University of Salford MANCHESTER

From the Peninsula westward: a journey among translations

Nigri, L

Title	From the Peninsula westward: a journey among translations
Authors	Nigri, L
Type	Book Section
URL	This version is available at: http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/33604/
Published Date	2013

USIR is a digital collection of the research output of the University of Salford. Where copyright permits, full text material held in the repository is made freely available online and can be read, downloaded and copied for non-commercial private study or research purposes. Please check the manuscript for any further copyright restrictions.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: usir@salford.ac.uk.

6

From the Peninsula Westward: A Journey among Translations

Lucia Nigri

> For above all the function of theatre, says Eduardo, 'is the desperate attempt on man's part to put some meaning into life'.[i]

Rethinking Definitions: Domestication and Foreignisation

As two opposite strategies, 'domestication' and 'foreignisation' represent the options a translator has when he or she works with a foreign text. Even if the adoption of these terms is relatively new to translation studies (Venuti 1995), the problem tackled here is an old one. We may even say that the origin of this dichotomic relationship may be traced back to the very first act of translation, since in the passage from one language to another the translator must always choose the degree of 'familiarity' of a text with the target language and culture.

Although the subject has been closely examined within the critical community in the last fifteen years or so, Venuti's redefinition of the whole question stands on giants' shoulders, those of the German romantics. Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) and Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), to name but two, were among the first to privilege foreignisation in a translation (less familiarity) over experiments of domestication (more familiarity).[ii] Foreignisation was for them central to the development of a German national culture (Lefevere; Berman) and, to put it in "ethical terms" as Anthony Pym has done, signalled "a mode of openness that welcomes rather than excludes the other" (27).

From this perspective, translation is not only an act of writing (or rewriting), but a social process which is in keeping with the nationalistic understanding of the role played by a whole generation in a specific historical moment. Yet, problems of national identities may also entail a different attitude towards translation, as for example the one endorsed by French translators who, only twenty years before the French Revolution, were more inclined to adopt domesticating practices. The French-German debate between authors like Jacques Delille (1738–1813) and Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), arguing in favour and against the target-text-oriented approach respectively, is an example of how different perceptions, closely linked to historical situations, may be considered as the starting point from which a particular translation strategy is favoured (Bassnett 2005: 396–97; see also Aaltonen 1997:

91). Therefore, it does not come as a surprise that in a more multicultural milieu, such as France today, Schleiermacher's and von Humboldt's theories have been eventually brought back to life and reassessed, after years of oblivion, by Berman and other French intellectuals.

Berman's contribution to the debate owes much to this German tradition and to the work of a much less acknowledged French scholar, Henry Meschonnic, who deserves consideration in a discussion of domesticating and foreignising strategies privileging the source- or the target-language culture. The reasons why Meschonnic's critique of translation practices is not more often cited in translation studies – with the exception of several authoritative voices (Pym) – are still unidentified. In the introduction to the English translation of Meschonnic's *Éthique et politique du traduire*, Pier-Pascal Boulanger rightly points out that:

> [T]he query [why Meschonnic's work does not circulate in translation studies in English] has become all the more pressing in that his work abounds with far-reaching concepts – such as 'decentring' and 'annexation', which he posited in 1973 and anticipated the well-known 'foreignising' and 'domestication' – that have yet to be discovered and discussed. (Meschonnic 16)

Venuti's contributions (1995, 1998) must be then understood in the wake of the criticism developed in France and in Germany in the previous years. Their originality does not lie so much in the recognition of a dichotomic relationship that, as we have seen, had already been acknowledged at least two hundred years before, nor in the rethinking of two terms that, however canonical today in the field of translation studies, are substitutions for previous vocables and definitions. What is really original in Venuti's contribution to the debate is his unprecedented acknowledgement of a specific Anglo-American tendency to reduce the source text to target-language cultural values, an operation which inevitably entails specific and 'targeted' social, historical, ethical, and political implications.

Discussing Eugene Nida's notion of 'dynamic' or 'functional' equivalence,[iii] Venuti forcefully attacks Nida's defence of transparency as "enlisted in the service of Christian humanism" (1995: 21).[iv] Convinced that every translation is politically and socially influential, he resolutely advocates the adoption of ethnodeviant foreignised practices in order to resist "the ethnocentric violence" of imprinting domestic values on a source text (ibid. 61).[v] For Venuti, this violence is perpetrated through the specific choice of texts to be translated (those accepted in the canon of a foreign literature) and the adoption of what he terms as 'fluency'. By this notion Venuti refers to "a discursive strategy ideally suited to

domesticating translation capable . . . of concealing [the] violence by producing the effect of transparency, the illusion that this is not a translation, but the foreign text, in fact, the living thoughts of the foreign author" (ibid.).[vi] Considered as a "locus of difference" (ibid. 42), translation also becomes for Venuti a matter of ethics (1998: 189).[vii]

But is the English-language panorama of translation that Venuti denounced almost twenty years ago still dominated by a target-language culture orientation and by texts which are part of an official canon? And what happens when a foreign non-standard language must be translated into English, or is used in a translation from English?

Here I will look at the relation between the Anglophone context and the translation of texts originally conceived in a less dominant language within the European milieu, such as the Italian, and will address issues of domestication and foreignisation with reference to the Italian theatre and the role played by non-standard languages. In particular, I will examine how the contemporary Neapolitan dialect has been translated into English even before Venuti's condemnation of Anglo-American translational practices and, vice versa, how an older version of this dialect has been used to translate Shakespeare.

In Britain Today

The translators' visibility is still perceived as a thorny issue, despite the fact that some steps towards a full appreciation of their role in the linguistic and cultural transfer to another language have been made to render the translator a key agent and full participant in the production team (Aaltonen 1997: 92; Snell-Hornby 2007: 115).

However, the British and American cultural standardisation of foreign literature condemned by Venuti is, as Cristina Marinetti argues in the chapter contained in this volume, still considered as the prevailing practice in translational processes. Fluency continues to be perceived as an essential prerequisite for a translation to be 'accepted', and, as a consequence, plays are linguistically and culturally homogenised to 'guarantee' a wider participation in an environment where financial considerations matter.

This is not to say that very fascinating theatrical experiments, which privilege foreignising practices in the linguistic and cultural transmission, have not been proposed. The Complete Works Festival organized by the Royal Shakespeare Company at Stratford-upon-Avon between April 2006 and April 2007 is a case in point. The festival was meant to stage thirty-seven Shakespearean plays, and included several versions of these plays in different languages. The performances – accompanied by English surtitles – were part of a successful multilingual and multicultural experiment of foreignisation, since many of these plays had

been domesticated abroad and returned – 'foreignised' – to the English stage.[viii] The process of foreignisation at stake here, however, is a peculiar one since the festival offered on stage what we may term as 'foreignised domestic plays'. The plays were in fact 'foreignised' linguistically and culturally, since the foreign directors had conceived them by taking into account the artistic, intellectual, and social environment where they would first be staged.[ix] Yet, it can be argued that the experiment was made possible because the 'canonical' (domestic) choice of plays to perform would meet, without too much risk, the demands of the audience, curious to see the transformations that their myth of 'Englishness', Shakespeare, went through.

But what happens when the choice of plays to stage is less canonical? When, for example, the text to be translated is linguistically considered as part of a minority, as in the case of plays written in a foreign dialect?

What Is a Dialect?

As an independent linguistic system possessing a grammar and a vocabulary of its own, a dialect is historically and geographically determined. Marginal to the dominant, official language, it is inextricably rooted in the socio-cultural context it belongs to and, as Luigi Bonaffini claims,

> is posited . . . as the language of concreteness and difference, in direct opposition to the flat homogeneity of the language of television and advertising, and therefore offers a greater potential for individual creativity. The strength of dialect, in fact, lies in its essential 'otherness', in its position of eccentricity with respect to the national language, in its different history, predominantly oral, which has saved it from the process of erosion and usura [sic] which always attends literary languages. (279)

On occasions, though, the geographical borders which generally contain dialects are crossed and what is perceived as specifically 'regional' reaches a national and international 'visibility', as has happened to the Neapolitan dialect, considered by many as the mouthpiece of a particularly rich theatrical, musical, and literary tradition, which, once outside Italy, has raised problems concerning its translation.

As a matter of fact, when the translation of a dialect text is attempted, the translator should be alert to the many implications of a language that represents for its speakers a space of naturalness,[x] a locus of resistance to the dominant national language, and a reservoir of ancient knowledge which is re-actualized in the present. Much is at stake here. Also,

translating dialectal literature into another language and into another context, for example the translation of Neapolitan into English (quite different from translating Neapolitan into standard Italian, where the national context remains the same), cannot prescind from a reflection on the personal, cultural, even political choices that stand behind the imprinting on the page of what is 'predominantly spoken'. Translations of plays written in dialect make even more evident the immediate link that exists between languages and theatre, since all those elements which, on the page, are residual traces of a complex semantic and connotative richness of the spoken language are (or should be) brought back to life on stage. But what aspects of this multifaceted operation are especially challenging? And which 'other' language is to be chosen in order to suggest the same subtleness, the same 'eccentricity' conveyed by the use of a dialect in the source text? Should a translator favour the standard language in the target culture or a corresponding sociolect which is geographically determined? And is, for example, the "happy tonality of Neapolitan, expressing love for life" (Bonaffini 285) translatable into English?

Translating Dialect: The Case of *Filumena Marturano*

If the English panorama is mainly dominated by domesticating approaches to translation of texts accepted in the canon of a foreign literature, the live interest in translating Neapolitan plays by Eduardo De Filippo (Eduardo, as he is known in Italy) implies a degree of complexity which is worth analysing.

Filumena Marturano, performed on 7 November 1946 at the Teatro Politeama in Naples, stages the story of a woman, Filumena, who feigns dying in order to convince Domenico, the man she had been living with for twenty-five years, to marry her. The woman's shrewdness in resorting to this stratagem is soon explained with the news that she has three children, one of them with Domenico. Resolved to give all her children his surname, Filumena does not reveal the identity of the son she has with the man, who eventually accepts the three as his own.

The play is thoroughly embedded within the socio-cultural and linguistic reality of the city where it was staged: Naples (Bentley 121; Esposito). As Eduardo himself declares in 1956, even the plot of the play is based upon a Neapolitan story that he had found in a piece of news:

> una donna, a Napoli, che conviveva con un uomo senza esserne la moglie, era riuscita a farsi sposare soltanto fingendosi moribonda. Questo era il fatterello

> piccante, ma minuscolo. Da esso trassi la vicenda ben più vasta e patetica di Filumena, la più cara fra le mie creature.
> [In Naples, a woman who had co-habited with a man without being his wife convinced him to marry her by pretending she was dying. This was a spicy, if tiny, anecdote. It was from this that I was inspired to produce the most complicated and pathetic story of Filumena, the dearest of my creatures.] (qtd. in Di Franco 1975: 123; my translation)

The language spoken in the play by the characters exploits, as Andrea Bisicchia argues, "the resources of the spoken language, which is able to penetrate, with detachment, the mediocrity of the life of the middle-class or the fantasy of the life of the low-class which, with a discursive and urban tone, plumbs the depth of the ambiguous psychology of the characters" (qtd. in Di Franco 1984: xiv; my translation).

Using dialect is a necessary choice for Eduardo who claims that he is a "servo del dialetto" [a slave of the dialect] because, as he continues, "non saprei recitare in lingua. È questo rapporto fra attore e autore che debbo risolvere. Io mi sono accorto che più le commedie sono in dialetto e più diventano universali. *Filumena Marturano* è stata tradotta in tutti i paesi" [I wouldn't know how to perform in standard language. It is this relationship between actor and author that I must necessarily solve. I've realized that the more the comedies are in dialect the more they become universal. *Filumena Marturano* was translated in every country] (qtd. in Di Franco 1975: 26; my translation).

A translator who wants to venture on this linguistic and cultural journey should therefore start from a full understanding of the language, of the ways Neapolitan conveys meanings which find in the reality of Naples their ultimate correlative. The risk is otherwise to misunderstand the interdiscursive dimension Eduardo's language belongs and refers to.[xi]

However, even a cursory glance at some of the English translations available today shows that something vital is indeed missing, since the lively Neapolitan dialect is replaced in most cases by Standard English.[xii] True, dialects are perceived very differently in Britain and the association of any of the English sociolects to the Italian dialect may even result in a distortion of the messages conveyed. Each dialect is socially connoted in its own peculiar way and an absolute correspondence between them is hardly attainable. But the language domestication which informs the translation of Eduardo's plays in English "reduces", as Alessandra De Martino Cappuccio argues, "the cultural impact of the original plays" (47).

For the sake of fluency, translations in English often sacrifice (domesticate) the immediacy of the original dialect in an attempt to convey 'a' sense which can be more easily

understandable by the majority of spectators or readers. This, of course, is achieved at the expense of a more nuanced 'local taste' (the foreign element) suggested in the source text with its idiomatic expressiveness.[xiii] Carlo Ardito's translation of *Filumena Marturano* (1976) seems to corroborate this assumption. The passage which follows is taken from the first act of the play, when Domenico lashes out at Filumena right after having discovered her trick:

DOMENICO: . . . Avesse visto maie na lagrima dint'a chill'uochhie! Maie! Quant'anne simmo state nzieme, nun ll'aggio vista maie 'e chiagnere!	DOMENICO: . . . All the years I've known you I've never seen you cry once, like other human beings.
FILUMENA: E avev' 'a chiagnere pe' te? era troppo bello 'o mobile.	FILUMENA: Now why should I cry over you?
DOMENICO: Lassa sta 'o mobile. un'anima in pena, senza pace, maie. Una donna che non piange, non mangia, non dorme, T'avesse visto maie 'e durmi'. N'ànema dannata, chesto si'. (act I, De Filippo 1964: 18)	DOMENICO: There's something peculiar about you, you know. I've never seen you shed a tear. You might as well be a woman who never eats or drinks or sleeps. Now that I think of it I've never seen you sleep, either. You're some kind of creature from another planet . . . (De Filippo 1976: 184)

The humour conveyed by the original language is here flattened, if not completely lost: "bello 'o mobile" – literally 'as if this piece of furniture were beautiful' (that is, 'as if you were special') – can only be translatable in English with a paraphrase that Ardito chooses to avoid. But what is truly missed here is not only Eduardo's humour, which is such a fundamental characteristic of all his plays,[xiv] but a peculiar aspect of the Neapolitan language, which 'makes sense' of things through the concreteness of the images evoked.

Ardito's domestication practice also misses another important cultural reference in the source text. In the original version, Domenico accuses Filumena of being a lost, damned soul ("N'ànema dannata"). In Ardito's rendering, Domenico's reference to Filumena's perdition in religious (and superstitious) terms – an important aspect of the Neapolitan and the Southern Italian culture – is translated into a more neutral "You're some kind of creature from another planet". The cultural richness referred to by a single expression is here ignored, with the consequent impoverishing of the target-play.

A translator, therefore, should always be alert to the cultural constituents of the original version, as Beatrice Basso seems to be aware of:

> [I]n the course of the translation process [of *Saturday, Sunday, Monday*], I found myself living through two main phases: the linguistic translation and the transmutation of the physical/cultural essence of the piece into another culture. The sensitivity both to the linguistic issues of the original text and to the culture from which the play stems, is – I believe – necessary to any translation aimed at production. (161)

If linguistic and cultural elements are central issues for a stage translator, so are paralinguistic, kinesic, and proxemic factors which are already inscribed in the source text. The intrinsic performability, and speakability, of the play text are in fact essential criteria to be taken into account by all the agents of the production team (translator, playwright, and actors).[xv] From this perspective, the long and detailed stage directions which accompany Eduardo's plays are meant as 'instructions' for the *mise en scène*. Almost all of the clues in the play are accompanied by the specification of the gestures, movements, postures that characters should assume, as shown in the following passage:

DOMENICO: (*come colto in fallo reagisce, furente*) . . .	DOMENICO: (*as if caught out angrily*) . . .
FILUMENA: (*niente affatto intimidita, con maggiore violenza di Domenico*) . . . (*Come raccontando una cosa incredibile*) . . . (*Con irrefrenabile senso di nausea*) . . . (*la indica [the table]*) . . .	FILUMENA: (*not at all put out and matching Domenico's tone*) . . . (*As if telling an incredible story*) . . . (*Disgusted*) . . . (*Points to the table*) . . .
DOMENICO: (*esasperato*) . . .	DOMENICO: (*Angrily*) . . .
FILUMENA: (*dispettosa*) . . .	FILUMENA: (*Maliciously*) . . .
FILUMENA: (*ironica*) . . .	FILUMENA: (*Ironically*) . . .
DOMENICO: (*con aria trionfante, credendo di aver compresa la ragione recondite della beffa di Filumena*) . . .	DOMENICO: (*Triumphantly as though suddenly understanding the reason for the trick she has played on him*) . . .
FILUMENA: (*avvilita per l'incomprensione, con disprezzo*) . . . (act I, De Filippo 1964: 19–20)	FILUMENA: (*Disheartened by his obtuseness*) . . . (De Filippo 1976: 185–86)

In a few pages, the stage directions are so frequent and exhaustive, even prescriptive, that it is almost possible to follow the plot through them. Arguably, the presence of so many stage directions in the translated dramatic text may represent the translator's intention to contain in the new version a foreignised element, the Italian gesture and physicality, which do

not disturb or challenge the dominant target-language culture where the cliché is widely accepted.[xvi] Once on stage, however, the translator (or possibly the playwright) should attempt to explain them carefully to the actors in order to avoid misunderstanding and caricature or a stress on what is believed to be the typical Italian ‘expressiveness’ through body language. To misinterpret this would do Eduardo’s play a great injury. After all, before being a playwright, Eduardo was an actor whose style was acclaimed all over the world because, as Eric Bentley beautifully describes,

> [v]oice and body are so quiet. Pianissimo. No glamor, no effusion of brilliance. No attempt to lift the role off the ground by oratory and stylization, no attempt to thrust it at us by force of personality. Not even the sustained mesmerism of big Ibsen performances. Rather, a series of statements, vocal and corporeal. . . . It is a realistic style. It makes few large departures from life. No oratory, no stylization. Both in speech and in gesture, rhythm, accent, and tempo are an imitation of life. (121–22)

Given that every translation requires understanding of the source- and target-language culture of the play, translating dialects is all the more complicated because the chances to lose seminal aspects of the original in the new version are, if possible, even higher. The language in use here is indeed closely rooted in the local reality where it is spoken, although the themes it treats are universal. Thus, when Eduardo’s plays are rendered into another language, the translator needs courage, since he or she is called upon to choose the right strategy in the translational process and to defend himself or herself from Harold Acton’s firm assertion that “Eduardo’s best plays defy the translator’s exertions” (qtd. in De Filippo 1992: xvi).

<A>Translating in Dialect: The Case of a Neapolitan *Tempest*

In 1983 Giulio Einaudi asked Eduardo to translate a Shakespearean play for the series “Scrittori tradotti da scrittori” [Writers Translated by Writers]. Eduardo, the “distinguished man of theatre, [who] represents three different figures so far left split in the practice of theatre . . . the author, the actor and the director” (Di Franco 1975: 3; my translation), had at the very end of his career the chance to put himself to the test as a translator, adding to the three figures recognized by Di Franco a fourth agent in the collaboration process.

As Eduardo confesses in the “Nota del traduttore” [Translator’s Note] published at the end of his *La tempesta* (1984), his fascination for the seventeenth-century theatrical genre of the *Féerie* and the themes of tolerance and forgiveness contained in the play were among the main reasons why he chose this comedy over the others. The representation of an

authoritarian father, the many references to the city of Naples, and the fact that the play is a farewell to the stage for both dramatists were also seen as further links connecting the lives and the careers of Shakespeare and Eduardo (Fischer; Tomaiuolo).

But what immediately differentiates, and characterizes, this translation from the source text is its language: the seventeenth-century Neapolitan.[xvii] The final version is however only the arrival point of a work on the text which was mediated by yet another translation, a 'literal' one, made by his wife Isabella in standard Italian. The Neapolitan *La tempesta* is then a translation of a translation, despite Eduardo's explanation that "in un certo senso ho tradotto direttamente dall'inglese, perché mia moglie Isabella mi ha trasportato in italiano letteralmente tutta la commedia, atto per atto, scena per scena, cercando poi in certi suoi libri inglesi il significato doppio e a volte triplo di certe parole arcaiche che non mi persuadevano" [in a way, I have translated directly from English, since my wife Isabella has transferred literally into Italian the whole comedy, act by act, scene by scene, finding in some of her English books the double and sometimes triple meaning of certain archaic words which did not convince me] ("Nota del traduttore"; my translation).

The case of Isabella Quarantotti's translation of *The Tempest* is another example – Italian this time – of the translator's invisibility. Despite Eduardo's acknowledgement that a first translated draft on which he actually drew exists, no published edition of Isabella's version can actually be consulted. The 'literal' translation remains invisible, as does its translator, and becomes nothing more than a map used by Eduardo; a 'subaltern' version.[xviii] Were it available, however, it would be interesting to explore the ways Isabella's version had interacted with, and possibly obliged, some of the choices later made by Eduardo for his Neapolitan *La tempesta*.

Yet, from Isabella's 'invisible' text Eduardo moved on to write a version performable in the dialect, which means that the dialect itself as the language in which the play was to be performed was the other discursive influence Eduardo was under. This is why, although *La tempesta* was never staged – but only tape-recorded by Eduardo who lent his own voice, differently modulated, to all the masculine characters – it is clearly endowed with elements related to its speakability.[xix] For Eduardo, probably influenced in this by his own career as an actor, the theatrical word is always "parola di voce, non d'inchiostro" [word of voice, not of ink] (qtd. in De Filippis 191; my translation), a word which is the actor's comfort zone, as it was the Neapolitan for him. It is this concern for speakability that may have driven Eduardo's historicization of a language written by, as he declares,

> un uomo che vive oggi; sarebbe stato innaturale cercare un'aderenza completa ad una lingua non usata ormai da secoli. Però . . . quanto è bello questo napoletano antico, così latino, con le sue parole piane, non tronche, con la sua musicalità, la sua dolcezza, l'eccezionale duttilità e con una possibilità di far vivere fatti e creature magici, misteriosi, che nessuna lingua moderna possiede più.
>
> [someone who lives nowadays; it would have been artificial to look for an adherence to a language for centuries not in use. But . . . how beautiful this old Neapolitan is, so Latin-like, with its paroxytone, rather than apocopate, words, with its own musicality, its exceptional suppleness and capacity – as no other modern language can – to bring magical and mysterious creatures back to life.] ("Nota del traduttore"; my translation)

On the use of the old Neapolitan, Saverio Tomaiuolo argues that *La tempesta* "textualizes and enacts a 'marginal' approach" to Shakespeare's plays both linguistically and dramatically; he also claims that

> [Eduardo] shares the translating methods Lawrence Venuti himself advocates, based upon marginal and alternative reconfigurations of the source text, according to which '[a] calculated choice of foreign text and translation strategy can change and consolidate literary canons, conceptual paradigms, research methodologies . . . and commercial practices in the domestic culture'. (130)

Yet, the possible ideological commitment implied in the use of vernacular should not be overestimated, being of secondary importance compared to the fact that, as mentioned before, Eduardo 'is' a "servo del dialetto", and therefore could not have acted in any other language than his 'mother tongue' ("non saprei recitare in lingua").[xx] True, he chooses an alternative to the 'standard' Neapolitan. But this has more to do with both a 'philological' faithfulness to Shakespeare's modern English – "ho cercato di essere più fedele possible al testo, come, a mio parere si dovrebbe essere nel tradurre" [I have tried to be as much faithful as possible to the text, as I believe it should be done in translation] ("Nota del traduttore"; my translation) – and Eduardo's particular concern for a text that should be easily, or as easily as possible, spoken by the actor(s).

But Tomaiuolo is right when he claims that "the final result is thoroughly 'foreignising'" (130). Eduardo's 'speakable old Neapolitan' provides an unusual lingual hybrid whose impact on Italian speakers varies according to their lingual competence. Being

Neapolitan, the play 'is' a 'domesticated Shakespeare', but in a way that 'foreignises' the text to audiences who do not speak the dialect as well as to those who speak only the contemporary dialect and are bound to perceive different rhythms or lexical choices with a defamiliarizing effect making for 'otherness'.

From a cultural perspective, on the other hand, the Neapolitan and Southern Italian reality is undoubtedly absorbed into the text. References to Naples and Neapolitans are frequent: Sicorax ("la strega Sicorace"; 1984: 38) is here associated with Benevento (a city in the South of Italy famous for its witches); the "Nostromo" [Boatswain] incites the crew by saying: "Guagliú, facímmece annòre: simmo Napulitane!" [Hey you, let's show who we are: we are Neapolitans!] (1984: 5; my translation); typical idiomatic expressions are interspersed in the play text, like "papà mio è buono cumm' 'o ppane" [my father is as good as bread] (1984: 62; my translation); and local patrons are mentioned underlining a religious background which adds to the specific Mediterranean atmosphere:

> dobbiamo rummanere addenucchiate
> nu pare d'anne, e forse cchiùne,
> nanz'a lu prutettore
> San Gennaro
> [We should kneel
> a couple of years, and perhaps even more
> in front of San Gennaro
> our patron] (1984: 64; my translation)[xxi]

La tempesta by Eduardo thus offers an unusual example of domestication. While building on the potential of cultural relocation to the Neapolitan linguistic context, it plays with an idea of naturalisation that avails itself of a language spoken by a minority and defamiliarizes it to its own speakers. To what extent this operation was an act of political and ideological 'subversion' of standard language, rather than the result of an unusual interpretation of translation faithfulness to the source and a particular interest in speakability, it is hard to tell. The reasons we have given so far, nevertheless, pinpoint that the latter certainly were a major concern in Eduardo's translation process; and this may help shift the attention from ideology to an aesthetics of language and theatre.

<A>Works Cited

Aaltonen, Sirkku (2000) *Time-Sharing on Stage: Drama Translation in Theatre and Society*, Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto, and Sidney: Multilingual Matters.

——— (1997) *Translating Plays or Baking Apple Pies: A Functional Approach to the Study of Drama Translation*, in Mary Snell-Hornby, Zuzana Jettmarová, and Klaus Kaindl (eds) *Translation as Intercultural Communication*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 89–97.

Bassnett, Susan (1991) "Translating for the Theatre: The Case against Performability", *TTR: Traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 4 (1): 99–111.

——— (2005) "Translating Terror", *Third World Quarterly* 26 (3): 393–403.

Basso, Beatrice (2003) "Italian Dramaturg in a Translation Process", *Theatre Topics* 13 (1): 161–63.

Bentley, Eric (Winter 1951) "Eduardo de Filippo and the Neapolitan Theatre", *The Kenyon Review* 13 (1): 111–26.

Berman, Antoine (1984) *L'épreuve de l'étranger: Culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique*, Paris: Gallimard.

Bonaffini, Luigi (Spring 1997) "Translating Dialect Literature", *World Literature Today* 71 (2), *Italian Literature Today*: 279–88.

De Filippis, Simonetta (2002) "Shakespeare ed Eduardo: Scrittura e riscrittura della Tempesta", Agostino Lombardo (ed.) *Shakespeare e il Novecento*, Roma: Bulzoni, 187–206.

De Filippo, Eduardo (1968) [1964] *Filumena Marturano*, Torino: Einaudi.

——— (1992) *Four Plays: The Local Authority; Grand Magic; Filumena Marturano; Napoli Milionaria*, Carlo Ardito (trans.), London: Methuen Drama.

——— (1984) *The Tempest*, Torino: Einaudi.

——— (1976) *Three Plays: The Local Authority; Grand Magic; Filumena Marturano*, Carlo Ardito (trans.), London: Hamish Hamilton and St. George's Press.

De Martino Cappuccio, Alessandra (2011) "Translating Neapolitan Dialect in Theatre: Problems of Cultural Transfer", *Translation Studies Journal* 3 (3): 47–63.

Di Franco, Fiorenza (1975) *Il Teatro di Eduardo*, Bari: Universale Laterza.

——— (1984) *Le commedie di Eduardo*, Roma-Bari: Editori Laterza.

Esposito, Edoardo (2004) *Eduardo De Filippo, discours et théâtralité: Dialogues, didascalies et registres dramatiques*, Paris: Editions L'Harmattan.

Fernandes, Alinne Balduino Pires (2010) "Between Words and Silences: Translating for the Stage and the Enlargement of Paradigms", *Scientia Traductionis* 7: 120–33.

Fischer, Donatella (2007) *Il teatro di Eduardo De Filippo: La crisi della famiglia patriarcale*, London: Legenda.

Lefevere, André (ed.) (1992) *Translation, History, Culture: A Sourcebook*, London and New York: Routledge.

Lombardo, Agostino (2008) "Eduardo e Shakespeare", *Memoria di Shakespeare* 6: 227–36.

Meschonnic, Henry (2011) *Ethics and Politics of Translating*, Pier-Pascale Boulanger (ed. and trans.), Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nida, Eugene Albert and Charles R. Taber (2003) [1969] *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: Brill.

Perteghella, Manuela (2006) "Poetry, Music and Transformation in the Gulf of Naples: A Creative Voyage of *The Tempest*", in Ead. and Eugenia Loffredo (eds) *Translation and Creativity: Perspectives on Creative Writing and Translation Studies*, London: Continuum, 109–23.

Pym, Anthony (2007) "Philosophy and Translation", in Piotr Kuhiwczak and Karin Littau (eds) *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Clevedon, Buffalo, and Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 24–45.

Schjoldager, Anne with Henrik Gottlieb and Ida Klitgård (2008) *Understanding Translation*, Denmark: Academica.

Segre, Cesare (1984) *Teatro e romanzo*, Torino: Einaudi.

Serpieri, Alessandro (1986) "Polifonia shakespeariana", in Id., *Retorica e immaginario*, Parma: Pratiche.

Snell-Hornby, Mary (2007) "Theatre and Opera Translation", in Piotr Kuhiwczak and Karin Littau (eds) *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Clevedon, Buffalo, and Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 106–19.

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

Tomaiuolo, Saverio (2007) "'Something Rich and Strange': Eduardo De Filippo Translating *The Tempest*", in Richard Trim and Sophie Alatorre (eds) *Through Other Eyes: The Translation of Anglophone Literature in Europe*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 121–32.

Venuti, Lawrence (1998) *The Scandals of Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.

——— (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.

Yang, Wenfen (2010) "Brief Study on Domestication and Foreignization in Translation", *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1 (1): 77–80.

[i] Ardito in De Filippo (1992: xvi).

[ii] The terms used by Schleiermacher were *Verfremdung* (alienation) and *Entfremdung* (naturalisation), privileging the source text and the target text respectively (Schjoldager with Gottlieb and Klitgård 141–42. On this issue see also Snell-Hornby 2006: 145-48).

[iii] In contrast to 'formal' equivalence, dynamic or functional equivalence is "to be defined in terms of the degree to which the receptors of the message in the receptor language respond to it in substantially the same manner as the receptors in the source language. This response can never be identical, for the cultural and historical settings are too different, but there should be a high degree of equivalence of response, or the translation will have failed to accomplish its purpose" (Nida and Taber 24; Yang 78).

[iv] Nida was the executive secretary for Translations of the American Bible Society.

[v] For Sirkku Aaltonen, James Holmes's definition of naturalisation is interchangeable with Venuti's notion of domestication (2000: 96).

[vi] "A fluent translation is immediately recognizable and intelligible, 'familiarised', domesticated, not 'disconcerting[ly]' foreign, capable of giving the reader unobstructed 'access to great thoughts', to what is 'present in the original'. Under the regime of fluent translating, the translator works to make his or her work 'invisible', producing the illusory effect of transparency that simultaneously masks its status as an illusion: the translated text seems 'natural', i.e., not translated" (Venuti 1995: 5).

[vii] On the relationship between ethics and translation strategies, however, there are different opinions. Susan Bassnett, for example, in an article entitled "Translating Terror" claims that, on occasions, domesticating practices in translation may be more 'ethical' than foreignising practices (2005: 396).

[viii] Among the plays are: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in Indian languages, *Richard II* in German, *Richard III* in Arabic, *Macbeth* in Polish, *Twelfth Night* in Russian, and *Henry V* in Italian, the latter directed by Pippo Delbono.

[ix] See, for example, the Japanese setting of Yukio Ninagawa's stylised *Titus Andronicus*.

[x] Yet, as Bonaffini claims in relation to the translation of dialect poetry, "[T]he fact remains that dialect is by nature a distinct and marginal language with respect to a standard language, and all speakers of dialect consider it such – that is, they are conscious of speaking a language which in some way is in opposition to another, more widespread and important, even if they are in a totally dialect-speaking setting where the opposition is only virtual. This means that translation from dialect must in some way reflect its uniqueness and diversity, even if the various solutions may take very different forms" (283).

[xi] By ‘interdiscursive system’ I here refer to Cesare Segre’s notion of a system of expressions and syntagms of unknown or lost origin, that are used and circulated by speakers (111). On interdiscursivity applied to theatre see Serpieri (109–92).

[xii] For a study of the cultural transfer in some of the English translations of *Filumena*, in particular by Keith Waterhouse and Willis Hall (1977), Timberlake Wertenbaker (1998) and Maria Tucci (2002), see De Martino Cappuccio. Tanya Ronder’s new translation of the play (2012) has been described as “revelling in the colloquial [and having] Filumena’s sons calling one another ‘twat’ and ‘big man’, and people screeching ‘silly old cow’” http://exeuntmagazine.com/reviews/filumena/ (last access 30 July 2012).

[xiii] Bonaffini claimed in fact that “the untranslatableness of dialect – that is, its semantic opacity – is proportional to the idiomatic use of words, slang, and jargon limited to local color” (285).

[xiv] In 1940, in an interview with Giovanni Sarno, Eduardo said that: “L’umorismo . . . è la parte amara della risata. . . . Esso è determinato dalla delusione dell’uomo che è per natura ottimista” [Humour . . . is the bitter side of laugh . . . It is determined by the disappointment that man, by nature optimistic, experiences” (qtd. in Di Franco 1975: 227; my translation).

[xv] On the question of performability see Snell-Hornby (2007: 111). Susan Bassnett, on the contrary, argues “against the case of performability”, a term “frequently used to describe the indescribable, the supposedly existent concealed gestic text within the written” (1991: 102). On the difference between performability and speakability, see Fernandes (131).

[xvi] On the role of translations in confirming stereotypes about Neapolitan culture, Alessandra De Martino Cappuccio claims that “the peculiarities of Neapolitan culture are either neutralized through the standardization of the language or incorporated in the receptor system

through clichés, so that the translated texts metonymically represent Neapolitan culture according to domestic stereotypes and preconceived ideas about such a culture" (50).

[xvii] On the question of Eduardo's rewriting of the play, see Lombardo; Fischer; Tomaiuolo.

[xviii] Perteghella argues that the textual relationship between Isabella's and Eduardo's version "points to a notion of a translational 'fragmented' agency, whereby two subjectivities enter in a dialogue with the text at different stages of the translational process, and collude at some point in the writing" (123).

[xix] For a discussion of Eduardo translating for a version to be published (in the Einaudi series) rather than for a performance to be staged, see Perteghella. Tomaiuolo reminds us that Eduardo "repeatedly suggested using marionettes instead of real actors, adding pre-recorded voices" (129).

[xx] On this point, see also Perteghella who denies any "politically motivated, ideologically driven domestication" (120).

[xxi] For other examples of domestication in the play, see Perteghella; Tomaiuolo.