

Established Paradigms, Evolving Trends

Established Paradigms, Evolving Trends:

*English Literary,
Communicative, and
Pedagogical Practices*

Edited by

Fabio Ciambella and Renzo Mocini

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Established Paradigms, Evolving Trends: English Literary,
Communicative, and Pedagogical Practices

Edited by Fabio Ciambella and Renzo Mocini

This book first published 2026

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2026 by Fabio Ciambella, Renzo Mocini and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN: 978-1-0364-5983-3

ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-0364-5984-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	vii
Navigating Spaces of Meaning: A Festschrift for Alba Graziano <i>Fabio Ciambella and Renzo Mocini</i>	

Section I: Restoration Theatre between Literary Criticism and New Linguistic Paradigms

Chapter One.....	2
Theatre Translation. The <i>Careless Lovers</i> Experience <i>Bianca Del Villano</i>	

Chapter Two	16
An Experiment in Collaborative Translation <i>Iolanda Plescia</i>	

Chapter Three	27
From <i>The Careless Lovers</i> (1673) to <i>The Canterbury Guests</i> (1694). Ravenscroft Reworks His Early Comedy <i>Valentina Rossi</i>	

Chapter Four.....	38
When Cleopatra ‘Became a Woman’: A Brief Comparative Analysis of <i>Antony and Cleopatra</i> and <i>All for Love</i> <i>Valerio Viviani</i>	

Chapter Five	49
Misleading Gaze: Image and Desire in <i>The Rover</i> <i>Rossana Sebellin</i>	

Section II: Eighteenth- to Twentieth-century Fiction(s)

Chapter Six.....	62
The Transformation of Suspense in <i>Pamela</i> and <i>Clarissa</i> <i>Riccardo Capoferro</i>	

Chapter Seven.....	71
The Novel of His Heart: Disraeli's <i>Tancred</i> and Orientalism <i>Daniele Niedda</i>	
Chapter Eight.....	82
Herman Melville's <i>Bartleby, the Scrivener</i> and Its Italian Translations as a Culturological Phenomenon <i>Michela Marroni</i>	
Chapter Nine.....	94
Rudyard Kipling, Imperial Bard and Outsider <i>Richard Ambrosini</i>	
Section III: New Trends in CLIL, ELF, and Other Pedagogical Practices	
Chapter Ten	106
“Decentring CLIL”: Insights and Reflections on CLIL in Italy and in India <i>Letizia Cinganotto</i>	
Chapter Eleven	125
Critical Aspects of CLIL: Development, Opportunities, and Challenges <i>Anna Romagnuolo</i>	
Chapter Twelve	135
Digital ELF and Other (Linguistic) Stories around Italian Chefluencers on Social Media <i>Fabio Ciambella</i>	
Chapter Thirteen.....	149
Fostering Oracy for Learning: Challenges and Pedagogical Innovations in Multilingual Contexts <i>Lucilla Lopriore</i>	
Contributors.....	162
Tabula Gratulatoria.....	166

INTRODUCTION

NAVIGATING SPACES OF MEANING: A FESTSCHRIFT FOR ALBA GRAZIANO¹

FABIO CIAMBELLA AND RENZO MOCINI

*“The greatest proof of knowledge is not how much we know,
but how much we are able to give”.*

T.S. Eliot

This volume honours Professor Alba Graziano, whose intellectual journey has traversed multiple domains of knowledge in a dynamic and interdisciplinary manner. Her scholarly contributions, pedagogical innovations, and insatiable curiosity have established her as a central figure in contemporary Italian academia. As she retires from her role as a university professor, she embarks on a new phase of research and engagement, continuing to interact with the academic community in meaningful and innovative ways.

As full Professor of English Language and Translation at the University of Tuscia in Viterbo, Alba has left a lasting impact on both research and teaching. Her distinguished career, deeply rooted in the study of Restoration, eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century literature, has consistently explored the mechanisms through which texts negotiate meaning within their historical and cultural contexts. At the same time, her pioneering contributions to *Content and Language Integrated Learning* (CLIL) have reshaped educational models, fostering new forms of disciplinary and linguistic interaction. Her involvement in teacher education was pivotal, particularly in her role in teaching Didactics of Anglophone Civilizations at the Scuola di Specializzazione all’Insegnamento Secondario (SSIS) from 1999 until its closure in 2009. She was also actively involved in the Tirocini Formativi Attivi (TFA), Percorsi Abilitanti Speciali (PAS), and university faculty development programmes, consistently reaffirming her belief that

¹ Although the introduction has been conceived jointly by the two authors, Renzo Mocini wrote the first section, while Fabio Ciambella authored the second one.

education is not mere instruction, but a process of meaningful creation. One of the most defining aspects of her career is the intellectual school she has built through generations of students and scholars. More than a mentor, Alba has forged a true academic tradition, instilling depth and rigour in those she has guided. Her influence extends beyond teaching, evident in the many researchers and professors now working in prestigious universities. Her enduring legacy remains unmistakable.

Among her many editorial endeavours, *Fictions. Studi sulla narratività*, the prestigious journal she founded and continues to direct, stands out as a landmark achievement in the study of narrativity and its diverse cultural expressions. As director of the University Language Centre (CLA), Alba launched numerous initiatives, broadening the scope of linguistic education and fostering institutional innovation.

Throughout her career at the University of Tuscia, Alba has consistently cultivated an international outlook in her research, establishing meaningful collaborations that transcend national and disciplinary boundaries. Her active participation in international conferences, scholarly exchanges, and cross-cultural encounters has been a key element of her professional trajectory.

Beyond her scholarly achievements, Alba's intellectual curiosity extends to areas as diverse as gastronomy, tourism, and the creative use of children's rhymes in teaching. Yet, in her view, each of these fields is intricately connected within the broader continuum of cultural expression.

Her investigations have continuously explored the intersection of tradition and innovation, shedding light on how literary, linguistic, and educational paradigms evolve, balancing preservation and transformation over time. From Restoration literature – one of her most recent research interests, which led to the founding of the Italian Research Group On Restoration Drama (IRGORD), which she also directs – to contemporary CLIL methodologies, from textual analysis to intercultural communication, Alba's work embodies the dynamic interplay between established knowledge and emerging perspectives.

The contributions in this volume showcase the breadth and depth of Alba's intellectual explorations over the years. The essays collected here, spanning literary analysis, pedagogical theory, and cultural studies, offer a reflection of the far-reaching impact of her work and the dynamic academic spaces she has helped cultivate. In this sense, the volume itself serves as a metaphor for Alba's scholarly journey, an ever-expanding exploration of boundaries, spaces, and ideas.

Celebrating Alba means recognising a scholar who has not simply produced knowledge but has nurtured a rich intellectual space where ideas

intersect, evolve, and flourish. As she moves beyond her formal academic role, her influence endures, shaping the research, teaching, and intellectual discourse of those fortunate enough to have worked with her.

As beneficiaries of her intellectual and human generosity, we thank her with profound gratitude and admiration.

This collection of thirteen essays is structured into three thematic sections, each reflecting a significant area of research explored by Alba Graziano throughout her career. Her scholarly contributions have spanned the fields of Restoration theatre, the evolution of fictional narrative in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and innovations in language pedagogy. By engaging with these diverse yet interconnected disciplines, the essays in this volume pay tribute to Graziano's intellectual legacy and highlight the continued relevance of her research interests.²

Section I, "Restoration Theatre between Literary Criticism and New Linguistic Paradigms", explores the intersections of literary criticism, translation, and performance studies within the context of Restoration drama. The section opens with Bianca Del Villano's chapter, "Theatre Translation. *The Careless Lovers* Experience", which examines the first Italian translation of Edward Ravenscroft's play *The Careless Lovers* (1673), completed in 2024 by Alba Graziano and a team of linguists and literary scholars. Del Villano highlights the unique challenges of translating theatrical texts, emphasising the interplay between linguistic accuracy and performative interpretation. Her analysis situates the translation within evolving theories of theatre translation, demonstrating how a pragmatic and historical-linguistic approach can enhance the transposition of Restoration comedy into a contemporary Italian context.

Even Iolanda Plescia's chapter, "An Experiment in Collaborative Translation", explores the collaborative effort of translating Ravenscroft's *The Careless Lovers* into Italian. Unlike Del Villano, Plescia emphasises how working together allows translators to share both challenges and solutions, describing one of the key benefits of sharing failings and difficulties. She also examines the complexities of translating culture-specific elements and the theoretical implications of group translation, arguing that the translator's role is ultimately a critical act, grounded in professional ethics and shaped by underlying theoretical assumptions that, while open to revision, guide final decisions.

² The editors have chosen to respect each contributor's individual linguistic preference, allowing them to use either British or American spelling throughout their essays.

Valentina Rossi's contribution, "From *The Careless Lovers* (1673) to *The Canterbury Guests* (1694). Ravenscroft Reworks His Early Comedy", extends the discussion of Ravenscroft's play, dealt with also by Del Villano and Plescia, by tracing its transformation over two decades. Rossi's analysis reveals how shifts in the political and cultural landscape, particularly following the Glorious Revolution, influenced Ravenscroft's dramaturgical choices. Her study highlights the playwright's transition from the bold, libertine ethos of early Restoration comedy to the more refined and sentimental tone characteristic of later works, thus illustrating a broader evolution in theatrical sensibilities during the period.

The fourth chapter, "When Cleopatra 'Became a Woman': A Brief Comparative Analysis of *Antony and Cleopatra* and *All for Love*", by Valerio Viviani, shifts the focus from comedy to heroic drama, exploring the changing representation of female characters between the Elizabethan and Restoration stages. Viviani examines how John Dryden's *All for Love* (1677) reimagines Shakespeare's Cleopatra, emphasising the role of actresses in shaping new interpretations of female protagonists. The chapter underscores the broader transformation of dramatic conventions, linking gender representation to evolving theatrical aesthetics and audience expectations.

Like Viviani's chapter, which examines female representation and social constructs in Dryden's *All for Love*, Rossana Sebellin's "Misleading Gaze: Image and Desire in *The Rover*" concludes the section by addressing themes of visual perception and desire in Aphra Behn's *The Rover* (1677). Her chapter focuses on the conflicting images and self-fashioning characters, the power dynamics of the gaze, and the complexities of male desire and female sexuality. The play is set during the Carnival season in Naples, a transitional period marked by disorder and role reversals, allowing for the temporary suspension of social hierarchies and gender norms. Through masks, disguises, and the interplay of watching and being watched, the play underscores how identity becomes fluid and open to reinterpretation when it is actively performed rather than taken for granted.

Section II, "Eighteenth- to Twentieth-century Fiction(s)", shifts from Restoration drama to narrative fiction, spanning the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. The first chapter, Riccardo Capoferro's "The Transformation of Suspense in *Pamela* and *Clarissa*", investigates how Samuel Richardson revolutionised narrative suspense. Capoferro argues that Richardson's technique of embedding characters' psychological anticipations into the structure of his novels created an immersive reading experience that contributed to the rise of the novel as a dominant literary

form. This chapter situates Richardson within a broader epistemological shift toward probabilistic thinking and empirical observation, linking literary innovation to intellectual histories.

Daniele Niedda's chapter, "The Novel of His Heart: Disraeli's *Tancred* and Orientalism", revisits Benjamin Disraeli's engagement with imperial themes, challenging traditional interpretations of *Tancred* as a purely Orientalist text. By highlighting Disraeli's use of irony and his nuanced exploration of cultural hybridity, Niedda reframes the novel as a critique of European expansionism rather than a straightforward endorsement of imperial ideology. His discussion connects with Capoferro's by emphasising how narrative strategies reflect broader ideological transformations.

Michela Marroni's "Herman Melville's *Bartleby, the Scrivener* and Its Italian Translations" further extends the section's focus on narrative complexity by addressing the linguistic and cultural challenges of translating Melville's enigmatic tale. Marroni explores how different Italian translations handle *Bartleby*'s elusive language and themes of passive resistance, highlighting the act of translation as a form of interpretation. Her discussion complements Niedda's by emphasising the transnational dimensions of literary reception and adaptation.

Richard Ambrosini's "Rudyard Kipling, Imperial Bard and Outsider" closes the section by reconsidering Kipling's complex relationship with the British Empire. Ambrosini argues that Kipling's works, particularly *Kim*, reflect an ambivalent stance toward colonial rule, shaped by the author's position as both an insider and an outsider. By connecting Kipling's narrative techniques to his hybrid identity, the chapter resonates with Niedda's exploration of Disraeli's cultural ambivalence, reinforcing the section's overarching theme of how fiction negotiates ideological and geopolitical tensions.

Finally, Section III, "New Trends in CLIL, ELF, and Other Pedagogical Practices", examines contemporary approaches to language learning and teaching methodologies, particularly in multilingual and multicultural contexts. Letizia Cinganotto's chapter, "'Decentring CLIL': Insights and Reflections on CLIL", analyses the application of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Italy and India through the EDUREFORM project. By comparing the educational frameworks of these two countries, Cinganotto highlights the adaptability of CLIL in fostering intercultural competence and multilingual education, thus setting the stage for a critical reassessment of its implementation.

Anna Romagnuolo's chapter, "Critical Aspects of CLIL: Development, Opportunities, and Challenges" discusses the development of CLIL, its opportunities, and the challenges of implementation. As already

anticipated in Cinganotto's chapter, the dual focus of CLIL, which pursues both content and language objectives, distinguishes it from traditional language teaching methods and has contributed to its widespread adoption in Europe and beyond. However, according to Romagnuolo, the implementation of CLIL has faced challenges, including issues related to teacher proficiency and cultural representation in subjects such as history. The chapter also traces the history of CLIL's development, its pedagogical implications, and the difficulties of balancing content and language learning, particularly when dealing with culturally and historically situated accounts.

Fabio Ciambella's "Digital ELF and Other (Linguistic) Stories around Italian Chefluencers on Social Media" explores the use of English by Italian chef influencers (chefluencers) on social media to connect with a global audience. It discusses how these chefluencers use various linguistic strategies, including English subtitles, code-switching, code-mixing, and English-only recipes with Italian accents, to broaden their reach and engage with non-Italian speakers. The article also touches on the importance of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and Digital ELF in facilitating cross-cultural communication in the digital age.

Finally, Lucilla Lopriore's "Fostering Oracy for Learning: Challenges and Pedagogical Innovations in Multilingual Contexts" expands the discussion by emphasising the significance of oracy in contemporary education. By exploring initiatives such as *Oracy Cambridge* and *Voice 21*, Lopriore underscores the necessity of integrating speaking and listening skills into language curricula, particularly in multilingual classrooms. Her chapter connects with Cinganotto's by highlighting the importance of communicative competence as a fundamental component of language education.

SECTION I

RESTORATION THEATRE BETWEEN LITERARY CRITICISM AND NEW LINGUISTIC PARADIGMS

CHAPTER ONE

THEATRE TRANSLATION.
THE *CARELESS LOVERS* EXPERIENCE

BIANCA DEL VILLANO

This contribution aims to offer a commentary and reflection on the transformative solutions adopted on the occasion of the first Italian translation of *The Careless Lovers* (1673) by Edward Ravenscroft, completed in 2024 by Alba Graziano with a group of linguists and literary scholars.¹ After addressing some theoretical questions related to theatrical translation as a specific practice, I will tackle in greater detail some semantic and pragmatic issues emerging from the comparison between the English hypotext and its Italian version.

Translation on Stage

Translating for the theater entails, more than proves necessary for other textual genres, the need to interrogate methodological approaches and practices that concretely result in the translation process. This is due to the double articulation intrinsic to dramatic communication, involving script and performance with their multiple textual levels (linguistic, audiovisual, gestural), whereby ‘drama translation’ complicates the task of transforming a text A into a text B. The theatrical translator is, in fact, faced with the paradox of having to deal with a text designed to be performed, but of which they must (and can) transpose only the linguistic component. Such a statement, so clear in excluding the ‘performance’ from the translation practice – at least at a first glance – risks being misunderstood if it is not placed within the broader ongoing debate on theatrical translation and not

¹ I am referring to Fabio Ciambella, Iolanda Plescia, Valentina Rossi, Rossana Sebellin and myself. The translation was published under the title of *Amanti spensierati* (see Graziano *et al.* 2024). A slightly different version of this essay contribution appeared in the same volume.

considered as the result of a theoretical trajectory that reclaims and revitalizes positions dismissed as ‘outdated’ in past decades.

In general, scholarly attention to drama developed within a theoretical interval first informed by the linguistic (semiotic) turn that arose in the 1970s and then governed by a shift in focus towards performance. Whilst the former promoted the centrality of the text, the latter privileged aspects of performance:

Rooted in the 1960s, over the years the idea of art as event has decisively contributed to an understanding of culture not as ‘text’, as in Geertz’s famous metaphor, or in Lotman and Uspensky’s semiotic system, but as ‘performance’. Theatre has become the overall model for what cultural studies have defined as ‘performative turn’, prompting critics to discard both hermeneutic and semiotic approaches in favour of an ‘aesthetics of performativity’. (Bigliazzi *et al.* 2013, 1)

The latter aesthetic was based on the rejection of the idea that meaning originates from the Subject (and likewise from the Text), favoring a relational vision of communication (theatrical and otherwise). In this perspective, meaning is realized in a participatory dimension that includes interpretation. In theatre, this dynamic is materialized in the physically shared space between actors and spectators (Bassnett and Lefevre 1990; 1998; Bigliazzi *et al.* 2013; Fischer-Lichte 2014 [2004]). Consequently, the very definition of translation – already problematic – has evolved to take into account all the stages involved in the realization of stage communication in its full multimodal nature, explicitly attributing a creative role to the translator.

In this perspective, translation is no longer exclusively linked to verbal language, thus finding itself overlapped with other practices (ranging from adaptation to rewriting, from remediation to retelling). Predictably, this shift has caused a rift between theoretical approaches, which align with the ideological priorities of the culturalist agenda, and practical considerations, where longstanding issues have yet to be addressed. For instance, the choice between domesticating or foreignizing the target text – or adopting a target-oriented (stage-oriented) versus source-oriented (including reader-oriented) approach – remains essential, albeit with renewed premises concerning the cultural positioning and determination of the text in relation to its audience.² It would be impossible here to list, or even

² On the definition of translation and its theoretical and practical foundations, the contributions of Massimiliano Morini (2012; 2022) and Lawrence Venuti (1995; 1998) are particularly stimulating and diverse. On the specifics of theatrical trans-

enumerate, all the translation solutions that emerged within or in response to the performative turn (see, for instance, Bassnett 1991; 1998; 2007; Bigliuzzi *et al.* 2013; Marinetti 2013). What is worth emphasizing, however, is their heterogeneity: despite the absence of a programmatic methodological agenda, these approaches have yielded crucial insights into the interaction between the translator's subjectivity and the text.

This concern has been central for the IRGORD group, whose work has been inspired by debates and theoretical discussions, culminating in a questioning of the status of both translator and drama translation. The outcome of this inquiry will be the subject of the next section.

Emptying Textual Spaces

The translation of *The Careless Lovers* into *Amanti spensierati* was intended by the IRGORD group in a traditional inter-linguistic sense, i.e., as a transposition of the dramatic text from the source verbal language into the target verbal language. Such a practice does not (and could not) include a hypothetical original staging but should strive to incorporate the 'empty space' of the performance to come.

According to this manifesto, far from limiting interpretation, the absence of the performed dimension of the source text can be inscribed in its own right among the specificities of the theatrical text itself – specificities that should be enhanced and reintroduced into a broader discussion on the aesthetic nature of dramatic texts. Performance, as part of the double articulation of the dramatic works identified by semiotic studies (to be discussed in more detail later), acts as a kind of 'primary scene' of interpretation precisely because of its absence from the written page. It is this characteristic that activates the imagination of the audience, whether it concerns directors and actors involved in staging, readers and spectators engaging with written or performed texts, or translators. But with one fundamental difference: in order to ensure that the dramaturgical machine continues to produce its own interplay of presence and absence, translation must not attempt to fill the interpretive gaps left by the missing primary scene; on the contrary, it must leave them open and 'functioning'.

This requires acknowledging, rather than denying, the distinction between script and performance, recognizing it as a distinctive feature of theatrical signification. To work in this perspective, the translation of *The*

lation, see Baines, Marinetti, Perteghella (2011), Nikolarea (2002), Zuber-Skerritt (1984) and, of course, Susan Bassnett (1980; 1983; 1985; 1990).

Careless Lovers has started from a reflection on theatre as ‘text’.³ The starting point could not but be the seminal studies of (post)structuralist theorists and semioticians, such as Barthes and Serpieri:

What is theater? A kind of cybernetic machine. At rest, this machine is hidden behind a curtain. But as soon as it’s discovered, it starts sending a number of messages to your address. What’s special about these messages is that they are simultaneous, yet at different paces: at a given point in the show, you receive six or seven pieces of information at the same time (from the set, the costumes, the lighting, the actors’ positions, their gestures, their facial expressions, their speech), but some of these pieces of information stick (in the case of the set), while others spin (the speech, the gestures); we’re therefore dealing with a veritable informational polyphony, and that’s what theatricality is all about: a thickness of signs [...]. (Barthes 1981, 258; my translation)

The multimodal nature of the cybernetic machine mentioned by Barthes was later tackled by Alessandro Serpieri. In 1981, in *Toward a Segmentation of the Dramatic Text*, he opened the essay by claiming the recognition of a specific status for the dramatic text (164), traditionally considered only as a literary work. Serpieri, thus, initiated systematic research on the specificity of the dramaturgical text through a theory of segmentation capable of breaking down the semiological units structuring the text and aligning with its enunciative nature.

[E]very author, in writing for the theatre, has in mind a stage realization which he *stamps* in the text, drawing upon the system of conventions operative in his time. Now, if every theatrical *language* in history has its specific stage competence, can we not hypothesize that the theatrical *langue* always possesses a particular status which distinguishes the dramatic text from any type of literary text? [...] The theatre [...] is institutionally tied to the speaking process; it requires a pragmatic context; and has a temporal axis always based on the present; its space is *deixis* [...]. (1981, 164-5)

Building on this foundational contribution, enriched by Serpieri’s subsequent reflections (see Serpieri 1988; 2002; 2001; 2004a; 2004b), the IRGORD group sought to identify the specificities of theater for the purposes of translation. Taking into account Serpieri’s assertion that “[t]he link between text and stage [...] is the meeting point between the potential for staging *connotated* in the text and the *metalanguage* used by the director, actor, scenery designer, etc.” (1981, 166, italics in the original), the research unit started an investigation into the role played by theatrical

³ See also Serpieri 1981; Eco 1977; Elam 1980; Pavis 1982 and Aston *et al.* 1983.

translators in the process of scenic transcodification and how they can express the textual connotation of scenic virtuality.

The answer emerged through a rethinking of the performative nature attributed to the pragmatic context. This could be articulated not only with reference to the physical scene shared by actors and spectators but also in relation to the co-text and to the illocutionary-perlocutionary dimension of language. Thus, rather than treating deixis as referential in an extra-textual sense, it was attributed a stylistic function operating on an intra-diegetic level (as in the text world theory, see Gavins 2007; Werth 1999). The goal was not to recreate an absent original performance, confined to its oral dimension, but to *virtually* produce it on the linguistic plane of the written page.

Recent advancements in historical pragmatics (see Jucker 2000; Jucker and Taavitsainen 2013; Culpeper and Kytö 2010) and genre studies have informed the distinction between areas of translation. The first to be addressed through semantic rendering (e.g., character names, toponymy, culture-specific terms) and the second requiring pragma-stylistic transposition (e.g., character functions, speech acts, politeness/impoliteness, discourse markers, cognitive metaphors). A cross-disciplinary approach was instead applied to the translation of the title, *The Careless Lovers*.

***Careless* but Careful Translations**

Synthesizing the general strategies adopted in translating *The Careless Lovers*, two main attitudes emerge: on the one hand, a historical-linguistic approach to the lexical aspects of the play, interpreted through an accurate reconstruction of the semantic history of each word; on the other, a pragmatic approach to syntax, modeled on the rhythm of the Italian language and modified in order to disambiguate speech acts and discourse markers.

The proviso scene, in which future husband and wife stipulate the terms of their life together, has been translated *pragmatically* so as to clarify the illocutionary force of the cues: “will I” translated as “prometto” emphasizes how the exchange mocks marriage vows and, at the same time, highlights the ironic legal subtext behind it (see Table 1-1, italics mine).

Table 1-1 The proviso scene (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 266-9).

<p>HILLARIA. In company, you shall never call me wife or dear or sweetheart but madam.</p> <p>CARELESS. In company, you shall never call me husband or by my Christian name but Mr. Careless.</p> <p>HILLARIA. In none of these particulars <i>will I ever</i> offend, Mr. Careless.</p> <p>CARELESS. In none of these particulars <i>will I ever</i> offend you, madam.</p> <p>HILLARIA. This 'tis for folks to meet that understand themselves; marriage with these circumstances I like well enough and must certainly be very pleasant and delightful.</p>	<p>HILLARIA. In compagnia di altri, non mi chiamerete mai moglie, né cara, o tesoro, ma mi chiamerete signora.</p> <p>CARELESS. E voi in compagnia non mi chiamerete mai marito, né col nome di battesimo, ma Mr. Careless.</p> <p>HILLARIA. <i>Prometto di non contravvenire</i> mai ad alcuna di queste clausole, Mr. Careless.</p> <p>CARELESS. <i>Prometto di non contravvenire</i> mai ad alcuna di queste clausole, signora.</p> <p>HILLARIA. Ecco che succede quando si incontrano persone che si capiscono; il matrimonio a tali condizioni mi garba assai, e sarà di certo fonte di diletto e di piacere.</p>
--	--

The linguistic act becomes an explicit performative in Italian (cf. Searle 1969), capable of clearly framing the illocutionary force of the bits as well as the formulaic structure of the wedding ceremony in the target language. Additionally, the negation “non” proves humorous in that it allows the audience to grasp the oppositional and libertarian vision of Hillaria and Careless, whose agreement clauses function by difference, i.e., by reversing rather than confirming formulas.

As anticipated, a different strategy comes out in relation to the lexical level, particularly with regard to characters’ names, which were addressed through a source-oriented approach to preserve the cultural and historical identity of the play.

In particular, place and character names – despite their ‘speaking’ nature – remained mostly unchanged to ensure that the specific context of late 17th-century English society could remain emotionally and critically accessible to the audience. Accordingly, lexical choices required historical-linguistic research, attentive to the internal development of theatrical language and to literary models operating before and simultaneously with the play. For terms such as “gallant”, “lover”, “mistress”, and “alderman”, it was deemed important to track their semantic richness by differentiating

their rendering in the Italian translation according to the microcontext of enunciation.

The least complex case is represented by the term “alderman”, a title of address denoting Muchworth’s social role, which was translated into Italian as “aldermanno”, since the alternative, “consigliere”, would have proved too generic and lacking the desired specificity.

More intricate solutions were adopted for “gallant”, examples of which are given in Table 1-2 (with italics added). “Gallant” first appears in the “dramatis personae” to designate the protagonist, Careless:

Table 1-2 Dramatis personae (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 107).

<p>[MEN] Mr. Muchworth, an old alderman. Mr. Lovell, a well-bred gentleman. Mr. Careless, a Town <i>gallant</i>. De Boastado, a conceited lord and traveller. Toby, a servant to Mr. Lovell. WOMEN Jacinta, daughter to Mr. Muchworth. Hillaria. Beatrice, their maid. Mrs. Clappam and Mrs. Breedwell, two wenches of the Town. A parson, a tailor, ghosts, fiddlers, drawers.</p>	<p>[UOMINI] Mr. Muchworth, anziano aldermanno. Mr. Lovell, gentiluomo di buona famiglia. Mr. Careless, <i>dongiovanni</i> di città. De Boastado, nobile vanesio e viaggiatore. Toby, servo di Mr. Lovell. DONNE Jacinta, figlia di Mr. Muchworth. Hillaria. Beatrice, la loro cameriera. Mrs. Clappam e Mrs. Breedwell, due donne di mondo. Parroco, sarto, fantasmi, suonatori, osti.</p>
---	--

The choice to translate “gallant” as “dongiovanni” immediately clarifies that Careless belongs to a genealogy of literary libertines. He is a pivotal character, in fact, not only for the plot development but also for what he represents axiologically: along with Hillaria, he is the spokesperson of a counter-discourse that, whilst apparently resorting to well-known dramaturgical conventions, actually epitomizes the most anti-Puritan aspect of the play, paradoxically positioning itself in the rear of the advancing bourgeois progress. Careless’s characterization complicates the very perception of what constitutes ‘progress’, both in terms of manners and of individual freedom within the social system. The epithet “gallant”, frequently used to address him throughout the text, with nuanced meanings ranging from “dongiovanni” and “cavalier sirvente” to the more neutral “signore” and “bellimbusto”, can certainly be read as an indication of the complexity of the role he plays.

“Gallant”, however, also serves as an umbrella term under which various male postures are represented in the drama (Table 1-3):

Table 1-3 Gallant 1 (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 122-3).

DE BOASTADO. Then <i>gallants</i> , in the escutcheon, is only a man with a spade fodant in a field gules.	DE BOASTADO. Poi, gentiluomini, nello scudo, c'è soltanto un uomo con un badile affondant su campo rouge.
---	--

In this line, for instance, “gallant” is used to address a group of friends, thus evoking forms of sociability, translated into Italian with the more general term “gentiluomini”. In similar cases, when used by a male speaker, the choice fell on “amici” (see Graziano *et al.*, 45). Female characters, on the other hand, as is clear from the micro-contexts provided in the play, add a ‘gender connotation’ that had to be marked in the translation. For example, in the following passage, Hillaria, speaking to her cousin Jacinta, refers to Careless as “our gallant” (Table 1-4):

Table 1-4 Gallant 2 (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 162-3).

HILLARIA. See! he's here, and our <i>gallant</i> with him; we'll conspue the business with them.	HILLARIA. Vedi? Eccoli qua, insieme al nostro <i>dongiovanni</i> . Discutiamo con loro di questa faccenda.
---	---

Here, the term “dongiovanni” serves, on the one hand, to confirm that in Hillaria’s perception, Careless fits the archetype of the serial seducer. On the other, the fact that the term takes on a tone of playful irony when spoken by Hillaria helps to bring out her sharpness of judgment and linguistic skill. She is the wittiest woman on stage, always ready to use her words to challenge and humorously undermine the status of her male interlocutor. She does not simply categorize Careless as yet another variation of a literary archetype established by Tirso de Molina’s *El Burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra* (1632), or by Molière’s *Dom Juan ou le Festin de pierre* (1665). On the contrary, her irony implies a positive evaluation of a character, whose nature can be interpreted as bittersweet and ultimately harmless.

Elsewhere in the text, “gallant” is translated as “bellimbusto”, particularly when used by Hillaria as a direct vocative (Table 1-5):

Table 1-5 Gallant 3 (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 164-5).

HILLARIA. And who sent for you, <i>gallant</i> ?	HILLARIA. E voi, <i>bellimbusto</i> , chi vi ha invitato?
---	--

This solution reveals much about Hillaria’s linguistic attitude, which appears to be aggressive and direct, but at the same time highlights the richness of the English term “gallant”. In other passages, it was possible to select different nuances of the word, such as “cavaliere” and “spasimante” – in contexts in which Hillaria uses a very polite albeit always humorous, tone (Tables 1-6 and 1-7):

Table 1-6 Gallant 4 (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 234-5).

HILLARIA. How now, <i>gallant</i> . CARELESS. Oh, madam. (<i>Sings, and walks about.</i>) HILLARIA. You are very merry, <i>gallant</i> .	HILLARIA. E dunque, mio <i>cavaliere</i> ? CARELESS. O, madame! (<i>Canticchia e passeggia.</i>) HILLARIA. Siete molto allegro, mio <i>cavaliere</i> .
---	---

Table 1-7 Gallant 5 (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 250-1).

HILLARIA. Come leave off your sneaking, pitiful love. My <i>gallant</i> has brought some company, let’s dance and be merry. Here they come, strike up music.	HILLARIA. Su, basta con questo patetico amore clandestino; il mio <i>spasimante</i> ha portato compagnia, balliamo, facciamo festa; eccoli, vai con la musica!
---	---

A very different meaning, “amante” (lover), was attributed to “gallant” only in contexts where it occurred in opposition with “marito” (husband) or connected to marriage, as in the following cases (Tables 1-8 and 1-9):

Table 1-8 Gallant 6 (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 266-7).

HILLARIA. I will be your wife, and since I can’t have a <i>gallant</i> before marriage, I’ll do like other wives and have one after. And now I think on’t too, a husband is very necessary, if it is only to save the trouble of being asked questions o’er and o’er, as who’s the father? who got it? And besides, what children the <i>gallant</i> gets, the husband must keep.	HILLARIA. Sarò vostra moglie, e dato che non ho potuto avere un <i>amante</i> prima del matrimonio, farò come le altre mogli e me ne prenderò uno dopo; anzi, ora che ci penso, un marito è proprio necessario, non foss’altro che per risparmiarsi le continue domande: chi è il padre? di chi è figlio? Che poi, i figli dell’amante sarà il marito a mantenerli.
--	--

Table 1-9 Gallant 7 (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 266-7).

<p>HILLARIA. Well, I have but this thing more to say to you: whosoever I choose for my <i>gallant</i>, you are not to quarrel or fall out with him but, on the contrary, to make him your particular intimate friend, to be always inviting him home to dinner, and the like.</p>	<p>HILLARIA. Benissimo: ho solo un'altra cosa da aggiungere. Chiunque io scelga come <i>amante</i>, voi non dovrete discuterci, né litigarci, ma al contrario farvelo amico, amico intimo, e lo inviterete sempre a casa per cena, e via di seguito.</p>
---	--

A similar variation – approached with the same historical-semantic method – was applied to the terms “lover” and “mistress”.

“Lover” was mostly translated as “innamorato” or “inamorata”, with the term “amante” being used only in specific contexts, such as in the tavern scene, where it acquired the current Italian meaning of “lover”.

In the case of “mistress”, the translation fluctuates between “amante”, “amata”, and “signora/padrona”, depending on the register and the social status of the character being referred to. For example, this last was used when the servants Beatrice and Toby are speaking (Table 1-10):

Table 1-10 Mistress 1 (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 132-3).

<p>BEATRICE. What a vengeance ails you both? Well, I'll go inform my <i>mistress</i> how squares go.</p>	<p>BEATRICE. Ma che vi succede a tutti e due? Vabbè, vado a informare la mia <i>padrona</i> di come stanno le cose.</p>
--	---

“Mistress” is instead intended by Lovell as “amata” when referring to his future wife, Jacinta (Table 1-11):

Table 1-11 Mistress 2 (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 118-9).

<p>LOVELL. I have not seen my <i>mistress</i> these three days, and my mind is not composed enough to return an answer to everything you urge. But venture thy body within these doors, and if ever thou return'st the same man—</p>	<p>LOVELL. Non vedo la mia <i>amata</i> da tre giorni, per cui non ho la testa per replicare a ogni tuo argomento. Ma prova a passarci per quella porta e vedi se ne esci come sei entrato...</p>
--	---

Not surprisingly, the meaning of “amante” (lover) is evoked by Careless and Hillaria throughout the text, but primarily in the final scene, in con-

texts where the term serves to make a difference from “moglie” (wife) or “marito” (husband), as shown in Tables 1-12 and 1-13:

Table 1-12 Mistress 3 (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 266-7).

<p>CARELESS. And also, whosoever I like for a <i>mistress</i>, be she maid, wife, or widow, you are to get acquainted with her, to visit her often, to speak in my praise, and tell my good qualities, to commend my abilities, and in fine, to use the utmost of your power to bring us together, gain us an opportunity, and if need be, to watch at the stair head, and in case of necessity, to hold the door.</p>	<p>CARELESS. E inoltre, chiunque io mi prenda per <i>amante</i>, che sia vergine, moglie o vedova, voi ci farete amicizia, le farete spesso visita, e tesserete le mie lodi con lei, snocciolerete le mie buone qualità, elogerete le mie abilità; e infine, farete tutto quel che è in vostro potere per farci stare insieme, anzi, procurerete le occasioni, e se ce ne fosse bisogno farete la guardia sul pianerottolo delle scale, e in caso di necessità ci terrete pure la porta.</p>
--	--

Table 1-13 Mistress 4 (Graziano *et al.* 2024, 268-9).

<p>HILLARIA. He has, as it were, but one <i>mistress</i> the more. Lead away, uncle. Whilst other wives and husbands scold and rant, We two will live like <i>mistress and gallant</i>.</p>	<p>HILLARIA. Diciamo che ha guadagnato un'<i>amante</i> in più: fateci strada, zietto. Mogli e mariti passino il tempo a litigare: Noi due, <i>amanti</i> spensierati vogliamo restare.</p>
---	---

The final passage is interesting from two perspectives. First, because it contains two occurrences of “mistress”, both in the sense of “amante” (lover), the second notably emphasized by its pairing with “gallant”. Second, in terms of the interpretive work done on the play’s title: the Italian translation, “amanti spensierati”, allows for an evocative reading that establishes a direct, circular relationship between the title and the conclusion, linking the beginning with the end.

The original title *The Careless Lovers*, in fact, seems to mischievously strike the right chords to appeal to the late-seventeenth-century spectators by subtly alluding to a potential catalogue of Careless’s women, therefore relating to the play’s theme only indirectly. In this first Italian translation, instead, *Amanti spensierati* celebrates the light and witty tone that characterizes the comedy’s linguistic texture. “Careless” and “lovers”, translated one by recourse to the most historically appropriate sense and the other seemingly literally but pragmatically addressing the modernity that is

starting to capture the attention of the reading and watching audience, provide a distinct synthesis of the method of translation developed and applied to convey, in the target language, the amusing exploits of Edward Ravenscroft's lively characters.

References

- Aston, Guy, *et al.* 1983. *Interazione, dialogo, convenzioni. Il caso del testo drammatico*. Bologna: Clueb.
- Barthes, Roland. 1981 (1963). "Littérature et signification". In *Essais critiques*, 258-77. Paris: Seuil/Points.
- Bassnett, Susan. 1980. *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- . 1983. "Problemi di traduzione di testi teatrali". In *Interazione, dialogo, convenzioni. Il caso del testo drammatico*, edited by Guy Aston *et al.*, 49-61. Bologna: Clueb.
- . 1985. "Ways through the Labyrinth: Strategies and Methods of Translating Theatre Texts". In *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, edited by Theo Hermans, 87-102. Worcester: Billing & Sons.
- . 1990. "Translating for the Theatre: Textual Complexities". *Essays in Poetics*, Vol. 15, No. 1: 71-84.
- . 1991. "Translating for the Theatre: The Case against Performability". *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, Vol. 4, No. 1: 99-111.
- . 1998. "Still Trapped in the Labyrinth: Further Reflections on Translation and Theatre". In *Constructing Cultures*, edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, 90-108. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- . 2007. "Culture and Translation". In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Piotr Kuhiwczak and Karin Littau, 13-23. Clevedon: Buffalo and Toronto.
- Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere, eds. 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- . eds. 1998. *Constructing Cultures*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bigliuzzi, Silvia, Peter Kofler and Paola Ambrosi, eds. 2013. *Theatre Translation in Performance*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- . 2013. "Introduction". In *Theatre Translation in Performance*, edited by Silvia Bigliuzzi, Peter Kofler and Paola Ambrosi, 1-26. Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Baines, Roger, Cristina Marinetti and Manuela Perteghella, eds. 2011. *Staging and Performing Translation. Text and Theatre Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Culpeper, Jonathan and Merja Kytö. 2010. *Early Modern English Dialogues. Spoken Interaction as Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eco, Umberto. 1977. "Semiotics of Theatrical Performance". *The Drama Review*, Vol. 21, No. 1: 107-17.
- Elam, Keir. 1980. *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. London: Methuen.
- Fischer-Lichte, Erika. 2014 (2004). *Estetica del performativo. Una teoria del teatro e dell'arte*. Translated by Tancredi M.M. Gusman. Roma: Carocci.
- Gavins, Joanna. 2007. *Text World Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Graziano, Alba, et al. 2024. *Edward Ravenscroft: Amanti spensierati*. Roma: Bulzoni.
- Jucker, Andreas. 2000. *History of English and English Historical Linguistics*. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett.
- Jucker, Andreas and Irma Taavitsainen. 2013. *English Historical Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Marinetti, Cristina. 2013. "Translation and Theatre. From Performance to Performativity". *Target*, Vol. 25, No. 3: 307-20.
- Morini, Massimiliano. 2012. *The Pragmatic Translator: An Integral Theory of Translation*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- . 2022. *Theatre Translation: Theory and Practice*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Nikolarea, Ekaterini. 2002. "Performability versus Readability: A Historical Overview of a Theoretical Polarization in Theater Translation". *Translation Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 4: <http://www.bokorlang.com/journal/22theater.htm>.
- Pavis, Patrice. 1982. *Languages of the Stage: Essays in the Semiology of the Theatre*. New York: PAJ Publications.
- Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Serpieri, Alessandro, et al. 1981. "Toward a Segmentation of the Dramatic Text". *Poetics Today*, Vol. 2, No. 3: 163-200.
- . 1988. "Libertà e vincolo della traduzione: Per una teoria della traduzione drammatica". In *Metamorfosi: Traduzione/Tradizione. Atti del IX convegno AIA*, edited by Elisabeth Glass, Francesco Marroni, Gabriella Micks and Carlo Pagetti, 37-72. Pescara: Edizioni Clua.

- . 2001. “Tradurre teatro (Shakespeare): La resa linguistica e la trasmissione dell’energia”. In *Teoria, didattica e prassi della traduzione*, edited by Giovanna Calabrò, 159-72. Napoli: Liguori.
- . 2002. “Tradurre per il teatro”. In *Manuale di traduzioni dall’inglese*, edited by Romana Zacchi and Massimiliano Morini, 64-75. Milano: Mondadori.
- . 2004a. “Translating Shakespeare: A Brief Survey on Some Problematic Areas”. In *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Rui Carvalho Homem and Ton Hoenselaars, 27-49. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- . 2004b. “Translation and Performance”. In *Shifting the Scene: Shakespeare in European Culture*, edited by Ladina Bezzola Lambert, Balz Engler, 258-81. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 1998. *The Scandals of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Werth, Paul. 1999. *Text Worlds. Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse*. Harlow: Longman.
- Zuber-Skerritt, Ortrun, ed. 1984. *Page to Stage. Theatre as Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

CHAPTER TWO

AN EXPERIMENT
IN COLLABORATIVE TRANSLATION

IOLANDA PLESCIA

Among Alba Graziano's many achievements is the recent launch of an Italian research group dedicated to Restoration theatre in English, which has just brought out the first Italian translation of *The Careless Lovers*, by Edward Ravenscroft (1673).¹ The founding members of the group had varying levels of expertise in the period, so when it came to deciding on a practical, collaborative debut project, I suggested we translate a playtext that had never been published in Italian (and had been generally neglected, along with its author). An exercise in translation seemed like a good way to gain access to the period and its cultural climate, while performing an act of service to the scholarly community in Italy. The project would also offer the invaluable opportunity of creating a shared paratext in which to explore not only the text itself but the group's translation choices, as well as instances of 'failed' translation, situations in which the original text resists translation, for a variety of reasons. In such cases decisions can only be considered provisional and need to be accounted for. The following is precisely this: a personal account of the rich and rewarding experience that part of the IRGORD group was involved in for well over a year.

One of the main pleasures of collaborative translation for me was the fact that failings and difficulties are shared. Elements that have no direct equivalent in a target text and language often present themselves as culture-specific features, which must be understood and disentangled from their

¹ The *Italian Research Group on Restoration Drama* (<https://sites.google.com/unioroma1.it/irgord/home>). Our translation of Ravenscroft's comedy is *Amanti Spensierati*, translated and edited by Alba Graziano, Fabio Ciambella, Bianca Del Villano, Iolanda Plescia, Valentina Rossi, and Rossana Sebellin (Graziano *et al.* 2024). The present chapter is a revised translation of my contribution to the introduction of that book.

context. They do not always have a solution, in the very basic sense that they cannot be ‘dissolved’ into the new text, but require various adaptation strategies. On the other hand, they can be treated and kept as elements of difference that lead us back to the context which generated them, following a deliberately foreignizing approach. The practice of translation – historically represented as a humble and ancillary exercise, leading to an unoriginal composition performed by invisible servants (Venuti 1995) – can then claim the dignity of a true interpretive act, as George Steiner has it (1998, 1-50). Translators themselves have tended to present their own work following the (sometimes false) modesty trope, as evidenced by Renaissance paratexts rhetorically constructed around the figure of *diminutio*, something close to what we would today call a ‘disclaimer’: but the translator knows full well that his/her work actually involves an assumption of personal responsibility and spirit of service not only toward the text, but also toward its intended audience, whose needs and horizon of expectations must be taken into account. The translator’s task therefore becomes an eminently critical act, one based on its own professional ethics and frequently on underlying theoretical assumptions that, while subject to change and reconsideration, direct final choices.

It is for this reason that I am grateful to Alba Graziano and our research group for this experience of shared responsibility, which we undertook not with a view to saving time, but as a privileged way of reading and understanding the play. In fact, if anything, more energy is spent in group translation, trying to bring individual styles back to a shared vision, one that is as unified as possible if not homogeneous: the researchers involved in this project (Alba Graziano, Fabio Ciambella, Bianca Del Villano, Valentina Rossi, Rossana Sebellin, and myself) are all engaged in textual work in English studies but in different capacities, with varying points of view and interests. Most of us are interested in language and translation, literary linguistics, and stylistics, as well as English literature, but we specialize in different periods, authors and text types. The research subgroup that worked on *The Careless Lovers* brought together experienced translators with people who had translated in the past and then moved on to other research interests; scholars who had studied translation from a theoretical point of view while not practicing it themselves; and even people who had never worked on translation, either in practice or in theory, but were fine textual specialists who brought to the table important reflections on structure, rhythm, and the pragmatic dimension of theatrical communication.

During our translation process, which lasted a little over a year, we asked ourselves practical questions, which I will comment on below, but we also discussed the theoretical premises of collaborative translation at length.

Interestingly, in theoretical translation studies, which have expanded greatly in recent decades, it is only recently that scholars have begun to shed light on a practice as old as time: group translation. For too long, at least since Leonardo Bruni's fifteenth-century treatise *De interpretatione recta*, the translator's activity has been portrayed as a solitary task, a hermit's exercise. This image is reinforced by countless depictions of St. Jerome, translator of the Bible and patron saint of translators, who is almost invariably shown alone in his cell, with just enough light to illuminate his work and a skull nearby as a *memento mori*, a reminder of the futility of even that most glorious enterprise. In Bruni's treatise, as Belén Bistué has argued in one of the books devoted in recent years to the topic of collaborative translation (in this case in early modern Europe), solitary work is considered a guarantee of quality: "a translation, in order to be correct, must be performed by a single person who is an expert in the two languages involved, and [...] this person must be able to both understand the original and produce a new version by himself. This is why, according to Bruni, translation is an intrinsically 'difficult task' [*res difficilis*]" (Bistué 2013, 2-3). But it is precisely because of the intrinsic difficulty of such a task that on the contrary, historically, groups of experts have always been created to collectively tackle different aspects of the same translation: suffice it to think of the 'translation teams' that made the dissemination of ancient scientific and philosophical texts in the Middle Ages possible, translating from Greek and Arabic with the help of experts met or sought out on the road (4). Strictly speaking, the mediated translations that became widespread in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, that is, those in which the translated text was built upon an intermediate source – itself a translation from a language that was even more distant, geographically and culturally, from the target language – can also be considered in terms of collaboration, as well as the working texts and notes produced by interpreters for the benefit of wealthy readers who, thanks to them, were able to venture into lesser-known languages. Advice from outside readers and experts has also always been freely required and given in translation, helping to dispel doubts and address ambiguities in the source texts.

As 'collaborative' translators we can ponder – and have done so in many discussions – the same questions posed in the opening paragraph of the introduction to an important volume of essays devoted to group translation:

If I sit down to translate, alone, finish the task and dispatch my text, does the translating end here? Or does it end once the text has been checked by the reviser, editor, the author, other colleagues or by me again? Are the others who work on my text, publish it, sell it, read it, debate it also translating? Are they part of the translation? What if I sit down to translate, with others?