SHAKESPEARE ON STAGE FOR THE SCREEN AND COLLABORATIVE TRANSLATION:
Cesare deve morire

FRANCESCO LAURENTI
UNIVERSITÀ IULM, MILANO

Abstract – The focus of this study is translating "for the stage" and, more specifically, the collaborative dimension in the field of translation for a yet-to-be *mise en scène*. After reflecting on the collaboration between several individuals in theatrical translation, this paper will examine on the feature-length film directed by the Taviani brothers that focuses on one of the Rebibbia theatrical experiences and more specifically on the work of the director and screenwriter, Fabio Cavalli. The aim is to understand how a Shakespearean text became a *Julius Caesar* staging within prison walls and later the transposition of the film *Cesare deve morire*, through a series of translations and retranslations where several participants were involved. The analysis of the translated work and the direct account of the theatre director will provide useful insights and understanding.

Keywords: collaborative translation; theatre translation; Shakespeare; regional languages; *Cesare deve morire*.

1. Introduction

Despite the widespread opinion that studies aimed at theatrical translation remain an almost unexplored area of Translation Studies, the investigations and research in this direction begun in the 1960s and have been gaining increased attention since the 1990s.

Momentum in this area occurred with the study carried out by Susan Bassnett (1991) who in 1991 claimed the need to construct a new prospect on a theory for theatrical translation.

Various hypotheses of the rationale for such an initial disinterest on the part of Translation Studies trace this lack of theoretical study back to the relationship between text and performance in a theatrical work, as Bassnett herself (1991) states at the beginning of her paper:

> In the history of translation studies, less has been written on problems of translating theatre texts than on translating any other text type. The generally accepted view on this absence of theoretical study is that the difficulty lies in the nature of the theatre text, which exists in a dialectical relationship with the performance of that same text and is therefore frequently read as something 'incomplete' or 'partially realized'(Bassnett 1991, p. 99).

During the 1960s, academic attention was initially directed at the performability of theatrical translation and, towards the end of the '70s under the influence of Bassnett, the fundamental issues of translation "for the stage" began to be studied. This led to the publication of the first books entirely dedicated to theatrical translation[1] at the beginning of the '80s.

From that moment on, the distinction between the studies referred to as translations "for the page" and translations "for the stage" (Merino 2000) was established and strengthened. These terms defined two different approaches referring to two distinct categories of translators ("philological translators", who translate plays at a verbal level, and "theatre translators" who work at a performance level) (Johnston 2004; Laera 2001) and "separate distribution circuits which condition the translation strategies used" (Espasa 2000, p. 52).

In the translation "for the page", the act of translating is generally "considered as prior to and autonomous from the *mise en scène*" (Espasa 2000, p. 52). The translator offers an interpretation that is not specific but conveys the ambiguities and different possible readings of the prototext by not making certain passages of the text explicit, leaving them as vague as the original author had done before. Moreover, as observed by Suh (2005), when referring to translation "for the page", the main strategy is "a very close (though not literal) translation of the original, such that the target text when compared with its original every utterance/turn of the original has its counterpart in the translation" (Suh 2005, p. 60).

Otherwise, for the stage translations, "the strategies range from deletion, reduction, merging, omission, adaptation, to other manipulations to conform to specific acting fashions" (Suh 2005, p. 60). These will generally have a more domesticating character than "for the page" translations, leading to a translation which is usually related to the specific style of presentation of the company (Espasa 2000).

The object of our study is represented by the translation "for the stage" and, more specifically, the collaborative dimension in the field of translation for a yet-to-be *mise en scène*.

After a reflection in reference to the collaborative between several individuals in theatrical translation, this paper will examine the feature-length film directed by the Taviani brothers, focusing on one of the Rebibbia theatrical experiences and more specifically on the work of the director and screenwriter, Fabio Cavalli. The aim is to understand how a Shakespearean text became a *Julius Caesar* staging within the prison walls and later the transposition of the film *Cesare deve morire*, through a series of translations and retranslations where several participants were involved. The analysis of

---

[1] Among these, for relevance and for the echo it had, it is worth remembering Zuber-Skerritt (1980).

the translated work and the direct account of the theatre director will provide useful insights.

2. Collaborative Theatre Translation

If the collaborative dimension has characterized the history of translation practices in a general sense, in some areas, as in the case of theatrical translation "for the stage", the collaborative approach is then fundamental, implying the involvement of various participants, and as such has been studied by Translation Studies scholars.

Starting from the assumption that "translation is and has always been a question of power relationships, and the translator has all too often been placed in a position of economic, aesthetic and intellectual inferiority" (Bassnett 1991, p. 101), Bassnett rejects the idea of Pavis (1989) who asserts, in the case of translation "for the stage", a "*real* translation takes place on the level of the *mise en scène*, in other words, that a theatre text is an incomplete entity" (Pavis 1989, p. 25). This means, according to Bassnett (1991), that the "unfortunate interlingual translator is still left with the task of transforming unrealized text A into unrealized text B, and the assumption here is that the task in hand is somehow of a lower status than that of the person who effects the transposition of written text into performance" (Bassnett 1991, p. 100). Drama text is indeed, in our opinion, an incomplete entity and it can be asserted, as expressed also by Suh, that:

> though operating at different stages in the drama communication chain, the communication roles of the drama translator and director are distinct but share an identical purpose and that the relationship between these key persons ought to be viewed from the perspectives of collaboration and complementarity rather than inferiority or superiority in status (Suh 2005, p. 32).

The effective actualization of a foreign play, after the writing of the playwright, through the translation and up to the staging, implies in fact, as stated by Suh, "the concerted action of several intervening persons" (Suh 2005, p. 33) (translators, actors, designers, dramatist, director, decorators, musicians, audience, etc.) "who manipulate, tailor and fine-tune it in accordance with the specific circumstances of each theatricalisation or in order to position the dramatic text within a proposed *mise en scène*" (Suh 2005, p. 33).

Given this collective process of working on a dramaturgical text, translators cannot completely influence the result of their creation, and this is one of the specific features of the work of the drama translator. In fact, it is the other participants involved in the production of the play who influence the final result (Moravkova 1993).

Given such a collaboration between multiple participants, it is easy to understand how the performed translated dramatic work does not belong any more to its initial author alone. It is, indeed, the collective product of several creators: the author, the translator, the director, the actors and the spectators and a perfect understanding must therefore be established among the diverse creators if they want to gain the spectators' admiration (Mbom 1988).

This approach to the foreign dramaturgical text is corroborated by Suh (2005) who, given the collaborative involvement of several participants that characterizes theatre translation for the stage, sees the problem of performability or speakability as a secondary issue for the drama translator. In turn, if the given drama translator doesn't resolve it in the written drama text he has translated then as stated

> in order for the translated version to be performed and for it to be consumed by the target audience just as in the case of the original, it must transit through the other persons involved in the drama communication chain […], who are the people who manipulate, tailor and fine-tune it in accordance with the specific circumstances of each theatricalization or in order to position the dramatic text within a proposed *mise en scene* (Suh 2005, p. 34).

The theatrical translator is required to be equipped with a bicultural competence as well as a capacity for cross-cultural communication, unlike the other participants in their respective efforts towards the rendering of a foreign work for the stage.

Unlike the other participants in the rendering of a foreign work for the stage, an expertise in cross-cultural communication and a bicultural competence is required of the theatrical translator.

Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that even the director can be considered, to all intents and purposes, as an interpreter of the play due to the fact that the director "interprets the words of the original play or those of the translated version into the language of movement and gesture, of voice and facial expression" (Suh 2005, p. 36) and, in this perspective, the director has the task of interpreter and mediator (between the dramatist and the audience) in some ways similar to that of the translator. Moreover, just like the translator, the director can decide which elements he can afford to reject; he can therefore decide to consider certain themes as relevant and others as irrelevant, along with reading "between the lines", choosing what he prefers or considers more appropriate (Regattin 2007).

In the back-and-forth exchange of skills and roles in the collaborative process that leads to the performance of a translated theatrical text, they often generate an overlapping of roles and proximity of tasks. Considering, for instance, the director's responsibility towards the playwright, the text and the spectators, his/her mission can be seen, from certain points of view, as analogous to that of the theatre translator.

Even the power relations between translator (who is for all intents and purposes a co-author) and director should be similar to the one between playwright and director. Both the playwright and the translator in fact generate a text for the director and the whole company to be performed. This aspect is analysed and described by Suh:

> After translating the original incomplete/unrealized play, the drama translator (as the new author) is also obliged in his turn, just as the dramatist did with the original, to entrust the director with the responsibility of completing, actualizing and communicating through the voices and gestures of the actors the message/effect which he has painstakingly interpreted and re-expressed in the target language (Suh 2005, p. 37).

However, despite this "ideal" relationship between the participants in the rendering of a foreign play being translated and performed, in reality, as reported by Bassnett (1980), a low prestige is quite often associated with the translator. Additionally, translation is still usually considered a secondary activity and "as a 'mechanical' rather than a 'creative' process" (Bassnett 1980, p. 2) with consequences, when dealing with theatre practice, as the little prestige accorded to translating and the consequent "subordination of the translation to other production factors" (Espasa 2000, p. 56).

3. *Cesare deve morire*: a case of Shakespearian collective translation

On February 18, 2012, at the closing ceremony of the LXII Berlin Film Festival, *Cesare deve morire* was awarded the highest honor, the Golden Bear. Paolo and Vittorio Taviani's film[2] was made possible thanks to the collaboration with screenwriter and director Fabio Cavalli, who worked within the walls of the Rebibbia prison for about 20 years.

The regional language version of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* created for the film version by the Taviani brothers was the culmination of a long period of collaborative work on translation.

The director and screenwriter Fabio Cavalli knew very well about the risk that could be run with *Cesare deve morire*. This risk, often linked to this type of dialectal transposition, was to remain bound by the tones and sayings and to fall into the "trap" of the dialect's catchphrases, resulting in the detriment of the dramatic tension of the original. This does not happen in the film however; on the contrary, the distinctive elements of the characters and the tone of the discourse remain intact, resulting in an amplification of the dramatic conflict. This is precisely due to the language chosen, which

[2] Produced by "Kaos Cinematografica", "RAI Cinema" and "Centro Studi Enrico Maria Salerno".

becomes a vehicle for the emotions, more than just the use of Italian would have allowed.

In 2004, Isabella Quarantotti De Filippo gave Cavalli the possibility of bringing Shakespeare's *The Tempest* to the stage of the actual Rebibbia prison set in the seventeenth-century Neapolitan version by her husband Eduardo (1984). On that occasion, as Fabio Cavalli (2021) recalls, "the protagonists of the show were already the prisoner-actors who would be celebrated years later for the Golden Bear at Berlin 2012" (Cavalli 2021).

In order to understand the collaborative process that had already led to the staging of De Filippo's translation (1984) of *The Tempest* (which was produced with the collaboration of his wife, a native English speaker), let us read a passage from Act I, Scene 2 where Ariel, summoned by Prospero, gives an account of his own magical intervention, which caused the shipwreck of King Alonso's vessel. Eduardo greatly expanded Ariel's line, without changing its basic content. He gave it the rhythm of a rhymed tarantella that the performer on stage cannot avoid, to the point of transforming the piece almost into a song and dance: "*... Me spartevo' e addeventavo / mille fiamme e fiammetelle, /me parevo tale e quale / cumm' 'o ffuoco artificiale: / gravuncielle e gravunelle / chellu ffuoco era Arielle ...*" (De Filippo 1984, pp. 30-31).

Cavalli's recollection (2021) describing the adaptation for the scene clearly points to the collaboration:

> What the *gravuncielle* and *gravunelle* were, was not intuitive. I remember that in adapting the text for the stage, the opinion of two prisoner-actors was useful and they unraveled the mystery: one from Caserta recalled the local tradition of searching the fields for the sparks of the fire of Saint Lawrence - the *gravuncielle*. A Neapolitan clarified that *gravun'* is nothing other than the deformation of coal. So, the two terms were in fact two synonymous variants, juxtaposed as a rhythmic reinforcement (Cavalli 2021).

The questions Cavalli also asks himself are: did Eduardo betray Shakespeare, or did he enhance his verve? Was it Shakespeare's intention to push Ariel so far into the Mediterranean, to the point of making him a *scugnizzo*, an *urchin* spirit?

What is certain is that this translation of *The Tempest* has never been staged (apart from an edition with Carlo Colla's puppets), except by the Teatro Libero of Rebibbia with Fabio Cavalli's inmate-actors, on a prison stage in 2005.

In such a context, as Cavalli (2021) also observes, there were many replicas of the play and flattering reviews were even published in the national press but, after so many years, and without the counterevidence of a new version, the critics have not expressed more on the subject and the question remains whether it was reasonable and culturally permissible to push

Shakespeare so far. One of Eduardo's most illustrious guests, pupil and fellow student, Carlo Cecchi, declared at the time that the one in Rebibbia was the best and perhaps the only way to exalt Shakespeare and Eduardo.

Since that collective experience the path that led to *Cesare deve morire* has been mapped out: *The Tempest* (for which Cavalli found the translation and staging adaptation of the Shakespeare/Eduardo piece practically already done), *Hamlet* and finally *Julius Caesar* for all of which the director tried to translate the adaptation of Shakespeare's work into regional languages in order to involve prisoner-actors in a "cultured" operation, and thus called upon the actors to share their skills with him in dealing with certain "native tongues" such as Sicilian, Neapolitan and Calabrian.

Let us read some passages taken from the play for the cinematographic transposition to better grasp the contribution of the actors to the rendering of Shakespeare's work in regional languages.

"*Addà murì! ...Ca se resta vivo troppo assai chillo Cesare ce fotte a tutti quanti...*"[3]. It is with these words, which give the film its title, that Brutus begins his monologue on the night before Caesar's assassination. Brutus continues: "*...si fosse ppe' me sulamente nun m'importass'i nient' ma chill' se fott'a Roma 'ntera...t'aggie voluto bene assaj'è'o ver.. ma si chill' riesce a mettersi 'a corona 'n'capa, chill' non è più Cesare, chill'addiventa...addiventa...*"[4] and suddenly he stops, as if he couldn't find the words; then he takes the script in his hand and reads: "*... Na-ser-pa-ve-le-no-sa?*"[5] and explodes: "*...No! No! No.... Ca si sbajate battuta è 'n guajo... Chillu chi voja 'ddicere Shecchispir' i ll'aggio capit, ma cume ce ll'aggi'à fa capì a li spettatori...ricomincio*".[6]

As he goes over the lines, Salvatore Striano/Brutus realizes that the rendering is not as convincing as he feels it could be because it does not convey the strength he finds in the original Shakespeare. As such the audience witnesses the genesis of the translation of *Cesare deve morire*, the dissent of the character who is drawing the plot, and the linguistic doubts of the actor who is reading the script.

The Taviani brothers worked with a script that from the initial draft to shooting obviously changed. They first "took possession" of the tragedy *Julius Caesar* and then, after deconstructing and reconstructing it with the

---

[3] "He has to die. If he lives, Caesar will defeat us all". Trans. in Paolo Taviani, Vittorio Taviani (directors). (2012) *Cesare deve morire* [movie], Rai Com (subtitles). Unless otherwise indicated, the following translations are taken from the movie's subtitles.

[4] "If it was just about me,/I wouldn't care,/but he will defeat all of Rome./I loved him, it's true,/but if he manages to place a crown on his head,/he is no longer Caesar, but becomes.../becomes..."

[5] "Becomes a poisonous serpent".

[6] "No.../I can't be getting the line wrong./I understand what Shakespeare meant,/but how to get it across to the audience?/It's starting again".

scriptwriter (and director of the stage scenes in the movie) Fabio Cavalli, they collaboratively translated the dialogues into the various dialects of the prisoner-actors. At this point, the actors themselves contributed to the text, according to a dynamic that is well described by the Taviani brothers:

> One day we saw, in a cell a little larger than the others, something that made us smile with astonishment and complicity. Six or seven inmates around a table were reading our script, placed in the middle, and were writing. Some of our actors were translating our lines into their own dialect. Standing behind them were other inmates who were not involved in the film but who were helping them as consultants [...]. The inmate-actor and the 'character' became familiar with each other through a common language and were more easily able to rely on the unfolding of the drama, which in Shakespeare always has a popular value too (Fantuzzi 2012, p. 42).

It is therefore a "plural translation" in the sense that both the film directors, Paolo and Vittorio Taviani, the theatre director Fabio Cavalli, just as the actors and the "linguistic consultant-prisoners" were all directly involved in the creation of a work written in a plurality of languages and not in a single dialect, unlike other similar experiments. A peculiarity of the film, in fact, lies in the choral dimension of language and in the effect it produces in the resulting multilingual text derived from it. But with which dialects are the Shakespearean characters recited? With what approach? What effect does this choice have on the actors and, therefore, on the spectator? Let us proceed and analyze step by step.

The protagonists of *Cesare deve morire* do not speak real dialects but different variations and regional jargons (from Liguria, Apulia, Campania and Lazio) that are generated by the encounter between the Italian language and lexical inserts, phonological habits and syntactic constructions of the dialects of origin. A model for them is Eduardo de Filippo (1984) who,[7] regarding his own experience of translation, said: "The actor in me rebelled against the puns that had become meaningless, and so I changed them; at other times I felt the need to add a few lines to better explain certain concepts to myself and to the public" (De Filippo 1984, p. 186).

The prisoner-actors in the Taviani brothers' film show that they assimilated an approach that had already characterized the Neapolitan playwright. In the film, the "domesticating" choice towards the English language is also dictated by the intention of the directors to transmit a "new truth" of the Shakespearean tragedy (Fantuzzi 2012) without impoverishing its high tone. The different dialects mark in fact the individuality of each actor who, although he can recite well in Italian, in his own dialect succeeds

---

[7] The company directed by Cavalli in 2012 had already staged De Filippo's Neapolitan translation of *The Tempest* (De Filippo 1984).

in "translating with even greater strength the high languages that animate a great drama such as *Julius Caesar*" (Di Marzio 2012). For these actors, dialect is the native language that brings them closer to the soul of Shakespeare due to a dynamic best described by the actress Iaia Forte who, when speaking about her own experience with dialect, declared, referring to the Florentine actor Carlo Cecchi (who chose Neapolitan as his theatrical language), "whether we were performing Shakespeare or Molière, he always asked us to translate the text into dialect first. He was convinced that in this way our body would find the sense and sound of the lines, and then come to inhabit Italian more naturally and more unashamedly" (Capuani 2012, p. 16). Therefore, dialect proves to be a physical-linguistic means to "inhabit" the Italian language and, thanks to the identification of the actors with the characters, it allows the overlapping of one with the other in an exchange between scenic truth and reality that sometimes risks degeneration, all to the advantage of dramatic strength.

In the case of Rebibbia's Shakespearean translations (but also with Brecht, Tolstoy, Gogol, etc.) the collaboration is explained by Cavalli himself: "the standard procedure is that I translate and adapt the text from the original (or from a translation in the case of Russian). This phase is followed by long translation sessions around a table, with my actors (inmates). Each is urged to rethink a line for how it sounds in their own dialect" (Cavalli 2021).

"Rethinking the line," for Cavalli (2021), means deeply understanding its meaning in the context of the scene, and "the linguistic solution often comes unexpectedly, perhaps from the most uneducated person in terms of general culture. Mastering the familiar vocabulary does not depend on the level of schooling" (Cavalli 2021). However, once the best expression has been defined in the different dialects, the work is not yet finished: the written work needs a style (λέξις). As Cavalli (2021) adds, "it is necessary for a work to have a general coordination, which unifies the rhythm, the cadence and the accent, so that nothing stands out in the agreement between the verbal expressions" (Cavalli 2021).

This briefly described path was the one that led to the definition of the screenplay for *Cesare deve morire*.

Since he had been visiting the prison and its inmate-actors for about a decade, Cavalli was accustomed to the sounds and expressions of the various regional languages of Southern Italy, and so the work of adaptation for *Cesare deve morire* fell to him, and to his interpreters in the theatre.

Another peculiar process, in the case, concerns the relationship between the casting and the translation. In fact, as Cavalli himself explains:

> Outside the prison world I do not know how it works, but on the Rebibbia scene it is necessary that the casting takes place at the same time as the translation. Just think of the expression that has become symbolic of the

Taviani film: "*Cesare 'a dda murì*!". This is how it sounds in Neapolitan. But if the interpreter were Sicilian - Catania-Syracuse area - it would sound like: "*Cisari havi a' mmòriri*!" (proparoxytone). And in Calabrese of the Locride area (with the first vowel "e" of the name Cesare that sounds very open, almost "a"): "*Cesare 'ndavi a morìri*" (flat/closed/paroxytone). As it is well understood, changing the interpreter in progress is overly complicated. If the line has been translated and adapted into Neapolitan, so it should be said. In Calabrese or Sicilian, it would not have remained the symbol of the film. Another one would have been chosen (Cavalli 2021).

Within this context and potentially in similar contexts, the adaptation of the text is therefore participatory, otherwise it does not work. Its translation can only be collective since translators and interpreters overlap, at least partially. The lexicon and syntax of the chosen passages follow the "familiar" language of those who must make the performance authentic. Indeed, in the case of prison theater, translation is a mediation between the text, its interpreter, and the very particular audience of a prison theater. Even so, the move toward cinematic disclosure of *Cesare deve morire* is perhaps too specific to be considered a case study. Certainly, though, it has offered and continues to offer interesting issues on the theme of translation.

4. Conclusion

The difficulty in translating a play, and a literary work in general,[8] from a classical language into a "minor" language lies in the fact that when translating a foreign text, say into Italian, the translator can use either literary written Italian or oral Italian (which generally lowers the register of the original). However, even when written and oral Italian are very similar, the translator can always opt for a nearly formal rendering of the oral language. By contrast, when translating into dialect, this difference between the written and oral register is minimal (if not completely non-existent). For this reason, translation into dialect is often more problematic and requires paraphrasing (Zuccato 2009).

How can the predicament in *Cesare deve morire* be resolved given that the dialect, generally considered "poor" and used almost exclusively for servile daily communication, is used by the Roman noblemen? The director

---

[8] We refer to the meaning of "minor language" by Venuti (1988): "I understand 'minority' to mean a cultural or political position that is subordinate, whether the social context that so defines it is local, national or global. This position is occupied by languages and literatures that lack prestige or authority, the non-standard and the non-canonical, what is not spoken or read much by a hegemonic culture. Yet minorities also include the nations and social groups that are affiliated with these languages and literatures, the politically weak or underrepresented, the colonized and the disenfranchised, the exploited and the stigmatized". (Venuti 1998, p. 132)

Cavalli, in the film, when Giovanni/Caesar, in front of the soothsayer who calls him out of the crowd, pronounces his first sentence ("*Sto qua! Sto qua! Chi me cerca?*"[9]), immediately says to his actor: "*D'accordo il dialetto, però non esser volgare, non è un dialetto volgare: è un dialetto, però in bocca a personaggi nobili.*"[10] The actor then repeats the same words three times, modulating his tone. It is thanks to the tone and the acting, in fact, that in the film the dialect becomes a noble and "honorable" language.

On the other hand, Nadiani (2006) wonders, "is it possible that this operation of languages in contact can restore some features of the original work better than a flat version in some sort of pseudo-standard?" (Nadiani 2006). It can, indeed. There is also a popular value in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* that lies precisely in the strong and straightforward language that characterizes the tragedy. We must not forget that, in Shakespeare's time and in ancient Rome, there wasn't much difference among the speakers of the different social classes, between the accents of the "affected" speech of the nobility and those of a popular language? It is Shakespeare who artificially constructs and composes a more complex language. Even the Globe Theatre in London, in recent years, has represented Shakespeare trying to remain faithful to the speech and accents of the Elizabethan era, creating a language halfway between Australian and Cornish, between Irish and Scottish with some nuances of Yorkshire dialects, proposing a language that, although bizarre, was perfectly understandable and appreciable (Boyle 2005).

In the last few years, studies on the translation of theatrical works have focused on describing collaborative practices by intercepting best practices, to arrive at some sort of protocol, that considers the dynamics of the various participants in the performance of a translated play. As we have seen, theatrical translation up to the staging represents a fundamentally collaborative affair and, in some cases, like the one we are examining in this essay, certain dynamics are generated that we could say are successful, judging by the effect they have had on the translated work.

Although theatrical translation has received the attention of scholars in recent decades, studies dedicated to the collaborative dimension in the context of theatrical translation are still very rare. In the case of the theatre, the "translated performance" is considered "in progress" until the moment of the staging. Even the staging is possible thanks to a form of collaboration. It is essentially where the audience becomes the first user of the translated work and, at the same time, a collaborator participating in the creation of the last phase of the translation. A further aspect of collaboration, as in the case of

---

[9] "I'm over here! I'm here! Who's looking for me?"
[10] "All right, the dialect, but don't be vulgar: it's not a vulgar dialect: it's a dialect, but in the mouth of noble people".

The Tempest translated by Eduardo De Filippo (1984) and reproduced by Fabio Cavalli, is that which takes place at a distance, or in absence, between two translators of the same work who converse, even if only in an ideological sense.

Furthermore, if the collaborative experience takes place in prison, the experience of the theatrical group allows participants to experiment with roles and dynamics that are different from those of imprisonment. Collaborative work on a foreign text can even replace "relationship mechanisms based on strength, control and challenges with those linked to collaboration, exchange and sharing".[11]

Within the collaborative process, the translator, unlike any other participant involved in making a play, does not have a clearly defined role in the theatre-making process, and therefore becomes an added person whose function is rarely considered in advance (Gregory 2016).

Added to this is the fact that even though, in theory, collaboration between translator and author would not be impossible, the author is often scarcely aware of the necessary repositioning in the intercultural field and experiences changes to their creation as a threat (Fois 2014).

Such a threat can also be perceived by the drama translator who, as a new author, as stated by Suh, "is also obliged in his turn, just as the dramatist did with the original, to entrust the director with the responsibility of completing, actualizing and communicating through the voices and gestures of the actors the message/effect which he has painstakingly interpreted and re-expressed in the target language" (Suh 2005, p. 37). For this reason, a sort of complicity should be created between the translator and the director and, as underscored by Gravier (1973), consequently the translator should help the director to clarify the issues raised by the text. At the same time the director, for his part, should have an idea of what to do when putting on the play and the translator, his collaborator, should attend the rehearsals and try to share the director's conception of the performance.

What is certain is that there is a need for a new awareness of the actual role of the theatrical translator in the collaborative process that leads to the staging of a translated work. The hope is that this study, besides adding further steps in this direction, may also offer up new pathways for future analysis.

---

[11] See Ministero della Giustizia, *Teatro in carcere*, https://www.giustizia.it/giustizia/it/mg_2_3_0_6.page, last modified July 2, 2018 (08.03.2022).

Bionote: Francesco Laurenti is a lecturer and research fellow of Comparative Literature at IULM University, Milan. He has been an Adjunct Professor at the University of Calabria, Roma Tre University and the SSML Institute Carlo Bo for Cultural and Linguistic Mediators (Rome, Milan, Bari). He has translated novels and academic books from English and French into Italian and has published several monographs and articles in peer-reviewed journals and collective volumes. He is an Editorial Review Board Member for the peer-reviewed literary translation journal *Testo a Fronte* and the comparative studies journals *Comparatismi* and *Poli-femo*. He is co-director of the Translation Studies series "Echo" published by Aracne Editore.

Author's address: francesco.laurenti@iulm.it

References

Baffi G. 2007, "*Amleto Principe di Camorra*". *Detenuti-attori a Rebibbia per Shakespeare napoletano*, in "La Repubblica Napoli", 21 Dicembre.

Bassnett S. 1980, *Translation Studies*, Routledge, London.

Bassnett S. 1991, *Translating for the theatre: The case against performability*, in "TTR: Traduction, terminologie, redaction", 4, 1, pp. 99-111.

Boyle J. 2005, The real sound of Shakespeare?, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/magazine/4694993.stm, Last updated: 3 August.

Capuani M. 2012, *Shakespeare o Molière? Meglio provarli prima in dialetto* in "L'ambasciata teatrale", 7, p. 16.

Cavalli F. 2021, *Teatro Libero di Rebibbia: Traduzioni Shakespeariane collaborative*, Roma, (28 Giugno). Interview.

De Filippo E. 1984, *La Tempesta di William Shakespeare in napoletano*, Einaudi, Torino.

Di Marzio M. 2012**,** *Cavalli: così ho vinto l'Orso d'oro coi detenuti di Rebibbia*, in "Il Giornale", 6 marzo. <**http://www.ilgiornale.it/news/milano/cavalli-cos-ho-vinto-l-orso-d-oro-coi-detenuti-rebibbia.html**> (10.02.2021).

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

Fantuzzi V. 2012, *Festa a Rebibbia per il film dei Taviani*, in "La Civiltà Cattolica", 3883, p. 32-43.

Gregory W. 2016, The Strangeness of the Theater Translator, in Word without Borders, December issue [https://www.wordswithoutborders.org/article/december-2016-translating-theater-feature-william-gregory]

Gravier M. 1973, *La traduction des textes dramatiques*, in "Etudes de Linguistique Appliquée: Exégèse et Traduction", octobre-décembre, pp. 39-49.

Johnston D. 2004, *Securing the performability of the play in translation*, in S. Coelsch Foisner, H. Klein (eds.), *Drama translation and theatre practice*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt, pp. 25-38.

Laera M. 2001, *Theatre Translation as Collaboration: Aleks Sierz, Martin Crimp, Nathalie Abrahami, Colin Teevan, Zoë Svendsen and Michael Walton discuss Translation for the Stage*, in "Contemporary Theatre Review", 21, [2], pp. 213-225.

Mbom C. 1988, *Le théâtre camerounais et les reflets d'une société en pleine Mutation*, in *Théâtre Camerounais*, BET & Co. Ltd., Yaounde, pp. 181-201.

Merino R. A. 2000, *Drama translation strategies: English-Spanish (1950-1990)* in "Babel" 46 [4], pp. 357-365.

Ministero della Giustizia, *Teatro in carcere*, in <https://www.giustizia.it/giustizia/it/mg_2_3_0_6.page>, last modified July 2, 2018 (08.03.2022).

Moravkova A. 1993, *Les problèmes spécifiques de la traduction des drames*, in *Proceedings of III FIT World Congress*, Institute of Translation and Interpreting, London, pp. 34-37.

Nadiani G. 2006, Spostare la scena, in "inTRAlinea", http://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/1635 (08.03.2022).

Pavis P. 1989, *Problems of translating for the stage: Intercultural and Post-modern Theatre*, in H. Scolnicov & P. Holland (eds.) *The Play Out of Context: Transferring Plays from Culture to Culture*, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, pp. 25-44.

Regattin F. 2007, *Tradurre il testo teatrale, o la messa in scena come traduzione intersemiotica. Il caso de I costruttori di imperi (B. Vian) nella regia di Michele Bottini*, in "MediAzioni: Rivista Online di Studi Interdisciplinari su Lingue e Culture", 4.

Suh J. C. 2005, *Drama Translation: Principles and Strategies*, in "Translation Today", 2, [2], pp. 53-69.

Zuber-Skerritt O. 1980 (ed.), *The language of theatre: Problems in the translation and transposition of drama*, Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Zuccato E. 2009, *The Stage of Orality: Theatre and Translation in Italian Dialects* in "inTRAlinea", http://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/1711 (08.03.2022).