Drama translation: theory and practice

The case of Conor McPherson's This Lime Tree Bower, The Weir, and St. Nicholas on the Italian Stage

Monica Randaccio

EUT

Impaginazione
Elisa Widmar

Drama translation: theory and practice
The case of Conor McPherson's *This Lime Tree Bower, The Weir,* and *St. Nicholas* on the Italian Stage

Monica Randaccio

To Neal, with love and gratitude. In loving memory of my father, Giugiù and Elio. To my mother, my sister and my family. And to all those who have always been there.

Man has 'spoken himself free' of total organic constraint. Language is a constant creation of alternative worlds. There are no limits to the shaping powers of words…

George Steiner, *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation*, 1975

HUGH: But remember that words are signals, counters. They are not immortal. And it can happen – to use an image you'll understand – it can happen that a civilization can be imprisoned in a linguistic contour which no longer matches the landscape of… fact.

Brian Friel, *Translations*, 1980

Index

Acknowledgments

Preface

This book is the result of my research on drama translation which has been conducted over the course of almost a decade. It has been preceded by several articles on the topic which have helped me to outline a more precise theoretical framework in which drama translation can be inscribed. Furthermore, my research has also allowed me to bring together my earlier interest in contemporary Irish drama with Translation Studies and this 'encounter' gave me deeper insight into both the worlds of Irish drama and drama translation. In the first chapter I have traced the development of drama translation from its earlier linguistic approaches to the most recent advances that see drama translation as a means of accessibility. Although I am aware that approaches and methods overlap and that rigid categorizations are not possible, I have nonetheless discussed various approaches to drama translation, following approximately a chronological order. Thus, the semiotic approach coincided with the renewed interest in the semiotics of drama and theatre in the 1970s and 1980s; the intercultural approach of the 1990s started to view translation as an 'intercultural transfer', subject to the manipulative processes of textual production; and, in the last two decades, the performative approach brought about a structural redefinition of drama translation. Drawing on the so-called 'performative turn' which originated in the Humanities, various issues were brought to the fore and a more

empirical process of translation for the stage was favoured: the translator therefore turned into an investigator of wider concerns, such as the relation between text and performance, translators, directors and audiences. The second chapter deals with two relevant issues in drama translation, namely intertextuality and the definition of what has been variously termed as 'version', 'adaptation' or 'rewrite'. Given the intricacy of the issue of intertextuality and its crucial role in various disciplinary fields, I have first investigated what intertextuality has meant in discourse analysis and in literary criticism, and then in translation and in drama translation. 'Version', 'rewrite' and 'adaptation' have also been considered in detail as various types of translations belonging to a continuum of different practices and strategies typically adopted for translating the playtext. In the third chapter various models of drama translation have been proposed to show how scholars tackled the complexity of the translation of the playtext from the 1980s to the first decade of the twentieth century, although I share the scepticism of those who believe that there are no models of drama translation which can encompass such an articulated translational process. In the fourth and fifth chapters, my analysis follows a two-step scheme and describes the original plays and their respective translations at the macrostructural and microstructural levels. The forth chapter illustrates in detail the process of translation of three Conor McPherson plays, *This Lime Tree Bower* (1995), *The Weir* (1997) and *St. Nicholas* (1997) from the Irish cultural settings to the Italian cultural landscape. At the macrostructural level, I have analysed the three original plays in relation to Irish theatre in the 1990s and then turned my attention to the 'encounter' between the translated plays in Italian and contemporary Italian culture and theatre from the late 1990s/early 2000s to the present day. Particular attention has been paid to the intertextual relationships between the original texts with their own culture, and the new intertextual relationships the translated texts have in the receiving culture. Finally, the fifth chapter compares the three original plays *This Lime Tree Bower*, *The Weir* and *St. Nicholas* with their translations at the microstructural level in terms of the rendering of language, register, special grammatical lexical and syntactic constructions and culture-bound terms.

Chapter 1. Drama translation: a historical overview

For years drama translation was considered as an important sub-field in the work of literary translators (Windle 2011: 153), and yet its ancillary role to literary translation was a source of dissatisfaction among scholar in Translation Studies. They pointed out how theoretical investigation of the field was a neglected area and lamented the paucity of studies on drama translation (Bassnett 2000, Lefevere 1992). However, in recent years this area of studies has attracted growing attention from diverse perspectives and the various methodological approaches testify to the richness and vitality of the field. This new-found vitality is certainly not homogeneous as testified, for example, by the abundant terminology which defines its object of study. In fact, although very often "translating for the stage", "drama translation" and "theatre translation" were once used interchangeably, these terms have acquired a more precise meaning. Thus, if "translating for the stage" has remained an umbrella terms over the past forty years, "drama translation" started to be used to designate "translation works for both the literary and the theatrical systems" (Aaltonen, 2000: 33), whereas "theatre translation" or "translation in the theatre" later come to signify "a stage-oriented type of translation...an acting version", "ontologically and cognitively different from a reader-oriented translation, as the play on stage is subject to fluidity, ephemerality, temporal arrangement

and physical accessibility" (Bigliazzi, Kofler and Ambrosi 2013: 1-26; Marinetti 2013a: 307-320).

The aim of this chapter is to trace the development of drama translation[1] from the 1970s to the present, which coincides with the renewed interest in this topic. A premise must be made: as it would impossible to account for all the approaches and methods adopted in this area of studies[2], I have decided to follow a chronological order that spans from the early linguistic approaches to the most recent advances that see drama translation as a means of accessibility. I am also aware that approaches and methods do overlap and, therefore, my attempt will try to avoid 'straight jacket' categorizations to favour a descriptive analysis which provides a brief but wide-ranging survey of what drama translation has meant through the years.

1A) FROM EARLY LINGUISTIC APPROACHES TO PERFORMABILITY

The scholars and researchers who favoured a more linguistically-oriented approach continued to consider drama translation, similarly to literary translation, as a process of textual transfer and they worked with a retrospective source-target oriented approach to analyse the target text as a translation of an original with which it must be compared. They drew primarily on studies on descriptive linguistics to highlights the syntactic, stylistic, pragmatic properties of the playtexts (Che Suh 2002: 51). At a time when Translation Studies had not yet established itself as an academic discipline, these studies were carried on by individual literary scholars (Lévy [1969] 2011; Mounin 1965) and translators (Corrigan 1961; Hamberg 1969). Thus, Lars Hamberg (1969: 91) recognises that "very special demands are made on the translator" who must not have an individual reader in mind, but an audience in a theatre situation. For this reason, he considers that translation errors will be less drastically apparent for some individual reader of the printed text than for an audience watching the play as performed on stage. Hamberg's considerations echo George Wellwarth's statement

---

[1]   As in my previous publications, I have decided to use the term 'drama translation' in line with the definition given by Aaltonen (2000).

[2]   Many interesting publications have dealt with drama translation from different perspectives, among which I will mention only the most recent ones: I. Ordóñez-Serón (2013) "Theatre translation studies: An overview of a burgeoning field (Part I: Up to the early 2000s)", *Status Quaestionis*, 5., pp. 90-129; I. Serón-Ordóñez (2014) "Theatre translation studies: An overview of a burgeoning field (Part II: From the early 2000s to 2014)", *Status Quaestionis*, 7., pp. 28-73; M. Laera (2019) *Theatre and translation*, Bloomsbury Publishing; A. T. Tarantini (2021) *Theatre Translation: a Practice as Research Model*, Berlin, Springer Nature; M. Morini (2022) *Theatre Translation: Theory and Practice*, London, Bloomsbury Publishing.

that drama translation is 'a specialized form of translation with its own rules and requirements' whose main function is what Mounin defines stage effectiveness (Mounin 1965: 137). More specifically, Wellwarth asserts that "the dramatic translator... must have a sense of the rhythm of speech patterns" (1981:53) and adds that "what the dramatic translator must watch out for particularly is an excess of sibilants in a sentence, or awkward consonantal clusters that may make a line hard to pronounce rapidly and thus may cause difficulties in sound projection" (1981: 53). Along the same lines, Robert W. Corrigan in his article "Translating for Actors" (1961) shows how a play is made up of a linguistic and physical language and that "it is only when the sense of speakability is achieved that we have theatre" (1961: 104). He is aware that language is gesture and that the dimensions beyond words in a play are determinant for translating any play as an acting text rather than a word-for-word version: "language in the theater must always be gestural... it is necessary at all times for the translator to hear the actor speaking in his mind's ear. He must be conscious of the gestures of the voice that speaks" (Corrigan 1961: 97). For this reason, he warns the dramatic translator that "duration *per se* in stage speech is a part of its meaning and stage time is based upon breath. This means that the translator must always, whenever he can, try to keep the same number of words in each sentence" (Corrigan 1961:106). Susan Bassnett-McGuire also reflects on the importance to respect the 'rhythms' of a play in translation. She draws on Stanislavski's notion of tempo-rhythm in a play, the tempo that dramatic actors vary to change the unfolding rhythm of their performances, through using innumerable variations of movements, speech, pauses, and body language (Bassnett-McGuire 1978: 161-180). Stanislawski in fact asserts: "Whole performances have their tempo-rhythms... a performance is... a series of large and small conjunctions of varied and variegated rates of speed and measures, harmoniously composed into one large whole... often a fine play, which has been beautifully designed and acted, fails to meet with success because it is performed with undue slowness or inappropriate briskness. Just imagine the result if you tried to play a tragedy in tempi suited to vaudeville!" (Stanislavski [1950] 1968: 213). In Bassnett-McGuire's view, the same should be true for drama translation and the translator must find what she coined "the basic undertextual rhythms" in a play (Bassnett-McGuire 1978: 165) because "for a translation to succeed, the translator must be aware of these rhythms and, if they cannot be translated, adapt them into equivalents" (1978: 165). Moreover, translation should work "where gesture and words are intermeshed for maximum effect" (1978: 171) because "moments of great crisis in the theatre hinge on a delicately balanced tension between words and action where the tempo-rhythms of speech and movement must be harmonized" (171) (Bassnett McGuire 1978: 171). Bassnett's position inevitably has huge implica-

tions. Among the various translation strategies,[3] she discusses "translating per-
formability" (Bassnett-Guire 1985: 90) which is "an attempt in the TL to create
fluent speech rhythms and to produce a text that TL actors can speak without too
much difficulty" (1985: 90-91). To mention performability is to open a Pandora's
box. Certainly, this highly controversial notion in the 'labyrinthic' development
of drama translation - to borrow a metaphor dear to Bassnett –, performability
has been contested several times but nonetheless still remains a central subject
of debate.

   After years of supporting the notion of performability, Bassnett herself re-
vises her position in an article from the explicit title, "Translating for the The-
atre: The Case Against Performability" (1991), Bassnett's doubts on perform-
ability derive from various considerations. The translator cannot pass from a
text in one language to a text in another without the ability to predict how that
translation will be realised on stage, which in turn depends on a director and a
group of actors, and not the translator. This would mean that the 'gestic subtext'
inserted into the dramatic text cannot be the primary character of the transla-
tion. Furthermore, if the proper translation of a text can be complete only in the
performative text, then "the translator would simply be engaged in the rather
unhappy, and not very important, task of translating an incomplete text from
the source culture into an incomplete text for the target culture" (Menin 2014:
117). The written dramatic text instead enjoys its own textual realisation, has its
autonomy and completeness, as it can be adapted to reading and to publication.
Finally, the term performability is a highly generic concept which is too difficult
to define and "it is generally employed by translators and critics as a kind of self-
justification, above all in Anglo-Saxon contexts where translations are heavily
adapted according to conventions that must also adhere to economic-productive
criteria" (Menin 2014: 117).

   More recently, for example, in a detailed and informative article on the per-
formative dimension of drama texts, Joseph Che Suh links performability to speak-
ability and acknowledges that "these two notions [are] often regarded as funda-
mental to and characteristic of drama, and [...] represent the gestic/action and
oral/acoustic dimensions of the drama/theatre texts" (Che Suh 2011: 1). However,
he rejects any idea that there is a universal applicability of a set of criteria to es-
tablish performability. For him, the focus must be instead "on the predictability of
such established criteria for a given culture, period or drama type" (Che Suh 2011:
3). What Che Suh highlights is how performability is not a constant feature of dra-

---

[3]   The other strategies are: to "treat the text as a literary work", "to use the SL cultural context as
frame text", "to use co-operative translation": for further details see S. Bassnett-McGuire (1985):
"Ways through the Labyrinth: Strategies and methods for translating theatre texts" in T. Hermans
(ed) *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*, New York, St. Martin Press, p. 91.

ma translation and this variation may be measured along a cline that establishes what is "the relationship between the verbal text on the page and the gestic dimension embedded in that text as performance" (Che Suh 2011: 1). To clarify what performability means, Mary Snell-Hornby, on the other hand, further widens the implications of performability and equates the relationship which exists between the stage text and the dramatic performance with that of the musical score with the global sensory effect of the music itself. For her, the key words in drama translation are "*performability/actability* (*jouabilité/Spielbarkeit*), *speakability* (*Sprechbarkeit*), and in the case of opera or musical, *singability* (*Sangbarkeit*)" (Snell-Hornby 2007: 110). Another complementary term, which contributes to performability is *Atembarkeit* ('*breathability*'), a concept which shows how "The stress patterns of sentence structures should fit in with the emotions expressed in the dialogue" (Snell-Hornby 2007: 111). Kevin Windle also highlights how 'speakability' (*Sprechbarkait*, *parlabilité*) have been included in the accepted terminology and how the other '-bilities' has become widespread: 'playability' (*Spielbarkeit*), 'actability and 'stageability' are related terms and reflect the idea that translators should rely on their ears and be aware of ease and naturalness of dialogue, whereas Fabienne Hörmanseder (2008: 97-111), shows how both *Sprechbarkeit* and *Spielbarkeit* are vital notions to the success of a translated play (Windle 2011; 356).

From the definitions given above, performability can thus be considered as the ability to produce a fluent translation that encompasses both the relationship between the verbal text and its performative dimension, but it changes from culture to culture, from one moment in time to another or from drama type to drama type. These considerations are relevant for drama translation scholars and they helped them to escape the constraints dominating the linguistic-oriented approach to drama translation. One of the constraints that lost is stringency was the idealised and often subjective notion of equivalence. Launched in the mid-sixties, this notion became the yardstick used to measure a given translation: it was essentially normative and evaluative, proceeded on the assumption that the target text (TT) should reproduce the source text (ST) and deviations from the original were deemed inexcusable. It was also reductionist and selective: only single texts or selected passages and their translations were discussed to demonstrate the superiority of the source text and the consequent deficiencies of the target text where the discovery of omissions and inaccuracies was a major preoccupation (Che Suh 2002: 51). Another constraint was the use of outdated linguistic models of the translation process that appeared either too vague or inapplicable.[4] Performability was in fact posing the question as to what

---

[4] For a reflection on the relationship between linguistics and literary translation in the 1980s, see A. Lefevere (1980) "Translating Literature/Translated Literature – The State of the Art", in O. Zuber

extent the target text relates to its source or how a text is formulated in the target language. In other words, performability was underlying the potential conflict between, on the one hand, the need to relate the target text to its source, "the adequacy factor", on the other, the need to formulate a text in the target language, "the acceptability factor" (Anderman [1998] 2009: 92). According to Gideon Toury (1995: 57), translations are cultural activities which are governed by certain constraints or norms. Translators can thus favour the norms realised in the ST or the norms of the target culture or language. If they adopt the norms of the source text (ST), then the target text (TT) will be adequate; if the culture target norms prevail, the target text (TT) will be acceptable. Relevant in Toury's view is the notion of norms which he defines as "the translation of general values and ideas shared by a community – as to what is right or wrong, adequate or inadequate – into performance instructions appropriate and applicable to particular situations" (1995: 55). Other constraints that the notion of performability tried to overcome were the old dichotomy between 'literal'/'faithful' and 'free' translations, and the dilemma between page or stage, i.e., the translator's choice of viewing drama as literature or as an integral part of a theatrical production (Van den Broeck 1988; Schultze 1998: 177-19).

Translators and drama scholars thus became aware that satisfying the linguistic requirements of performability entail that adjustments must be made at many levels. Therefore, they focussed on the rendering of speech, rhythm, syntax and colloquialisms, especially in dialogues. These changes, in turn, would bring forth adjustments in register, tone and style bound to an explicit context both in source-language and target-language systems. More importantly, these adjustments can also lead to profound ideological shifts in the target language. One of the ways of reproducing performability linguistically is to substitute a dialect in the source language with another dialect in the target language, and to omit passages so closely bound to the source-language cultural and linguistic contexts that they might be incomprehensible to the target language audience. Bassnett gives evidence of doubtful outcomes in drama translation especially due to the failure to recreate the 'undertexual rhythm' of the source text that changes completely the tone and style of the source text and at the same time may even change the ideology of the source language. She shows how in an early production of the Italian translation of John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* the class conflict, which has a relevant role in the original, was completely lost and the production presented "four hysterical young people screaming at each other for two hours and a quarter in an extended cliché of the Mediterranean comic argument" (1978:

(ed), *The Languages of Theatre. Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama*, Oxford, Pergamon Press, 153-161.

162). Similarly, when the Italian dramatist Eduardo de Filippo arrived on the English stage, all the starkness of his Italian humour was gone. In a production by the National Theatre, the English version of his *Filumena Marturano* resorted to mock-Italian accents and Anglo-Italian jargon, thus providing a stereotypical image of Naples and "a comic set of signs denoting Italianicity" (Bassnett 1985: 90) to give the impression that the play was a comedy. A more successful example of how performability can be achieved by substituting a dialect in a source language with another dialect in the target language is represented by Eduardo de Filippo's *Napoli Milionaria* (1945) for the Royal National Theatre's production in 1991. The translator Tinniswood adapted Eduardo de Filippo's play in the accent of Liverpool, the translator's native city and, consequently, distanced the Neapolitan context. However, at the same time, in Peter Tinniswood's own words, Liverpool most resembled "the uniqueness of Naples with its wicked, cruel effervescence, its dark, brooding melancholy, its exuberance and wittiness and, above all, its indomitable spirit" (Tinniswood 1992: 248).

In the plays that I have mentioned, translators paid heed primarily to target culture norms, thus privileging the 'acceptability factor'. In the British and the English-language theatres acceptability has usually been followed mainly for two reasons. The first is that a greater degree of adjustment would be required when plays from less frequently used language are performed in translation in English-speaking countries because the English audiences are often unfamiliar with source language cultures and societies (Anderman [1998] 2009: 94). The second reason is that knowledge of the original language in English-speaking theatres is not a fundamental prerequisite. This leads to a division between two types of situations in the production of translation: "the traditional linguistic translator" and "a duo comprising a dramatist and a linguist, the latter usually in a subordinate and often unacknowledged role" (Windle 2011: 157). However, acceptability remains the norm and it is interesting to see how the complex and multi-faceted adjustments required by performability shift the focus away from the source-language-bound aspects and ideology of a playwright's work. To give concrete examples of these adjustments in detail, I will describe how two well-known playwrights such as Anton Chekhov and Dario Fo have reached English-speaking theatres and what they became for their new audiences. Some scholars have analysed the history of Chekhov in translation as a blueprint of how the process of drama translation is inevitably affected by the norms and conventions of the English-speaking countries (predominantly British) as target cultures (Gottlieb 1989: 163-172; Bassnett 1998: 92-94; Anderman 2005: 120-157; Windle 2011: 157-159). Bassnett is very straightforward in declaring that there is an established and conventional norm in the interpretation of Chekhov in English translation and that the Russian dramatist's works underwent a change in mean-

ing that altered the basis of Chekhov's thinking. The translation process domesticated the Russian dramatist and neglected the Russian-bound aspects of his work. For this reason, she asserted: "What we have, therefore, is not a Russian but an English Chekhov, and it is this playwright, invented through the translation process, whose work has entered the English literary system" (Bassnett, 1998: 94). Gunilla Anderman, who generally agrees with Bassnett, also investigates in detail the process of anglicization of Chekhov from the early twentieth century to the twentieth-first century. She highlights the adjustments that were made to Chekhov's plays either to make them performable or because the rendition of the source language linguistic and cultural aspects was problematic to the point that a solution could sometimes not be found. In her extensive work about the reception in English translation of the major modern playwrights, *Europe on Stage: Translation and Theatre* (2005), Anderman's treatment of Chekhov in translation can be considered one of the most intriguing analysis of the process of adjustment plays undergo throughout history, a process which can be often defined in terms of performability. She shows how Chekhov, in his early English translations at the beginning of the twentieth century, first "emerged as the playwright of lyrical elegies and 'the voice of twilight Russia'" and how, in a production in 1911 Edwardian London, the audience got very bored, which was blamed on the 'Russianness' of the play. The attitude towards the early productions of Chekhov is summed up in a review that appeared on 12 May 1914 in the *Daily Chronicle* that declared that *Uncle Vanya* 'is not a play that suits the practical optimism of our English temperament' (Anderman 2005: 121). It was only a few years after World War I, in the 1920s, that Chekhov started to enter the English consciousness. For the intelligentsia, who had lost interest in the social issues made popular by Ibsen and turned instead to Russian Revolution and Soviet egalitarianism as symbols of a new order, "Chekhov became either a prophet of that order, as in the *Cherry Orchard*, or the chronicler of decadent bourgeois provincialism, as in *Three Sisters*" (127). In the years between 1930 and 1945, Chekhov's plays in English translation became established in the dramatic canon. They became popular masterpieces and, this time, no longer exclusive property of an intellectual elite. This change happened because Chekhov's plays in English was instrumental in transforming "his descriptions of the human condition into an account of 'the plight of middle classes'" (129) and started to be addressed mainly to middle-class theatregoers. While at the beginning of the twentieth-century Chekhov's work was an exclusive domain of linguists who were often engaged in reproducing Russian syntax and vocabulary literally, from the 1980s onwards many English playwrights started to produce new versions of Chekhov for the stage (131). Among the specific Russian aspects of Chekhov's plays requiring major adjustments which are analysed in Anderman's and Gottlieb's

works, it is worth highlighting those that created problems of performability and potential areas of ideological shifts, such as the use of dialogue, the characters' volubility in moving from 'laughter' to 'tear' (Gottlieb 1989: 165), the sense of nostalgia, the extensive use of diminutive forms and the lack of class distinction. In his dialogues, for example, Chekhov makes frequent use of pauses both within the sentences and at the end of them. These pauses serve to indicate that a character cannot express their emotions in words, either for a lack of education or because he/she cannot find the appropriate words. In some translations, for example, ellipsis and pauses have been eliminated to make the translation appears less 'foreign' and more 'actable' to English-speaking actors. The above-mentioned volubility of emotions of some characters and the nostalgic aspects of Chekhov's plays are also problematic in translation. The first has resulted in an overemotional attitude and a potential source of embarrassment to deal with in English translations; the second had often been translated as expression of a just 'purely' philosophical thought. Thus, plain factual assertion in the original has often acquired a more elevated stylistic tone in English translation which has become a constituent trait of the English Chekhov. Chekhov also makes extensive use of diminutive forms that are quite common in conversational Russian to express a wide range of feelings such as tenderness, affection and admiration. These diminutive forms are quite limited in English and the subtle shades of meaning in Russian diminutives have been conveyed in English translations using nouns and adjectives that resulted in less original words and less colourful expressions (Anderman 2005: 134-147). Unlike in English, the Russian language does not convey class distinction and it is impossible to understand the background of a character from his mode of speech. In Chekhov's Russian the servants are distinguishable only by a form of address to their masters and the aristocrats mostly from their occasional use of French. The English translations instead have generally imposed the British class system of the characters' mode of speech and they have sometimes resorted to the use of Northern working-class dialects and accents to identify servants (Gottlieb 1989: 165).

The process of Anglicization of Chekhov has an interesting counterpart in the process of 'Hibernisation' that Chekhov's work underwent in Ireland between the 1980s and the 1990s. The translations of Russian plays in fact became part of a wider linguistic, political and artistic rethinking of crucial issues in Ireland which was promoted by the Field Day, whose intention was to create 'a Fifth Province' to overcome the crippling oppositions of Irish politics (Randaccio 2001: Randaccio 2014: 113-128). The centrality of language was one of the main fields of investigation of Field Day, whose Board of Directors was composed by many representatives of the Irish intelligentsia. The Irish linguist Tom Paulin, a member of the Board, wished that "a confident concept of Irish English would

substantially increase the vocabulary and this would invigorate the written language" and that "a language that lives lithely on the tongue ought to be capable of becoming the flexible written instrument of a complete cultural idea" (Paulin 1985 [1983]: 15). Paulin's idea was also shared by the famous Irish playwright Brian Friel who declared what the purpose of his work was: "We are trying to make a home... one of the problems for us is that we are constantly being offered the English home, we have been educated by the English home and we have been pigmented by an English home [...] And the rejection of all that, and the rejection into what, is the big problem" (Friel 1982: 22). It is in this spirit that many Irish playwrights set out to translate Russian authors and the most famous translations in those years were Friel's *Three Sisters* and Tom Murphy's *The Seagull* (1981). In particular, *Three Sister*, which was first performed in the Guildhall, Derry, in 1981, was considered a 'translation in the deepest sense of the word', capable of illuminating "the complexities and confusions of life in Ireland today" (Richtarik 1994: 112).[5] There were profound motivations which pushed Friel towards the Russian playwright that lied both in Chekhov's artistic figure and in the similarities between Russia and Ireland. Chekhov, as a writer, gave an accurate representation of life in his art and, at the same time, was able to provide medical assistance to the villages he used to work for as a doctor. Similarly, "with Field Day, [Friel] was trying, like Chekhov, to accomplish something in the world outside the theatre, and the example of the Russian was proof that a writer could be socially committed without losing his artistic integrity" (*ibid.*). What triggered Friel's imagination, however, were the parallels between Russia and Ireland and the closeness between provincial Russia of the nineteenth century and provincial Ireland in the twentieth century. Both countries, in fact, had largely rural economies and a restricted gentry class whose power was imposed on the vast majority of society. Furthermore, both were on the edge of Western Europe, industrially underdeveloped and conscious of their backwardness. Major adjustments were made to keep the parallel alive and at the same time to use Irish English as an alternative to standard spoken English. Friel himself described the operation he set out to accomplish and gave a detailed explanation of the translation method adopted towards his source text. In his opinion, his own translation was undertaken primarily as an act of love: he had not adapted the play but changed it into an Irish setting, trying to give specifically Irish meanings. Moreover, his work was not even a translation in the usual sense, because he did not know a word of Russian. As he admitted, he simply put six texts in front of him and tack-

---

[5]   Anton Chekhov and Ivan Turgenev have had a constant influence on Friel's dramatic production as *Three Sisters* (1981), *Fathers and Sons* (1987), *A Month in the Country* (1992), *Uncle Vanya* (1998), *The Yalta Game* (2001) and *Afterplay* (2002) demonstrate.

led each line at a time, to find out first of all what was the meaning of each, then what was the tone and then, eventually, what was the sound. Friel was aware that his version of the *Three Sisters* represented a profound cultural and political statement for the target audience: "the versions of *Three Sisters* that we see and read in this country always seem redolent of either Edwardian England or the Bloomsbury set. Somehow the rhythms of these versions do not match with the rhythms of our own speech patterns, and I think that they ought to, in some way" (Friel 1980: 59).There was also the practical need to use a language easier to speak for the actors: "I wrote this play in an Irish idiom because with English translations Irish actors become more and more remote" (*ibid.*). Friel's adjustments to Irish English are particularly evident in the use of Irish expressions and constructions and the use a language rich in colloquialism and local expressions for some roles of lower social status. However, the Irish aspects of Friel's translation do not only consist of a large deployment of localisms, but also involves the creation of distinctively Irish geographical and cultural references (Randaccio 2014: 123). According to Anderman, the overall process of Chekhov's 'Hibernisation' helps to maintain a distance from the original texts to avoid false culture associations but, at the same time, does not make the nuances of the originals lost in translation (Anderman 2005: 134).

Major adjustments to the originals were also necessary in the translations of Dario Fo into English for several reasons. First of all, Fo's original plays have been themselves defined as "unfinished texts", texts that were continuously revised an updated according to Italian political affairs (Barsotti 2007: 56). Moreover, Fo's resorted to the tradition of the great clowns of *commedia dell'arte*, *i giullari*, and to the use of *grammelot*. In one of his most acclaimed one-man show both in Italy and abroad, *Mistero Buffo* (1969), Fo used the counter-culture of Middle Ages, drawing on gospels, legends and tales for episodes in which he played all the characters and invented a language, originating in part from Northern Italian dialects. This language, which was meant to give voice to the poor and disinherited, was defined by Fo himself as the "onomatopoeic patter used to imitate foreign languages and exotic languages" (*Manuale minimo dell'attore*, 1987: 337). The translation of *grammelot* into English was among the major challenges: in fact, the tradition that inspired Fo was rooted in peasant comedy that becomes outrageous in its insistence on body, eating and gluttony, whereas the English had a tradition of more urban comedies, going back to variety and vaudeville: "we don't have that kind of through-line contact with medieval buffoonery and peasants that Dario Fo certainly has" (Mitchell 1985: 394). One of the first attempt to transform Fo's *grammelot* resulted in "a startling rich and varied amalgam of Italian, Shakespeare, Cockney rhyming slang, spoonerisms, obscenities" (Mitchell [1984]1999: 286) with the addition of English jokes which frequently

departed from Fo's original. Fo's translations therefore failed to reproduce the *grammelot* in sound, intonation and gesture and it was transformed instead in a semantic wordplay (Mitchell 1985: 286). More importantly, however, Fo's plays underwent a serious ideological shift concerning the political content of his work. One of Fo's most well-known plays, *Non si paga! Non si paga!* (*Can't Pay! Won't Pay!*) (1974), based on specific political Italian events that led workers to adopt *autoriduzione*, 'auto-reduction', a left-winged act of political disobedience, has also been one of the most controversial for its political dimension. Fo and his characters at the end of the play believe that *autoriduzione* is the only way to cope with the severe economic crisis that Italy was going through in the 1970s: for this reason, Fo was accused of spurring people to refuse to pay the raising prices and convincing them to pay only what they considered to be a fair price. Many translations were made of this play both in UK and in the USA (Taviano: 2017) and two of them, in particular, present major ideological shifts. One is Ron Jenkins's American translation *We Won't Pay! We Won't Pay!* (2001) that successfully renders the tragicomic sense of the original play but makes it a general "comedy of hunger" where all the socio-political references are lost. By Jenkins's admission, "the protagonists of *We Won't Pay! We Won't Pay!* are driven by their collective hungers to break free from the constraints in which their poverty has confined them" (Ron Jenkins 2001: 3). The other is Joseph Farrell's translation *Low Pay! Don't Pay!* (2010), based on a revised version of the Italian original, which was updated by Fo himself in the first decade of the 2000s. Fo's criticism this time was directed towards the then Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi and his politics. Farrell's translation readapts instead the political references to criticise the Labour Party and New Labour in the United Kingdom. *Low Pay! Don't Pay!* becomes a play on the credit crunch, the financial crisis of 2007-8 which, starting in the USA, rapidly spread among all European countries and culminated in an international banking crisis of huge proportions (Farrell 2010).

Chekhov's and Fo's translations show in detail how a playtext can be made performable; performability, however, does not seem to be a reliable notion to explain all the adjustments which take place, very often at linguistic and ideological level. Viewing drama as literature or as part of a theatrical production still remains the translator's dilemma: as suggested, it is in the controversial relationship between the dramatic text and its performance that lies the paradox of the translator: "The translator is effectively being asked to accomplish the impossible – to treat a written text that is part of a larger complex of sign systems, involving paralinguistic and kinesic features, as if were a literary text, created solely for the page, to be read off that page" (Bassnett 1985: 87).

1B) THE SEMIOTIC APPROACH

The 'paradox of the translator' was widely investigated by those translators and scholars that have approached drama translation from a semiotic perspective. The renewed interest in the semiotics of drama and theatre in the 1970s and 1980s also encouraged drama translation scholars to investigate the dual nature of the dramatic text, either as written text or performance, and what was the translator's task. The question that arose was whether the translator was responsible only for the linguistic transfer or also for the semiotic transfer of a play. The semiotic approach to drama and theatre has its roots in the works produced in the 1930s and in the 1940s by the Prague School structuralists. Among these, Otakar Zich's *Aesthetics of the Dramatic Art* (1931) and Jan Mukařovský's "An Attempted Structural Analysis for the Phenomena of the Actor" (1931) (Elam 1980, 5-6, 233; Delli Castelli 2006: 55-70; Randaccio 2009: 139-158) were highly influential for the semioticians. Zich's *Aesthetics* emphasises the necessary interrelation in the theatre between different but interdependent systems, but he does not give any prominence to any of the component involved, not even to the written text. The written text in fact becomes part of a system of systems that makes up the total dramatic representation. Mukařovský's analysis is instead the first attempt to create a semiotics of performance. Drawing on Ferdinand de Saussure's definition of sign, he considers the work of art - the theatrical performance - as a semiotic unit, whose *signifier* is the work itself and the *signified* is the 'aesthetic object' residing in the collective consciousness of the public. The performance text thus becomes a macro-sign, whose meaning is constituted by its total effects. These studies paved the way to what was later called "stage semiotization" (Elam 1980: 9) to which Petr Bogatyrëv in "Semiotics in the Folk Theater" (1938) made a great contribution. He tried to outline the elementary components of theatrical semiosis and argued that objects and bodies on stage are transformed into theatrical signs that acquire a value they lack in real life. Therefore, on stage there is a predominance of the signifying function of all performance elements, as Jiří Veltruský puts it "all that is on the stage is a sign" (1964: 84). Beyond its denotative meaning, the theatrical sign also acquires connotative meanings relating to the social, moral and ideological values of the audience. Bogatyrëv shows how the theatrical sign has the capacity to give further cultural signification and how signs such as 'a costume' or 'a house' can in turn become one of the signs characterising the costume or the house in a play. Thus, 'an armour' can signify 'valour' or 'manliness'; a bourgeois domestic interior can represent 'wealth', 'ostentation' or 'bad taste'; a crown can symbolise 'majesty' or 'usurpation' (Elam 1980: 10-11). The dialectic denotation-connotation involves every aspect of the performance: the set, the actor's body, his movement and

speech are always shifting networks of primary and secondary meanings. The generative capacity of the theatrical sign thus depends on its connotative breath and accounts for its polysemic character: "a given vehicle may bear not one but *n* second-order meanings at any point in the performance continuum (a costume for example, may suggest socio-economic, psychological and even moral characteristics)" (Elam 1980: 11). Therefore, a rich semantic structure is created by a limited number of theatrical signs through what the Prague structuralists variously defined as its *mobility*, *dynamism* and *transformability*.

Jindřich Honzl in "Dynamics of Sign in the Theater" (1976) sees "the structure of the theatrical performance as a dynamic hierarchy of elements that cannot be determined *a priori*, and emphasizes that the changeability of this structure corresponds to the transformability of theatrical signs" (Nikolarea 2002). For Honzl, any sign on stage can stand for any class of phenomena. The dramatic scene, for example, can be represented through spatial, architectural or pictorial means, as well as indicated gesturally, verbally or through other acoustic means (Elam 1980: 13). Honzl also finds that a further dimension of this complexity lies in the ability of the audience to read signs because sometimes one of the components escapes the spectator's conscious attention. It can happen, for example, that the dialogue and the dramatic action may prevail over the visual and acoustic components (Nikolarea 2002).

After a few decades of general disinterest for the semiotics of drama and theatre, it was the semiotician Tadeusz Kowzan who took up the structuralist heritage in the late 1960s. In his essay "Le signe au théâtre: introduction à la sémiologie de l'art du spectacle" translated as "The Sign in the Theater: An Introduction to the Semiology of the Art of the Spectacle" (1968b: 52-80) and in his later book *Littérature et spectacle* (1975), he reasserts the stage semiotization and the transformability of the stage sign of his predecessors, and endeavours to find a typology of the theatrical sign and sign-system. Kowzan first makes a distinction between *natural* signs and *artificial* signs: whereas *natural signs* are those phenomena that happen without a motivation (e.g., fever indicating a disease), *artificial signs* depend instead on the intervention of human volition to communicate something to someone. This opposition helps him in the formulation of another principle, i.e., 'the artificialization' of natural signs on stage: "The spectacle transforms natural signs into artificial ones (a flash of lighting), so it can "artificialize" signs. Even if they are only reflexes in life, they become voluntary signs in the theatre. Even if they have no communicative function in life, they necessarily acquire it on stage" (1968b: 60). Kowzan is thus refining "the stage artificialization" and the specificity of signs. To investigate this specificity, he proposes a model for determining the constituent parts of theatre by establishing thirteen sign systems as the basic components of theatre. These auditive and

visual sign systems fall in turn into five categories; the spoken text (word, tone); the bodily expression (mime, gesture, movement): the actor's external appearance; the playing space (props, stage scenary, lightening); non-spoken sound (music, sounds effects). The implications of Kowzan's model are relevant for it stresses the non-hierarchical nature of the sign systems and makes the language of the spoken text only one sign in the network of auditive and visual signs.

Kowzan's redefinition of stage artificialization and his investigation of sign systems was a prelude to further studies that tried to explain the relationship between the written text and the performance in semiotic terms. The idea that the written text contains a series of clues for performance that can be isolated and defined was favoured by those who followed a model based on the notion of deep structure. In this model, the performance text can be extracted from the written text by analysis of the implicit in the utterances of the characters in the play (Pagnini 1970: 122-140). Paola Pugliatti (1976: 146) devised instead the notion of the "segno latente" – latent sign – and argues that the units of articulation of a dramatic text should not be considered as units of the linguistic text translatable into stage practice but rather as a linguistic transcription of a stage potentiality which is the motive force of the written text. From a different perspective, Franco Ruffini (1978: 85) maintained that the written text was not *actual* performance, but *positive* performance, i.e., the staging of a written text results in the merging of two texts, in which the performance text is 'submerged' into the script of the play. Anne Ubersfeld believed that the written text and the performance are indissolubly linked, and that the written text is *troué*, not complete in itself. She argues that theatre consists of the dialectical relationship of text and performance, impossible to separate, and this artificial separation has led to the prominence of the written text. For her, there is not a one-to-one correspondence between written text and performance and the context of the expression will not remain identical when transferred from the linguistic sign system to a system of performance signs. She noted that the theatrical text is diachronic communication that follows a linear reading, as opposed to the polysemic nature of signs deployed by performance. This would imply that performance "must effect its particular treatment of the text" (Ubersfeld 1999: 10), an activity that involves other signifying elements. This further processing of the text also implies a transformation of non-linguistic signs into text, a transformation effected by the practitioner of theatre: what is inevitable is therefore "a certain reciprocity between text and non-linguistic signs" (10). Later, Pavis (1992: 26-28) was unquestionably radical in his position: although he emphasises the simultaneity and equal value of the two semiotic systems, he believes that the *mise en scène* does not have to be faithful to a dramatic text as it is not a stage representation of the textual referent. He argues that different *mise en scène* of a common text,

particularly those produced at very different moments in history, do not provide readings of the same text. The *mise en scène* therefore is not a performative realisation of the text, nor is it a fusion of the two referents of text and stage.

Kier Elam draws on the Prague School structuralists, in particular on their notions of *mobility*, *dynamism* and *transformability* of the theatrical sign, its capacity to generate connotative meanings and give further cultural signification. He finds particularly promising Charles S. Pierce's trichotomy of sign functions as icon, index and symbol in theatrical semiosis and their co-presence on stage. The iconic signs are governed by the principle of similitude: the direct similitude between signifier and signified, as in the relationship between actor and character, is an example of iconicity in theatre *par excellance*. Indexical signs are connected to their objects physically or through contiguity, e.g., the pointing finger that relates to the pointed-to object, a knock on the door that points to the presence outside it. Symbolic signs show instead that the relationship between signifier and signified is conventional and unmotivated: the performance is in itself symbolic, and the spectator takes the stage events as standing for something else through convention (1980: 21-27). The notion of "stage semiotization" also proves particularly fertile for Elam's model of theatrical communication (1980: 35-36). This model makes a distinction "between the context of the performer-spectator transaction and the dramatic context of character-to-character communication" (1980: 135) and makes central the notion of deixis, i.e. a series of references by the speakers to themselves as speakers, to their interlocutors as listener-addresses and to the spatio-temporal coordinates of the utterance. Deixis that is made up of deictic elements such as demonstrative pronouns and spatial and temporal adverbs, is "an *I* addressing a *you here* and *now*" (1980: 139) and "allows language an 'active' and dialogic function rather than a descriptive and choric role" (*ibid.*). Alessandro Serpieri *et al.* also state that "The theatre [...] is institutionally tied to the speaking process; it requires a pragmatic context, and has a temporal axis always based on the present; its space is deixis [...]" (Serpieri *et al.* 1981: 165). Theatre is, in fact, mimesis, not a 'story 'told' from one perspective but rather a dynamic progression of speech acts. If fact, "the language of the theatrical text... proves intrinsically performative and indexical, with regard to both *person* and *action*" (*ibid.*). Deixis, therefore, allows the dramatic context to be referred to as an actual and dynamic world: the deictic reference presupposes the existence of a speaker, 'I', a listener, 'you', and an object, 'this'. Deixis is also found in those empty signs, called 'shifters', which do not specify its object but simply points to the contextual elements of the dramatic context. In Elam's example: "An indexical expression such as 'Will you give me that, please' remains ambiguous unless uttered in a context where the shifter *you*, *me* and *that* have evident referents" (Elam 1980: 141).

Building on these notions, drama translation therefore started to be investigated from a semiotic perspective. Scholars focussed on how drama translation must consider two semiotic systems, the dramatic and the performative. They acknowledged that the translator must be concerned with how the written text is going to be integrated in the network of other signs, that there is a theatrical potential that must be realised in translation, that the written text has multiple readings. The translations of the same written text, for example, can highly differ both synchronically, i.e., different translations at the same moment in times, or diachronically, i.e., translations that may have very different readings according to the times in which they were produced. Moreover, changes in deixis in drama translation allow other meanings to emerge. In the Italian context, many scholars have underlined the importance of the semiotic approach: to quote only a few, there are those who believes that in translation the problematic relationship between the dramatic text and the performance can only be resolved with a semiotic and 'pluricode' translation (Boselli 1996: 64), those who indicate the importance of the theories based on the performative realisation of the text (Regattin 2004: 162-163; Eleonora Fois 2013-14: 72). In the 1990s, major studies were conducted in a semiotic perspective. Among the main proponents, Mary Snell-Hornby stands out for her four-decade long analysis on drama translation and her indepth considerations on the semiotic approach. In an early contribution she discusses the basic factors that govern the verbal text and singles out five main components that make up its theatrical potential. The translator must be aware that language in theatre dialogues is "an artificial language" (Snell-Hornby 1996: 33), whose features are special forms of textual cohesion, semantic density, sophisticated forms of ellipsis, rapid changes of themes and special dynamics of deictic interaction. This language is also characterised by "an interplay of multiple perspectives" (Snell-Hornby 1996: 33), the simultaneous interaction of different views both between the actors on stage and between the actors and the audience, which are expressed through paradox, irony, allusion, metaphor, word-play, anachronism, climax and anti-climax (*ibid.*). Moreover, attention must also be given to the language as "potential action in rhythmic progression" (Snell-Hornby 1996: 34), which means that the translator must be sensitive not only to the stress patterns within sentences but also to the intensity of the plot with its alternation of suspense and calm. Snell-Hornby finally reminds us that the lines of the actors are an individual idiolect, "a mask of language" (34), a means of expressing emotions, through the voice, facial expression, gestures and movements and the action on stage is usually perceived by the spectator sensually, "as a personal experience" (34). She argues, however, that the theatrical text, like many other multimedial texts, depends on varying degree on non-verbal forms of expression for its full realization (Snell-Hornby

1996: 29-45). The basic theatrical sign is in fact visual and/or acoustic, whereas "the verbal sign is secondary and indirect" (Snell-Hornby 1997: 189), not valid in isolation but by virtue of its position within the dramatic situation. In the light of semiotics as a theoretical framework for theatre translation, she also looks at Pierce's famous trichotomy of the sign as icon, index and symbol. In theatre that is "a kaleidoscope of these three types of signs" (*ibid.*), it is essential for the translator to differentiate these signs to allow the spectator to interpret what he/she is seeing and hearing on stage. She shows how a Tudor costume in a naturalistic production or a table set for dinner can be taken as it stands as an iconic sign and it is fully interpretable as long as the spectator can situate it in context. An indexical sign is instead interpretable if the spectator can understand the point of connection (e.g. that smoke stands for fire), whereas the symbolic sign is only understandable if the spectator is familiar with its meaning in the culture concerned, e.g., in Western culture black is the colour of mourning (Snell-Hornby 2007: 108). The problem for theatre translation is that the interpretation of the signs can also vary radically from one culture to another, and even depends on the acting styles and stage conventions of the country or cultural community concerned.

These observations, however, refer only to non-verbal signs because "what is important for verbal language, and therefore of special significance for translation, is the insight that the linguistic sign is arbitrary and symbolic" (Snell-Hornby 2007:109). The linguistic sign is thus interpretable only if the recipient (or spectator) is familiar with its position within the language system and culture concerned. Consequently, the words of the dramatic text cannot be interpreted only as signs, but also as a basis for action and co-ordination with the immediate environment of the dramatic world in which they are to be embedded. The means for such co-ordination are *paralinguistic*, *kinetic* and *proxemic features*[6]. Theatre translation therefore depends on the possibilities the dramatic text offers for generating vocal elements, gestures and movements within the framework of its interpretability as a system of theatrical signs. From a slightly different perspective, Sophia Totzeva refers to *theatrical potential* (TP) as the semiotic relation-

---

[6]   Snell-Hornby specifies that "the basic proxemic features concern vocal elements such as intonation, pitch, rhythm, tempo resonance, loudness and voice timbre leading to expressions of emotion such as shouting, sighing or laughter. Kinetic features are related to body movements, postures and gestures and include smiling, winking, shrugging or waving [...]. Proxemic features involve the relationship of a figure to the stage environment and describe its movements within that environment and its varying distance or physical closeness to the other characters on stage" (2007: 109). These features have been widely studied in the field of non-verbal communication: see F. Poyatos (1993) *Paralanguage*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins; F. Poyatos (2002) *Nonverbal Communication across Disciplines: Volume 3: Narrative literature, theater, cinema, translation*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins; F. Poyatos (2008) *Textual Translation and Live Translation*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

ship between the verbal and non-verbal signs and structures of the performance. Translation therefore must create structures in the target language which can provide and evoke an integration of non-verbal theatrical signs in a performance and she shows in detail which are the linguistic structures of the text that retain their potential for theatrical communication (Totzeva 1998: 82). She bestows great importance to the possibility "for the dramatic text and its TP to offer and to retain the potential meaning and the potential ambiguity in a translation" (83). Among the structures with TP, there are the recurrent structures and the reductive structures which are more productive in the translation of dramatic texts. Recurrent structures, which are isotopic, repetitive or defective patterns, and reductive structures, such as ellipsis and sematic gaps, allow the translator to exploit the economy of expression of these structures and make him aware of their multiple signification (85). Other reductive structures employed in translation are presuppositions and implications, which often occur in dramatic texts and give a specific theatrical information structure with differences for characters and audience (87). According to Totzeva, in an ideal case, the translator will select only some of the meanings in the source text and "this selective stress on meaning provides greater freedom to deal with the meaning structures of the source text, as long as he or she is conscious of [...] exploiting more fully the expressive forces of the target sign-system, that is the target language and the theatrical sign-system" (90). Totzeva considers that her tentative approach to theatricality has been rarely applied to drama translation, the only exception being the deictic dimension in dialogue. (81). The use of deictics in dialogue translation has proven particularly interesting because changes in deixis reveals not only the wide range of choices available to the translator, but also how much theatrical translation can differ from the original written text. Sara Soncini's example in "Intersemiotic Complexities: Translating the Word of Drama" (2007) is a case in point. Building on Serpieri's and Elam's semiotic interpretation of drama and theatre, Soncini shows how in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Act II scene 2, Polonius, convinced that Hamlet's madness is unrequited love for Ophelia, swears his famous words in front of Gertrude and Claudius to prove the truthfulness of his statement: "Take this from this, if this be otherwise". This line remains opaque until its full semantic potential, 'take my head from my neck/trunk/shoulders if things are not as I told you', is activated by the actor's body and gesture in context. She then compares two Italian translations, one by Alessandro Serpieri (1978) and the other by Agostino Lombardo (1995) respectively, to see how deixis was treated. Lombardo was not translating for a specific production and rendered these lines as 'Staccatemi la testa dal collo se è altrimenti' in which the three deictics were linguistically expressed. In Serpieri's translation, 'Spiccate queste da queste, se questo sta in altro modo', instead all the ambiguity of the

deictics were retained because the translator was closely collaborating with the actor-director Gabriele Lavia to stage the play. She argues that Serpieri's translation, reproducing the playtext's linguistic gaps, allows meaning to emerge from the interlinguistic and intersemiotic dimension, whereas Lombardo's decision to fill in these gaps verbally may result in redundancy once the playtext reaches the stage (2007: 273). She concludes on the importance of the 'economy principle': "The economy principle which drama translation derives from its intersemiotic complexity should not be understood solely as a constraint... An awareness of the scenic virtuality of the dramatic world entails a widening of the range of choices available to the translator" (274).

Another example of the importance of deixis in the Italian translation can be found in the Irish play *Quietly* by Own McCafferty in 2014. The translation of *Quietly* is unpublished and was used only for a production of the play staged in 2016 at the theatre festival Trend, dedicated to the New British Dramaturgy and held in Rome every year. *Quietly* belongs to the tradition of works which deal with the Northern Irish Troubles and opens in a pub in Belfast, where a Polish barman, Robert, while watching Poland playing against Northern Ireland in a World Cup qualifier, is joined by the Catholic Jimmy and the Protestant Ian, both in their fifties, who have arranged to meet after sixteen years. In a rising atmosphere of tension and violence, broken only by the exchanges between Jimmy and Robert in the role of the observer, the story of the protagonists unfolds. At the time of another match, Northern Ireland – Poland in 1974, Ian, as a member of the Ulster Volunteer Force, threw a bomb into a pub where six people watching the match were killed, including Jimmy's father. This bombing proves devastating to both protagonists' lives. After the loss of his father, Jimmy abandoned his studies and joined the IRA, but was incapable of offering solace to his mother in her grief. On the other hand, Ian who had a clumsy sexual encounter with a girl given to him as a reward to celebrate the successful attack, years later came to know that she had become pregnant and had an abortion. When the two men leave in what seems an apparent reconciliation, the play ends with another outburst of violence. From outside the pub, Northern Ireland fans start to throw stones and shout 'Polish bastard' echoing Jimmy and Ian's speaking of Protestant and Catholic bastards throughout the play. From the very beginning, it is apparent that changes in deixis has consequences for the receiving Italian audience. The initial scene exemplifies how the use of deictics contributes to create a theatrical text which differs from the original:

The stage is in darkness. Lights up.	Il palcoscenico è al buio.
A bar <u>in Belfast</u>, <u>2009</u>. *Northern Ireland are playing Poland in a World Cup qualifier on a big screen TV.*	Siamo nel <u>retro di un pub</u>. Tavolini e sedie coperti da teli di plastica, in penombra, in un luogo che pare abbandonato da anni. In altro a sinistra una tenda fa intuire – fuori scena al di
Robert is playing the poker machine. He receives a text message.	là della tenda stessa – la presenza del pub vero e proprio, che non vedremo mai, ma dal quale giungeranno la voce di Robert e, successivamente, la telecronaca – in arabo – di una partita di calcio che scopriremo essere Irlanda del Nord- Polonia.
	La voce di Robert si sente da dietro la tenda, inizialmente parla al telefono.
	.....
<u>I can't live like that</u>.	.....
	....
<u>I</u>'m not happy either	.....
	.....
<u>Do u luv me</u>	....
	.....
<u>Of course I do</u>	...
	.....
Then what	.....
	.....
I don't know	....
	.....
<u>I</u>'m feel alone – what am I doing here- I want to get back to <u>Poland</u>	....
	....
	....
Can't talk now the place is starting to fill up	....
	....
	.....
I need u	
Talk later	

In the first passage, the original play shows Robert who is receiving and sending text messages in the opening scene. The spatial and time deictics – 'a bar in Belfast, 2009' - define the framework of the dramatic situation on stage. However, in the exchange of text messages there are other examples of spatial and social deixis ('Poland'; 'I can't live like that/ I'm not happy either/ Do u luv me/ Of course I do'), which are anaphoric references to Robert's dramatic world outside the stage. In this case, "deixis has the potentiality of putting entities into the dramatic world and keep them alive, entities which are only perceptible through the discourse [and]... may exist in another space and possible in another time than the time and space on stage" (Van Stapele 1990: 336). These deictics, therefore, help to create Robert's background – the reader/audience will later discover that he has a wife and a girlfriend – and establish his character as the impartial observer from 'Poland' between the two antagonists. In the Italian translation, spatial and time deictics become more vague - the action takes place in the back of a pub ('retro di un pub') - and spatial and social deixis as anaphoric references to Robert's background disappear. Although the spatial and time deictics of the original - 'a bar in Belfast, 2009' - are aurally and iconically shown on the Italian stage as the Irish anthem is heard and an Irish flag is seen, nonetheless the sense of vagueness of the location remains because the Italian audience may not be familiar with these non-verbal signs. Moreover, in the Italian translation, the dramaturgical choice of the two directors/actors was to reduce Robert's character to an off-stage presence. This choice, especially visible in the encoding of the three characters' interaction, strongly changes the discourse in the play. The sense of vagueness of the location and the downplaying of Robert's role, in fact, obfuscates the comparison the play makes between the Northern Irish conflict and the contemporary racism against the immigrants to Ireland (Randaccio 2017: 180-190; Randaccio 2018: 141-153).

As briefly shown, the semiotic approach proved particularly successful and gave deep insights into drama translation, however, it lost its primacy as a privileged model of analysis in the 1990s, as translation started to be view as a broader intercultural and communicative process.

1c) Intercultural approach

In the 1990s the 'cultural turn' gathered momentum in Translation Studies and scholars started to consider translation in relation to broader issues of context, history and conventions (Bassnett and Lefevere1998: 123). In the encounter between Cultural Studies and Translation Studies, translation started to be viewed as an 'intercultural transfer' subject to manipulative processes that are involved

in textual production. Scholars focused attention on translation as the product of a particular culture at a particular time and on its marketability and saleability. Power relations existing both in the source and target cultural contexts became relevant for translation and their imbalance soon interested those translation scholars working from an intercultural perspective. Edwin Gentzler (1998: vii-xxii) argues that there are various milestones that brought about a shift towards that perspective in the development of the field of Translation Studies. He mentions Bassnett's *Translation Studies* (1980) and Theo Hermans's *The Manipulation of Literature* (1985), both of which showed that translation was not a derivative genre but a primary literary tool that social institutions had at their disposal to construct desired cultures. The authors also wanted to understand how a text is selected for translation, the various roles the translator, the editor, the publisher or the patron play in this selection, what criteria determine the translator's strategies and how a text is received in the target system. The intercultural interest in translation was carried in two later books by André Lefevere, *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook* (1990) and *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (1992). Not only did these books make Translation Studies enter the realm of academia, but they also gave it international resonance. Some years later, in another book, *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation* (1998), Bassnett and Lefevere welcomed a new era for interdisciplinary research. They were aware that, from the 1970s, Translation Studies scholarship had collected a critical mass of information that could not be neglected by those Cultural Studies scholars discussing the intercultural movement: translated texts represented empirical data documenting cultural transfer and aspects of intercultural communication. Bassnett warned against the adoption of dangerous concepts of translation and canons of excellence based on old Eurocentric models and thought it was important to learn more about processes of acculturation, especially in those cultures experiencing a post-colonial development. These processes have wider implications in so far as they show the ways in which translation, criticism, anthologization, historiography and reference works construct the image of writers and their works, and then make this image become reality (1998: 10). The process of intercultural transfer is associated with notions of *hybridity* and *in-betweenness* and is seen to occupy metaphorically a 'third space' between the original and the receiving culture. In *The Location of Culture* (1994), Homi Bhabha first mentioned the 'third space' and linked it specifically to translation. Borrowing Walter Benjamin's idea of translation as liminal and irresolute, he stressed how the "foreign element that reveals the interstitial" creates "the conditions through which 'newness comes into the world'" (Bhabha 1994: 227). Bhabha is therefore concerned with the study of "translation's modes of productivity, whose 'newness' and 'foreigness' end up

challenging the cultural values of the establishment" (Bortoloni 2003: 469). According to Bhabha, in fact, "the 'time' of translation consists of that movement of meaning... [which] puts the original in motion to decanonize it, giving it the movement of fragmentation, wandering of errancy, a kind of permanent exile" (Bhabha 1994: 228). As Gayatri Spivak maintained in her influential essay "The Politics of Translation" (1992), translation is an activity "where meaning hops into the spacy emptiness between two named historical languages" (Spivak 1992: 178). Bhabha therefore highlighted a series of problems vital to translation such as 'movement', 'wandering' and 'erring', all concepts which invite a reflection on cultural encounters and cross-fertilisations.

Drama translation as intercultural communication undoubtedly borrowed from these notions and saw translation as 'movement', as 'transferring plays from culture to culture'[7], as creating a new cultural object in a new time and in a new space, adding to the original without replacing it. The most powerful metaphor of translation as intercultural exchange was Patrice Pavis's 'hourglass' (1992: 4):

> [A hourglass] is a strange object reminiscent of a funnel and a mill. In the upper bowl is the foreign culture, which is more or less codified and solidified in diverse anthropological, sociocultural modelizations. In order to reach us, this culture must pass through a narrow neck. If the grains of culture or their conglomerate are sufficiently fine, they will flow through without any trouble, however slowly, into the lower bowl, that of the target culture, from which point we observe this slow flow. The grains will rearrange themselves in a way which appears random, but which is partly regulated by their passage through some dozen filters put in place by the target culture and the observer.

This metaphor is suitable to show his idea of "translating for the stage" (1989: 25) as a specific "situation of enunciation" i.e., the situation in which a text is presented by an actor in a specific time and place, to an audience receiving both text and *mise en scène* that can never be the same of the original text and *mise en scène*. For Pavis, the best exemplification of this type of translation was Peter Brook's and Jean-Claude Carrière's nine-hour production of *The Mahabharata*, the adaptation of the great Sanskrit epic of India, which was taken from a major sacred text for Hindus. Pavis's theory and especially his application to *The Mahabharata*, however, was harshly criticised by others interested in discourses of interculturalism. For example, the director and cultural critic Rustom Bharucha called *The Mahabharata* "one of the most blatant and (accomplished) appro-

---

[7] It is not coincidence that one the most authoritative collections of essays on intercultural translation, edited by H. Scolnicov and P. Holland, was entitled *The Play Out of Context: Transferring Plays from Culture to Culture* (1989), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

priation... [of India], an appropriation and reordering of non-western material within an orientalist framework of thought and action, which has been specifically designed for the international market" (1993: 68). He also accused Pavis of having neglected the inequalities of cultural exchange implied in the "hourglass metaphor". In his opinion, Pavis's hourglass has posited a model in which the grains of culture, trickling through filters from one bowl to another and then collecting in particular formations and conglomerations at the bottom, restrict the wider dynamics of intercultural exchange by emphasizing the unidirectionality of the transfer, with the target culture acquiring the status of a destination. The intercultural exchange, he argues, should be a back-and-forth movement (Baharucha 1993: 241). In fact, what is centrally problematic in Pavis's model is that he revendicates the responsibility and the control of the target culture and the observer in the intercultural exchange.

Translation Studies scholars also became aware of this cultural imbalance that Lawrence Venuti termed "the ethnocentric violence of translation" (1995: 20). They drew attention to cultural misrepresentations, which are often created in translation and that better fall in line with the needs and expectations of that very target system and culture. Venuti, in his examples of how the German philosopher Martin Heidegger, and the Italian writers Giovanni Guareschi and Umberto Eco have been translated for the American market, illustrates how, in a hegemonic country, translation fashions images of their subordinate others and confirms dominant domestic values (Venuti 1998: 159). He therefore condemns what he has described as "the greatest scandal of translation, the asymmetries, inequities, relations of domination and dependence which exists in every act of translating, of putting the translated in the service of the translating culture" (Venuti 1998: 4). Similarly, in drama translation, Lefevere describes what happened to Bertold Brecht's *Mother Courage* when translated in the United States. He notes how in the English translations of Brecht's play the cultural transfer brought a Marxist text into an anti-Marxist target language system. These translations in fact rewrote the play to follow the code of the US entertainment industry and Brecht eventually became a musical (Lefevere 1982: 7). It was clear then that in drama translation theatrical productions are very often tied to a specific audience, place and time and that when a foreign dramatic text is chosen for a performance in another culture, its translation and production is inevitably at the service of the target culture.

In relation to intercultural exchange as intercultural performance, Erika Fischet-Lichte asserts that "the starting point of intercultural performance is, therefore, not primarily an interest in the foreign, the foreign theatre form or foreign culture from which it derives, but rather a wholly specific situation within the own culture, or a wholly specific problem originating in the own theatre"

(Fischer-Lichte 1990: 283). According to her, the intercultural performance does not take the foreign text or the foreign culture as the point of departure to be communicated by one's own theatre but, rather, interculturality emerges from one's own theatre and culture. She provocatively claims that when foreign texts and cultures merge into one's own culture, the basis for translation itself disappears and translation must be replaced by "productive reception" (Fischer-Lichte 1990: 287) to describe the adoption of elements from foreign theatre traditions. Drawing initially on various dimensions of functionality to explain certain regularities and features of translated plays (Aaltonen 1997: 89-98) and then on Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory, Sirkku Aaltonen starts out her detailed analysis of drama translation from the notion of 'productive reception'. She is particularly interested not only in how the source culture texts serve the needs of the target culture, but also in how the source texts and cultures are constructed in translation by the target culture. She singles out three categories into which translated texts fall according to socially and culturally conditioned reception, i.e., compatibility, integration and alterity.

Compatibility means that foreign theatre texts are chosen based on their discourses or discursive structures, which are either in line with those in the target society or made compatible with them. There are various situations in which theatre texts are chosen to be made compatible with the target culture. At the simplest level, there are those texts that are "socially given" (Aaltonen 2000: 53) and derive from "the structure of the world" (52). Then, there are the texts that, through cultural stereotypes, express a generalization. Finally, texts may be chosen because they share dramatic and aesthetic conventions with the target culture and rely on "recognizable intertextuality" (55), i.e., they draw, for example, on the recognizability of a well-known classic. To make the foreign texts compatible with other texts in the target system and with the reality of the target society, translation can use either acculturation or naturalisation to what can be perceived as an obstacle in translation. Aaltonen defines 'acculturation' as "the process which is employed to tone down the Foreign by appropriating the unfamiliar 'reality'... and blurring the borderline between the familiar and the unfamiliar" (55). She concludes that compatibility, in rewriting the source text, "can thus... be established on the level of the audience's competence in the general cultural conventions of the language, manners, moral standards, rituals, tastes, ideologies, sense of humour, superstitions, religious beliefs, etc., and the specific dramatic and performance conventions of theatre and drama" (55).

Integration refers to the relationship between the source text and its translation in the major rewriting strategies, according to which the foreign playtexts are integrated into the repertoires of the target theatre and made part of the target society. Aaltonen shows how rewriting strategies used to promote inte-

gration has a triple categorization. Therefore, "the entire source text is likely to be translated" (58) when the discourse of the foreign text is in line with the social discourse and the theatre aesthetics of the target society; "the source text is translated only in part, while other [parts] are deleted and new ones introduced" (58) when a foreign play is seen only as a suitable raw-material, a potential good story for performance or deals with an important issue in target society, even if translation still respects the source text and considers it essential; finally, "the foreign text provides an idea, a theme, or a concept which is further developed into a play" (58).

Alterity refers instead to the reaction provoked by a foreign dramatic text when its translation and its production enter a new culture: it is a "reaction to the Other" (58). Adapting Even-Zohar's explanation of how translated literature can come to occupy a central position in the literary polysystem (Even-Zohar 1987: 107-115), Aaltonen states that emerging, weak literatures would be more tolerant of alterity than strong literatures and these literatures would look at foreign drama without any need of adjustment to the target codes. Conversely, strong literatures would not be interested in foreign drama as a source of inspiration and "would rather try to assimilate the Other to cover up its alterity" (62). For example, when the Finnish National Theatre was established, it was important that there were playtexts available and that they were in Finnish. For this reason, many foreign plays from strong literatures were used to weave around them new plays, eventually turning them into Finnish plays (Aaltonen 2000: 66-67). However, she also shows how Even Zohar's model and his view of the behaviour of strong literary systems have been questioned by other scholars such as Gentzler, who claims that translations may play an innovative role even within a strong culture (Gentzler 1996: 119) and Annie Brisset, who underlines the importance of translations in Québec which had a fundamental role in forming identities and subverting established institutions (Brisset 1996: 10). In Gentzler's study on the use of literary translations in the 1950s in the United States, he argues that translation played a crucial role in subverting established institutions even in what was considered the strong American culture. Similarly, the role of theatre translation became central in forming identity and subverting established institutions after Quebec independence. In her well-known article, "In Search of a Target Language: The Politics of Theatre Translation" (1996), Annie Brisset sees translation as an act of autonomy, and a way of articulating one's own vocabulary and thinking. For her, translation does not introduce a foreign text but legitimise a distinct ethological and political entity, as in the case of Quebec (Brisset 1996: 14-27).

The attention to drama translation as cultural transfer first and foremost brought about the revision of the notion of 'performability'. Bassnett, who had

championed the importance of performability in her previous works, claimed that it was time "to set aside performability as a criterion for translation" (Bassnett-McGuire 1985: 102) and clarifies later that the term "has no credibility, because it is resistant to any form of definition" (Bassnett 1998: 95). She states that performability may be found in the translators' prefaces to suggest that a translated text is more suitable to a possible performance but "we are always expected to take such statements at face value, since there is never any indication of what performable means and why one text should be more performable than another" (Bassnett 1998: 95). She also claims that the search for performability and the gestic subtext is cultural bound and should not concern the translator, who has instead to deal only with the written text. Her conclusion seems to answer the question she asked some years before on what the translator's task was. The translator has therefore "to engage specifically with the signs of the text: to wrestle with the deictic units, the speech rhythms, the pauses, and silences, the shift of tone or of register, the problems of intonation patterns: in short, the linguistic and paralinguistic aspects of the written text that are decodable and recodable" (Bassnett 1998: 107).

While Bassnett denies performability as a criterion for translation, David Johnston makes performability central to his idea of drama translator as writer. For him, "performability means that the translator, who is the target-language representative of the author and has a performance in mind, engages in processes that are both intra- and inter-lingual" (Johnston 2004: 28). These processes are highly relevant as they "move within and across the various languages which together constitute the discourse or grammar of performance" (28). Johnston has already noted that in these processes the translator has the obligation to re-create a language, "a system of echoes, repetitions, responses, dramatic mainsprings and correspondences" (Johnston 1996: 251) and a style. As the dramatist is responsible for the creation of a language that is qualitative new, so it is the translator as *dramaturge* if the plays want to enjoy the same impact on stage (250). He gives the example of some dramatists like Seán O'Casey, Ramón del Valle-Inclán, Federico García Lorca who can write "a type of play in which the stage language and the sense of life combine to create a complicity between stage and audience which is virtually unique to the author" (253). He calls these highly innovative, and personalised pieces of work "ideotexts" (253) and they are the texts which represent a true challenge for the translator and the stage: "both *mise-en-scéne* and translation are essentially concerned within the actualization of a series of potentialities within the source text in a way which respects both the internal dramatic coherence and external theatrical complicity of the play" (254). Performability, as the result of wider external factors, is explicitly investigated by Eva Espasa. She analyses it at three different levels, the textual,

the theatrical and the ideological. She first defines performability from a textual viewpoint as "the intention of underlining the fluency of the translated text" and from a theatrical point of view as "a whole set of strategies of cultural adaptation" (Espasa 2000: 50). More interestingly, however, from an ideological point of view, performability is seen not only as influenced by textual and theatrical practices, but also by the complex negotiation of the various components of the production process: "it is crucial to consider who has power in a theatre company to decide what is performable – and what is ruled out as unperformable. Thus, performability is shaped by a question of status" (56). Rather than being dismissive of the complex chain of participants and of the interrelated economic factors that contribute to drama translation, Espasa views positively this process of negotiation as a fundamental factor of performability. In fact, she concludes: "I would argue for putting theatre ideology and power negotiation at the heart of performability and make such textual and theatrical factors as speakability and playability relative to it" (58).

Drama translation as cultural transfer also raised other questions such as the importance of its context of reception. According to Marta Mateo, the channel, the theatre-building and the use of stage are other extra-textual features which determine the reception of a target text in performance, all of which have a strong impact on the translator's decisions (Mateo 1995: 102). She argues that the translation of plays very often entails the transposition from one medium to another. She gives the example of written stage directions that can be subject to transformation and are usually converted into props, kinesic, proxemic or other verbal signs that help to visualize the play. There is also a change in emphasis from the spoken to the visual component, when a play is transposed to a filmed version. In this case, the environment in which the play takes place frequently transfers parts of the dialogue into visual images. Although she is aware that her analysis may seem to be beyond the scope of translation proper, she is convinced that "the choice of medium may form part of the *preliminary norms* of the translation process, as it will determine which plays lend themselves to one mode of presentation or to another and will therefore decide which plays to translate at a given moment" (Mateo 1995: 104). The theatre, both in terms of context and the structure of the building, also has an important role in the transposition of a play. Drama translators in their decisions must be aware that the performance of a play at a different theatre from which it was conceived entails a completely different reception of the play: "the translation strategies for a drama text will therefore be partly determined by the cultural location and design of the theatre at which it will be performed" (Mateo 1995: 105). Mateo also warns about translating what happens on stage as a network of signifiers in drama text. For example, the value that each director gives to the words spoken by a character at

a certain moment, and the cultural differences attached to gestures, movements or props must be carefully considered by the translator in the analysis prior to translation decisions (108).

At the start of the new millennium, Carol-Anne Upton and Terry Hale edited a book entitled *Moving Target. Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation* (2000) and brought to the fore other issues related to the role of the translators and the reception of drama translation as cultural transfer. They noted that that in the late 1990s, although one in eight professional productions reviewed in the British press was a translation, the role of the drama translator was nonetheless still largely overlooked. According to them, the attempt to engage with theatre as a cultural phenomenon and as a product of research in interculturalism, however, had left drama translation still at the crossroad of two disciplines, Theatre Studies and Translation Studies. The reasons why drama translation remained in an uneasy position was that the translation theorists are in general unaware of the richness and diversity of the theatrical tradition, whereas the theatre translators are similarly unaware of translation theory (Upton and Hale 2000: 12). They start from the assumption that the process of drama translation raises a series of questions which have wider implications, involving ideologies, community identities, dramaturgical skills and institutions. First, "the theatre translator has a socio-political responsibility to define and address the target audience" (2). If it is true that the theatre mirrors the collective identity of an audience, so theatre translation re-shapes its aesthetic and ideological perceptions. Furthermore, theatre translation requires a dramaturgical capacity to work at the same time in the visual, aural, gestural and linguistic dimensions and the whole process of translation is closely linked to *mise en scène*. The corollary is that the *mise en scène* is what throws into relief any cultural transfer at the end of the theatre translation process. Finally, the theatre translation process "requires a sensitivity to the various agendas at work in both the source and target cultures" (2), which involve in some case state censorship, cultural bias or institutional production policies. In this light, Upton and Hale chose to discuss "the issue of cultural relocation" which is also the leitmotif that links all the essays in their volume. Specifically, they see that the relocation of a play touches upon the dilemma of foreignization and domestication. The decision to relocate is certainly more consequential with a text to be performed than with a text intended to be read. Theatrical production in fact embodies and enacts a cultural milieu with concrete physicalization and preciseness through all the signifying elements (actors' physical appearance, gesture, set, costumes lightening, sound, kinesics, proxemics) besides the spoken word. However, foreignization and domestication are not absolutes and must not be considered opposite poles of a single spectrum of

possibilities; rather they become one of the many possibilities selected along a cline. This complexity, which the theatre embodies, allows drama translation to juxtapose the alien and the familiar, and to create distance and reconciliation. Upton and Hale state: "It is a theatrical truism that myth… introduces a familiar dilemma into a deliberately remote context; a specific cultural context is established, only to be transcended in the establishment of 'universal truth'" (8). For them, Bertold Brecht's Sichuan, Arthur Miller's Salem and William Shakespeare's Greece and Rome, show "the potential of the medium to explore domestic issues of contemporary morality with the critical distance afforded by the otherness of the setting" (8). This combination of foreign and familiar gives "a rich and liberating paradigm for the translator" (8). One of the best examples of this paradigm is what has been termed 'tradaptation'. 'Tradaptation' is a contraction of the terms 'translation' and 'adaptation' and it was first used by the French-Canadian theatre director Robert Lepage and later by Jatinder Verma, the Artistic Director of the London-based Asian Tara Arts Theatre Company, whose writings trace the outlines of a theoretical and aesthetic rationale behind the company's work. Verma uses the term 'tradaptation' in relation to his productions of Molière's *Tartuffe* (for the Royal National Theatre in 1990), and *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme* (for Tara Arts in 1994). Both plays were set in equivalent periods in India to when Molière originally wrote the plays and "provoked a re-perception of the Molière classics" (Verma 1996: 196). Although the re-location and updating of plays is not an unusual practice for the British stage, the process of 'tradaptation' goes beyond mining a play for fashionable parallels: "tradaptation" is, in fact, "a wholesale re-working and re-thinking of the original text, as well as its translation and/or translocation into a new, non-European, aesthetic context" (Cameron 2000: 17). However, the response of playgoers and critics, which was mixed if not hostile, has challenged the sense of appropriateness or authenticity held by the British audience for centuries. The presence of a new paradigm for drama translators thus allows Upton and Hale to make some thought-provoking observations. First, the drama translator is not only in the constant process of redefinition of the contemporary target culture, but he/she can also assume a subversive role through his translation strategies. Second, he/she does not provide a' parallel text' in his translation because the relationship between the source text and his translation is asymmetrical, and the original is recrafted to address the ephemeral moment of his performance. Third, "the inherent instability of the performance text" (9), which derives from the written text and exists both in translation and staging, has a very strong "anti-literary impermanence" (9) and allows the repertoire to be constantly invented and reinvented with each new production. Drama translation therefore exploits "the most anarchic char-

acteristics of the theatre": "in its formal mutability, in its constantly shifting ideals, in its consideration of target audience over source text and in its frequently *ad hoc* methodology...theatre translation defies any ambition to define prescriptive norms" (Upton and Hale 2000: 12).

Some years later Anderman discusses two problematic areas that are central concerns of the drama translator. She shows how geographical and historical relocations are common solutions in British drama to easily overcome the linguistic and cultural obstacles that may be encountered in the transfer from one language and culture to another (Anderman 2007: 9). In line with Aaltonen (2000: 55), she also highlights that acculturation, a process that may be total or may simply take the form of neutralisation through toning down what appears to be too 'foreign', is also one of the options available to make 'foreigness' less of an obstacle for English theatre audience (Anderman 2007: 9). She foremost underlines the importance of giving each character a voice, which implies that the translator must first be acquainted with the social life and position of the characters, with their idiosyncrasies in the source culture and then find lexical and grammatical means of matching expressions in the target language. Unfortunately, the lack of knowledge about the spoken mode of language was a neglected area of interest until very recently in drama translation. The result was that the specific characteristics of individual voices were lost in texts translated routinely into the standard variety of the target language, and that the new texts were devoid of any force and colour of the original (Anderman 2007: 8). For example, John Corbett and Joseph Farrell focuss on the use of Scots dialects in translation in the attempt to recover the lost voices of these texts. In line with his work with Bill Findley in *Serving Twa Maisters: Five Plays in Scots Translation* (2005), Corbett shows that the non-standard urban dialect of Scots, traditionally associated with conditions of class oppression and internal colonialism, has been a powerful vehicle for the translation of the classic repertoire of European drama in the twentieth century. However, he also warns us on the shifting perceptions of non-standard language as a literary medium, which can either enhance postcolonial reading of a text or favour a stereotyped version of it (Corbett: 2007: 43). Farrell believes that a translator of a dialect in literary works deals necessarily with the 'voice of the artist'. In the case of the Sicilian writer Vincenzo Consolo who uses an elaborate idiom of standard Italian and local Sicilian terminology, the translator must be aware that Consolo's purpose was especially "to dispute the authority of centres of political power and linguistic acceptability, and to assert the dignity of a language used by people in places far removed from media, political, industrial, financial or linguistic authority" (Farrell 2007: 61).

1D) THE PERFORMATIVE APPROACH

In the last two decades a host of publications on drama translation focussed explicitly on performativity as a concept which could radically change the prospective on translation. The notion of performativity was originally derived from John L. Austin's theory of speech acts formulated in the 1950s and it is a very difficult concept to pin down, especially for the multitude of meanings it has acquired since then (Schechner 2002: 123-169). Performativity and performance brought about a new theoretical development in the humanities and a major reorientation in various disciplines. Performativity became a central notion in Gender Studies and Cultural Studies and contributed to a new understanding of culture not as a 'text' but as a 'performance'. Performance thus meant an integrated and collaborative form of meaning-making and was applied to define our social and gender status. Judith Butler, for example, saw gender identity as performative. She started from the assumption that there are certain kinds of acts that are usually interpreted as expressive of a gender identity (Butler 1988: 527). However, to establish a common gender identity is highly problematic because the group that consists of all women or of all men contains so many different people that it is impossible to find a common denominator. She therefore notes that "'being a man' and 'being a woman'... [are] unstable affairs" (Butler 2011 [1993]: 86) and that gender identity is construed performatively through the reiteration and *repetiveness* of some acts in line with specific historical, social and cultural dictates.

It was clear that theatre started to be considered the model *par excellence* for what was defined the 'performative turn', dismissing hermeneutic and semiotic approaches in favour of an 'aesthetic of performativity' (Bigliazzi, Kofler and Ambrosi 2013: 1). As Richard Schechner (2002) maintained in his seminal work *Performance Studies. An Introduction*, "the world no longer appeared as a book to be read but as a performance to participate in" (Schechner 2002: 19). Performance in the theatrical context thus meant the dissolution of the subject/object dichotomy, entailing that a performance can only by accomplished through the physical co-presence of actors and audience (Fischer-Lichte 2008: 22). From this point of view, actors and spectators are considered as co-subjects of an event whose rules are negotiated among all participants. As Ficher-Lichte states (2008: 22):

> Based on the ostensible consensus that theatre is constituted and defined by the relationship between actors and spectators, the audience, conversely, understood the performance not primarily as a work of art - traditionally assessed on the basis of how successfully one applies theatrical means to the text – but as an event. The audience

aimed at a fundamental rethinking of the relationship between actors and spectators, opening the possibility of role reversal. According to them, the performance would only succeed as an event if there was equal participation by the spectator. For them, the performativity proposed by the performance was not to be realized through conventionalized actions such as clapping, jeering, or commenting, but through a genuine structural redefinition such as an open-ended result, incorporating the reversal of roles.

This 'structural redefinition' comprises all related activities, translation included. For this reason, performance and translation were considered coincident words. As Silvia Bigliazzi, Peter Kofler and Paola Ambrosi, have recently observed, "Translation *as* performance and *in* performance... implies a dynamic process of (re)signification integrated with the overall event in its various phases of production – something which can hardly be assimilated to a more traditional text-based concept of theatre with its hierarchical system of roles" (Bigliazzi, Kofler and Ambrosi 2013: 1-2). Cristina Marinetti also underlined the shift that occurred in Theatre Studies and its impact on drama translation. She notes how drama and performance has moved from a representational view, that of signifying something, to a performative view, that of transforming existing regimes of signification (Marinetti 2013a: 309). The questions that drama translator must answer therefore are not to what extent a performance represents a translated text or whether a dramatic text is performable, but what is "the force the text has in performance, what "it does" and how it functions "as a performance" (Marinetti 2013a: 311). She enthusiastically concludes: "the greatest advantage of seeing translation as *performative* is that it allows to place originals and translations, source and target texts, dramatic texts and performances on the same cline, where what counts is not the degree of distance from an ontological original but the effect that the reconfigured text (as performance) has on the receiving culture and its networks of transmission and reception" (Marinetti 2013a: 311).

In this framework, new relevant issues in drama translation were brought to the fore: the playfulness of performance and the consequent creative and translation options; the blurring of the boundaries between translation, version and adaptation, and the importance of audience-targeted relocation practices. The translator has the role of "co-subject and co-author of the performance" (Bigliazzi, Kofler and Ambrosi 2013: 13): he/she thus moves away from the verbal to the polysystemic and culturally semiotic event and becomes an investigator of wider concerns such as the relation between text and performance, translators, directors and audiences. A more theoretical approach was discarded to favour a more empirical process of translation for the stage. This is shown, for example, in the step-by-step staging and production of Maggie Rose's translation *Mobile Thriller*, the one-man play *Qualcosa trilla* by the Italian playwright Renato Ga-

brielli. In this case, the translator moves from the position of cultural mediator to that of "cultural promoter", who seeks to create a market for his/her translated play and works with producers, directors and actors as part of her creative project (Rose and Marinetti 2011:139-154); similarly, translators in Bernard-Marie Koltés's *Dans la solitude des champs de coton* use rhythms and sonorities to produce translations accounting for the performative dimension of the dramatic language (Bains and Dalmasso 2011: 49-71). Other examples of creative and translation options are shown when the translator becomes a stage sign language interpreter (Rocks 2001: 72-86), or when he must face the bilingualism of French-Canadian plays for the French unilingual audience (Ladouceur and Nolette 2011: 155-170). The performative turn, however, had also another merit, that of inscribing drama translation within the view of translation as a more and more interdisciplinary activity. Although a decade ago Mary Snell-Hornby still wondered what Translation Studies should give or 'export' to other disciplines to finally reach a desirable 'reciprocal interdisciplinarity' (Snell-Hornby 2006: 164), drama translation scholars such as Bassnett and Marinetti welcomed the potential openness of interdisciplinarity, enthusiastically described as a series of "electrical circuits and fields" (Bassnett 2012: 23) in order to "promote circularity and openness, fostering intellectual advancement through dialogue and relationship" (Marinetti 2013b: 308).

1e) Recent developments: towards accessibility

Drama translation in the twentieth-first century is certainly experiencing a progressive openness towards other disciplines, which may provide more appropriate means of investigating the translation process. And yet, this progressive openness has proved somehow controversial from a theoretical point of view, as Espasa reminds us, listing the many metaphors still used to describe drama translation as 'a labyrinth', 'a mask', a music 'score' and an 'hourglass' (Espasa 2013: 2013: 39-44) A plurality of sometimes conflicting approaches and views, however, has been brought together in an enriching and productive exchange. For example, the performative approach that is located at the confluence of Theatre Studies and Translation Studies, takes as its departure point the actual creative practice in the attempt to explore the relationship between written text and performance. It has been suggested that further investigation in this direction could include: the actors' role in shaping the translated performance text; more research on non-dramatic translation; translators working with companies devising works without scripts (Marinetti, Perteghella and Bains 2011: 7) and a wider reflection on the role and function of drama translation in a global, multi-

cultural and multilingual society (Marinetti 2013b: 27; Marinetti 2018: 126-146; Graham-Jones: 137-143). Although other scholars have agree on the importance of collaborative translation (Laera 2011: 213-225; Peghinelli 2012: 20-30), from various disciplinary standpoints, there are also those who have an another approach to the whole process of drama translation. Geraldine Brodie and Emma Cole, in their co-edited volume *Adapting Translation for the Stage* (2017), set out to dismantle the theoretical construct of the academic-practitioner divide thanks to the co-presence of many agents, with diverse roles, who work in the field of drama translation (Brodie and Cole 2017: 2). In this interprofessional, interdisciplinary dialogue between academics and practitioners, a relevant role is taken on especially by translators. Translators are seen "in the context and site in which they operate, the teams in which they participate and the products they generate" (Brodie 2018: 155), but with the prominent acknowledgement that there is an individual intervening between the source playwright and the target audience, who differentiates theatrical practice from other sites of translation (Brodie 2018: 1). In more general terms, this means a reassertion of the 'legitimacy of the two-step process' of literal translation and target language rewrite within the theatrical translation process (Brodie and Cole 2017: 3). Engaging with this 'two-step process' therefore has two consequences. On the one hand, it offers another perspective on the typical conviction of the performative approach that "the coalescence of writing and translating as a secondary practice within... [this process] only enhances playwrighting with no interlingual and little intercultural awareness" (Bigliazzi, Kofler and Ambrosi 2013: 12); on the other, it rectifies the assumption that practitioners are more concerned with performance while scholars are more concerned with the source text's original moment of writing and staging.

The openness of drama translation towards other disciplines and further areas of investigation has contributed to further explore the implication of relocating translation with an emphasis on its access across languages, its inclusion needs, and the field of translation for educational purposes (Espasa 2013: 282). Therefore, surtitling, audio description and sign language in the theatre have been considered in the wider context of accessibility and, in particular, of theatre. As it would be impossible to describe all the advances made in the internationally prosperous areas of audiovisual translation (AVT) that have now become a well-established field of research in Translation Studies,[8] I will limit my scope to

_____

[8]   To quote only a few publications which give a general overview of audiovisual translation without any intention of being extensive on the topic, see: E. Perego and C. J. Taylor, (2012) *La traduzione audiovisiva*, Roma, Carrocci; R. Baños, S. Bruti and S. Zanotti (2013) "Corpus Linguistics and Audiovisual Translation: in Search of an Integrated Approach", *Perspectives,* 21.4., pp. 483-490; E. Di Giovanni and Y. Gambier (eds) (2018) *Reception Studies and Audiovisual Ttranslation*,

show how drama translation has promoted accessibility through audio description services. Audio description (AD) was initially born in the 1980s as a help for the visually impaired in the theatre and developed as a service in the 1990s, especially for cinema. Some works have specifically dealt with audio description as a form of drama translation: Peter Holland gave some seminal suggestions in "Audio Description in the Theatre and the Visual Arts: Images into Words" (2009). He has investigated the difficult process of translating the various signifying systems of the theatrical event, "[to] make accessible a work of theatre... for an audience who are either blind or have partial sight by giving in a verbal form some of the information which a sighted person can easily access" (Holland 2009: 170). In general terms, a description in the theatre consists of two parts: the description of the set and costume, which is given before a performance, and the description of the action, which takes place during the play and "has to be given live in order to accommodate changes in pace which are an integral part of live performance" (170). Holland underlines some of the problematic areas of the process of audio describing for the theatre. This type of translation requires that the describer must have the skill to time the description so that it does not interfere with the words being spoken by the actors from the stage; the physical, social and psychological description of the characters must be considered to the extent that the details allow the picture as a whole to be formed. The describer must also tend to be impartial, but he runs the risk to reduce a description of a play to string of meaningless details unless he/she has a good understanding of the narrative of the action. The describer must also use his/her creativity and engage with the creative team on a production. Decision-making is also very important in the process of audio description for the theatre, especially when the describer has to strike the balance between the literal truth and the imaginative truth that may co-exist in a play that varies from one play to another. Finally, the audio describer must be aware of the unfixed nature of theatre to respect the live nature of theatre. Moreover, the changes that might happen from one performance to another can help him to look "at the production differently, focusing on the internal motivations of the characters rather than their outward behaviour" (177). Since then, a wide range of publications have dealt with audio description in the theatre from various disciplinary perspectives.[9] These outline the develop-

---

Amsterdam, John Benjamins; E. Perego and R. Pacinotti (2020) "Audiovisual Translation through the Ages", in Ł. Bogucki and M. Deckert (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Audiovisual Translation and Media Accessibility*, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, pp. 33-56.

[9]   Among the most recent publications, see L. E. Fryer (2010) "Audio description as Audio Drama – a Practitioner's Point of View", *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 18.3., pp. 205-213; J. P. Udo and D. I. Fels (2010) "Universal Design on Stage: Live Audio description for Theatrical Performances", *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 18.3., pp. 189-203; J. P. Udo and D. I. Fels (2011) "From the describer's mouth: Reflections on creating unconventional audio description for live theatre",

ment of drama translation from the 1970s on, showing that drama translation in its full interdisciplinary potential can now be found at the service of accessibility.

Audiovisual Translation in Close-up: Practical and Theoretical Approaches, pp. 257-278; A. Cavallo (2015) "Seeing the word, hearing the image: the artistic possibilities of audio description in theatrical performance", *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 20.1., 125-134; H. Roofthooft, A. Remael and L. Van den Dries (2018) "Audio description for (postdramatic) theatre. Preparing the stage", *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 30, pp. 232-24; L. E. Fryer (2018) "Staging the audio describer. An exploration of integrated audio description", *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 38.3. <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10055676/1/Fryer_staging%20 the%20audio%20describer%20final%20draft.pdf>; E. Di Giovanni (2018) "Audio description for live performances and audience participation", *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 29, pp. 189-211; E. Di Giovanni (2021) "Oltre l'accessibilità: I teatri inclusivi", *Lingue e Linguaggi*, 43, pp. 15-21; E. Di Giovanni and F. Raffi (2022) "Inclusive Theatres as Boosters of Well-being: Concepts and Practices", *Journal of Audiovisual Translation*, 5.1., pp. 166-185.

Chapter 2. Issues in drama translation

I shall turn now my attention to two closely related issues in drama translation, namely intertextuality and the definition of what has been variously termed as 'version', 'adaptation' or 'rewrite'. These two issues have indirectly been touched upon in the previous chapter on the approaches to drama translation, when play-texts have been seen to undergo 'processes of acculturation' (Aaltonen 2000) and 'major adjustments' (Anderman 2005); or express 'issues of cultural relocations' (Hale and Upton 2000); or become 'reconfigured texts (as performance)' (Marinetti 2013). However, they deserve thorough investigation; intertextuality, in fact, must be explored in its wider theoretical context to see how it becomes relevant for the process of translation and drama translation in particular; furthermore, version, rewrite and adaptation, which can be seen as a product of intertextuality, must be analysed in a more systematic way, as happened in the first decade of the twentieth-first century.

Given the complexity of the issue of intertextuality and how it played a crucial role in various disciplinary fields, it is first necessary to investigate what intertextuality has meant in discourse analysis (Faiclough 1992a; Fairclough 1992b: 193-217; Faiclough 1992c: 269-293; Briggs and Bauman 1992: 131-172), in literary criticism (Worton and Still 1990; Allen 2000), and then in translation (Sakellariou 2015; Farahzad 2009) and drama translation.

2a) Intertextuality in discourse analysis

Discourse analysists start from the premise that social actors do not formulate utterances in a vacuum and any individual speech event does not take place in isolation from another. Therefore, "discourse produced in one context inevitably connects to discourse produced to another context" Hodge 2015: 42). When social actors interact, "they use voices indicative of their social word, draw upon established genres to frame their discourse, engage with words that have come before them, and orient to anticipated responses" (*ibid.*). Central to this view is the notion of text. Text can be considered either as a linguistic construct wholly coherent in itself that can be moved from one setting into another or, more broadly, as a coherent complex of signs that can be extended to other domains (movie, painting, musical score) that must be read for complete meaning (Hodges 2015: 42). Discourse analysis therefore sees a text as an objectified unit of meaning, whether its focus is on language use (written or spoken) or it is conceived as part of a meaningful semiotic activity. According to discourse analysts, a text "can be lifted from its originating context (decontextualized) and inserted into a new setting where it is recontextualized... [and] in this way, fragments of discourse from one setting seemingly take on a life of their own as they are turned into texts (entextualized) and enter into social "circulation"" (Hodges 2015: 42-43). Particularly interesting is what has been defined as an "intertextual gap" (Briggs and Bauman 1992: 131-172) that concerns the intertextual relationship that a text has with an associated genre. Genres can be defined in general terms as 'recurrent forms'; for example, oral narratives, news reports, literary genre, such as the romance novel, crime story and murder mystery, or 'recurrent actions'; for example, an informal chat, a job interview, a poem, a scientific article. Genres are also associated with a set of conventions that guide the activity together with some features that the individuals in certain roles are expected to fulfil, e.g., the hero stands for justice. Therefore, they provide a frame for a specific discourse, give interpretative procedures and establish a set of expectations, in other words, they provide "conventionalized expectations for how those encounters should unfold and be interpreted" (Hodges 2015: 46). As Adam Hodges notes, "a soliloquy within a staged theatrical production is contextualized differently from a political speech broadcast on prime-time television, in large part due to the "genre knowledge" associated with these culturally recognized discourse types" (2015: 46). However, according to Mikhail Bakhtin in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (1986), genres are unstable, are formed and situated in a certain place and belong to a given culture in a historical moment, reflecting "all the changes taking place in social life" (Bakhtin 1986: 65). Genres therefore may mix, hybridize, and form new examples but a gap always arises

when the link between an utterance and a model introduces a variation on a theme. This gap then "can be suppressed to minimize the difference, or it can be foregrounded to maximize the difference" (Hodges 2015: 46). Hodges maintains that the notion of the intertextual gap emphasises the fact "that 'diachronic repetition' and the use of old language into new contexts inevitably reshape meaning" (47). He gives the example of "a modern performance of a Shakespeare play that may foreground the gap by setting the play in 1960s America with all that is associated with that era, including clothing and slang words to replace the traditional garb and linguistic features of Shakespeare's time" (*ibid.*). Examples of how prior meanings can be recontextualised imperceptibly and/or radically are shown in detail in most diverse genres, ranging from comedy to improv comedy, from everyday family interaction to media discourse in everyday interaction (Hodges 2015: 47-49).

Hodges, however, claims that intertextuality has wider implications, and that questions concerning ideology, political economy and power must be addressed if the nature of intertextual relations are to be understood. What must be investigated is the propagation of truth claims and narratives that constitutes the basis of ideologies, "that is, systems of thoughts and ideas that represent the world from a particular perspective and provide a framework for organizing meaning, guiding actions, and legitimating positions" (Hodges 2015: 53). The discourse analysts thus complement the Bakhtinian perspective on language with the Foucauldian notion of discourse as a systematic way of thinking that provides a set of assumptions, explanations and expectations governing the way a topic can be discussed. In this light, "where Bakhtin recognizes that we live in a world pre-populated by previously uttered words, Foucault recognises that "there can be no statement that in one way or another does not reactualize others" (Hodges 2015: 54). To the discourse analysts' concern with language use in interaction at the microlevel, Michael Foucault thus adds concern with the macro-level forms of knowledge that appear in society in any given historical period.

Hodges claims that "a focus on intertextuality is key to unravelling the way the micro feeds into the macro" (54) because it is "by the cumulative traces laid down across intersecting speech events that particular representations of an issue gain sufficient inertia to become reality" (*ibid.*). In fact, he concludes that "it is through a series of interconnected discourse encounters that isolated truth claims, or representations turn into larger narratives and shared cultural understandings" (*ibid.*).[1]

_____

[1]   Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has further contributed to make discourse analysis relevant to expose forms of power, political domination, hegemony and discrimination. Among the wide range of publications, see: N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (1992), *Language and Power* (2013), "Language and Globalization" (2009); T. A. van Dijk (1997), "Discourse and Ideology", in T. A. van

2b) Intertextuality in literary criticism

The term 'intertextuality' is usually attributed to Julia Kristeva and it has then been used to cover a broader range of theories than those Kristeva expounds in her seminal works on intertextuality, 'Words, dialogue and novel' (1967) and 'Problème de la structuraction du text' (1969).[2] The theory of intertextuality insists that "a text cannot exist as a hermetic or self-sufficient whole, and so does not function as a closed system" (Still and Worton 1990: 1). This notion which underpins the passage from structuralism to poststructuralism, and later to postmodernism, was particularly influential mainly within the fields of literary theory and criticism. It was relevant to poststructuralist theorists such as Roland Barthes and Gérard Genette and, in more recent times, it has had "a wide resonance within Cultural Studies and the theorization of life within a postmodernism frame" (Aly 2018: 1-2), as expressed in the works by Frederic Jameson in *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (1991), Jean Baudrillard in *Simulacra and Simulation* (1994) and Stuart Hall in *Questions of Cultural Identity* (1996).

Kristeva had the merit to introduce Bakhtin's work in Western debates and she explored the intertextual nature of his work. Mikhail Bakhtin made central to his theory that "the words we select in any specific situation have an 'otherness' about them: they belong to specific speech genres, they bear the traces of previous utterances" (Allen 2000: 21). He starts from the assumption that dialogism is the constitutive element of language and foregrounds class, ideological conflicts and hierarchies in society. As opposed to monologism, dialogism can have a centrifugal force that can promote 'unofficial' dimensions of society and human life. He sees in François Rabelais's *Gargantua and Pantagruel* how Carnival in medieval and Renaissance times becomes one of those moments in which the dominant order of society is overturned and he argues that the novel is the modern inheritor of this unofficial, satirical and parodic, dialogical tradition. Other concepts, such as 'polyphony', 'heteroglossia', 'doubled-voiced' and 'hybridization', which complement the term dialogism, draw our attention on Bakhtin's view of language and of its essentially intertextual nature (22). In the polyphonic novel, as for example in Fyodor Dostoevsky's novels, all characters have their own dis-

coursive consciousness: no individual discourse can stand objectively above any other discourse because all discourses are interpretations of the world, responses to and calls to other discourses (23). Similarly, *heteroglossia* shows the ability of the language to contain within it many voices, one's own and others' voices. It reminds us that within individual utterances and even within the same word we can find a clash of ideologies and past utterances: "The discourse of characters in a polyphonic novel [...] exemplifies the intertextual or dialogic nature of language by always serving two speakers, two intentions, two ideological positions, but always within the single utterance" (Allen 2000: 29). As Ramy Aly notes, Kristeva built upon Bakhtin's concepts such as 'dialogism' and 'carnival': however, the difference between the two scholars is that in Bakhtin's dialogism there are several voices within any utterance, while in Kristeva's intertextuality there are many texts within a text (Aly 2018: 1-2). Kristeva is concerned with how a text is constructed out of already existent discourses. Authors do not create original text, but they compile them from pre-existent texts. For her, a text is "a permutation of texts, an intertextuality in the space of a given text", in which "several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another" (Kristeva 1980: 36). Texts are made up of what she calls 'the cultural or social text', which represent all the different discourses, ways of speaking and saying, institutionally sanctioned structures and systems which represents culture: "In this sense, the text is not an individual, isolated object but, rather, a compilation of cultural textuality" (Allen 2000: 36). Kristeva shows how the tendency to presume that a text possesses a unique meaning is false. In her semiotic approach to texts, she stresses that there is a double meaning: one coming from the text and the other deriving from the social and historical context. Unlike Bakhtin, her 'poetic language' is "a dynamic conception of the 'literary word' as *an intersection of textual surfaces* rather than a point" (Allen 2000: 38). The concept of intertextuality lying at the heart of her poetic language is therefore meant to portray a language that is "against, beyond and resistant to (mono)logic [....] is socially disruptive [and] revolutionary" (Allen 2000: 45).

Barthes's theory of the text was suitable to Kristeva elaboration of intertextuality. For Barthes, meaning in the text is 'an explosion, a dissemination' of already existing meanings. He proposes a vision of a text which does not mean one thing alone: consequently, the reader no longer discovers meaning but follows the passage of meaning as it flows, explodes and regresses. His theory of the text therefore "involves a theory of intertextuality, since the text not only sets going a plurality of meanings but is also woven out of numerous discourses and spun from already existent meaning" (Allen 2000: 67). As for Kristeva, Barthes sees in Modernist and Postmodernist literature, examples of what he calls *text*, i.e., texts that can be re-written, rather than simply read, by the reader. In this view, Bar-

thes illustrates "a tension that is generated by the text's and intertextuality's disturbance of apparently stable oppositions: reading and writing, author and critic, meaning and interpretation, inside and outside" (Allen 2000: 68). The *text* therefore is what exists between that text and other texts: it is intertextual in its own nature and foregrounds the productive role of the reader. For Barthes the text is "woven entirely with citations, references, echoes, cultural languages (what language is not?) antecedent or contemporary, which cut across it through and through in a vast stereophony" (Barthes 1977: 160). Intertextuality, as meant by Barthes, will inevitably lead to what he has termed 'the death of the Author'. In the capitalistic society, the author is a modern figure. He promotes a view of interpretation, and he is the initiator of the relationship between author, work and the reader-critic, in which reading is a form of consumption. The ideology of the author and his dominance over the text is unquestionable: it helps to convey the meaning of a text, as imparted by the author, and thus a text has a unity that derives from the unified thought of his creator. Influenced by Kristeva's work on Bakhtin, "Barthes develops this point into a recognition that the origin of the text is not a unified authorial consciousness but a plurality of voices, of other words, other utterances and other texts" (Allen 2000: 72). In the interpretation of the literary work, we do not have to see what is in the author's head to discover intended meanings and original thoughts, but we must consider the text as "a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture" (Barthes 1977: 146). The text therefore becomes an intertextual construct, an 'intertext', that, in turn, refers to other intertexts and to the entire cultural code, comprised, as it is, of discourses, stereotypes, clichés, ways of saying. Barthes's idea of text and intertextuality therefore "destroys the 'myth of filiation': the idea that meaning *comes from* and is, metaphorically at least, the *property of* the individual authorial consciousness" (Allen 2000: 74) and "subverts the previously hierarchized, filial relationship between author and reader" (75). In fact, the modern writer, when he/she writes, is always in a process of reading and of re-writing and the intertextual nature of writing therefore turns both protagonists of the traditional model, author and critic, into readers.

Other critics play a crucial role in the investigation of intertextuality in the literary field. From a structuralist perspective, Genette wants to rewrite the entire fields of poetics from a new perspective that he calls transtextuality, which "includes issues of imitation, transformation, the classification of types of discourse, along with the thematic, modal, generic and formal categories and categorizations of traditional poetics" (Allen 2000: 100). In his celebrated works, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (1982) and *Paratexts. Thresholds of Interpretation* (1997), he defines transtextuality as all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts and reduces it to issues of quotation, plagia-

rism and allusion (Allen 2000: 100). In a very complex categorization, he singles out five categories, namely, intertextuality, architextuality, paratextuality, meta-textuality and hypertextuality and gives detailed descriptions of the multifarious intertextual relations that can be generally found in literary texts. Intertextuality is described rather straightforwardly as 'a relationship of co-presence between two texts or among several texts' and as 'the actual presence of one text within another'. Architextuality designates a text as part of a genre or genres and includes thematic and figurative expectations of the readers about the texts. Paratext is what is liminal to the text and helps to direct the readers' attention to the text. The paratext consists of a *peritext* (titles, chapter titles, prefaces and notes) 'inside' the text, and an of an *epitext* (interviews, publicity, announcements, reviews by and addresses to critics, private letters and other authorial and editorial discussions) 'outside' the text. Metatextuality denotes implicit or explicit reference of one text to another; it is usually an overt or covert commentary to a text. Literary criticism, for example, can be considered metatextual as it is not extraneous to the meaning a text acquires: metatextuality therefore contributes to establish the writers' success. Finally, hypertextuality refers to a text that represents a major source of signification for a text, which can be transformed, modified, elaborated as in the case of parody, sequel and translation; for example, Homer's *Odyssey* is James Joyce's *Ulysses* major hypertext.

2c) Intertextuality in translation

Many of the investigations conducted on intertextuality both in discourse analysis and in in the literary field had a strong impact on translation and the translation process. The application of the "protean notion of intertextuality" (Sakellariou 2015: 36) that favoured a reorientation in language and literature, as shown in the previous sub-chapters, also involved "a significant reconceptualization of both the practice of translation and the role of translator" (35). Particularly important in this regard is the view of intertetextuality as "textual interconnectedness" (36), which subsumes some of the concepts seen before and that I shall quickly recapitulate here. Texts are associated with genres that provide a discursive frame and a set of recognizable expectations; genres are unstable and can mix, hybridize and introduce a variation on a theme, especially when texts are decontextualized from their original context and recontextualised in a new social setting; texts are the result of already existent discourses and authors do not create original texts but they compile them from pre-existent texts. A text is therefore a 'permutation of texts' and a 'compilation of textuality'. The text is therefore 'an explosion, a dissemination' of already existing meanings, which

challenge the author's authority, foregrounds the productive role of the reader and subverts the well-established hierarchy between author and reader. This specific view of textual interrelationship "seems to depend heavily on a general notion of system, taken as a dynamic network of functions and interacting processes, that in given circumstances substantiate a particular range of the possibilities available" (39). Thus, the text is above all the result of intra-systemic processes (39).

The theoretical debate on intertextuality in translation therefore start from these premises. Panagiotis Sakellariou notes that the concept of intertextuality was primarily used to redefine translation through a reconceptualization of the relation between the source text and the target text and traces the historical development of intertextuality from a theoretical point of view. In the early 1970s, there were the first attempts to inscribe translation within the broader field of intertextuality[3] and they aimed at undermining the primacy of the original text over the translated text. Although a prevalent notion of equivalence and the ensuing concept of original's unitary meaning were starting to be questioned, the concept of intertextuality was not yet brought into a relationship of mutual exclusion with equivalence. This was the line followed by Albrecht Neubert (1981: 130-145), who tried to reconcile the source text and the target text as part of a broad intertextual network to which translation added new links with communicatively equivalent texts. Equivalence was therefore still maintained at functional level. However, this attempt at reconciliation proved problematic and other concepts of intertextuality, which soon displaced the notion of equivalence between source and target text, had wide resonance in Translation Studies. Theo Hermans (2003: 39-41, 2007: 57-75), for example, disentangled completely the target text from the source text and gives a totally different view of intertextuality. According to his theory of total equivalence, if there is equivalence between a source text and its translations, in relevant contexts the target text can perform the same functions of the source text. The source text and its translated texts are therefore treated as equal in value and status: the former ceases to be an original and the latter are no longer translations (Sakellariou 2015: 41). Given these premises, the translated text transcends the relation with the source text and becomes part of an intertextual network: translation is no longer a process of generating texts, but rather an interpretative process, repeatable and plural, which contemplates each time a specific point of view and makes choices each time from different alternatives in an inexhaustible potential for retranslation.

---

[3] See, for example, G. C. Spivak (1976) "Translator's preface" to Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. ix–xxxvii.; Terry Eagleton (1977) "Translation and Transformation" *Stand* 19. 3., pp. 72–77.

Consequently, no single translated text can be definitive (*ibid.*). As Sakellariou rather effectively claims: "translation is now open to a universe that presents the texture of an intertextual web" (*ibid.*).

2D) INTERTEXTUALITY IN DRAMA TRANSLATION

Intertextuality in drama translation exactly unravels this 'texture' in the widest possible sense. What Hermans calls "translation-specific intertextuality" (2007: 72) and that Sakellariou has explained in detail (2015: 41-42) is particularly poignant and can be easily adapted to drama translation. As Sakellariou notes, "translation encompasses the different kinds of relation that hold between the translated text in a given language" (2015: 41); more precisely, "translation-specific intertextuality includes a translated text's reference both to prior translations of the same original and to other translations of the same type, as well as its appeal to the prevalent notion of translation in a given community" (*ibid.*). Intertextuality in drama translation covers all that has been translated in a given language and the relevant expectations, norms and conventions governing the practice of drama translation in the target language. Beside these textual interdependencies in the target language, intertextuality also points to an idea of translation as a social system, according to which every translated play refers in various way to other translated plays, which enables the communication between different translations in different languages. This view of intertextuality brings forth two important considerations. First, the relationship between the original play and the target text is destabilised: the source text ceases to be the absolute point of reference and is projected against an intertextual web. The translated play involves just another intertextual relation among many interrelated elements in a series of intertextual references. Second, the prior hierarchy between original and translation, which was based on the ideal notion of 'the' correct interpretation, is no longer accepted and both original play and its translation appear to be on the same level in a network of textual interactions.

Other recent studies explore intertextuality in translation in more depth and add new insights into intertextuality in drama translation. In describing translation as an intertextual practice, Farzaneh Farahzad argues that every instance of translation not only deals with two different linguistic systems and operates in two different socio-historical contexts, but also deals with two physically recorded intertexts, traditionally called the source text and the target text. Within the framework of intertextuality, where no text is the source or the origin of the other and the translated text is never definitive, he prefers to term the two intertexts the prototext and the metatext. The prototext is the intertext which

gets translated, and the metatext is the intertext which is the result of the act of translation: "the two intertexts relate to one another as soon as they are placed in a translational context" (Farahzad 2009: 127). He then shows how intertextuality operates at two levels, defined as the Local Intralingual Level and the Global Interlingual Level. At the first level, the prototext relates to all other texts appearing in its own language, the language of the prototext. The prototext is part repetition, in that it repeats the form and content of other intertexts belonging to the same genre and discourse type in the language of the prototext, and it is part creation as it is distinct from any other intertext as an individual text which gives a new formulation of concepts" (128). At the Global Interlingual Level, "the prototext is translated and related through the metatext to all the texts written in all different languages, in terms of content and genre" (128). As Farahzad undelines: "the prototext precedes the metatext(s) in time, while parts of it, e.g., its content, terms and formal properties, get repeated in its translation(s)" (128). This is what creates an intertextual relationship between the prototext and the potential unlimited number of metatexts that can appear in a given language, the language of the metatext. However, each time a prototext is translated and moves from one intertextual and socio-historical context to another, it loses parts of its properties in favour of those of the new context (128).

Drawing on Hermans's "translation-specific intertextuality" and Farahzad's translation as an intertextual practice, I shall now describe how intertextuality applies to drama translation and, in order to do so, I shall specifically refer to the process that brought an Irish play to the Italian stage. In 2008, *The Cordelia Dream*, by the Irish playwright Marina Carr, was performed for the first time at the Wilton's Music Hall by The Royal Shakespeare Company in London. Inspired by Shakespeare's *King Lear*, Carr puts on stage an Old Man and a Woman in a loft. They are father and daughter locked together by ancestral love-hate and rivalry as composers. What brings them together after many years, it is the daughter's dream of dead Cordelia in Lear's arms. Like in their Shakespearean counterparts, the fates of the Old Man and the Woman become forever entangled. Despite her English premiere, Marina Carr is a distinctive Irish playwright, considered, since her earlier Beckettian debut in *Low in the Dark* (1995), among the most influential new voices of contemporary Irish drama. Suspended between tradition and innovation, realism and avant-garde experimentalism, the Irish drama scene before and after the economic boom of the 1990s, the so-called Celtic Tiger, features many themes and topics that Carr shares in those years with other emerging playwrights, both in the Republic of Ireland and in Northern Ireland, such as Martin McDonagh, Conor McPherson, Enda Walsh, Owen McCafferty. At the Local Intralingual Level, intertextuality works as follows: Carr's prototext relates to many other intertexts written in English and it can be considered partly a

repetition of certain genres and discourses, i.e., concepts of individual identi-
ties, marginalization of women, broken families, and partly a creation of a dis-
tinct intertext, i.e., the dysfunctional relationship between daughter and father
expressed through the Shakespearean reference. Thus, Carr's prototext is also
related to the Shakespearian intertext *King Lear*. However, a specific feature of
Carr's playwrighting is her dense web of intertextual relations in most of her
plays. By her own admission, these relations are the result of hearing "the voices
of the great dead writers [...] we hear all around us" because "writing is the cour-
age to sit down and face the ghosts [of the dead writers] and have a conversation
with them. It is going over to the other side and coming back with something
new, hopefully; gold, possibly" (Carr 1998: 190). For example, in her three most
famous plays, *The Mai* (1995), *Portia Coughlan* (1996) and *By the Bog of Cats*
(1998), she relates back to Ancient Greek plays, which have become foundational
'myths' of Western civilization. Thus, in Euripides's *Hippolyte* Phaedra's uncon-
trollable love for her stepson allows Carr's *The Mai* and her protagonist to rein-
terpret the classic tragedy. Similarly, Antigone's love for Polynices in Sophocle's
Antigone shapes the female protagonist's feelings in *Portia Coughlan.* Finally,
Medea's violence against her children in Sophocles's eponymous play serves as a
reference for Carr's *By the Bog of Cats*. The three Greek classics, *Medea*, *Hippolyte*
and *Antigone*, therefore are important intertexts and will somehow have a role in
the process of translation of Carr's more recent play *The Cordelia Dream*. At the
Global interlingual level, *The Cordelia Dream* was translated into Italian by Val-
entina Rapetti as *Il sogno di Cordelia* in 2011 and became a reading at the theatre
festival Trend in Rome in 2015 at the Teatro Belli. Thus, the prototext through its
metatext, i.e., *The Cordelia Dream* in Italian, relates to all other playtexts written
in Italian, both in genre and content. Although some of these intertextual rela-
tions are not easy to trace due to the fragmentariness of both contemporary Ital-
ian dramaturgy and productions in Italian theatre, some intertextual references
can be found in the threatening of female individual identities in classics such as
Pirandello's *Così è (se vi pare)* (*Right You Are (If You Think You Are*) (1917) and
Come tu mi vuoi (*As You Desire Me*) (1929).The impending sense of tragedy and
death inscribed in Shakespeare's *King Lear* is instead related to the many Ital-
ian translations of Shakespeare's play[4], and the gender issue of women's role in
the patriarchal family and society recall the social and gender issues highlighted

---

[4]   References to Italian translations and stagings of *King Lear* can be found in: P. Pugliatti e M.
Tempera (eds) (1986) *King Lear. Dal testo alla scena*. Bologna, CLUEB; S. Bellavia (2004) *L'ombra Di
Lear: Il Re Lear di Shakespeare e il teatro italiano (1858-1995)*, Roma, Bulzoni.
For a detail account of different Italian translations, staging and screening of another Shakespearian
play, see: V. Minutella (2013) *Reclaiming Romeo and Juliet: Italian Translations for Page, Stage and
Screen*, Amsterdam, Rodopi.

recently by the Sicilian-born Emma Dante's *Trilogia della famiglia* (*mPalermu*, 2001; *Carnezzeria* 2002; and *Vita Mia*, 2004). Like Marina Carr in *By the Bogs of Cats*, Emma Dante also revisits Sophocles's *Medea* (2003) to subvert the role assigned to women and eventually inflict a fatal blow to the patriarchal order. The intertextual relations seen so far, obviously refer to *The Cordelia Dream* in the Italian translation but there is an unlimited number of these relations, when the prototext is translated in all other languages. However, it is interesting to see what happens at intertextual level when Carr's play moves from the Irish to the Italian socio-historical context because it definitely loses some of its properties in favour of those of the new context. In fact, *The Cordelia Dream* is described as an attempt to propose a new playwright for the Trend festival, along with works of lesser-known dramatists such as Nina Raine (*Tribes*), Penelope Skinner (*Fred's Diner*), Alistair McDowall (*Captain Amazing*), Jen McGregor (*Comfort&Joy*) and Gary Duggan (*Dedalus Lounge*). In the words of Valerio Binasco, director and actor of the reading, the father-daughter relationship, which in Carr's play becomes almost archetypical thanks to the reference to *King Lear*, moves to the background. The two characters, Man and Woman, are portrayed in more realistic terms and recall the characters of Ingmar Bergman's films. Dialogue, in fact, prevail and Man and Woman are presented more as victims than perpetrators. According to Binasco, Carr in this play uses the typical frame of folktales and her protagonist, Woman, resembles a Little Red Riding Hood, who, like many women in Jacques Prévert's poetry, knocks at her father's door waiting to be devoured. Woman is pleading for acceptance and the whole play revolves around the idea of nothingness that condemns both father and daughter. As shown, the intertextual relations to the original dramatic context is marginalised in translation. Carr's play in Italian is no longer the work of a well-established and acclaimed playwright as she is in Ireland, and the depiction of women's uneasiness in their stereotyped roles, which often leads to powerful tragedies, is overshadowed. The new properties attributed to *The Cordelia Dream* in the Italian translation derive instead from other cultural references, creating different intertextual relations.

This detailed example shows the complexity of "translation-specific intertextuality" and how drama translation as an intertextual practice requires highly specialised skills and a profound cultural and social knowledge. If intertextuality in translation is a type of transforming activity which involves language, text, culture and thinking, As Yi Long and Gaofen Yu claim, "intertextuality puts forward higher requirements for the translators" (2002: 1108). Intertextuality emphasises the non-determinacy of text structure, that no text can exist without other texts, that text meaning depends on the interaction between the text and other texts, and that translation itself is intertextual in the conversion process from a prototext to a metatext. The translator plays three roles at the same time;

the reader of the prototext, the elucidator and the author of the metatext, thus performing the "three tasks of completing, interpreting and rewriting the text in intertextuality" (*ibid.*). The "translator as a reader" should carefully read the text and make use of intertextual knowledge associated with the original text to fully understand the meaning of the original. Moreover, if a text has meaning only when it is read, and the production of meaning depends on the horizon of expectations of a text, translators as readers are required to resort to their own social and cultural background, carefully interpret and complete the text. The "translator as elucidator" is a role that requires the translator to grasp the text at a higher level and elucidate the original text carefully. Translator as elucidators must first be familiar with the relevant themes and the historical and social background implied in the text and, secondly, possess all skills and strategies needed to express the unfamiliar content. They must also explore and display their literary and dramatic competence to elucidate the content, the form and the overall style of a text. The "translator as author" is the third role of the translator. Once he/she has completed the role of reader and elucidator, he/she expresses the prototext in another language, performing conscious or unconscious rewriting of the prototext and reflecting on direct or indirect intertextual relationships. In the process of translation, translators have to shuttle back and forth in the interwoven network of texts to get their own meaning and eventually turn it into a translation: "This is a process of creation and re-creation, which needs the full play of the translator's subjectivity [...] translation is the regeneration of the original text, and the translator is the giver of the regeneration of life"; however, "to what extent a translation can be revived depends entirely on the translator's subjectivity and creativity, in which intertextuality plays an important role" (Long and Yu 2020: 1018).

2e) Translation, version, rewrite and adaptation

As discussed so far, intertextuality determines how the playtext changes in the process of translation: attention shall now be turned to the definition of the product of intertextual translation, i.e., 'translation', 'version', 'rewrite' and 'adaptation'. It must be premised that the boundaries between these terms are often very fuzzy and the terms do not define categories in stark opposition.

'Version', 'rewrite' and 'adaptation' can be considered as various types of translations belonging to a continuum of different practices and strategies typically adopted for translating the playtext. In general terms, a 'version', typically used in English-speaking countries, provides the audience with a play adjusted to overcome their lack of familiarity with the source cultures and societies. This

often leads to playwrights being commissioned 'a translation' without knowing the source language in the belief, unfortunately, that their dramaturgical expertise is more important than the language knowledge. The playwright Christopher Hampton, who was invited to translate a new version of *Uncle Vanya* for the Royal Court in the early 1970s, recalled: "it was rare for playwrights to do that [to translate]. Instead, there were standard academic versions of classic plays, which people would perform. But now people think it's better to get someone who can write dialogue, rather than someone who can speak the language" (Logan 2003). A 'rewrite' draws on the Lefevere's theory of rewriting (Lefevere 1982/2000: 233-249; Laera 2014) and treats "translation as a discursive activity embedded within a system of literary conventions and a network of institutions and social agents that condition textual production" (Asimakoulas 2012: 241). The rewrite of a play makes it inevitably 'partial' in its representation of the source text, as it proposes a new image, function and impact of the text. It also shows how ideology, which is linked to the concept of language and power relations, creates distortion and manipulation (Hermans 1985): "rewriting and refraction" therefore "refer to the projection of a perspectival image of a literary work (novel, play, poem)" (Lefevere 1982: 10; [1982]2000: 234–235). 'Adaptation' may be understood as a set of translative interventions which result in a text that is not generally accepted as a translation but is nevertheless recognized as representing a source text" (Bastin 2009: 3). Thus, this term embraces other various notions such as appropriation, domestication, imitation and cultural relocation. What is relevant here is that "the concept of adaptation requires recognition of translation as non-adaptation, a somehow more constrained mode of transfer" and this is the reason why "the history of adaptation is parasitic on historical concepts of translation" (Bastin 2009: 4). Adaptation is regarded as a form of translation which is specific to some genres like drama, and in fact it is in relation to drama translation that adaptation has been mostly frequently studied. For example, Brisset (1986: 10) views adaptation as a 'reterritorialization' of the original work and an 'annexation' in the name of the audience of the new version. Santoyo (1989:104) similarly defines adaptation as a form of 'naturalizing' the play for a new milieu, the aim being to achieve the same effect that the work originally had, but with an audience from a different cultural background.[5] These definitions show how many drama translation scholars have brought deep insights into the debate and expressed their views on these forms of translations. In 2002, however, Joseph Che Suh still lamented that there was no agreement

---

[5]   See also R. Merino Álvarez (1992) "Profesión: adaptador", *Livius*, 1, pp. 85–97; R. Merino Álvarez (1994) *Traduccion, tradicion y manipulacion: teatro ingles en Espana 1950–1990*, León, Universidad de León y Universidad del País Vasco.

on the definition of adaptation in relation to drama translation among its main proponents, such as Brisset (1998), Jean-Michel Déprats (1990), Susan Bassnett (1990), Michèle Laliberté (1995) and Louise Ladouceur (1995) among others. He notes that, in English, the translations of playtexts were referred to or described variously as "adaptation", "rewriting", "version", "transplanting", "naturalising", "neutralising", "integrating foreign works", "large-scale amendments", "recreation", "transposition", "reappropriate"; in French, as "transposer complètement", "traduction ethnocentrique", "traduction-assimilation", "traduction totale", "déplacement", "déraciner de son contexte", "l'assimilation" (Che Suh 2002: 53). He suggested that the proliferation of terminology was due especially to the fact that research in drama translation had been carried in isolation and the lack of prior knowledge of others' works brought drama translation scholars to the coinage of new words to describe translational phenomena that were not unique to their own individual experience. What further compounded this proliferation of terms was also the vagueness of these terms. Many of the terms used in fact refer more or less to the same translation reality or phenomena with different semantic shades suggesting various degree of manipulation of the source text. Moreover, this vagueness had not enabled other translation scholars to map out a continuum and refine the various degrees or shades of the same phenomenon and to characterise more carefully the manipulation involved in each case. According to him, this would have also helped to shed light "on what constitutes translation proper" (Che Suh 2002: 53). In particular, he focussed on the relationship between "translation" and "adaptation" and how this controversial relationship had often led to confusion. He considered, for example, how Louise Ladouceur's authoritative observations sounded rather incomplete. She believes that the difference between adaptation and translation is quantitative more than qualitative in that it makes use of certain strategies which are not unique to adaptation: "l'analyse a révélé que le texts traduits et les texts adaptés font appel à des stratégies translatives de la même nature, mais à des fréquences et à des degrés variés (Ladouceur, 1995:37). What Ladouceur does not specify, however, is what precisely must be adapted, i.e., whether the process of translation should adapt the action, space, time, culture-bound terms and expressions or if it should involve all these aspects taken together. Moreover, it is not even clear if all these aspects require the same strategies and procedures and how these strategies and procedures differ to effect "translation proper" (Che Sue 2002: 54). Che Sue also showed how some scholars considered the definition "adaptation" rather pejorative. In their view, adaptation should not be a very free translation involving many modifications because one can adapt but nonetheless remain faithful to the source text and to the author's idea. Central to this notion remains the histor-

ically debated and theoretical issue as to whether a translator should preserve the foreign and exotic characteristics of the text or assimilate them into the text.

Around the same years, Bassnett also reflects on adaptation, which Peter Newmark called the third method of translating play. She had already maintained that the distinction between an "adaptation" and a "version" is a complete red herring and that it was time that "the misleading use of these terms are set aside" (Bassnett-McGuire 1985:93). Faithfulness in drama translation was "an impossible concept and it can only exist if the interpretative processes are not undertaken at all" (1985:93). Bassnett, who uses the term "literal" – virtually synonymous with "literary" – as opposed to "performable", argues that the two cannot be distinguished unless 'performable' is taken to mean the use of the name of a well-known, often monolingual, playwright to sell the translation of a lesser known bilingual translator (Bassnett 1990: 76). From a slightly different perspective, Aaltonen analyses the term 'free' versus 'faithful' translations, a dichotomy that has engaged translation scholars for years. Aaltonen notes that "the labels 'free' and 'faithful' are impressionistic and misleading" (2000: 41). The borderline between free and faithful is difficult to define: a translation can never be entirely faithful to another text, because it always, by its very nature, creates a new text. Moreover, a terminological confusion has also followed from the undefined use of labels such as "literal", "literary", "scholarly" or "academic", as attributes of translation of one kind, and "adaptation" as a description of the another. Aaltonen suggests her own definition: the term "literal" may be used to refer to "faithful" translations, i.e., those for which the entire source text has been translated and are a mere transcription of the foreign text into the target language. The term "literary" can be reserved for translations which follow the conventions of the literary system of the source text, whereas "adaptation" implies to adapt a play "to some secondary purpose" and to a "new context" and "could be used to describe a particular approach to the foreign text, not opposed to translation, but rather a type of translation" (Aaltonen 2000: 45). As already shown in chapter one, to choose adaptation as a translation strategy for Aaltonen means to be linked to the "spatially and temporally confined codes" of the target culture. As she suggests metaphorically, the 'territory of translation' is inhabited by 'many tenants' and each 'user' of a playtext - readers, theatre audiences, scholars, translators, light and sound technicians, costume and set designers - functions as a magnifying glass for its meaning (Aaltonen 2000: 29). However hard it may be to define "the terms of occupancy" (29), "adaptation" nonetheless remains a valid term to describe a translation strategy which does not translate the source text in its entirety but makes additions, omissions and changes to the general dramatic structure of its setting, plot and characters, thus suggesting new readings for it.

"Adaptation" has also been the main area of research of many scholars coming from the field of Adaptation Studies. This field of studies, which has widened the meaning of "adaptation", has had a controversial relation with Translation Studies. These scholars see translation and adaptation as a rewriting of texts in a wider perspective and they extend their analysis to works that involve the translation of novels, film, stage, cartoon and game adaptations. Drawing on works such as Mona Baker's *Translation as Conflict: A Narrative Account* (2006) and Emily Apter's *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature* (2006), Katja Krebs is specifically interested in underlining the political import of both translation and adaptation. She sees them as an integral and intrinsic part of our global and local political and cultural experiences, activities and agendas: "Translation is pivotal to our understanding of ideologies, politics as well as cultures, as it simultaneously constructs and reflects position taken. Similarly, adaptation offers insights into, as well as helps to establish cultural and political hegemonies" (Krebs 2014a: 1). She gives a series of examples of recent translation and adaptation, such as Stieg Larsen's *Millennium Trilogy*, J. K.Rowling's *Harry Potter* series and 'its various media permutations', which have permeated global culture and are all instances of "global translation *and* adaptation phenomena" (Krebs 2014a: 2). Theatre has also seen a resurgence of works based on translations and adaptations from other media: popular films have been turned into stage musicals on a regular basis and respected theatre companies have entire repertoires which consist of translations and adaptations from various different media and genres, including opera, fairytale and film. Krebs also points out that the example where stage and screen converge has its own geographical dimension because: "The list of countries which offered screenings of stage production... [shows that] Southern European countries such as Spain, France and Italy were notable by their absence, while screenings were clustered in Northern and Eastern Europe: Romania, Poland, Estonia, Finland, Sweden and Germany" (Krebs 2014a: 2). This brings forth other crucial issues which still need to be examined in more detail in the European context, such as the hegemony of the English language, the cultural expectations of stage and screen and the European cultural relations, i.e., North/East versus South/West divide or new EU members versus old EU members. What is undeniable, however, is "that both adaptation and translation are not merely innocent bystanders in cultural relations" (Krebs 2014a: 2). Given these assumptions and the examples mentioned above, Krebs believes that it is almost impossible to make an arbitrary distinction between the act of adaptation and the act of translation: "both translation and adaptation – as (creative) process, as process or artefact – are interdisciplinary by their very nature; both discuss phenomena of constructing cultures through acts of rewriting, and both are concerned with the collaborative nature of such acts and the

subsequent notions of authorship (Krebs 2014a: 3) [6]. A case in point for Krebs is Mike Pearson's production of Aeschylus' *The Persians* (2010) for the National Theatre of Wales that was welcomed as "one of the most imaginative, powerful and haunting theatrical events of the year" (Spencer 2010). Katie O'Reilly prepared her 'version' that was set in the Brecon Beacons in Wales, in a mock-up village usually inaccessible to the public but used by the military as a training-base. She insisted that her play was a real translation based on her close reading of the twenty-three translations that have been made over the last three centuries: she had been 'faithful' to the play without making recourse to invention. The contradiction in O'Reilly's operation is however apparent. While she describes *The Persians* with the terminology used within popular western discourse of translation, her process of rewriting complies with the definition of "adaptation" given by one of the most authoritative voices in Adaptation Studies: "a reinterpretation of an established text [...] with relocations of the source's text cultural and/or temporal setting" (Sanders 2006: 19). This contradiction, which has long been at the core of drama translation, as seen before, also helps to highlight how the two fields of research, Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies, have somehow failed to recognise what links them together. An extensive analysis conducted by Márta Minier tries to reconcile Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies, by showing how much they have in common in terms of methodologies, terminologies and objects of critical investigation in order "to paint a composite, multichrome picture of the translation/adaptation spectrum" (Minier 2014:13). She sets out to find parallels in both fields of research and tries to cast light on translation and adaptation while remaining aware of the specificity of each field. As it would be impossible to give a full account of such a dense contribution, I would focus only on some works cited by Minier that can give further insights into 'the dyad translation-adaptation' and that can ideally conclude this subchapter. Among the plethora of contributions in Adaptation Studies which variously acknowledges a debt to translation, there are Patrick Cattrysse's "Film (Adaptation) as Translation: Some Methodological Proposals" (1992), Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier's *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to Present* (2000) and Linda Hutcheon's *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006) that reinscribe the relationship between translation and adaptation within a wider framework. Starting from the assumption that the widespread use of the term "adaptation" to denote diverse practices and aspects of translation in the theatre has grown problematic, "Cattrysse's influential 1992

---

[6]   For a more recent and detailed discussion on the definition of adaptation, see also: K. Krebs (2014b) "Ghosts We Have Seen Before: Trends in Adaptation in Contemporary Performance", *Theatre Journal,*66.4., pp. 581-590.

article [...] encourages a broader, Jakobsonean scope to the term translation [...] to embrace film adaptation" (Minier 2014: 19). Cattrysse draws on Roman Jakobson's well-known definition of intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic translation, in which the last one includes translation between media, from "verbal art into music, dance, cinema or painting" (1992: 145). For him, interlingual and intersemiotic translation corresponds to what is termed "adaptation" in everyday discourse. His model for translational film adaptation has been so highly influential that the long tradition of Translation Studies has become the most appropriate background to build a film adaptation theory (Minier 2014: 20). Fischlin and Fortier dismiss the term appropriation for its hostile connotation and choose instead the term "adaptation" as "a working label" (2000: 3) because it is the most common term in use and emphasizes the process of adjusting, making something suitable for a different context. They try to distinguish adaptation from appropriation: whereas adaptation can be made without the alteration of a text, e.g., the quotation of one of Shakespeare's sonnets on a Valentine's card, appropriation implies textual modifications rather than a simple recontextualization (Minier 2014: 16-17). Moreover, Fischlin and Fortier are among those scholars who explicitly establish a parallel between Adaptation Studies and translation theory: "Adaptation, like translation and parody, is part of a cultural activity that posits reworking in new contexts as more characteristic of cultural development than are originality in creation and fidelity in interpretation" (Fischlin and Fortier 2000: 5)[7]. Linda Hutcheon's overarching theory goes as far as to extend the term "adaptation" to encompass "any medium both as an adapted and as an adaptive text" (Minier 2014: 18). Hutcheon starts from the assumption that adaptations are not new in our time and they belong deeply to Western culture as they appeal to the idea that storytelling is the art of repeating stories. She also suggests that the appeal of adaptations for audiences lies in their mixture of repetition and difference, of familiarity and novelty. She explores the adaptive process and argues that all media have something in common with respect to their role in the process of adaptation, and all genres reveal information about how adaptation functions. Building on this assumption, her method is therefore "to identify a text-based issue that extends across a variety of media, find ways to study it comparatively, and then tease out the theoretical implications from mul-

---

[7]   Other studies which analyse adaptation in relation to translation should be mentioned here: P. Zatlin (2005) *Theatrical Translation and Film Adaptation: a Practitioner's View*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters; J. Sanders (2006) *Adaptation and Appropriation*, London, Routledge; L. Venuti (2007) "Adaptation, translation, critique" *Journal of Visual Culture*, 6.1., pp. 25-43; L. Venuti (2008) *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*, London, Routledge; M. Perteghella (2008) "Adaption: Bastard Child or Critique? Putting Terminology Centre Stage", *Journal of Romance Studies*, 8.3., pp. 51-65.

tiple textual examples" (Hutcheon 2006: xiv). The definitions of 'version', 're-write' and 'adaptation' have travelled a long way in the last three decades.

Chapter 3. Models of drama translation

In this chapter I will consider in detail some models of drama translation which were developed between the early 1980 to the first decade of the twentieth-first century. I am aware that my purpose may seem narrow-focussed because, as shown in the previous chapter, it should be remembered that there are no models of drama translation which encompass the complexity of such a translational process. Lawrence Venuti, for example, is suspicious that any model proposed by linguistics-oriented approach would reduce the language to a set of systematic rules independent of cultural and social variation and, therefore, the translation would be studied as a set of systematic operations independent of cultural and social variation (Venuti 1998: 25). Other scholars have shared this scepticism, especially at the turn of the new millennium with the publication of the only two monographs entirely devoted to drama translation, i.e., Aaltonen's *Time-Sharing on Stage: Drama Translation in Theatre and Society* (2000) and Eva Espasa Borràs's *La traducció dalt de l'escenari* (2001). Aaltonen and Espasa Borràs have thoroughly analysed drama translation and their observations certainly cannot be constrained in a model. They both start from the acknowledgment of the dual perspective of the translated dramatic text as a written text and a theatrical performance, and from Octavio Paz's assumption that "no text can be completely original because language itself in its very essence is always a translation [...]".

However, the inverse is also entirely valid. All texts are original because each translation has its distinctive character. Up to a point, each translation is a creation and thus constitutes a unique text" (Paz 1992: 154). Drawing on Toury's and Even-Zohar's polysystem theory and Lefevere's framework of analysis developed in *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (1992), Aaltonen, by her own admission, is more interested in "translations rather than their source texts" (Aaltonen 2000: 6) and she shows in detail how the various strategies of translating for the stage are influenced and controlled by the dependencies between the literary system, the theatrical system and the receiving system. Espasa instead starts from the analysis of the process of theatrical communication in 'its semiotic density and heterogeneity and spatial and temporal discontinuity of its levels' (Espasa Borràs 2001: 73). She shows how many agents are involved in the reading of the written text and how they multiply once the written text becomes a performance. She also sees drama translation as part of theatrical communication and describes in detail the relationship between the theatre text, its translation and the deriving performance. In particular, she takes into account the extralinguistic factors which intervene when the performance takes place in a specific context. Thus, she inscribes translation and its performance in a wider process of theatrical communication that works in concentric circles: the source and target languages; the source and the target literary and theatrical contexts; the source and target culture understood as a general perception of life influenced by historical, social and ideological factors (Espasa Borràs 2001: 87).

Against this general backdrop, the models that I have chosen to illustrate here are therefore not meant to give an exhaustive account of how playtexts must be translated but they are representative of different approaches to drama translation and exemplify how drama translation has changed over the last thirty years.

In the 1980s, Reba Gostand was among the first to describe classifications and strategies in processes of drama translation, which include (Gostand 1980: 1-9):

Translation from one language to another (difficulties of idioms, slang, tone and style);

Translation from one culture to another (costumes, assumptions, attitudes);

Translation from one period/age to another (costumes, assumptions, attitude);

Translation from one dramatic style to another (e.g., realistic or naturalistic mode to expressionistic or surrealistic mode);

Translation from one genre to another (e.g., tragedy to comedy, satire, farce or romance);

Translation from one medium to another (e.g., stage play to radio, film and television);

Translation from playscript to musical rock-opera or ballet;
Translation from printed page to stage;
Translation from emotion or concept to happening;
Translation from verbal to non-verbal presentation;
Translation for one type of participants or audience to another (e.g., drama for school);
Translation from one director's interpretation to another.

At the end of the 1980s, these classifications and strategies, although interesting as a model to follow, did not seem to represent the practice of drama translation. Attention was instead given to a typology which focussed more on the process of translation, i.e., the process of translating the text into the target language; and the process of transposing the translated text on to the stage. This is exemplified by Ortrun Zuber-Skerritt's two-stage model (Zuber-Skerritt 1988: 488), in which stage one is covered by the first six steps and the second stage by the subsequent steps in the following scheme (Zuber-Skerritt 1988: 489):

Step 1: *preliminary analysis and content analysis* to evaluate if the play is worthy of translation;
Step 2: *exhaustive style and content analysis*;
Step 3: *acclimation of the text* by externalising the translation from the internal understanding of the source text;
Step 4: *reformulation of the text* and verbalisation in the target language;
Step 5: *analysis of the translation*, which is revised by the translator him/herself, who measures his/her translation against the larger context of culture, audience needs or intended text function;
Step 6: *review and comparison by another person* familiar with the original and able to judge whether comparable effects and functions are achieved and whether they are desirable;
Step 7: *analysis of suitability for the stage* to establish whether the text under consideration was written as a reading drama or for stage performances;
Step 8: *decision on what basis to use for the translation from page to stage.* There are a least four ways for this transposition to be realised:
1. to follow a published acting edition;
2. to produce one's own acting edition;
3. to decide not to use a stage script at all, but to let the production evolve from trials and discussions in rehearsals, experiments, creative ideas and spontaneous interactions with the audience; or:
4. to combine 3 with 1 or 2.

A more elaborated model which has become a reference point for drama translation scholars is that of Patrice Pavis, mentioned briefly in the first chapter. Drawing on Uspensky and Lotman, who define culture as "the non-hereditary memory of community" (Upsensky and Lotman 1978: 213), Patrice Pavis sees translation of texts in semiotic terms as the mechanism of cultural appropriation of reality. Translation is thus seen as the passage from one semiotic system into another, provided that an interpretative relationship is set up between the two systems. The difficulty in establishing this interpretative relation lies in evaluating the distance between source and target culture and in choosing the attitude to adopt towards the source culture. Pavis singles out three different attitudes which can be adopted towards the source text. The first chooses, as far as possible, to maintain allusions to the source culture in the translation, accentuating the differences between source text and target culture. The second attempts to adapt the source text entirely to the target culture, almost to the extent that the target culture no longer understands the origin of the source text. The third favours a compromise, resulting in a translation which mediates between proximity and distance. Once Pavis turns to "translation for the stage completed with a *mise en scène* in view" (Pavis 1989: 25) which goes beyond the rather limited phenomenon of the interlingual translation of dramatic texts, he is well aware that the specificity of this particular type of translation requires a more detailed analysis of what he calls "situations of enunciation".

He begins with the premise that time and space are among two fundamental factors which cannot be neglected when dealing with problems peculiar to translation for the stage: "We cannot simply translate a text linguistically: rather we confront and communicate heterogeneous cultures and situations of enunciation that are separated *in space and time*" (Pavis 1989: 26)[1]. According to him, the translator and the text of his/her translation are situated at the intersection of two sets to which they belong in differing degrees. The translated text forms part of both source and target text culture. In the theatre, the relationship between 'situations of enunciation' must be added to the text, which is the element common to all linguistic translation. The text, in fact, makes sense only in its situation of enunciation, which is usually virtual, since the translator takes a written text as a point of departure. The translator knows that the translation cannot preserve the original situation of enunciation, but it is intended rather for a future situation of enunciation with which the translator is barely, if at all, familiar. The

---

[1]   The notions of space and time have later been dealt with in S. Aaltonen (2005) "Ecce Homo Reactualized", *Cadernos de Literatura Comparada* 12.13, pp. 65-97; M. Randaccio (2015) "Teatralność oraz kategorie czasu i miejsca jako istotne zagadnienia w przekładzie dramatu", Translated from the English "Performability and the Notions of Time and Place as Relevant Issues in Drama Translation", in *PRZEKŁADANIEC*, 31, pp.9-30.

source text's situation of enunciation can be represented as a part of the source culture: once the text in its translated form is staged for the target audience and culture, it is itself surrounded by a situation of enunciation belonging to the target culture. It is important to realise that "the real situation of enunciation – that of the translated text in its situation of reception – is a transaction between the source and target situations of enunciation that may glance at the source but has its eyes chiefly on the target" (Pavis 1989: 26). Theatre translation is therefore "a hermeneutic act": in order to find out what the text source means, questions must be asked from the target language's point of view. This hermeneutic act – interpreting the source text – consists of delineating lines translated into another language, to pull the foreign text towards the target culture and language, so as to separate it from its source and origin. To accomplish this process, the texts undergo a series of transformations, or, as Pavis terms them, "concretizations". Pavis thus reconstructs the various stages that the dramatic text goes through in its journey from the original to that received by the audience.

The original text [T0] is the result of the author's choices and formulations and is readable only in the context of its situation of enunciation, i.e., in relation to the surrounding culture.

The text of the written translation [T1] depends on the initial situation of enunciation T0, as well as on the future audience who will receive the text in later stages. The text [T1] of the translation constitutes an initial concretization: the translator is in the position of a reader and *dramaturge*, who makes choices from among the potential and possible indications in the text to be translated. The translator must first of all effect a "macrotextual translation" (Pavis 1989: 27), a dramaturgical analysis of the fiction conveyed by the text. It is at this stage that some textual and linguistic microstructures must be reconstituted, such as the plot, the system of characters, the time and space of the action, the individual traits of each character and the suprasegmental traits of the author, the system of echoes, repetitions, responses, and correspondences that maintain the cohesion of the source text. It is clear, therefore, that theatre translation is not simply a linguistic question because it has to do with stylistics, culture, and fiction.

The text [T2] is another step in the translation process. It is the dramaturgical analysis and must incorporate a coherent reading of the plot as well as the spatio-temporal indications contained in the text and in the stage directions, whether by way of linguistic translation or by representing them through the *mise en scène*'s extralinguistic elements. The dramaturgical analysis and the concretization which follows are all the more necessary when the source text is archaic or classical. In such cases, the translation will be more readable for a target audience than the source text (in the original language) would be for the same audience.

The following step is testing the text on stage [T3]: concretization by *stage enunciation*. The *mise en scène* – the confrontation of situations of enunciation – whether virtual [T0] or actual [T1], proposes a performance text, by suggesting the examination of all possible relationships between textual and theatrical signs.

The last stage, which Pavis defines "the *recipient concretization* or the *recipient enunciation*" (1989: 29), is the point at which the source text finally arrives at its endpoint: the spectator [T4]. The spectator thus appropriates the text only at the end of a series of concretizations, of intermediate translations that reduce or enlarge the source text at every step; the source text has thus always to be rediscovered and reconstituted anew. Pavis concludes that "it would not be an exaggeration to say that the translation is simultaneously a dramaturgical analysis, a *mise en scène*, and a message to the audience, each unaware of the others" (Pavis 1989: 29).

In his model, Pavis further suggests that the translator's difficulty is to analyse "the cultural reinterpretation and the cross-coding among subgroups within a culture that is no longer homogeneous, since an infinity of languages, borrowings, and reinterpretations rework continually" (1989: 39). For him, the translator's task goes beyond the rendering and transplanting of this bricolage of ethnographic, ideological, and discursive elements because he must have the courage to choose a translation strategy, "a vision of this cultural discursive mix, which is perhaps schematic but at least systematic" (Pavis 1989: 39).

Louise Ladouceur proposes another interesting model for a project entitled *Les paramètres de l'adaptation théâtrale au Quebéc de 1980 à 1990*. As various other scholars, Ladouceur, also sees literature as a complex dynamic system, drawing on Even-Zohar's polysystem theory and Toury's *In Search of a Theory of Translation (1980)* and *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (1995). These scholars advocate a descriptive, systemic and semiotic approach to translation based on a functional notion of equivalence and oriented towards the target text. They are also interested in the norms and constraints which rule the production and reception of a text and the relationships between the translations and other types of texts. Moreover, they are concerned with the role translation plays in a given literature and the interaction among literatures (Ladouceur 1991: 34). Ladouceur's model is based on a principle of correspondence between mechanisms working at different levels of the textual structure and it allows an overall study of translation strategies, which proceed from a general presentation of the text, wherein an overall strategy is discernible, to its macrostructure, and, finally, to its microstructural strategies. The advantage of such a model is that it allows the classification of observable phenomena according to specific parameters and facilitates their description. Her model readapts and expands José Lambert and Hendrik Van Gorp's well-known four-step model that was proposed for the de-

scription of literary translation (1985: 52-53). Ladouceur's model comprises the following four steps; 1) compilation of preliminary data; 2) analysis of macro-structure; 3) analysis of microstructure; 4) comparison of translation with the systemic context. This last step serves to compare the norms observed in the text under study with those of other translations belonging to the same literary system. These textual norms can then be compared with the extratextual norms specific to the systemic context to which the translated texts now belong.

Ladouceur's descriptive model of drama translation can be outlined in detail as follows (Ladouceur 1991: 35-66):[2]

1) Preliminary data
   a) Presentation of the text
   - *Title of the translation*
   - *Translator*
   - *Original title of the play*
   - *Author*
   - *Indication of genres*
   - *Date, place, production*
   b) Metatext
   - *Preliminary pages*
   - *Preface (2013: postface, glossary)*
   - *Notes, included or separate*
   - *Footnotes*
   c) Identification of translation strategy
   - *complete*
   - *partial*
   - *amplified (2013: adaptation, imitation)*
2) Macrostructural analysis
   a) Surrounding text
   - *prologue*
   - *epilogue*
   b) text division
   - *Acts and scenes*
   - *Titles and divisions*

---

[2] This model has been proposed again in 2013 in the author's more systematic study on drama translation, with particular reference to drama translation in Canada. The changes in the new model have been signalled in parentheses down below. See: L. Ladouceur (2013) *Dramatic Licence: Translating Theatre From One Official Language to the Other in Can*ada, Alberta, Alberta University Press, pp. 32-45.

c) *Stage information*
  - *characters*
  - *setting*
  - *period*
  - *set and accessories*
  - *costumes*
  - *description of the action*
  - *stage directions*

3) Microstructural analysis

a) *Language register*
  - *literary, formal, informal, colloquial, vernacular, slang*
  - *dialects*

b) *Grammatical models*
  - *elisions, repetitions,*
  - *unusual stylistic inversions, omissions (2013: strategies)*

c) *Vocabulary*
  - *spelling discrepancies*
  - *lexico-sematic discrepancies*

d) *Special stylistic features*
  - *types of narration*
  - *figures of speech*

e) *Semantic discrepancies*
  - *addition*
  - *suppression*
  - *substitution*
  - *other modifications*

4) Analysis of the translation in relation the systemic context

a) *Comparison*
  - *translated texts*
  - *extratextual data*

b) *Intertextual relations*
  - *other translations of the same writer*
  - *original work of the same writer*

c) *Inter-systemic relations*
  - *structures of different genres*
  - *stylistic features*

Raquel Merino-Álvarez also proposes a framework for the description of translated playtexts based on Lambert and Van Gorp's model but she makes clear that her focus of research is the interlingual process of translation (from Eng-

lish into Spanish). She is therefore concerned exclusively with "the translation from page (SL) to page (TL)" (Merino-Álvarez 1994: 127). Merino-Álvarez divides her framework of analysis into stages, like Ladouceur, but her model only contemplates a three-stage scheme of analysis, i.e.,1) preliminary data; 2) analysis of the textual level, both at macro- and micro-level; intersystemic level of analysis.

Preliminary data give information on the publication of the play, that comprise: 1) the publication data (publishing company, type of collection the play may belong to, copyright - by the SL or/and TL author, SL and/or TL publishing company, etc... – and date of publication); 2) data about the playtext (whether SL or/and TL title is mentioned or whether the TL product is a translation, version, adaptation, etc...); 3) metatexts (introduction or preface by the SL or/and TL author, director of SL or/and TL performance and editor); 4) information on the performance both in SL and TL ('blurbs' and quotation from newspaper and periodical where the SL and the TL play and performance has been reviewed).

Merino-Álvarez claims that this information about the play will lead us to make some provisional hypotheses about the translation, such as whether the TT is presented as a reading, acting edition (prospective or retrospective translation) or what is the position of the play along the scale whose extremes are the adequacy pole and the acceptability pole. However, she specifies that "these initial hypotheses may be further corroborated as we advance into the study of the textual levels (both macro and micro levels) and finally in the intersystemic stage of the study" (1994: 129).

The analysis of the text at macrolevel is especially concerned with the structure of the dramatic text. The dual nature of drama therefore must be considered as the written playtext consists of "dialogue and frames" (1994: 129), i.e., the text to be spoken by actors on stage, and the stage directions and indications written by the author for the director, actors and readers. The dramatic text, composed of dialogue and frame, is then divided into further smaller units. Besides acts and scenes recognisable by printing conventions, there is a smaller unit termed *utterance* that is necessary to account for in the actual description of a specific text. The *utterance* is defined as "the words to be delivered by a certain actor, including the name of the character, the words to be said on the stage and the stage directions related to these words" (1994: 129). When these statements are delivered on stage they become what Patrice Pavis has termed 'stage utterances" (1994: 129). Furthermore, if the translation of a play is divided into acts, scenes and utterances at formal level, episodes and some other thematic divisions of the dramatic plot must be considered at the level of content. At this stage Merino-Álvarez wishes that "the first hypotheses formulated after the study of preliminary data will most probably be either modified or at any rate developed.

It should become much more patent now whether the translation is of the acceptable or adequate type" (1994: 129).

On the microstructural level of the text, the playtext must be considered as language. It is at this stage that the description of "an appropriate unit of comparison and description is even more crucial" (1994: 129). This unit will be the *utterance* that, as shown before, involves, on the one hand, the spoken words of the actors and, on the other, the names of the characters and the stage directions. The dramatic text is thus presented in two different layers: "the frame (stage directions, name of the character, etc.) and dialogue (the speech to be uttered on the stage)".[3] This dual nature of drama is relevant when attempting the more precise study of the translation process that the text has undergone. In fact, what shall be looked for at this level of analysis are optional shifts of various nature – morphological, syntactic, semantic – that can affect different layers, such as frame and/or dialogue, and different levels, such as the word, phrase, sentence, *utterance*, etc... . These shifts may be of four different types: "addition, deletion, modification and non-equivalence" (1994: 129). The microstructural analysis of this level is then juxtaposed to the previous hypotheses which will be, in turn, enriched by the microscopic description of the text. This juxtaposition will help to reach more satisfying conclusions on the type of translation concerned.

At the intersystemic level the translated text draws on the hypotheses formulated in the previous two stages and on other information on: other translations of the play (acting, reading editions, etc...) and the relationship between them and the translated text; the question of which is the exact the source text used because "sometimes the ST has to be traced back as different acting, reading or revised editions might exist" (1994: 130): this question may often complicate the study and affect the conclusions; information on the performance(s) of the playtext both in the source culture and in the target culture (number of performances, types and names of the company, places where it was shown, etc.); the readership and/or audience and critics' reaction to these performances and/or editions of the play such as in reviews in the press, etc... This last type of information is "particularly important in theatre due to the dual nature of drama and the social dimension of the play which may be read or/and watched on a stage" (1994: 130).

In 2004 Manuela Perteghella proposes a new and very detailed cultural model, which greatly enlarges the horizon of drama translation. Like Ladouceur and

---

[3]   Recently, particular attention has been paid to the 'prefabricated orality' inherent in the dramatic texts and how it is realised linguistically in translation. See O. Andaluz-Pinedo (2022) "Prefabricated orality in theatre translations: An overview based on an English–Spanish parallel corpus", *Across Languages and Cultures*, *23*(1), pp. 75-91 <https://akjournals.com/view/journals/084/23/1/article-p75.xml>. Last accessed 23 September 2022.

Merino-Álvarez, she also starts from a descriptive translation studies framework but draws on important notions from contemporary anthropology. Perteghella brings together James Holmes's notion put forward in *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies* (1988), according to which there can be some general principles by means of which translating and translation can be explained and predicted, with the anthropological concepts of 'writing cultures' and 'cultural translation'. In particular, she notes that the applicability of ethnographic models in translation has been examined by translation scholars such as Michaela Wolf, who in "Aspects of Cultural Anthropology in Translation" (1997) argues that the cultural Other can be verbalized only indirectly, and it is filtered and arranged through the ethnographer's or the translator's mediation. The application of paradigms from cultural anthropology is not only an act of interdisciplinary borrowings but a way to find a theoretical framework, still lacking in Translation Studies, for the phenomenon of drama translation. For her, in fact, "theatre translation is in itself an interdisciplinary 'object' of research [which] is interested in the relation of the cultural product (the translated playtexts), to its makers (translators, adaptors) and users (directors, actors, audiences, readers, and so forth... [and] is already dwelling on an anthropological concern" (Perteghella 2004: 2). She starts from the assumption that in the West the exchange of plays through translation has always taken place among societies and was always meant to be a socio-cultural phenomenon, not only a literary activity. Textual translation and theatrical production are therefore the concrete, cultural products for social consumption. She calls the continuous amalgamation of dramatic texts, genres and performance style "theatrical osmosis" (Perteghella 2004: 3). Borrowing notions from anthropology, she explains that theatre translation works according to primary diffusion, secondary diffusion and modification. 'Primary diffusion', also called 'cultural dispersion', explains the spread of certain practices, alien to a culture, which through translation have become part of a theatrical canon. Cultural dispersion occurs through the migration of the culture-bearers, through the exchange of cultural products, warfare, colonialism, or through travelling troupes of performers. Contrary to cultural dispersion, 'secondary diffusion', is achieved through 'borrowings', and 'stimulus diffusion'. These two types of diffusion are mediated by the translator's consciousness who decides what is deemed important to import from the source culture society and it is independent from migration: "Stimulus diffusion in particular has worked toward the building of national canons" (Perteghella 2004: 5) but it also allowed agencies operating within theatrical establishment to encounter foreign plays and foreign performances. Modification occurs instead when the plays undergo a certain type of rewriting such as imitation or version. Theatrical osmosis can therefore lead to the acculturation of the text, and/or its assimilation or a total

integration of the text/practice in the target culture. Perteghella points out that these phases are not contiguous and inevitable. On the one hand, it is true that very often in the translation of theatre texts plays originating from minority languages and moving into a dominant culture are more likely to be acculturated; on the other hand, a powerful culture sometimes needs the less dominant to regenerate itself. Acculturation can thus become fusion and plurality and can restore a balance in the power relations of languages and cultures. Theatrical osmosis thus gives rise to 'intercultural theatre' that in turn can lead to transculturalism or intraculturalism. Therefore, translated plays tend either to be universalised or posit themselves within local, regional or national traditions. The first phenomenon is the symptom of a process of globalisation and shows how a dramatic internationalism exists within Europe, whereas the second demonstrates how the transnational canon can be appropriated to influence smaller and smaller ethnocultural clusters, thus establishing intranational theatres. Perteghella then tries to establish a 'sociology of translation' and lists the various functions that the translated playtext will serve in the target social system and that may differ from those fulfilled in the source system (Perteghella 2004: 7). In the history of Western theatre translation, four social functions can thus be identified: 1) dissemination; 2) propaganda/protest; 3) introduction of alien or new dramaturgy; 4) introduction of alien theatrical practices. Among those, functions 1 and 3 belong to the reader-oriented tradition of translating drama, concerned with philological exactness and literary value, whereas function 2 and 4 belong to the stage-oriented tradition, which is "historically the dominant one, concerned above all with audience reception during a short time span in a specific place" (Perteghella 2004: 6). However, these functions cannot always be univocally ascribed to one tradition or the other. In fact, Perteghella concedes that sometimes the third function, introduction of alien or new dramaturgy, can be found between the two traditions and gives the example of Brecht's Epic Theatre, which not only introduced valuable new plays but also innovative staging practices. In addition to these functions, Perteghella singles out some 'historical variants', "which have either disrupted or altered the diffusion of theatre texts and practices or have induced different assignments of meaning to the phenomenon itself" (Perteghella 2004: 6). The historical variants that have played a crucial role in the development of theatre translation are: 1) translation as original creation; 2) copyrights; 3) scholarship and 4) the socio-economic power of languages.

The issue of translation as original or derivative has been subject to changes over the centuries. For example, Terence, Plutus and Seneca adapted old models to new materials and during the Renaissance drama translators were playwrights because translation was considered as original composition. The desire to borrow and imitate can result in cultural appropriation and favours transla-

tion and other types of rewriting. The concept of indebtedness has also changed over the century: the stigmatization of the practice of borrowing as uncreative and derivative, typical of Romanticism, gave way to the birth of copyright. Copyright has placed an economic constraint on the exchange of text and copyright laws have been a decisive factor for deciding what kind of translation are to be produced on national stages. With regard to scholarship, plays had been translated into Latin for humanist schools since the fourteen century. However, the appearance in the mid-eighteenth century of books, articles, anthologies and critical studies and monographs on playwrights and their plays prompted further translation and re-translations which re-shaped the reception of these translations. Finally, the socio-economic power of languages in anthropological terms shows the interplay between dominant and less dominant languages and shows how, in a translational perspective, 'weaker' languages and cultures are more submitted to transformation in the translation process. Many theatre texts have been translated into Latin, French and English: translations from these languages have played an important role in the theatrical osmosis of theatre texts, as Latin, French and English became, in turn, the official languages of the West, socially and commercially prestigious and accessible to transnational audiences (Perteghella 2004: 10). These translations, however, were not only filtered through the translator's consciousness, but also through the ideological web embedded in the dominant language, thus revealing the geopolitical link between translation and geopolitics. The diffusion of cultural traits is therefore often altered by the manipulative economic reasons of richer nations.

Drawing on these functions and historical variants, Perteghella elaborates her model of drama translation based on linguistic and performatives practices. She identifies several linguistic and performative practices originating from theatrical osmosis, placed within a historical context, each fulfilling one or more social functions in the target system (Perteghella 2004: 11). As she clarifies: "These practices should be understood as the 'ideology' guiding the drama translator(s), the discursive positions which the translation agency adopts, influenced by the historical period and its social and cultural milieu" (Perteghella 2004: 11). Among the linguistic level practices, chiefly concerned with the written text and belonging both to the reader- and stage-oriented tradition, there are: 'collaborative translation'[4], in which two agencies, playwright and translator collaborate on the script

---

[4]   Many publications have been written on the topic of collaborative translation since S. Bassnett-McGuire's seminal work, "Ways through the Labyrinth: Strategies and methods for translating theatre texts" (1985). To quote only a few: M. Laera (2011) "Theatre Translation as Collaboration: Aleks Sierz, Martin Crimp, Nathalie Abrahami, Colin Teevan, Zoë Svendsen and Michael Walton discuss Translation for the Stage", *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 21.2., pp. 213-225; J. Meth K. Mendelsohn and Z. Svendsen (2011) "Roundtable on Collaborative Theatre Translation Projects: Experiences and

for a given production; 'patchwork translation', devised by directors who use two different translations in different proportions; 'translation in which a 'famous (monolingual) playwright rewrites from a literal translation'. This translation can either be a ''word-for-word' translation', often accompanied by explanatory and context notes and belonging to the reader-oriented tradition, or 'scholarly translation' where the translation tries to reproduce the philological exactness rather the original theatrical and dramaturgical conventions. This practice leads to 'adaptation' or 'imitation/version'. Perteghella focusses in particular on adaptation at the textual level. Linguistic adaptation is historically the dominant practice: it replaces cultural and topical references to favour audience accessibility and, by adopting the codes of the receiving dominant culture, becomes a domestic adaptation, both in performance and at the textual level. In adaptation major changes are made and texts are re-written from another perspective to transform the text into something else from the aesthetic and political point of view. 'Imitation/version' is the result of secondary diffusion and it is an extreme form of adaptation. Imitation is still a type of translation, but "it has, on the cultural axis, signified the last step, from translation to assimilation of source language dramaturgy, plot, stock characters and so forth, thus occupying the elusive space between translation and composition" (Perteghella 2004: 15-16).

After the linguistic practices, Perteghella then describes the performative practices. The performance level practices are directly influenced by the production mode, the *mise en scène*, as conceived by directors, actors and designers. In this respect, audience reception is indissolubly linked to the act of translation. From this performative perspective, "translation is moulded and staged not only by the social functions, but also by the receiving 'theatrical cultures'" (Perteghella 2004: 16). Among these theatrical cultures shaping translation into a selected mode of production, there is the new social space, the functional building hosting the text to be performed, which may differ from the social space for which the foreign text was originally performed. Translation is also influenced by the economy of stage dialogue: the running time of the performance and the time of audience may differ from culture to culture and this would prompt the translator to make cuts or additions to the text. Furthermore, translation is conditioned by social and cultural conventions such as acting styles and environmental factors of production, which are linked to the setting and may include constraints on the actors (Perteghella 2004: 16-17). Among the performative practices, Perteghella discusses the most commonly used nowadays. The 'collaborative production' involves two types of

Perspectives", in R. Bains, C. Marinetti and M. Perteghella (eds) *Staging and Performing Translation. Text and Theatre Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 200-211; A. Peghinelli (2012) "Theatre Translation as Collaboration: a Case in Point in British Contemporary Drama", *Journal for Communication and Culture* 2.1., pp. 20-30.

collaborative agencies in the shaping the text, the director/translator or the actor/translator: in this case, the new linguistic text is built around the performance. Other interesting performative practices are 'polyglot performance' and 'transperformance': "'Polyglot performance' and 'transperformance' consist of performing foreign works in translation to a different, foreign audience" (Perteghella 2004: 17). In the case of polyglot performance, there is a star actor who works with a foreign cast, whereas 'transperformance' refers to a significant contemporary practice of Western theatre promoted by world-wide projects. Perteghella gives the example of the German translation and production of Mark Ravenhill's *Shopping and F***ing*, directed by Thomas Ostermaier and staged at the 1999 Venice Biennale and clarifies: "One might speculate that the audience is already familiar with the original text, and probably this kind of performances is very much part of our expectations, in the same way we would accept the foreign language of an opera" (Perteghella 2004: 18). Finally, 'tradaptation', as already discussed in the first chapter, is "a wholesale re-working and re-thinking of the original text, as well as its translation and/or translocation into a new, non-European, aesthetic context" (Cameron 2000: 17).

Perteghella further shows the dynamic interactions that take place between linguistic and performance practices: the target playtext, as a 'linguistic adaptation', might undergo 'performance adaptation' that, in turn, impacts on the visual level (for example, visual modernization), on the ideological level and on the aesthetic level. A 'linguistic adaptation' written into a dominant language may produce a domestic adaptation, which will show changes in "topicality, language modernization, update of plot, possible dialect localization or re-registration, substitution of cultural references" (Perteghella 2004: 19)[5]. The same translated text in a 'performance adaptation' will instead operate on both the visual and ideological level and will bring on stage "a political/ideological recontextualization, change of setting, visual modernization, possible use of actor's localized accent, use of target acting styles" (Perteghella 2002: 50-51; 2004: 19).

---

[5]   These are in detail the five strategies that Perteghella singles out to translate dialect and slang: 1) Dialect Compilation (to translate a dialect or a slang into a mixture of target dialects or idioms); 2) Pseudo-dialect Translation (to make up a fictitious, indistinct dialect, usually using non-standard language and idiomatic features of various target language dialects); 3) Parallel Dialect Translation (to translate a dialect or slang into that of another specific target language, usually one that has similar connotations and occupies an analogous position in the target linguistic system); 4) Standardization (to substitute dialect, slang, and jargon with standard language. The language is sometimes dotted with occasional colloquialism; 5) Dialect Localization (to localize a dialect or slang into another specific target-language frame). She concludes that this last strategy is a domesticating, acculturating strategy, which borders on adaptation and version. M. Perteghella (2002) "Language and Politics on Stage: Strategies for Translating Dialect and Slang with References to Shaw's *Pygmalion* and Bond's *Saved*", *Translation Review*, 64, pp. 50-51.

The model proposed by Perteghella offers a systematization of drama translation and widens the perspective from which it can be analysed. More importantly, it shows how new contributions from other disciplines can give Translation Studies further means of investigation for a such complex object of study. As outlined in the previous chapters, Theatre Studies offered a great contribution to Translation Studies, especially with the renewed interest for the semiotics of drama and theatre in the 1970s and 1980s. Theatre Studies brought to the fore the dual nature of the dramatic text and tried to resolve 'the translator's paradox', the drama translation scholar's central question as to whether the translator should be responsible for the linguistic translation or for the intersemiotic transfer. As outlined in the first chapter, drama translation as intercultural process and the models of drama translation seen above testify to how further questions have been raised and possible answers have been given over the last four decades.

In 2013 Espasa drew up a useful list of questions that need to be answered when researching drama translation. Her list – that she suggests it is not comprehensive but merely indicative –loosely follow Dirk Delabastita's "Translation and Mass-Communication: Film and TV. Translation as Evidence of Cultural Dynamics" (1989) and Jenny Williams's and Andrew Chesterman's *The Map: a Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies* (2002). Her questions range from the uneasy relationship between source texts and target texts (1), to the relationship between texts and the cultural and performative contexts (2), to ideological issues and audience's reception (3), to the choice of language variants, to cuts or additions in the translated text to genres (4). Here are some of the questions she raises according to the four areas she has singled out above (Espasa 2013: 329)[6]:

1) To what system(s) (literary, theatre, audiovisual) are the source and target texts affiliated? To what extent is this reflected in the strategies used? What are the source and target texts used? Are intermediate translations, from a third language, used?
   How are the target text labelled? 'Translations', 'versions', 'adaptations'? What does the label used mean in the specific context discussed? Is the label significant or justified in texts?
   What are the connections between verbal and non-verbal aspects in the plays being analysed? Do they complement/contradict one another?

What is the relative agency of translators, directors, actors... in transla-
tion?

What is the relative cultural status of the genre/play/author/translator
in the source text?

2) Is cultural adaptation significant? In what way is it affected by ideological
positions and how is this reflected in translated plays and repertoires?

Is there significant diachrony between source and target texts? Between
target text and its production? How does this affect the texts and perfor-
mance context?

3) In what way do translators accommodate their discourse to different au-
diences?

Have foreign cultural elements been retained, naturalized or deleted?

How have taboo or polemical elements been dealt with?

How are the needs of specific audiences met?

4) What target language has been selected? This is a significant issue in mul-
tilingual or bilingual societies.

What geographical or social language variants are chosen or ruled out?

Are there significant additions or reductions in translated text? Why?

Does the genre to which the source play originally belongs exist in the
receiving culture?

Do the source play's models find a counterpart in the target culture?

Espasa also points out that is important to decide whether the analysis of trans-
lation will be quantitative or qualitative. Examples of quantitative research in-
clude, for example, the statistical analysis of deletions in translated playtexts
through censorship, whereas examples of qualitative research comprise ap-
proaches as diverse as biographies of stage translators or the reception of trans-
lated drama in certain ages and cultures (Espasa 2013: 345).

Chapter 4. Constrasting macrostructure in drama translation

This chapter will deal in detail with the process of translation of three plays, Conor McPherson's, *This Lime Tree Bower* (1995), *The Weir* (1997) and *St. Nicholas* (1997) from the Irish cultural settings to the Italian cultural landscape. I have adopted a top-down approach inspired by the models seen in the previous chapter (Ladouceur 1991; Merino-Alvarez 1994) but I have simplified the framework for the description of these translated plays. My analysis will thus follow a two-step scheme and describe the original plays and their respective translations more generally at the macrostructural and the microstructural level. For the macrostructural level, I will refer to the context of production of the original texts and the context of reception of the translated texts.

I will therefore analyse the three original plays in relation to Irish theatre in the 1990s and then turn my attention to the 'encounter' between the translated plays in Italian and contemporary Italian culture and theatre from the late 1990s/early 2000s to the present day, in accordance with the principle that it is in the context of reception that a translated play becomes most productive (Fischer-Lichte 1990; Brisset 1996; Aaltonen 2000). Particular emphasis will be given to the intertextual relationships between the original texts with their own culture, and the new intertextual relation the translated text has in the receiving culture, in line with Farahzad's view of intertextuality in translation (2009).

Date and place of publication of both the original and its translation into Italian, together with information on the productions and reviews of the plays both in the source and target culture, will also help to compare the original and their translation in their respective contexts.

4A) *This Lime Tree Bower* (1995), *The Weir* (1997) and *St. Nicholas* (1997) in Irish culture and theatre of the 1990s

This Lime Tree Bower, was first performed at the Crypt Arts Centre in Dublin on 26 September 1995 and subsequently at the Bush Theatre in London (from 3 July 1996). A year later, *The Weir* premiered at the Bush Theatre in London on 19 February1997, followed soon after *St. Nicholas* (4 July 1997, Royal Theatre Upstairs).

   This Lime Tree Bower presents three intersecting monologues, which portray an unsettling week in the main characters' lives in the coastal suburbs of Dublin, in which humour mingles with violence. The three men all know each other and their stories intertwine. Joe is the youngest, he is still at school and recounts his fascination with a dangerous classmate, Damien, who offers Joe a tantalizing escape from his unsatisfying life at school and home. His fascination, however, will vacillate when Joe sees Damien raping a girl and he does not intervene. His lack of courage causes the young boy's moral dilemma. Frank is Joe's eldest brother, works in his father's chip shop and robs a bookmaker owned by a local councillor to whom his father is in debt. Their sister Carmel's boyfriend, Ray, is a misanthropic University Philosophy lecture, who while dating Carmel, at the same time contemptibly beds his students and embarrasses his colleagues in the attempt to have a promotion. There is a significant moment towards the end of the play when Ray, only half in shame, recounts that, to his colleagues' general embarrassment and amazement, he vomited right in front of the famous Professor Konigsberg, a philosopher, whose work revolves around the idea that 'language is dying now'. Despite their astonishing setbacks, their lives go on as nothing had happened, even if Joe's last comment apparently leaves space for appreciation of daily existence, which is epitomised in the sentence 'I can still see the girl', the girl he is in love with.

   The Weir is instead set in a pub of a rural part of Western Ireland. The characters are the barman Brendan, in his thirties, the three locals, Jack, Finbar and Jim, respectively in their fifties, late forties and thirties, and a newcomer to the village, Valerie, who share a conversation typical of pub chit-chat for most of the play. The conversation is low key, at times formulaic, until each character starts to tell his/her story, through McPherson's favourite mode of expression,

the monologue. The businessman Finbar prompts the recounting of their super-natural stories. Jack, an ageing mechanic, begins with a traditional Irish story of fairies; Finbar continues with a description of his ghostly experience with a Ouija board; Jim tells how he met the ghost of a man, allegedly a paedophile, for whom he had dug a grave some years before; and Valerie concludes with the story of her dead young daughter with whom she thought she had spoken on the phone. To everybody's final surprise, Jack narrates how he lost his chance to get married and his confession gives a sentimental tone to the play's conclusion. *The Weir* thus raises a strong current of empathy, seems to give appropriate moral responses and, through storytelling, the sense of communion acquires, for some, almost religious overtones (Wood 2003: 49).

St. Nicholas is exclusively a monologue, the monologue of a Dublin theatre critic standing on a bare stage, who tells the audience about 'a detail of his life', one summer spent in the custody of vampires. He tells the audience of his selfish and debauched life as a journalist and theatre critic in Dublin. He portrays his inability to write a story, his dysfunctional domestic life, his loveless marriage and his failure as a husband and father. He also describes his growing infatuation with a young actress, Helen, who was playing the part of Salomé in a mediocre production at the Abbey Theatre in Dublin and whom he follows to London. In the Crystal Palace Park in London, the protagonist meets William, who invites him to come and stay at his house. What the critic soon discovers is that William is the leader of a sect of vampires and, having taken up residence in the house, the critic agrees to procure fresh victims for the sect from the pub and club scenes in London. This arrangement seems to work for a while, but the critic begins to loathe his hosts and decides, on a particular night, to put an end to his agreement with William. However, his last consignment of victims includes Helen, the object of his desire. When the critic and Helen return to the house, they are both bitten by the vampires, despite the critic's efforts to avoid this happening. Leaving Helen in the house, the critic decides that it is finally time to return to Dublin with what he had previously yearned for and sorely lacked, a story. He eventually realises that the rudeness of his reviews has always been effective, whether he was sincere in his criticism or merely indulging his fondness for wordplay. Thus, he returns to the life he had abandoned, resigned to his faults and deficiencies.

These were the plays which made McPherson an internationally known and acclaimed playwright. In particular, the production of *The Weir* at the Royal Court win the Olivier Award for Best Play and the play was widely translated and performed. McPherson, as many Irish playwrights in the 1990s, became famous *via* the London stage: the praise lavished on his *The Weir*, for example, was mainly due to the "quality and authenticity of the production" (Wallace 2006: 40) and its Chekhovian sense of "pure theatrical poetry" that aligned the play-

wright alongside the 'giants' of contemporary Irish drama like Brian Friel and Thomas Murphy, whose Chekhovian reworkings were well-known both in Ireland and in The United Kingdom. Claire Wallace claims that McPherson's drama certainly appealed to the more conservative critical establishment in Ireland and the United Kingdom as it represented both "what an Irish playwright should be" and a "welcome antidote to *In-Yer-Face Theatre*" (Wallace 2006: 40), a return to a more comfortable experience of language based drama rather than a theatre of sensation, which is "tap[ed] into more primitive feelings, [...], mentioning the forbidden, creating discomfort" (Sierz 2001: 4).

Wallace's observations, however, may be inscribed in the wider context of the 1990s that marked a period of significant change for Irish drama, as acknowledged by many Irish drama scholars who analysed this change from various perspectives (Roche 1994; Murray 1997; Grene 1999; Jordan 2019; Richards 2004; Lonergan 2007; Pilkington 2010). From the early 1990s, many new Irish plays started to gain critical attention and the emergence of a new generation of playwrights, both in the Republican and in Northern Ireland, was observed. *The Weir* therefore is contemporary with the works of Martin McDonagh, Marina Carr, Donal O'Kelly, Enda Walsh, Eugene O'Brien, Marie Jones, and Owen McCafferty to mention just a few.

Most of these works were written and staged during the Celtic Tiger era, the period of rapid growth of the Irish economy that catapulted Irish society into a serious questioning of the social, economic and political order. Among the major concerns of Irish society that had an impact on Irish drama, there was especially the phenomenon of globalisation and the Lyotardian massive delegitimation of the mastercodes, the "dismantling of Gran Narratives [...] in favour of little narratives (*les petits récits*)" (Kearney 1997: 63). Globalisation changed Ireland radically in little more than a decade and one of its most striking effects was undoubtedly that Irish drama started to be viewed as "a commodity of international currency" (Grene 1999: 262). However, this new situation was greeted with mixed feelings. On the one hand, there was a fruitful and widespread circulation of plays between Dublin, London and Edinburgh and, sometimes through translation, a rapid flow of plays from United Kingdom and Ireland throughout Europe, which did not mean unidirectional movement of influence but a complex network of beneficial cultural and theatrical interrelations (Wallace 2006: 18). Emblematic are the examples of McDonagh's *The Beauty Queen of Leenane* (1996), an Irish play, first staged by the Druid Theatre in Galway, which was produced in London by a London-Irish dramatist; Marina Carr's plays, *The Mai* (1995), *Portia Coughlan* (1996) and *By the Bog of Cats* (1998), which were presented respectively in the Czech Republic and in the Netherlands in 2002 (Rapetti 2014: 250); and Enda Walsh's work, which was highly praised in Germany.

On the other hand, scholars of Irish drama started to reflect on the potential of signification of many recent Irish plays in order to establish whether they were mere simulacra, a replica of an imagined Ireland in a globalised world. One of the first and harshest voices against the damage globalisation caused to Irish theatre was that of Vic Merriman, who firmly condemned Carr's and McDonagh's plays and their staging of "Ireland as a benighted dystopia" (1999: 312). Pilkington suggests that in contemporary Irish theatre "there is a dominant trend that involves an emptying out of all ethical attachments to a country and a history [...] and a full-scale, no-holds-barred embrace of compliance and adaptability" (Pilkington 2010: 73). Lonergan starts from the assumption that globalisation is a *de facto* situation in Irish drama in the 1990s. Although he concedes that globalisation has tended to ignore and homogenize those aspects of a society that cannot be easily understood internationally, he also acknowledges that globalisation has created new opportunities for playwriters and theatre companies, pushing writers and audiences to deal with the social changes brought about by contemporaneity (asylum seeking, tourism, multiculturalism and interculturalism and universal human rights) (Lonergan 2010: 4).

Most Irish playwrights in the 1990s therefore oscillate, sometimes uneasily, between tradition and innovation (Murray 1997: 11). The 'little narratives' of their plays represent their personal response to the collapse of the grand narratives of 'history', 'religion' 'nation', 'progress', 'community', 'exile' and 'memory', at a time when public institutions, such as 'family', 'home', 'church', and notions of individual, social and national 'identities' are put under severe scrutiny. Thus, Marina Carr, like Marie Jones and Enda Walsh have portrayed "the fractured state of the families or the concept of home" (Middeke and Schnierer 2010: xii) in which families [are] broken by violence, cruelty and the inability to communicate" (Middeke and Schnierer 2010: xi), McDonagh harshly parodied and deconstructed a vision of Ireland which Eamon de Valera in his speech "On Language and the Irish Nation" (1943) promoted 'as a land whose countryside would be bright with cosy homesteads, whose fields and villages would be joyous with the sounds of industry [...] and the laughter of happy maidens, whose firesides would be forums for the wisdom of serene old age'. For example, in the set of *The Beauty Queen of Leenane,* pre-modern and post-modern Ireland are brought on stage side by side. The 1950s is laid over the 1990s like two "superimposed pictures" (O'Toole 1999: xi): the mores of rural Ireland, with its tyrannical mothers and returned Yanks, co-exist with the contemporary chaos of Australian soap operas and sexual liberation. Although the set is redolent with traditional pieties – Our Lady, the Sacred Heart, John and Bobby Kennedy – the focus of the family life is the television hosting 'a cast of characters whose motives and actions are conditioned by a culture different from the Irish'. McDonagh's west of Ireland,

located at the margins of a globalised culture, is even more remote and lonely than that portrayed by John Millington Synge at the beginning of the twentieth-century. The oscillation between tradition and innovation is also present in the "remapping of the boundaries of gender regulation and gender stereotypes" (Middeke and Schnierer 2010: xii); in the reflection on the marginalization of women that gives rise to a revision of views on wifehood, motherhood and pregnancy, as shown in the plays by Carr, Emma Donoghue and Marie Jones; and in issues concerning "the construction of masculinities and the inability to find and expression of men's identity in a fatherless society" (Middeke and Schnierer 2010: xii), as Owen McCafferty and McPherson aptly show. The earlier problem of political violence in Northern Ireland, The Troubles, became a prevalent subject in contemporary Irish drama after the peace process in the mid-1990s and was treated extensively from various perspectives but it seems to remain an unresolved issue (Middeke and Schnierer 2010: xii). Moreover, the traditional sectarian violence of Belfast invites comparison with a more globalised violence that expands beyond the borders of Northern Ireland, as testified, for example, by McCafferty's recent plays.

In this constant oscillation between tradition and innovation, McPherson's *This Lime Tree Bower*, *The Weir* and *St. Nicholas* are not exceptions. These plays belong to McPherson's early production and on the surface they seem quite conventional plays, but a deeper reading reveals the powerful intricacy of its intertextual relations with some of the most established themes and tropes of the Irish dramatic tradition. This *Lime Tree Bower* and *St. Nicholas* may be inscribed in what Eamon Jordan has defined the 'glut of monologue' in Irish theatre in the 1990s, mainly written for men or just male characters (2006: 125-155). *This Lime Tree Bower* belongs to that clusters of monologues, in which traditionally each characters' narratives is dependent to some extent on that of the others and which either substantiate or contradict each other (126); *St. Nicholas* formally refers back to the monologue as interior monologue (125); whereas the *The Weir* has been variously defined as a "clever confection of different tradition of drama" (Dromgoole 2002: 188-9) or "a species of semiotic shorthand for a traditional Irish drama" (Wallace 2006: 75). And yet their postmodern 'little narrative' questions authenticity and brings to the fore deconstructed visions of traditional Irish drama[1].

Scott T. Cummings believes that 'McPherson has stories, therefore he is' and that personal narrative, public confessions and private sins not only provide an

---

[1]   For insightful analyses on the relationship between postmodern grand and little narratives and 'a penchant for small-scale stories' in McPherson and contemporary Irish drama, see C. Wallace (2006) *Suspect Cultures. Narrative, Identity and Citations in 1990s New Drama*, Prague, Litteraria Pragensia, pp. 39-84; N. Grene (2002) "Stories in shallow places: *Port Authority*", *Irish Review*, 9, pp. 75-80.

entertaining evening but become an investigation into the nature and function of the story itself (Cummings 2000: 303). More recently, Eamonn Jordan reminds us that all personal stories, like cultures and societies, have a conscious and unconscious, and it is difficult to trace the influence of one over the other. In contemporary Irish drama he sees that history, myth and religion are both beneficiaries and exploiters of this instinct to narrate. Public narratives therefore can have a double function: they either "inspire, signal freedom and possibility, and can configure change and encourage ambition", or "be relayed to limit, repress, manipulate, trick and ensure acquiescence with the tradition, authority and order" (Jordan 2019: 20).

The first plays that invite comparison with the monologues, both in *This Lime Tree Bower* and *St. Nicholas*, and *The Weir*'s storytelling are Brian Friel's *Faith Healer* (1979) and Tom Murphy's *Bailegangaire* (1985). In *Faith Healer* the three monologues of the artist-healer, Francis Hardy, his wife Grace and his stage manager tell a part of the story of Frank's family and artistic life. Although flawed, with gaps and uncertain truths, their storytelling symbolically ends with Frank's death at the hands of those whom he had not been able to cure. Paradoxically, the faith healer comes to terms with 'his awesome gift' at the time of his death: "For the first time I had a simple and genuine sense of homecoming" (Friel 1996: 376) and the wider implications of this homecoming is the reconciliation of the artistic, individual and communal Irish identity in 1980s. The same reconciliation is found in Mommo's storytelling in *Bailegangaire*. The senile, bed-ridden Mommo, will eventually be able to articulate the story of how the town of Bochtán, "came by its new appellation the place without laughter" (Murphy 1988: 43). With the help of her two granddaughters, the narrative of the past and the present of Ireland reunite. In *The Weir*, the storytelling of supernatural events foresee for a moment 'the possibility to configure a change' to their individual and communal *status quo* in an Ireland swept by globalisation: after all, "*The Weir* can be seen as part of a tradition of Irish plays which explore threshold moments of fundamental cultural and political shift at key historical junctures" (Mathews 2012: 152) and it is an astute analysis of "that transition in exploration of a society caught between impulses of heroic isolation and willing submission to the forces of globalization" (153). Although it must be conceded that their storytelling creates a sense of empathy and communion, nonetheless none of the lead characters seem to experience a real 'homecoming', a true coming to terms with themselves and with the uneasiness of contemporary Ireland. The small rural pub, which has often been the backdrop of storytelling, has also undergone a change (Trench 2012: 165-183): it has lost its place as the site of Christy Mahon's possible 'heroic deed' in Synge's *The Playboy of the Western World* (1907) and of 'future hope' as in Tom Murphy's *Conversation on a Homecoming* (1986).

The pub in *The Weir* has instead the function of 'a third space' that, on the one hand, foregrounds a particular form of meaningful social relations in a divisive contemporary society but, on the other, more importantly, shows how the world their clients inhabit is a 'world elsewhere' (Greene 1999: 262). Similarly, there is no sense of 'homecoming' for the characters in *This Lime Tree Bower* and *St. Nicholas*, who inhabit a city that is a 'city between'. Joe, Frank and Ray begin "an imagined geographical journey around the fringes of contemporary Dublin" and the theatre critic "moves to a deeper metaphysical engagement with a more provisional city" (Keating 2012: 31). Their monologues express "a fundamental dis-ease with a society where the governing structures of Church and State had entirely fallen away" (34). The result is that masculinity is in crisis and self-delusion is foregrounded as in *This Lime Tree Bower* (Singleton 2006: 288) and, in the case of *St. Nicholas*, black humour becomes "the humour of acute uncertainty and doubt" and shows the "bleak devastation that beats at the heart of the play" (Colleary 2012: 85). On the one hand, McPherson's monologues look to the Irish theatrical precedents for their form, to the modernist influences of James Joyce and Samuel Beckett, to stream of consciousness prose; while on the other, "they tend to derive inspiration from the post-modern Hollywood screenwriting and tradition of Quentin Tarantino, with his brash underworld of violence, drugs and sex wrapped up in non-linear narratives" (Singleton 2012: 262).

4B) *Il pergolato dei tigli* (1999), *La chiusa* (1999) (2007) and *St. Nicholas* (1999) in contemporary Italian culture and theatre

This Lime Tree Bower, *The Weir* and *St. Nicholas* were translated into Italian for the first time as *Il Pergolato dei tigli* by Alfredo Rocca, *La Chiusa* by Anna Parnanzini e Maggie Rose and *St. Nicholas* by Anna Parnanzini and they were published together by Gremese Editore in 1999. After an apparently unsuccessful staging by director Nanni Bruschetta for the "Festival of Benevento Città Spettacolo" in the same year, another translation of the *Weir* appeared in 2005 by the acclaimed Italian director and playwright, Fausto Paravidino. This production, which was directed by Valerio Binasco, was awarded the UBU prize, a prestigious acknowledgement as best foreign play in 2006, and the new translation appeared in a collection of plays entitled *Tre storie da pub* ([2006] 2007). The collection included the translations of two other plays, one by another Irish playwright, Eugene O'Brien's *Eden* (*Eden*), and the other by the British playwright Robert Farquhar's *Dust to Dust* (*Polvere alla polvere*). Eugene O'Brien's *Eden*, incidentally, premiered under McPherson's direction in 2000, in Dublin at the Peacock Theatre, a smaller theatre located below the Foyer of the main Abbey

Theatre and dedicated to the presentation of new plays and contemporary classics. *Eden* is a play about marital breakdown and Irish taboos like dysfunctional masculinity and sexuality; Farquhar's *Dust to Dust* is instead a story of friends lost and found, who search for clarity and self-clarity after the death of one of the group. To gather the three playwrights together, the Italian collection made the relationship with alcohol central - 'three stories from a pub'-, thus somehow inscribing the main themes of the plays under a too restrictive label. On the other hand, the editorial collocation of these translations, published by *Il Melangolo*, the drama series of the Teatro Stabile di Genova, which has always favoured the promotion of contemporary Irish drama on the Italian stage, has proven to be an excellent means to bring unknown playwrights to Italian audiences.

I will now refer to some conditions within Italian theatre, from the late 1990s/ early 2000s to the present day, that constitute the backdrop of *Il pergolato dei tigli*, *La Chiusa* and *St. Nicholas*. These conditions are rooted in the major changes experienced by Italian theatre at the end of the twentieth century and allows us to see the new intertextual relations McPherson's plays created with the Italian theatrical scene, as shown in particular in the Italian reviews of *Il pergolato dei tigli*, *La Chiusa* and *St. Nicholas*.

The start of the new century marked the end in the Italian theatre of the model of *regia critica*, the critical direction model, which defined a typically Italian way of staging. The *registi critici* (critical directors)*, such as Giorgio Strehler (1921–97), Luca Ronconi (1933–2015) and Massimo Castri (1943-2013), were not only the final guarantors of the staging, but they also "took on the role of dramaturg (they applied themselves to the dramatic application of texts), of pedagogue (for the actors) and artistic manager (they directed the most important national theatres, the programmes of which they shaped with their choices)" (Canziani 2019). In fact, they also became co-authors, along with the playwrights, of the works being produced. Sometimes "they rose above the writer in visibility" (Canziani 2019). The emergence of a new generation of directors, such as Carlo Martone, Antonio Latella and Valerio Binasco, made the *regia critica* less pervasive and they also had parallel experiences in the fields of cinema and opera. Other directors instead have preferred a different *modus operandi* and concentrate on the creation of a very individual and original dramaturgy. Pippo Delbono**,** for example, who has often dealt with the issue of his own social marginality, has recently brought to the stage his own depressive illness as his artistic driving force in *La gioia* (*Joy*, 2018), a piece that achieved a strong emotional connection with audiences. Emma Dante instead shows her strength in improvisational work with selected performer ensembles. *Bestie di scena* (*Stage Beasts*, 2017) and her recent *Eracle* (2018) have a Mediterranean setting, reflecting her ability to read her own land of origin, Sicily, especially Palermo. The rise

of the monodrama, which started in the 1990s, has emerged as a response to the increasingly less important place that theatre occupied in the Italian system of culture and entertainment. This new type of theatre is a form can be considered as a form of social critique (*teatro civile*) and Marco Paolini, Marco Baliani, Laura Curino and Ascanio Celestini are today the critical cantors of contemporary Italy and their stories are often told in the many dialects of Italian. Finally, prizes like UBU, HYSTRIO, and ANCT, awarded to new Italian and foreign dramaturgy, have been a means of receiving recognition in the Italian theatre (Canziani 2019).

La Chiusa was McPherson's first play to be performed in Italy and the UBU prize awarded to it in 2006 proved how McPherson's play has gained a leading position as one of the most acclaimed works on the Italian stage and has helped to promote contemporary Irish playwrights in translation (Randaccio 2017: 186). What most reviewers of the play have underlined is the importance of telling stories, "a contemporary *winter's tale*" in which the word allows the characters a 'resurrection' (Scarpellini 2006). Each story gives balance to the text and creates a fascinating performance (Poli 2006), but the audience nonetheless "remains metaphorically closed in that pub", caught between contemporary discontent, loneliness and spooky folklore, a folklore which is defined, quite incorrectly, as belonging to the "anglo-saxon tradition" (Palazzi 2006). Quite interestingly, it has also been noted that Binasco's staging and Paravidino's translation make contemporary Irish drama suitable to move from Dublin to the Italian stage, not only to Broadway, while the Chekhovian's echoes of the play recall Cesare Pavese's atmospheres and settings in *Lavorare Stanca* (Zanovello, 2006a). The intertextual relations of the *Weir* with a specific Italian reality are highlighted in Paravidino's words. He states that the 'pub' has always hosted aspirations, daydreams and different lives and evoked symbolic presences, as in Binasco's film *Texas*, where a group of young people sit in a typical bar of the Ligurian and Piedmontese hinterland, dreaming of America as a myth of freedom (Zanovello 2006b). *Il pergolato dei tigli* soon followed in 2008 and it was interpreted and directed by three young actors who attended the acting school of the Teatro Stabile di Genova, Pierluigi Pasino, Vito Saccinto e Marco Taddei, and who have founded the theatrical company NIM, Neuroni in Movimento. The reviews of the play emphasise that *Il pergolato dei tigli* is a "dry and direct story", whose monologues "arouse the audience's imagination and allow them to follow easily the protagonists' mental wanderings" (Balduzzi 2008). The story of Il *Pergolato dei Tigli* is a "story of ordinary folly, an unusual and sincere journey into male virility". The actors have tried to tell their stories as if "they were at the local pub in a dynamic, rich and amusing language" without neglecting the dramatic overtones of their stories against the backdrop of the suffocating seaside town in which they are" (Redazione *il Giornale.it* 2008). *St. Nicholas*, which was broadcasted by Rai In-

ternational 2000/1 for the series "I solitari. Monologhi per giovani attori" under the direction of Alessandro Berdini and with Alberto di Stasio in the role of the protagonist, appeared on stage only on 20 December 2020 at the nineteen Trend theatre festival, which has undoubtedly had the merit in recent years to feature several contemporary Irish playwrights, both from the Republic and Northern Ireland. These plays, however, sometimes acquired a more universal meaning at the expense of their subversive potential, as in the case of Owen McCafferty's *Quietly* (Randaccio 2017; 2018) or overshadowing the strong criticism of Irish culture, as in Marina Carr's *The Cordelia Dream* (2011). *St. Nicholas*, directed and interpreted by Valerio Binasco, is a monologue that, as Binasco points out, deals with "the dark side of a theatre critic, the encounter between the natural and the supernatural", a character who draws on Edgar Allan Poe, Samuel Coleridge and Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu", and recalls "Bram Stoker, the inventor of Dracula and theatre manager himself" (RomaCulture 2020). This character is "evanescent, transmits damnation and, at the same time, is as hypnotic and seducing as the story he recounts" (Talone 2020). As the story unfolds, he exploits "the power of fascination that his story has got over his audience" (Cacciarini 2020). His monologue, which is rich in symbolisms and has many existential, philosophical and metaphysical references, is "an intense reading" (Sposaro 2020). Thanks to a skilful direction, which employs different camera angles on stage, the monologue is organised as a dialogue and creates the idea of a conversation that arrives directly to the public.

Chapter 5. Contrasting microstructure in drama translation

In this chapter the three original plays *This Lime Tree Bower*, *The Weir* and *St. Nicholas* will be compared with their translations at the microstructural level in terms of the rendering of language, register, special grammatical lexical and syntactic constructions and culture-bound terms. Although my analysis is mostly concerned with translation from "page (SL) to page (TL)" (Merino Álvarez 1994: 127), in the case of *The Weir*, different translation choices will be illustrated between the two translations available, the first conceived as a reading edition (written playtext), the other as an acting script, which interestingly reveal the dual nature of the dramatic text, especially evident in additions, deletions and modifications.

5A) FROM *THIS LIME TREE BOWER* TO *IL PERGOLATO DEI TIGLI*: FROM 'PAGE TO PAGE'

The language of McPherson in *This Lime Tree Bower* is primarily expressed as stage monologue. It is a language which involves actors addressing directly the audience and it is used to give a naturalistic portrayal of the characters, with special attention for the cadence of everyday speech. McPherson is faithful to the idea that his language should reflect his vision of the stage as a space where

ordinary people attempt to make sense of their lives and decisions, where, in McPherson's words, "ordinary human emotions are expressed very simple" (Wood 2003: 134). Marina Carr lucidly exposes her criticism of stage monologue and its peculiar language, though acknowledging its seductiveness for writers. She contends that there is something intrinsically undramatic in the way monologues work: "they are easy to write and you can get all the information that you want across. You can indulge 'your literary sensibility', you can show 'I can write beautiful sentences', but finally, that is not what theatre is about. It is about the spoken word and conflict [...] It is about eliciting the beautiful sentence out of a situation [...] and your character in the play has to carry the inner and outer world. To really work, your character has to to carry the spoken *and* the unspoken... [whereas] the monologue is beautiful because it carries all the unspoken" (Carr 2001: 61). However, McPherson's quite conventional language, deeply rooted in concrete, unmythical and un-epic structures, is able to investigate the inner and outer world of the characters, to carry the spoken and the unspoken, to investigate truth and illusion, narrative and experience because, by McPherson's own admission, the monologue form permitted him "to tell small stories in a bigger way" (Wood 2003: 128). These stories, which deal with the characters' existential expressiveness, as Maggie Rose remarks in the Preface to the Italian translations (Rose 1999: 5)[1], must however be read against the wider intertextual references to Samuel Taylor Coleridge's poem, *This Lime Tree Bower My Prison* (1797), which is the epigraph of the three intertwined monologues and gives the title to the play. The lines that McPherson quotes from Coleridge's poem: "A delight/ Comes sudden on my heart, and I am glad/ As I myself were there! Nor in this bower,/ This little lime-tree bower, have I not mark'd/ Much that has sooth'd me./[...] No sound is dissonant which tells of Life" somehow provide the framework that make 'bigger' the 'small stories' of Joe, Frank and Ray. Coleridge who addresses his friend Charles Lamb in the poem, is confined to a lime tree bower because of an accident while his friends are enjoying a walk, but, through the power of nature and his romantic imagination, he can experience a new-found appreciation of the 'little lime-tree bower' as his shelter. In fact, 'Nature ne'er deserts the wise and pure' and whatever happens in Nature, even in its slightest manifestations, deserves importance exactly as any stories that

---

[1]   All quotations from McPherson plays are taken from C. McPherson (1998), *The Weir*, Nick Hern Book, London. *This Lime Tree Bower* and *St. Nicholas* (2014), in *Plays: One. Conor McPherson*, London, Nick Hern Books, pp 85-134; pp.135-178.
All quotations from 'McPherson's translations are taken from *La chiusa.* Trans. Anna Parnanzini and Maggie Rose*; Il pergolato dei tigli*. Trans. Alfredo Rocca; *St. Nicholas*. Trans. Anna Parnanzini, in *Conor McPherson: Teatro* (1999), Roma Gremese; F. Paravidino, *La chiusa* (2007), unpublished script.

tells of the magnificence of human life. Coleridge's poem helps to establish an ironic contrast both at thematic and linguist level. The characters' lives revolving around robbery, rape and violence are not the best embodiement of a glorious life, and the poetic words in the epigraph, typical of eighteenth-century Romanticism, are starkly opposed in tone and temperament to the opening words of Joe, Ray and Frank:

> JOE Damien came to school halfway through the term... (87)
> RAY I woke up on a cold October morning in bed with one of my students... (93)
> FRANK I remember that Friday. The weather had been rotten all week... (97)

These initial sentences sound immediately as an ironical counterpart of that "delight" that opens the quotation from Coleridge. In Alfredo Rocca's translation this epigraph is completely omitted with the consequence that any reference to Coleridge's poem disappears and that the initial irony gets lost. This omission was perhaps made in the Italian translation because an Italian audience would be less familiar with the reference to Coleridge's poem but, at the same time, it does not allow the reference to the title of the play, "Il pergolato dei tigli", which is a literal translation of the title of Coleridge's poem, to be understood. Moreover, in Italian, the use of "pergolato" seems an inappropriate lexical choice that further eliminates any reference to the poem. 'Bower' in English means "a shady, leafy shelter in a garden or wood" and has a literary connotation: in Italian, 'bower' can be translated with two near-synonyms, "pergolato" and "<u>pergola</u>" but only the latter retains a poetic connotation. The choice of "pergola" is also supported in a recent Italian collection of Coleridge's poems, translated and edited by Edoardo Zuccato, where 'This Lime Tree Bower – my Prison' is in fact translated as "Questa <u>pergola</u> di tiglio, la mia prigione" (2018).

Joe, Frank and Ray account their narrative in brief turns, in a language with simple speech patterns, full of taboo words, vulgar expressions and slang, in which features of Irish English co-exist with the pervasive language of violence, crime and sexuality of both contemporary Dublin and crime stories. Interestingly, the use of this language aligns McPherson with those Irish dramatists who were rejecting the idealistic and heroic concept of nation and started to see their country as a "sour and elaborate joke" (Toíbín, 2001: 19). Between 1980 and 2000, many dramatists set out to bring on stage, "a narrative of their own, an aspect of national narrative which had been pushed aside, or erased, or prevented from emerging" (Toíbín 2001: 20). In order to do so, McPherson avoids some of the linguistic features typical of the Irish English - the fronted objects and complements, the marked use of the copula, a great emphasis on syntax to develop information structure - which had represented a radical, revolutionary, linguis-

tic move in Irish drama at the time of the Celtic Revival to establish and promote a new Irish identity.[2] He prefers instead very simple syntactic constructions, subject-verb-object or subject-verb-adverbial patterns, and the use of parataxis over hypotaxis. His sentences start very often with 'and' to enhance narration, or with 'but' to signal a change in the characters' thought or action, while repetitions are frequently used. Although the three characters invariably make use of the same simple syntactic constructions, Joe, Frank and Ray nonetheless have their own idiolects as examples of individual speech. Idiolect is here meant not only as 'the speech variety used by a particular individual, [...] a language variety unique to a specific speaker of a language", but in its extended definition as a speech characterized by the place of living, age, social status and level of culture of this individual (Sung 2020: 39). Joe's speech reveals that he comes from an uneducated background, that he is young, feels alone and that his cultural horizon is made up of 'thrillers and westerns' with a stereotyped image of sexuality. However, he frequently uses expressions showing his naivety and inability to act, especially when he sees his friend Damien raping a girl:

JOE	JOE
He had lots of thrillers and westerns.	Aveva un sacco di libri gialli e western.
I liked his books because the sentences were always short.	Mi piacevano i suoi libri perché le frasi erano sempre brevi.
The writers gave you the facts.	Gli scrittori ti danno solo i fatti.
In school we did books where nobody said what they meant and you had to work out what everybody wanted.	A scuola studiavo solo libri dove nessuno diceva quello che voleva dire e tu stavi lì da solo a cercare di capirlo.
I picked up a book with a black and silver cover.	Prendo un libro con la copertina nera e argento.
...	...

---

[2] David Birch states, for example, that John Millington Synge used an Anglo-Irish variety of English as a political move which was part of a larger movement to establish a national non-Gaelic/non-English Irish identity by establishing a National Irish theatre in English. It was "a political move against the sort of linguistic conservatism which kept the varieties of English spoken by a large percentage of the Irish population out of the public arena". The language he used does not aim to be a close transcription of actual speech patterns, but a dramatic representation which uses selected, often stereotyped, linguistic features. For the theatre of his days "this was a radical, revolutionary, linguistic move, in order to establish a radical national identity which stood counter to the polarities of Gaelic Irish and British English". D. Birch (1991) *The Language of Drama*, London, Macmillan, pp. 144.

They also had good sex bits (104).	Contengono anche belle scene di sesso (24).
...Damien had his trousers down and the girl's legs were on either side of him, like they were broken. Her neck was on the low rail around the grave and her head hung over the gravel. Damien was pushing into her like he wanted to put her in the ground. I run straight back to my bike and I cycled home. I said goodnight and I got sick (118).	Damien aveva i pantaloni tirati giù e la ragazza aveva le gambe spalancate come se fossero rotte. Aveva il collo appoggiato su una piccola ringhiera intorno alla tomba e la testa pendeva all'indietro sulla ghiaia. Damien spingeva dentro di lei come se volesse affondarla nel terreno. Io corro alla mia bici e me ne torno a casa. Passando in salotto auguro la buonanotte e vado in bagno a vomitare (35).

Ray's idiolect instead contains features both from the colloquial, sexist and very often vulgar language, and from the more formal language of the academics:

RAY	RAY
So I fucked over the student bar with her and her bunch of know-it-all shit-brain friends. And there we are, pint after pint, and she sitting besides me with her great big legs in knee-high boots. And I am getting a dirty mind and I know that if I don't get into her in the next few minutes, I'm going to give someone a dig... (124).	Perciò muovo il culo verso il bar degli studenti con lei e il suo gruppo di amici sapientoni-cervello di merda. Ed eccoci qua, pinta dopo pinta lei si siede con le sue belle gambe con gli stivali alti. E a me mi vengono pensieri sporchi e so che se non glielo infilo dentro nei prossimi cinque minuti, prendo a pugni qualcuno... (39).
He had been developing his brutal theory since the fifties. He said that language was an organic thing, like any plant or animal. And just like any plant or animal, it was born, lived healthily for a while, making other little languages, like its offspring, and then it died...	Lui aveva sviluppato fin dagli anni Cinquanta questa teoria radicale sul linguaggio. Diceva che il linguaggio era una cosa organica, come una pianta o un animale. E proprio come qualsiasi pianta o animale nasceva, viveva in buona salute per un periodo, creando altri piccoli linguaggi, come dei figli, e poi moriva...

There is lack of sincerity, he claimed, because language is sick now. It isn't vital enough to sustain validity (121-122).	C'è una mancanza di sincerità, affermava, perché ormai la lingua è malata. Non è abbastanza vitale, non riesce ad affermare la propria validità (38).

Finally, Frank's speech is characterized by the use of everyday language to underline his ordinary life, especially in his opening turns:

FRANK	FRANK
I normally got up at eleven.	Di solito mi alzavo verso le undici.
We opened at twelve on the dot.	Aprivamo a mezzogiorno in punto.
I had just sorted of drifted into working with Dad. He couldn't afford to pay me a fortune.	Oramai mi ero abituato all'idea di lavorare con papà. Non poteva permettersi di pagarmi una fortuna, ma
But I was living at home.	vivevo a casa.
I had no overheads.	Non avevo spese.
It was boring but it was better than nothing.	Una noia, ma era meglio di niente.
Because there's nothing worse than a seaside town in the winter when there's nobody around (98).	Perché non c'è niente di peggio che una cittadina balneare d'inverno, quando in giro non c'è anima viva (19).

The individual idiolects of Joe, Ray and Frank are well rendered in the Italian translation and Rocca tries to keep a colloquial spoken Italian both in the choice of syntactic structures and in the use of lexis, finding creative solutions for many taboo expressions. Joe's pondering that you 'had to work out' what books mean is translated with 'tu stavi lì da solo' /you were there alone', a colloquial expression which somehow implies the effort the young man has to make to understand what surrounds him as well as the loneliness he feels. 'The god sex bits' that Joe likes in books is translated with the more formal equivalent in Italian 'scene di sesso' (sex scenes), nonetheless this translation choice is adequate to portray Joe's naïve, childish and stereotyped notion of sexuality and helps to establishes a contrast with his later crude, almost sepulchral description of Damien's rape ('the girl's legs were on either side of him, like they were broken'/ 'la ragazza aveva le gambe spalancate come se fossero rotte; 'her neck was on the low rail around the grave'/ 'aveva il collo appoggiato su una piccola ringhiera intorno alla tomba'). Ray's shift of language from colloquial, vulgar language to formal language, which is also accompanied by an increased syntactic complexity, is reproduced in the Italian version. Thus, the expression 'So I fucked over the

student bar' has a corresponding strong equivalent (perciò muovo il culo verso il bar degli studenti/...), whereas 'And I am getting a dirty mind' is resolved with an ungrammatical construction in Italian (E a me mi vengono pensieri sporchi/...). The translation of the epithet Frank gives to the girl's friends is quite interesting, 'know-it-all shitbrain friends'/ 'amici sapientoni-cervello di merda'. This made-up expression in Italian perfectly renders Ray's despicable attitude towards the world of intellectuals and academics, as he often remarks that the "thickest people he ever met were all in third-level institutions" (93). In the original version, Ray's use of a low register is also illustrated in the following sentence by the use of the subordinating 'and', a typical syntactic trait of present-day Dublin (Hickey 2005: 127) '... and she sitting besides me...' that unfortunately gets lost in Italian (...lei si siede...). Ray's language however changes radically when he explains Professor Wolfgang Konigsberg's philosophical theory on language (121-122). The syntax of his sentences becomes more complex with the use of reported speech ('he said that language was...') and of some lexical choices that belong to a more formal English ('its offspring'). This change in tone in the Italian translation can instead be found only at the end of Ray's following sentences. If the word 'offspring' is in fact normalised with a more general 'figli', linguistic amplification is used later in the sentence to give relevance to Ray's words: 'it isn't vital enough to sustain validity'/'Non è abbastanza vitale, non riesce ad affermare la propria validità' (38).

What is interesting in *Il pergolato dei tigli* is that the translation strategy Rocca adopted for the culture-bound terms which refer to 'the topography of the place'. These terms, which are intimately close to "the universe of reference of the original culture" (Lefevere 1992: 122), play a crucial role for the whole meaning of the play. Many critics have highlighted how the geography of Dublin and its streets had been important for McPherson's characters since his early play *Rum and Vodka* (1992) (Randaccio 2002: 351-359). As noted, "the idea of a city as a 'space between' helps us to see a distinct evolution in the work of Conor McPherson, beginning with "an imaginary geographical journey around the fringes of contemporary Dublin [...] and moving to a deeper metaphysical engagement with a more provisional city in his later works" (Sara Keating 2012: 31). The characters' journeys around Dublin is in fact carefully traced and the name of the streets and the pubs are usually left untranslated. The only exception is the name of the bar where Joe and Damien want to go 'the Ancient Mariner', a bar on the outskirt of Dublin, that becomes 'Il Vecchio Marinaio' in Italian. The choice to translate the name of the bar in this case helps to evoke a whole idea of danger and violence often associated with remote pubs in the Irish dramatic tradition. As Joe explains: "The Mariner was called the 'The Bucket of Blood' because of all the fights and a barman lost his finger once, trying to kick someone out" (114) /

Il Vecchio Marinaio veniva chiamato "la macelleria" per tutte le risse che c'erano e una volta un barista aveva perso un dito cercando di sbattere fuori qualcuno" (31). However, because of the unfamiliarity of the Italian audience with Irish pub culture, what gets lost in translation is the wider connotative meaning of the accurate topography of the original version, as shown in these two emblematic moments of the plays. The first is when Ray recounts where he met his student, their affair, what happens after their sexual intercourse and the cherishing and consoling thought of his girlfriend Carmel; the second is when Frank tells of his trip with Joe and Ray after the robbery:

RAY	RAY
First stop. <u>Blackrock</u>. Two girls get out.	Prima fermata Blackrock. Due ragazze scendono.
...back across the dualer into <u>Goatstown</u>.	...Torno per la statale verso Goatstown.
... She lives in <u>Mount Merrion</u>.	...Lei vive a Mount Merrion.
We drove to a quiet pub near <u>Rathfarnham</u>.	...Andiamo in un pub tranquillo vicino Rathfarnham.
...She was going to the <u>Stag's Head</u>.	Andava allo Stag's Head.
...It was time to see Carmel.	Era ora di vedere Carmel.
Carmel had...these country virtues.	Carmel ha queste...virtù di campagna.
...Driving down to <u>Malahide Road</u> (95-97).	Guidando lungo Malahide Road (17-19).

FRANK	FRANK
We put the gear in the car and we were trying to decide where to go.	Montiamo in macchina e cerchiamo di decidere dove andare.
We hadn't thought about it.	Non ci avevo pensato.
Joe just said, <u>'Cork'</u>, and that was it.	Joe dice soltanto 'Cork' e questo basta.
...So we stopped in <u>Abbeyleix</u> for a cure.	...Così ci fermiamo a Abbeyleix per una cura ricostituente.
... It was very nice there and we didn't want to go. But <u>Cork</u> it was and off we went (130).	... Si stava molto bene lì e non volevamo andarcene. Ma Cork era, e Cork sarebbe stato (44).

Ray moves from Blackrock, the fashionable, prestigious and affluent south eastern suburb of Dublin, to Goatstown and Mount Marrion, other residential areas in the southside of Dublin, goes to a pub in Rathfarnham, still in the south side of the city. He then slowly heads towards Dublin city centre, where he leaves the student who goes to the Stag's Head, one of the historical and most famous

pubs in the heart of Dublin city. He then continues further north driving to Malahide Road, a long regional road that traverses many northern districts of Dublin, while thinking of his girlfriend Carmel. The trajectory of Ray's wanderings cannot go unnoticed to an Irish audience: the naming of these places makes theatregoers aware of the Northside/Southside divide, the well-established association of North Dublin with grubbiness, degradation and sordid life as opposed to the glamour, grandeur and intellectual life of South Dublin. If the meaning of this topography of places and an oppositional view of the 'city' get lost, the more spiritual dimension of Ray's journey, however, is still present in the Italian translation. Ray's words, in fact, seem to adumbrate a remote possibility of salvation in those traditional values that Carmel embodies: 'Carmel had these...country virtues/ The whole Greek idea of the good life/The life lived well' is literally rendered as 'Carmel ha queste... virtù di campagna/L'idea greca della bella vita/ La vita ben vissuta'. Ray's journey parallels the following trip of Frank, Joe and Ray, which brings them from Dublin to Abbeyleix and ends in Cork. Abbeyleix is a town situated in county Laos in the Irish Midlands, famous for its cultural and religious heritage, and Cork is the second-largest city of the Republic of Ireland, with a strong maritime history and representative of the Irish cultural and religious past. Although the meaning of the original topography and the strong references to the symbolic value of the towns mentioned are also lost in translation, nonetheless their trip can still be understood by an Italian audience as a spiritual and liberating journey. This second trip, which takes the three characters beyond the narrow borders of the 'city', appears to be a more spiritual and liberating journey than Frank's previous 'wandering' through Dublin and perhaps reveals its salvific power. The process of translation of *This Lime Tree Bower* into Italian at the microstructural level shows how a certain degree of domestication is achieved through omission, specific renderings of the three characters' individual idiolects and culture-bound terms.

5B) FROM *THE WEIR* TO *LA CHIUSA* (1999) TO *LA CHIUSA* (2007): FROM 'PAGE TO PAGE TO STAGE'

The process of translation that brought McPherson's *The Weir* to Anna Parnanzini and Maggie Rose's first translation and then to Fausto Paravidino's later version also encompasses a series of translational strategies which somehow imply a domestication of the text. As in *This Lime Tree Bower*, the language of the original play gives a naturalistic portrayal of the characters, reproduces the flow of everyday language and the small talk of ordinary people trying to make sense of their lives. However, unlike *Il Pergolato dei tigli*, the two translations of *The Weir* highlight

two more problematic areas which represent a challenge in translation, i.e., the rendering of the extensive use of Irish English and the characters' dialogue.

As argued elsewhere for many plays of Irish theatre translated into Italian (Randaccio 2015: 110), *La chiusa* also falls into the new category that Debora Biancheri terms "accommodation" (Biancheri 2013) in order to render more flexible what is usually referred to as "acculturation" in the field of drama translation. "Acculturation" means that the translated plays create an 'interstitial space' which re-inscribes the role of the translator, who sometimes shares multiple cultural affiliations, without participating in any of them (Sherry Simon 1996: 162). Biancheri thus claims that "measuring the translation strategy against the target's assumed knowledge and expectations *does not necessarily entail the assimilation of the foreign to domestic intelligibilities* (Biancheri 2013: 8 *emphasis mine*). In fact, at textual level, Parnanzini and Rose adopted in *La chiusa* a translation strategy that accommodates McPherson's play to the Italian target system, partly assimilating the foreign to the domestic, but still leaving an 'interstitial space' that is neither Irish, nor Italian. At performative level, Paravidino's strategy instead seems to be in line with the broader empirical process of translation envisaged by the so-called 'performative turn' in drama translation. Importance is therefore given to 'performativity', the theatrical potential of a play, which implies a dynamic process of (re)signification integrated into the overall event in its various phases of production and this process cannot be assimilated to a more traditional text-based concept of theatre and its hierarchical systems of roles (Bigliazzi, Kofler and Ambrosi 2013: 1-2).

Among the major adaptive interventions in Paranzini's and Rose's translation, particular attention has been paid to some culture-bound terms, the rendering of non-standard pronominal and verbal features in Irish English, some expletives and the typical discoursive marker 'like'. A comparison of the opening of Paravidino's translation also illustrates how the text moves from 'page to stage' and how it adapts to adhere to the conventions of theatre and to the audience's expectations (Randaccio 2021: 123-142). In Paranzini's and Rose's translation, with one interesting exception, some culture-bound terms have remained unaltered like 'Guinness", "Harp". When Jack says that he has just come back from a walk and that there was wind until he came "around the Knock" where there "was a bit of shelter then" (4) the mention of 'Knock' is not fortuitous. In fact, the Marian Shrine of Knock is a well-known place of Catholic pilgrimage in County Mayo in the west of Ireland, where the Virgin Mary is said to have appeared in August 1879. Since then, pilgrims have come to Knock in search of healing, reconciliation and peace. This place is therefore immediately recognizable to an Irish and British audience and anticipates the supernatural narratives of the protagonists' stories. In Italian 'Knock' has been translated with "Montorio", an equivalent of

Knock as it refers to the Santuario di Nostra Signora di Lourdes - the Sanctuary of Our Lady of Lourdes – near Verona, a place of pilgrimage where Our Lady of Lourdes is said to have appeared and a miracle to have taken place. The reference in Italian, however, can be missed as 'Montorio' is not widely known to an Italian audience.

The rendering of Irish English in many Irish plays and its implications represent a challenge for the Italian translator: in general, varieties and dialects of English have always constituted a central issue in translation as their definitions involve political and sociological questions which are of a different nature in the two linguistic systems (i.e., Irish English and Italian). Peter Newmark, for example, believes that a dialect is not a deviation from standard language, but "a self-contained variety" (1988: 195). For him, the translation of a dialect in a play depends on the intention of the translator who must decide whether he/she wants to maintain the emphasis on that specific variety of language, stress social differences among characters, or portray local and culture specific elements. More recently, Federico Federici has stated that the rendering of dialects and varieties of languages can have a conservative or experimental approach: "when translators do not attempt to force the norms, they are conservative in respecting the target language expectations and avoid challenging it with non-standard variants;" on the other hand, "when translators try to reveal the differences in the source language [...] they are experimental" (Federici 2011: 10). Parnanzini and Rose usually opt for a conservative approach to render the Irish English of the original. In their translation, they use a language which leans toward standard Italian to make their language more suitable for clear communication. When Brendan and Finbar allude to the fact that Jack always needs help to bet on the right horse, Jack tries to maintain that this is not true:

JACK.... And I've been known to have one or to wins myself, as well as yous know and don't forget.	JACK.... E vi dico che anch'io un paio di volte ho vinto qualcosa da solo, e voi lo sapete, come se lo sapete. Ho vinto un paio di volte.
BRENDAN. You do not. Go on out of that chancer. JACK. I do. FINBAR: I'd say the last win you had was fucking Red Rum or someone.	BRENDAN. Macché. Un tipo come te che va allo sbaraglio. JACK. È vero. FINBAR. Ti dico che l'ultima volta che hai vinto è stato con quel cazzo di Red Rum o che sia.
JACK. (*aside to* VALERIE) We do be only messing like this (16).	JACK. (*a parte, rivolto a* VALERIE) Non prenderci sul serio, facciamo sempre così (63).

In this exchange both the pronoun 'yous' and the verbal construction 'do be messing' have been standardized because they are difficult to render in Italian. In fact, the personal pronoun 'yous' is a feature of Irish English that started to gain foothold in nineteen century with the mass exodus of the Irish (Hickey 2007: 242), and the *Do(es) be + V-ing* form is a means to express a durative habitual action, in which speakers exploit the option of *do* to mark habituality (Hickey 2007: 216). Similarly, words like 'knacker' and 'fecking eejit', which have been translated as 'il furbo' and 'idiota', lose in part, if not all, their connotative meaning. Knacker is a derogatory term used to refer to the Irish Travellers, a nomadic indigenous minority of Ireland, and it is usually used as an insult; 'fecking eejit' is another common insult, which means 'fucking idiot' and should be pronounced with an Irish accent to be really effective.

An interesting case of translation choices in Parnanzini and Rose's translation is that which concerns the rendering of the discursive marker 'like'. 'Like' has been described as a mere, redundant filler, a meaningless interjection and has often been dismissed as non-standard, dialectal, and even vulgar (Schweinberger 2012: 182). In *The Weir* McPherson makes extensive use of 'like' but in Italian it has been translated very differently according to its function in the play. For example, at the beginning of the play when Jack cannot find his usual beer, he says "I'm having a bottle [...] I'm not happy about it, now mind, right? But, like" (4) has been translated as "Me la sto prendendo una bottiglia [...] Ma non faccio I salti di gioia, ricordatelo. Ecco" ('I am getting a bottle, but I don't jump for joy. Mind you. That's it'). In this case, the clause-external, syntactically unbound 'like' maintains in Italian its function as a floor-holding device (Schweinberger 2012:184). Later in the play, when Brendan, Jim and Finbar tell Valerie the story of the weir and how the area is 'steeped in old folklore', Brendan mentions the local abbey and says that when it was built: "Oh, back in oh, fifteen something, there was a synod of bishops all came and met there for... like... eh" (19). The function of like in this example is very different from the previous one: although it is still a clause-external, syntactically unbound 'like', it signals a planning difficulty that is well rendered in Italian: "Mah... intorno al Cinquecento, o giù di lì, ci tenevano un sinodo con tutti i vescovi che si riunivano là per... sì, per..." ('Oh... back in fifteen something, there was a synod of all the bishops who came to meet there for...yes, for...'").

Comparison of the initial exchange between Brendan and Jack in McPherson's original and in Paravidino's translation shows instead how the translational process fully 'accommodates' to the Italian stage and to the context of reception:

BRENDAN. Jack.	BRENDAN. Jack.
JACK. Brendan (*Lifting glass*). What's with the Guinness?	JACK. Brendan. *(alzando il bicchiere)* Cosa succede qua?
BRENDAN (*putting peat in the stove*). I don't know. It's the power in the tap. It's a new barrel and everything.	BRENDAN *(Trafficando col termosifone)* Non lo so. Si è rotta la pressione della spina.
JACK. Is the Harp one okay?	JACK. E <u>questa</u> qui va?
BRENDAN. Yeah.	BRENDAN. Sì.
JACK. Would not switch them around and let a man have a pint of stout, no?	JACK. E perché non le scambi?
BRENDAN. What about the Harp drinkers?	BRENDAN. E <u>quelli</u> che bevono <u>quella</u>, cosa bevono?
JACK (*derision*) 'The Harp drinkers'.	JACK. Ma <u>questa</u> chi la beve, nessuno.
BRENDAN. Your man's coming in to do it in the morning. Have a bottle.	BRENDAN. Domani la aggiustano.
JACK. I'm having a bottle. (*Pause*). I'm not happy with it, now mind, right? But, like.	JACK. '<u>Quelli</u> che bevono <u>quella</u>'...Ma la beve davvero qualcuno <u>questa</u> qui?
BRENDAN. Go on out of that.	BRENDAN. Prendila in bottiglia.
JACK (*drinks*). What the hell. Good for the worms.	JACK. L'ho presa in bottiglia. *Pausa.* Ci mettono dell'acido nella birra in bottiglia, lo sai?
	Ridono.
BRENDAN. I'd say you have a right couple of worms, alright.	BRENDAN. Ma smettila, acido!
	JACK. Acido e acqua... Mi farà bene ai vermi... *(beve)*
	BRENDAN. Qualcuno da qualche parte ce l'hai. *Ridono.*
They laugh. Pau*se* (3-4).	*Pausa.*

What is particularly interesting in this exchange is the complete omission of culture-bound terms ('Harp', 'Harp drinkers'); the addition of a funny gag ('Ci mettono dell'acido nella birra'/ 'They put acid in the beer'), and especially the increase in the use of deictic markers ('What about the Harp drinkers?'/ 'E <u>quelli</u> che bevono <u>quella</u>, cosa bevono?') that allows language to achieve an active and dialogic function, which underlines the importance of theatre dialogue.[3] All

---

[3]   Roberto Menin in "The concept of performability and its application within theatrical tradition" gives an insightful account of the importance of theatre dialogue with particular reference to dialogue translation into Italian. He quotes some of the earliest Italian linguistic

these changes show how Paravidino's translation is indissolubly bound to and depends on its performance to gain a favourable reception. In fact, as indicated before, the greatest advantage of 'a *performative* translation' is that it "allows [us] to place originals and translations, source and target texts, dramatic texts and performances on the same cline, where what counts is not the degree of distance from an ontological original but the effect that the reconfigured text (as performance) has on the receiving culture and its networks of transmission and reception" (Marinetti 2013a: 311).

5c) From *St. Nicholas* to *St. Nicholas*: from 'page to page'

As in the *This Lime Tree Bower*, the language of Conor McPherson in *St. Nicholas* is primarily designed to work as a stage monologue which increasingly culminates in a real verbal assault towards the audience. Central to the language of the unnamed theatre critic are "the twin concepts of delusion and absurdity" (Colleary 2012: 79), in which "the monologue form is 'essential' storytelling, a stripping away of dramatic illusion" (Wallace 2006: 6). The theatre critic is alone on a bare stage and his language becomes the expression of how "the comedy of entropy" works in *St. Nicholas* and informs the theatre critic perceptions, his relations with others and his worldview (Colleary 2012: 78). Drawing on the development of black humour in literary criticism, Patrick O'Neill argues that black humour is very different both from benign humour and derisive humour. Benign humour, which is warm, tolerant, sympathetic, is the humour of unthreatened norms, whereas derisive humour, which is cold, intolerant, unsympathetic, is the humour of rejection or correction and of defended norms. In contrast with both of them, black humour is the humour of lost norms, lost confidence and disorientation. As in physics, the tendency of closed systems tends to move from a state of order into a state of total disorder according to concept of entropy, thus black humour can be seen as a comedy of entropy (O'Neill 1983: 149; O'Neill 1990).

The language of the protagonist creates this 'comedy of entropy', which is expressed in very short, sometimes unfinished lines, taboo words and vulgar

---

works that have proven especially relevant for the Italian scholars, such as Giovanni Nencioni in "Parlato-parlato, parlato-scritto, parlato-recitato" (1976) *Strumenti critici*, 60, pp.126-179; Francesco Antinucci (1974) "Sulla deissi", *Lingua e Stile*, 2. 9., pp. 223-247; and some later works such as Pietro Trifone (1994) "L'italiano a teatro", in L. Serianni and P. Trifone (a cura di) *Storia della lingua italiana*, Torino, Einaudi, and Silvia Calamai (2009), *Dalla parola al palcoscenico: le lingue di Chiti, Malpeli, Maraini, Russo, Scimone, Tarantino*, in S. Stefanelli (a cura di), *Varietà dell'italiano nel teatro contemporaneo*, Atti della giornata di studio, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, 11 December, 2006, pp. 195-238.

expressions, intentionally used to shock the reader. It is interesting to note that the disorientation of the middle-aged protagonist is all-encompassing and black humour pervades his life as a critic, as a husband and father, and as a would-be lover. McPherson's seems to put aside black humour only when the theatre critic starts to reflect on the nature of vampires and recounts his adventure with them. The sentences, paratactically organised, follow a more stringent logic, become a pretext to show the most hidden secrets of human mind and eventually allow him 'to have the story' he has been desperately seeking for.

Parnanzini's translation renders well the two different paces of the monologue. On the one hand, the fractured rhythm of the lines is first used as in the original to show the devastating confusion of the protagonist and his tendency to make recourse to black humour, especially when he regrets his lack of creativity, sarcastically criticises his job and insults his colleagues:

But I had no ideas.	Ma non avevo idee.
No ideas for a story.	Idee per una storia.
I wanted to let my compassion seep out across the stage.	Sognavo una messa in scena che trasudasse della mia compassione.
handicapped people in love.	Handicappati innamorati.
Queers and lesbians absolving each other.	Gay e lesbiche che si riappacificano.
A liberal, fucking, all-encompassing... you know.	Cazzate progressiste in cui dentro ci trovavi di tutto...merdate simile, capite?
But nothing came (138).	Ma non veniva fuori niente (96).
...	
And what I was like in those places...	E in quei posti stavo...
I wasn't dying, like you might think.	Non stavo morendo, come potreste pensare.
No. I was dead.	No. Ero già morto...
...I was a bollocks to all the other critics.	Per tutti gli altri critici ero un rompicoglioni.
And I'll tell you why, because it was this: they were all cunts (142).	E lo sapete perché? Perché erano tutti degli stronzi (98).

On the other hand, a more reflective mood underpins the later part of the monologue, especially when the protagonist explains his initial fascination for the vampires and his disillusioned assumption that one misses their past for what it appeared to be and not for what it really was:

They have power. Not the power to make you do what they want. But real power. To make you want what they want. It hurts to consider things in their company. It becomes hard to make sense. They appeal to the older part of us (158). ...	Avevano potere. Non il potere di farti fare quello che vogliono. Ma il vero potere. Di farti volere quello che volevano loro. Quando ti trovavi in loro compagnia, era difficile riflettere sulle cose. Diventava difficile dargli un senso. Faceva presa sulla parte più antica che c'è in noi (111). ...
And I found myself trying to miss my family. But something wouldn't let me. I could only miss what they were like years ago. And that's the way life is, you can't have that, can you? You can't light a stranger's face with the mention of Santa (160).	Ed ero lì che cercavo di sentire la mancanza della mia famiglia. Ma qualcosa me lo impediva. Mi mancava solo come erano stati anni prima. Ma fa parte della vita e non puoi avere quello che è stato, no? Non puoi illuminare il volto di uno sconosciuto solo nominando Babbo Natale (112).

Here the mention of 'Santa' is crucial to the interpretation of the whole play. Santa Claus refers back to the title of the play, *St. Nicholas*. Santa Claus, or St. Nicholas, typifies the spirit of good cheers at Christmas in Western tradition and represents a trope dear to McPherson. In a later play, *Dublin Carol* (2000), McPherson recalls again the spirit of Santa Claus in which the protagonist, an undertaker, foresees a possibility of salvation from his own disastrous past. The intertextual reference is here quite obviously to Charles Dickens' 'the ghost of Christmas Present', one of the three Christmas Spirits that give Ebenezer Scrooge a possibility of redemption in the novella *A Christmas Carol* (1843). However, the possibility of salvation/redemption is quite unlikely for both characters in McPherson's *St. Nicholas* and *Dublin Carol* because "where Dickens readers are asked to make a distinction between the wonderful and the mundane in order to understand the fantastical tale of Scrooge's redemption, the audiences of McPherson's plays are asked to wonder at the fantastical notion of truth itself; they are unsure what to believe and they are left in a state of wonder" (Walsh 2012: 138). McPherson thus engender hopes but does not offer any plausible explanation for a more and more evanescent truth, often steeped in black humour. In the Italian translation this intertextual reference is lost. The title *St. Nicholas* remains untranslated as very often happens with plays in English translated into Italian from less known playwrights. There-

fore, it becomes generally more difficult for an Italian audience to relate the title to the later mention of 'Santa/Babbo Natale' and the recurring meaning of redemption/salvation which informs the whole play. Parnanzini also chooses in the opening lines to use a past tense instead of the present of the original (avevano potere/have power', 'it hurts/diventava difficile' and it 'becomes hard/faceva presa'). This translation choice changes in part the perspective of the protagonist's narration, which in Italian results more in a reflection on a past event then in the perceived sense of immediacy of the original version.

What follows is a turning point in the play because "the critic ambushes his own narrative" (Colleary 2012: 81): he breaks his character and directly addresses his audience in a series of satirical verbal assaults. In particular, "the narrator ridicules the audience for what in his view is their misguided belief and faith in science and the rational world over and above nature or magic or superstition" (Colleary 2012: 82):

...And you will say, 'These vampires are not very believable, are they?'...	...Voi direte "Questi vampiri non sono così credibili, no?"... (112).
I have the freedom to tell you this unhindered, while you can sit there assured that no one is going to get hurt. Possibly offended, but you'll live. We're all quite safe here to say things like 'If they were vampires, why don't their victims become vampires?'	Io ho la libertà di dirvi questa cosa, senza alcun impedimento, mentre voi rimanete lì seduti pensando che tanto nessuno si farà male. Forse vi offenderete, ma almeno continuerete a vivere. Qui siamo tutti al sicuro. Possiamo tranquillamente dire cose tipo "Se esistessero i vampiri, allora perché le loro vittime non dovrebbero trasformarsi in vampiri?"
And you are, of course, relying on the lazy notion foisted upon you by others in the effort to make you buy more popcorn (160).	E naturalmente voi rimanete, per vostra pigrizia, con un concetto imposto da altri nell'intento di farvi comprare altri popcorn (113). ....
<u>We want</u> the vampire's bite to be magic. Death-defying, supernatural.	<u>Vogliamo</u> che il morso dei vampiri sia "magico". Soprannaturale. Che sfidi la morte.
Why? Why do <u>we need</u> it to be magic? Because magic doesn't exist?	Perché? Perché <u>vogliamo</u> che sia magico? Forse perché la magia non esiste?

…	…
But <u>we never seem to think</u> for a moment that nature is magic.	Ma noi <u>non ci fermiamo mai a pensare</u> che la natura sia magica.
<u>We view</u> nature scientifically. We can predict laws.	<u>Consideriamo</u> la natura in modo scientifico. Possiamo predirne le leggi.
But our pride in doing this blinds us. Blinds us to the simple fact: <u>we don't know</u> why there are laws at all.	Ma in questo modo di operare, l'orgoglio ci acceca. Ci acceca per un semplice fatto: <u>non sappiamo</u> perché esistono delle leggi.
We may know that earth goes around the sun. And we may know that this is due to 'gravity'.	Sappiamo che la terra gira intorno al sole. E sappiamo anche che è dovuto alla "gravità".
But no one of us knows why there is gravity. So don't sit there and cast judgment on the credibility of what I say, when you don't know why you aren't floating off your seats (161).	Ma nessuno di noi sa perché esiste la gravità. Quindi non vi permetto di starvene lì seduti a sentenziare sulla credibilità della mia storia, quando non sapete neanche perché rimanete col culo attaccato alla sedia (113).

In the Italian translation the direct address of the protagonist to the audience is rendered, as in English, in the opposition of 'we/you' ('we want/vogliamo'; 'we need/vogliamo'; 'we never seem/non ci fermiamo mai a pensare'; 'we view/consideriamo'; 'we don't know/non sappiamo'; 'we may know/sappiamo'), which culminates in the final warning to the audience who cannot judge the truthfulness of the protagonist's story and is bound to remain in a state of bafflement and uncertainty.

Some final considerations must be made on translation of some the culture-bound terms. Unlike in the translation of *This Lime Tree Bower* and *The Weir*, the translation of *St. Nicholas* required a lower degree of domestication for its more overtly existential overtones. In fact, there are very few culture-bound terms. Some have remained untranslated in Italian, relying on the audience's general knowledge, as in the case of a 'bottle of Glenfiddich/una bottiglia di Glenfiddich', one of the most famous and worldwide-known Scotch whiskeys. Some others have instead been made explicit or summarised in Italian, as in 'I had a dirty big fry/Faccio una colazione completa', 'I have a very heavy fried full breakfast'/ 'un fritto orribile' to stress the amount of the fried food of the full breakfast. Interestingly, some culture-bound terms also identify a 'topography of place' as in *This Lime Tree Bower*, although on a minor scale. Early in the monologue, the protagonist recounts his life as

a theatre critic and traces his journey through the main destinations of the Dublin theatrical scene:

And then I'll shoot off down <u>the Project</u> or <u>the Peacock</u> to witness another amateur disaster. … I was reviewing a new production of the Salome at <u>the Abbey</u>. …. It was after the show in <u>the Flowing Tide</u> (143). … I was supposed to review some lunchtime shite <u>in Bewley's</u> (149).	E poi via <u>al Project</u> o <u>al Peacock</u> per assistere a uno di quei disastri amatoriali. … Stavo recensendo una nuova produzione di Salomé <u>all'Abbey</u>. …. E' successo dopo lo spettacolo <u>al Flowing Tide</u> (99). … Avrei dovuto scrivere una recensione su una merdata di <u>matiné al Bewley</u> (103).

The translator's choice is to leave all toponyms in the original with the only exception of 'in Bewley/matiné al Bewley'. The audience therefore may miss part of the connotative value of these places: that 'the Project' is multidisciplinary arts centre, located in Temple Bar, Dublin's popular quarter, famous for bars and restaurants; that 'the Peacock', located in the same building of the Abbey features more experimental and contemporary works; that 'the Flowing Tide' is a very famous pub close to the Abbey and popular among actors; and that 'Bewley', one of the most well-known cafés in Dublin, hosts regularly lunchtime theatre productions. However, the general meaning of the narrator's theatrical wanderings retains its importance for an Italian audience.

References

Aaltonen S. (1997) "Translating plays or baking apple pies: A functional approach to drama translation", in M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarová and K. Kaindl (eds) *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress, Prague 1995*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 89-98.

Aaltonen S. (2000) *Time-sharing on Stage. Drama Translation in Theatre and Society*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

Aaltonen S. (2005) "Ecce Homo Reactualized", *Cadernos de Literatura Comparada*, 12.13., pp. 65-97.

Allen G. (2000) *Intertextuality*, London and New York, Routledge.

Aly R.M.K. (2018) "Intertextuality" in G. Ritzer and C. Rojek, *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, Wiley & Sons, pp. 1-2.

Andaluz-Pinedo O. (2022) "Prefabricated orality in theatre translations: An overview based on an English–Spanish parallel corpus", *Across Languages and Cultures*, 23.1., pp. 75-91. <https://akjournals.com/view/journals/084/23/1/article-p75.xml>. Last accessed 10 October 2022.

Anderman G. ([1998] 2009) "Drama translation", in M. Baker and G. Saldanha, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 92-95.

Anderman G. (2005) *Europe on Stage. Translation and Theatre*, London, Oberon Books.

Anderman G. (2007) "Voices in Translation", in G. Anderman (ed) *Voices in Translation: Bridging Cultural Divides*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp. 6-15.

Antinucci F. (1974) "Sulla deissi", *Lingua e Stile*, 2. 9., pp. 223-247.

Apter E. (2006) *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press.

Bains R. and Dalmasso F. (2011) "Musical Realizations: a Performance-based Translation of Rhythm in Koltes' *Dans la solitude des champs de coton*", in R. Bains, C. Marinetti and M. Perteghella (eds) *Staging and Performing Translation. Text and Theatre Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 49-71.

Baker M. (2006) *Translation as Conflict: A Narrative Account*, London and New York, Routledge.

Bakhtin M. (1986) *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* C. Emerson and M. Holquist (eds). Trans. V. W. McGee. Austin, University of Austin Press.

Balduzzi R. (2008), "Il pergolato dei tigli", *Cinemaeteatro.com*, <http://www.cinemaeteatro.com/index.php/teatro/recensioni/594-il-pergolato-dei-tigli-mmmm.html>. Last accessed 20 July 2022.

Baños R., Bruti S. and Zanotti S. (2013) "Corpus Linguistics and Audiovisual Translation: in Search of an Integrated Approach", *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology,* 21.4., pp. 483-490.

Barsotti A. (2007) *Eduardo, Fo e l'attore-autore del Novecento*, Roma, Bulzoni.

Barthes R. (1977) *Image – Music – Text.* Trans. S. Heath, London, Fontana.

Bartoloni P. (2003) "Translating from the Interstices", in S. Petrilli (ed) *Translation Translation*, Amsterdam and New York, Rodopi, pp. 465-474.

Bassnett-McGuire S. (1978) "Translating spatial poetry: An examination of theatre texts in performance", in J. S. Holmes, J. Lambert and R. Van den Broeck (eds) *Literature and Translation*, Leuven, Acco, pp. 161-180.

Bassnett-McGuire S. (1985) "Ways through the Labyrinth: Strategies and methods for translating theatre texts" in T. Hermans (ed) *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*, New York, St. Martin Press, pp. 87-102.

Bassnett S. (1988) *Translation Studies*, London and New York, Routledge.

Bassnett S. (1991) "Translating for the Theatre: The Case Against Performability", *TTR: traduction, terminologie, redaction*, 4.1., pp. 99-111.

Bassnett S. and Lefevere A. (eds) ([1990] 1992) *Translation/ History/Culture. A Sourcebook*, London and New York, Routledge.

Bassnett S. (1998) "Still trapped in the Labyrinth: Further reflections on translation and theatre", in S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere (eds) *Constructing Cultures*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matter, pp. 90-108.

Bassnett S. and Lefevre A. (1998) "The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies", in *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp. 123-140.

Bassnett S. (2012) "Translation Studies at Cross-roads" in E. Brems, R. Meyerlaerts and L. van Doorslaer (eds) *Unknowns of Translation Studies*, Special Issue. *Target*, 24. 1., pp. 1-15.

Bastin G. L. (2009) "Adaptation", in M. Baker and G. Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 3-6.

Bellavia S. (2004) *L'ombra di Lear: Il Re Lear di Shakespeare e il teatro italiano (1858-1995)*, Roma, Bulzoni.

Bhabha H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*, London, Routledge.

Bharucha R. (1993) *Theatre and the World: Performance and the Politics of Culture*, London, Routledge.

Biancheri D. (2013) *Discoursive Representation and Translation Practice. The Constructed Reader of Irish Literature in Italian*, PhD Dissertation, Centre for Irish Studies, School of Humanities, National University of Ireland <https://aran.library.nuigalway.ie/bitstream/handle/10379/3496/2013biancheriphd.pdf>. Last accessed 20 July 2022.

Bigliazzi, S. Kofler P. and Ambrosi P. (2013) "Introduction", in S. Bigliazzi, P. Ambrosi and P. Kofler (eds) *Translation in Performance*, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 1-26.

Birch D. (1991) *The Language of Drama*, London, Macmillan.

Boselli S. (1996) "La traduzione teatrale", *Testo a fronte*, 15, pp. 63-80.

Briggs C. L. and Bauman R. (1992) "Genre, Intertextuality, and Social Power", *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 2.2., pp. 131-172.

Brisset A. (1989) "In Search of a Target Language: The Politics of Theatre Translation in Quebec", *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 1.1., pp. 9-27.

Brisset A. (1998) "Le publique et son traducteur: profil idéologique de la traduction théâtrale au Québec", *TTR*, 1.1., pp. 127-138.

Brodie G. (2018) *The Translator on Stage*, New York, Bloomsbury.

Brodie G. and Cole E. K. (2017) "Introduction", in G. Brodie and E. K. Cole (eds) *Adapting Translation for the Stage*, London, Routledge, pp. 1-18.

Butler J. (1988) "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory", *Theatre Journal*, 40. 4., pp. 519-351.

Butler J. (2011 [1993]) *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*, London and New York, Routledge.

Cacciarini S. (2020) "Vampiri e sogni in *St. Nicholas* di Conor McPherson l'ultimo spettacolo di Trend", *Il terzo news. Testata romana cultura e società*, <http://www.ilterzonews.it/>. Last accessed 30 July 2022.

Calamai S. (2009), *Dalla parola al palcoscenico: le lingue di Chiti, Malpeli, Maraini, Russo, Scimone, Tarantino*, in Stefania Stefanelli (a cura di), *Varietà dell'italiano nel teatro contemporaneo*, Atti della giornata di studio Pisa, Scuola Normale Superiore, 11 December, 2006, pp. 195-238.

Cameron D. (2000) "Tradaptation: Cultural Exchange and Black British Theatre", in C. A. Upton and T. Hale (eds) *Moving Target. Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, pp. 17-24.

Canziani, R. (2019) *Italian Theatre Today: Not a System, and so Many Transformations*, "Critical Stages/Scène Critiques, The IATC journal/Revue de l'AICT" (20) <https://www.critical-stages.org/20/italian-theatre-today-not-a-system-and-so-many-transformations/>. Last accessed 15 July 2022.

Carr M. (2001) "Marina Carr in Conversation with Melissa Sihra", in L. Chambers, G. FitzGibbon and E. Jordan (eds) *Theatre Talk: Voices of Irish Theatre Practitioners*, Dublin, Carysfort, pp. 55-63.

Carr M. (1998) "Dealing with the Dead", *Irish University Review*, 28.1., pp. 190-196.

Cattrysse P. (1992) "Film (Adaptation) as Translation: Some Methodological Proposals", *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 4.1., pp. 53-70.

Cavallo A. (2015) "Seeing the word, hearing the image: the artistic possibilities of audio description in theatrical performance", *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 20.1., pp. 125-134;

Che Suh J. (2002) "Compounding Issues on the Translation of Drama/Theatre Texts", *Meta: journal des traducteurs/Meta: Translators' Journal*, 47.1., pp. 51-57.

Che Suh J. (2011) "The Performability and Speakability Dimensions of Translated Drama Texts", *Intralinea. Online Translation Journal*, 13, <https://www.intralinea.org/specials/article/1671>. Last accessed 12 October 2022.

Coleridge S. T. (2018) *Tutto il mondo di ombre (Poesie 1791-1834)*, traduzione e cura di Edoardo Zuccato, Elliot, Roma.

Colleary S (2012) "Conor McPherson's *St. Nicholas* – A Study in Comic Anguish", in L. Chambers and E. Jordan (eds) *The Theatre of Conor McPherson: Right Beside the Beyond*, Dublin, Carysfort Press, pp. 77-88.

Corbett J. (2007) "Speaking the World: Drama in Scots Translation", in G. Anderman (ed) *Voices in Translation: Bridging Cultural Divides*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp. 46-55.

Corrigan R. W. (1961) "Translating for Actors", in W. Arrowsmith and R. Shattuck (eds) *Craft and Context of Translation*, Austin, University of Texas Press, pp. 95-106.

Cummings S. T. (2000) "Homo Fabulator: The Narrative Imperative in Conor McPherson's Plays", in E. Jordan (ed.) *Theatre Stuff: Critical Essays on Contemporary Irish Theatre*, Dublin, Carysfort Press, pp. 303-312.

Delabastita D. (1989) "Translation and Mass-Communication: Film and TV. Translation as Evidence of Cultural Dynamics", *Babel*, 35.4., pp. 193–218.

Delli Castelli B. (2006) "Traduzione teatrale e codici espressivi", *Traduttologia*, 2, pp. 55-70.

Déprats J. M. (1990) *Traduire, adapter, écrire. Traduire le théâtre*. Paris, Actes Sud.

Di Giovanni E. (2018) "Audio description for live performances and audience participation", *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 29, pp. 189-211.

Di Giovanni E. (2021) "Oltre l'accessibilità: I teatri inclusivi", *Lingue e Linguaggi*, 43, pp. 15-21.

Di Giovanni E. and Gambier Y. (eds) (2018), *Reception Studies and Audiovisual Translation*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Di Giovanni E. and Raffi F. (2022) "Inclusive Theatres as Boosters of Well-being: Concepts and Practice", *Journal of Audiovisual Translation*, 5.1., pp. 166-185.

Dromgoole D. (2002) *The Full Room: An A-Z of Contemporary Playwrighting*, London, Methuen.

Eagleton T. (1977) "Translation and Transformation" *Stand*, 19.3., pp. 72–77.

Elam K. (1980) *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*, London and New York, Routledge.

Espasa E. (2000) "Performability in Translation: Speakability? Playability? Or Just Saleability?", in C. A. Upton and T. Hale (eds) *Moving Target. Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, pp. 49-62.

Espasa Borràs E. (2001) *La traducció dalt de l'escenari*, Barcelona, Eumo Editorial.

Espasa E. (2013) "Masks, Music Scores, and Hourglasses: Rethinking Performability through Metaphors", in S. Bigliazzi, P. Ambrosi and P. Kofler (eds) *Theatre Translation in Performance*, London, Routledge, pp. 38-49.

Espasa E. (2017) "Stage Translation", in C. Millan-Varela and F. Bartrina (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. Routledge, pp. 335-349.

Even Zohar I. (1987) "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem", in G. Toury (ed) *Translation Across Cultures*, New Delhi, Bahri, pp. 107-115.

Fairclough N. (1992a) *Discourse and Social Change*, London, Polity.

Fairclough N. (1992b) "Discourse and Text: Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis" *Discourse and Society*, 3.2., pp. 193-217.

Fairclough N. (1992c) "Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis", *Linguistics and Education*, 4, pp. 269-293.

Fairclough N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language,* London and New York, Routledge.

Fairclough N. (2009) "Language and Globalization", *Semiotica*, 173–1.4., pp. 317–342. <file:///C:/Users/Monica/Downloads/10.1515_semi.2009.014-1.pdf>. Last accessed 20 October 2021.

Fairclough N. (2013) *Language and Power*, London and New York, Routledge, 2013.

Farahzad F. (2009) "Translation as an Intertextual Practice", *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 16.3-4., pp. 125-131.

Farrell J. (2007) "The Style of Translation: Dialogue with the Author", in G. Anderman (ed) *Voices in Translation: Bridging Cultural Divides*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp. 56-65.

Federici F. (2011) "Introduction: Dialects, idiolects, sociolects: Translation Problems or Creative Stimuli?" in F. Federici (ed) *Translating Dialects and Languages of Minorities. Challenges and Solutions,* Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, pp. 1-11.

Fischer-Lichte E. (1990) "Staging the Foreign as Cultural Transformation", in Fischer-Lichte, J. Riley, and M. Gissenwehrer (eds) *The Dramatic Touch of Difference: Theatre, Own and Foreign*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr, pp. 277-287.

Fischer-Lichte E. (2008) *The Transformative Power of Performance. A new aesthetics*, London and New York, Routledge.

Fischlin D. and Fortier M. (eds) (2000) *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to Present*, London and New York, Routledge.

Fo D. (1987) *Manuale minimo dell'attore*, Torino, Einaudi.

Fo D. (2001) *We Won't Pay! We Won't Pay! and Other Plays,* in F. Rame (ed) *The Collected Plays of Dario Fo. Volume 1*. Translated by Ron Jenkins, New York, Theatre Communications Group.

Fo D. (2010) *Low Pay? Don't Pay!.* Translated by Joseph Farrell, London, Methuen.

Fois E. (2013-4) *Poche parole ma significanti: quando la traduzione va in scena. Con due case studies*, tesi di dottorato, Università di Cagliari, a.a. 2013-14.

Friel B. (1980) "'Talking to Ourselves'. Brian Friel Talks to Paddy Agnew", *Magill*, December, 1980, 59-61.

Friel B. (1982) "The Man From God Knows Where", Interview with Fintan O'Toole, *In Dublin*, 28 October, pp. 20-23.

Friel, B. (1996) *Faith Healer*, in *Brian Friel: Plays One*, Faber and Faber, London.

Fryer L. E. (2010) "Audio description as Audio Drama – a Practitioner's Point of View", *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 18.3., pp. 205-213;

Fryer L. E. (2018) "Staging the audio describer. An exploration of integrated audio description", *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 38.3.; <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10055676/1/Fryer_staging%20the%20audio%20describer%20final%20draft.pdf>. Last accessed 20 October 2022.

Gentzler E. (1996) "Translation, Counter-Culture, and the Fifties in the USA", in R. Álvarez and M. C. Africa Vidal (eds), *Translation, Power, Subversion*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp. 116-137.

Gentzler E. (1998) "Foreword", in in *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp. ix-xxi.

Gostand R. (1980) "Verbal and Non-verbal Communication: Drama as Translation", in O. Zuber (ed) *The Languages of Theatre. Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama*, Oxford, Pergamon Press, pp. 1-9.

Gottlieb V. (1989) "Chekhov in limbo: British productions of the plays of Chekhov", in H. Scolnicov and P. Holland (eds) *The Play Out of Context: Transferring Plays from Culture to Culture*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 163-172.

Graham-Jones J. (2017) "The Critical and cultural fault lines of translation/adaptation in contemporary theatre", in G. Brodie and E. K. Cole (eds) *Adapting Translation for the Stage*, London, Routledge, pp. 137-143.

Grene N. (1999) *The Politics of Irish Drama: Plays in Context from Boucicault to Friel*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hamberg L. (1969) "Some Practical Considerations Concerning Dramatic Translation", *Babel*, 15, pp. 91-94.

Hermans T. (ed) (1985) *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*, New York, St. Martin Press.

Hermans T. (2003) "Translation, Equivalence and Intertextuality", *Wasafiri*, 18.40., pp. 39–41.

Hermans T. (2007) "Translation, Irritation and Resonance", in M. Wolf and A. Fukari (eds) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 57–75.

Hickey R. (2005) *Dublin English: Evolution and Change*, Amsterdam, Benjamins.

Hickey R. (2007) *Irish English: History and Present-day Forms*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hodges A. (2015) "Intertextuality in Discourse", in D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, and D. Schiffrin, *The handbook of discourse analysis*, Oxford, John Wiley and Blackwell, 2., pp. 42-60.

Holland P. "Audio Description in the Theatre and the Visual Arts: Images into Words", in J. Díaz Cintas and G. Anderman (eds) *Audiovisual Translation. Language Transfer on Screen*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 170-185.

Holmes J. (1988) *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam, Rodopi.

Honzel J. (1976) "Dynamics of Sign in the Theater", in L. Metejka and I. R. Titunik (eds), *Semiotics of Art: Prague School Contributions*, Cambridge, MIT Press, pp. 74-93, in Ekaterini Nikolarea (2002), "Performability versus Readability: A Historical Overview of a Theoretical Polarization in Theater Translation", *Translation Journal*, 6. 4. <http://www.translationjournal.net/journal/22theater.htm>. Last accessed 7 September 2021.

Hörmanseder F. (2008) *Text und Publikum: Kriterien für eine bühnenwirksame Übersetzung im Hinblick auf eine Kooperation zwischen Translatologen und Bühnenexperten*. Tübingen, Stauffenburg-Verlag.

Hutcheon L. (2006) *A Theory of Adaptation*, London and New York, Routledge.

Johnston D. (2004) "Securing the Performability of the Play in Translation", in S. Coelsch-Foisner and K. Holger (eds) *Drama Translation and Theatre Practice*, Berlin, Peter Lang, pp. 25-38.

Jordan E. (2006) "Look Who's Talking, Too: The Duplicitous Myth of Naïve Narrative", in C. Wallace (ed) *Monologues. Theatre, Performance, Subjectivity*, Prague, Litteraria Pragensia, pp. 125-156.

Jordan E. (2019) *The Theatre and Films of Conor McPherson: Conspicuous Communities*, London, Methuen.

Keating S. (2012) "The Geography of Conor McPherson's Plays: The City as Salvation or Hell?", in L. Chambers and E. Jordan (eds) *The Theatre of Conor McPherson: Right Beside the Beyond*, Dublin, Carysfort Press, pp. 31-41.

Kowzan, T. (1968a) "Le signe au théâtre: introduction à la sémiologie de l'art du spectacle", *Diogènes*, 61, 59-90.

Kowzan T. (1968b) "The Sign in the Theater: An Introduction to the Semiology of the Art of the Spectacle", Trans. S. Pleasance, *Diogenes*, 61, pp. 52-80

Krebs K. (2014b) "Ghosts We Have Seen Before: Trends in Adaptation in Contemporary Performance", *Theatre Journal* 66.4., pp. 581-590.

Krebs K. (2014a) "Introduction: Collisions, Diversions and Meeting Points", in K. Krebs (ed) *Translation and Adaptation in Theatre and Film*, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 1-35.

Kristeva J. (1968) *Theorie d'ensemble*, *Tel Quel*, Paris.

Kristeva J. (1980) 'Problème de la structuraction du text' in J. Kristeva, *Desire in Language: a Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Trans. T. Gora, A. Jardine, New York, Columbia University Press.

Ladouceur L. (1995) "Normes, fonctions et traduction théâtrale", *Meta: journal des traducteurs/Meta: Translators' Journal*, vol. 40. 1., pp. 31-38.

Ladouceur L. (2013) *Dramatic Licence: Translating Theatre From One Official Language to the Other in Canada*, Alberta, Alberta University Press.

Ladouceur L. and Nolette N. (2011) "Cow-boy pétré: A Bilingual Performance for a Unilingual Audience", in R. Bains, C. Marinetti and M. Perteghella (eds) *Staging and Performing Translation. Text and Theatre Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 155-170.

Laera M. (2011) "Theatre Translation as Collaboration: Aleks Sierz, Martin Crimp, Nathalie Abrahami, Colin Teevan, Zoë Svendsen and Michael Walton discuss Translation for the Stage", *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 21.2., pp. 213-225.

Laera M. (2014) "Introduction: Return, Rewrite, Repeat: the Theatricality of Adaptation", in M. Laera (ed) *Theatre and Adaptation: Return, Rewrite, Repeat*, London and New York, Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, pp. 1-17.

Laera M. (2019) *Theatre and translation*, New York, Red Globe Press and Bloomsbury.

Laliberté M. (1995) "La problématique de la traduction théâtrale et de l'adaptation au Québec", *Meta,* 40. 4., pp. 519-528.

Lambert J. and Van Gorp H. (1985) "On Describing Translations", in T. Hermans (ed) *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*, New York, St. Martin Press, pp. 50-61.

Lefevere A. (1980) "Translating Literature/Translated Literature – The State of the Art", in O. Zuber (ed), *The Languages of Theatre. Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama*, Oxford, Pergamon Press, 153-161.

Lefevere A. (1982) "*Mother Courage*'s cucumbers: text, system and refraction in a theory of literature", *Modern Language Studies*, pp. 3-20.

Lefevere A. (1992) *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London and New York, Routledge.

Levý J. ([1969] 2011) *The Art of Translation*, 97, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Logan B. "Whose play is it anyway?", *The Guardian*, Wednesday 12 March 2003, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2003/mar/12/theatre.artsfeatures>. Last accessed 21 May 2019.

Lonergan P. (2007) *Theatre and Globalization: Irish Drama in the Celtic Tiger Era*, Basingstoke, Palgrave and Macmillan.

Long Y. and Yu G. (2020) "Intertextuality Theory and Translation", *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10.9., pp. 1106-1110.

Marinetti C. (2013a) "Translation and theatre: From performance to performativity", *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 25.3., pp. 307-320.

Marinetti C. (2013b) "Transnational, Multilingual and Post-dramatic: The Location of Translation in Contemporary Theatre" in S. Bigliazzi, P. Ambrosi and P. Kofler (eds) *Theatre Translation in Performance*, London, Routledge, pp. 27-38.

Marinetti C. (2018) "Theatre as a 'translation zone': multilingualism, identity and the performing body in the work of Teatro delle Albe", *The Translator*, 24.2., pp. 128-146.

Marinetti C., Perteghella M. and Bains R. (2011) "Introduction", in R. Bains, C. Marinetti and M. Perteghella (eds) *Staging and Performing Translation. Text and Theatre Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-8.

Mateo M. (1997) "Translation strategies and the reception of drama performances: a mutual influence", in M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarová and K. Kaindl (eds) *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress, Prague 1995*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 99-110.

Mathews P.J. (2012) "'The 'Sweet Smell' of the Celtic Tiger: Elegy and Critique in Conor McPherson's *The Weir*", in L. Chambers and E. Jordan (eds) *The Theatre of Conor McPherson: Right Beside the Beyond*, Dublin, Carysfort Press, pp. 151-164.

Menin R. (2012) "Testo, discorso, globalizzazione", in *Altre Modernità / Otras Modernidades / Autres Modernités / OtherModernities*. <https://riviste.unimi.it/index.php/AMonline/article/view/2453/2677>. Last accessed 20 may 2018.

Menin R. (2014) "The concept of performability and its application within theatrical tradition", *Studi Germanici*, 5. 2., pp. 108-137.

Merino Álvarez R. (1992) "Profesión: adaptador", *Livius*, 1, pp. 85–97.

Merino Álvarez R. (1994) *Traduccion, tradicion y manipulacion: teatro ingles en Espana 1950–1990*, León, Universidad de León y Universidad del País Vasco.

Merino-Álvarez R. (1994) "A Framework for the Description of Drama Translations", *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses,* 29, pp. 127-138.

Merriman V. (1999) "Decolonization Postponed: The Theatre of Tiger Trash", *Irish University Review*, 29.2., pp. 305-317.

Meth J., Mendelsohn K. and Svendsen Z. (2011) "Roundtable on Collaborative Theatre Translation Projects: Experiences and Perspectives", in R. Bains, C. Marinetti and M. Perteghella (eds) *Staging and Performing Translation. Text and Theatre Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 200-211.

Middeke M. and Schnierer P. P. (2010) "Introduction", in M. Middeke and P. P. Schnierer (eds) *The Methuen Drama Guide to Contemporary Irish Playwrights*. London, Methuen, pp. vii-xix.

Minier M. (2014) "Definitions, Dyads, Triads and Other Points of Connection in Translation and Adaptation Discourse", in K. Krebs (ed) *Translation and Adaptation in Theatre and Film*, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 13-35.

Minutella V. (2013) *Reclaiming Romeo and Juliet: Italian Translations for Page, Stage and Screen*, Amsterdam, Rodopi.

Mitchell T. ([1984] 1999) *Dario Fo. People's Court Jester*, London, Methuen.

Mitchell T. (1985) "Popular Theatre and the Changing Perspective of the Eighties: John McGrath interviewed by Tony Mitchell", *New Theatre Quarterly*, 1. 4., November 1985, pp. 390-399.

Morini M. (2022) *Theatre Translation: Theory and Practice*, London, Bloomsbury Publishing.

Mounin G. (1965) *Teoria e storia della traduzione*, Torino, Einaudi.

Murphy T. (1988) *Bailegangaire*, in *After Tragedy: Three Irish Plays by Thomas Murphy*, London, Methuen.

Murray C. (2000) *Twentieth-Century Irish Drama: Mirror up to Nation*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Nencioni G. (1976) "Parlato-parlato, parlato-scritto, parlato-recitato", *Strumenti critici*, 60, pp.126-179.

Neubert A. (1981) "Translation, Interpreting and Text Linguistics", *Studia Linguistica*, 35 1.2., pp. 130–145.

Newmark P. (1988) *A Textbook of Translation*, New York, Prentice Hall International.

O'Neill P. (1983) "The Comedy of Entropy: The Contexts of Black Humour", *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, 10.2., pp. 145-166.

O'Neill P. (1990) *The Comedy of Entropy: Humour/Narrative/Reading*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

O'Toole P. (1999) "Introduction", in M. McDonagh, *Plays: One*. London, Methuen, pp. x-xvii.

Pagnini M. (1970) "Per una semiologia del teatro classico", *Strumenti critici*, 12, pp. 122-140.

Palazzi R. (2006) "Fantasmi e solitudine nel pub", *Il sole 24 ore*, 12 marzo.

Paulin T. (1985 [1983]) "A New Look at the Language Question", in *Ireland's Field Day*, Field Day Theatre Company, London, Hutchinson, pp. 3-22.

Pavis P. (1989) "Problems of translation for the stage: interculturalism and post-modern theatre", in H. Scolnicov and P. Holland (eds) *The Plays Out of Context: Transferring Plays from Culture to Culture*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 25-44.

Pavis P. (1992) *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*, Trans. L. Kruger, London, Routledge.

Paz O. (1992) "Translation: Literature and Letters", in R. Schulte and J. Biguenet (eds) *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. 152-162.

Peghinelli A. (2012) "Theatre Translation as Collaboration: a Case in Point in British Contemporary Drama", *Journal for Communication and Culture* 2.1., pp. 20-30.

Perego E. and Pacinotti R. (2020) "Audiovisual Translation through the Ages", in Ł. Bogucki and M. Deckert (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Audiovisual Translation and Media Accessibility*, Cham, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 33-56.

Perego E. and Taylor C. J. (2012) *Tradurre l'audiovisivo*, Roma, Carocci.

Perteghella M. (2002) "Language and Politics on Stage: Strategies for Translating Dialect and Slang with References to Shaw's *Pygmalion* and Bond's *Saved*", *Translation Review*, 64, pp. 45-53.

Perteghella M. (2004) "A Descriptive-Anthropological Model of Theatre Translation", in S. Coelsch-Foisner and K. Holger (eds) *Drama Translation and Theatre Practice*, Berlin, Peter Lang, pp. 1-23.

Perteghella M. (2008) "Adaptation: Bastard Child or Critique? Putting Terminology Centre Stage", *Journal of Romance Studies*, 8.3., pp. 51-65.

Pilkington L. (2010) *Theatre and Ireland*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Poyatos F. (1993) *Paralanguage*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Poyatos F. (2002) *Nonverbal Communication across Disciplines: Volume 3: Narrative literature, theater, cinema, translation*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Poyatos F. (2008) *Textual Translation and Live Translation*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Pugliatti P. e Tempera M. (eds) (1986) *King Lear. Dal testo alla scena*. Bologna, CLUEB.

Pugliatti P. G. (1976) *I segni latenti: Scrittura come virtualità in King Lear*, Messina/Firenze, D'Anna.

Randaccio M. (2001) *Il teatro irlandese contemporaneo: Soggettività e comunità in Friel, Murphy e Kilroy*, Trieste, Edizioni Parnaso.

Randaccio M. (2002) "Decolonising 'Ulysses' in the Neocolonial Irish Society: Conor McPherson's Plays", in S. Bassi, S. Bertacco e R. Bonicelli (eds) *In That Village of Open Doors. Le nuove letterature crocevia della cultura moderna.* Atti del I Convegno AISLI, Venezia, Libreria Editrice, pp. 351-359.

Randaccio M. (2009) "Drama translation as textual and cultural transformation", *Rivista Internazionale di Tecnica della Traduzione/International Journal of Translation*, 11, pp. 139-158.

Randaccio M. (2014) "Brian Friel as Linguist, Brian Friel as Drama Translator", in M. Randaccio (ed), "Forms of Identity. Ireland, Language, Translation", *Studi irlandesi/A Journal of Irish Studies*. 3, Firenze University Press, pp. 113-128. <http://www.fupress.com/bsfm-sijis>.

Randaccio M. (2015) "Martin McDonagh's *The Beauty Queen of Leenane* on the Italian Stage: Can the Space of the Irish Dramatic Tradition Be Rewritten?", *Litteraria Pragensia* 25.50., pp. 107-119.

Randaccio M. (2015) "Teatralność oraz kategorie czasu i miejsca jako istotne zagadnienia w przekładzie dramatu", Translated from the English "Performability and the Notions of Time and Place as Relevant Issues in Drama Translation", *PRZEKłADANIEC* , 31, pp. 9-30.

Randaccio M. (2017) "The Translation of Contemporary Drama: McCafferty's *Quietly* on the Italian Stage" *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS)*, 23.1., pp. 177-190.

Randaccio M. (2018) "Translating for the Stage: the case of Owen McCafferty's *Quietly*", in C. Sciarrino (ed) *Irish-Italian Studies. New Perspective on Cultural Mobility and Permeability*, Palermo, Palermo University Press, pp. 141-156.

Randaccio M. (2021) "Conor McPherson's *The Weir* into Italian as Intertextual Translation", *InVerbis*, 11.2., pp. 123-142.

Rapetti V. (2014) "Chasing the Intangible: a Conversation on Theatre, Language, and Artistic Migrations with Irish Playwright Marina Carr", in *Studi Irlandesi/A Journal of Irish Studies*, 4., pp. 147-259.

Redazione *il Giornale.it* (2008) "Tre uomini sotto il pergolato", 5 febbraio <https://www.ilgiornale.it/news/tre-uomini-sotto-pergolato.html>. Last accessed 30 July 2022.

Regattin F. (2004) "Théâtre et traduction: un aperçu du débat théorique", *L'Annuaire théâtral*, 36, pp. 156–171. <https://doi.org/10.7202/041584ar>. Last accessed 30 July 2021.

Richard S. (2004) "Plays of (ever)changing Ireland", in *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Irish Drama*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-17.

Richtarik M. J. (1994) *Acting Between the Lines: The Field Day Theatre Company and Irish Cultural Politics 1980-1984*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Roche A. (1994) *Contemporary Irish Drama: From Beckett to McGuiness*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan.

Rock. S. (2011) "The Theatre Sign Language Interpreter and the Competing Visual Narrative: the Translation and Interpretation of Theatrical Texts into British Sign Language", in R. Bains, C. Marinetti and M. Perteghella (eds) *Staging and Performing Translation. Text and Theatre Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 72-86.

Roma Culture (2020) "*St. Nicholas*. Spettacolo di Valerio Binasco dall'opera di Conor McPherson in diretta dal Teatro Belli 20.12.2020 − 21.12.2020". <https://culture.roma.it/appuntamento/st-nicholas/>. Last accessed 30 July 2022.

Ron Jenkins (2001) "The comedy of hunger", in F. Rame (ed) *The Collected Plays of Dario Fo. Volume 1*. Trans. by R. Jenkins, New York, Theatre Communications Group, pp. xi-xxii.

Roofthooft H., Remael A. and L. Van den Dries (2018), "Audio description for (postdramatic) theatre. Preparing the stage", *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 30, pp. 232-244.

Rose M. (1999) "Prefazione", in *Conor McPherson: Teatro*, Roma, Gremese, pp. 5-7.

Rose M. and Marinetti C. (2011) "The Translator as Cultural Promoter: or how Renato Gabrielli's *Qualcosa trilla* went on the Road as *Mobile Thriller*", in R. Bains, C. Marinetti and M. Perteghella (eds) *Staging and Performing Translation. Text and Theatre Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 139-154.

Ruffini F. (1978) *Semiotica del testo*, Roma, Bulzoni.

Sakellariou P. (2015) "The appropriation of the concept of intertextuality for translation-theoretic purposes" *Translation Studies*, 8.1., pp. 35-47.

Sanders J. (2006) *Adaptation and Appropriation*, London and New York, Routledge.

Santoyo J. C. (1989) 'Traducciones y adaptaciones teatrales: ensayo de una tipología', *Cuadernos de Teatro Clasico*, 4, pp. 96–107.

Scarpellini A. (2006) "Eroi annegati dall'alcol", *Diario*, 17 novembre.

Schechner R. (2002) *Performance Studies. An Introduction*, London and New York, Routledge.

Schultze B. (1998) "Highways, byways, and blind alleys in translating drama: historical and systematic aspects of a cultural technique", in K. Mueller–Vollmer and Michael

Irmscher (eds) *Translating Literatures, Translating Cultures. New Vistas and Approaches in Literary Studies*, Berlin, Erich Schmidt Verlag, pp. 177-196.

Schweinberger M. (2012) "The discursive marker LIKE in Irish English", in B. Miggie and M. Ní Chiosáin (eds) *New Perspectives on Irish English*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 179-202.

Scolnicov H. and Holland P. (1989) (eds) *The Play Out of Context: Transferring Plays from Culture to Culture*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Serón-Ordóñez I. (2013) "Theatre translation studies: An overview of a burgeoning field (Part I: Up to the early 2000s)", *Status Quaestionis*, 5, pp. 90-129.

Serón-Ordóñez I. (2014) "Theatre translation studies: An overview of a burgeoning field (Part II: From the early 2000s to 2014)", *Status Quaestionis*, 7, pp. 28-73.

Serpieri A. *et al.* (1981) "Toward a segmentation of the dramatic text", *Poetics Today*, 2.3., pp. 163-200.

Sherry S. (1996) *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*, London, Routledge.

Sierz A. (2001) *In-Yer-Face Theatre: British Drama Today*, London, Faber and Faber.

Singleton B. (2006) "Am I Talking to Myself? Men, Masculinity and the Monologue in Contemporary Irish Drama", in C. Wallace (ed), *Monologues. Theatre, Performance, Subjectivity*, Prague, Litteraria Pragensia, pp. 233-260.

Snell-Hornby M. (1996) "All the world's a stage: multimedial translation-constraint or potential?" in *Traduzione multimediale per il cinema, la televisione e la scena*, atti del Convegno internazionale, Forlì, 26-28 ottobre 1995, pp. 29-45.

Snell-Hornby M. (1997) "Is this a dagger which I see before me? The Non-Verbal Language of Drama*"*, in F. Poyatos (ed) *Nonverbal Communication and Translation: New Perspectives and Challenges in Literature, Interpretation and the Media.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp.187-201.

Snell-Hornby M. (2006) *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby M. (2007) "Theatre and opera translation", in P. Kuhiwczak and K. Littau (eds) *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp. 106-119.

Soncini S. F. (2007) "Intersemiotic Complexities: Translating the Word of Drama", in M. Bertuccelli Papi, G. Cappelli and S. Masi (eds) *Lexical Complexity: Theoretical Assessment and Translational Perspectives*, Pisa, Pisa University Press, pp. 271-278.

Spencer C. (2010), 'Five Stars', *The Telegraph*, August 13, <https://kaiteoreilly.com/work/2017/2/15/persians>. Last accessed 19 July 2021.

Spivak G. C. (1976) "Translator's preface" to Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. ix–xxxvii.

Spivak G. (1992) "The Politics of Translation", in M. Barrett M. and A. Philips (eds), *Destabilizing Theory*, Oxford, Polity Press, pp. 177-200.

Sposaro F. (2020) "Valerio Binasco in *St. Nicholas*: la storia di un critico teatrale tra superstizione e realtà", *La platea. Rivista di cultura teatrale*. <https://www.laplatea.it/index.php/teatro/recensioni/5624-valerio-binasco-in-san-nicholas-la-storia-di-un-critico-teatrale-tra-superstizione-e-realta.html>. Last accessed 30 July 2022.

Stanislavski K. ([1950] 1968) *Building a character*, Trans. E. R. Hapgood, London, Methuen.

Sung O. M. (2020) "Translation Challenges in Rendering Idiolects of Literary Characters", *Studies About Languages*, pp. 37-55.

Talone P. (2020) "*St. Nicholas* di Conor McPherson, reading agìto e a cura di Valerio Binasco", *Accreditati. Laboratorio di impressioni cinematografiche e teatrali*, <https://www.accreditati.it/st-nicholas-di-conor-mcpherson-reading-agito-e-a-cura-di-valerio-binasco/>. Last accessed 30 July 2022.

Tarantini A. T. (2021) *Theatre Translation: a Practice as Research Model*, Berlin, Springer Nature.

Taviano S. (2017) *Staging Dario Fo and Franca Rame: Anglo-American Approaches to Political Theatre*, London and New York, Routledge.

Tinniswood P. (1992) "Note on Adaptation", in *De Filippo: Four Plays*, London, Methuen Drama, pp. 247-248.

Toíbín C. (2001) "The Talk of the Town: The Plays of Billy Roche", in Dermot Bolger (ed) *Druids, Dudes and Beauty Queens. The Changing Face of Irish Theatre*, Dublin, New Island, pp. 18-29.

Totzeva S. (1998) "Realizing Theatrical Potential. The Dramatic Text in Performance and Translation", in J. Boase-Beier and M. Holman (eds) *The Practice of Literary Translation Constraints and Creativity*, Manchester, St. Jerome, pp. 81-90.

Toury G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies. And Beyond*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Trench R. (2012) "The Measure of a Pub Spirit in Conor McPherson's *The Weir*", in L. Chambers and E. Jordan (eds) *The Theatre of Conor McPherson: Right Beside the Beyond*, Dublin, Carysfort Press, pp. 165-183.

Trifone P. (1994) "L'italiano a teatro", in Luca Serianni and Pietro Trifone (a cura di) *Storia della lingua italiana*, Torino. Einaudi.

Ubersfeld A. (1999) *Reading Theatre*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

Udo J. P. and Fels D. I. (2010) "Universal Design on Stage: Live Audio Description for Theatrical Performances", *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 18.3., pp. 189-203;

Udo J. P. and Fels D. I. (2011) "From the describer's mouth: Reflections on creating unconventional audio description for live theatre", in A. Şerban, A. Matamala and J. M. Lavaur (eds) *Audiovisual Translation in Close-up: Practical and Theoretical Approaches*, Bern, Peter Lang, pp. 257-278;

Upton C. A. and Hale T. (2000) "Introduction", in C.A. Upton and T. Hale (eds) *Moving Target. Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, pp. 1-13.

Uspensky B. and Lotman J. (1978) "On the Semiotic Mechanisms of Culture", *New Literary History*, 9.2., pp. 211-232.

Van den Broeck R. (1988) "Translation for the Theatre", in J. T. Ydstie (ed) *In Honour of Patrick Nigel Chaffey on the Occasion of his 50th Birthday,22 September 1998 with Contributions from Friends and Colleagues*, Oslo: Centre for Applied Linguistics, University of Oslo.

Van Dijk T. A. (1997) "Discourse and Ideology", in T. A. van Dijk (eds) *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, London, Sage, pp. 379-407.

Van Dijk T. A. (2001) "Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity", in R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London, Sage, pp. 95-120.

Van Stapele P. (1990) "The Analysis of Deixis as a Basis for Discourse Analysis of Dramatic Texts", in M. A. K. Halliday, J. Gibbons and H. Nicholas, *Learning, Keeping and Using Language*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 333-348.

Veltruský J. (1964) "Man and Object in the Theater", in P. L. Garvin (ed) *A Prague School Reader on Aesthetics, Literary Structure and Style*, Washington, Georgetown University Press, pp. 83-91.

Venuti L. (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London, Routledge.

Venuti L. (1998) *The Scandals of Translation*, London, Routledge.

Venuti L. (2007) "Adaptation, translation, critique", *Journal of Visual Culture*, 6.1., pp. 25-43.

Verma J. (1996) "The Challenge of *Binglish*: Analysing Multi-cultural Performance", in P. Campbell (ed) *Analysing Performance: A Critical Reader*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, pp. 193-202.

Wallace C. (2006) *Suspect Cultures. Narrative, Identity and Citation in 1990s New Drama*, Prague, Litteraria Pragensia.

Walsh I. R. (2012) "Mysterium Tremens: Conor McPherson's *Dublin's Carol*", in L. Chambers and E. Jordan (eds) *The Theatre of Conor McPherson: Right Beside the Beyond*, Dublin, Carysfort Press, pp. 137- 150.

Wellwarth G. E. (1981) "Special Considerations in Drama Translation" in Marlyn G. R. (ed) *Translation in the Humanities*, State University of New York at Binghamton, pp. 53-59.

Williams J. and Chesterman A. (2002) *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*, Manchester, St Jerome.

Windle (2011) "The Translation of Drama", in K. Malmkjær and K. Windle (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 153-168.

Wolf M. (1997) "Translation as a process of power: Aspects of cultural anthropology in translation", in M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarova and K. Kaindl (eds) *Translation as Intercultural Communication*, ed. by Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 124-133.

Wood G. C. (2003) *Conor McPherson: Imagining Mischief*, Dublin, Liffey.

Worton M. and Still J. (eds) (1990) "Introduction", in M. Worton and J. Still (eds) *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, pp. 1-44.

Zanovello S. (2006 a) "Se la birra non affoga il dolore", *Il secolo XIX*, 3 marzo.

Zanovello S. (2006 b) "Paravidino: nei bar di periferia fra fantasie e aspirazioni", *Il secolo XIX*, 24 marzo.

Zatlin P. (2005) *Theatrical Translation and Film Adaptation: a Practitioner's View*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

Zuber-Skerritt O. (1988) "Towards a Typology of Literary Translation: Drama Translation Science", *Meta: journal des traducteurs/Meta: Translators' Journal*, 33.4., pp. 485-490.