



Shaping the father figure in post-war society through children's literature in translation

Salvatore Maria Ciancitto¹

¹Adjunct Professor, English Language & Communication, University of Catania, Italy, E-mail: salvatore.ciancitto@unict.it

Received: 01/07/2020

Accepted for Publication: 20/07/2020

Published: 10/08/2020

Abstract

Adult ideology has always tried to shape children's literature in translation according to its inherent main goals, as showed in the didactic and moralistic role attributed to children's literature. Thus, in order to provide books for children which could fit the established canon in those terms of morality and didacticism, texts were subjected to manipulations, which resulted, in the end, in a different text from the original. Indeed, the canon of children's literature provides that a book for children must be didactic and moralistic and teach the children to stay at their place. As far as adaptation is concerned, children's literature has been for long affected by changes that have determined new messages and ideas to be conveyed in the Target Text. Domestication is thus part of translation and not a parallel process. Moreover, domesticating cultural references as much as possible is carried out in order to help the children identify with the characters and better understand the story. In a country like Italy, recovering from war, where foreign cultures were not well known, such a norm was reasonable. This present work intends to focus on the role of children's literature in translation in Italy during 1950s, particularly focusing on Peter Pan by J.M. Barrie as case-study, to point out a way of shaping the cultural and social order of the after-war and reconstruction, in order to identify the dominant ideology and its constraints imposed on children and their literature.

Keywords: Peter Pan, children's literature, translation, ideology.

Introduction: Children's literature and translation

By its own nature, children's literature is a kind of literature which, since its beginnings, has tended to be cross-national and cross-cultural.

As Peter Hunt states (1994:1), children's literature is an area of writing concerning the roots of Western Culture, involving and integrating words and pictures and overlapping with other art forms. Children's books, he adds, are important educationally, socially and commercially. Furthermore, according to Tabbert (2002:307), children's books from foreign countries can be regarded as a political phenomenon, as they make critics aware of the fact that they themselves belong to a certain nation, culture or power bloc. So, they may also ask about the use or the nature of these books. In this view some of the concepts concerning children's literature have been influenced by more recent theories of translation.

In dealing with the translation of children's literature, some of those theories are extremely useful explaining the different issues which come into play when translating for children and help to

demonstrate that children's literature and translation are strongly dominated by the adult world.

As Zohar Shavit (1986) demonstrated, children's literature is a subsystem within the Toury's polysystem theory: since children's literature occupies a peripheral position within the literary system, it holds a low status which allows translators and publishers to manipulate it and change it. In this procedure, the idea of patronage has come into play. Thus, Children's Literature and its translation are the domain of the adult world: adults decide what is to be published and how, according to the current ideology.

The image of childhood and, hence, of its literature has always been dominated by the adults' point of view, according to which children should be educated and guided. That is why children's literature had had a strong moralizing attitude for centuries.

Thus, the concept of ideology can be linked to that of norms in translation: norms and constraints observed in a translated text, in the case of children's books, can reveal the status of a text and its readers. Furthermore, they can explain the reasons why a text was chosen to be translated and published in particular periods of time and what features it had to contain in order to be accepted.

Children's literature and adult domain

Defining children's literature is not as easy as it may seem. If we start from its content, we tend to affirm that a tale for children has as its main characters some children, it contains fantasy elements and plots are free of any direct reference to death or sex, which are considered as taboo according to the adult world, but, above all, a tale for children implies that the book is written for the children who are going to read it.

If we take these simple and superficial elements, we will notice that sometimes they do not match to books overtly belonging to children's literature. We affirmed that from the content a children's book is supposed to have, the main characters should be children themselves, in order to facilitate that sort of transfer which leads the reader to identify with the protagonist of the tale in anyway and find reading pleasant and interesting. If we consider Cinderella or Gulliver, we clearly notice that these characters are not children but adults, the former a noble maiden, the latter a doctor, but the novels in which they are the heroes are righteously part of children's literature. We also mentioned the fantasy element, but if we look at children's books we will notice the opposite. *The Treasure Island* by R.L. Stevenson, clearly written for children, or *Robinson Crusoe*, entered in the genre later on, have no fantasy or supernatural elements. A third feature we mentioned at first is the absence of taboo elements such as death or sex. In Harry Potter's saga, now the most famous children's book, we assist at the death of some characters, whether they are young (Cedric, Harry's friend, in *The Goblet of Fire*) or adult (Dumbledore in *The Half-Blood Prince*). Last, when we define the genre, we assume that the reader is a child, but we can also easily notice that is not always true. An adult can read a children's book for pleasure, as many adults do with Harry Potter's books or other classics, or read the book to a child which is not able to read yet.

Thus, children's literature is an important area of writing, western culture finds its roots in it and it is enjoyed both by adults and children. Very often it involves words and pictures and it mingles with other form of representation such as video or storytelling. The most famous characters of Children's Literature are part of the collective psyche of the people and most of them relate to basic myths and archetypes. Despite all this, it is quite difficult to define its borders.

Defining what children's literature is means to define its borders in the literary world canons. Moreover, it is difficult to define the concept of childhood, as it differs not only culturally but also over time. This is important, since, what a culture thinks of childhood is reflected in the books produced for that particular culture. Very often children's books content is what adults think children can understand or, sometimes even worse, what they should be allowed to understand.

If we consider children's literature as a literature created for children, we should point out that the in this case the audience is made up of children of different ages, with different needs and different abilities. Which makes quite difficult to establish a clear definition of it, according to this feature.

Moreover, to establish its borders implies to define its main purpose: are children's book made to educate or to entertain? Particularly in the past, it was not conceivable that children could read to entertain themselves, and partly it is still conceived so. Usually almost all the books intended for children contained a moral teaching, for this reason many of the fables, of popular origin, were directed to children. Furthermore, books for children were supposed to help them to develop their reading skills.

Thus, it seems clear that Children's Literature is extremely dominated and constrained by the Adult world and this is true, as we will see, from the practical point of view (writers, publishers, translators and buyers are all adults) and from the point of view of the content and the style and above all considering the manipulations that children's literature has suffered along the centuries in order to meet adults' approval.

When Children's literature was once established both in Great Britain and Italy, it had as main feature to teach and educate children, particularly in Italy there was the need to create a social class and the Italian citizen as the country had reached an independence quite late. On the other hand, the moral teaching in British literature for children had a religious and social background, as literature for children was to keep individuals in their place in society.

We must admit that children's literature (including books for teenagers in this definition) is labelled by the adult world as a not serious genre, receiving the definition of romance, in contrast with novel, whose main features is a tale made of concrete and plausible reality (Innocenti, 2000: 12-3). We have seen that children's culture receives from the adult culture elements which had been dismissed and in the same way, children's literature became the elite venue for the romance, dismissed by the arrival of the novel. In the full spirit of *Peter Pan*, growing up means to leave behind all the adventurous and mysterious world and implies the abandon of romance.

Nowadays, children's literature has an ethic component and the choice of texts is almost a moral question. This derives directly from the social use of children's literature, seen mainly as a teaching tool. Thus, children's books may be altered, often in a very extreme way, which could not be tolerated in the literary system. The clearest example is when pieces of the plot are cut out or adjusted for generic educational reasons, ranging from a better comprehension to a real censorship.

The moral aspect is useful to explain the reasons of personal reading choices, which are determined by the role that adults gave to children's literature: giving answers to the meaning of living and solutions concerning the self. Thus, it becomes fundamental for the reader to be able to identify himself/herself with the leading characters of the books, in which young readers may find strong models of behaviour.

Translating Children's literature

As we have seen so far, it is quite difficult to define what is meant by children's literature for the potentially vague nature of the semantic fields covered by the concepts referred to the nouns children and literature. When we try to identify the features of this genre, we find them hard to define, now in general terms we could affirm¹ that firstly, books for children addresses to two audiences: children, who want to be entertained and possibly informed, and, adults, who have quite different tastes (O'Connell, 1999: 208-16). With regard to this aspect, the dominance of the adult in the production process of children's books and the possible ideology which dominates them should be stressed.

Secondly, while some books appeal essentially to only the primary audience, many are what Shavit (1986: 63-91) calls ambivalent texts (which can be read by a child or interpreted by an adult on a more sophisticated level).

Thirdly, children's literature is written by people who do not belong to the target group. Finally, children's literature belongs simultaneously to the literary system and the social-educational system, which means that it is not only read for entertainment but also as a tool for education.

Furthermore, children's literature has tended to remain uncanonical and culturally marginalized, maybe because books for young readers are written for a minority: according to the polysystem theory, the primary target audience is children and they and their literature are treated in

many cultural systems as peripheral.

One of the early ideas about children's books in translation (Klingberg, 2008) was that in translated children's books the integrity of the original work must be touched as little as possible and in a kind of manual for translators of children's books categorised what he regarded as typical deviations from the Source Text. Anyway, there are some deviations which he definitely rejected, such as: modernisation (in his case this only involves the date and time of the story), purification (the deletion of what adults of Target Culture may consider as taboo for children) and abridgements (which may distort the meaning of a text).

Klingberg divides the concept adaptation further into subcategories like deletion, addition, explanation, simplification or localization, where the whole text is transferred into a country, language or epoch more familiar to the Target Language reader. Klingberg also describes antilocalizing (that is another way to call foreignization) as a means of retaining all the information in the original as it is.

Tiina Puurtinen (1991: 278), also remarks how Klingberg starts from the assumption that the author of the original work has already taken the perspective of child readers, their interests, reading abilities and so on and that he calls the extent to which their characteristics are taken into account "degree of adaptations of the source text", which in his opinion should be preserved in translation.

In a general way, Klingberg seems to think that the degree of readability of the Source Text can and must simply be transferred to the Target Text by making some mechanical adjustments. Using Toury's terms, Klingberg can be considered as a strong supporter of adequacy instead of acceptability: he makes no reference to the possibly different norms and conventions of the Source and Target systems of children's literature, which may require different levels of linguistic difficulty depending on the general principles of what is appropriate or useful for the child.

The Israeli literary historian Zohar Shavit (1986) prefers a target-oriented approach to translation. She understands the act of translation as a semiotic concept; thus, translation is understood as part of a transfer mechanism, which is the process by which textual models of one system are transferred to another. In this process, certain products are produced within the Target System, which relate in various and complex ways to products of the source system. Hence, the final product of translating is the result of the relationship that is itself determined by a certain hierarchy of semiotic constraints.

From Shavit's point of view of cultural semiotics, textual manipulations are symptomatic not only of translated children's literature, but of children's literature in general, as it is considered to be a sub-system of a minor status within the literary polysystem (Even Zoahr, 1978).

She starts considering that children's literature was regarded by other systems as inferior, hence most children's books are not considered part of the cultural heritage and national histories of literature barely mention children's books.

As part of a subsystem of the main literary system, then, children's literature is free to be manipulated in anyway. So, she underlines the fact that translators of children's literature can permit themselves great liberties regarding the text, as a result of the peripheral position of children's literature within the literary polysystem and the text is manipulated in various ways by changing, enlarging, or abridging it or by deleting or adding to it.

All this adjustment process is based on two principles which seem to dominate translation for children: an adjustment of the text to make it appropriate and useful to the child, in accordance with what society regards (in a certain moment in time) as educationally good for the child, so based on the didactic role of children's literature; and adjustment of plot, characterization, and language to society's prevailing perceptions of the child's ability to read and comprehend. Of course, these two principles had a different hierarchical relation in different periods.

Riitta Oittinen (2000) believes that translating for children shares one major problem with translating for adults: like other translations, it is anonymous, even invisible. Hence, she stresses the fact that we do not hegemonically think of translators as human beings with their own child images and yet translators cannot escape their own ideologies, which for her means their child images.

Child image is a very complex issue: on the one hand, it is something unique, based on each individual's personal history; on the other hand, it is something collectivized in all society. In fact, the scholar points out that when publishers publish for children, when authors write for children, when translators translate for children, they have a child image that they are aiming their work at.

Notably, she is interested in reading aloud, too, which is characteristic of books for children; then in her work she concentrates on these two central issues in translating for children: reading (silent and oral reading) and the relationship of words and illustration, asking how a translator takes all these different issues into consideration in the situation of translating an illustrated story for children.

In many instances she deals with adaptation for children, which is often considered a key issue in children's literature. Despite the generality of the concept as traditionally defined, adaptation is typically only defined in terms of how it deviates from the original. It is thus taken to be different from a translation, which is supposed to be the same as or in some way equivalent to the original. As a whole, she does not consider them separate or parallel issues: all translation involves adaptation, and the very act of translation always involves change and domestication. The change of language always brings the story closer to the target-language audience. Much of the disagreement, e.g., adaptation vs. censorship, reflects changes in culture and society, our child images, and our views about translating.

A study case: Peter Pan

To the majority of people Peter Pan is the essential Barrie but to get to the real core of the work we should forget Walt Disney's version of the story. Peter Pan's story passed through three distinct stages: a children's story in six chapters carved out of an "adult" novel, a children's play similar in only few respects to the children's story and a children's story in seventeen chapters based closely upon the play and its separately published sequel. Thus, the first origin of Peter Pan is to be found in *The Little White Bird* (1902), in which several plots are enclosed, one in another, and among them the children's story which was to be separately published as *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens*. The different plots are framed by the story of a narrator, never mentioned by name, who is a thinly disguised persona for Barrie himself. The main narrative is not a love story but a conflict of shadow and substance, a rivalry between the Creator-Artist (the narrator) and the Creator-Mother (Mary, the protagonist), in which a writer's literary fantasies are unfavourably contrasted with reality, represented by a living child (Geduld, 1971:55).

Framed by the main narrative is the story of little David's adventures with the narrator and his dog, a St. Bernard whose name is Porthos. Then we see that contained within the David story are two fantasy-tales: one, the Peter Pan narrative in its earliest form; the other, the story of the dog Porthos who was eventually to become Nana of the Peter Pan play and Peter and Wendy. When the dog reappears in those versions, he has undergone a change of sex and name, but his function as guardian is retained. In later developments of the Peter Pan story, Barrie definitely points to an identification of Porthos-Nana with the prototypic father. Mr Darling uses the dog as a substitute for himself by feeding it his own medicine. Mr Darling's faults are evidently those Barrie ascribed to his own father: he is "dog-like" and an unsatisfactory guardian for allowing his children to fly away (Geduld, 1971: 57). In fact, Nana is unable to save the Darling children from flying away with Peter Pan any more than the senior David Barrie was able to save his son David from a fatal fall on the ice.

Compared to *The Little White Bird*, *Peter and Wendy* has a basically simple structure. There are no Chinese boxes here, no fairy-tale digressions within an adult novel. The chapters located within the Darling household and framing the Neverland episodes are integral to the story they enclose. Instead of a series of loosely linked episodes, we now have a coherent children's novel whose three structural divisions – Peter's arrival at the Darling house, the adventures in Neverland and the return of the Darling children – embody the prototypic story stripped from the artist-mother theme previously imposed on it (Geduld, 1975:65).

In its kernel, *Peter and Wendy* turns mainly on the rivalry of Peter and Captain Hook for the possession of the substitute mother, Wendy. Attracted by stories told to the Darling children by their mother, Peter, on one of his flights from Neverland, hovers about the window of the nursery. Peter had first left Neverland in order to return to his own mother whom he had deserted years before. But his return is long overdue as another baby had taken his place and the window was barred against him. While visiting the Darling household, Peter conceives the idea of taking both the stories and Wendy back with him to Neverland where they can be anything, he desires them to be.

Apart from Hook, Peter's relations are mainly with female characters. In one way or another, all the male figures other than Peter and Hook are minimized. Michael and John are relegated to subordinate positions in Neverland; Mr Darling is reduced to the level of a dumb animal. In fact, as Mrs Darling comes off lightly, Mr Darling is presented as a hypocritical ass (Ormond, 1987:104): the head of the household assumes and unjustified superiority to his wife and children, but his lack of moral fibre is everywhere apparent. On the other hand, the female figures who surround Peter are based on inevitable prototypes: the girl-mother, Wendy, the inveterate spinster, Tinker-Bell, and the desirable "blood sister", Tiger Lily.

Peter is in a sense made up out of many people: his origin partly lies in Barrie's dead brother David, but his first name came from Peter Llewelyn Davies, who when still a baby became the subject of stories told by Barrie to the older boys, George and Jack. Though the principal model for Peter Pan is, of course, Barrie himself. Peter is everything that Barrie had been and had become. He is neither child, nor adult, and he is entirely sexless – image reinforced by the fact that the part in all the play's representation was played by an actress. Peter is also an adventure story addict, just as Barrie had been in childhood and had remained.

Children's fiction is very important in *Peter Pan*, where Barrie both draws upon and parodies other writers, such as Stevenson or Fenimore Cooper. The results, however, are very different from those envisaged by the romantics. Instead of growing through discovery, Peter sticks fast to his childhood, he does not develop at all. The unresolved tension between the Peter's role of a hero, as the title suggests, or of a negative figure refusing life is the perennial fascination of the book.

In fact, far from being happy and cheerful, Peter Pan is isolated and from this isolation, his knowledge that he is not a real person, comes Peter's otherwise inexplicable sadness which pervades the play and the novel and provides a great counterpoint to balance the otherwise overabundance of adventures. Again, Barrie is reminding his audience of the limitations as well as the marvels of childhood and of the price that has to be paid by those who choose to remain as children. Though the play is in a sense a celebration of immaturity, it is an awful warning to those who choose to remain immature.

For him, in consequence, there can be non-maturity, no increase in wisdom, no procreation, not even death. Peter is condemned to live out the same events every time a new generation of children follows him to the Never Never Land, as shown in the continuation of Peter and Wendy. On the negative side then, Peter is a victim of his own worship of immaturity; on the positive side, he expresses almost everything that children's literature up to 1904 had been trying to say and do. He is at the same time a child himself and a child's dream-figure, the archetypal hero both of a magical fairy tale and adventure story (Carpenters: 179-80).

Peter Pan in Italy

In Italy some 59 editions of Peter Pan, most of them being re-editions, can be counted. The first translation of Peter Pan dates back to 1922; then during the period between 1940-1950 there are a couple of translations whose main particularities is the way in which the world Neverland is translated. In fact, we find *Peter Pan e Wendy nell'Isola Imaginaria* (object of the following analysis) and *Peter Pan nell'isola di mai* (traduzione di Elda Bossi, 1949)

The 1939 version was translated by Milly Dandolo (1895-1947), a famous writer and translator of her time, and it opens a particular perspective on the topic of this paper.

Children's literature during Fascism is a literature made up of doctrine, exaltation of war myths and rites, the cult of Mussolini and it was intended to increase patriotism in children, as an extension of the programme for adults. There are two main phases in this project: the first, before 1926 and the grip of Fascism upon power, and the second, after 1926, after Fascism had gained power. The first phase then is characterized by idealistic culture, the second appears like a path to a real Fascist culture. In fact, after 1926 children's books underwent strong control, the foreign books translated into Italian were controlled and many magazines and comics were banned (even *Mickey Mouse* was censored). In 1938 a particular commission (*Commissione per la Bonifica Libreria*) was created and in a conference in Bologna, they tried to draw up a strategy of control over book production for

children. The Congress established three basic ideas in the control of published children's books: the child is conceived as naturally Fascist; books for children should represent a serene joy, a source of religious belief and patriotism; and children's literature should be free of foreign books, as they were considered to have a bad influence on children. In a talk, Nazzareno Padellaro produced a sort of list of the most harmful authors: Lewis Carroll, Rudyard Kipling; Louise May Alcott, Jack London, only to mention a few (Boero, 1995:169-71).

In such a cultural and literary environment, from one hand, the presence of *Peter Pan* may look like unusual, as it was a sort of outcast in a series of publications devoted to doctrine, from the other, it may look a sort of new genre for children (as it was in UK), since there was not such a fantasy tradition into Italian.

Probably the acceptance of the book by the regime and the public may be found in the main features of the books recommended for boys and girls: the first characterized by adventures tales and exaltation of war, the second treated the education of girls, preparing them for their role of mothers and wives. It is in this two mainstream that we may find the reflection of Peter, who fights against Hook and the pirates, and Wendy, who is brought to Neverland in order to act like the mother of the Lost Boys.

The 1951 edition of Peter Pan, on which this analysis is focusing on, is *Peter Pan e Wendy nell'Isola Imaginaria (1951)*, published in Italy in the after-war, in a period when the middle class was rising and fundamental was the role of the father figure. It is also part of a series, as clearly stated in the back of the small volume (*Collana dei più noti e ricercati romanzi dei migliori autori italiani e stranieri- A series of the most famous and valued novels of the best Italian and foreign authors [my translation]*), which the hyperbole should grant the quality of the edition. Moreover, in the back-cover is also indicated the range of age for which the book is suitable (*Racconti per bambini – adatti dai 6 ai 10 anni*). What seems unusual in this publication is the translator's name, as he is presented just as Prof. Cattaneo; unfortunately, no references about him were found. Presumably, the choice to put the title in front of the name might be a way to guarantee parents (the buyers) on the quality of the translation, in style and content since it was performed by a teacher.

In this period, after the constraints posed by Fascism, there is a new awareness about children's literature as part of the wider concern about education, even though the question is put in terms of good literature and there is an antagonist attitude towards other media – that would explain the information displayed on the back-cover of *Peter Pan*. What is particularly important, from a literary point of view it is the rediscovery and the use in schools of antifascist and *partigiani* books and maybe the importance of Peter Pan fighting against the despotic Hook is a kind of reflection of this attitude.

Thus, these two translations prove to be different from their cover layout and publications and are treated differently by their publishers, which were respectively Bompiani and Carroccio. Since the first is presented as a book for adults (the cover of the first does not present any picture, while in the third a particular form the Fairy Dance by Arthur Rackham is used), the 1951 version is presented overtly for children (not only the cover displays Peter Pan and Hook in a cartoon like style, but it also contains pictures).

Translation analysis

1 Translation of names

Adaptation in translation, both for adults and children, stems from the desire to collocate the Target Text in a familiar environment for the Readership and in order to do so, as we have shown, the elements more radically changed are names. In the following chart the translation solutions adopted by the translator compared with the original names are shown.

Source Text	Cattaneo
Peter Pan	Peter Pan
Wendy	Wendy
John	Gianni
Michael	Michele
Nana	Nana
George Darling	Giorgio Darling
Tinker Bell	Fata Campanella
Neverland	Isola Immaginaria
Tootles	Flautino
Nibs	Pennino
Slightly	Piumino
Curly	Ricciolino
Cecco	Cecco
Bill Jukes	Bill Jukes
Cookson	Cookson
Gentleman Starkey	Starkey il gentiluomo
Skylights	Skylights
Smee	Smee
James Hook	Giacomo Uncino

Thus, the names of *Peter* and *Wendy* have not undergone any change, this is due to the fact that they are the eponymous characters. Moreover, the second name *Pan* is quite comprehensible and conveys the same meaning of wilderness and freedom Barrie wanted to give; as for *Wendy*, this name was a total invention from Barrie. These conditions obliged to a certain extent the translators to leave it in the original form.

Instead, *John* and *Michael* and also Wendy's father's name changed. A domesticating strategy was adopted probably from the 1939 translation, transforming them into *Gianni*, *Michele* and *Giorgio*. When taking into consideration this choice, we must also remember the language policy in Italy during Fascism. In fact, in those days there was the attempt to purify the Italian language of any foreign influence, a cultivation approach in order to exalt the idea of Italy as Nation, on the basis of the idea of a common language in defining a Country. Thus, this attitude involves also the translation of *James Hook* with a different effect in Italian; while in English, James conveys an air of nobility to the character (as we will notice in his physical description), on the contrary the sound of the Italian name *Giacomo* with the Italian *Uncino* creates a sort of irony and comicity. Concentrating on the translation of *George Darling*, we will notice that its translation follows the indication of the Fascist law translating into the Italian correspondent of *Giorgio*.

Before moving on to examine the names of the inhabitants of Neverland, a few words should be spent on the rendering of the fabulous island. Cattaneo translated the word inserting the word *Isola* (to make clear from the name that it is actually an island), whose solution seems to lose in its evocative meaning, reducing the fabulous place in an kind of children's imaginative world.

The name of *Tinker Bell* seems to come from the word *tinker*, who was a person who did not have a fixed home, but travelled from place to place, usually mending metal pots, and the word *bell*. In fact, they seem to characterize the little fairy as she moves quickly, roaming here and there, as a small light and when she speaks, she sounds like a tiny golden bell. In this case, Cattaneo decides to be more explicit adding to the name the word *Fata* and using the female word *Campanella*.

The origin of the names of the *Lost Boys* is quite interesting. The first to appear is *Tootles*, whose name comes from the verb *to toot* (to produce a whistle with the mouth) which Cattaneo renders with *Flautino*. Somewhat controversial is the name of *Slightly*, whose origin can be traced in the play when he tells that her mother had written his name on the pinafore he was lost in, "slightly soiled". Thus, the translators decided for *Piumino*, maybe to render the adverb *slightly* with a noun

with a connotation of lightness, as it is the case of a feather. As for *Nibs*, it is rendered with *Pennino*. Finally, *Curly* is rendered in the first translations with the name of *Ricciolino*, respecting the origin and the image conveyed. Anyway, what is worth noticing in the translation of the Lost Boys' names is that in any case they have all a suffix denoting sweetness and all of them are diminutive.

For the pirates' names, Cattaneo decided to leave them in the original form, maybe considering pirates as typical foreign elements, with typical English names or anyway accepting to foreignize them.

It is clear that Cattaneo had in mind the early Fascist translations and does not seem to adopt different or particular solutions; moreover, when he refers to children in the story, has the tendency to use diminutives, as it is customary to speak to young children.

2 Syntactical analysis: the opening of the novel

The novel opens with an affirmation: all children, except one, grow up. From the beginning the theme of the novel is made clear and the main feature of Peter is presented without naming the boy yet. It is also clear the presence of a narrator (*I suppose*), which often interacts with its narratees and we will notice that very often we cannot be sure whether the narratees are adults or children. The end of the small paragraph is rather important: it also conveys the spirit of the novel, made of irony and bitterness, particularly in the awareness that we are obliged to grow up and abandon childhood.

In Cattaneo's version there is a clear example of expansion: a new sentence has been introduced and actually there was no need to specify that time goes by. Moreover, it is not clear why the translator decides to use the adverb *circa*/*all'incirca* [*about*] as Barrie states clearly that at the age of two we learn of our destiny. He decides to render mother with the word *mamma*: a diminutive noun often used by adults when speaking to children. Moreover, the last sentence of the paragraph has been deleted: no reference is made to the fact that two is the beginning of the end. I may suppose the sentence was deleted as they could not expect a child to be able to understand the joke.

The first chapter then goes on with the description of the Darlings, focusing the attention first on Wendy's parents and then on Nana, the nurse dog.

The chapter, then, continues with the description of Mr and Mrs Darling and Nana creating a sort of contraposition between the three characters. Mrs Darling is quite romantic and idealistic and from her short description, she does not seem to be really in love with Mr Darling. This man is depicted as being quite mean, instinctively we do not trust him and we perceive he is a kind of shaming figure as he will prove to be further on in the novel. Lastly, Nana, though it is a dog, seems to be the most sensible of the group and she is depicted as the proper nanny. The style of the narration is very informal, using often the adverb of course, so as to underline the familiarity of the readers with the narration and the characters and there is again the presence of a narrator which can be revealed by the pronoun I in the narration.

As we may notice, the episode in Cattaneo's version is shorter and there are many deletions. First of all, the adverbs were all eliminated and also the complete reference to Mrs Darling's mind and the way the Darlings got married is not mentioned. Also the reference to Napoleon is missing, maybe because it was supposed not to be comprehensible for children. The word guesses here is translated with *previsioni*, but it is not clear why. Moreover, the references to the Kensington Garden and to the attitude of Nana of looking into the others' perambulators have been deleted. Hence Nana is missing her main characteristics which make her almost human and connote her. In general there seems to be a strong domesticated strategy which tends towards a neutral background.

The last chapter originally was an added act to the play and it was represented only once in theatre. This episode is central to explain the main theme in Peter Pan, the young hero affirms clearly that he does not want to grow up, refusing, in the dialogue with Wendy and her mother, all that in concrete implies growing up: school, office and a beard. Thus, there is a strong contraposition between Peter and Wendy, who is now in an adult perspective of life and who would like to tame the rebellious spirit of Peter into the adult social conventions. The very last part of the episode shows a new contraposition, where Peter is able to win over loneliness and time, presenting himself to Wendy's future generations, as living a perpetual return. In the end, Peter almost finishes being a

character, assuming a mythical aspect: he embodies the ideal childhood as described in the last line referring to children who are gay, innocent and heartless.

Cattaneo's version presents some deletions and changes. What is striking is the passage from an indirect to a direct discourse, in the question posed by Mrs Darling at first. In this way, the text proves to be simpler for a young readership and this tendency is reinforced in the deletion of the metaphor of the beard whose denotative meaning was of growing-up. I may suppose that even in this case, the translation aimed to be plain in order to be more comprehensible for children aged from 6 to 10 as stated in the back cover of the book. According to this strategy also the expression describing the way Wendy looks at Peter has been changed. In the Source Text we read "with the look on her face that he liked to see on the ladies when they gazed at him", rendered in the Target Text with *espressione materna nello sguardo che piaceva tanto a Peter* (motherly expression in the look that Peter loved so much – [my backtranslation]). Thus, any possible erotic reference is deleted and it assumed that Peter can be looked at and loved to be admired only with a maternal attitude. From a lexical point of view it is worth mentioning the strong use of diminutive (*mamma, stellina, piccina piccina*) which were not present in the original and which have been used because considered as being closer to the language children are supposed to speak.

3 Syntactical analysis: Shaping the father figure

This long episode, taken from chapter two, is rather interesting to underline the strategy adopted by the translator. What can be immediately noticed is the fact that Cattaneo's translation is not a translation, but rather is a sort of abridged resumé of what passes in the original chapter. The episode is revealing of Mr Darling's unpleasant nature: he wants to be the head of the family, he wants to be respected by his loyal wife and by his children but in reality he is inconsistent. The episode of the naughty joke to Nana is quite revealing of this fact and the dialogue between Mr Darling and his children truly clarifies the little respect the children have for him, since they dare to call him coward.

It may be supposed that in Cattaneo's version, the episode must have been deleted and all the dialogue is presented as a funny joke made by a funny father, since it could have been considered as being more educative. In the Source Text the father figure and his respect are at stake and in the end, Mr Darling's figure turned out badly, punishing the victim of his terrible joke, the innocent and good Nana. In Cattaneo's version there is no hint of the dialogue and of the father's reactions. It is highly probable that showing such a scene in a book clearly conceived and addressed to children would have proved to be morally harmful, towards a father figure, hinge of the family.

Captain Hook is depicted by Barrie as a figure able to scare his enemies, a man of great cruelty but despite that of noble origins. He is presented as the worst (or the best!) of his crew, appearing on a chariot and depicted first through his name, of noble origins, James than counterbalanced by his own nickname Jas. His aspect, indeed is of a decayed nobleman, out of fashion, considered the reference to Charles II and the use of words of French origins in the text (*seigneur, raconteur of repute*) conveys an air of elegance, once again in contrast with his cruel manner of conduct and his swearing or his habit of using his hook to kill his enemies.

Even in this case, Cattaneo's version is not really a translation. The episode is clearly shorter than the original and once again it seems he knew the previous Fascist translations, as he translated Sea-Cook in the same way. However, some deletions can be noticed in the passage: mainly the reference to Hook's swearing has disappeared, presumably as it was considered as a bad example to young readers. Then, the cultural references to Charles II or the Stuart have been deleted too; in this case, I may assume, they were considered as being too complicated to be understood by a child. In the end, the result is an impoverishment in the figure of Hook, of which also the nickname is omitted. Even the picture of Captain Hook, like the others in the book, depicts a toddler or a young child dressed like a pirate, as a kind of reference that all about the character must not be taken seriously.

Conclusions

The edition here examined is part of a series devoted to children and that there is the indication of the range of age it may be suitable for: children aged from 6 -10. The idea of the publisher seemed to give a safe product for his consumers, whose contents can be educational and moral, according to the historical line which characterizes children's literature in its development. According to this strategy, besides the age indication we find the title and not the name of the translator (prof. Cattaneo): a way to ensure buyers about the quality in form and content of the translation. Then, following that ideology, the text has been manipulated in many parts: any irony is deleted, as was underlined in the opening of the novel. The episode in which the father's figure is made ridiculous and with no admiration is deleted. The reference to bad behaviour (such as swearing or rejecting school) is deleted, too, with the result of a new Target Text which contains the main elements of the Source Text but with a different ideology. The new one is, indeed, imposed by adults on the children who should bear in mind that a man role in the world is infallible, irreprehensible and this role could never put into question.

Works Citation

Primary sources:

Barrie, J.M. (1991). *Peter and Wendy*. Oxford: OUP

Barrie, J.M. (1939). *Peter e Wendy*. (Dandolo, M. trans.). Milano: Bompiani.

Barrie J.M. (1951). *Peter Pan e Wendy – Nell'Isola Immaginaria*. (Prof. Cattaneo. trans.). Milano: Edizioni Carroccio.

Secondary sources:

Boero P., De Luca, C. (1995). *La letteratura per l'infanzia*,Bari: Editori Laterza.

Carpenter, H. (1985). *Secrets Gardens – A study of the Golden Age of Children's Literature*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Even-Zohar, I. (1978). The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In Venuti, L. (Ed) *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 162-167). London: Routledge.

Geduld,H.M. (1971). *Sir James Barrie*, New York: Indiana University.

Hunt, P. (1994), *An Introduction to Children's Literature*. Oxford: OUP

Innocenti, O. (2000), *La Letteratura Giovanile*, Bari: La terza.

Klingberg, G. (2008). *Facets of Children's Literature Research*. Stockholm: Svenska barnboksintitutet.

O'Connell, E. (1999). *Translating for Children*. in Anderman, G., Rogers, M. (eds), *Word, Text, Translation* (pp. 208-216). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Oittinen, R. (2000). *Translating for children*: New York and London: Garland Publishing.

Ormond, L. (1987). *J.M. Barrie*, Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Puurtinen, T. (1991). Translating Children's Literature: Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Studies", *Translation and the (Re) production of Culture, Selected Papers of the CERA Research Seminars in Translations Studies 1989- 1991*,(pp. 273-28).

Shavit, Z. (1986) *Poetics of Children's Literature*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press

Tabbert, R. (2002). Approaches to the translation of children's literature. *Target*, 14:2, 303 – 351.