud) is used rather than the similar (au) of English. On the other hand, the vowels (ʌ) and (ɔ) and the diphthongs (ei), (æi), (eœ), (œ), (uœ), (iœ) and (ou) do not occur in Dutch R.P., although most of them are to be found in various provincial dialects; the modern Frisian language, for instance, contains all these diphthongs.

One need not expect, therefore, that anything approaching a homophonic translation from English into Dutch is possible, although their etymological relationship often enables translators to make effective use of cognates - even, occasionally, in a rhyming couplet:

_A Midsummer Night's Dream, III,ii, 94-95:_

About the wood go swifter than the wind,
And Helena of Athens look thou find:

(Burgersdijk:)

Nu vlug door 't woud, nog vlugger dan de wind,
Of gij de Atheensche Helena er vindt;

Yet, as this example shows, the contribution of cognates to phonemic correspondence is but small, when we compare (woud) with (vouit), (dæn) with (dan), (wInd) with (vInt), ('æзеңz) with (æte•neә), (helәnә) with (he•le•na), and (faInd) with (vInt). The vowel sounds and some of the consonants of most cognates have undergone major changes: deed - daad (da•t), day - dag (dәx), oak - eik (әik), dead - dood (do•t),

---

\(^1\) The (i*) sound as it occurs in words where \(e\) or \(ee\) is followed by an \(r\) can be regarded as an allophone of (e*); as could be the approximate (ɔ*) of \(o\) or \(oo\) followed by an \(r\), in relation to (o*).

\(^2\) This phonetic representation departs from that suggested in _The Principles of the International Phonetic Association_ (London, 1963), p.26, where the digraph "ui" is invariably represented as (æy), a diphthong that is decidedly more rounded than the one commonly used in Dutch R.P.
house - huis (h3is), cold - koud (kоut); and besides, a considerable number of them cannot be used in any case, because of their divergent semantic developments: clean - klein ("small"), small - smal ("narrow, thin"), starve - sterven ("die"); shape - scheppen ("create"), wife - wijf ("shrew, virago"); royal - royaal ("generous, ample"), brave - braaf ("good", = "well-behaved, respectable, decent"), life - lijf ("body").

However, the differences between the two languages' phonetic alphabets are of relatively minor importance if we remember that it should be phonic equivalence, not phonic identity or even correspondence we are looking for in a good translation, although not infrequently that still amounts to the use of whatever sound elements of the original are reproducible in the target language:

*Hamlet, I,v,182:*  
(Van Suchtelen:)  
Rest, rest, perturbed spirit!  
Rust, rust, verstoorde geest!  
('rоest, 'rоest, vе'sto·rdе yе·st)  
(Bedaar onrustig spook!  
(bе'dа·r оn'rоestоk 'sро•k)

as here, for instance, Van Suchtelen splendidly reproduced the sorrowful hushing sound and rhythm of Hamlet's words in what is, besides, a faultless translation, while the scholar Van Dam, in his: "calm down restless spectre", misses the boat in every respect. In this example the word "geest" is as important as the near-homophonic "Rust, rust" for the attainment of phonic equivalence, despite the absence of any obvious correspondence in sound to "spirit", with which "spook" can at least claim a shared initial consonant cluster; nevertheless, that semantically "correct" translation of "spirit" as Shakespeare uses it here, fails to capture the phonic mood of the original the way "geest" does.

The syllable-timed speech rhythm of Dutch and its significance in verse translation. - The most important phonological difference between the two languages is related to two features of Dutch which may have been observed in some of the examples given above. Firstly, Dutch words cannot end in voiced plosives or fricatives¹; in the case of plosives, this does not affect the spelling, as can be seen in: heb - hebben

---

¹ That is: unless such plosives or fricatives are exposed to assimilation with a subsequent voiced consonant; "met deze": (mеd•e•зе), "of dat": (оvдоt). This kind of assimilation is very common in colloquial Dutch, but - except, perhaps, for that of (n) into (γ) before (γ) or (k), and into (m) before bilabial plosives - is expressly avoided in theatrical elocution. For that reason, this feature has not been highlighted in subsequent phonetic examples, - nor has the colloquial neutralization of (меи) in the personal and possessive pronouns mij, gij, zij, mijn and zijn.
(hep - hebø), bad - baden (bat - ba-de), but in the case of fricatives it does: leef - leven (le-f - le-və), leea - leen (le-s - le-zə); the exception to this is the g: dag - dagen (daχ - da-γə). In the second place, the quantitative difference between checked and free vowels is much less pronounced in Dutch than in English; it would be quite inappropriate to use the full-length symbol (:) for any long vowel in Dutch, - there is, for instance, much less appreciable difference in length between the vowel sounds of the words "rat" or "rad" (rot), "raad" or "raat" (ra-t) and "raam" (ra-m) than between those of the English words "rot", "rod", "wrought" and "roared". This means that the variety of values between checked- and free vowels, stressed and unstressed syllables is much less marked, and of a different nature in the Dutch speech rhythm than in the English; and hence the most prominent characteristic of a Dutch person's accent when speaking English: the tendency to shorten long vowels, to give undue weight to unstressed syllables and enclitics, and to "harden" final voiced plosives and fricatives. These basic features of Dutch have a major bearing on the problem of verse translation, as the bi-syllabic structure of the iambic foot must be adhered to much more rigidly than in English, whose stressed rhythm allows a poet such as Shakespeare considerably greater metrical liberty. Hence the necessity for the translator to dispose of excess syllables by contraction or expansion, as discussed in the previous chapter, while in the original they can often be rhythmically accommodated:

Henry IV, I, III, i, 22:

0, then the earth shook to see the heavens on fire

(Durieux:)

Die trilde&macute;om dat ze d'hemel branden zag

If the two instances of -e apocope were disregarded, Courteaux's line, like Shakespeare's, would contain two hypersyllabic feet: (di tfildom dat sa de h-emel branda zαχ); but if they were retained as such, the Dutch line - in contrast to the original - would no longer be acceptable, somehow, as a variant of the pentameter; so they are contracted: (di tfildom dat sa de-mel branda zαχ).

Adverse effect of contraction. - A danger of this practice is the creation of artificial consonant clusters that are awkward or impossible to pronounce - such as the aspirated d of "d'hemel" in the Courteaux sample above which, in practice, would be reduced to (de-mel), a non-word whose meaning can only be

1 A final inflectional n is sounded only when it becomes medial - i.e.: when it is followed by a word with an initial vowel.
gathered from the context. The passage from Van Looy's *Macbeth* on p. 308 contains several elocutory ob-
stacles of that kind: "dat"'k draag" (dɔtik'draːx) in 1.9, and "twijfèl, van" ('twæefl, vɔn) in 1.10; these are examples of pseudo-elision, as they can only be articulated by re-syllabizing them: (dɔtik 'draːx) and (twæefl, vɔn) - as are the numerous occasions when this translator draws together the same final consonants of two subsequent syllables:

*Romeo and Juliet*, V,ii,30:

Poor living corse, closed in a dead man's tomb!  

*(Van Looy:)*

Arm levend lijk, gesloten in 'n gewelf!

*Romeo and Juliet*, V,iii,5-7:

So shall no foot upon the churchyard tread,  
Being loose, unfirm, with digging up of graves,  
But thou shalt hear it.  

*(Zoo komt geen enkle voet 't kerkhof betreën,  
De grond los zijnde, 'n vast door 't kuilen graven,  
Of gij zult 't kunnen hooren:)*

where, if the 'n and 't were dropped, the resulting line portions would read: (xə'slo·tən ɪŋ ya'weləf):  
"closed in vault"; (zɔ· 'kɔmt xe·n ɛŋklə 'vut ʔkɛrkʰɔf ba'tɾən): "so not a single foot will (come to) tread churchyard"; and (ɔf 'xæi zəlt kənə 'ho·ɾə): "but you shall be able to hear"; but if they are pronounced, and the otherwise missing articles and impersonal pronoun retained, the affected lines will contain hypersyllabic feet and become rhythmically awkward: (xə'slo·tən ɪŋ ya'weləf), (zɔ· 'kɔmt xe·n ɛŋklə 'vut at ʔkɛrkʰɔf ba'tɾən) and (ɔf 'xæi zəlt at ʔkənə 'ho·ɾə).

The same type of contraction can occasionally be found in the work of other translators as well, but mostly in places where a flanking fricative or lateral and/or a rhythmic pause provides extra sounding space for the doubled consonant:

*Measure for Measure*, II,i,18:

Another thing to fall, I not deny

*(Burgersdijk:)*

Iets anders is 't, te vallen. 'k Loochen niet,  
(its 'ændərs 'ɪst·ə'velə).

This is a variant of the device - used freely by all the older, and from time to time by many present-
day translators - of reducing a monosyllabic word to a medial consonant in a "running" cluster. The re-
sult need not necessarily be objectionable, even though it often tends to heighten the staccato quality which Dutch, due to its syllable-timed speech rhythm, is likely to have for an English listener. The ex-
ample in Van Looy's rendering of *Romeo and Juliet*, V,iii,6: "door (he)t kuilen graven" (dɔrt'kɔ·ylə
'γρα·νω) is certainly not the worst of its kind in his work, which abounds with tongue twisters such as those discussed on p.315. By and large, Burgersdijk displays better judgement and greater care in the spacing of his contractions:

**Macbeth, I,vii,1-2:**

If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well
It were done quickly.

**Burgersdijk:**

Ware"'t gedaan, als"'t is gedaan, dan waar†
Het goed, zoo"'t ras gedaan werd.

**Van Looy:**

Zoo"'t waar"'gedaan, wen"'t is gedaan,"'t waar"'t best
Indien"'t gedaan werd haast*lijk:

Here Burgersdijk has avoided the awkward clusters at the end of 1.1 by the modest expansion of "Het goed" ("It... well") into 1.2. Nevertheless, the regular occurrence of such clusters in his work and that of his early successors is one of the most valid reasons why modern Dutch theatre companies turn to more recent translators when it comes to staging a Shakespeare play.

**Othello, IV,i,66-72:**

There's millions now alive
That nightly lie in those unproper beds
Which they dare swear peculiar. Your case is better.
O, 'tis the spite of hell, the fiend's arch-mock,
To lip a wanton in a secure couch,
And to suppose her chaste! No, let me know;
And knowing what I am, I know what she shall be.

**Burgersdijk:**

Veel miljoenen slapen
In"'t hun onteigend bed, die durven zweren:
"Dit bed is"'t mijne": beter is"'t met u.
O, "'t is de hoon der hel, des duivels aartspot,
Wordt in"'t vertrouwde bed een hoel gekust
En kuisch gewaand! Neen, neen, ik wete liever;
'k"Weet, wetend wat ik ben, wat zij moet zijn.

**Voeten:**

Miljoenen liggen"'s nachts
onwetend op een peluw die zij delen
met anderen. Dan beter uw geval;
want"'t moet de wreede grap van satan zijn
in"'t eigen bed een slet te kussen
die men als kuis beschouwt. Nee, ik wil weten,
dan weet ik wat ik ben, en wat haar wacht.

A phonetic transcription of these two passages will show to what extent Voeten's text, containing only three contractions as against Burgersdijk's six, poses fewer elocutory problems for an actor:
"Many millions sleep in their dispossessed bed(s), who dare swear: "This bed is mine"; better it is with you. O, 'tis the spite of hell, the devil's arch-mock, (if) in the trusted bed a harlot is kissed And supposed chaste! No, no, I'd rather know; I know, knowing what I am, what she must be."

(Millions lie at night ignorant, on a pillow which they share with others. Than better your case; for it must be satan's cruellest joke to kiss in one's own bed a tart whom one regards (as) chaste. No, I want to know, then I know what I am, and what awaits her.)

Later in this chapter the "un-clustering" tendency of recent translators will be subjected to further scrutiny; meanwhile it may be observed that, if applied sparingly, this type of contraction can occasionally lend an appropriate and effective sharpness to a line:

*Cymbeline*, II,v,1-2:

Is there no way for men to be, but women Must be half-workers?

*King Lear*, II,ii,83-84:

Kent His countenance likes me not. -
Cor. No more, perchance, does mine, nor his, nor hers. -

Although in these two cases there is no phonic parallel in the English text for the contractions used (as there was in the opening lines of *Macbeth*, I,vii quoted on p.316), the sharpening effect they have in Andreus' and Straat's translations could be regarded as expressive of Posthumus' angry disillusion and Cornwall's sarcasm: (Ist 'fo•rt fær'veko vən do 'mens dan•o•dæχ / dət 'fraʊət 'halvə 'wɛrk dun?') ("Is it then necessary for the procreation of man / that women do half the work?"); (mI'sətin o•k 'tɔːˈɛinə nit, ɔf 'tsæənə ɔf ət hɑr•tə?) ("perhaps neither (does) mine, (n)or his (n)or hers?")

Excessive clustering is also often caused by vowel syncope. Not without justification, the cumbersome, heavy-going verse that is the product of this method of contraction is most commonly associated with Burgersdijk:

*Henry V*, V,ii,42-47...her hedges even-pleached, Like prisoners wildly overgrown with hair,

Burgersdijk: ...zijn fraaie dichte heggen Zijn, als langhaar*ge*en stopp*lige gevang*nen,
Put forth disordered twigs; her fallow leas
The darnel, hemlock, and rank fumitory
Doth root upon, while that the coulter rusts
That should deracinate such savagery.

(zaein 'fra-je 'dixtć 'hegę / zaein, als lo-p'ha-'ryen 'staplęga 'ya'vannę/ do-r 'wilde 'twaęęgę 'ha'-vlo-s;
op zaein 'okars, / di 'bra-ćk ny 'ľira, 'tira 'do-lık, 'şyirlęę, / en 've-ldıąę 'a-r�ro-k, en et 'kaute
r-ust, / dat 'sęlk an 'vustę 'uükęę 'must ąnt'wortęę.)("his fine dense hedges / Are, like long-haired,
stubbly prisoners, / Shaggy with wild twigs; On his fields, / Which lie fallow, darnel, hemlock / And rank
fumitory are teeming, and the coulter rusts / That should uproot such savage growth.")

Yet Burgersdijk is by no means the only, nor, for that matter, the worst offender in this respect; all
the early twentieth-century translators made frequent use of this type of elision; Van Looy, as we have
seen, even applied it regularly to unstressed final syllables (see p. 308). It contributes materially to
the old-fashioned flavour of Van Suchtelen's translations, which were not published until the late 1940's:

Hamlet, IV, vii, 1-9:

King Now must your conscience my acquaintance seal,
And you must put me in your heart for friend,
Sith you have heard, and with a knowing ear,
That he which hath your noble father slain
Pursued my life. — Laër. It well appears. But tell
me

Why you proceeded not against these feats,
So criminal and so capital in nature,
As by your safety, greatness, wisdom, all things
else,
You mainly were stirred up. — King O, for two
special reasons...

(zo 'zal toć xu ga'vee'-tę 'veł meęin 'vraęspęąk / ba'že-yłan en xu 'hant malęs 'frint er'kęęa, / ny 'vei
ęę'ho-ıĘ heęt șit bə'traubę 'broman / dat ėi xu 'e-dlo 'va-dơr heęt fę+r'slaęę / nıt 'hem-a-r 'męeı na-rę't
'le-ęę 'stomę. — Kla-ręblęiłęęk, / ma-r 'ua-ro-m 'don di 'faitea, 'zo-ıę mis'da-dęęx / en 'zo-ıę straf'-wa-ręęx
nit 'da-dıąęk bə'reęt, / zoools xu 'veiłaęxęęt, xu 'veisųęęt, 'ałęęs, / toć fon y 'aeist? — Ik 'hat'ue
'yełęęę 'reęęδęę,..)("Thus, surely, your conscience will my acquaintance / Seal and your heart acknowledge
me as (a) friend, / Now that you have heard from a reliable source / That (he) who hath slain your noble
father / pursued Not his but my life. — Apparently, / But why then (were) those feats, so criminal / And
so punishable, not immediately proceeded against / As your safety, your wisdom, everything / Did de-
mand of you? — I had two valid reasons,,")

Van Suchtelen:

— Zo zal toch uw geweten wel mijn vrijspraak
Bezeeg*len en uw hart m'als vriend erkennen,
Nu gij gehoord hebt uit betrouw*re bron
Dat wie uw eed*le vader heeft verslagen
Niet hem maar mij naar*ėt leven stond. — — Klaar-
blijk*lijk,

Maar waarom dan die feiten, zo misdadig
En zo strafwaardig niet daad*lijk berecht,
Zoals uw veiligheid, uw wijsheid, alles

Toch van u eiste? — Ik had twee geld*ge reed*nen,,

Of all these traditional syllable-saving devices, the apocope of an unstressed final -e before a sub-
sequent initial vowel is the only one that used to be compulsory, according to the Dutch rules of poetic diction (see Ch.XIX); Burgersdijk and Koster still regarded it as such. Modern translators eschew it for, although it does not lead to clustering, it tends to have an undesirable thickening effect on the phonic texture of the verse, particularly when several such elisions occur in close succession; besides, the drawing together of two or more words into phonic units often affects the comprehensibility of the text when spoken.

*Hamlet*, IV,v, 81-82:  
...poor Ophelia  
Divided from herself and her fair judgement...  

Burgersdijk:  
Dan de 'arme' Ophelia, rede'en oordeel dervend,...

This line, when read out fully: (don de 'arme o'fe lia, 're•den en 'o•rde•l 'dervent,...) ("then (the) poor Ophelia, deprived of reason and judgement,...") is perfectly clear, but when contracted into: (don |darmo fe•lja |re•den |o•rde•l |dervent,...), becomes little short of cryptic: the second and third foot sound like some intestinal disease.

*Julius Caesar*, I,ii, 86:  
Set honour in one eye and death i'th'other,...

Koster:  
Zet de 'eer voor' t ééne oog, voor het aër den dood,...

This is already a contraction of: "Zet de eer voor het ééne oog, voor het aëder den dood," (zët de 'e•r vo•r at 'e•n o•χ, fo•r at 'aëder de 'do•t,), a near-literal translation (except for the chiastic transposition of the second half), which, by apocope, aphaeresis and consonant syncope, is reduced to: (zët |de•r vo•rt |e•n•χ, |fo•r at |a•r de |do•t,...).

Roland Holst, following Van Looy's example (see p.308), occasionally applied apocope to the -en suffix of infinitives, strong past participles, plural nouns and finite verb forms. Although - as the phonetic transcriptions have shown - the ἐ of this suffix is rarely sounded, the elision of the whole syllable is more disruptive than that of an -e ending - because it can only be effected before an initial vowel, where the ἐ is usually pronounced:

*King Lear*, II,iv, 216:  
We'll no more meet, no more see one another.

Roland Holst:  
Wij zulle' elkaar nooit meer ontmoete' of zien.  

(wæi 'zœl əl'ka•r 'no•it me•r ont'mut af 'sin) sounds awkwardly truncated alongside the normal: (wæi 'zœeln əl'ka•r 'noit me•r ont'mutən af 'sin.).
The examples given here would suggest that the use of various contraction techniques belong to the past. This is not the case, even though the theatre-oriented translators of the post-World-War II period have clearly been aiming at a more fluent, less consonant-cluttered verse - and, for that reason, have not applied these syllable-saving methods as habitually as their predecessors, in whose days a broader, slower and more declamatory theatrical diction was en vogue, which could surmount the elocutory obstacles that were, somehow, part and parcel of speaking verse. But the structure of the Dutch language in relation to the iambic pentameter makes it impossible to avoid them altogether, nor is it necessarily desirable to do so; Shakespeare himself, after all, made liberal use of the standard contractions that the poetic conventions of his age put at his disposal. So -e apocope, vowel syncope and colloquially accepted forms of aphaeresis such as 't (het) and 'k (ik) can be found in all modern translations; examples from Voeten (pp.307 and 316), Andreus and Straat (p.317) have already been quoted. If they occur frequently, however, they impose a somewhat dated character on the work - as is consistently the case with Van Suchtelen (see p.318) and intermittently with Courteaux, whose translations owe their rather insecure stylistic quality partly to the alternation of passages of uncluttered verse with heavily contracted ones:

_Hamlet, I,1,46-49:_

What art thou that usurp'st this time of night, Together with that fair and warlike form In which the majesty of buried Denmark Did sometimes march? By heaven I charge thee, speak!

_Courteaux:_

Wat zijt gij die de nacht'lijke uren rooft En de krijgshaft'ge en edele gestalte Waarin de dode Denenvorst weleer Deze aard' betrad? Bij God, 'ik bezweer u, spreek!

(uit 'sæit ɔei di do 'noxtlæk 'yə 'rɔːft / en do kɾeɪks'haftʃən 'eːdələ ɣə'stamə / vaːr In do 'dɔː 'de-nəvɔːst ʌel'ɛə / de-'zəːrt ʰæt'rat? ʰɔei ɣət, kʰə'zweə r y, 'spɾeːk!') ("What are you that steal the nocturnal hours / And the warlike and noble figure / In which the dead prince of the Danes formerly / Trod this earth? By God, I adjure you, speak!").

**Rhythmic variety in translation.** - This discussion of contraction and its inevitability might possibly create the impression that what we have called the syllable-timed speech rhythm of Dutch imposes a rigidity and monotony upon the iambic pentameter which is entirely alien to Shakespeare. Fortunately this is not the case, for the following reasons. In the first place, it is a debatable point whether the stress-pulses of Shakespeare's verse are invariably isochronous; particularly the verse of his early plays often seems to have a syllable-timed rhythm. At the same time, the variability of syllable lengths in Dutch is, to some extent, subject to individual and regional habits of speech. Although the difference between
stress-timed and syllable-timed speech rhythms, therefore, seems to me a matter of degree rather than kind, it is undoubtedly still true that, in this respect, Dutch and (modern) English are at opposite ends of the scale.

This means, however, that despite its strict metre, the Dutch pentameter leaves the translator considerable freedom for the distribution of stresses, since his rhythmic feet need not be isochronous. The phonetic examples given so far in this chapter already illustrate this point; we will now look more closely at the way various translators have exploited this liberty. The metrical feet in the following examples will be indicated by bars, the stresses by accents.

*Richard III*, I, i, 14–18:

But I, that am not shaped for sportive tricks,
Nor made to court an amorous looking-glass;
I, that am rudely stamp'd, and want love's majesty
To strut before a wanton ambling nymph;
I, ...

Burgersdijk:

Doch ik, geenszins gevormd voor snaaksche grappen,
Of om verliefden spiegels 't hof te maken,
Die, ruw gestempeld, liefdes adel mis,
Om fier een dart'le, vlugge nymph te boeien,
Ik...

Roland Holst:

Maar ik, op speelse kunsten niet gebouwd,
N och toonaar voor der lusten spiegel, ik,
G rof afgestempeld, missend liefde's hoogheid
O m trots de dart'le nimf te naad'ren, ik...

("But I, by no means shaped for waggish jests,
Or to pay court to amorous mirrors,
Who, rudely stamped, want love's nobility,
Proudly to captivate a wanton, quick nymph, / I, ...")

Here, Burgersdijk displays a higher degree of rhythmic orthodoxy than is warranted by the original; the first two feet of 1.14 and the opening paeon "Ik" of 1.18 are his only departures from the metric pattern.

Roland Holst, in a somewhat freer translation, has managed to retain the rhythmic variations of Shakespeare's lines despite the displacement of "ik" from the beginning of 1.16 and 18 to the end of 1.15 and 17. He has also preserved the masculine endings of 1.14, 15 and 17 and, with them, the sardonic,
cutting tone of the speech, which - at least in these few lines - is somewhat dissipated in Burgersdijk's version.

The Tempest, II, ii, 1-3:
All the infections that the sun sucks up
From bogs, fens, flats, on Prosper fall, and make him
By inchmeal a disease!

Nijhoff (1930):
Moge al de ziekten, die de zon uit poel
En mestput opzuigt, Prospertje doen rotten
Met pest op plek naast plek!
('mo·ɣ | 'al də | 'zikta, | di də | 'zon 3i t | 'pul
en | 'mestpœ t | 'çpsi xət, | 'prœspær tʃə dən | 'røtə
met | 'pœst ap·* | 'lék na·st (| 'plek!)

("May all the diseases that the sun...sucks up
From bog and cesspit, make little Prosper rot
With the plague in every spot (on spot alongside
spot)!")

Nijhoff (1952):
Smetstoffen, opgezogen door de zon
Uit put en poel, stort u op Prospero en
Bezorg hem pest!
('smet|stœfə, | 'çρχə, | zoɣə | do·r də | 'zon
3i t | 'pœt en | 'pœl, 'stœrt | y | çp. | 'roσprə | en
be | 'çorx om | 'pœst!)

("Infections, sucked up by the sun
From pit and bog, throw yourselves on Prospero and
Bring him the plague!")

Courteaux:
Dat alle gifvualm die de zon opzuigt
Uit poel, moeras en zomp op Prospero
Neervalle en heel zijn lijf met ziekten sla!
(dat | 'alə | 'γfualm | di də | 'zon | 'çp | s3i xət
3i t | 'pul, mu | 'ros en | 'zompçp. | 'roσpə, | ro·
'ne·r | val en | 'he·l zon | 'lœif met | 'siktə | 'sla!)

("May ("that") all (the) poisonous vapours that the sun sucks up / From bog, fen and swamp...fall down
/ On Prospero and strike his whole body with diseases!"")

The most remarkable feature of this comparison is the shift between Nijhoff's two renderings from a conventional stress distribution that bears no relationship to the rhythmic intricacy of the original, to a highly syncopated pattern in the later version. Courteaux, a little more cautious, nevertheless achieves an interesting rhythm at the end of 1.1, and the stressed opening paean of 1.3 is very effective.

Othello, V, ii, 8-13:
If I quench thee, thou flaming minister,
I can again thy former light restore,
Should I repent me: but once put out thy light,
Thou cunning'st pattern of excelling nature,
I know not where is that Promethean heat
That can thy light resume.

Buddingh*:
O, vlammande vazal, als ik u doof,

Voeten:
Dienaar van vlam mend vuur, als ik jou doof
Dan kan ik u uw vroeger licht hergeven,
Als 't mij berouwt; maar als uw licht gedoofd is,
Gij kustrijkst werk der scheppende natuur,
Weet ik niet waar 't Prometheus-vuur is, dat u
Uw licht hergeeft.

('o·'vlâmen|də va·'zal, als |Ik 'y |'do·f,
dan |kàn ik ||'y yu |'vuyor |'lîxt hëč |'ye·van,
alst |mæi bə |'rout; ma·r als 'yu |'lîxt xə |'do·ft
xæi |'kœnstræikst |'værk də |'s̩xəpən|də na |'tyr,
vœ·t |Tk 'nit |'uə·ft pɾo |'me·tisis|fyr Is, dat
yu |'lîxt hër |' xe·f.t.)

("O, flaming vassal, if I extinguish you,
Then I can restore your former light to you,
If I repent; but when your light has been
ex-tinguished,
You, most artistic work of creating nature,
I know not where the Prometheus-fire is, that will
Restore your light to you.")

Neither of these two translators has done justice to the slow, deliberate rhythm of "If I quench thee";
Voetèn's syncopation and mixture of sonorities here is not necessarily more effective than Buddingh's
deep and euphonious: "O. vlammende vassal", which can at least be said to have a suitably sepulchral ring
to it. In both versions, 1.10 has been metrically normalized but for the displaced stress on "uw"/"jouw"
("thy" in the original); Voeten's fairly drastic reorganization of 11.9-10a has added nothing signifi-
cant to either sound or meaning. Buddingh, who has retained Burgersdijk's rendering of 11.9 and 11,
sticks closer to the original than his model in 11.12 and 13 (Burgersdijk has here: "Waar vind ik de
Prometheus vonk, die u / Uw licht hergeeft?" ("Where do I find the Prometheus spark that to you / Your
light restores?")) but has not been able to avoid an ungainly rhythmic oddity, a hendecasyllabic line
with a final stress.

_A Midsummer Night's Dream,_

III,ii,354-359:

Thou seest these lovers seek a place to fight:
Hie therefore, Robin, overcast the night.
The starry welkin cover thou anon
With drooping fog, as black as Acheron;
And lead these testy rivals so astray,
As one come not within another's way.

Rensburg:

Gij ziet, hoe't minnaarspaar te vechten tracht;  
Dus haast u, Robin, en betrek de nacht,  
Bedeck met nevels snel het firmament,  
Zoo zwart, als slechts de Acheron die kent;  
En leid die minnaars rond, nog zoo veroord,  
Dat geen den ander op zijn weg ontdooit.

So hurry, Robin, and overcast the night.  
Cover with fogs swiftly the firmament,  
As black as only (the) Acheron knows them;  
And lead those lovers, still so fierce, about  
(That none meet the other upon his way.)

At first sight there is nothing very remarkable about these two versions; the textual fidelity of Rensburg's is more impressive in isolation than alongside Burgersdijk's, from which his 11.354-357 differ in minor details only; and Burgerdijk's rendering of 11.358-359: "En leid die mededingers zóó rondom / Dat de een niet in 't bereik des andren kom" ("And lead those rivals round about in such a way / That one come not within the other's reach") is better in every respect. As for Verspoor: his free approach to the text has already been mentioned, and will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.

The first striking feature of the two passages' stress patterns is, that both translators missed out on the one important opening paean, in 1.355 of the original. In that respect they are in good company: only three of the nine translators of A Midsummer Night's Dream observed this point: Werumeus Buning ('Ga 'snelle 'geest - "Go swift spirit"'), Buddingh' ('Haast je dus, 'Puck - "Hurry therefore, Puck") and Courteaux ('Vlieg, 'Puck - "Fly, Puck") . Rensburg's verse here could be used as a textbook model of regular iambic pentameters; and Verspoor's only real "irregularity" is the displaced stress on "zwart"
(black) in 1.355; of the three stressed opening paeons marked, those in 11.354 and 358 are optional. Nevertheless, Verspoor's versification has an unmistakably individual rhythm, which at first glance may defy definition. Its nature manifests itself when special attention is paid to the unstressed rather than the stressed syllables: in these six lines there are no less than ten metrical feet consisting entirely of unstressed syllables, whereas in Rensburg's version there are only three such feet. To some extent, this phenomenon is related to the modern tendency away from contraction; more monosyllabic and polysyllabic words are used without vowel elision, so it is not surprising to find an increasing number of stressless feet in the work of most translators from Nijhoff onward; yet even with Buddingh' and Voeten they rarely average higher than one per line.

Shakespeare's iambic pentameter, despite its rhythmic variety, remains basically a five-stress verse form, with occasional four- and six-stress variations (if we take silent stresses into account¹). The nineteenth-century translators, including Burgersdijk, and the early twentieth-century ones: Van Looy, Koster, Roland Holst, Rensburg - maintained this pattern; but with the post-Nijhoff translators four-stress lines begin to predominate. Verspoor, finally, goes one step further still: five-stress lines are exceptional in his work, and many of his four-stress lines impress one as variations on a basic three-stress line (see 11.354, 358, 359) rather than vice versa. The spacing-out of stresses over the ten or (frequently) eleven syllables of his verse that is the result of this, is responsible for the peculiar, relaxed dynamics of this translator's work.

No more than in Shakespeare's own work, in which rhythmically conventional passages alternate with sometimes subtle, sometimes radical departures from the metrical pattern, is it possible to label the verse of his translators as either better or worse according to their stricter or freer treatment of rhythm: at most one may base one's judgement on the aptness of the stress distribution used, and on its degree of equivalence to the original. A minimal norm, of course, must be that the line is not merely a random sequence of ten or eleven syllables, but has a rhythmic pattern of some kind - and one that is not totally incompatible with the structure of the iambic pentameter, as is the case in Buddingh's version of Othello V,ii,12 discussed on p.323, or in the following examples from Van Looy's work:

Romeo and Juliet, I, iv, 62: Her collars, of the moonshine's wat'ry beams; De gareels van een waterig maanlicht;
(də ɣa'reləs fən ən ɣa'tərək ma'nələxt;)

Hamlet, V, ii, 26: Here's the commission: read it at more leisure. Hier is de order zelf; lees ze op uw gemak;
('hiər ɪs 'dɔr dər 'zelf; 'leəs zə ɔp ɣə 'mək);
or: ('hiər ɪs də ˈɑːdər ˈzəlf; ˈleəs ɔp ɣə ɣə 'mək.). Instances of such verse abound in Van Looy's translations; they are found sporadically in the work of recent translators, usually in hypersyllabic lines where no clear indication is given whether any syllables, and if so which, are to be contracted:

Cymbeline, V, iii, 64:
Still going? This is a lord! O noble misery!

Andreus:
Opnieuw gevlucht! Hooggeboren ellendeling!
(op ˈnɪu ɣə ˈvənlɛxt; ˈhoxəˈboɾən ɛlˈɛndələŋ;)

On this occasion, Andreus' rendering is justified by the original - in so far as that is hardly more "regular" than its translation.

Masculine and feminine lines. - So, by and large, instances of technically poor verse are fortunately relatively rare in Dutch Shakespeare translations - even though few of them, on the other hand, stand out by virtue of consistently excellent versification. One feature of Shakespeare's verse that is neglected by many translators is his, often pointed, use of masculine and feminine lines. The inflectional syntax of Dutch favours the feminine line more than English does; the incidence of unstressed 11th syllables in Shakespeare's verse lies well below 50%, which used to be the standard in the alternatingly masculine and feminine heroic couplets of Dutch classicist drama. Some examples have already been given in which the adverse effect of feminine lines in the translation of masculine passages (see pp.300 and 321) was evident. As one of them happens to be Burgersdijk's, it must be observed that this translator was certainly conscious of the problem; in the accompanying notes to his Een Midsomermachtdroom he wrote: "It is doubtlessly not by accident, that in none of his (other) plays Shakespeare makes as little use of trailing or feminine lines, which here only amount to five percent. of the total; it appeared to the translator, that in this play indeed as many masculine lines as possible must be used and that the use of feminine lines would damage the impression of the whole." Elsewhere too, it is evident that Burgers-

dijk took this aspect of versification into account, but only as far as prior considerations of meaning and syntax allowed him to. His early successor, Edward B. Koster, often surpasses him in ingenuity, when it comes to giving a rendering of great conceptual fidelity without sacrificing the predominance of masculine lines:

*Julius Caesar*, III, i, 149-157:  
O mighty Caesar! dost thou lie so low?  
Are all thy conquests, glories, triumphs, spoils,  
Shrank to this little measure? Fare thee well.  
I know not, gentlemen, what you intend,  
Who else must be let blood, who else is rank.  
If I myself, there is no hour so fit  
As Caesar's death's hour, nor no instrument  
Of half that worth as those your swords, made rich  
With the most noble blood of all this world.

Burgersdijk:  
O, 'groote 'Caesar,'ligt gij 'zoo in't 'stof?  
Zijn 'al uw 'roem, tri'umfen, 'krijgsbuit,'macht,  
Tot 'zulk een ,maat ge'krompen? - 'Vaar gij 'wel! -  
Ik 'weet 'niet,'eedle 'mannel, wat gij 'voor hebt,  
Wie 'meer te 'groot werd, 'wie nog 'meer moet  
bloeden;
Ben ,ik het 'zelf, dan is geen 'uur zoo 'welkom,  
Als 'Caesars 'doodsuur; en geen 'wapen,tuig  
Slechts 'half zoo 'kostbaar als uw 'zwaarden,'pas  
Ver'rijkt door't 'eénsche 'bloed der 'gansche  
wereld.  
("O, great Caesar, do you lie thus in the dust?  
Are all your glory, triumphs, war spoil, power  
Shrank to such a measure? - Fare you well! -  
I know not, noble men, what you have in mind,  
Who else has grown too great, who (still) else  
must bleed;  
If I be it myself, then is no hour so welcome,  
As Caesar's death's hour; and no weapons  
But half as precious as your swords, just now  
Enriched with the noblest blood of the whole  
world.")

Koster:  
O,'machtge 'Caesar!'ligt gij hier 'zoo 'laag?  
Is 'al uw 'zege,staatsie,'roem en 'buit  
Ge'slonken tot 'zoo'n 'nietigheid? - 'Vaar'wel. -  
Ik 'weet 'niet,'Heeren, wat uw 'plannen 'zijn,  
Wie 'meer nog 'bloeden ,moet, te 'weeldig 'wast:  
Ben ,ik het 'zelf, geen 'uur is ,zoo ge'schikt  
Dat 'Caesars 'doodsuur,'noch een ,instrument  
Van 'half de 'waarde als uwe 'zwaarden,'rijk  
Ge,maakt door't 'edelst 'bloed van 'heelt deze 'aard.  
("O, mighty Caesar! do you lie here so low?  
Is all your victorious pomp, glory and spoil  
Shrank to such a trifle? - Farewell. -  
I know not, Gentlemen, what your plans are,  
Who else (still) must bleed, has grown too rank:  
If I be it myself, no hour is so fit  
Than Caesar's death's hour, nor an instrument  
Of half the worth as your swords,... made rich  
...with the noblest blood of all this earth.")

Here Koster translation - although marred by a few (italicized) syntactic awkwardnesses - is certainly as faithful as Burgersdijk's, which has feminine endings in four of the nine lines. Courteaux, who
generally does not seem to be especially concerned about this matter, also used four trailing lines in his rendering of this passage; and Fleerackers, his Flemish predecessor, retained only three masculine endings:

O 'Machtge 'Caesar,'ligt ge daar 'zoo 'laag?
'Al uw vic'itories,'glories,'buik, tri'o'mfen,
is't 'al ge'krompen tot 'die 'maat? Vaar'wel.
Ik 'weet 'niet, 'heeren, wat gij nog van 'zins
zijt,
Wie 'nog te 'hoog 'opschiet, wie 'nog zal 'bloedien.

('O mighty Caesar, do you lie there so low?
All your victories, glories, spoil, triumphs,
is it all shrunk to that measure? Farewell.
I know not, gentlemen, what else you intend,
who else has grown ("shot up") too high, who else
will bleed.

If I be it, then no hour is so welcome to me
as Caesar's death's hour and are to me no weapons
worth half yours, since they have been made rich
with the (very) noblest blood of all the world.")

However, as the use of the decasyllabic line often appears to have come as naturally to Shakespeare as the hendecasyllabic does to a Dutch poet, it would be unreasonable to expect his translators to neglect more important aspects of his poetry for the sake of observing this feature at all times. In many passages, where the presence of either type of line in itself carries no particular poetic weight, the quality of the verse in translation would gain nothing by a dogmatic counting of syllables; but this does not justify the disregard - by most of the present-day, and some of the older translators - of the occasions where Shakespeare exploits them to underline or contrast moods or characters. These occasions, admittedly, are not always as self-evident as in the example from Julius Caesar quoted above, or the one from Richard III on p.321. It might be quite accidental, for instance, that at their first confrontation in Act I,v of Twelfth Night, Viola's lines are almost exclusively masculine, while feminine lines predominate in Olivia's speeches - until finally (11.248-252) she assumes a more decisive tone to dismiss Orsino's courtship-by-deputy: "Get you to yourlord. / I cannot love him: let him send no more; / Unless, perchance, you come to me again / To tell me how he takes it. Fare you well. / I thank you for your pains: spend this for me." - Burgersdijk has lost this distinction by distributing his masculine and feminine lines equally over the speeches of the two characters; but Verspoor, whose Droom van een Midsomer-naacht lacks the brittleness of the original due to a too-relaxed rhythm (see pp.324-325) and an excess of hendecasyllables, has unconsciously reversed the rôles here by giving Viola more feminine lines than Olivia:
"Why, what would you? -
Vio. Make me a willow cabin at your gate,
And call upon my soul within the house;
Write loyal cantons of contemned love
And sing them loud even in the dead of night;
Halloo your name to the reverberate hills,
And make the babbling gossip of the air
Cry out 'Olivia!' O, you should not rest
Between the elements of air and earth
But you should pity me!

-'Wat zou 'u doen? -
-Onder een 'treurwilg, wonen voor uw 'deur
en 'roepen naar mijn 'ziel in 'huis ge'vangen,
'verzen van 'vuur over ver'smade 'liefde
'uitsingen in het 'holste van de 'nacht
dat uw 'naam door de 'bergen ,rolt en 'uitslaat
en dat het 'fluister, trillen van de 'lucht
'echo't O'livialief: in 'lucht en 'aarde
had u ,geen 'leven meer, geen 'rust of 'duur
tot u zich 'eindelijk over ,mij er'barmde!

"- What would you do? -
-Live under a weeping willow at your door
and call out at my soul imprisoned in the house
sing out...stanzas of fire about despised love
... in the dead of night
that your name rolls through the mountains and
breaks forth
and that the whisper-trembling of the air
echoes Olivia-love: in air and earth
you would lead a wretched life, have rest nor peace
until at last you would take pity on me!"

Phonic effectiveness in translation. - A survey of the efforts of Dutch Shakespeare translators shows
that, in the course of the last hundred years, they have become increasingly aware of sound, in the
widest sense - even though many of them have clearly been less concerned with a modern Dutch equivalent
of Shakespeare's Elizabethan music than with general euphony, clarity and elocutory ease, or with the
assertion of a phonic quality of their own. This relatively modern preoccupation with sound is undoub-
edly related to the fact that today's translators - in contrast to most of their nineteenth-century pre-
decessors who (consciously or not) expected their work to be read rather than heard, and concentrated on
conceptual fidelity - are, by and large, theatre-oriented and know that their reputations depend in the
first place on the immediate impression created by their work in performance.
It will be clear from the various points discussed in this chapter, that a conscientious translator is
bound to run into one situation after another where the interests of sound, structure and meaning are
in conflict; a problem which is all the more serious because, in Shakespeare's work at its best, these
factors constitute an indivisible poetic trinity. Associated with this is the difficulty that on many oc-
casions the contribution of sound and rhythm to the poetic quality of a line or passage is distinct, yet
quite indefinable in terms of assonance, sonority, alliteration or any other prosodic variables - as is the case in the following example:

*Romeo and Juliet*, II,i,57-59: Two of the fairest stars in all the heaven,
Having some business, do intreat her eyes
To twinkle in their spheres till they return.

It has proved to be impossible to capture, in Dutch, the tones of youthful adulation and delight that characterize this passage - due partly to the prominence of voiced consonants and stressed long vowels: (‘tu:’), ('staːz), ('ɔːl), ('ɑːiz), ('sfiːz), (rr'tːn), partly to the pattern of varying sonorities that cannot be reproduced by any sequence of semantically suitable words in Dutch. This is what the Dutch translators have made of it:

Burgersdijk:

Een tweetal schoonste sterren aan den hemel,
Naar elders afgezonden, smeekt haar oogen
In hare plaats te schitteren, tot zij keeren.
("A twosome (of the) fairest stars in (the) heaven, / Sent off elsewhere, entreats her eyes / To glitter in their stead, till they (re)turn."

Van Looy:

Twee van de mooiste sterren in de lucht
Een zending hebbend, vragen aan haar oogen
Tot hun terugkeer in hun sfeer te twinkelen.
("Two of the most beautiful stars in the sky / Having a mission, ask her eyes / Till their return to twinkle in their sphere(s)."

Werumeus Buning:

Twee van de schoonste sterren in den hemel,
Die elders gaan, willen haar 't oog verleiden
Te schitteren in hun sfeer tot morgennacht.
("Two of the fairest stars in (the) heaven, / That go elsewhere, want to tempt her eye / To glitter in their sphere(s) till tomorrow night."

Van der Plas:

Twee van de klaarste sterren aan de hemel
Op reis naar elders vragen aan haar ogen
te twinkelen in hun sferen op hun plaats.
("Two of the clearest stars in (the) heaven / journeying elsewhere ask her eyes / to twinkle in their spheres in their stead.")

Buddingh:

Twee van de schoonste sterren aan de hemel, 
Die elders moeten zijn, smeken haar ogen,  
Tot hun terugkeer in hun plaatst te schitteren. 

("Two of the fairest stars in (the) heaven, / That must be elsewhere, entreat her eyes, / Till their return to glitter in their stead.")

Courteaux:

Twee van de mooiste sterren aan de hemel 
Gaan 'n boodschap doen en vragen Julia's ogen 
Zolang ze weg zijn in hun kring te pinklen.

("Two of the most beautiful stars in (the) heaven / Go on an errand and ask Juliet's eyes / As long as they are gone to twinkle in their orb.")

The relatively high degree of correspondence between these six versions shows to what extent the translators are limited by their prior consideration of meaning; even when they allow themselves some liberty in this respect — as Werumeus Buning, Van der Plas and Courteaux have done here — it does not necessarily bring them closer to an adequate rendering of the original's sound pattern. However, fortunately that is not always as intangible, nor as irreproducible as in the above instance. For example, the angry (voiceless) sibilants and alveolar plosives in the following lines can, to some extent, be echoed in Dutch:

Hamlet, I,ii,156-157:  O most wicked speed, to post / With such dexterity to incestuous sheets!
Burgersdijk:  O allersnoodste drift, / Die zoo zich haast tot een bloedschendig bed!
            (o· 'alər,snu·sətə 'drıft / di 'zo· ziʃ 'hæ·st·ət on blut'ʃəndəx 'bɛt!')
            ("O most heinous urge, / That hastens thus to an incestuous bed!")
Van Dam:  O allerboosste spoed! / Zoo rap zich repen naar 't bloedschendig bed! 
            (o· 'alər,bo·sətə 'spuṭ! / 'so· 'ræp siʃ 'repe·nə·tət blut'ʃəndəx 'bɛt!)
            ("O most evil speed! / So rashly to rush to the incestuous bed!")
Voeten:  O verdorvenheid die zich / zo jachtig spoedt naar een bloedscheenig bed! 
            (o· vərdərvən,haɪt di ziʃ / 'so· jɔktəx 'spuṭ nə·rən blut'ʃəndəx 'bɛt!')
            ("O depravity that / speeds so hurriedly to an incestuous bed!")

Despite the not fully adequate "drift" in 1.156, Burgersdijk's version is phonetically the most satis-
factory of the three; Van Dam's effective use of sibilants is offset by the inept rolling r's in 1.157, and the two extra velar fricatives in Voeten's rendering of that line fail to compensate for the paucity of sibilants. - Sibilants serve a different purpose in the following passage, where their combination with liquid consonants and a predominance of low-sonority, high frontal vowels does much to endorse the hushed, hypnotic effect of Titania's luring lines:

*Midsummer Night's Dream, III, i, 132-139:*

I am a spirit of no common rate:
The summer still doth tend upon my state;
And I do love thee: therefore, go with me.
I'll give thee fairies to attend on thee;
And they shall fetch thee jewels from the deep,
And sing, while thou on pressed flowers dost sleep:
And I will purge thy mortal grossness so,
That thou shalt like an airy spirit go.

Van Sachtelen:

Ik ben een geest van niet geringe stand;
Een eeuwge zomer heerst er in mijn land.
Ik heb u lief, dus volg mij naar dat oord;
Mijn elfen zullen luistren naar uw woord,
Naar paarden voor u duiken diep in zee;
En zoekt de rust, zingen van zoete vreug;
Door mij uw zware sterfelijkheid ontteven,
Zult ge als een luchtgeest voortaan zelve zweven.

("I am a spirit of no mean standing; / An eternal summer reigns in my land. / I love you, therefore follow me to that region; / My fairies will attend to your words, / Dive for pearls for you deep in the sea: / And if you seek rest, sing of sweet peace. / By me relieved of your heavy mortality, / You shall henceforward float like an airy spirit yourself."")

Werumeus Buning:

Ik ben van edele geestelijke staat
En zomer doet mijn schoonheid nog geen kwaad
En 'k heb u lief, wees daarom lief met mij,
Ik schenk u elven tot uw liverei,
Zij weten waar men parel-schatten raapt,
En zingen als gij in de bloemen slaapt,
En 'k louter u de traagheid van uw aard
Dat gij zult zeven of ge een luchtgeest waart;

("I am of (belong to a) noble spiritual state / And summer does still no harm to my beauty / And I love you, be therefore sweet with me, / I give you fairies for your retinue, / They know where one fetches..."
pearl-treasures / And sing when you sleep in the flowers, / And I (will) purge (you) the tardiness of your nature / (so) That you will float as if you were an air(y)-spirit;

Verspoor:

Ik ben een woudgeest van de hoogste lijn, eeuwige zomer heerst in mijn domein; ga met mij mee - ik heb u liefgekregen, mijn elfenstoet bedient u allerwege; uit zee halen zij parels en juwelen en zingen u in slaap in lustprielen - Ik hef uw trage vorm tot lichter leven dat gij als elfje af en aan kunt zweven!

("I am a wood-spirit of the highest lineage, / eternal summer reigns in my domain: / go with me - I have fallen in love with you, / my train of fairies will serve you in every way: / out of the sea they will fetch pearls and jewels / and will sing you to sleep in bower's of delight - / I shall elevate your tardy form to lighter life / (so) that you able to be flit to and fro like a fairy!")

Courteaux:

Ik ben een geest en van verheven stand, Een eeuw'ge zomer toont mijn zonnig land, En ach, ik heb u lief, blijf dus bij mij En al mijn elfen plaats ik aan uw zij, Die diep in zee voor u gaan parels halen En 's nachts in slaap u zingen met koralen. Van aardse grofheid zal ik u bevrijden En als een geest zult u de lucht doorsnijden.

("I am a spirit and of elevated standing, / An eternal summer adorns my sunny land, / And ah, I love you, stay therefore with me / And I'll place all my fairies at your side, / Who deep in the sea will go to fetch pearls for you / And at night will sing you to sleep with carols. / Of earthly grossness I shall liberate you / And like a spirit you shall traverse the air.")

Out of this selection, Van Suchtelen's and Verspoor's versions get closest to a Dutch sound equivalent of this enchanting passage; Verspoor's rhythm, as could be expected, surpasses Van Suchtelen's in fluidity, variety and appeal, but his long sequence of hendecasyllables have a dissipating effect and there is too much of a sameness in his rhyme vowels; those of Van Suchtelen's first two couplets, on the other hand, are a little too sonorous. - In Courteaux's otherwise passable rendering a few ill-chosen words, such as "tootit", "plaats", "'s nachts", "koralen", "aardse", "grofheid" and "doorsnijden" - one or two of which are conceptually correct enough - have too disruptive an effect on the soporific flow of soothing voiced consonants. Phonically, Werumeus Buning may have the edge on Courteaux here - but the inanity
of his rhymes, which might be bettered by many a schoolboy’s doggerel, devalidates this passage as much as it does the rest of his Midsomernachts Droom - an incomprehensible lapse for a poet of considerable literary stature.

Soporific sounds also play a part in the following passage; but in its context, they assume an ominous, sinister character:

**Macbeth, III, ii, 40-44:**

His cloistered flight, ere to black Hecate’s summons
The shard-born beetle with his drowsy hums
Hath rung night’s yawning peal, there shall be done
A deed of dreadful note.

---

Van Looy:

Eer 't kloostergangig fladdren
der vleermuis der roep, Lichtschuwe schildtor komt en slaaprig zoemt,
Omstommelt 't nachtsein voor 't geewen,
Zal daar gedaan zijn 'n daad schrikkelik van aard.

("Ere the batish fluttering / Of the bat is done, ere to Hecate’s call, / Light-shunning shard-beetle comes and sleepily hums, / Bumbles about the night’s signal for yawning, / There shall be done a deed terrible in nature.")

---

Diels:

...eer de vleermuis
haar schemervlucht heeft uitgevlogen; eer nog op de roep der sombre Hecate
de schildtor met zijn soezeric gezoem
de nachtklep heeft gerateld, zal er weer een gruw’lijk werk gedaan zijn.

("Ere the bat hath flown / Has rung the sleepy night-chiming, / There shall be done a deed terrible in nature.")
("...ere the bat / her twilight-flight has flown (to its end); ere / yet to the call of (the) somber Hecate / the shard-beetle with its dozy humming / has rattled the night-clack, there will again / a gruesome work be done.")

Koster's rendering here seems to prove an interesting point: that, if handled with some sensitivity, the phonic qualities of a translation may, on occasion, look after themselves if it is semantically sound. Admittedly, Koster has spread into an extra line and done a certain amount of structural reorganization; besides, any obvious phonic correspondence between "bat" and "vleermuis", "black" and "duistre", "shard-borne beetle" and "schild-gedragen tor", "hath rung night's yawning peal" and "het slaap'rig nachtgebeier heeft geluid" is far to seek - yet to a Dutch ear the subtle, shifting sonorities and the tolling rhythm of his rendering convey much the same sensations as those evoked by the original. All the more unfortunate, therefore, that Dutch theatre audiences have never been given a chance to hear this fine translation, but have had to content themselves for the first fifty years of this century with Van Looy's contorted splutterings. Diels' version - the one used on stage in 1957 and 1963 (see Ch.XIII) - is well represented in this excerpt; in happy contrast to Van Looy, it is lucid and articulate and, on the whole, intelligent, but poetically rather facile, and clearly designed for immediate effect rather than for a lasting impression. On points of sound and rhythm, most of this passage is "neutral", having none of the positive qualities of Koster's version: such details as it shares with the latter impress one as second hand. By itself, "soezerig gezoem" is fine, but its effect is all but destroyed by the insensitive "de nachtklep heeft geratel" in the next line.

Without being in any way outstanding, the overall phonic quality of Diels' Macbeth is in line with the work of most post-war translators, whose preoccupation with lucidity and elocutory ease came as an understandable reaction against the constricted language of their predecessors: - Burgersdijk and, particularly, Van Looy. However, in their zeal to make Shakespeare more manageable for the actors and more accessible to the theatre-going public by opening up his verse, avoiding ugly and cumbersome consonant clusters, and using a clear modern idiom, these translators often disregarded the fact that much of Shakespeare's language is neither lucid nor euphonious, and that some of his most impressive passages owe their effect to a harshness and tightness that cannot be smoothed out without serious detriment to dramatic impact:

_King Lear, III,vii,54-64:_ Because I would not see thy cruel nails
Pluck out his poor old eyes, nor thy fierce sister
In his anointed flesh rash borish fangs.
The sea, with such a storm as his bare head
In hell-black night endured, would have buoyed up,
And quenched the stelléed fires.
Yet, poor old heart, he holt the heavens to rain.
If wolves had at thy gate howled that dern time,
Thou shouldst have said 'Good porter, turn the key,'
All cruels else subscribe. But I shall see.
The wingéd vengeance overtake such children.

Burgerdijk:

Wijl 'k niet kon zien, dat gij uw wreede nagels
In 't arm, oud oogenpaar, uw woeste zuster
Haar evræt evacht omphæl, ten hemel
Gebruist en 't starvœr uitgedød;
De zee hadd' bij een storm, als hij blootshoofds
Bij helsche nacht verduren moest, ten hemel
Gebruist en 't starvœr uitgedød;
Hij, arme grijisaard, hielp den hemel reeg'nen.
Ja, hadden in die schriknacht wolven aan
Uw poort gehuuld, gij hadt geroepen: "Wachter,
Sluit open;" 't wreedst wierd week; — doch ik
zal zien, hoe zulk een kroost gewiekeerde wraak bereikt.

"(Because I could not (bear to) see, that you... would thrust your cruel nails / Into the poor old pair of eyes, your savage sister / Her boar's tooth in his sacred flesh. / The sea would, with a storm as he, bare-headed, / Had to endure in hellish night, have... surged up to heaven /... and quenched the star-fire; / He, poor old man, helped (the) heaven to rain. / Yea, had in that night of terror wolves / Howled at your gate, you would have cried: "Watchman, / Open up;" the cruelest would (have) soften(ed); — but I shall see / How winged vengeance will overtake such issue.

Roland Holst:

Wijl 'k niet wou zien uw wreede nagels, scheurend
Zijn oogen arm en oud, noch hoe uw zuster
Verwoed beestige tanden hem zou slaan
In 't heilig vleesch. Bij zulk een storm als hij
Brootshoofds in hellezwarten nacht doorstond
Had zich deze in luide opstandigheid
Verheven, en die sterren uitgedød.
Maar hij, arme oude, hielp den hemel reegnens.
Hadde' in dat noodwe wolven aan uw poort
Gehuuld, gij had gezegd: "Wachter, doe open" —
Wat wreed is werd toen zacht. Maar ik zal zien
Hoe wraak, gevleugeld, zulke kindren inhaalt.

(væilk nit kon 'zin, dat 'xæi yu 'vre:de 'na:yls
Int 'ɔr'm, 'aut o:γem,pa:r, yu 'ůustə 'zəεσər
hə 'e:νə,tənt Int 'hæiləx'fle:s hem 'slυx.
de 'zε: hɔd' bæi an 'stɔrm, als 'hæi 'blo:st,ho:fts
bæi 'hɛlsa 'nɔxt fə'dɜra 'must, ten 'he:əmal
γα'brɔist ent 'stɔrvər 'ʃi:tə,do:ft;
'hæi, 'ɔrmə 'γæisərt, 'hɪlp de 'he:əmal 'rε:γεν. 'jə', 'hədən ɪn ɪ'shri:knoxt 'wɔlven ən
yu 'pɔ:rt ɣə'hiylt, 'xæi ,hɔt ɣə'rups 'u'ɔkərt,
,'sliːt ˈo:ɾə; 'tʊrɛst vɜət 'vɛ:k; — doːx 'ɪk sol
'zin,
u 'zælk ən 'kroːst ɣə'uiktə 'vra:k baːrəikt.)

(uæilk nit 'wʌu 'zɪn yu 'vre:de 'na:yls, 'sxe:ɾənt
sæin o:γem ən 'aut, 'nɔx ˈhu yu 'zæstər
vər'əut ˈheːstəvə tənda hem zʊ wə 'sλən
Int 'hæiləx 'fle:s. bæi 'zælk ən 'stɔrm əls 'hæi
'bloomts,ho:fts in 'hɛlsa,zuːrtə 'nɔxt doːr'stənt
hɔt ,sɪx də 'zɛ. In ˈlɪsid ɔp'stɔndəv,hæet
fə'hɛvən, ən də 'stərərn 'ʃi:tə,doːft.
mər 'hæi, 'ɔrm ˈauːdə, 'hɪlp də 'heːməl 'rε:γεν.
'hɔd ɪn də 'nɔːtər 'wɔlvan ən yu 'pɔ:rt
ɣə'hiylt, 'xæi ,hɔt ɣə'zɛxt 'u'ɔkərt, ˈduː o:ɾə -
əvət vɛɾt ˈvɜət ɪs ˈvɛɾt ən ˈzɔkət. mər 'ɪk sol 'zin
hʊ 'vرا:k, ɣə'vɨldə, 'zælkə 'kɪndə 'ɪnhausəlt.)
("Because I did not wish to see your cruel nails, tearing / His eyes poor and old, nor how your sister / Furiously would thrust bestial teeth / In his sacred flesh. With such a storm as he / Bare-headed in hell-black night endured / The sea in loud rebelliousness would have / Raised itself, and quenched the stars. / But he, poor old one, helped (the) heaven to rain. / Had in that tempest wolves... howled at your gate / ... you would have said: "Watchman, open up" - / Whatever is cruel then softened. But I shall see / How vengeance, winged, will overtake such children.")

Straat:

Omdat ik niet jouw wrede nagels zien wou / bij 't plukken van zijn arme, oude ogen, / en niet je felle zusters zwijntand / zien slaan in zijn gezalfd, geheiligd lijf! / De zee, bij zulk een storm als hij doorstond, / blootshoofds, in zwarte helle nacht, was óp- / gestoven om het sterrevuur te blussen. / Maar arm, oud hart, hij hielp het zwerk aan regen. / Hadden er wolven aan jouw poort gehuld, / die barre nacht, dan had hij wel gezegd: / "Portier, maak open" - wreedheid ingesloten. / Maar ik zal zien, hoe wraak die vleugels heeft / een kroost als dit noog eens inhalen zal.

(om'dat Ik 'nit jau 'vre•ða 'na•øels' in uow / hæit 'plekø van zæin 'orma, 'aʊθa 'o•γәn, / en 'it jø 'felø 'zæstærs•νεινa,τοντ / sin 'sla•n In zæn ya'zulft, χα'hæiλαβτ 'læif! / da 'ze•, bæi 'zælkn øn 'storm als 'hæi dø•p•stønt, / 'blo•ts,ho•fts, In 'zwæøta 'hela,νοχτ, υαν 'cρ- / χα'ø•sto•vin øm øt 'stæø,γυτ øø 'blosø. / mæ•r 'arm, 'dùt 'haæt, χα'æi 'hìlp øt 'swærk a•n 're•γα. / høldøn er 'ølvøn a•n jau 'pø•øt χα'øhylt, / di 'bøøø 'νοχτ, 'døøøn høt jæi ,νεl υа'ζεχt / pø•tir, mæ•k 'o•oø - vre•θæøt 'ɪŋγә,ζο•ø. / mæ•r 'Ik sʊl 'zin, hu 'vra•k di 'vλøyøls 'he•f t / æn 'kro•st æls 'dIt noχ,ęøøs 'Inhæ•λø 'zal.)

("Because I did not wish to see thy cruel nails / (At the) plucking (of) his poor, old eyes, / and not see thy fierce sister's boar's tooth / strike into his anointed, sanctified body! / The sea, with such a storm as he endured, / bare-headed, in black hell's night, would have... / rushed up to extinguish the star-fire. / But poor, old heart, he helped the sky to rain." (i.e.: he procured rain for the sky.) / "Had wolves howled at thy gate, / that dire night, then thou wouldst have said: / "Porter, open up" - locked up cruelty. / But I shall see, how vengeance that has wings / yet will once overtake issue such as this.")

There is little to choose between these three translations, if we are looking for the most faithful rendering of the content; in some small details, such as the "scheurend" and "plukken" for "pluck", "helle-zwarte nacht" and "zwarte helle nacht" for "hell-black night", and Straat's "gezalfd" for "anointed", "arm, oud hart" for "poor old heart" and "barre" for "dern", the latter and Roland Holst have improved on Burgersdijk's version, and Straat's "wreedheid ingesloten" for "All cruels else subscribe" is a debatable, yet certainly interesting alternative for the conventional interpretation chosen by his two predecessors. Besides, both Roland Holst and Straat have been more adventurous in their distribution of stresses than Burgersdijk; - yet whose version closest approaches the original's sound, so expressive of furious indignation? Roland Holst has expanded into one, Straat into two extra lines; both have filled out the hemistic (1:59), Straat even with a feminine line. By doing so, they have relaxed the rhythmic
pulse of the passage - and, in the process, sacrificed some of its climactic bite. An actor might well lose his dentures while playing Gloucester in Burgerdijk's version, but so he might, too, when using Shakespeare's own text: the spitting fury the situation requires is phonically present in both.

Time and again, for all his contractions, his nineteenth-century idiom and scrupulous old-fashioned syntax, Burgerdijk proves to have been very sensitive to the dramatic qualities of Shakespeare's sound and rhythm - more so than a number of his modern successors, as some directors and actors are beginning to realize. One of the small bonuses of the Nederlandse Comedie's failed experiment with Measure for Measure in 1970 (see p.260) was the discovery by several of the young actors involved that Burgerdijk's text somehow provided more support in establishing the mood and pitch of the "dark" scenes than Andreus' more relaxed and conversational version did. On paper, the latter has considerable merit and - although not of the same standard, like Straat's Koning Lear - here and there improves on the older version; yet at a sub-textual level, often in mere nuances of sound and tension, Andreus sometimes fails where Burgerdijk has succeeded or, at least, succeeded better - as in the passage below, where only a few displaced stresses, a couple of feminine lines too many, have sapped the necessary tautness out of his rendering:

*Measure for Measure,*

II,iv,155-163:

My unsoiled name, th'austereness of my life,
My vouch against you, and my place i'th'state,
Will so your accusation overweigh
That you shall stifle in your own report,
And smell of calumny. I have begun;
And now I give my sensual race the rein.
Fit thy consent to my sharp appetite;
Lay by all nicety and prolixious bluses,
That banish what they sue for...

Burgerdijk:

Mijn onbevrakte naam, mijns levens strengheid,
Mijn woord dat u weerspreekt, mijn hooge rang,
't Zal alles zoo uw aanklacht overwegen,
Dat gij in uw verhaal verstikken zult
En rieken zult naar last'ring. Eens begonnen,
Laat ik mijn' lusten than de teugels vrij;
Dus schik u naar den honger, die mij drijft;
Leg alle preutscheid af en draalend blozen,
Dat afwijst wat het smeekt;...

("My unsoiled name, my life's austerity, / My word that contradicts you, my high rank, / It all will so
I now give free rein to my desires; / So conform to the hunger that impels me; / Lay by all prudery and hesitant blushing / That rejects what it entreats;.."

Andreus:

Mijn zuivere naam, mijn strenge levenswijze,
Mijn woord tegen uw woord, mijn hoge functie,
zullen uw aanklacht zozeer ondergraven,
dat u zult stikken in uw woorden, en een stank van laster verspreiden. Ik ben hieraan begonnen en zal de teugel vieren van mijn lusten:
geef aan mijn hongerende hartstocht toe;
leg af uw pretentie en het eindeloos blozen
dat afsmeekt wat het afweert;...

("My pure name, my austere way of life, / my word against your word, my high station / will undermine your accusation so much / that you shall choke in your words and... spread a stench / of calumny. I have begun this / and shall loose the reins of my desires: / give in to my starving passion; / lay by your prudery and the endless blushing / that implores what it wards off;..")

Unfortunately there is a limit to the number of examples that can be given; the ones quoted in this chapter are, of necessity, brief and rather arbitrary. But they have served their purpose if they have contributed to an understanding of the problems of sound and rhythm that Dutch Shakespeare translators are faced with; and of the ways in which, and the extent to which some of the most prominent amongst them have solved these problems.
CHAPTER XVI

CONTENT AND MEANING:

CONCEPTUAL AND SEMANTIC FIDELITY IN DUTCH SHAKESPEARE TRANSLATIONS.

Having discussed structure and sound - the skeleton and the motoric nervous system, one might say, of the living organism Shakespeare's work constitutes - the time has come to pay attention to its flesh, blood and soul: the words and their meaning, the images and the ideas they express.

Differences of structure, sound and rhythm between two languages can be discussed systematically - if summarily - in relatively few pages; that such a technical analysis of the problems posed by poetic and dramatic content is more difficult is, in one way, due to the fortunate circumstance that ideas as universal as those Shakespeare was concerned with transcend barriers of time, nationality and language - certainly so between peoples historically and culturally as closely akin as the English and the Dutch; in another way, however, this is due to the complexity which the expression of these ideas assumes in Shakespeare's language. Since armies of scholarly commentators throughout four centuries have found, and continue to find matter for dispute in the totality as well as in the minutest details of Shakespearean vocabulary and imagery, it is little wonder that not even a translator of the profoundest understanding of the source, and the greatest creative command of the target language, is capable of doing justice to the plays in all their patent and potential significance.

A translator's problems, of course, range well beyond those which the Shakespeare commentator or editor encounters; they are only partly of an interpretative nature. Even the simplest workaday passages, the most obvious images or quibbles can present insurmountable obstacles; it is not until one starts comparing a number of different translations of the same word, phrase or passage that one becomes fully conscious of this. The Dutch semantic equivalent of star is ster; of heart: hart; of house: huis; of king: koning; of time: tijd; yet many of these - on the face of it - most mundane words do not always have the same collocations. When, for instance, Polonius says of Ophelia that: (Lord Hamlet is a prince,)"out of thy star" (Hamlet, II,ii,140), it appears that there is no Dutch expression incorporating the word ster to convey the same sense; amongst the various renderings (e.g. Burgersdijk: te hoog voor u ("too high for you"); Van Looy: ver boven u ("far above you"); Van Suchtelen: boven uw stand ("above your station")) Van Dam has offered the closest approach with: buiten uw sfeer ("outside your sphere"). But whereas star
can as a rule be translated by *ster*, much more often it proves to be impossible to match the Shakespear-ean polysemy of the word *time* by its Dutch *prima facie* equivalent *tijd*; in an expression such as "To be-
guile the *time*, / Look like the *time*" (*Hamlet*, I,v,61-62) its sense can only be adequately conveyed by
the word *wereld* (*world*).
Yet in these two instances the aura of meaning is at least fairly limited and definable; much more dif-
ficult are those many occasions when a word or an expression, like a pebble thrown in a pond, assumes
rings of metaphoric significance well beyond its immediate lexical sense, which reverberate throughout
the poetic structure of a play. A good example of this is Francisco's "I am sick at heart" (*Hamlet*, I,i,
9), which sounds like a *leitmotiv* of cosmic disintegration in the overture of Shakespeare's greatest
tragedy. There is nothing mysterious about the five words used; but the far-ranging differences in their
rendering indicate how impotent the most capable translators become in the face of a complexity such as
these words assume in their context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgersdijk:</td>
<td>ik ben moe en mat.</td>
<td>&quot;I am tired and weary.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Looy:</td>
<td>ik ben 't meer dan zat.</td>
<td>&quot;I am more than fed-up with it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dam:</td>
<td>ik voel me naar.</td>
<td>&quot;I feel unwell.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Suchtelen:</td>
<td>ik voel me ellendig door en door.</td>
<td>&quot;I feel wretched through and through.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddingh':</td>
<td>ik ben ziek van hart.</td>
<td>&quot;I am ill at heart.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voeten:</td>
<td>ik voel me triest.</td>
<td>&quot;I feel dismal.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteaux:</td>
<td>ik ben bang te moede.</td>
<td>&quot;I am afraid, I feel apprehensive.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of these versions has captured more than a fragment of the meaning of "sick at heart"; Buddingh's
attempt at transliteration has misfired because the expression has no currency in Dutch: it sounds alien
and, due to this, carries little meaning.
In the case of *time* quoted above, as in that of "sick at heart", the problem of polysemy or metaphoric
deepth is evident to an English reader also; equally often, however, a divergent set of renderings indi-
cates the existence of a semantic problem for translators, where none is immediately apparent in the
original. One of several in Ophelia's lament after her confrontation with Hamlet in Act III,i occurs in
1.150: "Th'observed of all observers". Its various renderings are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgersdijk:</td>
<td>Waar ieders oog op staarde,...</td>
<td>&quot;That everyone's eye stared (gazed) upon,...&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Van Looy: de van alle / Opmerkers, opgemerkte,... ("the by all / Noticers, noticed,...")
Van Dam: Geacht door elk, die acht gaf. ("Esteemed by everyone, who was observant.")
Van Suchtelen: Gëëerd door elk die eren kan. ("Honoured by everyone who is able to honour.")
Voeten: door eerbetoon omringd. ("encompassed by homage.")
Courteaux: waar elk oog / Naar opkeek met ontzag ("to whom each eye / Looked up with veneration")

and again, as with "sick at heart", none of them quite manage to give a fully satisfactory sense equivalent of the words observe and observers. Here Van Looy - like Buddingh' in the previous example - has tried to be literal: at least in one sense opmerken is the correct translation of observe - but its partial synonym notice in the metaphor may convey the unsatisfactory narrowness and awkwardness of this translation. Of the six, Van Dam's solution is the most acceptable.

Despite its complexity, the general problem of semantic transference can be subdivided into a number of recognizable categories. To illustrate these, all the examples have been selected from Hamlet, in order to show the variety of obstacles a translator may meet with in one single play.

To begin with, the impossibility of giving an exact, word-for-word translation is (as has already been demonstrated in Ch.XIV) frequently due to the limits imposed by the iambic pentameter - when it cannot accommodate all the words and syllables required:

I,ii,180-181: Thrift, thrift, Horatio! The funeral baked-meats / Did coldly furnish forth the marriage tables.

Burgersdijk: Slechts zuinig-, zuinigheid, Horatio! 't Restje / Van 't uitvaartmaal kon dienst doen voor de bruiloft. ("Mere thrifti-, thriftiness, Horatio! The remnant / Of the funeral meal could serve for the wedding.")

Van Looy: Zuinig, zuinigheid, vriend, de uitvaartgerechten / Koud konden dienen voor de bruilofts-tafels. ("Thrifty, thriftiness, friend; the funeral dishes / Cold(ly) could serve for the wedding tables.")

Van Dam: Uit zuinigheid, Horatio! De pastijen / Van 't lijkmaal sierden koud den bruiloftsdish. ("Out of thriftiness, Horatio! The pastries / Of the funeral "corpse" meal adorned cold the wedding banquet.")

Van Suchtelen: Zuinigheid! Het begraf'nismaal voorzag / De bruiloftsdish van koude vleespasteiern. ("Thriftness! The interim meal provided / The wedding banquet with cold meat pastries.")

Voeten: Zuinigheid, vriend! Men had van 't dodenmaal / nog vleespasteien voor de bruilofts-tafel. ("Thrifthness, friend! One had, from the funeral meal" ("meal-of-the-dead") /
still meat pastries (left) for the wedding table."

Courteaux: Slechts zuinigheid, Horatio, zuinigheid! / De rest van het begraafnismaal kon dienen / Als koude schotel voor de bruiloftstafel. ("Mere thriftiness, Horatio, thriftiness! / The remnant of the interment meal could serve / As cold dish for the wedding table.")

"Thriftiness" has been used rather than "thrift", in the metaphrases, to underline the syllabic congestion caused by the only acceptable Dutch sense equivalent, "zuinigheid" - a nominal derivation from the adjective "zuinig" ("thrifty, economical, parsimonious") - which unfortunately cannot capture the curt sarcasm of "Thrift, thrift,"; neither Courteaux's full, nor Burgersdijk's and Van Looy's rather awkward partial repetition have anything like the same effect. Some sacrifice has been made by all: Van Dam, Van Suchtelen and Voeten have dispensed with any repetition of "zuinigheid"; Burgersdijk has omitted "tables", and he nor Voeten have offered an equivalent for "coldly"; Van Suchtelen has dropped "Horatio", for whom Van Looy and Voeten have substituted "vriend"; and even Courteaux, despite his extra line, has made do with "De rest" (cp. Burgersdijk: "'t restje") for "baked-meats". On the other hand, all except Van Looy have found it necessary to insert the word "maal" ("meal, repast") which is understood in the original; and none of them have exploited the fact that the original 1.180 is hypermetric. Understandably, Shakespeare's brilliant use of double entendre can but rarely be reflected satisfactorily in translation; especially when it is combined with a phonetic quibble, as in Hamlet's first line:

I,ii,65: A little more than kin, and less than kind.

which has already been sampled in Roorda van Eysinga's and Kok's renderings (see p.127). In such a situation, translators often have to forego one of the two senses in which the word is used (i.e.: "kind") and can attempt, at best, to produce a line that shares something of the original's structural or phonetic character:

Burgersdijk: Wat meer dan neef, doch niet in 't minst uw zoon. ("Somewhat more than nephew, but not in the least your son.")

Van Looy: Iets meer dan bloed- en minder geestverwant. ("Something more than (a) blood-(relative) and less (a) kindred spirit.")

Van Dam: Meer dan verwant en minder dan welwillend! ("More than related (:kin) and less than benevolent!")

Van Suchtelen: Iets meer dan neef, maar minder dan een zoon. ("Something more than nephew, but less than a son.")
Voeten:  Verwant naar 't bloed, maar vijand naar de geest... ("Related (:kin) by blood, but enemy in spirit...")

Courteaux:  Verwant door 't bloed, maar zeker niet door 't hart... ("Related (:kin) through blood, but certainly not through the heart...")

Van Looy has chosen one, Van Dam the other of the two senses of "kind" implied here; Burgersdijk and Van Suchtelen have sidestepped the choice and echoed Claudius' preceding line ("But now my cousin Hamlet, and my son"); Voeten has attempted to convey both, with a regrettably unsubtle result; Courteaux has solved the problem admirably by maintaining the positive-negative antithesis and using, for its poles, the words "bloed" and "hart" - whose connotations come near to covering the notion of kin and kind (in both senses) and do so in a poetically satisfying way. Next to this, Van Looy's translation is the most felicitous.

Problems of polysemy are no easier to deal with in prose than in verse, although the absence of mass-limitations does give translators more scope to compensate for the loss of word play by introducing a quibble of their own. Of the following passage, Roorda van Eysinga's and Kok's versions have also been quoted (see pp.101 and 128):

II,ii,226-230:  Ham. Then you live about her waist, or in the middle of her favours? - Guiz. Faith, her privates we. - Ham. In the secret parts of Fortune? O most true: she is a strumpet.

Burgersdijk:  - Dus gij zit zoo omstreeks haar gordel, of in het midden van haar gunst? - - Waarlijk, wij zijn slechts haar lijfeigenen. - - Met uw lijf aan Fortuna behoorrend? O! 't is waar, zij is een sloop. ("- So you sit (thus) about her belt, or in the middle of her favour? - - Truly, we are merely her serfs" (litt. "body-owned"). - - "Belonging to Fortune with your body? O! 'tis true, she is a strumpet...")

Van Looy:  - Dus leeft ge omtrent haar gordel, of in het hart harer gunsten? - - In trouwe, haar dagelijks toegelatenen, wij. - - In de heimelijke appartementen van Fortuin? O, zeer waar; ze is een lichtekooi... ("- So you live about her belt, or in the heart of her favours? - - In faith, her daily admitted ones, we. - - In the secret apartments of Fortune? O, very true; she is a prostitute...")

Van Dam:  Dan huist gij zoo wat bij haar gordel, of in het midden van haar gunst. - - Haar schamerlijke lansknechten zijn we. - - Lansknechten in de schamelheid van Fortuna! O 't is al te waar, zij is een slet... ("- Then you dwell somewhere near her belt, or in the middle of her favour. - - Her humble lansquenet we are. - - Lansquenet in the humbleness/shame of Fortune! O 'tis all too true, she is a slut...")

Van Suchtelen:  - Dan huist ge dus omtrent haar leest, of te wel in 't middelpunt van haar gunst? - - Inderdaad, dat is ons deel. - - Dus deelgenoten van Fortuna's diepste verborgenheden?
Maar ja, 't is waar ook, zij is een snol. ("- So then you dwell about her waist, or in the centre of her favour? - - Indeed, that is our part. - - So partners in Fortune's deepest secrecies? But yes, 'tis true too, she is a tart.")

Voeten:
- Dan zitten jullie dus in de buurt van haar middel, of in het hartje van haar gunsten. - - Precies, in dat deel zijn wij thuis. - - In Fortuna's schamdeel? Ach ja, ze is een slet... ("- So then you sit in the neighbourhood of her waist, or in the heart of her favours. - - Precisely, in that part we are at home. - - In Fortune's private ("shame") part? Ah yes, she is a slut....")

Courteaux:
- U woont dus in de buurt van haar gordel, of halverwege haar gunsten? - - Ja, wij zijn ermeer vertrouwd. - - Met de schoot van Fortuna? Ja, dat zal wel, ze is een lichtekooi... ("- So you live in the neighbourhood of her belt, or halfway her favours? - - Yes, we are familiar with it. - - With the lap/womb of Fortune? Yes, I daresay so, she is a prostitute....")

Notwithstanding their varying degrees of success, it is at once apparent that all translators have, in some way or other, captured both the sense and the playfulness of the exchange as a whole. On an occasion such as this, the development of word play is facilitated by the consequential character of repartee; the problem is much greater when a more or less obvious ambiguity is contained in a single word, as in the case of "kind" on p.343, or that of "(Get thee to a) nunnery" (III, i, 119), which has been translated as "hoerenhuis" ("whorehouse") by Voeten, but by all the others as "klooster" ("convent"), a word that in itself shares none of the Elizabethan ambiguity of "nunnery"; but could perhaps be stretched that way by an actor's intonation or expression, which would be a solution far preferable to Voeten's blatant coarseness.

Divergent renderings are often due to different choices within a closely circumscribed semantic field, such as "sloot", "snol", "slet" and "lichtekooi" for "strumpet" in the passage above, or "uitvaart" and "begrafenis" for "funeral" on p.342. Sometimes, however, they bear the stamp of a deliberate, independent interpretation on the part of the translator. We have already seen an example of this in Kok's and Burgersdijk's different renderings of I,v,84: "But, howsoever thou pursues this act", where the former has: "Maar hoe gij ook die wandaad moet vervolgen" ("But however you may prosecute that crime"), and the latter: "Maar hoe gij ook uw taak volbrengen wilt" ("But however you mean to accomplish your task") (see pp.123 and 145). Of their successors, only Van Dam followed Kok's example, with: "Maar hoe gij ook die daad bestraffen wilt" ("But however you mean to punish that deed"); all the others, with slight variations, adhered to Burgersdijk's interpretation.
In this instance a choice is inevitable, because the two possible interpretations cannot be accommodated in one single translation; but on occasion, some translators display a preference for an exclusive, narrow translation where a more inclusive semantic equivalent is available. This tendency manifests itself clearly in the various renderings of III.i.56: "To be, or not to be" : Burgersdijk and Courteaux, like the majority of their predecessors, have chosen the obvious translation: "De zijn of niet te zijn" — obvious, because (te) zijn, as an independent verb, semantically covers (to) be in all its fullness and potential diversity of meaning. Van Looy has provided a slight variant with "Zijn of niet zijn", but Van Suchtelen and Voeten have opted for a more specific translation, with "Bestaan of niet bestaan" ("Exist or not exist") and Van Dam for one that is narrower still: "Leven, of niet?" ("Live, or not?") — Opponents of this practice may rightfully argue that, if Shakespeare had wished to be as specific as this, nothing would have stopped him from expressing himself more precisely.

In a number of situations, the semantics of translation as such play only a secondary part in the diversification of renderings. In the choice of textual variants and the solution of cruces, for instance, a translator is usually guided by the edition he has selected as a basis for his work; so the resulting translation is preconditioned by the original editor's choices and interpretations. Hence one finds, for the opening line of Hamlet's first soliloquy (I.i.i.129) renderings based on the F1 reading "O that this too solid flesh..." with Burgersdijk, Van Looy and Van Suchtelen: "O dat dit al te (Van Looy: tè te) vaste vlees(ch)", while Van Dam (who was his own editor; his Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet was published in the same year as his translation1) has chosen the Q2 reading: "too too sallied" and translated it as aangevochten ("assailed, tempted"); Dover Wilson's emendation to sullied has been followed by Voeten and Courteaux (respectively: more and onreine: "unclean"). A similar division runs through the translations of I.i.62-63:

So frowned he once, when, in an angry parle, / He smote the sledded Polacks on the ice.

where Burgersdijk, Van Looy and Courteaux are aligned on the side of Malone and Dover Wilson, while Van Dam, Van Suchtelen and Voeten have opted for the alternative leded pole-axe interpretation:

1 In 1924 (by: The Bodley Head, London). It was based primarily on the Q2 text and therefore invalidates Dover Wilson's claim to being the first to regard that as the most important source text (see: J. D. Wilson: The Tragedy of Hamlet, prince of Denmark, Cambridge, 1961, p.xxvii. Wilson's edition first appeared in 1934).
Burgersdijk: Zoo was zijn fronsblik, toen zijn gramme vuist / Den Pool, zijn slede ontboosd, het ijs deed meten. ("So was his frown(ing)-glance, when his grim fist / Caused the Pole, bounced out of his sledge, to measure the ice."

Van Looy: Zoo fronsde hij eens, toen in een scherrep treffen, / Hij 't seldend Polenvolk neérbonsde op 't ijs. ("So frowned he once, when in a sharp encounter, / He struck the sledging Polish people down on the ice.")

Courteaux: Zo was zijn grimm'ge blik, toen hij de Polen / In een verwoede slag op 't ijs verpledte. ("So was his grim glance, when he...crushed the Poles / In a fierce battle on the ice.")

Buddingh', - in principle endorsing Burgersdijk's choice in cases like these - has modified his rendering to: zo frouste / Hij eenmaal, toen hij in zijn drift de Pool / Bij 't onderhand'len uit zijn slee op 't ijs sloeg. ("So frowned / He once, when in his (fit of) passion he..struck the Pole / During the parleying out of his sledge onto the ice.")

Van Dam: Zoo dreigend keek hij, toen in boos gesprek / Hij den geduchten strijdbijl smeet op 't ijs. ("So menacing he looked, when in angry conversation / He flung the formidable battle-axe on the ice.")

Van Suchtelen: zo dreigde / Zijn blik toen hij in drift, bij 't onderhand'len / Zijn lood-bezwaarde strijdbijl smakte op 't ijs. ("So threatened / His glance when in (a fit of) passion, during the parleying / He dashed his lead-weighted battle-axe onto the ice.")

Voeten: dezelfde dreigblik / Als toen hij, driftig onderhandelend, / Zijn zware strijdbijl neersmeet op het ijs. ("The same menacing glance / As when he, impatiently parleying, / Flung down his heavy battle-axe onto the ice.")

When one or another interpretation of a textual crux, such as the one above, is of relatively minor significance in relation to the meaning of the play as a whole, and does not even have serious consequences for its immediate context, the translation of a play offers its readers, performers and audience an advantage over their English counterparts, in so far as a merely obscure patch of the text is clarified without any effort on their part; - this in contrast to the many occasions when it is impoverished due to the irretrievable loss of elements of metaphor, word play and meaningful ambiguity. So there is only gain when translators base their renderings on the likeliest solution of lines such as "Or of a most select and generous, chief in that" (I,iii,74), "Doth all the noble substance of a doubt" (I,iv,37) and "And either... the devil, or throw him out" (III,iv,169)¹; while one cannot but regret the sacrifices

¹ J. D. Wilson's readings of the lines concerned. Munro (The London Shakespeare, 1958), whose text I have used as a standard throughout this part of the study, has, for the first two lines: "Are most select and
they must resign themselves to when faced with the kind of quibbles Polonius' lines are full of - like the following ones (I,iii,127-131) which, even in their best rendering (i.e. Van Looy's), have lost a whole dimension of meaning:

Do not believe his vows; for they are brokers,
Not of that dye which their investments show,
But mere implorators of unholy suits,
Breathing like sanctified and pious bonds
The better to beguile...

("Do not trust his vows. They are but go-between, / And not of such calibre as the garment shows, / They are suppliants with unholy solicitations / Like saints muttering of pious covenant / The better to deceive."

Compared to Shakespeare's poetic exploitation of polysemy, therefore, textual cruces, corruptions and emendations are a relatively minor worry to the translator - as are those instances of archaic terminology and usage in his work, which have been satisfactorily elucidated by philological and lexical scholarship. Hence, words like "blazon" (I,v,21), "valanced" (II,ii,403), "petar" (III,iv,206), "loggats" (V,i,85) and "eisel" (V,i,258) pose no serious problems, and have been translated into modern Dutch terms or approximations within a narrow semantic field (blazon: verhaal, kondschap, onthulling, bericht, relaas - "story, intelligence (= information), revelation, report, account"; valanced: met franje versierd, van franje voorzien, befranjet, gestoffeerd - "adorned - provided with fringe, fringed, upholstered"; petar: (spring)mijn, (spring)bus, vuurpijl - "(explosive) mine, (blunder)bus, rocket"; loggats (play at -): kegelen, voor een werpspel gebruiken - "play at skittles, use for a game of coits"; eisel: azijn, edik, gal - "vinegar, gall"). When, due to scholarly disagreement, there is a choice of different interpretations, the problem - as far as the translators are concerned - reverts to that of polysemy, and their renderings will diverge accordingly; the word "hent" (III,iii,88), for instance, is translated by Burgersdijk and Voeten as "tijd" ("time" = "occasion") and, in a slight variant on this sense, by Buddingh' as "uur" ("hour"); by Van Suchtelen as "dood" ("death", in the sense of: "execution") and by Van Looy, Van Dam and Courteaux, directly or paraphrastically, as "greep" or "stoot" ("grip", "stroke, thrust").

generous in that" and "Doth all the noble substance often dout".

1 bonds: The reading adopted by Wilson, after Rowe and Knight. Munro has followed Theobald's emendation to: bawds.
In a similar case, that of "abridgement" (II,ii,400), Burgersdijk, Van Dam, Voeten and Courteaux have chosen to read it as "pastime, diversion" (respectively: tijkkorters, verstrooiing, tijdpassering, tijdverdrijf); Van Looy has settled for the alternative: "besnoeiing" ("curtailment"), while Van Suchtelen has ingeniously caught both senses in: "daar komt mijn tijdverkorting mij onderbreken" ("there my pastime comes to interrupt me") and Buddingh' has evaded the issue with the vague paraphrase: "daar komen anderen mijn aandacht vragen" ("there others come to demand my attention").

Distinct from this are what one might call diachronic and cultural obscurities, i.e. expressions and elements of imagery, sometimes of a proverbial or folkloristic nature, which may have been immediately understood by Shakespeare's contemporaries and are possibly still meaningful to at least part of the modern English public, but which, no matter how exactly translated, are merely enigmatic or entirely meaningless to a Dutch audience - or, at best, retain their prima facie meaning but are without any further significance.

_Hamlet_ has its fair share of terms and expressions that belong to this category; the "nunnery" Hamlet advises Ophelia to go to (see p.345) could be considered one of them, and Voeten's version of it is symptomatic of the frustrating obstacles they present to translators: should the rendering be literal or, in some way, exegetical? The problem, as in the case of Voeten's "hoerenhuis", is that an exegetical rendering tends to rob the passage in question of any subtlety it may have, and thereby produces an ugly rent in the unique poetic fabric of Shakespeare's language; - as would, for instance, Hamlet's calling Polonius a "koppelaar" ("pandar") instead of a "visventer" ("fishmonger": II,ii,173), or saying plainly that he objects to being called a son by his mother's seducer, who has, besides, robbed him of his rightful inheritance - when all this can be hinted at so beautifully in the simple rejoinder: "Not so, my lord: I am too much in the sun." (I,ii,67) which, unfortunately, is all but lost in any Dutch translation. How would the delicacy of Ophelia's mad-scene stand up to a translation that would, somehow, attempt to clarify the nature of the songs she sings, or to explain the aptness of the way she distributes her field flowers? What else can translators do with the topical matter contained in Hamlet's conversation with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern about the ascendance of the child-actors, but reproduce it as they find it? Is there any way to suggest within the text what Hamlet really seems to have in mind when he calls the rumbling Ghost in the cellarage "Truempenny" and "A worthy pioner" (I,v,150 and 163)? Whether the first of these apppellations is translated as "aardgeest" ("earth-spirit": Burgersdijk) or "trouwe ziel" ("faith-
ful soul": Van Looy), and the second as "delver" ("digger"), "pionier" ("pioneer") or "genist" ("engineer"), neither will convey to a twentieth-century Dutch reader or listener that Hamlet is pretending to invoke a familiar demon, for no other purpose than to mislead Marcellus and ensure his discretion. Some translators wisely follow their text editors' examples in such cases, and content themselves with giving an explanatory foot note; but occasionally an attempt is made at a more immediate solution of such a "cultural crux". An interesting example of this is what the earliest, and the most recent Hamlet translator have done with that troublesome expression:

II,ii,359-360: ...when the wind is southerly I know a hawk from a handsaw.

Most of the translators, taking - on the authority of their editors - "handsaw" to be a corruption of the word "hernshaw", have settled for the falconry image of a bird of prey ("havik" or "valk") pursuing a heron ("reiger"), in the hope that it will speak for itself and suggest something about the relationship between Claudius and Hamlet, or between Hamlet and Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. But Roorda van Eysinga and Courteaux have tried to relate the expression to Dutch proverbial usage; the former by rendering it as:

als de wind zuidelijk is, onderscheid ik een' knol van een' citroen. ("when the wind is southerly, I distinguish a turnip from a lemon." - i.e.: "I know chalk from cheese")

and the latter, as:

als de wind zuid is, kan ik een uil van een valk onderscheiden. ("when the wind is south(early), I can distinguish an owl from a falcon")

Roorda van Eysinga evidently understood the expression, but has created an incongruous and puzzling mixed metaphor by retaining the compass directions relating to the falconry image; Courteaux has come a little nearer the mark by adapting the Dutch saying Elk meent zijn uil een valk te zijn ("Everyone takes his owl to be a falcon", - i.e.: people are inclined to overrate the value of trifling possessions they cherish) and converted it into something approaching the sense of "to know chalk from cheese" - but the relationship of predator and prey is lost nevertheless, and the "havik"-"reiger" translation remains preferable.

The various problems discussed so far are legitimate - in the sense that they cannot be solved by a better understanding of the text, nor even by a particularly high degree of poetic ingenuity. Although the competence of several Dutch Shakespeare translators of this century might be questioned because of their lack of creative talent as poets and dramatists - or even simply: their ineptitude at manipulating their
own language, - very few of them are to be dismissed on the grounds of a clearly inadequate understanding of the text: if details of interpretation are occasionally debatable, they are usually based on the authority of some dissenting text editor. So when small, but significant details are needlessly lost in translation, this is more likely to be attributable to carelessness or insensitivity than to mere ignorance. Van Suchtelen, for instance, is the only translator who has observed the telling shift from a formal to a familiar tone in Claudius' address to Laertes (I,ii,42-50):

And now, Laertes, what's the news with you? You told us of some suit; what is't, Laertes? You cannot speak of reason to the Dane, And lose your voice. What wouldst thou beg, Laertes, That shall not be my offer, not thy asking? The head is not more native to the heart, The hand more instrumental to the mouth, Than is the throne of Denmark to thy father. What wouldst thou have, Laertes?

("And now, Laertes, what news do you bring? / You spoke of a request; what is't, Laertes? / If you speak a reasonable word to the Dane / It is not lost; It is not lost; what canst thou ask me / That I would not gladly give thee, even unrequested? / The head entertains ("feeds") no truer friendship for the heart, / The hand is not more helpful to the mouth, / Than Denmark's king to thy father. / What dost thou wish, speak, Laertes.")

This subtlety has simply been overlooked by all the other translators - even by Burgersdijk, the one that would be least expected to be careless about dramatically effective details. Another slip of this nature - confined to Voeten, this time - is the failure to observe the aloofness Hamlet assumes towards Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern ("My excellent good friends!" ... "Good lads,": II,ii,219, 220) once he has become aware of their duplicity, signalled by his formal: "Gentlemen, you are welcome to Elsinore" (1.352), which Voeten has translated as "Vrienden ("Friends"), jullie bent welkom op Elseneur" - while a little further on in the scene, he waywardly has him welcome the actors with: "Welkom, mijne heren" ("Welcome, gentlemen") where Shakespeare has: "You are welcome, masters" (1.401).

As has been shown above, some dilution of Shakespeare's metaphoric superstructure is unfortunately inevitable; however, a comparative study shows that there is considerable variety in the extent to which different translators have retained elements of imagery - and this not necessarily in proportion to their varying degrees of poetic sensitivity or adroitness. A fairly extended sample passage will serve
to show the, in that respect, characteristic difference between Van Looy and Voeten - whose Hamlet translations are the only ones that have been performed by professional companies in the Netherlands in the course of this century.

I, iv, 23-36:

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

Van Looy:

Zoals het vaak gebeurt bij enkelingen,
Dat wegens 'n zieke steë in hun natuur,
Iets aangeboorns, (waaraan zij schuldloos zijn,
Daar toch natuur haar oorsprong niet kan kiezen)
't Zij door de weeldrijheid van somger aard,
Wat soms vernielt der rede stut en steunsels;
Of door 'n aanwensel, dat te sterk doorzuurde
De erkende levensvormen; - dat die menschen,
Dus dragend, zeg ik, 't merk van één mismaking,
Zijnde natuurs knechtskleed of doem van 't lot,-
Al waren als genade puur hun deugden,
Zoo vlekloos als een mensch ze dragen kan,
Voor 't algemene oordeel zijn besmet
Door die bizondere fout.

("As it often happens with individuals,
That due to a diseased spot in their nature,
Something inborn, (wherein they are guiltless,
Since nature can after all not choose her origin)
Be it by the luxuriance of some disposition,
That sometimes destroys reason's prop and supports;
Or by a habit that too strongly has leavened
The recognized forms of life; - that those men,

Voeten:

Zo komt het dikwijls voor dat sommige mensen
die, door de een of andere voze plek
in hun natuur - waar zij geen schuld aan dragen,
want de natuur kiest zelf haar oorsprong niet -
een overheersende karaktertrek
die alle schansen van de rede neerhaalt,
of door een hebbelijkheid die al te zeer
de goede vormen overschaduwt, dat
die mensen, zeg ik, door één smet getekend,
't zij aangeboren of door 't lot bepaald -
al zijn hun andre deugden wit als sneeuw en
zo talrijk als de mens maar kan bezitten,
op grond van zulk een fout door iedereen
voor slecht gehouden worden.

("So it often occurs that some men
who, by some flaccid spot or other
in their nature - in which they bear no guilt,
for nature does not choose her origin herself -
a dominant trait of character
that pulls down all the redoubts of reason,
or by a habit that all too much
overshadows good manners, that
Thus bearing, I say, the mark of one deformity, being nature's servants' garb or doom of fate, —
Though were their virtues as pure as mercy,
As spotless as a man may bear them,
For the general judgement are tainted
By that particular fault.

those men, I say, marked by one blemish,
— be it inborn or determined by fate —
though their other virtues are as white as snow and
as numerous as man may but possess them,
on the grounds of such a fault by everyone
are considered (to be) bad.

There has been occasion to take a very dim view of Van Looy's merits as a translator in previous chapters, on account of the often deplorable phonetic and rhythmic qualities of his work, and the extraordinary liberties he has taken with basic structural features of his mother tongue. In all fairness, he must not only be credited with a generally sound understanding of Shakespeare's vocabulary and imagery, but also commended for the valiant, if frequently misguided attempts he made to reproduce them as faithfully as possible — witness the passage above. Bert Voeten, on the other hand, whose adequate understanding of the text cannot be doubted either, too often dispenses with eloquent details of imagery for the sake of unencumbered and euphonious (but not necessarily always very poetic) verse: — a practice that is not validly supported by his avowed principle of removing or elucidating pointless obscurities; there is nothing obscure or pointless in the metaphors that have been lost in his version of this passage. This aspect of Voeten's work will come under closer scrutiny in the next chapter.

While it is not possible to subject the work of all Dutch translators to a detailed study within the scope of this chapter, a selection of passages and their various renderings will help to give an impression of the degree to which a number of them — in the face of the general limitations discussed above — have managed to capture Shakespeare's meaning, and an indication of how they rate in relation to each other in that respect. An attempt has been made to offer as broad as possible a spectrum of Shakespeare's use of language, from fairly workaday to metaphorically highly complex verse, and some characteristic prose.

Through this the well-beloved Brutus stabbed;
And as he plucked his cursed steel away,
Mark how the blood of Caesar followed it,
As rushing out of doors, to be resolved
If Brutus so unkindly knocked or no,
For Brutus, as you know, was Caesar's angel.

Judge, O you gods, how dearly Caesar loved him!  
This was the most unkindest cut of all;  
For when the noble Caesar saw him stab,  
Ingratitude, more strong than traitors' arms,  
Quite vanquished him. Then burst his mighty heart;  
And, in his mantle muffling up his face,  
Even at the base of Pompey's statuë,  
Which all the while ran blood, great Caesar fell.

Koster:
Hierdoo stak Brutus, zoo door hem geliefd;  
En, toen hij 't vloekb're staal rukte uit de wond,  
Merkt op hoe Caesar's bloed het volgde, alsof  
Het buitenshuis rende om gewis te zijn  
Of Brutus zoo onvriend'lijk klopte, of niet;  
Want Brutus, naar ge weet, was Caesars engel:  
Getuigt, o goön, hoezeer hem Caesar liefhad!  
Dàt was wel de aller-allerverredeste stoost;  
Toen de eed'le Caesar toch hem stootten zag,  
Verwond hem de ondank gansch, veel sterker dan  
Verraderswaap'nen: toen brak 't machtig hart,  
En in zijn mantel hulidend zijn gelaat,  
Viel aan het voetstuk van Pompeius' beeld,  
Dat al dien tijd van bloed droop, groote Caesar.

Marcellus¹:
En hier stak hem zijn teerbeminde Brutus!  
En toen hij wegtrok zijn misdadig mes, —  
Ziet, hoe het bloed van Caesar haastig volgde,  
Alsof 't naar buiten rende, om te hooren  
Of 't Brutus was, die zóó hevendachtig klopte,  
Want Brutus, weet gij wel, was Caesars zoon.  
Gij, Goden, weet, hoe Caesar hem beminde heeft!  
Dat was de wredeste steek, dien Caesar voelde!  
Want, toen die trouwe man zag Brutus' dolk, —  
Toen wierp ondankbaarheid, nog sterker dan  
De wapens des verraads, hem gansch terneer!  
Toen brak het krachtig hart van onzez Caesar!  
Het aangezicht gehuld in zijnen mantel,

¹ Italics have been used to indicate where bold or spaced type occurred in the edition of Marcellus' 
Julius Caesar (Amsterdam, 1908).
Vlak voor het voetstuk van Pompejus' standbeeld,  
Dat medebloede al dieen tijd, - viel Caesar!

Verkade:
En zie hier stak hem zijn geliefde Brutus,  
en toen terug trok hij zijn vloekbaar mes,  
Zie, hoe het bloed van Caesar schielijk volgde  
Alsof 't naar buiten liep, om te vernemen  
Of het wel Brutus was, die zoó kon kloppen.  
Want, zoo gij weet, was Brutus Caesars engel;  
Gij, Goden, weet, hoe lief hem Caesar had;  
Die stoot was het meest harteloos van allen,  
Want toen d' eedle Caesar zag zijn dolk,  
Trof zwaarder nog dan de verraders arm  
Hem de ondankbaarheid. Toen brak zijn hart,  
En met zijn mantel 't aangezet bedekkend,  
Vlak voor het voetstuk van Pompejus' standbeeld,  
Dat meegbloed had al dieen tijd, viel Caesar.

Fleerackers:
en hier stak Brutus, Brutus zoo bemind!  
En toen hij zijn vervloekte dolk terugtrok,  
ziet, hoe het bloed van Caesar schielijk volgde,  
alsof 't naar buiten stortte om uit te zien,  
of 't waarlijk Brutus was die zoó barsch klopte.  
Want Brutus, als gij weet, was Caesars engel.  
Goden, getuigt hoe lief hem Brutus was.  
Dit was voorwaar de wredeste stoot van al;  
Toen de eedle Caesar Brutus stooten zag,  
sloeg, sterker dan de dolken der verraders,  
ondank hem neer. Toen brak zijn machtig hart.  
En met zijn mantel zijn gelaat onhullend,  
daar, aan het voetstuk van Pompejus' standbeeld,  
waar al dieen tijd het bloed van afdroop, viel  
de groot Caesar!

Buddingh':
Hier stiet de zo beminde Brutus door,  
En toen hij het vervloekte staal wegrukte;  
Merkt op, hoe 't bloed van Caesar het bleef volgen,  
Naar buiten gutste, om te zien of 't werk'lijk  
Brutus was, die zo wreed aanklopte, of niet:  
Want Brutus, als gij weet, was Caesar's engel.

Right in front of the pedestal of Pompey's statue,  
Which bled along all that time, - fell Caesar!

("And see here stabbed him his beloved Brutus,  
And when drew back he (sio) his damnable knife,  
See, how the blood of Caesar swiftly followed  
As if it went outside, to learn  
If it really was Brutus, who could knock thus,  
For, as you know, Brutus was Caesar's angel;  
You, Gods, know, how Caesar loved him;  
That stab was the most heartless of all,  
For when the noble Caesar saw his dagger,  
Heavier still than the arm of (a) traitor(s) struck  
Him (the) ingratitude. Then broke his heart,  
And with his mantle covering his face,  
Right in front of the pedestal of Pompey's statue,  
Which had bled along all that time, fell Caesar.")

("And here stabbed Brutus, Brutus so beloved!  
And when he drew back his cursed dagger,  
see, how the blood of Caesar swiftly followed,  
as if it plunged outside to see out,  
if it were truly Brutus who knocked so grimly.  
For Brutus, as you know, was Caesar's angel.  
Gods, testify how dear Brutus was to him.  
This was verily the cruelest stab of all;  
when the noble Caesar saw Brutus stab,  
struck, stronger (or: more strongly) than the  
daggers of the traitors,  
ingratitude him down. Then broke his mighty heart.  
And with his mantle enveloping his countenance,  
there, at the pedestal of Pompey's statue,  
from which all that time the blood dripped (off), fell  
(the) great Caesar.")

("Here stabbed the so beloved Brutus through,  
And when he tore the cursed steel away;  
Mark, how Caesar's blood continued to follow it,  
Gushed outside, to see if it were really  
Brutus, who knocked so cruelly, or no(t):  
For Brutus, as you know, was Caesar's angel.")
Taking Koster's rendering as a norm—with possibly Buddingh's version of 1.172, his (and Burgersdijk's) "oordeelt" in 1.178, and 11.181-182 as slight improvements—it is clear how precisely the content and even the structure of these lines can be reproduced in Dutch without causing undue awkwardness; although traditional syllable contractions figure prominently in Koster's version, they are, by and large, not of a nature to render his lines inarticulate or inordinately cluttered and hard to speak. This readily proves that there is no justification for the extraordinary paraphrastic liberties Marcellus has taken in what looks like an attempt to "improve" on Shakespeare where he must have felt he did not express himself strongly enough ("teer-beminde" for "well-beloved" in 1.172; "misdadig" for "cursed" in 1.173; "om te hooren" for "to be resolved" in 1.175, "hardvochtig" for "unkindly" in 1.176; "zoon" for "angel" in 1.177; "dien Caesar voele" in 1.179, "die trouwe man" for "Caesar" in 1.180, "van onzeen Caesar" in 1.182), or even for the slighter departures that can be observed in Verkade's and Fleerackers' versions, particularly where they do not contribute anything of poetic or dramatic value. The Van-Looy-ish structural oddities in 1.173 and 180 of the former strike one merely as maladroit; Fleerackers', however, shows a few gains: the organization of 11.181-182 has placed the word "ondank" in a dramatically strong position, as his spreading of 1.185 has the word "viel", which in no other way can take the final stress as "fell" does in the original text.

Two features of this passage illustrate the problem of polysemy discussed on pp.345-346: the use of "unkindly" and "unkindest" in 11.176 and 179, and the "traitors' arms" of 1.181. The latter is simply a matter of choice between two interpretations: Koster, Marcellus, Fleerackers (and Courteaux) have chosen one (arms = weapons), (Burgersdijk,) Verkade and Buddingh' the other (arms = limbs). But the former is more clearly an instance of intentional ambiguity: particularly in 1.179 the interpretation "most unnatural" suggests itself at least as strongly as "most unfriendly". None of the translators have attempted to indicate that the same word was used, or that it carried a potential double meaning. It is inter-
esting to note that only Burgersdijk - whose version has not been quoted - translated it in 1.179 as: (van alle) "t onnatuurlijkst" ("of all, the most unnatural"). - Buddingh's rendering of the passage departs from Burgersdijk's in many details: only 11.177, 181, 184 and 185 have been left unchanged; some of his departures (e.g. in 1.176) correspond with Koster's version. The nature of Buddingh's work as a revision of Burgersdijk's translations will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. Borrowings from predecessors can be observed with most translators: their similar renderings of 11.178, 180, 184 and 185 suggest that Verkade was familiar with Marcellus' version; Fleerackers, in turn, probably knew both Verkade's and Burgersdijk's translations. with which he shares a few features, and Courteaux's version (which, like Burgersdijk's, has not been quoted) contains echoes from a number of his predecessors. However, in lines where a word-for-word rendering is possible, a close correspondence between different versions is inevitable, and certainly no proof of imitation.

A Midsummer Night's Dream,
III, ii, 289-298:

Puppet? why so! Ay, that way goes the game.
Now I perceive that she hath made compare
Between our statures; she hath urged her height;
And with her personage, her tall personage,
Her height, forsooth, she hath prevailed with him.
And are you grown so high in his esteem,
Because I am so dwarfish and so low?
How low am I, thou painted maypole? Speak!
How low am I? I am not yet so low
But that my nails can reach unto thine eyes.

Burgersdijk:

Ben ik een nufje? - Zoo! was dat uw spel?
Nu zie ik, dat zij mijne en hare leest
Hem vergelijken deed; zij liet hem zien,
Hoe lang, hoe rank, hoe schraal zij was, en wist
Hem in te pakken met haar lang figuur! -
En zijt gij groot geworden in zijn gunst,
Omdat ik zulk een dwerg ben, nietig klein?
Hoe klein ben ik, gij bonte boonstaek?
hoe klein ben ik? zoo klein toch niet, dat ik
Uw oogen met mijn nagels niet bereik!

Rensburg:

Speelpop? Waarom; ah, gaat het spel daarheen?
Nu merk ik, dat ze van ons het figuur
Heeft vergeleke', 'r lengte gelden deed

("Am I a little Miss Pert? - So! was that your game?
Now I see, that she...my and her shape ("last")
Made him compare; she made him see,
How tall, how slender, how gaunt she was, and managed
To take him in with her tall figure! -
And are you grown great in his favour,
Because I am such a dwarf, miserably small?
How small am I, you gaudy bean-stake?
How small am I? yet not so small, that I
Will not reach your eyes with my nails!")

("(a toy--)Doll! Why; ah, does the game go that way?
Now I observe, that she... our figures
Has compared, drew attention to her height
En met haar grootte, grootte van persoon
En lengte, zeker, won ze het bij hem.
En zijt gij in zijn achting zoo verhoogd,
Daar ik maar zoo overgachtig ben en klein?
Hoe klein ben ik, geverfde Meiboom, spreek:
Hoe klein ben ik? Toch ben ik niet zoo klein,
Of 'k sla mijn nagels in uw oogen wel!

Van Suchtelen:

Pop? En waarom? Ah, dít bedoelde uw spel!
Nu merk ik dat ge hem onze gestalte
Hebt laten vergelijken! Ja, zij heeft
Gesnoeefd op haar figuur en door haar lengte,
De lange lat, heeft zij hem dus verleid.
En staat ge nu zoo hoog dan in zijn gunst,
Omdat ik klein en kort ben als een dwerg?
Hoe klein wel ben ik, opgedirkte meiboom!
Hoe kort ben ik? Kom, spreek. Toch niet zo kort
Dat niet mijn nagels tot uw ogen reiken!

Werneus Buning:

Klein, poppejijn? ha; als 't spel zoo moet zijn
Weet ik 't tenminste; zij maakt vergelijk
Tussen haar staat, en mij; welnu, dat zij!
In tengerheid en lengte slaat ze mij.
En won uw hoogheid (ha, uw hoogheid!), zoo zijn
hart!

Won uwe lengte in zoo korten tijd
Omdat ik arme dwerg hem lager sta?
Hoe klein dan wel, gij Mei-paal? Zeg eens op!
Kijk hoe mijn nagels nog veel kleiner zijn,
Waarom ik de oogen krab u uit de kop?

Verspoor:

Ledeop, làág...is dat jou spelletje?
Dat heb ik dan doorzien. Zij vergelijkt ons
naar ons figuur. Zij heeft haar lengte mee!

Die wist ze dan maar wát goed uit te spelen:
Haar lengte heeft Lysander ingepalmd!
Ben je in zijn achting dan zó hoog gestegen
omdat ik klein ben en laag bij de gronds?
Hoe laag ben ik, jij opgemaakte lat?

And with her size, (the) size of her person
And height, forsooth, she prevailed with him.
And are you so heighted in his esteem,
Because I am so dwarfish and small?
How small am I, painted May-tree, speak:
How small am I? Yet am I not so small,
But I'll still strike my nails into your eyes!"

("Puppet? And why? Ah, this (is what) your game meant!
Now I observe that you... our statures
Have made him compare! Yea, she has
Boasted of her figure and with her height,
(The) long lath, she has seduced him thus.
And do you rate now so high (then) in his favour,
Because I am small and short like a dwarf?
How small then am I, prinked-up may-tree?
How short am I? Come, speak. Yet not so short
That my nails do not reach unto your eyes!"

("Small, little doll? hah, if the game has to be thus
At least I know it; she makes compare
Between her state, and me; well then, so be it!
In slenderness and height she beats me.
And did your highness (hah, your highness!), thus win
his heart!

Did your height prevail in so short a time
Because I poor dwarf rate lower with him?
How small then, you May-pole? Speak up!
Look how much smaller still my nails are,
With which I'll scratch the eyes out of your head!"

("Manikin, low...is that thy little game?
Then I have seen through it. She compares us
According to our figure(s). She has the advantage
of her height!
She certainly knew how to make the best of that!
Her height has captivated Lysander!
Art thou then risen so high in his esteem
because I am small and lowly ("low-near-the-ground")?
How low am I, thou trussed-up lath?"

("Manikin, low...is that thy little game?
Then I have seen through it. She compares us
According to our figure(s). She has the advantage
of her height!
She certainly knew how to make the best of that!
Her height has captivated Lysander!
Art thou then risen so high in his esteem
because I am small and lowly ("low-near-the-ground")?
How low am I, thou trussed-up lath?"
Hoe laag? Zeg óp! Nog altijd niet zo laag dat mijn nagel niet tot in je ogen kan.

How low? Speak up! Yet still not so low that my nail(s) cannot (reach) unto your eyes."

The differences between the various renderings of this passage are more marked than with the excerpt from Julius Caesar; most of the translators seem to have tried to capture the mood of Hermia’s speech rather than give a word-for-word equivalent of it. The most important reason for this is undoubtedly the difficulty of reproducing the semantic sequence: stature - height - (tall) personage - high - dwarfish - low in a fully satisfactory way; in Dutch, the prima facie sense equivalents of "height", "high" and "low" are "hoogte", "hoog" and "laag" - but none of these are normally used to refer to physical stature; only the terms "lengte" ("length" and "height"), "lang" and "kort" ("long" and "tall", and "short") or "groot" and "klein" ("great, large, big" and "small") have this particular collocation. On the other hand, "hoog" and "laag" do fit the senses of "exalted" and "base" which "high" and "low" also assume in this passage. So diversification of terminology is inevitable, and each of the translators has gone about this in a different way. After making the best of diversity in his rendering of 11.292-293 (lang - rank - schraal - lang), Burgersdijk has settled for the "groot"-"klein" antithesis. Rensburg vacillates between "lengte" and "grootte", then moves on to "verhoogd" in its figurative sense, but, like Burgersdijk, consistently translates "low" by "klein", while Van Suchtelen alternates between "klein" and "kort". In an otherwise unsatisfactory rendering Werumeus Buning displays some ingenuity in his exploitation of the word "hoogheid" in 1.293; Verspoor alone has ventured, quite successfully, to stretch the sense of "laag" sufficiently to retain it as a translation for "low", but has used the conventional "lengte" for "height" in 11.291 and 293, hinging his verbal contrast entirely on the figurative "hoog" in 1.294.

As the variety of renderings suggests, the word "Puppet" also poses something of a semantic problem; Burgersdijk has translated it as a "petite, prim girl or woman"; the others have used variants of the word "pop", which can mean both "doll" and "puppet", but is often used also as a term of endearment, - the reason, probably, why it was rejected by Burgersdijk. Verspoor's "lederepop" is a poor choice, as the word is applied figuratively to a lanky, loose-jointed rather than a short person. - Of the various translations of "painted maypole", the least literal, Burgersdijk's "bonte boonenstaak", is the most satisfying.

Macbeth, I,v,38-52:

Come, you spirits
That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here,
And fill me, from the crown to the toe, top-full
Of direst cruelty! Make thick my blood,
Stop up th' access and passage to remorse,
That no compunctions visiting of nature
Shake my fell purpose, nor keep peace between
Th' effect and it! Come to my woman's breasts,
And take my milk for gall, you murth'ring ministers,
Wherever in your sightless substances
You wait on nature's mischief! Come, thick night,
And pall thee in the dunnest smoke of hell,
That my keen knife see not the wound it makes,
Nor heaven peep through the blanket of the dark,
To cry 'Hold, hold!'

Koster:
Komt, gij geesten, komst,
Die moordgedachten kweekt, ontsekst mij hier,
En vult mij overvol van kruin tot zool
Met felste wreedheid, en verdikt mijn bloed,
Verstopt den doorgang tot de deernis gansch,
Opdat niet met haar wroeging-stem natuur
Schokke mijn gruwzaam plan, noch vrede geev'
Daartusschen en de daad! Sluipt in mijn borsten,
Geef gal voor melk mij, dienaars van den moord,
Waar ge ook in uw onzichtb'ren wezensvorm
De boosheen der natuur dient! Kom nu, nacht,
En mantel u in dichtsten hellerook!
Dat mijn bits mes de wond niet zie die 't maakt,
De hemel niet door duisters dekkleed tuur'
En roep': "Halt! Halt!"

Van Looy:
Komt, komt, demonen,
Kweekers van moordgedacht, ontsekst mij hier,
En vult van kruin tot teen mij top-vol op
Met barre wreedheid! Maak dik 't bloed mijn,
Stop op den mond, de gangen naar de wroeging,
Opdat geen welling van natuur, geen meelij
Vervikke mijn fel plan, noch spoel' verzoening
Tusschen hét en d'uitslag. Komt aan mijn borsten
En neemt mijn melk voor gal, moordende helpers,
Waar ge ook in uw onzichtb're aanwezigheid
Loert op natuur haar zonden! Kom, nacht dik,

("Come, you spirits, come, That breed thoughts of murder, unsex me here,
And fill me to overflowing from crown to sole With fiercest cruelty, and thicken my blood,
Block the passage to pity completely,
That not with her voice of remorse nature Shake my gruesome plan, nor make peace
Between it and the deed! Sneak into my breasts, Give me gall for milk, servants of murder,
Wherever you in your invisible form of being Serve the evils of nature! Come now, night,
And cloak yourself in densest hell-smoke!
That my keen knife see not the wound it makes,
Heaven peer not through darkness' coverlet
And cry: "Hold! Hold!'')

("Come, come, demons, Breeders of thought of murder, unsex me here,
And fill me up from crown to toe top-full With dire cruelty! Make thick the blood mine (sio),
Stop up the mouth, the passages to remorse,
That no impulse of nature, no compassion
Move my fierce plan, nor wash reconciliation
Between it and the outcome. Come to my breasts
And take my milk for gall, murdering assistants,
Wherever you in your invisible presence
Lie in wait for nature's sins! Come, night thick,
Wikkels u in den dichtsten smook der hel,
Dat mijn scherp mes niet zie wat wonde 't maakt;
Geen hemel pincoog' door des duisters deken,
En roep' halt..

Helpt mij, geesten,
die moordgedachten teelt, laat mij niet langer
een vrouw zijn, maar doordrenkt mijn hele wezen
met felle wreederheid! Komt, verdikt mijn bloed,
spert elke toegang af voor medelij, opdat geen man end knagen van 't geweten
't wreed opzet schokke, of vredestichtend trede
tussen toeleg en daad. Kom aan mijn borst,
en meng mijn melk met alsem, doodstrawanten, waár ook je wezenloze wezenheid
mensen tot misdaad drijft! Kom, donk're nacht,
en hul je in de zwarteste hellewarm,
dat mijn scherp mes niet zie wat wonde 't slaat,
en schreeuw: laat af!

Help me, spirits,
That breed thoughts of murder, let me no longer
be a woman, but impregnate my whole being
with fierce cruelty! Come, thicken my blood,
bar every access for compassion,
that no admonitory twinge of conscience
shake the cruel intention, or tread pacifyingly
between design and deed. Come to my breast,
and mix my milk with wormwood, henchmen of death,
wherever your vacuous being
prompts men to crime! Come, dark night,
and envelop thyself in the blackest vapour of hell,
that my sharp knife see not what wound it makes,
and shriek: desist! -

Help me, spirits,
That breed thoughts of murder, let me no longer
be a woman, but impregnate my whole being
with fierce cruelty! Come, thicken my blood,
bar every access for compassion,
that no admonitory twinge of conscience
shake the cruel intention, or tread pacifyingly
between design and deed. Come to my breast,
and mix my milk with wormwood, henchmen of death,
wherever your vacuous being
prompts men to crime! Come, dark night,
and envelop thyself in the blackest vapour of hell,
that my sharp knife see not what wound it makes,
and shriek: desist! -

Come, you throng of spirits
That sows thoughts of murder, unsex ("-woman") me now,
And pour me brimful, from crown to toes,
With dreadful cruelty! Make my blood congeal,
Bar every road and access for pity;
No fearful admonishing of conscience shock
My grim purpose, or make peace between
The deed and the plan! Come into my woman's breast
And turn my milk into gall, you demons of murder,
Wherever in dense veils of mist you lie in wait
For mischief and corruption! Come, black night,
Envelop yourself in filthiest vapour of hell, that not
My biting knife see(s) the wound it cuts,
Nor through the (its) cover heaven peep(s) and cries:
"Hold, hold!"

Comparing this excerpt and its translations with the previous examples, in which instances of polysemy played a more or less prominent part, an interesting fact emerges: that metaphors as such, even in as high a concentration as they occur here, do not necessarily pose a serious problem, although some details
- e.g. "compunctious visitings" (1.43) - demand modification of some kind. Once again, Koster's version can serve as a norm whereby to judge the accomplishments of his successors. Here, as in Hamlet (see p. 348), archaically used words have been transposed into modern equivalents: "sightless" (1.47) has been translated as "invisible" by all, "remorse" (1.42) as "pity, compassion" by all but Van Looy, "ministers" (1.46) as "servants" by all but Courteaux. Remarkably, these four translators have unanimously read "tend on" in 1.39 as "breed, generate" rather than "attend, wait on" - the interpretation accepted by Kok and Burgersdijk (respectively: "die...vergezelt" ("that accompany") and: "begeleiders / Van" ("attendants / Of")) - but they are divided in their readings of "wait on" in 1.48: only Koster has translated it as "serve", while Van Looy and Courteaux have chosen "lie in wait for"; Diels has taken the way of least resistance in a paraphrastic rendering. The accommodation of both "access" and "passage" has been managed by Van Looy and Courteaux, while Koster and Diels have made do with one of the two. - A small syntactic dilemma arises from the word "to" in the same line (42): is "to remorse" a prepositional qualifier of "access and passage" or an adjunct relating directly to "Stop up"? Koster and Van Looy have chosen the first (to: "tot", "naar"), Diels and Courteaux the latter alternative (to: "voor"). It is regrettable that the two recent translators have failed to retain the keyword "nature" in their renderings of 11.43 and 48; the almost diametrically opposed meanings the word assumes in these two instances are of great significance to the whole context. Apart from this, and his unsatisfactory rendering of 11.46b-47, Courteaux's translation is very faithful; but in Diels' version too many elements of imagery have been needlessly watered down, and his "wezenloze wezenheid" in 1.47 has nothing but sound to recommend it. Van Looy's is, as usually, marred by manneristic syntactic oddities such as "'t bloed mijn" and "nacht dik".

Romeo and Juliet, I,1,1-9:  
Sam. Gregory, on my word, we'll not carry coals. -
Gre. No, for then we should be colliers. -
Sam. I mean, and we be in choler, we'll draw. -
Gre. Ay, while you live, draw your neck out of collar. -
Sam. I strike quickly, being moved. -
Gre. But thou art not quickly moved to strike. -
Sam. A dog of the house of Montague moves me. -
Gre. To move is to stir, and to be valiant is to stand. Therefore, if thou art moved, thou runn'st away. -

Burgersdijk:
- Op mijn woord, Gregoor, wij moeten niets langs onzen kant laten gaan. - Zeker niet, want dan ("- Upon my word, Gregory, we must let nothing pass by our side (i.e.:"accept no insult"). - Certainly
krijgen wij er langs. - - Neen, maar dan zal ik mijn kantje wel keeren en van leer trekken. -
- Neen, vriend, je houdt je leeren kolder wel aan, daar ken ik je voor. - - Pas op, als ik eens aan den gang kom, gaat het er op los, of ik den kolder in den kop had. - - Zoo? maar je komt niet gauw aan den gang. - - Een hond van het huis Montague kan me al aan den gang brengen. -
- Aan den gang gaan is te gaan lopen, en een kerel, die een hart in 't lijf heeft, houdt stand; dus, als je aan den gang gaat, loop je weg. -

Van Looy:
- Op mijn woord, Gregorius, we zullen aanpakken. -
- Neen, dan zouden we pakknechten zijn. -
- Ik meen, wij gaan niet bij de pakken neerzitten, we slaan er op los.

- Wel, zoolang als ik je ken, kon jij je biezen goed pakken. -
- Ik sla gauw als ik in roering ben. - - Maar je roert je niet gauw om te slaan. - - Een hond van dat Montagu-huis-brengt me in roering nou. -
- Roeren is bewegen en dapper zijn is staan: wanneer jij beweegt ga je loopen.

Werumeus Buning:
- Gregorio, als wij ze zien, geen klets meer. -
- Zijn wij soms kletsmeiers? - - Als er gekletst moet worden, dan met staal! - - Je kletst er nog al aardig over, gek! - - Ik trek gauw, als ik gek ben! - - Maar je bent niet zoo gauw gek, dat je trekt. - - Dat vee van Montague maakt me zoo gek. -
- Geen gek houdt stand, een wakker man houdt stand. Als jij gek wordt, trek je terug. -

Van der Plas:
- Gregory, ik zeg je één ding, we laten ons niet meer beledigen. - - Natuurlijk niet. - - Ik bedoel, als ze ons kwaad maken geven we ze een veeg uit de pan. -
- Zeer juist: als je het vege lijf wilt redden not, for then we'll get what for. - - No, but then I'll certainly turn my side and go hell-for-leather. -
- No, friend, thou'lt keep thy leather jerkin on, I know thee (well enough) for that. - - Watch out, if I once get going, I'll pitch into them, as if I had the blind staggerers. - - Is that so? but thou dost not get going quickly. - - Even a dog of the house of Montague can get me going. -
- To get going is to go running, and a fellow that has a heart in his body, stays put; so when thou getst going, thou runn'st away. -")

("- Upon my word, Gregory, we'll take matters in hand ("aanpakken": "lay hold of, seize" + "be resolute"). -
- No, then we'd be porters ("pak-knecht": "packet-servant"). - - I mean, we're not going to accept defeat, ("sit down with the packs", i.e.: give up as a bad job) we'll pitch into them. - - Well, as long as I've known thee, thou hast been good at turning thy heels ("grabbing thy rushes": i.e.: flee). -
- I strike quickly when I'm stirred up. - - But thou dost not stir quickly to strike. - - A dog of that house of Montague stirs me now. -
- To stir is to move and to be brave is to stand: when thou mov' st thou goest running. -")

("- Gregory, when we see them, no more twaddle. -
- Are we twaddlers? - - If any clashing is to be done, then with steel! - - Thou jaw'st rather nicely about it, mad (cap, fellow)! - - I draw quickly, when I'm mad! - - But thou art not mad that quickly, that thou draw'st. - - That cattle of Montague's makes me (so) mad. - - No madman stays put, an alert man stays put. When thou goest mad, thou retreat'st.

("- Gregory, I tell thee one thing, we won't let ourselves be insulted any more. - - Of course not. -
- I mean, when they make us angry we'll have a smack at them ("een veeg uit de pan": "a wipe from the pan"). - - Very true: if thou wilt save thy
moet je wachten. -- Ik sla er zo op los als ze me opwinden.
- Maar jij raakt niet zo gauw opgewonden.
- O nee? Zo'n hond van het huis Montague windt me al op.
- Opwinden betekent afdopen; en wie lef heeft blijft staan, dus als jij opgewonden raakt, ga je op de loop.

Courteaux:

- Gregorius, ik zeg je één ding: we laten niet met ons zullen. -- Nee, daarvoor zijn we te so-
lied. -- Ik bedoel, dat we ons zullen gedragen als soldaten. -- Zorg er dan voor, dat je mij geen solo laat spelen. -- Als ik eenmaal aan de gang ga, is er geen tegenhouden meer aan.
- Maar je-gaat niet gemakkelijk aan de gang.
- Een hond van het huis Montecchi wilstaat om me aan de gang te brengen. -- Aan de gang gaan is bewegen, en dapper zijn is pal staan. Bijgevolg, als je aan de gang gaat, loop je weg.

("vege": fey) life thou must wait. -- I pitch into them just like that when they excite me (litt.: wind me up). -- But thou dost not get excited so quickly.
- 0, don't I? Even one of those dogs of the house of Montague excites me.
- Winding up means running down (off); and who has guts stays put, so when thou getst wound-up (ex-
cited), thou goest on the run. --

("Gregory, I tell thee one thing: we won't let our-
selves be trifled with. -- No, we're too solid for that. -- I mean, that we'll behave like soldiers.
- See to it then, that thou wilt not let me play solo. -- Once I get going, stopping (me) is out of the question.
- But thou dost not get going so easily.
- A dog of the house of Montecchi is enough to get me going. -- To get going is to move, and to be brave is to stand firm. Consequently, when thou getst going, thou runn'est away. --")

Metaphrasing these five versions is almost as difficult as translating the original itself, if one wishes to convey, somehow, the way in which the play of words has been reproduced in Dutch. Again, there has been a variety of approaches. The sequence: carry coals - colliers - choler - collar has been paralleled by a set of purely phonic puns by only one of the five: Courteaux (sollen - solied - soldaten - solo).

Burgersdijk and Van Looy, while sticking closer to the sense of the original, have created their effect by semantic word play; Burgersdijk by means of four interlocking sets: langs zijn kant laten gaan - er van langs krijgen (i.e.: "to be given a hiding") - zijn kant(je) keeren - van leer trekken (litt: "to
draw from (the) leather", i.e.: "to go at it with gusto") - leeren korder ("jerkin") - korder in de kop ("frenzy in the head, the blind staggers"); Van Looy, very ingeniously, with a single one: aanpakken - pakknechten - bij de pakken neezitten - zijn biezen pakken.

Werumeus Buning's attempt to make something approximating genuine word play out of klets(en) ("talk nons-
sense, twaddle" - "make a slapping, clashing sound") is very feeble, and degenerates into twaddle indeed with the shift to the word gek ("mad(men)"), which has to generate, by itself, all the wit for the re-
main ing five lines. Van der Plas' weak pun on veeg ("wipe, blow" - "fey, mortal") is not pretentious e-
nough to be disturbing; and he amply makes up for it with the witty find of opwinden - afdopen, which,
unlike Werumeus Buning's *gek*, is opposite to the situation as well. In any case, the last five lines are less difficult to translate satisfactorily; the keywords _move - stir - stand - run away_ have several usable equivalents in Dutch, exploited to good effect by Burgersdijk (aan de gang gaan/komen/brengen - standhouden - weglopen), Van Looy (roeren - bewegen - staan - loopen) and Courteaux (aan de gang gaan/ brengen - bewegen - pal staan - weglopen).

In their renderings of the first four lines of this passage, these five translators have all, with varying degrees of success, resorted to the principle of _compensation_ - i.e. the substitution of an interrelated set of expressions, images or puns in their own language where either word play or meaning or both would be lost in a literal translation: the expression kolen dragen ("carry coals") has no proverbial content in Dutch; and there is no phonological relationship between the words mijnwerker ("miner"), toorn or woede ("choler") and kraag ("collar"). - Even though one may not safely base a judgement of _merit_ on an isolated example such as this, situations where compensation is called for - or, at least, desirable - certainly provide a valid _testing norm_ for a translator's ingenuity. In _King Lear_, for example, there is little to choose between Burgersdijk, Roland Holst and Straat when it comes to their renderings of prose passages; they all display a reasonable understanding of the, at times very difficult, text and have managed to capture the Fool's peculiar brand of wit:

_**King Lear, I, iv, 90-97:**_

_Poor_ Sirrah, you were best take my coxcomb.

_Kent_ Why, Fool?

_Poor_ Why? for taking one's part that's out of favour. Nay, and thou canst not smile as the wind sits, thou'st catch cold shortly. There, take my coxcomb. Why, this fellow has banished two on's daughters, and did the third a blessing against his will. If thou follow him, thou must needs wear my coxcomb.

_Burgersdijk:_

- Vriend, ik raad u in ernst, neem mijn kap aan.
- Waarom, nar?
- Wel, omdat gij partij neemt voor iemand, die in ongenade is gevallen. Ja, ja, als gij niet glimlachend u naar den wind kunt draaien, zult ge spoedig verkouden worden; hier, neem mijn narrekap. Zie eens, die mensch daar heeft twee van zijn dochters verbannen en aan de derde tegen zijn wil

("- Friend, I advise you in earnest, take my cap. -
- Why, fool?
- Well, because you take sides with one that is fallen into disfavour. Ay, ay, if you cannot smilingly turn according to the wind, you will soon catch cold; here, take my fool's cap.

See, that man over there has banished two of his daughters and against his will procured a blessing..."
een zegen bezorgd; als gij zijn volgeling wordt, moet gij bepaald mijn narrekap dragen.

Roland Holst:
- Vriend, ik raad je, neem mijn zotskap maar aan. -
- Waarom, nar? -
- Wel, omdat gij partij trekt voor iemand die uit de gunst viel. Heus, gij draait niet met de wind mee, en gij zult gauw kou vatten; daar, neem mijn zotskap. Kijk, die vent heeft twee van zijn dochters verbannen, en de derde gezegd tegen zijn wil; als je hem volgt, moet je noodig mijn zotskap dragen.

Straat:
- Vreind, jij kunt het best mijn zotskap nemen. -
- Waarom, nar? -

But there is a difference in quality between them, when they are faced with a quibble:

**King Lear, IV,vi,139-144:**

Lear Read. -
Glo. What, with the case of eyes? -
Lear O, ho, are you there with me? No eyes in your head, nor no money in your purse? Your eyes are in a heavy case, your purse in a light. Yet you see how this world goes. -
Glo. I see it feelingly. -

Burgersdijk:

- Lees! - - Wat! met mijn oogkassen lezen! -
0, ho! staan wij er zoo mee? Geen oogen meer in uw hoofd en geen geld meer op zak? Uw oogkassen kunnen nog veel, uw geldkas niets meer lijden; toch ziet ge nog best, hoe het in de wereld toegaat. -
- Ik zie het niet, maar voel het wel. -

("- Read! - - What! read with my case of eyes! -
- 0, ho! is that the situation? No eyes (left) in your head and no money (left) in (your) pocket? Your case of eyes may yet suffer much, your cash-box cannot suffer (i.e.: "afford") anything more; yet you still see very well, how it goes in the world. -
- I do not see it, but I do feel it. -")
Roland Holst:
- Lees! — Wat! Met mijn oogkassen? —
- Ah, zoo! Is dat 't geval? Geen oogen in uw hoofd, en geen geld in uw beurs? Dan hebben uw oogen het zwaar, en uw beurs het licht; en toch kunt ge nog zien hoe 't in de wereld toegaat. —
- Ik zie 't met mijn gevoel. —

Straat:
- Lees! — Wat! Met mijn oogkassen? —
- O ho, wou je daar naartoe? Geen oogen in je hoofd, geen geld in je zak? Jouw oogen hebben het zwaar, je beurs heel licht — toch zie je hoe het staat met deze wereld. —
- Ik zie dat, op de tast. —

("- Read! — What! With my case of eyes? —
- Ah, so! Is that the case (no quibble)? No eyes in your head, and no money in your purse? Then your eyes are in a grave, and your purse in a light condition" (litt: "your eyes have it heavy, your purse light") "; and yet you can still see how it goes in world. — I see it with my feeling. —")

Here, Roland Holst and Straat have made do with a prima facie translation, relinquishing the quibble on "case" as well as the double meaning of "feelingly"; with a little more effort, Burgersdijk has retained both, and besides made excellent use of the two senses of "lijden". Roland Holst might have preserved the ambiguity of "feelingly" by dropping "mijn": "Ik zie 't met gevoel" ("I see it with feeling") would have been superior to Burgersdijk's rather wordy solution.

It may be argued that in a play like King Lear a few puns are hardly missed - particularly in translations that have as many positive qualities as Roland Holst's and Straat's. The situation is different when an entire scene depends, for its effect, on verbal fireworks - as does, for instance, the first encounter of Petruchio and Katherine in The Taming of the Shrew, which besides is complicated by the fact that the verse does not allow for verbal elaboration the way prose did in the examples above.

The Taming of the Shrew,

II,i,193-215:

Petr. ...Myself am moved to woo thee for my wife. —
Kate Moved! In good time: let him that moved you hither
Remove you hence: I knew you at the first
You were a moveable. — Petr. Why, what's a moveable? —
Kate A joint-stool. — Petr. Thou hast hit it: come, sit on me. —
Kate Asses are made to bear, and so are you. —
Petr. Women are made to bear, and so are you. —
Kate No such jade as you, if me you mean. —
Petr. Alas, good Kate, I will not burthen thee!
For knowing thee to be but young and light... —
Kate  Too light for such a swain as you to catch;  
And yet as heavy as my weight should be.  

Petr.  Should be! Should — buzz! — Kate Well ta’en, and like a buzzard.  

Kate  O slow-winged turtle! shall a buzzard take thee?  

Petr.  Ay, for a turtle, as he takes a buzzard.  

Kate  Come, come, you wasp, i'faith, you are too angry.  

Petr.  If I be waspish, best beware my sting.  

Kate  My remedy is then to pluck it out.  

Petr.  Ay, if the fool could find it where it lies.  

Kate  In his tail. — Kate In his tongue. — Petr.  Whose tongue?  

Petr.  What, with my tongue in your tail? Nay, come again!

Van den Berg:

....weldig ik gedrongen naar je hand te dingen. -  
- Gedrongen? Laat hem, die u hierheen drijft,  
u keer van hier dringen; ik zag 't direct,  
i zijn rondburgerig. — Opdringerig?  
- Ja, als een proptsig kakkelmiestertje!  
- Precies raak, met de eerste slag! ga zitten!  
- Eerst zijn er om te dragen, dus jij!  
- Vrouwen zijn er om te dragen, dus jij!  
- Maar niet zo stom om jou te dragen, ik althans!  
- Helaas, lief Kaatje', ik zal je niet tot last zijn,  
want daar ik weet, dat je te jong en licht bent.  

- Te licht en snel voor zoo'n Kloris als jij!  
en toch niet minder dan 'k behoor te wegen.  
- Behoor te wegen?  
Behoor te zeggen! — Leuk! snel als een zwaal!  
- O traagzomene mug, de zwaal houdt u!  
- Ja, voor een mug, als hij niet wijzer is.  
- Kom, kleine wasp, je bent werkelijk te steeklig.  

- Als ik een wasp ben, pas op voor mijn angel.  
- Mijn oplossing daarvoor: ik trek ze uit.  
- Ja, als de dwaas wist waar ze steekt.  
- Wie weet, waar een wasp zijn angel draagt?  
- In zijn staart. — In zijn tong. — Wiens tong?  
- De jouw' als j'over staarten spreekt, adieu.  
- Wat!.. Met mijn tong in jouw staart, dat meen je niet...  

("...I was pressed to sue for thy hand. —  
- Pressed? Let him who pressed you hither,  
press you hence again; I saw it immediately,  
you are obtrusive. — Obtrusive?  
- Yea, like a fiddling little close-stool!  
- Right on the mark, with the first blow! Sit down!  
- Asses are (made) to bear, so (art) thou!  
- Women are (made) to bear, so (art) thou!  
- But not so stupid as to bear thee, I at any rate!  
- Alas, dear Kate, I shall not be a burden to thee,  
(for) because I know, that thou art too young and  
light...  

- Too light and quick for such a swain as thou!  
and yet no less than I ought to weigh.  
- Ought to weigh?  

Ought to be silent! — Jolly! Quick as a swallow!  
- O tardily humming gnat, the swallow holds you!  
- Ay, (takes me) for a gnat, if he is no wiser.  
- Come, little wasp, thou really art too prickly.  

- If I be a wasp, watch out for my sting.  
- My solution to that: I pull it out.  
- Ay, if the fool knew where it sits (or: pricks).  
- Who knows not, where a wasp wears his sting?  

In his tail. — In his tongue. — Whose tongue?  
- Thine, if thou speakest of tails, adieu.  
- What!... With my tongue in thy tail, thou dost not  
mean that...")
Courteaux:

"...That moves me to sue for thy hand."
"Move? Very well, go on moving then,
Move thyself homewards! I knew when I saw thee
That thou art movable. - What is movable?"
"A folding-stool. - Very well, come and sit on
me then."

- Exactly, asses must bear, so, so must thou.
- No, women must bear, so, so must thou.
- No jade like thee, if thou mean me by any chance.
- I do not wish to burden thee, Kate-my-love,
I know that thou art too young and too light.
- So light that I don't let myself be caught by a
peasant.

Yet exactly as heavy as I would (wish to be)."
"A kite, caught? - Heavens, how quick-witted!"
"O tardy turtle, the kite will surely seize thee."
"Beware, this is no turtle without gall!"
"Come, come, thou wasp, thou really art too venomous.
- Well, if I am waspish, avoid my sting."
- That does no harm, I'll pull it out one day.
- Ay, if the silly cur knew where it sits.
- Who knows not where the wasp has her sting?
In the tail it sits. - In her tongue. - Whose
tongue?"
- In thy tongue, twaddler. Now I'm off.
- Why? My tongue thy tail? No, Kate, come,.."

Voeten:

"...bewoog mij om je hand te komen vragen."
"Wat een bewogenheid! Beweeg je nóg eens,
mee ditmaal rechtsomkeert. Ik zag 't meteen:
die zet je zo opzij. - Opzij? Mij? - Ja,
je bent een klapstoe. - Kostelijk, kom maar
zitten."

- Mannen die vrouwen dragen noem ik ezel.
- Je maakt een fout, het is de vrouw die draagt.
- Geen zandruiter als jij, ik zou je danken.
- Ach, lieve kind, ik wil je niet belasten,
je bent zo jong, zo luchtig. - Zeg maar vluchtig,
een kinkel zoals jij kan me niet vangen. -

("...moved me to come and ask for thy hand."
"What an emotion! Move (thyself) once more,
but this time turn tail. I saw it at once:
one sets (shifts) that one aside easily. - Aside?
me? - - Ay,
thou art a folding stool. - Priceless, come and
sit down. -

- Men that bear women, I call asses.
- Thou art mistaken, it is the woman that bears.
- Not a poor horseman ("sand-rider") like thee, thanks.
- Ah, dear child, I don't wish to burden thee,
thou art so young, so ethereal. - Say rather elusive,
a swain such as thou cannot catch me."
- Mijn net is groot. - Toch vlieg ik er niet in.
- Denk aan de lijnstok, vogeltje! - Ik vogel, jij kever - een keer pik, en je bent weg!
- Dit wordt te gek. Je lijkt meer op een wasp.
- Als ik een wasp ben, pas dan op mijn angel.
- Daar weet ik raad mee, wasp, ik trek hem uit.
- Ja, als de sukker hem kan vinden. - Wat! Wie weet niet waar een wasp haar angel heeft?
Van achteren. - Van voren. - 't Is geen tong!
- Je zou 't wel zeggen als je jou hoort praten.
Adieu. - Het is mijn hart dat op mijn tong brandt.
Nee, blijf!...

- My net is large. - Yet I won't fly into it.
- Mind the lime-twig, little bird! - I bird, thou beetle - on(c)e peck, and thou art gone!
- This goes too far, thou art more like a wasp.
- If I be a wasp, then watch out for my sting.
- I know what to do about that, wasp, I pull it out.
- Ay, if the crock can find it. - What! Who knows not where a wasp has her sting?
Behind. - In front. - It's not a tongue!
- One would certainly say so, to hear thee talk.
Adieu. - It is my heart that burns on my tongue.
No, stay!.."

In this scene - as Erik Vos has rightly pointed out¹ - Shakespeare has exploited repetition and parallelism to show the temperamental compatibility of the two characters, by creating a kind of harmony-in-discord. Van den Berg and Courteaux have both perceived this and tried to retain the echo-pattern: Courteaux with greater success than his predecessor. Van den Berg starts of well with the sequence gedrongen - drong - dringen ("compel, urge, push") - opdringerig ("pushy, obtrusive"), but his "protsig kakkemijne-stoeltje" is an awkward non sequitur. In 11.198-199 he has reproduced the original's parallel, but in a somewhat halting rhythm ('|•|•|•|•|•|') in 1.200 he has lost "jade", but compensated for it with a further "dragen". The wegen - zwenken - zwaluw sequence in his rendering of 11.205-206 is maladroit again, but the remainder has been very well managed; the "steekt" in 1.211 even bears the very apt double meaning of "is hidden" and "stings" or "pricks". The "tails"-"tales" pun in 11.213-214 unfortunately cannot be reproduced in Dutch.

Courteaux has wisely settled for the literal translation: bewegen - beweging - beweegbaar in 11.193-196, which may be less witty than Van den Berg's solution, but facilitates the transition to "vouwstoel"; his 11.198-199 are rhythmically unexceptionable, and his translation of "jade" as "knol" is altogether satisfactory. The quibbles "wou"-"wou" and "gevat"-"vatten" in 11.203-206 are very ingenious, and the "gal" in 1.207 even provides a link Shakespeare's chain does not have: the association of a wasp follows logically here, because of the Dutch word "galwesp" ("gall-fly").

Of the three, Voeten has given the slickest, most natural and conversational rendering - but he has

¹ See: op.cit. (p.305, note ¹), pp.421-426.
chosen to ignore the sustained verbal echoes and replaced them by associations of ideas: bewegen - rechtsomkeert - opzij zetten; zitten - dragen - ezels - (zand)ruiter; vluchtig - vangen - net - (in)vliegen - lijmack - vogel(tje). In themselves these associations are quite witty and effective, but the dramatic modus operandi has been shifted from a verbal to an intellectual level, and is therefore basically at odds with Shakespeare's way of portraying the two characters and their relationship.

As has already been shown in Ch.XIV (pp.300-301), rhyme - being a purely phonic element, and as such creating problems akin to those arising from puns - can exercise considerable strain on structural and, above all, semantic fidelity in translation. Even with the most conscientious translators, the accuracy of rendering tends to drop a few degrees when they are dealing with rhyming couplets.

Othello, II,i,148-160:  
Iago  
She that was ever fair and never proud,  
Had tongue at will and yet was never loud,  
Never lacked gold and yet went never gay,  
Fled from her wish and yet said 'Now I may';  
She that, being angered, her revenge being nigh,  
Bade her wrong stay and her displeasure fly;  
She that in wisdom never was so frail  
To change the cod's head for the salmon's tail;  
She that could think, and ne'er disclose her mind,  
See suitors following and not look behind;  
She was a wight, if ever such wight were, -

Des.  To do what? -
Iago  To suckle fools and chronicle small beer. -

Buddingh¹:

- Een vrouw, die mooi is en toch nederig blijft;  
  Die welbespraakt is en toch nimmer kijft;  
  Die, rijk aan goud, zich toch eenvoudig kleedt;  
  Die, vaak verlokt, steeds elk bedrog vermeed;  
  Die, hoe boos ook, als zij zich wreken kon,  
  Het onrecht droeg en niet op straffen zon;  
  Die nooit zo dom was, of zo onbedreven,  
  Een zalmstaart voor een schelviskop te geven;  
  Die denken kan, maar praatjes steeds ontwijkt,  
  Door vrijers dicht omzwermd, er niet naar kijkt;

Voeten:

- Een vrouw die mooi is zonder ijdelheid,  
  en welbespraakt zonder luidruchtigheid;  
  die geld genoeg heeft, maar zich sober kleedt,  
  verleiding kent, maar nooit haar eer vergeet;  
  die, als zij wordt gekrenkt en zich kan wreken,  
  de smaad verdraagt en niet de staf wil breken;  
  die nooit de brave hoeder van haar schout  
  zal ruilen voor een rappe bedgenoot;  
  die denken kan, maar wat zij denkt verhult,  
  en geen aanbidders op haar hielen duldt;

¹ On this occasion, Buddingh's departures from Burgersdijk's rendering are limited to a few syntactic and idiomatic modernizations.
Dat zou een vrouw zijn, als zij existeert, -
- Die wat? -
- Die dwazen zoogt en 't bierverbruik noteert. -

("- A woman that is fair and yet stays humble;
That has the gift of the gab and yet never wrangles;
That, rich in gold, yet dresses simply;
That, often tempted, always avoided every deceit;

That, no matter how angry, when she might avenge herself,
Bore injustice and did not brood on punishing;
That never was so dumb, nor so naive,
To give a salmon's tail for a cod's head;
That can think, but always eschews gossip,
Closely swarmed about with suitors, does not look at them;

That would be a woman, if she exists, -
- That what? -
- That suckles fools and keeps notes of the beer-consumption. -")

zo'n vrouw is goed - gesteld dat zij bestaat -
- Voor wat? -
- Voor zuigelingenzorg en leuterpraat. -

("- A woman that is fair without vanity,
and has the gift of the gab without loudness;
that has money aplenty, but dresses soberly,
is acquainted with temptation, but never forgets her honour;
that, when she is insulted and can avenge herself,
bears ignominy and does not wish to pass censure;
that never... will exchange the upright warden of her womb /
... for a nimble bed-fellow;
that can think, but keeps hidden what she thinks,
and does not suffer suitors at her heels;
such a woman is fit - supposing that she exists -
- For what? -
- For sucklings' care and twaddle. -")

Yet, as these two examples demonstrate: within a reasonable margin of liberty, the general sense can still come across very well. Voeten's major departures here - in 1.154-155 and 160 - are symptomatic of his approach to translation: being conscious of the potentially bawdy implications of "cod's head" and "salmon's tail" he has chosen to paraphrase the lines (rather tamely) in an exegetic way rather than retain the proverbial image, as Buddingh' (and Burgersdijk) did, - which suggests little beyond the folly of exchanging a delicacy for a homely dish, and leaves it to the reader or the audience to decide whether a reflection on Desdemona's preference for Othello above the gallants of Venice is implied or not, a possibility not left open by Voeten's different interpretation. His paraphrastic treatment of 1.160 still bears the nature of an anticlimactic clinch-line, but offers nothing more in the way of wit or clarity than the more literal alternative; the only valid objection to Buddingh's rendering might be the rather far-fetched rhyme-word "existeert" in 1.158.

The problems posed by rhyme are complicated further in the songs, with their highly compact verse structure and their often pregnant concentration of meaning. Yet again, taking the special effort required into account, one may well be gratified by the way a number of translators of both older and more recent vintage have risen to these occasions.
The Tempest, I, ii, 396-404:

Full fathom five thy father lies,
of his bones are coral made;
those are pearls that were his eyes:
nothing of him that doth fade,
but doth suffer a sea-change
into something rich and strange.
sea-nymphs hourly ring his knell:
Ding-dong.
Hark! now I hear them - Ding-dong bell.

Burgersdijk:

Vijf vadem diep uw vader rust,
zijn gebeente werd koraal,
de oogen paarlen; ongebluscht
Is hun gloed; geen zegepraal
Viert verderf; uit ieder deel
Schept de zee een rijk juweel.
Nimfen luiden met gezang
Hem zijn uitvaart; hoor: ding
dang!
Ding, dang!
("Five fathoms deep your father
rests, / His bones became coral,
The eyes pearls; unextinguished
Is their glow; no triumph
Corruption celebrates; out of
every part / The sea creates a
rich jewel. / Nymphs knell with
songs / His obsequies; hark:
ding dang! / Ding, dang!")

Nijhoff (1952):

Vijf vaam diep ligt je vader in zee,
Maar in zee gaat niets verloren:
Zijn oog wordt een parel, zijn rib
wordt koraal,
En schelpen worden zijn oren;
Zo wordt alles aan hem voltooid
En tot een ding van de zee vermooid.
Aanhoudend luiden de zeemeerminnen
Zijn doodsklok. - Ding, dong.
Hoor, ze beginnen.
("Five fathoms deep thy father lies
in the sea, / But in the sea nothing
goes to waste: / His eye becomes a
pearl, his rib becomes coral,
And his ears become shells:
Thus all of him is perfected
And beautified into a thing of the sea.
Continually the mermaids ring
His death-knell. - Ding, dong.
Hark, they begin.")

Courteaux:

Vijf vadem diep uw vader zonk;
Uit 't gebeent' koraal ontstaat;
Parelglans waar 't oog eens
blonk.
Niets van hem dat ooit vergaat;
Zeezilt 'ål verkeren doet
In een rijk en zeldzaam goed.
Hoor der nimfen klokkenzang:
Ding, dong
Luister, ik hoor hen: ding,
dong-dang.
("Five fathoms deep your father
sank; / Out of his bones coral
comes into being; / Pearl-glow
where the eye once shone.
Nothing of him that ever perishes;
Sea-salt causes all to change
Into something rich and rare.
Hear the nymphs' knelling-song:
Ding, dong
Listen, I hear them: ding, dong,
dang."")

The Winter's Tale, IV, iii, 1-22:

When daffodils begin to peer,
With heigh! the doxy over the dale,
Why, then comes in the sweet o'the year;
For the red blood reigns in the winter's pale.
The white sheet bleaching on the hedge,
With heigh! the sweet birds, O, how they sing!
Doth set my pugging tooth on edge;

Ter Laan:

Wanneer de bloemen bloeien gaan
- en heisa! dan met een meid in de wei! -
breekt 't zonnetij voor mij weer aan:
na den winter in't roode bloed de mei.
Het witte linnen bleekt op de heg
- en heisa! wat zingen di vogels hier! -
't jeukt in mijn vingers, geen mensch op den weg
For a quart of ale is a dish for a king.
The lark, that tirra-lyra chants,
With heigh! with heigh! the thrush and the jay,
Are summer songs for me and my aunts,
While we lie tumbling in the hay.

I have served Prince Florizel and in my time wore
three-pile; but now I am out of service:

But shall I go mourn for that, my dear?
The pale moon shines by night:
And when I wander here and there,
I then do most go right.

If tinkers may have leave to live,
And bear the sow-skin budget,
Then my account I well may give,
And in the stocks avouch it.

("When the flowers start flowering / - and hey! then with a lass in the meadow! - / then the sunny season begins again for me: / after the winter, (the) may in the red blood. / / The white linen is bleaching on the hedge / - and hey! how those birds are singing here! - / my fingers itch, not a man in sight ("on the road") / and a king's wage is a mug of beer. / / The lark tirra-liras (for) joy / - and hey! how beautifully those thrushes warble! - / 'Tis a summer song for me and my lass / at the wanton frolicking in the bay. / / I have been in the service of Prince Florizel and in my day went about in heavy velvet. But now I am without service. / / But should I grieve for that, dear (child)? / At night the moon still shines! / Although I am wandering like the wind, / I'll finish up somewhere. / / If one allows gipsies the liberty / to live off the farmer" ("op de boer teren": "to live from hand to mouth") / " I am prepared (to give) my account / and the gallows may convert me.")

Twelfth Night, II,iii, 33-38:
O mistress mine, where are you roaming?
O, stay and hear, your true love's coming,
That can sing both high and low.
Trip no further, pretty sweeting;
Journeys end in lovers meeting,
Every wise man's son doth know.

Burgersdijk:
O liefste mijn! waar zijt ge aan 't dwalen?
Ik riep u reeds ontelb're malen
Met een luid en smachtend lied.
Vleidt ge ook, meisje, op vleugelvoeten,
't Eind is toch, uw lief te ontmoeten;

What is love? 'Tis not hereafter;
Present mirth hath present laughter;
What's to come is still unsure.
In delay there lies no plenty;
Then come kiss me, sweet-and-twenty:
Youth's a stuff will not endure.

Verspoor:
O meisje mijn, waar magje dwalen
Laat dan je lief je overhalen
zingende de heuvels rond:
Laat je leiden op mijn zingen:
alle, alle wandelingen
Welke jongling weet dit niet?
Kom! de liefde kent geen "morgen"!
Lach als 't tij is, want verborgen
Is ons, wat de toekomst biedt;
Kom toch! uitstel baart geen rozen;
Laat ons kussen, liefste, kozen,
Voor de jonkvrouw hemenvliekt.

("O beloved mine! where are you roaming? / I already called you countless times / With a loud and languishing song. / Even though you flee, girl, on winged feet, / Yet the end is, to meet your love; / What youth does not know this? / / Come! love knows no "tomorrow"! / Laugh while there is time, for hidden / Is to us, what the future holds; / Do come! delay bears no roses; / Let us kiss, beloved, fondle, / Ere youth flies away.")

Cymbeline, IV,i,259-282:
Fear no more the heat o' th'sun,
Nor the furious winter's rages;
Thou thy worldly task hast done,
Home art gone and ta'en thy wages,
Golden lads and girls all must,
As chimney-sweepers, come to dust.

Fear no more the frown o' th'great;
Thou art past the tyrant's stroke;
Care no more to clothe and eat;
To thee the reed is as the oak.
The sceptre, learning, physic, must
All follow this and come to dust.

Fear no more the lightning-flash,
Nor th'all-dreaded thunder-stone;
Fear not slander, censure rash;
Thou hast finished joy and moan.
All lovers young, all lovers must
Consign to thee and come to dust.

No exorciser harm thee!
Nor no witchcraft charm thee!
Ghosts unlaid forbear thee!

Andreas:
Vrees niet meer de hete zon
of de barre noorderwinden,
't Loon dat U op aarde won,
zult U ver van 't aardse vinden.
Jong of oud, het is gelijk
voor de god van 't dodenrijk.

Vrees niet meer het wreed gezaag
dat elk naar zijn hand wil zetten.
Weg de zorg voor alledag;
U hoort nu naar andere wetten.
Prins of bedelaar, 't is gelijk
voor de god van 't dodenrijk.

Vrees de bliksem nu niet meer,
of de harde donderslag.
Oanaarraakbaar is uw eer.
U bent ver van nacht en dag.
Liefde, haat, het is gelijk
voor de god van 't dodenrijk.

Rust vrij van tovenarij,
Rust vrij van hekserij.
Geen spook omspokte uw graf.

("Fear no more the hot sun,
Nor the dire northern winds.
The wages that you earned on earth,
You will find far from the earth(ly).
Young or old, it is the same
to the god of the realm of the dead.

Fear no more cruel authority
that imposes itself upon everyone.
Gone (is) the care of everyday;
You now obey other laws.
Prince or beggar, it is the same
to the god of the realm of the dead.

Fear no more the lightning
nor the loud thunderbolt.
Inviolable is your honour.
You are remote from night and day.
Love, hatred, it is the same
to the god of the realm of the dead.

Rest free of sorcery.
Rest free of witchcraft.
No spirit visit your grave.

Eindigen in mond op mond -
Liefde is lachen, meegenomen
voor wat later nog kan komen:
jeugd is iets wat zo vergaat.
Lief zijn is een levenskwestie
laat je zoeken, zoet en zestien,
later is altijd te laat!

("O girl mine, where may'st thou wander / Let (then) thy love persuade thee / singing round the hills:
Let thyself be guided at my singing: / all, all wand-erings / end up in mouth to mouth //

Love is laughter, an advance / against whatever may come later: / youth is something that perishes in an instant. / To be loving is a matter of life (and death) / let thyself be kissed, sweet and sixteen, / later is always too late!")
Nothing ill come near thee!
Quiet consummation have,
And renownéd be thy grave!
't Kwaad late van U af.
Rust hier zacht, door niets gedeerd.
En uw graf zij steeds geërerd.
Evil leave off from you.
Rest here in peace, harmed by nothing.
And your grave be honoured always.

Literal translations are, of course, out of the question: as long as the gist of the content comes across, all one may reasonably expect is something akin in mood and lyrical quality to the original. Yet the examples given display considerable variety in the degrees of liberty taken: in the two cases quoted, Burgersdijk evinces a greater concern with the original text than most of his recent colleagues - more successfully so in the song from *The Tempest* than in that from *Twelfth Night*. Space did not allow to give his rendering of the examples from *The Winter's Tale* and *Cymbeline* as well; in the latter case, he has again followed the original much more closely than Andrews. In their approach, Verspoor and Andrews are obviously adherents of Nijhoff's poetic autonomy principle, which will be discussed in Chapter XVIII; neither of them, however, shares Nijhoff's creative talent, which bestows on his lyric the charm of an original piece of poetry. But to their credit it may be observed that, unlike Nijhoff, they both have attempted to retain Shakespeare's metric pattern; and Verspoor's song, with its predominance of liquid consonants, is certainly pleasingly mellifluous. Here, as elsewhere, Courteaux's traditional approach to translation is evident: his rendering of Ariel's song is even more faithful than Burgersdijk's; unfortunately, it is marred by a few awkward contractions and syntactic oddities. Undoubtedly most successful of all these is Ter Laan's version of Autolycus' song, which combines a remarkable textual fidelity with a very felicitous reproduction of the mischievous mood that pervades it; - it is the only one of this set that is in every respect preferable to Burgersdijk's rendering.

The purpose of this exercise has been to show, in the first place, what limitations and obstacles are in the way of any translator's attempt at reproducing Shakespeare's idiom and imagery in his own language; secondly, to what extent translators have been able and willing to stretch their resources, within the limitations discussed, in order to accommodate the burden of meaning in their renderings. For that purpose, extended and representative examples have been quoted from the work of all the important, and most of the minor Dutch Shakespeare translators of this century. The comparison of various versions of the same passage has demonstrated that there are considerable differences in the semantic fidelity attained; - yet how safely may one draw conclusions about the quality of the translations, and about the competence
of their authors on the basis of these?
To do so confidently, one would have to subscribe to a rigid norm concerning the task of the translator; in theory one might demand, for instance, that a Shakespearean word be translated consistently into the same Dutch term whenever it occurs in a particular sense and with the same set of connotations; that every Shakespearean ambiguity be matched by an equivalent ambiguity, and every Shakespearean image, reproduced in one of the same power and plasticity. The examples have shown that, in practice, such a rigid norm cannot be upheld even by those translators who, in principle, aim for the highest possible degree of precision; for even in passages where a truly integral translation is syntactically and semantically practicable, considerations of sound and metre will - and should - have a strong modifying influence on the final product.

In our awareness of this, we may relax our basic norm from a demand for maximal, to one for optimal preservation of meaning; but then the problem arises that there is room for disagreement as to how heavy considerations of sound and clarity ought to weigh, and even how the term "meaning" is to be defined. How meaningful is Shakespeare's complex imagery to a modern reader, and more particularly: to a modern theatre-goer? Do not our modern techniques of acting, staging, mounting and lighting make much of Shakespeare's verbal evocation redundant? Is the development of poetic and dramatic thought in his plays necessarily better served by the translator who reproduces the text as literally as his language, his insight and expressive ability allow, than by the one who absorbs and digests the meaning of a verse line, a sentence or a whole speech at a time and then recreates it in his own idiom? - Again, in practice we find that none of the translators dealt with in this chapter can be fully identified with either of these extremes; the ones with whom conceptual fidelity appears to come first: Burgersdijk, Koster, Van Looy, Van Suchtelen, Straat, Courteaux - occasionally find a need to approach the text with a certain measure of freedom; while their opposite numbers: Marcellus, Nijhoff, Voeten, Verspool, Andreus - have rendered whole passages almost literally, probably because they simply found no clearer, more concise or more expressive way to formulate a thought or sequence of thoughts contained in them.

For this reason a few excerpts, no matter how eloquent and representative they may be, will not help us to arrive at a final critical assessment of any one translation, let alone of the whole output of any one major translator - if this assessment is to be based on the exact degree to which the total meaning of the original, in its narrowest and its widest sense, has been transferred into the target language. Be-
sides, our impressions of the work of various translators, gained cumulatively in the course of these three chapters, may give us cause to wonder whether such an assessment would be just: are we to rate Van Looy's merits higher than Voeten's, or Rensburg's than Verspoor's only because they have been, on the whole, more scrupulous or ingenious at preserving meaningful details? Yet our negative answer to that must not blind us to the potential value of any one such meaningful detail: within a jumble of cluttered, inarticulate verse and opaque, stilted dialogue, the true ring of a single key-word may carry us to the heart of Shakespeare's play; while a whole fabric of the most mellifluous lines, the most life-like conversations, the clearest arguments may strike us as basically un-Shakespearean, if only because an invigorating element of refractoriness is lost, or because we are left without any mysteries to solve for ourselves.

The reproduction of meaning - which may mean, on occasion: obscurity, riddle, mystery - remains therefore an important factor in our judgement of these translators' merits, even though we are evidently as yet far removed from formulating such a judgement. All one can say at this stage is, that there should be a minimal correspondence of meaning between original and translation, below which the latter cannot stray without losing validity. If this threshold is crossed unconsciously, the author in question must be regarded as negligent or incompetent - a verdict that very few of the translators dealt with so far deserve; if it is crossed deliberately - that is to say, if an author chooses to modify the content of a play or part of it for reasons of his own - we move from the category of translation into that of adaptation.

The term "adaptation", however, is applicable to a variety of situations: the next chapter will deal with the different forms and degrees adaptation can assume, and examine where the boundary lies between a permissible modification of the original and the point where an independent work has come into being, with which the name of Shakespeare can no longer be unreservedly associated.
CHAPTER XVII

NATURE AND DEGREE OF ADAPTATION

IN TWENTIETH-CENTURY DUTCH VERSIONS OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS.

The eighteenth-century versions of Hamlet, King Lear, Macbeth, Othello and Romeo and Juliet by Ducis and Weisse, dealt with in Chapter IV, constitute a point of departure for a discussion of the concept adaptation; they represent one extreme form of it, for which it might be better to use the term derivate or derivation. It must be remembered that the public, not Ducis himself, declared or assumed his plays to be versions of Shakespeare's; Ducis published them under his own name, without any reference to Shakespeare - and justly so, for, regardless of their quality, they are autonomous works of art that owe about as much to their sources as Shakespeare's plays do to Plutarch, Holinshed, Hall, Daniel, Saxo Grammaticus, Bandello, Cinthio, Boccaccio - as well as to some earlier Elizabethan plays.

Although closer to the originals, Van Lennep's Otello and, more particularly, his Romeo en Julia of the 1850's (see pp.104-110) were really more serious offences against the canons of literary integrity, because they were fairly radical adaptations, misrepresented by their author as bona fide Shakespeare translations. But while the Ducis and Weisse plays (and Nieuwenhuijzen's Desdemona likewise: see p.40) are borderline cases whose correspondence to Shakespeare is confined to some plot elements and the occasional verbal echo, Van Lennep's versions certainly have a sufficiently firm basis in the text and structure of their originals to fall within the category of "adaptation" - if that term, in at least one sense, may be applied to a play (or, for that matter, any literary work of art) whose content and form corresponds recognizably to its original, but departs from it in some important aspects or details. Formal departures, in this context, do not weigh as heavily as conceptual ones: Brunius', Van Loon's and Kok's prose versions are to be regarded as translations rather than adaptations, because they are more or less successful attempts at reproducing the original content literally, be it in a different medium. Yet since Burgersdijk, no Dutch Shakespeare translations, worthy of the name and of serious artistic consideration, have been produced that are not in blank verse - with, of course, rhymed couplets, lyrics and prose passages where the originals have these too.

Stage adaptations. - This formal agreement amongst such a wide variety of translators does not mean, how-
ever, that all the extant iambic pentameter versions are actually integral translations. In a number of them, specifically prepared for stage productions and, as such, usually unpublished, passages have been deleted or redistributed, presumably in consultation between the translator and the director concerned. It is known that Burgersdijk himself edited his translations for use by the **KUNFT** in the 1880's; and in that sense, the vast majority of Shakespeare plays produced on the Dutch stage since then have undoubtedly been adapted to a greater or lesser extent.

Since absolutely integral performances of many Shakespeare plays - *Hamlet*, *Richard III*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Cymbeline*, to name a few - are impracticable on account of their great length, the common and universal practice of stage adaptation cannot be objected to, as long as cutting is applied with discretion. On that point, unfortunately, opinions are bound to diverge considerably: is *Hamlet* still essentially *Hamlet* if, for example, all references to Fortinbras are removed and the play ends at the prince's death? Is *Romeo and Juliet* complete without its light-hearted servants' scenes? Does the deletion of Malcolm's exchange with the Doctor and his subsequent account of Edward the Confessor's saintly qualities deprive *Macbeth* of an indispensable dimension?

These may be matters for dispute at an academic level; but in the practice of the theatre, the director's judgement in cutting passages - sometimes even whole scenes - is only occasionally questioned: for examples, one may refer back to the previously discussed productions of *Macbeth* by Defresne in 1937 (pp.226-227), *Henry IV*, parts I and II by De Meester in 1947 (p.244) and *Richard II* by Douglas Seale in 1958 (p.243). Besides, really major infringements upon the content of a play - such as the happy-ending alternatives to *Romeo and Juliet* and *King Lear* in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century English theatre and, more recently: Bouwmeester's reduction of *The Merchant of Venice* to a four-act tragedy - seem to belong to the past; also, particularly since the development of single all-purpose settings has disposed of time-consuming scene changes, it has been possible to accommodate more text within a reasonable playing-time. At any rate, such cuts and deletions as are still habitually made in the longer plays rarely have as deleterious an effect on a Shakespeare production as the much more insidious damage done by the occasional wayward interpretation on the part of directors and actors. What would we make of a performance of *Measure for Measure* - without a single cut, as the case may be - in which, by action and implication, it is suggested that the Duke Vincentio is actually hypocritical, corrupt, perverted and depraved himself? Yet this "idea" was seriously put forward by at least one of the parties involved in the 1970 Leer om Leer / Maat
voor Maat experiment in Amsterdam (see p.260).

Only ready access to the prompt books of all known Shakespeare productions would give a complete insight into the nature and extent of actual cuts made in performed plays - for even acting copies are, in this respect, not fully reliable. Several unpublished theatre translations - e.g. Gerard Messelaar's Driekoningenavond and Veel Leven om Niets - are, in fact, integral, and their copies in the Toneelmuseum show no deletions; which is no guarantee that they were performed without any cuts. But some, usually cautious editing is not uncommon; in the typescript of Joris Diels' Macbeth, for instance, IV,i,125-132 (- Ay, Sir, all this is so...Our duties did his welcome pay. -) and IV,iii,140-159 (- Well; more anon...That speak him full of grace. -) have been deleted; some further cuts and changes have been hand-written in. Similarly, Voeten's acting copy for Van Hensbergen's Othello production (see p.276) does not contain I,iii,198-219 (I have done, my Lord...piecéd through the ear); II,i,1-19, 40b-42 and 52-55; II,iii,10; III,i,1-29a; III,ii,5-6; III,iv,1-18; V,ii,117-118 (then murder's out...grows harsh), 315 (- Most heathenish and most gross! -) and 364-367 (More fell than...Let it be hid.). Van Hensbergen has trimmed the play by a further 156 lines, - a total of 84 cuts of often no more than a half-line or a line at a time. The most substantial of these occur in Brabantio's speeches (Van Hensbergen played the part himself, and evidently wished to reduce it to its bare essentials); in Othello's vow towards the end of III,iii (457-464: - Never, Iago...Swallow them up); in a speech of Desdemona's in III,iv (148-154: Nay, we must think...he's indicted falsely) and the sword passage in V,ii (254-273: I have another weapon...Where should Othello go?)! The sum total of these deletions can still be regarded as modest and judicious; the essence of the play has undoubtedly been left intact. The only objection that might be raised against many of Van Hensbergen's half-line cuts, as well as to a number of his re-wordings of the text (e.g. III,iii,43: I have been talking with a suitor here - Voeten: Ik had hier juist een smekeling; een man.. - Van Hensbergen: Ik had hier juist iemand met een verzoek ("someone with a request"), een man..) is, that they too often make havoc of the verse structure.

Voeten is the only translator since Van Lennep who appears to be sufficiently confident of the justness of his, sometimes extensive, adaptatory modifications to have his acting versions published as vertalingen rather than bewerkingen. In his edition of Troilus en Cressida of 1959, I,iii,62-68a, 70-74, 286-290a,

---

1 The line-numbering here, as throughout these chapters, is that of The London Shakespeare, ed. John Munro, London, 1958.
337-340a and 343-356; III, iii, 161-163a; IV, iv, 139-147; V, iii, 20b-22; V, vi, 27-31 and V, viii, 1-2 have been deleted without explanation; only the shifting of Pandarus' final appearance from V, x (11.53-55) to the end of V, iii is covered by a note; the liberal paraphrastic technique applied elsewhere, particularly in the play's prose passages, is also touched on in the verantwoording ("justification", "account") that is appended to this, as to most of Voeten's Shakespeare translations. In these brief postscripts he usually makes a point of referring to any textual support for his deletions, if there is any; this way, for instance, he accounts for the cutting of III, iv, 70-75, 77-80, 160-164, 166-169 and 201-209, and IV, vii, 68b-81 and 114-123 in his version of Hamlet: these are passages that do not occur in the Fl text. But he makes no reference to his departure from the traditional act/scene divisions (III, iv and IV, i have been run together, and IV, ii and IV, iii have become III, v and III, vi, respectively) even where these involve some condensation and trimming.

For the 1970 production of De Getemde Feeks by "Theater" (see p.275), Voeten incorporated a number of extra Christopher Sly episodes - drawn from the anonymous The Taming of a Shrew of 1594 - in his translation, which was first published in 1963. This version, based on the New Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1953) edition of the Fl text, also features a number of minor deletions (by far the largest of these is that of IV, iii, 146-157) as well as a small insertion between III, ii, 140 and 141:

The Taming of the Shrew, III, ii, 137-141:

We'll over-reach the greybeard, Gremio,
The narrow-prying father, Minola,
The quaint musician, amorous Licio -
All for my master's sake, Lucentio.

Signor Gremio, came you from the church? -

("we toy with that old rip, Gremio, / that troublesome Nosy Parker Minola, / with that infatuated string-piper Licio - / all for the benefit of Lucentio. / But come, you would not like ("will not wish!) to miss the spectacle in church/... ... - Luc.: - Thou art guest of honour; / I'll attend the ceremony at a distance. - / Tran.: What, signore Gremio! nu al uit de kerk? -")

In contrast to Voeten, those amongst his modern colleagues who work specifically for the theatre - Straat, Verspoor, Andrews - as a rule publish their translations without cuts, when they do publish them, even if the text-rendering of the latter two often bears an adaptatory or paraphrastic character. In Verspoor's
Droom van een Midsomernacht only V,i,210, 223-229 and 302b-305 are missing, and in the same scene the lines 44-60 have been re-distributed: Verspoor has allotted 11.44-45 to Lysander, 11.48-49 to Demetrius, 11.52-53 to Helena and 11.56-57 to Hermia, leaving the interjectory and final comments to Theseus. Further facets of Voeten's use of adaptation will be reverted to later in this chapter.

Secondary adaptations. - Acting versions such as Voeten's and Diels' may be called primary adaptations, in so far as what has remained of the plays after cutting is related directly to their English base text or texts. There are, however, several types of versions whose relationship to the original is somewhat more remote or complex.

An example of the most common of these categories has already been given; Van Hensbergen's variant of Voeten's line from Othello, quoted on p.381, belongs to it: "iemand met een verzoek" may, in a narrow sense, convey the meaning of "a suitor" as well as Voeten's een smeekeling, but the line is no longer Shakespearean - if only, in this case, because it is a line of prose in the middle of a verse passage. Generalizing from this instance, one might say that secondary adaptation occurs when a director's or dramaturgist's editorial activity extends from cutting to re-wording phrases or lines of an extant translation without evident consultation of its source text; for the results of such activity, no matter how effective or felicitous, no longer bear any immediate relation to Shakespeare.

Van Hensbergen's liberties of this nature, which jar mainly because they often betray a lack of poetic sensitivity, are too few and far between to merit further attention. Much more extensive are the adaptatory changes wrought by Willem Royaards (see pp.213-218) in the translations on which his Shakespeare productions were based. Apart from making substantial cuts, this director used to rewrite Burgersdijk in many minor ways. Interesting examples of this abound in the Julius Caesar text prepared, presumably, for his solo recital of that play in 1898. Some small emendations appear to have been occasioned by the necessity - in this particular instance - of clarifying which person is speaking and who is addressed, and disposing of a confusing multiplicity of voices:

**Julius Caesar, II,i,39:** Get you to bed again; it is not day.
Burgersdijk: Ga weer naar bed, het is nog lang geen dag.
("Go to bed again, it is not yet day by far.")
Royaards: Leg je weer slapen, Lucius; 't is nog geen dag!
("Lie down to sleep again, Lucius; 'tis not yet day!")
Julius Caesar, II, i, 86-97: Cass. I think we are too bold upon your rest.
Good morrow, Brutus. Do we trouble you? -
Brut. I have been up this hour, awake all night.
Know I these men that come along with you? -
Cass. Yes, every man of them; and no man here
But honours you; and everyone doth wish
You had but that opinion of yourself
Which every noble Roman bears of you.
This is Trebonius. - Brut. He is welcome hither.
Cass. This, Decius Brutus. - Brut. He is welcome too.
Cass. This, Casca; this, Cinna; and this, Metellus Cimber.
Brut. They are all welcome.

Burgersdijk:

Cass. Wij storen, vrees ik, al te stout uw rust
Met vroegen groot; doch, Brutus, wilt ge ons loren? -
Brut. Ik was reeds op, en heb geen oog gelegen.
Ken ik de mannen, die daar met u zijn? -
Cass. Ja, elk van hen; en geen hier, of hij draagt
U eerbied toe; ja ieder hunner wenscht,
Dat gij uzelf ziet in het licht, waarin
U al, wat edel is in Rome, ziet.

Dit is Trebonius. - Brut. Hij is welkom hier.
Cass. Dit Casca, Cinna, dit Metellus Cimber.
Brut. Zij allen zijn mij welkom.

(" - We disturb, I fear, too boldly your rest
With early greeting; but, Brutus, will you hear us?
- I was up already, and have not slept a wink.
Know I the men that are with you there?
- Yes, every one of them, and none here, but he
holds

You in esteem; ay, everyone of them wishes,
That you would see yourself in the light, in which
Whoever is noble in Rome, sees you.
This is Trebonius. - - He is welcome hither. -
- This Decius Brutus. - - He is welcome too. -
- This Casca, Cinna, this Metellus Cimber.
- They all are welcome (to me). -")

Royaards:

Cass. Wij storen, broeder, al te vroeg uw rust,
doch wilt ge ons horen? -
Brut. Ik was reeds op en look dees nacht geen oog.
Ken ik de mannen die daar met u zijn?
Cass. Ja, allen! En geen is er bij, die U
geen eerbied toedraagt, en niet vurig wenscht,
dat gij uzelf ziet in 't licht, waarin
u al, wat edel is in Rome, ziet!

Dit is Trebonius; dit Decius Brutus;
dit Casca; Cinna; dit Metellus Cimber! -
Brut. Zij zijn mij allen welkom.

(" - We disturb, brother, too early your rest,
but will you hear us? -
- I was up already, and did not sleep a wink this night.
Know I the men that are with you there?
- Yes, all! And there is none amongst them, who

does not hold you in esteem, and does not wish ardently
that you may see yourself in the light, in which
whoever is noble in Rome, sees you!
This is Trebonius, this Decius Brutus;
this Casca; Cinna; this Metellus Cimber! -
- They are all welcome (to me). -")

Apart from the deletion of Brutus' brief interjections, which turns Cassius' lines 90-94a, 95a and 96 into one uninterrupted speech, most of the changes in the above passage are of a stylistic nature. The intro-
duction of *dies nacht* ("this night") in 1.88 and the word order of 1.97 suggests Royaards' awareness of the English text, but such instances are rare; the vast majority of his departures from Burgersdijk have no valid basis in Shakespeare. As long as they are confined to modifications of that translator's sometimes stilted syntax and idiom, they are understandable and, not infrequently, constitute modest improvements. But on occasion Royaards has seen fit to impose puzzling changes of meaning:

*Julius Caesar, II,i,193-201:*

```
Whether Caesar will come forth to-day or not;
For he is superstitious grown of late,
Quite from the main opinion he held once
Of fantasy, of dreams and ceremonies.
It may be these apparent prodigies,
The unaccustomed terror of this night
And the persuasion of his augurers,
May hold him from the Capitol to-day.
```

**Burgersdijk:**

```
Maar 't is nog lang niet zeker,
Of Caesar zich vandaag vertoonen zal;
Want hij is thans niet vrij van bijgeloof,
Geheel in strijd met wat hij vroeger dacht
Van droomen, voorgevoelens, wondertekens.
't Kan zijn, dat al die vreemde luchtverschijnsels,
Die ongewone schrik van deze nacht,
En licht ook de overreding van zijn wichlaars
Hem heden verre houdt van 't Kapitool.
```

("But it is not at all certain,
Whether Caesar will show himself to-day;
For he is nowadays not free of superstition,
Quite at odds with what he formerly thought
Of dreams, premonitions, miraculous signs.
It may be, that all those strange phenomena,
That uncommon terror of this night,
And possibly also the persuasion of his augurs,
Hold him far from the Capitol to-day.")

*Julius Caesar, II,i,215-220:*

```
Caius Ligarius doth bear Caesar hard,
Who rated him for speaking well of Pompey.
I wonder none of you have thought of him.
```
Burgersdijk:

- Caius Ligarius wrokt steeds tegen Caesar,
  Die hem verweet, dat hij Pompeius prees;
  Vreemd, dat aan hem geen uwer heeft gedacht. -
- Ga gij dan, vriend Metellus, bij hem aan;
  Hij heeft mij lief, en 'k gaf hem daartoe grond;
  Zond hem tot mij, ik zal hem voor ons winnen.

("- Caius Ligarius chafes continually against Caesar, / Who reproached him, that he praised Pompey; Strange, that of him none of you has thought. -")

- Go you then, friend Metellus, along by him;
  He loves me, and I gave him reasons for that;
  Send him to me, I'll win him for our cause. -")

Royaards:

- Caius Ligarius moekt en wrokt fel tegen Caesar,
  die hem den troous verweet, dien hij Pompejus hield;
  vreemd, dat geen onzer nog aan hem gedacht heeft! -
- Ga gij dan, vriend Metellus, tot Ligarius;
  Hij heeft mij lief; ik gaf hem daartoe grond;
  Zondt gij hem tot mij; 'k wil dan met hem spreken.

("- Caius Ligarius sulks and chafes fiercely against Caesar, / Who reproached him for the faith, which he kept with Pompey: / strange, that none of us yet has thought of him! -
- Go you then, friend Metellus, to Ligarius;
  He loves me; I gave him reasons for that:
  Send you him to me; I wish to speak with him then. -")

Revisions of this kind, along with fairly sizeable cuts (e.g. 11.101-111, 171b-180, 185-191) add up to a considerable difference between Burgersdijk's translation and Royaards' adaptation of this particular scene. Elsewhere, - in the Forum scene, for instance - the changes effected are less incisive; and when considered in its entirety, this acting copy of Julius Caesar, like Royaards' other stage adaptations, retains much of the Burgersdijk character. Nevertheless - particularly in view of Royaards' reputation as an exceptionally fine speaker of verse - the frequency with which metrical irregularities occur in his versions is striking.

But the liberties taken by Royaards are modest indeed when compared with those to be found in the two adaptations produced by Jan G. Jofriet, alias Gerard den Brabander, a popular Amsterdam bohemian and sonneteer of the years just prior to and following World War II, who was known as a prolific "translator" of, amongst others, Tolstoy, Calderon, Ibsen and Rilke. One may hope that Den Brabander's proficiency in Russian, Portuguese, Norwegian and German was adequate to do justice to the work of these giants of world literature; however, this seems doubtful in view of the fact that he could not read English. His Leer om Leer (1950) and Een Midsomernachtsdroom (1952) are based exclusively on Burgersdijk's translations of Measure for Measure and A Midsummer Night's Dream, and contain no evidence whatsoever of any direct consultation of the Shakespeare texts. In principle, one need not object to such a second-hand procedure; if
resorted to by a poet of true stature, the result might still be a worth while, original piece of work. But Den Brabander's failure to acknowledge his debt to Burgersdijk, and his publication of the two plays as direct bewerkingen of Shakespeare have given them the unfortunate character of rather clumsy forgeries. One cannot help wondering what induced Johan de Meester in 1950, and Egbert van Paridon in 1959 (see pp.241 and 251) to prefer the graceless doggerel of these versions to Burgersdijk's infinitely superior originals; ironically, De Meester's Leer om Leer production was, as we have seen, one of the most successful Dutch Shakespeare productions ever, despite its adulterated text. Of the two, this is still by far the most palatable, although Den Brabander has liberally cut about in some parts, elaborated on others, and disrupted Measure for Measure's coherent system of imagery by arbitrarily introducing ideas of his own, which are, more often than not, entirely incongruous. Besides, he has gone to the trouble of rendering the entire play in rhymed verse, vacillating between four-, five- and six-foot lines, and often making do with the most far-fetched rhyme words. The Duke's important, theme-defining speech addressed to Angelo in Act 1,1 (11.26-47: - Angelo, / There is a kind of character in thy life,... Take thy commission. -) has been reduced to eleven lines:

- Angelo, vriend, de vroomheid van uw wezen
laat zich beluisteren als een verhaal,
dat, uit de bronnen van uw ziel gerezen,
u naar de tong welt tot een klare taal.
Om wijsheid, om gezag, om deemoed en al dezen,
uw eigendommen, dienende allemaal,
de dommen en de blinden, die niet lezen,
de doven met gebarschten oorbokaal
en de doperenden een licht te wezen,
stel ik u, onomstotelijke these
en toortse op mijn troon en tribunaaal.

(" - Angelo, friend, the piousness of your being
can be listened to like a tale,
which, arisen from the sources of your soul,
well to your tongue into a clear language.
On account of wisdom, on account of prestige, on
account of meekness and all these,
your properties, serving all,
(to be to) the dumb and the blind, who do not read,
(to) the deaf with ruptured ear-goblet (?)
and to the wandering a light,
I place you, (as an) irrefragable thesis (?)
and torch upon my throne and tribunal. -")

To Den Brabander's apparently limited ingenuity as a rhymer such a persistent a-b pattern proved too taxing to be used very often; so generally he has confined himself to couplets. In Leer om Leer, prose and blank verse alike have undergone the rhyming treatment; the following passage is an example of this, and also shows how this adapter, at times, allowed himself to be carried away by an image of his own invention, while Shakespeare's much more apt and impressive simile - faithfully rendered by Burgersdijk - has been lost:
Burgersdijk:
- Wat zie ik? Claudio? waarom zit je in hechtenis? -
- Om te veel vrijheid, Lucio, te veel vrijheid;
Gelijk steeds overdaad streng vasten teelt,
Worde elke vrijheid, al te zeer misbruikt,
In dvang verkeerd. Wij jagen van nature,
Gelijk de ratten rattengif verzwalgen,
Vol dorst naar 't booze; en 't drinken is de dood.-
- Als ik in hechtenis zoo wijs zou kunnen spreken,
zou ik dadelijk naar eenein van mijn schuldegens zenden; maar toch, om de waarheid te zeggen, is mij de dwaasheid der vrijheid liever,
dan de wijsbegeerte der gevangenschap.

("- What do I see? Claudio? why are you under arrest? -
- Because of too much liberty, Lucio, too much liberty; / As surfeit ever engenders rigorous fasting, / So every freedom, abused too much,
is turned into restraint. By nature we pursue,
Just as rats devour rates' poison,
Thirstily ("full of thirst") evil; and drinking
is (our) death. -
- If I could speak so wisely under arrest, I
would immediately send for some of my creditors;
but yet, to say the truth, the folly of freedom
is dearer to me, than the philosophy of imprisonment.")

Den Brabander:
- Luc. Maar waarom dan voorbijgeleid?
- Clau. Om te veel vrijheid, Lucio, te veel vrijheid.
Zo kraaide 't haantje in poeliers nabijheid,
Maar het verkraaide zich aan d' overdaad,
want steeds is er een hok, dat openstaat.
Geliefde haan, gevierde kraaiengenoot,
kraai je de keel schor, maar je kraait je dood. -
- Als ik in 't kooitje nog zó wijs kon kraaien,
ik zou direct wat schuldeisers gaan paaien
en, wat ik schuldig ben, maar afdoen in de lik.
Tóch, beste Claudio, heb ik op 't ogenblik
liever de vrije dwaasheid
dan gevangen wijsheid.

("- Hey, Claudio! Thy appointment! - Bide your time.-
- But why then led along? -
- Because of too much liberty, Lucio, too much liberty. / Thus crowed the little cock in (a) poulterer's proximity. / But it overcrowed itself with surfeit, for there is always a coop that is open.
Beloved cock, fêted crowing-companion,
Crow thy throat hoarse, but thou crowest thyself to
death. -
- If I could still crow so wisely in the little cage,
I would at once appease some creditors
and settle, what I owe, in quod.
Yet, good Claudio, at the moment I rather have
(the) free folly / than imprisoned wisdom. -")

Although examples of such nonsense abound in Leer om Leer, fortunately Den Brabander has often contented
himself with a fairly close, rhymed paraphrase of the Burgersdijk text:

Measure for Measure,  
II, iv, 100-113:

(Is.) ... were I under the terms of death,  
Th'impression of keen whips I'd wear as rubies,  
And strip myself to death, as to a bed  
That, longing, have been sick for, ere I'd yield  
My body up to shame. - Ang. Then must your brother die. -  
Is. And 'twere the cheaper way:  
Better it were a brother died at once,  
Than that a sister, by redeeming him,  
Should die forever. -  
Ang. Were not you, then, as cruel as the sentence  
That you have slandered so? -  
Is. Ignomy in ransom and free pardon  
Are of two houses: lawful mercy  
Is nothing kin to foul redemption. -

Burgersdijk:

Zoo ik ter dood veroordeeld ware, ik zou  
Eer geeselstriemen als robben dragen,  
Me ontkleed voor den dood als voor een bed,  
Waarnaar ik had gesmacht, dan ik mijn lichaam  
Aan schande prijs gaf. - - Daarmee liet gij dan  
Uw broeder sterven. - - 't Offer waar 't geringst;  
't Waar 't beter, dat een broeder eenmaal stierf,  
Dan dat een zuster om hem 't lijf te redden,  
Steeds, immer stierf. -  
- En waar gij dan niet even wreed als 't vonnis,  
Door u zoo fel gelaakt? -  
- Vrijkoop door schande en vrije schuldvergiff'nis  
Zijn gansch verscheiden; en genabetooning  
Heeft met een eerloos losgeld niets gemeen. -  
("If I were sentenced to death, I would  
Sooner wear the stripes of a lash(ing) as rubies,  
Undress for death as for a bed,  
For which it had been longing, than I would...  
yield up / My body to shame. - - So doing, then,  
you'd let / Your brother die. - - The sacrifice  
were (the) most trifling; / It were better, that  
a brother died once, / Than that a sister, to re-  
deem his life, / Died continually, forever. -

Den Brabander:

Trof mij de doodstraf, heer, ik zou dit vege lijf  
Ontkleden voor den dood als voor een nachtverblijf.  
Want eerder zal het onder geselslagen  
de striemen als een snoer robben dragen  
dan dat het zich aan zulke schande gaf. -  
- Waarmee je dus je broeder beulsmijl overgaf, -  
- Zijn offer ware 't minst. 't Is beter ééns te  
sterven  
an over't schandebed een voortbestaan verwerven  
naaast haer, die offerde en eeuwig stervend is. -  
- Is dat niet even wreed als 't vonnis is? -  
- Vrijkkoop door schande en schuldbegiffenis,  
het zijn er twee, heer, de genade alleén  
hoeft met een eerloos losgeld niets gemeen. -  
("Were the death sentence to fall on me, Lord, I  
would undress this fee body / for death as for a  
night's lodging. / For sooner will it under whip-  
lashes / wear the stripes as a string of rubies  
than that it would itself up to such shame. -  
- With which, therefore, you'd abandon your brother  
to the executioner's axe. - - His sacrifice were  
(the) most trifling. It is better to die once  
than to gain a continuance of life across the bed
- And were not you then as cruel as the sentence,
  By you so fiercely censured? -
- Redemption through shame and free remission of
guilt / Are totally different; and (an) applica-
tion of mercy / Has nothing in common with an igno-
nominious ransom. -"

of shame / alongside her, who sacrificed and is et-
ternally dying, - / - Is that not as cruel as the
sentence is? - / - Redemption through shame and re-
mission of guilt, / they are two (things), lord,
mercy alone / has nothing in common with an igno-
nominious ransom. -")

If Leer om Leer still passes muster as a - be it highly unorthodox - secondary adaptation, this is due
to a reasonable proportion of acceptable passages like the one quoted above, and to the occasional charm
of Den Brabander's humour in the broad-comedy scenes:

*Measure for Measure*, III,ii,84-86:

It was a mad fantastical trick of him to steal
from the state, and usurp the beggary he was
never born to. Lord Angelo dukes it well in his
absence: he puts transgression to't.

("A foolish trick to steal out of his realm / and be a beggar. A trade that does not suit him. / And
Angelo dukes away and gives us the fits / and nails all trousers shut!")

The success of this effort probably induced Den Brabander to try his hand at *A Midsummer Night's Dream*
two years later: but whereas his Leer om Leer at least has the dubious merit of its tongue-in-the-cheek
unorthodoxy - being a poor specimen of Shakespeare, it was still passably representative of Den Braban-
der's irreverent "pop-art" at its best - his *Midzomermaachtíjoom* is nothing more than a badly mutilated
Burgersdijk translation. Apart from modernizing and colloquializing them, he has left the prose passages
as they were, and been content also to retain virtually all of Burgersdijk's rhymed couplets. But the
blank verse has undergone the same doggerel treatment as in Leer om Leer - with the result that much of
it has been reduced to the poetic level of the Pyramus and Thisbe satire. One brief example will suffice:

*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, II,i,122-134:

The fairy land buys not the child of me.
His mother was a vot'ress of my order:
And, in the spiced Indian air, by night,
Full often hath she gossiped by my side;
And sat with me on Neptune's yellow sands,
Marking th'embarकéd traders on the flood;
When we have laughed to see the sails conceive
And grow big-bellied with the wanton wind;

Den Brabander:

heel 't elfenland koopt mij dit kind niet af.
Zijn moeder bleef mij trouw tot aan het graf.
Zij zat in Indie's zwoel doorgeurde lucht

met in haar buik de ongeborene vrucht.
Wij lachten om een schip der handelsvloot,
gebold van zeil en met gespannen schoot.
Which she, with pretty and with swimming gait Following, - her womb then rich with my young squire, -
Would imitate, and sail upon the land, To fetch me trifles, and return again, As from a voyage, rich with merchandise.
("the whole fairyland buys not this child of me. / His mother remained faithful to me to the grave. / She sat in India's sultrily scented air / with in her belly the unborn fruit. / We laughed at a ship of the merchant navy, / with bulging sail and with stretched womb. / She compared herself with that cadence of sails, / for she walked heavily and waddled like a goose, / "a landschip," she said, which, when it would return, / "would bring many precious objects along for me.""")

Fortunately, Den Brabander's adaptations are unique of their kind amongst twentieth-century Dutch Shakespeare versions; it remains a mystery how they could ever have been considered acceptable for performance - and for publication into the bargain.

There are other secondary adaptations, but they belong to a different category: that of free paraphrases. Drs. J. Hoornweg's Fragmenten uit Een Midsomernachtsdroom ("Fragments from A Midsummer Night's Dream"), published in a series designed for children's amateur theatre, is one of these. The bulk of the play has been reduced to narration; only the artisans' scenes and their Pyramus and Thisbe performance have been left intact. Dr. P. H. Schroeder's version of De Klucht der Vergissingen (The Comedy of Errors), made for the same purpose - i.e.: performance by school children, possibly high school students - is a slightly more sophisticated paraphrase, written in pleasant modern prose; although heavily condensed, the play follows the intrigue of the original step by step - only the Courtesan has, understandably, been disposed of; by way of compensation, the Ephesian Dromio's fat wife is brought on stage in pursuit of her supposed husband in the course of III,ii. The play is divided into two acts, between III,ii and IV,i.

The text treatment in these two cases is so free that there is no way of determining whether the adapters used existing translations or worked directly from the English, nor does this seem of material interest. The oldest paraphrase of this order, a "licentious" adaptation of The Tempest by "Charivarus" (G. Nolst Trenité), dating back to 1913 and something of a classic in its own right, is definitely based directly on Shakespeare; it differs from the other two in its use of verse (iambic hexameters in rhyming couplets), and when the occasional passage has been almost literally translated, no correspondence with other translations available at that date (Moulin, Kok, Burgersdijk) of a nature suggesting imitation is evident. The following example shows Charivarus at his most faithful:
The Tempest, I,ii,196-206:
I boarded the king's ship: now on the beak,
Now in the waist, the deck, in every cabin,
I flamed amazement. Sometime I'd divide,

And burn in many places; on the topmast,
The yard and bowsprit would I flame distinctly,
Then meet and join. Jove's lightnings, the precursors
Of sulphurous roaring the most mighty Neptune
Seem to besiege, and make his bold waves tremble,
Yea, his dread trident shake.

("I came on board, and seated myself on the fore-deck, / And then again amidships, on the deck, in the cabinets, / And flamed up to everyone's terror. Then I struck outward / And divided into little flames and burnt, it seemed amazing, / In all places at the same time, then again separately, / On bowsprit, yard, on mast, on sail, on rope, in the rigging, / Then I was suddenly one flame again, upon the other side. / The sulphurous blue light, it cracked in the air, / So, that Neptune himself, usually so formidable, / was sea-sick due to the shaking of the waves! / I saw his trident quake!")

Charivarius' "licentiousness" (he called his adaptation losbandig) consists primarily in his drastic condensation and rearrangement of the play's structure and content: Caliban, Trinculo and Stephano have disappeared and, with them, all of II,ii and III,ii as well as the relevant portions of I,ii, IV,i and V,i. Ariel's background and his quest for freedom have been scratched also, as has the masque of IV,i; the romance of Miranda and Ferdinand has been pieced together from parts of I,ii, III,i and IV,i in the first half of the play, while the second is devoted to a digest of the courtiers' intrigue drawn from II,i and III,iii. Besides, what is left of the original Tempest has been dealt with in a light-hearted, bantering vein, and been larded with ingenuous anachronistic jokes calculated to amuse the average high school fête audience: Alonso and his retinue, for instance, discover Ferdinand and Miranda while playing a game of tennis, and Miranda's delight at her first sighting of Ferdinand (I,ii,417ff: I might call him / A thing divine; for nothing natural / I ever saw so noble...) has assumed the gushiness of a modern teenager's reaction at a confrontation with her favourite film star:

Pro. Die knaap die je daar ziet,
   Is van 't gestrande schip. Maar mooi vind ik hem
   niet. -

("That lad thou seest there,
Is from the stranded ship. But I don't consider him
good-looking.")
Mîr. Nu ik dan wel, papa. Ik vind hem schilderachtig!
Wat is hij goed gebouwd! Hij is eenvoudig prachtig!
Wat heeft hij mooie oogen, en kijk, wat slanke handen!
Wat heeft hij glanzend haar! Wat mooie blanke tanden!
Ik zal hem even kietelen, dan lacht hij weer, pa.
Mâg ik? —

Well, I do, daddy. I find him picturesque!
How well-built he is! He is simply splendid!
What beautiful eyes he has, and look, what slender hands!
What shiny hair he has! What beautiful white teeth!
— Thou dost not know that. — I do. He just smiled, I saw that.
I'll tickle him, then he'll laugh again, dad. May I? —

revisions. — Of greater interest than the slight, but innocuous efforts discussed above, is a type of version which, as the others, is covered by the Dutch term bewerking and, as such, belongs to the subject matter of this chapter, even though in English it would be called a revision rather than an adaptation.

The edition of Burgersdijk's translations by F. de Backer and G. A. Dudok, published in three volumes in 1941, '44 and '45, and subsequently used as a basis for separate pocket editions of a number of the plays, is called a bewerking in this sense, although the two editors have done little but write up-dated introductions to the plays and augment the original notes with their own: even Burgersdijk's old-fashioned spelling and syntax have been left unchanged.

But C. Buddingh's revision, published between 1955 and 1963, has been so thorough and extensive as almost to deserve consideration as a new set of translations. Unlike the work of secondary adapters such as Royaards, Buddingh's versions bear indubitable evidence of his consultation of the English texts; on many occasions he has succeeded in substituting detail readings that are structurally and/or semantically closer to Shakespeare than Burgersdijk's:

Romeo and Juliet, III,v,6-18: Ro. It was the lark, the herald of the morn,
No nightingale. Look, love, what envious streaks
Do lace the severing clouds in yonder east.
Night's candles are burnt out, and jocund day
Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain tops.
I must be gone and live, or stay and die. —
Ju. Yond light is not day-light: I know it, I.
It is some meteor that the sun exhalas
To be to thee this night a torchbearer,
And light thee on thy way to Mantua.
Therefore stay yet: thou need'st not to be gone. –
Ro. Let me be ta'en, let me be put to death:
I am content, so thou wilt have it so.

Burgersdijk:
- Het was de leeuwrik, 's daag'raads bode, en niet
  De nachtegaal; zie, lieve, daar in 't oost,
  Wat booze strepen 't scheurend zwart omzoomen;
  De nacht heeft lang haar kaarsen opgebrand,
  En vrolijk gluurt, hoog op de tenen staand,
  De dag daar van der bergen neveltopen;
  Ik moet nu gaan en leef, of blijf en sterf. –
  - Dat is geen daglicht daar, ik weet het, ik;
  't Is een verheev'ling, uit de zon gevloeid,
  Die u deez' nacht tot fakkeldrager zij,
  En voorlichte op uw weg naar Mantua;
  O toef dus nog; uw heengaan heeft nog tijd. –
  - Men grijp' mij dan, en leide mij ter dood;
  't Is ook mijn keuze, als gij het zoo verlangt.

("- It was the lark, daybreak's messenger, and not
  The nightingale; sea, dear, there in the east,
  What angry streaks lace the severing welkin;
  The night has long since burnt up its candles,
  And merrily, standing high on its (the) toes,
  The day peers there from the mountains misty tops;
  I must go now and live, or stay and die. –
  - That is no day-light there, I know it, I;

'Tis an aerial phenomenon, flown forth from the sun,
That be this night a torchbearer to you,
And light you on your way to Mantua;
O therefore linger yet; your departure has yet
time. –
- One seize me then, and lead me to (my) death;
'Tis my choice too, if you wish it (to be) so.")

In this passage, examples of closer readings occur in 1.6 (de heraut van de ochtend); 1.7 (Geen nachtegaal); 1.9; 1.12 (Dat licht daar is geen daglicht); 1.13 (Het is een meteoor); 1.16 (ge hoeft nog niet van hier); and 1.17 (Laat men). In 11.8 and 10 Buddingh' has retained Burgersdijk's reading - both occasions where its sound was particularly pleasing (1.8) or a felicitous combination of rhythm and image
was attained at the cost of some interpretatory liberty and expansion (1.10). Most of the remaining emendations are unobtrusive, and largely successful, attempts at replacing obsolete or archaic syntactic and idiomatic elements by their modern equivalents: (1.7: lieve - liefste; 1.10(b): der bergen neveltoppen - 't amneveld bergland; 1.12: ik weet het, ik - 'k weet het zeker; 11.13-14: uit de zon gevlooid - die uit de zon / Gevlooid komt; 1.14: zij - om te zijn; 1.15: voorlichte - (om) bij te lichten; 1.16: toef - blijf; 1.17: Men grijp'... leide - Laat men... grijpen... nemen), which often also serve the purpose of easing the occasional constrictedness of Burgersdijk's verse (1.18: 't^Is ook mijn keuze;^als - Het is mij wel, als); - occasionally, these involve some little loss of precision (1.14: deez' nacht; 1.15: op uw weg).

Usually, Buddingh's revision is aimed primarily at judicious modernization, while the unmistakable character of Burgersdijk's work is preserved. In the following passage from The Taming of the Shrew, there is a conflict in Burgersdijk's translation between the informal tenor the situation requires and the formality of nineteenth-century poetic diction; this conflict has been removed in Buddingh's version without any loss of precision:

The Taming of the Shrew, IV,i,108-117:

Pet. You peasant swain! You whoreson malt-horse drudge!
Did I not bid thee meet me in the park,
And bring along these rascal knaves with thee? -
Gru. Nathaniel's coat, sir, was not fully made,
And Gabriel's pumps were all unpinned i'th'heel;
There was no link to colour Peter's hat,
And Walter's dagger was not come from sheathing;
There were none fine but Adam, Rafe, and Gregory;
The rest were ragged, old, and beggarly;
Yet, as they are, here are they come to meet you. -

Burgersdijk:
- Jij boerenlummel, schaapskop, ezelskind!
Heb ik je niet gezegd, dat jij in 't park
Met dit geboef't mij tegenkomen zoude? -
- Nathaniëls rok, heer, was zoo erg getarnd;
En Gabriëls schoenen sloften telkens uit;
Er was geen zwartsel meer voor Peters hoed;
De schee van Walters dolk werd juist gelapt;
In 't beste pak slechts Adam, Ralph en Flip,
Al d' and'ren haav'loos en gescheurd; maar toch,
Zoals ze zijn, ze staan daar tot uw dienst. -

Buddingh':
- Jij boerenlummel, schaapskop, ezelsveulen!
Heb ik je niet gezegd, dat jij me in 't park
Met dit geboef't tegemoet zou komen? -
- Nathaniëls jas, heer, was niet helemaal klaar,
En Gabriëls schoenen glipten telkens uit;
Er was geen zwartsel meer voor Peters hoed;
De schee van Walters dolk werd juist gelapt;
Enkel Flip, Ralph en Adam waren netjes;
Al de anderen slordig, haveloos; maar toch,
Zoals ze zijn, staan ze daar tot uw dienst. -
("- Thou peasant yokel, mutton-head, ass's child!
Have I not told thee, that thou... in the park
With this riff-raff shouldst meet me? -
- Nathaniel's frock-coat, sir, was so badly frayed;
And Gabriel's shoes kept on shuffling off;
There was no blackening left for Peter's hat;
The sheath of Walter's dagger was just being
mended;
In their best suits only Adam, Ralph and Philip,
All the others ragged and torn; but yet,
As they are, they stand there, at your service. -")

The metaphor does not and cannot fully capture the difference in tone between Burgersdijk's "dat hij in 't park / Met dit geboeфт' mij tegenkomen zoude"; his "rook" in l.111; "In 't beste pak" and "slechts" in l.115, and Buddingh's less formal and old-fashioned alternatives "dat hij me in 't park / Met dit ge-
boeфт te genoot zou komen", "jas", "waren netjes" and "Enkel", because English does not feature the slight structural and idiomatic variations that are clearly indicative of the shift in tenor Buddingh' has ac-
complished - yet it is particularly in these small changes that the greatest merit of Buddingh's revision
lies: the general excellence of Burgersdijk's work has been left unimpaired, but it has been revitalized
by the admirable discretion with which Buddingh' has pared down its sometimes disturbing element of nine-
teenth-century ceremoniousness. - In the following example, the emendations again affect outdated features
of syntax and idiom, but the formal tenor, which suits the occasion, has been retained:

_Macbeth, V, ix, 5-17:_

_Burgersdijk:_

- _Uw zoon, heer, heeft des krijgsmans schuld be-
taald._

_Buddingh':_

- _Uw zoon, heer, heeft de krijgsmantsol betaald,
Hij leefde, tot hij man geworden was;
Nauw gaf zijn heldemood hiervan getuig'nis
Door zijn onwrikbaar pal staan in de strijd,
Toen stierf hij als een man. — Hij is dus dood? —
— En reeds van 't veld gedragen. Uwe smart
Zij niet door u naar zijn waardig gemeten,
Dan waar' zij eind'loos. — Zijn de wonden voort? —
— Op 't voorhoofd, ja. — Zoo zij hij krijger!
En die zal ik hem wijden. —

(Hij leefde slechts, tot hij man geworden was;
Nauw gaf zijn heldemood hiervan getuig'nis;
Door zijn onwrikbaar pal staan in de strijd;
Of hij stierf als een man. — Hij is dus dood? —
— En reeds van 't veld gedragen. Uw verdriet
Moet gij niet meten naar zijn waarde, anders
Zou 't eindloos zijn. — Heeft hij zijn wond van voren? —
— Op 't voorhoofd, ja. — Dan zij hij een krijger!
Afs!)

Gedicht

Had ik zoo menig' zoon als haar op 't hoofd,
Een schooner dood kon ik voor hen niet wenschen;
Dit zij zijn uitvaart. — Meerder rouw werdent
hij,
En die zal ik hem wijden. —

("Your son, lord, has paid the warrior's debt:
He lived, until he had become a man;
No sooner did his heroic courage bear witness to
this,
By his unyielding stand(ing firm) in (the) battle,
Then he died like a man. — So he is dead? —
— And carried off the field already. Your sorrow
Be not measured by you by his worth,
Then were it endless. — Are the wounds before?
— On the forehead, yes. — Thus be he God's
warrior!
Had I as many a son as hair upon my (the) head,
A fairer death I could not wish for them;
This be his obsequies. — More mourning he de-
serves,
And that shall I devote to him. —")

However, the observation made above that Buddingh's effort could almost be regarded as a new set of
translations would not be justified if he had consistently been as discreet as in the examples given so
far. There is considerable variety in the amount of revision he has done; and where - as, for instance,
in Hamlet - he has rewritten entire passages, modern fluency and lucidity have occasionally been attained
at the expense of poetry. In Hamlet's first soliloquy, the lines (I,ii,140-142): "so loving to my mother
/ That he might not beteem the winds of heaven / Visit her face too roughly" appear in the original ren-
dering and its revision as follows:
Burgerdijk:

zoo teeder voor mijn moeder
Dat hij niet toeliet, dat des hemels adem
Te ruw haar in 't gelaat blies
("so tender to my mother / That he would not
tolerate that heaven's breath / Too roughly
(would) blow her in the face")

Buddingh':

zo teeder voor mijn moeder
Dat hij de wind niet toestond haar te ruw
In haar gesicht te blazen
("so tender to my mother / Dat he would not permit
the wind... to blow (her) too roughly / In her face")

Burgerdijk's version cannot be said to have captured fully the sublime gentleness of image, sound and rhythm of the original; yet it has a fine poetic quality of its own, which has somehow been modernized out of existence in Buddingh's revision. Something similar may be observed in the two renderings of the line "In the dead waste and middle of the night" (I,ii,198):

Burgerdijk:

In 't doodsch en eenzaam midden van de nacht
("In the deathlike and desolate middle of
the night")

Buddingh':

In 't holst van de doodstille, lege nacht
("In the dead" (litt.: "most hollow") "of the dead-
silent, empty night")

Here Burgerdijk's line, while not verbally accurate, has retained the original's essence and poetic weight admirably, by virtue of the nuclear position of the near-homophonic "midden", combined with the evocative epithets "doods en eenzaam". Buddingh's rendering is not without a poetic merit of its own, and certainly offers an interesting and suggestive rhythm - but it has lost the truly Shakespearean ring of Burgerdijk's translation; and, while in the former instance Buddingh's alternative has disposed of one or two small features that might be considered old-fashioned (des hemels adem / Te ruw haar in 't gelaat), in the latter one wonders what has induced him to change the line at all. This also goes for the occasional prose passage, such as the one below, where he has not been content to confine his revision to the outdated and stilted aspects of Burgerdijk's language, but has replaced an accurate and witty rendering by one that is decidedly less satisfactory:

The Comedy of Errors, II,ii,
35-38: Sconce call you it? So you would leave battering, I had rather
have it a head. And you use these blows long, I must get a sconce
for my head, and insconce it too; or else I shall seek my wit in
my shoulders. But, I pray, sir, why am I beaten?

Burgerdijk:

Op mijn bol, heer, zegt gij? als gij het slaan

Buddingh':

Op mijn bol, heer, zegt gij? door uw getrommel zou
"On my sconce, sir, you say? if you would leave off (the) beating, I had rather take it for a head, but if you continue (with) that bashing, I must proceed to get a sconce (i.e.: "bulwark") for my head and cover it well, or seek to store my little bit of wit in my shoulders. But I pray you, sir, why am I beaten?"

Surprisingly - for the general quality of Buddingh's work, and the numerous occasions when he has actually surpassed Burgersdijk's precision, can leave no doubt about his excellent command of English and his great attention to detail - the revision does contain a sprinkling of mistranslations in places where Burgersdijk's original was correct, -or at least not erroneous:

*Macbeth, V,v,2:*

The cry is still 'They come!'

Burgersdijk:

Schreeuwvrij: "Zij komen"; 't Geschreeuw is verstomd, zij komen; ("Cry on: "They come";"")

Buddingh:

"The Cry is silenced, they come;"

*A Midsummer Night's Dream,*

III,ii,186-190:

Lysander's love, that would not let him bide,-
Fair Helena, who more engilds the night
Than all yon fiery oes and eyes of light.
Why seek'st thou me? could not this make thee know,
The hate I bear thee made me leave thee so?

Burgersdijk:

Lysander's min verbood hem, dat hij bleef:
Dee' schoone Helena, die in de nacht
Meer licht verspreidt dan gindsche sterrenpracht.
Wit zoeket ge mij? begreep dit dus nog niet,
Dat haat tot u de grond is, dat ik vlieg?

("Lysander's love forbade him to stay:
This fair Helena, who in the night
Spreads more light than yon splendour of stars.
Why seek you me? so you did not yet understand,
That hate towards you is the reason, that I flee?")

Buddingh:

Lysanders liefde wou niet, dat hij bleef.
Waarom, o Helena, die in de nacht
Meer licht verspreidt dan gindsche sterrenpracht,
Zoekt ge mij steeds? Begrijpt ge dan nog niet,
Dat het uit haat is: dat ik u verliet?

("Lysander's love did not wish him to stay.
Why, o Helena, who in the night
Spreads more light than yon splendour of stars,
Do you seek me still? do you then not understand,
That it is due to hate: that I left you?")
However, blunders of this kind are few and far between; even at its least inspired, Buddingh's work, in so far as it can be considered original, stands up to comparison with that of any other present-day Dutch Shakespeare translator, certainly in point of fidelity. When viewing it alongside Burgersdijk's original texts, one may sometimes have cause to regret the loss of some of the latter's path, grittiness, sonority and undoubtedly superior poetic sensitivity in heavily amended passages; yet such losses are usually offset by the gains discussed before: greater lucidity, judicious modernization of the language, and easing of the old translation's occasionally excessive constrictedness. One extended sample, finally, will show instances of both losses and gains that, in the balance, make it very difficult to decide whether one should be grateful for Buddingh's impressive enterprise or perhaps, after all, rather revert to the old master and put up with his nineteenth-century literary peculiarities.

_Hamlet_, I, V, 92-112:

O all you host of heaven! O earth! What else?
And shall I couple hell? O fie! Hold, hold, my heart;
And you, my sinews, grow not instant old,
But bear me stiffly up. Remember thee!
Ay, thou poor ghost, whiles memory holds a seat
In this distracted globe. Remember thee!
Yea, from the table of my memory
I'll wipe away all trivial fond records,
All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past
That youth and observation copied there;
And thy commandment all alone shall live
Within the book and volume of my brain,
Unmixed with baser matter. Yes, by heaven!
O most pernicious woman!
O villain, villain, smiling, damnèd villain!
My tables, meet it is I set it down,
That one may smile, and smile, and be a villain:
At least I am sure it may be so in Denmark.
So, uncle, there you are. Now to my word:
It is 'Adieu, adieu! Remember me.'
I have sworn't.

Burgersdijk:

O hemelmachten! o gij aard'! Wat meer?
Of hel, uw hulp? Wee mij! - Wees sterk, mijn hart!
En gij, mijn spieren, wordt niet plots'ling oud,
Maar houdt mij krachtig staande! - Uws indachtig!
Ja, arme geest, zoolang geheugen huist
In dezen waanzins-speelbal! Uws indachtig!

Buddingh':

O, hemelmachten! O, aard! Wat nog meer?
Ook nog de hel? O, schande! Kracht, mijn hart!
En gij, mijn spieren, wordt niet plots'ling oud,
Maar houdt mij stevig staande! Ik u gedenken?
Ja, arme geest, zoolang herinnering huist
In dit verbijsterd hoofd! Ik u gedenken?
O, uit het boek van mijn geheugen veeg ik
Alle ijdele, dwaze herinneringen,
Boekenwijsheden, beelden en indrukken,
Door jeugd of zucht naar kennis daar gegrift,
Slechts uw bevel leeft voortaan, gans alleen,
In 't dagboek van mijn brein, en onvermengd
Met minder hoge dingen! Ja, bij God!
O, diep verdorven vrouw!
O, schurk, glimlachende, vervloekte schurk!
Mijn opschrifboekje, ik teken 't aan, dat iemand
Dit steeds weer glimlacht tooch een schurk kan zijn;
Dat kan, weet ik, terminste in Denemarken;
Zo oom, daar staat gi: Nu mijn wapenspreuk;
Zij luidt: 'Vaarwel, vaarwel, gedenk mij, Hamlet!'
Ik heb 't gezworen.
( "O, powers of heaven! O, earth! What yet else?
Or hell, your help? Woe me! - Be strong, my heart!
And you, my muscles, grow not suddenly old,
But keep me strongly on my feet! - Mindful of you!
Ay, poor ghost, as long as memory dwells
In this toy ("playing-ball") of lunacy! Mindful of
you!
O! away from the annal(s) of memory,
Those foolish, those good-for-nothing recollections,
Those saws of books all, every impression,
By youth or desire for knowledge incised there;
For your command, and this alone, shall live
In the book of my brain, alone, and unmixed
With less exalted matters! Yes, by God!
O woman, you bringer of mischief!
O villain! villain! laughing and damned villain!
I note it, - ay right(ly), I write it down,
That one that laughs, and laughs again, may be
(a villain;
In Denmark, certainly, it may be so;
There you are, uncle! But now, but now, my parole,
It is: "Farewell, farewell! be mindful of me."
I have sworn't. -")

A few observations on these two renderings are called for. Burgersdijk's archaic genitival construction
"Uws (mijns) indachtig" (11.95, 97, 111) does mean: "Remember(ing) you (me)"; the alternative re-trans-
lotion "Mindful of.." has been used to point the difference with Biddingh's less stilted, yet aptly solemn "gedenken", a verb applied particularly to remembering the dead. - The English word "memory" can refer to both the faculty and the content of reminiscence; in Dutch, these two senses require different words: "geheugen" in the first, "herinnering" in the second case. However, as Shakespeare's use of the term in 11.96 and 98 only suggests the first sense, Burgersdijk's rendering of 1.96 would seem preferable to Biddingh's. Biddingh's revisions "In dit verbijsterd hoofd" (1.97) and "0, diep verdorven vrouw" (1.105) are distinct improvements on Burgersdijk's awkward "In dezen waanzins-speelbal" and "0 vrouw, gij onheilbrenger", as are his more fluent versions of 11.98-100 and 102-103. Burgersdijk's extra repetition of "schurk" reflects Shakespeare's triple "villain"; on the other hand, Biddingh's "glimlachende" is the better translation of "smiling". The different readings of "Word" (1.110) are interesting: Biddingh's "wapenspreuk" is in line with Dover Wilson's interpretation, and may have been prompted by it. There will be further occasion to view Biddingh's revision in the light of the changes in the Dutch language over the last hundred years, which will be discussed in Chapter XIX.

partial adaptation. - It would be correct to consider the stage versions discussed at the beginning of this chapter as partial adaptations, in so far as only incidental fragments and details are affected by deletion or modification. However, I would like to apply this categorization more particularly to direct and, possibly, integral translations, of which some passages have been subjected to a more liberal and paraphrastic treatment than the rest.

By his own admission, most of Voeten's translations are partial adaptations in this sense; his earliest attempts at Shakespeare - amongst which, remarkably, The Merry Wives of Windsor, a play that would lend itself readily to fairly drastic paraphrasing - are marked by greater textual fidelity than his more recent versions. Voeten's argument in defence of his adaptatory and paraphrastic practice is greater lucidity: "The clarifying and, often, renovating - by means of adaptation - of passages that, with their countless quibbles, allusions and references to contemporary situations and events, were every-day fare to the Elizabethan public, but mean nothing to the theatre-goer of today..., has been applied...particularly in the prose scenes, of which they constitute an important part."¹ And on occasion, his rendering

¹ Postscript to Hendrik IV, (deel I), Amsterdam, 1962, p.157
does bear an exegetic character:

\textit{Henry IV, I}, III,iii,68: 
\textit{Voeten:}
What, will you make a younker of me?
Moet ik me door sloeries laten plukken als de Verloren Zoon? ("Should I let myself be fleeced by trollops like the Prodigal Son?")

Here, he has evidently followed the interpretation of \textit{younker} given by Humphreys in his Arden edition of the play (1968, p.113), and incorporated it in his translation. But far more often, Voeten's dealing with an obscure allusion or a difficult sequence of puns consists in taking the way of least resistance and paraphrasing them away altogether:

\textit{Henry IV, I}, II,i,73-83: 
\textit{(Gad.)} 'zounds, I lie; for they pray continually to their saint, the commonwealth; or rather, not pray to her, but prey on her, for they ride up and down on her, and make her their boots. -
\textit{Cham.} What, the commonwealth their boots? Will she hold out water in a foul way? -
\textit{Gad.} She will, she will: justice hath liquored her. We steal as in a castle, cocksure. We have the receipt of fernseed, we walk invisible. -
\textit{Cham.} Nay, by my faith, I think you are more holding to the night than to fernseed for your walking invisible. -

(".Damn it, now I lie, for they pray continually to their saint, the community, or pray is not the word, they hail (call upon, invoke) her, and if she is taken in, they shake her out. - - What? The community? Can that be done just like that? - - It can, it can - justice is blind, we keep out of range, we are invisible. - - That may well be, if you work in the pitch dark. -")

Even though the quibbles on "pray" and "prey", "boot(y)" and "boots" are intranslatable, with some effort Voeten's lame attempt can easily be bettered, as a comparison with Courteaux's rendering shows:

\textit{Voeten:}
..Verdomd, nou lieg ik, want ze bidden aan één stuk door tot hun heilige, de gemeenschap, of bidden is het woord niet, ze roepen haar aan, en als ze er inloopt, schudden ze haar uit. -
- Wat? De gemeenschap? Kan dat dan zo maar? -
- Dat kan, dat kan - de gerechtigheid is blind, wij blijven buiten schot, wij zijn onzichtbaar. -
- Dat zal wel, als je in 't hardstikke donker werkt. -

\textit{..En toch, drommels, daar lieg ik, want ze bidden onafgebroken tot hun heilige, het gemenebest. Ze laten het gemene liggen en nemen het beste en daaruit snijden ze hun laarzen. -
-Wat, laarzen snijden uit het gemenebest? Zullen de laarzen op een slechte weg wel waterdicht zijn? -
-Zeker zullen ze dat zijn, zeker. Het gerecht}

(".And yet, the deuce, there I lie, for they pray continually to their saint, the commonwealth. They leave the common (=vile, worthless) stuff behind and take the wealth ("best") and cut their boots out of that. - - What, cut boots out of the commonwealth? Will the boots be waterproof on a bad road? -
- Certainly they will, certainly. Justice itself
heeft ze zelf ingevet. We stelen als het ware in
een burcht; zo veilig als het maar kan. We hebben
het recept van varenzaad: we zwerven onzichtbaar.
- Nee, allemachtig, ik geloof dat jullie die on-
zichtbaarheid meer aan de nacht dan aan varenzaad
te danken hebben.

Voeten does not limit his liberties to prose passages:

The Taming of the Shrew, II,i,33-34:

I must dance bare-foot on her wedding day
And, for you love her, lead apes in hell.

("And what do I get? A hot-water bottle in bed. I may / sit about at her wedding as an old maid.")

This pithy, free rendering lies within the scope of legitimate compensation for lost obscurities - in
this case: "dance bare-foot" and "lead apes in hell". But on many occasions, Voeten's only motive for
paraphrasing and condensation would seem to be impatience with what he must have regarded as cumbersome
Elizabethan verbosity - even when verbosity or pedantry lies clearly in Shakespeare's line of character-
ization:

Troilus and Cressida, I,iii,321-335:

Uly. This challenge that the gallant Hector sends,
However it is spread in general name,
Relates in purpose only to Achilles.
- Nes. True. the purpose is perspicuous even as sub-
Whose grossness little characters sum up; \stance,
And, in the publication, make no strain
But that Achilles, were his brain as barren
As banks of Libya, - though, Apollo knows,
'Tis dry enough - will, with great speed of judgement,
Ay, with celerity, find Hector's purpose
Pointing on him.
- Uly. And wake him to the answer, think you?
- Nes. Yes, 'tis most meet. Who may else oppose,
That can from Hector bring those honours off,
If not Achilles?

("- That challenge of Hector's - seemingly / directed at all the Greeks - is only / aimed at Achilles.
- Thou art right; / the purpose is as clear as two times two. / Methinks, when this becomes known Achilles
will - / though his spirit were as barren as the coast / of Libya - immediately understand / that Hector
means him. - / - And do you think, that he then will (be prepared to) fight? - - Yes; / he will have to; for who else but Achilles / can gain honour by a fight with Hector?

This dilatory treatment of Shakespeare's language by Voeten is particularly pervasive in his version of Troilus and Cressida; due to this, much of this play's complex imagery, which is essential to it, has been lost. But instances of such (over)simplification also occur in his Hamlet:

II,ii,210-212:
You cannot, sir, take from me anything that I will more wittingly part withal: except my life, except my life, except my life.

Voeten:
Neem het; er is niets waar ik liever afstand van doe, uitgezonderd mijn leven... mijn leven...
("Take it; there is nothing I rather part with, except my life... my life...")

Osric's fustian has been reduced to such normality as to make Horatio's remark ("Is't not possible to understand in another tongue?") almost pointless:

Hamlet, V,ii,103-108:
..Sir, here is newly come to court Laertes: believe me, an absolute gentleman, full of most excellent differences, of very soft society and great showing. Indeed, to speak feelingly of him, he is the card or calendar of gentry, for you shall find in him the continent of what part a gentleman would see.

Voeten:
..Hoogheid, onlangs is Laertes hier aan het hof gekomen; een volmaakte edelman, geloof mij; in het bezit van de voortreffelijkste eigenschappen, aller-aangenaamst in de omgang en stralend van uiterlijk. Werkelijk - om het met het juiste gevoel uit te drukken - een staalkaart van ridderdeugden; want u zult in hem alles verenigd vinden, wat een edelman gaarne zou willen zien.
("..Highness, recently Laertes has come to the court here; a perfect gentleman, believe me; in the possession of the most excellent qualities, most agreeable in company and of radiant appearance. Really - to express it with the right feeling - a pattern of courtly virtues; for you shall find everything united in him, which a gentleman should like to see. --")

It will be clear from these examples that there is considerable variety in the degree of adaptatory and paraphrastic licence Voeten has assumed: this makes it difficult to assess the value of any one of his translations as a whole, particularly where- as in Hamlet - the greater part of the play has been rendered with reasonable fidelity, while some portions, for no apparent reason, have been slightly or heavily condensed, modified or paraphrased.

An early - and fortunately, all but forgotten - predecessor of Voeten's was P. V. Marcellus, whose version of Julius Caesar suggests an anxiety on his part that Shakespeare was not explicit enough in making
his points:

Julius Caesar, II, i, 169-180:

O, that we then could come by Caesar's spirit,
And not dismember Caesar! But, alas,
Caesar must bleed for it! And, gentle friends,
Let's kill him boldly, but not wrathfully;
Let's carve him as a dish fit for the gods,
Not hew him as a carcass fit for hounds,
And let our hearts, as subtle masters do,
Stir up their servants to an act of rage
And after seem to chide 'em. This shall make
Our purpose necessary and not envious:
Which so appearing to the common eyes,
We shall be called purgers, not murderers.

("...O, could we but approach Caesar's spirit, / While his life was spared! What a pity, / That Caesar must die! - And, worthy friends, / We kill him with courage, but not out of vengefulness! / We bring him as a sacrifice to the Gods! / Not do we slaughter him as a carrion for dogs! / We wish to be judges, not murderers! / The judge passes his sentence without passion / And punishes the deed alone - not what he fears! / O, let us leave innocence unscathed! / Then we ('ll) stand blameless in the eyes of the people, / Which (will) honour us as purgers of the nation."

Marcellus' excessive concern for clarity often manifests itself in typographical features such as spaced and bold print and small, emphatic additions:

Julius Caesar, II, i, 299-302:

I have made strong proof of my constancy,
Giving myself a voluntary wound
Here in the thigh. Can I bear that with patience
And not my husband's secrets?

("For look here, if I can be silent: / I have given myself a wound, / A wound - in my leg; there it is - s e e ! / Can I bear such pain with constancy / And no secrets - of my dear husband.

Various kinds of adaptatory modifications also occur in Werthes Buning's Een Middernachtts Droom. In the first place, parts of the prose passages have been rendered in rather ungainly doggerel, sometimes

---

1 In this instance, the italics are the translator's own.
not without comic effect:

_A Midsummer Night's Dream, III,i,25-28:_

- Masters, you ought to consider with yourselves: to bring in, - God shield us! - a lion among ladies, is a most dreadful thing; for there is not a more fearful wild-fowl than your lion living:

and we ought to look to't. -

("- Brothers, you must consider it yourselves, / Whether it is good to give the ladies a lion / God (shall) guard us terribleness / A lion among ladies as it were / For there is in the world not a wilder fowl / Than the lion in his common behaviour. -")

Less acceptable are passages where Werumeus Buning has taken it upon himself to rewrite Shakespeare entirely, in a way which makes one wonder whether he has actually understood the English:

_A Midsummer Night's Dream, IV,i,43-53:_

- Welcome, good Robin. See'est thou this sweet sight? Her dotage now I do begin to pity:
For, meeting her of late behind the wood, Seeking sweet favours for this hateful fool, I did upbraid her, and fall out with her; For she her hairy tempels then had rounded With coronet of fresh and fragrant flowers; And that same dew, which sometime on the buds Was wont to swell, like round and orient pearls, Stood now within the pretty flowerets' eyes Like tears, that did their own disgrace bewail.

("- Welcome, Puck, I do not enjoy seeing this; / I rather wish, things had gone differently. / When I sought sweet flower for this hateful bed / I would have preferred to put the coronet on her (head) another way. / But wet with dew awakening the woman, / His hairy head still in her arms fierce, / Wreathed with fresh flowers, hardly saw me, / When, like the drop in the morning on the twig / Where one almost broke it like a flower of pearl, / Appeared in her fair light-blue eye / A tear that like her own regret bewailed, -")

It is difficult to make head or tail of this nonsense, which would seem to turn Oberon at this late stage into a strangely pusilanimous character; the worst of it, however - as of all Werumeus Buning's _Midnachte Droom_ - is his execrable treatment of the Dutch language. One may be grateful that nothing came of his plans, announced in 1943 (in _De Gids_, vol.1 of that year) to issue a complete set of Shakespeare
translations of his own.

In the course of this chapter various types of adaptation (or rather, of beverking: "re-treatment" in the widest sense) to which Shakespeare's plays have been subjected in the Netherlands in the course of this century have been dealt with. On the one hand the scope of this survey has, unfortunately, been limited by a lack of available data, particularly in the area of actually used stage texts; on the other, space and time do not allow us to devote as much attention to this topic as it may deserve. There is no need to go into details about an isolated condensed adaptation such as Chiem van Houweninge's De Rozenoorlogen (The Wars of the Roses), based on excerpts from the Henry VI trilogy and Richard III, staged in 1969 by Theater Producties Croislet; Johan de Meester's abridged version of Henry IV, I and II has already been mentioned (see p. 380); of a fragmentary nature was also an anthology of excerpts from various plays, entitled What's in a Name, presented by Erik Vos' Arena in 1963. Under the heading revisions belong the various changes translations have undergone at the hands of the translators themselves between publications or productions; although these would be of great interest in a detailed study of any one particular translator's work, they have usually been of a minor nature, and do not warrant further discussion here - the one exception being Nijhoff's two versions of The Tempest, which will come under close scrutiny in the next chapter. Paraphrases, in some way akin to Schröder's Klucht der Vergissingen but serving a different purpose, are Martin Deelen's Dutch translations of the American Illustrated Classics of World Literature comics versions of Hamlet, A Midsummer Night's Dream, Julius Caesar, Macbeth and Romeo and Juliet: possibly not the most sophisticated means to familiarize the young with the genius of Shakespeare, but perhaps serving its purpose well enough; Deelen has even gone to the trouble of rendering some of the most important speeches - e.g. Hamlet's soliloquies - in blank verse.

Finally, one might wish to view the paraphrastic or compensatory techniques resorted to by most translators when confronted with intranslatable quibbles or topicalities in the light of partial adaptation, in the sense in which I have used that phrase above - but there is, to my mind, an essential difference between Voeten's practice in such situations, illustrated by the example on p. 403, and the way the more orthodox translators have gone about this - which has been discussed at some length in Chapter XVI.

In conclusion, the question may arise whether any limit ought to be set to the legitimacy or permissibility of adaptation. The judgements expressed or implied in the course of this chapter, when Den Brokander's,
Voeten's and Werumeus Buning's work was discussed, may well have suggested that their versions are reprehensible in a way in which, for instance, Hoornweg's, Schröder's and Charivarius' artistically negligible paraphrases are not.

The principle involved, of course, is not one of absolute or relative artistic merit. Short of plagiarism - i.e., the presentation of someone else's translation as one's own - there is no treatment or maltreatment of a Shakespeare play that any authority in the world could reject or condemn effectually enough to stop it from being published or performed. While any type of version, therefore, has an inalienable right to exist, one may justly object to a misrepresentation of its nature: no adaptation should be called a translation, nor should one kind of adaptation be put before the public as another.

For that reason, Schröder's *zeer vrije bewerking* of *The Comedy of Errors* and Charivarius' *loshandige* of *The Tempest* may be accepted for what they are worth; and the complete set of plays published "in de vertaling van Dr. L. A. J. Burgersdijk bewerkt door C. Buddingh" can be regarded as a valid and valuable contribution to the Dutch Shakespeare library - if anything, Buddingh has erred on the side of modesty. By the same token some, if not all of Voeten's versions ought to be dismissed as *vertalingen*, unless their nature were more precisely qualified: even footnotes to some of the excised, condensed or modified passages would help to justify his liberties to some extent. Werumeus Buning's *Een Midsomermachts Droom* is clearly not acceptable as a translation either; and Den Brabander's versions should have been specified as "free adaptations, based on Burgersdijk". And if such versions are used on the stage, the audience has a right to be informed about their relationship to the originals.

A problem at least partially related to that of adaptation is that of poetic liberty - but this requires an approach beyond the consideration of structural and semantic features that, by and large, sufficed for the survey of adaptations and revisions. The next chapter will be devoted to this aspect of the work of a few modern Dutch Shakespeare translators.
CHAPTER XVIII

POETIC AUTONOMY IN TRANSLATION.

In connection with the productions of Droom van een Midsommermaacht in 1961 and 1966 (see pp. 257 and 267), Dolf Verspoor's translation drew a mixture of favourable and unfavourable comments from various drama critics. Interesting, on the latter occasion, was an observation by reviewer Leo Hanekroot (De Pijl, February 1966), who found it an admirable modern version, yet noted that despite its poetic qualities, it could not be regarded as modern Dutch poetry - and thereby illustrated the irresolvable conflict that arises when poetry of one culture and era is transposed into another: to reproduce the character of Shakespeare's work satisfactorily, he suggested, one would have to resort to the poetic conventions of the seventeenth-century Dutch Rederijkers.

The observation is debatable, in so far as the strongly formulaic character of the Rhetoricians' poetry is basically alien to Shakespeare's language as well as to the structure of his drama. It must be conceded that Sybant's Dolle Bruiloft (see Ch.I), with all its imperfections, captures the spirit of The Taming of the Shrew in a unique way; in this instance, however, we are dealing with a comedy, and one need but remember Ducis to imagine how Macbeth, King Lear or Antony and Cleopatra would have emerged in the guise of a Vondelian tragedy. Besides: Sybant wrote in the idiom of his own time, and Hanekroot readily admits that a modern translation in the seventeenth-century temporal dialect, no matter how ingenious, could not be expected to rise above the level of pastiche.

The basic conflict, therefore, remains: to deserve consideration as a valid work of art and, as such, to do justice to the quality of the original, a Shakespeare translation must take shape in a poetic language that comes naturally to the translator - in the sense that it is determined by his time and cultural environment. This means that every serious translator is faced anew with the task of reconciling Shakespeare's poetic form, idiom and mode of thinking with that of his day and age; and that the survival of a translation beyond its era will depend on the author's success in transcending the inherent temporal and cultural compromise and infusing it with a poetic value and vitality of its own, which is nevertheless compatible with that of the original.

That this ideal is closest to realization in a period and cultural climate whose poetry - more particularly: dramatic poetry - is inspired by and attuned to Shakespeare's own, is borne out by the quality of the
Schlegel-Tieck translations, produced in the florescence of German Romanticism. But, as the first part of this study has shown, Dutch literature cannot boast any Herder, Schlegel, Goethe, Schiller or Grillparzer: the romantic Weltanschauung met with little real sympathy in the Netherlands prior to the 1850's, and Dutch poetic drama hardly got off the ground; besides, throughout the nineteenth century, Shakespeare translation remained the province of scholars and scholarly dilettantes. Burgersdijk’s achievement against this background will be assessed once more towards the end of this study; at this stage, let it suffice to say that the vacillation between acceptance and rejection of his work over the last eighty or ninety years indicates that it is still too early to speculate on its permanence; to do so were as dangerous as to overestimate the lasting quality of recent translations, whose immediate appeal rests mainly on the modernity of their language. This feature will be discussed in some detail in Chapter XIX. The activity of a considerable number of practicing and “accredited” Dutch poets as Shakespeare translators in the course of this century can possibly be attributed to an increasing awareness of the conflict discussed above, at a time when verse drama has become virtually extinct and poetic theory – and the art of poetry itself – has been undergoing a variety of revolutionary changes. Nevertheless, only a few of these translators have been seriously engaged in a search for new solutions to the problem.

Van Looy, whose work has been subjected to critical scrutiny in previous chapters, is significant in this respect because his is the first attempt at readjusting the relationship between his rôle as a poet-translator, his medium, and his source. The burden he forced upon the Dutch language and the liberties he took with its syntactic and phonic character – in line with the aesthetic philosophy he subscribed to – might have led to less awkward and pretentious results, if they had been guided by a greater poetic talent and a more sensitive ear. Yet one should be careful not to ascribe his failure as a translator too readily to the fact that he was, after all, more highly regarded as a writer of evocative impressionistic prose than as a poet. Gerard den Brabander, J. W. F. Werumeus Buning and Bert Voeten enjoyed, or still enjoy (in the first two cases: posthumously) a reputation as modern poets of some stature, and by virtue of this, might be entitled to have the licence they allowed themselves as Shakespeare translators or adapters looked upon as examples of poetic autonomy – if their liberties were not of such a patently un-poetic nature.

Even Adriaan Roland Holst – considering his position as one of the foremost poets of the century – has not imposed much by way of a distinctive personal stamp on his renderings of King Lear and Richard III and, as a translator, falls squarely within the category of the conservatives; as examples in preceding.
chapters have shown, his versions surpass Burgerdijk's only occasionally in poetic power, and equally often lose by the comparison. Only his choice of plays, particularly that of *King Lear*, can be regarded as significant for his poetic personality.

His contemporary and peer in the realm of Dutch letters, Martinus Nijhoff, is the only poet who approached his task as a translator in a specifically poetic way and, accordingly, adjusted the medium of language to form a hyphen between the spirit of the play, as he experienced it, and his twentieth-century reader and listener. It is a moot point whether - and if so, to what extent - his two versions of *The Tempest* are to be considered responsible for the shift towards the less formal register, the less rigid treatment of the verse and its rhythm and the paraphrastic text handling that have become characteristic of Shakespeare translations since World War II. Whatever the case may be, his first version, published in 1930, was certainly an early forerunner of this type of translation and a radical departure from the orthodox norms that had guided Burgersdijk's, Koster's, Roland Holst's and even Van Looy's work, and continued to be observed by Van Suchtelen and, more recently, by Buddingh' and Courteaux. What Nijhoff's followers - if the majority of post-war translators may be regarded as such - failed to take into account was that this departure was less of an intentional break with standard practice than a sensitive poet's adjustment to the particular nature of the play he was dealing with.

*Nijhoff's first "Storm".* - The phrase "magic realism" is commonly applied to the style of Nijhoff's mature poetry of the 1930's, which, according to Roland Holst, would have gained him world fame if Dutch were a widely-read language, and which dealt with transcendental themes in a humble every-day idiom of an extraordinarily evocative power. A nostalgia for lost childhood innocence and a longing for redemption are recurrent motifs in this poetry, and it is not surprising that both the subject matter and the poetic character of *The Tempest* had a great appeal for Nijhoff at this stage of his career.

He called his version: *STORM, Een Spel van Tooverij* ("A Play of Magic"); the subtitle immediately suggests which aspect of the play received special emphasis and, as we shall see, the language employed throughout, and a number of idiomatic details in particular convey the impression that he viewed the romance as a fairy tale with parable-like undertones, told in a kind of vernacular poetry of great directness and sim-

---

plicity. Occasionally, Nijhoff’s evangelical frame of mind caused him to over-interpret Shakespeare’s use of religious terms in the play:

EPISODE, 13-20:

Now I want
Spirits to enforce, art to enchant;
And my ending is despair
Unless I be relieved by prayer,
Which pierces so that it assaults
Mercy itself, and frees all faults.
As you from crimes would pardoned be,
Let your indulgence set me free.

("Gone are book and magic art; / Despair will be my ending, unless / A prayer liberate my soul, / Which so fiercely presses towards heaven / That it extorts mercy. / Help! deliver me! you are also / Hoping (to receive) charity.")

In contrast to “indulgence”, “barmhartigheid” is an exclusively biblical term – it refers to God’s mercy, indulgence or charity, and is particularly associated with the parable of the Good Samaritan. Although a little less pronounced, the same tendency is evident in the rendering of Miranda’s famous lines (V,i,181-184):

O, wonder!
How many goodly creatures are there here!
How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world,
That has such people in’t!

("O, marvel! / How numerous are the beautiful creatures! / How glorious is Man, reborn world, / Renewed in a whole people!")

Here again: “schepselen” – although a perfectly correct translation of “creatures” – is a form only used in a religious register; the alternative, more mundane plural of the word being: “schepsels”. As a rule, however, the scriptural element in the more solemn passages of Storm is merely a matter of tone; and this is often modified by an admixture of Nijhoff’s informal story-telling vocabulary:

III,i,60-75:

You fools! I and my fellows
Are ministers of Fate. The elements,
Of whom your swords are tempered, may as well
Wound the loud winds, or with bemooned-at stabs

Verdwaasden! Vrij,
Ik en mijn helpers, zijn in dienst van ’t Noodlot;
Het staal waarvan uw zwaardjes zijn vervaardigd
Steekt eer een gat in golven of in stormwind,
Kill the still-closing waters, as diminish
One doyle that's in my plume. My fellow-ministers
Are like invulnerable. If you could hurt,
Your swords are now too massy for your strengths,
And will not be uplifted. But remember,
For that's my business to you, - that you three
From Milan did supplant good Prospero;
Exposed unto the sea, which hath requit it,
Him and his innocent child; for which foul deed
The pow'rs, delaying, not forgetting, have
Incensed the seas and shores, yea, all the creatures,
Against your peace.

("Foolish ones! We, / I and my helpers, are in the service of Fate; / The steel of which your little swords are made / Will sooner prick a hole in waves or in (a) stormy breeze, / Than that it will hurt one little feather in my wing; / My henchmen are also invulnerable; anyway, / Those weapons are already too heavy for you, you can / Hardly lift them. - Know you will: / (Hear, hear my message!) know: that you three / Have driven Prospero from Milan, / Abandoned him to the sea (which has requited it) / Him and a helpless child; that, for that misdeed, / The power that delays sometimes but never forgets, / Has unchained (the) sea, land, yea, all the creation / Against your egotism.")

The effect of the diminutives "zwaardjes" and "veertje" is much greater than the metaphor - with the aid of "little" can convey: they give an innocuous air to the whole passage. There can be no doubt that Nijhoff employed this device deliberately, so as to reduce the scale of events as if they are watched through the wrong end of a telescope. At times the result smacks too much of the nursery, as when Prospero threatens Ariel to peg him in the knotty entrails of an oak (I,i,294-296) "en laat je / Twaalf wintertjes door schreeuwen" ("and leave thee / To howl away twelve little winters") - and in the passage where Antonio tries to persuade Sebastian to kill the king (II,i,264-276):

Seb. But for your conscience?
Ant. Ay, sir: where lies that? If 'twere a kibe,
'Twould put me to my slipper; but I feel not
This deity in my bosom. Twenty consciences,
That stand 'twixt me and Milan, candied be they,
And melt, ere they molest! Here lies your brother,
No better than the earth he lies upon,
If he were that which now he's like, - that's dead,- Whom I, with this obedient steel, three inches of it,
Can lay to bed for ever; whiles you, doing thus,

Dan dat het in mijn vlerk één veertje krenkt;
Ook mijn travanten zijn onkwetsbaar; trouwens,
Die wapens zijn u reeds te zwaar; gij kunt
Ternauwnood hen tillen. - Weten zult ge:
(Hoort, hoort mijn boodschap!) weten: dat gij drieën
Prospero hebt verdreven uit Milaan,
Hem prijsgaft aan de zee (die 't heeft vergolden)
Hem en een hulpeloos kind; dat, voor die wandaad,
De macht, die uitstelt soms maar nooit vergeet,
Zee, land, ja, heel de schepping heeft ontketend

Tegen uw zelfzucht.

- Maar uw geweten? - Beste man, waar zit dat?
Trouwens, al deed het pijn als winterteenen,
Dan zou 'k pantoffels aandoen: neen, ik voel
Geen stemmetje in mijn hart; de tiend gewetens,
Die mij Milaan verbieden, zijn van suiker
Dat smeelt voordat het prikt. - Daar rust uw broeder,
Haast niet meer van den bodem te onderscheiden,
Wanneer dit "rust" eens werd wat het al lijkt;
Met 't puntje van dit vriendelijke mes

Spreid ik zijn eeuwig bedje, en desgelijks
To the perpetual wink for aye might put
This ancient morsel, this Sir Prudence, who
Should not upbraid our course.

(‘- But your conscience? — Dear man, where lies that? / Anyway, even if it hurt like chilblained toes,
/ Then I’d put on slippers: no, I feel / No little voice in my heart; the ten consciences, / That bar me
from Milan, are made of sugar / That melts ere it pricks. There your brother rests, / Hardly distinguish-
able from the ground, / When this "rest" would once become what it already resembles; / With the little
tip of this friendly knife / I’ll make his eternal little bed, and in the same way / You see to it, that
for ever the old flesh / Of Father Bore will doze off, before he / Can give us (little) beans.")

The same objection may be felt to apply to the occasional instance of excessive delicacy:

IV,i,181-184:

At last I left them
I'th'filthy-mantled pool beyond your cell,
There dancing up to th'chins, that the foul lake
O'erstunk their feet.

("At last I housed / The cattle in the covered you-know-what-pit: / There they are (stand) stamping about
in the chilly sludge / That it dashes up to their chins.")

The fairy-tale atmosphere is enforced by some characteristic terminology Nijhoff uses:

IV,i,196-197:

Monster, your fairy, which you say is a harmless
fairy, has done little better than played the Jack
with us.

("That little pixie, monster, which thou said was so harmless, has actually played us an ugly trick.")

In view of what we know to have happened, the standing expression "iemand bij de neus nemen": "to grab
someone by the nose", i.e.: "play a trick on one" is very aptly used here. - Prospero's "demi-puppets"
(V,i,36) are also rendered as "kabouters" —: "dwarfs, gnomes, trolls, pixies", little people of the
benevolent red-capped, white-bearded variety associated with Snow-white and that, portrayed in plaster,
adorns suburban gardens.

The key-word "Art", which endows the figure of Prospero with significance beyond that of a magician-
prince, has an excellent Dutch equivalent in the word "Kunst", yet Nijhoff often chooses to narrow down
its scope to the denotation of magic; e.g. in I,ii,1 he translates it as "macht" ("power"), in I,ii,25
as "tooovermacht" ("magic power"), in II,i,286 as "toooverblik" ("magic sight"), in IV,i,41 as "toooverij"
("magic, enchantment"), in V,i,50 as "dwang" ("constraint").

On the basis of these isolated examples, Nijhoff's approach to The Tempest and the language he used to convey his interpretation may not make an altogether favourable impression; besides, it must be said that his detailed understanding of the text - at least at the time when he produced the first version - was imperfect. The following are instances where he has clearly misunderstood or misread the English:

I,ii,284-285:

Art. Yes, Caliban her son. -

Pros. Dull thing, I say so: he, that Caliban,.. - Eén stuk stompeinnheid, die Kalibaan..

("Yes, Caliban, her son, - A lump of obtuseness, that Caliban.")

I,ii,571: That beasts shall tremble at thy din. - Dat al de dieren om je kol heen sidd'ren.

("That all the beasts about thy den shall tremble")

II,i,191-193:

Nor I: my spirits are nimble. - Neen, mijn gedachten vliegen:

They fell together all, as by consent. - Nu schieten ze op één punt neer, als bij afspraak;

They dropped, as by a thunderstroke. - Nu storten ze, als bij donderslag.

("No, my thoughts are flying: / Now they shoot down upon one point, as by consent; / Now they plummet, as by thunderstroke.")

II,i,221-225:

Although this lord of weak remembrance, this, - Ofschoon dat heerschap met zijn slecht geheugen,

Who shall be of as little memory - (Die 't slacht zal heugen als hij straks in 't graf ligt!)

When he is earthed,.. -

("Although that gent with his poor memory, / (Who will remember it poorly ("badly" - i.e.: as something bad, a bad experience) when presently he will lie in his grave!)")

II,i,242-243:

Whereof what's past is prologue; what to come, - Om dit voorspel te ontwikk'len, met een daad

In yours and my discharge. - Noah u noch mij te wijten.

("To develop this prologue, with a deed / For which neither you nor I will be to blame.")

III,ii,138-139:

Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments - Soms deinen duizend bengelende instrumenten

Will hum about mine ears; - Al gonsend om mij heen;

("Sometimes a thousand dangling instruments / Sway, humming, about me;")
IV, i, 164: Come with a thought.

V, i, 2-3: and time / Goes upright with his carriage.

V, i, 70-71: I will pay thy graces
Home both in word and deed.
("your honesty / I'll reward at home, in word and deed.")

V, i, 64: The charm dissolves apace;

Despite these regrettable blemishes, *Storm* is still justly regarded as one of the most remarkable and poetically satisfying Dutch Shakespeare translations. Nijhoff may have failed to grasp the occasional verbal detail, and gone too far in emphasizing *The Tempest's* fairy-tale character and religious aspect; yet his version testifies to a deep empathy with the essence of the play. Due to the fact that *The Tempest* depends for its poetic quality more on situational than verbal metaphor, little of its meaning is lost by the respectful liberty Nijhoff has exercised in his handling of the text, which is at its most paraphrastic in some of the key passages; he has also observed the unusually loose verse structure and reflected it in his use of run-on lines, hypermetrism and hemistich, and a free conversational rhythm. Without sacrificing his lucid, simple twentieth-century idiom, he rises, in important passages, to poetic heights rarely attained by any Dutch Shakespeare translator before or since. In spite of its "dangling" instruments, Caliban's music speech in III, i (11.126-134) is an example:

Be not afraid: the Isle is full of noises,
Sounds and sweet airs, that give delight, and hurt not.
Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments
Will hum about mine ears; and sometimes voices,
That, if I then had waked after long sleep,
Will make me sleep again: and then, in dreaming,
The clouds methought would open, and show riches
Ready to drop upon me, that, when I waked,
I cried to dream again.

("Be not afraid: the island is full of sounds, / Singing, buzzing; that caresses, that does no(t) hurt. / Sometimes a thousand dangling instruments / Sway, humming about me; sometimes there are voices, / And it is as if I awaken from a deep sleep / And am sung to sleep again; then I dream, / That clouds open up, and something that glistens / Almost glides down on me; but then I awaken, / Sobbing to be allowed to dream on.")

Breng mij een denkbeeld! ("Bring me an idea!")

De tijd volvoert zijn taak. ("Time completes its task.")

uw eerlijkheid
Beloon ik thuis, met woord en daad.

De ban wijkt langzaam ("The spell yields slowly")
And Nijhoff's first rendering of Prospero's renunciation speech (V,i,21-57) certainly belongs to the finest Shakespeare in Dutch:

Hast thou, which art but air, a touch, a feeling of their afflictions, and shall not myself, one of their kind, that relish all as sharply, passion as they, be kindlier moved than thou art? though with their high wrongs I am struck to th' quick, Yet with my nobler reason 'gainst my fury do I take part. The rarer action is in virtue than in vengeance. They being penitent, the sole drift of my purpose doth extend not a frown further. Go release them, Ariel. My charms I'll break, their senses I'll restore, and they shall be themselves.

Ariel
I'll fetch them, sir.

Pros. Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes and groves;

And ye that on the sands with printless foot do chase the ebbing Neptune, and do fly him when he comes back; you demi-puppets that by moonshine do the green sour ringlets make, whereof the ewe not bites; and you whose pastime is to make midnight mushrooms, that rejoice to hear the solemn curfew; by whose aid weak masters though ye be — I have bedimmed the noontide sun, called forth the mutinous winds, and 'twixt the green sea and the azured vault set roaring war; to the dread rattling thunder have I given fire, and rifted Jove's stout oak with his own bolt; the strong-based promontory have I made shake, and by the spurs plucked up the pine and cedar: graves at my command have waked their sleepers, oped, and let 'em forth by my so potent art. But this rough magic I here abjure; and, when I have required some heavenly music, — which even now I do, — to work mine end upon their senses that this airy charm is for, I'll break my staff, bury it certain fathoms in the earth, and deeper than did ever plummet sound I'll drown my book.

Treft u, die slechts van lucht zijt, zoo gevoelig iets van hun leed? zou ik, als soort-genoot, die 't zelfde smaakt, die ondergaat als zij, nog niet door meer verteederend ontroerd zijn? Zij hebben mij tot in het merg gegrift,

Maar toch kies 'k, met mijn hooger Ik, partij tegen mijn wraak; vergeven kost een kracht edeler dan vergelden; wroeging ziende, ligt er geen frons van ergerenis voortaan in mijn bedoeling meer; ga heen, ontsla hen; ik breek den ban, 'k herstel hen in hun zinnen, zij worden meer zichzelf.

— Ik breng ze u, heer.

— Geesten van berg en bron, van woud en vijvers,

En gij die 't strand langs, op spoorloze voeten de zee drijft in haar ebb en voor haar vlucht zoodra ze in vloed terugkomt; gij kabouters die maakt in 't gras, bij maanlicht, zure kringen waarvan het schaap niet eet; gij die bij onttij de paddestoelen knutselt; gij die lacht wanneer de vesper luidt; 't was met uw bijstand, (hoewel nietig ge uit u zelf ook zijn) dat ik de middagzon gedempt, den storm verwekt heb, en tusschen groene golven en 't hol azuur verbolgenheid gestookt; het knetterend weerlicht ontrukte ik aan den vuist van Zeus en spleet zijn eigen elk; het vaste voorgebergte heb ik doen schudden; boomen heb 'k ontworteld, pijnen en ceders; graven als ik last gaf, stieten hun slapers wakker, en de dooden wandelden in mijn dwang. — maar dit ruig toov'ren ik zweer het af; en, wanneer ik bereikt heb een hemelse muziek (waar 'k thans aan werk) die hen beziele tot mijn einddoel met zingende toovermacht, dan breekt 'k mijn staf, begraaf de stukken vademem onder aarde, en werp zoo diep als nooit een peillood neerzonk mijn boek in zee.
("Strikes you, that are but (made) of air, so sensibly / Something of their affliction? Ought not I, as a congener, / That tastes the same, that suffers as they do, / To be moved by a still greater clemency ("softening")? / They have grieved me to the marrow, / But yet I (choose to) take, with my higher self, sides / Against my revenge; to forgive demands a strength / Nobler than to requite; seeing remorse, / No frown of vexation will henceforth / Lie in my intention any more; go, release them; / I'll break the spell, I'll restore them in their senses, / They'll be themselves again. — I'll fetch them for you, sir. — / - Spirits of mountain and spring, of wood and ponds, / And you that along the beach, on trace- / less feet / Drive the sea into its ebb and flee for it / As soon as it returns at high tide; you trolls / That make in the grass, by moonlight, sour rings / Whereof the sheep does not eat; you that in off- ("unseasonable")hours / Potter at making (the) mushrooms; you that laugh / When evensong sounds; — it was with your help, / (Slight though you are in yourselves) that I / Have dimmed the midday sun, engendered the tempest, / And between green waves and the concave azure / Stirred up wrath; the crackling lighting / I wrested from Zeus' fist and rifted / His own oak; the firm promontory / I have made shake; trees have I uprooted, / Pines and cedars; graves as I gave command, / Pushed their sleepers awake, and the dead / Walked in (by) my constraint. — But this rough (working of) magic, / I abjure it; and, when I have attained / A heavenly music (which I'm now working at) / That animate them to my final purpose with / Singing magic power, then I'll break my staff, / Bury the pieces fathoms under earth, / And throw as deep as never plummet sounded / My book into the sea. —")

"De Storm" of 1952. — In the previous chapter we have seen how far Buddingh' occasionally went in his revision of Burgersdijk; yet his work, which never really affects the spirit of the original, is slight compared to the changes Nijhoff wrought in his own Storm for its republication in 1952. Most of the aspects of the first version that might be objected to have been removed; errors have been corrected:

II,i,191-195 (see p.416):

Noch ik, Klaarwakker is mijn geest. Zij vielen allen neer, of t afspraak was, En sliepen als bij toverslag.

("Nor I. Wide-awake is my spirit. They all fell down, as though it were (by) consent, And fell asleep as by a stroke of magic.")

II,i,221-223 (see p.416):

Al heeft die ridder van het kort geheugen, (Wiens heugenis al even kort zal zijn Als hij in 't graf ligt!),

("Although that knight of short memory, (Whose memory" (i.e.: being-remembered) "will be just as short / When he lies in the grave!...")

IV,i,164 (see p.417): Ik denk je herwaarts, Ariël.

("I think thee hither, Ariel.")

V,i,2-3 (see p.417): De tijd reikt ruimschoots toe. ("Time suffices amply.")

The nursery-tone, and many of the diminutives are gone:
II, ii, 152-157:

I prithee, let me bring thee where crabs grow;
And I with my long nails will dig thee pig-nuts;
Show thee a jay's nest, and instruct thee how
To snare the nimble marmoset. I'll bring thee
To clust'ring filberts, and sometimes I'll get thee
Young scamels from the rock. Wilt thou go with me?

Storm, 1930:

Ik neem u mee waarheen de mispels groeien;
Graaf truffels uit, kijk, met mijn lange nagels;
Ik ruik waar kievits-eitjes zijn, en 't schuwst
Konijntje kan ik strikken, houdt ge ervan,
Ik weet een oesterbank; ik klauter recht
De rots langs, voor nestmeeuwtjes. - Gaat ge mee?

("I'll take you along whither (sic) the medlars
grow; / Dig out truffles, look, with my long nails;
I smell where little peewits' eggs are, and the
shyest / Little coney I can snare; if you like
them, / I know an oyster-bank; I clamber right
Along the rock, for little nest-mews. Will you
come?")

Trinculo no longer refers to the storm (II, ii, 19) as "een aardig buitje" ("a nice little shower") and to
pailfuls (II, ii, 23) as "emmertjes" ("little buckets"), Prospero calls the comic conspirators "vlegels"
("churls") rather than "bengels" ("scapegraces, naughty boys"; V, i, 252, 274) and "snuiters" ("jokers,
chaps"; V, i, 255); and generally, jarring lapses of tone and decorum have been amended:

IV, i, 146-147:

You do look, my son, in a moved sort,
As if you were dismayed. Be cheerful, sir.

Storm, 1952:

Het komt mij voor, mijn zoon, dat gij ontroerd
En als verslagen zijn; kom, wees goedsmoeds.

("It seems to me, my son, that you are moved
And as it were dismayed; come, be of good cheer.")

V, i, 71-78:

Didst thou, Alonso, use me and my daughter.
Thy brother was a furtherer in the act.
Thou art pinched for't now, Sebastian. Flesh and blood,
You, brother mine, that entertained ambition,
Expelled remorse and nature; - who, with Sebastian,
(Whose inward pinches therefore are most strong),
Would here have killed your King; -..

_Sterm_, 1930:

Wreed was het,
Alonso, wat ge mij deedt en mijn dochter;
Uw broeder hielp een handje: Sebastiaan,
Knelt het daar niet van binnen? - Vleesch en bloed,
Broeder met uw vertroetelde eerzucht, zonder
Berouw of meegemoel, die met Sebastiaan
(Die nog tenminste inwendig in de kneel zit)
Uw koning wilde doden;..

("Cruel it was,
Alonso, what you did to me and my daughter:
Your brother gave a (little) hand: Sebastian,
Does it not pinch inside there? - Flesh and blood,
Brother with your mollycoddled ambition, without
Remorse or sympathy, who with Sebastian
(Who at least is in a fix inwardly)
Intended to kill your king; . . .")

and the final lines of the epilogue (cp. p. 413) show how the religious element has also been toned down:

_Ik heb geesten meer, noch kunst.
Wanhoop wordt het geen mij waakt.
Vindt niet mijn gebod de kracht
Dat het de genade treft.
Die van alle schuld ontheft.
Op vergeving hoopt ook gij;
Laat mij door uw mildeheid vrij.

("I no longer have spirits, nor art.
Despair will be that which awaits me
If my prayer does not find the strength
To strike mercy
That exonerates from all debt (guilt).
For forgiveness you also foster hope.
Set me free by your liberality.")

It will be evident from the quoted examples how radically Nijhoff's second version differs from the first; not only does it in many respects constitute a considerable technical improvement, but some of the concepts that lay at the basis of the first _Storm_ have been modified; although the emphasis on magic persists, the fireside-tale cosiness has disappeared, along with the parable-like naivete; the language is tauter, sterner, more homogeneous and particularly, less informal throughout; as a result, the characters are more remote, yet, at the same time, larger and more awe-inspiring; the entire poetic focus has been shifted. While by and large the text has been followed much more closely, even in passages that have been
as freely translated as before a pervasive element of higher seriousness is noticeable, although the idiom continues to be sober and straightforward:

III,i,1-7: There be some sports are painful, and their labour
Delight in them sets off. Some kinds of baseness
Are nobly undergone, and most poor matters
Point to rich ends. This, my mean task,
Would be as heavy to me as odious, but
The mistress which I serve quickens what's dead,
And makes my labours pleasures.

Storm, 1930:
Moge arbeid soms een kwelling zijn: steeds brengt
De inspanning geestkracht voort; verdrukking wordt
Geadeld door geduld, en bukken-kunnen
Verscherpt en staalt den wil. - Dit lage zwoegen
Hield ik niet uit, en haatte ik, wanneer niet
Mijn meesteres neerslachtigheid bezielde
En een karwei tot vreugde omschep.
("If labour may sometimes be a torment: exertion
still / Brings forth spiritual strength; oppression
is / Ennobled by patience, and being able to stoop
Sharpened and steel the will. - This mean drudgery
I would not stand, and would hate, if not
My mistress animated dejectedness
And transformed a job into joy.")

De Storm, 1952:
Soms is een arbeid zwaar, terwijl zijn druk
Toch vreugde schenkt; soms wordt een krenking
Met ere ondergaan, en is ellende
De weg naar een hoog doel. - Dit lage werk
Zou slopend zijn en hatelijk, als niet
Zij die ik dien de dode stof bezielde
En last herschep tot lust.
("Sometimes a labour is heavy, while its strain
Yet gives joy; sometimes an injury is
Nobly undergone, and wretchedness is
The way to a high end. - This mean work
Would be sapping and hateful, if not
She whom I serve animated (the) dead matter
And transformed a burden into pleasure.")

Even the comics' dialogue, while losing none of its juiciness, has a sturdier, more adult ring to it:

III,ii,23-27: Thou liest, most ignorant monster: I am in case to justle
a constable. Why, thou deboshed fish, thou, was there ever
man a coward that hath drunk so much sack as I to-day?
Wilt thou tell a monstrous lie, being but half a fish and
half a monster?

Storm, 1930:
Dat heet ik liegen monster, dat heb je mis; ik
was net in de stemming, om met den eerstest agent
die ik zie te gaan bakkeleien! - Jij leelijk zee-
beest, iemand die zooveel kan drinken op één dag
als ik, - weet je dat nog niet? - mag je dien
zoo maar voor lafbek uitmaken? Begin je nu al

De Storm, 1952:
Je liegt, achterlijk monster, ik ben in staat
een dragonder te lijf te gaan.

Weet jij niet, halfzacht weekdier, dat een man
nooit laf is, die zoveel wijn heeft gedronken
als ik vandaag? Verkoop jij een monsterlijke
liederlijke taal te verkondigen, terwijl je zelf maar een kruising bent van een monster met een schollekop!

("I call that lying monster, thou art wrong there; I was just in the mood to go and tussle with the the first cop that I see! - Thou ugly sea-beast, someone who can drink as much in one day as I, - dost thou not know that yet? - canst thou call him a coward just like that? Dost thou begin to proclaim abominable language now already, while thou art thyself but a cross between a monster and a plaice's head!")

Emendations may, at times, be only fragmentary, yet still contribute in a major way to the totally different mood of the second Storm:

IV,i,148-158:

Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits, and
Are melted into air, into thin air:
And like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
As dreams are made on; and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.

Storm, 1950:

Zoo loopt ons feest ten eind. Ik zeide u toch,
De spelers waren geesten; zij zijn thans
Tot lucht teruggevloeid, tot dunne lucht.
En als dit vluchtig saamgeknutseld schouwspel,
Gaan stoere torens, statige paleizen,
Verheven tempels, ja, heel de aardbol zelf,
Met wat zij teelt en tieren laat, verdampen,
En als van dit verbleekt visioen, zoo blijft er
Geen spoor van na. Wij zijn van eender maaksel
Als dromen zijn en ons geringe leven
Ligt midden in een slaap.

("Thus our festivity comes to an end. I told you,
The actors were spirits; they have now

leugen, jij, die zelf maar half een vis bent, en half een monster?

("Thou liest, backward monster, I am capable of tackling a dragoon. Dost thou not know, effete mollusc, that a man is never cowardly that has drunk as much wine as I have today? Dost thou tell a monstrous lie, thou, that art thyself but half a fish and half a monster?")

De Storm, 1952:

De feestvreugde is voorbij. Ik zei u toch,
De spelers waren geesten; zij zijn thans
Tot lucht teruggevloeid, tot dunne lucht.
En als dit voos en vluchtig visioen,
Zoo gaan omwolkte torens, lustpaleizen,
Gewijde tempels, ja, de aardbol zelf
En alles wat hem opvolgt, eens teloor,
Zonder dat er, als van dit ijle spel
Een spoor van blijft. Wij zijn van eender maaksel
Als dromen zijn en ons geringe leven
Ligt midden in een slaap.
Run back into air, into thin air.
And like this fleeting rigged-together spectacle,
(the) Sturdy tower, stately palaces,
Lofty temples, yea, all the globe itself,
With what it engenders and allows to thrive, will evaporate / And as of this faded vision, thus
No trace of it will remain behind. We are of the same make / As dreams are and our futile life
Lies in the middle of a sleep.

Nijhoff's first motive for undertaking the revision was possibly his awareness that the original Storm could do with a lot of improvement at a technical, prima facie level; but consciously or not, he reviewed The Tempest with the eyes of a mortally ill man who had recently experienced the terror of World War II, which had demonstrated that malice, treason and monstrosity on a cosmic scale were no fairy-tale matters. The world of G. B. Shaw, Noel Coward and T. S. Eliot had given way to that of Sartre and Beckett, and De Storm of 1952 belongs to that world; Jan Kott had not yet formulated his ideas, but this version would be able to reflect such ideas, whereas the old Storm could never have done so.

Both Storm and De Storm are unique amongst Dutch Shakespeare translations in that, while doing justice to Shakespeare, they clearly convey the translator's poetic frame of mind at different stages of life. The second version is undoubtedly superior to the first - yet one may conceivably regret the loss of certain qualities the first Storm possessed despite all its weaknesses: a sense of discovery, a pristine freshness, and a spirit of hope - and be grateful for what lyrical fragments Nijhoff saw fit to salvage from its wreck and incorporate in his final, more down-to-earth vision of Shakespeare's swansong:

**V, i, 88-94:**

Where the bee sucks, there suck I.
In a cowslip's bell I lie;
There I couch when owls do cry.
On the bat's back I do fly
After summer merrily.
Merrily, merrily shall I live now
Under the blossom that hangs on the bough.

("Gone along with the bees / I slumber in a gentian, / Glide when the owls begin to croak, / On a bat('s back) thence / After summer's sunlight; / Gliding and flitting my track henceforward will go / Through the quivering blossoms of the orchards."
Poetic approaches of other translators. - No other Dutch Shakespeare translators have left such a distinctively and intrinsically poetic stamp on their work, but certain aspects of Nijhoff's approach may be found elsewhere. The departure from a formal poetic register in favour of a modern every-day idiom, a conversational tone and a natural speech rhythm may have been in P. V. Marcellus' mind when he made his unsatisfactory and clumsy attempt at Julius Caesar, which has been sampled on pp.302-303 and 406; along with the discreetly paraphrastic text treatment that was to be characteristic of Nijhoff's Storm, this new approach to Shakespeare's language - which may be seen as a reaction against the extreme artificiality of the Tauchtigers and Van Looy - was first applied in a poetically satisfying way by Remko ter Laan in his version of The Winter's Tale (1923). Autolycus' song from Act IV,iii has already been quoted in Ter Laan's fine rendering (see pp.373-374); the passage below is representative for his appealingly fluid handling of blank verse:

The Winter's Tale, I,ii,62-74:

Pol. We were, fair Queen,
Two lads that thought there was no more behind
But such a day to-morrow as to-day,
And to be boy eternal. - Her. Was not my lord
The verier wag o'th'two? -
Pol. We were as twinned lambs that did frisk i'
th'sun,
And bleat the one at th'other. What we changed
Was innocence for innocence; we knew not
The doctrine of ill-doing, nor dreamed
That any did.

    Had we pursued that life,
And our weak spirits ne'er been higher reared
With stronger blood, we should have answered heaven
Boldly 'Not guilty'; the imposition cleared
Hereditary ours. -

("- We were, queen, two children, / that thought, that there was nothing more to come / than another day tomorrow, just like today, / and to be children forever. - - Was not my lord / The naughtier of both? - - We were like / two lambs, that, frisking in the sun, / bleat one at the other. We exchanged / innocence for innocence and we knew not / the doctrine of sinfulness and dreamed not / that this doctrine had its followers. / And had we continued that life / and not reared higher our spirit(s) / with stronger blood, we should in heaven / have boldly answered "free of guilt", / but for guilt, which was a heritage to us."")

Due to the nature of its language The Winter's Tale, like The Tempest, lends itself well to this kind
of treatment. The only serious objection one might raise against Ter Laan's Winteravondspreekje is that the bland texture of his verse, facilitated by his habit of expanding liberally (see p.309), is insufficiently varied to do full justice to the occasional density and refractoriness of expression that plays such an important and dramatically effective part in the original. He foreshadows Voeten in the way he has smoothened out whatever feature of the text might prove to be an obstruction to the reader's or listener's immediate comprehension:

I,ii,135-146:

Come, sir page, Look on me with your welkin eye. Sweet villain! Most dear'st! my collop! Can thy dam? -may't be? - Affection! thy intention stabs the centre: Thou dost make possible things not so held, Communicat'st with dreams; - how can this be? - With what's unreal thou coactive art, And fellow'st nothing. Then 'tis very cedcent Thou mayst co-join with something: and thou dost, And that beyond commission, and I find it, And that to the infection of my brains And hard'ning of my brows. ("Let me see thine eyes, / my little page blue-eyes, little villain, / my greatest property! And thy mother should... / O love, your passion penetrates murderously into the heart! / You make possible to us that which never seemed so, / and play a dream-game with us - how can it be? - / and conspire with unreality / and if you make Something subservient to yourself, o, how easily / you also cooperate with Nothing, / as (you do) here now: here you are excessively active / and I comprehend it and it assails my brains / and makes them ill and makes my forehead harder!")

The concern with lucidity and with the uncluttered, mellifluous line shown by Ter Laan, the interpretatory liberty exercised by Nijhoff, and the modern idiom used by both are, in various combinations, traceable features in the work of most of the prominent present-day translators. Voeten, as we have seen, aims for maximum lucidity, but often does so at the expense of imagery and poetic complexity. Andreus aims for a natural, conversational tone, but in the process frequently loses sight of the verse altogether; in his version of Cymbeline, which play shares the free verse and the many run-on lines of the other romances, he uses enjambment so indiscriminately that the verse often reads like scanned prose devoid of all rhythmic tension:
Cymbeline, IV, ii, 7-16:

So sick I am not, yet I am not well;
But not so citizen a wanton as
To seem to die ere sick. So please you, leave me:
Stick to your journal course. The breach of custom
Is breach of all. I am ill, but your being by me

Cannot amend me: society is no comfort
To one not sociable. I am not very sick,
Since I can reason of it. Pray you, trust me here.

I'll rob none but myself; and let me die,
Stealing so poorly.

("It's not that bad. I don't feel well at all, / but am no little city slicker that... of dying / thinks before he is sick. Leave me be. Please. / Do as thou art used to. If in one thing I / 'd be a nuisance, I am a nuisance in everything. I feel / ("myself") a little peculiar, but if thou stayest here, then... should / that not help anyway, for society does not comfort / one who is unsociable. And really, my sickness / signifies nothing: after all, I still talk about it. / Just let me look after the house. I can't... anybody / rob but myself - and if I die, / I'm but a petty thief.")

Andreas:

Zo erg is 't ook niet. 'k Voel me lang niet goed,
maar ben geen stads mensje dat aan sterven
denkt voor hij ziek is. Laat me. Alsjeblieft.
Ga je gewone gang. Als ik in één ding
zou storen, stoor ik ook in alles. 'k Voel
me een beetje vreemd, maar blijf je hier, dan zou
dat toch niet helpen, want gezelschap troost niet
wie ongezellig is. En heus, mijn ziekte
betekent niets: ik praat er toch nog over.
Laat mij maar passen op het huis. 'k Kan niemand
berooven dan mijzelf - en als ik sterf,
ben 'k slechts een kruimeldief.

As with Voeten, the effect of this over-deliberate modernism is poetically negative. Andreas' Leer om Leer, samples from which have been quoted on pp.298-299 and 339, is, in this respect, an improvement on Kimbelijn, yet lacks the tautness Measure for Measure requires.

In contrast to that of Andreas, the verse of Dolf Verspoor - whose Droom van een Midsomernacht provided a starting point for this chapter, and has been sampled on a number of occasions (see pp.300, 324, 333 and 358-359) - could never be mistaken for prose; his attention to sound and rhythm, discussed at some length in Ch.XV (see pp.324-325), certainly gives his work a highly individual flavour, and an undeniable poetic charm which is lacking in the less ambitious work of his contemporary Gerard Messelaar, with whose reading of the opening lines of Twelfth Night Verspoor's is compared below:

Twelfth Night, I,i,1-7:

If music be the food of love, play on;
Give me excess of it, that, surfeiting,
The appetite may sicken, and so die.
That strain again! It had a dying fall:
O, it came o'er my ear like the sweet sound,
That breathes upon a bank of violets,
Stealing and giving odour!
Verspoor:
O - als muziek voedsel kan zijn voor liefde,
speel op, speel door dan, overdagig door,
mateelooz, dat ik mij oververzadig
en dat mijn zin in liefde eraan vergaat.
Ja! Weer! Die ééne streek - die weg wou smelten...
dat vloeit mij aan zoals de zachte toon
aanwaaiend uit een bed van bosvioleten,
ijl, vleidend...
("O - if music can be (a) food for love,
play on, play on then, on to excess,
without measure, that I may over-saturate myself
and that my craving for love may perish with it.
Ay! Again! That one strain - that would melt away...
that flows at me like the gentle tone
wafting on out of a bed of forest violets,
tenuous, flattering...")

Verspoor follows Ter Laan's example in spreading liberally when it suits the easy flow of verse he aims
at and, like Nijhoff, finds many an occasion to deal paraphrastically with the text; but it is difficult
to reconcile the sugary tone of the following passage from his Droom van een Midasomernacht with the
malicious, Jan-Kottish interpretation of the play this translation was supposed to be designed for:

A Midsummer Night's Dream, II,i,165-174:
Yet marked I where the bolt of Cupid fell:
It fell upon a little western flower,
Before milk-white, now purple with love's wound,

And maidens call it love-in-idleness.

Fetch me that flower; the herb I shewed thee once.

The juice of it on sleeping eyelids laid
Will make or man or woman madly dote
Upon the next live creature that it sees.

Fetch me this herb; and be thou here again
Ere the leviathan can swim a league.

("But I continued to trace where that arrow did come
down: / right on a little flower of the land of the

Messelaar:
Als door muziek de liefde wordt gevoed,
O speel dan voort opdat onmatigheid
Mijn liefde ziek doe worden en dan sterven.

Nog eens die wijs; zij klonk zo heerlijk uit,
Strelend mijn oor als zoete zuidenwind,
Die langs een perk vol met viooltjes strijkt,
En geuren steelt en geeft.

("If by music love is nourished,
O play on then so that intemperance
May make my love grow sick and then die.

Once more that tune; it sounded away so deliciously,
Cressing my ear like (a) balmy southerly wind,
That brushes along a border full of violets,
And steals and gives odours.")

Maar ik bleef nagaan waar de pijl wél neerkwam:
vlek op een bloempje van het avondland
dat altijd wit geweest was en nu purper
begon te bloeden uit zijn liefdeswond;
sindsdien hebben de meisjes voor dit bloempje
een naamje: 'liefde op het eerste gezicht':
dát is het bloempje dat je hier moet halen -
ik heb je er al eens op gewezen ook -:
het sap daarvan, op het slapende ooglid
van man of vrouw maakt waanzinnig verliefd,
en wel op 't eerst beste levend wezen
dat bij 't ontwaken voor die ogen treedt.
Háál jij die bloem voor mij! Zorg trug te wezen
vóór de walvis één mijl heeft afgelegd!

("But I continued to trace where that arrow did come
down: / right on a little flower of the land of the"
evening" (i.e.: the West)" / that always had been white and now purply / began to bleed out of its love-wound; / since then (the) girls have for this little flower / a little name: 'love at first sight'; / that is the little flower that thou must fetch for me - / I have already pointed it out to thee once, too -: / the juice of it, on the sleeping eyelid(s) / of man or woman makes (one) insanely infatuated, / with, in fact, the very first live creature / that at (the) awakening steps before those eyes. / Fetch thou that flower for me! See to it to be back / before the whale has travelled one mile!"

Verspoor's characteristic mellifluousness, therefore, is often far from purposeful; hence his poetic impulse often strikes one as only skin-deep and manneristic: he has adopted the superficial features of Nijhoff's poetic autonomy without the inner vision to account for it; one need but turn back to Burgersdijk's rendering of the opening lines of Twelfth Night (see p.139) to realize, by comparison, how truly poetically satisfying the old master's work can be. - Yet the use of an explicitly modern idiom, along with a modern approach to the iambic pentameter, need not be insipid or purposeless, if handled by an inspired translator, as the following passage from Evert Straat's Koning Lear demonstrates:

King Lear, IV,vii,11-24:
Come on, sir: here's the place. Stand still. How fearful
And dizzy 'tis to cast one's eyes so low:
The crows and choughs that wing the midday air
Show scarce so gross as beetles. Halfway down
Hangs one that gathers sapphire, dreadful trade!
Methinks he seems no bigger than his head.
The fishermen that walk upon the beach
Appear like mice; and yond tall anchoring bark
Diminished to her cock; her cock, a buoy
Almost too small for sight. The murmuring surge,
That on th'unnumbered idle pebble chafes

Cannot be heard so high. I'll look no more,
Lest my brain turn and the deficient sight
Topple down headlong.

("Come - here's the place. Stand still. How dizzy / makes one a glance into that so grim abyss! / Crows and choughs, gliding at halfway height, / Look but scarcely like beetles. / There, halfway, someone hangs - appalling trade! - / picking fennel - smaller than his head / he seems. The fishermen on the beach are mice / to look at - that tall bark at anchor / has shrunk to its own cock, / that cock a buoy, too small to discern, / The rustling of the surf that chafes the pebbles, / - innumerable and tiny - one can... so high / not hear. Well, I'll not look anymore, / my brain would turn, and the lack of vision / make me go head over heel, perpendicularly down.")

Straat:
Kom - hier's de plek. Blijf staan. Hoe duizelig
maakt je een blik in die zo barre diepte!
Kraaien en kauwen, halverhoogte zwevend,
zie er maar nauwelijks als kevers uit.
Daar, op de helft, hangt iemand - ijzig vak! -
venkel te plukken - kleiner dan zijn hoofd
lijkt hij. De vissers op het strand zijn muizen
om zo te zien - die hoge bark voor anker
is ingekrompen tot haar eigen jol,
die jol een boei, te klein om te ontwaren.
't Geruis der branding, die de kiezel schuurt,
- ontelbaar en miniem - kan je zo hoog
niet horen. Nou, ik kijk er niet meer naar,
 mijn brein zou draaien, en 't gebrek aan zicht
mij over de kop doen slaan, loodrecht omlaag.
Although Straat here, as usually, follows the text almost literally while expanding it over an extra line and a half, his stresses somehow seem to fall on the right words of their own accord, creating a rhythmic pattern that is natural and unpretentious yet wholly apt; even the occasional unorthodox enjambment (kleiner dan zijn 'hoofd / lijkt hij - kan je zo 'hoog / niet horen) is poetically and dramatically justified. Verspoor's verse, which bears the evidence of an approach based on the principle of poetic autonomy, often strikes one as pleasantly poetical and melodious without ever generating the power that will turn it into poetry; Straat's does, yet the poet in Straat is entirely subservient to the translator, the text, and Shakespeare. Only time will tell which of these approaches will turn out to have produced the versions with the greater staying power - but at this stage, the odds are on Straat.
CHAPTER XIX

DIACHRONIC FACTORS IN TRANSLATION

In the previous chapter the contrast between old-fashioned and modern Dutch idiom, between nineteenth-century poetic diction and a distinctly twentieth-century conversational mode, between the formality of older, and the informality of present-day translators has been referred to; this matter was, also, particularly germane to the discussion of C. Buddingh's revision of Burgersdijk's work (see pp.393-402). As was pointed out in Chapter XI (see pp.184 and 189), the Dutch language - at least the written language and, hence, that of literature - has aged much faster over the past hundred years than English.

changes in syntax and idiom. - This aging has, in the first place, been due to grammatical changes. The inflectional endings of nouns denoting genitive, dative and accusative case, number and gender, and the rules of agreement affecting the inflections of articles, adjectives, possessive, demonstrative and relative pronouns were still fully observed by Burgersdijk:

Hamlet, III,i,146-154:
O, what a noble mind is here o'erthrown!
The courtier's, soldier's, scholar's, eye, tongue, sword;
Th'expectancy and rose of the fair state,
The glass of fashion and the mould of form,
Th' observed of all observers, quite, quite down!
And I, of ladies most deject and wretched,
That sucked the honey of his music vows,
Now see that noble and most sovereign reason,
Like sweet bells jangled, out of tune and harsh;...

Burgersdijk:
O welk een eed'le geest is hier verwoest!
Des hoov'lings, denkers, krijgers, oog, tong, zwaard;
De hoop en bloem van de' eens zoo rijken staat,
Der zeden spiegel, der beschaving toonbeeld,
Waar ieders oog op staarde, thans niets, niets!
En ik, ik armste, ellendigste aller vrouwen
Die zijner eedien honig zoog, zie thans
Dat edelste, albeheerschende vernuift
Vol scherpen wanklank, als ontstemde klokken...

("O what a noble mind is here destroyed! / The courtier's, thinker's, soldier's, eye, tongue, sword; / The hope and flower of the once so rich state, / The mirror of manners, the model of civility, / That everyone's eye gazed upon, now nothing, nothing! / And I, I poorest, most wretched of all women / That sucked the honey of his vows, now see / That noblest, all-commanding reason / Full of harsh discord, like bells out of tune,
"

A contemporary comment (see p.147) suggests that as early as the 1880's such grammatical orthodoxy was at variance with oral usage and that the development of the language from a synthetic towards a more
analytic structure was well advanced. A small number of nominal inflections is preserved in modern Dutch: the genitival *s is still used as an alternative for the construction with *van* (of), and is retained in the construction *iets, niets, veel, weinig, (al) het* with an adjectival qualifier (see p. 292); the suffix *-e* of attributive adjectives and the plural endings *-n, -en, -eren and -s* of nouns are not likely to disappear\(^1\), nor is the distinction between gendered (masculine or feminine) and neuter nouns by means of the definite articles *de* and *het* in the singular. But most case-agreement features, of which several occur in the quoted passage (*des, rijker, der, aller, zijner, scherpen*) have become obsolete or archaic; the *-(e)n* suffix of articles, pronouns and adjectives indicating the dative or accusative singular or dative plural of a masculine headword has lapsed entirely; the genitival *-(e)r* of articles and demonstratives accompanying a plural or a feminine singular noun is slightly less archaic than the genitival *-(n)s* of articles and pronouns with a masculine singular; both are still occasionally used, and then suggest a formal tenor. Even the genitive of relative and interrogative pronouns: *wier, wiens* (whose) has an old-fashioned ring to it. The dative *-e* of singular nouns has gone altogether, except in a number of standing prepositional phrases: *ter sake* (to the point), *ten slotte* (finally), *ten gerieve van* (for the convenience of), *ten laste leggen* (lay to a person's charge).

In the following passage it may be observed how discreetly Buddingh' has removed a number of dated inflectional features from Burgerdijk's rendering of Ophelia's lament, without affecting the excellent quality of that translation:

O, welk een eed'le geest werd hier verwoest!  
Oog, tong, zwaard *van de hoov'ling, denker, krijgsmann*;  
De hoop en bloem van deze rijke staat,  
Spiegel der zeden, 't toonbeeld *van* beschaving,  
Waar ieders oog op staarde, thans niets, niets!  
En ik, ik armste, ellendigste aller vrouwen,  
Die *uit* zijn vleiende eden honing puurde,  
Zie thans dat edel, vorstelijk vernuift  
Vol scherpe wanklank, als ontstemde klokken,...

("O, what a noble mind has here been destroyed!  
Eye, tongue, sword of the courtier, thinker, soldier;  
The hope and flower of this rich state,  
Mirror of manners, the model of civility,  
That everyone's eye gazed upon, now nothing, nothing!  
And I, I poorest, most wretched of all women,  
That sucked honey out of his flattering vows,  
See now that noble, princely reason  
Full of harsh discord, like bells out of tune,...")

The only other syntactic changes affect the use of verbs, and the most important of these is the reduction

---

\(^1\) Where *-en* and *-s* plural endings are used alternatively with the same stem, the *-en* form is often the more archaic of the two: *vingeren/vingers* (fingers), *vaderen/vaders* (fathers).
of the rôle played by the inflectable subjunctive mood, which, if used in a modern context, tends to lend it an archaic or highly formal character. Depending on its original function (exhortative, optative, conditional) it is therefore often commuted into the imperative or indicative mood, or paraphrased with the aid of an appropriate auxiliary. The gradual way in which this change has taken effect can be seen in a comparison of Burgersdijk's rendering of an exhortative passage from King Lear with those by Roland Holst and Straat:

*King Lear*, I,iv,259-272:

..Suspend thy purpose, if thou didst intend
To make this creature fruitful.
Into her womb convey sterility;
Dry up in her the organs of increase,
And from her derogue body never spring
A babe to honour her! If she must teem,
Create her child of spleen, that it may live
And be a thwert disnatured torment to her.
Let it stamp wrinkles in her brow of youth;
With cadent tears fret channels in her cheeks;
Turn all her mother's pains and benefits
To laughter and contempt; that she may feel
How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is
To have a thankless child!

Burgersdijk:

...Verzaak uw opzet, was het ooit uw plan,
Dit scheepsel vruchtbaar te doen zijn!
Onvruchtbaarheid zij 't erfdeel van haar schoot!
*Versterve* in haar, wat tot vermeerd'ring dient;
En nimmer *spruite* uit dit onteerd gedrocht
Een zuig'ling, die haar eert! En moet zij baren,
Schepp dan een kind des toorns, opdat het *leev'*,
Haar tot een mart'ling door wanschappenheid!
Het *groev* haar rimpels op 't gelaat der jeugd,
Door tranengutsen voren in den wang;
't *Moog* al haar moederzorg en moederwee

In spot en hoon *verand'ren*; dat zij 't *voel'*,
Hoe de ondank van een kind veel feller grieft,
Dan addertand het kan!

("
..Renounce your purpose, if it ever was your plan,
To cause this creature to be fruitful!
Sterility be the heritage of her womb!
May that wither in her, which serves increase;
And may never spring from this degraded miscreant
A babe that honours her. And if she must give birth,
Then create a child of wrath, that it may live,
(To be) to her a torment due to (its) monstrosity!
May it groove wrinkles in her face of youth,
By the gushing of tears, furrows in her cheek;
May it... turn all her mother's care and mother's pain
To mockery and contempt, that she may feel it,
How the ingratitude of a child grieves much more fiercely,
Than (an) adder's tooth can!")
Roland Holst (1914):

Herroep uw opzet als gij ooit den wensch had
Dat scheepsel daar te laten baren!
En laat onvruchtbaarheid in tot haar schoot;
Mergel het barend deel van haar lijf uit!
Wek nooit uit haar ontstaarde schoot een kind,
Dat haar zou eeren! Als zij baren moet,
Het zij een kind van bitterheid, opgroeien
Haar tot wanstalig wrange marteling!
Laat 't in haar jonge voorhoofd rimpels kerven,
Haar wangen doorgroeven met vloeden van tranen;
En al haar moederlijke zorg en weloendoen
Met hoon en smaad vergelden, dat zij ook voelt
Hoe de beet van een slang nog niet zoo pijnigt
Als de ondank van een kind!

Straat (1969):

Zie er van af, als zij het ooit bedoeld hebt,
dit scheepslet vrucht te laten dragen!
Doe haar steriel verdorren in haar schoot,
droog in haar op de voortplantingsorganen
en laat uit haar verdorven lijf geen kind
ooit spruiten dat haar eert. Maar is beschikt
dat zij zal baren, dan een kind van wrok,
levend als onnatuurlijk kwade kwelling.
Laat het haar rimpels groeven in haar jeugd,
met guts van tranen kerven in haar wang.
Mag al haar moederpijn en moederrots
omslaan tot spot en hoon, zodat zij voelt
hoe scherper dan een slangentand het is
een kind te hebben, dat ondankbaar blijkt.

What is particularly remarkable in Burgersdijk's version of this excerpt is that, of the seven occasions where he uses a subjunctive¹, at least two (possibly three: if "spring" in 1.263 is read as a vt) are conversions from imperatives while, in the remaining cases, the original features paraphrastic constructions. This seems to indicate that ninety years ago the use of this mood was not felt to be particularly forced or artificial in a poetic context - where, besides, it offered distinct advantages in terms of

¹ Buddingh' has disposed of six of these in his revision of the passage.
syllable-saving economics. Roland Holst, however, resorts to a subjunctive only once, and Straat confines himself entirely to imperatives and paraphrastic constructions (11.263-264: laat...spruiten; 11.267-268: laat...groeven, ...kerven; 11.269-270: mag...omslaan). Not only do modern translators avoid using simple subjunctives when the original has other moods, as in the above instances; they also prefer alternatives in cases where subjunctive forms do occur:

**Macbeth, III,i,40-41:**
Here had we now our country's honour roofed
Were the graced person of our Banquo present...

*Van Looy (1900):*
Nu hielden wij de keur van 't rijk gezameld,
Waar d'eeldie persoon van onzen Banquo hier...
("Now we held the elect of the realm gathered,
Were the noble person of our Banquo here...")

*Diels (1952):*
Hier zou de bloem van 't rijk nu samen zijn
Als onze dierb're Banquo niet ontbrak...
("Here the flower of the realm would now be together
If our dear Banquo was not absent;...")

**Romeo and Juliet, II,i,66:**
O, that I were a glove upon that hand...

*Courteaux (1964):*
O, was ik maar een handschoen aan die hand,
("O, if only I were ("was") a glove upon that hand...")

The last example shows clearly that the commutation is of a strictly formal nature; Courteaux has used an indicative verb form, but the optative function has been preserved, as has the conditional sense in the excerpt from Macbeth.

A minor change has been the gradual disappearance of a separate verb form in the preterite indicative (or conditional subjunctive) for the second person plural - a purely syntactic plural, which, like that associated with the pronoun *vous* in French, was commonly used for a formal singular:

**A Midsummer Night's Dream, II,i,64-68:**
When thou hast stolen away from fairy land,
And in the shape of Corin sat all day,
Playing on pipes of corn, and versing love
To amorous Phillida...

*Buddingh':*
Maar ik weet,
Hoe gij eens wegsloopt uit het elfenland,
En dagen lang, als Corydon vermomd,
Voor Phillida, dat minziek kind, op 't riet

*Maar 'k weet*
Hoe gij eens wegsloopt uit het elfenland,
En dagen lang, als Corydon vermomd,
Voor de minzieke Phillida op 't riet
It is symptomatic of some degree of confusion and unfamiliarity felt when dealing with this verb form, that Boudingh' has retained it on one occasion (wegsloop't), but modernized it on the other (pijpte). Its occurrence is, of course, exclusively connected with that of the pronoun gi\j^{1}; - and this leads us to the change that has affected the use of that word, which is an idiomatic rather than a syntactic matter. The relationship between gi\j and English thou is a problematic one. Both are archaic and survive orally only in ceremonial and ritual usage - e.g. in the address of God in prayer - and as an informal, familiar mode of address in certain regional dialects. But their position in the paradigm of personal pronouns is quite different: there, gi\j, being formally a plural, corresponds to English you, while the Dutch parallel for thou is fij or je - in modern colloquial usage, the familiar address applied to children, subordinates or intimate friends and relations, like French tu and German du. Unlike English, modern Dutch also has an informal second person plural: jelui or jullie ("you-people"; cp. German Ihr), while in formal address the formerly oblique case w has assumed both the singular and plural functions of gi\j.

The matter would hardly merit such elaboration were it not for the prominent part played by modes of address and by the laws of decorum they are subject to in Shakespeare's dialogue, which teems with yous and thous. It would seem that the Elizabethan usage of thou, thy and thee is best represented in modern Dutch by fij/je, jou and jou/je, while Shakespeare's you, your, ye should be translated as jullie or as gi\j/je/ u, uw and u. Yet even in a clear-cut case of shifting decorum as that of Claudius' address to Laertes (Hamlet, I,ii,42-50) most translators have overlooked or chosen to disregard the distinction (see p.351). However, the relationship of Shakespeare's use of you or thou to a respectful or familiar tenor is by no means always clear, and it is understandable that even present-day translators often revert to the nineteenth-century habit of using gi\j (and w) indiscriminately to cover both. An interesting illustration of this problem is provided by Caliban's way of addressing Prospero, and the characteristic way in which

---

^{1} gi\j is associated with one distinct present tense verb form: zijt (2nd p.pl. of the verb zijn: "to be")
Nijhoff and Courteaux have dealt with it in the following passage:

The Tempest, I,ii,332-337:

Thou strok' st me, and made much of me, wouldst give me
Water with berries in 't. and teach me how
To name the bigger light, and how the less,
That burn by day and night: and then I loved thee,
And showed thee all the qualities o' th'Isle,

When thou cam' st first,

Nijhoff (1930):

Toen jij pas hier was,
Was je wel vriend'lijk, aizadoe me, eerstje me, liet me
Water met bessen drinken, onderwees me
Hoe 't groote licht, hoe 't kleine licht genoemd
wordt,
Die branden 's daags en 's nachts. -Toen hield ik
van je.
Ik wees je wat op 't eiland van belang was,

("When thou wert just here,
Thou wert quite friendly, stroked me, honoured me,
let me / Drink water with berries, instructed me
How the big light, how the small light is called,
That burn by day and night. -Then I loved thee.
I showed thee what(ever) on the island was of im-

portance,,")

Contrary to the impressions made by the metaphorases, Nijhoff's version sounds informal and modern, and Caliban's use of je and jij here conveys an interesting mixture of contempt and, possibly, nostalgia for

the intimacy and familiarity of his early relationship with Prospero; Courteaux's rendering merely sounds

formal, and derives an archaic ring from his observance of the old preterite forms - from which, like

Buddingh' in the previous example, he departs once (leerde for leerdet, in 1.334).

However, the problem of decorum has, apparently, bothered Nijhoff too: while he has consistently fol-

lowed Shakespeare's thou in Prospero's intimate or condescending address of Miranda, Ariel and Caliban, and

the respectful you Miranda and Ferdinand use with one another and with Prospero, he has converted thou

and thy to gij and u in Iris' speech to Ceres and in Prospero's way of addressing Alonso, but done the

reverse when he switches his attention to Antonio (see example on pp.420-421, the 1952 version).

Amongst the post-war translators, Verspoor, Straat and Andreus have dropped gij altogether and use u,


jullie and jij. In doing so, however, Verspoor and Andreus follow modern Dutch social conventions independent from Shakespeare's application of you and thou; hence, in Droom van een Midsomernacht, the mode of address amongst the lovers is consistently informal, whether this agrees with the original or not:

**A Midsummer Night's Dream, II,i,194-195:**

Dem. Hence, get thee gone, and follow me no more. - Ga weg jij, kom me niet meer achterna. -

Hel. You draw me, you hard-hearted adamant! - Tot jou voel ik me weerloos aangetrokken jij trekt mij mee, onwrikbare magneet... 

("Go away thou, don't run ('come') after me any more. - / - To thee I feel helplessly attracted / thou draw'st me along, unyielding magnet,...")

But Verspoor's obvious predilection for a relaxed modern idiom does not prevent him from striking a more formal note in the quarrel between Oberon and Titania:

**A Midsummer Night's Dream, II,i,63-64:**

Ob. Tarry, rash wanton: am not I thy lord? -

Ti. Then I must be thy lady:...

("- Stand, fickle one! I am your consort! - / - Then I should be your spouse...")

Similarly, Andreus has the Duke in Act I,i of his Leer om Leer address Angelo respectfully with u and uw, where Shakespeare uses thou and thy while, in his Kimbelijn, Belarius addresses the princes as jij (and jullie) where Shakespeare has you. Straat usually reproduces Shakespeare's you by u or jullie, and his thou by jij - even in unusual situations such as Kent's address of Lear, and Edmund's and Lear's invocation of "Goddess Nature" - but even he is not wholly consistent:

**King Lear, IV,i,76-79:**

Glo. ..I'll repair the misery thou dost bear
With something rich about me. From that place
I shall no leading need. - Edg. Give me thy arm.
Poor Tom shall lead thee. -

("..there I'll / repair the misery that thou must bear / with something that I have with me (as) precious. / From there I'll no longer need a guide. - - Come, / give me your arm. Mad Tom shall lead you. -")

- and the prose excerpt from this play quoted on pp.336-337 shows an instance where he has translated you and your as je and jow.
Following much the same rule of thumb with regard to formal and informal tenor as Verspoor and Andreus, Voetan still uses *gij* regularly, if less frequently than Courteaux and Buddingh', alongside *u*, *jullie*, and *fij*, and Diels does so sparingly; in Act I, iv of the latter's *Macbeth*, for instance, Duncan addresses Macbeth as *gij* (text: thou), but in II, iii the young princes use *fij* (text: you) with one another. In the work of translators prior to 1930, the distinctions Shakespeare makes are disregarded also - but with most of them the informal mode of address is confined to comic prose passages.

Other idiomatic changes that have taken place since Burgersdijk made his translations are too complex, various and subtle to allow of a coherent, let alone full analysis. Over this relatively short period the Dutch vocabulary has been extended in many ways, but few if any words required for the translation of Shakespeare's temporal dialect have actually become extinct. However, a shift in attitude towards literary and theatrical decorum has occurred in the course of this century, which has limited the effective usage of many words, particularly in relation to the register and tenor to which they are appropriate; while it has broadened the scope of others. This shift has taken place in one direction only: words that were used as conversational in the nineteenth-century theatre have come to be regarded as unduly solemn, formal and ceremonious; simultaneously, a great deal of idiom that was considered too colloquial, common or even vulgar to be used in a literary context has been accepted as "normal", civilized or desirably expressive. To what extent this literary shift reflects a change in oral usage is difficult to establish, certainly if dramatic poetry in general, and Shakespeare translations in particular are our point of departure; for it must be taken into account that Burgersdijk, his predecessors and, probably, several of his early successors viewed Shakespeare, whether consciously or not, with romantic-historicist eyes and may well have adjusted their vocabulary and the tenor of their language in accordance with this view, in an attempt to suggest the historical remotes of Shakespeare's poetry; one need but read the work of early twentieth-century neo-romantics Van Schendel and Van der Leeuw, or Roland Holst's re-creations of Celtic tales alongside the naturalistic prose of Couperus and Van deyssel to realize how much store the former put by the evocative power of a somewhat archaicizing vocabulary and a heightened stylistic tenor when dealing with historical or quasi-historical subjects.

Just as there are many people who prefer the King James version to a modern translation of the Bible (as in the Netherlands, the seventeenth-century *Staten Vertaling* to the *Nieuwe Vertaling*) because they feel that its archaic language is somehow more appropriate to the subject, a sizeable section of the Dutch
public — along with a few modern translators — continues to consider the application of an unmodified
modern idiom to Shakespeare's poetry as either disrespectful or incongruous. All these factors cloud
one's judgement in deciding which words and expressions have, in fact, become dated since Burgerdijk
used them, and to what extent they have done so; yet there would be general agreement that the dusty,
stilted and old-fashioned impression some of his and his early successors' language makes on a modern
reader or listener is at least partly due to idiomatic details.
If we wish to make a brief and cursory exploration of this difficult field, Buddingh' is a particularly
trustworthy guide, because his mildly conservative revision offers modest, and therefore pertinent
illustrations of shifts in idiomatic usage. A number of these have already been mentioned in passing in
Chapter XVII; in addition to the syntactic emendations, whose nature and significance will be clear in
the light of what has been discussed in the previous pages, the passage from Romeo en Julia (p.394)
shows the substitution of "meteoor" — a more precise translation as well as a less archaic one — for
"verheev'ling", and that of "blijven" for "toeven". In the excerpt from Een Snippe Getemd/De Getemde
Feets (The Taming of the Shrew) (pp.395-396), attention has already been drawn to the replacement of
"rok" by "jas" and of "slechts" by "enkel"; in that from Macbeth (pp.396-397) no less than five idiомatic
modernizations occur: "verdriet" for "smart", "waarde" for "waardij", "dan" for "zoo", "zoveel" for
"zoo menig" and "meer" for the anomalous comparative "meerder"; even the substitution of "anders" for
"dan" (1.11: "for then") could be regarded as one, which points up the fact that a word may have acquired
a slightly old-fashioned ring in one sense, but be modern in another; this also applies to the particle
"zo(o)", which is no longer a regularly used equivalent for then or if, but has retained the sense of
thuis, so, such and as. It is also interesting to observe that Buddingh has used "slechts" for "only" in
1.6 of this passage, while in 1.115 of the Shrew excerpt on p.395 he has replaced it by "enkel" as a
translation of "none... but", just as Courteaux has dropped it in favour of "maar" in the line from his
Romeo en Julia quoted on p.435: in a formal or solemn context slechts is still acceptable, but in a more
informal or intimate tenor enkel or maar are preferable.
In the brief excerpt from Een Midasommernacht's Droom on p.399, Burgersdijk's "min" ("love", 1.186) and "vlied"
("flee", for Shakespeare's "leave", 1.190) strike us as old-fashioned, and Buddingh' has improved on them
with "liefde" and "verliet" (p.t. of verlaten — to leave), and in the long one from Hamlet (pp.400-401) he
has done so by inserting "nog" between "wat" and "meer" in 1.92 ("what else") and by substituting the verb
"gedenken" for the adjective "indachtig" (11.95, 97 and 111: "remember") and "ijdele" for "nietswaarde" (1.99: "trivial"); but, oddly enough, his addition of "gans" to "alleen" in 1.102 ("all alone") supplies a slightly archaic note not found in Burgersdijk's corresponding line; the modern Dutch equivalents for "all" in this sense are (formal) geheel and (informal) helemaal, and Buddingh's choice of the outdated adverb here was clearly dictated by syllable-saving considerations.

One could go on ad infinitum quoting examples to demonstrate how particles such as indeen (if), doch (but), (al)dus (thus) and thans (now) are being supplanted by als, maar, zo and nu; how altijd (always, ever) is taking the place of altoos and immer; omdat (because) of wijl and daar; hoezel and al (although) of (of)-schoon; and voordat (ere, before) of eer and alvorens. Dated nouns like toorn (wrath), heer (army), maagd (maiden), knaar (boy, youth) and gelaat (face) have, for modern equivalents, woede, leger, meisje, jongen and gezicht, and the present-day translator tends to prefer the adjectives gruwelijk (horrible), ongewoon (uncommon) and jaloers (jealous, envious) to gruwbaar, ongemeen and ijversuchtig; the verbs kijken (look, glance) and krijgen or verwerven (acquire) to blikken and geworden or erlangen, and combined modifiers such as wat een and so'n (what a, such a) to welk een and zulk een. On p.307 some examples were given of consonant syncope which distinguish the modern form of some words (weer: again and weather; neer: down; veer: feather; leer: leather; mee: with) from an older or more formal one (weder, neder, veder, leder, mede); yet this kind of contraction does not necessarily modernize a word: in the case of vergaren and vergaderen, for instance, both forms are current in the different specialized meanings of gather, collect and hold a meeting respectively, and contractions such as eel and sael sound old-fashioned alongside the uncontracted forms edel (noble) and zadel (saddle). - The consistency with which these changes are observed depends on the tenor of the context and on the conservatism or radicalism of the translator.

**Spelling changes.** - Another factor which, at least on paper, dates a translator as belonging to an older or a younger generation, is his orthography. A number of officially implemented spelling changes in the course of this century has gradually narrowed the gap between written and spoken Dutch; the most important of these are demonstrated in the translation of the excerpt below, where obsolete orthographic features have been italicized:

**Julius Caesar, V,v,31-38:**

Farewell to you; and you; and you, Volumnius.

**Burgersdijk:**

Vaarwel dan, gij! - ook gij! - en gij! Volumnius.-
Strato, thou hast been all this while asleep. 
Farewell to thee too, Strato. Countrymen,
My heart doth joy that yet in all my life
I found no man but he was true to me,
I shall have glory by this losing day,
More than Octavius and Mark Antony
By this vile conquest shall attain unto.

("Farewell then, you! - you, too! - and you! Volumnius.- / You, Strato, were asleep all the time; / Fare you, Strato, well too.- My countrymen, / My heart exults, that I in all my life / Found no one that did not keep faith with me. / This fatal day will afford me greater glory / Than ever Octavius and Mark Antony / By this vile victory will attain.")

The three changes highlighted in this passage are: the lapse of the case -n (see p.432), which lingered on in the written medium into the early 'thirties, long after it had disappeared from oral usage ("de", "ganse": 1.32; "enk'le": 1.35); the removal of the unsounded -oh after a final, and in some cases, medial s (it is immaterial, as in the case of "gans(e)", 1.32 - whether it is followed by an inflectional or derivational suffix or not); and the reduction of double vowels to single ones, regardless of etymological considerations, in open-ended syllables and in closed syllables that become open due to inflection ("landgenoot" - "landgeno-ten": 1.33; "groot" - "gro-ter": 1.36; "snood" - "sno-de": 1.38); the only exception to this rule is the ee in original open-ended syllables, because its sound value is different from a single e (i.e.: (e)) in that situation: hence twee and tweede (two, second), but deel, de-len (part, parts).

As spelling changes in themselves have no real bearing upon the quality or acceptability of a Shakespeare translation, they do not warrant further discussion; but they may be seen as symptomatic of a phenomenon that is relevant: the rapprochement between the language of letters and that of life which has permeated Dutch writing in the last hundred years, particularly since the early 1930's; and which has had a noticeable effect on the language used in the theatre and, hence, on the post-World War II translations.

poetic diction and the language of the theatre. - The phrase "poetic diction" has been used on a number of occasions in the course of this study, particularly in connection with the pioneer Shakespeare translators discussed in Chapters VII and VIII. An English reader will associate it with the formuiaic idiom of Augustan poetry which, ever since Wordsworth took his stand against it in the Preface to the Lyrical Ballads, has been thought of as a language of Art distinct from, and alien to the language of life and nature. In the Netherlands it conjures up the image of Bilderdijk, that Byronesque poet who rejected
German *Sturm und Drang* in favour of Racine and Voltaire, and who revitalized Dutch poetry by reverting to the Golden Age of Vondel and Hooft - which meant that, while in England and Germany the transition from classicism to romanticism was marked by a revolution in the use of language for poetic purposes, the poetic techniques and conventions of the Age of Reason were applied with renewed inspiration by Dutch writers. Whether a poet's cue was passion or reflection, his motive ethical or purely aesthetic, his mode lyrical, epic or dramatic, he never questioned the function of his language, which was not to copy or reproduce nature, but to ennoble it in accordance with certain accepted norms.

When finally the Dutch cultural climate was ripe for the romantic recognition of Shakespeare as the pre-eminent exponent of a poetry in which Art and Nature were ideally blended, and the need was felt to give him a place of his own in Dutch letters, the suitability of this stylistically circumscribed language for the purpose of translating his work was taken for granted. The translators may have been rationally conscious of the variety of tone and tenor in Shakespeare's verse, of the freedom with which he adjusted his language to the dramatic occasion, and of the evolution it underwent between his early and late plays; but none of them was of adequate creative stature to transcend the conventions of the age, break the shackles of poetic diction and stretch the resources of the living language sufficiently to embue it with the richness and variety of Shakespeare's English.

Although they are not all equally self-evident, most of the conventions that constitute this poetic diction have already come to our attention. The most important are: the strict observance of inflectional changes and case-agreement; a rigid adherence to metre, necessitating the liberal use of standard contractions and elisions of the kind discussed on pp. 306-307; the licence to invert the regular order of structural elements for the sake of poetic effect or metrical convenience (see the example from *Hamlet* on p. 431, l. 149: "The glass of fashion" - "*Der zeden spiegel*", instead of "(De) spiegel *der zeden*"; cp. Buddingh's version on p. 432), and to employ certain syntactic features rarely or never found in oral usage, such as the exhortative past participle (e.g. *Macbeth*, II,iii,128: "let's briefly put on manly readiness" - Burgersdijk: "Nu fluks ons *toegestalt als 't mannen past*" ("Now quickly equipped (ourselves) as it suits men")); the obligatory apocope of an unstressed final -e before an opening vowel; and, last but not least, the use of a heightened idiom, in which a threshold of decorum and formality was to be observed (hence the neglect of Shakespeare's distinction between you and thou, except in prose passages) and from which neologisms other than compounds of existing words were excluded. Most of them are readily
traceable in Burgersdijk's rendering of the following passage from *Henry IV, II* (III,i,4-31):

How many thousand of my poorest subjects
Are at this hour asleep! O sleep, o gentle sleep,
Nature's soft nurse, how have I frightened thee,
That thou no more wilt weigh my eyelids down,
And steep my senses in forgetfulness?
Why rather, sleep, liest thou in smoky cribs,
Upon uneasy pallets stretching thee,
And hushed with buzzing night-flies to thy slumber,
Than in the perfumed chambers of the great,
Under the canopies of costly state,
And lulled with sound of sweetest melody?
O thou dull god, why liest thou with the vile
In loathsome beds, and leav'st the kingly couch
A watch-case, or a common 'larum-bell?'
Wilt thou upon the high and giddy mast
Seal up the ship-boy's eyes, and rock his brains
In cradle of the rude imperious surge,
And in the visitation of the winds,
Who take the ruffian billows by the top,
Curling their monstrous heads, and hanging them
With deafing clamour in the slippery clouds,
That, with the hurly, death itself awakes?
Canst thou, O partial sleep, give thy repose
To the wet sea-boy in an hour so rude;
And in the calmest and most stillest night,
With all appliances and means to boot,
Deny it to a king? Then happy low, lie down!
Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown.

("How many thousand humble subjects / Are now asleep! - O sleep, o sweet sleep! / Nature's nurse, how did I drive you away, / That you will not burden my eyelids, / Immerse my senses in forgetfulness? / Why, o sleep, do you lie in the smoke of hovels, / And stretch yourself rather on prickly straw, / With the night-humming of flies dozed off, / Than in the great ones' sweetly-scented-through chamber, / By rich costly canopies overarched, / And lulled by sweet melodies? / O doze-god, why do you lie with beggars / In the loathsome bed, and shun the king's couch, / As if it were a sentry- or alarm-bell box? / Do you seal upon a swishing(ly) high mast / The youthful mariner's eye, and cradle his brain / In the rocking-bed of the violent, proud surge, / Amidst the whirling of the tempest, / That seizes by the tuft the violent billows, / Curls their giant heads and with deafening / Roaring hangs them in the dripping welkin, / That even death awakes with the din? / Do you, o sleep, partially bestow upon the wet-through / Ship-boy your rest in such (a) terrible hour / And do you deny it in the stillest, calmest night / With all assistance and means, to a king? / So lie down, you enviable rustic's son! / Hard lies the head, encompassed by a crown. ")
Burgersdijk and his early fellow-translators must be assumed to have adopted the principles of poetic diction as a matter of course; the extent to which they modified its conventions or operated in a more or less inhibited manner within them could be taken as a measure of their independence and talent as creative poets. We have seen in Chapters VII and VIII how, judged on that basis, Moulin's work compares with Roorda van Eysinga's and Opzoomer's, Roorda van Eysinga's with Kok's, Kok's with Burgersdijk's; and examples quoted in subsequent chapters may be viewed in the light of poetic diction and serve to line up the relative merits of Koster, Roland Holst, Rensburg and several others in this light - as well as show the persistence of some, the gradual eclipse of others of its features.

Prior to Burgersdijk, only Van der Stok can be said to have freely sinned against the rules - without any marked beneficial effect on the quality of his work; - he used the occasional je for thou and neglected the final -e apocope, a "fault" for which he was severely censured by Pannevis (see p.174). Since Burgersdijk, they have continued to serve as guidelines for most of the early twentieth-century translators and, even though the grammatical changes discussed in the previous pages have had their effect, and the idiomatic formality-threshold has been lowered considerably, some vestiges of poetic diction can be seen to survive in the work of recent translators such as Buddingh' and Courteaux. Van Looy, ironically, created a more severely limiting and time-bound variety of his own - which retained and even aggravated some of the most obnoxious and artificial features of the system he rebelled against. Nijhoff was the first to view Shakespeare's language with entirely fresh eyes.

Attention has already been drawn to the possibility that the conservative aspect of poetic diction may have been exploited and emphasized deliberately by early translators of a romantic-historicist bent; that a historicist approach to Shakespeare's poetry is still upheld by a sector of the modern public has also been pointed out (see pp.439-440), and is clearly demonstrated by Hanekroot's comment on Verspoor's Droom van een Midsummeracht cited on p.410: this undoubtedly has a bearing on the tenacity with which its conventions have survived the complex changes that have affected Dutch poetry as well as the language of the theatre. Yet it is remarkable that no major difference is noticeable between the application of poetic diction by Burgersdijk and by the majority of his nineteenth-century colleagues who catered primarily for a reading public; the higher quality of the former's versions is attributable to his superior poetic sensitivity and creative ability rather than to a practical-theatrical orientation. Evidently the illusion of historic reality and verisimilitude which the Duke of Meiningen and his followers brought to
the theatre did not incorporate an innovatory approach to the language used on the stage and to the way it was used: the Meiningers themselves were notorious for their conservative, melodramatic style of dict-
ion - even in their own time.
Nor did the advent of social realism and naturalism have an immediate modifying effect upon the way verse drama - Shakespeare's, Vondel's or anyone else's - was presented. The categories of modern and classical drama were kept strictly separate, even though during the last two decades of the nineteenth century actors were beginning to move more freely and successfully from one to the other. In the world of Dutch letters, this period was marked by the coexistence of naturalism and fin de siècle aestheticism, and we have seen how Royaards, who had first drawn critical attention in Ibsen's Nora (see p.160) developed into a theatrical aesthete whose Shakespeare productions formed the basis for a tradition that stayed alive up to, and in some respects until after World War II, and that perpetuated the lofty, romantic approach to the text and the declamatory delivery of verse of the nineteenth century. Verkade's conversational treatment of Shakespeare, therefore, might have initiated an early and revolutionary departure from the established theatrical manner if his diction had not been deplorable, his delivery halting and prosaic; besides, the Van Looy texts he chose to play throughout his Shakespearean career were the least suitable of all existing translations to sustain such an approach; they did nothing to bridge the gulf between Shakespeare and his twentieth-century Dutch audience and help it to recognize his language as a living reality rather than an antiquated and abstruse verbal artifice.
It is tempting to look for a connection between the physical presence of a proscenium arch in the theatres our time has inherited from the eighteenth and nineteenth century and the manner in which a dramatic e-
vent is enacted on one side of it, and experienced on the other. Even the realism of Ibsen, Chekhov, Shaw and the early twentieth-century pièce bien faite was as highly qualified as that of the "fourth wall" style of productions it gave rise to: it continued to be an illusion of reality kept at a respectful re-
move from the audience. In his early productions Verkade tried to shorten that physical distance; un-
fortunately, he put a spiritual distance and a barrier of inarticulateness in its place. But the attempt may be seen as significant, as may De Meester's abortive experiment with a radical departure from the picture-box set, perhaps conceived as something approaching theatre-in-the-round, for his first produc-
tion of Nijhoff's Storm in 1930 (see pp.228-229). In the post-war era, the still-present obstacle of the arch has no longer been able to stop directors from finding ways to bring their plays gradually closer
to the audience and from trying to turn them into actual experiences instead of illusory events watched across a void. An attendant phenomenon has been the phasing-out of the differentiation between categories of "high" and "low", realistic and un-realistic drama - since the reality aimed for is self-contained and unrelated to the old concept of theatrical realism. Hence also the carefully graded levels of decorum for farce, comedy, tragedy, prose and verse, modern and classical drama no longer need to be observed any more than the boundary between the kinds of language suitable for public and private use.

A theory along these lines - despite its obvious dangers of oversimplifying a complex and varied set of developments and their causal relationships - has the attraction of providing a reason why in the course of the late 'forties and the 'fifties Burgersdijk and Van Looy were suddenly found to be stuffy, dated and unplayable, and a demand arose for acting versions of Shakespeare plays that were free of archaic idiom, complicated grammatical niceties and elocutory obstacles; it certainly seems to be borne out by the fact that the progressive, innovatory approach to Shakespeare's language is characteristic specifically of the younger theatre-oriented translators, in contrast to the more or less pronounced conservatism of their colleagues whose principal object was publication rather than performance.

Examples in earlier chapters have already demonstrated the greater degree of licence with regard to structural, rhythmic and semantic fidelity displayed in the work of Voeten, Verspoor and Andreus as against that of their predecessors and more conservative contemporaries - a licence clearly motivated by a desire to break away from the formality, phonic density and crabbedness associated with the poetic diction of older versions. The emphasis with each of these three translators lies on a different aspect of modernity: with Voeten, on lucidity; with Verspoor, on the uncluttered line and a relaxed yet lively rhythm; with Andreus, on a low-keyed, informal tenor. What they share - not only with one another but particularly with the textually more orthodox Straat - is a modern idiom from which the restraints of theatrical decorum have been stripped; and in this respect, Straat is possibly the most radical of all:

*King Lear*, IV,ii,62-67:

Thou changéd and self-covered thing, for shame,
Be-monster not thy feature. Werc't my fitness
To let these hands obey my blood,
They are apt enough to dislocate and tear
Thy flesh and bones. Howe'er thou art a fiend,
A woman's shape doth shield thee.
Roland Holst:
Verwricht, onkenbaar ding! Schaam u, maak niet
Monstertlijk uw gelaat! Kon 'k deze handen
Gehoor doen geven aan mijn bloed, zij waren
In staat u 't vleesch te scheure' en af te trekken
Van uw gebeente! - Maar al zijt ge een duivel,
Uw vrouwgedaante is u een schild.

("Twisted, unknowable thing! Shame on you, do not
make / Monstrous your countenance! Could I make
these hands / Obey my blood, they were
Able to tear your flesh and rip it off
From your bones! - But even though you are a devil,
Your woman's shape is a shield to you. -")

In the metaphrases, unfortunately, some of the most telling details are lost: "countenance" and "mug" give some impression of the difference between "gelaat" and "smoel", but the one between "gebeente" and "botten" is untranslatable.

Eloquent examples of Andreus' and Verspoor's colloquialized idiom have been quoted (see pp.298-301, 339, 358-359, 427, 428) and some of them show how its use, particularly when coupled with a highly paraphrastic approach to the text, can lead to results that come dangerously close to prosiness or bathos; but if applied with a proper sense of the dramatic occasion, as is usually the case in Straat's work, its directness gains in impact by comparison with a conservative translation. This also goes for Voeten's rendering of the following passage:

Othello, V,ii,134-141:
Oth. She turned to folly, and she was a whore. -
Em. Thou dost belie her, and thou art a devil. -
Oth. She was false as water. - Em. Thou art rash as fire, to say
That she was false. O, she was heavenly true! -
Oth. Cassio did top her: ask thy husband else.
0, I were damned beneath all depth in hell
But that I did proceed upon just grounds
To this extremity. Thy husband knew it all. -

Burgersdijk:
- Zij werd door min verdwaasd en was een boel. -
- Gij doet haar schennis aan en zijt een duivel. -

Voeten:
- Haar lust regeerde haar, zij was een hoer. -
- En u belastert haar, u bent een duivel. -
- Zij was als water valsch. - Gij dol als vuur,
Zoo gij haar valsch noemt; zij was hemelsch trouw. -

- Haar boel was Cassio; vraag 't maar aan uw man.
O, 'k waar tot dieper dan de hel verdoemd,
Zoo 'k geen onwraakb're gronden had, aleer ik
Dit uiterst middel koos. Uw man weet alles. -

("- She turned foolish with love and was a courtesan. - You do her injury and are a devil.
- She was as water false. - You (as) mad as fire,
If you call her false; she was heavenly true. -

- Her paramour was Cassio; only ask your husband.
O, I were damned (to) deeper than hell,
If I had no unchallengeable grounds, ere I
Chose these extreme means. Your husband knows all.")

Voeten often commits the same error of judgement as Andreus: to get away from stiltedness and to facilitate a conversational tone, he tends to turn his verse into scanned prose, due to which it often lacks the positive features of sound and rhythm that can make it such an effective vehicle of dramatic tension; but the passage above has an undeniable power - even the unorthodox enjambments "dolzinnig / als vuur" and "Zij / doortrapte?" have positive and dramatic qualities.

As the threshold of decorum for prose used to be considerably lower than that for verse, the difference in tenor between the renderings of the two modes by progressive translators might be expected to be smaller than that in the work of the older ones. This holds good for the four discussed so far; but some of their modern colleagues observe a fairly wide margin of formality by confining present-day colloquialisms to the prose passages. Courteaux, for instance, whose idiom in verse is conservative by modern standards, uses a spicy and unrestrained up-to-date jargon for the rendering of Shakespeare's "broad" prose:

*Henry IV,* II, iv, 108-112:

Away, you cutpurse rascal! You filthy bung, away!
By this wine, I'll thrust my knife in your mouldy chaps, and you play the saucy cuttle with me. Away, you bottle-ale rascal! you basket-hilt stale juggler, you! Since when, I pray you, sir? God's

Courteaux:

Weg, jij boef van een beurzensnijder! jij vuile gapper, weg! bij die beker wijin, ik steek mijn mes in je vermolmd bakkes als je de brutale snoeshaan met mij durft spelen. Scheer je weg, biersnuit! jij versleten strooien soldaat! Hoelang al, asjeblief, me-
light, with two points on your shoulder? Much! —
neer? O, sjonge, sjonge, met twee snoeren op je
schouder! Wel, wel! —

("Away, thou cutpurse rogue! thou dirty snatcher, away! by that mug of wine, I'll stick my knife into
thy mouldy phiz if thou darest to play the cheeky bloke with me. Clear off, beer-muzzle! thou threadbare
straw soldier! Since when, please, sir? O boy, boy, with two strings on thy shoulder! Well, well! —")

Some of the most unceremonious modern idiom is found in the work of Gerard Messelaar, whose Driekoningen-
avond (Twelfth Night) contains expressions like: troela ("popsy", for: wench), sloerie ("trapes", for:
minx), kwibus (for: oxcomb), satladder ("boozler", for: drunken rogue), donder op, kras op ("buzz off,
get lost", for: sneak up (II,i,81), and: depart from me (IV,i,15)), als een aap in zijn trouwpak ("like
an ape in his wedding suit", for: Like a pedant that keeps a school i'th'church (III,ii,63-64)), hij
heeft echt een klap van de molen beet (standing expression: "he's really been knocked (over the head) by
the wind-mill", for: the man is tainted in's wits (III,iv,13)); Hoe gaat het toch met mijn suikerbeest,
hoe maakt mijn soepkippetje het? ("How is my sugar-beast, how does my little soup-chicken?", for: Why,
how now, my bawcock! How dost thou, ohuck? (III,iv,101)); but the language and sound of his verse is much
more formal and conservative than, for instance, Verspoor's whose rendering of the following passage
(Twelfth Night, I,v,236-245) has been quoted on p.329:

- Ik bouwde voor uw deur een wilgenhut,
En riep vandaar mijn ziel aan in dit huis,
En liet'ren schreef ik van versmade liefde,
Die 'k luid zou zingen in de holst der nacht.
Uw naam liet ik de heuvels tegenklinken,
Zodat de echo steeds maar zou herhalen: "Olivia". En u zou rust noch duur
Gegund zijn door de aarde of de lucht,
Totdat uw meelij was gewekt.

("- I'd build at your door a willow cabin,
And thence call at my soul within this house,
And songs I'd write about despised love,
That I would sing loudly in the dead of night.
Your name I'd let resound against the hills,
So that the echo continually would repeat:
"Olivia". And rest nor peace would be
Granted you by the earth or the sky,
Until your sympathy were aroused. -")

In the age of permissiveness the attitude towards the use of Shakespeare's unexpurgated bawdy on stage
has become much more liberal than it used to be. As far as its translation is concerned: the "victorian"
primness of the early versions is often exaggerated and over-generalized; Kok's work, particularly in
the prose editions, does evince a prudish attitude (see pp.132-133), but Burgersdijk, like Moulin before
him, has often done as much justice to bawdy passages as his modern successors - witness the excerpt from
his Romeo en Julia quoted on p.144 — and only appears to have felt obliged to bowdlerize Shakespeare's
indelicacies if they occur in an exchange between characters of opposite sexes, as the excerpt from
Othello on pp. 448-449 shows; another good example of this is his disposal of the tongue-tail-tale quibble in The Taming of the Shrew, II, i, 212-215 (see pp. 367-370 for Van den Berg's, Courteaux's and Voeten's readings) in favour of a less improper quip:

"- Who knows not, where a wasp carries her sting?
I'll catch the wasp, and even though she may struggle,
She'll lose her sting. - - Her tongue?
- - Her nails rather, those the man, that... ...you,
Wild Kate, will catch, will cut off. - Dear Kate, stay;"

Yet, the general present-day opinion that Burgersdijk is unduly prim and proper is of fairly recent vintage; as late as 1947 the theatre critic of Trouw (an orthodox protestant newspaper) found it necessary, after seeing Driekoningenaavond in January of that year, to express indignation at the crudeness and blasphemous levity of his language, and suggested that this undesirable element could be removed from the text without impairing the play in any way. For the sake of its purity of soul, it is to be hoped that this poor critic did not live to be exposed to the way Shakespeare's improprieties have been presented in the Dutch theatre since the late 1950's; for, at least, Burgersdijk did not make them more explicit than the original demanded, and often less so:

Measure for Measure,

III, ii, 49-54:

Burgersdijk:

- Hoe maakt het mijn lief brokje, uw meesteres?
Koppelt ze nog altijd, hé? -
- Waarachtig, heer, zij heeft geen vlees meer om in te pekelen en zit nu zelf in de pekelton.

- Wel, dat is zeer goed; zoo behoort het; zoo moet het zijn; altijd versch vlees, en die het lever in de pekel!

("- How does my dear morsel, your mistress?
Does she still procure, ha?
- Truly, sir, she has no meat left to pickle
and now sits herself in the pickling-barrel.

Andreas:

- Hoe maakt dat sappige stuk 't van me: je meesteres?
Koppelt ze nog?
- Op mijn woord, Heer, ze heeft al haar pekelvlees op-gegemaakt en zit zelf in de kuip om haar ziekte uit te stomen.
- Bravo! Goed zo! Zo hoort het ook; zo moet het wezen:
de hoer altijd gaaf en madam met poeder op haar zwen-ren...

("- How does that juicy piece of mine: thy mistress?
Does she still procure?
- Upon my word, Sir, she has finished all her salted
meat and sits in the tub herself to steam out her dis-
ease.

- Well, that is very good; that is proper; so it must be; always fresh meat, and who provides it in pickle!"

- Bravo! Very good! That is proper, too; so it must be: the whore always sound and the brothelkeeper with powder on her sores. ...

The various renderings of Hamlet's joke about the secret parts of Fortune, quoted on pp. 344-345, show the same relationship between older and more recent (or: conservative and progressive) translators' approach to bawdy: Voeten's reading is the most explicit, but neither Burgersdijk nor Van Looy, Van Dam and Van Suchtelen show any particular anxiety to gloss over the smutty implications of the quibble, even though they all have solved it in a different way. Van Looy's solution is the most devious and "chaste" of that particular set; yet on other occasions, his reproduction of bawdy is as frank as that by any modern translator:

**Macbeth, II.i, 22-30:**

**Macb.** What three things does drink especially provoke?

**Port.** Marry, sir, nose-painting, sleep, and urine. Lechery, sir, it provokes and unprovokes: it provokes the desire, but it takes away the performance. Therefore much drink may be said to be an equivocator with lechery: it makes him and it mars him; it sets him on and it takes him off; it persuades him and disheartens him; makes him stand to and not stand to: in conclusion, equivocates him in a sleep, and giving him the lie, leaves him.

Van Looy:

- Welke drie dingen worden door drinken zoo bijzonder aangevuurd?


("- What three things are so particularly incited by drinking?

- Well, sir, nose-colour, sleep and urine. Cohabiting, sir, it incites and extinguishes; it eggs on the desire, but inhibits the performance. Therefore drunkenness may be said to be a shady dealer

Diels:

- Welke drie dingen worden door de drank vooral bevorderd?

- Wel, heer, een rooie neus, slapen en wateren. Voor de wellust betekent hij een aansporing en een ontsporing; hij stijft het voornemen maar verslapt de uitvoering. Daarom kan men van de drank zeggen, dat hij een dubbele rol speelt met de wellust; hij wekt hem en nekt hem; hij maakt hem en kraakt hem; hij doet hem streven en sneven; hij helpt hem op de been en brengt hem ten val; kortom, hij legt hem in de luren, sust hem in slaap, en smeert 'm.

("- What three things are especially promoted by drink?

- Well, sir, a red nose, sleeping and urinating. To lechery it constitutes an incentive and a derailment; he sets on" (litt: "stiffens") the intention but slackens the performance. Therefore one can say
with lechery; it makes him and harms him; it sets him up and makes him decline; it persuades him and disheartens him; makes him stand (up) and not stand (up) and finally it fritters him away in a sleep and earns him (a reputation for) lying, so as then to leave him in the lurch."

of drink, that it plays a dual part with lechery; it awakens him and kills him; it makes him and breaks him; it causes him to aspire and to die; it sets him on his legs and overthrows him" (i.e.: "causes him to fall")"; in short, it makes a fool of him, hushes him to sleep, and makes itself scarce.""

The passage of time and the changing attitude towards propriety, therefore, appear to have had less effect on the translation of Shakespeare's bawdy than might have been expected, although they undoubtedly have had a considerable bearing on the extent to which it has been used on the stage and the emphasis it has received in performance.

precedent and texts. - Two more diachronic factors must be mentioned, which affect translations but are not directly related to changes in the language and its use.

The first of these is the factor of precedent, already briefly touched on in Chapter XVI (see p.357). We may remember how Van Lennep justified his extensive borrowing from Moulin's Othello by telling his readers that he "saw no chance to express the same better than (Moulin) did, and came to the same conclusion as Mr. Jourdain, that the first reading was the best" (see p.109). Except for Den Brabander in his Een Midsummermaanachtroon - and disregarding Buddingh's revision of Burgersdijk - no translators since Van Lennep have gone as far as he did in drawing on a predecessor's version; yet it holds good for all of them in turn that their work has been conditioned in one way or another by what has gone before. If, for instance, we compare Courteaux's rendering of King Henry IV's soliloquy on sleep (see p.294) with Burgersdijk's (see p.444), we find that two of the eleven quoted lines are identical (11.5 and 8), one is almost so (1.14) and several other contain extensive verbal echoes (11.4, 6, 11 and 13). Since by no means all the instances of close structural and verbal correspondence between Courteaux and Burgersdijk are of the kind where an alternative rendering is difficult to arrive at, it must be assumed that the Flemish translator has regularly consulted his great predecessor and decided, like Van Lennep, that "the first reading was the best", - not a surprising conclusion for the moderate conservative Courteaux appears to be. However, Courteaux is not alone in this; even the progressive Voeten, it would seem, has on occasion been unable to avoid echoing one or other of his older colleagues:

_Hamlet, III, iv, 105-113:_ 

_Ham._ Do you not come your tardy son to chide,
That, lapsed in time and passion, lets go by
Th'important acting of your dread command?
O, say!

Gho. Do not forget. this visitation
Is but to whet thy almost blunted purpose.
But look, amazement on thy mother sits.
O step between her and her fighting soul.
Conceit in weakest bodies strongest works... 

Van Suchtelen:
- Komt ge niet om uw trage zoon te gispen,
  Die tijd en toorn liet glippen en verzaakte
  't Voltrekken van uw schrikkelijk bevel?
O spreek! -
- Vergeet het niet! Ik kom thans slechts
  Om uw alhaast verstompte plan te weten.
Doch zie: ontzetting greep uw moeder aan;
Treedt tussen haar en haar worst'ende ziel;
Verbeelting werkt op 't zwak gemoed het sterkst...

("- Do you not come your tardy son to censure,
That let time and wrath slip away and neglected
The executing of your terrible command?
O speak! - / - Do not forget it! I come now only
To whet your almost blunted purpose.
But see: horror seized hold of your mother;
Step between her and her struggling soul;
Imagination works most strongly on the weak mind.")

Voeten:
- Komt gij niet om uw trage zoon te laken,
die tijd en drift verbeuzelt, en verzuimt
geval te geven aan uw streng bevel?
O spreek! -
- Vergeet het niet; ik kom slechts om
uw welhaast botgeworden plan te scherpen.
Maar ziet, angst maakt zich meester van uw moeder;
treedt tussen haar en haar gekwelde ziel!
Verbeelding schokt een zwak gemoed het hevigst...

("- Do you not come your tardy son to reproach,
that trifles away time and passion, and fails
to carry out your stern command?
O speak! - - Do not forget it! I come only to
sharpen your almost blunted purpose.
But see, fear takes possession of your mother;
Step between her and her tortured soul;
Imagination shocks a weak mind most violently.")

Most of the parallels between Voeten's and Van Suchtelen's readings could have been arrived at independently, but one or two details (the structure of 1.106, the translation of "weakest bodies" by "zwak gemoed") suggest consultation. Burgersdijk's version differs from both in some important respects, yet Voeten's 1.105 is identical to his.

Further elaboration of this factor is unnecessary: it is obvious that the present generation of translators can only benefit by the discoveries, and learn from the mistakes made by their predecessors. One of the most radical innovators, Dolf Verspoor, summarizes this very eloquently in the postscript to the 1962 edition of his Droom van een Midsomermacht: "It remains... ...a hazardous undertaking to attempt for our time what a Burgersdijk accomplished with the language resources of his time. To try and improve on certain of his and Nico van Suchtelen's solutions, certainly proved to be impossible to me: the few de-
tails from their versions that have found their way into this one, are to be regarded as an homage rather than as a sign of lack of respect." - Verspoor's work, in fact, contains so few echoes of older translators that it induced one of his critics (Anton Koolhaas, VN, February 1966) to remark that it seems to be "his greatest concern to stay clear of Burgersdijk as far as possible" -; and its somewhat dubious qualities, of which a too obvious and over-deliberate originality is one, do bear out that Verspoor has been unwise not to do more homage-by-imitation to the older masters: to his disadvantage, his versions reflect the influence of their examples in the only possible negative way.

The last, and least obtrusive factor to affect translations, which is at least in some sense of a diachronic nature, is an entirely external one: the factor of texts, which has also been dealt with briefly in Chapter XVI (see pp.346-347), where we saw how the use of divergent English editions of the plays - in contrast to the precedent factor - accounts for differences, rather than correspondences, between translations of the same play. On that occasion we were specifically concerned with various solutions of cruces, emendations and editorial interpretations; but text editions involve several other details -: variants, stage instructions, annotation - and if the part they jointly play is called unobtrusive, this is only because it has, of all factors, the least obvious effect on the quality of the translations as such, and is least likely to impress itself as decisive upon their readers and users.

Yet the specification of the texts used and the effects they have had poses a complex problem - too complex to deal with satisfactorily in this introductory study; the detective work required to sort this out would take several years of diligent research. For very few translators have bothered to indicate the exact basis for their work. Van Suchtelen is known to have relied on the 1933 Arden edition of *Hamlet* by Edward Dowden, "whose commentary I made regular use of in my notes", as he tells us in a brief postscript to his translation - but such a clear specification is rare; Van Looy, for instance, based his original translation of that play on Cassell & Co.'s edition of 1894, and revised it with the aid of the Dent edition of 1909, meanwhile reverting to some of his original readings; Bert Voeten used the *Arden Shakespeare*, the *New Temple Shakespeare* and the *New Cambridge Shakespeare* for his *Hamlet*, but chose certain F1 readings in preference to all of these.

It is evident that all modern translators have benefited from the excellence of scholarly editions such as the *Arden, London* and *New Cambridge Shakespeare*; nevertheless, because of the liberal modern attitude to semantic and structural fidelity, combined with textual eclecticism, the exact part different texts
have played in any one translation is difficult to determine where it has not been specified. Verspoor's free rendering of the crux-line III,ii,25 of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*: "Ik stamp, dat struikelt, rolt en pakt de benen" ("I stamp, one stumbles, rolls and cuts his sticks") indicates that he followed the Qq Ff reading *At our stampe*, and not Johnson's emendation to *At a stump*, adopted by Quiller-Couch and Munro (the *New Cambridge and London Shakespeare*); but Courteaux's version: "Ze struiklen, vallen, rollen in het zand" ("They stumble, fall, roll in the sand") evades the issue by leaving the crux out altogether, thus depriving us of an opportunity to establish which text he has (or has not) used. At least Courteaux and Verspoor are still alive to help us solve such riddles, but this, of course, is not the case with many older translators whose sources are besides often much more difficult to trace. Nijhoff's two versions of *The Tempest*, for instance, pose a number of textual puzzles. These are his readings of I,ii,14-15:

*Storm*, (1930):


*De Storm*, (1952):

(Pros.) Wees niet ontsteld, meewarig hartje, er is.. -

The first of these indicates a text emendation allotting the final "No harm" in 1.15 to Miranda; and the 1952 version seems to be based on a complete rearrangement of 1.15, which would read as follows:

(Pros.) No more amazement: tell your piteous heart...

Mir. O woe the day! - Pros. There's no harm done. - Mir. No harm?

Neither of these variants occur in any of the standard twentieth-century editions; the first one originates from Johnson, and, independently, from Walker, the second from the German scholar Karl Elze (1821-1889). But Nijhoff's versification of all Caliban's speeches in II,ii - not to be found in any twentieth-century text either - suggests Dyce's edition, with whose line division it shows the closest correspondence. Then, his translation of IV,i,124-127 appears to be based on one of three alternative emendations proposed by W. A. Wright and partially adopted by Dover Wilson (the *New Cambridge Shakespeare*):

Mir. Sweet, now, silence!
Juno and Ceres whisper seriously;
There's something else to do. - Pros. hush, and be mute,
Or else our spell is marred. -

Mir. - Spreek zachter, liefste;
Juno en Ceres fluisteren geheimzinnig,
Er is nog iets op komst. - Pros. Zijwijd; stilte;
Wordt de bezwering onderbroken. Stilte. -

anders
The only tentative conclusion one may draw from these confusing data is that Nijhoff possibly used the Furness Variorum edition of the play and selected whatever reading appealed to him.

As textual divergence is most pronounced in the plays with a complex history of early editions, a high incidence of variants will inevitably be reflected in the translations of such plays. One of these is Richard III with its eight Q editions, none of which agree with the F1 text. In the example below Burgersdijk's version follows F1, while Roland Holst's is based on the Q1/Q2 variant (IV,iv,88-91):

A dreame of what thou wast, a garish Flagge
To be the ayme of every dangerous Shot;
A signe of Dignity, a Breath, a Bubble;
A Queen in ieast, onely to fill the Scene.

Burgersdijk:

Een droom van wat gij waart, een bonte vlag,
Om 't doel te zijn van ieder dreigend schot,
Een glanzend schild, een ademtocht, een zeepbel,
Strookoningin, slechts om 't toneel te vullen...

("A dream of what you were, a garish flag,
To be the aim of every menacing shot,
A shiny crest, a breath, a soap-bubble,
Queen of straw, only to fill the stage..."

but elsewhere the origins appear to be reversed, and at times the two translations have a particular Q or F variant in common; in neither case is the evidence unambiguous enough to indicate the use of one particular nineteenth or early twentieth-century edition.

At this stage an indication of the complexity of the base text factor is all that can be given; for a detailed study of any major translator, however, a thorough exploration of this aspect may prove to be indispensable.
CHAPTER XX

MINUTIAE

After the discussion of all the major factors that have had a bearing on the translating of Shakespeare into Dutch, particularly since the time when Kok and Burgerdijk published their first renderings of the complete canon, some attention must now be paid to a number of small matters concerning the presentation of translations, which it has not been possible to deal with under any of the previous headings.

titles. - The first aspect of a translation by which the general public identifies it as a Shakespeare play is its title. The great "name" tragedies present, in that respect, no surprises: for Titus Andronicus, Hamlet, Othello, Macbeth, Julius Caesar, Coriolanus, Antonius en Cleopatra and Koning Lear the original titles have been retained by all translators without modification except for the Dutch Koning for King, the latinization of Antonius and the addition (or retention) of the subtitles Prins van Denemarken and De Moor van Venetië to Hamlet and Othello respectively by one or two of the older translators; Brunius' prefixing of Marcus and Caius Marcus to Antonius and Coriolanus, and Van Lennep's italianized Otello have never been imitated. Less obvious is the reason why all translators of Romeo and Juliet have settled for the rather dowdy name Julia in preference to the more appealing Julietta, by which the Juliet of Measure for Measure is known.

Other name-bearing plays have been subject to the same convention: Troilus en Cressida, Timon van Athens and Pericles are uniformly titled as such, the last with the subtitle Vorst van Tyrs in Kok's prose version; the only exception is Andreas' Dutch-sounding Kimbelijn for Cymbeline. The histories follow the same pattern, except that two of the kings' names, John and Henry, have been replaced by their Dutch equivalents; hence the cycle is generally known as: Koning Jan, (Koning) Richard II (De Tweede), (Koning) Hendrik IV (De Vierde), V (De Vijfde), VI (De Zeeede), (Koning) Richard III (De Derde) and (Koning) Hendrik VIII (De Achtste). In complete editions these plays - as in many of their English counterparts - are usually presented in the historical order of their subjects rather than in the chronological sequence in which they were written.

The titling of the comedies, understandably, shows a little more variation. De Koopman van Venetië and De Vrolijke Vrouwtjes van Windsor are uniform; Nijhoff's first Storm is the only departure from De Storm,
Kok's *Einde Goed, Alles Goed* (All's Well that Ends Well) and *Een Winteravond Vertelling* (The (*A*) Winter(*"night"*)'s Tale) the only ones from the standing expression *Einde Goed, Al Goed* and *Een Winteravond-sprookje* (*"A Winter Night's Fairy Tale"*); and VERSPOOR is the only translator of *Twelfth Night* who has chosen to translate its alternative title: *What You Will*, as *Wat U Maar Wilt* (*"Whatever You Wish"*) in preference to *Driekoningsavond* (*"Three Kings' Eve"*, = *Twelfth Night*). But the remaining ones are known by three or more titles:

---

**As You Like It:**

Orlando en Rosalinde (Kok, verse); Zoo Als Gij Wilt (*"As You Wish"*: Kok, prose);
Elk Wat Wils (*"Something to Everyone's Liking"*: Burgersdijk, Buddingh'); *Naar Het U Lijkt* (*"As It May Please You"*: Van Looy, Courteaux).

---

**The Comedy of Errors:**

De Klucht der Vergissingen (*"The Farce of Errors"*: Kok, Burgersdijk, Schröder, Buddingh'); Het Spel (*"The Play"*) der Vergissingen (Werumeus Buning); Een Blijspel Vol Verwarring (*"A Comedy Full of Confusion"*: Verkade); Een Klucht (*"A Farce"*) Vol Verwarring (Courteaux).

---

**Love's Labour's Lost:**

Veel Vrijage Vergeefs (*"Much Courting in Vain"*: Kok); Veel Gemin, Geen Gewin (*"Much Loving, No Profit"*: Burgersdijk, Rensburg, Buddingh'); Liefde's Lief en Leed (*"Love's Delight and Grief"*: Saalborn's title for Burgersdijk's translation); Liefde's Lose Les (*"Love's Wily Lesson"*: Straat); Liefde's List en Leed (*"Love's Cunning and Grief"*: Courteaux).

---

**Measure for Measure:**

Naar Eigen Maat Gemeten (*"Measured by one's Own Measure"*: Kok); Maat voor Maat (*"Measure for Measure"*: Burgersdijk); Leer om Leer (standing expression: *"Tit for Tat"*: Arnold Saalborn, Den Brabander, Buddingh', Courteaux, Andrus).

---

**A Midsummer Night's Dream:**

Een Zomernachtadroom (*"A Summer Night's Dream"*: Kok); Een Midzomer湄会droom (Burgersdijk, (Royaards), Van Suchtelen, Den Brabander, Buddingh', Courteaux); Een Midzomer湄会droom (Van Looy, Rensburg, Hoornweg); Een Midzomer湄会droom (Werumeus Buning); Droom van een Midsommermaacht (Verspoor).

---

**Much Ado About Nothing:**

Veel Beweging om Niets (*"Much (Com)motion about Nothing"*: Kok); Veel Leven om Niets (*"Much Noise about Nothing"*: Burgersdijk, Van den berg, Buddingh', Messe-
laar, Diels); Veel Drukte om Niets ("Much Fuss about Nothing": Courteaux).

The Taming of the Shrew: De Spijtige Schoone Getemt ("The Spiteful Beauty Tamed": Kok); Een Snibbe Getemt ("A Vixen Tamed": Burgersdijk); De Getemde Feeks ("The Tamed Shrew": title usually given to Burgersdijk's translation in performance; Van den Berg, Buddingh', Voeten); De Feeks Wordt Getemt ("The Shrew Is Tamed": Courteaux).

Two Gentlemen of Verona: De Twee Vrienden van Verona ("The Two Friends of Verona": Kok); Twee Edellieden van Verona ("Two Noblemen of Verona": Burgersdijk, Buddingh'); De Twee Veronesen ("The Two Venetians": Courteaux); Twee Heren uit Verona ("Two Gentlemen from Verona": Zaal).

names. - Another set of conventions that has some interesting aspects is that of the naming of characters. It has already been observed that the kings of the history plays are known by the Dutch equivalents of their names; the same applies to the queens (Isabella, Margaretha, Anna, Catharina) and to the Christian names of some of the other main characters: Hendrik Percy, Humfried van Glo(uce)ster - yet not to all: George, John, Edward have generally been left as they are and not been replaced by: Joris, Jan and Eduard. The one notable exception is Jan van Gent (John of Gaunt), which is also the sole example of a Dutch family name being used for an English prince; names such as York, Lancaster, Mortimer, Warwick, Somerset, Northumberland, Richmond - all those derived from British geographical locations - have been retained. This is also the case in other plays featuring British, English or Scottish names (Macbeth, King Lear, The Merry Wives of Windsor). Titles, however, are translated if a Dutch equivalent exists: King and Queen into Koning(in), Prince(ss) into Prins(es); Duke, Duchess into: Hertog(in); Earl, Countess into: Graaf, Gravin; Marquess into Markies, and Sir, occasionally, into Jonker - but more usually the latter and Lady are left unchanged, except as forms of address: Sire, (Mijn)heer, Vrouwe; the Scottish Thane is modified to: Thaan. As in Dutch the Latin names of classical history remain unmodified, the traditional anglicisations used by Shakespeare: ((Mark) Antony, Pompey, Tarquin) revert to their original forms: (Marcus) Antonius, Pompeius, Tarquinius, in the translations of the Roman tragedies and any other passages where they occur. Of the "romantic" names - the (quasi)-classical, Italian, Teutonic and French ones in the comedies and in Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet and Othello - very few are changed: Julia has already been mentioned; others are Valentin for Valentin, Geertruida for Gertrude, Imoegen for Imogen, Bernardijn for Barnardine, Corijn for Co-
rin and Calibanaan or Kalibanaan for Caliban. A sense of linguistic consistency probably prompted the ital-
iziation of Friar Laurence into Broeder Lorenzo, by all translators except Van Looy - yet his friend Friar
John is generally given the Dutch name Broeder Johannes. Similarly, Don John and Friar Francis in Much A-
do have become Don Juan and Broeder Francisco (Courteaux: Franciscus), although Benedick is known by the
Dutch equivalent: Benedict, and Beatrice has been adopted without modification.
Translators have been able to exercise their freedom and ingenuity, however, in the devising of suitable
names for the many comic characters. The degree to which Burgersdijk has been identified with Shakespeare
is evinced by the fact that the comics from the most popular comedies tend to be remembered by the names
he gave them, even though some of the alternatives used by other translators are as witty or apt as his;
it is significant that his choice for Bottom: Spoel ("Bobbin" or "Shuttle") has not only been retained by
Den Brabander, Buddingh' and Courteaux, but even by Verspoor. The complete list of names for the artisans
in A Midsummer Night's Dream follows below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quince:</th>
<th>Bottom:</th>
<th>Flute</th>
<th>Snout:</th>
<th>Starveling:</th>
<th>Snug:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgersdijk:</td>
<td>Dissel</td>
<td>Spoel</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>Tuit</td>
<td>Slokker</td>
<td>Schaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Adze&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Shuttle&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Wind&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Spout&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Gulper&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Plane&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Looy:</td>
<td>Guds</td>
<td>Boom</td>
<td>Pijp</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Kommerling</td>
<td>Kraal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Gouge&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Beam&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Pipe&quot;)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(&quot;Starveling&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Beading&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensburg:</td>
<td>Kwee</td>
<td>Bodem</td>
<td>Fluit</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Hongeraar</td>
<td>Knus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Quince&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Bottom&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Flute&quot;)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(&quot;Starver&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Snug&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Suchtelen:</td>
<td>Mispel</td>
<td>Bulder</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Schrielhals</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Medlar&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Bellow&quot;)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(&quot;Skinny-neck&quot;)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werumeus Buning:</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>Gat</td>
<td>Blaas</td>
<td>Koper</td>
<td>Minman</td>
<td>Plank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Pear&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Hole&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Bladder&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Copper&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Little man&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Plank&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddingh':</td>
<td>Dissel</td>
<td>Spoel</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>Gochel</td>
<td>Schraalhals</td>
<td>Schaaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Adze&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Shuttle&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Wind&quot;)</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>(&quot;Skinny-neck&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteaux:</td>
<td>Leuter</td>
<td>Fluit</td>
<td>Tuit</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Sokker</td>
<td>Spaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Twaddle&quot;)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(&quot;Spout&quot;)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(&quot;Chip&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;Skinny&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verspoor:</td>
<td>Wig</td>
<td>Tuit</td>
<td>Snout</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Schriel</td>
<td>Knus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Wedge&quot;)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(&quot;Snout&quot;)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names listed for Werumeus Buning are the ones conversationally used in the course of the play as ab-
breviations of their official "Greek" forms: Pereus, Gateus, Blaseus, Kopereus, Minmaneus and Plankeus.
Buddingh's "Gochel" (Snout) is probably a nonsense word invented by himself: Buddingh' first gained a reputation with his Gorgelrijmen, a collection of nonsense verse full of neologisms of the "gochel" variety. The only Shakespearean comics that emulate the popularity of Bottom's company are Sir Toby Belch and Sir Andrew Ague Cheek who, in the Netherlands, are best known as Jonker Tobias and Jonker Andries. Burgersdijk gave them the surnames Hikkenburg ("Hickupsbury") and Bibberwang ("Shivercheek"); Verspoor retained the latter but changed the former to Van Boerenburgh ("O'Belchbury"); and Messelaar offered the appealing alternatives Risp (a genteel term for "Belch") and Wangewee ("Cheekpain").

In the versions of As You Like It, Touchstone has become Toetssteen (lit.), Oliver Martext: Olivier Draaitekst ('Turntext' - Burgersdijk) or Smoortekst ('Smothertext' - Van Looy) and Audrey: Dorothea (or Doortje for short - Burgersdijk) or Aagje ("Agatha" - Van Looy); Much Ado's Dogberry and Verges are best known as Brummel (Burgersdijk) or Braam (Courteaux; both mean: "Blackberry" - the literal translation: Kornoelje, does not seem to have appealed to anyone) and Knuppel ("Cudgel"). Burgersdijk's example has also been generally followed in the naming of comic characters in Measure for Measure: Pompejus for Pompey, Elleboog for Elbow and Schuim for Froth are literal translations and hence obvious choices, but this cannot be said for Vrouw Moddergaar ("Mistress Mudrake", for Overdone); Andreus has only dropped Burgersdijk's Isegrím (for Abhorson) in favour of Jan Gruwel ("John Horror").

The low-life population of Henry IV has been divided according to the nature of the original names; the "real" (sur)names have uniformly been adopted without change: (Sir John) Falstaff, Poins, Bardolf, Peto, Gadshill; the "emblematic" ones have been turned into their Dutch counterparts by all translators except Voeten. Hence: Pistool (Pistol), Zielig ("Pitiful" - for Shallow), Stil ("Silent, Quiet" - for Silence), Schimmel ("Fungus" - for Mouldy), Schaduw (Shadow), Wrat (Wart), Slap (Feeble), Buik (Bulck), Klauw ("Claw", for Fang), Strik (Snare), Vrouw Haastig ("Mistress Hasty", for Quickly) and Doortje Scheurlaken ("Dorrit" Tearsheet) in Burgersdijk's version; Courteaux has adopted most of these, but called Shallow: Schraal ("Scanty, Skinny"), Mouldy: Schimmelig (lit.), Builk: Stierkalf (lit.) and Mistress Quickly: Vrouw Snel ("Swift"). Voeten, who has only translated part I, has left the surname Quickly unchanged, as he has done with all the attribute names in his Vrolijke Vrouwtjes van Windsor - yet he has translated Ford's pseudonym Brook into: Beek (lit.). In his version of this comedy, Burgersdijk carried Zielig, Pistool and Vrouw Haastig over from Henry IV, II; and, in line with these, called Slapperman: Slapperman ("Slack"-man) and Simple: Simpel, but retained the English surnames for the other characters. Cour-
teaux, who calls Slender: Smal ("Thin" or "Narrow"), follows the same convention except for Ford, which he translates into: Vliet ("Stream").

The translations of the remaining attribute names in the canon hold few surprises. The only one in The Comedy of Errors, Pinch, has predictably been turned into (Doctor) Knijp (lit.) in all versions; and Christopher Sly, The Shrew's tinker, into (Christoffel) Sluw (lit.) by all translators except Voeten, who, consistent with his practice in De Vrolijke Vrouwtjes, uses the English name. Speed and Launce from Two Gentlemen of Verona are known as Flink ("Sturdy, Stout" - Burgersdijk, Courteaux) or: Haast ("Haste" - Zaal) and Lans ("Lance"); and the threesome from Love's Labour's Lost, Dull, Costard and Moth, as Dom ("Stupid" - Burgersdijk) or Sloom ("Slow, Dull" - Courteaux), Dikkop ("Fathead" - Burgersdijk) or Kop ("Head", "Sconce" - Courteaux) and Mot (lit.) respectively. Burgersdijk has added one such name to Shakespeare's collection by calling the anonymous Clown in The Winter's Tale: Stoffel ("Blockhead, Duffer"). Shakespeare's occasional use of familiar or honorary nicknames is also reflected in most translations; for instance, both Princess Katherine of France and Katherine Minola are addressed as "Kaatje" where the original has: Kate, and Falstaff permits himself the familiarity of calling Prince Hal: "Hein". Voeten again prefers to leave these names untranslated, with an occasional exception in De Getemde Feege, where he sometimes uses "Kat" or "Katje" ("Cat", "Little Cat"); he also retains Hotspur, whom Burgersdijk and Courteaux have turned literally into: Heetspoor. The latter two translators, however, depart from their usual practice in the scenes of Henry IV, I involving Lady Percy, whom Courteaux leaves her English name Kate, while Burgersdijk evasively resorts to Vrouw ("wife") whenever the short name occurs. -

stage directions. - Despite their variety of approaches to the task of translation, there is little divergence between Dutch Shakespeare translators of the past and the present where the use of stage directions are concerned. With very few exceptions, they limit them to the kind found in English editions since the days of Rowe, Pope, Theobald and Capell: i.e. act and scene divisions are indicated, usually followed by a simple locational specification; entries and exits are marked, occasionally with appropriate qualifications such as: boven ("above"), van verschilende kanten ("severally"), in de verte ("at a distance"), een licht dragend ("bearing a light"), gewapend ("armed"), "in kamergevaard" (in his (night)gown), vermoeid, als knaap ("disguised", "as a youth") or onder geleide ("attended", "with attendants"). Acting directions are generally confined to essentials: zij trekken hun degens ("they draw"), zij vechten ("they fight"), valt ("falls"), sterft ("dies"), zich terugtrekkend ("retiring"), drinkt ("drinks"), knielt ("kneels"),
haar kussend ("kissing her"); so are stage- and sound effects: Trompetgeschal. Tromgeroffel ("Flourish", "Alarms"), Basuin ("Sennet"), Kanonschoten ("Guns"), De storm houdt aan ("Storm still"), Donder (slagen) en bliksemschicht ("Thunder and Lightning"). The more elaborate mechanics for the late plays, however, are faithfully reproduced:

The Tempest, III,iii,82/83: He vanishes in thunder; then, to soft music, enter the shapes again, and dance, with mocks and mows, and carrying out the table.

Nijhoff: Hij verdwijnt onder een donderslag. De gedaanten komen dansend terug, trekken spottende grimassen en gaan weer heen, de tafel medememend. ("He vanishes to the sound of thunder. The apparitions return dancing, make mocking grimaces and depart again, taking the table along").

But visual elaborations such as have been incorporated elsewhere in the texts by some modern English editors - particularly Quiller-Couch and Dover Wilson, for the New (Cambridge) Shakespeare - are rarely found in Dutch translations. Below we compare a direction from that series' edition of A Midsummer Night's Dream with the corresponding one in the Signet Classic version, and with a number of translations:

Act II,ii,32/33 (Titania sleeps / (The fairies steal away / OBERON appears, hovering above the bank; he and 35/36: alights and anoints the eyes of Titania with the juice of the flower

(Signet): (Exeunt Fairies. Titania sleeps.) / (Enter Oberon (and squeezes the flower on Titania's eyelids)

Burgersdijk: (De elfen verdwijnen. TITANIA is in slaap.) / (OBERON komt op en drukt het bloemaap op TITANIA's oogleden.) ("(The fairies vanish. TITANIA is asleep.) / (OBERON enters and squeezes the flower juice on TITANIA's eyelids.")"

Van Suchtelen: (Elf af, Titania slaapt) / (Oberon op) / (perst de bloem uit boven Titania's oogleden) ("(Exeunt fairies, Titania sleeps) / (Enter Oberon) / (presses the flower above Titania's eyelids")"

Den Brabander: (Elf af, Titania slaapt) / (Oberon op. Drukt het bloemaap op haar oogleden) ("(Exeunt fairies. Titania sleeps) / (Enter Oberon. Squeezes the flower juice on her eyelids")"

Werumeus Buning: (af: alle elfen. Titania slaapt). / (op: Oberon) ("(exeunt: all fairies. Titania sleeps). / (enter: Oberon")"

Courteaux: (Elf af, Titania slaapt) / (Oberon komt op en perst boven Titania's ogen het sap uit de bloem) ("(Exeunt fairies, Titania sleeps) / (Oberon enters and presses the juice from flower above Titania's eyes")"

Verspoor: Elf af. Titania slaapt in. Oberon, alleen op. ("Exeunt fairies. Titania falls asleep. Oberon enters, alone.")
These examples demonstrate that, within a tradition of restraint, there is nevertheless some variety. A close comparison of the directive habits of early translators (Burgersdijk, Koster, Van Looy, Roland Holst, Rensburg) shows that Burgersdijk is the only one who allowed himself the occasional liberty. In his Othello, for instance, the following acting directions can be found that do not occur in any of the nineteenth-century text editions:

II, i, 217: Iago. Lay thy finger thus...

II, i, 298: 'Tis here, but yet confused:

IV, i, 57/58: Exit Cassio

IV, i, 107: Cassio Alas, poor caitiff!

IV, i, 110: Cassio Alas, poor rogue...

V, i, 23/24: Rodrigo (makes a pass at Cassio.)

V, i, 62/63: (after: O inhuman dog!)

V, i, 73/74: (after: I'll bind him with my shirt)

V, ii, 81/82: (after: Down, strumpet!)

V, ii, 248: (after: Let it go all.)

V, ii, 290: (after: Wrench his sword from him.)

JAGO: (grijpt RODRIGO's hand en legt hem die op de mond) ("grabs RODRIGO's hand and lays it to his mouth")

(Hij wijst op zijn voorhoofd) ("He points at his forehead")

(CASSIO af.) / (OTHELLO komt bij en houdt de hand aan 't hoofd.) ("Exit CASSIO. / (OTHELLO comes to and touches his head with his hand.")

CASSIO: (Glimlachend) ("Smiling")

CASSIO: (Lachend) ("Laughing")

(Hij schiet uit zijn schuilhoek te voorschijn en doet een stoot naar Cassio) ("He rushes forward out of his hiding place and makes a pass at Cassio")

(Hij stort voor dood neder) ("He collapses as if dead")

(Hij begint CASSIO te verbinden) ("He begins to dress CASSIO's wound")

(grijpt haar aan) ("seizes her")

(Hij gaat in het achtervertrek) ("He enters the inner stage")

(Het geschiedt) ("It is done")

Most of these directions are superfluous, unless they are meant to be an aid to the visualization of the action designed for readers inexpert in stage matters; that they may be seen as such is borne out by the fact that in III, iii where, at Othello's line: "Be sure of it; give me the ocular proof!" (1.364) the direction (takes him by the throat), incorporated by many editors since Rowe, has been left out - but, instead, the action is demonstrated in one of the many illustrations the edition contains.

Of the modern translators, Nijhoff is the first to have elaborated discreetly on traditional stage di-
rections, in his second version of The Tempest. In II,ii, for instance, his translation of Caliban's line (17): "Perchance he will not mind me." is followed by the direction: *Hij strekt zich voorover op de grond en dekt zich met zijn mantel." ("He stretches prone on the ground and covers himself with his cloak") and, in IV,i, Ferdinand's line (54): "I warrant you, sir;" is preceded by: *ziende naar Miranda die zich tegen hem heeft aangevlijd. ("looking at Miranda who has nestled against him.").

In this respect, Nijhoff has not been imitated by younger successors such as Verspoor and Andreus. Verspoor, working with the "empty-stage" style productions of the 1960's in mind, has dispensed with all but the bare essentials: he does not even include locational directions and scene divisions. Andreus has retained these, but is negligent about exits and entries, where he relies irresponsibly on textual indications, particularly in his version of Measure for Measure. In I,ii, for instance, he does incorporate the direction *Exeunt Lucio and Gentlemen* between 11.73 and 74, but fails to bring Lucio back on with the Provost, Claudio and Juliet after 1.105 (where, by the way, he begins a new scene: *Derde Tafreel*) or just before 1.114. At II,iii,9 he does not have Juliet enter, nor, at III,i,47, Isabella; at III,i,53 he marks an exit for the Duke and the Provost, but the Duke does not reappear before his line (I52):

"Vouchsafe a word, young sister,...". The messenger in IV,ii comes on (at 1.92) and delivers his errand, but never leaves; in IV,iii, the Provost addresses the Duke at 1.59 without having entered, nor does he leave at 1.99. Friar Peter's entry at IV,vi,8 is left entirely to Isabella's hearsay; and in V,i Mariana (veiled) is marked as present at the beginning, then, superfluously, enters at 1.169, while Isabella does not exit at 1.162, yet re-enters 1.276; finally, after their compulsory marriage, Angelo and Mariana make no reappearance at 1.393, yet are patently present at 1.410. - Fortunately, Andreus' *Kimbelijn* is less erratic - though by no means perfect - in this respect. An interesting device of which a few examples can be found in the latter is the substitution of an explicit direction for one that is implicit in the text, but has been lost in translation:

*Cymbeline, IV,ii, 37-38:*

I am sick still, heartsick. Pisania,
I'll now taste of thy drug. - Swallows some.

("I still feel sick, sick with heartache. Perhaps / this will help, Pisania? - swallows some of the miracle drug")

*Cymbeline, V,v, 61: Heard you all this, her women?*  

(tot de hofdames) U heeft het ook gehoord?  
("(to the ladies-in-waiting) You heard it too?")

Andreus:

'k Voel me nog ziek, van hartzee ziek. Misschien helpt dit, Pisania? - eet vast wat van het wondermiddeltje
The only present-day translator who adorns his work with the extensive scene-setting and action-determining directions introduced by Wilson and Quiller-Couch is Bert Voeten, and that only in a few of his translations specifically based on texts edited by those two scholars. His versions of The Merry Wives (based on Alexander's edition for The Tudor Shakespeare, Collins), Hamlet (see p.455) and Troilus and Cressida (on Alice Walker's edition for The New Cambridge Shakespeare) contain only standard directions; but in those of Henry IV, I and The Taming of the Shrew Wilson's and Quiller-Couch's pictorial elaborations are faithfully reproduced:

Henry IV, I, i, ii (scene-heading; John Dover Wilson)

Sir JOHN FALSTAFF lies snoring upon a bench in a corner. The PRINCE OF WALES enters and rouses him.

FALSTAFF (ontwakend) En, Hal. (lit.) wakker)

(Poins makes signals behind Falstaff's back)

Voeten:

(Sir John Falstaff ligt op een bank in een hoek te snorren. De prins van Wales komt op en schudt hem)

Do., I, ii, 136/137:

(Poins geeft de prins een wenk achter de rug van Falstaff) ("Poins gives the prince a signal behind Falstaff's back")

Do., II, i, 3/4:

(Poins kruip weg achter een bosje) / (Falstaff op, buiten adem) ("Poins crawls away behind a bush")

(Enter Falstaff, out of breath)

Do., II, ii, 101/102:

(They all run away, leaving the booty behind them, and Falstaff, after a blow or two, runs away too, roaring for mercy as the Prince and Poins prick him from behind with their swords.

(De rovers rennen weg, met achterlating van de buit. Falstaff maakt zich na een of twee degenstoten ook uit de voeten, brullend om genade als de Prins en Poins hem van achteren met hun degen prikken)

("The robbers run away, leaving the booty behind. Falstaff, after one or two sword thrusts, also takes to his heels, roaring for mercy when the Prince and Poins prick him from behind with their swords")

The Taming of the Shrew, Induction, i (scene-heading; Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch)

Before an alehouse on a heath

The door opens and SLY staggerers out, driven forth by the hostesses

Eerste Toneel. Voor een herberg op de hei. (De deur gaat open en Sly strompelt naar buiten, op de hielent gezeten door de waardin)
("First Scene. Before an inn on the heath. (The door opens and Sly staggers out, followed close upon his heels by the hostess")"

do.,II,i (scene-heading):
KATHARINA with a whip stands over BIANCA, who crouches by a wall, her hands tied behind her.

("Katharina stands with a whip over Bianca, who crouches on the ground with her hands tied behind her back")"

do.,III,ii,84/85:
PETRUCHIO and GRUMIO, basely attired, enter the square in boisterous fashion.

(Petruchio en Grumio, havelooi gekleed, komen luidruchtig op) ("Petruchio and Grumio, raggedly dressed, enter noisily")"

do.,IV,i (scene-heading):
The hall of Petruchio's house in the country; stairs leading to a gallery; a large open hearth; a table, benches and stools; three doors, one opening on to the porch without.

GRUMIO enters the house, his shoulders covered with snow, his legs with mud.

Grumio (throws himself upon a bench) Fie, fie...

("The hall of Petruchio's house in the country. (A gallery with a staircase; a large open hearth; a table, benches and stools; three doors, of which one opens on to the landing. - Enter Grumio, snow on his shoulders, his legs muddy; he drops upon a bench")"

do.,IV,i,108/109:
The door is rudely flung open and PETRUCHIO enters with KATHARINA, both stained with mire from head to foot; she strides into the midst of the room; she, wellnigh swooning but still strained, stands leaning against the wall just within the door -

(De deur wordt ruw opengegooid en Petruchio komt op met Katharina, beiden van top tot teen onder de modder; zij loopt naar het midden; zij, nagenoeg uitgeput maar nog niet getam, blijft dicht bij de deur tegen de muur leunen) (lit.)

The most interesting conclusion to be drawn from these examples is that, even if Voeten had not himself specified the New Cambridge Shakespeare editions as the base texts for these two versions, the stage directions would provide ample evidence that they were. Since it appears that the majority of those translators whose sources are known have, like Voeten, followed these very closely on the point of stage di-
receptions, they may turn out to be valuable guides in detailed research aimed at establishing which base
texts have been used in cases where this is not known.

A good example is the placing of the two entries of (Banquo's) Ghost in the banquet scene of Macbeth
(III,iv). Except for Burgersdijk, all the nineteenth-century translators as well as Koster, Van Looy and
Van Suchtelen direct the first entry at the end of 1.39 (after: May't please your Highness sit.); Burgers-
dijk has shifted it to the middle of 1.43 (after: Than pity for mischance!), Diels, to 1.37 (after: Meet-
ing were bare without it.) and Courteaux to the end of 1.41 (after: Were the graced person of our Banquo
present,); Buddingh' has followed Burgersdijk. The directions for the second entry show an equal variety,
and it is not distributed the same way. On this occasion, Moulin, Destanberg and Kok have Banquo appear
at the end of 1.89 (after: I drink to th'general joy o' th'whole table.), Pekelharing and Diels at the end
of 1.88 (after: Give me some wine, fill full.), Burgersdijk, Koster, Van Looy and Van Suchtelen at the
end of 1.92 (after: Our duties, and the pledge.) and Courteaux in the middle of 1.91 (after: Would he
were here!).

From these two minute data it is possible to deduce that Moulin could have used the Steevens, Boswell's
Malone or Singer edition of Macbeth (the last, published in 1826, is the most likely of the three: he
also used Singer's Othello); that Kok might have relied on any one of these, on Delius (like Destanberg),
or on the first Hudson edition of 1856 - but not the second (1871), which places the first direction at
the end of 1.45 (after: To grace us with your royal company?); that Pekelharing's version appears to be
based on either Knight's or Collier's edition, and Burgersdijk's on that of Staunton, published in 1860;
that Koster, Van Looy and Van Suchtelen could have followed Furness (1878) or any later edition that
agrees with it on these two details; that Diels has apparently used the New Cambridge text, and Courteaux,

These are, however, only two of many variables: apart from other stage instructions, specific textual
variants, emendations, scene divisions and notes should make it possible, in many cases, to identify the
unknown base text of a translation with a high degree of accuracy - although the textual eclecticism of
the more scholarly translators will have to be taken into account; Burgersdijk, for instance, shows in
his introduction to Macbeth that he was familiar with Delius', Furness' and Darmesteter's editions, to
which he refers the interested reader for more extensive information on the play than his "limited scope"
allows him to give. -
presentation: introductions, annotation, quality of publication. - A good introduction and a supplement of informative and explanatory notes can add considerably to the value of a published translation or set of translations; besides, regardless of its intrinsic merit, its prestige can be enhanced or prejudiced by the format and style of publication.

In these respects, the complete Burgersdijk has rarely - if ever - been equalled. If one is prepared to take the characteristic nineteenth-century lack of taste in matters of typography for what it is, the hefty volumes of the early editions merit admiration for their generous layout, the clarity with which the text is presented (in two columns) and the charm of its many copperplate illustrations. These are signed: G. B., but regrettably the publishers failed to state the artist's full name on the title page; apart from that, the only objectionable features of these editions are the absence of any information about Burgersdijk himself, and the placing of the introductions and notes, separate from the translations, at the end of each volume. As the content and nature of all the plays is covered at some length in the 120-page Preface of the first volume, Burgersdijk's introductions to the individual plays do not dwell on matters of interpretation, but are confined to information on dating, sources and texts; variations in length (Hamlet is given ten columns, All's Well that Ends Well four, Twelfth Night only one and a half) depend on the complexity of such factual information rather than on the importance of the play in question. Location maps of English origin are prefixed to all the introductions; these are very helpful with the histories and of some interest with the Roman tragedies, but dispensable and slightly ridiculous with plays such as The Winter's Tale. The annotation is generous by Dutch standards, although undoubtedly limited, perhaps even scanty, if compared to that of the great scholarly English (and German) text editions of the nineteenth century. Twelfth Night is given almost eighty, Hamlet close on a hundred notes - explaining cruxes and obscurities, providing information of a historical nature, elaborating on details lost in translation, or defending the choice of particular renderings where alternatives readily suggest themselves. Characteristic is the following one:

Hamlet, III, iv, 134: Mijn vader in zijn doen alsof hij leefde. In 't Engelsch: My father, in his habit as he lived. - Het woord habit beteekent vaak eenvoudig "kleeding", "gewaad", zoodat men kan vertalen: Mijn vader, in zijn kleeding, of hij leefde (als bij 't leven); maar het drukt ook zeer dikwijls het geheele uiterlijk voorkomen, houding, ("- The word habit often simply means "clothing", "garment", so that one may translate: My father, in his clothing, as (if) he lived (as in life); but it also very often expresses the total external appearance, deportment, mode of behaviour,
wijs van doen aan, zooals hier verkozen is. as has been chosen here.

In the De Backer-Dudok editions of Burgersdijk (see p.393) the introductions have been extended and updated, and the notes been augmented - sometimes up to almost double their original number. But the simple pocket editions of Buddingh's textually much more interesting revision contain no trimmings of any kind.

Van Looy's translations, published in separate volumes and set in an "artistic" type of the Art Nouveau period are not annotated; the second Hamlet edition of 1912 contains a brief, apologetic introduction, and an appendix with alternative renderings for some twenty lines. The edition of his first translation, Macbeth (1900), has an interesting 11-page preface, where he has given a scene-by-scene description of the way in which he would like to see the play staged, in terms of symbolic colours (see p.200); this edition also contains simple black-white illustrations at the beginning of each scene. The artist, Rie Cramer, provided similar vignettes for Verkade's translation of Julius Caesar, published in 1926. Van Looy's Romeo en Julia and Naar het U lijkt feature nothing but the text.

Edward B. Koster provided a smattering of footnotes with his translations, published separately in a well-designed 16° format by De Wereldbibliotheek ("The World Library"), the house that, in due course, was also responsible for publications of Roland Holst's, Ter Laan's and Van Suchtelen's translations as well as the first two of Bert Voeten's and, in conjunction with De Nederlandse Boekhandel in Antwerp, a large number of Courteaux single-play editions. Roland Holst's versions were published without introductions or notes, as were Ter Laan's Een Winteravondspreekje, Nijhoff's Storm and De Storm, Rensburg's one-volume set of three plays and Werumeus Buning's separately published four translations; of the latter's Een Midzomermaachte Droom a De-Luxe edition appeared, with large colour illustrations - looking much like a children's story book. This version, as well as his Een Winteravondspreekje is still available in a paper-back series (published by Strengholt) designed for use on the amateur stage.

Van Dam's elegantly published Hamlet is complemented by a brief introduction, solely concerned with textual matters, and a handful of appended notes; Fleerackers provided his Macbeth and Julius Caesar with a concise and simple introduction to the Elizabethan theatre, Shakespeare, and the play at hand, a brief analysis of its characters and an assessment of its literary value, in addition to which there are some footnotes.

Van Suchtelen's translations all have appendices, consisting of a few introductory paragraphs and fairly
extensive notes; Voeten's De Vrolijke Vrouwstjes van Windsor and De Koopman van Venetië, published in the same series and format and probably regarded at the time, by the publishers, as a continuation of Van Suchtelen's work, have the same feature - except that the introductory paragraphs concerning the play and the text used have been shifted to the last page and turned into a Verantwoording ("Justification"). In the editions of his subsequent translations (published by De Bezige Bij) Voeten has retained the Verantwoording, but almost entirely dispensed with the notes.

Verspoor, whose versions must be seen as published acting copies, makes do with some brief remarks on the play in the form of a postscript, as does Andreus in his Leer om Leer; the latter's Kimbelijn has a publisher's note on the inside of the back cover, and Straat's Koning Lear: a translated extract from Jan Kott on the outside; Courteaux is the only one amongst the present-day translators who takes the trouble of prefacing his plays with thorough introductory essays, containing the standard information but slanted mainly towards interpretation; he also gives fairly generous appended notes.

The work of Voeten, Verspoor, Andreus and Straat has appeared in attractively designed paper-back issues only; the separate editions of Courteaux's translations, published during the late 'fifties and early and middle 'sixties, were of the same kind, but the collected edition that has recently been completed consists of a set of high quality linen-bound volumes - small in format, discreetly elegant and moderately conservative in presentation: reflecting to perfection the nature of Courteaux's work.
CHAPTER XXI

CONCLUSION

criteria. - It is generally assumed that the "perfect" translation of a work of literature is an unattainable ideal, and that the extent to which its approximation is bound to fall short of that ideal will be proportionate to the greatness, profundity and complexity of the original - regardless even of a relatively close geographical and temporal proximity and kinship of the two languages and cultures involved. In the preceding chapters the validity of this assumption in relation to translations of Shakespeare's plays into Dutch has been investigated; the point of departure for this investigation has been, in the first instance, a strictly theoretical norm whereby the perfect translation is seen as an integral reproduction of the original's form and content, its structure, sound, rhythm and meaning in the equivalents of the target language. Chapters XIV, XV and XVI explored, on this basis, the syntactic, phonic and semantic limitations and obstacles Dutch translators have to contend with, and the success or lack of it with which they have stretched the resources of their mother tongue to overcome them. Two modifications of that norm, applicable particularly to Shakespeare's work as dramatic poetry, i.e.: dramatic licence and poetic autonomy, were examined in Chapters XVII and XVIII; while in Chapter XIX the relativating effect of various diachronic factors was discussed. At the end of this exploration, one can indeed conclude that perfection in translation is unrealizable, and a close approximation of it only incidentally feasible under the terms of the original norm; and that its modifications, allowing for an adaptatory or poetically autonomous approach, might be considered questionable due to the limiting and narrowing effect beyond that imposed by the language itself -, which they tend to have on the original's complex qualities.

However, if one is prepared to forego the quest for the unattainable absolute and to view the efforts of various translators in degrees of relative merit, one's judgement - as has already been indicated at the end of Chapter XVI - will resort to the guidance of considerations much less precise and inflexible than the norm that constituted the original point of departure; at times, they may even appear to be at variance with it, as when one objects to a particular detail of translation because it is "too literal" for comfort, or admires an other as a satisfying example of paraphrastic ingenuity or poetic licence. The
operative term, then, becomes: "satisfying", which suggests at once how relative and subjective one's final verdict on the quality of a translation may be: a case in point is the entirely personal reaction to Nijhoff's *Storm* of 1930 as one of greater satisfaction - in spite of all its patent weaknesses - than that generated by the, in every rationally defensible respect much improved, final version of 1952. A minimal standard of structural and conceptual fidelity, phonetic equivalence and rhythmic effectiveness will nor should, of course, ever stop being a primary objective for a serious translator - and, consequently, an important guideline for a critic in assessing the merits of the former's efforts. But its importance is qualified, as in the case of Nijhoff's two renderings of *The Tempest*, by a regard for the autonomous character as a work of art which the translation does or does not possess. Difficult to define though such a character may be, some of its aspects can be recognized even when it is not possible to isolate or analyze them satisfactorily. The most important is that of the *creative synthesis of form and content*, which must follow the analytic process inherent in translation for the result to assume a life of its own. Besides one may look for *homogeneity* - a consistency of style and quality that ensures the artistic unity of the finished article; for *personality*, an aspect closely connected to the previous ones, but capable of affecting a translation adversely if its stamp is too in- cisive as well as when it is totally absent; for *poetic and dramatic empathy*, which will manifest itself in a translation as a whole as much as in the judicious licence its author has allowed himself with regard to his primary objective of fidelity, whenever the effectiveness of a poetic or dramatic detail demands it. Compared to these, *ingenuity* is only a minor aspect: a good translator may be expected to possess an adequate command of both the source- and the target language, and the alertness of mind to hit upon *le mot juste* when confronted with a basically untranslatable detail; many moderately gifted translators can boast of great ingenuity, but too obtrusive, slick or facile an application of it will sometimes be found to be a disturbing feature of a translation. As a norm of judgement, therefore, ingenuity by itself is deceptive; even more so are *immediate appeal* and *lucidity*, aspects that may be commendable, but just as often merely enhance a translation superficially while, in fact, detracting from an essential refractoriness in the original.

*a provisional assessment: from Koster to Nijhoff.* - How does the work of Dutch Shakespeare translators of the past ninety years rate when measured by these criteria? - Whatever final assessment we may try to formulate at this stage is subject to the reservation that this study has been concerned primarily with
translation - its problematic aspects, and various approaches to it - and only in the second place with individual translators. Nevertheless, in the course of it as much individual and comparative exposure has been given to the work of about thirty translators and adapters as its scope allowed. More than two hundred passages of translation, selected from some seventy-five versions and ranging in length from four to more than twenty lines, have been quoted, along with a multitude of briefer excerpts which, in some cases, are as eloquent in illustrating their authors peculiarities as the more extended examples.

As a cross-section of the best, the worst and the average in the work of individual translators has been constantly aimed at in the selection of these excerpts, a fairly accurate impression of the merits of several of the most prominent translators will have emerged; and, on occasion, I have not hesitated to express or imply my own assessment of certain of their qualities. Yet it has not been possible to do due justice to all of them; so, apart from being a summary of our findings, this chapter has the purpose of restoring the balance of our impressions in cases where the sampling has been so limited as to suggest or induce a favourable or unfavourable bias. While our acquaintance with a few under-exposed translators will be extended, however, it is still to be remembered that a much more detailed analysis than can be given here will be needed to arrive at a responsible verdict on the work of the major translators, and that, at best, we may draw a provisional conclusion about which of them are to be regarded as such.

The first translator who comes to mind as having been crowded out in this survey - just as his work, at the time of its publication, was overshadowed by Burgersdijk's and Van Looy's - is Edward B. Koster (1861-1937), a secondary school teacher whose childhood in England may have stimulated his interest in Shakespeare, while his scholarly training in the classics explains his predilection for the three Roman tragedies, which he translated along with Macbeth, The Merchant of Venice and Othello; the last of these is the only one of his versions that was ever performed (see p.195). His success as a poet was far from spectacular either: his lyrical poetry was rejected out of hand by De Taachtigers to whom he felt originally attracted, and even his most significant poems: Niobe, Odusseus' Dood ("Death of Ulysses") and Adrastos have been all but completely forgotten.

To some extent the disregard of his Shakespeare translations may be accounted for by the choice of plays and the timing of their publication. Coriolanus, in Burgersdijk's version, had been performed in 1899, but had insufficient appeal to stay on the repertoire and was not produced again until 1960; Antony and Cleopatra was, for many years, considered altogether unplayable. Neither of the KVHNT's productions of
Julius Caesar (in 1901 and 1905; see pp.193-194) had met with much critical success; Koster's version appeared in 1910, and was probably out of print by the time the next attempt at staging this tragedy (in 1920: see p.223) was made. Bouwmeester was too attached to his Burgerdijk text to contemplate a change when, in 1908, Koster's Koopman van Venetië appeared; and Verkade, who was to monopolise Macbeth for so many years, rejected his translation in favour of Van Looy's unspeakable, but undoubtedly more revolutionary rendering. It is not possible to estimate at this stage how widely these translations were read, but their publication by De Wereldbibliotheek (see p.471) does suggest a fairly wide distribution.

There can be no argument about the superiority of Koster's Macbeth over Van Looy's, but this is the only play these two translators have in common. Koster's main contender therefore is Burgerdijk - and how does his work compare with the latter's? In the few examples quoted so far its scrupulous precision has been highlighted (see pp.354 and 360), as well as Koster's regard for the predominance of masculine lines in Shakespeare's work (see p.327) and his ability to capture the phonic character of an important passage (see p.334). Alongside these admirable qualities, the only objectionable feature that has been pointed up is his reliance on syllable-contraction (see pp.306-307 and 319), a habit he shares with all his contemporaries and many later translators. On the basis of this evidence, Koster would deserve a place alongside Burgerdijk as one of the best Dutch Shakespeare translators to date; but, to test this assessment further, a few excerpts from his Koopman van Venetië and Coriolanus are juxtaposed to Burgerdijk's renderings:

The Merchant of Venice,

II,i,13-22:

In terms of choice I am not solely led
By nice direction of a maiden's eyes.
Besides, the lottery of my destiny
Bars me the right of voluntary choosing:
But if my father had not scanted me
And hedged me by his wit, to yield myself
His wife who wins me by that means I told you,
Yourself, renowned prince, then stood as fair
As any comer I have looked on yet
For my affection.

Burgerdijk:

Mijn keuze, prins, wordt niet alleen geleid
Door wat een ijdel meisjeshart begeert;
De loterij, waaraan mijn toekomst hangt,

Koster:

'k Word bij de keuze niet alleen geleid
Door 't keurig schatten van een meisjeoog:
En bovendien belet de loterij
Ontneemt mij zelfs het recht van eigen keus;
Maar had mijn vader in zijn wijsheid mij
Niet zoo beperkt, en mij niet opgelegd
Slechts hem als echtegenoot te aanvaarden, die
Mij op de wijze wint, die ik u noemde,
Dan ware uw uitzicht, wijdvermaarde prins,
Wel even schoon als dat van eenig ander,
Die vóór u naar mij dong.

("My choice, prince, is not solely led
By what a vain maiden's heart desires;
The lottery, on which my future depends,
Denies me even the right of a choice of my own;
But had my father in his wisdom... not
Restricted me thus, and not enjoined me
To accept but him as husband, who
Wins me in the manner that I mentioned to you,
Then were your prospect, widely-renowned prince,
Surely as fair as anyone else's,
Who courted me before you.")

The Merchant of Venice,
IV, i, 35-43:

I have possessed your Grace of what I purpose;
And by our holy Sabbath have I sworn
To have the due and forfeit of my bond.
If you deny it, let the danger light
Upon your charter and your city's freedom.
You'll ask me, why I rather choose to have
A weight of carrion-flesh than to receive
Three thousand ducats. I'll not answer that!
But say, it is my humour: is it answered?

Burgersdijk:
Ik deelde uw hoogheid mee, wat ik verlang,
En ik bezwoer bij onzen heil'gen sabbat,
Te vordren, wat mij toekomt door mijn schuldbrief.
Als gij dit weigert, brengt ge van uw stad
De rechten en de vrijheid in gevaar.
Vraagt gij, waarom ik liever zoo'n gewicht
Van krengenvleeswil hebben, dan drieduizend
Dukaten wil ontvangen; 'k heb geen antwoord
Dan dit: 't is mijn verkiezing. 't Is toch antwoord!

Koster:
'k Liest Uw Genade weten wat ik wensch;
En bij mijn heil'gen Sabbath zoer 'k er op
Te hebben wat mij toekwam bij kontrakt:
En weigert gij, dan koom 't gevaar ter neer
Op privilege en vrijheid van uw stad.
Waarom 'k een pondje van dat minne vlees
Veeleer verkiezen wil dan drieduizend
Dukaten? Wel daar antwoord ik niet op:
Maar stel, 't is zoo mijn luim: is dát geen antwoord?

1 Koster has followed the Hamner emendation of this line: "by his will".
("I imparted to your highness, what I desire,  
And I have sworn by our holy sabbath,  
To claim, that which is due to me according to  
my bond.  
If you refuse this, you will... endanger  
Your city's rights and freedom.  
(If) you ask, why I rather... will have  
Such a weight of carrion-flesh, than... receive  
Three thousand ducats; I have no answer  
But this: it is my choosing. It is an answer!")

("I let Your Grace know what I wish;  
And by my holy Sabbath I have sworn to it  
To have what was due to me under contract:  
And do you refuse, then the danger (may a)light  
On (the) privilege and freedom of your city.  
Why I... will choose... a little pound of that  
Mean flesh much rather than three thousand  
Ducats? Well, I'll not answer that:  
But say, such is my whim: is that no answer?")

Coriolanus, III, iii, 122-137:
You common cry of curs! whose breath I hate  
As reek o' th' rotten fens, whose loves I prize  
As the dead carcasses of unburied men  
That do corrupt my air, I banish you!  
And here remain with your uncertainty!  
Let every feeble rumour shake your hearts!  
Your enemies, with nodding of their plumes,  
Fan you into despair! Have the power still  
To banish your defenders; till at length  
Your ignorance, which finds not till it feels,  
Making but reservation of yourselves,  
Still your own foes, deliver you as most  
Abated captives to some nation  
That won you without blows! Despising  
For you the city, thus I turn my back.  
There is a world elsewhere.

Burgersdijk:
Plebejer-hondentroep, wiens adem 'k haat  
Als damp van 't vuilst moeras, wiens liefde ik  
schat  
Als krengenstank van onbegraven lijken,  
Die heel de lucht verpesten, ik ban ò!  
Blijft hier, gij met uw onbestendigheid!  
Dat ieder zwak gerucht u 't hart doe poepl'lén!  
Waaie u de vijand, wapp'rend met zijn helmboes,  
Vertwijf'ling toe! Behoudt de macht ter banning  
Van uw beschermers, tot uw onverstand,  
Dat niets begrijpt dan wat het voelt, ten laatste,-  
Daar 't nimmer û beveiligd, die aldoor  
Uzelf bestrijdt, - als diep onzaal'ge slaven  
U overlever't aan een ander volk,

Koster:
Gij goor en honds'ch gemeen! welks adem 'k haat  
Als stank-van vunze vennen, en welks gunst  
Ik niet méér schat dan 't rottende karkas  
Dat mijne lucht bezwadert, ik ban u;  
Blijf hier nu met uw wankelmoedigheid!  
Moog 't zwakst gerucht uw harten beven doen!  
Uw vijand door het wuiven van zijn pluim  
U waaieren tot wanhooi! Houd de macht  
Om al uw heul te bannen; tot in 't eind  
Uw domheid, die niet vindt voordat ze voelt,  
En zelfs u zelf niet redt, omdat ge steeds  
Uw eigen vijand zijt, u levere uit  
Als need'rig gevang'n'en aan een volk
Dat zonder slag u overwon! Om u
De stad verachtend, draai ik haar den rug:
Daar is een wereld elders.

("You nasty and currish rabble! whose breath I hate
As stench ofusty fens, and whose favour
I value no more than the rotting carcass
That pollutes my air, I banish you;
Remain here now with your irresolution!
May the feeblest rumour cause your hearts to tremble!

Your enemy by the waving of his plume
Fan you into despair! Keep the power
To banish all your comfort; until in the end
Your stupidity, which finds not ere it feels,
And does not even save yourselves, because you still
Are your own enemy, deliver you

As humble captives to a nation
That without (a) blow conquered you! On your account
Despising the city, I turn my back to it:
There is a world elsewhere.")

If these random examples prove anything, it is that Koster more than equals Burgersdijk on several points:
on those of structural and conceptual fidelity he is often the better of the two, and his sensitive ear
for the sound of Shakespeare's verse rarely fails him; indeed, one is hard put to find a passage in his
work where he must bow to his great predecessor's superiority. His affinity for De Tachtigers, although
fortunately much less pronounced than Van Looy's, does manifest itself in the occasional semantic and
syntactic licence: e.g. "keurig" ("neat") in 1.14 of the first quotation, for "kieskeurig" ("nice", i.e:
fastidious, picksome), which he explains in a footnote; "u levere uit" in 1.133 of the Coriolanus pas-
sage, instead of: "levere u uit"; and in a few instances of hyper-transliteration: in his rendering of
the last three lines of Portia's speech (11.20-22) he has retained the structure of the original so pre-
cisely (except for the substitution of "uw kans" for "U") as to make it, in Dutch, very difficult to un-
derstand; and the too-literal rendering of Coriolanus III, iii, 131 ("die niet vindt voordat ze voelt")
imposes a meaning on the verb vinden it cannot be made to share with find in this context. However, if
in Koster's scrupulous rendering of Portia's response to Morocco some element of liveliness and grace
appears to be missing when compared with Burgersdijk's much freer translation, this is due to the latter's characteristic readiness to sacrifice some precision for the sake of more clearly evoking the persona of the speaker; and one might generally find that the virtue of Koster's consistent precision is offset by some lack of charm and variety in tone. On the other hand, Burgersdijk does not always display the greater dramatic empathy of the two: in the closing lines of the second Merchant excerpt (1.42-43) Koster's version captures Shylock's idiosyncrasies more satisfactorily, and in conveying Coriolanus' disdainful fury at the beginning of the last passage he has succeeded at least as well as Burgersdijk. Therefore, although his work - like that of most early twentieth-century translators - is dated because of its language, Koster is certainly to be regarded as one of the best among them.

The work of Jacobus van Looy has figured prominently in this study; if anything, more prominently than it deserves. It does possess the qualities of homogeneity and personality - in that none of his translations could be mistaken for anyone else's - but it does so in a way hardly conducive to the recognition of these qualities as commendable features of a Shakespeare translation. Its positive elements: that of conceptual fidelity, good understanding and occasionally felicitous ingenuity (see pp. 352 and 363) have been duly acknowledged, so, since it will be discussed once more at some length in the next chapter, no more space or time need to be devoted to it here.

As the author of three translations (of Love's Labour's Lost, A Midsummer Night's Dream and The Winter's Tale) Jacques Karel Rensburg (1870-1943), one of Amsterdam's colourful bohemians in the early decades of this century, whose delicate Japanese-inspired poetry and ambitious theories in the field of esoteric philosophy have fallen into oblivion, might be considered as deserving more prominence than he has received so far in this survey. However, the quality of his versions is, at best, unremarkable, often stylistically defective and stilted, and occasionally even blemished by an inadequate understanding of English:

**A Midsummer Night's Dream**, III, ii, 1-3:

I wonder if Titania be awakened;
Then, what it was that next came in her eye,
Which she must dote on in extremity.

("It surprises me, if Titania awakened. / For, that which first came before her eyes, / Makes her infatuated to extremity.")

Rensburg:

't Verwondert me, als Titania ontwaakte.
Want, wat het eerste haar voor ogen kwam,
Maakt haar tot aan het uiterste verliefd.

On the whole Rensburg's work impresses one as insensitive and uninspired, even when compared with the
merely acceptable level in that of an average translator such as Courteaux:

A Midsummer Night's Dream,  
V.1.7-17:  
The lunatic, the lover and the poet  
Are of imagination all compact.  
One sees more devils than vast hell can hold:  
That is, the madman. The lover, all as frantic,  
Sees Helen's beauty in a brow of Egypt.  
The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,  
Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven;  
And as imagination bodies forth  
The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen  
Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing  
A local habitation and a name.

Rensburg:

Hij die waanzinnig is, minnaar of dichter,  
Bestaat volkomen uit verbeelding slechts:-  
Deen ziet meer duivels dan de hel bevat,-  
Zoo ziet de dwaas; de minnaar, even razend,  
Helena's schoonheid in Egyptisch bakkes.  
In schoonen waanzin rollt des dichters oog,  
Blikt uit den hemel neer of omgekeerd.  
En daar verbeelding vormen baart van dingen,  
Die onbekend zijn, schenkt des dichters pen  
Daaraan gedaante' en geeft aan 't ije niets  
Een plaatselijke woning en een naam.  
("He who is lunatic, lover or poet,  
Consists completely of imagination merely:-  
The one sees more devils than hell contains,-  
Thus sees the fool; the lover, equally frantic,  
Helen's beauty in Egyptian phiz.  
In beautiful lunacy the poet's eye rolls,  
Glances down from heaven or the other way round.  
And because imagination bringth forth forms of  
That are unknown, the poet's pen gives  
Shape to them and gives to the tenuous nothing  
A local dwelling and a name."})

Courteaux:

De dolleman, de minnaar en de dichter  
Zijn heel en al verbeelding. De ene ziet  
Meer duivels dan de hel bevat; de minnaar,  
Niet minder dol, ziet Helena's heerlijkheid  
Op 't bruin gelaat van een zigeunervrouw;  
Het dichtersoog, dat vonkt in schone waanzin,  
Blikt op ten hemel, blikt ter aarde neer;  
En als verbeelding onvermoeide dingen  
Het leven schenkt, verleent des dichters pen  
Ze vaste vorm en geeft aan vluchtig niets  
Een plaats op deze wereld en een naam.  
("The madman, the lover and the poet  
Are wholly imagination. The one sees  
More devils than hell contains; the lover,  
No less mad, sees Helen's glory  
In the brown countenance of a gipsy woman;  
The poet's eye, which sparks in beautiful lunacy,  
Glances up to heaven, glances down to earth;  
And as imagination to unthought-of things  
Gives life, the poet's pen bestows  
Tangible form on them and gives to volatile nothing  
A place in this world and a name."})

So, since Rensburg's versions have not offered superior or equivalent alternatives to the work of other translators and are not distinguished by originality - the best of his lines can often be traced to Burgersdijk - or anything by way of a strikingly personal approach, they are justly neglected.
Roland Holst's two translations have been given a fairly comprehensive airing in the course of the preceding chapters; although, perhaps, disappointing in so far as their language does not bear the distinctive personal impress one might have expected to find in the work of such an outstanding poet, these versions of *King Lear* and *Richard III* compare favourably with Burgersdijk's and, due to their recognizable origin in this century rather than the last, have not dated as much - even if they are bound to be superseded by Evert Straat's recent renderings. This fate has not yet befallen Remko ter Laan's fine, if somewhat bland and over-long *Een winteravondspookje*, despite the fact that it antedates Werumeus Buning's, Buddingh's and Courteaux's versions. This one translation does not place Ter Laan in the category of the major translators, but it nevertheless constitutes a good example of a markedly progressive and individual approach sufficiently tempered by poetic sensitivity and discretion not to become obtrusive. Due to the concentration and exactness of its verbal imagery, *Julius Caesar* does not stand up very well to the kind of free, paraphrastic treatment which Ter Laan applied successfully to *The Winter's Tale*; for that reason, Verkade's version of 1926 and Fleerackers' of 1938, though both of considerable merit, are less satisfying than Koster's translation. On pp.353-356 a passage from these three renderings has been sampled along with Marcellus' and Buddingh's versions; another excerpt follows below in a three-way comparison:

*Julius Caesar*, II, i, 19-27:

And, to speak truth of Caesar,
I have not known when his affections swayd
More than his reason. But 'tis a common proof
That lowliness is young ambition's ladder,
Whereeto the climber-upward turns his face;
But when he once attains the upmost round,
He then unto the ladder turns his back,
Looks in the clouds, scorning the base degrees
By which he did ascend.

Koster:

(...nu, Caesar liet
(De waarheid wil het) nooit door zijn gevoel
Zich meer beheerschen dan door zijn verstand.
't Wortd algemeen gezien dat need'righeid
De ladder van de jeugdige eerzucht is,
En daarheen wendt wie haar bestijgt den blik;
Maar is hij eenmaal op de hoogste sport,
Hij draait de ladder zijnen rug dan toe,

("...well, Caesar let
(Truth wishes it (to be said)) never by his inclination
Himself be ruled more than by his reason.
It is generally seen that humbleness
Is the ladder of youthful ambition,
And to that who ascends it turns his glance;
But is he once upon the highest rung,
He then turns his back unto the ladder,
Kijkt in de wolken, en de lage trapjes
Waarnam hij opklom, zijn veracht.

Verkade:
Maar meteen
Dient dit gezegd van hem: "zijn zin voor recht
Week nooit voor zijn begeerten" maar hoe vaak
Bleek voor de eerzucht need'righeid een ladder,
Waar aan die klint zijn volle aandacht schenkt,
Maar, is eenmaal het hoge doel bereikt
Dan keert die klom, zijn rug den ladder toe
En starta omhoog, veracht de lagere sporten
Waarnam hij steeg.

Fleerackers:
En wel is waar heb ik het nooit beleefd,
Dat Caesar zijn gevoel liet meester spelen
Overs zijn koele rede. Maar zoo gaat het:
Beginnende eerzucht klint omhoog langs deemoed.
Dat is haar ladder. En zoolang zij klint,
Houdt zij den blik gevestigd op de ladder.
Eens op de hoogste sport, keert ze er meteen
den rug naartoe, misprijst de lager sporten,
Waarnam zij zich verhief, en slaat haar blik
Omhoog tot in de wolken.

Looks in the clouds, and the low steps
By which he climbed up, are despised.

This must be said of him: "his sense of justice
Never yielded to his desires;" but how often
Did for ambition humbleness prove a ladder,
To which he who climbs gives his full attention,
But, once the high goal is attained
Then he who climbed turns his back unto the ladder
And gazes upward, despises the lower rungs
By which he ascended.

("And it is true, I have never experienced it,
that Caesar allowed his inclination to play master
over his cool reason. But that's the way it goes:
beginning ambition climbs up along meekness.
That is its ladder. And as long as it climbs,
it keeps its glance fastened to the ladder.
Once upon the highest rung, it turns at once
its back unto it, disapproves of the lower rungs,
by which it raised itself, and directs its glance
upwards into the clouds.")

Here, even Koster has allowed himself some paraphrastic liberty in the first two lines; but the essential elements of the ladder image - which depends, for its effectiveness, as much on the order in which it progresses as on the details that constitute it - are all there, concentrated and in sequence. Verkade has weakened the passage by demetaphorization; Fleerackers, by analysing it as if Brutus were a schoolteacher explaining the process to his class, instead of a meditating senator, - and by inverting the order of the last two very important details.

At the same time, this passage has highlighted the difference in nature, approach and quality between the actor, Verkade's and the scholar, Fleerackers' translations: the latter is undoubtedly the better of the two; less approachable, perhaps, but certainly more scrupulous than the former. Emiel Fleerackers (1877-1948), a Flemish Jesuit, was a seminar teacher and textbook writer, as well as a poet and storyteller of some calibre. His poetic instinct accounts for the better features of his Macbeth and Julius Caesar, but also, at times, imbues his translation of the latter play with more passion and sentiment.
than its restrained tone warrants:

*Julius Caesar*, III, i, 60-65:

But I am constant as the Northern Star,
Of whose true-fixed and resting quality
There is no fellow in the firmament.
The skies are painted with unnumbered sparks:
They are all fire and every one doth shine;
But there's but one in all doth hold his place.

("but I stand firm, firm as the polar star stands, / which, eternal, unperturbed and unyielding, / finds no equal in the entire firmament. / the heavens glitter with countless sparks; / each is a fire; and every star glows; / but one of all, however, holds its own place;..")

However, although Fleerackers appears to have looked to Verkade for the occasional turn of phrase, he has avoided the latter's tendency to superficial paraphrasing as well as the disturbing vestiges of Van Looy's modified "poetic diction" that mar Verkade's translation:

*Julius Caesar*, IV, iii, 212-223:

Under your pardon. You must note beside
That we have tried the utmost of our friends,
Our legions are brimful, our cause is ripe.
The enemy increaseth every day;
We, at the height, are ready to decline.
There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
On such a full sea are we now afloat,
And we must take the current when it serves,
Or lose our ventures.

Verkade:

Een ogenblik. - Je moet ook niet vergeten,
Van vrienden kunnen wij niets meer verwachten,
't Leger voltallig is, rijk onze zaak.
De vijand groeit nog iedereen dag in kracht,
Wij op ons hoogste punt, kunnen slechts dalen.
Er is getij in menselijke zaken:
Den vloed benut, het leidt ons tot fortuin.
Den vloed verzuimd, dan wordt de levensreis
Een drijven tussen banken vol geven.
Op zulk een hooge zee zijn wij nu sturend,
Wij moeten verder, nu de stroom ons dient,

Fleerackers:

maar ik sta vast, vast als de poolstar staat,
die eeuwig, onoverstoord en onverwrikbaar,
geen weerga vindt in 't gansche firmament.
De hemel schittert met ontelbare vonken;
elk is een vuur; en ieder starre gloei;
slechts één van al toch houdt haar eigen plaats;..

Met uw verlof. - Gedenk nog
dat wij het uiterst van de vrienden vergden;
't heer is voltallig, rijp staat onze zaak;
eens op ons hoogste, kunnen wij slechts dalen,
terwijl de vijand met den dag versterkt.
Daar is getij in menselijke zaken;
den vloed bezeild, gij vaart naar 't hoog geluk;
den vloed verwaarloosd, heel uw levensvaart
dobbert en drijft in ondiepte en ellende.
Thans waren wij op zoo een vollen vloed,
en varen moeten wij, zoolang de vloed
Eer ons getij verloopt.
("One moment. - Thou must not forget either, From friends we cannot expect anything more, The army complete is, ripe our cause. The enemy yet grows every day in strength, We at our highest point, can only decline. There is (a) tide in human affairs: The flood utilized, it leads us to fortune. The flood omitted, then the voyage of life becomes A drifting between banks full of dangers. On such a high sea we are steering now. We must (go) further, now that the current serves us, Before our tide runs out.")

ons dient, of last en lading is verloren.
("With your permission. Remember besides that we have exacted the utmost of our ("the") friends; the host is complete, ripe stands our cause; once at our highest, we can only decline, while the enemy grows stronger by the day. There is (a) tide in human affairs; the flood sailed on, you travel to high happiness; the flood neglected, your whole voyage of life bobs and drifts in shallows and misery. Now we are sailing upon such a full flood, and sail we must, as long as the flood serves us, or burden and cargo will be lost."")

Both these translations have positive qualities: they are coloured, though not unduly so, by the personal vision of their authors and testify to a commendably independent approach to Shakespeare's language. Verkade's aversion to nineteenth-century ceremoniousness and theatricality has led him to some tentative experimentation with a conversational idiom (see 1.212 above) which is, at times, effective, but does not combine very well with the syntactic eccentricities he borrowed from Van Looy; the occasional detail (such as the one quoted on p.285) shows his actor's ear for the dramatically effective accent. Fleerackers has overcome the drawbacks of poetic diction more homogeneously and with greater poetic authority and sensitivity; yet neither he nor Verkade can be regarded as Shakespeare translators of lasting significance.

For the sake of the convenient comparison with Verkade, Fleerackers, whose translations appeared in the course of the 'thirties, has been dealt with out of sequence, and we must now revert to an isolated Hamlet of the 'twenties: Dr. B. A. P. van Dam's version, based on his own text edition of the play (see p. 346). A review of this edition falls outside the scope of this study, but one feature of it must be mentioned, because it has a bearing on Van Dam's competence as a translator. He has systematically disposed of hemistichs, hypermetrism and any other irregularities in the versification of the play — apparently believing Shakespeare to have been an assiduous counter of syllables, and regarding every departure from the iambic pentameter as a prompt-book or acting-copy corruption, for which some player's predilection for expansiveness, repetition or exegesis is to be held responsible.
"Hamlet, I, i, 128-139:
If thou hast any sound, or use of voice,
Speak to me.
If there be any good thing to be done,
That may to thee do ease and grace to me,
Speak to me.
If thou art privy to thy country's fate,
Which, happily, foreknowing may avoid,
O, speak!
Or if thou hast uphoarded in thy life
Extorted treasure in the womb of earth,
For which, they say, you spirits oft walk in death,
Speak of it! Stay, and speak! Stop it, Marcellus.

"If you dispose of sound or voice, / If there is any good work to be done, / That is conducive to your comfort and my praise, / If you know of Denmark's fate, / Which prescience possibly might still be able to avert; / Or, if you have piled up during your life / Extorted treasures in the womb of the earth, / For which, as it is said, you ghosts have to walk, / Tell it, stay and speak! stop it, Marcellus!"

In this practice Van Dam displays a disturbing lack of insight into Shakespeare's stagecraft, and, in line with this, his translation, for all its scholarly precision and impeccable versification, is quite devoid of dramatic and poetic empathy. The brief examples quoted on pp. 313 and 331 are symptomatic of this; throughout, this *Hamlet* remains a dry and barren intellectual exercise and never develops the living power that can only be generated by a spark of creative inspiration, no matter how small and defective that may be. In the following, and last example, Van Dam's rendering is juxtaposed to that by Burgersdijk, who is here by no means at his best, yet evinces in small details of sound, rhythm and stress a much greater sensitivity for what is essential in Shakespeare's art:

"Hamlet, III, ii, 361-372:
'Tis now the very witching time of night,
When churchyards yawn, and hell itself breathes out
Contagion to this world. Now could I drink hot blood
And do such bitter business as the day
Would quake to look on. Soft! now to my mother.
O heart, lose not thy nature. Let not ever
The soul of Nero enter this firm bosom.
Let me be cruel, not unnatural.
I will speak daggers to her, but use none.
My tongue and soul in this be hypocrites:
How in my words some never she be shent,
To give them seals, never, my soul, consent!"
Burgersdijk:
't Is nu het echte spookuur van de nacht,
Dat graven gapen en de hel haar pestwalm
Op aarde blaast. Warm bloed kon ik nu drinken,
En bitt' re gruw'len plegen, die de dag
Met huiv' ring zien zou. Stil, thans naar mijn
moeder. -
O hart, verzaak niet uw natuur! De ziel
Van Nero dring' deez' vaste borst niet in;
Ik moge wreed zijn, onnatuurlijk niet.
'k Wil-dolken tot haar spreken, niet gebruiken;
Mijn tong en ziel, toont hierin huichelkunst;
Hoe ook, mijn ziel, uw taal voor schuld haar
straff',
Bezegeel 't niet met denaden; neen, houd af!
('Tis now the real witching hour of the night,
(At) which graves yawn and hell its pestilential
fume
Blows on (the) earth. Warm blood I now could drink,
And commit bitter horrors, which the day
Would see with (a) shudder. Soft, now to my
mother. -
O heart, forsake not your nature! The soul
Of Nero penetrate not into this firm bosom;
I may be cruel, not unnatural.
I will speak daggers to her, not use (them);
My tongue and soul, in this show the art of
hypocrisy;
Howsomewever, my soul, your language upbraid her
for guilt,
Do not seal it with deeds; no, refrain!"

Van Dam:
Nu heeft de nacht haar spookuur ingezet,
Waarop het kerkhof gaat en het haar smetstof
Uitlaat. Nu zou 'k warm bloed kunnen drinken
En zulk een bitter ding doen, dat de dag
Van 't zien zou sidd'ren. Wacht, nu naar mijn
moeder.
O, hart, verlies uw aard niet, laat niet ooit
De ziel van Nero dit trouw binnenst ingaan,
Laat mij niet onnatuurlijk zijn, wel wreed:
'k Zal dolken spreken, maar 'k gebruik er geen;
Mijn tong en ziel zijn hierin huichelers!
Hoe deernijk ook mijn woorden haar kastijden,
Die te bezeeglen...zieën, dat zult gij mijden!
("Now the night has launched its witching hour,
At which the churchyard yawns and hell its infected
exhales. Now I would be able to drink warm blood
And do such a bitter thing, that the day
At seeing it would shudder. Wait, now to my mother.
O, heart, lose not your disposition, let not ever
The soul of Nero enter this faithful interior,
Let me not be unnatural, (but) cruel:
I shall speak daggers, but I use none;
My tongue and soul in this be hypocrites!
However grievously my words (may) chastise her,
To seal those...soul, that you shall avoid!"

Translations between the "Storms". - The translators of the twenty-two year period that elapsed between
Nijhoff's first and second rendering of The Tempest did not introduce anything startling by way of a new
approach to Shakespeare - nothing, that is, of lasting artistic significance; the best work of these two decades is of a conservative character.

As for Nijhoff himself: he has received, in the course of this study, the most extensive exposure afford-
ed to any translator other than Burgersdijk, and the merits of his two Storms need no further elaboration
here. Whether he is to be regarded as a major translator or not, depends on the greater or lesser import-
ance one attaches to his work as a catalyst, or merely as an early symptom of the changing trends in translation that have manifested themselves since the early 'fifties. However, as we have seen, the two versions offer an intriguing insight into Nijhoff's nature and development as a poet, and the attention devoted to them in Chapter XVIII has by no means exhausted their value in that respect.

Apart from Fleerackers, who has been dealt with, the 'thirties added no weighty new names to our catalogue of translators - unless it be that of Douwe Kalma (1896-1953), the Frisian scholar and writer who published his first Shakespeare version, *Macbeth*, in 1932 and, in the course of the following twenty years, translated the complete canon into the tongue of his home province; an assessment of this great enterprise, however, requires a thorough grounding in Frisian, particularly since Kalma - a belated *Taoh-tiger* in his approach to language - developed a highly individual idiom for these translations, which makes them very difficult to follow even for native Frisian speakers and, consequently, unsuitable for performance. Kalma was a prolific essayist, prose writer, poet and dramatist in his own right, while his output as a translator embraced, beside Shakespeare, the works of Homer, Molière, Leconte de Lisle, Shelley, Swinburne; his acknowledged masterpiece in this field is the Frisian rendering of the Middle-English poem *Pearl*. As a Shakespeare translator, he had a close predecessor in Teatse Beltsje Holtrop (1865-1925), whose Frisian versions of *Hamlet* and *Julius Caesar*, published respectively in 1925 and 1928, are considered to be of very high quality.

Of a number of Dutch translations of the 'thirties - Willem van Looy's version of *The Merchant of Venice*, used by Verkade in his production of that play in 1935; C. L. Schepp's of *Henry IV, I* and *II*; H. A. Gomperts' of *Romeo and Juliet* and Arnold Saalborn's of *Measure for Measure* (the last two of which were performed by the student amateur companies of Amsterdam and Utrecht University, respectively) - no publications are known to me; and I have been unable to trace a copy of a bilingual *Hamlet* by Flemish author J. Decroos that was published as a school text in 1936.

A sizeable excerpt on p. 368 served as an introduction to the work of Onno van den Berg, a lawyer, banker and amateur translator who produced versions of *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing*, the first of which, published in 1941, is the more important - having been the basis of four professional productions. Van den Berg's approach to translation was fairly orthodox and the standard of his work is more than acceptable, displaying considerable wit in capturing the repartee that is such in important ingredient in both plays; but since the poetry of these comedies is not of the profoundest in Shakespeare's
work, we may assume that Van den Berg, by confining his efforts to this level, indicated an awareness of the limitations of his talent - a discretion which some of his younger fellow-translators would have been well-advised to observe. Bert Voeten's translation of *The Shrew* has, by now, superseded Van den Berg's in the theatre, but its superiority is open to question even though it has the advantage of immediate appeal common to all Voeten's Shakespeare versions. The difference in approach between the two translators, so evident in their renderings of the excerpt mentioned above, shows up more subtly in a "straight" passage where Voeten's facility at versification gives him a head start, but, at a second reading, Van den Berg's sturdier version turns out to be richer by having retained a number of details that Voeten has lost:

*The Taming of the Shrew*, V, ii, 136-145:

Fie, fie! unknit that threatening unkind brow; And dart not scornful glances from those eyes, To wound thy lord, thy king, thy governor: It blotst thy beauty as frosts do bite the meads, Confounds thy fame as whirlwinds shake fair buds, And in no sense is meet or amiable. A woman moved is like a fountain troubled, Muddy, ill-seeing, thick, bereft of beauty; And while it is so, none so dry or thirsty Will deign to sip or touch one drop of it.

Van den Berg:

Foei, frons dat voorhoofd niet zoo dreigend zwart en flits geen valsche blikken uit die oogen, opdat g'uw heer, uw vorst en leidsman kwetst: 't verflten uw schoonheid als de vorst de weiden, Verkreukt uw roem als ruikweden de knop en is op geen manier gepast en minzaam. Een vrouw in drift is als een troeb'le bron, drabbig en dík, leelijk, van schoon ontdaan; en is zij zoo, dan is er geen zoo dorstig, dat hij een droppel drinkt of zelfs maar proeft.

("Fie, do not knit that brow so threatening(ly) black and flash no vicious glances from those eyes, to (":that you") hurt your lord, your prince and leader:
it withers your beauty as (the) frost the meadows, crumples your reputation as squalls the bud

Voeten:

Weg met die rimpels, strijk dat voorhoofd glad, en laat die ogen niet zo bliksem naár uw gemaal, uw koning, uw gebieder; het tast uw schoonheid aan als vorst het veld, en schendt uw goede naam als storm de bloesem, het past u niet en het is liefdeloos. Een bitse vrouw is als een troebele bron die drabbig, dik, beroofd van alle glans, geen mens bewegen kan één teug te drinken, hoe dorstig en verhit hij ook mag zijn.

("Away with those wrinkles, wipe that brow smooth, and do not let those eyes flash that way at your husband, your king, your ruler;
it affects your beauty as frost the field, and damages your good name as storm the blossom,
and is in no way meet and amiable.
A woman in temper is like a troubled well,
muddy and thick, ugly, devoid of beauty;
and is she thus, then there is none so thirsty,
that he (will) drink a drop or even but taste it.
"

it does not befit you and it is loveless.
A snappish woman is like a troubled well
that muddy, thick, bereft of all splendour,
can move no man to drink one draught,
no matter how thirsty and heated he may be.
"

Van den Berg's qualities are not such as to place him amongst the prominent Shakespeare translators of the century, but he certainly ranks with the best of the second plan.

This cannot be said of the poet J. W. F. Werumeus Buning (1891-1958); for, even though the objections raised against his version of A Midsummer Night's Dream (see pp. 297 and 406-407) and the emphasis placed so far on this, his worst effort in this field, may have given a somewhat prejudicial impression, none of his Shakespeare versions are of a high standard. Het Spel der Vergissingen (The Comedy of Errors) is the most familiar of these, having been used for five professional productions, and Romeo en Julia, published in 1942 but, to my knowledge, never performed, the best - yet even this translation is far from brilliant (see pp. 363-365). However, to do Werumeus Buning what justice we may, the following passage has been chosen to show his work at its most satisfactory; and, for the sake of convenience, the same excerpt from Michel van der Plas' unpublished Romeo en Julia (dating from 1952, but revised on several occasions since) has been placed alongside it, and both may be compared with Burgerdijk's and Buddingh's renderings quoted on p. 394:

Romeo and Juliet, III, v, 6-18: (text on pp. 393-394)

Werumeus Buning:

Het was de leeuwerik, 't is de dageraad,
Geen nachtegaal; kijk, lief, 't jaloersch bleek licht

Breekt door de schrale wolken in den Oost;
Nachts kaarsen branden uit; de jonge dag
Staat al gereed op 't nevelig gerbergd;

'k Moet gaan en leven, of ik blijf en sterf. -
- Dat licht is 't daglicht niet, dat weet ik, ik:
't Is van een meteoor, die de zon baart
Om u dreez' nacht tot toortsdrager te zijn,
En bij te lichten op uw weg naar Mantua;
Blijf nog wat, blijf - ge hoeft nog niet te gaan.
- Laat ze mij vangen en ten doode brengen,
Ik ben tevree, als gij het zoo beveelt...

Van der Plas:

Het was de leeuwerik, de ochtendbode,
En niet de nachtegaal. Zie hoe jaloersch strepen

In 't oost de scheurende wolken samenbinden.
De kaarsen van de nacht zijn opgebrand.
Over de mistige toppen der bergen
Sluip de dag op zijn tenen naderbij;
Of ik ga en leef, of ik blijf en sterf.
- Dat licht is 't daglicht niet, ik weet het zeker
Het is een meteoor de zon ontsprongen
Om jou als fakkeldrager voor te gaan,
En je vannacht naar Mantua te leiden.
Blijf daarom nog, je hoeft nog niet te gaan.
- Dan mogen ze mij grijpen en mij doden.
Ik vind het goed, als jij het zo wilt hebben.
"It was the lark, 'tis the break of day,
No nightingale; look, love, the envious pale light
Breaks through the scanty clouds in the East;
Night's candles burnt out; the young day
Stands at the ready on the misty mountains;

I must go and live, or stay and die. -
- That light is not (the) day-light, that I know, I:

'Tis a meteor's, which the sun brings forth
To be this night a torchbearer to you,
And to provide light on your way to Mantua;
Stay a little yet, stay - you need not go yet. -
- Let them take me and put me to death,
I am content, if you command it so..."

"It was the lark, the morning's messenger,
And not the nightingale. See how envious streaks
In the east lace together the severing clouds.
The candles of the night are burnt out.
Over the misty tops of the mountains
The day steals nearer on his toes;
Either I go and live, or I stay and die. -
- That light is not (the) day-light, I know it for certain

It is a meteor sprung from the sun
To go before thee as a torchbearer,
And guide thee this night to Mantua.
Therefore stay yet, thou need'st not go yet. -
- Then they may seize me and kill me.
I do not mind, if thou wilt have it so.")

On the evidence of the metaphrases, there would seem to be little to choose between these two versions;
Werneus Bunng's gains on points of literalness and structural fidelity once or twice, but has sacrificed some details of imagery that have been retained by Van der Plas. On the whole, the latter's rendering reflects the mood and the tenor of the original more satisfyingly, and being the only post-war translation of this play (other than Buddingh's and Courteaux's) it has justly been selected for all three professional Romeo en Julia productions since 1952. Its versification is somewhat uneven (see 11.8, 9b-10 and 11 above) and it suffers from patches of insipidity, but its unobtrusively modern idiom is pleasing.

The only major translator to emerge during this period was Nico van Suchtelen (1878-1949), a many-sided scholar, a novelist, essayist and poet of some stature and, for the last twenty years of his life, director of the "Wereldbibliotheek" publishing house (see p.471). Apart from Shakespeare he translated, among other, works by Marcus Aurelius, Dante, Petrarcha, Spinoza and Goethe.

However - as his age suggests and the general character of his Shakespeare translations bears out - these belong to the early decades of the century rather than the late 'forties when they were published; and one may safely deduce from their language that they were made well before they appeared in print, due to which they immediately created a rather dated impression and never received the attention they deserve.
Van Suchtelen's Een Midsomernachtsdrøm is at least as good as Burgersdijk's and his Hamlet is often better, having a dynamic character quite of its own. It so happens that none of the extended passages quoted
from this version have been placed alongside Burgersdijk's, so, for good measure, here is Van Suchtelen's rendering of the "witching hour" speech (Hamlet III,ii,361-372), sampled in Burgersdijk's and Van Dam's versions on p.487 (text: on p.486):

't Is juist het uur voor nachtelijk gespook:
De graven gappen, hellekwalm verpest
De wereld. 'k Zou warm bloed kunnen drinken
En gruweldaden plegen die de dag
Hui'v'rend aanschouwen zou... Stil, naar mijn moeder.

O hart, verloochen uw natuur niet, laat
Niet Nero's ziel mijn boezem binnen dringen.
Wreed wil ik zijn, ja, maar niet onnatuurlijk;
'k Wil dolken spreken, doch geen dolk gebruiken.
Weest huich'laars, tong en ziel, voor deze reis;
Hoe hard haar 't vonnis van mijn woord ook slaat,
Mijn ziel bezeeg'te 't nimmer door de daad.

('Tis the very hour for nocturnal mischief ("haunting"):
The graves yawn, smoke from hell infects
The world. Warm blood I'd now be able to drink
And commit deeds of horror that the day
Shudderingly would behold... Soft, to my mother.

O heart, belie not your nature, let
Not Nero's soul penetrate into my bosom.
Cruel I will be, yea, but not unnatural;
I will speak daggers, but not use a dagger.
Be hypocrites, tongue and soul, on this occasion;
However hard the sentence of my word strikes her,
My soul seal it never by the deed."

The translation is freer than either of the previously quoted ones, and one or two details have been lost, but there is a marked gain in rhythmic impact. Although Van Suchtelen rarely misses out on important elements of imagery, this shift away from a primary concern with strict textual fidelity in favour of positive dramatic movement is consistent and pervasive enough to be a characteristic feature of his Hamlet and Een Midsomermachtdroom. His Macbeth, published posthumously¹, is less satisfactory; the licence taken with regard to verbal details is not as judicious as in the other two translations, and is not compensated for by a proportionate gain in dramatic plasticity. It falls short of the overall quality of Koster's version even though, in places, it still possesses a dynamic character that the latter lacks, and is less stilted throughout; but it contains little evidence of a creative poetic and dramatic sensibility at work and, as the following example shows, occasionally suggests an imperfect understanding of the text:

Macbeth, II,i,49-60:

Now o'er the one half-world
Nature seems dead, and wicked dreams abuse
The curtained sleep. Witchcraft celebrates
Pale Hecate's off'rings; and withered Murthere,
Alarmed by his sentinel, the wolf,
Whose howl's his watch, thus with his stealthy pace,
With Tarquin's ravishing strides, towards his design
Moves like a ghost. Thou sure and firm-set earth,
Hear not my steps, which way they walk, for fear
Thy very stones prate of my whereabouts,
And take the present horror from the time,
Which now suits with it.

Koster:

"Now seems nature on the one half
Of the world dead, and wicked dreams violate
The curtained sleep: the witches' throng
Brings sacrifices to (the) pale Hecate;
Withered Murder, awakened by the call to arms,
Of the wolf, his sentinel that, howling, calls
the hours,
Sneaks thus, ghost-like, with stealthy pace,
With the violating stride of Tarquin,
Towards his goal. - You solid, firm-standing earth,
Hear not my steps, where they go, for fear
That even your stones talk of my plan,
Depriving the night of the silence of horror,
Which suits it now."

Van Suchtelen:

Over half the world
Nature seems dead; the curtain of sleep
Wicked dreams deceive, witches sacrifice
To pale Hecate and gaunt murder,
Startled by the howling with which the wolf,
His sentinel, awakens him, sneaks with stealthy strides,
Swift as Tarquin, towards his goal,
Like a ghost.-

You earth, solid-jointed,
Hear not my steps, wheresoever they go, that
Not, what I intend, your stones betray betimes
And deprive the moment of the horror
That it now awaits..."

One may wonder whether Van Suchtelen himself would have contemplated publishing this uninspired *Macbeth*; in any case, it is regrettable that it has diminished the stature to which his *Hamlet* and *Een Midnederlandstroom* entitled him. Nevertheless, together with Nijhoff's two *Storms*, Van Suchtelen's three versions
point the way towards the various approaches that were adopted by the Shakespeare translators of the last two decades.

translations since 1952. - Little more needs to be said about these; - on the one hand, due to their current prominence, most of them have been given more attention than the work of older and less familiar translators of comparable standard - in some cases, possibly, more attention than they deserve. On the other hand, the authors involved are all still alive (of the ones dealt with so far only octogenarian Adriaan Roland Holst, born in 1888, and Michiel van der Plas, born in 1927, still survive) and by and large at an age that holds the possibility, if not necessarily the promise, of their continued activity and development as Shakespeare translators - even Cornelis Buddingh' (b.1918) and Willy Courteaux, having completed their tasks of revising or translating the complete canon, might yet conceivably wish to improve on their efforts in the future -; so an assessment of their work at this stage could be premature. Bert Voeten (b.1918) started his career as a Shakespeare translator with De Koopman van Venetië in 1951, the version used for the unsuccessful production of the following year by the Nederlandse Comedie (see p.242); his De Vrolijke Vrouwtjes van Windsor appeared in print in 1952, Hamlet in 1958, Troilus en Cressida in 1959, Coriolanus in 1960, Hendrik IV, deel I in 1962, De Getemde Peeks in 1963 and Othello in 1964; all of them were used in the theatre, some of them more than once, and, due to this, Voeten's name is the one most closely associated with Shakespeare in the Netherlands at the present time. Whether this association is to be considered fortunate is open to question; the fair selection of passages from his work presented in this study may have shown that Voeten is a gifted, fluent, sometimes brilliant translator whose work fulfilled a need at the time when it arose, but also that, in his approach to the text, his practice is often at variance with his professed objectives - which are commendable enough in themselves - and that his rendering, when subjected to close scrutiny, is often facile, insensitive and superficial if judged by the standards set by the best of his predecessors. Yet it is only with theirs that his versions brook comparison; for on the occasions when Voeten is content to apply his talent to Shakespeare's words as he finds them, the easy flow and ring of his verse and the clarity of his language ensure a result that few other translators have attained:

Hamlet, III, iv, 52-61:

Look here, upon this picture, and on this,

Voeten:

Kijk naar die beeltenis, en dan naar deze;
The counterfeit presentment of two brothers.
See what a grace was seated on this brow;
Hyperion's curls, the front of Jove himself,
An eye like Mars, to threaten and command;
A station like the herald Mercury
New-lighted on a heaven-kissing hill:
A combination and a form indeed,
Where every god did seem to set his seal
To give the world assurance of a man.

("Look at that likeness, and then at this one; / the speaking portraits of two brothers. / See these
noble features, see: the forehead / of Jupiter, the curls of Apollo, / the eye of Mars, full of threat
(-ening) and command; / a bearing like Mercury, the herald, / newly descended on a hill that / kisses
heaven - a combination ("playing-together") of beauty / and strength, on which the gods, it seemed, /
all impressed their seal to... show... the world / the pattern of a man.")

Unfortunately, passages of this quality do not constitute a sufficiently consistent part of Voeten's
work to justify his reputation as the Netherlands' foremost living Shakespeare translator.
The nature of C. Buddingh's work, commenced in 1955 and completed in 1963, has been discussed at some
length in Chapter XVII (see pp.393-402). As an independent effort, it bears a moderately conservative
character and lacks the impact of the best new translations; as a revision and modernization of Burgers-
dijk, however, it is an admirable achievement, retaining the great qualities of the old translation
while free from its most obtrusively dated elements - but it does, at times, show a less acute poetic
sensibility than is found in the original.
W. Courteaux's first translations (Hendrik IV, deel I en II) were published in 1955, and separate ed-
tions of the plays henceforth continued to appear at the rate of two or three a year; a collected edition
has recently been completed (see p.472). Although no separate attention has been paid to this translator,
aspects of his work have been discussed throughout this study. Its obvious indebtedness to Burgersdijk's
model was touched on in Chapter XIX (see p.453), its textual fidelity was contrasted with Voeten's ad-
aptatory practice on pp.403-404; its occasionally excessive reliance on syllable-contraction was shown
on p.320, as were some dated features of the idiom used in his verse, as well as the modern character of
his prose again in Chapter XIX (pp.437 and 449-450). Other extended examples from his work (see pp.294,
302-303, 322, 331, 333, 361, 364, 369 and 373) demonstrate that his verse is not always cluttered, nor
its idiom consistently conservative. But, while reliable throughout in the sound and detailed understanding
of the text they display, and never dropping below an acceptable level of competence, these versions rarely strike one as inspired; they lack stylistic homogeneity, and have no distinctive flavour of their own: Courteaux's virtues as a translator are generally of a passive, retiring kind; one might wish that his scrupulousness had been teamed up with some active, creative elements, such as Nijhoff's poetic vision and Van Suchtelen's dramatic sense. Yet the virtues are there, and we need but turn back to his rendering of Kate's and Petruchio's sparring match (p.369) to recognize the dividends they have paid. Several of Courteaux's translations have been performed in Flanders.

Gerard-Messelaar's translations (Drie kongenavond, 1956; Veel Leven om Niets, 1957) have received but scant attention (see pp.428 and 450), but since they have not been published and are not likely to be performed again either, they do not merit much more. Their qualities are similar to Courteaux's: they contain distinct echoes of Burgersdijk; the verse has been competently handled, but is never remarkable; the prose is witty, conversational and modern.

Joris Diels' Macbeth (1957) has so far been performed twice (see pp.242-243 and 265-266); excerpts from it have been quoted and discussed on pp.334-335, 361-362 and 452-453. It shares both the merits and the weaknesses of Voeten's translations: its lucidity, fluency and ingenuity are offset by a lack of true poetic depth; yet - again, like Voeten - Diels has his moments of true inspiration:

_Macbeth_, V,v,19-28:

To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
To the last syllable of recorded time;
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
Life 's but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
And then is heard no more. It is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.

("Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and forever tomorrow / Creeps along in tardy pace from day to day / to the end of (the) prescribed time, / and every yesterday (has) lighted fools / on the path to dark death. Out, stub of candle! / Life is a shadow, a comedian, / that upon the stage brags and sulks his hour / and then is forgotten; 'tis a tale / told by an idiot, loud and noisy / and (it) signifies nothing.")

Despite a few lost details, this is more than acceptable work, and Diels' _Macbeth_ contains many passages
of this quality; it is, undoubtedly, a very playable acting version, as good as most of Voeten's and, on the whole, commendably faithful to the text. His translation of *Much Ado About Nothing*, staged in 1969, is unfortunately unknown to me; neither of these translations has been published - and would seem to deserve to be, if Voeten's do.

The translators of the 1960's - Evert Straat, Dolf Verspoor and Hans Andreus - and their work have featured prominently in many of the preceding chapters, particularly at the end of Chapter XVIII (pp. 426-430) where their individual approaches to Shakespeare's poetry were compared and contrasted, and in the course of Chapter XIX (see pp. 434, 438-439, 448 and 451-452) where the modern idiom common to all three was highlighted. The personality and style of each is distinctive enough to have emerged clearly from the examples given, and there is no need to elaborate further on Andreus' conversational prosiness, Verspoor's highly individual treatment of the verse and Straat's updated orthodoxy: of the three, Andreus (*Kimbe-lijn*, 1963; *Leer om Leer*, 1964) is the least interesting; Verspoor (*Droom van een Midsomernacht*, 1962; *Wat u maar wilt*, 1963 (dates of publication); *Hendrik IV*, deel I en II, 1968) ranks, in my estimation, with Voeten as a very talented translator, whose work is spoilt by a too persistent straining after novelty and superficial effect.

There remains Evert Straat, who first drew attention with his version of *Richard III* in 1960, and subsequently translated *Love's Labour's Lost* (1960), *Antony and Cleopatra* (1963) and *King Lear* (1969). All the examples of his work quoted in this study have been drawn from the last translation - the only one currently available in print - but like Nijhoff's *Storm* and *De Storm*, it contains all the evidence required to prove its author to be a most remarkable translator, the best of all those still alive and active by a comfortable margin. Not only is Straat's style homogeneous - a virtue shared by Andreus and Verspoor - , it is also apt to the character of the tragedy; his verse is not merely lively and pleasing as Verspoor's is, it is alive, and in complete harmony with its content. Neither quality could have been attained without the help of a truly creative power and a strong poetic and dramatic empathy.

By virtue of these features, Straat's *Koning Lear* may escape the fate that is bound to overtake the bulk of recent translations, which owe their appeal primarily to their explicitly modern sound and idiom - an idiom that will date as quickly as the stilted poetic diction of the older translations. Straat's language also belongs unmistakably to the second half of this century and will, in time, lose some of its directness; but since it is used honestly and purposefully as the most immediate and effective means of
communication between that remote Elizabethan, Shakespeare, and the Dutch reader and theatre-goer of today, and never serves merely as a decorative screen of self-indulgent charm or deliberate ordinariness and modernity, nor as a filter designed to dilute the poetry for easier digestion, his work's chances of survival are much greater.

Finally, a few observations about Burgersdijk. It will be evident from the prominence afforded to him in this study that I still regard him as the most important Dutch Shakespeare translator to date - and this not only because he was the first to produce verse renderings of the entire canon, although the degree to which the two complete sets of recent date are based on, or inspired by his is significant enough. Incidentally his work has been improved on - by Koster, Nijhoff, Van Suchtelen, Buddingh' -, yet its overall high standard is as yet to be challenged: it retains the edge of vitality over Koster's translations, which suffer from occasional dryness due to their over-scrupulous precision; that of fidelity over Nijhoff's versions of The Tempest; that of consistency over Van Suchtelen's output; that of poetic sensibility over Buddingh's revisions; even in his Koning Lear some instances are to be found where Straat's rendering does not quite equal it in effectiveness and ingenuity (see pp.335-337 and 366-367). For a few decades, Burgersdijk's great merits have been obscured by the understandable aversion felt against his dated language and the obsolete conventions within which he worked. But, given a basic soundness and integrity in its make-up, a discarded old object may in due course become a valuable and cherished antique; and there are indications (see p.338) that the enduring worth of Burgersdijk's achievement is reasserting itself: a tentative reappraisal of his work has been initiated, and to some of those concerned with the presentation of Shakespeare in the theatre, the life, power and sonority of his translations is beginning to shine through the armour of their poetic diction and the cobwebs of their age. This renewed appreciation is not of a purely academic nature either; it is prompted by an awareness that, in their zeal to break with the stuffy conventions of the last century, many recent translators have lost sight of the fact that Shakespeare himself observed the existing conventions of his age and, for instance, exploited subtle gradations of tenor with great dramatic effect; and that, due to this, their lucid, euphonious, approachable renderings lack a vital ingredient of the originals that has, somehow, been preserved to some extent in Burgersdijk's translations.

However, for the time being they continue to be old-fashioned rather than venerably old; and even if
they will ever graduate to the stature of Dutch classics in their own right, they never will be the translations to end all translations: for that, they contain too many imperfections. Is there one amongst the young authors discussed who will accomplish the feat of giving the Netherlands their own Shakespeare for all time?

Only the future will tell; and meanwhile it remains desirable for every new generation to approach the greatest dramatic genius of history afresh.
CHAPTER XXII

THE TRANSLATORS, THE THEATRE AND THE CRITICS.

Some reference was made to the relationship between the translators and the theatre in Chapter XI, and it was marginally touched on in Chapters XII and XIII, where a specification of the version used in each Shakespeare production would have done little but add a number of, at that stage, unfamiliar names to the already confusing multitude of directors, actors, designers and critics. Since then, however, these names have acquired some individuality and in some cases, their association with particular productions has entered into the discussion - but our picture in this respect is as yet far from complete and requires some elaboration.

Burgersdijk in the theatre. - It will be clear from the preceding chapters that, since World War II, Burgersdijk's importance in the Dutch theatre has rapidly waned. Nevertheless he has been - and still remains - the most frequently produced Shakespeare translator to date; even since 1945, his work has been the basis for 11 of the 70 registered professional productions as well as for numerous semi-professional and amateur performances. Altogether, with the respectable number of 80 professional productions over a range of 22 plays to his name, Burgersdijk holds a record which it will take a long time to beat.

Except for Kok's prose-version of Othello and Van Lennep's Otello, played in Rotterdam in 1879 and by the Amsterdam VINT company in 1880 respectively (see p.155), Burgersdijk's texts were the only ones used in full-scale Shakespeare productions from 1879 until 1908. Strictly speaking, Royaards' adaptations of The Merry Wives of Windsor, A Midsummer Night's Dream and The Winter's Tale, performed between 1909 and 1922 (see pp.214-218), were - like his solo Julius Caesar (see pp.385-386), performed in 1898 - modified Burgersdijk versions as well; Driekoningenavond was the only Shakespeare play he produced without altering the text, and at its staging in 1917 critic Top Naeff (GA, January 1917) observed: "On paper, Burgersdijk's translation (of Twelfth Night) may seem dreadful, but this performance was its vindication; a revelation; nothing grated; the language is voornaam ("distinguished, stylish, of high calibre")."

Comments on Burgersdijk by drama critics are few and far between, particularly between 1900 and 1950. Before the turn of the century there was some vocal opposition against his texts, mostly on the part of
the hyperaesthetic Tachtigers; C. F. van der Horst's comments on Een Midsomernachtdroom (see p.147) are representative of this. But it was of insufficient impact to prevent them from being used on the stage, certainly as long as there were no acceptable alternatives; and it would appear that by 1900 the majority of drama critics had come to take Burgersdijk for granted, even though they did not necessarily admire his translations nor, for that matter, positively approve of them.

A few isolated instances of direct, if mild criticism were occasioned by the KWIHT production of King Lear in September 1904, when the NRC reviewer observed that Burgersdijk's "faithful, but refractory" text was not helpful to the performance, and the All critic wrote: "The problem of verse-speaking in Dutch is aggravated by the intricacies of the exact, but opaque Burgersdijk translation"; and in September 1911 Van Bruggen (All) held the translator largely responsible for the lifelessness of the same company's production of Elk Wat Wils (As You Like It); on this occasion, Burgersdijk's version had been revised by W. G. van Nouhuys.

What other comments occur in reviews of the next four decades have usually been prompted by the use of an alternative translation and are by no means always unfavourable for Burgersdijk. As late as 1941 a HCR critic, after seeing Louis Saalborn's revival of Driekoningenavond in March of that year, remarked: "How skilful, intelligent and sonorous Burgersdijk's well-tried translation is - witty too, and made in full realization of his responsibility towards the original poet, whose intentions have been followed conscientiously." And in 1962, when De Nederlandse Comedie played Verspoor's version of Twelfth Night (see pp.257-258), even Jeanne van Schaik (GA), a usually vociferous protagonist of modern versions, complained: "must one be so forcedly modern as to deprive us of all the lovely familiar lines?"

But by this time favourable references to the old translator, either oblique or direct, were well and truly drowned out by unfavourable ones. On the last occasion his Midsomernachtdroom was used professionally - by Theater for its open-air production in June 1957 - no reviewer had anything to say in its favour, and Max Nord of Het Parool found the text "disturbingly wooden and outdated". And when Ensemble staged Naar Het U Lijkt in September 1962 (see pp.271-272), only three critics expressed themselves benevolently about the translation: Hans van Straten (HVV) and Wim Boswinkel (AH) considered it still quite usable, "although," the latter remarked, "a quick exercise with the red pencil should dispose of some of the most archaic passages, which prove obstructive to the actors' articulation," and the Vkt reviewer noted that "at the outset it sounded as if a new translation was required, but once (Sigrid) Koets
began to speak, the language came to life." But H. A. Comperts (Het Parool) and Ber Hulsing (Het) found it too solemn and ceremonious for comfort; according to André Rutten (De Tijd) it proved to be a handicap to most of the actors, and the NRC critic regarded it as a major impediment to the performance: Burgersdijk's jokes, word play and aphorisms were no longer witty, and his heavy-going, undigestible idiom rested like a shadow on the production; "a new translation or a revision is called for; even an adaptation by a modern writer such as Den Brabander would have been a considerable improvement." Jeanne van Schaik (GA) shared this view: "The greatest handicap to this production: the translation by Burgersdijk, in whose language no leaves rustle, no brook babbles, no healthy joy is tangible"..."Who will bring this delightful play up to date with a fresh translation?"

These comments are understandable enough, particularly when it is taken into account that by 1962 one had come to associate Shakespeare with Voeten's, Verspoor's and Straat's well-mouthing contemporary idiom. But the Volkskrant review quoted above is significant when compared with Top Naeff's observations on Royaards' Drie koningenavond in 1917 and with the objections raised against Koning Lear in 1904: it makes one wonder whether the thinly-spread aptitude of Dutch actors at speaking verse is not to be held responsible as much as the recalcitrance of Burgersdijk's language itself for the stuffiness and ceremoniousness these translations acquire when used on stage. Such a view seems to be supported by the circumstance that in 1962 a gifted actress was still capable of bringing the old poetic diction to life; it certainly was upheld by a number of the people involved in the Lear on Lear / Maat voor Maat experiment by De Nederlandsche Comedie in 1970 (see p.200), who felt that the Burgersdijk text had a much greater dramatic power than the Andreus version, and that it offered an actor a much wider range of mood and expression, provided that actor was able and willing to master its inherent difficulties.

Van Looy and Verkade: an unfortunate combination. - The first translator to encroach on Burgersdijk's domain was Jacobus van Looy (see p.187), who owed his position in the Dutch theatre, second to none but his great predecessor's (thirty productions based on four of his five translations), exclusively to his obstinate champion Eduard Verkade (see pp.199-213). Two generations of Dutch theatre-goers heard three of Shakespeare's most important tragedies in none but Van Looy's versions; no alternative to his Hamlet was used between 1908 and 1957, to his Macbeth between 1904 and 1957, or to his Romeo en Julie between 1911 and 1952. Besides, his translation of As You Like It was staged by Verkade in 1922, 1928, 1937 and
1940, and it is interesting to note that director Cor Hermus chose to switch to J. C. Bloem's revision of Burgersdijk's version of this play in 1947 (see pp.240-241) despite the fact that his principals were the same as those of Verkade's last two Naar Het U Liélt productions, in one of which Hermus himself had played Toetssteent (see p.211).

The examples given of Van Looy's work in Chapters XIV, XV and XVI should amply suffice to support the opinion that, despite his prominence in the theatre throughout the first half of the century, he cannot be regarded as a major Shakespeare translator; and that this prominence was an unfortunate circumstance - deleterious to Shakespeare's and, indeed, Verkade's own cause. Used as he was to raising controversies - and probably relishing them - right from the start of his career, Verkade made a habit of not heeding his critics; but he could not have chosen a set of translations less conducive to his success as a Shakespearean actor and director, and less alien to his principles of dramatic simplicity and spiritual depth than these pretentious and manneristic specimens of poetic ineptitude. Since his personal integrity and the honesty of his convictions cannot be called into question, nothing in his whole career raises more serious doubts about his artistic competence and judgement than his persistent loyalty to these execrable translations, and the lengths he went to defend their merits; when in 1937 Defresne unwisely chose Van Looy's Macbeth for his production (see pp.226-227) - the first to break Verkade's "monopoly" of the play - the latter disapproved of the performance¹ yet still maintained that "Van Looy had approximated (Shakespeare's immortally beautiful verse) more closely than anyone else in our language." The translation must be held to blame for the unusual complaint of poor articulation levelled by many reviewers at such outstanding verse speakers as Albert van Dalsum and Charlotte Köhler on this occasion; and it is not to be wondered at that after fifty years of Van Looy's Hamlet - and this, for much of that time, from the mouth of the habitually inarticulate Verkade - Dutch audiences experienced the sensation of hearing the tragedy for the first time when confronted with Bert Voeten's version in 1957.

Judging by some remarks in Van Looy's introduction to the second edition of his Hamlet (1912), where he strikes the resigned tone of a grievously misjudged and underrated genius, he had been subjected to severe criticism from some quarters; yet considering the quality of his translations - particularly that of Macbeth - such criticism as was directed at him by contemporary drama reviewers was remarkably tent-

¹ In an article on the files of the Toneelmuseum library; the newspaper in which it appeared has not been specified.
ative and mild. Comments like Van Bruggen's, who called his Macbeth "a difficult score" (AH, September 1909), and found his Hamlet "poetic but undramatic, often obscure, with passages in which the choice of words lacks character and style" (AH, September 1908) were offset by the appreciation of other critics: Rössing (NvD, 12th December 1907) was impressed by the "pithy, powerful Dutch" of his Hamlet, and a NRC reviewer (January 1908) considered the same version "strong in the coarser aspects; it has the earthy power of seventeenth-century language." - Of the three Van Looy translations in Verkade's early repertoire, however, only Hamlet met with a fairly favourable reception; when any appreciation for Macbeth or Romeo en Julia was expressed, it was qualified by a critical comparison with his predecessor's work: "Van Looy's (Macbeth) translation has qualities alongside Burgersdijk's, but lacks the latter's directness" (NRC, September 1909); -"The new Van Looy translation (of Romeo and Juliet) has merit, but Burgersdijk's is pithier, truer, more poetic and more romantic" (Rössing, NvD, February 1911).

At its first production in 1922, several reviewers praised Van Looy's rendering of As You Like It as resonant, poetic and very beautiful, but Verkade's new productions of Hamlet and Macbeth of that year prompted only one or two comments on the texts. "Ad Interim" found Van Looy's Hamlet "fine as literature, but in rapid delivery difficult too follow (NvD, May 1922), and a critic of the Leidsch Dagblad wrote, after attending a performance of Macbeth in November: "It is doubtful whether Van Looy's translation helps to establish the required doom-laden atmosphere; it may be artistic, but it is too disjointed to be used on stage, for it is inevitable that passages of it become incomprehensible when spoken."

There is hardly anything so far that can be regarded as harsh criticism, and the strongest objections raised against Van Looy prior to this date concerned a minor aspect of his work that would count in his favour today: his occasional use of colloquialisms, which prompted Top Naeff (GA, March 1917) to condemn his Romeo en Julia as being "full of banalities and sordid fashion words"..."entirely lacking the richness and precision of the original." It seems incomprehensible that throughout the long years of their use not a single critic was awake to the real weaknesses of Van Looy's versions, which were not, in the first place, their abstruseness and imprecision - as we have seen, semantically they were often very faithful - but their blatant artificiality and their rhythmic ungainliness, clear evidence of their author's poetically tone-deaf ear and his total misconception of Shakespeare's basically natural language.

Even in 1937, when both his Macbeth and Naar Het U Lijkt were being performed again, one or two reviewers still found something gracious to say about these versions: Cor de Groot (De Maasbode), for instance,
considered the latter "not mellifluous, but muscular and strongly evocative" (October 1937), and the former "rhythmically powerful and image-provoking", even though he felt obliged to add: "however, Burgersdijk's and Koster's versions are easier on the ear and would have been preferable; Van Looy's translation demands elocutory resources which this cast on the whole does not possess." (February 1937).

Maurits Uylde (Akh, same dates) wrote in a similar vein, albeit without the deferential gesture towards the translator: "Van Looy's translation is not as easy to follow as Burgersdijk's, and much of the text was lost," and about Naar Het U Lijkt: "Verkade shows a decided preference for Van Looy's translation, although...it is difficult to speak articulately, and besides lacks many a witty turn of the original."

The majority of comments in 1937 ran along these lines, and general dissatisfaction with the Van Looy texts was at last becoming evident; but it was not until 1949 that one isolated critic (Akh, March), reviewing Paul Steenbergen's anniversary season as Hamlet under the direction of Verkade, ventured to observe: "It is regrettable that Van Looy's text is used, whose distorted, un-beautiful, unpronounceable and incomprehensible language not only undermines one's understanding, but also destroys the winged beauty of the original." When, eight years later, Steenbergen himself directed the same play with Coen Flink in the title rôle and finally disposed of Van Looy in favour of Voeten's translation, R. Blijstra (HVW, October 1957) remarked: "It is clear that Voeten, confronted with Burgersdijk's opaqueness and Van Looy's almost unreadable and unplayable text, pushed the scales the other way, towards maximum clarity — much to the liking, one imagines, of producer Steenbergen, whose great talent...foundered on the rocks of Van Looy's translation."

Koster, Royaards, Verkade, Roland Holst, Ter Laan, Nijhoff. — Prior to 1940 Burgersdijk and Van Looy dominated the Dutch Shakespeare scene, almost to the exclusion of all other comers. Koster's only entry into the theatre — with Othello in 1908 — came and went quite unheralded. Hardly any reviewers graced the occasion with comments; one of the few was J. H. Rössing (NvD, September 1908) whose lukewarm reaction amounted to nothing more than that "Dr. Koster's translation sounded good; only his use of modern fashion words grated, as also that of the blatant "hoer" ('whore') instead of a subtler expression."

Willem Royaards, who had discreetly and correctly called his Vrolijke Vrouwtjes van Windsor and Een Midi-somernachtdeoor: adaptations after Dr. L. A. J. Burgersdijk, ill-advisedly took the credit for Een Winteravondsp oohtje in 1922 himself. At least one critic, whose identity I have not been able to establish,
commented on this unfortunate attempt: "We owe Dr. Royaards much, but he presumes immodestly and immoderately in taking the task of translation upon himself as well; he has either been unable to respond to Shakespeare's concentrated poetry, or to give expression to that response; his translation is wordy, pallid, powerless and old-fashioned in vocabulary. Rhythm and imagery are often lost; Burgersdijk is not perfect either, but while Royaards has obviously consulted the former, he has not been able to improve on him." Jeanne Kloos was responsible for the lyrics of this version, which - according to the same critic - she had "with great licence, turned into passable Dutch ditties."

A little more ambitious, and certainly more independent, were his colleague Eduard Verkade's versions of *The Comedy of Errors* - played successfully by his own company in 1923 and 1925 (see p.210); as no critics commented on the text on either occasion, it must have been acceptable enough to escape attention - and of *Julius Caesar*, discussed in Chapter XXI (see pp.482-485). The latter was staged under his own direction in 1926 (see pp.209-210) and published in the same year; it even survived World War II and was the basis for both Van Dalsum's and Flink's productions in 1951 and 1963 respectively (see pp.237-238 and 261-262). On the occasion of its original performance, Verkade's merits as a translator of this great tragedy aroused barely enough interest amongst the drama critics to be mentioned; only in Top Naeff's lengthy review of the production (GA, April 1926) a few paragraphs were devoted to the translation; apart from finding it too "rational" and indicative of a deficient poetic sensibility, this critic mainly disapproved of its conversational idiom, its "jijen en jouen" and its lack of "romantic loftiness" - the same reasons for which she disliked Van Looy's *Romeo en Julia* and Rössing, to a lesser extent, found fault with Koster. As far as the critics were concerned, it appears, the time was not yet ripe for a break with poetic diction; none of them seem to have realized that Van Looy's substitute for it, imitated in several ways by Verkade in his *Julius Caesar*, was basically as far removed from the language of reality as the formal register of the nineteenth century theatre; - and that the objectionable "commonness" resulting from a sprinkling of modern idiom was one of its most superficial features, and in itself bore no relationship to a quality of poetic dignity - or lack of it - in these translations.

In what a relatively short time the tide of critical opinion turned against older translations is demonstrated in an interesting way by the subsequent stage history of this *Julius Caesar*. As recently as 1951, not a single critic remarked on it; but in 1963 hardly anyone failed to point out its poor quality, outdatedness and swollen, manneristic language; but for one or two critics who considered Verkade's effort
still usable, there was general agreement that it was a major shortcoming in the Rotterdam production. That the same fate did not overtake Roland Holst's Koning Lear and Richard III, Ter Laan's Een Wintervondsnorsje and Nijhoff's Storm (of which only the last was performed, once, before 1940) might be regarded as the best possible testimony to their superior qualities - subject to the reservation that the abstention from overt criticism, in Roland Holst's case, might be due to deference to a still-alive and generally admired poet, and the special circumstances under which his work was performed on the most recent occasion (see below); that Ter Laan's version has hardly provoked any comment at all; and that Nijhoff's Storm was played for the last time in 1948, and superseded since then by his 1952 version.

To revert to Roland Holst: his translations were performed with marked success only during that part of the post-war period when, at least amongst the critics, conservative standards still prevailed: Richard III in 1947, Koning Lear in 1948 (see pp.234-236). The revival of the latter production in 1953 was marked by a total absence of references to the translation, and the use of Evert Straat's Richard III by the Haagse Comedie in 1961 suggests that Roland Holst's version was no longer considered playable, while Diels' choice of his Koning Lear in 1964 (see p.267) may have been guided by the preference of his leading actor, Albert van Dalsum, whose retirement this production was designed to mark.

Almost without exception, reviewers in October 1947 hailed the Richard III translation as excellent, splendid, superb; Manuel van Loggem (KhT) found it "wonderful; this is living, melodious, sinewy Dutch," and a similarly warm reception was extended to Koning Lear in November 1948; only, on this occasion, the critic of De Waarheid remarked on "a few odd lapses", without going into any detail. In November 1964, however, very few reviewers bothered to mention the translation, and those who did were mostly uncritical; A. Koolkaas (VII) described it as "poetically beautiful, but opaque"; and Jan Spierdijk (Tel.), while admiring it on the whole, found fault with some instances of over-literality and quoted, as one of these: "Zo jong en zo onzacht?" ("So young and so untender?"). If any of them considered Roland Holst's language dated, none saw fit to voice such an opinion - as they well might have on a less special occasion, and if the poet in question had been less highly regarded.

Ter Laan's Winteravondsnorsje was staged by the Residentie Toneel in 1945 and by the Haagse Comedie (basically the same company; see p.244 and p.264) in 1960. The only reference to the translation I found in the reviews was a brief one by Jan Spierdijk (Tel., January 1960), who found it "lucid and poetic". Predictably, the critical reactions to Nijhoff's Storm, when first presented in January 1930 (see pp.228-
229) were generally less assuredly positive than they came to be at a later stage. A NRC reviewer wrote: "As far as I could hear, Nijhoff has executed his task in a masterly way, with great insight and reverence. The Tempest's splendid verse has been rendered in strong, colourful modern Dutch - leaving some extravagances in the burlesque scenes aside." Very interesting is a comment by Werumeus Buning, who was, at the time, drama critic for De Telegraaf: "In lyrical passages, Nijhoff's translation is a success; in the dramatic passages of blank verse, Burgersdijk offers more fluent, more speakable language." Most of the critics chose not to commit themselves to any opinion on this occasion, and even an isolated reaction in the Haagse Courant to De Meester's second Storm production in March 1941 evinces a certain reserve: "Nijhoff's translation certainly does not overshadow Burgersdijk; but on stage it has the advantage of its more conversational, and therefore more immediately appealing and suggestive language." Undividedly favourable responses were first recorded in June 1953, when Cees Laseur used the second version for his Holland Festival production (see p.247). Leo Hanekroot (De Tijd) commented that the translation excelled "by its marked, even strong plasticity, its outspoken profile, beautiful speakability and somewhat dark and exalted tone: a splendid Dutch equivalent of the play." - As usually, this critic's pompous verbiage must be taken with a grain of salt - what could be meant by an "outspoken profile"? - but "the somewhat dark and exalted tone" is certainly a feature that distinguishes Nijhoff's second from his first rendering, and more characteristic of it than the "supreme vitality, effervescence and infectiousness" Jeanne van Schaik (GA, June 1958) ascribed to it when reviewing Theater's open-air production of the play (see p.252).

Yet finally, reviews of the most recent staging - by the Nederlandse Comedie in September 1969 (see p.259) - show that, at least to some critics' minds, time is catching up on Nijhoff too: Jan Spierdijk (Tel.) found De Storm as beautiful a translation as ever, and Hans van den Bergh (Het Parool) still described it as "lucid, simple, masterly - exactly fitted the tone of this production"...; but Wim Boswinkel (Ali) expressed the view that "once jolly, it now proves to be refractory; it does not mouth well. Outdated." - and Guus Rekers (GA) went even further: "By now its countless inversions sound manneristic, and its linguistic ingenuities are worn out"...: a comment that makes one wonder if the translation referred to is really that model of poetic simplicity we found Nijhoff's De Storm to be - or has it merely become fashionable to regard any Shakespeare version made prior to 1960 as inevitably outdated?

Van den Berg, Werumeus Buning, Den Brabander. - Onno van den Berg's translations of The Taming of the
Shrew and Much Ado About Nothing had a short but successful stage history. The former provided the basis for no less than four professional productions: by "Studio" in 1941 (see p.228), the ATG in 1950, the Rotterdams Toneel in 1953 and "Ensemble" in 1959 (see pp.237, 240 and 271); on the first and last of these occasions it drew no comments from reviewers, but in 1950 it was the subject of at least one (unidentified) appreciative paragraph: "fine, modern, does justice to the original...", and in 1953 it was generally acknowledged as satisfying. Veel Leven om Niets was played by START in 1946, and by the Rotterdams Toneel in September 1947 (see pp.233 and 238). The majority of the critics were delighted with it: Simon Carmiggelt (Het Parool) described it as "modern, elegant, always poetic; it far surpasses Burgersdijk"...; and Godfried Bomans (Vkt.) considered its prose more graceful than Burgersdijk's verse. But there were a few dissenting voices: the GA reviewer found it "not at all convincing; such pseudo-student-esque novelty and liveliness is atrocious"; and the Trouw and Maasbode critics took umbrage at "indelicacies" in its idiom.

J. W. F. Wermoeus Buning's version of The Comedy of Errors is the only one of his four Shakespeare translations that has maintained itself in the professional repertoire. The Haagse Comedie used it in 1948, the Rotterdams Toneel in 1960, "Arena" and the Nieuwe Comedie in 1960 and 1964 respectively; besides, it was adapted by directors Ton Lutz and Krijntje Braak for the "Globe" production of 1969 (see pp.245, 260-261, 269 and 275-276). Only in January 1948 and January 1960 did it elicit a few responses from reviewers, and these were all favourable: W. Brugmans (Vkt.) and R. Blijstra (HVv) hailed it as excellent in 1948, as did Carmiggelt (Het Parool), who called it "a free, often brilliant translation"...; and in 1960 W. Boswinkel (AII) described it as "salty", and was satisfied that it contained "all that the original has to offer." - No such favour befell his Een Midsomarnachts Droom on the one occasion it was used professionally: by the Haagse Comedie in October 1954 (see p.248); the highest praise it received was that it was more earthy, less prudish than Burgersdijk's version - a comment justified solely by his names for Bottom and Flute (see p.461). Elsa den Hartog (HP) considered it unremarkable, and Ben Struman (AII) was struck by the peculiar use of rhyme in the artisans' scenes.

One's faith in the competence of Dutch drama critics to assess the quality of a translation-in-performance is severely tested by the unprecedented enthusiasm with which most of them received Gerard den Braabander's adaptation of Measure for Measure in November 1950; the relative unfamiliarity of the play and the excellence of the production (see pp.241-242) are the only extenuating circumstances for such a wide-
spread failure of judgement. "Poetic, splendid, lively, warm, witty," was the consensus of opinion; "uncommonly rich in sound and images," according to Jan Ros (De Linie) and Ben Stroman (Ah); A. T. Kamphoff (Haags Dagblad) admired its "unusual vitality, untrammelled quality"; Simon Carmiggelt (Het Parool) found it "wonderfully poetic... leaves nothing to be desired", and Ben van Eysselsteyn (HC) wrote: "Den Brabander must have a sense for the language of the theatre in his very blood and nerves: what lively, poetic splendour; sometimes, in solemn passages, Vondelian, sometimes bawdy like Bredero - justice has been done to Shakespeare at last!" - A little more cautious and discreet were Elsa den Hartog's judgement (HrP: "lively, stimulating") and Cor de Groot's in De Nieuwe Eeuw: "Den Brabander has done nothing to mute down Shakespeare's bawdy - if anything, he has exaggerated it." Apart from that, De Groot found the version "good, playable", although he considered the rhyme too obtrusive. The only really judicious comments came from W. Wagener (Haarlems Dagblad), who enjoyed its "delightful, extremely stage-crafty libertine fireworks", yet observed that it "might well cause Burgersdijk and Van Looy to turn in their graves"... "from a literary point of view, it is probably indefensible"; and from J. W. Hofstra (Vkt.), who wrote: "Den Brabander seems to have banned Burgersdijk to the realm of decent bores - but it remains to be seen which of the two versions is closer to the text."

The publication of Den Brabander's Leer om Leer text that same year may have opened a few critical eyes; in any case, when his adaptation of Een Midsommermachtijdroom was performed by "Paxk" in 1959 (see p.251), it got little sympathy from the reviewers. The kindliest response to it was that in the Nrc, where it was described as "a theoretically dubious, yet quite reasonable attempt at cautiously modernizing, popularizing and simplifying Burgersdijk with some modern idiom; but why then not use a legitimate modern translation, such as Werumeus Buning's?" And Ben Stroman (Ah), one of Den Brabander's enthusiastic admirers in 1950, condemned it as "a totally superfluous, poor, droningly-rhymed and text-falsifying adaptation of Burgersdijk's translation; if anything in it sounded acceptable, it was Burgersdijk undiluted."

Van der Plas, Meeselaar, Diels, Buddingh'. - While it may safely be assumed that the publication of Den Brabander's adaptations brought their true nature home to their reviewers, his version of A Midsummer-Night's Dream still might have met with a more favourable reception if its performance by "Paxk" had been acceptable. For the standard of a production, and the actors' skill at making the best of a translation's qualities (whether they be good or bad) are factors that obviously have a considerable bearing
on critical responses to the translation itself - particularly when its text has not been published, and is not available for examination alongside the English. A clear case in point is Michel van der Plas' *Romeo en Julia*: although certainly not a brilliant translation, its reputation seems to have suffered unjustly from the unsatisfactory standard of the productions in which it has been used. Both the first of these, Van Paridon's staging for "Puck" in 1952, and the *Nieuwe Komodie* production in 1966 (see pp. 251 and 270) were handicapped by the youth and inexperience of the actors involved; and on both occasions adverse or indifferent comments on the translation outbalanced favourable ones. In 1952, only H. A. Gomperts (*Het Parool*) was impressed by its simplicity and resonance; the *HAV* reviewer thought it lacked suppleness, and Jan Ros (*De Nieuwe Linie*) found it "not always felicitous; its rhyme is too dominant and droning." In September 1966 the most honest comment came from Jan Verstappen in *Het Binnenhof*, who found it difficult to judge the translation, because it was so poorly spoken; L. Hanekroot (*De Tijd*) and C. Hendriks (*HAV*) made complimentary remarks about the "suppleness and manipulability" of this "harmonious recreation" of Shakespeare's language in the idiom of the mid-'sixties; E. Bekius (*Vad.*) and G. Rekers (*GA*) thought it was a sound, lucid modern version. The remaining responses ranged from "very free", "not very poetic" and "unsatisfying" to: "facile, homespun, not-quite-poetry" (P. Ruivenkamp, *HC*) and "disqualified by bathetic patches of toffee-wraper rhymes" (W. Boswinkel, *AH*); A. Koolhaas (*VN*) was also bothered by passages of "bad rhyme alongside fine, flashing word play in modern idiom"... all this despite the fact that Van der Plas' rendering of Shakespeare's couplets is poetry of the highest order when compared with the inane doggerel of Den Brabander's *Leer om Leer* and Werumeus Buning's *Een Midzomermaids Droom*, which met with very little criticism - but then: even the most melodious rhyme can degenerate into a drone in the mouths of incompetent actors, under a director who does not understand Dutch. So, even though Van der Plas' own revision of his work must be taken into consideration, the uncontested quality of the actors in Greter's ill-conceived production of *Romeo en Julia* in September 1968 (see pp. 262-263) may well account for the altogether more favourable reception the critics extended to the translation this time: Deering (*AD*) and Van den Bergh (*Het Parool*), critical in 1966, now found it "poetic, youthful, angular"... "skilful, faithful, fluent": judgements representative of the majority opinion; only Bekius (*Vad.*) had changed sides in the reverse direction; his new verdict: "(an) occasionally pleasant (rendering), yet in itself it highlights the incompatibility of modern idiom and Shakespearean rhetoric"..., may reflect on the forced modern "relevance" of the production as much as on the
translation itself; really adverse criticisms - by W. Boswinkel (AH: "dry, commonplace") and C. van Hoboken (Trouws: "its obtrusive modernisms are extremely irritating alongside what are, evidently, straightforward Shakespearean fragments") were in the minority.

Gerard Messelaar's unpublished versions of Twelfth Night and Much Ado About Nothing had the benefit of only one production each: by the Haagse Comedie in 1957 and 1958 respectively (see pp.248 and 250); but, as the skill of the actors and the overall standard of production on both occasions more than sufficed to do justice to these translations, their assessments by the reviewers gave a fair impression of their merits. H. A. Gomperts (Het Parool), a usually reliable critic in this point, spotted Messelaar's strengths and weaknesses at once; his verdict of Drie komeinavond was: "surprisingly natural, ingenious, tasteful - if a little too glib in poetic passages...; and of Veel Leven om Niets: "it sounded excellent;... is better in the prose than in the verse sections." Other judicious responses to Drie komeinavond came from Jan Spierdijk (Tel.): "light, fresh, sometimes too commonplace"...; C. B. Dolaard (Haags Dagblad), W. Boswinkel (Ali) and Jan Ros (De Linie): "lively, mouthing well, but not very musical or poetic." Veel Leven om Niets, the less successful of the two, was given an unqualified "very satisfying" and "remarkably good" rating only by L. Hanekroot (De Tijd) and P. H. Dubois (Vad.); Spierdijk (Tel.) belittled it beyond its deserts as "a piece of handimanship; it has a certain baticic slickness, but lacks, both in sound and essence, the poetry that is the only relieving feature of this rather flimsy play."

Joris Diels' Macbeth was the basis for both productions of that play since World War II: one by the Nederlandse Comedie in March 1957, and one by the Haagse Comedie in October 1963 (see pp.242-243 and 265-266); on both occasions, reviewers' impressions of the translation varied widely. An article in Het Vrije Volk in March 1957 condemned it as "hopelessly inadequate, pedestrian, ludicrous - it is about time that something is done about the situation where this essential work is left to muddlers and dabblers"...; but R. Blijstra, the drama critic of the same daily, gave it a more moderate verdict that was nearer the mark: "uneven: by turns too pedestrian and too ceremonious." Jeanne van Schaik (GA) found it "too polished, tending to take the fibre out of the original", but several other reviewers, among whom Cor van der Lugt Melsert (EW) considered it successful and even remarkably good. H. A. Gomperts (Het Parool) believed it to be a great handicap to the performance; "its smooth, but opaque doggerel promoted droning recitation by the actors." That was in 1957, but in 1963 he acceded that it sounded considerably better under Diels' own direction, although he still felt that a new translation "by a poet who will eschew linguistic co-
quetry is called for nevertheless." On this second occasion a small majority of the critics were favourably impressed; Hanekroot (De Tijd) thought it "very speakable" and Koolhaas (VW) wrote: "It has qualities; sometimes it is a little obscure, but often sober and purposeful." Others continued to object to its combination of bathetic with excessively solemn idiom, and felt it did no justice to Shakespeare's poetry. Diels' second performed translation, that of Much Ado About Nothing, staged by himself for the Haagse Comedie with great success (see p.268), appears to have met with general approval: no adverse criticisms were expressed.

Of the complete canon which he so capably revised, C. Buddingh's Richard II was the only version used in a production so far, - the first attempt at that great play ever to be professionally staged in the Netherlands - by the Nederlandse Comedie in 1958 (see pp.243-244). Once again there was evidence that an English director (i.e. Douglas Seale) was incapable of exercising sufficient control over the handling of the Dutch text, and this may account to some extent for the divided opinions on the quality of the translation. André Rutten (De Tijd), Cor van der Lugt Melsert (Ew), Jan Spierdijk (Tel.) and several other reviewers hailed it as "skilful, perspicuous", "excellent", and "sober, resonant, splendid"... "does justice to all the poetry and word play"; Jeanne van Schaik (GA) and a NRC critic offered qualified verdicts: "exact, but somewhat dry" and "respectable, but not always euphonious"; H. L. Prenen (HP) found it not impressive and dismissed it as "warmed-up Burgersdijk"; both H. A. Gomperts (Het Parool) and P. H. Dubois (Vad.) acknowledged its faithfulness to the original, but were worried by that bugbear of the Dutch Shakespeare actor: rhyming couplets - and Gomperts confessed that he did not like "this literal copying of Shakespeare's verse in Dutch rhymes; a greater degree of licence might lead to a better approximation of the original." For all the probity of this opinion, it still remains remarkable that the use of rhyme only seems to strike critics as bothersome when textual direction has been inadequate, or when the actors involved are of questionable calibre.

Voeten, Straat, Verspoor, Andreus, Zaal. - As will be obvious by now, the sudden diversification of translations during the middle and late 'fifties was accompanied by a proportionate increase in the interest taken by the drama critics in their qualities. Only ten years earlier, a reviewer's comment on a translation was the exception rather than the rule; but as changing attitudes to the language of the theatre began to manifest themselves, one became aware of the important rôle a translation had to play in the
totality of a Shakespeare production. However, the understandable eagerness with which a truly fresh and innovating approach to Shakespeare's poetry was awaited has, in a number of cases, led to a widespread suspension of critical faculties on the part of the reviewers, many of whom ascribed the loftiest qualities to a translation on the basis of a single hearing, and before there was any opportunity to study it on paper and arrive at a well-considered judgement. The initial reception of Den Brabander's Leer om Leer was an example of this; but the adapter-translator of the post-war period whose genius has been most consistently overrated is Bert Voeten - which certainly is a measure of his work's undeniable effectiveness in the theatre.

Of all the living translators, Voeten has by far the highest number of produced versions to his name: his Koopman van Venetië served productions by the Nederlandsche Comedie in 1952, the Haagse Comedie in 1959 and "Ensemble" in 1966; his Vrolijke Vrouwtjes van Windsor was staged by the Haagse Comedie in 1952 and by "Ensemble" in 1960; the Haagse Comedie produced his Hamlet in 1957, as did the Nieuw Rotterdams Toneel in 1966; his Troilus en Cressida was the basis for the production by the Holland Festival Ad Hoc company in 1959, and was revived by "Theater" in 1969; his Coriolanus was staged by the Nederlandsche Comedie in 1960; his Hendrik IV, deel I by the Haagse Comedie in 1962, which also produced his Othello in 1964. De Getemde Feeks, commissioned by the Haagse Comedie in 1963, was first performed by "Theater" in 1970, and "Globe" staged Othello again in 1971 (see pp.242, 250, 272; 246-247, 271; 249, 262; 252-253, 274; 255-256; 265; 266; 275 and 276-277).

In the course of this long career Voeten has met with some of the most extravagant praise ever showered upon a translator, and with very little criticism - although it should be observed that comments of any kind have been few and far between since 1964, and were not particularly vocal, although invariably favourable, with regard to his first two, most orthodox translations. His Vrolijke Vrouwtjes was given a single "excellent" rating, in the Rotterdams Nieuwsblad in January 1952; his Koopman, in October of that year, was praised as "admirable" by Van der Lugt Melsert (EW) and as "masterly, brilliant, fresh" by S. Carmiggelt (Het Parool), while two or three other reviewers expressed their satisfaction with it; in January 1959, Jan Spierdijk (Tel.) alone called it "sublime, inspired and inspiring."

But his Hamlet elicited responses from all the reviewers at its first performance in October 1957. Most voluble in her boundless admiration was Jeanne van Schaik (GA): "We owe the greatest thanks to the translator Bert Voeten, who has accomplished the incredible. All the dust of time has been blown away
and, as a result, a text may be heard (that is) direct, hits home, is devoid of any rhetoric, life caught in the act and solidified into words. They who feel themselves separated from the English of Shakespeare by a distance that can only be bridged by dictionaries and glossaries...undergo, liberated from the ceremoniousness, the dated evasive movements of a Burgersdijk, the sensation as if they have always been myopic and now have been given spectacles. The most important sensation is that the people, which used to be presented for admiration at the suitable distance of classicity, suddenly stand alongside you, have become your brothers, friends and henchmen. All perplexity disappears at this extension of the contemporary world, but in what a veritable, deep-sounding, all conformism eschewing perfection." - Henceforward, Voeten could do no wrong in this critic's eyes; in June 1959, she extolled his Troilus en Cressida as "a re-creation with the stature of genius; the taste, the tact, the masterly use of language and the virtuosity of it cannot be overestimated. The old varnish has been peeled off, as it were, and a masterpiece has come to light in the freshness of modern colours; but besides, the theoretically impossible task has been accomplished of muting down, remodelling and redistributing the original renaissance form structure so that it has become acceptable to our modern sense of style." - Her reaction to Coriolanus, in September 1960, was a little less vociferous; she recognized that Voeten had been taking "some considerable liberties," but nevertheless thought the translation sounded excellent. But his Hendrik IV again met with her unqualified admiration, in January 1962: "Voeten has succeeded first of all in doing justice to the high poetic qualities of the play; but besides, the low-life prose passages have become as immediately appealing and lively as if they were overheard in a tavern only yesterday. Where allusions, topicalities and witticisms of Elizabethan England have become inaccessible to the modern audience or reader, (Voeten) has reserved the right to substitute modern equivalents, based on a rich knowledge and understanding of the latest commentaries on the text. An effort deserving of general gratitude and acknowledgement." And her opinion of Othello was: "brilliant, at once raw and poetic!", to which she added the reflection: "In a way we are privileged compared with the English, to whom Shakespeare's language is, in fact, something alien."

But Jeanne van Schaik was not alone in her admiration for Voeten; Anton Koolhaas (VN) considered his Hamlet the most important gain of the 1957 production: "It is a translation of a beneficent naturalness, which dispenses profundity in a language that belongs to our time, yet is permeated in a humane way by the permanence of these utterances!.; and he hailed Troilus en Cressida as: "a phenomenal trump card; by
cleansing the play of some of its baroque obscurities and impurities Voeten has revealed an almost new work of art; a re-creation of unique penetrating power, which casts new light on the play and clarifies many of its intentions."

It would be tedious and unprofitable to give a detailed account of all the reviews; Jan Spierdijk (Tel.), Leo Hanekroot (De Tijd), Ben Stroman (AH), Jan Ros (De Linie), Cor van Hoboken (Trouw), P. Ruivenkamp (HC), P. H. Dubois (Vad.), Hans van Straten and Elfred van Vliet (HVV) all showed themselves to be un-wavering admirers of Voeten's translations; terms such as "clear, lucid, direct, uncomplicated; witty, effective, lively" feature strongly in their comments. At an early stage one or two of them (e.g. Ben van Eysselsteyn, De Maasbode, October 1957) took exception to Voeten's use of "uncalled-for coarsenesses"; but of greater interest are a few examples of a more cautious judgement amidst all this unqualified praise. H. A. Gomperts (Het Parool) found Hamlet "lucid, literal" and observed Voeten's practice of making "deliberate, unambiguous choices in cases of cruces and alternative possibilities"; and called Troilus en Cressida "a respectable tour de force", but, while acknowledging that Coriolanus had "the merit of clear, colloquial immediacy" he regretted the replacement of this tragedy's "unusual, concrete images by diluted, explicatory expressions; a great deal of the original is lost this way." An anonymous HP reviewer wrote of Hamlet, in 1957: -"Voeten's version... is explicitly modern, anti-romantic; it has exceptional merit, but proportionate failings: Shakespeare's language has correctly been rendered as that of a realist, but it must be remembered that he nevertheless was, above all, a poet; lyricism always transcends grossness. Voeten failed to balance these elements; his language is too plain, direct, clear-cut, lacking in nuance." Most acute of all, perhaps, was T. Elias's comment on Hamlet in De Tijd, on the same occasion: "an admirably clear translation, easy to follow; however, its mundane idiom is a little deceptive; it has dissociated the mystery of the play's content from its verbal packaging, so that we are led to believe that "we have suddenly understood" the play... that there is nothing enigmatic about it."

Three translators made their debut in the Dutch theatre in the early 'sixties: Evert Straat, Dolf Verspoor and Hans Andreus. Straat's version of Richard III, staged by the Haagse Comedie in January 1961 (see pp.264-265), was received with modest, but discerning appreciation: H. A. Gomperts praised it as "skilful, subtle, poetic" (Het Parool), C. van Hoboken (Trouw) noted its faithfulness, and Ben Stroman (AH) found it "direct, clear, uncomplicated, yet faithfully approximating Shakespeare's rhetoric power."
Jan Spierdijk (Tel.) also admired its directness and perspicuity, but felt these qualities had been attained at some cost to the poetry.

But for P. H. Dubois (Vad.), in whose opinion Straat's *Antonius en Cleopatra* - produced by Ton Lutz for the *Nederlandse Comedie* in November 1963 (see pp.258-259) - "sounded well, but (was) a little inflexible and lacking in brilliance", no reviewer had anything but the highest praise for this translation. According to Jeanne van Schaik (GA), it deserved "as much applause as the production: it has a splendid, direct, impudent force. Straat does not eschew coarse, modern idiom, which has an immediate and powerful impact. The irony between the lines is frequently entirely in keeping with the subtlety of the original. A great feat!" And A. Koolhaas (VII) described it as "rich and direct", admired Straat's use of idiom with immediate appeal; there was "the strongest imaginable tie between word and action; one cannot expect more of a translation than Straat has attained in this one." Other reviewers, amongst whom H. A. Gomperts (Het Parool), David Koning (EM) and Jan Spierdijk (Tel.) remarked on the exactness and the poetic quality of the translation.

The third and last of Straat's translations that was used in the theatre (his *Koning Lear*, commissioned by the *Nederlandse Comedie* in 1969, has not been produced so far) was *Liefde's Lose Les* (*Love's Labour's Lost*), staged by "Centrum" in March 1966 (see p.270). Again the consensus of opinion was, on the whole, very favourable: particularly significant, coming from Jeanne van Schaik (GA), was a comment on Straat's fidelity; his rendering "preserved the richness of Shakespeare's language, yet was lucid without resorting to facile adaptation." M. S. Koops (HVV) found it besides "sublimely witty", as did several of his colleagues; yet there is some indication that Straat may have felt less at home with the euphuistic niceties of Shakespeare's early comedy than with the more robust and gritty poetry of the late tragedies; Hans van den Bergh (Het Parool) hailed him as a "champion translator, a virtuoso at transposing Shakespeare's witticisms, idiomatic expressions, dialect and pedantic constructions (into modern Dutch equivalents)"

Musicality is perhaps the strongest aspect of Dolf Verspoor's translations, even if the music is his own rather than Shakespeare's, and not all the critics have responded positively to it. His *Droom van een Midsomernacht* was first heard in the highly successful production by the *Nederlandse Comedie* in November
1961 (see p.257), and was used again, by the Haagse Comedie, in February 1966 (see pp.267-268). On the first occasion favour outbalanced criticism in the chorus of reviewers, even though many of them were conscious of its light-weight quality; the verdicts of Jan Spierdijk (Tel.): "free - too much so, perhaps - but its poetic ingenuity disarms any reservations at first hearing", and Gabriel Smit (Vkt.): "a virtuoso piece, with just not quite sufficient power of its own; but Shakespeare's Dream glows through it everywhere" represent a good cross-section of the opinions. Hans van Straten (HvV) remarked on its "syncopated rhythm that breaks through the mellifluousness of the verse, giving it a modern tension;" Cor van der Lught Melsert (EW) found it "at first hearing: virtuose, playful, nimble, but occasionally too deliberately "at the heels" of the poetry." Jeanne van Schaik (GA) described it as "fresh, immediately appealing, cheeky yet poetic throughout," but was alone in attributing "exactness" to it.

By 1966, the charm of Verspoor's Droom appears to have worn a little thin. Hans van den Bergh (Het Paroel) still enjoyed its sharpness and wit; Hanekroot's qualified admiration has already been quoted (see p.410). But P. Ruivenkamp (HC) found it better "on paper than on the ear", and a remarkable number of critics noted that it was not euphonious and seemed difficult to speak; "the actors' fault?" the HRC reviewer wondered. Koolhaas (VNI) tartly remarked, on this occasion, that Verspoor's main concern seemed to have been "to stay clear of Burgersdijk as far as possible."

His Wat U Maar Wilt (Twelfth Night), staged by the Nederlandse Comedie in December 1962, by "Theater" in January 1968 and, in Martin van Zundert's adaptation, by the Groot-Limburgse Toneel in September 1970 (see p.257-258, 272 and 275) also underwent a shift in critical appreciation, but in the reverse direction; at its first performance, the greatest compliments extended to it were that it was modern, (extremely) free and ingenious, and these came from a small minority of critics. André Rutten (De Tijd) found it "less surprising than one might have expected of this translator; it is more modern, but not more attractive than the old one"; and according to A. Koolhaas (VNI), it was as forcedly modern as the production; "it has deliberately removed all glow from the text and all atmosphere from the play." Between 1962 and 1968 Verspoor revised the text; so at the second staging Hans van den Bergh (Het Paroel) remarked that it was "now perfectly polished", and a number of others described it as "fine, supple, very playable, fresh and modern, scintillating, grippingly rhythmical." Koolhaas still considered its modernisms disturbingly deliberate, and Nic Brink (GA) and W. Hartering (NvtD) thought its excess of rhetorical witticisms had an adverse effect on its lucidity.
Verspoor's most successful translations to date - to judge, that is, by their critical reception - were his versions of the two parts of *Henry IV*, which were given a monumental production by "Theater" in October 1968 (see pp.273-274); at least Koolhaas (*VM*), until then a severe critic of this translator's work, hailed them as "incredibly rich, fresh, true to the essence of the plays, a masterpiece." None of the reviewers laboured under any illusion as to the textual licence which Verspoor, in line with his usual practice, had allowed himself - but this awareness did not deter them from near-unanimous enthusiasm. According to Simon Koster (*Haarlems Dagblad*) this double *Hendrik IV* "approaches Shakespeare's richness of language in the 'high' scenes; in the comic prose passages it abounds with striking finds in a typically Dutch idiom of a Bredero-like expressiveness", and Ben Bos of *De Nieuwe Linie* wrote: "Verspoor again proves to be a truly creative translator who takes great liberties with the text and comes up with a surprising work in a brand-new Dutch idiom."

Hans Andreus' *Kimbeijin* was the basis for a fairly successful production by the *Nieuws Rotterdamse Toneel* in January 1963 (see p.261), but his *Leer om Leer* fell victim to circumstances: its staging by Johan de Meester for the *Nieuwe Komedie* in 1964 was a total failure, as was the *Measure for Measure* production by the *Nederlandse Comedie* in 1970, for which it was used alongside the Burgersdijk text. Due to this only the least satisfactory of his two translations has come to the attention of the drama critics - who were, on the whole, not greatly impressed with it. Only the reviewer of the *NRC* made more than a fleeting reference to it: "The title does not sound very melodious - yet Andreus is entitled to great appreciation. The task is more risky still than usual, because one associates richness of language even more with *Cymbeline* in particular than one tends to do with all Shakespeare's plays, so that the critic will soon be inclined to regret the loss of splendour in translation. We are prepared to accede that, if Shakespeare is to be translated at all, some such loss must be accepted: one cannot expect the impossible from a translator. Andreus, it seems to us, has fulfilled the necessary requirement: he has diligently looked for image-equivalents, generally found them, and produced a fine whole. Some of the sentence structure is a little over-complicated, yet it sounded well on stage." This reviewer also wondered whether Andreus was aware of the existence of another version of *Cymbeline*, by the Rotterdam author A. Wagener. This translation had been used once, in an amateur production in that city.

Apart from this friendly notice, very few comments expressed unqualified satisfaction. Anton Deering (*AD*) and André Rutten (*De Tijd*) found it resonant and poetic; Hans van den Bergh (*VM*) felt that *Cymbeline*'s
"rich imagery had been somewhat severely trimmed," but was content that a "gain in pithiness and comprehensibility" compensated, to some extent, for a loss of poetry. H. A. Gomperts (Het Parool) considered "the dialogue admirable, the poetic passages weak. Too many accents and shades have been lost!".; and the HP critic simply remarked that "Anireus appears to have plucked Shakespeare's gorgeous plumage all too much." Jan Spierdijk (Tel.) characterized the translation as "incidentally poetic, but generally too refractorily modern," and Daniël de Lange (Vkr.) thought it sounded dry at crucial points. David Koning (EW), finally, heard some "rhythmically progressive" quality in it, but was critical of the modern-idiomatic dialogue, which "tended unduly towards naturalism."

A translator not dealt with so far - because the text of his only translation, Twee Heren uit Verona, was not available for perusal when the data for this study were collected - is Wim Zaal. His version was performed by the young actors of the Nieuw Rotterdamse Toneel in January 1970 (see pp.263-264). Reviewers' comments suggest that the quality of his work is comparable with that of Andreus': W. Boswinkel (Al) described it as "pleasantly fluent, at times very faithful to the rather taut, schoolish rhyme scheme; at times very felicitous in finding witty solutions for the countless aphorisms and verbal games that (over-)ornate the play!"., and Anton Deering (AD) thought it was "excellent, modern, cheeky." But the rest of the critics were not impressed; their appreciation ranged from: "better in wit than in poetry; certainly no improvement on Burgersdijk" (Simon Koster, Haarlems Dagblad) and "more modernistic than modern; ingenious but not poetic" (P. H. Dubois, Vrd.) to: "excessively swollen and pompous - reminiscent of eighteenth-century rhetoric" (Jaap Joppe, HC). One may safely assume, therefore, that Zaal is not likely to be the brilliant translator whom the Netherlands have been waiting for.

As this survey has shown, relatively few twentieth-century Dutch Shakespeare translators of any note have been neglected by the theatre; the only regrettable instances of such neglect have been Koster's and Van Suchtelen's translations, while, among those of recent date, Buddingh's versions have not met with the attention they deserve. But there is no reason to feel that Dutch theatre-goers have suffered an irreparable loss by the oversight of Marcellus' Julius Caesar, Van Dam's Hamlet and Rensburg's maladroit efforts. Whether Fleerackers' translations have been produced in Flanders or not, is unknown to me; but a considerable of Courteaux's versions have been performed, by the companies of both the Koninklijke Nederlandse Schouwburg in Antwerp and the Koninklijke Vlaamse Schouwburg in Brussels, and a version of King Lear by
the Flemish poet Hugues C. Pernath was the basis for a production by the Antwerp company in 1969, which was seen in Rotterdam that year (see p.279). - A detailed history of Shakespeare performances in Flanders, which could not be accommodated in this survey, might prove to be well worth making; a number of Dutch directors and actors, amongst whom Adriaan and Wilhelmina van der Horst (see p.222), and later Johan de Meester (see p.228 ff.) and Ben Royaards (see pp.221-222) have contributed to this history, just as a range of Flemish actors and actresses (Hubert and Flor Laroche, Jules Verstraete, Magda Janssens, Julia de Gruyter) and director Joris Diels made their mark in the Shakespeare culture of the Northern Netherlands. Such a study could also bring to light the work of some Flemish translators which, neither in the theatre or in print, has come to the attention of the Dutch public, and may be as worthy of interest as that of their northern colleagues.

The space allotted in this chapter to Dutch drama critics and their assessments of translations may seem excessive - particularly where, on occasion, these assessments have been far from judicious. But there can be no doubt about the key function these critics are expected to fulfil in the relationship between the live theatre and its audience: directors and actors look upon their views as gauges of the public response to their efforts, while the potential audience seeks their guidance in the choice of its entertainment, and tends to regard their judgements as well-considered, well-informed and reliable.

The prestige that a number of the cited and quoted critics enjoyed or still enjoy is fully justified where their acumen and expertise as judges of drama, acting and production is concerned; but we have seen that, as assessors of the subtle and complex art of translation, by no means all of them have consistently shown the discernment required to arrive at a balanced judgement when faced with an unread new version - or the discretion to refrain from a positive verdict on the basis of such inconclusive evidence as the fleeting impressions gathered at a first performance. Yet, since particularly in that crucial situation (i.e., the confrontation with an unpublished new translation) there has been no higher or, for that matter, any other critical authority to resort to, the public - and possibly even the people involved in the production - have generally been prepared to accept a drama critic's opinion as responsible, knowledgeable and final; and too often a translator's reputation, whether good or bad, has been founded on that shaky basis. One might wonder, for instance, whether Bert Voeten would have received the Martinus Nijhoff Prize as an official recognition for his services as a translator in 1959, if it had not been for
the extraordinary enthusiasm his work aroused in such highly-respected critics as Jeanne van Schaik and Anton Koolhaas.

Besides, not only the relatively few "permanently" unpublished translators - Van der Plas, Messelaar, Diels - have depended exclusively on the judgement of drama critics for their reputations: Shakespeare translations have been largely disregarded as objects for legitimate literary criticism throughout this century. In a prestigious literary periodical like De Gids, for instance, a brief review by D. G. van der Vat of the De Backer-Dudok edition of Burgersdijk (1943, I), a diffident and uncomfortable reference by W. van Maanen to Den Brabander's Leer om Leer in his article 'Rumoer om Shakespeare' (1951, I) and Erik Vos' essay 'Ritmische aspecten bij het vertalen' (see p.305, note1) is all that has been published by way of critical commentary on Shakespeare's translations; and, by and large, the placement of the incidental few paragraphs or, in exceptional cases, a column or two of review dealing with a newly published translation has been left to the ephemeral media of the nation's daily and weekly newspapers. If they ever were to be collected, these scattered comments might add up to a considerable body of criticism, but the fact remains that they are still too few and far between, too diverse in approach and of too little authority in themselves to have had a leavening effect upon the critical faculties of the general public and, indeed, even of those of the drama critics. One might wish for previews, containing a thorough examination of a new or existing translation used, along with information and commentary on the play in question, to be published in newspapers on the eve of a new production; or, preferably still, for theatre companies to submit translations they intend to use to a knowledgeable outside critic for examination in time for his findings to be incorporated in the program notes, and serve as a guide for the general public and as a sound basis for the drama critics against which to check their own impressions.

The rounding-off of this study would require, strictly speaking, a summary of Dutch twentieth-century activity in the field of Shakespeare commentary, criticism and scholarship outside the provinces of translation and the theatre, like the ones given in Chapters II and V on the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and in Chapter X on the late nineteenth century up to 1900. The reason for not giving this is only partly a matter of not having all the facts available; whereas until 1880 the assimilation of Shakespeare's work into the cultural life of the Netherlands was largely a matter of concern to a few
scholars and literati, and the subsequent two decades were marked by a vigorous activity on the part of Shakespeare enthusiasts to provide an informative and authoritative background to the first florescence of Shakespeare in the Dutch theatre for the benefit of the general public, this activity has since then slackened off and become marginal to the country's general cultural pattern. In the course of this century, Dutch scholars have taken their place in the international brotherhood of Shakespearean scholarship, and confined their activities, on the whole, to writing for, and educating other scholars; some of them have occasionally broken out of this isolation and joined "amateurs" in keeping a deeper level of interest in Shakespeare and his work alive among Dutch readers; hence, one finds articles by Prof. W. G. C. Bijvanck in De Gids and Het Toneel alongside less expert, but loving contributions by the great novelist Arthur van Schendel (who even published a romanticized biography, Shakespeare, in 1910) and poet W.umeus Buning; books such as A. G. van Kranendonk's Shakespeare en zijn tijd ("Shakespeare and his time") (Querido, Amsterdam, 1938), F. W. A. Korff's Levensproblemen bij Shakespeare ("Problems of Life in Shakespeare") (Erven Bohn, Haarlem, 1929) and Justus Meyer's De Schoonheid van Shakespeare ("The Beauty of Shakespeare") (W. de Haan, Utrecht, 1948-1950) alongside essays by poets Herman Gorter, Albert Verwey and Hugo Verriest and novelist Theun de Vries; and, more recently, publications of the order of Prof. A. G. H. Bachrach's much-quoted Naar Het Hem Leek ("As He Liked It") (Bert Bakker, Den Haag, 1957), Rondom Shakespeare, a joint effort of scholars A. G. H. Bachrach, J. Swart and W. S. van Thienen (De Haan, Zeist/Antwerpen, 1964), and W. van Maanen's and H. H. J. de Leeuw's contributions to De Gids alongside those by Joris Diels, Wim Boswinkel and Erik Vos.

These works and articles have undoubtedly had their effect; but besides, every Dutch schoolchild these days is confronted with Shakespeare in his English classes, and Shakespeare's complete works in some English edition or other grace the bookshelf of any Dutch citizen who takes a pride in his erudition - often along with commentaries ranging from Harley Granville Barker's to Jan Kott's. In the Netherlands, Shakespeare's plays are no longer a foreign entity, ignorable, remote and beyond reach; even for those who cannot read his language, he has become part of an indigenous cultural reality, and can never again cease to be so.


p.55, 1.11: *De Inspraak van het Bloed* dates from 1833; the plays mentioned earlier appeared, along with other works, in the three volumes *Mengel- en Tooneelpoëziij* noted above.

p.55, 1.23: Kijn's *Montignì* was published in 1818; Van Halmael's *Gerard van Velsen and Reinier en Willem van Oldenbarneveldt* in 1817 and 1828 respectively.

p.63: The term "vaudeville" is used here (and again on p.71) in the nineteenth-century sense: lightweight dramatic entertainment incorporating music, song and dance - of the kind referred to as "pantomime" in present-day Britain.

p.72, 1.1: see: Hunningher, *op.cit.*, pp.16-17.


p.72, 1.15: see: Hunningher, *op.cit.*, p.27.


p.153: Duke George expressed this view in a letter to the Court Theatre's superintendant, Carl Freiherr von Stein, in 1862 - the only time ever he is known to have put his ideas on the function of theatre in writing.


p.431: *Hamlet*, III.i,154: out of tune. — Munro (*The London Shakespeare*) has the reading: out of time, but is clear that the translator has followed the more usual alternative.
APPENDIX I

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE DUTCH TRANSLATIONS AND ADAPTATIONS OF
SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS QUOTED, DISCUSSED OR MENTIONED IN THIS STUDY.

(Following the collected editions, the items are listed in the alphabetical order of the English titles of the plays and, within those rubrics, in the chronological order of their publication or first year of performance. If not bracketed, the numbers refer to pages on which excerpts or details from the version referred to are quoted; parenthesized numbers indicate pages on which the version referred to is mentioned or discussed only. Versions contained in the collected editions are, as a rule, not listed again under the separate titles unless quoted. The date of publication given is that of whatever edition is used in this study; where this is felt to be of particular interest, the first date of publication is given in parentheses.)

I: Collected Editions.

1. ANONYMI: WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S TOONEELSPELEN. Met de Bronnellen, en Aantekeningen van verscheyden Beroemde Schryveren. Naar het Engelsche en Hoogduitsche vertaald en Met nieuws geïnventeerde Kunstplaatjes versierd. ("W.S.'s PLAYS. With the Sources, and Notes of several Famous Writers. Translated from the English and the High German and adorned With finely devised Art prints.") Te Amsteldam By Albrecht Borchers, 1778 (Vol.I), 1779 (Vol.II) and 1780 (Vol.III). (25-32, 39)

2. B. BRUNIUS: WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. TOONEELSPELEN. Verruyt met de Voorreders, Aantekeningen, ens. van ROVE, POPE, THEOBALD, HAMMER, WARBURTON, JOHNSON en CAPELL. Naar de Uitgaaf van Capell uit het Engelsch vertaald en met Aantekeningen van Prof. ESCHENBURG en van den Vertaaler verruyt. ("W.S. PLAYS. Enriched with the Prefaces, Notes, etc. of R., P., T., H., W., J. and C. According to C.'s edition translated from the English and enriched with Notes by Prof. E. and the Translator.") Te Amsteldam By Albrecht Borchers, 1781 (Vol.IV) and 1782 (Vol.V). (32-39)

3. A. S. KOK: SHAKESPEARE'S DRAMATISCHE WERKEN. Vertaald en toegelicht door v ("S's DRAMATIC WORKS. Translated and elucidated by v"). Amsterdam, G. L. Funke, 1880. 7 Volumes. (128-133)


6. C. BUDDINGH': DE TONEELSPELEN VAN WILLIAM SHAKE-


II: Anthology of excerpts.

9. L. Ph. Ch. van den BERGH: BLOEMLEZING uit de Dramatische Werken van WILLIAM SHAKE-SPEARE, in Nederlandse dichtmaat overgebracht door Mr. v. Lid van de Maatschappij van Nederlandse Letterkunde te Leiden. ("ANTHOLOGY from the Dramatic Works of W.S., transposed into Netherlandic poetry by Mr. v., Member of the Society of Dutch Literature at Leiden."). Amsterdam, J. Immerzeel Jr., 1834. (67, 86, 88-91)

III: Separate versions.

ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL:

10. J. KINKER: EINDE GOED, ALLES GOED. c.1783. unpublished. ** (40)

ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA:

(2) B. BRUNNIUS: Marcus Antonius en Cleopatra.

(3) L. Ph. Ch. van den BERGH: Antonius en Cleopatra (excerpts; see: Bloemlezing). (33, 34-35, 38, 39)

(9) L. Ph. Ch. van den BERGH: Antonius en Cleopatra (excerpts; see: Bloemlezing). 89


12. E. B. KOSTER: ANTONIUS EN CLEOPATRA. Drama van William Shakespeare. Vertaling van Dr. v. (A&C. Drama by W.S. Translation by Dr. v.) Rotterdam, Johan Pieterse, 1904 (475)


AS YOU LIKE IT:

14. R. POSTHUMUS: As Jemme It Liie Meie, fen WILLEM SHAKE-SPEARE. Uit it Ingelsch troch v. ("AYLI, by W. S. From the English by v.").) Dockum, 1842. (87)


The COMEDY OF ERRORS:


CORIOLANUS:

(2) E. BIJNIENT: Caius Marcus Coriolanus. (see: coll. ed. Vol. IV). (33), 38, 39


Cymbeline:


Hamlet:


(9) L. Ph. Ch. van den BERGH: Hamlet. (excerpts; see: Bloemeling). 89, 90

25. P. Ph. ROORDA VAN EYSINGA: HAMLET, treurspel van William Shakespeare. Uit het Engelsch, in den vorm van het oorspronkelijke, vertaald door W. S. Indisch ambtenaar, Ridder der Orde van den Nederland-


27. A. S. KOK: HAMLET, Prins van Denemarken. Treurespel. \(SHAKESPEARE's Dramatische Werken\) Vertaald en Toegelicht door \(v\). \("hlt., Prince of Denmark. Tragedy. \(S.'s Dramatic Works\) Translated and Elucidated by \(v\).\) \) Amsterdam, G. L. Funke, 1873. \(130-131\)


30. J. DECROOOS: SHAKESPEARE's HAMLET. Engelsch en Nederlandsch, Tegenover Elkaar door \(v\). \("S.'s Hlt. English and Dutch, Alongside one another by \(v\).\) \) Kortrijk, Verlag Steenlandt. \(n.d. (1936)\) (488)


HENRY IV, PART I:

(1) ANONYMI: Eerste Deel van Henrick den Vierden, met het leven en den dood van Henrick, genaamd Hotspur. \("First Part of HIV, with the life and death of Henry, named Hotspur.\) \) (see: coll. ed. Vol.III). \(25, 27, 463\)


35. C. L. SCHEPP: Koning Hendrik IV. n.d. \(193?\), unpublished. \* (488)

36. W. COURTEAUX: William Shakespeare. HENDRIK IV. Ingeleid en vertaald door \(v\). \("W.S. HIV. Introduced and translated by \(v\).\) \) Amsterdam-Antwerpen, Wereld-


**HENRY IV, PART II:**

(2) B. BRUNIUS: *Het Tweede Deel van Koning Hen- rik den Vierden, behelsende desselfs Dood, en de Kroening van Koning Henrik den Vijfden. ("The Second Part of King HIV, dealing with his Death, and the Coronation of King HV.")* (see: coll. ed. Vol.V) (33), 35-37, 39


(35) C. L. SCHEPP: (see above). *(488)

(36) W. COURTEAUX: (see above). 294, 449-450, 462

(38) D. VERSPOOR: (see above) *(497, 519)

**HENRY V:**


**JULIUS CAESAR:**

39. R. POSTHUMUS: *De KEAPMAN fen VENETIEN in JULIUS CAESAR, Twu Toneelstikken, fen WILLEM SHAK-

**SPEARE: Uit it Ingels foarfrieske trug v. ("The MoV and JC, Two Plays, by W.S.: Frisianized from the English by v.")* Grinz, J. Oomkens, 1829. 87-88

40. C. W. OPZOOMER: *JULIUS CAESAR. Treurspel van William Shakespeare, Uit het Engelsc vertaald door Mr.v. ("JC. Tragedy by W.S., Translated from the English by Mr.v.")* Amsterdam, J. H. Gebhard & Co., 1860. (86), 113-116, (174)


42. P. V. MARCELLUS: *JULIUS CAESAR. Treurspel van William Shakespeare. Vertaald door v. ("JC. Tragedy by W.S. Translated by v.")* Amsterdam, H. M. Draaisma (printer; private, non-commercial publication), 1908 302-303, 354-355, 406, (425, 482, 520


45. T. E. HOLTROP: *W. Shakespeare. JULIUS CAESAR. In Frysk oersetting fen v. (W.S. JC. A Frisian translation by v.)* Snits, 1928. *(488)


355-358


KING JOHN:

(1) ANONYMI: Leven en Dood van Koning Johannes. ("Life and Death of King John") (see: coll. ed. Vol.II).

25)

KING LEAR:


44)

(9) L. Ph. Ch. van den BERGH: Koning Lear. (excerpts; see: Bloemlezing.) 90


52. H. C. PERNATH: Shakespeare's KONING LEAR. 1968. unpublished. *


LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST:


202, 459, 463


(459, 497, 517)

MACBETH:


56. P. BODDAERT JR.: MACBETH, Treurspel. Gevolgd naar het Pransch van M. DUCIS. ("Mob. Tragedy. Imitated from the French by Mr. DUCIS") Te Amsterdam, by the Wed. J. Döll, in de Kalverstraat, 1800. (45)

(9) L. Ph. Ch. van den BERGH: Macbeth. (excerpts; see: Bloemlezing). 88, 89


61. E. B. KOSTER: William Shakespeare. MACBETH. Treurspel, vertaald door Dr. ν. ("W. S. Mob. Tragedy, translated by Dr. ν.") Amsterdam, Wereldbibliotheca, 1907. (First edition: Rotterdam, Johan Pieterse, 1895.) 287, 292, 294, 334, 360, 469, (475-476), 493


MEASURE FOR MEASURE:


The MERCHANT OF VENICE:

(39) R. POSTHUMUS: (see above). (87)


73. E. B. KOSTER: De Koopman van Venetië. Drama van WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. Vertaling van Dr. v. ("The MoV. Drama by W.S. Translation by Dr. v.") Rotterdam, Johan Pieterse, 1908. 289, (475), 476-478, (480)


The MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR:


76. I. J. LION: DE VRONLIJKE VROUWTJES VAN WINDSOR. 1848. unpublished. * (86, 102), 103-104


A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM:


(505)

(54) J. K. RENSBERG: (see above). 179, 324, 357-358, 461, 480-481.


MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING:

(2) B. BRUNIUS: Veel Leven Om Niets. (see: coll. ed. Vol.V) (33)


86. O. van den BERG: VEEL LEVEN OM NIETS. 1946. unpublished. *

(488, 509)

87. G. MESSELAAR: Veel Leven om Niets. 1957. unpublished. *

(496, 512)


(497, 513)

OTHELLO:

(1) ANONYMI: Othello, of de Moor van Venetien. (see:

90. P. J. UYLENBROEK: OTHELLO, of De Moor van Venetië; treurspel. Het Francsche van Duits vrij gevolgd. ("Oth., or The Moor of Venice; tragedy. The French by Duits freely adapted.") Te Amstel, by Abraham Mars, 1802. (45)


93. E. B. KOSTER: William Shakespeare. OTHELLO. Treurspel, vertaald door Dr. τ. ("W.S. Oth. Tragedy, translated by Dr. τ.") Amsterdam, Wereldbibliotheek, 1908. (475, 505)


94. B. VOETEN: OTHELLO, De Moor van Venetië.


RICHARD II:

(2) B. BRUNIUS: Richard de Tweede, Koning van Engeland. (see: coll. ed. Vol.IV). (33), 37-38, 39

(4) L. A. J. BURGERSDIJK: KONING RICHARD DE TWEEDE. (315)


RICHARD III:

(9) L. Ph. Ch. van den BERGH: Koning Richard III. (excerpts; see: Bloemlezing) 88

95. A. S. KOK: KONING RICHARD III. Treurspel van William Shakspere; Uit het Engelsch vertaald door τ. ("KING RIII. Tragedy by W.S.; Translated from the English by τ.") Amsterdam, J. C. Loman Jr. 1861. (120-122), 124, 125


97. E. STRAAT: William Shakespeare. RICHARD III.
Vertaald door ν. ("W.S. RIII. Translated by ν.")
1960, unpublished.* (497, 516)

ROMEO AND JULIET:


(9) L. Ph. Ch. van den BERGH: Romeo and Julia. (excerpts; see: Bloemlezing) 90-91


100. J. van LENNEP: ROMEO EN JULIA. Treurspel in vijf berichten, naar het Engelsch van WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, door Mr. ν. ("R&J. Tragedy in five acts, after the English by W. S. by Mr. ν.") Amsterdam, P. Meijer Warnars. 1852. (63, 77, 104-105, 106-108, 173).


(6) C. BUDDINGH': ROMEO EN JULIA. (see: coll. ed. Vol.VI). 331, 394, 440


The TAMING OF THE SHREW:


(6) C. BUDDINGH': DE GETEMDE FEeks. (see: coll. ed.
Vol. I, 395-396, 440, 460


The TEMPEST:


TROILUS AND CRESSIDA:


TWELFTH NIGHT:


TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA:

(2) B. BRUNIUS: De Twee Edellieden van Verona. (see:
De Autolycus-liedjes zijn vertaald door Mevrouw Jeanne Kloos-Reijneke van Stuwe. ("A WINTER NIGHT's FAIRY TAILE. From the English by W.S. by Dr. v.' The Autolycus-songs have been translated by Mrs. J. R. van S. K.") Amsterdam, 1922. (505-506)


(54) J. K. RENSBURG: (see above). (480)


* (Of items No. 13, 38, 86, 87, 88, 104, 115 and 117, stencil copies are available for perusal in the Toneelmuseum Library in Amsterdam, which also contains manuscripts of items No. 35, 41, 76, 77 and 79. I had access to a stencil copy of item No. 65 by courtesy of the Haagse Comedie, and to one of item No. 94 by courtesy of the theatre company "Een." Item 52 may be accessible on the files of the Koninklijke Nederlandse Schoensburg in Antwerp, and item No. 87 on those of the Haagse Comedie in The Hague.)

** (Of items No. 67, 74 and 102 I have not been able to locate copies. For information about item No. 10, see: F. PENNINK, Nederland en Shakespeare, 's Gravenhage, M. Nijhoff, 1936, p.147 ff.)
APPENDIX II

ALPHABETICAL INDEX

OF NAMES AND TITLES.

(With the exception of the name of Shakespeare and the titles and the names of characters listed on pp. 458-463, all the names of persons and characters, and all the titles of books, periodicals, articles and plays mentioned or discussed in the course of this study are given in this index. The digits refer to the page numbers; when these are linked, this indicates that the name or title concerned occurs on all the intervening pages.)

AAGJE (AUDREY) 211
Aanteekeningen over Tooneel-Kunst 212
Aaron, Joyce 260
Abbot, Mr. 82
Abercrombie, D. 325
ABHORSON 242
Abspoel, Albert 274
ACHILLES 253, 275
"Ad Interim" 205, 504
ADAM 196, 241, 272
Adam in Ballingschap 214
Adam Scheffer 61
Addison, Joseph 16
Adel en Mathilda 55
Adrastos 475
ADRIANA 210, 245
ADRIANO 247
AEGEON 210, 245
AEMILIA 210, 245
Aerden, Ben 240
Aeschyllos 147
AGAMEMNON 252, 253
AGUECHEEK, SIR ANDREW 163, 277
AJAX 252, 253, 279
ALBANY 44, 236, 267
Albertingk Thym, J. A. 72, 149
Alolina 10
Aldridge, Ira 82, 83
Alexander, Peter 467
Algemeen Dagblad (AD) 258, 265, 511, 519, 520
Algemeene Oefenschool, De 19
Aldingh Brugmans 242, 255
All's Well That Ends Well 40, 182, 470
Alleyne, Edward 3
ALONSO 218, 229, 247, 392, 437
Alphen, Hieronymus van 21-22, 52
Alving, Manon 251
Amsterdams Toneel Gezelschap (ATG) 234-238, 240, 241, 267, 509.
Amsterdamsch Lyrisch Tooneel 197
Amsterdamsch Tooneel 223
Amsterdamsche Courant 72
Amsterdamsche Toneel Vereniging (ATV) 225-226
Andersen, Elizabeth 245, 246, 248-250, 253, 264, 280.
Andrewsen, Harry 255
Andriessen, Jurriaan 247, 250, 252
ANDROMACHE 253
Andrónicus 9
ANGELO 165, 230, 241, 387, 438, 466
Annals, Michael 277
Annales or A General Chronicle of England 2
ANNE, LADY 79, 235, 265
Antigone 161
ANTIGONUS 271
ANTIIPHOLUS 210, 245, 261, 269, 276
ANTONIO (MAAN) 164, 194, 238, 250
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