'The Isle Is Full of Noises': Italian Voices in Strehler's *La Tempesta*

Manuela Perteghella

Collaboration at the Heart of Theatre Translation

Theatre needs different types of expertise, knowledge and skills in order to happen: from writers to artistic directors, from sound and lighting designers to actors, from props makers to stage managers, the pluralism of their creativities and their collaborative processes makes theatre one of the most collaborative media. Within this context of collaboration and multi-creativity, what happens in the translation of plays specifically (re)written for stage production, when yet another subjectivity, that of the *theatre translator,* comes into play? What happens to translations which are expressly commissioned by a director for a particular production? How can collaboration manifest itself during the writerly process?

This case study looks at the journey undertaken by Shakespeare's *The Tempest* in the company of both artistic director Giorgio Strehler and Shakespearean scholar, critic and translator Agostino Lombardo, tracing their collaboration by analyzing aspects of Lombardo's translational process, which is in turn informed by Strehler's artistic reading and his own interpretation of the text, a play he had already staged thirty years earlier, in a commission by poet Salvatore Quasimodo (1947). Strehler's revisitation-variation of *La Tempesta* was staged in 1978 at the Piccolo Teatro di Milano, which he himself co-founded with Paolo Grassi and Nina Vinchi in Milan in 1947. The personal correspondence between Lombardo and Strehler becomes what

M. Perteghella (✉)
Independent Scholar, Stratford on Avon, UK

© The Author(s) 2018

J. Boase-Beier et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Literary Translation*, Palgrave Studies in Translating and Interpreting, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75753-7_14

might be termed a "space" of interaction, intervention and negotiations, a metaphorical "stage" where translation is both possible and necessary, and where different interpretations of the source and target texts will inform the *mise en scène*.

This case study therefore seeks to highlight and illustrate how collaborative translations for the stage are shaped, not only by analysing the translated text(s) but also by putting these into the larger creative context of what Rosy Colombo terms "the complex migration of the Shakespearean text into the body of Italian language and culture" (Colombo 2007a: xiv).[1]

The paratexts, including the epistolary exchanges which took place between August 1977 and June 1978, and marginalia (notes, deletions, alternative words and sentence structure added by Strehler on Lombardo's script), are here analyzed to illustrate a collaborative writing practice, to pinpoint the role and shape of collaborative translation in stage production and, concomitantly, to understand the relationship between artistic director and commissioned translator. In a previous study of the many facets of collaboration in theatre translation I noted how this is necessarily influenced by the negotiations between all the participants involved (Perteghella 2006a). The shared views and ideas which make up the journey of the source text from its first draft to the "final" script used by actors in performance allow for the democratization of meaning-making and highlight the unique participatory model of text-making used in theatre translation. At the same time, this model of collaborative and cooperative practice also necessarily contains its own challenges. It can be exposed, for example, to the (often) problematic relationship between the several participants (Perteghella 2006a: 127). In particular, it can be susceptible to the power relations which can take shape when different skills, knowledge and expertise "are brought together in the same space at the same time, all these converging perspectives which do not have to be negotiated with when translating in solitary fashion" (ibid.).

Theatre translation should be considered, perhaps most intriguingly, a decision-making process of negotiation among different subjectivities. I use the idea of "translation agency" (Perteghella 2006a: 112) to signify "the individual rewriter constrained in the reading/translational/rewriting act by his or her culturality, context, status, and subjectivity" (ibid.).

In theatre translation, collaborative translational practices point to two or more agencies involved in the translational process. Lombardo, Shakespearean scholar and therefore a "specialist" translator, "acquires the status of an expert translator" (Perteghella 2006a: 116) of Shakespeare. A specialist translator therefore will often be an academic who necessarily will bring to the translation his or her own in-depth knowledge not only of the text in question, but

also of the poetics and historical and cultural context of the playwright and their body of work. Strehler, artistic director and commissioner of the translation, but also contributing to the actual translation of the play, acquires the status of a "privileged translator"; that is "…the translators in question hold a canonized position in the target literature or theatre, which is taken to entitle them to the privilege of a more personal response to Shakespeare" (Delabastita 1998: 223). The privileged translator has therefore acquired a preferential—even celebrity—status (in this case as artistic director) prior to becoming a translator. Further, Arthur Horowitz, in his study of twentieth-century theatre productions of *The Tempest*, observes how the stage director is ultimately the "controlling agent within the creative process … directing a production of *The Tempest* turns its director into Prospero's surrogate within the theatrical exchange" (Horowitz 2004: 12). This case study seeks to foreground the personal and cultural factors that have influenced the rewriting through the use of the translator's notes and essays, the director's correspondence with his chosen translator, and annotations which shed light on the decision-making process.

Theatre Translation: A Special Case Study Method?

Recent research in the use of case study methodology in translation prefers and encourages multiple case studies as opposed to the traditional single case study research (Susam-Sarajeva 2001: 167). An analysis of multiple translations with a marked difference between them (authors, genres, languages) is preferred, in order to identify recurring patterns of translational behaviour (comparative analysis) or differences in these patterns (contrastive analysis) (Susam-Sarajeva 2001: 175). Within the single case study design, Yin differentiates between an holistic case study which uses only one unit of analysis, and an embedded case study involving more than one unit of analysis (Yin 2014: 50). The embedded design therefore represents a more elaborate analysis along multiple subunits. The embedded single case study would enhance "insights into the single case" (Yin 2014: 56). Whilst the analysis of a single unit of study would undoubtedly allow us to collect a richness of detail and even examine current theory, we can agree that this richness cannot be used to provide general observations or norms (Susam-Sarajeva 2001: 169). This is particularly important when the researcher wants to develop or build theory.

This current case study, with its focus on one unit (*The Tempest*, translated, edited and/or retranslated by two agencies—Lombardo and Strehler—into one language—Italian) falls into the broad category of single case studies. The single case study method is employed here because the rewriting of the translation assisted by the director's interpretation can be considered typical or "common" (Yin 2014: 52) as an example of collaborative theatre translation practices. Further, the analysis of one translated play rewritten after external input and subsequently retranslated into theatrical performance opens up discussion of how *embedded* such a study must be, with its own various sub-units of analysis (Yin 2014: 53). In this particular instance, the survival of the first translation by Lombardo—not his first draft, or attempt at translating the *Tempest*, but rather the finished translation which Lombardo thought to be ready enough to be sent to Strehler—as well as the subsequent changes and alterations, the discussions between the writer and the director, Lombardo's further response to Strehler's queries and his own suggestions, all these inputs and impulses not only allowed the retracing of "the existence of a first text" (Colombo 2007a: xv), but, furthermore, the observation that "a sort of second text had taken shape" (ibid.).

These two texts then can either be seen as two different, yet dependent, texts, or as embodying the reconstructed, now visible, journey of translation through necessary drafts. In this particular case, the subsequent drafting process is informed by other participants. The main unit of analysis is the collaborative translation of Lombardo and Strehler. The investigation into their collaborative writing for the stage is achieved by a multi-layered analysis: a paratextual analysis (looking at the actual correspondence and notes by Strehler to Lombardo, as well as their own views on translation and the play in general); a textual contrastive analysis which must be shifted from the textual, descriptive comparison between source text and target text, to the "other" versions of the target text; finally, an analysis of the "intersemiotic translation" (Jakobson 2000: 114), the product of an "interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of non-verbal sign-systems" (ibid.), here involving the subsequent translation of *La tempesta* from page onto stage, including the scenic interpretation by the director, as well as that by the actors and stage designer.

With regard to the textual contrastive analysis, illustrative fragments from the source text, representing stylistic and textual examples, will be analysed in the translation(s). At the same time, *The Tempest* becomes a frame of reference, with the contrastive analysis of its two Italian versions (or drafts) "highlighting differences between otherwise similar phenomena" (Susam-Sarajeva 2001: 175). The examination of changes to and interpretation of characterization in the resulting target texts is an important tool for identifying strategies,

choices and solutions at textual and performance levels. These changes are not only driven by a personal impulse (by the translator and the director), but often are shaped by previous translations of the text and by the scholarship they have consulted. Further, collaboration is linked to the participants in this process (a subunit of analysis). As discussed earlier, the research needs also to be translator-orientated, considering the wider context in which translators of drama operate as, for example, expert academics such as Lombardo and theatre practitioners such as Strehler. The staging of the text in a performance context at the Piccolo Teatro di Milano will also be analyzed (another subunit of analysis).

I have already discussed how translating *The Tempest* is a challenging task (Perteghella 2006b). The play explores themes of magic and illusion, revenge and forgiveness, betrayal, dream and reality, politics and idealism, wilderness (in the idea of nature and present on the island) and civilization (urban locations of Milan and Naples), exile, and tropes of metamorphosis (magic, sea-changes, but also behavioural transformations). Among the other recurring themes are the acts of storytelling and reminiscence. Miranda has very few memories of her life in the dukedom, Prospero reminisces about his time as the rightful Duke of Milan, and thus creates memories of her homeland for Miranda. Caliban remembers his mother Sycorax, Prospero and Caliban remind each other of when they first met. Most significantly, already from the twentieth century, *The Tempest* had been analyzed and deconstructed in terms of colonial slavery. Within the "modernist colonial subtext" (Horowitz 2004: 21) critics agree that the practice and the concept of European colonialism (and associated issues of race and identity) have shaped the writing of the play (Hulme 1986).[2] These are reflected in particular in the characters of the native Caliban and Ariel, and that of the more powerful (white) usurper, Prospero, in the locality of the island, fictionally situated somewhere between Tunis and Naples, but metaphorically taken to signify the New World. Modern and contemporary theatre productions (and screen adaptations) of the play therefore have had to negotiate these critical readings and established viewpoints. One of these viewpoints was that of critic Jan Kott, for whom "Shakespeare should be read as a dramatist of pain" (Kennedy 1993: 9). Strehler had been influenced by Kott's critical study of Shakespeare. In *Shakespeare our Contemporary* (Kott 1966), Kott perceived Shakespeare's works as contemporary and relevant to modern issues. He participated in the first textual and thematic exploratory meeting between Lombardo and Strehler (15 October 1977), during which the participants' ideas about some of the play characters differed. Unlike Kott, Strehler thought that Prospero had undergone a change. But for Kott "non c'è scoperta di nessuna verità" (there is no discovery of any truth) (Strehler 1977;

see Colombo 2007b: 350). Colombo observes how it is Lombardo who eventually will "show [Strehler] in the work the existence of a truth negated by Kott" (Colombo 2007a: xix). All however agreed Caliban to be the "Other", but not a monster (Strehler October 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 349–350). In fact, the colonial subtext of *The Tempest*, although present, is neither developed nor further explored by Lombardo and Strehler, who preferred to focus on the metaphorics of magic, illusion and Prospero's "journey towards the real" (Strehler 1992: 104; Colombo 2007b: 365). In fact, a "metatheatrical" reading by Strehler started, according to Horowitz (2004: 19), already in the *mise en scène* of 1948.

The Tempest contains several stylistic challenges; for example musicality, through poetry and songs. Devices such as parallelism, alliteration and onomatopoeia recur throughout the text, together with witty wordplays and puns. The whole incantatory effect and musical qualities of the language are created above all by this use of repetition (McDonald 1991: 17). Characterization becomes complex because of the ambiguity of the characters. For example, Prospero himself can be seen as the scholar, the good father, the benevolent master and teacher, but also as a vengeful torturer and tyrant (and in a postcolonial context, *the* white colonialist). In a recent article, writer Margaret Atwood, describing her experience of updating and translating the play into a novel, asks questions about the characters and their relationships, which are open to varying interpretations:

> Is Caliban himself the Freudian Id? Is he a victim of colonial oppression …? But what about his rapist tendencies? … What does Prospero mean when he says of Caliban, at the end of the play, "This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine"? And by the way, who is Caliban's father? (Atwood 2016: 3)

Atwood also picks up on the underpinning theme of the play, that of theatre itself, of actors, of theatrical effects as illusions, of Prospero as the director *par excellence* and the island as a stage: "Of all Shakespeare's plays this one is most obviously about plays, directing and acting" (Atwood 2016: 4). Metatheatre is something that surfaces in both Strehler's productions of *The Tempest* too. In his own notes about the possible staging of the play Strehler observes: "La 'teatralità', il fittizio, l'inventato, il 'diretto da' è continuo nella *Tempesta*" (the "theatricality", the fictitious, the made-up, the "directed by", is recurring/continuous in the *Tempest*) (27 January 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 340). This is a view also shared by Lombardo, who identifies in the spirit of Ariel that of theatre itself: "… è Ariel … ad anatomizzare il teatro, a rivelare i meccanismi teatrali, a mostrare al pubblico il modo in cui il teatro controlla i materiali della vita" (… it's Ariel … who dissects theatre, who reveals its inner workings, who shows to

the audience the way theatre controls life's materials) (Lombardo 6 March 1978; see Colombo 2007b: 108). Even the colonial reading is second to that of Prospero as the man of theatre: "C'è una componente 'schiavistica' in Prospero che non si può dimenticare. Come farla collimare con la sua umanità e saggezza? Forse il 'direttore degli spettacoli' è sempre, naturalmente, un po' o tanto o troppo tiranno. È la sua parte!" (There's a component of "slavery" in Prospero that we cannot forget. How can we reconcile this with his humanity and wisdom? Perhaps the "director of the show" is always, naturally, a bit, or much, or too much of a tyrant. It's his role!) (Strehler 27 January 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 340). Lombardo, reflecting on the challenges of translating the "linguistic" drama of the play (how language is differently used and felt by Caliban, Prospero and Miranda, Ariel, and so forth) which in turns creates a "historical and existential drama," suggests "the adoption of a sort of 'epic quality'" for the staging of the play (Lombardo 6 March 1978; see Colombo 2007b: 107). Strehler was twenty-seven when he first staged *The Tempest* in a commissioned translation by poet Salvatore Quasimodo, an open-air event in the enchanting Boboli Gardens in Florence in 1948. This production, closing the Maggio Musicale Fiorentino festival, highlighted the musical qualities of, and songs in, the play (Strehler came from a musical family; he himself was an accomplished musician and directed several operas), mixed Italian classical and baroque references, and gave emphasis to the Masque scene. It also introduced *commedia dell'arte* into the Shakespearean tale in the characters of Stefano and Trinculo (Horowitz 2004). At the time of the second commission, Strehler had become a household name in Italy, an engaged director with a European outlook. At the time of composition, Lombardo had been for many years Professor of English Literature and Shakespearean Studies at the University of Rome La Sapienza. In 1977, he was asked by Strehler to translate the play for a new production to be staged at the Piccolo Teatro di Milano in 1978. *La tempesta* opened on the 28 June 1978. For several years afterwards, Strehler's *Tempesta* was part of the Italian repertory, toured Europe, and participated in festivals in the US (Horowitz 2004: 178). In 1981 RAI (the Italian broadcasting corporation) decided to film and broadcast the production, thus bringing it to a larger television audience.

Sounds, Voices, Roars and Noises: The Making of *La Tempesta*

In 2005, after Lombardo's death, the discovery among his papers of two unpublished scripts, together with the preserved correspondence (paratextual material) between Strehler and Lombardo, revealed how the first translation

sent to Strehler (which Colombo terms T1; Colombo 2007a: xv) had necessarily changed after the input of the director, into a second play (T2; Colombo 2007a: xv) used as the script for performance, itself subject to further changes once positioned on stage, as observed by Lombardo's daughter, Natalia (see Colombo 2007b: 135). These two translations, which I shall refer to as T1 and T2, following Colombo's classification (2007a), together with the English text, were finally published in 2007 (Colombo 2007b), accompanied by the rich material of ideas, notes, letters, by publisher Donzelli, curated by Colombo, in a multimedia edition with the addition of a DVD of the RAI televised version.

Paratextual Analysis: Letters, Annotations, Reflections

The Tempest is regarded as the last play written by Shakespeare, composed in 1611. It is a play in five acts ending with an Epilogue spoken by Prospero, addressing his audience directly. This structure is kept in both translations. Colombo, analysing and discussing the correspondence between Lombardo and Strehler, observes how this same correspondence becomes the scenario for

> … an unusual dialogue between the compact and analytical rhythm of the director, focused on the first three acts; and that more relaxed and measured of the translator, now a dear friend, and signatory of a synthetic and organized writing, which highlights some central themes of the play. (Colombo 2007a: xxi)

The first act "rewritten" by Strehler is sent back to Lombardo, though this is a rewriting overlapping, entwined with, Lombardo's own writing, "adattata alle mie necessitá ritmiche" (adapted to my own rhythmic needs) (letter dated August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 10), a rewriting which must be checked again by Lombardo (ibid.) in a continuous practice of co-authoring. This rewriting is manifest in the letters accompanying copies of the annotated script, with extensive notes, reflections, also transcriptions of his discussions with Kott, Kott's own writings on *The Tempest,* and some "brandello d'intuizione" (crumbs of insight) (letter dated August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 5), but also "sospetto" (doubt) (letter dated August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 9), "domande-proposte" (queries-suggestions) (letter dated August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 13) and "cambiamenti-proposte" (changes-suggestions) (undated letter; see Colombo 2007b: 15). Strehler also goes back to Quasimodo's own 1947 translation, comparing Quasimodo's choices of some words to those of Lombardo (undated letter; see Colombo 2007b: 17, 19). This "going back" to other resources highlights the importance of the

consultation of other texts, but also of "memories" of the texts that came before. In this conversation, both characterization and the relationship between characters is discussed at length. Most significantly, Strehler sees the practice of translation as a form of critique in itself: "a 'critical interpretation' cannot be born without a 'textual interpretation' that is itself critical too" (letter dated August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 6). Lombardo also illustrated some of his own translation strategies and methods in one of his articles. He believed, as did Strehler, and because of his collaboration with him, that the translator of drama must not only be loyal to the source text, but also loyal to the director, to the actors and to the target audience (Lombardo 1993; Colombo 2007b: 138, 143–145).

Strehler informs Lombardo of his own discussions with Kott about Prospero and Caliban, in particular the director's idea of what type of language (and culture) Caliban had as a child, before his encounter with, and education by, Prospero (letter dated August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 27). Strehler imagined Caliban's language from Prospero's perspective, a mixture of groans, gestures, and harsh sounds, while Kott believed Caliban's language was already musical, just "different" from that of Prospero (Colombo 2007b: 27). The difficulty of some scenes (such as that between Miranda, Prospero, Ferdinando in Act I) (letter dated 25 August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 33) is thoroughly discussed in terms of language and performance, as well as *how* to represent the "island-theatre-world-history" which is also "sea, and wind, and light" (Strehler 2007: 34). Particular attention is paid to the music in the play. Indeed, sounds and music are an important topic for Strehler, who comes to the text with performance preoccupations: "… I would make the storm very sonorous, at the beginning, with cries, noises, 'roars'" (Strehler, letter dated 25 August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 10) and the songs must be accompanied by music (the composer will be Fiorenzo Carpi, another participant in the making of the theatre production). Strehler had already identified a piece of fourteenth-century music and song (letter dated 25 August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 35, 36) as a model for Ariel, to avoid the pitfalls of turning songs into Italian opera (Colombo 2007b: 35). Rhythm too is discussed by considering the possible Italian *mise en scène*: "una traduzione è, a teatro, legata anche alla sua 'traduzione scenica'" (a translation is, in theatre, also linked to its "scenic translation") (letter dated August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 6), and Strehler insists that the difference between prose and verse be felt (letter dated August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 7). Strehler, as the director, inescapably sees rhythm as a "'verbal idea,' of a show, that it is also—necessarily—my own personal musicality, which I cannot escape and which is connected to a certain way of 'interpreting' scenes and situations" (letter dated August 1977; see

Colombo 2007b: 8). The discussion and subsequent choice of words therefore become linked to solving rhythm and characterization. Lombardo (1993: 144) pointed to some directorial decisions which influenced his translation: Ariel was in the air for most of the time, attached to a wire, so he needed to give the actor playing Ariel easy lines to speak, considering her breathing patterns, her acrobatic movements in the air, and her distance from the audience. Her lines should also evoke femininity, lightness and movement. Further, according to Lombardo, each translation should have a linguistic and rhythmic unity of its own while still maintaining a relationship of absolute "loyalty" to the source text. Lombardo wanted in fact to create

> a translation which is a faithful version of the English text but has a textual autonomy for an Italian audience … and which also has some connection … with the Italian literary tradition … and with the tradition established both by previous translations and by other manifestations of Shakespeare's influence in Italy. (Lombardo 1993: 140)

In Strehler's letters, there is praise for Lombardo's translation: "Devo subito dirti che la scena tra Antonio e Sebastiano è tradotta in un modo stupendo. È bellissima, Agostino: stilisticamente, come piglio, come ritmo interno." (I have to say this to you right away: the scene between Antonio and Sebastiano is translated wonderfully. It's beautiful, Agostino: stylistically, in its tone, in its internal rhythm.) (letter dated 21 November 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 44). Further, the letters from Strehler to Lombardo can be seen as the director's reflections on theatre generally, and the relationship between text and performance, a glimpse into Italian theatre in particular, but also into the Italian political and cultural contexts of the time (letter dated 21 November 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 42–43). Finally, they bear witness to Strehler's own intimate relationship with the stage.

Textual Analysis

The significant linguistic intervention in Lombardo's texts is an overall modernization of the language: Lombardo understands the essence of dramatic translation as temporal, and accordingly language must always be contemporary (Lombardo 1993: 140). In Lombardo's T1 the names of the characters are all Italianized, but Ariele and Calibano are changed into the more English Ariel and Caliban at the suggestion of Strehler, to foreground the foreignness of the two characters among the other (Italian or Spanish) names (letter dated August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 13). This principle is also applied to

Sycorax (Sicorace in T1, Sycorax in T2). T1 is naturally scrupulous in terms of its relation to the source text and reflects Lombardo's status as expert academic, approaching the text with philological exactness, and an in-depth understanding of the Elizabethan cultural context.

In T1 Lombardo does not introduce into the text elements of regional dialects, which he will do in T2, after Strehler's interpretation of the characters of Trinculo, the jester, and Stephano (Stefano), the drunken butler, as "masks" (letter dated 21 November 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 52–55). Strehler decided to introduce *commedia dell'arte* motifs into performance with these characters. Lombardo gives these characters, seen as clowns and buffoons, respectively Neapolitan and Venetian idiomatic expressions in T2, and by so doing they draw parallels with the Masks of Pulcinella/Coviello and Brighella/Zanni, placing *La tempesta* within the Italian theatrical tradition, and as such re-introducing, although in different ways, the *commedia dell'arte* elements, already experimented within 1948. The Neapolitan Mask of Pulcinella is most appropriate for Trinculo, as Strehler, sees them both as "scared, ravenous, coward, easily dominated" (letter dated 21 November 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 52), yet Strehler reflects on how best to show and speak *this* Neapolitaness (letter dated 21 November 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 53–54), suggesting Trinculo be played by a Neapolitan actor. Strehler perceives Stephano originating from Veneto already in the source text, from the word "coragio" in act V (letter dated 21 November 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 55), and here again both Strehler and Lombardo must solve the problem of what type of Veneto dialect to have (letter dated 21 November 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 57). In T2 Neapolitan exclamations are introduced: "by this light" becomes "Sole mio" (sun of mine), "Alas" is rendered as "Maria Vergine!" (Virgin Mary!), "I shall no more to sea, to sea" becomes "Per mar no voj piu' andar" (Venetian vernacular for: I don't want to go to sea anymore). Stephano's song "The master, the swabber" (II. ii. 49) is presented both in standard Italian and in dialect in T2 ("il nostromo e il mozzo", "el mozo el capitan") (Lombardo 2007: 221). However, overall, only a very few dialect expressions or words are introduced into (a less formal) Italian.

Changes are made to puns and wordplays for which an Italian equivalent is found, in order to keep the humour on stage. The noun "temperance" was used as a proper name by the Puritans during Shakespeare's time:

Adrian: It must needs be of subtle, tender and delicate temperance
Antonio: Temperance was a delicate wench. (II. i. 41–42)

Lombardo keeps "temperance" in T1, but substitutes "grazia" (grace) in T2, also an Italian proper name, keeping the pun in exactly the same place as in the English text:

Adriano: Il clima, qui, dev'essere delicato, sottile,
Pieno d'una certa qual sua grazia
(The climate here must be delicate, subtle,
full of a certain grace)
Antonio: Grazia era una fanciulla delicata (Lombardo 2007: 189)
(Grace was a delicate young girl)

The pun "dollar-dolour" between Sebastian and Gonzalo (II. i. 19–20) is rendered in T1 as "dollaro-dolore" (one dollar/grie) (Lombardo 2007: 188), and in T2 as "dell'oro-dolore" (some gold-grief) (Lombardo 2007: 189), keeping both the assonance and the wordplay, with the Elizabethan dollar substituted with the metal of the monetary system in Renaissance Italy.

Regarding challenging words and concepts, Prospero's description of Caliban as "this thing of darkness" (V. i. 275) is rendered by Lombardo in T1 as "questo figlio del buio" (this son of darkness) (Lombardo 2007: 326). Strehler was impressed by Lombardo's choice of "son," but saw Prospero's utterance as also acknowledging, at the same time, his own dark side. After suggesting the variant of "grumo" (lump, clump) (letter dated January–February 1978; see Colombo 2007b: 101). "questa cosa del buio" (this thing of darkness) (Lombardo 2007: 327) is the rendering in T2. Sebastian's line "a living drollery" (III. iii. 21), which refers to the spirits of the island appearing in mysterious shapes, was originally translated as "fantocci viventi" (living puppets) (Lombardo 2007: 254) but had to be changed for scenic reasons into "un giocod'ombre" (a game of shades) in T2 (Lombardo 2007: 255). The word "tawny" (II. i. 53) uttered by Antonio to indicate the appearance of the island, is translated in T1 as "nerastra" (blackish) (Lombardo 2007: 190), which refers to the shade of colour but does not convey the sense of arid soil in contrast to lush vegetation. This becomes "bruciata" (parched) (Lombardo 2007: 191) in T2.

Next follow some examples of how similar expressions have been changed for the stage performance, including problems of rhythm, of speech, of orality. In Ariel's song "those are pearls who were his eyes" (I. ii. 402) is translated closely in T1 as "quelli che erano i suoi occhi sono perle" (Lombardo 2007: 176), while in T2, considering both rhythmic delivery and music constraints (of Ariel's song), this is changed to "Ed i suoi occhi/Perle" (and his eyes, pearls) (Lombardo 2007: 177), reducing the number of words. This line will then be sung on stage as "son perle gli occhi." (are pearls his eyes). In Miranda's speech

to Prospero, asking him to stop the storm: "If by your Art, my dearest father, you have/Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them" (I, ii, 1), Lombardo first translates "allay them" as "Acquietatele" (quieten them) (Lombardo 2007: 144). This choice is discussed by Strehler in their correspondence, during which he suggests "calmatele" (calm them down) because of "rhythmic breathing" inherent in acting (letter dated August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 8–9; Lombardo 2007: 145). "Roar", in the same passage is also discussed with relevance to the noises and sounds of the actual storm on stage. In T1 we find "tumulto" (commotion), in T2 "fragore" (roar, racket) is chosen over the variants of "ruggito" (roar) and "urlo" (cry) (Lombardo 2007: 10).

Among the difficult vocabulary to translate is "moody," when Prospero gives yet more chores to Ariel, and Ariel becomes annoyed (i. ii. 243). In T1 Lombardo has "sei scontento?" (are you displeased?) (Lombardo 2007: 162). Strehler sees a possible relationship on stage between Prospero-teacher and Ariel-pupil, therefore suggests childhood expressions such as "fai i capricci" (throw a tantrum) (letter undated; see Colombo 2007b: 25). Eventually in T2 both agree on "metti il broncio?" (sulk) (Lombardo 2007: 163); this reverts to "fai i capricci" in the stage production.

The treatment of idioms is important in translation because these are used mainly in conversational language, and therefore add to characterization, and they are also culture-bound, presenting another challenge to the translator of theatre texts. As an example, consider the storm scene, in which the captain is losing control of the vessel. The sailors and the nobles are panicking, and during their cries of fear there is a reference to Elizabethan sailors getting drunk in times of danger;

Boatswain: (slowly pulling out a bottle) What, must our mouths be cold? (I. i. 52)

In T1 Lombardo substitutes this rather obscure idiom with an equivalent Italian one: "gola secca" is a metaphor for "without drinking":

Nostromo: Come! E dovremo rimanere con la gola secca? (Lombardo 2007: 142)
(How! And we should stay with a dry throat?)

This passage undergoes disambiguation in T2, keeping however an informality "Come! Senza farci l'ultima bottiglia?" (Lombardo 2007: 143) (How! Without having our last bottle?). The source play contains compounds, mostly with reference to the sea (McDonald 1991: 19). "Sea-sorrow" (I. ii. 170) is rendered as "travaglio marino" (marine anguish) (Lombardo 2007: 156) in T1 but "odissea" in T2 (odyssey; adding the idea of a long, perilous yet adventurous

sea journey), (Lombardo 2007: 157); "sea-change" (I. ii. 404) is "mutamento marino" (marine transformation) (Lombardo 2007: 176) in T1 and "metamorfosi marina" (marine metamorphosis) (Lombardo 2007: 177) is in T2, which indicates the physical change of Alonso, Ferdinand's father, believed to be drowned by his son; for "sea-swallow'd" (II. i. 246) Lombardo has "inghiottiti dal mare" (swallowed by the sea) in both texts (Lombardo 2007: 206, 207), keeping the imagery of the sea-cannibal swallowing or eating the sailors and the party of nobles from Naples. In the following lines Caliban's relationship to Miranda and Prospero is explored:

Caliban: You taught me language; and my profit on't
Is, I know how to curse (I. ii. 361–5)

In the English text "you" is ambiguous: either a plural you to both Miranda and Prospero, or a formal "you" to either of them as they are both present on stage. Lombardo subverts both these theories by using the singular informal "tu" in T1: Caliban addresses either Miranda or Prospero with the informal singular "tu" ("mi hai insegnato il linguaggio,") (you taught me language) (Lombardo 2007: 172). In T2 however, we have a change of perspective. Caliban addresses both Miranda and Prospero with the plural "you" (voi avete) (Lombardo 2007: 173).

Caliban also makes explicit, as both Kott and Strehler believed, that he already had his own language, and Prospero and Miranda have forcefully imposed their own: "Caliban sapeva parlare, come poteva un bambino, solo, in un'isola, con alle spalle un certo insegnamento materno" (Caliban *knew how to speak*, in the way a child would, alone, on an island, with a certain maternal teaching behind him) (letter dated August 1977; Colombo 2007b: 27).

This prior knowledge by Caliban is made explicit in Lombardo's revised translation, which also emphasises how both Prospero and Miranda have imposed their own language and cultural teachings:

Caliban: Mi avete insegnato
A parlare come voi: e quel che ho guadagnato
È questo: ora so maledire. (Lombardo 2007: 173)
(You have taught me
To speak like you: and what I have gained
Is this: now I know how to curse)

Another example of manipulation of personal pronouns of address is given in the treatment of the relationship between Ferdinand and Miranda: Shakespeare uses the formal "you" as opposed to the informal, more intimate "thou", when they speak with each other: Lombardo in T1 also uses the formal "voi" but in T2 Lombardo and Strehler choose the informality of "tu".

The relationship is therefore brought to a more intimate level between the two young people. In the following textual example Prospero is indicating the young Ferdinand to Miranda and asks her to open her eyes:

> Prospero: The fringed curtains of thine eyes advance
> And say what thou seest yond (I. ii. 413–5)

In T1, the imagery of the "fringed curtains" is translated closely as "frangiate cortine" (fringed curtains or screens) (Lombardo 2007: 176) while in T2 as "il frangiato/Sipario" (Lombardo 2007: 177).

The word "sipario" specifically indicates the type of curtain (and the convention) used in theatre: the language of Lombardo's rewriting has been influenced by Strehler's own metatheatrical reading of the play.

Scenic Translation Analysis

The analysis of the scenic translation (or of the intersemiotic translation of Lombardo's text transposed to the stage by Strehler and his team of theatre practitioners) is possible by viewing the 1981 RAI film of the production. Because of the time lapse between the theatre and the televised event, changes have obviously been made to the cast and other participants. *La tempesta* was first shown in Milan on the 28 June 1978 at the Teatro Lirico, Piccolo Teatro di Milano. The set was designed by Luciano Damiani, the lighting by Vinicio Cheli (in the 1981 broadcast, by Alberto Savi), the music was composed by Fiorenzo Carpi.

In the opening scene, "a ship at sea during a storm" the shape of a ship is projected against a screen, the waves are created by the movement of a huge cloth of blue silk by hidden actors. The storm acoustics are rendered with a variety of harsh, threatening noises and sounds (drums, percussions) but also with the human voice (cries, shouts). Prospero is played by Tino Carraro, Miranda is played by a young Fabiana Udeno. Both wear white tunics. Ariel, played by Giulia Lazzarini, is supported for most of the time by a visible wire, and dressed up as a Pierrot-like character, changing into dark clothes when she appears as a harpy, or into blue clothes as a sea-nymph. Ariel's energetic acrobatics in the air give us the impression of her lightness, yet the wire is also a reminder of her dependence on Prospero. Indeed, Pia Kleber observes that the gestus of Prospero as tyrant was expressed throughout the play "in body posture, action, props, and tone of voice" (Kleber 1993: 150). As in Lombardo's

observation, Ariel doubles as the embodiment of theatre, moving props and costumes around (Fig. 1).

The stage is minimalist, giving the sense of the "un-inhabitability" of the "naked" island, and of solitude and exile. But this emptiness also forces the audience to focus on the actors and their voices and words. On the bare stage, props and costumes acquire symbolic meaning. The island is a wooden platform with white sand, some shells, some driftwood, surrounded by the blue cloth of the sea, still or agitated. Beyond the screen at the back of the stage, a light, becoming brighter or darker, represents the passing of time.

Music and sounds are present throughout. Ariel uses bells to perform spells, her voice for the animal sounds and her songs. Music, which reminds us of medieval choral music, can be heard in the background. Caliban was played by Michele Placido in the 1978 production, and by Massimo Foschi in the RAI broadcast. Caliban, naked, painted black, crouches most of the time like an animal (we first see him coming out of the trap door under the stage, symbolically emerging from inside the "earth"), his movements accompanied by rhythmic, shamanic drums. Kebler observes how in Act II "Caliban danced with a voodoo ritual prop, reminiscent of an African witch-doctor's wand, neutralizing Prospero's magic. But Strehler didn't make Caliban specifically an African tribesman" (Kleber 1993: 148). Caliban sits or lies down on the ground, in physical contact with his island, hating and fearing Prospero the usurper (Fig. 2):

> There were, however, several wonderful moments in the production when Caliban was shown as a "noble savage", the real king of the island, full of tenderness, not hatred … When Prospero exclaimed: 'So slave, hence!'… Caliban stood upright against the bright background, turned around, and looked Prospero straight in the eye. His beautiful, majestic black body defied Prospero's words. (Kleber 1993: 149)

Ferdinand, played by Massimo Bonetti, is also punished by Prospero, and, like Caliban, soon appears in and out of the trap door, unclothed, his (white) body shining with sweat after the hard labour. Ferdinand, however, is never threatening, thus counterbalancing Caliban (and in fact is rewarded by marrying Miranda). Both Trinculo and Stefano incorporate instances of non-standard language and idioms in their lines, whilst also using their respective localized accents while speaking in Italian. They are both wearing black masks and their costumes are reminiscent of the Italian *Maschere*, the comical and often grotesque characters of the *commedia dell'arte*. There are also elements of physical comedy in their encounter with Caliban. Strehler invited Kott to the final dress

Fig. 1 Giulia Lazzarini as Ariel, Tino Carraro as Prospero. (Photo by Luigi Ciminaghi. Reproduced with kind permission of the Piccolo Teatro di Milano – Teatro d'Europa)

Fig. 2 Michele Placido as Caliban and Tino Carraro as Prospero. (Photo by Luigi Ciminaghi. Reproduced with kind permission of the Piccolo Teatro di Milano – Teatro d'Europa)

rehearsal in Milan of *La tempesta.* Kott disapproved of the use of the clown tradition and particularly the treatment of the end, which sees Caliban returning to his rock (descending once more into the trap door of the stage):

> Of all possible endings in *The Tempest*, Caliban's return to his rock-prison seems the most false and traditional. When Prospero and the newcomers from the Old World leave the island, Caliban should remain alone on the stage: deceived twice, he is richer in experience only. (Kott 1979: 122; quoted in Kleber 1993: 147)

The issue of colonialism in *The Tempest* is not brought to the fore in this particular intersemiotic translation: Strehler's production is more concerned with parallels between magic and theatre. The Masque scene which celebrates the love between Ferdinand, the son of the Duke of Naples, and Miranda, Prospero's daughter, was omitted in Strehler's production. Prospero becomes a high priest celebrating the couple's union, holding a fire-torch and sheaves of wheat (respectively symbols of love, life and fertility) which he then passes onto Miranda and Ferdinand. At the end of the play the screen at the back falls down, revealing the island as an illusion, the stage itself. Prospero then takes off his red cape and crown (symbols of his restored dukedom) and his

tunic, breaks his wand (symbol of his magic) and, wearing only a shirt and trousers—Strehler wanted the final unclothing to reveal the actor, "the man" (Note dated August 1977; see Colombo 2007b: 346)—he walks into the auditorium, and addresses the audience directly. According to Kleber, "Tino Carraro began his last speech in his own persona" (Kleber 1993: 150).[3]

Conclusions

The objective of this case study was to analyze how collaboration between the various practitioners involved in the linguistic and scenic translation of the play can manifest itself and affect the process of translating for the stage, and what changes have been applied to the first target text, through reading, interpretations and annotations, by the stage director. I have noted how modernization or actualization of the language has been employed, with some disambiguation and explanation of archaisms, and substitutions of old-fashioned words suggested by Strehler. Scholarship produced on Shakespeare and on *The Tempest*, including Lombardo's and Kott's own writings, has had an influence on the translational approach, as well as Strehler's consulting of the previous translation by Quasimodo. The reference to these "parallel texts" then becomes part of the overall translation strategy. Strehler played in his production on the relationship and analogies between artifice or magic and the illusion of theatre. This is reflected in the linguistic changes which are then embodied in performance. Lombardo, for example, needed to take into account Ariel's suspension in mid-air in Strehler's production.

The first translation was revised by Lombardo in written and oral conversations with Strehler, re-imagined by Strehler with comments, suggestions, alternative words, so that T2 is in fact the result of T1 assisting Strehler in conceiving the *mise en scène*. Thus, we can argue that this collaborative practice made up of conversations, textual annotations, rewriting and continuous editing, creates a common agency in the writing of translations for the stage, a "fragmented agency whereby two subjectivities enter in dialogue with the text at different stages of the translational process, and collude at some point in the writing" (Perteghella 2006b: 123). Further changes happen to the translated play once it reaches the rehearsal room, such as the deletion of the Masque scene, and there are interpretative juggling acts by the actors, too. Because of the nature of theatre translation as a collaborative practice, taking into consideration its complexities and its various participants, I would argue that it is often more appropriate to use the single, embedded case study as the appropriate methodology for stage translations. These layers can only be

unwrapped by a particularizing in-depth analysis, therefore a single, embedded case study which presents multiple units of analysis is a suitable method for analysing translations that become theatre scripts. As a representative case study, such analysis can be replicated in similar case studies, mapping similarities and differences in collaborative textual practice. In this particular case study, the focus has been not so much on the relationship between source text and target text, but rather on the two target texts. This analysis, together with Strehler's notes and letters, has helped us to retrace and describe the process of changes brought up by a collaborative writing practice in the context of stage production. Collaboration here has materialized in exchanges on drafts, during pre-performance readings and in rehearsals, in directorial notes, in the translator-consultant role, whilst exploring the language of the play, its possibilities, with a focus on performance.

One final reflection is about the Donzelli Editore publication, curated and edited by Rosy Colombo, on which this case study is based, and which has allowed me to analyze how collaborative practice is realised in conversations, letters, exchanges, drafts and eventually on stage. The book is a special and important project: the source text, the two translations side by side, the correspondence and other paratextual material, make visible the changes between the two versions, and its inclusion of the multimodal text, that is the filmed stage production included in the DVD also reflects Strehler's belief that the final "judge" of the translation will be the stage itself (letter dated August 1977; Colombo 2007b: 15). This book edition, with the three names of the authors (Shakespeare, Lombardo and Strehler) presented together on the book cover, becomes a model, for both publishers of translations and for theatres, of how the visibility of the translator as a co-author is an ethical necessity. Finally, it shows how the verbal translations—all that comes *before*—are integral part of theatre making: they can not only enrich the reader's (and spectator's) experience, but above all can contribute to the awareness of how theatre translations can be, and usually are, made collaboratively.

Notes

1. All English translations of extracts from the Italian articles, correspondence between Lombardo and Strehler, and notes on the scripts in the Donzelli publication (2007), are mine.
2. For different perspectives on *The Tempest*, including its screen adaptations (see Bigliazzi and Calvi 2014).

3. For a detailed and critical study of the intersemiotic translation of Strehler's *La tempesta*, and in particular, of the director's metatheatrical interpretation (see Bajma Griga 2003).

References

Atwood, M. (2016) 'A Perfect Storm: Margaret Atwood on rewriting Shakespeare's *Tempest*', *The Guardian Review*, Saturday 24 September 2016.

Bajma Griga, S. (2003) *La Tempesta di Shakespeare per Giorgio Strehler* (Shakespeare's Tempest for Giorgio Strehler), Pisa: Edizioni ETS.

Bigliazzi, S. and L. Calvi (eds) (2014) *Revisiting The Tempest: the Capacity to Signify*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Colombo, R. (2007a) 'Caro Agostino, Caro Giorgio' (Dear Agostino, Dear Giorgio), in R. Colombo (ed.) *La Tempesta tradotta e messa in scena* (The Tempest Translated and Staged), Roma: Donzelli Editore, pp. xiii–xxiv.

Colombo, R. (ed.) (2007b) *La Tempesta tradotta e messa in scena* (The Tempest Translated and Staged), Roma: Donzelli Editore.

Delabastita, D. (1998) 'Shakespeare Translation', in M. Baker and G. Saldanha (eds) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge, pp. 263–268.

Horowitz, A. (2004) *Prospero's "True Preservers": Peter Brook, Yukio Ninagawa, and Giorgio Strehler. Twentieth-Century Directors approach Shakespeare's The Tempest*, Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Hulme, P. (1986) *Colonial Encounters*, London and New York: Methuen.

Jakobson, R. (2000) 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', in L. Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 113–118.

Kennedy, D. (ed.) (1993) *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kleber, P. (1993) 'Theatrical Continuities in Giorgio Strehler's *The Tempest*', in D. Kennedy (ed.) *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 140–157.

Kott, J. (1966) *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, New York: Anchor Books.

Lombardo, A. (1993) 'Translating Shakespeare for the Theatre', in R. Clark and P. Boitani (eds) *English Studies in Transition: Papers from the ESSE Inaugural Conference*, London: Routledge, pp. 138–146.

Kott, J. (1979) 'Prospero or the Director: Giorgio Strehler's *The Tempest* (Piccolo Teatro di Milano)' tr. Barbara Krzywicka, *Theater* 10. 2 (1979), pp. 117–122.

Lombardo, A. (tr.) (2007) 'La Tempesta' (The Tempest), in R. Colombo (ed.) *La Tempesta tradotta e messa in scena* (The Tempest Translated and Staged), Rome: Donzelli Editore.

McDonald, R. (1991) 'Reading *The Tempest*', in S. Wells (ed.) Shakespeare Survey (Vol. 43), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 15–28.

Perteghella, M. (2006a) *A Descriptive Framework for Collaboration in Theatre Translation* (Unpublished doctoral thesis), Norwich: University of East Anglia.

Perteghella M. (2006b) 'Poetry, Music and Transformation in the Gulf of Naples: A Creative Voyage of *The Tempest*', in M. Perteghella and E. Loffredo (eds) *Translation and Creativity*, London and New York: Continuum, pp. 141–166.

Strehler, G. (1992) 'È iniziato il lavoro della Tempesta' (Work on *The Tempest* has Started), in Strehler, G. *Inscenare Shakespeare* (Staging Shakespeare), Rome: Bulzoni, pp. 104–5.

Susam-Sarajeva, Ş. (2001) 'Is One Case Always Enough?', *Perspectives* 9 (3): 167–176.

Yin, R. K. (2014) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (5th edn), Thousand Oaks: Sage.