

## The four neoclassical Spanish Hamlets: assimilation and revision<sup>1</sup>

Ángel Luis PUJANTE  
Keith GREGOR  
*University of Murcia*

### ABSTRACT

This paper considers the four late eighteenth-/early nineteenth-century Spanish translations of Jean-François Ducis's *Hamlet* (both early and revised versions) as instances of the problematic relation between Spanish Shakespeares and French neoclassical sources in the period preceding and also postdating the Napoleonic invasion. Ranging from the first Spanish version of the play attributed to Ramón de la Cruz, which was first performed in 1772, to José María de Carnerero's 1825 rendering for a production which appears never to have taken place, through the anonymous manuscript kept at the Biblioteca Menéndez Pelayo in Santander and Antonio de Saviñón's 'liberal' version of the 1810s, the texts discussed are viewed as sites of both assimilation of, and resistance to, the didactic and carefully regulated tragedies of an earlier epoch. At the same time, and given that at least three of these translations seem to have been intended for performance or, as in the case of de la Cruz's, definitely reached the stage, the texts concerned, however remote they may be from the Shakespearean original, were, it is argued, the only kind of 'Shakespeare' available in a number of European countries including Spain. As such they should be seen as playing their part both in the evolution of the Hamlet 'myth' and in the spread of Shakespeare's work on the continent.

### 1

Amongst the different European cultures to include their own translations of Jean-François Ducis's neoclassical adaptation of *Hamlet* the case of Spain is unique. For not only was Spain the first country in which such a translation was produced, but there are no fewer than *four* extant versions of the play: two based on the 1770

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is part of the research project BFF2002-02019, funded by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science and FEDER. The authors would like to express their thanks to Dirk Delabastita, Isabelle Schwartz-Gastine, Gunnar Sorelius and Marta Gibinska for their invaluable assistance during preparation.

edition of Ducis's adaptation, two on the later and so-called 'definitive' version of 1809.<sup>2</sup> The latter two, at least, appeared after the publication of Leandro Fernández de Moratín's rendering of the Shakespearean 'original' in 1798, the second of these, which was intended and authorized for performance, dating from as late as 1825.

That a French text could be rendered so promptly and profusely in Spanish is not, in itself, unusual. As far as drama was concerned, if the age of Lope de Vega and Calderón saw the growth of a national popular theatre in which foreign plays were virtually or totally absent, what followed in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was the exact opposite. Regarding tragedy, dependence on the French neoclassical model was extremely heavy: there had been nothing like classical tragedy in the two previous centuries, and therefore no audience for it, so all attempts to adhere to the French model were bound to be more or less revolutionary – and very often failures. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, playwright María Rosa Gálvez summarized the state of tragedy on the Spanish stage in the previous century as follows:

In truth, in these latter times it seemed that the fate of tragedies in Spain was improving, some of those staged being well received. But, unfortunately, we cannot make boast of it, for only the foreign tragedies were applauded ... The wretched Spaniard who

---

<sup>2</sup> The fortunes of Ducis's *Hamlet* in Europe – and of his other Shakespearean versions – were notable. Leaving aside France (where it was performed 203 times between 1769 and 1851), his *Hamlet* was, in turn, translated or adapted, not only in Spain, but also in Italy, the Low Countries, Russia and Poland. The Italian translation, by Francesco Gritti, was staged and published in 1774, as documented by Petrone (1993: 169-79) and not in 1772, as stated by Van Tieghem (1947: 246) and by those who follow him on this point (see Vanderhoof 1953: 88 and Heylen 1993: 29). Also, Heylen misquotes Van Tieghem in suggesting that there was a Swedish translation of Ducis's *Hamlet*, when all that Van Tieghem says is that Ducis's Shakespearean adaptations were acted at the Swedish court by a famous French actor, i.e. in French (1947: 247). There was, however, a *Hamlet* production in Göteborg in 1787, though there is no information available about the adaptation or its author (see Berg 1896: 342).

For the translations of Ducis's *Hamlet* in the Low Countries and in Russia see Delabastita (1993) and Levin (1993: 75-6), respectively. Finally, there appears to have been a Polish translation of Ducis's *Hamlet* by Andrzej Horodyski used in a 1799 production in Warsaw, but it was never published and the manuscript is now lost. See Żurowski (1976: 189-90).

For the lasting success of Ducis's *Hamlet* on the French stage, see Benchetrit (1956) and note 17.

dares to write a tragedy ... is made to regret it and to curse the dark temptation which led him to write an original work rather than a translation. Thus, there is a deluge of translators and, perchance, but one creative mind.<sup>3</sup>

As a kind of compensation for the absence of great playwrights and masterpieces comparable to those of the previous period, in this enlightened age people tended to think, to discuss, to write and to translate much more than ever before. The standard nine-volume bibliography of eighteenth-century Spanish writers lists a vast number of tragedies, both published and unpublished (Aguilar 1981-1999). Most of them, however, were translations and adaptations of French tragedies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, i.e. those that should be taken as models. As Ruiz Ramón puts it,

In the intentions of translators and adapters we can see, above all else, a wish to create a literary atmosphere in keeping with the neoclassical genre, and a vocation to renew Spanish drama, raising the aesthetic and moral level of the audience, who, for the most part, revelled in the decadent forms of Baroque theatre.<sup>4</sup>

This last remark is important because it points to the variety reflected in the playbills and shows that the new neoclassical tragedy had to overcome no small popular resistance; the box-office accounts have demonstrated that in the Age of Reason Madrid audiences preferred 'comedias de magia', i.e. those involving magic, magicians and the supernatural (see Andioc 1988: 27-54), to these harrowing depictions of the moral 'Truth'.

---

<sup>3</sup> "A la verdad, en estos últimos tiempos parecía que iba mejorando la suerte de la tragedia en España; se han representado algunas con aceptación; pero, por desgracia, no podemos hacer gloria de ella, porque sólo se han aplaudido las extranjeras. [...] Al miserable español que se atreve a escribir una tragedia ... se le hace escarmentar, o acaso maldecir la negra tentación en que cayó de escribir original, y no traducción. De ahí es que hay un diluvio de traductores, y por milagro un ingenio." *Obras poéticas* (1804), quoted in Ruiz Ramón (1967: 389). All the translations from the Spanish are our own.

<sup>4</sup> "En la intención de traductores y adaptadores vemos, sobre todo, una voluntad de crear un ambiente literario propicio al género neoclásico y una vocación de renovar el teatro español, elevando el nivel estético y moral del público que, en su gran mayoría, se solazaba con las formas decadentes del teatro barroco" (Ruiz Ramón 1967: 387).

Rather than being an alternative for European playgoers at the time, it should be stressed that derivative plays like Ducis's *Hamlet* and further versions of the play in other languages were the customary, if not the only, form of access to 'Shakespeare'.<sup>5</sup> Admittedly, all but one of the cases we shall be discussing are instances of production without reception, since they were never staged or published, and therefore are only available in manuscript form. However, the mere fact that they were written and, as we shall see, at least intended for performance surely bears witness to the importance of the Hamlet myth in Spain, an importance which would grow in a period spanning over fifty years. The features of Ducis's adaptations and those of his *Hamlet* are sufficiently well known (see Golder 1992: 13-72), and we will not go into them here, except when we deal with the way they were treated in the subsequent Spanish translations.

The first of these translations, attributed to playwright Ramón de la Cruz, was played on the Madrid stage in October and December 1772, but was only published in 1900.<sup>6</sup> We shall refer to it as 'Cruz'. The second translation, anonymous and undated, cannot have been written much later than 1800, as it is based on the 1770 French edition, and probably not earlier than 1793. We shall refer to it as 'Santander', after the city where the only manuscript is kept.<sup>7</sup> The third, by translator and playwright Antonio de Saviñón, is also undated, though it must have been written between 1809 (since it follows the French edition of this year) and 1814, which was the

---

<sup>5</sup> Let us remind ourselves that even in England Shakespeare was adapted, sometimes beyond recognition, from the Restoration till practically the middle of the nineteenth century (see Gary Taylor, 1991: 200-201). Similarly, audiences in Germany, where Ducis's versions were not used, had to rely on severely eviscerated or adapted versions of the plays, as in the 'first' Hamlet – Friedrich Ludwig Schröder's 'domesticated' versions of 1776 and 1777 (see Williams 1990: 67-68, 72-81).

<sup>6</sup> In the *Revista Contemporánea*, 1900, CXX, pp. 142-158, 273-291, 379-391, 500-512 y 640-651, a text edited by Carlos Cambronero. This edition is based on one of the two rather similar manuscripts kept at the Madrid Archivo de la Villa (Tea 1-118-1, A and Tea 1-118-1, B) – a third one, kept at Biblioteca Nacional (Mss. 16095), differs from the other two on some significant points, as we shall see. Unless otherwise stated, quotations will be from the first of the manuscripts mentioned.

<sup>7</sup> At the local Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo (Mss. 277).

year of Saviñón's death.<sup>8</sup> We shall refer to it as 'Saviñón'. The fourth and last was written by journalist and man of letters José María de Carnerero; dated 1825, it is also based on the 'definitive' version of the play. One of its manuscripts contains all the necessary authorizations for performance, but no theatre records have been found of any production.<sup>9</sup> We shall refer to this version as 'Carnerero'.

All of the translations were composed in verse as theatrical texts, i.e. not in informative prose translations for reading only. The connection of the first and fourth with the theatre is obvious, but even the Santander and the Saviñón could be said to have been rendered for some intended or hoped-for performance. The Santander is preceded by a very brief note, most of which is a translation of Ducis's own note to the 1770 edition of his *Hamlet*. Yet at the end, right after the author's remarks about the moral qualities of his play, the translator adds: "From which it follows that the audience might extract some usefulness from its performance" ("De que resulta que el público podría sacar utilidad de su representación") – i.e., obviously endorsing the eighteenth-century didactic intention, but also expressing the hope or possibility that this version might be staged. As for the Saviñón rendering, no such note accompanies the manuscripts, though the specificity of the stage directions, together with Saviñón's track record as a performance author, point in the direction of a probable, or at least intended, production.

It has been pointed out that very few of the eighteenth-century Spanish tragedies were truly neoclassical (Ruiz Ramón 1967: 392). For one thing, playwrights did not use alexandrine couplets, the standard medium of French neoclassical tragedy – and of Ducis's versions. Instead, they preferred the hendecasyllabic line, which was occasionally employed in the Spanish theatre of the Golden Age but which, by the eighteenth century, was not regularly rhymed, certainly not in couplets. This is basically the

---

<sup>8</sup> The text appears in three manuscripts (Mss. 268, 275 and 312) kept at the Real Academia Española and distinguished, mainly, by the greater clarity of the stage directions in the first, as well as some verbal differences and the odd line omission. Quotations will be from the first, 'performance' manuscript.

<sup>9</sup> The text intended for performance (Tea 1-36-10) is kept at the Archivo de la Villa de Madrid, while at the Biblioteca Nacional there is another near-identical manuscript version (Mss. 16238) with no such authorizations. Quotations will be from the first manuscript.

choice of the first three Spanish translators of Ducis's *Hamlet*, who make the even lines rhyme in assonance, though Cruz's use of a variety of the *lira*<sup>10</sup> for almost a whole scene (2.5) links him – at least on this point – to a Renaissance Spanish poetic form and distances him from the French model. As for Carnerero, in all but 6 of the 33 scenes which make up his translation he uses hendecasyllabic couplets rhyming in consonance, which, in contrast, is the closest one could get to the French alexandrine couplet. Be that as it may, and with the striking exception of Carnerero, the translators' choice expresses a resistance to a foreign metre and rhyme that were extremely alien to the Spanish theatrical tradition and which would have sounded very artificial and monotonous. Cruz's translation of the title ("Hamleto") could also be interpreted as another attempt at making the play sound a little more Spanish – yet with no lasting success: he was the only one to do so, the final "o" having never been used in Spanish translations of the tragedy since.

But there is one other aspect in which these four translations manipulate their neoclassical original, thus differing from it and among themselves.

### 3

The aspect we have in mind is the treatment of the neoclassical requirement of *vraisemblance*. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* contains, as is known, a ghost. Ducis seems to have been unsure at first what to do about it. In the 1770 edition of his *Hamlet*, the ghost is mentioned in the dialogue as a figment of Hamlet's imagination, i.e. the ghost must not be 'real' or have stage presence. But this edition contains a significant variant scene at the end of act 4, scene 6, which is preceded by the following note: "This is the way in which the end of this act was performed on the first night" ("Voici la maniere dont on a représenté la premiere fois la fin de cet Acte") (Ducis 1770). A few lines further on there is this stage direction: "Re-enter the ghost" ("Le Spectre reparoit"), and then later on the ghost speaks to Hamlet, though all it says is: "Frappe" (i.e., kill your mother). Ducis, therefore, dared to challenge the principle of *vraisemblance* on this point. It appears, however, that his daring was short-lived, as it went no further than the premiere. Besides, the reference to what

<sup>10</sup> It is a *lira* in that it shows a regular alternation of one hendecasyllabic line with three heptasyllabic lines, but it is a variety of it in that the lines rhyme in assonance, whereas the authentic *lira* rhymes in consonance.

was done on the stage that first night reads like a curiosity. One would have thought, therefore, that the attempt was abandoned for good. And yet, the variant scene, with ghost as on-stage character, was reintroduced in the 1778 edition – and in as late an edition as Brussels 1834.<sup>11</sup>

As the Cruz translation could only have been based on the 1770 French edition (in which the stage presence of the ghost is referred to as a discarded idea), it is curious that the translator not only decided to make the ghost 'real', but also to make its 'reality' unambiguously explicit. Cruz does not translate the variant scene, but goes beyond Ducis in act 3, scene 2 in a way that changes the sense of the original decisively. In Ducis there are two stage directions at this point to the effect that the ghost is only seen by Hamlet, i.e. that it does not come onstage: "Seeing the ghost of his father" ("Voyant l'ombre de son pere") and "He sees the ghost again" ("Il voit encore l'ombre"). In the Cruz translation the directions make it clear that ghost appears on stage: first, "The ghost passes over the stage" ("Pasa la sombra de un lado a otro"), then "The ghost passes once more" ("Vuelve a pasar la sombra"), and thirty-seven lines further on, "Exit the ghost" ("Vase la sombra"), i.e. at first the ghost crosses the stage, later to return and remain onstage for these thirty-seven lines.<sup>12</sup>

So it is that Cruz made the ghost appear precisely in a scene in which Hamlet sees it but Gertrude and Ophelia do not, the discrepancy being a part of the dialogue. Cruz's introduction of the ghost here as a stage presence – visible to Hamlet and to the audience – creates a theatrical effect, specifically a dramatic irony, that not only goes beyond neoclassical principles and Ducis's intentions but brings it closer to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*: in the closet scene, the ghost is onstage and visible to Hamlet, but Gertrude cannot see it. We do not think that Cruz's decision was inspired by Shakespeare's text, which he had probably never read, but rather

---

<sup>11</sup> John Golder (1992: 28, 49) asserts that the Ducis ghost was probably never *seen* on the French stage, only heard from – and that only in the premiere. A stage direction like "Le spectre reparoit" should, therefore, be understood as meaning "reappears to Hamlet." This may be true, though of little relevance to the question of what a foreign translator with no knowledge of what had happened on the French stage would make of the written text.

<sup>12</sup> In 1777 Cambon van der Werken, the first Dutch translator of Ducis's *Hamlet*, translated and inserted the variant scene which corresponded to the first acted version, i.e. with the ghost onstage urging Hamlet to kill his mother – she even added the ghost to the list of characters (see Delabastita & D'hulst 1993: 225).

by a theatrical instinct or outlook that made him depart from neoclassical tenets where he thought fit or necessary. Cruz is the only Spanish translator of Ducis's *Hamlet* to make the ghost 'real': the Santander translator simply skips the Ducis variant scene in which the ghost appears, and the other two simply follow the 'definitive' version of 1809 in ruling out its actual physical presence. Saviñón further acknowledges the fact that Hamlet *believes* he sees it by the use of stage directions of his own ("*believing he sees the ghost of his father again*" [*volviendo a creer que ve la sombra de su padre*"]) and, somewhat more problematically, "*seeing the ghost*" [*viendo la sombra*"] in 5.6).

In this context of response to neoclassical principles, it is worth mentioning the curious individual ending in the Biblioteca Nacional manuscript of the Cruz translation, which is not present in the 1900 edition. In the 1770 Ducis text, Hamlet manages to abort Claudius's conspiracy by killing him and stopping the conspirators. Since in Ducis Claudius is Ophelia's father, she apparently turns against Hamlet (whom she calls "barbare") when she sees Claudius's body. Hamlet closes the play saying that he has done his duty and suggesting that, in so doing, he has lost Ophelia ("I love you and lose you") ("*Je t'adore & je te perds*"). The text leaves a possible reconciliation open, but does not mention it explicitly. In its three manuscripts the Cruz translation amplifies this ending but basically mimics the action of the Ducis text. However, in the manuscript kept at the Biblioteca Nacional, nine lines are added that change the sense of the ending decisively. In them Ophelia offers the possibility of reconciliation, Hamlet takes her at her word and is received by her with open arms. In the last two lines, spoken by "todos" ("all"), the noble audience's pardon for the company's mistakes is sought.

This explicitly happy ending, which was not used in the theatre, may have been conceived of as an alternative – one that looks like an imitation of the endings of Spanish seventeenth-century plays in both the reconciliation achieved and the apology for the actors's errors. The ending may not even be the translator's, but the copyist's. Since it was not printed or acted, what little effect it may have had was on the readers who bought possible manuscript copies.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> In both the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries manuscripts of plays were sold for reading purposes only.



There is also a double ending to the Saviñón manuscript kept at the Real Academia Española, though both options had been exploited by Ducis in different editions of the so-called 'definitive' version of 1809. Saviñón appears to have preferred the ending which the 1834 Brussels edition of Ducis's *Oeuvres* offers as "Variantes" to *Hamlet*, appending the non-variant scenes in Ducis's text (5.7 and part of 5.8) as "Variantes del Autor" in his own (Ducis 1834). In doing so, he seems to have opted for the more neoclassical of the two possible *dénouements*, since Ducis's variant ending both excludes the on-stage killing of Claudius (5.7) (in Saviñón Hamlet enters in the following scene "with drawn sword" ["con la espada desnuda"] to show that vengeance has been enacted) and includes Elvire's account of Claudius's perfidy to give greater *vraisemblance* to Gertrude's sense of betrayal by her former lover. At the same time, and for a translator who seems to have accepted wholeheartedly Batteux's famous dictum about the importance of rendering things "just the way they are, with no additions, cuts or shifts" ("telles qu'elles sont sans rien ajouter ni retrancher, ni déplacer"),<sup>14</sup> Saviñón had very few qualms about adding, cutting or shifting where he saw fit. Apart from the occasional embellishment or obligatory religious invocation,<sup>15</sup> his most striking modifications seem geared towards defining the character of Hamlet and, in particular, towards softening what may seem an unacceptably severe attitude towards his mother. Hence the very pointed addition to Ducis's original stage direction "*She [i.e. Gertrude] swoons upon a chair. Hamlet places the urn upon the table next to the chair*" ("*Elle tombe sans connaissance sur un fauteuil. Hamlet place l'urne sur une table qui est à côté du fauteuil*"): "*and throwing himself at his mother's feet he speaks what follows with the utmost tenderness*" ("*y echándose a los pies de su madre con la mayor ternura dice lo que sigue*") (5.4). Hence also the grief-stricken addition to Hamlet's final speech: "How am I (ah,

<sup>14</sup> From the *Cours de Belles Lettres* which, together with passages from Petitot, Bitaubé, La Harpe, Delille, the *Encyclopédie* (the entry for 'traduction' in volume 33) and Spain's own neoclassical theorist Luzán, is cited at length in a manuscript (Mss. 346) kept at the library of the Real Academia Española.

<sup>15</sup> Most spectacularly in his rewriting of the oath Hamlet makes his mother swear in Ducis, "No, your mother ... is not an assassin" ("Non, ta mère ... ne fut point criminelle") (5.4), as "I swear and attest my innocence before Heaven" ("juro y atesto al Cielo mi inocencia").

wretch!) to embrace life / when my mother lies in eternal darkness?" ("Qué pueda amar la vida, ¡ay infelice!, / cuando a mi madre cubre noche eterna?") (5.8). How, indeed? (Hamlet's role as suffering hero extends, in Saviñón, beyond the text itself as Ducis's mildly optimistic "doomed to suffer, / I will yet find a way to live, to outlive death" ["réserve pour souffrir, / Je saurai vivre encor; je fais plus que mourir"]) is reworked as "condemned to grief / I shall live to increase my suffering" ["al llanto condenado / viviré para hacer mayor mi pena"] (5.8).

If a certain propriety (what it is seemingly to depict on stage) and filial affection are the keynotes in Saviñón's reworking of Ducis, in Carnerero's later translation, with French fashion now receding and a heavily conservative reinvestment in the work of Spanish Golden Age authors such as Calderón,<sup>16</sup> *vraisemblance* nonetheless returns with a vengeance – mainly in the text's accretions. Amongst the numerous additions to the Ducis original are several which seem geared towards the fleshing out of characters, especially Claudius and Gertrude (referred to throughout the play and in the list of *dramatis personae* as "La Reyna"), making explicit and, if necessary, reiterating the motivation for their acts. "To soothe my conscience ... That is my intention" ("Consolar mi conciencia ... Ése es mi intento") informs the Queen in I.4, in a soliloquy which is four times the length of the same speech in Ducis; Claudio, meanwhile, provides a running commentary on his action, comparable only to that of Iago in *Othello*, with the following class-based rationale: "Whether they be criminal or not, mighty deeds / are incapable of inspiring the common sort; / and those who undertake actions such as ours / fail to achieve their ends, unless they learn the art of dissimulation" ("Criminales o no, los grandes hechos/ entrar no pueden en vulgares pechos;/ y los que acciones cual la nuestra emprenden,/ del fin se alejan, si a fingir no aprenden") (3.4). Such 'insights' are central to Carnerero's overall design which seems to have been to fill in the psychological gaps in Ducis's text in pursuit of an, at times, dubious *vraisemblance*.

There is, however, a further set of additions which seem prompted more by a native dramatic tradition than by imported concepts such as *vraisemblance*. Thus from the very outset Hamlet's

<sup>16</sup> See Carnero (1997) for the ideological implications of the reinstatement of Calderón.

vengeance is cast in terms of outraged honour, and by none other than the “ghost” whose words Hamlet is citing: “Beloved child ... / your hopes are just ones, as are your doubts; / but if you will dare all for my honour’s sake / then it is for blood I ask and blood that you must shed” (“Hijo amado ... / justa es tu expectación, tu duda es justa; / pero si a todo por mi honor te atreves, / sangre te pido y sangre verter debes”) (2.5; emphasis added). Satisfying old Hamlet’s blood at the expense of Claudio’s becomes the main thread of a plot which, as Voltimán in the last act declares,<sup>17</sup> leads inevitably to the triumph of honour over death: “To death ... or to glory ... for to die for this / is to die with honour. Oh happy death” (“A la muerte ... o al triunfo ... que en tal suerte / es morir con honor, dichosa muerte”) (5.5).

## 5

It may seem paradoxical that, of all four translations, the first, dated 1772, is the least neoclassical, whereas the last, dated 1825, despite its neo-baroque honour code, is the most. If Ramón de la Cruz was indeed the author of the translation which has been attributed to him, he was certainly very open to foreign drama and indeed is credited with some fifty translations or adaptations of French and Italian plays. However, as a dramatist in his own right who occupies a notable place in eighteenth-century Spanish comedy, he is both a more solid literary figure than the other three and is rightly linked with the Spanish theatrical tradition. That the other three translations of Ducis’s *Hamlet* should owe more to neoclassicism than Cruz’s can be accounted for by the persistence of its tenets in a country where, for a variety of reasons, including those of cultural politics, Romanticism came late, and therefore by a wish to adhere as closely as possible to the French original. More specifically, the sheer success of this *Hamlet* on the French stage, where it was performed 203 times between 1769 and 1851,<sup>18</sup> might also have encouraged the other three translators to produce their own versions for the Spanish stage, even if they were never performed.

<sup>17</sup> In so doing, he replaces Elvire in Ducis’s play, presumably on the grounds that such high-sounding words were more seemly in the mouth of soldier rather than of a lady-in-waiting.

<sup>18</sup> In the decade of the 1830s alone, i.e. at the so-called “peak” of the Romantic movement, the play was performed no fewer than 65 times by the Comédie Française (Benchetrit 1956).

The case of France and also the Netherlands, where the two Dutch renderings of Ducis's *Hamlet* were "the only kind of *Hamlet* to be performed before Burgersdijk's translation in 1882" (Delabastita 1993: 226), show the persistence of the model in other European countries. A comparative study of this persistence in these and other cultures would, we suspect, reveal further cases of assimilation and instances of revision. This would open some interesting avenues of research, avenues, which, however, extend beyond the scope of the present paper.

### References

- Aguilar Piñal, F. 1981-1999: *Bibliografía de autores españoles del siglo XVIII*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Andioc, R. 1988: *Teatro y sociedad en el Madrid del siglo XVIII*. Madrid: Castalia.
- Benchetrit, P. 1956: "Hamlet at the Comédie Française: 1769-1896." *Shakespeare Survey* 9: 59-68.
- Berg, W. 1896: *Anteckningar om Göteborgs Aldre Teatrar*. Vol. 1. Göteborg: Zachrissons boktryckeri.
- Carnero, G. 1997: "El teatro de Calderón como arma ideológica en el origen del Romanticismo conservador." *Estudios sobre teatro Español del siglo XVIII*. Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza. 215-50.
- Delabastita, D. 1993: "Hamlet in the Netherlands in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries. The Complexities of the History of Shakespeare's Reception." Delabastita & D'hulst, L. (eds.). 1993: 219-33.
- Delabastita, D. & D'hulst, L. (eds.). 1993: *European Shakespeares. Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Ducis, J.-F. 1770: *Hamlet, Tragédie, Imitée de l'Anglois*. Paris: Gogué.
- Ducis, J.-F. 1834: *Oeuvres de J. F. Ducis*. Vol. 1. Brussels: Lacrosse.
- Golder, J. 1992: *Shakespeare for the Age of Reason: The Earliest Stage Adaptations of Jean-François Ducis 1769-1792*. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation.
- Heylen, R. 1993: *Translation, Poetics and the Stage: Six French Hamlets*. London: Routledge.
- Levin, Y. D. 1993: "Russian Shakespeare Translations in the Romantic Era." Eds. Delabastita and D'hulst. 75-90.
- Petrone Fresco, G. 1993: *Shakespeare's Reception in 18th Century Italy. The Case of Hamlet*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Ruiz Ramón, F. 1967: *Historia del teatro español (desde sus orígenes hasta 1900)*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Taylor, G. 1991: *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present*. London: Vintage.
- Van Tieghem, P. 1947: *Le Prérromantisme*. Paris: Sfelt.

- Vanderhoof, M. B. 1953: "Hamlet: A Tragedy Adapted from Shakespeare (1770) by Jean-François Ducis." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 97.1: 88-142.
- Williams, S. 1990: *Shakespeare on the German Stage, Volume 1: 1586-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zurowski, A. 1976: *Szekspiriady Polskie*. Warsaw: Pax.