It's a Long Way to Piccadilly – Europe on the English Stage

Gunilla Anderman
University of Surrey

In Henry James' review of the first English language production of *Hedda Gabler*, he prophesised that "[W]e shall never take [Ibsen] to our hearts because he is not pleasant enough, nor light enough, nor casual enough; he is too far from Piccadilly and out glorious standards". Henry James' prediction, made in 1891, is revealing in a number of respects. Not only does it tell us that a great writer is not necessarily right, as evidenced by the number of Ibsen productions planned for the centenary of the playwright's death in 1906, it also gives us an inkling of the problems facing European writers on their way to the London stage as well as the time span often required for a foreign dramatist to be performed in English translation and to achieve the status of "honorary British playwright".

For a play to travel in translation from one language to another usually requires some degree of adjustment. The extent to which changes need to be made in order to enhance audience comprehension and enjoyment of a play originating in a different language and culture will, however, vary. If a play travels from a major language such as English into a less well known European language, minimal adjustment may be required as educational programmes and media coverage have made Anglo-American social, cultural and literary references familiar throughout the world. But whatever the degree of adjustment required, transferring a play from one language to another is never just the simple replacement of one word in the

source language by another in the target language. Commenting on early translations of *The Seagull* by Anton Chekhov, Tom Stoppard makes the observation that while these translations may differ on virtually every line, they still share a common approach in that they are as scrupulous as ledgers: everything on the Russian side of the line is accounted for on the English side, sentence by sentence, and the sentences themselves – allowing for the occasional flourish- faithfully carry over nouns, verbs and qualifiers (Cf. Anderman 2005: 22). In short, they are translations traditionally viewed as "literal".

50>51 Stoppard's "ledger principle" may derive its origin from early language methodology whereby translation was used to test students' acquisition of new vocabulary. By reproducing, literally, texts in the foreign language by equivalent words and expressions in their own, students dutifully provided evidence that they had acquired new vocabulary in the language they were learning. Also characteristic of this so-called grammar-translation method, in its heyday in use throughout Europe, was the exclusive concern with the written language. Prior to the breakthrough of modern drama the implications of this approach was, however, of limited importance to stage language as the use of the vernacular was not considered a suitable mode of expression.

When, in 1914, *Pygmalion* opened at His Majesty's Theatre in London, the *Daily Express* took a Charing Cross flower girl along to the Haymarket, loftily reporting her reactions to the amusement of its readers: "Well, I've never 'ad such a night in all me natural..." Offended in particular by the "not bloody likely" in Act 3, the *Daily Sketch* headline indignantly pronounced: "Mrs Patrick Campbell swears on stage and cultured London roars with laughter" (Butler 2001). Clearly, the language of Eliza Doolittle would not find a convincing match in translation into a standard variety of any language and different adjustments would be needed in order to turn her, successfully, into a representative of the social underbelly of whatever country the play would be performed in.

If the original language in which a dramatic work is written is familiar to theatre audiences, changes in translation into English may be relatively few in comparison with translation between a less well known European language and English: this is for instance the case of French-English translation. Introducing his translation of Genet's *Splendid's* at the Lyric in 1995, Neil Bartlett tells us that "this is not a version or an adaptation of *Splendid's*; this is Genet's [French] text done in English" (1995: xvi). In this case the strategy chosen by the translator of taking the English audience to the French text while refraining from any attempt at "Anglicisation" is more likely to have a successful outcome than would a similar approach were the source language to be completely unfamiliar to theatre-goers when a difference in approach may be called for. »

The reasons why the voice of a dramatist writing in another language may not be heard in its unadulterated form in English translation, are many and varied; some are straightforward linguistic, while others are the result of social, cultural and political differences pertaining in the two languages. Included among the linguistic problems is the frequently found fallacy that a literal translation provides the basic raw material to be used in order to shape a play written in another language into a performable English language version. Although options are not normally believed to be involved in literal translation, this is nevertheless often the case. A good example of this is the absence of articles in Russian: *chaika* in Russian means either "a seagull" or "the seagull", *vishnyovyi sad* either "a cherry orchard" or "the cherry orchard" and *tri sestri* either "three sisters" or "the three sisters". When for instance Nina applies the epithet to herself shortly before the curtain goes down on Chekhov's play, she is likely to be referring to "the" bird shot two years previously as well as to the general vulnerability of "an" innocent bird, that is a young girl such as herself, ending up in the firing line of a self-centred cynic like Trigorin. But as in English nouns are preceded by articles, the greater univer-

sality of the Russian cannot be retained and in translation into English a choice needs to be made. For example, in Tom Stoppard's 1997 version of *The Seagull*, the reference to the bird is kept in the definite form (discussed in Anderman 2005: 142):

> NINA: If only I could rest – I need rest! I'm *the* seagull – but I'm not really, I'm *an* actress. Yes.

And later, after she hears the sound of Arkadina's and Trigorin's laughter:

52>53

> NINA: *The* seagull. No, that's *not* me...You remember how you once shot *that* seagull? A man happened to come along and see her, and having nothing much to do, destroyed her? Idea for a short story...Wrong story, though. (Chekhov 2001)

In contrast, Peter Gill chooses to use the indefinite article "a" in both instances:

> NINA: I'm so tired. If only I could rest. (*Raising her head.*) I'm *a* seagull. No. That's not it. I'm *an* actress. Oh, well.

And later:

> NINA: I'm *a* seagull. No, that's not it. Do you remember when you shot a seagull? 'By chance, a man comes along and, for want of anything better to do, he destroys her'. A subject for a short story? That's not it. (Chekhov 1999)

Here Chekhov has used the syntactic resources of Russian to great dramatic effect; the conditions of a particular situation or person may be interpreted as applying to the particular and, at the same time, the universal. In English, on the other hand, the translator must choose between the definite and the indefinite which results in ensuing loss of open-endedness.

In translation between Germanic languages such as German, Swedish, Danish and Norwegian and English, another

type of problem arises, unlikely to be given a solution through the simple replacement of a lexical equivalent. The Germanic language family makes frequent use of a process whereby two words are combined in order to create a new word with a different meaning. While the process does exist in English as in "under" and "ground" combining to provide the name of an urban means of transport, creative formation of new compounds has remained more productive in Germanic languages other than English, which has instead developed in a different linguistic direction making greater use of lexical borrowings from notably French. As a result, while the meaning of two words put together may be transparent in translation, the means to render an equivalent novel concept in English are not always easy to find. For instance, the Norwegian word *liv* (life) may combine with *glädje*, to form *livsglädje* (life-joy). However, a translation into English as "joy of life" loses not only in word economy, being three words instead of one, it also belongs to a different, less elevated style in Norwegian than in English, as does *joie de vivre*, the French loan likely to be provided by a dictionary, *joie de vivre*.[1] In Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler*, the problem of translating this Germanic form of compounding into English is illustrated by Hedda's husband. Tesman's description of Eilert Løvborg as having a high degree of *livsmod* (life-courage), that is "courage to take on life" emerges in a number of English translations semantically inaccurately and dramatically weakened as simply "courage" (discussed in Anderman 2005:97).

In addition to problems involving the lack of lexical and syntactic equivalence between source and target language, considerable social, cultural and political obstacles also come into play. In the case of the European canon, extra-linguistic aspects may frequently be seen to have helped as well as hindered foreign playwrights to reach the English stage. In *The National Theatre and its Work 1963-1997*, Simon Callow chronicles thirty years of National Theatre productions, concluding with a complete list of the nearly five hundred productions

mounted since 1963. Among modern dramatists, vying for the leading position are Ibsen, Chekhov and Brecht, in terms of frequency of performance.

Acceptance of the work of these playwrights on the English stage, now well known to English theatre-goers, did not however, come overnight. In the case of Ibsen, the father of modern drama, the play with which he secured his reputation as a European playwright was *A Doll's House* which dealt with the subject of women's rights. When the play was first published in Copenhagen on 4 December 1879 it was a huge success. The first professional performance in England took place on 7 June 1889, at the small Novelty Theatre in Great Queen Street. Clement Scot, theatre critic for the *Sunday Times*, the *Observer*, the *Illustrated London News*, *Truth* and the *Daily Telegraph*, at the time the paper with the largest circulation in the world, immediately went on the attack, a position that he was to defend staunchly in his response to Ibsen productions on the London stage:

> Having flung upon the stage a congregation of men and women without affection, an unlovable unlovely and detestable crew – the admirers of Ibsen, failing to convince us of the excellence of such creatures, turn around and abuse the wholesome minds that cannot swallow such unpalatable doctrine. (Decker 1952:121)

However, a number of other critics leapt to Ibsen's defence. In the *Star*, A. B. Walker realised that something new was happening as seen from his review of 9 June, 1889:

> What is being done at the Novelty by this little band of Ibsenites marks the beginning of a dramatic revolution. There is a future for the stage after all.

During the 1891 theatre season the battle to get Ibsen's work on the English stage was resumed: *Rosmersholm*, *Ghosts*, *Hedda Gabler* and *The Lady from the Sea* were all staged in

London. However, the reaction to discussing on stage the issues that Ibsen examined in *Ghosts* such as venereal diseases, prostitution, heredity, Darwinism and euthanasia, was such that, as the result of the one performance on 13 March 1891, the producer, J. T. Grein was to gain the title of "the best abused man in London" (Ackerman 1987:143). It was to take some time for *Ghosts* to gain its place in the canon. From the cries of "filth and obscenity" in 1891, to 1928, when a young John Gielgud played Oswald to Mrs Patrick Campbell's Mrs Alving.

Still, in spite of the initial opposition to Ibsen's work, the introduction of the Norwegian playwright writing in a less well-known European language must be viewed as helped by several favourable circumstances: the Ibsenites were a formidable group of supporters including Bernard Shaw, Edmond Gosse, Henry James and William Archer. The latter, also acting as Ibsen's translator, was as luck would have it, bilingual, having spent prolonged periods of his childhood in Norway. Thus in some ways, Ibsen was fortunate: he wrote at a time when the English stage was ready for a new kind of foreign drama, different from the previous customary French imports, and as a result, attracted a band of followers who rallied to the cause. A disciple of Eugène Scribe, the father of the well-made play, Ibsen aired issues on stage that were topical, making structure and content more important than form, leaving the literal translations by Archer and Gosse to be polished, often by English playwrights of future generations.

Much less fortunate, however, was Ibsen's Scandinavian compatriot August Strindberg. Failing to attract the attention bestowed upon Ibsen by his band of supporters, Strindberg had to follow the traditional route available to Scandinavian playwrights: entry to Europe via Germany. During Strindberg's lifetime, German productions of his plays were frequent, the result of the untiring work of Emil Schering, the translator of Strindberg's *Collected Works* that appeared in German between 1902 and 1930. However, Schering never gained sufficient mas-

tery of Swedish to fully grasp, let alone reproduce, Strindberg's innovative use of language. Schering translated literally, word for word, the way he was taught Latin and Greek, and in addition ensured that his German sentences were correctly formed, as he had been instructed at school. In fact Schering's translations contain mistakes of such an elementary nature that they continue to provide Strindberg scholars with a source of amusement (Müssener 1995: 25-34). And in the case of successive translations into other languages from German, it is not difficult to imagine the distortions that must have accumulated by the time the text reached the third or fourth language down the line. In a letter written in 1894, as his international career was starting to take off, Strindberg amused himself by hypothesising about the future of two of his plays about to be translated. The German translations, he speculated, were likely to form the basis for the Italian version which in turn would be used to produce a French text which, when completed, was likely to provide the basis from which the English translator would work. What would happen, Strindberg mused, if, at that point, someone had the bright idea of translating the English version into Swedish and what would be the legal position with respect to the copyright of his own, original version? (Meidal 1995: 20).

Writing in a less well-known European language, the cards were stacked against Strindberg and it is perhaps not surprising that the Swedish playwright has only recently started to acquire an English voice. In Richard Greenberg's version of *The Dance of Death* that opened at the Lyric Theatre on 20 February 2003, full justice was done to Strindberg's sardonic parody on the middle-class marriage, accentuating the humorous aspects of the play. And later the same year, in the autumn of 2003, Patrick Marber's *After Miss Julie* transported Strindberg's original in time and space, moving it from the 1880s to 1945, on the eve of Labour's post-war election victory. Locating the play to an English aristocratic setting, on an occasion as festive and unrestrained as the magical atmosphere of a Swedish

Midsummer Eve, Marber successfully overcame the problem of translating this culturally untranslatable event. Both productions owe their success to new versions, perceptively interpreting the source text for the enjoyment and understanding of English audiences.

More rapid success on the English stage was awarded to Chekhov. For the intelligentsia, World War I had brought about a loss of interest in social issues made popular by Ibsen's plays; instead their attention now turned to Chekhov. To those who regarded the Russian Revolution and Soviet egalitarianism as symbols of a new world order, Chekhov became either a prophet of that order as in *The Cherry Orchard* or a chronicler of decadent bourgeois provincialism as in *Three Sisters*. As a result, Chekhov's major plays in translation initially attracted mainly the interest of the intellectual elite of Edwardian London. However, during the 1920s they gained in popular appeal owing to the arrival in England of Theodore Komisarjevsky, a Russian émigré director highly amused by the "highbrow" seriousness with which Chekhov's work was treated on the English stage. Deciding that the English needed a different Chekhov, Komisarjevsky had Trigorin, Tusenbach and Trofimov played as romantic leads and, in addition, soaked the stage in moonlight or shadowy silhouettes resulting in "an almost underwater atmosphere" (Senelick 1987:294). As we know, the popularity of this bittersweet Chekhov has steadily increased to the point that Chekhov in translation now ranks second only to Shakespeare in the number of English-speaking performances staged. However, to some, this success may have come at a price. According to Susan Bassnett, the acculturation process has succeeded in domesticating the work of Anton Chekhov on the English stage to such an extent that the focus has been shifted away from the Russian-bound aspects of his work. What we now have, she suggests, is a completely English Chekhov, a playwright, invented through the translation process whose work has entered the English literary system (Bassnett 1998: 94).

>>

Political factors which initially played a part in attracting attention to Chekhov's plays on English stages also influenced the introduction of Bertolt Brecht, the German playwright, in translation. As many translators and adaptors of Brecht's work for the English stage bear witness, the process of giving the German playwright a voice in translation has not been helped by the Brecht Estate and the insistence on approval of English versions of Brecht's work. Instead of a process of acculturation whereby the more overt Germanic edges might gradually have been softened, a look at the history of "English Brecht" shows

the playwright's work registering swings in popularity like a barometer reflecting the political climate at a particular point in time. During the politically conscious 1960s and 1970s, Brecht's political agenda was seized by radical alternative theatre companies while during periods of domination of commercially-based theatre such as musicals and light comedies, a play such as the *Life of Galileo* which depicts the struggle of a single individual appears to be more successful than Brecht's more typical ensemble pieces. The first play by the German playwright to be staged by the Royal Shakespeare Company was *A Man is a Man*, which was produced in 1975, directed by Howard Davies, while the National Theatre, in 1965 presented *Mother Courage and Her Children* as well as two adaptations, *Edward II* in 1968 and *Coriolanus* in 1971. It was to take to the move to the South Bank in 1979 until Peter Hall decided to stage *The Life of Galileo*. More recently, however, as observed by David Hare (Johnston 1996: 139) who adapted *Life of Galileo* for the Almeida in 1994 and Ranjit Bolt (1992: 36) whose version of *The Resistable Rise of Arturo Ui* was used for the National Theatre performance in 1991, the attitude of the Brecht Estate appears to have softened, perhaps in recognition of the significance of the fall of Communism, an even that might have made new versions of Brecht's plays necessary if the playwright's work was not to lose interest (Hare 1996: 139)

In the case of drama from southern Europe, the waiting

time for writers working in Italian, Spanish and Portuguese to be given an authentic voice in English translation appears to be even longer than playwrights from the other side of the south/north divide. As a reason for the limited knowledge of the work of Luigi Pirandello in the English-speaking world, less than successful translations of the Italian playwright's work have been quoted:

> Of the plays appearing from 1927 onwards, when the great boom of Pirandello's popularity in Europe and the United States was beginning to fade, little is known, perhaps because in several cases the English translations are so bad as to be unreadable, let alone actable. (Bassnett-McGuire 1983: 6-7)

As in the case of Brecht, copyright restrictions have continued to put obstacles in the way of facilitating the route to English-speaking stages of the Italian playwright's work. Matters have not been helped by Pirandello granting copyright of some of his plays in English translation to the Italian actress Marta Abba, thus restricting their availability for performance on English-speaking stages to a single translation. Although the original period of copyright initially ended after fifty years following the playwright's death, at this point opening a window for new translations of his work, EU legislation has now extended the period to 70 years, reinstating original copyright restrictions. However, the last few years seem to have witnessed a thaw in English performance rights as evidenced by Martin Sherman's translation entitled *Absolutely (Perhaps)* in 2003 as well as Tom Stoppard's 2004 version of *Henry IV* at the Donmar.

A characteristic of recent versions of Pirandello's work appears to be an understanding that the emotional temperature associated with Southern Europe may be pitched at a level more easily expressed by English actors. While in the past, English translations of Italian drama have been characterised by emotional outbursts which have done little more than reinforce national stereotypes, this approach has now started to give away

to a more understated mode of expression. Thus, in a translation of Pirandello's *Naked* by Wiliam Murray dated 1962, Ersilia, the protagonist, expresses her anguish through the use of highly emotional language. However, in the 1998 production at the Almeida with Juliette Binoche in the part of Ersilia in a version by Nicholas Wright, the same sentiments are expressed but within a more understated, English range of emotions.

> GROTTI: (*He goes to her and attempts to embrace her.*) Ersilia. Ersilia.
> ERSILIA: (*Violently, proudly, fending him off.*) No, damn you, leave me alone!
> GROTTI: (*After her, reaching for her wildly.*) No, no. Listen, listen.
> ERSILIA: (*Defending herself.*) Leave me alone, I said!
> GROTTI: (*Continuing.*) Oh, God, let's cling together in our despair. (Pirandello 1962: 57–58)

> (*Moves quickly to her. Tries to embrace her.*)
> ERSILIA: Leave me alone.
> GROTTI: Listen.
> ERSILIA: Don't touch me.
> (*He stays beside her. Perhaps touches her. Gentler now than we've ever seen him.*)
> GROTTI: I sometimes think that sharing grief is the same as love. (Pirandello 1998: 47)

In the case of Spanish drama on the English stage, the problems of transferring in literal translation the plays by Ramón Valle-Inclán are well attested. In 1968, *Bohemian Lights* was chosen by the Oxford Theatre Group as their opening Fringe production at the Edinburgh Festival, the first time a play by Valle-Inclán was performed before an English-speaking audience. According to most critics the production was "shooting at difficult game" with reviews ranging from "controversial", "stunning", "truly haunting" to "theatre of the minority", "harsh" and a "tragedy-comedy" (Zahareas 1976: 38). In a faithfully literal translation by A. N. Zahareas and G. Gillespie

(1976), the play, set in Madrid, contains over 300 footnotes providing information about allusions made to social, cultural and literary aspects and events of the times, not infrequently with 3 endnotes attributed to a single line of translated dialogue. In the case of the English-speaking stage production of *Bohemian Lights*, the problems of translating the play for the English stage were of such a complex nature that in his 1993 version for the Gate, David Johnston decided to relocate the play from Madrid to Dublin. Commending this choice, in his review, Barry Ife found the comparison between Ireland and Spain particularly apt seeing "The move away from a generalised post-Bolshevik disturbances of Madrid to Dublin before the Easter Rising [is giving] extra force to Valle's final vision of the play" (*apud* Johnston 1996: 65). >>

Copyright restrictions have also put obstacles in the way of finding an English voice for Federico Garcia Lorca, a playwright not helped by the political circumstances which cost him his life and also resulted in the absence of his work on Spanish stages during the Franco regime. In 1954, *Blood Wedding*, directed by Peter Hall opened at the Arts Theatre in London in translation by Richard L. Connell and James Graham-Luján, also the translators of *Yerma* which premiered at the Arts Theatre in July, three years later. Sanctioned by the Lorca Estate and further authorised by the preface written by Lorca's brother they were the only translations of Lorca's plays available until 1986, fifty years after the playwright's death, when copyright restrictions lapsed. Unfortunately, not only does the literal rendering of these translations deprive Lorca's peasants of a voice, making his characters sound uniformly middle class, they also give them a type of language never used in conversation between English-speaking people (Edwards 1998:16). These authorized versions of Lorca's plays do not read as if they have been translated but, to quote David Johnston, as if they have "simply been photocopied into English" (1998: 56). Described as "reverential to the point that the source language

is wholly audible beneath the English", it has been suggested that the "officially sanctioned translations (...) performed a great disservice to Lorca in terms of his potential for influencing the English stage" (*Ibidem*: 55).

In conclusion we may note that literal non-actable translations do seem to have a function although not for performance purposes. The first known translation of *A Doll's House* was the work of a Danish school teacher by the name of T. Weber. Published in Copenhagen in 1880, it was dedicated to the translator's country woman, Her Royal Highness Princess
62>63 Alexandra, Princess of Wales. According to William Archer, in his translation Mr Weber emerges as "some gentleman who seems to have conceived that in order to write our language he had but to procure a Danish-English dictionary, look up all the words and take the first meaning that came to hand". Nevertheless, Mr Weber's translation appears to have served a purpose although somewhat different from that intended by its creator. When at the end of the play Nora informs her husband that the only way to save their marriage is if they both change, in its awkwardness, Weber's translation so impressed Harley Granville-Barker that he proposed using it as an entrance exam for female applicants to drama school. If a candidate succeeded in delivering, with true feeling Weber's translated line "cohabitation between you and me would then become a matrimony", they would have given irrefutable proof of their talent" (discussed in Ackerman 1987: 28)

However, in the absence of such ulterior uses of drama translations, language transfer on the stage, in contrast to the page, is usually helped through adjustments in the target text in order to maximise audience comprehension and enjoyment. Although at times seemingly less faithful to the source text, by shifting the focus to the actors and facilitating their means of expression on stage, the original intentions of the foreign playwright might instead, ultimately, be more closely mirrored in English translation. <<

NOTES

[1] For discussion of the use of French derived words such as "apathy" from *apathie* and their inevitable stylistic shift from the vernacular to a different register in English, see Martin Bowman in relation to his and Bill Findlay's translation of Michel Tremblay's *Messe solenelle pour une pleine lune d'été* (Bowman 2000:32).

WORKS CITED

Ackerman, Gretchen P. (1987), *Ibsen and the English Stage 1889-1903*, New York & London, Garland Publishing.

Anderman, Gunilla (2005), *Europe on Stage: Translation and Theatre*, London, Oberon Books.

Bassnett, Susan (1998), "Still Trapped in the Labyrinth: Further Reflections on Translation and Theatre", in Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (eds.), *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literay Translation*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp. 90-108.

Bolt, Ranjit (1992), "Ranjit Bolt inteviewed by Giles Croft", in *Platform Papers*, 1: *Translation*, London, National Theatre Bookshop, pp. 27-40.

Boswell, Laurence (1996) "Interview: The Director as Translator", in David Johnston (1996), pp. 145–52.

Bowman, Martin (2000), "Scottish Horses and Montreal Trains: The Translation of Vernacular to Vernacular", in Carole-Anne Upton (ed.), *Moving Target: Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, pp. 25-33.

Butler, Ralph (2001), National Theatre performance programme for *My Fair Lady*.

Callow, Simon (1997), *The National Theatre and Its Work 1963–1997*, London, Nick Hern Books, in association with The National Theatre.

Chekhov, Anton (1999), *The Seagull*, version by Peter Gill, from a literal translation by H. Molchanoff, London, Oberon Books.
– – (2001), *The Seagull*, version by Tom Stoppard, London, Faber and Faber.

Decker, Clarence R. (1952), *The Victorian Conscience*, New York, Twayne Publishers.

Edwards, Gwynne (1998) "Translating Lorca for the Theatre: *Blood Wedding, Yerma and The House of Bernarda Alba*", *Donaire*, 11, pp.15-30.

Genet, Jean (1995), *Splendid's*, trans. Neil Bartlett, London, Faber and Faber.

Hare, David (1996), "Interview: Pirandello and Brecht", in David Johnston (1996), pp.137-43.

James, Henry (1891), "On the Occasion of Hedda Gabler", *New Review*, IV, June 1891.

64>65

Johnston, David (1996), "Theatre Pragmatics", in David Johnston (ed.), *Stages of Translation*, Bath, Absolute Classics, pp. 57–66.
– – (1998), "Translating García Lorca: The Importance of Voice", *Donaire*, 11, pp. 54–60.

Lorca, Federico Garcia (1955) *Three Tragedies (Blood Wedding, Yerma, The House of Bernarda Alba)*, trans. J. Graham-Luján and R. O'Connell, New York, New Directions.

Meidal, Björn (1995), "'En klok råtta måste ha många hål': Strindberg och översättarna", in Björn Meidal and Nils Åke Nilsson (eds), *August Strindberg och hans översättare*, Kungl., Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien, pp. 11-24.

Müssener, Helmut (1995), "'Det är synd om...': Strindberg och de tyska översättarna", in Björn Meidal and Nils Åke Nilsson (eds), *August Strindberg och hans översättare*, Kungl., Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien.

Pirandello, Luigi (1962), *To Clothe the Naked and Two Other Plays*, trans. William Murray, New York, Dutton & Co Inc., pp. 57-8.
– – (1998), *Naked*, adapt. Nicholas Wright, from a literal translation by G. McFarlane, London, Nick Hern Books.

Senelick, Laurence (1987), "Stuffed Seagulls: Parodies and the Reception of Chekhov's Plays", *Poetics Today*, 8, 2, pp. 285-98.

Valle-Inclán, Ramon del (1976), *Luces de Bohemia*, trans. A. N. Zahareas and G. Gillespie, with an introduction and commentary by A.N. Zahareas, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.