

Karen Sullivan\* and Elena Bandín

# Censoring metaphors in translation: Shakespeare's *Hamlet* under Franco

**Abstract:** In the three versions of *Hamlet* translated during the Franco regime in Spain, metaphors related to the censored themes of sex and religion were altered or removed. In this study, we employ the Metaphor Identification Procedure (Pragglejaz Group 2007) to identify all metaphors involving sex and religion in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and its three Franco-era Spanish translations. We find that under the influence of censorship, authors employ many of the strategies for metaphor translation also used for uncensored texts, such as those identified by Newmark (1981), van den Broeck (1981), and Toury (1995). However, we argue that censorship encourages strategies judged as less preferable, more extreme, or which are not usually discussed in translation studies. These strategies appear to be selected specifically to remove the material subject to censorship, whether this is found in the source domain (vehicle) or the target domain (tenor) of a metaphor.

**Keywords:** metaphor, translation, censorship, *Hamlet*, Shakespeare

DOI 10.1515/cog-2014-0016

Received May 8, 2013; revised February 24, 2014; accepted March 17, 2014.

## 1 Introduction

Under the best of circumstances, metaphors can pose difficulties for translation. Translators wrestle with how to balance “faithfulness” and “comprehensibility” (Dobrzyńska 1995), or how to optimize the “accuracy” of a translated metaphor (Newmark 1981). Metaphor translation strategies have been listed, classified, assessed (van den Broeck 1981; Toury 1995; Dobrzyńska 1995; Schäffner 2004), and even numerically ranked (Newmark 1981).

What, then, happens to metaphor translation when conditions are less than ideal, and censorship is a greater concern than faithfulness and

---

\*Corresponding author: Karen Sullivan: University of Queensland. E-mail: [ksull@uq.edu.au](mailto:ksull@uq.edu.au)  
Elena Bandín: University of León. E-mail: [elena.bandin@unileon.es](mailto:elena.bandin@unileon.es)

comprehensibility? Do the previously identified strategies still apply? Does the choice of strategy depend on whether the censored topic is found in the source domain (vehicle) or the target domain (tenor) of a metaphor?

To examine how metaphors are translated in censored texts, the current study examines three versions of *Hamlet* translated in Franco-era Spain, using the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) advocated by the Pragglejaz Group (2007). All three *Hamlet* translations employ recognized strategies for translating metaphors, such as replacing the source domain of a metaphor with another source domain (van den Broeck 1981; Newmark 1981; Toury 1995; Schäffner 2004).<sup>1</sup> Strategies of this kind are necessary in translation, and are not usually the result of censorship. However, we suggest that the influence of the censor board under the Franco dictatorship encouraged translators to change certain metaphors, such as those with sexual and religious themes, in more extreme ways than required to “render them as accurately as possible”, the goal of uncensored translation according to Newmark (1981: 87).

One way to identify unnecessarily extreme changes is to compare the three *Hamlet* translations. When translator José María Pemán renders *In the secret parts of Fortune* (2.2.247) as *en el amor* ‘in the love’ of Fortune, we know that this adaptation is not a linguistic necessity, because the versions of *Hamlet* translated by Antonio Buero Vallejo and Nicolás González Ruiz both reproduce the metaphor as *en las partes secretas de la Fortuna* ‘in the secret parts of Fortune’. Pemán chose to translate this metaphor less directly than the other authors, apparently in order to remove the reference to sexual ‘secret parts’.

The three translators in the current study left no commentaries on their translation of individual passages such as *In the secret parts of Fortune*. However, a comparison of the three translations and the themes of censorship in Franco-era Spain (Oliva 1989, 2002; Merino and Rabadán 2002) indicates that the source or target domains of censored metaphors often aligned with the topics of Francoist censorship in general, which suggests that censorship played a role in the authors’ translations.

Further evidence of censorship as a motivating factor is provided by a comparison of the aspects of metaphoric structure that were changed, replaced or removed by the translators’ strategies. When the source domain of a metaphor was sexual or religious but the target domain was not, the source domain was often changed but the target-domain meaning was translated as accurately as possible. When the target domain itself was the problem, the metaphoric language was

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that the “source” and “target” domains of conceptual metaphors should not be confused with the “source” and “target” languages in translation.

either retained or removed entirely. Across the three translations in our study, 37% of the metaphors with sexual or religious source domains were translated as instances of the same conceptual metaphor, 34% were removed entirely, and 29% were translated as different metaphors or non-metaphoric paraphrases. In contrast, 61% of the metaphors with sexual or religious target domains were translated with the same metaphor, 33% were removed, and only 5% were translated as different metaphors or non-metaphoric paraphrases. We suggest two reasons why metaphors with sexual or religious target domains were rarely translated as different metaphors or without metaphor. First, *Hamlet* involves little actual sex, and few pagan figures such as fairies or witches, so most target-domain material did not require censorship. Second, it is more difficult to change a target domain than a source domain and still produce a meaningful translation (see Section 4.2).

The three translations were, on average, 67% the length of the full text in Spanish. The baseline full-length Spanish word count, with which the three translations are compared, is taken from Buero Vallejo's script of *Hamlet* that was licensed for publication but not for public performance (see Section 2.3). This full-length script will here be termed Buero's "published script" and contrasted with the "performed scripts" by Buero and the two other playwrights. Scripts licensed for performance were subject to far stricter censorship than scripts published in text form. As compared with Buero's published script, the three performed scripts in our study removed 33% of the total words, partly for reasons of censorship, but mostly in order to shorten the play. That is, most metaphor removals can be attributed to the overall reduction in length of the performed versions of *Hamlet*. On the other hand, the replacement, alteration or addition of metaphors cannot be explained by the need to shorten the plays, since these strategies do not usually result in shorter translations. The changes to these metaphors were motivated by other factors, such as the need to pass censor review.

We also found that the performed scripts employed three strategies not considered by Newmark (1981) and van den Broeck (1981), two of which were noted by Toury (1995). These consist of the replacement of one metaphor with an entirely different one, the replacement of non-metaphoric language with metaphor, and the insertion of a metaphor where no analogous content existed in the source text. These three strategies were especially favoured by translator José María Pemán, whom we will argue was the staunchest supporter of the Franco regime (see Section 2.3). These strategies did not shorten the plays and were not necessitated by the translation task. Instead, the three strategies promote Francoist values at the expense of "accuracy", "faithfulness" and "comprehensibility", characteristics that translators are encouraged to optimize in contexts not subject to censorship (Newmark 1981; Dobrzyńska 1995).

## 2 Background to the study

The current study employs the findings of three existing lines of research. First, it draws on studies of metaphor translation in uncensored texts, in order to compare these methods with the translation strategies in the Spanish versions of *Hamlet*. These studies will be discussed in Section (2.1). Second, the recognized themes of censorship during the Franco regime permit the study to focus on the metaphors that are likely to be affected by censorship (Section 2.2). Finally, the political views of the three Spanish translators must be taken into consideration, in order to help explain the differences between their translations (Section 2.3).

### 2.1 Strategies for metaphor translation

In order to examine the effects of censorship on metaphor translation, the translation of metaphors in uncensored texts must first be understood. Several typologies of metaphor translation strategies have been suggested (summarized in Schäffner 2004), beginning with van den Broeck (1981). Van den Broeck's three translation options have been included in all subsequent typologies of metaphor translation strategies. For this reason, these three categories are here presented first, and then expanded upon as more recent typologies are introduced.

Throughout this paper metaphors will be described in terms of a source domain that maps to a target domain, as in Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 1999). Several translation theorists, including van den Broeck, use the terms “vehicle” and “tenor”, as is traditional in translation studies (Schäffner 2004: 1255). However, we will consistently refer to these concepts as “source domain” and “target domain”, to ease comparison of the different typologies discussed. Metaphors and mappings will also be described in Conceptual Metaphor Theory terms, purely because this theory continues to provide the most metaphor names and descriptions.

Van den Broeck's first metaphor translation strategy is *sensu stricto*, which we interpret as translation that preserves both the source and target domains of a metaphor. For example, when Hamlet says he must clear *the table of my memory* (1.5.102), this phrase involves no material subject to censorship, and the phrase is translated *sensu stricto* in all three translations. Antonio Buero Vallejo translates this noun phrase as *la tabla de mi memoria* ‘the table of my memory,’ despite the relative inaccessibility of the ‘tablet’ sense of both English *table* and Spanish *tabla*. José María Pemán translates the phrase as *tabletas de mi memoria* ‘tablets of my memory’, and Nicolás González Ruiz as *las páginas de mi memoria* ‘the pages of my memory’. All three translations fall into the *sensu stricto* category, as

all three maintain the same domains. That is, all three conceptualize memories (in the mind) as writing (on a writing surface). The difference in word choice (*tabla*, *tableta*, or *páginas*) does not indicate that the phrases evoke different conceptual metaphors.

The second category of metaphor translation is van den Broeck's "Substitution", in which one metaphor is replaced with another that maps to the same target domain (or one "vehicle" is replaced with another, in van den Broeck's terminology). For example, Buero Vallejo translates Claudius' claim that *the memory be green* of his brother's death (1.2.2) as the assertion that his brother *sigue en nuestra memoria* 'continues in our memory'. The source domain of ripening fruit (which is green when fresh) is replaced by the source domain of moving objects (that pass through a location and then leave it). However, the target-domain meaning of the two metaphors is similar, and indicates that the death of Claudius' brother has not been forgotten. The translated phrase remains metaphoric, and the target domain is comparable, but the source domain and overall conceptual metaphor are different.

Van den Broeck's final category is "Paraphrase", in which a metaphoric expression is translated as a non-metaphoric one. For example, Horatio notes that Hamlet's mother's wedding to Claudius *followed hard upon* the death of Hamlet's father (1.2.385). In Buero's translation, Hamlet's mother and Claudius *tardaron poco* 'delayed little' in marrying after the funeral. The Moving Time metaphor, in which events metaphorically move towards the experiencer (Lakoff and Johnson 1999) was not translated. Rather, Buero opted for a paraphrase that no longer involved the metaphor.

Newmark (1981) expands van den Broeck's three categories into seven. He also recommends certain translation strategies over others. He names van den Broeck's first category, translation *sensu stricto*, as the best strategy. The "Substitution" strategy described above is ranked the next best. Newmark's third-most-preferable strategy is to translate a metaphor as a simile. For reasons discussed below, we did not consider similes as distinct from metaphors in our study. The *Hamlet* translations include metaphors translated as similes, such as when Hamlet accuses Rosencrantz of being *a sponge . . . that soaks up the King's countenance, his rewards, his authorities* (3.6.10–14), and Pemán translates this as *Como esponja que chupa los favores reales* 'Like a sponge that soaks up royal favours'. Here, Pemán has introduced the metaphor with *como* 'like', translating the metaphor as a simile. In all other respects, Pemán's translation is *sensu stricto*. According to many metaphor theorists (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff and Turner 1989; Glucksberg and Keysar 1990; Moder 2008; Sullivan 2013), metaphors and similes involve the same source domains, target domains, and underlying conceptual metaphors. Replacing a metaphor with a simile does not remove any

material that could be problematic for the censor review. This distinction also distracts from concerns such as whether both domains are translated, only the target is preserved, or both domains are replaced, all of which Newmark would consider “simile” if *como* ‘like’ is included. For the purposes of the current study, the presence or absence of *como* ‘like’ was deemed less useful than a categorization based on which domains were changed or deleted. We therefore did not distinguish similes from metaphors in our analysis, and would consider Pemán’s translation of the ‘sponge’ metaphor above as *sensu stricto*.

Newmark’s fourth- and seventh-rated strategies were not employed in the translations. The fourth-rated category consists of the translation of a metaphor (or simile) with a simile plus “paraphrase” – that is, a non-metaphoric translation of the metaphoric material. The seventh-rated category is the same, but consists of a metaphor translated as a metaphor plus paraphrase. These strategies could not be used to eliminate censored material, as they leave both source and target domains intact. Moreover, these strategies were not found anywhere in the texts. The two strategies will therefore not be discussed further.

Van den Broeck’s “Paraphrase”, described above, is rated by Newmark as the fifth-most preferable strategy. Paraphrases occur frequently in the *Hamlet* translations. Newmark also adds the strategy of “deletion, if the metaphor is redundant” (Newmark 1981: 91) as the sixth-best strategy in his list of seven. For the purposes of our analysis, we will not include Newmark’s specification that the deleted metaphor must be redundant, for there are other reasons that a translator might need to remove a metaphor, including shortening a text or passing censor review.

In sum, then, seven strategies of metaphor translation were ranked by Newmark (1981), four of which are relevant in the *Hamlet* translations: *sensu stricto*, substitution, paraphrase, and deletion. We additionally observed three strategies not included by van den Broeck (1981) or Newmark (1981). First, one metaphor may be replaced with an entirely different one. That is, both the source and target domains may be substituted. Van den Broeck (1981) and Newmark (1981) consider only source domain replacement (Newmark’s “replacing the image”) and do not discuss the possibility of replacing the metaphor entirely. Toury (1995) discusses the replacement of metaphors, but does not distinguish between source domain replacement and replacement of both domains. We suggest that the substitution of an entire metaphor is distinct from the substitution of only the source domain, and should be considered a separate category.

The final two strategies we observed are among those identified by Toury (1995). Toury observes that Newmark’s approach begins with metaphors identified in the source texts, and does not consider metaphors present in translations that lack metaphoric counterparts in the source texts. Metaphors in translations, Toury notes, can arise from the translation of material that is non-metaphoric

in the original texts. For example, Pemán translates Laertes' exclamation *Dear maid, kind sister, sweet Ophelia!* (4.2.167) as *joh tú, jardín de mis primeros besos!* 'Oh you, garden of my first kisses!' The translation involves an image metaphor mapping the gesture of planting seeds to that of kissing (as in the English expression *to plant a kiss*). This speech is one of several in the play that Pemán has chosen to translate as rhyming verse. Here, *besos* 'kisses' is presumably chosen in part to rhyme with *sesos* 'brains' two lines earlier.

Finally, Toury (1995) notes that metaphors can be added without any linguistic counterpart in the source text. This occurs frequently in Pemán's translation of *Hamlet*. At the end of Act 1, Scene 2, when Horatio has just told Hamlet about his father's ghost, Hamlet remarks, *Dinamarca está llena de secretos* 'Denmark is full of secrets', in which secrets are described as objects and Denmark is a container. There is no counterpart to this line or this metaphor in the English text.

These ten options are listed below, in Newmark's order of preference, with the additional three strategies from our observations and those of Toury (1995) listed last. We do not here suggest our own order of preference, but we will at times refer to Newmark's rankings in order to highlight differences between the translations or to point out unusual translational choices. The three strategies not deemed relevant for our study (strategies 3, 4, and 7) are shown in italics.

1. Source and target are reproduced.
2. Source is replaced but target is reproduced.
3. *Source and target are reproduced as a simile.*
4. *Source and target are reproduced as a simile and a non-metaphoric paraphrase is added.*
5. Metaphor is replaced by a non-metaphoric paraphrase.
6. Metaphor is deleted.
7. *Source and target are reproduced and a non-metaphoric paraphrase is added.*
8. Source and target are replaced.
9. Non-metaphoric expression is replaced by metaphor.
10. Metaphor is added.

Of the seven relevant strategies, numbers 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9 were employed by all three translators considered in the study. Strategies 8 and 10 were found only in the translation by Pemán.

## 2.2 Censored themes

All censorship examined here is self-censorship, meaning that the translators censored their own work to avoid conflict with the censor board, rather than have

changes mandated by the board following a review. Self-censorship was abundant in Francoist Spain due to the secrecy and unpredictability of the censor board, which issued no official regulatory laws until 1963, several years after the publication of the translations considered here. To avoid the delay, disgrace and danger of official censorship, authors and translators attempted to predict which material would be objectionable to the board and removed or changed this material (Bandín 2007).

Despite the regime's secrecy, self-censorship was informed by an awareness of the themes that were likely to conflict with the triad of values of the so-called national Catholicism: God, country and family. Objectionable themes can be grouped into the following categories (Oliva 2002: 143):

1. Sexual morals
2. Political opinions
3. Use of language
4. Religion

These themes guided the analysis in the current study. If a given source or target domain related to one of these themes was systematically eliminated, we took this as probable evidence of self-censorship. In our study, we found few examples of possible censorship based on "Political opinions", perhaps because the political struggle in *Hamlet* was set in a foreign land. The foreignness of the setting is emphasized in a few cases of metaphor insertion or replacement, such as Pemán's addition of the line *Dinamarca está llena de secretos* 'Denmark is full of secrets', noted in the previous section. Pemán's mention of 'Denmark' may be intended to emphasize the foreignness of the setting, and to dissuade comparisons between the political situation in *Hamlet* and that of Francoist Spain. However, most political metaphors were translated *sensu stricto*, so we chose not to include political metaphors in our study.

"Use of language" often coincided with "Sexual morals" or "Religion". For instance, when Hamlet refers to Fortune as a *strumpet* (2.2.504) and the translators remove or replace this reference, these translation strategies could be attributed to the word *strumpet* or to the sexual source domain. Offensive language in Shakespeare's English typically relates to sexual morals or religion, so these themes are often intertwined (Partridge 2001). For our purposes, "Use of language" was of interest only when it was deemed metaphoric according to the procedure for metaphor identification described in Section (3). We therefore only considered examples of "Use of language" when they also corresponded to "Sexual morals" or "Religion".

In sum, the potentially self-censored metaphors included in our study relate to "Sexual morals" (as in references to prostitution, sex, and procreation), or to



“Religion” (such as paganism, blasphemy, sin and witchcraft). As these are recognized themes of censorship under the Franco regime, their systematic removal or alteration points to an effect of self-censorship.

### 2.3 Three translators and their political views

The current study examines translations of *Hamlet* by three of the most representative Spanish playwrights/translators during the 1939–1975 Franco dictatorship: José María Pemán, Nicolás González Ruiz and Antonio Buero Vallejo, all of whom self-censored their work to obtain approval from the censor board. These three translators were selected based on their range of political persuasions, which were expected to impact their self-censorship. The play *Hamlet* was chosen on the basis of its long history of translation and performance in Spain (Campillo Arnaiz 2005) and due to the existence of translations by the three authors described above.

Of these three translators, José María Pemán was arguably the staunchest supporter of the Franco dictatorship, and indeed has been dubbed the most important intellectual figure of the Franco regime (Álvarez Chillida 1996: 121). As such, Pemán was entrusted with the text of *Hamlet* to be performed in 1949 at the Teatro Español national theatre. During and after the Civil War, Pemán was devoted to the propagandistic campaign of the *Falange*, which “was entrusted with overseeing the nation’s moral hygiene in the early years of the regime” (Gregor 2010: 90). Pemán took this responsibility to “moral hygiene” seriously. Indeed, we will see that MORALITY IS CLEANLINESS is one of his favourite metaphors.

González Ruiz was also a follower of the Franco regime. He supported the official censorship and even saw it as a kind of creative activity in its own right (Gregor and Bandín 2011: 144). Due to his political conservatism, González Ruiz was selected by the controversial theatre company manager Nuria Espert to translate the version of *Hamlet* examined here. Espert counted on González Ruiz’s politically conservative translation to pass censor review, enabling her company to perform the script in a manner which “succeeded in presenting a radical repertoire despite the censorship regulations within which they were obliged to exist” (Delgado 2003: 138). Both Pemán and González Ruiz, then, were self-described supporters of the Franco regime.

In contrast to the other translators, Antonio Buero Vallejo belonged to the small group of “dangerous” authors who remained in Francoist Spain and were kept under close scrutiny by the regime. Buero Vallejo, a proponent of the 1960s trend of social realism, offered an anti-romantic *Hamlet*, to be performed at the Teatro Español in 1961. The censors carefully examined his translations, and

despite Buero's self-censorship, refused to authorize his *Hamlet* until two passages were modified or removed.<sup>2</sup> The censors' unfavourable comments begin by describing the text as "good Castilian Spanish" – faint praise by any standards – and go on to critique the script as too "solemn and pompous", and "lacking in the humorous and sarcastic tone abundant in the original work".<sup>3</sup>

Antonio Buero Vallejo produced two versions of *Hamlet*. The first of these was a version designed to be performed, and the second was a longer script licensed for publication, but barred from public performance. The performed script was subject to a stringent censor review, conducted by the Theatre Censorship Office (censorship file 246–61). In this version Buero Vallejo eliminated almost as many metaphors as González Ruiz did in his *Hamlet*. However, Buero's published script was reviewed by a different censor board (the Book Inspection Service; censorship file 5148–62) and was not subject to the same level of censorship as a performed script (Bandín 2007). The published script employs more direct metaphor translations than any of the performed versions. Buero's published script therefore demonstrates that most of the metaphors in the English *Hamlet* could be translated into Spanish, and that the translations that omit these metaphors do so for reasons other than linguistic necessity. Buero's published script therefore provides a baseline to which the three performed translations can be compared.

As noted, the three translators' performed versions of *Hamlet* were reduced in length. The English version of *Hamlet* employed here (Wilkes 1984) contains 32,191 words, minus the front matter but including stage directions. Buero's full-length published script includes 35,567 words, minus front matter but including stage directions. This script was taken as a baseline word length for the text of *Hamlet* in Spanish, to which the three performed scripts could be compared. The three performed versions were of varying lengths, as in Table 1.

The relative length of these texts should be kept in mind when assessing the translation of metaphors, particularly those that were omitted rather than altered or paraphrased. Many metaphors were doubtless eliminated for concerns of length. However, of the sexual and religious metaphors that were not eliminated,

<sup>2</sup> The first censored passage was on page 51, Part 1 (*'para yacer entre las piernas de una doncella'*; 'That's a fair thought to lie between a maid's legs'). The second cut, on page 34, Part II, was the word *hideputas* 'whoreson', uttered by one of the gravediggers. Censorship files of this period are found in the 'Fondo de Cultura' at the Archivo General de la Administración (AGA) in Alcalá de Henares, Madrid. For this particular report on *Hamlet* see AGA (03) 046 SIG 73/09375, File 246–61.

<sup>3</sup> *La traducción de Buero está hecha en buen castellano, quizá tirando a solemne y algo campanudo en ocasiones. Falla el toque cómico-sarcástico en que el original abunda* (Censorship File 246–61). All translations from the Spanish are our own.

**Table 1:** Word count in the Spanish editions of *Hamlet* used in the study

	Buero (published)	Buero (performed)	González Ruiz	Pemán
Word count	35,567	27,935	21,515	21,995
Percentage of words in Buero's script translation	100	78.5	60.5	61.8

almost half were translated by means other than *sensu stricto* across the three performed scripts. These other strategies did not contribute to the shortening of the text, and the choice of these strategies must have been driven by different motivations.

### 3 Methodology

Metaphors were collected in an English edition of *Hamlet* (Wilkes 1984), the Spanish translations by Pemán and González Ruiz, and both the performed and published Spanish translations by Buero Vallejo. Metaphor identification followed the Pragglejaz Group's (2007) Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP). The two authors of this study, one a native speaker of Spanish and one of English, read and coded all five texts. The coders used the Merriam-Webster's Spanish-English Dictionary (2003), the online Oxford English Dictionary (OED 2013), Delabastita (1993) and Partridge (2001). Coding decisions were then compared between the analysts and minor discrepancies resolved. All disagreements resulted either from misinterpretation by the non-native speaker of each language, or from different analyses of Shakespearean English as documented in the OED, Delabastita (1993), and Partridge (2001). These disagreements were resolved in discussion. In this situation, the percentage of inter-coder agreement was not deemed relevant.

We diverged from the MIP in that we considered similes as metaphoric, as discussed in Section (2.1). The distinction between metaphor and simile, albeit significant in other respects (Glucksberg and Keysar 1990; Chiappe and Kennedy 2001; Sullivan 2013) did not seem relevant for the current study. The presence or absence of *como* 'like', for example, does not affect whether the source or target domains of a metaphor are preserved in a translation.

For the Spanish texts, a Spanish audience contemporaneous with the time of translation was assumed. For the English text, an English-speaking Elizabethan audience was assumed. The word meanings attributed to this Elizabethan

audience are the reconstructed word meanings of the time (for example, in the OED, Delabastita 1993, and Partridge 2001). The word meanings of these two eras and audiences were employed as the “contemporary meanings” in step 3b of the MIP: “For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context” (Pragglejaz Group 2007: 3).

As noted (Section 2.2) a significant amount of what might be categorized as Oliva’s “Use of language” was deemed metaphoric according to the MIP. For example, when Hamlet compares himself to a *whore* (2.2.595), Buero translates this as *ramera* ‘prostitute’ in both his translations, but the other two authors omit the phrase. We considered this use of *whore* in the English text to be metaphoric, because the sense of *whore* indicating ‘prostitute’ was the most basic sense in Elizabethan English. In Buero’s translations, *ramera* was likewise deemed metaphoric because it had a more basic sense ‘prostitute’ in contemporary Spanish. The term *ramera* is arguably less offensive in Spanish than *whore* in Elizabethan English, but the metaphor in both translations is the same. Buero’s translation of *whore* as *ramera* was therefore counted as *sensu stricto*, but the other translators were considered to have deleted the metaphor.

After application of the MIP, metaphors were evaluated according to the “contextual meaning” and the “more basic contemporary meaning” of the metaphoric lexical units. Only metaphors with either “more basic” (that is, source-domain) or “contextual” (target-domain) meanings related to Oliva’s themes of censorship (see Section 2.2) were considered in our study. For example, when Hamlet calls Ophelia *metal more attractive* (3.2.110–111) the lexical units *metal* and *attractive* are both metaphoric. The physical pull of magnetic “metal” is mapped onto sexual appeal. These two units were counted as mapping to a sexual target domain.

We included examples with a relatively indirect connection to sex or religion, as in *metal more attractive*, which indicates sexual feelings but not necessarily sexual activity. We did not want to eliminate metaphors on the basis of our subjective impression of what might have been considered sexual or heretical in Francoist Catholicism. We also included metaphors with religious source and target domains that appeared completely compatible with the ideals of Francoist Catholicism, though we did not predict these to be censored in any of the translations. For example, metaphors with unambiguously Christian source domains were usually translated *sensu stricto* by all three authors. When man is compared to *an angel* (2.2.319), this simile is translated *sensu stricto* by all three translators as *un ángel* ‘an angel’. This metaphor was included in our study, though it would not be predicted to conflict with the tenets of Francoism. In the very next line, man is described as *like a god* (2.2.320). This pagan simile is predictably Christianized by two of the translators: Buero translates *like a god* as *semejante a Dios*

‘resembling God’ in both his versions of *Hamlet*, whereas Pemán translates *like a god* as *cercano de Dios* ‘close to God’. Although *like a god* is clearly less compatible with Catholic beliefs than *like an angel*, we included both examples because they both relate to religion.

## 4 Results and discussion

According to the criteria discussed above, we found 98 metaphors in the English edition of *Hamlet* with source domains related to sex or religion, and 45 metaphors with target domains related to these themes. We compared these 143 metaphors with their translations in the three Spanish texts. In the Spanish translations, we found 28 additional metaphors related to sex and religion that had no metaphoric counterparts in the source text. All 28 of these additional metaphors involved the conceptual metaphor MORALITY IS CLEANLINESS.

This section begins by examining the translations of the 98 metaphors with sexual and religious source domains (in 4.1) and then compares these to the 45 metaphors with target domains related to these themes (4.2). The 28 MORALITY IS CLEANLINESS metaphors will be considered alongside the 45 metaphors with sexual and religious target domains, based on their inclusion of the MORALITY target domain, which relates to religion, and usually (in these texts) also to sexuality.

### 4.1 Self-censorship strategies for source domains

Of the 98 metaphors with source domains related to sex and religion, fewer than half were translated *sensu stricto* in any of the three performed translations of *Hamlet*. Even considering that all three performed texts were shortened, this is a low number of metaphors to be translated with the strategy that Newmark, for example, singles out as the best and most preferable (1981). The low level of *sensu stricto* was not necessitated by differences between English and Spanish, as can be seen from Buero’s published script of *Hamlet*, which translated 65 of the 98 metaphors via *sensu stricto*, as illustrated in Table 2.

Following the name of each translation strategy in the first column of Table 2, the parenthetical number indicates the ranking of the strategy in the list in Section (2.1). Strategies not included in Table 2 were not found in our data. For example, no metaphors with religious or sexual source domains were inserted (strategy 10 in the list) so this strategy is not listed in Table 2.

As shown in Table 2, the simplest and most common deviation from *sensu stricto* is the complete removal of a metaphor (strategy 6). When metaphors are

**Table 2:** Translation strategies for 98 metaphors with sexual or religious source domains

Strategy and preferability ranking	Buero (published)	Buero (performed)	González Ruiz	Pemán
<i>sensu stricto</i> (1)	65	39	47	23
replacement of source domain (2)	15	16	12	14
non-metaphoric paraphrase (5)	14	14	8	12
deletion (6)	4	29	31	41
replacement of both domains (8)	0	0	0	8

found in an untranslated text but entirely absent in a translation, several explanations are possible. The metaphor simply may have been cut to abbreviate the text for performance, or it may have been deleted for reasons of censorship. In some cases, deletion appears to have been chosen as a mechanism of censorship when strategies 2 and 5 were not options; that is, when no other relevant source domain was available and a non-metaphoric paraphrase would have been difficult or impossible. For example, the metaphor in (1) maps makeup, which hides a prostitute's ugliness, onto King Claudius' lying words, which direct attention away from his immoral actions.

(1) *KING CLAUDIUS* [aside]: . . .

*The harlot's cheek, beautied with plast'ring art,  
Is not more ugly to the thing that helps it  
Than is my deed to my most painted word . . .  
(3.1.57–59)*

The above metaphor in Shakespeare's text is a special case of the more general conceptual metaphor mapping from SEEING onto KNOWING, which includes a mapping from VISIBILITY onto KNOWNNESS. Invisible things (such as the prostitute's true face) correspond to unknowns (such as Claudius' secret actions), and the reasons for invisibility (makeup) map to reasons for unknownness (Claudius' lies). This novel special case of KNOWING IS SEEING is eliminated in the theatre translations of Pemán, González Ruiz, and Buero. We argue that no satisfactory replacement or non-metaphoric paraphrase of the above metaphor would have been possible, given its novelty and complexity. The metaphor could only be translated *sensu stricto* or deleted. This analysis is supported by the published script version of *Hamlet* by Buero, not intended for public performance and so not subject to the same rigours of censorship. In this translation Buero translates the metaphor in (1) *sensu stricto*, as in (2).

(2) *CLAUDIO* [Aparte]: . . .

*No es más repugnante bajo la seducción de su pintura el rostro de la ramera que mi acción bajo mis mentirosas bondades.*

‘The prostitute’s face, under the seduction of its paint, is no more repugnant than my actions under my false virtue.’

(Buero)

The passage in (2) demonstrates that a *sensu stricto* translation of the metaphor in (1) was possible in Spanish. The omission of the metaphor from all three theatre versions of *Hamlet* must therefore be due to other factors, such as concern with the source-domain image of the prostitute.

After *sensu stricto*, the next-best metaphor translation strategy is the substitution of one metaphor for a different one with the same target domain, according to Newmark (1981). Indeed, after *sensu stricto* and complete deletion, this was the most common strategy in the *Hamlet* texts for translating metaphors with sexual and religious source domains. In substitution, either the source domain may be replaced with an entirely new one, or different mappings may be selected from the same source domain. For example, the metaphor CAUSATION IS PROGENERATION was eliminated several times in the translations, presumably due to the PROGENERATION source domain. José María Pemán replaces this source domain with another when he translates King Claudius’ compliment to Polonius in (3a) as (3b).

(3) a. *KING: Thou still hast been the father of good news.*

(2.2.45)

b. *CLAUDIO: Siempre fuisteis, Polonio, como el abril que llega con la buena noticia de sus flores.*

‘CLAUDIUS: You have always been, Polonius, like April that comes with the good news of its flowers.’

(Pemán)

c. *REY: Tú siempre has sido el padre de las buenas noticias.*

‘KING: You have always been the father of good news.’

(González Ruiz)

d. *CLAUDIO: (Afable) ¡Siempre padrino de buenas nuevas!*

‘CLAUDIUS: (Affable) Always the godfather of good news!’

(Buero)

The original metaphor in *father of good news*, CAUSATION IS PROGENERATION, maps from a PROGENITOR to a CAUSE, and from an OFFSPRING to an EFFECT (Lakoff

and Johnson 1999: 178). According to this metaphor, Polonius, as the cause of Claudius' receiving good news, is conceptualized as its father. Pemán chooses instead to map from a metaphor by which April is personified and 'brings the good news of its flowers' via CAUSATION IS GIVING (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 196). Here, Polonius' causation of good news is seen as April (Polonius) bringing flowers (the news). Although the source domain has been replaced, the target domain of CAUSATION is the same, and the mapped structure in this domain (the CAUSE and EFFECT) is analogous, though the CAUSE and EFFECT are mapped from different source-domain elements. The target-domain meaning, that Polonius has caused the king to hear good news, is similar in each case.

More often, a source domain is adapted rather than replaced completely. If we look at Buero Vallejo's translation of (3a) in (3d), we find that Buero has made a different modification than Pemán. Here, Polonius is the *padrino* 'godfather' of good news, rather than its direct PROGENITOR. In the source domain of PROGENERATION, a GODFATHER has a caretaking role towards an OFFSPRING. The CARETAKER of an OFFSPRING maps to the FACILITATOR of an EFFECT. In this instance of CAUSATION IS PROGENERATION, then, Polonius' causal role is less direct in the target domain than in the original version. Buero apparently saw this change as preferable to mapping from a PROGENITOR itself.

In some cases, source-domain modifications must become elaborate to circumvent a structure that could potentially cause offence. For example, Hamlet's criticism of poor actors in (4a) contains benign target-domain structure (a criticism of actors) but potentially offensive source-domain material in which nature is conceptualized as a craftsperson and its imitators as apprentices. This conflicted with the Catholic view of God as the creator, and the metaphor was eliminated by González Ruiz and altered by Pemán and Buero as in (4b) and (4d).

(4) a. *HAMLET: ... O, there be  
players that I have seen play, ...  
... that I have thought some of Nature's  
journeymen had made men, and not made them well,  
they imitated humanity so abominably.*  
(3.2.28–35)

b. *HAMLET: Cómico he visto ...  
como si El que hizo un día los cardos y las flores  
hubiera hecho, primero, los humanos  
y luego – especie aparte – los actores.*  
'HAMLET: I have seen actors ...



as if He who one day made the thistles and the flowers  
had made, first, humans  
and then – a different species – actors.’  
(Pemán)

c. OMITTED

(González Ruiz)

- d. *HAMLET: ¡Ah! Cómicos he visto representar, . . . de tal modo que llegué a pensar si algún aprendiz del obrador de la naturaleza no se habría metido a fabricar hombres y le salieron aquellos engendros que tan abominablemente imitaban a la humanidad.*

‘HAMLET: Oh! I have seen actors play . . . in such a way that I came to wonder whether some apprentice in the workshop of nature hadn’t been involved in making men and had given rise to those freaks that imitated humanity so abominably.’

(Buero)

Pemán directly replaces *Nature* with *El que hizo un día los cardos y las flores* ‘He who one day made the thistles and the flowers’ (i.e., God). Pemán also omits any reference to an apprentice or journeyman, as God has no apprentices in the Catholic tradition, but personally made all of creation. Pemán did not apparently feel comfortable adapting the Catholic model to accommodate the mapping of an apprentice or journeyman. However, omission of an apprentice leads to further complications, because God is incapable of making mistakes, as an apprentice or journeyman might. Pemán therefore must map from an *especie aparte* ‘separate species’ to actors, rather than from badly created versions of the human species. While the target domain – actors – remains the same as in the original text, Pemán’s version has substantially altered the source domain.

Buero Vallejo renders more minor alterations, referring to *algún aprendiz del obrador de la naturaleza* ‘some apprentice in the workshop of nature’. This metaphor can be interpreted in two ways. First, the ‘workshop of nature’ could be a workshop run by nature, thereby maintaining Shakespeare’s personification of nature. Second, the ‘workshop of nature’ could be the workshop where nature is made, presumably by God. Buero’s translation therefore offers a choice between Shakespeare’s metaphor and a metaphor by which God creates nature in a workshop. This clever ambiguity offers a choice between a *sensu stricto* interpretation and a substitution interpretation, with the latter interpretation presumably available for the benefit of the censor board. In either interpretation, Buero Vallejo has kept an *aprendiz* ‘apprentice’ in the source domain, and attributes the strangeness of actors to this inept apprentice.

Changing a source domain might be thought of as a relatively benign strategy for eradicating problematic source-domain structure. However, examples such as (3) and (4) demonstrate that such changes can range from Buero's subtle, careful modifications in (3d) and (4d), to Pemán's dramatic changes in (3b) and (4b). Translators apparently control the extent to which they modify a metaphoric source domain. They can replace single mappings, as in Buero's shift from *father* to *padrino*, or replace entire source domains, as in Pemán's description of 'April flowers', with substantial differences in the resultant translations.

After source-domain substitution, the next-most preferable strategy for translating metaphoric words or phrases is to paraphrase them with non-metaphoric ones, according to Newmark (1981). This strategy differs from the complete deletion of a metaphor in that the omitted metaphor is replaced with a non-metaphoric translation. In (5d), for example, Buero Vallejo translates *witchcraft* with non-metaphoric *prodigio* 'marvel':

- (5) a. *KING: I've seen myself, and serv'd against, the French,  
And they can well on horseback, but this gallant  
Had witchcraft in't.*  
(4.4.87–89)
- b. OMITTED  
(Pemán)
- c. OMITTED  
(González Ruiz)
- d. *CLAUDIO: A los franceses los conozco bien: he guerreado contra ellos y por cierto que son excelentes jinetes; pero aquel mancebo era en esto un prodigio . . .*  
'CLAUDIUS: I know the French well: I have fought against them and they are certainly excellent horsemen; but this youth was a marvel at it . . .'  
(Buero)

Most non-metaphoric paraphrases in the translations affected single words such as *witchcraft* or *whore*, when these were used metaphorically according to the MIP. These words related to either Oliva's theme of religion, as in example (5), or the theme of sexual morals, as in (6).

- (6) a. *HAMLET: He that hath kill'd my King and whored my mother, . . .*  
(5.2.69)

- b. *HAMLET: Y yo tengo un camino que es Dios quien me lo marca.*  
 ‘HAMLET: And I have a path that God marks out for me.’  
 (Pemán)
- c. OMITTED  
 (González Ruiz)
- d. *HAMLET: . . . ese que mató a mi padre y deshonoró a mi madre . . .*  
 ‘HAMLET: He who killed my father and dishonoured my mother . . .’  
 (Buero)

In (6d), Buero takes the simple expedient of translating metaphoric *whored* as non-metaphoric *denhonoró* ‘dishonoured’. King Claudius has not literally made Hamlet’s mother into a prostitute (the central sense of *whore*), but he has arguably dishonoured her. Paraphrasing the metaphor is a simple strategy that requires no additional alteration. González Ruiz has omitted the passage, probably to shorten his much-abbreviated text, and Pemán has replaced the metaphor with an entirely different one.

Pemán’s replacement translation in (6b) is an example of strategy 8 in our reformulation of Newmark’s list (section 2.1). This strategy removes a metaphor and replaces it with another, unrelated metaphor. The strategy may be intended to offset the removal of one metaphor, thereby maintaining the overall number of metaphors in the work, or perhaps it is merely coincidence that a new metaphor is inserted in the place where another one was removed. Whatever the rationale for its use, this strategy appears rare. In fact, only Pemán employs it in our study, as in his translation (6b) above. Here, Hamlet says *Y yo tengo un camino que es Dios quien me lo marca* ‘And I have a path that God marks out for me’. This requires the substitution of the metaphor in (6a) with a metaphor that maps from a physical path, marked out by a guide, onto a plan of action made known by God.

Metaphors with sexual and religious source domains, then, can be translated in four ways that remove or change the source domain. Two of these strategies, complete deletion (strategy 6) and complete replacement (strategy 8), remove both domains of the metaphor. The other two strategies, non-metaphoric paraphrase (strategy 5) and source-domain replacement (strategy 2), remove only the source domain.

It can be seen in Table 2 that Pemán leads the three translators both in the deletion of metaphors and in complete replacement of metaphors. In comparison, Buero and González Ruiz prefer paraphrase and source-domain replacement, strategies that leave the target-domain meaning relatively intact. In fact, the numbers in Table 2 understate the range of differences between these translators. Considerable variation exists in how a given strategy is employed, as can be

seen in the comparison of Buero and Pemán's translations in (3) and (4). These translations are technically source-domain replacements, but Buero's translations subtly shift the source domain, whereas Pemán's change it completely.

Despite differences between the translators, all three often chose less-preferable strategies on Newmark's list for the translation of metaphors with sexual and religious source domains. As noted, most of the 98 metaphors with these source domains were predicted to be completely compatible with Francoist Catholicism, and were included in our study for the sake of completeness and impartiality. Despite these uncontroversial metaphors, a surprisingly large number of metaphors with religious and sexual source domains were replaced or deleted. Of the 98 metaphors, 14% were translated with changed source domains; 12% were paraphrased without the use of metaphor; 3% were replaced completely; and 34% were deleted. Clearly, the three translations diverge considerably from Newmark's recommended translational practices.

## 4.2 Self-censorship strategies for target domains

Given the large number of sexual and religious source domains that were changed or removed in the translations of *Hamlet*, sexual and religious target domains might be expected to show even more effects of censorship. After all, the purpose of metaphors is to provide inferences about the target domain, which is understood via the source domain. In a sense, metaphors are 'about' the target domain. However, metaphors with sexual and religious target domains appear to have been less impacted by censorship than those with source domains related to these themes.

In the first place, *Hamlet* contains relatively little literal sex. The plot includes sexual tension between Hamlet and Ophelia, Queen Gertrude's relation to King Claudius, and no other sexual activity. There are likewise few religious figures or actions, assuming that the existence of the Ghost was not potentially offensive to Catholic sensibilities (and if it were, the play could scarcely have been translated at all). For these reasons, we found only 45 metaphors with religious and sexual target domains, as opposed to the 98 with source domains related to these themes.

Of these 45 metaphors, a much higher percentage was translated *sensu stricto* than was found for the metaphors with sexual and religious source domains (see Table 3). Overall, 61% of the metaphors were translated *sensu stricto*, compared to only 37% of the metaphors with sexual or religious source domains. Note that the totals in "metaphoric paraphrase" and "insertion" in Table 3 are not counted as among the 45 metaphors with religious and sexual target domains, nor included in calculations concerning the percentage of metaphors translated via specific

**Table 3:** Translation strategies for 45 metaphors with sexual or religious target domains

Strategy and preferability ranking	Buero (published)	Buero (performed)	González Ruiz	Pemán
<i>sensu stricto</i> (1)	39	34	30	19
non-metaphoric paraphrase (5)	4	3	1	3
deletion (6)	2	8	14	23
metaphoric paraphrase (9)	3	0	4	9
insertion (10)	0	0	0	12

strategies, because these two strategies do not translate metaphors found in the source text.

Not only were more of the 45 metaphors translated *sensu stricto* than was the case for the 98 metaphors with sexual and religious source domains, but there was less variety in the translation strategies overall. This is partly due to the fact that only two of the four strategies discussed in Section (4.1) are potentially effective for target domains. Switching source domains can leave the target domain relatively unchanged, so strategy 2 was not employed for the metaphors in Table 3. Similarly, rendering a passage non-metaphoric preserves most religious or sexual themes, so strategy 5 was rare.

Translation *sensu stricto* was the most common method employed by Buero and González Ruiz, followed by deletion. Pemán's favoured strategy was deletion, followed by *sensu stricto*. For unknown reasons, we found no examples in which a metaphor was replaced entirely (strategy 8). This strategy would, of course, eliminate a sexual or religious target domain as well as the source domain. Presumably the rarity of the strategy overall (see Table 2) led to its absence in the translation of the metaphors counted in Table 3.

As usual, Buero's full-length published script had fewer deletions and more instances of *sensu stricto* than any of the scripts licensed for theatre performance. The published script was not intentionally shortened, nor was it subject to the same level of censor review as scripts that were designed to be performed. For all three performed versions, the number of deleted metaphors was almost commensurate with the total shortening of the text (see Table 1). This suggests that most metaphors were deleted due to considerations of length.

A minority of metaphor deletions can be attributed to religious or sexual target domains. For example, both González Ruiz and Pemán delete the two metaphoric units in *No fairy takes, nor witch hath power to charm* (1.1.174), in which we considered *takes* and *hath* as metaphoric. Deletion of this line removed not only the metaphoric verbs, but also the reference to witches and fairies, and may have been motivated by the pagan nature of these target-domain concepts. Overall,

metaphors with religious and sexual target domains were either translated *sensu stricto* or deleted.

Counter to any expectations for translation set forth by Newmark (1981) and van den Broeck (1981), all three translators added several metaphors with a religious target domain, either as a translation of non-metaphoric language (strategy 9 as discussed in Section 2.1) or as a pure addition with no counterpart in the source text (strategy 10). In every case, the added metaphor was MORALITY IS CLEANLINESS, in which uncleanness maps to sin and cleanliness maps to religious virtue.

All three translators employed strategy 9 to translate non-metaphoric language with the metaphor MORALITY IS CLEANLINESS. Buero's full-length published script translated three instances of non-metaphoric language with the metaphor, González Ruiz translated four this way, and Pemán translated nine. Buero's performed script included no instances of this translation strategy. Pemán's most obvious use of the strategy may consist of his version of the words that Hamlet mimes inscribing on his forehead, as a vow to avenge his father's death, in (7b).

(7) a. *HAMLET*:

... *Now to my word:*

*It is 'Adieu, adieu! Remember me'. [Writes]*

(1.5.114–115)

b. *HAMLET*: (*Como si escribiera con su dedo sobre su frente*)

*'Lavar la mancha de este incesto'*

*'HAMLET: (As if writing on his forehead with his finger)*

*"Cleanse the stain of this incest"'*

(Pemán)

c. *HAMLET*: *Ese eres tú, tío. Y ahora a mi consigna, que es: '¡Adiós, adiós!*

*¡Acuérdate de mí!'*

*'HAMLET: And now to my motto, which is: "Farewell, farewell! Remember me!"'*

(González Ruiz)

d. *HAMLET*: [Escribe.]

... *Sí, señor tío; aquí quedas. Y ahora es mi lema,*

*que es: '¡Adiós! ¡Adiós! ¡Y no me olvides!'*

*'HAMLET: And now my motto is: "Farewell, farewell! And don't forget me!"'*

(Buero)

Rather than the non-metaphoric *Adieu, adieu! Remember me*, translated by both González Ruiz and Buero as equally non-metaphoric entreaties, Pemán has Hamlet swear a different, metaphoric oath: *Lavar la mancha de este incesto* ‘Cleanse the stain of this incest’, in which both *lavar* ‘cleanse’ and *mancha* ‘stain’ are metaphoric.

In addition to the nine translations of the type in (7), Pemán added twelve instances of MORALITY IS CLEANLINESS with no counterparts in the original text (strategy 10). For example, Pemán’s Hamlet repeatedly complains of how Claudius ‘has stained my mother’ (*ha manchado a mi madre* [2.2]) in an ‘impure bed’ (*lecho impuro* [3.4]), when Shakespeare’s Hamlet says nothing of the kind. The ‘stained’ queen contrasts with Pemán’s added references to Ophelia’s virtuous ‘purity’ (*pureza* [3.1]). Though Pemán deleted numerous metaphors which he considered inconsistent with Francoism, MORALITY IS CLEANLINESS was apparently so consistent with Pemán’s worldview that he added it repeatedly to his script of *Hamlet*, either in the place of non-metaphoric language or without any apparent counterpart in the English text.

## 5 Conclusion

In the three Franco-era translations of *Hamlet*, metaphors related to the censored themes of sex or religion are rarely translated *sensu stricto*. Most of the time, these metaphors are translated in ways not recommended for translations in general. In the texts examined here, the strategies for metaphor translation are motivated less by “accuracy” and more by the measures that the translators deemed necessary to remove sexual or religious material. These measures, in turn, are influenced by two major factors: (1) whether the sexual or religious content is in the source or the target domain, and (2) the attitude of the individual translator.

Certain translation strategies are preferred for sexual or religious source domains, and some are more effective for target domains. When the source domain contains sexual or religious material, this source domain is frequently replaced by a different source domain (strategy 2) or by non-metaphoric material (strategy 5). Alternatively, the entire metaphor may be deleted (strategy 6). When the target domain is the problem, the metaphor is usually deleted. For both source- and target-domains, strategies that merely add explanatory material to the metaphor (strategies 3, 4 and 7) are not effective. Strategies 4 and 7 were found nowhere in the *Hamlet* translations.

Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* frequently includes sexual and pagan source domains, such as those in examples 2–6. Fortunately for the translators, source-domain material is easier to alter or remove than target-domain content, via

strategies such as source-domain replacement (strategy 2) and non-metaphoric paraphrase (strategy 5), both of which are still relatively high on Newmark's scale of preferability.

*Hamlet* includes few potentially offensive target domains. There is little sexual activity in the play, and few pagan deities, witches or fairies. This may have been an advantage for the Franco-era translators, because a target domain is difficult to seamlessly remove from a text. Changes to the source domain do not necessarily remove sexual or religious content in the target domain, so strategies 2 and 5, like strategies 1, 3, 4 and 7, cannot be used to censor a target domain. This leaves complete replacement (strategy 8) and complete deletion (strategy 6) as the only options.

Metaphor translation in the *Hamlet* texts depended not only on the locus of the sexual or religious material, but also on the individual translators. When Pemán replaced a source domain via strategy 2 (as in examples [3] and [4]), González Ruiz and Buero sometimes employed *sensu stricto*, metaphor deletion, or any strategy in between. Pemán is the most enthusiastic in his addition of metaphor (specifically MORALITY IS CLEANLINESS), adding this metaphor via strategies 9 and 10 over five times more often than either of the other translators.

Nevertheless, the three translators seemed to agree that certain metaphors could not be left in the text. Referring to nature as the creator of humans, as in (4), is clearly in conflict with the tenets of Francoist Catholicism and could not be translated as unambiguously *sensu stricto* by any of the translators. Neither would the description of a prostitute's face in (1) be considered appropriate in Francoist Spain for a play to be performed in front of the general public. Despite the translators' many differences, they all avoided *sensu stricto* for certain metaphors with religious and sexually themed source domains.

In future studies of the censorship of metaphor, it may be useful to assess source-domain alterations separately from target-domain changes, as the presence or prevalence of one does not seem to entail the presence or prevalence of the other. Moreover, it may be practical to employ Newmark's scale of preferable metaphor translation strategies, or a modified version thereof. A preponderance of low-ranked strategies, not motivated by linguistic necessity, may be indicative of other factors influencing the translation, such as the impact of censorship. A version of Newmark's scale based on the actual translational practices of a range of well-known translators could serve as an even more useful yardstick by which to measure deviations from translational best practice, whether due to censorship, inexperience, or other factors.

**Acknowledgments:** The research for this paper was funded by projects FFI-2011-24160 "La presencia de Shakespeare en España en el marco de su recepción



europea” and FFI-2012-39012-C04-03 “Traducción inglés-español y censura en España (TRACE 1939–1985): cadenas textuales y contexto cultural”. We are grateful to the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness for its support. This work was also supported by a Faculty Fellowship in the Centre for the History of European Discourse at the University of Queensland.

## References

- Álvarez Chillida, Gonzalo. 1996. *José María Pemán: pensamiento y trayectoria de un monárquico, 1897–1941*. Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz. Servicio de Publicaciones.
- Bandín Fuertes, Elena. 2007. *Traducción, recepción y censura de teatro clásico inglés. Estudio descriptivo–comparativo del Corpus TRACETci (1939–1985)*. León: Universidad de León. <https://buleria.unileon.es/handle/10612/1885> (accessed 19 February 2014).
- Campillo Arnaiz, Laura. 2005. Bowdlerizing or maximizing? Two strategies to render Shakespeare’s sexual puns in nineteenth–century Spain. *Ilha do Desterro* 49, 25–36.
- Chiappe, Dan L. & John M. Kennedy. 2001. Literal bases for metaphor and simile. *Metaphor and Symbol* 16(3&4), 249–276.
- Delabastita, Dirk. 1993. *There’s a double tongue: An investigation into the translation of Shakespeare’s wordplay, with special reference to Hamlet*. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi B.V.
- Delgado, María. 2003. *Other Spanish theatres. Erasure and inscription on the twentieth–century Spanish stage*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.
- Dobrzyńska, Teresa. 1995. Translating metaphor: Problems of meaning. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24, 595–604.
- Glucksberg, Sam & B. Keysar. 1990. Understanding metaphorical comparisons: Beyond similarity. *Psychological Review* 97, 3–18.
- Gregor, Keith. 2010. *Shakespeare in the Spanish theatre: 1772 to the present*. London: Continuum.
- Gregor, Keith & Elena Bandín. 2011. The role of the censor in the reception of Shakespearean drama in Francoist Spain: The strange case of *The Taming of the Shrew*. In Alberto Lázaro & Catherine O’Leary (eds.), *Censorship across borders*, 143–160. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the flesh*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Turner. 1989. *More than cool reason*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Merino, Raquel & Rosa Rabadán. 2002. Censored translations in Franco’s Spain: The TRACE project – theatre and fiction (English–Spanish). *TRR: traduction, terminologie, redaction* 15(2), 125–152.
- Merriam-Webster’s Spanish-English Dictionary*. 2003. Springfield, Mass.: Merriam-Webster Inc.
- Moder, Carol. 2008. It’s like making a soup: Metaphors and similes in spoken news discourse. In Andrea Tyler, Yiyoung Kim, & Mari Takada (eds.), *Language in the context of use: Discourse and cognitive approaches to language*, 301–320. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Newmark, Peter. 1981. *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Oliva, César. 1989. *El teatro en España desde 1936*. Madrid: Alhambra.
- Oliva, César. 2002. *Teatro español del siglo XX*. Madrid: Síntesis.
- Partridge, Eric. 2001. *Shakespeare's bawdy*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Pragglejaz Group. 2007. MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 22(1), 1–39.
- Oxford English Dictionary: The definitive record of the English language*. 2013. Online edn. www.oed.com. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schäffner, Christina. 2004. Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 1253–1269.
- Sullivan, Karen. 2013. *Frames and constructions in metaphoric language*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Van den Broeck, Raymond. 1981. The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation. *Poetics Today* 2(4), 73–87.

### Primary Sources

- Buero Vallejo, Antonio. 1961. *Hamlet*. Theatre Script in Censorship File 246–261. AGA (03) 046 SIG 73/09375.
- Buero Vallejo, Antonio. 1962. *Hamlet*. Madrid: Alfil. Censorship File 5148–62.
- González Ruiz, Nicolás. 1960. *Hamlet*. Theatre Script in Censorship File 147–160. AGA (03) 046 SIG 73/09332.
- Pemán, José María. 1949. *Hamlet*. Theatre Script in Censorship File 192–149. AGA (03) 046 SIG 73/08871.
- Wilkes, Gerald A. (ed.) 1984. *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. Sydney, Australia: Sydney University Press.