PORTUGUESE-SPEAKING SHAKESPEARE IN TWO RECENT ANNOTATED TRANSLATIONS OF *LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST*[1]

Beatriz Viégas-Faria

Introduction

It was upon reading John Jowett's 2007 *Shakespeare and Text* that I had a first glimpse of an idea for an article to be written about Shakespeare in translation. Some of the passages in Jowett's book did strike me as passages that could be read as if they were discussing and actually explaining the importance and the complexities (and non-transparency) of non-English texts that take on themselves the task of conveying Shakespeare to their potential readers. So, I would like to quote the following few passages from Jowett's work and ask that you read it while thinking of Shakespeare in translation.

> 'Text' is the mode in which Shakespeare's works exist. From this perspective, text is the very essence of Shakespeare. Locutions such as 'I often read Shakespeare' make the point. "Shakespeare and text" might virtually mean 'Shakespeare as text'. 'Shakespeare as text' is potentially limitless. A Shakespeare text does not depend for its identity on the author's name appearing on the title page, for this would exclude some of the early and most authoritative printings. Nor does it depend on its appearance in Shakespeare's lifetime, for many of his now best-known plays remained unprinted until 1623, seven years after his death. 'Shakespeare as text' might reach out to refer to any and all Shakespeare works ever printed, copied, digitized, or remembered, from the early 1590s to today. (p.3-4)

Once we assume the translator is the author of the translated text, in a country such as Brazil, when any one person says *'Leio Shakespeare a toda hora'* ('I often read Shakespeare'), unless this person can read Shakespeare in English, this will actually mean 'I often read Shakespeare translated into Portuguese'. And unless this person enjoys comparing different translations, he will not know which translator wrote the copy he read of any given play or sonnet. It is common practice that

---

[1] This paper was presented at the 2010 International Shakespeare Conference (held at The Shakespeare Institute, Stratford-upon-Avon), in the Seminar "Shakespeare Translator's Footnotes and Introductions (mediating the mediation between Shakespeare and the non-English speaking reader)."

Literature teachers tell their students to read any translation of *Romeo and Juliet*, for instance, whether these are secondary school or university students.

The excerpt quoted above, from John Jowett's *Shakespeare and Text*, reminds us of Foucault's concept of author-function, and Jowett himself (2007, p.23) mentions Foucault: "it is only through seeking to describe the artistic, cultural, and material aspects of authorship and collaboration with respect to particular texts that any notion of the author can be founded, whether romantic or post-dating Michel Foucault's metamorphosis of authorship from the act of writing to the construction of the authorial figure through acts of publication and reception". This is an important issue here, for the concept of author-function is studied by Mittmann (2003), and she presents the concept of translator-function, as will be seen further ahead in this paper.

John Jowett (2007, p.5) points out that he works with the notion of "a textual world in which the categories by which we describe things are blurred, traditional interpretations are open to challenge, and the condition of text itself is unstable. [...] Text is puzzling, Protean, and capable of shifting beyond reach at the very point where we try to grasp it".

In the last chapter of his *Shakespeare and Text,* John Jowett discusses a *sine qua non* of textual production: the readers. Given that I believe no translation project is complete if the translator does not have in mind his[2] potential readership, the following is yet another passage that fits extremely well concepts that are vital in helping us think about the creative translation process:

> At the other end of the process that the text enacts lies the reader, as implied addressee, as bearer of cultural value, and as actualization of the market in which the book as a commodity circulates. [...] it is the book as a material object that actualizes the text [...] Most readers still experience Shakespeare through the medium of print, and use modern-spelling editions. [...] Modern spelling and punctuation, and enhanced stage directions, are two areas where editing addresses the readers' interests rather than the actual foundations of the text. (p.158).

In that very chapter, "Texts for Readers", Jowett (p.158-9), in defining a Shakespeare edition and the tasks of the editor, is defining a translation product as well, and the tasks of the translator:

> An edition [A translation] might be defined as a mediation of a text to a [non-English speaking] reader. The phrase raises major issues not only about the 'text', [...] but

---

[2] Whenever in this paper I write "he", "his", please understand "he/she", "his/hers".

also the nature of the communication that the editor [the translator] seeks to enable. Beyond the text of the play, the modern critical [translated] edition includes some or all of a number of elements: a record of the foundation of the text (typically a collation line or textual notes); a commentary explaining and contextualizing words and expressions, justifying textual decisions, and perhaps exploring the theatrical dimension of the script, an introduction dealing with text [and translation], critical reception, theatre history [of Shakespeare in our non-English speaking culture], and other matters, appendices of supplementary information such as extracts from source material, and visual illustrations. The basic form will follow the guidelines for the series to which the [translated] edition belongs. But there remains scope for each editor [translator] to shape his or her edition in ways that no other editor [translator] would follow, to an extent that is often apparently belied by the shoe-horning of the material into the series format. The editor [translator] too is an author, and intends certain outcomes.

The translations into Portuguese of *Love Labour's Lost* investigated for the purposes of this paper were two: Aimara da Cunha Resende's 2006 Brazilian translation, *Trabalhos de amor perdidos,* and Rui Carvalho Homem's 2007 Portuguese translation, *Canseiras de amor em vão.* Both translations are part of a series of translated editions that follow *most* of the characteristics listed by Jowett in the above paragraph (there are no visual illustrations in neither of the two publications, for instance). In the following section, I present the passages from both series' Introductions, as well as the passages from both translators' Introductions that deal with the aims of the translated editions and the aims of the translators with reference to the translation process itself. It is interesting to see that the greater number of observations regarding translation in the Brazilian edition are placed in the series' Introduction (under the form of norms for the series' publications), whereas most of these observations in the European edition are included in the translator's Introduction.

The Series' and the Translators' Introductions

"Traduções da Shakespeariana", an Introduction to the Brazilian Series

Each edition will follow the norms of the Series and the translator's choices. The Series asks for one basic text (choice of the translator) among the standard editions in English. This basic text must be compared, during the translation work, with four or five ancillary texts (again, choices of the translator) — renowned internationally for their high academic value.

The translations published in the Series must be "cultural translations", aiming at reaching both readers and theatre professionals. In following the norms of the Series, the translations should seek to "rescue Shakespeare's ideas, verbal creations, imagistic language, richness of sounds and rhythms, and dramaturgic structures".[3]

The cultural translation, according to this introduction to the Series, is seen as the means by which the plays originally written to be seen simultaneously by nobility and the common citizen can possibly reach the Brazilian readership in the 21st century in a way that would be as close as possible to what Shakespeare did at his time, in his country, in his language – especially when it comes to imagistic language, rhythm, puns, wordplays, poetry, popular sayings.

It is important to point out that this introduction to the Series says, "whenever such a [cultural] translation is necessary, it will be explained in footnotes". And footnotes will also be used whenever intertextual material within the original text needs to be acknowledged, in order to clarify the allusions – to make them known and understandable to today's readers.

Introduction to Resende's Translation

In her introduction to the text, the translator mentions some of her translation decisions towards the end, and tells about the choices made in reference to the characters' names. Pointing out that hers is a cultural translation, she lists the names that were not simply given a Portuguese spelling, or else kept in their English spelling, but were substituted with Portuguese words – needed to preserve the comic relevance of the names. Therefore, Resende chooses to translate Costard as Cabeção (big head), Dull as Lerdo (slow), and Moth as Meio-Quilo (half a kilo — a well-known expression, in Brazil, with a pejorative connotation, referring to an undersized person).

Resende writes about the importance of her footnotes when it comes to explaining the allusions that pervade the text of this particular play — especially in relation to mythological and folkloric figures.

---

[3] This and all the other quotes in this paper that are translations from texts originally written in Portuguese were translated by me, and I take full responsibility for any mistakes I might have made.

"Shakespeare para o Século XXI", an Introduction to the European Series

This introduction reports that, although plays by Shakespeare have been translated in Portugal since the last three decades of the 19th century, either to be published or to be staged, a project was needed that would embrace the updated translations of all of Shakespeare's plays, so that the non-English reader in Portugal can enjoy these amazing texts today.

Introduction to Homem's Translation

The translator emphasizes the fact that Shakespeare's plays are texts that were written for a very dynamic theatrical process long before they became canonical (monumental) reading material. In the case of *LLL*, the large number of instances of wordplay (especially puns and malapropisms) makes of it a text that is extremely fun to read and a monumental challenge for translators. According to Homem (2007, p.11), this challenge can be exasperating, given the number of "discourse patterns and verbal ornaments", as well as "forms of regularity" (for instance, rhymes and sonnets within the play)

Besides, the translator of this particular text, says Homem (2007, p.11), faces all the scholarly data that reveal the uncertainty of meaning of so many passages – when the critical editions will give the reader little more than tentative interpretive paraphrases.

And then Homem (2007, p.12) sums up the task of the drama translator, when he mentions he cannot resort to footnotes that will list all the possible readings for each passage of the text (a privilege of scholarly editions), but rather has to choose one version that preserves the largest range of meanings, and as close as possible to the source text — and making sure that the translated text will function on both page and stage.

Homem points out the myriad of cultural references (what I call intertextual material) that appears in the text. The Ancient Greek and Roman classical texts are an important source of intertextuality, and French, Spanish, and Italian words are used in this English play, as well as a multitude of Latin words, phrases, and sentences.

Homem shows that he knows translation theory concepts and history, and mentions Bassnett, Steiner and Venuti (theoreticians in Translation Studies), besides making reference to Delabastita. Therefore, he refers to the more recent tendency among theoreticians to give preference to translation strategies that will "preserve

marks of diversity in the texts to be translated, somehow avoiding that their 'foreign' condition be lost through a process that creates in the reader the illusion that the text in question could have been originally written in the target language" (p.13).

The translator points out, in his Introduction, that the contemporary translator of *LLL* faces two layers of "the foreign": one relates to the fact that the source text was not only written in English, but in Elizabethan English; the other relates to the fact that there is in the play an image carefully built of the foreign or pedantic characters that renders them stereotypical, and therefore a reason for laughter. Examples are Holofernes, the schoolmaster, whose lines are crowded with Latinisms, and the Spanish traveler, Armado, who uses farfetched words (words of Greek and Latin roots), much too sophisticated (thus pedantic and pretentious) in spoken English. All of which means the translator must work very intently in trying to achieve the very same discourse effects in the target language. Since Portuguese is the target language, with most of its vocabulary comprising words of Greek and Latin roots, the translator's task should not be that of literal translation, but of careful reconstruction.

Observations

While Resende explains her translation decisions regarding the names of three characters in her Introduction, Homem talks about his options at the beginning of his end-of-text notes (p.159-160). His intention was to spell names in such a way that they would sound French (to keep the foreign mark of the text as explained in his Introduction). Costard goes by the name Artolas (*tola* = head) in this translation of *LLL* into European Portuguese, and Jaquenetta becomes Jaquinita (feminine and diminutive of Jacques).

Neither Resende nor Homem make reference to the translation of the title, *Love's Labour's Lost.* As for the Brazilian translation, *Trabalhos de amor perdidos,* one assumes Resende took the traditional translation, as it is by now "crystallized" (or "frozen") in the Brazilian Portuguese language and culture. Regarding Homem's title, *Canseiras de amor em vão,* it is apparently (as suggested in the Introduction to the Series "Shakespeare para o Século XXI") an updated version of the traditional title, *Canseiras de amor baldadas* (as found in the bibliographical references to Homem's Introduction to his translation).

A final observation: neither translated edition is bilingual. In the following section, I tried to condense as much as possible some key concepts in Solange Mittmann's 2003 *Notas do Tradutor e Processo Tradutório* (The Translator's Notes and the Translation Process) — those key concepts that I deemed relevant to the purpose of the present study.

Mittmann's Three Categories of Translators' Notes

Mittmann (2003), based on what translation scholars say about translators' notes and on what (French) Discourse Analysis say about footnotes, analyzes translators' footnotes from various works of fiction and non-fiction translated into Brazilian Portuguese, and suggests her own innovative view on translators' footnotes: a discourse-based notion.

Discourse is defined within Discourse Analysis as an effect of meanings between the interlocutors (Pêcheux, 1993, apud Mittmann, 2003, p. 172) — that is to say that author and original-language reader/translator produce meaning and translator/writer and target-language reader produce meaning. In other words, meanings are produced in those interfaces between author, translator, and reader of the translated text. The text is seen as the materialization of the discourse. While a text can (naively) be seen as homogeneous,[4] discourse is always heterogeneous.

Following Foucault's notion of author-function, Mittmann presents the concept of translator-function: "the translator-function is responsible for the organization of the different voices present in the translation process, as well as responsible for steering the translated text towards a certain interpretation, thus giving the illusion of homogeneity and transparency" (2003, p.136). This is so, according to the author, because "the discourse of translation — and even more so, the discourse of the translator's footnotes — does not emerge from and does not end in the translator that enunciates, but rather emerges from the relations with other subjective beings and other discourses, whether identifiable or not" (p.136).

---

[4] Not only Discourse Analysis, Semantics/Pragmatics, and the academic studies on reading support this view, but research work from different areas of knowledge, such as John Jowett's *Shakespeare and Text* and Lukas Erne's *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), give testimony to the complexities (and historicity) of text as materialization of discourse. Moreover, all the scholarly annotated editions of Shakespeare's texts are here to prove one of the main assertions in Discourse Analysis: language is opaque, never transparent, exactly due to its socio-historical movements and changes. Summing up all these variables, we can have a glimpse of the challenges a translator faces when working on texts from past centuries.

The translation process is defined as a discourse-based process that is (a) permanently in relation with other discourses, and (b) a process of production of meanings. According to Mittmann, the translator's footnotes are an extension of the translation process. This means they are not there simply to clarify meaning (as prescribed by the traditional views), nor are they there to solve translation problems that were not solved within the translated text. Clarifying meaning and solving problems are goals of footnotes[5] responding to a concept of translators' notes that follows from the traditional concept of translation as a process of conveying meanings supposedly to be found in the source text itself.

Once we see the translated text as the "result of a particular interpretation that takes place under specific conditions and speaks to an audience that is different from that conceived by the author" (Mittmann, 2003, p.120), translators' notes automatically take on a new definition, and they can be seen as a space that opens itself to discuss the text in translation. And that is when the traditionally prescribed concept of an ideally invisible translator does not hold anymore. According to Mittmann's findings, the description of some translators' footnotes will show that they do not limit themselves to clarifying meaning and explaining details of the cultural context in question; they will go beyond that and actually "comment, interpret and dispute the original text" (p.121). This reveals a translator creating footnotes which "discourse is a portrait of the translation process itself".

At this point, it is important to emphasize that, although the translator is the enunciator of the translated text and of his notes, the translator is not the source of what is asserted, neither does he recovers meanings that naively could be thought to be universal and transparent. As Mittmann puts it, the translator's interpretation "takes place not only at the moment of reading the original text, but also at the moment of producing the translated text and its notes" (p.133), always bearing in mind that the translator is a subjective being, determined by his sociohistorical circumstances. Thus, translators' notes should be seen as the actualization (materialization) of the translator's discourse during the translation process.

Mittmann (2003, p.137) says one can find the "marks of the translator's visibility"[6] in his footnotes, and not only that: in the translators' notes is where one

---

[5] When I write "footnote", please read "footnote and end-of-text note".

[6] Among others, Lawrence Venuti (*The Translator's Invisibility*) is one of the authors from the area of Translation Studies discussed by Mittmann.

finds the forms through which the translator says he is the enunciator of his own discourse.

It is important that we bear this in mind: although the original text, with all its intertextual material, constitute the translation process, the translator opens that particular space, at the bottom of the page or at the end of the translated text where he writes his own original text – visibly marked (numbered) and identified as a Translator's Note. These notes are constantly dialoguing with the translated text, which is forever dialoguing with the original text — and notes, translation, and original text dialogue with their previous texts of reference and source material (so that intertextuality is woven into the fabric of those three texts and their discourses).

Worth of notice is the fact that footnotes will aid in creating the illusion that that is the only space where the voice of the translator is inscribed, thus supporting the illusion that in the translated text the only voice to be heard is that of the author of the original text (Mittmann, 2003, p.137) – which helps corroborate the traditional vision of translators' footnotes as conveying objective information derived from the original text itself, whereas in fact the translator's discourse produces meanings that emerge from his particular reading (interpretation) of the source text.

Mittmann (2003, p.135) recognizes three different possible discourse operations in translators' notes that do not present a purely clarifying or contextualizing text: (1) when there is no coincidence between translator and author; (2) when the translator resorts to discourses other than the author's; and (3) when the translator expresses both being at a loss for words — given the multiplicity of meanings — and his doubts during the translation process.

When operation (1) applies, it shows the relation between translator and author of the original text, i.e., the relation between the discourse of the translation and the discourse of the original text. The original discourse supports the translation discourse, and yet this does not always obtain in the form of alliance, for it is possible that the two discourses diverge. Therefore, the translator's notes of this type "will always mark the distance between the two subjective positions: that of the translator and that of the author. This distance leads to a corroboration of the translator as the enunciative 'I', creating the subjective illusion of an enunciator that is outside the discourse and thus can talk about it" (Mittmann, 2003, p.169).

When operation (2) applies, it shows an intervention of the interdiscourse that supports the translation discourse. This obtains when, for instance, the translator looks

for definitions, equivalents and comparisons in academic texts and in dictionaries. The intervening discourses are intertextual material within the translators' notes. They give support to (and could even prove) the translator's point of view and his approach to his task.

When operation (3) applies, it shows the struggle of the translator with his own speech. Opposite to the traditional concept of the translator who "will always know" how to make a linguistic decision in face of the original text, this type of notes reveals doubts, lack of equivalent terms between the pair of languages, and multiplicity of meanings.

Mittmann borrows from Eni Orlandi (renowned Brazilian author in Discourse Analysis) a definition of footnotes as being "scars" in the textual tissue, a scar that makes visible a space opened in (apparently) the author's discourse, so that the translator's discourse may be read, so that the translator's voice may be heard. The more footnotes in a translation, the more the translator, as a sociohistorically determined subjective being, asserts his having no control over the multiplicity of meanings originated from the original discourse, and yet, interestingly enough, the more he exerts control over the potential readers of the translated text, by steering their interpretation, "in order to avoid the non-meaning" (Mittmann, 2003, p.169-170). In fact, "as a complementary discourse, the [translator's] notes do not close this or that space that was left opened in the translated text – on the contrary, they reveal the open character of the text." (Mittmann, 2003, p.167)

Differently from Mittmann's analysis, this paper has included the presentation of the Introductions written by the two translators studied. It can be observed in those two texts by the translators how much their voices are present in the translation product as they write at length about the translation process – making explicit, for instance, the permanent relation of their translations with other discourses. In other words, how much research work they developed in order to understand the "text" of *Love's Labour's Lost*, in order to disclose as much as possible to their Portuguese-readers (without being boring to the non-academic reader) the intricacies of the plot, the characters, the dialogues and their context. Both Resende's and Homem's discourses go in the direction of making the reading of their translations palatable to their potential readership — and at the same time, as it usually happens with translations — there is an underlying or rather parallel discourse, where they disclose the huge amount of obstacles to the task.

In the following section, I present examples of the above discussed categories of translator's notes, as found in Resende's *Trabalhos de amor perdidos* and in Homem's *Canseiras de amor em vão.*

Examples of Notes from the Two Translations of *LLL*

Aimara da Cunha Resende, in her Brazilian translation of *LLL,* presents 227 numbered footnotes. Rui Carvalho Homem, in his Portuguese translation of the same play, presents 132 notes at the end of the text, identifiable by the number of Act, Scene, Line(s), and an extra 3 notes that discuss names of characters (above mentioned). From those 227 footnotes and 132 end-of-text notes, the translators had 72 notes in common (roughly 1/3 of Resende's notes and roughly 1/2 of Homem's notes).

Of the 72 notes in common, 22 were motivated mainly by **Latinisms**, though there is 1 passage in Italian and 1 in French. Homem uses his notes to translate the Latin phrases into Portuguese. Resende employs a different translation approach, and translates the Latin phrase in the text itself, immediately following the original in Latin, and uses a note each time to point out that the English text does not include an English version of the Latin phrase. Moreover, it is extremely interesting to observe different translation approaches for the passages in Latin: while Homem corrects Holofernes's misquotations of some Latin expressions, and explains it, *using his notes to present the mistaken version* of those Latinisms, Resende resorts to other authors and, with them, believes the mistakes were intentional in Shakespeare, *using her notes to present the corrected version*. Example:

> (4.2: 112-117) *Facile precor gelida quando peccas omnia sub umbra. Ruminat...*
>   And so forth. Ah, good old Mantuan![7]
> **Resende** (p.106) *Facile precor gelida quando peccas omnia sub umbra. Ruminat...*
> Fausto, enquanto todo o gado rumina à sombra fresca, e assim por diante. Ah! Meu velho e querido Mantuano!
> **Homem** (p.91) *Fauste precor, gelida quando peccus omne sub umbra. Ruminat...*
> e assim por diante. Ah, bom velho Mantuano
>
> *N.B.:* Both translators also explain in their notes that this is a citation from a 15th-century writer from Mantua, Italy. His writings were studied in schools in England, so Shakespeare's public would understand and recognize the Latin excerpts.

---

[7] The examples in English were taken from Mowat and Werstine's 1996 edition (The New Folger Library Shakespeare).

Of the 72 notes in common, 19 were motivated by historical-cultural implicit meanings. Example:

> (5.2: 523-524) Holding a trencher, jesting merrily? / You put our page out. Go, you are <u>allowed</u>.
> **Resende** (p.196) Dançar de lá pra cá, só pra a agradar. / Destruiu nosso texto, é um <u>direito</u> seu.
> **Homem** (p.139) Pronto a servi-la, com facécias de bobo? / Calastes-nos o pajem – foi <u>licença</u> de tolo.
>
> *N.B.:* Both translators enlighten their readers on the right/license that jesters had in court, allowed as they were to do and say much that was forbidden to others in front of the authorities – and get away with that.

Of the 72 notes in common, 12 were motivated by **intertextual implicit meanings**. A good number of these instances of intertextuality refer to Mythology. Example:

> (5.1: 134-135) He shall present Hercules in minority. His enter and exit shall be strangling a snake
> **Resende** (p.153) Ele vai representar Hércules quando criança; ele vai entrar e sair estrangulando uma serpente.
> **Homem** (p.116) Ele apresentará Hércules de tenra idade. Entrará e sairá a estrangular uma cobra
>
> *N.B.:* Both translators explain that Hercules, as an infant, strangles two serpents sent by Juno to kill him.

Eight of the 72 notes in common were motivated by **inferential meanings**. Example:

> (5.2: 525) a smock will be your shroud.
> **Resende** (p.196) U'a saia como mortalha vai ter.
> **Homem** (p.139) por mortalha tereis saia.
>
> *N.B.:* Both translators explain this is an insult from the speaker to the hearer on his masculinity.

One of the translators' notes was caused by a question of **form and structure** of the text (an irregular, much longer verse – the example appears later on in this section), and ten of the 72 notes in common were motivated by various types of **wordplay**: puns, malapropisms, onomatopoeia, neologism, and a wordplay such as this:

> (5.1: 79-80) I smell false Latin! Dunghill for unguem.
> **Resende** (p.149) Que cheiro de latim falso, pum…quem, no lugar de unguem.
> **Homem** (p.114) Cheira-me a falso Latim: "merdum" em vez de meritum.

N.B.: Both translators explain the original wordplay in the English text.

From my survey of the 72 notes in common to both translators, it is worth mentioning that, although I have listed them as 1 occurrence of each type, a few of the examples actually encompass more than one type of motivation. One example is the very first one listed above (4.2: 112-117 – *Facile precor…*): listed as motivated by a Latin phrase, both translators explained the intertextual nature of the Latinism, as well as its historical-cultural meaning (Shakespeare's audience would have recognized the quotation).

Now, in reference to Mittmann's analysis of translators' notes, we find rich examples in both Resende's and Homem's translations — within that list of notes in common — that can illustrate the differences between the traditionally prescribed footnotes and those other three types, as encountered by Mittmann in her study.

All of the above-listed examples, with the exception of the last one (example of wordplay translated), are notes that fit in the description of a more traditional translator's note, i.e., they are there to contextualize and/or clarify the meaning the translator read in the text, during his translation process.

As for Mittmann's first type of translator's note — when there is no coincidence between translator and author, — it very seldom appears in the 72 notes in common examined. A good example in Homem is presented in those lines where Latinisms are misspelled in the English editions, and Homem corrects the spelling of the Latin words or else corrects the Latin sentence (as in the very first example above). A good example in Resende is the footnote motivated by form and structure mentioned above.

> (4.2: 25-39) Sir, he hath never fed of the dainties that are bred in a book […]
> **Resende** (p.99 – lines 24-33) Meu senhor, ele nunca se alimentou das delícias que cultivam nos livros [...]
> **Homem** (p.89 – lines 33-49) Senhor, ele nunca provou as delícias de leitura [...]

> *N.B.:* Both translators explain that the verses here are irregular and much longer. Homem preserves the irregularity and length of the English text, while Resende says she keeps most of the translated lines as 10-syllable verses in her translation, "shifting the emphasis of the awkward composition more to semantics". Homem observes there is prose within the versified form, and both translators observe that in their texts.

In relation to Mittmann's second type of translator's note — when the translator resorts to discourses other than the author's — it is interesting to observe that the two translators invite another author's discourse into their own at different points of the play, and then they bring to their notes (in common) very different insights into the passage in question.[8]

One example is their notes on (4.2: 11) Holofernes' line, "Sir Nathaniel, *haud credo*". While Homem in his note (p.164) informs this is a controversial passage, and mentions A.L. Rowse's 1952 interpretation, the translator says he does not follow Rowse's suggestion in order to be able to recreate the wordplay that follows (when Nathaniel answers: "'Twas not a *haud credo*, 'twas a pricket" ("Não era do alto clero, era só um veadito" in Homem's translation, p.88). Resende in her footnote (p.98) explains her translation process in recreating the wordplay ("Eu disse que o cervo não era um *nolocreo*, era um veadinho de dois anos").

Another example is found in the translators' notes to the Latin word *perge* (4.2: 63): while Homem in his end-of-text note (p.165) translates it into Portuguese ("prossegui"), Resende (p.101-102) mentions John Dover Wilson's 1969 edition of *LLL* to inform this was a word well known in Elizabethan England, when Latin was studied in schools and the teachers would often use it (meaning "go on") in the classroom. And Resende notes she follows her translation practice here and adds the Portuguese word right after the Latin word ("*perge*, continue") in the text.

As for Mittmann's third type of translator's notes — when the translator expresses his doubts during the translation process, — we have a wonderful example in Homem's very first note (p.160) on the text, referring to six different passages of the play (twice in 1.1, twice in 4.3, and twice in 5.2): "To be coherent with the dominant strategies adopted in this translation, where emphasis is given to preserving the marks of rhetoric and style present in the English text, whenever in doubt, these marks should prevail against adopting solutions validated by the literary conventions of Portuguese; therefore, a choice was made in preserving the typical structure of the English sonnet (three quatrains and a couplet) in its development, punctuation, and rhyme".

---

[8] It is important here to note that both translators refer to the Quarto and the Folio editions of *LLL*. Based on Jowett's thesis, that each Shakespeare text is actually a mediation between the text as originally produced and the reader, one could say that even those early editions in a sense carry the discourse (embedded in their textual materialization) of an author other than Shakespeare, i.e., the printer's.

One of Resende's footnotes that expose her decision-making process while translating is note 4 (p.11): "The Shakespeare text (1.1: 109-110) says: 'At Christmas I no more desire a rose/Than wish a snow in May's new-fangled shows' [followed by literal translation into Portuguese]. Given that, in England, December, the month of Christmas, is the beginning of winter, Berowne cannot wish for roses, typical of spring; same thing with wishing to see snow in the month of May, the second month of Spring in England. If I were to translate this passage literally, it would be of difficult apprehension by the average spectator [in Brazil]. Therefore, I chose to carry out a cultural transposition, by inverting the images".

The two examples above do not belong in the set of 72 notes in common for both translators, perhaps meaning different translators will question their decisions at different points in the original text (and express this questioning via spelling out the paths they took to come to a solution in the translated text). But then this is obviously not a conclusion; it is rather a speculation, since more data and other studies would be necessary to put this forward as a viable hypothesis and then verify it.

The conclusion for now is that Mittmann's theoretical framework proves valuable and relevant when it comes to analyzing translators' footnotes, and it responds well to Jowett's remark, "An edition might be defined as a mediation of a text to a reader". A translated edition then may be seen as mediating the mediation of a Shakespeare text to non-English speaking readers, encompassing there all the difficulties (challenges) of multiple meanings, form and structure, wordplay, etc, all (ideally) to be conveyed through an altogether different linguistic code, responding to the demands of a publishing project (and a publishing house), while at the same time attempting to foresee a potential readership for Shakespeare in translation today.[9]

Final Remarks

My expectation, when I first thought of writing this paper, was that I would find more footnotes (in common for both translators) on the wordplays of the English text, especially the puns. Only one particular pun seems to have motivated notes in both Resende's and Homem's translations.

---

[9] In a sense, Shakespeare annotated editions will share certain resemblances with translated editions, in that they must cope with the linguistic changes that took place in the English language since the early 17th century: orthographic, phonological, semantic.

(5.1: 79-80) I smell false Latin! *Dunghill* for *unguem*.
Resende (p.149) Que cheiro de latim falso, *pum...quem*, no lugar de *unguem*.
Homem (p.114) Cheira-me a flaso Latim: "merdum" em vez de *meritum*.

N.B.: Both notes explain the pun in the English text.

In the example above, Resende "imitates Shakespeare's technique", whereas Homem "creates a new wordplay". I find Malcolm Offord's 1997 list of translation strategies for dealing with puns,[10] as found in a 1866/1952 French translation of *LLL,* most enlightening: the translator either ignores the pun completely, imitates Shakespeare's technique, creates a new wordplay, adopts the surface meaning, majors on the underlying meaning, or spells out both meanings of the pun. Another example from our two Portuguese-language translations:

(1.2: 155-158) [Costard] I will fast being loose.
      [Boy] No, sir, that were fast and loose.
Resende (p.40) Se eu ficar solto, meu jejum fica afiado.
     Conversa fiada, isso sim. → creates a new wordplay
Homem (p.56) deixai-me jejuar em soltura.
     Não, que isso era jejum e incontinência.→ imitates Shakespeare's technique

N.B.: Resende explains in her footnote that "loose" means both "free" (not in prison), and "with diarrhea". As for Homem, the pun is solved in the text, and no translator's note was added.

I took the nine examples described in Offord's analysis of the six types of pun-translation strategies and verified them in Resende's and Homem's translations. All six strategies were found for the nine examples, with only one omission (the translator ignored the pun, and no translator's note was added). Therefore, the present paper is now intended to be the first part of a more comprehensive study. Its second part would aim at verifying solely the notes on the translation of wordplays in both Resende's *Trabalhos de amor perdidos* and Homem's *Canseiras de amor em vão* and it would be an attempt also at verifying the validity and relevance of Offord's six types of strategies.

Although I have not made a survey of the translators' notes on puns, from the sample I collected following Offord's illustrative passages, the result is the following: for nine puns, Resende opened four footnotes and Homem opened only one (none of them are among the examples that illustrate this paper).

---

[10] According to Offord, there are 278 puns in *LLL.*

Conclusion

However scarce the data presented in the present study, it seems to corroborate the notions presented in the four Introductions to these two editions translated into Portuguese, where there are references to the fact that the translations ought to work on stage as well as on page. When Homem wrote in his Introduction that the translator "cannot resort to footnotes that will list all the possible readings for each passage of the text (a privilege of scholarly editions)", this explains why both he and Resende will not explain most of the wordplays — because they are already solved in translation. The notes in common for both translators in their vast majority are there to translate foreign-language expressions (mostly Latinisms) and to explain three types of implicit meanings: historical-cultural, intertextual, and inferential — that is, traditional translator's notes, opened specifically to clarify meaning. Nevertheless, these traditional notes (as revealed in Mittmann's study) can also be clearly interpretive, thus revealing in an explicit manner the discourse of the translator as an authorial voice: when the translator invites specific authors (and not others) to corroborate his reading of the source text (or else to disagree with them); when the translator offers the reader an insight into a translation process that is made up of many doubts, and questions for which there are multiple answers; and even when the translator chooses to disagree with the source text. I hope I have proved that with the examples taken from Resende's and Homem's translations.

References

HOMEM, Rui Carvalho. Introdução. In: SHAKESPEARE, William. **Canseiras de Amor em Vão**. Transl. Rui Carvalho Homem. Porto: Campo das Letras, 2007. p. 7-28.

JOWETT, John. **Shakespeare and Text.** Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

MITTMANN, Solange. **Notas do Tradutor e Processo Tradutório:** análise e reflexão sob uma Perspectiva Discursiva. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS, 2003.

OFFORD, Malcolm. Mapping Shakespeare's Puns in French Translations. In: DELABASTITA, Dirk (Ed.). **Traductio: Essays on Punning and Translation.** Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997. p. 233-60.

RESENDE, Aimara da Cunha. Introdução. In: SHAKESPEARE, William. **Trabalhos de Amor Perdidos.** Transl. Aimara da Cunha Resende. Belo Horizonte: Tessitura/CESh, 2006. p. xxiii-xxxiii.

SHAKESPEARE, William. **Canseiras de Amor em Vão.** Transl. Rui Carvalho Homem. Porto: Campo das Letras, 2007.

SHAKESPEARE, William. **Love's Labor's Lost.** Edited by Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine. The New Folger Library Shakespeare. New York: Washington Square Press, 1996.

SHAKESPEARE, William. **Trabalhos de Amor Perdidos**. Transl. Aimara da Cunha Resende. Belo Horizonte: Tessitura/CESh, 2006.