

Università degli Studi di Trieste
Dipartimento di Scienze Giuridiche, del Linguaggio,
dell'Interpretazione e della Traduzione

Rivista Internazionale di Tecnica della Traduzione

International Journal
of Translation

EUT

n. 26/2024

The *Rivista Internazionale di Tecnica della Traduzione* –
International Journal of Translation of the IUSLIT
Department and Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne
per Interpreti e Traduttori, University of Trieste aims
at providing a forum of discussion for the
multifaceted activity of translation and related issues.

ISSN 1722-5906 (print)

ISSN 2421-6763 (online)

Euro 30,00



Rivista Internazionale di Tecnica della Traduzione (RITT)
The Rivista Internazionale di Tecnica della Traduzione – International Journal of Translation of the IUSLIT Department and Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori, University of Trieste aims at providing a forum of discussion for the multifaceted activity of translation and related issues.

Scientific Committee

Ovidi Carbonell i Cortés (Universidad de Salamanca)
Marco A. Fiola (Ryerson University, Ontario)
David Katan (Università del Salento)
Heidi Salaets (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven)
Michael Schreiber (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz)

Editorial Committee

Nadine Celotti
Paola Gentile
Pascale Janot
Marella Magris
José Francisco Medina Montero
Stefano Ondelli
Giuseppe Palumbo
Manuela Raccanello
Lorenza Rega
Federica Scarpa

Editors

Paola Gentile
Marco Rucci

© Copyright Edizioni Università di Trieste
Trieste 2024

Proprietà letteraria riservata.
I diritti di traduzione, memorizzazione elettronica,
di riproduzione e di adattamento totale e parziale di questa
pubblicazione, con qualsiasi mezzo (compresi i microfilm,
le fotocopie e altro) sono riservati per tutti i paesi

ISSN 1722-5906 (print)
ISSN 2421-6763 (online)

EUT - Edizioni Università di Trieste
via Weiss 21 – 34128 Trieste
<http://eut.units.it>
<https://www.facebook.com/EUTEdizioniUniversitaTrieste>

Rivista
Internazionale di
Tecnica della
Traduzione
International Journal of Translation

Numero 26
2024

Sommario

Table of contents

	<i>Marco Rucci</i>		<i>Carla Valeria de Souza Faria</i>
7	Prefazione	77	Le forme allocutive in funzione vocativa tradotte da studenti italofofoni di portoghese come lingua straniera
	<i>Elisabeth Braem</i>		
	<i>Paola Gentile</i>		
15	Een vergelijking van tolkdidactiek: het opleidingsmodel van de KU Leuven en van de Universiteit van Triëst		<i>Elena Errico</i>
		101	Reyna Grande, translingüismo y autotraducción
	<i>Luis Cortés Rodríguez</i>		<i>Francesca Morselli</i>
	<i>Antonia Sánchez Villanueva</i>	115	Tradurre i <i>Juristische Arbeiten</i> di E.T.A. Hoffmann
33	La serie enumerativa y su <i>Índice de incidencia interactiva</i> en un momento culminante de un debate político (II). El “minuto de cierre”		<i>Monica Randaccio</i>
		137	Intertextuality and ‘version’, ‘adaptation’ ‘rewrite’: Developing topics in drama translation
	<i>Carla Valeria de Souza Faria</i>		<i>Jean-Claude Trovato</i>
55	La traduzione del diminutivo in <i>Brichos - a floresta é nossa</i> in italiano svolta da apprendenti di portoghese come lingua straniera	159	La sottotitolazione – un approccio didattico professionalizzante

Intertextuality and ‘version’, ‘adaptation’ ‘rewrite’: Developing topics in drama translation

MONICA RANDACCIO

Università di Trieste

In this paper my attention will focus on two closely related issues in drama translation, namely intertextuality and the definition of what has been variously termed as ‘version’, ‘adaptation’, or ‘rewrite’. Approaches to playtexts have been variously seen as ‘processes of acculturation’; ‘major adjustments’; ‘issues of cultural relocations’; or as ‘reconfigured text (as performance)’. The concept of intertextuality will be explored thoroughly in its wider theoretical context, including discourse analysis and literary criticism, to see how it becomes relevant for the process of translation, and drama translation in particular. Furthermore, version, rewrite and adaptation, as a product of intertextuality, will be analysed in the attempt to reach some tentative conclusions on the state-of-the-art on this topic.

KEYWORDS

Intertextuality in drama translation, discourse analysis, literary criticism, version, rewrite, adaptation.

1. INTRODUCTION

There are two closely related issues in drama translation, namely intertextuality and the definition of what has been variously termed as ‘version’, ‘adaptation’ or ‘rewrite’. Playtexts have been defined as ‘processes of acculturation’ (Aaltonen 2000) and ‘major adjustments’ (Anderman 2005); or express ‘issues of cultural relocations’ (Hale and Upton 2000); ‘reconfigured texts (as performance)’ (Marinetti 2013). All these definitions are inherently linked to intertextuality and are of the utmost importance for the process of translation. In addition, version rewrite and adaptation have been an object of study in the first decade of the twenty 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.

2. INTERTEXTUALITY IN DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Discourse analysts 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 world, 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 reshapes 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” (98)” (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

3. 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 structuration 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

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 Dijk (eds) *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, London, Sage, pp. 379-407; T. A. van Dijk (2001) “Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity”, in R. Wodak, and M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London, Sage, 95-120.

2 This text appeared in *Theorie d’ensemble* in the literary review *Tel Quel*, Paris, 1968; ‘Words, dialogue and novel’ was instead later published in Kristeva, J. (1980) *Desire in Language: a semiotic approach to literature and art*, Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon S. Roudiez (trans.), Leon S. Roudiez (ed.), Columbia University Press, New York.

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 discursive 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 that 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, Barthes 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 poetic 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, plagiarism and allusion (Allen 2000: 100). In a very complex categorization, he singles out five categories, namely, intertextuality, architextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality 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 copresence 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 *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.

4. INTERTEXTUALITY IN TRANSLATION

Many of the investigations conducted on intertextuality both in discourse analysis and 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 previously, 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 intertextuality 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 pri-

marily 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 intertextuality³ 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. 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.*).

5. 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

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.

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 identities, marginalization of women, broken families, and partly a creation of a distinct intertext, i.e., the dysfunctional relationship between daughter and father expressed through the Shakespearean reference. Thus, Carr's prototext is also related to the Shakespearean 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 courage 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, Euripides's *Hippolyte* and Phaedra's uncontrollable love for her stepson allows Carr's *The Mai* and her protagonist to reinterpret 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 Valentina Rapetti as *Il sogno di Cordelia* in 2011 and became a reading at the festival theatre *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 relations are not easy to trace due to the fragmentariness of both contemporary Italian 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 Italian translations of Shakespeare's play⁴, and the gender issue of women's role in the patriarchal family and society recall the social and gender issues highlighted recently by the Sicilian-born Emma Dante's *Trilogia della famiglia* (*mPalermu*, 2001; *Carnezzzeria* 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

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

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).

6. TRANSLATION, VERSION, REWRITE AND ADAPTATION: SOME TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

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 2013). 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

5 See also R. Merino Álvarez (1992) "Profesión: adaptador", *Livius*, 1, pp. 85-97; (1994) R. Merino Álvarez *Traducción, tradición y manipulación: teatro inglés en España 1950-1990*, León, Universidad de León y Universidad del País Vasco.

views on these forms of translations. In 2002, however, Joseph Che Suh still lamented that there was no agreement 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) and 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 historically 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” ((Bassnett-McGuire 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). 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 underlying the political import of both translation and adaptation. She sees them as an integral and intrinsic part of our global and local political and cul-

tural 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 re-

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.

writing 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 analysis. 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 article [...] encourages a broader, Jakobsonian 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). 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 multiple textual examples” (Hutcheon 2006: xiv). The definitions of ‘version’, ‘rewrite’ and ‘adaptation’ have travelled a long way in the last three decades.

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.

- Aaltonen S. (2000) *Time-sharing on Stage. Drama Translation in Theatre and Society*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.
- Allen G. (2000) *Intertextuality*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Aly R.M.K. (2018) "Intertextuality" in *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Ed. by G. Ritzer & C. Rojek, Wiley & Sons, pp. 1-2.
- Anderman G. ([1998] 2009) "Drama Translation", in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. by M. Baker & G. Saldanha, London and New York, Routledge, pp.92-95.
- Apter E. (2006) *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press.
- Baker M. (2006) *Translation as Conflict: A Narrative Account*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Bakhtin M. (1986) in C. Emerson & M. Holquist (eds.) *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, Trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin, University of Austin Press.
- Barthes R. (1977) *Image – Music – Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath, London, Fontana.
- Bastin G. L. (2009) "Adaptation", in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. by M. Baker & G. Saldanha, 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.
- Briggs C. L. & Bauman R. (1992) "Genre, Intertextuality, and Social Power", *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 2.2., pp. 131-172.
- Brisset A. (1998) "Le public et son traducteur: profil idéologique de la traduction théâtrale au Québec", *TTR*, 1.1., pp. 127-138.
- 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.
- Déprats J. M. (1990) *Traduire, adapter, écrire. Traduire le théâtre*, Paris, Actes Sud.
- Eagleton T. (1977) "Translation and Transformation", *Stand* 19 (3), pp. 72–77.
- Fairclough N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*, London, Polity.
- Fairclough N. (1992a) "Discourse and Text: Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis", *Discourse and Society*, 3.2, pp. 193-217.
- Fairclough N. (1992b) "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. Accessed 20/10/2021.
- 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.
- Fischlin D. & Fortier M. (2000) (eds.) *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to Present*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Hermans T. (1985) (ed.) *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 *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Ed. by M. Wolf & A. Fukari, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 57-75.
- Hodges A. (2015) "Intertextuality in Discourse", in *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Ed. by D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton & D. Schiffrin, Oxford, John Wiley and Blackwell, 2, pp. 42-60.
- Hutcheon L. (2006) *A Theory of Adaptation*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Krebs K. (2014) "Ghosts We Have Seen Before: Trends in Adaptation in Contemporary Performance", *Theatre Journal* 66.4, pp. 581-590.
- Krebs K. (2014) "Introduction: Collisions, Diversions and Meeting Points", in *Translation and Adaptation in Theatre and Film*. Ed. by K. Krebs, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 1-35.
- Kristeva J. (1980) "Problème de la structuration du text" in J. Kristeva, *Desire in Language: a Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva J. (1968) "La Sémiologie: science critique ou critique de la science" in *Théorie d'ensemble*, (Coll. «Tel quel»), Paris, Seuil, pp. 80-93.
- Ladouceur L. (1995) "Normes, fonctions et traduction théâtrale", *Meta*, Vol. 40.1, pp. 31-38.
- Laera M. (2014) "Introduction: Return, Rewrite, Repeat: the Theatricality of Adaptation", in *Theatre and Adaptation: Return, Rewrite, Repeat*. Ed. by M. Laera, London and New York, Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, pp. 1-17.
- Laliberté M. (1995) "La problématique de la traduction théâtrale et de l'adaptation au Québec", *Meta*, 40.4, pp. 519-528.
- Lefèvre A. ([1982] 2000) "Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature" in *The Translation Studies reader*. Ed. by L. Venuti & M. Baker, London: Routledge, pp. 233-249.
- Logan B. "Whose play is it anyway?", *The Guardian*, Wednesday 12 March 2003, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2003/mar/12/theatre>. artsfeatures. Accessed 21/5/2019.
- Long Y. & Yu G. (2020) "Intertextuality Theory and Translation", *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10.9, pp. 1106-1110.
- Marinetti C. (2013) "Translation and theatre: from performance to performativity" in *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 25.3, pp. 307-320.
- Merino Álvarez R. (1992) "Profesión: adaptador", *Livius*, 1, pp. 85-97.
- Merino Álvarez R. (1994) *Traducción, tradición y manipulación: teatro inglés en España 1950-1990*, León, Universidad de León y Universidad del País Vasco.
- Minier M. (2014) "Definitions, Dyads, Triads and Other Point of Connection in Translation and Adaptation Discourse", in *Translation and Adaptation in Theatre and Film*. Ed. by K. Krebs, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 13-35.
- Minutella V. (2013) *Reclaiming Romeo and Juliet: Italian Translations for Page, Stage and Screen*, Amsterdam, Rodopi.
- Neubert A. (1981) "Translation, Interpreting and Text Linguistics", *Studia Linguistica*, 35.1-2, pp. 130-145.
- Perteghella M. (2008) "Adaptation: Bastard Child or Critique? Putting Terminology Centre Stage", *Journal of Romance Studies*, 8.3, pp. 51-65.
- Pugliatti P. & Tempera M. (1986) (eds.) *King Lear. Dal testo alla scena*, Bologna, CLUEB.
- 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 Clásico*, 4, pp. 96-107.
- Spencer C. (2010) 'Five Stars', *The Telegraph*, August 13, <https://>

kaiteoreilly.com/work/2017/2/15/persians. Accessed 19/7/2021.

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

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

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

Venuti L. (2008) *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*, London, Routledge.

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

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

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