

I.2

Of Languages and Kings: Names, History, and Shakespeare in Portuguese

RUI CARVALHO HOMEM
(University of Oporto)

Many readers are bound to recognize the Lewis Carroll misquote in the title above, behind which lie those lines in *Through the Looking-Glass* where the Walrus proposes, in ballad metre, that «The time has come [...] / To talk of many things / Of shoes and ships and sealing wax / Of cabbages and kings»¹. Rather than cracking a gratuitous joke, by citing this delirium of zeugma I am claiming that a trope that «yokes disparate things together» is one of the rhetorical devices that are arguably akin to the dislocations that translation is about². The effort to find adequate correspondences that characterizes translation very often leaves its practitioners with the feeling that «disparate things yoked together» are indeed what their craft is about. Further, this paper will focus on translation decisions that ultimately rest on consciously endorsed heterogeneity, which entails that the (il)logic of nonsense will at times seem congenial to the perplexities to be discussed. The relevance of Carroll's text as my pretext, on this occasion, is also ensured by the challenges posed to translators by many of its features – including the vast array of proper names, both fictional and historical, that it cites³. And in the present paper I will indeed be arguing that, to misquote yet another earnest intellectual sporting his wit on the playground of language, «the naming of [kings] is a difficult matter»⁴.

The narrative drive imprinted by these playful pre-texts, their 'once-upon-a-time' impetus, also ties in with the variety of ways in which the present paper is time-bound, in the fullness of the senses this phrase can carry. It could hardly be otherwise, emerging as it does from a context of reading largely informed by the historicizing trends in Translation Studies, in Shakespeare Studies and in literary criticism at large. Even though it is predicated on a refusal to subscribe fully to any one critical vogue, the engagement with Shakespeare in/and translation offered in the following pages is inevitably informed by the modes of reading that have become

¹ Lewis Carroll, *Alice in Wonderland*, ed. by Donald J. Gray, New York, Norton, 1992 [1865], p. 142.

² See *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, ed. by Alex Preminger et al., Princeton (NJ), Princeton University Press, 1993, p. 1383, and *A Dictionary of Literary Devices*, ed. by Bernard Dupriez, trans. by Albert W. Halsall, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991, p. 475.

³ See Christiane Nord, «Proper Names in Translations for Children: *Alice in Wonderland* as a Case in Point», *Meta* 48:1-2 (May 2003), pp. 182-96.

⁴ Thomas Stearns Eliot, *Old Possum's Book of Practical Cats*, London, Faber, 1976 [1939], p. 1.

prevalent with the «new contextualisms», to cite Howard Felperin's felicitous phrase for the rise of New Historicism and Cultural Materialism to the condition of a critical orthodoxy⁵. But this acceptance of a broad conformity to critical mores characterized by an emphasis on the historically specific and contingent will here be balanced by an awareness of the challenges that such modes of reading have recently faced. The challenges in question include the retrieval and re-signification of the notion of 'presentism'; as well as an awareness of the trans-historical element in the human experience that has led Terry Eagleton to insist that there are circumstances whose very rate of recurrence in many different contexts means that the historical repeats itself into the trans-historical; or in other (and somewhat sardonic) words, «if it is indeed the case that human subjects are always historically constructed, then here at least is one vitally important non-historical truth»⁶.

As for the insights to be derived from the field of Translation Studies by my historically aware reading, they will mostly concern the relative nearness of the target text to the discourse, the values and the mindset of its readership or its audience. It is true that in the history of pronouncements on translation this has more often been construed in spatial than in temporal terms. Such predominance of spatial tropes has ranged from the remarks on the relations between national languages and cultures to be found in Goethe, Humboldt and – prominently – Schleiermacher; through the shifting positions of translated literature, between centre and periphery, as described in Polysystem Theory by Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury; down to the *agon* between foreignizing and domesticating forces in Lawrence Venuti's characterization of the cultural politics (and the geopolitics) of translation⁷. But this is a domain in which we can with some confidence cite the commonplace according to which other places can be translated as other times (and vice-versa). After all, the concern with making it old or making it new, opting between archaism or modernization has also been prominent in Translation Studies, in particular with regard to texts invested with the authority that today we usually call canonical. George Steiner provides a number of enlightening remarks on this relation between texts and time from the standpoint of translation, one of which concerns the archaizing trend in 19th-century philology⁸; as does Jean-Michel Déprats in his article on «Translation at the Crossroads of the Past and Present», which claims that the temporal issue is the most crucial in contemporary translation for the stage⁹.

This paper will approach the temporal concern from a standpoint afforded by a stock theme in translation criticism – the translation of names; not as an object per se, but rather as a tool for inquiry into how we handle proximity and distance

⁵ Howard Felperin, *The Uses of the Canon: Elizabethan Literature and Contemporary Theory*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1990, p. vi and *passim*.

⁶ Terry Eagleton, *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic*, Oxford, Blackwell, 2003, p. xi.

⁷ Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, London, Routledge, 2004 [2000].

⁸ George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992 [1975].

⁹ Jean-Michel Déprats, «Translation at the Crossroads of the Past and Present», in *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. by Rui Carvalho Homem and Ton Hoenselaars, Amsterdam/New York, Rodopi, 2004, pp. 65-78.

when translating Shakespeare. This is a matter in which the time-bound nature of the present study will also be apparent – since prevalent attitudes towards the translation of proper names have significantly altered over the past century¹⁰. The divergent expectations generated by historically variable conventions loom large among the ‘difficulties’ suggested with my Eliotian misquote, but in what follows I will actually be pointing out that names of ‘kings’ (in historiography as in drama) pose less problems to the translator than those of their courtiers or dramatic associates.

In his book *La Traducción de los Nombres Propios* (‘the translation of proper names’), Virgilio Moya declares from the outset a basic perplexity: the commonplace, endorsed by many translation manuals, that proper names should not be translated, but rather «transferred» (i.e., retained in the form they have in the source language, or SL) is promptly queried by the many exceptions to the rule that usually follow any enunciation of that commonplace. And the list of exceptions is itself followed by an even more glaring paradox: the notion that in most cases they should not be translated (by which we should understand, translated anew) precisely because there already is an «accepted» version¹¹.

A prime example of the latter attitude concerns the convention that the names of kings *are* translated – or rather, they are «naturalized» (Moya’s term), «morphologically adapted»¹², or «substituted»¹³. (Irrespective of terminological preferences, in this paper I will be at one with the authors just quoted in endorsing an understanding of ‘translation’ as inclusive of a broad range of strategies for the interlingual and intercultural processing of proper names.) This conventional practice of rendering the names of royalty into long-acknowledged forms in the target language (TL) enjoys a normative value conferred, above all, by historiographic practice, as by the use of those names in a variety of texts of a public nature, official or otherwise (from chronicles to state papers to newspaper headlines). Their weight on collective memory is obviously greater when they belong in a series – i.e., when earlier monarchs have already borne that name, previous use ensuring the acceptedness of the naturalized form. And their public recognition is reinforced by their memorialization, sometimes, in the names of streets or squares, and through literature – through the formalized inscription of those names as titles of canonical works in the target languages themselves. This is obviously the case with Shakespeare’s history plays in translation in a variety of West European languages, or (indeed) with 19th-century operas on historical characters, from Donizetti’s *Anna Bolena* and *Maria Stuarda* to Verdi’s *Don Carlo*. Again, the normative value of this practice is not diminished by our awareness that it was the memorability, the enduring memory of the names of royalty, that secured their translatability – since the naturalizing practice is otherwise a superseded practice.

Indeed, the translation of proper names has undergone a significant change over the past two centuries: as Moya, among others, has pointed out, an older

¹⁰ See Virgilio Moya, *La traducción de los nombres propios*, Madrid, Catedra, 2000, pp. 12-3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹² C. Nord, «Proper Names in Translations for Children», cit., p. 182.

¹³ Albert Péter Vermes, «Proper Names in Translation: An Explanatory Attempt», *Across Languages and Cultures* 4:1 (2003), pp. 93-4.

practice of naturalizing in TL both first and last names started to be altered in the 18th century, when we find in several European languages the last names being transferred and the first name still naturalized. Naturalization of first names was still current practice in the early 20th century, since the tendency to transfer *both* first and last names was to become standard only by mid-century – with a few notorious exceptions, led by the case of royalty; and in a number of cases naturalized forms of certain names have coexisted with transferred forms¹⁴. Transferring (rather than naturalizing) foreign names ties in with the concern over difference and the preservation of alterity that has dominated discourse on intercultural communication; and this only confirms Moya’s argument that changes in translation policy as regards proper names have followed broader changes, affecting the very understanding of what (a) translation is – i.e., changes in the «constitutive conventions» of translation¹⁵.

This pattern of evolving conventions and of rules promptly overruled by exceptions amounts to a complex context into which to translate the names of *dramatis personae* in Shakespeare’s histories. In contrast to the relative stability observed with regard to the names of monarchs, strategies for rendering other historical names are bound to prove much more uncertain, and this uncertainty is not just a technical issue – it is also cultural, political, and strongly enmeshed in the complications of historical narratives and national representations. The University of Oporto Shakespeare research-and-translation project of which I am a member¹⁶ has generally opted for endorsing a longstanding tradition of naturalization as regards the names of monarchs that are also the titles of the plays; but our strategy otherwise involves retaining the remoteness of English medieval history in its onomastics – i.e., retaining in their original form the names and titles of English noblemen. Issues of coherence are promptly raised – to begin with, when other characters have, in the source text, the same Christian name as the king. It should be noted, though, that such slips in coherence are rather often restricted to one’s reading of the names on that editorial addition that the list of *dramatis personae* usually is, and not a perception afforded by dramatic dialogue: Shakespeare’s historical characters are not often addressed (or referred to) by their first names. But what I am describing as a general option for the retention of their remoteness, understood in this case as their foreignness, in fact rests on the assumption of a present-day attitude: the preference for transferring ST features, rather than naturalizing them. The latter option was for centuries, and in particular in the Medieval and Early Modern periods, the standard practice as regards names, invariably rendered into their cognates in the sources (of whatever nature) through which they were inscribed in the onomastics of various European languages.

A brief look at the list of characters appended to the Portuguese version of (e.g.) *Henry IV, Part I*, by Gualter Cunha, will allow me to ground and specify this description of the translation policy in question:

¹⁴ V. Moya, *La traducción de los nombres propios*, cit., pp. 12-3, 24 and *passim*.

¹⁵ Moya cites Nord for this phrase and concept: see *ibid.*, p. 17.

¹⁶ This project, carried out by a team of researchers/translators led by Manuel Gomes da Torre, aims to publish a new Complete Shakespeare in Portuguese. To the present date, fifteen plays have been published in this series.

Personagens (por ordem de entrada)

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Rei Henrique (Henrique IV) | Primeiro viajante |
| Lorde John de Lancaster | Segundo viajante |
| Conde de Westmoreland | Lady Percy |
| Sir Walter Blunt | Criado de Hotspur |
| Príncipe Henry | Francis |
| Sir John Falstaff | Taberneiro |
| Poins | Hospedeira |
| Conde de Northumberland | Meirinho |
| Conde de Worcester | Lorde Edmund Mortimer |
| Hotspur, Sir Henry Percy | Owen Glendower |
| Primeiro almocreve | Lady Mortimer |
| Moço de estrebaria | Douglas |
| Segundo almocreve | Mensageiro |
| Gadshill | Segundo mensageiro |
| Camareiro | Sir Richard Vernon |
| Peto | Arcebispo de York |
| Bardolph | Sir Michael |
| | Soldados, outros viajantes e acompanhantes ¹⁷ |

As mentioned above, the king's name (which coincides with the title) was obviously naturalized; all other first names were transferred. This was thoroughly discussed by the Oporto group, a crucial element behind the decision to retain English first names being the case of Falstaff, because of his alias as «Jack»: should «John» (or rather, «Sir John») have been rendered as its Portuguese cognate («João»), then it would have to coexist in the target text with its short form in SL, since «Jack» could hardly find a satisfactory Portuguese rendering. Scenes involving Falstaff and his associates, in both parts of *Henry IV*, in fact showcase the conspicuously different case of «loaded» or «meaningful» names (the terminologies respectively of Theo Hermans and Luca Manini¹⁸): an echo, after all, of those «characteristic names» that in the *Poetics* Aristotle opposed to the «real names», in both cases with regard to characters in comedy¹⁹.

We find such characters (and such names) in the lowlife scenes of these history plays, and in their case the dominant strategy of the Oporto project has been that of actual translation, by which I here mean a rendering focused on semantic content – the rendering that makes Mistress Quickly «Dona Despachada». Besides

¹⁷ William Shakespeare, *Henrique IV, Parte I*, trans. by Gualter Cunha, Porto, Campo das Letras, 2003, pp. 45-6.

¹⁸ See M. Gomes da Torre, «The Translation of Proper Names in *Measure for Measure*», in *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century*, cit., pp. 203-15. The two definitions have been put forward in: Theo Hermans, «On Translating Proper Names with Reference to De Witte and Max Havelaar», in *Modern Dutch Studies: Essays in Honour of Peter King*, ed. by Michael Wintle and Paul Vincent, London/Atlantic Highlands (NJ), Athlone, 1998, p. 13 and Luca Manini, «Meaningful literary names: Their forms and function, and their translation», *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 2:2 (1996), special issue ed. by Dirk Delabastita, pp. 161-78.

¹⁹ Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. by and with critical notes by S.H. Butcher, Mineola (NY), Dover Publications, 1951 [1894], p. 37.

this, the list of *dramatis personae* makes it immediately apparent that the functional designations of incidental characters (servants, messengers) were duly translated; and so were the indicators of royal/noble/clerical status – King, Prince, Earl, Archbishop –, rendered as «Rei», «Príncipe», «Conde» and «Arcebispo». «Sir», however, was transferred – on the understanding that Portuguese does not offer an adequate version of the title that would at the same time preserve it as a historical marker of Englishness. The same judgement determined the transference of «Lady», but «Lord» was naturalized as *Lorde*, a form that has long been available in Portuguese (probably because of the accepted rendering of ‘House of Lords’ as ‘Câmara dos Lordes’)²⁰. A first (though minor) complication involving the mixture of Portuguese and English concerns the preposition in Lord John of Lancaster, rendered as «Lorde John de Lancaster», but the potential awkwardness of this hybrid solution is attenuated by the existence of English aristocratic names of Anglo-Norman origin that have always borne the particle *de*.

The complications that emerge when one starts considering possible alternatives to the translation policy materialized in the list of characters’ names in Cunha’s *Henrique IV* prominently include the significant overlap between family names and titles that are also placenames, i.e. political designations with a clear territorial reference – and with their own set of cultural and historical expectations as much as translation conventions: Lancaster, Westmoreland, Northumberland, Worcester. Some of those might lend themselves to a naturalization into forms acceptable to most readers and listeners, but others most certainly would not; in fact, the forms that would emerge from a historically and etymologically supported naturalization would strike most audiences as so rare, unfamiliar or erudite that the effect would be outlandish, evocative not of late medieval England but rather of some fantasy land, a Ruritania of heavily named noblemen.

One of the feudal titles/placenames that might seem easier to render is Northumberland – because of its morphological closeness to and partial referential overlap with Northumbria (indeed glossed in some dictionaries as «another name for Northumberland»). The name’s Latinate resonance lends itself to a calque rendering as ‘Nortúmbria’, indeed an accepted form in Portuguese, since history books employ it as the name of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom; but this also alerts us to the inadequacy of such a rendering. The same reason that, when translating the histories (as distinct, say, from some of the tragedies and comedies), would prevent us from resorting to sheer free coinage of names²¹ – that reason being a concern with preserving the accuracy of historical reference – makes it unacceptable to give a late medieval nobleman a title that was in use only from the 7th to the 9th century AD: only ‘Northumberland’ existed as the name of a 15th-century earldom, and hence as the name of a nobleman that was dramatically recreated by Shakespeare.

The option for transferring these English aristocratic names was maintained even in the case of Lancaster, a name with particular implications when we come upon it in the process of rendering Shakespeare’s histories (especially *Richard II* and the *Henry IV* and *Henry V* plays) into Portuguese. It reminds us that these

²⁰ This is an option that the project has made only in the case of texts whose setting is unmistakably English, not in occurrences of the word ‘Lord’ in plays set elsewhere.

²¹ See C. Nord, «Proper Names in Translations for Children», cit., p. 185.

texts ostensibly refer to a period when dynastic links, grounded on a network of intermarriage involving a number of European monarchies, added to the generally shared significance of power, to its gestures and trappings. Such links indeed secured a relative internationalization of the images of power – for which the practice of rendering all aristocratic names (Christian names, certainly; titles, fairly often) was the ‘natural’ (i.e., cultural) corollary. The particular Anglo-Portuguese complexities that surround the name of Lancaster can here be described only briefly, as follows: this is a name that from the late 14th century has had a prominent Portuguese version as ‘Lencastre’, following the marriage in 1387 of Philippa of Lancaster, daughter of John of Gaunt and a sister of the future Henry IV of England, to the Portuguese king João I. This royal marriage was part of the broader Anglo-Portuguese agreement that materialized in the Treaty of Windsor (1386), the oldest extant political treaty in Europe. The naturalization of Lancaster in Portuguese chronicles and other documents of the period, and the continued presence in Portugal of relatives and retinue of the queen who would in some cases adopt the name associated with her dynastic origins, would ensure the inscription of ‘Lencastre’ (in a variety of alternative spellings) in Portuguese onomastics: today, the phone directory lists an amazing total of 527 entries for this name; and, even to those that know little Portuguese history, it has become familiar through toponymic memorialization of that (indeed, influential) queen.

This might seem to be a case where naturalization would be the obvious, even inevitable, solution, in spite of the heterogeneity it would generate in the handling of the characters’ names; and yet it does not fail to raise problems that indeed led the Oporto project to reject it. And here is the reason why, for us, Shakespeare’s «Lancaster» cannot become ‘Lencastre’: unlike present-day family names, Lancaster, Westmoreland, Northumberland and Worcester have, in Shakespeare’s plays, and in the historico-political environment they dramatize, an ‘objective’ referent which is individual but also communal, geographic, political. They designate English earldoms and dukedoms, not just as abstract extensions of power, but rather as territories and communities. When transplanted elsewhere – into another language, without their specific historical and socio-political ‘moorings’ – they become de-semanticized and no longer carry such referents; they can hence be treated like ‘ordinary’ family names, as is currently the case with the Portuguese ‘Lencastre’.

At this point it should be said that the transferring strategy I have been outlining (on the basis of one specific example) is hardly consensual in the context in which we have been carrying out our translations. Indeed, the history and critical discussion of Shakespeare’s translation into Portuguese has rather prominently included pleas for domestication that can in fact intersect, for the sake of a critical assessment of translators’ options, with this discussion of onomastics. Some of those pleas have strongly leaned on literary history, including an argument for resorting to Portuguese texts that are roughly coeval with Shakespeare’s, or that hold an arguably equivalent value in Portuguese to Shakespeare’s canonical import in English literary history, as sources for phrasings to be invested in the production of a text whose preserved remoteness would rest not on its foreignness, but rather on its pastness. This strategy was forcefully argued in a few short paratexts (a prefatory note and a blurb) of a much cited translation of *Richard III* that was done and published by members

of an influential theatre company in 1986²², who used it in their production of the play. The blurb on the back of the book insists that any translation is dated, and yet it registers a refusal to rewrite Shakespeare in an unequivocally modern Portuguese. It argues rather that «Shakespeare's theatre is not of our time», and from this, as also from the wish to signal its distance, it derives a determination to ransack «our classics» for archaisms to be invested in translation, even if «at the risk of new anachronisms»²³. It endorses a paradox: a desire for authenticity (somehow it would not be Shakespeare, if it were not to sound old) is to be achieved by means of the inauthentic – a feigned antique diction.

Should we want to pursue a similar strategy for the translation of proper names in Shakespeare's histories, we might find ourselves raiding not texts coeval with Shakespeare's, but rather with the historical developments Shakespeare dramatizes – in particular the early to mid-15th-century chronicles by Fernão Lopes, a fundamental figure in the history of Portuguese prose and of the country's early historiography. Lopes chronicles in some detail the development and culmination of Anglo-Portuguese relations, and offers lists of names of English noblemen that became involved in John of Gaunt's Iberian campaigns:

E a ffama das gemtes que o Duque [dAlancastro] ally tragia eram duas mjll lamças e tres mjll archeiros, e estes de booa gemte [...]; capitaães muy homrados senhores e fidalgos: assy como monsire Joham dOllamda, comdestabre desta hoste, jrmaão del-Rey de Ingraterra da parte da madre [...] que vinha esposado com dona Issabell, filha do Duque, e o senhor dEscallas, e o senhor de Ponjns, e o senhor de Astingues, e o senhor de Ferros e seu jrmaão monsire Thomas Frecho, e monsire Tomas Symom, e monsire Richart Burley, que era mariscall, e monsire Richart Persy e monsire Tomas Persy o moço, e monsire Maabornj, e monsire Joham Falconer, e monsire Baldouym de Freiul, e outros muytos cujos nomes nom fazem myngua.

It is said of the men the Duke brought with him that he had two thousand lances and three thousand archers, and these were very good men [...]. The captains were very honourable lords and nobles, including Sir John Holland, the Constable of the army, who was a brother of the King of England through his mother [...] and was married to the Duke's daughter, Elizabeth; Lord Scales; Lord Poynings; Sir Hugh Hastings; Lord Ferrers; and his brother Sir Thomas Fychet; Sir Thomas Symond; Sir Richard Burley, who was the Marshal; Sir Richard Percy; Sir Thomas Percy the younger; Sir John Mauburney; Sir John Falconer; Sir Baldwin de Frevill; and many others unnecessary to name here²⁴.

As this list shows, it would not occur to Lopes to follow any other practice, when recording English proper names – many of whom will have made their first appearance ever in Portuguese sources precisely in his chronicles –, but that of naturalization. However, these are names that have been recognizably naturalized following the most empirical sort of information (probably auditory), and the

²² William Shakespeare, *Ricardo III*, trans. by Eduarda Dionísio, Maria Adélia Silva Melo, and Luís Miguel Cintra, Lisboa, Difel, 1986.

²³ *Ibid.*, blurb (my translation).

²⁴ Fernão Lopes, *Crónica del Rei Dom João I, LXXXIII*, quoted in *Fernão Lopes - the English in Portugal, 1367-87: extracts from the Chronicles of Dom Fernando and Dom João*, ed. and trans. by Derek W. Lomax and R.J. Oakley, Warminster, Aris & Phillips Ltd., 1988, pp. 194-95.

contingencies of such a source, together with the remoteness of the Portuguese in which Lopes wrote, made these naturalized forms unfeasible for an appropriation by a present-day translator. Would-be translators of Shakespeare's *Richard II* may be fascinated by Fernão Lopes's detailed descriptions of the duke of Lancaster (Bolingbroke and Philippa's father) in his military romps in the Peninsula just a few years before the moment in English history in which Shakespeare has him feature as «old Gaunt»: but would such translators be willing to style Gaunt, after Lopes, «Dom Joham» ('Don Juan')?

This sense that the versions of proper names afforded by historiographic sources, however validated by time and earlier conventions, may prove rhetorically and dramatically unsuitable to a present-day rendering of a Shakespearean history finds yet another confirmation with regard to the name of the king who commissioned Lopes to write his chronicles – King Duarte, eldest son and heir to João I of Portugal and his English wife, Queen Philippa. 'Duarte' is an old, though not archaic, Portuguese equivalent to Edward: the Portuguese king was possibly thus christened after his maternal great-grandfather, Edward III of England. Not insignificantly for the present-day resonance of a name that is neither very common nor very rare, the current pretender to the Portuguese throne is called Duarte. And yet few Portuguese speakers today (other than those who are linguistically, historically and academically minded) would recognize it as a version of Edward – for the simple reason that 'Eduardo' also exists in Portuguese, and thousands of male individuals in the Portuguese-speaking world answer by that name. 'Eduardo' is also the name that has long been used in Portuguese to refer to all the English kings from Edward the Confessor to Edward VIII. And this also creates a paradoxical situation for a translator of Shakespeare's histories who commits him/herself to a naturalizing strategy. Portuguese history offers an important precedent (remembered in the name of the current would-be king), from the very historical period that Shakespeare dramatizes, and with direct dynastic links with English royalty, for rendering Edward as 'Duarte'; but the hypothetical audience or readership such a translator might want to reach would in all likelihood react with amazement and incomprehension if the many occurrences of Edward in Shakespeare's histories were to be rendered into anything other than 'Eduardo'.

The rationale that was implicitly or explicitly endorsed in this paper rests on an ambition for system and coherence (as is proper to a translation project that is also an academic research project), but also on an awareness of the contingencies to which that ambition is subject: that (il)logic of «yoking disparate things together» suggested by my pretextual zeugma has found an echo in the work described above, in the form of the various difficulties faced by translators in defining a homogeneous strategy for rendering proper names. In fact, the translations of proper names in the histories, as practised in the Oporto project, run the whole gamut of possibilities identified by (e.g.) Peter Newmark and Albert Vermes²⁵: *transference* (in the case of names whose English forms are preserved), *naturalization* (through the adoption of conventional or 'accepted' forms, the names of kings, prominently; occasionally through coinage of forms that prove rhetorically and dramatically convincing as if

²⁵ See Peter Newmark, *Approaches to Translation*, Oxford, Pergamon, 1981 and A.P. Vermes, «Proper Names in Translation», cit.

they already had a tradition behind them), *translation* proper («Dona Despachada» for «Mistress Quickly»), *modification* (e.g. with the occasional coinage of ‘meaningful names’ that are semantically distinct from those in SL). Besides and beyond the technicalities of language through which one attempts to make sense over what is humanly contingent, it is the intercultural implications that prove most stimulating: when tales of kings intersect with the meanders of languages, affording a complex object for consideration at the crossroads of Shakespeare Studies, social and political history, Translation Studies. The present publication is, after all, proof of the continued attractions of that crossroads, and of the gratifications it offers to all those who contribute to its growing traffic.

Works Cited

- Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. and with critical notes by S.H. Butcher, Mineola (NY), Dover Publications, 1951 [1894].
- L. Carroll, *Alice in Wonderland*, ed. by D.J. Gray, New York, Norton, 1992 [1865].
- R. Carvalho Homem, T. Hoenselaars (eds), *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century*, Amsterdam/New York, Rodopi, 2004.
- B. Dupriez (ed.), *A Dictionary of Literary Devices*, trans. by A.W. Halsall, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.
- T. Eagleton, *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic*, Oxford, Blackwell, 2003.
- T.S. Eliot, *Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats*, London, Faber, 1976 [1939].
- H. Felperin, *The Uses of the Canon: Elizabethan Literature and Contemporary Theory*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1990.
- D.W. Lomax, R.J. Oakley (eds), *Fernão Lopes – the English in Portugal, 1367-87: extracts from the Chronicles of Dom Fernando and Dom João*, Warminster, Aris & Phillips Ltd., 1988.
- L. Manini, «Meaningful literary names: Their forms and function, and their translation», *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 2:2 (1996), special issue ed. by D. Delabastita, pp. 161-78.
- V. Moya, *La traducción de los nombres propios*, Madrid, Catedra, 2000.
- P. Newmark, *Approaches to Translation*, Oxford, Pergamon, 1981.
- C. Nord, «Proper Names in Translations for Children: *Alice in Wonderland* as a Case in Point», *Meta* 48:1-2 (May 2003), pp. 182-96.
- A. Preminger et al. (eds), *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Princeton (NJ), Princeton University Press, 1993.
- W. Shakespeare, *Henrique IV, Parte I*, trans. by G. Cunha, Porto, Campo das Letras, 2003.
- W. Shakespeare, *Ricardo III*, trans. by E. Dionísio, M.A. Silva Melo, L.M. Cintra, Lisboa, Difel, 1986.
- G. Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992 [1975].
- L. Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, London, Routledge, 2004 [2000].
- A.P. Vermees, «Proper Names in Translation: An Explanatory Attempt», *Across Languages and Cultures* 4:1 (2003), pp. 89-108.
- M. Wintle, P. Vincent (eds), *Modern Dutch Studies: Essays in Honour of Peter King*, London/Atlantic Highlands (NJ), Athlone, 1998.