Dídac Pujol[*]

# Three Translators in Search of an Author: Linguistic Strategies and Language Models in the (Re)translation of Shakespeare's Plays into Catalan[1]

**Abstract:** This article shows how the language of Shakespeare's plays has been rendered into Catalan in three especially significant periods: the late 19th century, the early 20th century, and the late 20th and early 21st centuries. The first section centres on the contrast between natural and unnatural language in *Hamlet*, and considers how this differentiation is carried out (by linguistic techniques that differ substantially from Shakespeare's) in a late 19th-century Catalan adaptation by Gaietà Soler. The second part of the article investigates the reasons why in an early 20th-century translation of *King Lear* the translator, Anfòs Par, resorts to medieval instead of present-time language. The last section of the article illustrates how and explores the motivations why Salvador Oliva's first (1985) version of *The Tempest* is retranslated in 2006 using a different language model. The ultimate aim of the paper is to put forward the hypothesis that, in the case of Catalan, Shakespearean translations are both a reflection of the current state of the language and a major linguistic experimentation that shapes and creates (sometimes through a *via negativa*) the Catalan literary language.

**Keywords**: Shakespeare, translation, retranslation, adaptation, oral discourse, TV3's oral standard, Catalan-Spanish code-switching and diglossia, Catalan literary language, linguistic strategies, language models, Gaietà Soler, Anfòs Par, Salvador Oliva, *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *The Tempest*.

## Introduction

The first Catalan translation ever of a piece by William Shakespeare is Hamlet's soliloquy "To be, or not to be" (3.1.58-92). Rendered by Ramon Franquesa i Gomis, it was published in 1880. Four years later, in 1884, Ovidi de Llanza translated the same passage. In 1886 Celestí Barallat i Falguera translated Act

---

[*] Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

Three, Scene One of *Hamlet*. It was not until 1898 that the first work by Shakespeare was translated in full into Catalan. The play was, precisely, *Hamlet*, and its translator Artur Masriera.

As is often the case in many European countries' reception of Shakespeare, the Englishman's work was first introduced in the target culture not via translations but through performances and adaptations. The first published Catalan adaptation of a play by Shakespeare is Abelardo Coma's 1874 parody *Otello il moro di Valenzia* ('Valencia' being a city in Spain where Catalan is spoken). As can be inferred from the title and subtitle, this work is written using macaronic language, more precisely a mixture of Italian and Catalan, or an Italianized Catalan—the use of Italian reflects the influence of Ernesto Rossi's performances in Barcelona, which took place in 1866, 1868, 1875 and 1884 (as recorded by Par, *Representaciones shakesperianas*, vol. II: 75-78, 92-93, 109-110 and 130). The code mixing used in this adaptation is due not only to cultural factors but also linguistic ones: Italian and Catalan are rather similar languages and speakers can understand each other relatively well. It is worth pointing out that language coexistence, albeit of a different kind, namely code-switching (between Catalan and Spanish), is also present in another adaptation-cum-translation of a play: Gaietà Soler's *Hamlet*, published in 1898. The reasons behind code-switching in this work will be analyzed later on in the article. For the time being, suffice it to say that the phenomenon of language alternation gives a glimpse of an underlying problem that is central to Catalan writers and translators (of Shakespeare and other authors) during the 19th and 20th century, namely the wish to update and (re)construct a literary language that was lost or truncated after medieval times (due to the fact that Spanish became the language of prestige) and during the Franco dictatorship (due to language repression).

After achieving its greatest splendour in medieval times with writers like Ramon Llull (13th-14th centuries) and Ausiàs March (15th century), Catalan literature saw a major quantitative and qualitative decline between the 16th and the 18th centuries, a period traditionally known in Catalan literary history as the Decadence. It was in the 19th century that a group of authors, belonging to a movement known as the Renaissance (1833-1909), began to revive Catalan as a literary language, a process which continued until the Spanish Civil War in 1936 via a movement known as Noucentisme (1906-36). Both during the Renaissance and Noucentisme language models were sought because the literary language had been abandoned for three centuries and writers needed points of reference to create a modern Catalan literature. Literary language was regained through sustained efforts: creative writing, the vindication of nationalism and a cultural policy that normativized and created a literary language—orthographically, lexically and syntactically. Translations of the ancient and modern classics also played an important role in the process. In actual fact, much

of the allure of Shakespeare for Catalan authors and translators (and even audiences, especially during the Franco dictatorship and until the mid-1980s) has had to do with language issues. Thus, between 1907 and 1910, a total of 16 translations of Shakespeare's plays appeared in a series called Biblioteca Popular dels Grans Mestres (Popular Library of the Great Masters). For the translators in this series, Shakespeare was a way to resuscitate the Catalan literary language. In this sense, during the Noucentist period (1906-36) Shakespeare filled a linguistic, as well as a cultural, need insofar as the translation of his works helped Catalan literature, culture and national identity grow stronger and distance itself from the influence of Spain and the Spanish language (Buffery 101-141). Shakespeare thus became a vehicle to fix the literary language (Buffery 143-177): "fix" in the sense of "restore", but also in the sense of "establish a modern grammar and lexicon". In the first third of the 20th century, therefore, the translation of Shakespeare's works was a means to create a particular Catalan language model. The richness of Shakespeare's vocabulary, for instance, was adduced as a source of authority in order to justify both the creation of neologisms and going back to medieval times in order to fill in lexical gaps.

Significant progress was made in terms of the creation of a modern literary language, at least until 1939, when Francisco Franco's dictatorship (which lasted until 1975) truncated a possible full recovery. This began in the 1980s and 1990s with the creation of a Catalan oral standard that culminated in the full-blown standard language of the 2000s, which has become a reference for writers, translators and speakers.[2] It must be noted that in the mid-1980s, when one of the pieces studied in this article was published, the Catalan language was not the same as it is today. Catalan, like all living languages, has evolved, especially as regards the oral standard, which did not exist in the early 1980s. The oral standard for Catalan was created *de facto* during the years that span from 1983 to 1997: Catalan national radio Catalunya Ràdio was launched on 20 June 1983; a few months later, on 10 September 1983, Catalan national television TV3 was born. The main objectives of these media were to construct a stronger Catalan national identity and, above all, to forge an oral standard that could serve as a model for speakers, who at the time (due mainly to the prohibition of Catalan from the public sphere, especially in schools, during the Franco regime) had no clear guidelines on what was acceptable (or correct) spoken Catalan and what was unacceptable at the phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical levels (in the early 1980s spoken Catalan was heavily "contaminated" with Hispanisms and had to be "purified"). The creation of

---

[2] For an overview of translation from the late 19th to the early 20th century, see Gallén. For translation and language models in the period comprised between 1906 and 2000, see Ortín. On the language models in the 1990s and 2000s, see Pujol, "Models de traducció" 241-245.

a Catalan oral standard culminated in the publication of two books by Televisió de Catalunya: the style guide (*El català a TV3*, in 1995) and the linguistic criteria for translation and dubbing (*Criteris lingüístics*, in 1997). During the previous decade (1982-92), there had been a fierce battle around the type of language model that needed to be created: one group of linguists and writers defended a formal, rigid language model based on written Catalan, whereas another group wanted a more flexible model closer to ordinary speech (for a summary of the two positions, which were called "català *heavy*" and "català *light*" respectively, see Pazos and Grup d'Estudis Catalans).

It is within this wide-ranging Catalan cultural and linguistic context spanning more than a century (from the late 19th to the early 21st century) that the present article falls, analyzing three particular instances of how the language of Shakespeare's plays has been rendered into Catalan in modern times. My focus is on three different periods: the late 19th century, the early 20th century, and the late 20th and early 21st centuries. The first section of the article centres on the contrast between affected and unaffected language in *Hamlet*, and ponders how this distinction was implemented (by linguistic means very different from Shakespeare's) in a late 19th-century Catalan adaptation. The second part deals with an early 20th-century translation of *King Lear* in which the translator uses an archaic, medieval language instead of a contemporary one. The last section of the article shows how, and investigates the reasons why, the only translator of Shakespeare's complete dramatic works into Catalan, Salvador Oliva, has retranslated some of the plays, my focus being specifically on the differences in the language models deployed in his translation (1985) and later retranslation (2006) of *The Tempest*. It goes without saying that the three works dealt with here (*Hamlet*, *King Lear* and *The Tempest*) are highly canonical, both internationally and in the Catalan context.[3]

## Gaietà Soler's Translation-cum-Adaptation of *Hamlet* (1898)

Gaietà Soler's late 19th century translation-cum-adaptation of *Hamlet* is titled *Hamlet. Drama en tres actes y en vers; original de Shakspeare; traduhit y arreglat á l'escena católica per G. S., Angel Guerra* [Hamlet: Drama in Three

---

[3] According to Estill, Klyve and Bridal (9), in the period 1960-64 *Hamlet* was the first play most written about, *King Lear* the third and *The Tempest* the sixth. In the period 2000-04, *Hamlet* is still the first play most written about, *The Tempest* climbs to the second position and *King Lear* drops from third to fifth place (the authors reach these conclusions after analyzing the *World Shakespeare Bibliography* records). In Catalan (see Pujol, "Bibliografia comentada" 227-235), the most translated of the three plays is *Hamlet* (seven times), while both *King Lear* and *The Tempest* have been translated five times each; Shakespeare's most translated play into Catalan is *Macbeth* (nine times).

Acts and in Verse; Original by Shakspeare; Translated and Arranged for the Catholic Stage by G. S., Angel War]. The work was published in 1898. In the title, the translator, a Catholic priest, used his initials ("G. S.") followed by the pseudonym "Angel Guerra" (Angel War). According to the title, Soler's text was meant to be performed on stage, and it certainly was, at least in 1898, 1907, 1911, 1913 (?) and the year of his death, 1914 (see Buffery 257-260). Apart from being performed at theatres and at a meeting of the group Joventut Catòlica (Catholic Youth), my hypothesis is that the play might have been performed in schools, perhaps as part of catechism classes, for Soler worked as a religion teacher in Barcelona. The fact that the play is arranged for the Catholic stage makes even more sense if we bear in mind that in 1906, two years before the adaptation-cum-translation was published, Soler initiated a fierce campaign in the newspaper *Diario de Barcelona* against the laicism advocated by the influential Catalan politician Enric Prat de la Riba. This, and the pedagogical longing to introduce Shakespeare to his pupils, could explain Soler's involvement in writing (as the subtitle indicates) a heavily bowdlerized and abbreviated adaptation-cum-translation.

The passage from Soler's *Hamlet* that I will concentrate on here is the famous episode in which the players perform in court, before Hamlet, the play *The Murder of Gonzago*, also called *The Mousetrap* (*Hamlet* 3.2.142-248). In the original there is stylistic variation: Shakespeare establishes a marked contrast between the naturalistic language of the audience (Hamlet, King Claudius, Polonius, and so on), who comment on the actors' performance, and the contrived, convoluted, shoddy language used by the characters in Hamlet's play, *The Mousetrap*.[4] In the play written by Hamlet, his characters use an exaggerated, even mock language, the result being what I call "forced" orality, which is more typical of highly elaborate written discourse than of ordinary spoken conversation.

Shakespeare contrasts "naturalistic" orality with "forced" orality in six ways. First of all, in *The Mousetrap* the members of the court speak (in the aforementioned episode, not in the rest of the play) in a naturalistic, lively prose, whereas the players in *The Mousetrap* speak in rhymed verse and, more specifically, in couplets: the contrast between realistic language and contrived language thus becomes very evident in Shakespeare's play. Secondly, the players' discourse is not isolated; rather, it alternates quite often with that of Hamlet and the other members of the court, so both types of speech clash markedly. Thirdly, the players' language is peppered with mythological

---

[4] Another example of language used by Shakespeare in an intentionally "shoddy" way can be found in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, when the artisans rehearse (and later on act before Theseus and Hippolyta) the tragicomedy *Pyramus and Thisbe* (3.1 and 5.1 respectively).

references (ll. 148-163), which leads to the abuse of periphrases such as "Phoebus' cart" instead of "the sun" (l.148). Fourthly, in *The Mousetrap* there are many unnatural syntactic inversions (hyperbatons), such as "Discomfort you my lord it nothing must" (l.159) or "Thoughts black, hands apt, drugs fit" (l.243). Fifthly, the players' language is plagued with sayings and proverbs, especially in lines 178-204, where they succeed each other quite randomly. And lastly, the players use archaisms, for example "enactures" instead of "performance" (l.188). All these six traits give the discourse of the players in *The Mousetrap* a rigid and stilted flavour that contrasts with the vivid, spontaneous and naturalistic language of the audience (the court members).

Let us see now how the aforementioned contrast between naturalistic and forced orality is reflected in Soler's *Hamlet*. This work provides an interesting solution as regards the translation of the two types of orality (naturalistic and forced) that occur in the passage we are analyzing: while in Shakespeare's text all the characters speak in English, in Soler's translation of the passage (33-36) the players in *The Mousetrap* speak in Spanish instead of Catalan, whereas the audience at the court speak in Catalan. This language shift is meant to "translate" the clash in registers (naturalistic and forced orality) that takes place in the English original: the alternation between two languages in the context of a single conversation (technically known as code-switching) has, in Soler's translation, the aim of establishing a clearly marked and continuous contrast between the language of the court members and that of the players. The use of Spanish in a Catalan context is, in itself, an element that turns the language of the players in *The Mousetrap* into a strange and contrived one. To this we should add the fact that Soler does not use a run-of-the-mill Spanish, but a highly (and deliberately) elaborate one. Thus, in the passages in Spanish, Soler, like Shakespeare, makes the players speak by means of learned or archaic words and expressions, for instance "presto" [apace] (33) or "tósigo" [bane, venom] (35). Apart from this, in Soler's translation the players invert, almost systematically, the auxiliary and the main verb, artificially put the adjective before the noun (the unmarked Spanish word order is Noun + Adjective) and use, in general, and as happens in Shakespeare, a totally unnatural syntax: "Yo dejar debo ya esta amarga vida" [Leave must I this life bitter] (33); "Mucho juraste [...] Aquí gozar quisiera / solitaria quietud; rendido siento / al cansancio mi espíritu" [Promise did you a lot [...] Here enjoy would like I / quietness solitary; exhausted feel I / to tiredness my spirit] (34). Furthermore, when in the English original the players speak in couplets ("tree [...] be [...] forget [...] debt", 3.2.181-184), Soler also makes them often speak in couplets ("dispuesto [...] tiempo [...] silencio [...] intento [...] presto", 35), a fact that contrasts with the real-life syntax and the blank (i.e. unrhymed) iambic pentameter of the members of the court (of Hamlet in the following example):

> This play is the image of a murder done in Vienna. Gonzago is the Duke's name, his wife Baptista. You shall see anon. 'Tis a knavish piece of work; but what o' that? (Shakespeare 3.2.226-229)

> Es un assassinat que hi hagué a Viena,
> lo Rey se diu Gonzaga, 'l germá Céssar.
> ¡Ah! ja veureu aviat, es una trama
> d'un embolich diabólich, mes ¿qué importa?

> [It is a murder that took place in Vienna,
> the King is called Gonzaga, his brother Caesar.
> Oh! You'll see soon, it is a plot
> diabolically muddled, but who cares? (my translation)]⁵ (Soler 34)

As can be observed, in the above passage Soler translates in verse what in the original is in prose. This is one of the main characteristics of Soler's translation: he uses verse (sometimes blank, sometimes rhymed) to translate, respectively, rhymed verse and prose. Given the fact that Soler imposed upon himself, as the subtitle of his *Hamlet* indicates (*Drama en tres actes y en vers* [Drama in Three Acts and in Verse]), to translate the whole of his *Hamlet* in verse, he must not have deemed it feasible to establish, as the original does, a contrast in registers by making the players in *The Mousetrap* speak in verse and the members of the court in prose. Ruling out the possibility of using prose, the only option that must have remained to the translator was to juxtapose a markedly fabricated verse (with a convoluted language that has a tendency to rhyme) with another type of verse that has a more unaffected appearance, namely blank verse written in ordinary language. Soler does not follow, therefore, the original pattern (which consists in the alternation of exaggerated verse and naturalistic prose), but it achieves the aim of differentiating between naturalistic orality and forced orality by means of linguistic strategies which are partly identical to the original (archaic language and syntactic inversions as opposed to contemporary ordinary language) and partly different from the original (the use of two languages instead of one, as well as the contrast between blank verse and verse with a tendency to rhyme instead of the original's contrast between prose and verse). The readers of Soler's adaptation, presumably Catalan school pupils, understood, of course, both Catalan and Spanish: in the late 19th century education in Catalan schools was solely in Spanish—it had been so since the prohibition of Catalan in 1768, and in actual fact the first modern school that taught in Catalan was created precisely in 1898, the same year that Soler's adaptation was published. In Soler's time, therefore, Catalan was relegated to

---

⁵ Throughout this article, all back-translations from Catalan and Spanish into English are mine, and appear between square brackets.

oral uses, while classroom reading of literary works was done entirely in Spanish, so it seems natural that Catalan appears in Soler's translation as unelaborated, ordinary speech, whereas Spanish is associated with high style and stilted rhetoric.

## Anfòs Par's Translation of *King Lear* (1912)

In the Introduction we saw that between 1907 and 1910 a total of 16 translations of Shakespeare's plays appeared in the series Biblioteca Popular dels Grans Mestres [Popular Library of the Great Masters], henceforth abbreviated as BPGM. The BPGM was the first sustained effort (and a collective one at that) to translate Shakespeare into Catalan. Anfòs Par, a pre-eminent Catalan and Spanish Shakespearean critic, lived in the same period as the translators that published in the BPGM. What does he think of this series and the translations that appeared therein? The name of the series is significant: the editions are "popular" and cheap, and they are aimed at a general, non-specialist readership. Par cannot refrain from criticizing this attempt:

> Sobrevinieron entre los años de 1907 y 1910 una turbamulta de buenos escritores, pero de los que, como traductores, es mejor no acordarse [...]; verdad es que la edición se vendía barato.

> [Between 1907 and 1910 there arose a tumultuous throng of good writers but whose names, as translators, it is best not to remember [...]; truth be said, the edition was sold cheaply.] (Par, *Shakespeare en la literatura*, vol. II: 214)

Par, unlike the translators in the series, was not a writer, but a philologist and literary critic, and his 1912 translation of *King Lear* is, as we will see, radically different from the one published in 1908 in the BPGM by A. Albert Torrellas.

Par lived in a time of linguistic hesitation, experimentation and reform as far as the Catalan literary language is concerned (see Casacuberta). One of the things that differentiates Par from the translators in the BPGM (among them the so-called "prince of the poets" Josep Carner, who translated three plays by Shakespeare between 1908 and 1910) is the fact that, while Par resorts to medieval Catalan in a more or less systematic way, pushing in his translation of *King Lear* the limits of the Catalan language, the translators in the BPGM take the Catalan spoken at the time, purify it from Hispanisms and rework it in literary terms, introducing archaisms very sparingly. In order to find out the differences in the language models between the two groups I decided to examine the coetaneous Catalan translations of *King Lear*, namely the one by Par (1912) and the one by Albert Torrellas (1908), more specifically the opening speeches by Goneril and Regan in which they tell their father how much they love him

(*King Lear* 1.1.55-61 and 1.1.69-76,[6] Albert Torrellas 12-13, Par 81-83). The results point to a substantial difference between the two passages and show that Albert Torrellas' version, even though it contains elements of literary language ("vos am" and "vos aimo", 'I love thee'), is much more based on spoken, contemporary language. On the other hand, Par often resorts to medieval archaisms, not only lexical but also morphological and morphosyntactic: "dessús" ('above'; Albert Torrellas: "molt més encara"), "misser" ('my lord'; Albert Torrellas: no translation), "ningun" ('none'; Albert Torrellas: "cap"), "ço" ('this', 'the'; Albert Torrellas: "lo"), the feminine form "ma amor" ('my love'; Albert Torrellas: "el vostre amor"), the lack of first person conjugation verb endings as in "declar" ('declare'; Albert Torrellas: "declaro") and the use of the relative pronoun "qui" ('who'; Albert Torrellas: "que" 'that') to refer to things.

Besides the wide linguistic gap in the translations, the paratexts themselves reveal the language model professed by each translator. In the title of his translation, for instance, Albert Torrellas employs the modern article "el", whereas Par uses the older form "lo". And with regard to the way the translators sign their translations, Par uses the medieval name "Anfòs" instead of the one commonly employed in his personal correspondence and in his private life, "Alfons".[7] The largest paratexts in Par's translation, though, are the preface and the lengthy introduction and many footnotes: all of them abound in medieval archaisms. Let us take one of the footnotes, which sheds light on Par's use of archaisms. Commenting on his translation of Regan's "I am made of that self mettle as my sister", 1.1.69), Par writes the following footnote in order to justify his translation of Shakespeare's "mettle" as "metall" 'metal' (it should be noted that he and some editors of *King Lear* spell "mettle" as "metal"):

> Alguns comentaristes dupten sobre si l'anglès *metal* dèu esser pres en lo sentit del català *metall* o si es sinonim de *mettle*, mot ab lo qual originariament hom designava lo tremp de l'espasa y qui s'estengué després a «coratge, fermesa de temprament, vigor». En realitat, Shakespeare l'usa en aquest sentit en diversos passatges. Adueixen aquells, ademés, qu'en dos in-folio hom hi llegeix *mettle* y no *metal*. Aixís la traducció seria: «So feta del meteix tremp que ma germana.» Emperò una raó d'afinitat, falaguera pera los catalans, m'inclina a creure qu'es *metall* ço que l'autor espressa. [...] Y es que les *maneres* literaries depenen molt

---

[6] Throughout this section, quotations and line numbers are taken from the substantially revised Folio text *The Tragedy of King Lear* (written c. 1610) rather than the Quarto text *The History of King Lear* (published c. 1605-06). The different texts can be found in Shakespeare (1153-1184 and 909-941 respectively).

[7] As far as Par's personal correspondence is concerned, see Julià i Muné (100, 102, 355 and 358). Ribes Amorós (168, n. 1) remarks that in his private life the translator was known as "Alfons".

de l'epoca. No coincideix nostre autor ab Joanot Martorell quan aquest diu (*Tirant*, II, 85): «Yo só composta de tal metall que james prometi res que nou atengues»? Pera mi, sí. Si de les relacions universals de Shakespeare no cal duptar-ne, sobre les catalanes hi hem d'insistir; qu'es bella y vera cosa anar descobrint l'antiga vida forana de nostra literatura. (82, n. 3)

[Some commentators doubt whether the English word *metal* must be taken in the Catalan sense of *metall* ['metal'] or whether it is synonymous with *mettle*, a word which originally designated the strength of a sword and which then spread to "courage, firmness of temperament, vigour". In fact, Shakespeare uses the term in this sense in several passages. In addition, there are those who argue that in a couple of Folios one can read *mettle*, not *metal*. Thus the translation would be: "I am made of the same mettle as my sister". Yet a reason of affinity, pleasant for Catalans, inclines me to believe that what the author expresses is *metall* ['metal']. [...] In fact, literary *modes* depend much on the times. Does not our author coincide with Joanot Martorell[8] when he says (*Tirant*, II, 85): "I am composed of such metal that I never promised anything that I could not attend to"? In my opinion, yes. If there is no doubt about Shakespeare's universal relations, we must insist on the Catalan ones, as it is a true and beautiful thing to discover the ancient foreign life of our literature.]

From the above quotation it can be inferred that Par's lexical choice when there are variations in the original ("mettle" and "metal") is largely determined by the lexical and semantic coincidence with the Catalan form "metall" 'metal' in a medieval Catalan writer. Par not only uses a profusion of medieval archaisms in his translation ("regonèixer" 'recognize' instead of "reconèixer", 78; "mils" 'better' instead of "millor", 79; "assats" 'enough' instead of "suficient", 88), but he also revels in lengthy footnotes that explain the reasons for his lexical choice: thus, when employing "seny de lladre" 'thief's sense' instead of "toc de retreta" 'curfew bell', Par writes (202, n. 1) that he has found this phrase in the city of Barcelona's local edicts from 1310; and when translating Shakespeare's "convey" (which has the sense of "to handle skilfully"), he prefers to use one single verb, "tracmanyar", instead of three modern words (102, n. 3), because "tracmanyar" appears in Jaume Roig's long satirical poem *Spill* (c. 1460).

What are the reasons underlying Par's choice of such a language model? In other words: why, in the 20th century, does Par insist on using medieval language, at the risk of being accused, as he says, of sounding "archaic" (xi)? As can be inferred from reading the preface to *Lo Rei Lear* (ix-xv), there are four reasons why Par opts for a medieval language model, the first two being historical and the last two linguistic and stylistic: 1) lack of literary tradition; 2) Hispanisms; 3) parallel language reasons; and 4) his concept of orality.

---

[8] A medieval Catalan writer, author of the novel *Tirant lo Blanch*.

Regarding the first of the historical reasons, namely the lack of a Catalan literary tradition, Par believes it is most urgent to introduce archaisms due to what he perceives as the lack of modern literary vocabulary in Catalan. In this, he is clearly opposed to the Noucentist literary movement (1906-23), whose members choose to purify modern Catalan from Hispanisms:

> Nostra tradició classica's rompé y jo cuide qu'aquesta es la dissort més greu qu'ha soferta Catalunya. En conseqüencia, avui-en-dia pera tasques qui no admetin la parla popular, sinó qu'ofereixin un caracter refinadament literari, l'escriptor ha de decidir se, adés per nostre llenguatge modern artisat per nostra primera ciutat intelectual, ab més o menys purificacions, adés per un català en lo qual tot mancament modern sigui corretgit y omplenat per nostre periode classic, malgrat que pera remeiar l'actual pobresa sigui precís introduir arcaismes. (xii)

> [Our classical [literary] tradition broke down [in medieval times, resurrecting in the mid-19th century], and I believe this is the worst misfortune that Catalonia has ever suffered. Consequently, nowadays, for tasks that do not fit popular speech, but that offer a refined literary character, a writer has to decide between our modern [Noucentist] language, embellished in our first intellectual city [i.e. Barcelona] with quite a few purifications, and a Catalan in which every [linguistic] lack is corrected and filled up by [the writers of] our classical [i.e. medieval] period, even though to remedy the current [linguistic] poverty it is necessary to introduce archaisms.]

The second historical reason why Par prefers a medieval language is the profusion of Hispanisms that "infest" the Catalan of the time (xi). In fact, this is a way of purifying modern Catalan from Spanish words. Very often, Par's language is too archaic, but on occasion the medieval lexicon he rescues succeeds, at least from the point of view of today's normative Catalan: this is the case, for instance, with respect to his refusal to use the Hispanism "modos" 'manners' (in the sense that can be found in the sentence "a person who does not have manners") in favour of "maneres", a word that, as he explains (87, n. 2), he borrows from Ramon Llull (c. 1232-c. 1315) because he finds it is the exact equivalent of the English word "manners".

In addition to historical motivations for using medieval language, there are reasons of language parallels. Reading the preface to *Lo Rei Lear*, it is easy to realize that Par equates Shakespeare's Renaissance English (16th-17th centuries) with the medieval Catalan of Ramon Llull, Bernat Metge and Joanot Martorell (13th-15th centuries):

> En totes les llengües mitg·evals los mots servaven més sovint qu'ara llur significança llogica y primitiva. Y es per açò qu'he tingut lo goig d'encontrar en nostres sobirans Metge y Martorell algunes frasis integres, calcades al peu de la

lletra a les shakesperianes, les quals, anc que poques, són una prova concloent de l'intercambi d'idees y maneres qui s'estableix entre periodes similars de totes les llengües, y una indicació segura d'aon dèu hom situar-se pera traduir-les. (xii)

[In all medieval languages, words kept more often than now their logical and primitive meaning. And it is for this reason that I have had the joy of finding in our sovereign writers [Bernat] Metge and [Joanot] Martorell some complete sentences, absolutely identical to Shakespearean ones, which, even though they are but a few, are conclusive evidence of the exchange of ideas and ways [of writing] that occurs between similar periods in all languages, and a safe indication of where one must place himself to translate them.]

"Similar periods": despite the fact that Renaissance English and medieval Catalan belong in very different historical periods, for Par both are cases of "old" languages: "old Catalan has given me the means to translate exactly old English" (87, n. 2). Everything suggests that the translator understands the "similar periods" in both literatures not in chronological terms but in qualitative terms: they are "the golden time" (xiii) of Catalan and English literature, and therefore they are akin to each other not only because they represent the utmost linguistic and literary grandeur in their respective languages, but also because they present linguistic coincidences due to a supposed etymological kinship—it is as if Par believed in the existence of an *Ursprache* or protolanguage which had connected English and Catalan and which, as we recede in time, would be easier to access. If we want to translate Shakespeare's English, the best way to do so is by using old Catalan, the translator seems to imply. As there is a lack of language models in the so-called Decadence period between the 16th and the 18th centuries, in which literary production in Catalan is practically non-existent, Par cannot use a 16th-17th century Catalan equivalent, so the most logical thing for him to do is to go back to the golden age of Catalan literature in medieval times.

The last reason why Par chooses an archaic language model has to do with his conception of orality. As Pujol ("La traducción al catalán" 122-125) explains, Par conceived his translation to be read, not to be performed on stage. Shakespeare's theatrical language is, therefore, light years away from Par's: whereas for Shakespeare the written word "was no more than a means of recording speech" (Gurr 107), for Par the printed word becomes the source from which theatrical orality springs. Actually, for Par the oral element is not important at all: as we have seen, for him to translate Shakespeare is a task that does not fit "popular speech", but has "a refined literary character" (xii). In fact, rather than a "literary" character, Par's translation has a "bookish" nature, not only because he goes back to medieval Catalan writers but also because of the scholarly nature of the translation, which abounds in lengthy footnotes. Let us

add to this that the translations in the BPGM were meant to be staged (in fact, some of them were: see Buffery 258-259 and Pujol, *Traduir Shakespeare*, 75 n. 1), and it will become evident that the BPGM translators' cultural attitude to Shakespeare's plays stands in stark contrast to that of Par, even though their ultimate end is the same, namely to contribute to the creation of a literary language through translation.

## Salvador Oliva's Translation and Retranslation of *The Tempest* (1985, 2006)

The last items in the corpus analyzed in this article are Salvador Oliva's translation (1985) and retranslation (2006) of *The Tempest*. Salvador Oliva is the only person to have translated into Catalan all of Shakespeare's dramatic works. He first translated them between 1984 and 1992. Later on, in the early 21st century (from 2003 onwards), Oliva decided to revise them—the process is an ongoing one, and so far almost half the works have been republished in revised form. Among the retranslations are some of the most well-known tragedies (*Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Romeo and Juliet*), comedies (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*), historical plays (*Henry IV*, *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*) as well as the last work that most critics think Shakespeare wrote alone, namely *The Tempest*. It is on this romance that I will concentrate here.

If we put Salvador Oliva's translations in the context of the creation of TV3's oral standard (see the Introduction), it is easy to see that his first translation of Shakespeare's complete dramatic works took place precisely between 1984 (one year after the creation of TV3) and 1992 (three years before TV3's style guide and five before its linguistic criteria for translation and dubbing were published). Oliva's first translation of *The Tempest* appeared in 1985: this places the play in the early stages of the formation of the Catalan oral standard. In actual fact, Oliva's translations may be said to contribute to the "normalization" of oral Catalan insofar as they were originally conceived not to be read or to be staged, but to be used as dubbed and subtitled versions of the British series *The BBC Television Shakespeare* (1978-85), an ambitious project that took all of Shakespeare's plays to the small screen. Oliva's translations thus contributed, however mildly, to the creation of an oral standard for TV3, a channel that not only used them for dubbing and subtitling but also co-published the works more or less at the same time as they were being shown on TV.

Given these facts, it is worth investigating why and how Oliva decides to begin to retranslate Shakespeare's plays a decade after having finished the first versions (and two decades after having begun them). Of course Oliva is not the first translator to retranslate his previous translations: he may have done so to

polish and improve the first versions. Yet, apart from this, there is another motivation why Oliva retranslates Shakespeare, namely to accommodate or adapt his previous language model (which evolved as TV3's oral standard was forged in the decade 1983-93) to the consolidated language model that emerged after the publication of Televisió de Catalunya's style guide (1995) and criteria for translation and dubbing (1997).

This aspect of rewriting his previous translations manifests itself in the form of two major kinds of linguistic (mainly lexical and morphological) change: suppressions and substitutions. The classification below categorizes, illustrates and comments on the main different types of modifications due to the adoption of a more modern oral language model. Quotations from Shakespeare's *The Tempest* appear in the first place, followed by Oliva's 1995 translation and his 2006 retranslation. The differences are marked in italics.

1) Suppressions:

    1a) Morphology: suppression of postverbal pronouns, which nowadays tend to be perceived as formal and literary as opposed to unmarked and oral:

        Keep your cabins (1.1.12) → quedeu-*vos* a les cabines (24) → torneu a les cabines (4)
        There they hoist us (1.2.148) → I van deixar-*nos-hi* (31) / *Ens* van deixar *allà dins* (14)

    1b) Culture: suppression of culturally distant items because the linguistic equivalent is no longer in use:

        At least two glasses (1.2.41, in reference to the passage of time as measured by an hourglass full of sand) → Amb ben bé *dues arenades* (35) → Ø (18)

2) Substitutions:

    2a) Lexicon: substitution of formal, literary or infrequent lexical items for common, oral, unmarked ones:

        Both, both, my girl (1.2.61) → *Ambdues* coses, filla meva (28) → *Les dues* coses, filla (10)
        ignoble stooping (1.2.116) → innoble *asserviment* (30) → *servilisme* innoble (12)
        For this (1.2.327) → Per aquests *mots* (38) → Per aquestes *paraules* (23)
        there (1.2.281) → *allí* (36) → *allà* (20)
        say what thou seest yon (1.2.412) → digues què veus *allí* (42) → digues què veus *allà* (28)

    2b) Lexicon: substitution of unmarked lexicon for phrases with an oral tinge:

        a goodlier man (1.2.486) → un home més *afavorit* que aquest (45, 'handsome') → un home / més *ben plantat* que aquest (32, 'fine-looking')

2c) Morphology: substitution of postverbal pronouns (which nowadays tend to be perceived as formal or literary) for preverbal ones (which are perceived as unmarked and as more oral):

and [mine art] let you out (1.2.294) → i [les meves arts] van deixar-*te* lliure (37) → i [les meves arts] *et* van deixar lliure (21)
And [I] showed thee (1.2.339) → i vaig mostrar-*te* (39) → i *et* vaig mostrar (24)

2d) Morphology: substitution of formal, literary past participle verb endings for common, less marked ones:

Hast thou forget her? (1.2.260) → L'has oblid*ada*? (36) → L'has oblid*at*? (19)
Thence I have followed it (1.2.396) → Per això l'he segu*ida* (41) → Per això l'he segu*it* (27)

2e) Morphology: substitution of formal, literary forms of the verb 'to be' for common, unmarked ones:

what thou hast been (1.2.263) → allò que *fores* (36) → allò que *eres* (20)
I should sin (1.2.118) → *Fóra* un pecat en mi (30) → *Seria* fer un pecat (13)

2f) Syntax: substitution of the syntactic structure Subject + Verb (when the subject is long) for the more oral, less marked Verb + Subject structure:

All the infections that the sun sucks up / From bogs, fens, flats, on Prosper fall, and make him / By inch-meal a disease! (2.2.1-3) → *Que totes les infeccions* que xucla el sol / dels aiguamolls, pantans i fanguissars / *caiguin damunt de Pròsper*, i li deixin / el cos plagat de llagues! (59) → *Que caiguin sobre Pròsper totes les infeccions* / que xucla el sol dels aiguamolls, pantans i fanguissars, / i que li llaguin el cos (53)

Oliva's changes in the 2006 retranslation of *The Tempest* reveal his wish to accommodate the target language to contemporary oral usage, and more specifically to TV3's oral standard, which is caracterized by syntactic simplicity and for being close to oral speech—every single substitution in the 2006 retranslation examples given above is due to a desire to use a language that flees the written literary tradition (the 1985 items sound obsolete and bookish: they belong in a bygone era) and favours contemporary ordinary speech, the one likely to be heard on the street and in TV3 broadcasts. As such, Oliva's retranslation is much more effective in terms of reaching and connecting with theatre audiences—a recent survey (Palomo Berjaga 1215-1231) has confirmed this in the case of Oliva's 2006 *Romeo and Juliet* translation with respect to Josep Maria de Sagarra's 1946 translation: Oliva's translation is better understood than Sagarra's by the actors and actresses interviewed (96.6% vs 3.4%), who note that it sounds less literary and poetic than Sagarra's (90% vs 3.3; other answers: 6.7%) (Palomo Berjaga 1226-1227).

One final aspect of Oliva's retranslation worth commenting on is his change in the metrics used. A comparison of Oliva's 1985 and 2006 translations of *The Tempest* reveals that in the first version Oliva uses highly irregular anisosyllabic lines to translate Shakespeare's regular iambic pentameter (the lines range from 8 to 18 syllables), whereas in the revised version he still uses anisosyllabic lines, but rewrites them to fit into the two most usual Catalan metrical patterns, namely 10- and 12-syllable lines (decasyllables and alexandrines), which incidentally often lengthens the number of lines with respect to Shakespeare's original. This change reflects Oliva's wish to approach Shakespeare's language by attempting to replicate the rhythms and cadences of spontaneous, natural speech in the target language—Catalan tends to organize itself around ten syllables, much in the same way as English speech does in iambic pentameters.

## **Conclusion**

Throughout this article, we have seen that the translators' linguistic strategies and language models are key in the rendition and rerendition of Shakespeare's dramatic oral discourse. These elements, of course, affect all translations, whether they are Shakespearian or not, but in the case of the translation of Shakespeare into Catalan in the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries they are crucial, for in these three centuries the Catalan literary language has been shaped and has evolved much more than English or Spanish. In fact, it might be argued that most translations and retranslations of Shakespeare into Catalan have taken place due to one or more of the following facts: 1) the Catalan language has evolved quite rapidly from one generation to another; 2) modern literary Catalan was moulded in the first half of the 20th century; and 3) the Catalan oral standard was created in the late 20th century.

To go back to Gaietà Soler's 1898 translation, it should be noted that throughout the 19th century the Catalan language was, in literary terms, much under the shadow of Spanish: it was not until the Renaissance literary movement in the second half of the 19th century that the Catalan language overcame, little by little, the state of literary diglossia in which it was immersed.[9] In this context of progressively overcoming literary diglossia, Soler's preference for Catalan in 1898, when the Renaissance movement was already consolidated, is

---

[9] The poet and playwright Víctor Balaguer, for instance, began his career writing in Spanish (1838-58) and turned to Catalan halfway through (1859-92), even though he kept publishing his historical essays in Spanish until his death in 1901. It is significant, in this respect, that Balaguer adapted *Romeo and Juliet* first into Spanish (*Julieta y Romeo*, 1849) and later on into Catalan (*Les esposalles de la morta* [The Engagement of the Dead One], 1878).

understandable, yet the sporadic use of Spanish, inconceivable in Catalan translations of Shakespeare's plays in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, can be accounted for easily if we take a historical approach.

In the same way, the language employed by Anfòs Par in his translation of *King Lear* can be explained if we take into account the lack of a consolidated literary language model at the time (1912). Only later on, led by Pompeu Fabra, did the Institut d'Estudis Catalans (the academy of the Catalan language, created in 1907) publish the *Normes ortogràfiques* (1913), the *Diccionari ortogràfic* (1917), the *Gramàtica catalana* (1918) and the *Diccionari general de la llengua catalana* (1932), all of which laid the basis not only for modern literary Catalan, but also for modern normative speech free of Hispanisms.

In a similar vein, some of the differences between Salvador Oliva's translations of Shakespeare's works in the 1980s and his retranslations in the 2000s can be explained if we take into account the profound change that the creation of a Catalan oral standard by TV3 has had on speakers, writers and translators alike: TV3 has created a language model that has become, *de facto*, the linguistic reference for Catalan society as a whole.

All in all, we can now explicitly state the thesis that has underpinned this article, namely that the language of Shakespeare's plays has been translated and retranslated into Catalan (since the late 19th century up to our day) using different linguistic strategies and different language models whose very existence depends on: 1) the status of a given language and literature in society; 2) the translator's linguistic and literary agenda; and 3) the type of audience (readers, theatregoers, TV watchers or film spectators) that the (sometimes commissioned) translator or play director have in mind.

The precise extent to which Shakespearean translations, and translations in general, have shaped the development of the Catalan language remains an issue for future research, as this would require extensive study of literary data and corpora, such as those found in the *Diccionari descriptiu de la llengua catalana*, an ongoing spin-off of the Corpus Textual Informatitzat de la Llengua Catalana, a database that contains more than 52 million words taken from both literary (30.65%) and non-literary (69.35%) sources in a chronological range (1833 to 1988). Nonetheless, it may be asserted that without translations, especially those of Shakespeare and of modern and ancient classics in the Noucentist period (1906-36), the Catalan language, literary and otherwise, would not be the same as it is today: it is the Noucentist writers and translators who laid the foundations for the construction of a literary language by experimenting with different language models (Casacuberta, Ortín) and by implementing, to a great extent, the language model created by the grammarian Pompeu Fabra in the first third of the 20th century. Without them, great post-civil war writers of the 1960s and 1970s like Josep Pla, Mercè Rodoreda and Salvador Espriu would not exist, and the literary language as we know it today would be much different.

## WORKS CITED

Albert Torrellas, A. Trans. *El rei Lear*. Biblioteca Popular dels Grans Mestres 8. Barcelona: Estampa d'E. Domenech, 1908.

Buffery, Helena. *Shakespeare in Catalan: Translating Imperialism*. Cardiff: U of Wales P, 2007.

Casacuberta, Margarida, et al. Eds. *La llengua de 1907*. Girona: CCG Edicions, 2008.

Coma, Abelardo. Adaptor. *Otello il moro di Valenzia. Paroddia in versi per Abelardo Coma; musica di Francisco di P. Sánchez Gabanyach*. [Barcelona:] Imprenta Barcelonesa, 1874.

Corpus Textual Informatitzat de la Llengua Catalana. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans. 31 July 2016. <http://ctilc.iec.cat>.

*Diccionari descriptiu de la llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans. 31 July 2016. <http://dcc.iec.cat/ddlc/index.asp>.

Estill, Laura, Dominic Klyve and Kate Bridal. "'Spare Your Arithmetic, Never Count the Turns': A Statistical Analysis of Writing about Shakespeare, 1960-2010". *Shakespeare Quarterly* 66.1 (2015): 1-28.

Gallén, Enric. "La traducción entre el siglo XIX y el *Modernisme*". *Historia de la traducción en España*. Ed. Francisco Lafarga and Luis Pegenaute. Salamanca: Ambos Mundos, 2004: 661-673.

Grup d'Estudis Catalans. *El barco fantasma (1982-1992)*. Barcelona: Llibres de l'Índex, 1992.

Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: CU P, 2004.

Julià i Muné, Joan. *L'inici de la lingüística catalana. Bernhard Schädel, Mn. Antoni M. Alcover i l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans. Una aproximació epistolar, 1904-1925*. Barcelona: Curial – Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 2000.

Oliva, Salvador. Trans. *La tempesta*. Barcelona: TV3-Vicens Vives, 1985.

——. Trans. *La tempesta*. Barcelona: Vicens Vives, 2006.

Ortín, Marcel. "Las traducciones, del *Noucentisme* a la actualidad". *Historia de la traducción en España*. Ed. Francisco Lafarga and Luis Pegenaute. Salamanca: Ambos Mundos, 2004. 674-694.

Palomo Berjaga, Vanessa. *Josep Maria de Sagarra, traductor de 'Macbeth': anàlisi i comparació amb l'original de Shakespeare i amb les traduccions franceses, castellanes i catalanes precedents*. PhD thesis. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2016. <http://hdl.handle.net/10803/393969>.

Par, Anfòs. Trans. *Lo Rei Lear. Tragedia de Guillem Shakespeare; feelment arromançada en estil de catalana prosa per Anfòs Par; ab notes esplicatives dels mellors comentaristes anglesos y estudis critics del traductor*. Barcelona: Associació Wagneriana, 1912.

—— [as Alfonso Par]. *Representaciones shakesperianas en España*. 2 vols. Madrid and Barcelona: Biblioteca Balmes, 1936 and 1940.

—— [as Alfonso Par]. *Shakespeare en la literatura española. Juicios de los literatos españoles, con noticias curiosas sobre algunos de ellos y sobre sucesos literarios famosos*. 2 vols. Madrid and Barcelona: Librería General de Victoriano Suárez / Biblioteca Balmes, 1935.

Pazos, Maria-Lluïsa. *L'amenaça del català light*. Barcelona: Tibidabo, 1990.

Pujol, Dídac. "Bibliografia comentada de les traduccions catalanes de Shakespeare: part II (1970-2010)". *Estudis Romànics* 33 (2011): 211-236. <http://publicacions.iec.cat/repository/pdf/00000165/00000019.pdf>.

——. "Models de traducció literària i audiovisual en català col·loquial: el cas de *Jackie Brown* de Quentin Tarantino". *Caplletra. Revista internacional de filologia* 58 (2015): 235-264. <http://www.raco.cat/index.php/Caplletra/article/view/292717/389090>.

——. "La traducción al catalán de la oralidad fingida en el teatro de Shakespeare". *La oralidad fingida: descripción y traducción. Teatro, cómic y medios audiovisuales*. Ed. Jenny Brumme. Frankfurt and Madrid: Vervuert/Iberoamericana, 2008. 115-134.

——. *Traduir Shakespeare. Les reflexions dels traductors catalans*. Lleida: Punctum & Trilcat, 2007.

Ribes Amorós, M. Salomé. "Alfons Par, l'home i el seu context". *Llengua & Literatura* 15 (2004): 167-210.

Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works*. 2nd ed. Ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon, 2005.

Soler, Gaietà. Trans. *Hamlet. Drama en tres actes y en vers; original de Shakspeare; traduhit y arreglat á l'escena católica per G. S., Angel Guerra*. Barcelona: Imprempta de F. Altés, 1898.

Televisió de Catalunya. *El català a TV3. Llibre d'estil*. Barcelona: Edicions 62, 1995.

——. *Criteris lingüístics sobre traducció i doblatge*. Barcelona: Edicions 62, 1997.