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Allographic Translation, Self-Translation, and Alloglottic Rewriting:
Towards a Digital Edition of Poetry by Pedro Homem de Mello

Elsa Pereira
(Centre of Linguistics, University of Lisbon)*

This chapter focuses on a series of interlingual materials related to the genetic dossier of twentieth-century Portuguese author Pedro Homem de Mello (1904–84), whose poetry is the object of an ongoing digital edition. In general terms, we may organise such documents into two
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main categories: a group of allographic translations (made by other people rather than the poet) and a series of authorial witnesses, ranging from self-translation to alloglottic rewriting, which involves a thorough reinvention of a text using a different language. We will, therefore, be referring to Umberto Eco’s concept of ‘intersystemic interpretation with marked variation in the substance’ and focus on its main subtypes.¹

The essay starts by presenting examples of this form of textual variation and analysing their theoretical implications for a genetic-critical edition. It will then proceed to elaborate on the editorial approach adopted in the project and the use of the electronic medium to organise the digital archive.

Allographic translations
Starting with the first type of interlinguistic interpretation identified by Eco, we must note that Pedro Homem de Mello had several of his works translated into French and English, either by native speakers or by Portuguese writers living abroad. That was the case with the books related to his activity as an ethnographer² and also with some of his poetry, which was rendered in French, by commission of several promoters of the Portuguese culture abroad (Figure 6.1).

¹ Umberto Eco (2003: 236) identified three subtypes of intersystemic interpretation with marked variation in the substance: interlinguistic interpretation (translation between natural languages), rewriting (reworked versions of one text by the same author) and translation between non-linguistic systems.

² The author published some of these books in multilingual editions. Danças Portuguesas (Mello 1962) included a French and an English version by Maurice Villemur and Elaine Sanceau, while Danças de Portugal (Mello 1966) was
Portuguese → French

• ‘Chanson verte’, by Armand Guibert (translation of the poem ‘Canção verde’ [Mello 1951: 25–7]).

• ‘La Maison brûlée’, by Pierre Hourcade and Adolfo Casais Monteiro (translation of the poem ‘Casa queimada’ [Mello 1951: 19–20]).

• ‘Remords’, by Evelyne Kesteven (translation of the poem ‘Remorso’ [Mello 1948: 26–28]).


---

\(^3\) This unpublished anthology belongs to the archive of João Gaspar Simões, at the Portuguese National Library (BNP, E16, box 42/29). According to Isabel Meyrelles (private correspondence), the book was commissioned by David Mourão-Ferreira, but was never published. The typescript at BNP is identified as ‘Le Deuxième Modernisme: la Génération de Presença: 1927-1940. Seléction, préface et notes de João Gaspar Simões. Choix de textes et traduction translated by Marie Radelet and Elaine Sanceau. In the author’s archive, there is yet another text about tourism and landscape, which was translated by Elaine Sanceau (‘The Costa Verde’—BPMP, ML-P15C-no. inv. 1134C).
**Figure 6.1** Published allographic translations (Portuguese to French) of Pedro Homem de Mello’s poetry.

Besides these translations, there is also a collection of 77 poems translated into English by Arnold Hawkins and released in book form, with a few sparse reprints in periodicals (Figure 6.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portuguese → English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[translation of poems from the books Caravela ao Mar (Mello 1934), Jardins Suspensos (Mello 1937), and Segrêdo (Mello 1939b)].

In Arnold C. Hawkins (1941a), Lusitanian Lyrics, Porto: Lello & Irmão.

‘Dance of the hours’, ‘Scene’, ‘Truth’, by Arnold C. Hawkings

[reprints from Lusitanian Lyrics (Hawkings 1941a)].


Figure 6.2 Published allographic translations (Portuguese to English) of Pedro Homem de Mello’s poetry.

The English compilation was targeted at the British community in Porto (where the author and the translator lived and worked as lecturers)⁴ and was favourably received by the critics. One of them praised the challenging nature of the translation in such terms:

---

⁴ Arnold Caesar Hawkins (b. 1909) was born into a Scottish family based in Porto, owner of the Dow’s Port wine house. After completing his education at the Trinity College, he founded the English Room at the University of Porto (1940) and the British Institute of Porto (1943), where Pedro Homem de Mello was also a teacher. In the early 1950s he was appointed to a lecturing position at the University of Oxford and later acted as the British Council Representative in Austria.
This book ... is certainly a great novelty, daring, risky. ... Homem de Mello ... is perhaps the hardest of any of the contemporary Portuguese poets to translate. Firstly, his poems are classical rather than ‘modernistic’, which means to say that most of them are in Portuguese verse-forms which are unusual and exotic if reproduced with English words. ... Secondly, Homem de Mello is not only classicist in form, he is what is called a ‘traditionalist poet’. ... He has his roots in the popular poetry of Portugal, ... in popular song, music, and dance. ... So the second pitfall in translating Homem de Mello was this: to keep the popular freshness of the original in a language whose poetical achievement is aristocratic. (Anonymous 1941b: 9)

Although the name of the poet is absent from the book cover, and it is only on the title page that we find reference to the translation, Hawkins (1941a: VII) states in the preface that ‘this book is an adventure in friendship’, referring to the close bond that existed between author and translator and apparently suggesting that Pedro Homem de Mello was somehow involved in the process. This impression is also confirmed by the correspondence in the poet’s private collection, which contains several intermediate versions that Hawkins sent for Mello’s approval (Figure 6.3).

5 The cover states ‘Arnold C. Hawkins | Lusitanian Lyrics’, while the title page adds: ‘Lusitanian Lyrics: Selections from the Poems of Pedro Homem de Mello Translated by Arnold C. Hawkins’.

6 There is confirmation of their close friendship in two of Mello’s books. Cartas de Inglaterra (Mello 1973) opens with the poem ‘Friendship’, offered by ‘Bill and Dulci’ (Arnold Hawkins and his wife Dulcie Violet Fimister) to ‘Pedro and Helena’ (Pedro Homem de Mello and his wife Helena de Pamplona). Years later, the poet would dedicate Carta a Bill (Mello 1977) to this friend, whose photo is printed on the title page.
Portuguese → English


(drafts included in Arnold Hawkins’ correspondence to Pedro Homem de Mello, dated from 1939 to 1947. These manuscripts are currently owned by one of the poet’s daughters-in-law, Helena Telles da Silva).

**Figure 6.3** Draft allographic translations (Portuguese to English), later published in *Lusitanian Lyrics* (Hawkins 1941a).

As we can see in the example provided in Figure 6.4, there are, indeed, some variants between those drafts and the published versions of the book.
Figure 6.4 A side-by-side comparison of the manuscript (HTS, Hawkin’s letter to Mello), on the left, and the final translation (Hawkins 1941a: 24), on the right, using Juxta collation software.

The highlighted passages correspond to the variants.

However, it remains unclear if the poet has made any contributions to the final version, considering that he was fluent but not proficient in English and that his correspondence with Hawkins is entirely in French. Since we are not sure whether the author had any input, as often happens in authorised translations, the question is whether we should include these materials in a digital critical-genetic edition of poetry by Pedro Homem de Mello.

---

As noted by Andrea Ceccherelli (2013: 13), between authorised translation and self-translation there is a vast middle ground, occupied by various modes of collaboration. At the one end of the scale, some authors dialogue with their translators, giving their stamp of approval to the translations that are signed by others (i.e. translation in collaboration with the author). At the other extreme of the spectrum, there are also authors who partly or entirely...
Traditionally, allographic translations are not considered in a genetic edition, because they belong to what some textual critics call *derivative works*. As Elena Pierazzo (2015: 53) points out, a different ontological status is involved in allographic translations, due to the presence of other types of authorship, and consequently, these documents are somehow independent of the source text from which they derive. Still, Dirk Van Hulle identified five different ways in which translations may inform the work of genetic scholars and possibly earn a place in the edition:

[Translation studies and genetic criticism inform each other in at least five different ways: genesis as part of translation; translation of the genesis; genesis of the translation; translation as part of the genesis; and finally the genesis of the untranslatable. (Van Hulle 2015: 40)\(^8\)]

The challenge here would be to integrate the allographic materials into the editorial design, while preserving their independence from the author’s documents. That kind of architecture requires a non-linear approach, organised on different levels.

\(^8\) In this regard, let us mention the new subdiscipline of genetic translation studies, which ‘analyses the practices of the ... translator’, through his working documents (Cordingley and Montini 2015: 1).
Figure 6.5 Generic model of the ongoing edition.

For the ongoing project, we decided to make allographic translations available in a paragenetic device located in marginal notes (see below, part 3), while the body of the edition is reserved for the authorial genesis, assembling various types of document witnesses (Figure 6.5). This includes not only the manuscripts, typescripts, and printed texts that Pedro Homem de Mello produced in his mother-tongue, but also a few poems written in his second language, French, and a group of unpublished exercises that fall into what Gérard Genette (1994: 202) calls *traductions auctoriales* (or self-translations).

**Self-translation and alloglottic rewriting**

In the poet’s archive, owned by the Portuguese National Library, there is a folder (BNP, E14, box 9 [folder 2]) that stands out in the collection, due to the bilingual nature of the materials therein. It

---

9 Pedro Homem de Mello published a few French poems, of which there are no Portuguese versions available: ‘Mystère’, ‘Alentejo (Paysage portugais)’, ‘Félicité’, *Prisma*, III (3) 1939a: 143–46. It is possible that they were written directly in that language, since French was his second idiom, similarly to what happened with most European writers until the end of the Second World War (Grutman qtd. in Ceccherelli et al. 2013: 46).
contains typescript copies of seventeen compositions that Pedro Homem de Mello published from 1933 to 1951, most of which explicitly mention the books to which they belong. Side by side with those fair copies of the Portuguese originals, the author placed in the folder one – sometimes two – French version(s) for each composition (Figure 6.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BNP, E14, box 9 (folder 2):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Refus’ (self-translation of the poem ‘Recusa’ from Mello 1951: 64–5);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Sonata’ (from Mello 1947: 80) + ‘Sonate’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Desencanto’ (from Mello 1939b: 17–8) + ‘Désenchantement’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Aquarelle’ (self-translation of the poem ‘Aquarela’ from Mello 1937: 86–7);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Peixe vermelho’ (from Mello 1939b: 49–50) + ‘Le poisson rouge’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Canção Verde’ (from Mello 1951: 25–7) + ‘Chanson verte’ + ‘Chanson verte’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Naufrágio’ (from Mello 1940: 17–9) + ‘Naufrage’ + ‘Naufrage’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Infinito’ (from Mello 1934: 117) + ‘Infini’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘O bailador de fandango’ (from Mello 1942: 63–4) + ‘Le danseur de fandango’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Vila Verde’ (from Mello 1947: 47–9) + ‘Ville Verte’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Canção à ausente’ (from Mello 1939b: 53–4) + ‘Absence’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Barco Vazio’ (from Mello 1939b: 11–3) + ‘Le bateau vide’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Pecado’ (from Mello 1942: 21–3) + ‘Péché’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Quando o vento dobrou todo o salgueiro’ (from Mello 1939b: 61–2) + ‘Quand le vent vient plier le saule vert’;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Profecia’ (from Mello 1937: 90–1) + ‘Profécie’;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- ‘Espanto’ (from Mello 1951: 32–3) + ‘Étonnement’;

**Figure 6.6** Pedro Homem de Mello’s self-translation and alloglottic rewriting.

Manuscripts from earlier writing stages of the French versions did not survive, but some of these typescripts include autograph revisions that bring them closer to the status of a work in progress. Initially, they were destined to be published as translations in the bilingual booklet collection *Autour du Monde*, which the Parisian house Pierre Seghers organised between 1952 and 1970. This is suggested by a letter, dated from 2 January 1952, where Alain Bosquet invited Pedro Homem de Mello to participate with selected poems translated into French. The same information is confirmed by a news article from 24 May 1952 (Anonymous, 1952b: 4), which refers to the forthcoming publication in Paris of an anthology of poems, translated by the author himself. For some reason, however, the volume never saw the light of day and chances are that those self-translations eventually became a recreative exercise with new scribal purposes, as they involve a reinvention of the texts while rendering them into a different language.

---

10 BNP, E14, box 9 (folder 6), letter from Alain Bosquet, dated 2 January 1952.

11 We could not find any volume with Pedro Homem de Mello’s poems in Pierre Seghers’ collection *Autour du Monde*. So far, only one of these French versions from BNP, E14, box 9 [folder 2] was found in the Portuguese magazine *Prisma*, III (3) (1939: 144), although it is not published as a translation of ‘Aquarela’. Indeed, it has a very different title: ‘Águeda (Paysage portugais)’.
In previous articles (Pereira 2017), we have already observed that Homem de Mello often submitted his compositions to thorough rewriting processes, favouring structural variance and ‘vertical revision’ to make a ‘different sort of work out of’ previous texts (Tanselle 1990: 53). This procedure resulted in multiple different versions with extreme variation phenomena and could also be related to the writing habits of many authors from the modernist period, whose approach to revision shaped literary style at the beginning of the twentieth century. As Hanna Sullivan (2013: 16) pointed out, all the main techniques we recognise as modernist are intimately related to experimental acts of revision, which sometimes ‘could be a way to defamiliarize circulating work and to make it new for the second time’ (Sullivan 2013: 239).

There are many examples of this type of practice in Homem de Mello’s poetry, and that also seems to happen in the unpublished French versions we are considering in this article. It is true that, despite substantial rhythmic variation, some compositions correspond partially to a more literal *metaphrastic translation*,¹² as happens in Figure 6.7 (where ‘Absence’ roughly follows ‘Canção à ausente’, published in the 1939 book *Segrêdo*).

---

¹² John Dryden (1680) identified three different ways of translating: ‘First, that of Metaphrase, or turning an Authour word by word, and Line by Line, from one Language into another. ... The second way is that of Paraphrase, or Translation with Latitude, where the Authour is kept in view by the Translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly follow’d as his sense .... The Third way is that of Imitation, where the Translator (if now he has not lost that Name) assumes the liberty not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion’. 
**Figure 6.7** A side-by-side comparison of the Portuguese and French typescripts of ‘Canção à ausente’, in BNP, E14, box 9 (folder 2). The highlighted passages correspond to the matching text.

However, many of the French typescripts included in BNP, E14, box 9 (folder 2) are very different from the respective Portuguese versions, and it is not only due to the apparent distance between languages and their syntactic rules or vocabulary. Indeed, they seem to correspond to Oustinoff’s concept of *(re)creative self-translation*,\(^\text{13}\) which entails a radical manipulation of the original,

\(^{13}\) In his study of three prominent self-translators (Green, Beckett, Nabokov), Michael Oustinoff (2001: 29–34) establishes a first typology of self-translation strategies, comprising: 1. naturalizing self-translation (‘auto-traduction
sometimes making it difficult to recognise similarities between the two texts. Let us compare, for example, ‘Sonata’ (copy from the 1947 book *Bodas Vermelhas*) with the contiguous French version in the author’s typescripts.

![Side-by-side comparison of the Portuguese and French typescripts of ‘Sonata’, in BNP, E14, box 9 (folder 2). The highlighted passages correspond to the matching text: the passages with a light grey and a dark grey background are in linear correspondence, while the bold passages and the white text against a black background appear in a different position.](image)

Figure 6.8 A side-by-side comparison of the Portuguese and French typescripts of ‘Sonata’, in BNP, E14, box 9 (folder 2). The highlighted passages correspond to the matching text: the passages with a light grey and a dark grey background are in linear correspondence, while the bold passages and the white text against a black background appear in a different position.

Altogether, only the title and a few partial lines were literally preserved during the process of self-translation, but not all those words appear in the same position (Figure 6.8). The poem was thoroughly rewritten and shortened by one line, the rhythm and the strophic scheme were

naturalisante’), 2. centred self-translation (‘auto-traduction décentrée’) and 3. (re)creative self-translation (‘auto-traduction [re]créatrice’).
altered, and even the lyric message is not entirely coincident. So much so that we cannot but ask ourselves what kind of textual instances they are. Will they be a source and a target text of a translation, made by the same person? Are they two versions of a single poem, written in different languages? Or, on the contrary, are we dealing with two separate texts that share only a few matching words? María Recuenco had already asked similar questions and identified different theoretical positions regarding self-translations, which we could associate to three main procedures in terms of editorial handling.

Some critics consider that, regardless of the distance between source and target texts, self-translation does not substantially differ from an allographic translation, as both establish a modelling relation with the original. This is true for Anton Popovič, who offered a straightforward definition: ‘Due to its modelling relation to the original text, the autotranslation cannot be regarded as a variant of the original text, but as a true translation’ (1976: 19).

According to this understanding, the French script depends on the Portuguese text, by way of a subaltern relation. Therefore, we should edit self-translations just like we did for the allographic translations in this project – that is, in a paragenetic device, adjacent to the main level of the edition.

---

14 In ‘Beyond Translation: Self-Translation’, María Recuenco Peñalver asks: ‘[W]hat are we talking about when we refer to self-translation? Is it a translation, a new original, a work in progress, a second version, a final version that supplants the first one?’ (2011: 200). In the course of her analysis, she identifies five different theoretical positions: self-translation as an intermediate point between creation and translation, self-translation as creation and translation, self-translation as translation, self-translation as recreation (second original or version), and self-translation as a continuation of the original.
For other experts, though, the interlingual exercise must be regarded as an extension of the writing process: ‘[O]ne has to examine them ... in the light of the continuation of the writer’s work in the source language and in the light of his former work in the target language’ (Perry 1981: 181).

The French witness would thus not be hierarchically dependent on the Portuguese instance (as happens in translations), but constitutes an alternate version of the same poem, within a circuitous creative process where all witnesses have the same status. Brian Fitch and Rainier Grutman belong to this second school of thought, according to which we would have to integrate the alloglottic witnesses in the author’s writing chronology and present them on a par with the Portuguese versions of the poem:

What is, I feel, appropriate is to attribute equal status to both versions ... The fact of the matter is that both ... are alternative outcomes of the same textual productivity. ... The only difference is that the second versions also involve a shift of language-system. (Fitch 1985: 119)

The distinction between original and (self)translation therefore collapses, giving way to a more flexible terminology in which both texts can be referred to as ‘variants’ or ‘versions’ of comparable status. (Grutman 2009: 259)

For other authors, still, this is not a mere translation, nor a version of the same text, but a whole different poem; it is a new original with its own macrostructure:
[The author] passes, of course, from one language to another, but also, and above all, from one text to another: he creates a new textuality, a full textuality. (Bensimon 2002: 135)

[S]elf-translators ... may finally develop a new text with all the characteristics of a second original. (Santoyo 2004: 229)

Following this third hypothesis, favoured by Paul Bensimon and Julio-César Santoyo, among others, the Portuguese and the French texts should be presented as two independent poems in the author’s œuvre, despite their common ground.

While any one of the approaches described would be valid from a theoretical standpoint, the ongoing edition of poetry by Pedro Homem de Mello opted for the second possibility. The French authorial witnesses will be considered within the work’s genesis (in contrast to the paragenetic framework of the allographic translations), and the contiguous placement of the documents in the author’s folder suggests that they form a textual cluster with the Portuguese copies.15

---

15 Bought in 1986 by the Portuguese National Library, BNP E14 corresponds to a part of Pedro Homem de Mello’s personal archive, and many folders seem to preserve the author’s arrangement of the materials. Although this is a strong argument for the joint editorial handling of the Portuguese and French witnesses in box 9 (folder 2), mention should be made of other types of isoglottic rewriting, which involve scattered documents in the genetic dossier. The theoretical discussion implied in such cases deserves further consideration, but some critics consider that, no matter how different they may seem to be, versions ‘can never be revised into a different work’ (Bryant 2002: 85) and in no circumstances can be unlinked from one another. Others argue that a work may be regarded as new whenever a certain degree of continuity is not preserved from one version to the next (McLaverty 1991: 137), since authors may
Therefore, they are to be considered versions of the same poem, regarded in terms of a ‘[l]arge-value hypertext or macrotext’ (Rada 1991: 68), of which there is no primary instance.

In doing so, we refer to the idea of work as a collection of texts linked through variation (Shillingsburg 2004: 77) and to Siegfried Scheibe’s concept of authorisation, according to which all author’s versions ‘are of equal standing’ (Scheibe 1995: 175). It means that, instead of a single base text, each poem will be presented as a series of individual versions that are assembled in one unit. That brings us to a new editorial paradigm, called versioning or multiple texts (Reiman 1987: 167–80), which is based on a heuristic display of textual fluidities, through the functional integration of text and apparatus.

By arguing in favour of this option, we face a practical problem, though, because each language’s morphological and syntactic rules originate ‘an endless array of mismatchings’ (O’Reilly qtd. in Van Hulle 2004: 386), which significantly complicate the critical apparatus. In this sense, it will be useful if we resort to the notion of non-interchangeable versions, which is suggested by Gérard Genette when he says that a literary work may have plural immanences that are not identical and interchangeable (Genette 1994: 187). That means that the Portuguese versions on the one hand, and the French versions on the other form two independent blocks, within the same textual unit that constitutes a poem.

To put this in visual terms, Figure 6.9 presents the editorial model designed for the project.

quote or recycle verbal material, without this implying the rewrite of an earlier composition. In this case, a systematic scale should be drawn for the continuum of textual fluidities, to identify the turning points between a version and what may constitute a different text.
At the main level of the edition, there is a chronological and non-hierarchical presentation of all the authorial witnesses, organised into two sections: the Portuguese versions (collated through an apparatus) and the French versions (also compared with each other). At the same time, a paragenesis device, located in marginal notes, will include the respective allographic translations, thus providing a representation of the work’s genesis in extenso.

**A digital editorial approach**

Naturally, a multilevel edition such as this would be difficult to achieve in a printed book, due to the material constraints of the page. Only in recent decades has this type of non-linear presentation been fully explored, thanks to the electronic hypertext. Briefly, we may say that the digital paradigm is based on a series of programming languages that process the textual information marked by the editor, enabling different kinds of automatic treatment and display. Therefore, the transcriptions and the apparatus must be represented in a formal semantic language, easily interpretable by computers through existing or bespoke software solutions.

---

**Figure 6.9** Editorial model of the ongoing project.
In this project, we will be using TEI-P5 conformant XML for text encoding, and resort to the XSLT, CSS, and JavaScript styles that comprise the open-source interface of the Versioning Machine.\textsuperscript{16} The software has been adopted by several international projects\textsuperscript{17} and is appropriate for displaying multiple versions of text in a flexible and dynamic environment.

In order to illustrate how these functionalities may apply to our editorial model, the article will now conclude with a short demonstration, using one poem by Pedro Homem de Mello. It is entitled ‘Canção verde’ and consists of a cluster of eighteen authorial witnesses, schematically represented in Figure 6.10: sixteen of them written in Portuguese, and two in French. Additionally, there are two allographic translations made by Armand Guibert and Isabel Meyrelles.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node (node1) at (0,0) {Canção verde};
\node at (3,0) {16 witnesses in Portuguese};
\node at (3,-1.5) {18 authorial witnesses};
\node at (3,-3) {2 witnesses in French};
\node at (3,-4.5) {2 allographic translations};
\node at (3,-6) {by Armand Guibert and Isabel Meyrelles};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{16} The interface was originally conceived in 2000 by Susan Schreibman: http://v-machine.org.

\textsuperscript{17} A list of projects using the Versioning Machine can be found at http://v-machine.org/vm-in-use/versioning-machine-in-use/.
Figure 6.10 Document witnesses of the poem ‘Canção verde’.

The first step to be taken is transcribing all the assembled documents in a single XML file. The Portuguese authorial witnesses are encoded with an in-line apparatus, using the TEI-P5 location-referenced method,\(^\text{18}\) which associates lines of corresponding text, by specifying a @loc attribute within the <app>s that need to be assembled. Elsewhere in the document, the same procedure is repeated for the French versions, but in this case, a @type="trans" attribute may be added to the <rdg>s (Figure 6.11). Since the location values that associate the French readings are different from those specified in the <app>s of the Portuguese witnesses, two separate collations are generated, giving shape to the above-mentioned concept of non-interchangeable versions.

Figure 6.11 Encoded apparatus for line 33 of witness O (French version) and line 34 of witness P (French version), using the location-referenced method. The respective <rdg>s are identified with @type=“trans”.

On the other hand, the allographic translations (made by Armand Guibert and Isabel Meyrelles) may be recorded within <note> elements, with a @type=“critical” assigned attribute (Figure 6.12). That will grant them a subordinate position towards the authorial versions, represented in the <body> of <text>.
Figure 6.12 Encoding an allographic translation, within the element <note>.

Once the encoding is complete, a transformation to HTML is executed, applying the Versioning Machine’s stylesheet. This will automatically reconstruct eighteen individual version panels and sequentially display them into a horizontal scrolling page, which users may choose to visualise and reorder in multiple possible combinations. For this demonstration, let us focus on the Portuguese witness (N) and the French versions (O and P) that belong to BNP, E14, box 9 (folder 2).
Figure 6.13 Display of witnesses N, O, and P in the VM’s interface. It includes transcriptional choices (‘Correction’), traces of authorial alterations (strikethrough and bold passages) and variant readings (shadow highlight).

After an introductory Bibliographic panel (where metadata and a synopsis of the poem’s compositional history are provided), the user will find a parallel display of individual versions with different layers of critical and genetic information. In the example shown in Figure 6.13, these include transcriptional choices for alternate spelling or regularised forms (represented by the <choice> <sic> <corr> and <choice> <orig> <reg> elements), traces of in-document authorial revisions (encoded with the <del> and <add> elements), and variant readings (encoded with <app> and <rdg>). These variants are highlighted between either the French versions or the Portuguese witnesses, because of the separate collation generated by the apparatus.

Furthermore, the allographic translations (encoded within the <note> elements) will appear in the Notes panel, to be accessed through user manipulated pop-up windows (Figure 6.14).
This presentation will provide the user with a heuristic display of the work’s genesis, which ‘conveys and embodies a pluralistic notion of text’, intimately related to the affordances of the electronic medium (Sahle 2016: 30–31). An edition in such terms enhances compositional fluidities, favours textual awareness and facilitates research into exo-, endo-, epi-, and paragenesis, which – as we have seen – is particularly relevant in Pedro Homem de Mello’s bilingual poems. As a consequence, it may be of interest to translation studies, as much as to genetic criticism and scholarly editing, boosting the unexpected intersections between these two fields of study.
Documentation

Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal (BNP), E14, box 9 (folder 2), (folder 6).

Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal (BNP), E16, box 42/29.

Biblioteca Pública Municipal do Porto (BPMP), ML-P15C-no. inv. 1134C.

Helena Telles da Silva (HTS), private collection.
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