Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Translation Studies

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rtrs20

Theatre self-translation as cultural renegotiation and a tool of empowerment: the case of Luigi Pirandello

Magdalena Kampert

To cite this article: Magdalena Kampert (2024) Theatre self-translation as cultural renegotiation and a tool of empowerment: the case of Luigi Pirandello, Translation Studies, 17:1, 120-134, DOI: 10.1080/14781700.2023.2193192

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2023.2193192

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Published online: 09 Jun 2023.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 693

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rtrs20

TRANSLATION STUDIES
2024, VOL. 17, NO. 1, 120–134
https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2023.2193192

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS Check for updates

Theatre self-translation as cultural renegotiation and a tool of empowerment: the case of Luigi Pirandello

Magdalena Kampert

School of Modern Languages and Cultures, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland

ABSTRACT
This article investigates theatre self-translation as cultural renegotiation and a tool of empowerment, in terms of the relation between language and dialect, and the conceptualization of "national". Building on previous research on the figure of self-translator, the issues of power and the monolingual paradigm, the article analyzes Luigi Pirandello's self-translation of *Tutto per bene* from Italian into Sicilian. The case study begins with an outline of the Italian sociolinguistic context and Pirandello's views on language, dialect and translation, followed by a detailed analysis of significant changes made in self-translation and of the (in)visibility of the Sicilian and Italian plays. While this self-translation occurs between language and dialect, it still involves cultural renegotiation dictated by a shift in the sociolinguistic reality. Pirandello's dialect self-translation demonstrates that self-translators are agents helping challenge the existing power relations and that self-translation is a tool of empowerment, recognition and cultural inclusion.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 22 November 2021
Accepted 16 March 2023

KEYWORDS
Self-translation; cultural renegotiation; Pirandello; dialect; empowerment

The self-translator, power and the monolingual paradigm

Self-translation – understood as the process and the result of translating one's own writings into another language (Grutman 2009) – occurs mainly between languages of unequal status (Grutman 2013a, 2013b). Self-translators often find themselves dealing with situations of linguistic and/or cultural marginality. The phenomenon is inscribed in broader sociocultural dynamics in the geopolitical spaces which are the meeting point for what is considered major or minor(ized) in wider power relations.[1] These concern the languages involved in self-translation and the respective cultures and contexts in which the texts are written. Self-translation can incorporate tensions between major and minor(ized) languages and cultures, placing self-translators amidst conflicting expectations of the domestic/local and foreign/global. Awareness of the existence of various demands and barriers separating the respective cultural-linguistic worlds is reflected in the multi-lingual and multi-cultural knowledge of self-translators and feeds into the decision-making process. Hence, self-translation appears as an act of

CONTACT Magdalena Kampert Magdalena.Kampert@glasgow.ac.uk

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

(re-)negotiation linked to power hierarchies within wider sociocultural and political contexts.

Power in self-translation can be conceptualized also in relation to its distinctive feature: the figure of the author-translator. Self-translators are inherently affiliated to two distinct linguistic and cultural communities (Kippur 2015, 11), which attests to their hybrid literary and national/territorial identities questioning the nationalist paradigm of monolingualism which dominated European literary histories and traditions (Hokenson and Munson 2007). The unity of two roles in one figure involves also a particular notion of authority, understood as a privileged position in terms of the self-translator's agency (Castro, Mainer, and Page 2017; Ceccherelli, Imposti, and Perotto 2013, 14; Cordingley 2013, 2; Grutman 2009; Grutman and Van Bolderen 2014, 324; Lagarde and Tanqueiro 2013, 11; Tanqueiro 1999). The author's authority and the authenticity surrounding the self-translator's work entail instant validation of both linguistic versions of the work. Consequently, from a theoretical point of view, neither version should take precedence. These theoretical underpinnings make self-translation a meaningful tool for problematizing and challenging the monolingual paradigm associated with the notion of "national" and power asymmetries between languages and cultures involved.

Discussing translation in relation to minority languages, Michael Cronin stressed the "essentialist concept of Europe" (1995, 85) which did not convey the continent's complexity and resulted in partial representation of the European translation experience. Olga Castro, Sergi Mainer and Svetlana Page similarly pointed to "an existing perception of Europe as a monolithic cultural and/or political space" (2017, 6). These essentialist and monolithic visions are reflected in studies on Italian self-translation, which overlook the local multilingualism. Despite various examples of dialect self-translation, studies on Italian self-translation have developed mainly in the context of studies of Italian diaspora and concentrated on émigré writers in the first place (Nannavecchia 2014). However, dialect self-translation offers a rich perspective which – as will be shown in the following section – entails the intricate relation between Italian and dialects. The lack of a more systematic study on self-translation in the peninsula seems to result from the framework of national literature conceived as mono-lingual/-cultural, which at one point served to form a unitary Italian language and culture. The concept of monolingualism has been tied to nationhood and mother tongue, playing a significant role as a driving force behind the formation of identities, disciplines, institutions and of the social constructs of culture and nation (Gramling 2016; Yildiz 2012). In the European context, the political ideology of the nation enforced the concept of national literature according to monolingualism of the state (Lagarde and Tanqueiro 2013, 10).[2]

In Italy, literature was an important channel for spreading the unitary language and culture. After political unification in 1861, the official attitude of educational authorities was antidialect (De Mauro 2002, 88–89; De Mauro and Lodi 1979, 13–18; Marazzini 2004, 24–26, 199–200). The national literary tradition was presented in its noble form, with dialects being framed as enemies of national unity and a sign of incivility and provincialism. The schools promoted a model of language that was rooted in the past and imitated the best writers, which was supported by the canon established through the Coppino law of 1867 (Richardson 2001, 68). Consequently, monographs and criticism on national literature tended to present only the Italian work by Italian writers. Dialects, multilingualism and (self-)translations were given a marginal space and treated as a

biographical curiosity (see Ferroni 1991; Ferraro's [2016, 134] observations on Giuseppe Ungaretti's bilingual writing). The absence of more extensive research on dialect self-translation confirms and reinforces power hierarchies between the languages and cultures. Luigi Pirandello's dialect self-translation is then a starting point for questioning power relations between language and dialect, problematizing the notion of "national" and reassessing the role of self-translators in translational and cultural history.

In this article, I analyze Pirandello's self-translation of the play *Tutto per bene* (1920) and ask how it functions as an act of cultural renegotiation and a means of empowerment in the passage into the Sicilian variant *Ccu 'i nguanti gialli* ([1993] 2002). The term "culture" is intended here as patterns of thinking, feeling and acting acquired within a social environment that distinguish a group of people from others (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 2010). Although Sicilian has the status of a dialect, in this article it will be referred to also as language in the sense of a means of communication. I begin by situating Pirandello's self-translations briefly in their sociolinguistic context, focusing on the relationship between Italian and dialects. I then outline Pirandello's own views on language, dialect and translation to stress his role of a powerful agent in renegotiating power asymmetries between Sicilian and Italian. With these steps in mind, I carry out a comparative analysis of *Tutto per bene* and *Ccu 'i nguanti gialli*. I investigate how Pirandello negotiates between the sociolinguistic realities of – broadly speaking – Sicilian and Italian and, to paraphrase Umberto Eco (1995, 123), how linguistic/textual "infidelities" allow cultural accuracy. The micro-textual analysis is followed by observations on the (in)visibility of the Sicilian and Italian plays, which further highlight the questions of power within national borders. Unlike the notion of invisibility applied by Lawrence Venuti (1995), the term is understood here as a lack of information on a text being part of the self-translation process, and a lack of the audience's/reader's awareness of the fact that Pirandello undertook the practice. Using the example of Pirandello, I portray self-translators as agents giving voice to the marginalized languages and cultures, and self-translation as an opportunity to break out of the monolithic categories of "national".

Pirandello's self-translations and their sociolinguistic context

Pirandello (1867–1936) translated eight of his early plays between Italian and Sicilian, from 1915 to 1925. There are three self-translations from Italian into Sicilian, and five self-translations from Sicilian into Italian (Kampert 2019, 25).[3] *Tutto per bene* represents the last self-translation from Italian into Sicilian with the Italian play being the only source text without Sicilian elements. It is also the only case in which Pirandello changed the plot in the passage to another linguistic variant. All of his self-translations represent "endogenous asymmetrical self-translations" (Grutman 2013a), where endogenous stands for internal bilingualism, that is languages coexisting within the same space, and asymmetrical indicates languages of unequal status.

Pirandello's self-translation is closely connected with the socio-linguistic situation in the post-unification period. While political unification occurred in 1861, Italy remained culturally and linguistically diverse. The fact that up till that point the Italian territory was home to several nation-states resulted in profound differences in traditions, customs, economic and social development, and language (De Mauro 2002, 15–27). The only form of a shared language was a model of literary Italian elaborated by the elite

(Marazzini 2004, 184). Before 1861, Italian was acquired through books and employed only by the literate few for writing or on official occasions (De Mauro 2002, 27–35; Richardson 2001, 63–64). There was a complete lack of a shared spoken language. Everyday communication represented the domain of dialects – independent descendants from Latin, rather than subordinated versions of the interregional standard. Their use was widespread and fundamental, but their prestige was much lower in comparison with the literary language, even if they developed eminent variants used by educated classes and writers (De Mauro 2002, 32–34). Hence, the use of Italian was essentially written and infrequent, making it unsuitable for contexts such as everyday work and private life.

The sociolinguistic situation of the unified Italy was characterized by a clear opposition between the natural, common use of dialects and the prestigious language that offered itself as foreign in its own country. Amidst this ongoing linguistic diversity, the new nation felt an urgent need to create a national language. Bureaucracy, army, press, internal migration, education and later radio and television were among several social factors that facilitated linguistic unification, but the diffusion of a national language was slow and problematic. Although elementary school became free and mandatory, a huge part of the population did not attend it and a 1910 survey by Camillo Corradini demonstrated that teachers were inclined to use either dialect or a hybrid language (Richardson 2001, 69). Since the out-of-school environment was still dominated by dialects, knowledge of Italian did not coincide with its effective use. Its actual acquisition and real contact with it could only be achieved through secondary school; however, between 1911 and 1912 only 4% of the population attended it (De Mauro 2002, 101–102). De Mauro observes that, in the province of Palermo, schools in the urban areas adopted Italian, whereas schools in the rural areas employed dialect as a means of mediation.

Subsequently, a crucial factor in the Italian-dialect relationship was Fascist policy which, from 1922 to 1943, focused on the nationalist promotion of Italianness, intolerance of diversity and laws and ministerial decisions concerning questions of language (Richardson 2001; Marazzini 2004, 207–211; for Sicily see Alfieri 1992).[4] Since dialects embodied heterogeneity and regional pluralism, they challenged the unitary ideology that associated the national language with national unity. In 1930 the press was prohibited from publishing dialect texts or discussing dialects (Richardson 2001, 71). The use of dialects started to gradually decline, but their use in literature endured. In the early twentieth century, there was still a lack of a common spoken language that would effectively represent a lively, day-to-day speech of working-class protagonists (Pagliaro 1972). Due to the striking difference between a spoken language represented by dialects and a written language, some writers – particularly poets and playwrights – were led to employ dialect in their works (see Haller 1999; Marazzini 2004, 201–206).

In terms of the position of Sicilian, notwithstanding its long written tradition, it is perceived chiefly as a spoken, vivid language and classified as a dialect. Its status, however, represents an intricate and debateable issue. *Ethnologue* (2018) – an annual reference publication on the living languages – describes Sicilian as "distinct enough from standard Italian [ita] to be considered a separate language". Gaetano Cipolla (2004) highlights that Sicilian has all essential features required of a language. In a similar vein, in an official communication of May 2018, the Sicilian region named Sicilian a language and once again required it to be taught (Giunta Regionale della Sicilia 2018). Finally, UNESCO (n.d.) acknowledges Sicilian as a vulnerable language. While the historical and political

context highlights the asymmetrical nature of the relationship between Italian and Sicilian, the actual use of the two languages at the time questions it. Despite a higher position of Italian on a formal level, it might also be argued that Sicilian occupied a higher position in an informal context, as an everyday language. The status of Sicilian is then dependent on politics and power relations rather than on an "objective" prestige. Sicilian language and literature are perceived through the lens of the dominating Italian culture. Yet, both are distinct languages linked to distinct cultural realities. In the context of this article, Sicilian is deemed minorized in view of its lack of prestige, normalized use and recognition by speakers of the politically dominant Italian, with the speakers of Sicilian widely accepting the dominant stance.

Between language, dialect and translation: Pirandello as a powerful agent

Around 1921 Pirandello (1965, 1209–1012) still claimed that a spoken Italian language did not exist. He criticized writers, especially playwrights, for adopting a tedious language lacking in spontaneity (1965, 1018–1023). He contended that a literary language, studied through books, rather than lived, was not well suited for a play whose characters were not people of letters. He stressed repeatedly that each region spoke its own dialect with its own phonetics, morphology and syntactic system (1965, 881–890). In the essay "Dialettalità (1921)" (1965), he remarked that, in the history of Italy, each region was a nation and that *dialettalità* – the dialectal character – should be understood as an essential feature of expression in Italian literature. He also believed that dialect literature was to remain within the boundaries of a dialect, because many words were connected so strongly with their local environment that they could not be appreciated and fully understood beyond its frontiers. Nevertheless, he still stated that the process of creation in language and in dialect is the same, the only difference is the means of communication (Pirandello 1965, 1205–1209).

In "Teatro siciliano? (1909)" (1965), Pirandello affirmed that numerous words in dialect were the same as those of the national language, but only as concepts of things, not as a particular emotion of them. He felt that language, that is Italian, expressed the concept of a thing and dialect expressed its emotion. Although his statement might appear controversial, his opinions on language and dialect were not isolated. This viewpoint was shared by De Mauro (in Camilleri and De Mauro 2013) who argued that Italy has many languages. He pointed to the fact that all idioms are potentially equal, even if some of them are called languages for historical and social reasons, and one could add, for political reasons. Drawing on theoretical linguistics and scholars such as Humboldt and Saussure, De Mauro claimed that each dialect can become a language in the strict sense of a literary language or a national language.

There is no clear evidence of what Pirandello thought specifically of his self-translations, however, his idea of translation meant reduction, diminution and damage (Pirandello 1965, 217). He compared the process of translation to transplanting a tree produced in one terrain that flourished in one climate, into another foreign terrain where it would lose its greenery and flowers. In his view, words are made of impalpable elements and have a value that transcends their meaning. Since each language evokes a specific sentiment, the transplanted tree – translation – is inimitable and bound to dress in different leaves and flowers. As will be shown in the discussion of (in)visibility, the relationship between the Sicilian and Italian plays was not made explicit through

paratext. In light of Pirandello's considerations, not making explicit the relationship between the two variants allowed him to avoid the association of his work with the dismissive idea of translation, which presumed inferiority of the translated text. This could indicate that Pirandello considered the Sicilian variant to be of equal status, at least in its premises and value as a literary work.

Given the sociolinguistic context at the time, it could be argued that, at least in Pirandello's eyes, Sicilian represented a more powerful means of expression in the realm of theatre than Italian. The act of self-translation into Sicilian was, on the one hand, an effective means of theatrical communication and, on the other hand, a rebellious stance against the politics of linguistic and cultural homogeneity, a means of voicing the minorized Sicilian and of projecting different parts of his identity.[5] Overlooking his self-translation and the Sicilian side of his work, is like engaging only partially with his literary output and having an incomplete image of the writer and, in a wider perspective, of the national literature, culture and identity.

Self-translation as cultural renegotiation: *Tutto per bene* and *Ccu 'i nguanti gialli*

Tutto per bene derives from a short story with the same title (1906). It was written between December 1919 and January 1920, for Ruggero Ruggeri, an Italian actor, and was staged for the first time at the Teatro Quirino in Rome on 2 March 1920 (Pirandello 2007a, 401). It was published the same year by Bemporad in the first volume of the second collection of *Maschere nude*. The play focuses on Martino Lori, a widower who seems unable to recover from the death of his wife. His daughter, Palma, was entrusted to Senator Manfroni, Lori's friend, up to the age of eighteen. Once she marries a rich nobleman, Flavio Gualdi, Lori remains alone. All characters treat him with contempt because they are convinced that, for personal gain, he pretends not to know that his late wife betrayed him, and Palma is the daughter of Manfroni. Moreover, Manfroni stole Lori's father-in-law's notes and used them for publishing a scientific work in his own name. Once the truth is revealed to Lori in a conversation with Palma, any potential revenge is impossible and meaningless. His only choice is to continue playing the "comedy" which so far he had been playing unconsciously.

Ccu 'i nguanti gialli is the last dialect play by Pirandello, written for a specific actor, Angelo Musco. Pirandello expressed his intention to provide him with an adaptation of *Tutto per bene* shortly after the first staging of the Italian play (2007a, 412). According to Alberto Varvaro (Pirandello 2007b, 1889), he must have prepared it between spring and summer 1921. It was staged for the first time by Musco in the Teatro Biondo in Palermo on 9 September 1921. Although staged numerous times, the Sicilian play was published only in 1993 in *Tutto il teatro in dialetto* edited by Sarah Zappulla Muscarà.[6] The following analysis shows that the divergences between the Italian and Sicilian plays reflect the use of the respective languages in a specific sociocultural context. Yet, the degree of amendments goes far beyond language. As will be shown below, Pirandello engages in an act of cultural renegotiation of his play and, through self-translation, challenges power asymmetries associated with language, dialect and the monolingual idea of "national".

The most obvious change involves the play's title, which captures the essence of events and of the protagonists' attitude. The Italian title, *Tutto per bene*, indicates things done in

an appropriate, honest way conforming to prevailing social conventions. The Sicilian title, *Ccu 'i nguanti gialli* (lit. "with yellow gloves" or as in the English expression "to handle/treat someone with kid gloves") similarly implies appropriate behaviour, including towards those who are very suggestible, but also embraces the idea of pretending. This relates to the theme of masks which recurs in Pirandello's work. Pirandello claimed that people are forced to wear a mask imposed by circumstances, to play the role assigned to them on the stage of life. Every attempt to tear off the mask ends in tragedy, because in a hypocritical society no one has the right to be themselves. Here too, at the end of the play, the protagonists continue wearing their masks, playing a role according with social habits and expectations. The Sicilian phrase is more figurative and colourful, and captures a game of appearances which is a key issue, and therefore seems to accentuate a nuance that is less visible in the Italian expression.

The title words "tutto per bene" are reiterated at the very end of the Italian play by Lori, the most tragic protagonist. Upon learning about his wife's betrayal, Lori realizes why everyone despised him and that now no one would believe that he was unaware of the truth. He is left disheartened, feeling suspended between fiction and reality, as he had lived the drama of his life unconsciously and finds himself forced to wear the mask assigned to him by the circumstance and society. The expression "tutto per bene" is used first in the interrogative, when Palma, who so far disrespected Lori, assures him of her love. Lori repeats it shortly after that twice, in the affirmative followed by ellipsis, when Palma offers to drive him home. The play concludes with the very same words repeated by Lori as he greets Manfroni on his way out with Palma. In the Sicilian text, while Masinu speaks in the same circumstances, he uses first the expression "tuttu ccu versu e ccu manera" (with the proper manner) in the affirmative, rather than the interrogative, followed by ellipsis. The expression is restated once and, unlike in the Italian variant, Masinu is portrayed as pleased like a stupid child (a stage direction reads: "contento come un bambino scemo" (Pirandello [1993] 2002, 335), lit. "as happy as a foolish child"). The play ends with the reiteration of "tuttu ccu versu e ccu manera" and the double use of the title "ccu 'i nguanti gialli". The repetition of the unaltered title words in the Italian text would seem to make them resonate more strongly; however, the repeated use of a different Sicilian expression in the Sicilian text followed by the title words reasserts the ironic meaning of the title and adds to the lively tone of the play. Moreover, the childish portrayal of Masinu communicates his tragicomic situation, as opposed to a more tragic character of Lori.

The action of the play moves from Rome to an unspecified place in Sicily, a main town in a province. The relocation brings about changes to the characters' names and professions (Table 1).

Table 1. Characters and their professions.

Tutto per bene	Ccu 'i nguanti gialli
Martino Lori – a state counsellor	Don Masinu Teri – chief archivist of the prefecture
Salvo Manfroni – senator	Saru Nicosìa – Commendatore
Palma Lori	Parma Teri
Flavio Gualdi – marquis	Flaviu Lanzara – marquis
La Barbetti – widow Agliani, widow Clarino	Donna Sabedda Mammamìa – widow Clarino
Carlo Clarino – her son	Cocò Clarino – her son
La signorina Cei	'A Si-Donna Pippinedda Mangalaviti
Veniero Bongiani – count	Don Munniddu Minneci – baron

When compared with the Italian text, the social status of the Sicilian characters is lowered, even though they are still high-ranking in the local society. The names of the Sicilian characters are adapted to the regional reality so that they correspond to the place of action and, at the same time, are more comical. For instance, the name Donna Sabedda Mammamìa displays the comical character of the protagonist, which is further highlighted in a short exchange between Sabedda and Parma concerning Sabedda's humorous surname, in Act One of the Sicilian play. The sociological switch corresponds to a shift from tragic to comic affecting the overall tone of the play, as will be shown throughout this analysis.

Other adjustments pertain to the characters' appearance and disposition. Signorina Cei is blond, tall, in her early thirties, dresses with discreet elegance and shows natural good taste, whereas Pippinedda is a poor, old maid, dressed in black, trying to repress her rebellious nature. Bongiani is a very elegant founder of one of the richest film studios, whilst Minneci is an insignificant provincial aristocrat. Although seemingly negligible, these changes present the audience with a slightly different image of the characters. Shifting from discreet to rebellious and from influential to unimportant, appears to be part of rendering "Sicilianity" or the Sicilian spirit of the characters, at least stereotypically. Although Pirandello opposed the exaggerated representation of the Sicilian type which reinforced a violent and primitive image of Sicily to audiences beyond Sicily (Pirandello 1965, 1205–1209), he still engaged with those stereotypes in the Sicilian play.

The relocation of the play to a dialect environment brings about further modifications to the plot. In the Italian text, Palma's dead mother, Silvia, is the legitimate daughter of La Barbetti and Agliani, whereas Carlo is La Barbetti's illegitimate son. In the Sicilian variant, Silvia is Donna Sabedda Mammamìa and Baron Mennula's illegitimate daughter, whilst Cocò is Sabedda's legitimate son. While the Italian plot revolves around a stolen scientific secret, the Sicilian plot is built around the last will stolen by Nicosìa who concealed a second will in which Mennula invalidated the first one in favour of Parma. There seems to be no clear explanation for making Cocò a legitimate child, however, making Silvia an illegitimate daughter might relate to the question of inheritance and the two variants of Mennula's will. The ideas of will and inheritance seem to harmonize better with the Sicilian context of that period, as they recall plots of Verismo representing life in the rural environment. Many plays of the Sicilian dialect theatre were written in a *verista* register and Pirandello's play displays some of those tendencies (Scuderi 2006).

Pirandello rewrote extensively some passages because of the changes made to the plot, but there are also numerous modifications that are not dictated by the core changes and result in different behaviour of the characters. Some of the Sicilian characters appear on stage or exit it quicker than their Italian counterparts. These adjustments make the action appear more rapid and spontaneous. The Sicilian dialogues similarly tend to appear more vivid and expressive, showing differing attitudes and behaviour. For instance, Barbetti's astonishment upon learning that Palma's civil marriage took place the day before the religious ceremony is expressed in one line in the Italian text (Pirandello 1920, 16–17). The Sicilian text features a more developed reaction and conveys not only amazement, but also outrage (Pirandello [1993] 2002, 262–263). It shows a more conservative view of social norms and conduct in Sicily at the time. It also allows Pirandello to bring up the theme of mask, drawing from the way in which social relations and conventions were lived in Sicilian reality.

An interesting amendment concerns the passage of *Tutto per bene* which begins with some philosophical reflections on order and confusion exchanged between Manfroni and Veniero as they move from the dining room to the living room (e.g. "ci vuole ogni tanto qualcuno che metta un po' di confusione nell'ordine della gente savia … " [Pirandello 1920, 92]; lit. "someone who could infuse confusion into sage people's order is, sometimes, needed … "). The philosophical reflections express the idea that there is no escape from the old, established order, alluding to the theme of masks and the impossibility of freeing oneself from them. Their exchange is followed by a line on ruining the digestion with that kind of philosophy, and Palma's departure. The Sicilian variant excludes the philosophical part and opens immediately with Parma's departure (Pirandello [1993] 2002, 309–310). Although the philosophical part in the Italian text is marginal and not indispensable, it emphasizes in a very subtle way the subtext of the title phrase "tutto per bene". The Sicilian variant still conveys the meaning, but the omission of the philosophical part seems to "impoverish" the play at this point.

At the time Pirandello was increasingly known as a cerebral, philosophical playwright. His most famous play, *Sei personaggi in cerca d'autore*, premiered on 9 May ([1921] 1993) and proved challenging for the audience (Pirandello 2007a, XXV). The fact that Pirandello removes the philosophical material from the Sicilian play suggests that he adopts different approaches to the two languages and that the Sicilian play is a vehicle to present a more "comical" image. His decision seems to reflect the use of dialect and language in the sociolinguistic context of that period. Camilleri (in Camilleri and De Mauro 2013), born in 1925, recalls that his parents would use Italian for serious or official conversations. This tendency can be observed in the Sicilian play through Italian interferences which characters resort to it in formal circumstances, whenever they need to endorse their words or create distance between themselves. By contrast, some added Sicilian phrases reduce the level of formality and increase the level of directness. For example, "beddu miu" (my lovely boy – said in an ironic way), "ma no, caru miu" (come on, my dear) and "picciotti: è tardu!" (folks, it is late!).

While most of the additions do not provide any new information, they influence the overall tone of the play. New elements and the frequent use of repetition result in redundancy that adds to the comedy and underlines certain emotions. To illustrate, in Act One, Cocò says to himself "Faremu 'u trunzu d' 'a mala figura!" (We'll make a really bad impression – expressed using a colourful dialect phrase) and Sabedda says to Pippinedda "Cu' semu? Chi veni a diri cu' semu? Iu sugnu 'a nanna d' 'a spusa, 'a nanna!" (Who are we? What does it mean who are we? I'm the bride's grandmother, grandmother!). Other additions, such as "Bestia!" (lit. "Beast!", here "Idiot!"), "Mama dassi ascutu a mia!" (Mom, listen to me!) or "Oh Diu miu" (Oh, my God), convey anger, agitation and impatience. As these phrases either do not appear or are not repeated in the Italian play, they reinforce the emotional state of the Sicilian characters.

Overall, Pirandello's lexical choices in Sicilian present more comical overtones and show a tendency to be wordier. This is illustrated in the following examples of exclamations and expressions that are part of a culture strongly rooted in religious traditions and observances (Table 2), diminutives and lines that demonstrate the disparate expressiveness between Italian and Sicilian (Table 3).

Table 2. Religion-related Sicilian exclamations and expressions.

	Tutto per bene	Ccu 'i nguanti gialli
1.	via (enough)	basta, santu Diu! (enough, holy God)
2.	No, no e no!	Maria! Maria!
3.	passate da tanto tempo (long gone)	successi quann'idda non era mancu nn' 'a menti di Diu (lit. it happened when she wasn't even in the mind of God)
4.	scusi, che età ha? (excuse me, how old are you?)	mi dicissi 'na cosa, signurina: quant'anni avi stu cristianu? (lit. tell me something, miss: how old is this Christian – meaning person)
5.	quella signorina! (that young lady!)	sta cristiana (lit. that Christian – here meaning woman)

Table 3. Lines showing disparate expressiveness between Italian and Sicilian.

	Tutto per bene	Ccu 'i nguanti gialli
1.	io soffoco dall'angoscia (I suffocate with anguish)	mi scatta 'u cori (my heart jumps)
2.	Non mi seccare! (Don't bother me!)	Uffapapà! Non mi rumpiri 'a testa! (lit. "Arrgh dad! Don't break my head", here "Arrgh dad! Don't get on my nerves!")
3.	Neanche qua, nessuno (Not even here, no one)	Nuddu c'è, mancu ccà, signuri mei! (There is no one, not even here, gentlemen)
4.	No …	làssami, làssami! (leave me, leave me)
5.	imbecille (imbecil)	Rendered variously as: pezzu d'armalu (lit. kind of animal) facci di negadebiti (face of a hypocrite) pezzu di sceccu (lit. kind of donkey)

The Sicilian play generally features many more exclamations of religious nature (Table 2, examples 1–3) that occur in various circumstances to convey a range of feelings, such as anger, nuisance or gentleness. Along with the conservative outlook on socially accepted conduct discussed earlier, these expressions convey further a strong attachment to religion. This is also denoted through phrases that could be classified to a greater or a lesser extent as typical of Sicilian (Table 2, examples 4–6). While Pirandello could have selected similar expressions for the Italian play, they appear less frequently in the Italian variant.

The Sicilian text features also a higher number of diminutives which usually result in a different tone when compared with their Italian counterparts, for example "povera" ("poor") becomes "bon'armuzza" ("good little soul"). Moreover, Sabedda often refers to Parma using the diminutive forms, for instance "figghiuzza mia, figghiuzza" (my little daughter, little daughter) and "'a to nannuzza sugnu!" ("I'm your little granny!"). These words refer to the concepts of something familiar, affectionate and dear, and therefore are more emotionally coloured. That is the case also with the Sicilian phrases provided in Table 3. Although they communicate the same meaning in the contexts in which they appear, the Sicilian variants tend to be conveyed through more vivid expressions which might have fitted better the Sicilian way of speaking or might have been more common in the Sicilian environment. Pirandello's lexical choices show his awareness of the subtle differences in the use of languages by the respective speakers.

The above analysis reveals that, although Pirandello's self-translation concerns a dialect and a language, the play still undergoes cultural renegotiation which brings to the fore issues of power between dialect and Italian and in the monolingual

conceptualization of "national". Power relations between Italian and Sicilian are reflected in the way the characters use the two means of communication. This involves the emotional sphere, the conversation topics, the aim they want to achieve through their enunciation and how they want to come across. The Italian interferences in the Sicilian play serve to mark the boundaries and establish hierarchies in the relationships between characters. Similarly, the changes made to the plot, characterization and Pirandello's lexical choices are indicators of specific attitudes and a way of life. The Italian play finds its new expression in the specificity of a local culture. Pirandello's self-translation thus exposes local hybridization, indicative of the illusion of monolingualism of the national culture and literature.

(In)visibility and power relations in Pirandello's self-translation

Issues of power are reflected further in the invisibility of the Sicilian play and of the act of self-translation, as opposed to the visibility of the Italian play. The issue of (in)visibility is seen from the perspective of information available to the audiences and is manifested through performances and peritext of the printed texts. Since the Sicilian play was not published until 1993, it is not possible to determine whether there was any information about the source text or that it was translated by Pirandello. While it was staged repeatedly, it is not known whether the audience was aware of the relationship between the two variants. Pirandello communicated his intent to prepare a Sicilian adaptation for Musco, which would make it an "explicit self-translation" (Santoyo 2013, 219), but he did it in private correspondence, rather than publicly. Hence, the self-translation of *Tutto per bene* remains "implicit" (ibid.), and results in the invisibility of the act of self-translation. The fact that the Sicilian variant was staged many times suggests that – in a way – the Sicilian and Italian variants were equally visible at the time. Thereafter, the Sicilian play gradually disappeared from the stage, but it was finally published. Still, despite the publication or acknowledgement of Pirandello's self-translation in monographs and articles dedicated to his work, the invisibility of his practice and of the Sicilian plays has not changed.

The same pattern of invisibility can be observed in Pirandello's self-translations from Sicilian into Italian. With the exception of *Liolà* (1917), the only printed plays were the Italian self-translations, which did not feature any information on the Sicilian source plays, even if all of them were staged.[7] To illustrate, *'A birritta cu 'i ciancianeddi* premiered on 27 June 1917 in the Teatro Nazionale in Rome and then was staged successfully and repeatedly across Italy (Pirandello 2007a, 630, 1827). The Italian self-translation was published in 1918 (Pirandello 1918a, 1918b), yet, there was no peritextual information on the Sicilian play. The complete Sicilian text appeared in print only in 1988 in *Odissea di maschere* by Zappulla Muscarà, along with the 1918 Italian version and the story of the play. It was only through *Odissea di maschere* that the Sicilian play and self-translation gained some visibility and that the two variants were given equal status, being published in the same volume and format.[8]

Ultimately, none of the publications of the Sicilian plays has affected their position in Italian literature. The Italian plays are presented as independent works and their presence in the Italian literary canon is decidedly stronger. Although Pirandello wrote also in a language other than that of the national literature, he tends to be perceived mostly as

a writer who wrote in Italian and his self-translations have not been discussed in depth.[9] Considering the Italian sociolinguistic context, the invisibility of Pirandello's self-translation and of the Sicilian plays might result from broader socio-political factors and from the monolingual paradigm dominating the conceptualization of national literature and its writers. From the current perspective, the invisibility of self-translation seems to derive also from a scarce interest in the practice, whereas the invisibility of the Sicilian plays seems to be dictated by the minor(ized) status of Sicilian. Yet, considering Pirandello's reflections on dialect and translation, the invisibility of self-translation should not be identified with the irrelevance of self-translation or lesser importance of the dialect version.

Conclusion: self-translation as a tool of empowerment

In this article, I have sought to present theatre self-translation as an act of cultural renegotiation and a means of empowerment, using the example of Pirandello's self-translation of the play *Tutto per bene* into Sicilian. Addressing the figure of self-translator, the issues of power and the monolingual paradigm, I have outlined the sociolinguistic context of Pirandello's self-translation, with a particular focus on the language-dialect relation, and Pirandello's views on language, dialect and translation. Following the preliminary contextualization, I have analyzed the significant changes made in self-translation and discussed the question of (in)visibility. What emerges from these observations is that the play undergoes a process of cultural renegotiation which is closely related to power relations governing the complex relationship between language and dialect. I argue that through his agency as self-translator, Pirandello confronts power asymmetries between language and dialect and speaks against the hegemony of the monolingual notion of "national".

Relations between languages and cultures of unequal status unavoidably encompass underlying power issues which influence the literary production, but the act of self-translation can represent a form of empowerment. Pirandello gives voice to Sicilian through self-translation and questions the marginalized position assigned to it. He shows its full potential of expression and emotion which, according to his views, could not be conveyed through Italian. Self-translation is a tool of resistance against monolingual language policies which subverts power of the dominant Italian. Giving shape to a play in a language considered minor, in this case a dialect, presumes importance of that given language and culture. If we consider the figure of author-translator and their agency which entails instant validation and confers authority upon all versions of the work in the same way despite any divergences, self-translation consists of separate but equal versions.

Of course, the above observations show also that, within a broader societal perspective, the Sicilian plays and the activity of self-translation remained invisible. Pirandello's self-translation has not changed the status of Sicilian or conceptualization of "national". However, from the perspective of Pirandello as self-translator, it was an individual act of empowerment against limiting exclusion that came with the idea of nation as a linguistically and culturally homogeneous place. Pirandello's self-translation clearly shows that the monolingual national culture carries with it the silent twin, its own hidden multilingualism. Self-translation expands monolithic visions, giving space to an idea of "national" that embraces multilingual, multicultural and multifaceted identities.

The invisibility of the Sicilian plays and of Pirandello's self-translation conceals his association with two linguistic and cultural universes, equal in value and importance. This issue is clearly linked to broader power relations and raises the problem of how we think of and what we classify as "national". I contend that acknowledging self-translation and self-translators is a starting point for reassessing their role in translational and cultural histories across different geographical spaces. Closer examination of the socio-cultural implications of self-translation and self-translators as powerful agents can offer a way to break out of a nationalist cultural narrative and serve as a tool of empowerment and recognition of the minor(ized), leading to a gradual re-evaluation and shift in the position of those languages and cultures that are considered "minor" and/or "peripheral".

Notes

1. The expression "minor(ized)" follows Castro, Mainer, and Page (2017) who propose this term for languages/literatures considered inferior, to challenge their secondary position and emphasise their resistance.
2. See also the discussion of the myth of monolingualism of national cultures by Edwin Gentzler (2008), in relation to Americas.
3. For further information on Pirandello's self-translations see D'Amico (in Pirandello 2007a), Varvaro (in Pirandello 2007b) and Zappulla Muscarà (2000).
4. Marazzini (2004) emphasizes the authoritarian politics which involved the antidialect debate and the repression of ethnic minorities.
5. Although Pirandello joined the Fascist party in 1924, he considered himself apolitical and his work and life contrasted in various ways with Fascist ideology. His initial judgement of Fascism changed considerably within a few years, but he avoided an official rupture. See Giudice (1963).
6. The analysis is based on the 1920 Bemporad edition of the Italian text and on Zappulla Muscarà's edition of the Sicilian text.
7. See the catalogue of Pirandello's theatrical works by D'Amico (Pirandello 2007a), the accounts of Varvaro (Pirandello 2007b) and Zappulla Muscarà (2000).
8. For further information on self-translation of *'A birritta cu 'i ciancianeddi* see Zappulla Muscarà (1988) and Kampert (2019).
9. The publications dedicated to Pirandello's self-translation have focused mainly on *Liolà*, e.g. De Francisci (2014), Lepschy (2009), Salibra (1977).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Magdalena Kampert is a lecturer in translation studies at the University of Glasgow. She has written on self-translation in the Italian and Polish contexts, and on the Sicilian translation of *Le Petit Prince*. She has also acted as a guest editor for the special issue "Rethinking (Self-)translation in (Trans)national Contexts" of the journal *New Voices in Translation Studies* (2020).

ORCID

Magdalena Kampert http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9552-2041

References

Alfieri, Gabriella. 1992. "La Sicilia." In *L'italiano nelle regioni*, edited by Francesco Bruni, 798–860. Torino: UTET.

Camilleri, Andrea, and Tullio De Mauro. 2013. *La lingua batte dove il dente duole*. Bari: Laterza.

Castro, Olga, Sergi Mainer, and Svetlana Page, eds. 2017. *Self-Translation and Power. Negotiating Identities in Multilingual European Contexts*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ceccherelli, Andrea, Gabriella Elina Imposti, and Monica Perotto, eds. 2013. *Autotraduzione e riscrittura*. Bologna: Bononia University Press.

Cipolla, Gaetano. 2004. "U sicilianu è na lingua o un dialettu? / Is Sicilian a Language?" *Arba Sicula* XXV: 138–175.

Cordingley, Anthony, ed. 2013. *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*. London: Bloomsbury.

Cronin, Michael. 1995. "Altered States: Translation and Minority Languages." *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction* 8 (1): 85–103. doi:10.7202/037198ar.

De Francisci, Enza. 2014. "Liolà, (Lost in Its Own Literal) Translation?" *Pirandello Studies* 34: 55–65.

De Mauro, Tullio. 2002. *Storia linguistica dell'Italia unita*. Bari: Editori Laterza.

De Mauro, Tullio, and Mario Lodi. 1979. *Lingua e dialetti*. Roma: Editori Riuniti.

Eco, Umberto. 1995. "Riflessioni teorico-pratiche sulla traduzione." In *Teorie contemporanee della traduzione*, edited by Siri Nergaard, 121–146. Milano: Bompiani.

Ethnologue. 2018. "Sicilian." Accessed June 14, 2018. https://www.ethnologue.com/language/scn.

Ferraro, Alessandra. 2016. "Traduit par l'auteur. Sur le pacte autotraductif." In *L'autotraduction littéraire: perspectives théoriques*, edited by Alessandra Ferraro, and Rainier Grutman, 121–140. Paris: Garnier.

Ferroni, Giulio. 1991. *Storia della letteratura italiana. Il Novecento*. Torino: Einaudi.

Gentzler, Edwin. 2008. *Translation and Identity in the Americas. New Directions in Translation Theory*. London & New York: Routledge.

Giudice, Gaspare. 1963. *Luigi Pirandello*. Torino: UTET.

Giunta Regionale della Sicilia. 2018. "Iniziative per la promozione e valorizzazione della lingua siciliana e l'insegnamento della storia della Sicilia nelle scuole di ogni ordine e grado della regione. Atto di indirizzo." Accessed July 14, 2021. http://www.regione.sicilia.it/deliberegiunta/file/giunta/allegati/Delibera_199_18.pdf.

Gramling, David. 2016. *The Invention of Monolingualism*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Grutman, Rainier. 2009. "Self–Translation." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker, and Gabriela Saldanha, 2nd ed., 257–260. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Grutman, Rainier. 2013a. "A Sociological Glance at Self-Translation and Self-Translators." In *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, edited by Anthony Cordingley, 63–80. London: Continuum.

Grutman, Rainier. 2013b. "Beckett and Beyond Putting Self-Translation in Perspective." *Orbis Litterarum* 68 (3): 188–206. doi:10.1111/oli.12022.

Grutman, Rainier, and Trish Van Bolderen. 2014. "Self-Translation." In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Sandra Bermann, and Catherine Porter, 323–332. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Haller, Hermann W. 1999. *The Other Italy: The Literary Canon in Dialect*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press.

Hofstede, Geert, Gert Jan Hofstede, and Michael Minkov. 2010. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York, London: McGraw-Hill Education.

Hokenson, Jan Walsh, and Marcella Munson. 2007. *The Bilingual Text. History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Kampert, Magdalena. 2019. "Self-translation and Hybridity – The Case of Pirandello's *'A birritta cu 'i ciancianeddi*." *Pirandello Studies* 39: 25–40.

Kippur, Sara. 2015. *Writing It Twice: Self-Translation and the Making of a World Literature in French*. Evanston: Northwestern Univ Press.

Lagarde, Christian, and Helena Tanqueiro, eds. 2013. *L'autotraduction aux frontières de la langue et de la culture*. Limoges: Editions Lambert Lucas.
Lepschy, Anna Laura. 2009. "On Pirandello's Versions of *Liolà*." *Cuadernos de Filología Italiana* XVI: 263–273.
Marazzini, Claudio. 2004. *Breve storia della lingua italiana*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
Nannavecchia, Tiziana. 2014. "Italian Meta-Reflections on Self-Translation: An Overview of the Debate." *Tradução em Revista* 16: 95–109. https://www.maxwell.vrac.puc-rio.br/23237/23237.PDF.
Pagliaro, Antonino. 1972. "La dialettalità di Luigi Pirandello." Chap. VII in *Forma e tradizione*, 205–252. Palermo: S. F. Flaccovio.
Pirandello, Luigi. 1906. "Tutto per bene." *Rivista popolare di politica, lettere e scienze sociali*, June 1906, 15–30.
Pirandello, Luigi. 1917. *Liolà*. Roma: A. F. Formíggini.
Pirandello, Luigi. 1918a. "Il berretto a sonagli. Commedia in due atti di Luigi Pirandello. Atto Primo." *Noi e il Mondo* 8: 591–598.
Pirandello, Luigi. 1918b. "Il berretto a sonagli. Commedia in due atti di Luigi Pirandello. Atto Secondo." *Noi e il Mondo* 9: 667–674.
Pirandello, Luigi. 1920. *Tutto per bene: commedia in tre atti*. Firenze: R. Bemporad & Figlio.
Pirandello, Luigi. [1921] 1993. *Sei personaggi in cerca d'autore*. Reprint. Torino: Einaudi.
Pirandello, Luigi. 1965. *Saggi, poesie, scritti varii*, edited by Manlio Lo Vecchio-Musti, 887–890. Milano: Mondadori.
Pirandello, Luigi. [1993] 2002. "Ccu 'i nguanti gialli." In *Tutto il teatro in dialetto*, edited by Sarah Zappulla Muscarà, 2nd ed., vol. 2, 253–335. Milano: Bompiani.
Pirandello, Luigi. 2007a. *Maschere nude*, edited by Alessandro D'Amico, 4 vols. Milano: Mondadori.
Pirandello, Luigi. 2007b. "Opere teatrali in dialetto." In *Maschere nude*, edited by Alberto Varvaro, vol. IV, 1247–1919. Milano: Mondadori.
Richardson, Brian. 2001. "Questions of Language." In *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Italian Culture*, edited by Zygmunt G. Barański, and Rebecca J. West, 63–80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Salibra, Luciana. 1977. "*Liolà*: Pirandello autotraduttore dal siciliano." *Bolletino del Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani* 13: 257–292.
Santoyo, Julio-César. 2013. "Autotraducción: ensayo de tipología." In *Al humanista, traductor y maestro Miguel Ángel Vega Cernuda*, edited by Pilar Martino Alba, Juan Antonio Albaladejo Martínez, and Martha Lucía Pulido Correa, 205–221. Madrid: Dykinson.
Scuderi, Antonio. 2006. "Sicilian Dialect Theatre." In *A History of Italian Theatre*, edited by Joseph Farrell, and Paolo Puppa, 257–265. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tanqueiro, Helena. 1999. "Un traductor privilegiado: el autotraductor." *Quaderns: Revista de Traducció* 3: 19–27.
UNESCO. n.d. "UNESCO Interactive Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger". Accessed July 14, 2021. http://www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/en/atlasmap/language-id-1023.html.
Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.
Yildiz, Yasemin. 2012. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press.
Zappulla Muscarà, Sarah. 1988. *Odissea di maschere. 'A birritta cu 'i ciancianeddi di Luigi Pirandello*. Catania: Giuseppe Maimone Editore.
Zappulla Muscarà, Sarah. 2000. "Pirandello traduttore e autotraduttore." In *Pirandello e la parola*, edited by Enzo Lauretta, 133–142. Agrigento: Edizioni Centro Nazionale Studi Pirandelliani.