Univerzita Karlova v Praze
Pedagogická fakulta

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

2020 Jana Šťastná

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Pedagogická fakulta

Katedra anglického jazyka

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

Slovní hříčky v Shakespearově Romeovi a Julii

Wordplay in Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet

Jana Šťastná

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Jakub Ženíšek, Ph.D.

Studijní program: Specializace v pedagogice (B7507)

Studijní obor: Anglický jazyk se zaměřením na vzdělávání (OB2AJ17)

2020

Odevzdáním této bakalářské práce na téma "Wordplay in Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet" potvrzuji, že jsem ji vypracovala pod vedením vedoucího práce samostatně za použití v práci uvedených pramenů a literatury. Dále potvrzuji, že tato práce nebyla využita k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

Praha 23. 7. 2020

ANOTACE

Bakalářská práce „Překlady slovních hříček v Shakespearově Romeovi a Julii" se zabývá problematikou překládání Shakespeara jako kulturního fenoménu se zaměřením na slovní hříčku jakožto typický prvek Shakespearova dramatického díla. Prostřednictvím konkrétních příkladů ze hry *Romeo a Julie* jsou v této práci analyzovány české překlady slovních hříček na pozadí Delabastitových překladových strategií a lingvistických mechanismů, jejichž analýza je posléze reflektována z hlediska aplikovatelnosti Delabastitových teoretických poznatků na konkrétní slovní hříčky v originálním i cílovém jazyce.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

Shakespeare, Romeo a Julie, literatura, lingvistika, překlad, slovní hříčka,

ANNOTATION

This bachelor thesis called "Wordplay in Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet" deals with the problematics of translating Shakespeare as a cultural phenomenon, more specifically translating wordplays, a quintessential element of Shakespeare's theatrical work. This thesis works with particular Czech translations of wordplays from the play *Romeo and Juliet*. These translations are analysed in accordance with Delabastita's translation strategies and linguistic mechanics. These strategies and mechanics are reflected unto each and every one of the wordplays and their subsequent translations used in this thesis.

KEYWORDS

Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, literature, linguistics, translating, wordplay

Contents

1 Introduction

Wordplays are something we encounter every day, either in ordinary speech, in ads, jokes or in newspapers. It is by no means something new. Quite the opposite. Wordplays can be found even in classical literature, William Shakespeare being one of many writers who used them in his plays.

In Shakespeare's dramas, wordplays function not only as jokes but also as something that makes the story more dynamic. Shakespeare also uses wordplays to help him portray certain characters. In general, and in Shakespeare's case, wordplays are a certain challenge for the reader. It is by no means an easy task to find and to understand a wordplay. One has to know the wordplay's language quite well, has to be able to find new meanings and connections, and last but not least, one has to have a vivid imagination. English wordplays in Shakespeare's plays pose a considerable challenge for the Czech reader, especially when we take into consideration the fact that Shakespeare's language is incredibly complex, with many archaisms, outdated grammar or various stylistic devices and figures of speech.

Understanding Shakespeare's wordplays is difficult but translating them into Czech is even harder. Czech literary scholars and reviewers consider Shakespeare one of the greatest playwrights of all time. There even is a summer festival of Shakespeare's plays every year. For that reason, Czech translations of his plays are always under scrutiny. On the other hand, outstanding translators of Martin Hilský's calibre may become celebrities. In order to come up with a good translation, one has to rise to the task of retaining the vibrancy of Shakespeare's wordplays. The reader expects a certain level of ease, ingenuity and fluency. The question is whether it is even possible to fulfill these expectations. In other words, is it even possible to translate Shakespeare's wordplays into Czech, a language so different to English? One of the goals of this thesis is to answer this question.

For research purposes, the theoretical part of this thesis will elaborate on the importance of translating Shakespeare in our age, as well as on the history of translating Shakespeare in the

context of Czech literary development. This thesis will also seek to establish which translations have recently been most popular with the publishers and theatrical producers, an inquiry which will serve as the starting point for choosing the main representatives whose translations will be analyzed in the practical part of this thesis, with special focus on the quality of translations of wordplays as the possible variable for the contemporary success of the given translations in comparison to others.

The theoretical part will also contain the definition of a wordplay and present strategies used to translate wordplays. The importance of translating wordplays in Shakespeare's plays will also be mentioned. Another chapter of the theoretical part will be dedicated to dividing wordplays into categories based on their respective linguistic mechanisms.

The goal of the practical is to confirm the findings established in the theoretical part and to apply these findings on some examples of wordplays found in one of Shakespeare's most famous plays – *Romeo and Juliet*. In the first step of the practical part, the wordplays will be divided into categories mentioned in the theoretical part. Then, their Czech translations will be analyzed. The analysis will be based on the strategy used in their translation, while also considering the linguistic mechanism they use. The results will be summarized, further analyzed and compared with the findings of the theoretical part.

2   The Pitfalls of Translating Shakespeare

Translating William Shakespeare's plays is generally considered as something culturally important. According to Delabastita, the cultural importance of translating Shakespeare can be approached from two points of view: a) *quantitative,* in which we take into consideration the amount of translations and adaptations of Shakespeare's plays on a global scale or b) *qualitative*, in which we assess the influence of Shakespeare's work on processes connected to defining the cultural identity and linguistic-literary tradition across the world. "The worldwide cultural importance of Shakespearean rewritings is indeed confirmed by the plethora of publications devoted to the subject. It is further attested by the fact that many translation

scholars have elected to test their views against the case of Shakespeare translation, using it as a touchstone for the relevance and validity of their theoretical constructions" (Delabastita 104).

2.1 Technicalities

Shakespeare poses a great challenge for translators mainly due to the frequent archaisms, cultural references, neologisms, metaphors, wordplay etc. The challenge resides mainly in the difficulty of choosing the appropriate translation technique. However, trying to preserve the musicality of Shakespeare's blank verse throughout the translation is problematic as well. Translating Shakespeare's blank verse is considered one of the key challenges when translating Shakespeare into Czech (Drábek 12). According to Josek, the difficulty is caused by the nature of each language: one line of blank verse has ten or eleven syllables and since Czech words are usually longer than English words, translators need to condense a lot while preserving the overall meaning (Josek, 15. 11. 2017). Drábek, on the other hand, states that the main difference is the fact that Czech translators are not rhythmically inventive enough and that they often compensate the rhythmical element by intensifying the expressivity or by intellectually problematizing monologues (Drábek 12).

2.2 Original or Adaptation

When translating Shakespeare, translators often use already existing translations either in their native language or in another foreign language. According to Drábek, it is necessary to distinguish whether the translator used the original or an adaptation as the source text. "*The original* means the original version of each play, for example the spoken English version of Hamlet. However, translators use written scripts as a basis for their translation and it is necessary to state that each version can differ from the previous one" (Drábek 23). The difference usually lies in the number of lines, or a discrepancy as to which character utters a particular line. The way in which the translator presents Shakespeare's original is greatly influenced by the choice of the source text (Drábek 23). As a consequence, many translations reflect, with a little delay, the tendencies in editing Shakespeare. One of positive outcomes of translating edited versions of the original is the fact that these translations have certainly been

instrumental in the translators' growing awareness of certain subtleties in Shakespeare's verbal texture (wordplays, ambiguity, imagery, and the like) (Delabastita 108).

Translators often use not only the English versions, but also existing translations in their native language or even a foreign language. It is thus possible to find translations of Shakespeare's plays translated by authors who did not even speak English. This practice is called *indirect translation* and, in the 18th century, such translations were more common than any other type of translation (Drábek 80). At first, Shakespeare's works were introduced to the rest of Europe thanks to French translations and later German translations (even in the 19th century, Czech translators frequently translated Shakespeare from the prosaic German translations by Eschenburg and Wieland) (Drábek 80). "As Delabastita concludes, "the status of English, French, and German as a lingua franca in certain areas and at certain times has strongly determined the international spread of Shakespeare's works" (109).

2.3   The Contemporary Consensus on Translating Shakespeare

Due to the influence of post-modernism, we can now observe the tendency to produce translations that are less like the original. According to Delabastita and Drábek, translating Shakespeare in a way so as to appeal to the modern reader the most is now an often occurrence. However, it can sometimes seem as if the translator is making the language more primitive. Drábek does not support these translations. He thinks that a translation that "gives up its style in order to appear more modern, more civil and perfectly understandable" is forgetting the most important aspect of a play – playing with the meaning – thus opposing the play itself) (Delabastita, 112; Drábek 73).

Another often occurrence that Delabastita describes is the longevity of some translations. New translators often fail to successfully replace the works of their predecessors, which causes a simultaneous coexistence of a greater number of actively used translations (in theaters or in publishing houses). Delabastita states that this trend makes any effort to chronologically arrange translations of Shakespeare's works almost impossible. It is evident that solving this complex problematic will need many more years of empiric research. However, he also states

that the result could provide a useful and enriching look into the post-renaissance literature (Delabastita 114-115).

3   Periodization Czech translation of Shakespeare

Associate professor Drábek from the Masaryk University in Brno offers a detailed periodization of Czech translations of Shakespeare in his publication *České pokusy o Shakespeara* (2010). Two years later, he expanded his publication by almost 700 pages of unknown and rare texts from 1787 to 1922. He bases his periodization on Fisher's own periodization from 1927 and elaborates on it in order to analyze the changes in the esthetics of translating Shakespeare's plays.

1. The generation of Vlastenské Theatre (1782–1807), unknown author from Jindřichův Hradec, Karel Hynek Thám, Prokop Šedivý, pseudonym H. Kukla
2. The generation of Josef Jungmann (1807–1840), unknown author from Slovakia, Bohuslav Tablic, Michal Bosý, Antonín Marek, Josef Linda, Josef Kajetán Tyl, Josef Jiří Kolár (I)
3. The generation of "museum" Shakespeare (1840–1885) Josef Jiří Kolár (II), Josef Václav Frič, František Doucha, Jan Josef Čejka, Ladislav Čelakovský, Jakub Malý
4. The generation of academic Shakespeare (1885–1922) Josef Václav Frič, Josef Václav Sládek, Jaroslav Vrchlický, Antonín Klášterský, Bohdan Kaminský
5. The generation of Otokar Fisher (1916–1945) Otokar Fischer, Antonín Fencl, Bohumil Štěpánek (I), E. A. Saudek (I)
6. The generation of Erik Adolf Saudek (1936–1963) Erik Adolf Saudek (II), Bohumil Štěpánek (II), František Nevrla, Jaroslav Kraus, Jaroslav Kutta, Otto František Babler, Aloys Skoumal, Bohumil Franěk
7. Shakespeare our contemporary (1959–1980) Zdeněk Urbánek, Josef Topol, Jaromír Pleskot, Václav Renč, František Vrba, Břetislav Hodek
8. The generation of the turn of the millennium (1977–?) Alois Bejblík, František Fröhlich, Milan Lukeš, Antonín Přidal, Martin Hilský, Jiří Josek, Olga Walló, Stanislav Rubáš

(Drábek 21)

Due to the vast nature of this problematic and the richness history of Czech translations of Shakespeare, I will only enumerate all the generations of translators and the rest of this thesis will be only dealing with generations respective to the translations that are analyzed in the practical part of this thesis – the generation of academic Shakespeare (Sládek), the generation of Erik Adolf Saudek (Saudek) and the generation of the turn of the millennium (Hilský). The choice of the aforementioned translators is further explained in chapter 3.4 but it is linked to the frequency of their translations in theaters as well as their accessibility on today's market.

3.1   The Generation of Academic Shakespeare

The main protagonist of this generation of translators named after their publisher – Czech Academy – was the Anglicist, poet and editor of the *Lumír* magazine, Josef Václav Sládek. He began to interest himself in Shakespeare at an early age, when the generation of "museum" Shakespeare was at its peak. After realizing he would never become a botanist, inspired by his close friend and translator Jaromír Čelakovský (an important translator of the "museum" Shakespeare generation), he decided to pursue a career in literature (Drábek 149). Sládek's first attempts to translate Shakespeare were abysmal, as seen in his correspondence with Čelakovský:

> "Oh, Caesar! The Longer I translate, the happier I am that he was butchered. (Sládek's letter to Čelakovský, January 22, 1867)"
> (Drábek 149)

His two-year stay in the USA provided Sládek with excellent knowledge of English, which is further proved by his decision to publish *Průpravná mluvnice anglického jazyka s příklady, výslovností a slovníkem* upon his return to his homeland as well as becoming an English lector at a university in Prague. In 1892, Sládek became an "exceptional member of the editorial board of *Sborník světové poezie*" (Drábek 150). There, he put in motion his plan to translate some of Shakespeare's titles. One year later, Sládek's translation of the comedy *The Taming of the Shrew* was put on stage of the National Theatre in Prague.

Sládek directed all of his efforts towards translating and it is evident that he wanted to translate all of Shakespeare's work. At first, he was helped by Antonín Klášterský and Jaroslav Vrchlický. However, Vrchlický, who should have been translating Hamlet, gave up. Mainly because of his poor English (Drábek 151). Eliška *Krásnohorská* should have been his replacement, but she also backed out. According to Klášterský, it was mainly because her understandable prudery conflicted with the renaissance sensuality of the plays:

> Shakespeare's work is full of lasciviousness and double entendres so typical for his era, which discouraged Krásnohorská. "I was not married, I do not understand it and I will not ask anyone about it!" answered Krásnohorská briefly (Klášterský, 1934, p. 434 in Drábek 152).

Eventually, Sládek remained the only one left to translate Shakespeare, and he did so until his death. Sládek did not manage to finish the translation of the second part of the tragedy *Henry IV*, his 33rd translation. It was Antonín Klášterský who took over after Sládek. Klášterský considered Sládek's translation an outstanding feat that contributed a great deal to Czech literature and theatre. In his book about the life and work of Josef Václav Sládek, Klášterský claims: "His translations are religiously accurate. There is almost no epithet missing, no scene left out; the translations of wordplays are surprisingly witty and funny. In terms of rhythm, the translations are perfect, fluent and clear. "The best thing about the translations is that they are poetic, elegant and very rich in poetic language" (Klášterský 20).

By translating Shakespeare's four remaining plays, Klášterský finished the second ever complete translation of Shakespeare's work into Czech (Drábek 152). In his book, Drábek states that Klášterský's decision to finish Sládek's work was rather reverential than objective. "Klášterský never tried to hide the fact that he finished Sládek's work out of reverence. It is thus necessary to consider it as such," (Drábek 153). Klášterský was not as strong in English as Sládek, which is attested to by the fact that he had asked to have his translation of Keats' poems proofread (Drábek 154). Although Klášterský's translations of *Titus Andronicus, Henry VII* and *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* formally completed Sládek's magnum opus, we must not forget the fact that these translations are word-for-word translations and according to Drábek,

it is meaningless to compare them with Sládek's translation (the nature of their origin being the main factor) (Drábek 154-155).

Another translator of the academic Shakespeare generation that is worth mentioning is Bohdan Kaminský. His translation of *Twelfth Night* was put on stage of the Vinohrady Theatre. It was by no means a one-off event, because there are records of this translation being put on the stage in Olomouc and in Ostrava as well (Drábek 160).

3.2   The Generation of E. A. Saudek

E. A. Saudek debuted in 1936 when he published his translation of *Julius Caesar*. He soon gained a prominent position amongst Shakespeare's translators. He is often dubbed the best translator of Shakespeare of the 20th century. Drábek asserts that there was a certain *cult of personality* around Saudek (Drábek 190) when he was still alive and it persisted long after his death (Saudek's translations are being published even today, alongside the translations of Josef Josek or Martin Hilský, see chapter Contemporary translations of Shakespeare).

Saudek was born in 1904 to a Czech-Austrian jewish family. After finishing high school, he started studying Germanistics and Czech studies at the Faculty of arts, Charles University. He was taught by Otokar Fischer to whom he later dedicated his translation of the play *Julius Caesar*. The second Shakespeare's play that Saudek translated was the tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet* in 1937. It was Jiří Erejka who directed its first staging. Saudek already worked with Erejka on the play *Julius Caesar*, which received many plaudits from the public as well as from several critics. The play has since become a manifesto of the young generation of artists (Drábek 191-192).

At first, the older generation reproached Saudek's translations for being too modern. According to some critics, the translations did not make the audience feel the Shakespearean spirit of the past (Vodák, 1950, p. 133). Others blamed Saudek for being too poetic. Apparently, his choice of words strikingly resembled the work of Vrchlický (Vodák 125).

Saudek's other translations were also very acclaimed by the people interested in theatre – *Midsummer Night's Dream (1938), Twelfth Night (1938), Merry Wives of Windsor (1939), Taming of the Shrew (1939)* and *Hamlet (1941)*. Due to historical circumstances, the last two had to be published under the pseudonym Aloys Skoumal. That was during the Nazi occupation. At that time, Saudek had to keep away due to his Jewish roots.

After the war, Saudek became a militant supporter of the idea of communism. "In January 1949, the Council for theatre and dramaturgy met in Bratislava and divided dramaturgy into separate categories and decided that in the five following years that classics and modern western plays could only make up one quarter of the repertoire of Czech theaters. This obviously impacted the production of Shakespeare's plays. After this, Saudek's pace of translating Shakespeare slowed down. Between the years 1945 and 1963, he translated the same number of plays as he did from 1936 to 1941. Despite all this, his post-war translations of *Othello, King Lear* and *Macbeth* have been put on stage of almost every important Czech theatre and earned Saudek considerable praise (Drábek 202).

Drábek remarks that there was virtually no negative criticism of Sládek's work during his life. His first great criticizer was Jiří Levý, who first mentioned Saudek's translations of Shakespeare during a discussion with the members of the *Czechoslovak writers club* in 1952. Levý talked equally about the positive sides of Saudek's translations as well as the negative ones. Later on, Levý published Sládek's, Klášterský's and Vrchlický's translations of Shakespeare in six volumes and thus sided with the generation of Sládek that directly opposed the generation of Otokar Fisher of which Saudek was one of the more progressive members. Disagreements between Saudek and Levý were getting worse and worse. Scathing remarks in discussions, newspapers and allusions in their works lasted till Saudek's death (Drábek 203).

Drábek affirms that Saudek's relationship with František Nevrla, who translated all of Shakespeare's work by 1963, was also full of controversy. Despite the fact that Saudek translated only 14 plays and a half during his life, without the necessary political connections, Nevrla could not compete with Saudek, who was favored by the post-war politics. During Nevrla's life, only one of his translations was put on stage. If a play was not translated by

Saudek, it was simply not performed. Drábek remarks that this was mainly due to the fact that Saudek signed contracts for a variety of other translations. But also due to his illness, he never provided the contracted theaters with the translations in question (Drábek 207).

After Saudek's death, several books about Saudek's style were published. These publications criticized Saudek's for being too baroque, for not keeping enough distance from the characters, for using primitive jokes or too much pathos. Overall, this criticism (positive or negative) has only contributed to keeping Saudek's *cult of personality* alive (Drábek, 2012, s. 209).

Saudek's legacy lived on through his students, although quite poorly. One of his students was Bohumil Franěk. His translations of Shakespeare's lesser known plays (*Cymbeline, Timon of Athens, All's Well That Ends Well*) are considered below-average. Another Saudek's student was the aforementioned Aloys Skoumal. But not even he managed to translate Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing* well enough, despite the fact that his translations of James Joyce or Lewis Carroll are considered superb (Drábek 212-213).

According to Drábek, František Nevrla is often unjustly ignored as a translator of the generation of Saudek. Nevrla wanted to rectify Saudek's translation of *Julius Caesar* which he considered imperfect. Critics and actor liked Nevrla's translations for being easy on the ears, musical, rhythmical, faithful to the original and for their style (Drábek 217). However, he was reproached for his conservatism, something which was not fashionable at that time. Nevrla translated Shakespeare's work in its entirety, including sonnets and poems, by 1963 as a celebration of Shakespeare's 400th birthday in 1964. However, he could not attend the celebrations (Drábek 221-222).

Nevrla's first translations were from German, since didn't start learning English until the 1950s. However, his first translations were not well received. His first critically acclaimed translations were those of Shakespeare's sonnets, which were considered better than Saudek's. The fact that he did not speak English really well has prevented Nevrla from successfully translating Shakespeare's plays. The fact that he teamed up with Professor Jaroslav Albrecht in order to rid his translations of factual errors was not enough. One of the reasons for not

breaking through was the fact that his translations were not always original. Nevrla often looked for inspiration in existing translations. He certainly was not the only one to do so (for example Saudek inspired himself in Russian and German) but Nevrla unfortunately often plagiarized whole verses, as proved by historical sources (Drábek 222).

3.3 The Generation of the Turn of the Millennium

Translations of Shakespeare from the years 1977 – 2009 greatly reflected the socio-cultural changes. Communist censorship opposed individuals rather than ideas and thoughts (one example being **Zdeněk Urbánek**, signer of the Charter 77, whose translation of *Henry IV* had to be published as a samizdat, despite not being against the communist ideology). There was, however, a certain amount of repression even against translators whose works were not on the *blacklist* and whose works could have been published *freely* in the 1970s and 1980s. As claimed by Drábek, the eased feel of translations published after the cancellation of censorship in November showed itself in its entirety (Drábek 278).

We must not forget to mention two of the more important translators of the 1970s – **Aloïs Bejblík** and **Milan Lukeš**. Both started translating at a later age and considered translation a secondary profession – Bejblík translated Shakespeare for specific stagings and Lukeš translated to order. Later on, he was the dramaturge of BBCs' broadcasts of Shakespeare's plays on which he worked with Olga Walló (Drábek 284).

Antonín Přidal is another representative of the pre-revolutionary era worth mentioning. He was the author of the *Shakespeare for beginners* radio series, a sought after dramaturge and an editor of several translation (not only) by Saudek (Drábek 265).

After November 1989, the translation of Shakespeare's work has helped restore the independence of Czech literature and theatre, as it has already done many times in the past. Drábek sees the ideological unlimitedness as a typical feature of the post-revolutionary translations. It was probably a reflection of the general atmosphere which manifested itself by a great sensitivity to the long-lasting ideology that bound everyone. After 1989, Jiří Josek and

Martin Hilský became the main faces of the *traditional* translation of Shakespeare (Drábek 279). When it comes to translations for the purposes of voice acting, the contribution of director Olga Walló must not be forgotten.

Olga Walló was already mentioned in connection with Milan Lukeš and the translation of Shakespeare for television. It was Walló who struck a deal with BBC for the rights to broadcast the series about Shakespeare. And while some plays were kept in English with Czech subtitles, others (especially the more famous ones) were broadcasted in Czech. Even though the voice acting scripts were based on existing translations, they must have been modified a lot (due to different pauses, rhythm etc.). Walló thus translated at least twelve of Shakespeare's plays for voice acting purposes. However, she still is not as appreciated as her translator counterparts (Drábek 274).

The late **Jiří Josek** was certainly another important contemporary translator of Shakespeare's work. Unlike Hilský, Josek translated to order. As he himself said in one of his last interviews (published in *Divadelní noviny)*, he by no means planned on translating Shakespeare's work in its entirety. However, he started receiving more and more orders to translate the titan of English literature and thus started thinking about going all the way (Josek, November 15, 2017). Due to his premature death, the idea has unfortunately never become a reality. Although he managed to translate 34 of Shakespeare's plays, which is a respectable feat.

Josek was an advocate of mirror translation, which is proved by the fact that all of his translations of Shakespeare's plays were published by his publishing house *Romeo* in a manner where there was Josek's translation on one page and Shakespeare's original on the other. Josek explained this by his desire for staying as faithful to the original as possible. He also wanted to keep the characters as individual as possible. The thing is that Shakespeare distinguishes between different characters by their manner of speaking. Best case scenario, these differences are greatly reduced in translations. Josek admits that he adopted his inclination for mirror translation from Alois Bejblík who is mentioned at the beginning of this chapter (Josek, November 15, 2017).

As a director, Josek had a tendency to edit and improve his translations as the time went on. That is why some of his translations were published several times (*Much Ado about Nothing* twice, *Hamlet* four times, *Romeo and Juliet* five times). He also created subtitles for the adaptation of Shakespeare's historical dramas – the tetralogy *The Hollow Crown I & II* produced by BBC and broadcasted by *Česká televize*. Josek also translated subtitles for the London National Theatre's livestreams within the *NT Live* project that is being broadcasted in cinemas across the whole world (Josek, November 15, 2017).

The most prominent Czech translator of Shakespeare is currently **Martin Hilský** who finished the complete translation of Shakespeare's work in 2009. Just like Bejblík and Lukeš, Hilský started translating at a later age. His first translation was *Midsummer Night's Dream* in 1983. This translation was put on stage of the National Theatre in Prague. His other pre-revolutionary translations were exclusively to order. Since the beginning of 1990s, Hilský projects his modernist or even postmodernist view of literature as a mirror into his translations while keeping enough space for various interpretations (Drábek 286-287). He also justifies Shakespeare's timelessness by the possibility of repeatable realization of the meaning of Shakespeare's work:

> "Do you know what Shakespeare never says in the play (*Romeo and Juliet)?* Why the Capulets and the Montagues hate each other. He simply says they do. And i think that's great, because every generation can find its own reason why the houses hate each other. I think that that is the reason why the play is so popular even 400 years after being written,"
> (Hilský, March 3, 2014).

As maintained by Drábek, this modernist idea is contradicted by Hilský's tendency to be authoritative through various notes and comments which he adds to his translations. Drábek believes that these additions codify the translation and basically prevents the reader from creating his own opinion (Drábek 287). These contradictory prescriptivist tendencies have shown maybe even more in Hilský's publication *Souborné dílo Williama Shakespeara* which contains an extensive introductory study, instructional characteristics and technical descriptions of poems and plays, as well as extracts from Hilský's earlier essays.

Drábek attributes the current success of Hilský's translations to the fact that he was the first to manage to attract attention to the translator, be it through various radio dramas or through being the *patron* of the culturally important *Summer Shakespeare Festival* that take place every year in Prague, Brno, Ostrava and Bratislava. Hilský, as Drábek remarks, presents Shakespeare as a cultural phenomenon and although he does not try to hide the fact that his goal is to make Shakespeare more accessible to the *ordinary* audience, his opinion on Shakespeare as a titan of dramatic literature is quite evident (Drábek 287).

3.4   Contemporary Translations of Shakespeare

As mentioned in the chapter *The contemporary view on translating Shakespeare*, the modern age is defined by the simultaneous coexistence of several different translations of Shakespeare. The goal of this last short chapter thus is to briefly chart translations used in current showings of Shakespeare dramas and translations that are currently available in bookstores. This will serve as a necessary addition to Drábek's publication came out in 2012 and thus couldn't contain some of these data.

According to the *i-divadlo.cz* website, there are currently 30 showings of Shakespeare's plays (not counting the showings that are only inspired by Shakespeare's plays or that were created by merging two or more of his plays). Out of these thirty showings, the majority used Hilský's translations – 18 in total. Josek's translations were used 11 times. Milan Lukeš's translation of *Macbeth* was used once and was used by the Prague-based group *Kašpar*. Other translations are currently not being used. It can be said that the current production is completely dominated by Hilský and Josek (i-divadlo.cz, 2003-2020).

> The experiment of the Theatre on the Balustrade is also worth mentioning. They show their version of Macbeth called Macbeth – Too Much Blood in "simple English", as they call it. Only time will show whether it will be a one-off event or whether others will follow suite. But as a herald of future translating of Shakespeare, it is certainly something to think about. (Nazabradli.cz, 2017)

When it comes to written publications of Shakespeare, the situation is a bit different. Although the most frequent ones are still those of Hilský and Josek, the biggest Czech bookstore chains (*Luxor, Academia, Knihy Dobrovský*) offer new editions of translations by Sládek or Topol. New editions of Saudek's translations are currently being sold only by one chain – *Levné Knihy*. Other translations are not on offer.

(*Academia.cz; KnihyDobrovsky.cz; LevneKnihy.cz; Luxor.cz*)

4   About Romeo and Juliet

Romeo and Juliet is among the most popular Shakespeare's plays, sometimes it is considered even the most popular play of all time. Since the it was written, the play has become an inspiration to several plays, films, ballets, operas and symphonies. For the reasons mentioned the play has been chosen as the basis for the wordplay analysis of the thesis.

As Jiří Josek points out in his prologue to his translation of *Romeo and Juliet*, it is not Shakespeare to be credited for authorship of the play. He gained his inspiration in the existing tragedy of *Romeo and Gulietta* by Italian playwright Luigi da Porto. Later adaptation of the play by Mattea Blandella served as the basis for an epic poem by Barthur Brook *The Tragical History of Romeus and Juliet*, by which was Shakespeare probably inspired most profoundly. The major difference, as Josek pinpoints, is the accent, which in Shakespeare's adaptation lays mainly on the love as a central theme of the play, and also further development of the character of Mercutio, who is within the Brook's poem hardly mentioned. (Josek 5-6)

In *Romeo and Juliet*, as was the case with many other Shakespeare's tragedies, comedy and tragedy go hand in hand. The first half of the play (specifically till Mercutio's lethal injury) the play resembles a comedy rather than a tragic story, which is caused, among other things, by a presence of wordplay. The wordplay, however, over transcendences the common of pattern and it actually serves not only as the source of humour within the play, but also, as will be further developer in the Analysis, it takes a role of the anticipator of conflicts between

Montagues and Capulets. Moreover, wordplay also becomes a central feature to the character of Mercutio. Being aware of this, *Romeo and Juliet* will serve as a suitable source text for the wordplay analysis.

5   Definition of Wordplay

Wordplay, speaking in Czech context, is not considered an established linguistic term. While abroad it represents the topic widely discussed in the past three decades within several academic writings, as far as the Czech academic literature is concerned, wordplay has never become a central topic of a scholarly treatise. For the reason mentioned, definition of the wordplay as used in the thesis is based on the quite well-established English terminology (although, also in English terminology may not be as clear as appears).

In English, two different terms were coined to name the language phenomena: wordplay and pun. In terms of English, the two terms are considered more less synonymous, among which the authors usually do not distinguish within their academic writings, which can be sometimes source of confusion, as in case of Delabastita. In Czech language the word pun and wordplay are translated as the same word, therefore it is unnecessary to take the possible slight difference in their meaning into consideration for the purposes of the thesis.

The English word wordplay can be translated into Czech in various ways. Common translations which can observed in academic literature are: *slovní hříčka, hra se slovy* or *slovní hra.* (Hronová 5).

The English term wordplay can be understood in its broader meaning as any verbal feature od Elizabethan drama – or the language of drama as such (the words of plays) (Bruster & McKeown 295). From this point of view, it is apparent that defining wordplay can be much more challenging than it might have seemed.

A dictionary definition can therefore serve as a good starting point. Cambridge dictionary (2020) defines wordplay as:

> The activity of joking about the meaning of words especially in an intelligent way.

Based on the definition, it is logical to estimate that wordplay is tightly connected with such terms as humour and meaning.

Oxford Learner's Dictionary defines wordplay as:

> Making jokes by using words in a clever and humorous way, especially by using a word that has two meanings, or different words that sound the same.

Similarly, the definition suggests the connection between wordplay and humour, in addition it concretize the „meaning of the words" form Cambridge Dictionary's definition by explaining that wordplay is related to multiple meaning of the words (or polysemy) or two words which are pronounced identically while having different meanings (homonymy).

Delabastita (604) defines wordplay as:

> Wordplay is the general name for the various textual phenomena in which structural features of the language(s) used are exploited in order to bring about a communicatively significant confrontation of two (or more) linguistic structures with more or less similar forms and more or less different meanings.

Delabastita's definition can be in many ways considered similar to the dictionary definitions mentioned above. The main difference, however, is the alternation of the term humour by the term communicative significance, which appears more suitable concerning the fact that hardly every wordplay in Shakespeare can be considered humorous. Delabastita (604) further develops his structuralist conception of wordplay by explaining that

.

Even though the various definition mentioned can be considered satisfactory, the Achilles' heel arises in terms of wordplay intentionality. Both Schröter and Delbastita agree that intentionality should not be considered important aspect of distinguishing of a wordplay. Their argument is that wordplay unintended is still a wordplay (Schröter 59). Taking such assumption into consideration, for the purpose of the thesis wordplay will only be seen as an intentional phenomenon used consciously as the part of dramatic text.

6 Wordplay Translation Strategies

Wordplay translation is often considered a technical obstacle which can be overcome by translator's creativity. This might be the reason why translating wordplay, demanding as it can be, represents an appealing activity to many translators.

> Translating Shakespeare's wordplay to another language can bet truly problematic. However, I absolutely enjoy it at same time. To me, it always means attempting the impossible. And if I eventually make it work, it makes me happy (Hilský, 26th Jun 2009).

According to Delabastita, it is always possible to produce a wordplay in the target language, as polysemy, idiomacity, paronymy and homonymy are regarded as linguistically universal. Translation of wordplay to an exact equivalent is, however, rarely possible. Nevertheless, not all wordplay resists perfectly corresponding translation to same extent. For example, the wordplay based on polysemy is typically easy to translate even though the target language is historically remote from the original language. Such phenomena can be understood through a certain degree of objectivity within extra-linguistic reality.

There several strategies to be employed when translating wordplay into target language. Delebastita (604) lists the major of them:

a) PUN → PUN: the pun from the source text is translated by a pun in the target language. Concerning its linguistic basis, the wordplay in the target language may be different from the original pun in terms of its formal or semantic structure as well textuality and contextual setting.

b) PUN → NON-PUN: the pun is translated as a non-pun phrase which may preserve the meaning of the original wordplay or at least one of the meanings (while sacrificing the other one).

c) PUN → RELATED RHETORICAL DEVICE: the original pun is replaced by another related rhetorical device similar to wordplay, such as repetition, alliteration, rhyme, irony, metaphor etc.)

d) PUN S.T. = PUN T.T.: the original pun is reproduced from the source text without being actually translated

e) NON-PUN → PUN: the pun is placed on the position in the text where it cannot it be found in the source text (it usually serves as a compensation for the earlier omission of a wordplay)

6.1 Relative Significance of Individual Values in Literary Work

Jiří Levý deals with the topic of translating wordplay in his treatise *Umění překladu* (*The Art of Translation*), specifically in the chapters concerning translation of drama (drama language stylization, translation of dialogues etc.). the topic of translating of the wordplay in Shakespeare is discussed in relation with relative significance of individual values in a literary work. Despite the fact that translating Shakespeare's wordplay represents a peripheral topic within Levý's book, his viewpoint regarding the topic is, concerning the lack of academic literature discussing wordplay in Shakespeare, a rare one and therefore of great significance in the context of the thesis.

While the 'faithful', literalistic translation is, according Levý, typically a domain of such translators who lack the artistic gift, as far as the brilliant translators are concerned, their translations tend to focus on the general ideas rather than on individual parts, which, in some cases, can result in misinterpretations of the individual ideas (Levý 117-118).

Levý (118). further explains that many translations, par excellence, require some understanding of the general principle, predominantly if the person needs to translate idioms or phrases – these needs to be translated as one lexical unit. As far as the metaphorical expressions are concerned, it is necessary to take the secondary implications of individual words, their relationship to sensual reality and relationship between an idea and its artistic expression into consideration (Levý 118). If the value of the lexical unit is not equivalent to the sum of its parts, but represents a new semantic quality, then substation by a similar whole in the target language is called for (f.e. As blind as a bat – *Slepý jako patrona*).

In some cases, it is not possible to cover all the attributes of the source text. In such situation, the translator must decide which values of the work are the most prominent and which can be most readily omitted. It is therefore a question of understanding relative significance of individual values in a literary work

As an example, Levý analyses the following wordplay from Shakespeare's Hamlet:

> Second Gravedigger: Was he a gentleman?
> First Gravedigger: He was the first that ever bore **arms**.
> Second Gravedigger: Why, he had none.
> First Gravedigger: Why, art a heathen? How dost thou understand the Scripture? The Scripture says Adam digged. Could he dig without **arms**?
> (W. Shakespeare)

The basis of the wordplay lays in the double meaning of the words arms, which in English carries the meaning a) plural of the word arm b) coat-of-arms. The Gravediggers are digging Ophelia's grave discussing a long tradition of their craft, which can be dated to times of Adam. The first gravedigger supports such assumption that Adam was the first person to have arms (meaning coat-of-arms). The second gravedigger that, as long he knows, Adam had no arms, to which the first gravedigger reacts that he of course had to have *arms* (by which he means plural of the word arm - a part of human body), otherwise he would not be able to dig the grave. Such homonymy cannot be found in Czech language, therefore it is necessary, as Levý suggests, to sacrifice either the wordplay or the meaning of its components (Levý 118).

As an example of the way of translation of the wordplay, Levý shows the translation by E. A. Saudek, who opted for preserving the wordplay:

> 2. hrobník: Copak byl Adam šlechtic?
> 1. hrobník: Samo sebou. Vždyť měl **páže**.
> 2. hrobník: To není pravda.
> 1. hrobník: Jak to, že ne, ty pohane? Jak to rozumíš Písmu? Stojí psáno: Adam kopal. No a čím by kopal, kdyby neměl **paže**?
> *(Saudek)*

Levý explains that Saudek chose to base his wordplay on paronyms *páže* (a pageboy) and *paže* (arms) and therefore preserved on of the meanings of the original wordplay. He, however, sacrificed the second meaning of the word *arms*. According to Levý, it was appropriate to decide to preserve the wordplay for cost of losing one of its values. The reason for such assumption is that wordplay is a very typical feature of Shakespeare drama (Levý 118-119). To what extent has Levý's assumption been employed by Czech translators will be further exemplified in the analysis.

7   Linguistic Mechanism of Wordplay

Should the wordplay be discussed in the context of western languages, Delabastita (602-603) points out that puns are most likely to be based on of the following linguistic mechanisms.

- phonological and graphological structure
- lexical structure (polysemy)
- lexical structure (idiom)
- morphological structure
- syntactic structure

7.1   Phonological and Graphological Structure

According to Delabastita (602), a language tends to use a limited number of phonemes and graphemes. As the result, several pairs of the similar or even identical words can be found in a language, which similarity cannot be explained by semantic or historical relation. Such words are further described as (Delabastita 602-603):

- homonyms
- homophones
- homographs
- paronyms

By **homonyms** we understand the words with the identical sound form, but each of the carries a different meaning. Delebastita mentions that modern English is extremely rich in homonyms. Such phenomenon is typical for the languages with the prevalence of short words over the long words. It is therefore assumed that such high incidence of homonyms in English is caused by the large number of monosyllabic words in English (Delabastita 603).

Homophones, on the other hand, are different in their graphical form, while their sound form is identical (Schröter 197). Schröter exemplifies homophony on the following example from the TV series *The Blues Brothers* (Schröter 165):

CURL UP & DYE BEAUTY SALON

While the phrasal verb *curl up* is an example of the wordplay based on polysemy, the word dye creates a wordplay by its sound correspondence with the word die – dye and die are the example of homophones.

Homography is basically a reversed homophony, while the written (graphical) form of the words is identical, the pronunciation is different. Both Schröter and Delabastita (602) only give a single example of wordplay based on homographs, which indicates the rareness of the phenomena in English language.

How the US put US to shame.

The pun above stems from the graphical correspondence of the pronoun us and acronym US (United States). It is not a perfect example, however, as the pronoun us had to be, against the odds, written in capitals, so that the pun becomes obvious.

Wordplay based **paronymy** occurs, according to Delabastita (604), when two words share more less similar sound and graphical form. An example retrieved from Delabastita is from the poster above the church door:

> Come in for a faith lift.

The pun is based on the similar sound from of the words *faith* /feɪθ/ and *face* /feɪs/ and also on the connection with the common phrase face lifting. Therefore, the wordplay plays with the sound similarity of the phrase come in for a faith lift and Come in for a face lift.

7.2   Lexical Structure (Polysemy)

Majority of English words are polysemous – they carry more than a single meaning. These various meanings of the polysemous word often share the common semantic basis and they are closely related. Monothematic words are, on the other hand, quite rare in English and they predominantly include the technical words, such as atom, atmosphere etc. (Ginzburg et al. 33)

Polysemy is often based on homonymy. If the two words share the same sound form, it seems that the words are of the same semantic unit. For instance, the English word ear carries two different meanings: a) a body part b) a part of corn. Although the words are etymologically unrelated (from Latin a) *auris* b) *acus, aceris*), from the synchronic point of view, the words are thought to be related metaphorically – the word ear (a part of corn) is considered to be derived from the polysemous word ear (a body part) (Ginzburg et al. 34).

7.3 Lexical Structure (Idiom)

Groups of words which seem to be semantically inseparable are traditionally called phraseological units. The fundamental criterion for recognition of the set-phrase is stability of its lexical components and its grammatical structure. The word set-phrase indicates that the basic feature of the phraseological units is their idiomacity or lack of motivation. (Ginzburg et al. 75). Phraseological units are usually defined as unmotivated groups of words that cannot be created freely within the speech. They are always reproduced as the set phraseological units and their general meaning is conditioned historically and therefore cannot be reduced to a summary of the meaning of its components (Delabastita 604). According to Delabastita (604), it is a difference between the literal meaning of the group of words and their idiomatical meaning which provide space for wordplay.

7.4 Morphological Structure

Many derived words and compounds become a part of the word stock, and they may lose some of their transparency during the process of their integration. As a result, there is a difference in understanding the general meaning of the word and understanding its individual components based on the morphological rules. Majority of the morphological puns use derived words or compounds in a way which is etymologically incorrect, but semantically effective. (Delabastita 604) as can be observed in the following example:

> Drop that gun, said Tom disarmingly

7.5 Syntactic Structure

Wordplay can be also observed on syntactic level. Grammar often creates phrases and sentences which can be understood in different ways. The phenomenon is called syntactic ambiguity. Ambiguity, according to MacDonald et al. (676), takes place if the sequence of words offers more than a single syntactic interpretation. Put simply, wordplay can occur on the

syntactic level as the result of various syntactical devices (preposition, articles etc.) as will be exemplified on the following instance:

> A Scotsman takes all his money out of the bank once a year for a holiday; once it's had a holiday, he puts it back again.
> (Schröter 279)

The pun is based on the double meaning of the preposition *for*. The phrase *for a holiday* can be understood either as a) in order to pay for a holiday b) so that they may go to holiday.

On top of it, Schröter (280) mentions that grammar can also serve as a possible linguistic mechanism of wordplay as he further exemplifies on the following dialogue from Shrek (film):

> Fiona: Please, I wouldst like to look at the face of my rescuer.
> Shrek: Oh no, you wouldn't…-st.

The pun is based on the lack of knowledge of on the characters in terms of grammar. The English word *wouldst* is an archaic equivalent to modal verb would, the correct negative form is in this case *woudlst not be*. Because the character is not familiar with the form, he copes with it by adding '-st' to a regular negative of the word would, by which the wordplay is created.

7.6   Horizontal and Vertical Puns

Wordplay can be further divided according to arrangement of its components (words or longer linguistic constructs) into horizontal wordplay and vertical wordplay (Delabastita 128).

According to Delabastita (128), in case of horizontal pun, the two different meanings are produced simultaneously and both components of the wordplay are present in the text. By repeating a linguistic unit, its second meaning gets highlighted, as can be observed in the following wordplay from Delabastita (129):

Counsel for **council** home buyers.

The word counsel and council are homophones in English, which is even more emphasised by their placement in the text.

Oppositely, in a vertical pun, the two different meanings blend in, such wordplay is therefore much more difficult to reveal. It is because one of the wordplay components is omitted from the text, therefore it is up to reader's observation skills and language knowledge to deduce a second meaning of the word or phrase. Vertical pun also often refers to another text or commonly used phrase. Delabastita (129) cites the following example of the vertical pun:

Wedding **belles**

It is another example of a wordplay based on homophony, this time of the words *belles* and *bells*. The second meaning, however, is not explicitly mentioned in the text, therefore the readers must deduce it based on their knowledge of the collocation *wedding bells*.

8   Analysis I

In the following part, the wordplay from *Romeo and Juliet* will serve as a representative sample regarding Shakespeare idiomacity. Firstly, the puns well be sorted out according to Delabastita's translation strategies (see chapter 6) and further analysed with respect to three chosen official Czech translations. First of all, in terms of Delbastatita's strategies (see chapter 5) and, to a certain extent, with respect to Levy's relative significance of individual values in literary work (see 5.1). The selected representatives of Czech translations are Josef Václav Sládek (Shakespeare, 2011), Martin Hilský (Shakespeare, 2015) and Erik Adolf Saudek (Shakespeare, 2018. These will be referred to in the text according to their names.

8.1   Horizontal Wordplay Based on Phonological and Graphological Structure

There are several examples of wordplay to be found in *Romeo and Juliet* which basis stems from the structure of phonemes and graphemes, specifically they are based on homophony, homonymy a paronymy. An example of wordplay based on homography cannot be observed within the play, such fact is likely to be caused by the character of the text, which is meant to be performer rather than read, and therefore it does not set suitable conditions for occurrence of the homography-based wordplay.

It is truly symbolic that Shakespeare opens the first act of the play with wordplay. Sampson and Gregory – two servants of the house of the Capulets are about to initiate a grapple with servants of the Montagues. Before the arrival of their rivals, Capulets exchange several words among

which wordplay play a huge role as a way of encouragement before the upcoming dispute with Montagues.

(1) Sampson: Gregory, o' my word, we'll not carry coals

Gregory: No, for then we should be colliers

Sampson: I mean, an (if) we be in choler, we'll draw

Gregory: Ay, while you live, draw your neck out o' the collar

(Shakespeare 168)

.

The wordplay above can be understood either as two individual puns, the first of which is based on the use of the words of the same root: *coals* /kəʊlz/ and *colliers* /ˈkɒlɪəz/ and the second one on homohpony of the words *choler* /ˈkɒlə/ and *collar* /ˈkɒlə/. The other way to understand the wordplay is to understand it as a whole, in which the words mentioned above would be considered the representatives of paronymy, which would appear regarding the dialog as a logical conclusion. Within his first line, Samson explains that he and Gregory will not coals, by which he suggests, metaphorically, that they have no intention to disgrace themselves in front of Montagues. Gregory agrees and continues that if they disgraced themselves, they would become colliers (people carrying coal). Samson reacts that if Montagues are about to conjure up their choler, he will draw his sword. At this point, however, Gregory cools Samson down and advices him to better draw his head out of collar (a slang term for a noose), or in other words - to avoid problems.

As has been mentioned before, a wordplay as the one described above play a great role in terms of the plot development, as they often serve as the basis of verbal conflicts which typically grow into fight with swords. For these reasons it would be fair to assume, based on Levý's hypothesis, that the general principles will take over the literal translation and translators will attempt to translate the wordplay, even though the Czech equivalents of the words coal, colliers, choler and collar are homonyms, neither paronyms.

(2) Samson: Slovo s to, Gregorio, hrdlit se od nich – nedáme!

Gregor: Ne, to bychom byli hrdličky.

Samson: Já myslím, vrazí-li nám urážku do hrdla, že z pochvy vytáhnem.

Gregor: Ano, spíše hrdla dbej, abys je výtah z oprátky, dokud jsi živ.

(Sládek 7)

Sládek clearly decided to preserve the wordplay even if it resulted in a slight deviation from the original meaning. Even though he changed the meaning, he at least attempted to retain the linguistic principle of Shakespeare's wordplay – his choice of words was based on their identical root: *hrdlit – hrdlička* (to have their heads cut, a turtledove) and homonymy: *urážka do hrdla – hrdla dbej* (to throw an insult in their face – mind your throat).

(3) Samson: Povídám, Řehoři, oni nám rybník nevypálí.

Řehoř: Bodejť! Spíš si prsty spálí.

Samson: Jářku, kdo nás dopálí, jedna se mu vpálí.

Řehoř: A potom tě sbalí. Nehas, co tě nepálí.

(Saudek 10)

Saudek likewise decided to preserve the wordplay at the cost of shift form original meaning. Linguistic principle, however, he only preserved partially, as all of its components share the same root on which the wordplay is based in his translation: *nevypálí – spálí – vpálí – nepálí* (will not burn out – will burn themselves – will punch him – does not bother you).

(4) Samson: Povídám, Řehoří, na nás si vyskakovat nebudou.

Řehoř: Nebo si to odskáčou.

Samson: Až nás rozčílej, skočíme jim po krku.

Řehoř: A budem je mít z krku.

(Hilský 8)

Congruently, Hilský opted for a preservation of the wordplay, nevertheless, his translation differs profoundly from both Sládek and Saudek's translations. Firstly, Hilský is the only translator to account for the dialect of the characters, as Shakespeare's distinguishes them within the play. As far as wordplay is concerned, he split wordplay in two parts. The first part is identically with Sládek and Saudek's translations set up on repetition of the words with identical root: *vyskakovat – odskáču – skočíme* (to be saucy with sb – to pay for sth – to jump on), while the second wordplay is based on the idiomatic expression *skočit po krku* (to assault sb). At the same time, Hilský's translation represents the most profound deviation from the original meaning, namely in Gregory's second line in which Shakespeare conveys Gregory's

attempt to calm Samson down. Hilský, however, conveys completely opposite idea in his translation.

The following pun also originates in the first act – scene IV, when Romeo, Mercutio and Benvolio plan to intrude, in secret, Capulet's ball. Mercutio's attempts to cheer Romeo up after his unrequited love go in vain.

(5) Romeo: Not I, believe me. You have dancing shoes
With nimble soles. I have a soul of lead
So stakes me to the ground I cannot move.
(Shakespeare 171)

The words *sole /səʊl/* and *soul /səʊl* are the representatives of homophones. Romeo states in his line that while his fellows are wearing appropriate shoes for dancing, due to their nimble soles, his soul if lead – metaphorically he asserts that his grief pins Romeo down, leaving him unable to move.

(6) Romeo: Věř, nelze mi; vy k lehkým střevícům
i lehkou mysl máte; duše má
 jak olověná k zemi kruší mne,
že ani pohnouti se nemohu.
(Sládek 30)

Sládek preserved the communicatively significant device in his translation by adding the line i *lehkou mysl máte* (your mind is light) a polysemous wordplay emerged, based on polysemy of the word *lehký* which in the first case carries the meaning not heavy and in the second case easy-going. It is important to stress that Sládek's expansion of the original line sounds very natural and it helps to develop the contrast between numb heart-broken Romeo and his lively fellows.

(7) Romeo: Kdež tančit já! Vy máte v nohou lehko,
i na duši. Mne olověný žal

přibíjí k zemi. Nemohu se hýbat.

(Saudek 32)

As was the case with Sládek, Saudek also preserved the wordplay by adding extra piece of line to his translation. In his case, the pun is based on the lexical structure, namely on the use of the collocations – *mít v nohou lehko* (literally: to have light feet, idiomatically, to be cheerful) and *mít lehko na duši* (literally: to have light soul, idiomatically: not feeling any troubles). Such addition again emphasises the contrast of the feelings of Romeo and his friends. Furthermore, Sládek alternates soul of lead from the original pun with, by *olověný žal* (grief of lead), by which he presumably avoids possible repetition of the word *duše* (soul) in his translation.

(8) Romeo: Vy se vznášíte, jak je vám lehko.

Má duše ale ztěžkla smutkem tak,

Že přibíjí mi nohy do podlahy.

(Hilský 30)

A slightly different strategy was employed by Hilský in his translation of the pun. His *je vám lehko* (literally: you feel light) omitted the original reference to soles. It, however, set the conditions for the contrast of the meanings of the wordy *lehko* (light) and *ztěžkla* (became heavier). As was the case with Sládek's or Saudek's translation, such wordplay is of the minor significance in comparison with the original pun.

The last example of the horizontal pun again originates in the scene four, act one and it depicts another Mercutio's attempt to cheer Romeo up.

(9) Mercutio: You are a lover; borrow Cupid's wings,

And soar[1] with them above a common bound[2].

Romeo: I am too sore[3] enpierced with his shaft

To soar[4] with his light feathers, and so bound[5],

I cannot bound[6] a pitch above dull woe:

Under love's heavy burden do I sink.

(Shakespeare 171)

The wordplay works as a combination of the two individual puns. The first one stems from homonymy of the word bound, while the second one is based the homophones *soar /sɔː/* and *sore /sɔː/.* Mercutio gives Romeo advice regarding Cupid wings and tells him to sore with them (to fly up with them). Romeo opposes that he was empierced too sore (deeply) by Cupid's arrow to be able to soar (levitate) on his wings and feels so bound (sad) that he cannot bound (escape) and therefore he is falling down.

(10) Mercutio: Jsi zamilován; vydluž Mílkovy

si perutě a jimi povyleť

nad všední tíže pouta obvyklá.

Romeo: Jsem příliš těžce raněn jeho šípem,

než abych jeho lehkou perutí

mohl povzlétnout; a upoután jsem tak,

že na píď odpoutat se nemohu

od tupé trýzně; klesám lásky tíží.

(Sládek 31)

In Sládek's translation the pun appears much less distinctive than in case the original, despite his obvious attempt to preserve communicatively significant device, by using the word sharing the same root but slightly different meaning (tíže/burden – *těžce*/hardly / *upoután*/bounded – *odpoutat*/unbound) and by the word contrast (*těžce raněn*/seriously wounded – *lehkou perutí*/ with a light feather).

(11) Merkuzio: Což nemiluješ? Kupidova křídla

Si vypůjč od něho a povyleť!

Romeo: Jsem příliš ztěžklý ranou jeho šípu

A lehounká ta jeho křidélka

Mě ani o píď nad žal nepovznesou.

Ach, klesám, láskou příliš obtěžkán.

(Saudek 33)

Should we consider the pun in Sládek's translation non-distinctive, in case of Saudek's translation a complete omission of the pun is the case. Contrastive use of the words *ztěžký*

(increased in weight) – *lehounká* (light), however, serves as the communicatively significant device. Even though, the option that the wordplay was overlooked by Saudek seems to be plausible as well.

(12) Merkucio: Amor má křídla, tak ať ti je půjčí,

Hned budeš létat, plesat samou láskou.

Romeo: Já mu už jednou pěkně naletěl,

A teď v tom těžce lítám, na duchu

jsem skleslý tak, že místo plesání

klesám ke dnu, láskou obtížen.

(Hilský 31)

In comparison with the previous trasnlators, Hilský's translation stands out. He preserved the wordplay at the cost deflection from the original meaning (the mention of Cupid's shaft was omitted completely). Both components of the pun are based on the repetition of the words sharing the same root, while carrying moreless different meanings (*létat*/to fly – *naletěl*/ I bought it / *skleslý*/downhearted – *klesám*/I am falling down). Hilský's translation, unlike the preceding ones, is far less poetic and does not imitate language of sonnets.

8.2 Vertical Wordplay Based on Phonological and Graphological Structure

The only example of the vertical pun, which can be observed in *Romeo and Juliet*, is from the act two, scene one, taking place after the Capulet's ball by their garden fence. Romeo jumps over the fence in order to see Juliet, while Mercutio and Benvolio are seeking Romeo. On their way they are mocking Romeo's blind love.

(13) Mercutio: If love be blind, love cannot hit the mark

Now will he sit under a medlar tree

And wish his mistress were that kind of fruit

As maids call medlars when they laugh alone. —

O Romeo, that she were! Oh, that she were

An open arse, and thou a poperin pear.

(Shakespeare 173)

Sooner than we approach the wordplay itself, which is located at the end of Mercutio's monologue, it is necessary to understand the related symbols and metaphors. Mercutio states that should the love be blind, it cannot hit its target. Later on, he refers to Romeo to be sitting under a medlar tree and wishes for his mistress to bet he kind of fruit growing on the tree. The fruit represented a common metaphor to women's intimate parts, this is why Mercutio refers to open arse in his speech, which again was a name used for the medlar tree fruit, so that Romeo could be a *poperin pear* (an euphemism for the male intimate parts). The wordplay within the *poperin pear* is actually based on the phonological agreement with the phrase pop her in. Therefore, it is an example of the homophony-based pun.

(14) Mercutio: Když láska slepá, k terči nestřelí.

Teď nám tam sedí někde pod mišpulí

a přeje si, by jeho milenka

tam byla ovocem, jež dívčiny,

když samy smějou se, zvou drážďata.

Romeo, kéž by byla, kéž by byla…

a spadla tobě rovnou do klína!

(Sládek 47)

Sládek's translation of Shakespeare is a literal one, nevertheless, it successfully preserves the ambiguity of the original pun. Major deviation is present in the translation of the phonological wordplay. As the euphemism concerning the *poperin pear* is not a common metaphor in the Czech language, Sládek opted for alternation of the wordplay by the semantically related metaphor *spadnout rovnou do klína* (to fall into one's lap).

(15) Merkuzio: Leč je-li slepá, terče nezasáhne

Teď jistě sedí někde pod mišpulí

A touží, aby byla to, co zvou

Mišpulkou dívky, dáma jeho srdce.

Ó Romeo, kéž by byla, pravím, kéž,

Měkounkou a tak dále, ty zas hruškou!

(Saudek 47)

Saudek's translation is also predominantly literal and preserves the metaphors included in the source text. Unlike Sládek, he chose the literal translation even when it came to *poperin pear* metaphor. Even though it seems that he intended to preserve the original euphemism, literal translation does not really serve the purpose, as the source text pun is based on the phonological agreement which is not present in Czech language. It is therefore arguable to what extent Saudek understood the pun as his translation does not really convey the meaning of the Shakespeare's wordplay.

(16) Merkucio: Potmě šíp lásky nezasáhne cíl.
Určitě sedí někde pod třešní
A čeká, až mu spadne do klína
Šťavnatá, sladká, něžná třešinka.
Třešinku třeba rázně utrhnout,
Romeo, než ji zobne jiný ptáček.
(Hilský 45)

At first glance, Hilský's translation differs dramatically from the previous ones. Firstly, Hilský based his metaphor on different fruit symbol – a cherry. Such decision appears logical regarding the knowledge of the Czech reader – possibly not familiar with the subtropical fruit and its appearance, which prevents the reader from understanding the metaphor itself. Regarding the pun itself, it was translated as a semantically related metaphor *než ji zobne jiný ptáček* (literally: before another bird bites it), understandable for the Czech reader.

The last example of the vertical pun can be found in the scene one, act four, in which Romeo speaks out about his premonition which revealed to him in his dream the night before and due to which he hesitates to attend the ball of Capulet's. Mercutio mocks his fear based on superstitions by his well-known monologue about Queen Mab, which is proceeded by the following pun:

(17) Mercutio: That dreamers often lie

Romeo: In bed asleep, while they do dream things true

(Shakespeare 171)

. The verb to lie is a full homonym in English, carrying the meanings a) lie (in the bed) b) not telling the true. In such sense, Mercutio's line can be therefore interpreted in two different ways. Romeo's response is based on the second – unintended sense of the Mercutio's line.

(18) Mercutio: Že snílci mluví často pravdy málo.
Romeo: Tak, – ze spaní; však jim sny pravda jsou.
(Sládek 32)

Sládek decided to preserve the communicatively significant device in his translation on the level of idiomacity. Romeo reacts to Mercutio's remarks on dreamer's tendency towards lying by adding *ze spaní* (sleep talking). Sládek's translation therefore represents a deflection from the Shakespeare's pun (lie in bed asleep – sleep talk) in order to create a wordplay.

(19) Merkuzio: Že sen je jen lež.
Romeo: Však ze snů tryská jasnovidná síla.
(Saudek 34)

In Saudek's case, the pun was omitted completely and at the same time, there is a shift in the meaning regarding the word dreamers, which was translated by Saudek as *sen* (a dream). The shift is later followed by Romeo's response *ze snů tryská jasnovidná síla* (the dreams ooze prescient power).

(20) Merkucio: Že sny jsou často lež.
Romeo: Ve spánku lež však pravda může být.
(Hilský 32)

Hilský substituted the pun with a related rhetorical device, namely paradox: *lež může být pravda* (a lie can be true). Nevertheless, interesting phenomena occurred in terms of semantic

36

deviation regarding the word dreamers, which in both Saudek's and Hilský's translations was altered by the word *sen* (dream).

8.3   Horizontal Wordplay Based on Lexical Structure (Polysemy)

The following type of wordplay is, as will be further exemplified, plays a significant role in disputes preceding the street grapples. It is predominantly based on use of polysemous words. While one party use the most logical meaning (based on the context) of a polysemous words, their antagonists react by using another meaning of the word, turning it into insult or mock. Such verbal interaction goes on until it gets replaced by another wordplay based on the same strategy or until the sword fight begins.

The first example of the wordplay of the type is from the earlier described first act, scene one (see 7.1.):

(21)   Gregory: The quarrel is between our masters and us their men.
Sampson: 'Tis all one, I will show myself a tyrant.
When I have fought with the men, I will be cruel with the maids,
and cut off their heads.
Gregory: The heads of the maids?
Sampson: Ay, the heads of the maids, or their maidenheads;
take it in what sense thou wilt.
(Shakespeare 168)

Samson is told by Gregory that the upcoming fight is not only the of their masters and men, to which Samson reacts that he wants to prove himself a tyrant, and as soon as he have fought the men he will be cruel to their maids (meaning women) and he will cut off their heads (behead them). Gregory, however, responds to the other meaning of the polysemous word maids (virgins) and asks Samson whether he referred to virgins by his statement. Samson replies that it is up to Gregory to decide whether he was talking about the heads of maids or their maidenheads, which is the archaic term for virginity. Morphologically, there is no apparent

connection between the meaning of the compound maidenheads and the meaning of its components, which provides suitable conditions for the possible wordplay.

(22) Spor je pouze mezi našimi pány a mezi námi, jejich muži.

Samson: Vše jedno; povedu si tyransky: až budu hotov s muži, budu

ukrutníkem na panny; vypadnu na ně.

Gregor: Vypadneš na panny?

Samson: Ano, nebo padnu na ně; měj si pro to smysl, jaký chceš.

(Sládek 8)

Sládek's translation preserves the polysemous pun by using identical polysemy which coincidentally occurs also within the Czech language: panna (a woman/a virgin). It is the second part of the wordplay, based on word morphology, which seems to resist the translation to higher degree, as it lacks its natural equivalent in Czech. In this particular case Sládek's translation may be considered quite unnatural. His wordplay, if it can be seen as one, is based again on morphology, namely the use of the derived words sharing the same root *vypadnu* (I will attack) and *padnu* (I will fall on her). Such words, however, do not necessarily evoke the coveted meaning of taking one's virginity, therefore it highly arguable whether such pun can be understood by a Czech reader without knowledge of the original pun.

(23) Samson: Mně je to jedno. Já neznám slitování. Nejprve odpravím

mládence a potom spořádám panny. Hlavy jim zuřežu.

Řehoř: Komu? Montekovic pannám?

Samson: Baže pannám. Nebo aspoň jejich panenství. Vylož si to, jak chceš.

(Saudek 11)

Saudek's translation, as well as the one by Sládek, takes advantage of the identical polysemy regarding the word panna (a woman/ a virgin) in Czech. Nevertheless, his translation of the morphological pun can hardly be considered an elegant solution, as he decides to translate the pun by using the non-existing, unprecedent and therefore unnatural phrase *uřezat panennství* (to cut one's virginity).

(24) Samson: Všecko jedno. Já budu krutej ke všem.

Nejdřív udeřím na pány, potom se vrhnu na panny. Nepřežije ani jedna.

Řehoř: Ani jedna?

Samson: Ani jedna. Chápej to, jak chceš, ale má to pronikavej smysl.

(Hilský 8)

Hilský's translation, as has already been mentioned, also reflects diversity of the individual characters by using slang terms as part of their speech, which serves as a mean of distinctness between servants and their masters. Hilský's translation strategies are again unlike the ones used by Sládek and Saudek. He is the only translator to avoid the possibility of using the parallel mechanism of polysemy regarding the word maid and its Czech equivalent panna. His wordplay is surprisingly based on paronymy, in this case of the words *panny* (women) and *pány* (men), by which the reference to 'virgins' has been omitted. The second pun, based on the word maidenhead, was translated as the pun stemming from polysemous word *pronikavej* (slang expression for intruding), by which he suggested Samson's subliminal plans.

The second instance of the horizontal polysemy-based pun originates in the act two, scene four, when Mercutio and Benvolio await Romeo to come back after the ball at Capulet's, Benvolio mentions that Romeo received a letter from Tybalt (Juliet's nephew).

(25) Benvolio: Tybalt hath sent a letter to his father's house.

Mercutio: a challenge, on my life.

Benvolio: Romeo will answer it.

Mercutio: any man that can write may answer a letter

Benvolio: nay, he will answer the letter's master, how he dares, being dared

(Shakespeare 175)

Benvolio announces that Tybalt sent the letter to the house of Romeo's father. Mercutio reacts that it definitely must be a challenge. Benvolio replies that Romeo is going to answer it, by which he means that Romeo will accept the challenge. Such statement is mocked by Mercutio, who, responding to another means of the word answer (to reply), responses that answering

(replying) the letter is somewhat anybody is able to accomplish. Benvolio therefore disambiguates his statement by adding that Romeo will answer by accepting the challenge.

(26) Benvolio: Dnes Tybalt, Capuletův synovec, mu poslal list do domu otcova.

Mercutio: Toť vyzvání, –jak že tu stojím živ!

Benvolio: Však mu Romeo odpoví.

Mercutio: Odpovědít na list může každý, kdo umí psát.

Benvolio: Ne tak; – on odpoví pisálkovi toho listu, že, když strašen, není

strašpytel.

(Sládek 63)

Sládek's translation is a literal one in which the pun does not carry the necessary significance. The second meaning of the verb answer (accept the challenge) is expressed by the subordinate clause serving as an object in the final verse. It is only possible to estimate, what might have been the reason for Sládek to omit such apparent wordplay, translated by both Saudek and Hílský, concerning the fact that the translation is quite favourable in Czech.

(27) Benvolio: Starého Kapuleta synovec,

Pan Tybalt mu prý dneska poslal dopis,

Merkuzio: Vyzvání! Oč se vsadit!

Benvolio: Však ho Romeo vyřídí.

Merkuzio: Cožpak o to, vyřídit dopis může každý, kdo umí psát.

Benvolio: Pisatele vyřídí, ne ten dopis.

(Saudek 62)

Saudek used the combination of polysemy and syntax in order to preserve the wordplay. The polysemous word *vyřídit* is used in two various senses a) to answer and b) to kill someone. On syntactic level, the wordplay is based on ambiguity regarding the object of the verb *vyřídí.* It is not clear whether the object ho refers to the object of the preceding line or to the writer of the letter – Tybalt. This ambiguity sets conditions for the Czech equivalent of the Shakespeare's pun. In this particular case, it is an example of the wordplay translated in the very natural and understandable way.

(28) Benvolio: Tybalt, ten Kapuletův synovec, prý Romeovi poslal domů dopis.

Merkucio: Krk na to dám, že ho vyzval na souboj.

Benvolio: Romeo určitě odepíše.

Merkuzio: A co je na tom? Umí přece psát.

Benvolio: Chci říct, že výzvu přijme. A pak odepíše toho, kdo mu píše.

(Hilský 60)

Hilský also preserved the wordplay, his translation, however, it may not apear as smooth as in case of Saudek. Hilký's again wordplay is again based on polysemy, this time using the Czech equivalent *odepsat,* which carries the meanings a) to reply and b) slang term for killing somebody (if used transitively). In this sense, his translation resembles semantically the one by Saudek. What can be considered problematic is the transitivity of the verb in Romeo's *určitě odepíše*, as the intransitive form used in the line does naturally imply the second meaning of the verb (to kill somebody). Probably aware of the arguable ambiguity, Hilský had to add a further explanation by *přijme výzvu* (will accept the challenge) in order to make the pun clear for the reader.

The last example of the pun of the type is again an instance of dispute preceding the grapple, and it can be found in act three, scene one. Mercutio and Benvolio await Romeo's arrival. Romeo is supposed to answer Tybalt's challenge for the sword fight. As Romeo is late, there is growing tension between Mercutio and Tybalt, as can observed in the following dialogue:

(29) Tybalt: Mercutio, thou consort'st with Romeo.

Mercutio: Consort? What, dost thou make us minstrels? …

(Shakespeare 177)

The pun is based on polysemous word consort, which carries the meanings a) to keep seeing somebody and b) to play music with somebody. Tybalt, who demands Romeo's presence tells Mercutio that he (Mercutio) is known to consort with (to be in touch with) Romeo, to which Mercutio responds by using the second meaning of the word: Consort (Are we playing music together)? You consider us musicians?

41

(30) Tybalt: Mercutio, ty a Romeo spolu hrajete –

Mercutio: Hrajem? Jak, děláš ty z nás muzikanty? …

(Sládek 79)

Sládek preserved the wordplay and he identically with Shakespeare based it on polysemy. It is, however, impossible to estimate the intended meaning of the word *hrajete* (you play) in Tybalt's line. One of the possible interpretations can bet the option that the verb was used to end in itself, so that it sets conditions for the pun.

(31) Tyblat: Merkuzio! Ty s Romeem si hraješ do noty-

Merkuzio: Cože, do noty? Copak jsme šumaři?

(Saudek 80)

Also Saudek opted for preserving the pun, in this case based on idiomacity. While Tybalt uses the phrase *hrát si s někým do noty* (idiomatically: to get along with somebody) and Mercutio responds to its literal interpretation (to play according to the same music sheet) and says: *Cože, do noty?* (What, according the same music sheet?) by which he implies that Tybalt called them musicians.

(32) Tybalt: Hraješ Romeovi do noty

Merkucio: Já že hraju Romeovi do noty?

Jsme snad jedna banda, nebo co?

(Hilský 78)

Hilský's translation mechanism of the wordplay is similar to one employed by Saudek – it is based on idiomatical and literal meaning of the phrase *hrát někomu do noty* (literally: to play according to someone's sheets, idiomatically: to act in someone's favour).

8.4 Vertical Wordplay Based on Lexical Structure (Polysemy)

This type of wordplay is involved in the play quite plentifully. That is why it deserves larger number of specific examples. First of above mentioned can be found in fourth scene of the first act, which was described more into depth in this part (see 7.1, translation No 5).

(33) Romeo: Give me a torch: I am not for this ambling;

Being but heavy, I will bear the light.

(Shakespeare 171)

The pun in this line could seem quite complex – it derives from polysemy of two words – *heavy* and *light.* Romeo's line would literally mean: Give me the torch: I do not feel like talking today. I am sad, I will take the light. However, it could be also understood as: I feel unwell, thus I will take something light – torch. It is mainly about the contrast of the secondary meanings of the words *light* and *heavy,* which, in this case, creates the core of the pun.

(34) Romeo: Mně dejte pochodeň, chuť nemám k tanci;

v mé mysli temno; světlo ponesu.

(Sládek 30)

Sládek decided not to incorporate the pun. However, the contrast of the words *light* and *heavy* is stressed as in the original. Eclipse of the mind does not literally mean *heavy (sad),* it is obvious that one of the Sládek's priority was to preserve the imaginative contrast, which – in this particular case – I consider a good decision.

(35) Romeo: Mně není do skoku. Chci pochodeň!

Mám černo na duši, leč budu svítit.

(Saudek 32)

We could barely find a wordplay in Saudek's translation, who same as Sládek, decided to preserve at least the contrast between dark (*černo na duši* / dark in soul) and light (*budu svítit*

/ I will shine). Part of the translation *budu svítit* could be, same as the Shakespeare's *bearing the light*, interpreted also metaphorically: although Romeo is *dark in soul (he is sad),* he will try to look happy which would mean a semantic shift from the original. However, the wordplay would be preserved if we accept the second interpretation.

(36) Romeo: Mně není do skoku. Dejte mi louč,
ať posvítím si na svou černou chmuru.
(Hilský 30)

Neither Hilský preserved the wordplay. He decided to leave it out, unlike the others, also the contrast of the original. He held up at least some kind of wit through *posvítím si na svou černou chmuru* (I will beam my black gloom)*,* thanks to which he preserved the primary meaning of *heavy* and *light*.

Second example of wordplay is part of the first scene in the third act. Mercutio is deadly wounded by Tybalt, he bleeds out to death. Nevertheless, also at the edge of death he still keeps his unshakeable sense of humour. He does that, because he does not want his relative to suffer from sadness or he just can give out deep emotions. In the context of play, this moment serves as a vital mean for visualisation of the Mercutio's character.

(37) Mercutio: …ask for me to-morrow, and you shall find me a grave man.
(Shakespeare 177)

In this paragraph form the latest Mercutio's monolog is hidden one pun, which stems from polysemy of word *grave.* In the first meaning this could be understood as: ask for me tomorrow and you will find a serious man. With this, Mercutio emphasizes that he certainly will not be laughing the other day. In its second meaning, the line can be translated as: ask for me tomorrow and you will find my in the grave. The word *grave* can be then simultaneously understood as serious as well as buried.

(38) Mercutio: ...ptej se po mně zítra a najdeš

mne vážného jako hrob.

(Sládek 82)

Sládek also tried to preserve the pun and he did so with the phrase *vážný jako hrob* (serious as a grave)*,* which preserves more or less both meanings of *grave.* On the other hand, the usage of the phrase in real life is quite problematic and useless at the same time.

(39) Mercuzio: …Poptej se po mně zítra, podivíš se,

jak budu usedlý. Na tomhle světě mám po legraci, to mi věř.

(Saudek 82)

Saudek also decided to preserve the pun, but he shifted the meaning one sentence further. Meanwhile the original pun is translated literally, using only one meaning of *grave* – settled (to certain extent synonymic to *serious*). In the next sentence, Saudek uses rather idiomatical pun. The phrase *na tomhle světě mám po legraci* (I am done with humour in this world) means literally that Mercutio ends with humour, metaphorically, he describes his fear from death. Saudek also managed to preserve semantic principle of Shakespeare's wordplay.

(40) Merkucio: Od zítřka se budu tvářit vážně, uvidíš.

(Hilský 80)

In Hilský's translation were preserved both meanings of *grave.* (I will be serious – I will be dead). However, in this case, it can hardly be considered a wordplay.

8.5   Wordplay Based on Lexical Structure (Idiom)

No instances of wordplay based on the lexical structure (idiom) were found.

8.6   Wordplay Based on Morphological Structure

See the example (21) from 7.3. – Horizontal pun based on lexical structure (polysemy).

8.7   Wordplay Based on Syntactic Structure

A part of Juliet's monologue from the scene five, act three can be considered example of the syntactic wordplay. Julie is told by her mother – Mrs. Capulet, that her cousin Tybalt was murdered and Romeo – Juliet's husband is the person responsible for his death. Juliet pretends to hate Romeo for the crime he committed, in fact, she is still remaining in love with him.

(41) Juliet: I never shall be satisfied with Romeo

till I behold him— dead--is my poor heart,

so for a kinsman vexed

(Shakespeare 171)

Juliet tells her mother that she will never find piece, unless she beholds Romeo. The double dash symbol implies the pause. In stage performance, Juliet realises at this point that her mu mis taken aback by what she said, and she improvises in order to conceal the initial meaning of what she said and adds the line – I behold him – dead. Even though it has been categorized as the pun based on syntactic structure, it can be equally considered an example of the wordplay of another type – based on devices of the spoken language, such as pauses, intonation etc. Such category, however, has not been established within the generally accepted list of the pun mechanisms.

(42) Julie: Ba nikdy spokojena nespatřím Romea,

nežli – mrtva, – když mé srdce

tak ztrátou příbuzného trýzněno.

(Sládek 111)

In his translation, Sládek employed such word order which do not set suitable conditions for the wordplay. Namely his decision to finish the line preceding the pause with the word *nežli*

(than) seems illogical regarding the original pun, which is based on the improvised ending of Juliet's speech denying what she originally intended to convey.

(43) Julie: S Romeem nemohu být spokojena,

dokud ho neuvidím – mrtva, mrtva

je moje duše pro bratrance.

(Saudek 104)

Saudek's literal translation serves the purposes of the wordplay perfectly, based on the same principle of the original Shakespeare's pun.

(44)   Julie: Uleví se mi, až ho uvidím –

Mrtvého – bratrance je mi moc líto.

(Hilský 102)

With slight differences, Hilský's translation is also identical with the one by Saudek and preserves the mechanism of the original wordplay.

9   Analysis II

In this part, the findings from the wordplay translation analysis will be further reflected according to Delabastita's strategies mentioned in the previous chapter, with the reference to Levý's assumptions regarding translation of the wordplay based on relative significance of individual values in a literary work.

In the following table, the wordplay is divided into categories according Delabastita's wordplay translation strategies. The numbers in the column 'instances found' correspond to the numbers of the puns from the previous chapter. In the brackets, the total number of the puns of the given type can be found.

Strategies employed in wordplay translation	Instances found (total number)	Instances found (%)
Pun → pun	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 18, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 38, 42, 43, 44 (20)	55,5
Pun → zero pun	19, 22, 23, 26 (4)	11,1
Pun → related rhetorical device	8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 20, 24, 34, 35, 36, 40 (11)	30,6
Zero pun → pun	39, 24 (2)	5,6
Pun S.T → pun T.T.	- (0)	0
Total number of instances found	36	

Such findings, in context of wordplay from *Romeo and Juliet*, confirms Levý's assumptions regarding tendency to preserve the puns, as they represent a typical phenomenon of Shakespeare's plays (see relative significance of individual values in a literary work). The prominent number of puns are representatives of the wordplay translated as related rhetorical device, namely metaphors and also contrast or paradox. Such findings prove translator's general tendency towards preservice of the communicatively significant devices in the text, rather then preserving only one of the meaning conveyed by the wordplay by translating it literally. Only in two instances translated opted for omitting the wordplay completely. A single example of compensation for the wordplay was found in the text.

9.1 Translation Strategies Employed by Individual Translators

Translator	Pun → pun	Pun → zero pun	Pun → related rhetorical device	Zero pun → pun	Pun from S.T. = pun from T.T.
Sládek	2, 6, 10, 18, 22, 22, 30, 38, 42 (9)	26 (1)	14, 34, (2)	- (0)	- (0)
Saudek	3, 7, 23, 23, 27, 31, 43 (7)	19 (1)	11, 15, 35, 39 (3)	39 (1)	- (0)
Hilský	4, 12, 24, 28, 32, 44 (6)	- (0)	8, 16, 20, 24, 36, 40 (6)	24 (0)	- (0)

There are no significant differences when it comes a total number of the translated puns by the three chosen translators. Also in terms of the translating strategies used, the findings regarding the translators appear similar, even tough, in specific cases, certain translating features become apparent as far as the individual translator is concerned.

Sládek preserved a wordplay (or at least communicatively significant devices) in eight out of the total number of twelve instances. In a single instance, Sládek, surprisingly, omitted the wordplay completely, strangely in the case of the wordplay which was translated by both Saudek and Hilský. One of the possible interpretations of Sládek's omission of the wordplay is that Sládek simply overlooked the pun in the original text (which is of course an interpretation highly speculative).

Within the scope of the translations mention, Hilský's wordplay stands out from various reasons. Firstly, he is the only translator to translate all instances of the wordplay in the play or

at least substitute them with a related rhetorical device, which strategy is the predominant feature of Hilský's translation.

Saudek is the only translator to opt for compensation of the pun on the place where it did not occur in the source text. It is therefore a paradox that Saudek also omitted a wordplay in one instance. As was the case with Sládek's case of omission, it as an instance difficult to interpret.

9.2 Analysis of The Strategies Employed in Wordplay Translation

In the following part, the wordplay will be analysed with respect to their categorization according to Delabastita's wordplay translation mechanisms. Should the pun be translated according to Delabastita's wordplay translation strategies in order to compare these mechanisms of the original wordplay with mechanisms of the wordplay translated to the target (Czech) language.

9.2.1 Horizontal Wordplay based on Phonological and Graphological Structure

Translation strategies employed	Instances found
Phonological and graphological structure → morphological structure (derivation)	2, 3, 4, 10, 12
Phonological and graphological structure → related rhetorical device	8, 11
Phonological and graphological structure → lexical structure (idiom)	4, 7
Phonological and graphological structure → lexical structure (polysemy)	6

In case of the wordplay based on phonological and graphical structure, there is a specific phenomenon to be observed in terms of Czech translation of the wordplay – the translation into wordplay based on the derived words. Such means often a predominant mechanism of translation of the wordplay of the kind. Such mechanism has not been listed in Delabastita's mechanisms, which is caused by the fact that his strategies stem from the mechanisms characteristics for the wordplay occurring within the western languages. The 'Derivational strategy' represents a domain of the Slavic language translation mechanisms, as word derivation is a major category of the word formation processes in those languages.

Not a single example of the wordplay translated as the same mechanism based wordplay, which can possibly be caused by the fact that Czech and English language are historically unrelated and Czech words in general tend to be longer, which provides less opportunities for creation of a pun base on phonological structure in comparison with English, as has been discussed earlier in the theoretical part.

9.2.2 Vertical Wordplay Based on Phonological and Graphological Structure

Translation strategies employed	Instances found
Vertical wordplay based on the phonological and graphological structure → related rhetorical device	14, 15, 16, 20
Vertical wordplay based on the phonological and graphological structure → lexical structure (idiom)	18
Vertical wordplay based on the phonological and graphological structure → zero pun	19

Vertical puns, as has been explained in the preceding chapters, are much more demanding to 'reveal' and, as the findings of the analysis suggest, also to translate appropriately. Only a single instance of the vertical pun was translated gain into a pun in the target language. In the rest of the instances, the wordplay was replaced by another related rhetorical device or it was omitted from the text completely.

9.2.3   Horizontal Wordplay Based on Lexical Structure (Polysemy)

Translation strategies employed	Instances found
Horizontal wordplay based lexical structure (polysemy) → lexical structure (polysemy)	22, 23, 27, 28, 30
Horizontal wordplay based lexical structure (polysemy) → lexical structure (idiom)	31, 32
Horizontal wordplay based lexical structure (polysemy) → phonological a graphological structure	24
Horizontal wordplay based lexical structure (polysemy) → zero pun	26

Regarding the considerable number of the polysemous puns from the source text translated as polysemous puns in the target language, it is fair to assume that such wordplay is accessible to equivalent translation into Czech, which confirms Delabsatita's assumptions regarding agreement of the polysemous words within historically unrelated languages (see chapter 6). From this viewpoint, Sládek's omission of the wordplay represents a truly surprising instance.

9.2.4 Vertical Wordplay Based on Lexical Structure (Polysemy)

Translation strategies employed	Instances found
Vertical wordplay based on lexical structure (polysemy) → related rhetorical device	34, 35, 36, 40
Vertical wordplay based on lexical structure (polysemy) → lexical structure (idiom)	38, 39

Oppositely to horizontal polysemy-based wordplay, in case of vertical wordplay, not a single instance of the equivalent translation of the wordplay can be observed and in the total number of four instances, the pun was replaced by a related rhetorical device. Such finding anticipates possible difficulties regarding translation of vertical puns into Czech language.

9.2.5 Horizontal Wordplay Based on Morphological Structure

Translation strategies employed	Instances found
Horizontal wordplay based on morphological structure → zero pun	22, 23
Horizontal wordplay based on morphological structure → related rhetorical device	24

A single representative of the pun based on the morphological structure cannot be considered a representative sample regarding assessment of the prevailing translation mechanism of the

wordplay of the type. As apparent from the table above, strategies of the translation vary from one other.

9.2.6 Wordplay Based on Syntactic Structure

Translation strategies employed	Instances found
Syntactic structure → syntactic structure	41, 42, 43

As was the case with morphological wordplay, it is impossible to deduce implications regarding translating strategies of the wordplay set on the syntactic level due to lack of representative examples.

10 Conclusion

Translating William Shakespeare is globally considered an important cultural phenomenon connected to defining cultural identity and to literary tradition of countries all over the world. Czech translations of Shakespeare are divided into eight generations based on their specific features and chronology. To this day, dozens of translations were produced, but few managed to *survive* until today. Publishers and theaters use the translation of Hilský and Josek the most, while Saudek's and Sládek's are used as well, but not as often. That is why I have decided to choose three translations from the aforementioned authors for the purposes of this work.

Wordplays are an important part of both Shakespeare's comedies and, surprisingly, tragedies. Wordplay is the general name for the various textual phenomena in which structural features of the language(s) used are exploited in order to bring about a communicatively significant confrontation of two (or more) linguistic structures with more or less similar forms and more or less different meanings. However, it may not always be an easy task to recognize and decipher a wordplay (especially a vertical one). One needs to be attentive and have a good knowledge of the language as well as considerable amount of imagination.

Levý's theories about translating wordplays as a typical occurrence in Shakespeare's plays from the point of view of relative importance of values shows that preserving the meaning of a wordplay is a priority for a translator, even at a cost of deviation from the original text. In *Romeo and Juliet*, wordplays play an important role in the dynamic of the story and in character development. From this point of view, the play seems ideal for analyzing translations of wordplays. The practical part has proved that at least a half of the original wordplays in *Romeo and Juliet* was translated (or replaced by another stylistic element of comparable importance) in all of the analyzed translations. A wordplay was completely omitted in only three cases.

The practical part is based on Delabastita's assumptions about translating wordplays. Delabastita supposes that a wordplay can be translated either as a wordplay as well or by means of another stylistic element. Other options are omission, compensation elsewhere or using the original wordplay without translating it. This assumption has been proven without exceptions in *Romeo and Juliet*'s translations.

In order to divide wordplays into more specific categories, I have used Delabastita's categorization of wordplays. According to this categorization, there are wordplays based on the phonology and graphemes, based on their lexical structure (polysemy or idioms), morphological or syntactic structure. Dividing wordplays into vertical and horizontal is another kind of categorization. The practical part divides the original wordplays into the aforementioned categories. Then, their Czech translations are divided into the same categories. While Delabastita's categorization could be used for the original wordplays, dividing their Czech translations were much more difficult to categorize, especially the ones created by means of derivation.

The final analysis shows that one means of translation was more often than the others. Due to the low number of wordplays and due to the fact, some types of wordplays were present in low number or not at all, the results of this work cannot be taken as defining. However, they can serve as a useful material for further research.

Wordplays are not untranslatable, even though translating them is difficult and requires the translator to be creative and to have great language skill. The success of translating wordplays does not directly depend on the period of time during which it is being translated and the quality of the translation often varies depending on the translator and on the wordplay itself. There are not many Czech publications about translating wordplays. And because wordplays play an important role in Shakespeare's work, I certainly hope that this work will be followed by many others in the future.

11 Works Cited

Academia.cz., 2020. https://www.academia.cz/.

Bruster, Douglas and Nell McKeown. "Wordplay in Earliest Shakespeare." *Philological*

   Quarterly, vol. 96, 2017, pp. 293-322.

   https://www.academia.edu/35685867/Wordplay_in_Earliest_Shakespeare .

"Wordplay." *Cambridge Dictionary,* 2020,

   https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/wordplay.

Delabastita, Dirk. *Traductio: Essays on punning and translation.* Manchester: St. Jerome

   Publishing, 2020. Print.

Delabastita, Dirk. "Shakespeare in translation: a bird's eye view of problems and

   perspectives Shakespeare in translation: a bird's eye view of problems and

   perspectives." *Ilha do Desterro,* vol. 45, 2008, pp. 103-115.
   https://www.researchgate.net/publication/49617414_Shakespeare_in_translation_a_bi
   rd's_eye_view_of_problems_and_perspectives_Shakespeare_in_translation_a_bird's_
   eye_view_of_problems_and_perspectives.

Drábek, Pavel. *České pokusy o Shakespeara.* Větrné mlýny, 2012,

   https://is.muni.cz/el/phil/podzim2016/DVQ039/Drabek_Ceske_pokusy_o_Shakespear
   a_web.pdf. (translated by Jana Šťastná)

Gingzburg, Jevgenija, et al. *A course in modern English lexicology*. Moscow: Higher school

   Publishing House, 1966. Print.

„Ani Shakespeare není bez chyby, řekl v on-line rozhovoru překladatel Hilský." *iDnes.cz*, 26

   June 2019, https://www.idnes.cz/kultura/divadlo/ani-shakespeare-neni-bez-chyby-
   rekl-v-on-line-rozhovoru-prekladatel-hilsky.A090625_161506_divadlo_efl.
   (translated by Jana Šťastná)

"Rozbor díla: Romeo a Julie (William Shakespeare)." *YouTube,* uploaded by Filozofická

   fakulta Univerzity Karlovy, 3 March 2014,
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C68eLWnqExg&t=76s

Hronová, Katarína. *Jazykové hříčky v češtině.* Praha: FF UK, 2007. Print.

i-divadlo.cz. 2020. https://www.i-divadlo.cz/.Josek, Jiří. *Předmluva: Romeo a Julie/Romeo and Juliet*. Praha: Romeo, 2012. https://kramerius5.nkp.cz/view/uuid:240adf40-78dc-11e7-aab4-005056827e52?page=uuid:b1e586a1-9d0b-11e7-a093-005056825209.

KnihyDobrovsky.cz. 2020. https://www.knihydobrovsky.cz/.

LevneKnihy.cz. 2020. https://www.levneknihy.cz/.

Levý, Jiří. *Umění překladu*. 4th ed., Praha: Apostrof, 2012. Print.

Luxor.cz. 2020. https://www.luxor.cz/.

MacDonald, M. C, Pearlmutter, N. J., & Seidenberg, M. S. (1994). Lexical nature of syntactic ambiguity resolution. *Psychological Review*, *101*(4), 676-703. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/34b5/1001891b3104be96a8d4c31ef80c76b01b08.pdf .

McDonald, Maryellen Coles, et al. "Lexical nature of syntactic ambiguity resolution." *Psychological Review*, vol. 101, 1994, pp. 676-703. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/34b5/1001891b3104be96a8d4c31ef80c76b01b08.pdf .

"Macbeth – Too much blood." *Divadlo Na Zábradlí*, 2020. https://www.nazabradli.cz/cz/17-repertoar/aktualni/1363-macbethcz/.

"Wordplay." *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries*, 2020. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/wordplay.

Řihout, František. *Záměry a výsledky shakespearovské dramaturgie na pražských jevištích v 50. letech XX. století.* Praha: FF UK, 1981. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare.* London: Ward, Geddes & Grosset. 2008. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo a Julie.* Translated by Josef Václav, 1st ed., Praha: Městská knihovna v Praze, 2011. https://web2.mlp.cz/koweb/00/03/54/27/71/romeo_a_julie.pdf.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo a Julie.* Translated by Martin Hilský, Brno: Atlantis, 2015. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo a Julie.* Translated by Erik Adolf Saudek, Brno:

Československý spisovatel, s. r. o., 2018. Print.

Schröter, Thorsten. *Shun the pun, rescue the rhyme?*. Karlstad: Universitetstryckeriet, 2005.

Print.

Klášterský, Antonín. *A. J.V.Sládek – Jeho život, literární dílo, ukázky bibliografie*. Praha:

Nakladatel Jan Svátek, 1922. Print. (translated by Jana Šťastná)