TIME-SHARING ON STAGE

Drama Translation in
Theatre and Society

Sirkku Aaltonen

Time-Sharing on Stage

TOPICS IN TRANSLATION

Series Editors: Susan Bassnett, University of Warwick
Edwin Gentzler, *University of Massachusetts, Amherst*

Editor for Translation in the Commercial Environment:
Geoffrey Samuelsson-Brown, *Aardvark Translation Services Ltd*

Other Books in the Series

Annotated Texts for Translation: French — English
Beverly Adab

Annotated Texts for Translation: English — French
Beverly Adab

'Behind Inverted Commas': Translation and Anglo-German Cultural Relations in Nineteenth
Century
Susanne Stark

Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation
Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere

Culture Bumps: An Empirical Approach to the Translation of Allusions
Ritva Leppihalme

Linguistic Auditing
Nigel Reeves and Colin Wright

Paragraphs on Translation
Peter Newmark

Practical Guide for Translators
Geoffrey Samuelsson-Brown

The Coming Industry of Teletranslation
Minako O'Hagan

The Pragmatics of Translation
Leo Hickey (ed.)

The Rewriting of Njáls Saga: Translation, Ideology, and Icelandic Sagas
Jón Karl Helgason

Translation, Power, Subversion
Román Alvarez and M. Carmen-Africa Vidal (eds)

Words, Words, Words: The Translator and the Language Learner
Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers

Written in the Language of the Scottish Nation
John Corbett

Time-Sharing on Stage

Drama Translation in Theatre and Society

Sirkku Aaltonen

Contents

Acknowledgements

Introduction

Translation promises to open for us a window on the world, but we do not always seize the opportunity to look out. And even if we should manage to steal a glimpse of the 'Other' out there, we still only see what we are prepared to see, and what falls in line with the narrative we have chosen. Maybe translation is not a window on to the secret garden of the foreign at all, but one on to the multitude of texts which can be used to serve everyone. These texts are surrounded by other texts, and get their shape from them. They are not self-sufficient or independent of context and reception. Foreign drama may not be introduced into domestic repertoires so as to show foreign texts in the light of contemporary domestic issues, but rather domestic issues are presented in the light of foreign texts. [1]

If we pursue the mirror image, it can be argued that in contemporary Western theatre, as in literature, translations almost as a rule function as mirrors which are held up to our own image, and although at their best they show us fragments of the rest of the world, we feel safer if those fragments are familiar. Familiarity supports the myth of authenticity, which is important when realism is the dominant narrative, and makes acceptance easier. If, however, we see translation as an inherently selfish activity, which even at its best can only produce cultural hybrids and vaguely suggest that there is something unlike ourselves out there, we can view texts as endless chains in which two loops can never be exactly the same. So instead of one *Waiting for Godot* we would have as many different 'Godots' as there are productions which would make the play a fetishised cipher through which varying groups could claim authenticity or legitimacy for particular social or cultural platforms (Healy, 1997: 214).

Whichever of the above ways to view translation activity is adopted, the study of translated theatre texts brings out a variety of reflections and images generated by their historical context. The selfish motives behind decisions to translate are evident. The first Finnish translation of *Macbeth* was completed in 1834. The translator renamed the play *Ruunulinna* according to its Finnish protagonist and his castle, and reset the story in Finland with Finnish characters and allusions. The image was that of Finland and her history, and the issue was the acceptance of Finland among the other civilised cultures in Europe.

However, the play never gained the approval of contemporary theatre practitioners, and even publication in printed form was carried out at the writer's own expense. The image was not acceptable to the contemporary literary or theatrical systems. Another Finnish translation of the same play some 30 years later chose a different strategy, and followed its English source text very carefully in terms of both the dramatic structure and the metre. This time the play was accepted for publication in printed form, and hailed as the first 'genuine' Shakespeare translation into Finnish. The image in the mirror satisfied the queen.

Towards the end of the twentieth century, Finnish theatre audiences are being offered translations of Shakespeare's plays which use only some 30% of the dialogue of the 'original' play, or which recast and reset the plays. A contemporary production of *Romeo and Juliet* in Bulgaria was largely silent, and the players mimed the parts. They presented the play through performed actions which they occasionally punctuated with a few of the most significant speeches delivered at high speed. The Montagues were portrayed as Ottoman Turks and the Capulets as Bulgarian Communists. A 1992 Croatian production of *Titus Andronicus* cut scenes and shifted around others to address the contemporary Croatian political and social climate (Healy, 1997: 206, 223, 228).

In 1906 in Ireland, Lady Gregory introduced Molière to Abbey Theatre audiences in her own Kiltartan dialect as part of the Irish literary revival and in more recent times, Martin Bowman and Bill Findlay have succesfully introduced plays by the Canadian Michel Tremblay in the Scottish theatre in Scots. In the 1980s, the Suzuki Company of Toga in Japan shortened Chekhov's *Three Sisters* to an hour's performance. When Shakespeare's plays were performed by the Parsi theatre in India in the first decades of the twentieth century, the most common additions to them were songs and dances. Favourite songs had to be sung over and over again to please the audiences (Loomba, 1997: 119).

The above are examples of intercultural theatre, of exchanges and encounters between cultures, of how theatres seize texts from other cultures, share them, move into them and make them theirs. They illustrate ways in which texts have been integrated into indigenous repertoires, but they also represent the various codes [2] which govern the discourse of theatre translation. Foreign source texts express a variety of codes – the linguistic and the socio-historical as well as the cultural and theatrical – that govern their discourse and give it its specificity Since in translation these codes are interpreted and redirected to express the codes of the target society, they may help to

explain why a particular translation strategy has been given priority over another, or why a particular strategy may have been rejected at some point but become accepted at another. The understanding of these codes helps us to read images in the mirror.

The discourse of a translation, resulting from the choice of a particular strategy, thus draws its specificity from its context. It may express, for example, a spatially and temporally specific reaction towards a particular foreign culture, a comment on the indigenous theatre, culture and language, or a response to foreign generic or theatrical conventions. What is common to all theatre translation, however, is that theatre texts, more than perhaps any other genre, are conceived for a particular context – the immediate here and now. The ephemerality of a stage production is a direct result of an ongoing process of interpretation and redirection of the codes written into the original playtext (Johnston, 1996a: 11).

The importance of various contextual codes for theatre translation means that scientific models promoted by linguistics-oriented approaches are insufficient for the study of what goes in it. The problem with these models is, according to Venuti (1998: 25), that language is defined in them as a set of systematic rules independent of cultural and social variation, and translation is therefore studied as a set of systematic operations independent of the cultural and social formations in which they are executed. However, theatre texts are so closely connected with their historical contexts that by ignoring this, scientific models exclude very important variables from their explanations.

The distinction in translation studies between a linguistics-based orientation, aiming to construct an empirical science, and an aesthetics-based orientation which emphasises the cultural and political values informing translation practice and research (Venuti, 1998: 8), echoes the difference which obtains between 'thin' and 'thick' description, suggested by Clifford Geertz for cultural analysis. According to Geertz (1973: 6–7, 10, 20), the two approaches can be illustrated by the example of an event where 'two boys are rapidly contracting the eyelids of their right eyes'. A thin description would approach the phenomenon as 'the boys rapidly contracting the eyelids', whereas a thick description of the same event would refer to it, for example, as 'the boys practising a burlesque wink'. A thick description thus explores the structures of signification and attempts to determine their social ground and import, and Geertz argues that cultural analysis is (or should be) guessing at meanings, assessing the guesses, and drawing explanatory conclusions from the better guesses. The thing to ask about a 'burlesque wink' is not what its ontological status is; it is the

same as that of rocks and dreams – it is a thing of this world. The thing to ask is what its import is: what it is that, in its occurrence and through its agency, is being said. When foreign texts are rewritten from within a new context, their choice and translation strategy are the agencies for a range of codes. What is actually being said through these agencies is at least as interesting as, if not more so than, the mechanics of the agencies.

The interest in what follows is directed functionally towards translated texts which have been intended for use, or actually been used, in stage productions. This specification is important, as theatre translation is not necessarily synonymous with drama translation. Not all translated drama is produced or intended for production on stage, and some may exist only in the literary system as printed text. Since the time of Seneca, closet drama has been intended primarily for private reading rather than production. Similarly, many outdated dramatic texts have become elements of the literary system and are no longer produced on stage. The theatre does not necessarily use dramatic texts, and dramatic texts can also exist outside theatrical systems. Although drama and theatre are interrelated concepts, they have to be kept separate as they do not refer to the same phenomenon.

The study of strategies employed in theatre translation shows that while some texts follow their sources carefully and translate them in their entirety, others involve degrees of divergence from them through omissions and additions. Theatre translation thus also comprises imitations, which, while openly admitting that they are creating a new play around some idea or concept from the foreign work, still rely on the recognised intertextuality between the two. Some scholars might want to confine the last two strategies to the sphere of theatre praxis rather than to that of translation, but in this text the decision has been taken to include them, because their exclusion would have left a large and important part of translation work in the theatre outside the analysis. Theatre translation as a genre traditionally employs 'adaptation' (Berman in Brisset, 1996: xvi), which is a 'practice almost as old as the theatre itself' (Harrison, 1998: 10). [3]

The study of theatre translation is an integral part of the study of theatre, although so far translation studies and theatre studies have seldom joined forces.[4] The term *intercultural theatre* is used throughout this book to encompass the movement of foreign dramatic texts between different cultures, although some scholars have suggested restrictions in the use of this term and felt that the term still remains largely undefined. That translation and general theatre studies should not be separated shows in the order of the contents of this book. The

first chapter approaches theatre translation primarily from the point of view of theatre studies and theatre history, and starts with a discussion of the types of interaction within and among theatrical traditions and the terminology used to describe it. Intercultural theatre, if its content and scope can be agreed on, can be distinguished from other related concepts on the basis of the aims and forms of the exchange between the cultures involved in it. The conflicting reactions of theatre practitioners and critics to intercultural theatre can be understood on the basis of their assumed motivation and aims: the proponents of intercultural exchanges believe that they can increase understanding between different cultures and help to create new theatrical forms, whereas the opponents often come from cultures which may have suffered from contact with other, dominant cultures. They therefore focus on the damage that hegemonic cultures with their better financial facilities can cause.

The study of translated theatre texts typically draws its material from the text-centred theatre, which is the dominant theatrical form in the Western logocentric tradition. However, other forms of making theatre have existed in the West besides that, and the use of texts is not confined exclusively to the Western theatre either. The exchange of dramatic texts has a long history, and theatre texts have been common property ever since antiquity, as indigenous repertoires have been complemented by foreign drama for various reasons. This has been the case in both the Eastern and Western theatre traditions, although the movement between the two traditions has been often uni-directional.

The second chapter approaches theatre texts from the point of view of translation studies by setting up the methodological framework within which theatre translation can be studied. Entire cultures and theatres are systems which display both intra- and inter-systemic regularities in their behaviour. These systems are larger and more powerful than the individual elements in them, and therefore it can be claimed that translators who carry out their work within these systems in a particular time and place do not act as independent individuals. Instead, their behaviour can be understood against their membership of a specific culture and society, working for a particular stage at a certain point in time. A theatrical system is a living organism coexisiting in a symbiotic relationship with other social and cultural systems. It provides the material basis for theatre translation, and is a complex network of subsystems, mainstream and fringe theatres as well as various consumer and producer organisations.

The focus in the study of theatre translation falls here on the

translations rather than their source texts, although this would not necessarily need to be the case. Theatre histories abound in examples of how the interest abroad in some aspects of the source culture has created or contributed to the popularity of a particular genre. For example, in the middle of the nineteenth century, theatres in various parts of colonial India performed both English and Indian dramatic classics. The almost forgotten corpus of Sanskrit drama was 'restored to a reputation of classical excellence because of the praises showered on it by Orientalist scholars from Europe' (Loomba, 1997: 115).

Translation is inherently ethnocentric and discriminating in the ways in which it constructs the 'realities' of foreign theatre texts. The different realities on the basis of one and the same source text are possible because meanings are constructed from texts, like rewritings of the myth of Pandora's box, a cornucopia that contains all the provisions to feed mankind (Littau in yon Flotow, 1997: 45). Readers, translators, directors, actors, designers and technicians all construct their own readings, which are then coordinated in the stage production for audiences to use as a basis for their meaning construction. Not only are different readings a characteristic of texts; they have their origin in the readers of these texts as well. Social and cultural changes have made it more and more difficult for people to read the world in even remotely similar ways. As societies have become more heterogeneous and their boundaries both socially and culturally more blurred, the number of codes used for encoding and decoding has increased, and decoding has consequently become more difficult (Fiske, 1993: 107). Although copyright law aims to make an attempt, readings are difficult to monitor, and 'any work of art, once it has left its creator's hands, is simply there to be read and interpreted' (Esslin, 1994: 15). One and the same reading may therefore not be self-evident to all spectators, and to some there may be no obvious reading on offer at all. The reading may also be inferred from the style of presentation.

Venuti (1998: 4) has called the greatest scandal of translation the asymmetries between cultures involved in the exchange. These asymmetries are part and parcel of theatre translation as well, not only in the inherent ethnocentricity of the activity, but also in that not all texts in all systems are affected by them in the same way. In order to understand the workings of various subsystems, the framework provided by systems theory to the study of theatre translation can therefore be supplemented with a cultural studies model which can explain the behaviour of systems in a hierarchical relation to each other. So while the systems model helps scholars to analyse

translations on the basis of characterising systems as either strong or weak, additional considerations may be needed to take into account both the fragmentation of the target system and the intra- and inter-systemic hierarchical relationships which obtain between mainstream and fringe theatres and between source and target cultures. The choice of a translation strategy; and what is being said through its agency; is regarded as a function of the receiving theatrical cultural and social systems and their view of their position in cultural hierarchies.

Theatre texts, and therefore also their translation, do not necessarily follow the same rules as texts in a literary system. As theatre translation may use strategies which would not be acceptable in contemporary literary translation, a number of justifications have been developed in their defence. The most common explanation for the decisions and choices made usually involve concepts such as 'speakability' and 'playability' (or 'performability') as well as the more generic 'requirements of the stage', but their reference has not been agreed on much beyond claims that speakability does not mean simplicity and that it somehow involves the use of rhythm. Another terminological confusion in the discussion and analysis of theatre translation concerns the use of attributes such as 'free' and 'faithfu', borrowed from descriptions of translations in the literary system. Most important, ambiguity and cross-purposes are introduced into descriptions through labels such as 'adaptations' and 'literary' ('scholarly' or 'academic') translations, and these modifiers are frequently used even though their point of reference remains unclear. Adaptation', for example, is used to refer both to translations which only make partial use of their source text and to those which have been written to follow the constraints of the theatrical, not the literary; system.

The third chapter forms the core of the analysis of the regularities between the underlying codes and the types of intertextuality involved in the choice of translation strategies. The reason for the choice of foreign theatre texts can always in some way be traced back to the receiving system, and therefore the term *productive reception* is adopted here as a technical term to describe important aspects of theatre translation, such as compatibility; integration, and translation as expressive of an attitude towards the alterity of translation work in intercultural theatre.

Foreign theatre texts are chosen on the basis of their compatibility with the discourses or discursive structures which either are in line with those in the target society or can be made compatible with them. Acculturation and naturalisation are strategies used to bring foreign

texts in line with the conventions of the receiving systems. Inevitably the bias leads to 'misrepresentations', which are only gradually becoming an important theme in Translation Studies.

A theatre production is always closely tied to its own specific audience in a particular place in a particular point in time, and in consequence, when a foreign dramatic text is chosen for a performance, the translation as well as the entire production unavoidably represents a reaction to alterity The Other in the form of a foreign source text may represent desirable cultural goods. It may be of symbolic value or give domestic issues universal qualities, but it may also epitomise a threat. The translation process always involves an effort to adjust them to the aesthetics of the receiving theatre and the social discourse of the target society

The translation strategies by which foreign texts are integrated into the repertoires of the target theatre and made part of the discourse of the target society fall roughly into three categories: texts may be translated in their entirety; or only partially with various types of alteration; or they maybe based on some idea or theme from the source text. If the source text is translated in full, the attitude expressed through the agency of the translation strategy is that of reverence. Reverence characterises the choice of both the text and translation strategy when the 'Foreign' represents desirable cultural goods; the foreign text is not seen to need any, or at least very little, adjustment to the discourses of the target system and society The hope is that the translation will carry over some of the qualities of the source text and the culture it represents into the target system. When the foreign source texts are seen primarily as material for the indigenous stage or expressive of domestic issues, they are subverted to serve the needs of the target system and society through strategies which rewrite them to fall in line with the discourse of the target society They are adjusted through being adapted to the aesthetics of the theatre – which may include aesthetic considerations as well as systemic conventions and constraints of the media or ideological issues, such as world views. The mode of translation in adaptations is either rebellion against fixed models or lack of interest and therefore disregard of the specificity of the Foreign. Alterity is either disguised or not highlighted, and considered to be of secondary importance. Adjustments are justified either for the sake of the art or for the sake of the community

The sections in the final chapter consider the translator as author and discuss the problematics of copyright law. The law was introduced partly in response to printing technology and therefore its prerogatives do not always suit the pragmatics of oral texts. The

translator's right is subordinate to that of the author, as indebtedness to somebody else's work is seen as a handicap in the Western way of looking at art and literature. Copyright law is characterised by this same patriarchal anxiety of influence in deciding who qualifies as an author. In consequence, the indebtedness of a translator's work to that of a foreign playwright tips the balance in favour of the latter, who is granted unrestricted power over the text. The theatre is by nature a collaborative art form, with equal investment of labour from both the foreign writer and the translator. Both derive their work from different materials for different audiences. Copyright law, whose main concern is to define cultural work as a tradable commodity, does not recognise this. Instead it establishes a hierarchy where indebtedness to somebody else's work decides the value of the work. I challenge the foundations of copyright law and support the concept of collective authorship. Translators are gradually becoming accepted as a species of author – creators whose work deserves the same recognition as that of their foreign counterparts, the playwrights. Texts circulate on the market in a variety of ways, and the time has come to replace hierarchy with connection.

The title of this book comes from the French philosopher, Michel De Certeau (1984: xxi), who has compared texts to rented apartments where tenants may make comparable changes to their living quarters. Like tenants, translators as readers redecorate texts when they move into them. Words become the outlet or product of silent histories when the reader's world slips into the author's place. Throughout history, the time-sharing of texts has been an important aspect of intercultural theatre and, for a brief moment, each at a time, translators and other theatre practitioners have occupied foreign texts as tenants. Some texts may have been expected to look as if nobody was visiting them or, even if somebody called, as if the texts had been left untouched. Others have been allowed or even encouraged to bear the marks of the lodgers. Translated texts can therefore be approached and studied in relation to their tenants, who have responded to various codes in the surrounding societies and through this response integrated the texts (or failed to do so) into the entire sociocultural discourse of their time.

The journey into the labyrinth can begin.

Notes

1. This view has been suggested by Thomas Healy (1997: 213–214) to describe Shakespeare appropriations in Europe.

2. Annie Brisset (1996: 5) quotes André Belleau and defines the term 'code' as' that which in a message (or in a text) is identified as a function of choice, an imposition of constraints of various kinds at various levels'. I apply the same definition here.

3. Annie Brisset's suggestion, that translated theatre texts should also include those scripts where only some parts of a work have been translated while other parts have vanished and undergone various types of alteration, is a useful one. She includes in this category of *adaptations* both reactualisation and imitation, where reactualisation entails the spatial and sometimes temporal transposition of a foreign play. Imitation is the most radical form of adaptation which produces a new work in its own right where the original work survives only as an intertext (Brisset 1996: 12).

4. An effort to do so can be seen in the establishment of the Performance Translation Centre at the University of Hull in 1997 which, according to its publicity leaflet, aims 'to identify and examine issues related to the transfer of dramatic material from one language and culture to another'. However, its scope of study comprises the entire theatre event, not only the written element in a performance. The way the centre uses the term 'translation' in the leaflet suggests that it refers to the process of transposing a written text into a performance, which is, Bassnett claims (1998: 94), a common usage of the word in theatre studies in English.

Chapter 1—
Intercultural Theatre

As interaction between theatres has taken place throughout history, the problems of defining what constitutes *intercultural theatre* are largely academic, and often related to finding a conceptual framework for research. In order to find suitable tools, such as workable definitions of culture, for their analysis, contemporary Theatre Studies' scholars have often turned to the related disciplines of anthropology and sociology for descriptions of the cultural basis of theatrical interaction.

The research approach of a contemporary theatre semiotician, Patrice Pavis, for example, has been inspired by the work of Camille Camilleri, Clifford Geertz and Claude Lévi-Strauss, and his model of the different strands of theatrical exchange owes a great deal to the studies and writings of these scholars. With reference to Camilleri's concept of culture, Pavis also (1996: 2–5) views culture as a system of significations which allows a society or group to understand itself in its relationship with the world. Culture marks our representations, feelings and activity, that is, every aspect of our mental life; and the cultural order, which must be distinguished from the natural order, is created by human art and transmitted by social heredity.

On a theatre stage, culture affects every element of production, and, for example, the dramatic text accumulates innumerable layers of sediment resulting from various languages and experiences, which it brings together in a new text. This is a long-term process, as Eugenio Barba (quoted in Pavis, 1996: 4) has remarked: 'What lasts for only a short time is not theatre, but spectacle. Theatre is made up of traditions, conventions, institutions and habits that have permanence in time'.

Intercultural theatre then, according to Pavis (1996: 5), is one of the possible exchanges between theatres and cultures, and should be approached by distinguishing its sphere from those of other concepts with which it is often implicitly associated. These concepts cover several varieties of theatrical activity and illustrate the configurations where theatre can be found both diachronically and synchronically at the crossroads of cultures with the self-pronounced aim of pursuing

the search for not only other, new forms of theatre, but also old forms which have long since become extinct. It becomes obvious in reading Pavis' account, as he himself (Pavis, 1996: 1) also points out, that intercultural theatre has still not been established as a recognised territory or a new genre with well defined borders. It might therefore be advisable to follow his advice, and look at some theatrical interaction as 'intercultural exchanges within theatre practice' rather than 'intercultural theatre' which is emerging from the synthesis of heterogeneous traditions.

As the focus of this book is restricted to the movement of texts between cultures in the narrow field of translation in the text-centred tradition, the problems of defining 'intercultural' are somewhat marginal to it. However, when the term 'intercultural' is used later as an attribute to refer to the way theatre texts move across borders, the reader should be aware of the terminological imprecision or vagueness of the concept, and the many ways theatre and culture can be interwoven.

At the Crossroads of Cultures

Intercultural theatrical exchanges can be related to various aspects of culture, and we can distinguish between these exchanges on the basis of which aspect of culture they are most interested in. The distinction proposed by Pavis (1996: 5–7), discussed in this section, is useful primarily for the understanding of the variety of ways theatre and culture can be interrelated, but it also makes it easier to find a more precise and restrictive meaning for the term 'intercultural' by narrowing it down to the hybrid forms which emerge when performance traditions from distinct cultural areas are brought together voluntarily (Pavis, 1996: 8).

According to Pavis (1996: 5–10), we can find different ways in which the aims and direction of the work of theatre practitioners may relate to the idea of culture. [1] In *intracultural theatre*, which is the counterpart of intercultural theatre, practitioners search for national traditions. By so doing, they are hoping not only to define their own theatre better in relation to external influences, but also to understand more deeply the origins and the transformation of their own culture. The work of the French actor—director Jacques Copeau and his stage manager Louis Jouvet, who were among the most important figures of the French theatre in the years before the Second World War with their '*Théâtre du vieux-colombier'*, is an example of intracultural theatre. The plays of the Italian dramatist and actor—manager Dario Fo and, in

Oriental theatre, the research of the Japanese Butoh belong to a theatre which addresses aspects of the indigenous culture. Intraculturality is also an important aspect of the ways in which the old traditions of Noh and Kabuki have been used for the modern Japanese stage. According to de Poorter (1993: 59–60), although a hundred years ago it looked as if the art of Noh and Kabuki would be swept away by new Western fashions, the traditions have asserted themselves. Noh and Kabuki actors have brought to life old plays obsolete for centuries and introduced old elements into current plays. Some new Noh and Kabuki plays may not be based on old themes, but they are still performed in the Noh and Kabuki manner, and there are modern plays (such as those by Yukio Mishima) in which the themes derive from Noh.

Intracultural theatre does not cross its own cultural boundaries, whereas *transcultural theatre* does – proposing to go beyond particular cultures on behalf of a universality of the human condition. Transcultural directors are concerned with traditions only in order to grasp more effectively what they have in common and what is not reducible to a specific culture. Pavis (1996: 6) mentions the work of Peter Brook and his search for what connects people beyond and beneath ethnological and individual differences as an example of transcultural theatre. Transcultural aspirations are also important for a great deal of interaction in the contemporary Western text-based theatre in that the choice of dramatic texts for translation is most frequently motivated by a perception of the existence of some common ground in how the audiences perceive reality and how they relate to it. The different strands of realism [2] – empiricist realism, relating to our perception of observable reality; emotional realism, relating to our subjective experience of it; and ethical realism, relating to our understanding of what is just may decide whether theatre texts from foreign cultures are accepted or rejected.

In some respects Brook's work approaches Pavis' definition (1996: 6) of *ultracultural theatre*, in that it may involve the search for some ontological original and mythological lost purity of the theatre. Ultraculturality signifies a movement of return to the roots, the authentic rite and ceremony, on the assumption that there exists a common human substratum, whatever cultural elements have been imposed upon it. Antonin Artaud's fascination with Oriental theatre, inspired by a performance of a group of Balinese dancers, can be read as a desire to get closer to the mythological source of the art. Artaud discarded language in favour of symbolic gesture, movement, sound and rhythm, whereas Brook's *Orghast* employed a musical iconic

language which had been assembled from ancient languages. While Artaud envisaged a theatre which would free the unconscious and mark a return 'to a state of primitive ferocity and power' (Hartnoll, 1990: 36), Brook wanted to reconstitute a universal language of the senses and the emotions. As a further example of ultracultural theatre, Pavis (1996: 6) gives Andrei Serban's *Medea* and *The Trojan Women*, in which the Romanian, who was Brook's pupil, invented a new language which was made up of Greek, African, American and American Indian languages.

Pre-cultural theatre involves no search for the common origins of cultures and theatrical forms, but is rather based on what is common to Eastern and Western theatre practitioners before they have become individualised or acculturated in particular traditions or techniques of performance. Eugenio Barba's work, according to Pavis (1996: 7), can be seen as an example of precultural theatre in that in his attempt to find universal pre-expressive principles common to different traditions, he focuses on the common substratum from which both Occidental and Oriental theatres have arisen. To think of one's own theatre in the flow of a 'tradition of traditions' is as important for the comprehension of one's own identity as to look at the theatre in terms of ethnic, national, group or even individual traditions (Barba, 1996: 218).

Directors of *post-cultural theatre* are convinced that our era is confined to recycling fragments seized from diverse cultural contexts. The movement of fragments is not free or accidental but linked in many ways to cultural hierarchies. Asymmetries between cultures in economic relations have influenced aesthetic freedom and, as a rule, reinforced the hegemonic position of the West (Pavis 1996: 149).

In metacultural theatre one culture is commenting on another on a meta-textual level. Directors such as Robert Wilson, Maurice Béjart, and Eugenio Barba represent metacultural theatre in their work in as far as they aim at directing the actors to make a commentary on forms that are foreign to their own tradition, and inscribing this commentary on to the stage production (Pavis, 1996: 7).

In *intercultural theatre* proper, Pavis distinguishes a number of varieties. As he sees it (Pavis, 1996: 8), intercultural theatre in the strictest sense characterises the work of many contemporary theatre practitioners such as Taymor, Emig and Pinder, who adapted elements of Balinese theatre for American audiences, and Brook, Mnouchkine and Barba, who appropriated Indian or Japanese traditions. Pavis' list is extensive and also includes from the North American context practitioners such as Robert Lepage, Lee Breuer, Elisabeth LeCompte, John Jesurun, Winston Tong, and Hou Hsiao-Hsien.

Multicultural theatre comprises the cross-influences between various ethnic or linguistic groups in multicultural societies, and the meaning arises from the clash of contexts, not from the coexistence or multiplicity of cultural sources (Pavis, 1996: 8–9). One example of this would be the contemporary '*Binglish*' [3] productions in Britain, in which Asian or all-black casts perform European texts, or adaptations of these, as well as new texts from Asian and black writers. In their work, the companies aim to challenge the dominant conventions of the English stage, and, for example, the Talawa Theatre Company produced Oscar Wilde's *Lady Windermere's Fan* without any adjustment in the text to an all-black cast. Consequently, in one of the lines, a character was talking about 'gazing into your deep blue eyes' (Verma, 1996: 195).

A *cultural collage* chooses forms and techniques without regard for their ethnological function and importance in their home cultures. Directors such as Robert Wilson cite, adapt, reduce, enlarge, combine, and mix various elements and turn the unexpected and quasi-surreal encounter of cultural material into a cultural collage. *Syncretic theatre*, illustrated by the work of Derek Walcott and Wole Soyinka, involves the creative reinterpretation of heterogeneous cultural material and results in the formation of new configurations (Pavis, 1996: 9). *Postcolonial theatre* takes up elements of the home culture (that of ex- or neo-colonisation) and employs them from its own perspective. Within the African theatre, Nigerian dramatists such as Wole Soyinka, Ola Rotimi, John Clark and the Ghanaians, Ama Ata Aidoo and Efua Sutherland, are often given as examples of forces which draw their strength from the rich and varied indigenous African forms and traditions whose origins lie in precolonial times (Jeyifo, 1996: 157; Pavis, 1996: 9). The *Theatre of the Fourth World* is created by authors or directors belonging to pre-colonisation cultures (the Maori, Aborigine or Indian) which have often become minority cultures in relation to that of the coloniser (Pavis, 1996: 10).

The above categories are fluid, and the work of an individual director can be characterised by more than one of the aspirations. Aims may overlap, be unconscious and difficult to express. The borderlines between the approaches are hazy, and productions may simultaneously relate to several aspects of a culture. Although there may be some examples which fall conveniently into a particular category, there are others that do not, depending on the point of departure for observation. Definitions also depend on the definer, as the opinions of the work of Peter Brook illustrate well (see, for example Pavis, 1996 and Bharucha, 1993). The categories can, however, provide the tools for

the analysis of intercultural exchanges and the ways theatre and culture are related.

Pavis' categorisation comprises the entire production and thus the multiform elements of theatre such as text, dance, gestures, music, song, masks and costumes. We should bear in mind that, as the distinctions between the categories are meant to be applied to entire productions rather than to individual elements in them, these do not necessarily all have to fall in line with the overall response of the production to the indigenous and/or foreign culture(s). Theatre translation, if understood in its narrower sense as comprising only the movement of written texts, would be included only in some of the above forms of interaction. Moreover, the usefulness of the categorisation is rather limited for the study of theatre translation if other elements of the production were excluded, since the ways texts have been combined with acting styles, settings, props, lights, music, backdrops, and so on in the intercultural exchanges would offer more valid results. The overall significance of the entire production should thus not be ignored, as the individual elements receive their readings in context. When *Hamlet* was produced in Hämeenlinna town theatre in Finland in autumn 1997, the text was the old translation from 1879 rewritten for three actors who moved amongst videoscreens and a cinematic musical background. Similarly the *Binglish* productions in Britain rely on the combination of texts and other elements for their effect.

Intercultural exchanges are unavoidably connected with cultural and economic hierarchies, and the ways in which elements from other cultures are chosen and employed may display different reactions of theatre practitioners to asymmetries between cultures. Differences of perspective may become visible in the announced motivations for intercultural exchanges such as Peter Brook's production of the Indian epic *The Mahabharata* and the work of post-colonial directors and the Theatre of the Fourth World. Intercultural exchanges, cooperation or exploitation depending on the point of view, across increasingly hazy cultural boundaries has been both strongly promoted by enthusiasts and equally fiercely criticised by antagonists. Some have justified a desire and need for interaction between theatrical traditions by claiming that it can increase understanding between cultures, while others have seen in it just another way of consolidating old cultural, social and economic imbalances. The proponents have seen their work resulting in a hybridisation, a new theatrical form at the intersection of two cultures and two theatrical forms, whereas those who have hesitated have detected in it a well concealed effort to continue the

exploitation which has its roots in old colonial attitudes, as well as 'an ethnocentric strategy of Western culture to reconquer foreign symbolic goods by submitting them to a dominant codification' (Pavis, 1996: 4, and Bharucha, 1993: 1–2).

These widely differing views suggest that intercultural theatre may acquire its reading not only from the perception of the general relationships between the foreign and native cultures but also from the asymmetrical position of the cultures involved in the exchange. This has been pointed out, for example by Rustom Bharucha, who has emphasised the different implications of interculturalism for people in impoverished, 'developing' countries like India, and for their counterparts in technologically advanced, capitalist societies like America:

> . . . as much as one would like to accept the seeming openness of Euro-American interculturalists to other cultures, the larger economic and political domination of the West has clearly constrained, if not negated the possibilities of a genuine exchange. (Bharucha, 1993: 2)

Although it remains undisputable that the parameters for intercultural cooperation in theatre are set by the initiator, receiver or buyer, the meanings made of it are different for audiences in different theatrical systems. The implications of Shakespeare's plays as performed by the Parsi theatre in India at the beginning of the twentieth century must have been very different from the Western productions of Indian canonical texts in both Europe and America later in the same century As a consequence, it may be true that 'intercultural theatre (. . .) is not placed directly at the service of a political struggle' (Pavis, 1996: 4), but it may be equally valid to claim that in intercultural theatre, the West is seeking to extend its domination to cultural matters (Bharucha, 1993: 2). Questions of national identity and independence are more important for some cultures than they are for others.

The Text-centred Theatre Tradition

Text-centred theatre is only one form of theatre, although in some traditions its dominance has left all other forms in the shade. It has long roots in theatrical history, and there have been records of the movement of theatre texts between cultures ever since antiquity. In some theatrical traditions, drama translation forms an important part of intercultural theatre, although in the entire field of exchanges, it is

only of restricted significance. Theatre texts are most commonly elements of theatre which uses spoken language, most typically of text-centred theatre which involves written theatre scripts as an element in the production.

The study of drama translation tends to focus on Western theatre, because the verbal element is more central to Euro-American than to Asian or African drama. Importantly, however, it should be borne in mind that logocentrism in theatre is not an evolutionary superior stage, as has been suggested, for example, in a recent book of theatre history which claims that as societies reach a greater stability and unity and become less dependent on hunting (or fishing) and more dependent on industry and commerce, and when they acquire social, political and military self-confidence as well as awareness of their own singularity, they tend to turn increasingly away from dance to language as a more flexible medium through which they can in practice form their views of themselves (Wickham, 1994: 33–34). The dominant text-centred convention of Western theatre thus receives its explanation and justification as a more advanced form of theatre, while at the same time the theatre of the Other is dismissed as underdeveloped. In theatre translation studies, the focus is on the text-centred theatre and thus usually on the Western tradition, but it should be acknowledged that the subject matter does not cover more than a fraction of the interaction between theatrical systems in intercultural theatre.

The centrality of the verbal element in theatre has long roots in the Western world where the mainstream dramatic tradition goes back to ancient Greece and is mediated by texts. According to this tradition, the play is an expression of a writer, and the actor is a vehicle for the writer. The reason there is so much information about author-centred classical drama is because texts have survived, whereas we know little of the vast amount of actor-centred dramatic activity in the ancient world because no one was concerned to keep records (Brown, 1995: 62). For a translation scholar, literary records of Western theatre are thus more easily available.

No strict characterisation of theatrical traditions on the basis of their text-centredness is feasible. Western theatre has not always and everywhere been dominated by scripted drama, nor has Eastern theatre relied exclusively and everywhere on other means – song, dance, gestures – of doing theatre. All through Western theatrical history there have been genres, sometimes weaker, sometimes stronger, which either have not used the spoken element at all, or not based the performances on scripted texts. For example, in the period

of the late Roman Empire, the emphasis shifted towards mime and pantomime, [4] since an actor-centred theatre could evade censorship in a way that text-centred theatre could not. In Medieval times, there existed a genre of pagan comedy which, although at one end of the spectrum it relied on scripted plays, at the other it was based on improvised folk drama (Brown, 1995: 68). Renaissance Italy was unique in producing the technology of modern theatre, and long before plays in other countries were signed or printed, Italian presses were publishing theatrical texts. However, before theatrical companies existed elsewhere, travelling Italian troupes were creating a foreign market for the '*commedia dell'arte*', and descriptions of professional acting companies and their comedy, improvised around a sketched plot, began to appear in the 1560s (Brown, 1995: 107–108, 125).[5] *Commedia dell'arte*, which flourished from the sixteenth to the early eighteenth centuries, had its *scenario*, or pre-arranged synopsis, which provided the general framework for the *commedia* performers, as the basis of their improvisations. Similarly, English drama has been essentially text-centred only from the time of the Elizabethans. In the Elizabethan theatre, written texts were used as suggestive starting points for the actors, and the writing down of plays was a much more fluid process than that implied by the *well-made play* of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Bassnett, 1990: 73, 77–78). The pattern is repeated in some form all over Europe. According to Tiusanen (1969: 44), the real stars and favourites of mid-seventeenth century Finnish theatre performances were *larvatores*, clowns who wore masks. They appeared in the list of characters in the playscripts, but did not have any pre-written lines. They were supposed to improvise both the action and their lines.

In the same way as improvising appears at certain points in time and in some societies to have been an important part of the Western theatrical tradition, text-centred theatre has flourished for a variety of reasons in some societies in the East. In India, the earliest surviving plays come from the first and second centuries AD, and are the work of Asvaghosa, a north Indian playwright. They are written in Sanskrit and show that dramatic writing was fully developed by this time, conforming to rules already laid down in *Natyasastra* (the world's oldest text of dramaturgy from about AD 400, attributed to the sage of Bharata), therefore suggesting that the origin of theatre and drama occurred somewhat earlier in history (Brown, 1995: 449).[6]

The spoken dramatic form of some genres in Asia has a colonial history. For example, South-East Asian theatre is a complex blend of dance, song, movement and recited text, and in many of these

countries (Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines) the languages do not even possess a word that describes a purely spoken dramatic form (Brown, 1995: 483). However, Vietnam developed a spoken theatre form, *kick noi*, which dates back to the influence of the staging of Molière's *L'Avare* in translation in 1907. Many European plays were performed in translation, and in 1921, the first Vietnamese play was written and performed (*A Cup of Poison* by Vu Dinh Long). Many theatre companies for spoken drama have developed since then, and from the nineteenth century onwards Western influence has been strong, particularly under French rule (1862–1945) (Brown, 1995: 496–497). Similarly, after the American take-over of the Philippines in 1898, Western styles were introduced, and text-centred plays, usually involving songs, were the norm (Brown, 1995: 494). So while the study of drama translation, and theatre translation in particular, almost as a rule concentrates on the dominant logocentric tradition in the West, it would not necessarily have to do so.

The Exchange of Dramatic Texts

Within Western text-centred theatre, texts have crossed boundaries and helped to establish new systems or given new blood to the old ones throughout history The earliest examples of theatrical exchange of dramatic texts go back to the Roman translations of Greek drama. In this exchange, the borderline between the indigenous and borrowed was blurred, and it thus illustrates well the sometimes very artificial separation of the two: there are cases when it is practically impossible to tell where the 'original' ends and a 'new' text begins. However, the performances before Roman audiences of translated and adapted Greek tragedies and comedies are the first effort to transfer a considerable body of drama from one language to another.

For the Romans, the influence of the Greek classics was most visible in epic and drama: Homer provided the model for Ennius in epic as well as the original for Livius Andronicus; Euripides was the pattern for Ennius in tragedy, as Sophocles was for Accius. Menander and other playwrights of the 'New Attic Comedy' were the sources of the *palliatae* of Plautus and Terence. At the time of the first drama translation, 240 BC, literary Latin had begun to diverge from the spoken language, and towards 70 BC lively activity in political and judicial oratory had contributed to the advance of prose in particular. Spoken Latin was still a rather minor language, struggling for mastery of the Italian dialects (Duff & Duff, 1962: 18, 85).

For the Romans of this period, theatre was a Greek activity, and the

first play written in Latin was therefore probably a translation. The author, Andronikos (Romanised as Livius Andronicus), a slave from the Greek colony of Tarentum in southern Italy, was commissioned to write his play for the Roman Games in 240 BC in order to celebrate the end of the first Great War against Carthage. All in all, the Romans imported, translated and adapted hundreds of Greek texts (Brown, 1995: 49–50).

Despite the large number of Greek texts imported into Latin, the work survives of only two Roman dramatists from the period of the Republic. There are twenty and a half plays by Plautus from 210–184 BC, and six plays by Terence dating from 166–160 BC. All these plays can be traced back to Greek 'originals', although their approach to their models varies. Terence kept much closer to them, and, following the realist aesthetic of his sources, he eliminated choral interludes and soliloquies, and rolled two plays into a single narrative. Plautus took more liberties with his sources, and it has been suggested that this may have happened because he was not of Greek extraction. He radically rewrote his Greek models, translating passages only when it suited him. The visual references, from costumes to silver coins, were all Greek, but the language was Latin which was Roman, and so was the terminology used to evoke the gods, law, and the political system (Brown, 1995: 50). Plautus was no servile translator but a free manipulator (Duff & Duff, 1962: 124).

Texts gave rise to other texts, and helped to set up a theatrical system. A genre of plays with Roman settings eventually emerged, but most plays, including all that have survived, were set in Greece. The aesthetic code of Greek dramatists such as Menander had been based on the idea that art should imitate reality, but the new Roman aesthetic was that art should imitate Greece (Brown, 1995: 50). To accentuate the Greek setting, typical Greek elements were emphasised and strengthened. In addition to the tendency to change the location to Athens, the names of characters which seemed less Greek than necessary were replaced by others: *Syros* in the *Dis Exapaton* of Menander was changed to the colourful *Chrysalus*, and in Plautus's *Bacchides* the plain *Moschos* to the quadrisyllabic compound *Pistoclerus*. These Greek personae with their Greek names lived in Greek houses, consumed Greek food and used Greek money Sometimes the fictional Greek world was brought to the attention of the Roman spectators by an occasional explicit reference to its Greekness (Gilula, 1989: 103).

Drama translation into Latin appears to have followed the prevailing practice in all Roman literary translation. According to Hugo Friedrich (1992: 12), Roman literary translation would typically

rewrite the original without any concern for the stylistic and linguistic idiosyncracies of the original. Translation meant transformation in order to mould the foreign into the linguistic structures of one's own culture. Latin was not violated in any form, not even when the original text disrupted the structure of its own language by deviating from normally accepted conventions through the invention of neologisms, new word associations and unusual stylistic and syntactic creations.

A distinction between translating and 'original' writing was not regarded as significant: in the undated Byzantine tragedy *Christor Paschon* (*The Passion of Christ*), the author had culled more than half his text from plays by Euripides, principally from his play *The Bacchae* about the followers of Dionysus (Brown, 1995: 64–65).

It was not, however, until modern times that mediation between cultures became a conscious theatrical programme. In the last third of the eighteenth century, Goethe set out to create a '*Weltliteratur*' which would include the most significant plays in world literature. He began to develop an international repertoire for his own small provincial theatre in Weimar, and wanted it to include the most important dramas in European theatre history as well as advanced contemporary plays. Unlike the Romans, Goethe did not place much importance on mediating the foreignness of the plays, but he was like the Romans in that he was prepared to make far-reaching alterations and changes in them. He was vigorously and energetically supported in this by Schiller, who, for example, made changes to *Macbeth*, in the translation out of consideration for the moral standards and expectations of the Weimar audience. Goethe himself revised *Romeo and Juliet* to such an extent that his version was described by a later Shakespeare scholar as an 'amazing travesty' (Fischer-Lichte, 1996: 28–29). Similar reactions to foreign drama can be detected in other European cultures as well, and, for example in France, Shakespeare's plays have been rewritten in various translations (Ducis, 1770; Dumas, 1846; Meurice, 1864; Schwob & Morand, 1899; Gide, 1929; Bonnefoy, 1957; Mesguich, 1977) primarily to respond to the requirements of the receiving theatre (Heylen, 1993).

Not just any drama would interest Goethe, and the Weimar theatre was made up exclusively of European dramas. Although he recognised the value of Indian drama, he believed that it would not be appreciated by a Western audience (Fischer-Lichte, 1996: 29). However, even with Western drama, Goethe considered alterations necessary, and did not hesitate to shorten the plays, sometimes changing them considerably. Any production of a foreign play therefore became a

cultural hybrid, a mixture of elements taken from two cultures: the one in which the play originated and the one in which it was staged (Fischer-Lichte, 1989: 173).

While the European avant-garde movement was absorbing elements of total theatre from the East in the first half of the twentieth century, theatres in Asia turned to the West for forms of drama which were different from their own tradition. In China, Japan and Korea, popular balladry and puppetry have formed an extremely important basis for more complex drama, and the three traditions are in general notable primarily for their performance, not as literature (Brown, 1995: 465). Since the opening of Japan to the West after 1868, various artists struggled to introduce first Western drama and later a Western realistic theatrical style into Japanese theatre. Contemporary European drama was staged; Ibsen and Chekhov in particular were popular, and Stanislavsky was regarded as the authoritative style. The approach to foreign classics varied from looking at them through the indigenous tradition to mediation through the entirely foreign, Western view of theatre. Thus, for example, in 1885 *The Merchant of Venice* was thoroughly reworked and produced in the style of Kabuki theatre, whereas *Julius Caesar* followed in 1901 as the first 'faithfully' translated Western play (Fischer-Lichte, 1996: 30; 1989: 174). *Hamlet*, translated by the Shakespearean scholar Tsubouchi Shoyo and directed by Osanai Kaoru, was staged in a wholly Western style in 1911 (Fischer-Lichte, 1990a: 14). The introduction of Western drama gave a start to the Japanese spoken theatre *shingeki*. The literary society, Bungei kyokai, which had initiated the *Hamlet* project, and the Tsukiji Little Theatre founded in 1924, took Western realistic theatre as their model, since they believed that the traditional indigenous theatre forms could no longer deal with the problems of modern Japanese society. Through recourse to realistic theatre of European origin, they attempted to give the initiative to the modernisation of Japanese society by proposing a model which would help to achieve it (Fischer-Lichte, 1990a: 14). Ironically, these same traditional Japanese theatre genres that were being rejected were being enthusiastically taken up in the West (Yeats and Noh, for example).

In the 1960s, however, *shingeki* was rejected as an elitist copy of a Western model, and the Little Theatre Movement began to speak for a new awareness of indigenous traditions. It did not advocate an exclusive return to the Japanese theatre tradition, nor did it aim at a complete denial of Western drama. The movement was, nevertheless, critical of the ideology that Western theatre could accurately relate to Japanese society (Fischer-Lichte, 1989: 175).

One of the most prominent and influential representatives of the Little Theatre Movement was the Suzuki Company of Toga (SCOT), led by Tadashi Suzuki, who, for example, in the mid-1970s turned to Greek tragedy, and in the late 1980s, began to produce Chekhov and Shakespeare (Fischer-Lichte, 1996: 33). By proceeding from Western plays Suzuki formed particular mixtures of elements from Western and Japanese theatrical traditions. The text no longer had the status it held in the Western theatre and, for example, Chekhov's text in *The Three Sisters* was shortened, and more than half of the dialogue was cut. The four acts were revised into ten scenes, and with the exception of Andrei, Suzuki merged together all the male characters (Fischer-Lichte, 1989: 175–176).

Modern Western drama was introduced to China from Japan at the beginning of the twentieth century, and Japanese theatre had considerable influence on Chinese students and political refugees living in Japan. In 1906, Li Xishuang founded the Spring Willow Society in Tokyo whose aim was to introduce spoken theatre into China, and the troupe dramatized *Uncle Tom's Cabin, La Dame aux Camélias* and *La Tosca*. Later in the 1920s and 1930s, Ibsen and O'Neill were introduced, and Chinese playwrights began to follow the principles of Western drama in their writing. They believed this to be the only way of presenting modern plays, known as *huaju*, or spoken drama, as opposed to the traditional Chinese theatre which calls for singing and dancing as well as speaking (Fischer-Lichte, 1990a: 14; Zuolin, 1990: 183–184).

In Japan, the introduction of Western drama was believed by supporters of *shingeki* to help bring about a socio-historical change, and similar views can be detected in the ways Chinese theatre has assimilated elements from the Western tradition. The first decade of the twentieth century witnessed a massive political upheaval in the history of China with the downfall of the imperial dynasty in 1911 and the establishment of a Republic. The awareness of the possibility of change and recognition of the need for it paved the way for the growth of a new cultural movement. Old institutions were challenged and theatre practitioners found new ideas of humanity, equality and freedom in Western and particularly Shakespeare's plays. In consequence, Shakespeare became an immediate and relevant theatrical alternative. In the first three decades of this century more than 20 Shakespeare plays were performed. Until recent times productions have been efforts to extend, develop, or introduce new forms of spoken drama, and there has been a growing interest also in taking Shakespeare's dramas as models with which to enrich traditional Chinese opera. One such production was the *kunju* opera inter-

pretation of *Macbeth* with the play relocated in China (Weijie, 1990: 161, 164–165). Shakespeare productions before 1949 were less concerned with Shakespeare than with the concept of spoken drama in general, while productions of Shakespeare in the 1950s were concerned only with representing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan world on stage, allowing the audience to view Shakespeare as an Elizabethan playwright. *Antony and Cleopatra* (1984) marks a change in Shakespeare productions. In the 1980s, Shakespeare was presented as relevant and topical to modern society but within a form of Chinese theatre which also preserved its own characteristic features. The *kunju Macbeth* is probably the culmination of the inspiration to turn back to the potential of traditional Chinese theatre, while still respecting the special nature of the Shakespeare texts. In the last five years there have been several other attempts to adapt Shakespeare to traditional Chinese theatre with the aim of revitalising its traditional forms (Weijie, 1990: 166–167).

In the Third World countries the combination of cultural elements is accorded a fundamentally different value from that given to them in Western or Japanese cultures. While in the West and Japan it is to be seen as the result of a deliberate desire to extend their own culture, in the Third World it is the result of colonisation, where it functions more frequently as a kind of transitional phase by which imposed foreign traditions will be gradually eliminated (Fischer-Lichte, 1996: 35). For example, in India and Africa, theatrical interculturalism differs significantly from that in Europe and the Far East because it has been directly related to colonisation by the Europeans and thus does not result from free choice. Western theatre was introduced there as a model of the colonising society and implemented on the consciousness of the native people as the instrument of colonisation (Fischer-Lichte, 1990a: 15). Indian theatre in the second half of the nineteenth century drew extensively on foreign melodramas. The Parsi theatre companies, which may have developed from the Bombay theatre where English, Parsi and other English-educated Indians mingled to produce English-language plays, toured towns in northern India until 1940, giving regular performances with their proscenium arch and painted backdrop copied from the English theatre. The fantastical scenic effects, storm and battle scenes, explosions and all the necessary theatre machinery, glamorous costumes and make-up, the front curtain, tableaux and the choral singing at the beginning and close of the play also came from the West. Shakespeare was in constant repertory on the Parsi, but also on the Marathani and Bengali stages, and in 1934, over 200 adaptations of Shakespeare in various

languages were listed in India (Fischer-Lichte, 1990a: 15; Loomba, 1997: 118). In colonial Africa students in schools were encouraged to perform European dramas styled on the Western model. In these productions African traditions were partly touched on in order to ease the learning and internalisation of the foreign model. Moreover, the students were asked to write their own dramas based on the European model (Fischer-Lichte, 1990a: 15–16).

In contemporary Western (Euro-American) theatre, interculturalism takes two main forms: there is the exchange of texts which most countries are engaged in; and there are the larger theatrical frames, comprising entire performance traditions adopted mainly from various Eastern theatres. We can assume that the movement of theatre texts remains largely within the West and that it is also closely connected with perceptions of cultural hierarchies, displaying considerable differences in the number of texts translated from and into any particular language. For example, of the 182 translated theatre texts in the Finnish theatre repertoires in 1996/97 only three plays came from outside the Western theatre (a South-African, a Japanese, and a Mexican play), whereas 30 plays came from England and the USA. Not all cultures enjoy the same popularity as sources of foreign theatre texts, nor do all cultures have the same need for translated drama.

In the exchange between East and West, cultural and economic hierarchies frequently set the terms for the cooperation. Rustom Bharucha (1993: 240) claims that interculturalism has become something of a trend among certain circles in the Euro-American theatre, when Western theatre practitioners follow in the footsteps of the avant-garde movement of the beginning of this century in search for new theatrical expression. It is often a one-way movement, with an academic or cultural body facilitating the encounters with other cultures. These bodies are, for the most part, located in the West, where there is money available for research into those parts of the world where people have yet to obtain the basic necessities of life.

The difference in theatrical traditions has both promoted and hindered theatrical exchange between the East and West. The avantgarde movement in Europe (c. 1900–1940) is an example of the former in that it turned away from text-centred theatre to use other scenic elements. It was fascinated by the East as a source of inspiration, and wanted to distance itself from the Western obsession with language. Theatre practitioners such as Craig, Artaud and Tairov were concerned with re-animating European theatre, and they turned to foreign theatre cultures largely for reasons of theatre aesthetics

(Fischer-Lichte, 1996: 30–31). Craig spoke in favour of 'mask' as it was used in African and Asian theatres, and in line with Meyerhold, Tairov and Artaud, he based the idea of a non-literary theatre on Japanese, Chinese and Balinese theatres. Yeats and Brecht turned towards the Japanese Noh in proposing a new kind of dramaturgy The most profound changes which the European avant-garde achieved in the theatre were aimed against the literary, psychological realistic theatre of illusion, and they directly affected the status of the literary text and language, performance art, the conception of space and the quality of audience perception (Fischer-Lichte, 1990a: 12–13).

A different theatrical tradition may also meet with rejection and lack of interest. For example, since the Euro-American mainstream theatre has, as a rule, relied heavily on the text as an element of the performance, it has had difficulties in accepting some foreign drama in which the text does not fill the same function. One reason for the lack of interest in Chinese drama today may be the view of the position of dramatic texts and the fact that the Chinese dramatic text is just a very loose framework for performance (Gissenwehrer, 1990: 152).

Notes

1. The discussion here is based on Pavis' categorisation and examples which I have clarified and expanded.

2. The terms have been introduced into media studies by Ien Ang 1991 and Pentti Alasuutari 1991 and applied to drama translation by Aaltonen 1996.

3. The term '*Binglish*' has been appropriated by Jatinder Verma from the word used by Singaporeans to describe their spoken language, *Singlish. Binglish* thus suggests a form of spoken English as much as a process: Asian and black life in modern Britain is 'not-quite English' but characterised by an effort to 'be English' (Verma, 1996: 194).

4. The term mime did not necessarily mean silence, while pantomime implies that one actor played every part (Brown, 1995: 62).

5. Travelling troupes were organised from the mid-1540s onwards (Brown, 1995: 127).

6. Again, it is a great deal more difficult to establish early drama which is not mediated by texts. Patanjali's *Mahabhasya*, a grammatical text of 140 BC, suggests that all the elements for the formation of drama were present by this date: pantomime, graphic illustrations of stories and the art of storytelling. This places the possible origin of theatre in India between 200 and 100 BC, several centuries prior to the plays of Asvaghosa (Brown, 1995: 449).

Chapter 2—
Theorising Theatre Translation

A study of the movement of texts between theatrical systems requires an interdisciplinary framework, and theatre translation can best be analysed, and the findings understood, against the background of many disciplines, of which translation studies, theatre studies, cultural studies, literary studies, communication studies and linguistic studies first come to mind. All these can offer their particular insights into the study of what happens to theatre texts when they cross cultural borders.

Since this study concentrates on the various ways that cultural and theatrical systems may use foreign theatre texts and the possible agency of different translation strategies, it starts from the assumption that texts do not have any inherent fixed readings which would automatically be, or have to be, repeated in their translations. Readings arise from relations and differences among signifiers but also from the interaction between signifiers and readers/audiences. They are always context generated, and therefore a correlation exists between the discourse of the translated texts and their linguistic, sociocultural, and theatrical context.

Meaning Production

All human interaction involves translation. It is important for interaction between different personalities, and it is needed between different geographical and social language varieties. Translation is an essential part of interaction between two different languages. All translation involves the construction of readings which are then further processed into new texts. Similarly translators as authors produce texts on the basis of their readings of texts to be translated. Thus the study of translations consists of readings by scholars of readings by translators of readings by other translators or authors. To what extent translators and authors exist as clearly separable categories, or whether they should be viewed as closely related species, is debatable.

Even though a text can, if only in theory; be isolated, like a virus under a microscope, its meaning still lies in the eye looking at it. Who the eye belongs to makes a difference, as texts themselves do not have the power to impose meanings. Meanings do not arise in isolation. In translation, more than in any other form of writing, they are formed at the crossroads of cultures at sites where different systemic (or institutional) idiolects or discourses compete for power. The lack of an inherent meaning becomes replaced by a multiplicity of meanings as languages construct the plurality of human experience. From among this endless chain of meanings forking out in numberless directions readers will, in their particular context of social cultural and systemic or institutional idiolects, find a chink to move in and make the text their own.

Readers are tenants who move into texts and occupy them for a while. In the theatre there are many tenants, and just as many meanings to be taken of texts. Theatre audiences and scholars then construct their readings of the translators', directors', actors', light and sound technicians', costume and set designers' readings of the author's reading of the world – meanings upon meanings upon meanings. All tenants who move into texts will make them theirs in many ways, of which only some can be studied with the magnifying glass of the translation scholar. The scholar can merely report what is visible, and read his/her own meaning into it.

Theatre practitioners occupy texts as tenants for a brief moment. In translation, cultural, social, theatrical and linguistic systems work through the translators and in this way determine the terms of occupancy of the texts to be translated. All visits generate new texts just as the 'original' was once generated. As Octavio Paz has expressed it:

> No text can be completely original because language itself in its very essence is always a translation – first from the nonverbal world, and then, because each sign and each phrase is a translation of another sign, another phrase. However, the inverse is also entirely valid. All texts are originals because each translation has its distinctive character. Up to a point, each translation is a creation and thus constitutes a unique text. (Paz, 1992: 154)

At the end of the translation process, some proportion of another text, the source text, is distinguishable in the new text, the translation, although the proportion of 'new' to 'old' varies both between systems and at different points in time. When translated texts are compared with their source texts, some of the meaning construction becomes visible. It is not unlike that carried out by the author of the source

text, but when texts cross cultural and linguistic boundaries the multiplicity of meanings in them becomes enhanced.

Meaning construction is not a random process, and although there will undoubtedly be a certain amount of variation in the readings of different individuals, it is still possible to find some agreement about the dominant themes at least synchronically, and often also diachronically, as long as one moves within related cultural systems. Dominant readings may arise over the years and become fixed and solidified, at least for some time and some cultures (see also Aaltonen, 1996: 33–34, 54).

Translation always implies a transformation of the original and the original text never reappears in the new language. Yet it is always present, because translation, without saying it, expresses it constantly, or else converts it into a verbal object that, although different, reproduces it (Paz, 1992: 155). The time-sharing of texts on stage means new tenants moving into texts and making them their own, not as individuals but within the confines of their social, cultural, theatrical and linguistic contexts. The most immediate influence and control on translation work for the stage is exercised by the theatrical system, which thus acquires a new element by integrating the translated text into its repertoire of other, both indigenous and foreign, texts.

The Theatrical System

To be able to unearth the systemic discourse or idiolect which guides translation activity and translational decision-making we need to focus on the dependencies between certain contextual elements and text production. A useful theoretical framework for the analysis is provided by the (poly)system theory, developed most fully by Gideon Toury (1980), Itamar Even-Zohar (1990) and André Lefevere (1992), and amplified by numerous other scholars. The approaches proposed by the above scholars for the study of translated texts are complementary in that Even-Zohar emphasises intra-literary relations, whereas Lefevere concentrates primarily on extra-literary links. Gideon Toury's contribution to Translation Studies is the study of translational norms and conventions. [1]

Systems are not rigid constructions, and both Even-Zohar and Lefevere regard them as open structures whose borders are only vaguely defined. In Lefevere's (1992: 12–13) outline, the literary system is an artificial system which consists of objects (texts) and human agents who read and (re)write them.[2] Through rewriting, works of literature are manipulated to various ends, while the system acts as a

series of constraints on the reader and (re)writer. (Re)writers – translators, historians, and compilers of anthologies – remain within the boundaries of the culture that is theirs by birth or adoption. They can choose to stay within the parameters limited by its constraints, or they may choose to operate outside those constraints. Translators do not operate as individuals in isolation. Instead their work is governed by influences from both within and without the system to which they submit their translation work. The translator's survival as a translator depends on how willingly she or he follows the conventions of the system, or how tolerantly the system views deviations. [3]

Lefevere (1992: 14–15) claims that there is a double control factor which guarantees that the literary system does not fall too far outside the other subsystems of which society consists. The first factor tries to control the literary system from the inside within the parameters set up by the second. It consists of professionals – critics, reviewers, teachers, translators – who will occasionally repress certain works of literature, and who will often rewrite works of literature until they are deemed acceptable to the poetics and ideology of a certain time and place. The second factor is patronage, which is usually more interested in the ideology of literature than in its poetics, and delegates authority to the professionals where poetics is concerned. As a rule, patrons (groups of persons, a religious body, a political party, a social class, publishers, the media) operate by means of institutions – academies, censorship bureaux, critical journals, and the educational establishment – set up to regulate at least the distribution of literature. Patronage consists of the three interacting elements: an ideological component, which governs the choice and development of both form and content; an economic component, which means the economic system of reward provided by the patrons; and finally an element of status, which grants integration into a particular group.

Although Lefevere's interest lies mainly in the literary system, his model applies to the theatrical system too. His analysis of the various ways in which the constraints of the sociocultural system such as patronage, social conditions, economics and institutional manipulation select and shape translation work, for example, can be extended to the theatre, although the systemic elements there are, to some extent, different from those in the literary system. The theatrical system which provides the material basis for theatre translation is in itself a complex network of subsystems, mainstream and fringe theatres, as well as various producer and consumer sub-systems, who all have their expectations and preferences *vis-à-vis* the discourse of translated theatre texts. Within the boundaries of this umbrella

system or institution, [4] the brief of the rewriter who prepares the text for a production is somewhat different from that in the literary system (see below). The number of rewriters is larger, and it may vary both within the system as well as between different systems. Playwrights, translators, stage directors, dress and set designers, sound and light technicians, as well as actors all contribute to the creation of theatre texts when they move into them and make them their own. A written foreign text accepted by a stage for production has to pass through several hands before it reaches the stage where the spoken element takes over.

In theatre translation, as in all translation, the codes which are represented by the discourse of the completed translations are voices not only from the theatrical system but also from the surrounding social, cultural and linguistic systems, which all have their own reasons for looking for channels of expression. In consequence, these systems support the translation work only if it is seen to respond adequately to the stimuli from them.

The discourse of theatre translation is part of the discourse of the entire cultural system, and therefore, under the influence of the group,[5] it is controlled inside the theatrical system by professionals – translators, artistic and stage directors, critics, and reviewers – who also, as representatives of various institutional idiolects contribute to the synchronisation of the discourses. Patrons, who function outside the system, maintaining stability and cultural coherence with an ideological, economic and status component, include theatrical boards and various municipal and state institutions, that is, elements which, according to need, can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of texts.

Theatrical systems and subsystems may vary in their choice of professionals who will be responsible for the rewriting or translation of the foreign texts. Some may employ two categories of translators, that is, those who produce the 'literals' (translations which are produced as if in isolation, and aiming to write the source text with the words of the target language) and those who write the stage versions on the basis of these literals (breaking out of the isolation, and moving the text into the theatrical system). Other systems may employ dramaturges who are responsible for the final stage versions of the texts. Often for commercial reasons, some systems may employ surrogate translators who contribute primarily their name and status to the translation, but who may also take part in writing the stage versions.

Theatrical systems are not rigid constructions but living organisms whose edges constantly merge into other systems. They respond to

discourses from their surrounding contexts, often also actively taking part in creating them. Theatrical systems are not monolithic structures, but rather diversified compilations of various subsystems which have a life of their own and which have their own reasons for adopting a particular discourse in their translations. The praxis of theatre translation is thus governed by the codes of both the internal and external cultural and social networks, which act as links between the theatrical subsystem and the larger cultural and social systems. Throughout, considerations such as commercial and power-related factors are involved in the shaping of the systemic norms and conventions which define tolerated behaviour (see also Aaltonen, 1996: 54–55).

As was mentioned in the Introduction, theatre texts are not necessarily synonymous with dramatic texts, and the two may, in some cases, function as objects or elements in different systems and be governed by different systemic conventions. The distinction between the two systemic memberships is made therefore by calling dramatic texts used in the theatre 'theatre texts'. 'Drama translation' as a term thus includes translation work for both the literary and theatrical systems, whereas 'theatre translation' is confined to the theatrical system alone. However, theatre translation can extend beyond drama translation when other literary genres are adapted for the use in a theatre performance. The following section will discuss the distinction between the two in more detail.

Drama and Theatre

The two systems in which dramatic texts mainly function and which therefore set up the parameters for their creation, circulation and reception are the theatrical and literary systems, housed within the larger cultural social and economic systems, and there is historical and generic variation as to how and which texts come to be located in the two systems. Texts may belong to both or only one of the systems, and they can move in and out of them as well as from one into the other.

The double tie of dramatic texts to the literary and theatrical systems is present in the way in which the word 'drama' is used to refer to both a written text and a theatrical performance, and the dual systemic membership is made even more complicated by the fact that there is drama which is no longer or perhaps never has been performed (closet drama), and there are performances which are not based on any written work, or which are not accompanied by the

publication of any text (improvised, *commedia dell'arte* theatre). Finally the text may be the result of a performance (Bertolt Brecht is known to have improved his playscripts after every performance, thus taking many years to 'finish' them).

Drama and theatre, a written text and a theatrical performance, can thus be interrelated in various ways. The theatrical system does not necessarily use a verbal component in its shows, and a written text may stand in various relations to a theatrical show. Of these Kowzan (1985: 1–2) has distinguished three types which may exist between a written text and a performance. Firstly, any written text which is performed orally and implies intonation and a minimum of facial mime may be considered a sort of theatrical show. The text exists *a priori*. The interest in theatre translation focuses most importantly on the written text in this category. Secondly there is a transition from the written text to performance without words (the so-called stage directions, and texts which are used as the starting points for dumb shows, scenarios for ballets or mimes), or texts for plays without dialogue or monologue. The text itself is acted out non-verbally. Rustom Bharucha's experiment with Frank Xaver Kroetz's *Request Concert* in five Asian cities (see Bharucha, 1993: 91N–161) illustrates the relationship between a written text and a performance in this category. The written text here does not usually interest translation scholars (being similar to the author's comments or stage directions), and it is likely to be seen to fall within the confines of theatre studies rather than translation studies. Thirdly the performance may have been accompanied by speech, in which case an oral text which has been written down *a posteriori* has become a written text. Shakespeare's plays, for example, represent this relationhip. [6] This category can provide material for scholars of theatre translation, but only after the written text has come into existence. The performance may also have been without speech, in which case it may have been described in a more or less reliable way, and thus resulted in a written text which is a verbal relation of the actions performed on stage.

Written dramatic texts can function outside the theatrical system, and conversely the theatrical system can function without them. Kowzan extends the concept of drama to include the entire range of theatrical shows (ballet, pantomime), and others (for example, Esslin, 1980: 14) have supplemented the list by including theatrical shows in different media. Complexity seems thus to be an inescapable characteristic of theatre and drama, and, depending on the topic, researchers have to narrow their focus in order to achieve validity for their findings.

Some cultures may separate the literary and the stage drama from each other, often confining the majority of dramatic texts to the theatrical system alone. An example of this can be found in Finland, where a decision was taken (either consciously or unconsciously) in a comprehensive reference work on Finnish writers from the sixteenth century to the present day, *Suomalaisia kirjailijoita 1500-luvulta nykypäivään*, published by Otava in 1994, to exclude playwrights almost entirely from among the 700 writers mentioned in the book. As a result, there were very few dramatists included whose production did not include other genres as well. When asked about the omission, the publisher blamed the fact that Finnish drama was so seldom published in printed form, and information about it was therefore difficult to come by (see Aaltonen, 1996: 57). Drama in the Finnish context, where only costly rewritings of the canon but very few modern playscripts are published in printed form, is not seen as literature.

Drama as literature is interrelated with some other literary genres, and it may be difficult to distinguish drama from them on formal grounds. For example, Kinnunen (1985: 30, 34) maintains that there is not much difference between drama and the short story, and that drama may be distinguished from a poem or a novel only by its function. The blurred borders between genres also become visible in the theatrical system. Theatres may use other than dramatic texts as their material, and, apart from drama, their repertoires may include poetry, letters, short stories and novels. Prose texts or poems may end up on stage, and many classics, such as novels by Dickens, the great Indian epic *The Mahabharata*, the twelfth-century Sufi poem of Fariud-din Attar *The Conference of the Birds*, to name but a few, have found new forms of life on stage. Moreover, a dramatic text may change its format, for example, from verse drama into a prose synopsis (in France Antoine de La Place (1745) presented his *Hamlet* as closet drama and included in it the most striking passages linked together with the plot synopses (Heylen, 1993: 26)) or from verse into a prose translation as was the case with early Shakespeare translations by Pierre Le Tournier (1776–1783), in Germany by Christoph Martin Wieland (1762–1766) and J. J. Eschenburg (1775–1782) or in Denmark by Johannes Boye (1777) and Nils Rosenfeldt (1790–1792).

Theatre texts as well as dramatic texts in general do not thus necessarily have to meet any formal criteria. However, drama can functionally be distinguished from other genres, and, Birch (1991: 28–29), for example, defines a dramatic text as one which is used for the performance of reading, writing, analysis, rehearsal, production and reception by various institutions like amateur and professional

theatre, teaching, television, film, radio, video, journalism, speech therapy, voice coaching, public speaking, designing, reviewing or in any of the performance processes. Therefore, only the function – past or present – rather than any intrinsic properties defines both a dramatic text and a theatre text. The general guideline is that if a text is used as a dramatic text, it is a dramatic text, and if it is used on stage it is an element of the theatrical system.

Another distinction which still has to be made is that between the oral and written text which are both elements of the theatrical system. One of the elements of a theatre production is the written theatre text, which will have its counterpart, an oral text, on stage. The two are different entities, each with its own semiotic system. To quote Pavis (1992: 26–28), the *mise en scène* is not the staging of a supposed textual 'potential', and it does not have to be faithful to a dramatic text as it is not a stage representation of the textual referent. Moreover, different *mises en scène* of a common text, particularly those produced at very different moments in history, do not provide readings of the same text. The *mise en scène* is not a performative realisation of the text, nor is it a fusion of the two referents of text and stage.

Pavis' characterisation emphasises the simultaneity and equal value of the two semiotic systems, the text and the *mise en scène*. While Pavis denies the existence of a textual potential which would form a link between the written text and the performance, some translation scholars have argued that it might be possible to establish such a link at least in some dramatic texts (Totzeva, 1995). Pavis' claim that the *mise en scène* is not a staging of a supposed textual 'potential' is echoed in the studies of many theatre semiologists as well, and Salosaari (1989: 10), for example, has remarked that only when a performance has materialised and the text been given a certain function on stage is it possible to say anything definite about the textual potential. It cannot be anticipated. The specificity of dramatic theatre lies primarily 'in the ways in which it enables the production of felt experience, in the event' (Melrose 1994: 8). 'Meaning does not "occur", felt-experiences do not "occur". These are produced in and by (. . .) the users as individualised participants in the activation of socially determined knowledges and modes of experience, and not anonymously within (. . .) systems' (Melrose, 1994: 28).

An effort to define the theatrical potential (or meaning) in texts forms part of the reading of theatre practitioners, stage directors, dramaturges, translators, actors, costume and set designers, light and sound technicians, and in so far as it follows any fixed patterns set in past productions, it could even be predicted to some extent. Whether

the potential as such would form a closed set of options is highly questionable. As Bassnett (1998: 91–92) points out, if there is gestic [7] text, it will have to be infinitely variable. Similarly, a subtext will inevitably be decoded in different ways by different performers.

Birch (1991: 11) has criticised the prioritisation of the written text in the discussion of drama in the theatrical system. When verbal language and the dramatic text as a literary text are granted a privileged or controlling status, it often leads to situations in which *mises en scène* are viewed and assessed on the basis of literary criteria. The dramatic text is only one of the elements of a *mise en scène*, and there are other equally important elements in it which can guarantee either its success or its failure if allowed to do so. For example, acting can spoil a play just as easily as a play can destroy good acting. Costumes can take over and become the centre of attention, but they may also rescue a badly directed or badly written play. A director can make much of very little, or the other way round. The written text is there to be utilised in the total process which is theatre. It cannot be awarded any supreme place, nor can there be any single definite reading of it. The reading of a play will vary from age to age, from culture to culture, from reader to reader, and from performance to performance. Moreover, it varies between individual spectators or readers. The shaping process of the theatre, together with the right of every reader to 'own' the text, negates the notion of a single intended reading. A writer cannot claim to 'possess' a text (Bassnett-McGuire, 1981: 38, 40).

A production of *Hamlet* in France in the 1970s (as analysed by Heylen, 1993: 122–130) illustrates the multiplicity of readings and something of the process of how different readings arise. The stage director, Daniel Mesguich, of the Thètre du Miroir rejected the instrumental notion of writing, where the text is closed with a single meaning which is recognised by everyone. In Mesguich's view, a classical text is in fact two texts. The first text is the materially visible and readable text. The second text, which is most often unwritten and sometimes unspoken, consists of the interpretative layers which over the years have been and continue to be grafted on the original text: commentaries, analyses, past productions, critical reception, and stereotypical images. In a sense, both theatre and translation start with the death of the author. Mesguich used two stages in his *mise en scène*. On the small stage, the actors gave their lines in English. On the large stage, the medium was French. Mesguich wanted to show that a *mise en scène* was itself a translation. There was a time difference between the English and the French Hamlet, which also exists in the theatre between the written and the spoken word. The signification

becomes established in the 'air pocket' which exists between the two. If the written and the spoken word for some reason become merged, the 'air pocket' disappears and so does the signification. The lines are 'forgotten'. The actors illustrated this in the *mise en scène* by forgetting their lines.

Theatre Texts on the Page

The duality of dramatic texts as elements of both the literary and theatrical systems affects the ways in which foreign drama becomes integrated into the domestic systems, as both the theatrical and the literary system have their own norms and conventions which regulate text-generation in them. In Europe, for example, two distinct forms of drama translation had developed by the nineteenth century, one of which was commercial translation, for which the eventual performance was crucial and the other was the aesthetic translation of classical texts for the reader (Bassnett, 1990: 79).

The literary and the theatrical system may, in principle, function independently and choose their texts for publication on different grounds. They can, however, also cooperate in their use of dramatic texts and both benefit from each other's activities. The availability of printed play texts for a general readership as well as for stage production is organised differently in different countries. In Germany and England the number of drama translations printed in book form is considerable. In these countries, the literary system may wait until a play has established itself in the theatre in order to be able to use the publicity generated by the success on stage, or a printed version may come out at the same time as the production as a tie-in. However, the publication also provides the means of making texts available for production in the theatre. [8]

In Finland, the situation differs from that in England and Germany Commercial literary publishers have not been interested in publishing drama in printed form since the 1920s, when cheap paperback booklets made both Finnish and foreign drama available for the theatres and also for those interested in reading it. Publishers then gradually lost interest, and the few contemporary translations which are published in printed form most commonly come as supplements to the national theatre journal *Teatterilehti*. Commercial literary publishers, who were keen to offer both indigenous and translated drama to Finnish audiences when the national theatre was taking its first unsteady steps in the nineteenth century, have not found plays a feasible economic option ever since. For example, in my study of the

translation of contemporary Irish drama into Finnish (Aaltonen, 1996) I found that while 43 full-length Irish plays had been registered for copyright in translation by the theatre unions, only six had been published in printed form by literary publishers. The greater part of both domestic and foreign drama in Finland only exists as playscripts. These, typed and in A4 format, are available on request from the central library run by the theatre union in Helsinki. As their accessibility is so heavily restricted, plays are not read by the general public (Aaltonen, 1996: 58).

A similar separation of the literary and the theatrical system is noticeable in other countries as well. When Annie Brisset studied the integration of foreign plays into theatre repertoires in Québec from 1968 to 1988, she found that only 15 plays had been published in printed form, while at the same time the number of plays on stage in seven large theatres in Montreal and Québec City was 716 (Brisset, 1996: 12).

Translated theatre texts may thus function in only one of the systems, but they may also move from one system into the other, and become confined to that. For example, in contemporary Finland older translations of plays by Shakespeare, Molière, Lessing and Beckett, which started their life in both the theatrical and literary system, have gradually been confined to the literary system alone, and they are seldom used by the theatre any longer except for special effect (such as the Finnish production of *Hamlet* in 1997 in Hämeenlinna town theatre described above in the first chapter).

The two systems may define the accepted or tolerated translation strategies differently. If the literary and theatrical systems join forces or decide to coordinate their text-generation, the translations are likely to follow the conventions set by the system which is the principal home environment of the texts. An early example of the effect of the dominance of one of the systems can be found in Finland, where publishers began to print drama even before the national theatre had been established, to make plays available for the future stage. As some of the plays never reached the stage, it can be assumed that the literary system was primarily responsible for the translation strategies.

An example of a culture where the contemporary theatrical system exercises some influence over the publication of drama is provided by contemporary England, where the most important publisher of drama, Methuen, prefers 'stage' to 'page' translations, that is, translations where the focus is on the expectations of the receiving stage rather than on the careful repetition of the details of the source text.[2] However, because the stage production is more context bound than

the written text could ever hope to be, the printed version can never be an exact copy of the text as it comes out in a peformance. This has been pointed out by Trevor Griffiths who warns amateur companies against expecting to find accurate acting copies from a bookshop shelf:

> . . . many new plays are published to coincide with their premières. This means that the version that is prepared for publication does not contain the cuts, rewrites and changes that may have been made and approved by the writer during the rehearsal period. This means that the performed version of the play may be quite different from the published script. (Griffiths, 1982: 17)

The translation strategies expected, accepted or tolerated from translators vary according to the system they work for. This is evidenced, for example, by translations which have moved out of one system and into another. Dated translations may be acceptable in the literary system, whereas they will have to be revised or rewritten if the theatre should wish to use them in their production. Equally, as Trevor Griffiths said, a stage play will be revised to some extent before its publication in printed form. The theatrical system, with its weight on the immediacy of orality, and the literary system, with its emphasis on the permanence of the written language, behave according to their own rules when choosing a translation strategy.

In the theatre, a preference for a particular translation strategy, in particular if it is seen to deviate from some generally accepted practice in the literary system, is commonly explained by reference to the 'requirements of the stage'. A close imitation of a foreign text, which in itself is written for a different context both spatially and temporally, is often rejected as being too 'scholarly' or 'academic'. Publication in printed form and a theatre performance are deemed to require different translation strategies, as these comments on the recent English scene illustrate:

> The handful of translations worthily and devotedly carried out by academic enthusiasts has proved more of an obstacle than a help in staging. They are translations which have no home. (Laskowski, 1996: 193)

> An overly 'faithful' translation . . . can often make a foreign play awkward, torpid, colourless, like a Turkish tapestry viewed back to front. (Johnston, 1996a: 9–10)

Theatre translation is more tied to its immediate context than literary translation, as experience in the theatre is both collective and imme-

diate. Unlike readers, who can take their time in forming their individual reading of a text, a theatre audience functions as an item in a severely restricted time and place. Some of the strong reactions against academic or scholarly translations, such as Laskowski's above, may be understood against this background. Even in cases where a translator is not working towards a particular space or group of actors, s/he will still, in all likelihood, be angling the new version so that it penetrates into a particular consciousness (Johnston, 1996a: 11).

As a genre, theatre translation traditionally relates to the source text differently from its counterpart in the literary system where translation does not involve a change of medium. In the literary system, the medium remains the same, that is, a written text is translated and published as a written text, whereas in the theatre the text becomes an element of a performance on stage. In the theatre, orality, immediacy and communality unavoidably introduce a new dimension to the translation of texts, and, while in literary translation contemporary Anglo-American discourse emphasises the translator's invisibility and the faithfulness of the translation (Venuti, 1995a: 1), theatre translation actively rewrites, or adapts, many aspects of the source text, justifying this strategy with references to the 'requirements of the stage' and criteria such as 'playability' and 'speakability'.

Speakability, Playability, Performability

An unavoidable issue in any discussion about the ways foreign texts are rewritten for a new cultural, social, and linguistic system is the dichotomy of 'free' versus 'faithful' translations. In theatre translation the attributes 'academic', 'scholarly', or literary are used to describe one pole and 'adaptation' the other, and a systemic prioritisation of one strategy over the other is often made plain, as was illustrated by the comments of contemporary British theatre translators in the previous section. As modifiers of the relationship between the source text and its translation, the labels 'free' and 'faithful' are impressionistic and misleading, but, more seriously, they also divert the discussion away from the much more important issue of the reasons for the existence of different relationships.

It is difficult to define where the borderline between 'free' and 'faithful' lies or where one becomes the other. A translation can never be entirely 'faithful' to another text, because it always, by its very nature, creates a new text. Texts give rise to new texts which start a life of their own in another context, and the distinction between 'free' and 'faithful' can only be based on a subjective assessment of the

compatibility of the readings of the two texts. Similarly, the attempt made by contemporary copyright laws to define where 'free' becomes 'new' is bound to present problems. Texts are always built on other texts in an endless chain, although in translation more than perhaps any other form of writing the process of text-generation is based on recognisable intertexuality.

The characteristics 'speakability' or 'playability' have a long history in discussions of theatre translation. In one of the first significant attempts at a theory of drama translation, Jirí Levy (1969: 128) claimed that the language of drama stands in a functional relationship to the speaker, listeners and the norms of the spoken language. Levy saw the language of drama as a stylised form of the spoken language, constrained by theatrical conventions, and he emphasised speakability and easy graspability as criteria in the assessment of drama translations into another language: short sentences and sentence chains, well known words in preference to rarer ones, the avoidance of difficult consonant clusters and so on (for the construction of dramatic dialogue, see also Veltrusky, 1977).

Levy's outstanding contribution is that he clearly saw the centrality of performance in drama translation, but although he has inspired the work of a great many other scholars, some of his assumptions have not been accepted without reservation. One of the targets of criticism has been the vagueness of concepts such as speakability and performability. Performability has been criticised for being an empty term which has never been defined clearly. According to Bassnett (1990: 76; 1991: 102), there is no sound theoretical basis for it, and even if a set of criteria could be established, it would constantly vary from culture to culture, from period to period and from text type to text type. She explains the persistence of the term, performability, by the scarcity of theoretical work on the relationship between the written text and the performance, the absence of theoretical writing on theatre and translation, the failure to take into account the two traditions of translations for the theatre, the dominance of the idea of the play, established in the nineteenth century and applied retro-spectively to texts written centuries earlier, and the problem of fidelity and power relationships.

Speakability and performability have, however, remained central in discussions of the characteristics of theatre texts, and their vagueness as a criterion has not been questioned nearly as much as different interpretation and their validity Paris (1989: 30), for instance, who reads speakability to mean 'easy pronunciation', warns against the danger of banality which 'is lurking under cover of the text that

speaks well'. Besides, he points out, there are other elements in theatrical communication which are linked with speakability. Pavis himself (1992: 152) uses the phrase 'language-body' to refer to the union of speech and gesture which is language- and culture-specific (the combination of speech and movement has also been discussed by Veltrusky; 1976: 102–103). Another view of speakability is adopted by Brigitte Schultze, the German translation scholar, (1990: 268), who describes speakability as an important instrument for producing literary and theatrical meaning. She argues against confusing speakability with convenient pronunciation, and emphasises the importance of the *type* of speakability and its function in the process of generating theatrical meaning.

Speakability defined in terms of simplicity is clearly not a very accurate way of characterising theatre texts. Theatre texts do not need to be simple and easy to speak. They may, and often do, differ from texts in the literary system, and efforts to describe this difference usually involve descriptions of this difference in some concrete terms. For example, Snell-Hornby (1984: 104–108) has combined the two concepts of playability and speakability in one term, and used the phrase 'playable speakability' (*spielbaren Sprachlichkeit*) to underline the significance of rhythm. The dramatic figure must be understandable in the concrete space of the theatre, and the language must follow the natural rhythm of breathing. Also other scholars have seen the rhythm of speech as providing a potential key to understanding the language of the stage. Bassnett-McGuire (1985: 89) has argued that naturalist speech rhythms in the target language explain why theatre texts need constant updating. [10] Patterns of speech are in a continuous process of change, and therefore tied to a particular point in time.

The persistence of concepts such as speakability, playability and performability can be read as generalised descriptions of translation strategies in the theatre which are seen to set them apart from the dominant view in the literary system of how translations should relate to their source texts. If the norm is the 'faithful' translation, supported by, for example, copyright law in the legal system, a deviant approach to the source text, a 'free' translation, must be justified in some way, and the 'requirements of the stage' defined in terms of 'playability' and 'speakability' have provided this justification.

A terminological confusion has also followed from the undefined use of labels such as 'literal', 'literary', 'scholarly' or 'academic' as attributes of translations of one kind, and 'adaptation' as a description of another. The terms 'literal' and 'literary' may be used as synonyms to refer to 'faithful' translations, that is, those for which the entire

source text has been translated (see the comments of the translators in the previous section and also Bassnett, 1990: 76). It might be advisable to reserve the term 'literal' for a transcription of the foreign source text in the target language, a strategy commonly used in some theatrical systems for nearly all and in others for 'rare' languages. This is the case, for example, in the the cooperation of Martin Bowman and Bill Findlay in the translation of the plays by the Québecois play-wright Michel Tremblay into Scots:

> Martin Bowman produces a literal draft into unidiomatic English from Tremblay's original. This first draft is a kind of French-in-English which avoids as much as possible any kind of English literary interference such as the translation of idiomatic expressions into English equivalents. This translation is accompanied by an explanation of usage, catching passing irony, wordplay and humour, and explaining cultural elements unfamiliar to a Scot. Before Bill Findlay casts this draft into Scots, there is an exchange of questions, answers, clarification, and qualification, after which a first Scots draft is completed. Then follows a working through of the Scots text with close attention to the original. . . . Finally changes are made during rehearsal. (Findlay, 1994: 729)

This procedure introduces a clear division of labour where one of the translators is assumed to have the necessary knowledge of the foreign language of the source text and the conventions which were followed when it was written, while the other is the master of the target language as well as the systemic norms and conventions of the stage in the target system. Some theatrical systems have solved the problem of expertise in the conventions and norms of theatre translation by employing a salaried dramaturge whose job it is to see that texts which are submitted to them do not fall too far out of the systemic requirements of the target stage.

The term 'literary' can then be kept for translations which follow the conventions of the literary system irrespective of their similarity or dissimilarity to the conventions of theatre translation. This differs slightly from the way Bassnett (1990: 76) has used the term 'literal' (here virtually synonymous with 'literary') as opposed to 'performable' when she argues that the two cannot be distinguished unless 'performable' is taken to mean the use of the name of a well known, often monolingual playwright to sell the translation of a lesser known bilingual translator. 'Literary' (and 'performable' or 'stage') as attributes of translations are best seen as functional terms, referring to the systemic membership of the texts at any particular moment in time.

The term 'adaptation' also persists in discussions of theatre translation as a description of a translation strategy, and its vagueness causes confusion. David Johnston pointed out in his interview with David Hare that in the latter's translation of Pirandello, the phrases *translated and adapted by* appeared on the cover, and *version by* on the inside. The publisher was responsible for both labels. Johnston and Hare agreed that one could not really separate the three strategies (Johnston, 1996a: 143). David Edney, however, claims that the labels do help to make some distinction between translation strategies:

> Although I always call my scripts 'translations', directors often refer to them as 'adaptations', (or as translations/adaptations). I take this to be an expression of approval, indicating that the text sounds natural and playable: 'It does not read like a translation'. . . . In my mind, the distinctive feature that sets an adaptation apart from a translation is the presence of effects, conceived by the adapter, which are not found in the original. (Edney, 1996: 230)

While Edney's usage is not commonly accepted, Bassnett (1998: 98) would ban the use of both 'adaptation' and 'version' of translations as referring to a more radical difference altogether from the source text than would be implied by the word translation. The problem with the term adaptation is that despite its popularity its signification is unclear. Nevertheless, there is a need for a term to describe a translation strategy which does not translate the source text in its entirety but makes additions, omissions and changes to the general dramatic structure of its setting, plot and characters, thus suggesting new readings for it. The translator Steve Gooch (1996: 20) offers a similar, though vaguer, interpretation when he suggests that adaptation should be used to imply adapting a play to some secondary purpose, either to say something slightly different from the original or to apply the play to some particular new context. Adaptation could thus be used to describe a particular approach to the foreign text, not opposed to translation, but rather a type of translation. In the theatrical system, the ability to write an 'adaptation' is usually valued more highly in economic terms than the expertise in the source language of the text to be translated. In a standard BBC contract, translation and adaptation are separately costed, and the work of adaptation is better rewarded (Mulrine, 1996: 127).

The choice of a translation strategy, a 'faithful' translation, a reactualisation or an imitation (that is to say, adaptations), is linked with the spatially and temporally confined codes which through these strategies become represented in the discourse of the completed translations.

The linguistic code, governed by the sociocultural and theatrical system, decides on the way the indigenous idiom can be used on stage, whereas the sociocultural or ideological codes receive their response from translation strategies which address the issues regarded as important in the indigenous society and culture. In what follows we shall move to examine the ways different translation strategies have been used to integrate foreign theatre texts to indigenous repertoires, and how these strategies are related to the linguistic, sociocultural and/or theatrical codes of the target society

Notes

1. I have discussed systems theory as a framework for theatre translation in Aaltonen, 1996: 50–52.
2. Rewriting includes activities such as translation, historiography and anthologisation, criticism and editing (Lefevere, 1992: 9).
3. For the discussion of how norms and conventions govern the choice of translation strategies, see Aaltonen, 1996: 52–56, 64–68.
4. For example, Annie Brisset (1996: 4) uses the the term 'institutional apparatus' to describe the visible material basis of the literary institution. In the theatre, she includes production houses, programming, directors, set designers, actors, publishers, critics, awards and distinctions, and teaching programmes, and it therefore has considerable similarities with my use of the concept of 'theatrical system'.
5. Culture is a kind of shaping of specific inflections which mark our representations, feelings, activity – in short, and in a general manner, every aspect of our mental life and even our biological organism under the influence of the group (Camille Camilleri, 1982: 16, quoted in Pavis 1996: 3).
6. Some of the printed editions are believed to have been based on his own 'foul papers' or a prompt copy, both of which precede performance. Some others are *a posteriori*, for example *Hamlet*.
7. *Gestus* as used by Bertolt Brecht referred to the attitude of a character towards a circumstance. For an actor, it is the social significance of a scene. The adjective, coined by the critic Eric Bentley, is *gestic* (Harrison, 1998).
8. In some countries, such as Spain, film scripts are easily and cheaply available too.
9. The publisher's representative Michael Earley insisted on the preference for 'stage' versions over scholarly or academic versions which could not be acted but would be of interest as reading material in the Round Table discussion at the On Stage Translation conference at the University of Hull 12–14 September, 1997.
10. She has since revised her view and criticised generalised discussions of the need for fluent speech rhythms in attempts to define the 'performability' inherent in a text (Bassnett, 1991: 102).

Chapter 3—
The Time-Sharing of Theatre Texts

The relationship among the source text, its translation and the type of intertextuality in the time-sharing of theatre texts does not result from independent choice; the choice is always tied to the time and place of the occupancy, and based on the contribution the translation is expected to make to cultural and social discourse in the target society Translators, and through them entire theatrical systems or sub-systems, move into texts which have been found suitable for a particular purpose. These texts have had other tenants, who have left in them sediments of their histories, and there will be new tenants who will continue to do so.

Although it is interesting to explore the strategies by which texts can be adjusted to meet the needs of the target system, the reason why translators as tenants have chosen a particular type of intertextuality is a far more important object of study The categorisation of strategies as such is therefore less significant than the codes that have given rise to it. This chapter will outline potential regularities between the underlying codes and the types of intertextuality represented by the chosen translation strategy, and study the ways in which the discourse of foreign source texts is integrated in translation into the discourse of the target society

Translation as a Form of Egotism

A translation always rewrites its source text because the starting point for the entire process lies in the Self. The Foreign is only of secondary importance, if at all. When foreign playtexts are chosen for translation, the choice is based on some need of the indigenous system for them, but it is also affected by the compatibility of the discourse of the foreign text with that of the receiving theatrical system and the target society To begin with, foreign works selected for translation are those whose discursive strategies are in harmony with codes governing what is thinkable, sayable and writable within the target society (Brisset, 1996: 158). Thus, one of the conditions of the acceptance of a foreign text for translation is that it must be possible

to bring its discourse in line with that of the receiving theatrical system and society at large.

Texts are chosen and rewritten in ways determined by various historical and social situations relatable to the aesthetics of theatre or its social functions. [1] Theatre translation, like all translation, is always an egotistically motivated activity As Fischer-Lichte has pointed out:

> The starting point of intercultural performance is, therefore, not primarily interest in the foreign, the foreign theatre form or foreign culture from which it derives, but rather a wholly specific situation within the own culture, or a wholly specific problem originating in the own theatre. The net of relationships which an intercultural performance weaves between the own theatre, own culture, and the foreign theatre traditions and cultures from which it adopts elements, is thus clearly dominated by the own. (Fischer-Lichte, 1990b: 283)

The aim of a translated theatre text is very seldom, or never entirely, to provide an introduction to the Other or to mediate the Foreign. Instead the foreign work is given the task of speaking for the target system and society The aim is not that the audience be brought closer to, or made familiar with the foreign tradition, but rather that the foreign tradition is, to a greater or lesser extent, transformed according to the different conditions of specific fields of reception (Fischer-Lichte, 1990b: 283).

The centrality of the target system in the entire process of intercultural theatre may be emphasised to the extent that the distinction between the source and target cultures becomes irrelevant. Fischer-Lichte (1990b: 284) has argued that parallels with the theoretical concepts and vocabularies of translation to describe and assess intercultural performances are misleading. According to her, the intercultural performance does not take the foreign text or even the foreign culture as the point of departure to be communicated by one's own theatre, but rather, interculturality stems from the needs and demands of one's own theatre and culture, and the foreign text or the foreign theatrical conventions are chosen, transformed, and re-planted according to their relevance to the situation in question. It therefore makes little sense to speak of the source text and the target text, even less of a source culture or a target culture, as should be the case when the Foreign is to be communicated in translation. In intercultural theatre, the source culture and the target culture are one and the same thing, that is, one's own culture.

If the texts, and through them also the cultures involved in the

process of intercultural theatre, merge into one's own culture, and if the source is used only as material to produce something in the target culture, the basis for translation disappears, claims Fischer-Lichte. To replace it, she has suggested the concept of 'productive reception' to describe the adoption of elements from foreign theatre traditions (Fischer-Lichte, 1990b: 287): an intercultural performance productively receives elements from the foreign theatre traditions and cultures according to a problem which lies at the point of departure. The potentiality as well as the specific restrictions of production and reception and the impending problem are decisive which culture or theatre tradition will be looked in, which elements are chosen, in what way these are altered, and how they will be combined. Productive reception allows any element of any number of foreign cultures to undergo cultural transformation through the process of production, thereby making the own theatre and the own culture productive again.

We can argue similarly that translation is always inherently characterised by productive reception. It is fundamentally ethnocentric and the very function of translating is assimilation (Venuti, 1998: 11). In theatre translation, the Foreign is not the primary inspiration in the decision to turn to other cultures. Instead the interest is motivated by the perception of the benefits for the Self of such exchange. The choice of suitable texts is always based on the needs of the target system and the compatibility of the discourse of the source text with that of the target culture. Moreover, foreign source texts are manipulated to serve various causes in the receiving system and society.

The perception of the egotistical nature of intercultural theatre and through that also theatre translation and the argument for replacing the concept of translation with that of productive reception in descriptions of it is thought-provoking. Not only does the source culture exist only in so far as it can serve the needs of the target culture by producing suitable texts, and not only are these texts used selectively for that purpose, but the source text and the source culture it represents are also constructed, in translation, by the target culture. The construction is part of the target culture, and has no existence as such beyond the translation process. In that sense the source and the target poles are, indeed, one and the same thing – one's own culture – and the choice of elements interesting from the point of view of reception only.

The discussion of productive reception does, however, acquire a new dimension if attention is focused on to representations of the Other and its constructions in the final product, a translation and then a performance. In literary studies, research into constructions of the

Other, most notably by Edward Said (1978) and more recently by Homi Bhabha (1994), have increased understanding of the artificial nature of cultural representations, and also highlighted the cultural hierarchies which have given rise to them. In theatre studies, Rustom Bharucha (1993: 15) has criticised European avant-garde directors, and accused Artaud, for example, of having created 'his own "East", an imaginary Orient, from which he derived sources of rejuvenation and for evening out all the distinctive characteristics of varied and complex arts such as Kabuki, Noh, Wayang Kulit, Baris, Kathakali and Chhau', making their identities interchangeable. Other directors are deemed equally guilty of 'misrepresentation' by not acknowledging the distortion of the original rituals in the service of American standards and expectations. [2]

In translation studies, researchers are also aware of the role of the target system and culture in constructing representations of the Other, and some scholars have drawn attention to the 'misrepresentations' or absence of some cultures as sources in the choice of texts for translation. Lefevere (1992: 73, 75) has pointed out that the literature produced in the Islamic system is the least available to readers in Europe and the Americas, and also misrepresented in the existing translations, as his quote of a letter by Edward Fitzgerald to his friend, E.B. Cowell, on the subject of the Persian poets illustrates: It is 'an amusement for me to take what Liberties I like with these Persians who (as I think) are not Poets enough to frighten one from such excursions, and who really do want a little Art to shape them'. And, Lefevere claims, Fitzgerald would never have dared to take such liberties with classical Greek or Latin literature, because of the prestige enjoyed by these literatures in his time and since. Venuti (1998: 4) has described as 'perhaps the greatest scandal of translation, the asymmetries, inequities, relations of domination and dependence which exist in every act of translating, of putting the translated in the service of the translating culture'. His range of examples from translations for the American market of Wittgenstein, Heidegger, Guareshi and Eco as well as the representation of, say, Japanese literature illustrates how in a hegemonic country translation fashions images of their subordinate others and confirms dominant domestic values (Venuti, 1998: 159).

The many ways in which a translation can relate to its source text, by using the entire text or only some parts of it as well as rewriting it to fall in line with the needs and expectations of the target system and culture, put the validity of some general claims about the nature of translation activity into question. For example, the description by Venuti (1995b: 15) of the relation between the source text and its translation as mimetic and interpretive assumes that the aim of the activity

is mediation and communication, which as we have seen is not nearly always the case.

The significance of a source culture should not be ignored in the study of translations, although the traditional view of translation as replication needs to be revised. If translation is seen as a basically egotistically motivated activity, the study of the source text and culture is of interest from the point of view of the use made of them by the target culture. The fact that in translation both the material, that is, the construction of the Other, and the final product have their origins in the same culture can be used as a starting point for studies of how and why representations are constructed in a particular way, and also what their implications are for both the source and the target culture.

If interculturality in translation could be based on genuine exchange, and the choice, transformation and transplantation of foreign elements could take place between equal partners, all source cultures, not only the powerful ones, could exercise some control over the outcome of the process, which unavoidably has consequences for them as well. The inequalities of cultural interaction have been pointed out by scholars who come from cultures which have traditionally provided the material for intercultural theatre, and therefore represent the source culture. For example, Bharucha has criticised the hour-glass model of intercultural theatre suggested by Pavis (1992: 184–185), in which the sand neatly falls from the top, the source culture bowl, into the bottom, the target culture bowl, and shown that the exchange of intercultural theatre never leaves the source culture intact, as Pavis' model suggests. According to Bharucha (1993: 241), the 'grains of culture', trickling through filters from one bowl to another and then collecting in particular formations and conglomerations at the bottom, restrict the larger dynamics of intercultural exchange by emphasising the unidirectionality, with the target culture acquiring the status of a destination. Ideally, Bharucha argues, interculturalism should be a back-and-forth movement. The criticism has been extended to translation studies as well, and Western scholars have been accused of not making an attempt to account for the relationship between 'unequal' languages (Niranjana 1992: 48).

Cultural imbalances have, however, been registered in translation studies, where scholars are becoming increasingly aware of the effects of the ethnocentric violence of translation (Venuti, 1995a: 20). Some have been pessimistic about justice ever being attained, and seen translation as inherently incapable of fair representation: 'cannibalism cannot be a two-way process'. [3] Others have not lost hope, and

argued for foreignisation in translation [4] as a strategic cultural intervention in world affairs, pitched against hegemonic notions of the English language and the unequal cultural exchanges in which they engage their global others. It is obvious that while so much attention has been given to the 'loss of poetics' in translation, it should in future be directed to the politics in it.

One explanation of why research into the appropriations and most blatant 'misrepresentations' of the source texts, and through them also of the source cultures, has not attracted more scholars in translation studies may be the paucity of suitable texts due to the tendency to select the texts under cultural proximity and consonance.[5] Texts tend to be chosen for translation from familiar cultures whose discursive strategies are seen to be compatible with what is thinkable, sayable, and writable within the target society Another explanation may be that as researchers now recognise that 'fidelity' in representation is always a relative concept and its function as a criterion for the choice of translation strategies varies both diachronically and synchronically, they see their task to be primarily the study of variation in the different strategies, and the reasons for them, rather than giving support to this or that way of translating. This wish to refrain from value judgements has been strongly criticised, for example by Venuti (1998: 28) who has claimed that, apart from being impossible, it also has other negative consequences:

> The insistence of value-free translation studies prevents the discipline from being self-critical, from acknowledging and examining its dependence on other, related disciplines, from considering the wider cultural impact that translation research might have. (Venuti, 1998: 29)

It should, however, be borne in mind that emphasis on the target pole and noncommittal to any particular strategy in the study of translations does not imply the acceptance of 'misrepresentations'.

'Misrepresentations', that is, the acculturation and appropriation of the representations of the Foreign, are often justified by explaining that they make communication and mediation possible, and thereby help to increase understanding between cultures. This is, however, not necessarily the case, as the interaction tends to use the values of dominant cultures as tools for constructing images of the Other. Translations provide thus mirrors in which we can see ourselves rather than windows through which we see the rest of the world. Moreover, the generalising of economic and cultural exchanges on a global scale may mislead us into thinking that a 'one-world culture' is

in the process of emerging, although it is rather a standardisation of social practices dominated by the capitalist West (Pavis, 1996: 16–17).

In the study of theatre translation, the above discussion directs analysis to the ways in which foreign texts are chosen and used to make the target system productive, bearing in mind that the partners in intercultural contacts are seldom equal, and the association of materials is usually carried out on terms set by one of the partners only.

Productive Reception I—
Compatibility

Even if the categorisation of theatre texts into 'free' and 'faithful' translations of their source texts is rejected as irrelevant, different relationships between the two texts must still be acounted for. Theatre texts, perhaps more than any other genre, are adjusted to their reception, and the adjustment is always socially and culturally conditioned. Theatre as an art form is social and based on communal experience; it addresses a group of people in a particular place at a particular time. It grows directly out of a society its collective imagination and symbolic representations, and its system of ideas and values (Brisset, 1996: 5).

Both the choice of texts and the adjustments are carried out in the interests of the integration of a foreign theatre text into the aesthetics of the receiving theatre as well as the social discourse of the target society. The adjustments can affect various elements in the text, depending on whether, and to what extent, the Foreign needs to be disguised, or whether links need to be strengthened with the own theatre and society.

Foreign works are selected on the basis of some discursive structures which either need to be already in line with those in the target society or can be made compatible with them. Structures which can either enhance or hinder integration have been illustrated by Jonathan Culler (1975: 140–152), who has distinguished between different levels of *vraisemblance*, that is, the ways in which a text may be brought into contact with and defined in relation to other texts. In theatre translation he refers to five levels that have their greatest impact in the choice of texts, but they can also affect the ways the Foreign is rewritten for its new context.

The first two levels of *vraisemblance* have their greatest impact on the choice of texts for translation. The simplest level, the socially given text, requires no justification because it is seen to derive directly from the structure of the world. Similarly the second level of *vraisemblance*, the cultural stereotype, is accepted, not as a true representation of

reality, but as a generalisation. That Italians are noisy, Finns reserved, the Other unpredictable, economists and book-keepers boring, and stepmothers wicked are examples of stereotypes which are recognisable within Western culture. [6] The two levels of *vraisemblance* rely on the compatibility of social discourses. Foreign play texts which represent either empiricist or emotional reality familiar to us are admitted into the theatrical system more easily than those that are not compatible with our way of looking at the world. A look at theatre repertoires well illustrates the way the indigenous theatre sees itself as part of the world; some cultures are very popular partners as sources of new theatre texts, whereas others feature in the repertoires only seldom, if at all.

In intercultural theatre, different theatrical conventions may both hinder and increase interaction. The third and fourth levels of *vraisemblance* are based on aesthetic conventions within which each genre constitutes a special *vraisemblance* of its own. We accept certain types of inconsistency in foreign drama as long as they occur within the conventions of the genre and our competence in them. Although the basic assumptions underlying dramatic performance in general tend to be the same in different cultures (the events shown are fictional rather than real; people who are killed are not really dead; the actors' personalities are not identical with those of the characters), specific and varied conventions, which are almost infinite in variety, govern different varieties, genres and subgenres. Some of these, such as those governing the performance of classical Greek tragedy or Japanese traditional drama, are highly formalised and rigid, while others allow a certain amount of flexibility; and new conventions arise in some forms of drama from case to case as they develop (Esslin, 1994: 145–146). There may, however, also be either an implicit or an explicit indication that what we are receiving is not a generic convention, although it may gradually develop into one. The audience may be drawn into the play, either concretely in a performance, or when it is being addressed directly by dramatic figures as part of the play, which breaks the frame of the generic convention of illusion by claiming that the text is not intelligible at the level of the generic *vraisemblance*. The creation of distance between the audience and performance is similar to those introductions to novels which explain how the material has become accessible to the narrator, thus playing on the opposition between truth and fiction.

The fifth and last category of *vraisemblance* relies on recognisable intertextuality. A play or film may borrow an idea and use another known text as its material. Medieval mystery plays drew on Bible

narratives, and Kurosawa's film *The Throne of Blood* on *Macbeth*. In theatre translation imitations are equally common, and they usually draw on the recognisability of well known classics, the archetypes of cultural heritage. The motivation behind writing an imitation may be a desire to emphasise the universality of some issue important in one's own theatre and society, or underline the symbolic value of the foreign text as a representation of that issue.

In order to make foreign texts compatible with other texts in the target system as well as with the 'reality' of the target society, translation can make use of either acculturation or naturalisation [7] in an effort to disguise what is perceived as an obstacle to integration. Acculturation is the process which is employed to tone down the Foreign by appropriating the unfamiliar 'reality', and making the integration possible by blurring the borderline between the familiar and the unfamiliar. In rewriting the source text, the *vraisemblance* is established on the level of the audience's competence in the general cultural conventions of the language, manners, moral standards, rituals, tastes, ideologies, sense of humour, superstitions, religious beliefs, etc., and the specific dramatic and performance conventions of theatre and drama (Aaltonen, 1996: 18). Acculturation removes the cultural anchoring[8] and eliminates or minimises the relationship to any specific culture.

Some acculturation always takes place in the translation of foreign drama, as I found in my study of the translation into Finnish of Irish milieux descriptions in twentieth century Irish realist drama. Between related cultures such as the Finnish and the Irish, it was possible in many places to move from a specific (Irish) to a more generic (European) image (Aaltonen, 1996). Acculturation may also be a conscious decision by the director in a particular performance, as has been illustrated by Lavelli's *Playboy of the Western World* as described by Pavis (1996: 10), in which the translation consciously acculturated the Irish colouring of the text. Cultural specifications can always be, if not neutralised, at least mimimised, argues Pavis.

Acculturation may also involve naturalisation, in which the Foreign becomes replaced by recognisable signs of the Self. Naturalisation denies the influence of the Foreign, and rewrites the play through some elements as if coming from the indigenous theatre and society. It reduces everything to the perspective of the target culture, which is in the dominant position and turns the alien culture to its own ends (Pavis, 1996: 11).[9] An example of naturalisation would be the first Finnish *Macbeth* translation (1834), which used the traditional *Kalevala* metre of Finnish folk poetry as well as alliteration, another

characteristic of the Finnish national epic. The play was also reset in Finland, with Finnish characters and allusions.

In the theatre, acculturation and naturalisation are ways of rewriting the foreign elements of the source text from within the target culture. Their use is motivated by the desire to disguise, or at least not to highlight, the foreign origin of the text, and to make its realities and theatre aesthetics compatible with those of the target society Although the attitude towards alterity may, in itself, be an important issue in the target culture, translations also unavoidably contribute to this discourse by the choice of translation strategy Foreign theatre texts are manipulated for other reasons as well and an important consideration in the choice of a translation strategy may be a need to turn the Other into a vehicle for some social comment in the target society.

**Productive Reception II—
Integration**

The relationship between the source text and its translation in the major rewriting strategies, where foreign playtexts are integrated into the repertoires of the target theatre and made part of the discourse of the target society, fall roughly into three broad categories, which form a cline rather than three distinct points on a scale. The relationships have been distinguished by scholars in such connected fields as translation, theatre and film studies, which all deal with the creation of new texts on the basis of old ones.

In her study of theatre translation in Québec, Annie Brisset divided the ways in which foreign source texts were rewritten for the indigenous theatre on the basis of how much of the source text was used in the translation. There were texts which had been translated in their entirety, but there were also those in which only parts of the source text had been translated and other parts had vanished or undergone various types of alteration. Adaptations, as she described the latter category, include both reactualisations and imitations. Reactualisation, in Brisset's definition, involves the spatial and sometimes temporal transposition of a foreign play, whereas imitation is the most radical form of adaptation which produces a new work in its own right, with the original work surviving only as an intertext (Brisset, 1996: 12).

In theatre studies, a similar categorisation has been distinguished in the different ways a director can use a text as the basis for a performance. When he distinguishes in his book *Directing Plays* between three different types of directors, director—playwright Don Taylor (1996: 27, 35, 39) implies that the choice of approach to a theatre text

depends on the director rather than on any systemic or cultural factors. Text-directors, transformational directors, and auteur—directors, as Taylor calls them, each have their characteristic way of using the text they are preparing for the stage. Text-directors give the text a central role in the performance and try to follow it as closely as possible. They aim to 'penetrate every cranny of the author's meaning, . . . and to imagine the best possible way of presenting those meanings on stage'. A text-director's imagination is constrained by the text. For transformational directors, anything is possible. For them a play is material for performance; it provides elements which can be used to make a particular statement. Transformational directors will be prepared to cut the playwright's text, to leave out whole aspects of the work if necessary, and even to insert material from other works. They may ignore the playwright's structure and be quite prepared to overlay it with a new structure of their own. For auteur—directors, the play provides an idea or concept around which a new play is constructed. The playwright becomes just one element in the creative team, and the script for the performance is developed in cooperation with all the members of the team.

Similar techniques can also be applied when the rewriting involves a change in both the media as well as the genre, for example, when a novel is turned into a film. Dudley Andrew (1984: 98–100) has proposed the categories of transformation, intersecting, and borrowing to describe how a film can relate to the novel which has given rise to it, and his categories correspond largely to the distinctions made by both Brisset and Taylor. Text-directors respect the text, and so do translations for which the entire source text, not just parts of it, has been translated. Equally, Andrew's transformations aim to reproduce in film something that is considered essential in the original text (say, the making of Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* into a film by Ang Lee in the 1990s). However, when the rewriting rejects the criterion of 'fidelity' to its source, the strategy becomes either intersecting or borrowing. In Andrew's analysis, intersecting is a technique of adaptation which highlights the uniqueness of the source text and creates a refraction of it. If the original artwork is like a crystal chandelier whose formal beauty is a product of its intricate but fully artificial arrangement of parts, the production would be the flashlight intersecting it not for its own shape or its quality of light but for what it makes appear in this or that dark corner (Andrew, 1984: 99) [10] Its goals are therefore similar to those of Taylor's transformational director or Brisset's translations, which reactualise the foreign text. A case in point is Hitchcock's *Sabotage* which is based on Joseph Conrad's *Secret Agent*. The third of

Andrew's categories is borrowing, in which the material idea or form of an earlier, usually successful text, is employed to a greater or lesser extent (for example, Akira Kurosawa's *Macbeth*). The same strategy is employed by auteur—directors who write a new text on the basis of the old one, and in translations which write an imitation (or parody) of the source text.

The above tripartite categorisations characterise the different strategies with which the source text can be written. When the discourse of the foreign text is seen to be compatible with both the social discourse of the target society as well as the theatre aesthetics of its cultural system, the entire source text is likely to be translated. However, when a foreign text is regarded only as suitable raw-material or a good story with the potential for performance or the potential to speak for an important issue in the target society, only parts of it may be translated, while others are deleted and new ones introduced. The translation is, however, still seen to respect the entire source text, and only refract it by intersecting it at what is seen to be essential in it. In the third category, the foreign text provides an idea, a theme, or a concept which is further developed into a play.

The categorisation is of interest only as far as it relates to the codes underlying the choice between the strategies. A translator, like any writer of theatre texts, uses a suitable strategy to bring the discourse of the source text in line with that of the receiving theatrical system and the entire target society, and thus guarantees its acceptance and integration.

**Productive Reception III—
Alterity**

A theatre production is always closely tied to its audience in a particular place at a particular point in time, and in consequence, when a foreign dramatic text is chosen for a performance in another culture, the translation as well as the entire production unavoidably represent a reaction to the Other.

To begin with, the stage is open for some texts but not for all that are on offer. As the first four levels of *vraisemblance* discussed above indicated, texts are brought into contact with other texts in the system and defined in relation to them on the basis of the extent to which they share the same view of 'reality' and the conventions that are used in relating to it. Cultures whose social discourse is seen to be compatible with that of one's own are given priority over those which look at the world differently. Different theatrical and dramatic conventions may promote or hinder the admission of texts from other

cultures, a fact which explains the absence of theatre texts from large areas such as China, Japan, India and Africa in European theatre repertoires, and the over-representation of texts from other areas such as other European countries and North America.

Only certain cultures are seen to possess symbolic goods which can increase the cultural capital in one's own culture; others do not fill this function. In the theatrical season 1993–1994, the five most popular source cultures of drama translations integrated into the Finnish theatrical polysystem were – by nationality of author – English (10% of all performances), American (9%), French (4%), Swedish (7%), and Russian (3%), whereas mainstream Finnish audiences saw only a single Argentinian, Chilean, Ethiopian, Dutch, Irish, Israeli, Yugoslavian, Canadian and Swiss play (Aaltonen, 1996: 15).

The symbolic value of some cultures as a source of prestigious cultural capital may be linked with a variety of other factors, ranging from a country's – or maybe an individual theatre's – political past and preferences to general trade relations and the knowledge of foreign languages. A country's geopolitical situation, that is, its distance from a particular country, and the size of its population, seems to have less significance for the cultural influx from one country to another than, for example, commercial interests. For example, on the basis of geopolitical location, Russia should have been Finland's closest cultural ally. Instead, the cultural influx has been predominantly from the United States and Great Britain, with all other countries, and Russia in particular, far behind (Jalonen, 1985: 269). Commercial factors, coupled with the desire to take distance politically and therefore also culturally from Russia, have laid Finnish cultural imports open to the dominance of the United States and Great Britain throughout the years of independence.

The view the colonial British administrators in India held of the indigenous culture as impoverished and in need of a cultural boost from either its own past or a more alive Western tradition established models of drama and directed the choice of plays of Parsi theatre companies which mushroomed in Bombay in the 1850s. These companies, which became very popular in India from that time, developed from amateur groups which had been directly related to British-run schools and colleges. Their repertoires thus consisted of both Indian and English classics, Shakespeare, Molière and Kalidasa, but they also took over the material culture of European theatre in India (Loomba, 1997: 114–115).

A newly established nation may for historical reasons react strongly against cultural imports from dominant cultures for fear of

manipulation, and it may act in a hostile manner towards what she sees as a threat against her independence. National revivals are usually characterised by a desire to take distance from cultures which are seen this way. A case in point is Québec, where theatrical imports excluded or minimised imports from France or the English-speaking part of Canada (Brisset, 1996: 54–55). In the first years of Finnish independence in 1917, the country turned her back on the old coloniser. Between the two World Wars, the Finnish National Theatre produced only eight Soviet plays, and after the Second World War, Soviet plays were produced mainly by the openly leftist Workers' Theatre. Even as late as the 1960s, they tended to come to Finland through London (Paavolainen, 1992: 267).

Foreign theatre texts as such may be very important for the definitions of one's own culture. When the Finnish National Theatre was established in 1872, domestic drama made up only a quarter of the plays in its repertoire. Similarly, when the Polish National Theatre was established in the capital in 1765 to be used for plays in Polish, they were all translations of foreign authors (Hartnoll, 1990: 651).

Foreign texts which are chosen for translation are aesthetically and socially subject to the same constraints as original writing in their attitude to the Foreign, but unlike indigenous writing for the stage, the translations also express an attitude to alterity indirectly through the way in which the Foreign is rewritten to serve a new master.

Annie Brisset (1996: 196) found, in her study of the connection between the rewriting strategies employed in the translation of foreign theatre texts and the social discourse in Québec, that naturalisation was a prerequisite for the acceptance of the Foreign into the literary institution. The translator's task was not so much to introduce the receiver to what was unusual or original in the foreign work, but rather to turn the foreign work into a vehicle for representing the Québecois 'reality'. The period Brisset chose for her study, the years from 1968 to 1988, was remarkable from the point of view of a change in the social discourse, which became characterised by efforts to distance itself from the Other, and significant both politically and culturally for the establishment of an identity to the Self. Brisset analysed both theatre translations published in printed form as well as productions of translations in the seven largest theatres in Montreal and Québec City.

According to Brisset (1996: 10), the translation strategies employed in the rewriting of foreign source texts established a discourse which expressed three different approaches to alterity. In iconoclastic translation, either the source text was reactualised or the translation

formed an imitation or it formed a parody of it. Iconoclastic translation, by breaking up the structure of the source text and using fragments of it to produce a different work, was thus situated between creation and translation proper. The tie to the Foreign was, however, not entirely severed, because foreign works were still used as the reference point against which the indigenous theatre defined itself. The second mode, perlocutory translation, was aimed at producing a certain reaction in the consciousness of the audience by transforming the presuppositions of the original text and manipulating its point of view. Omissions and additions were introduced and the themes and images of the source text given a new motivation. The third mode, the identity-forming function, was tied to the quest for a native language, Québecois, and through that to the need to distinguish oneself from cultures which were perceived as a threat. It was important not to be mixed in with the others in the North American melting pot, and also to be at a distance from the old coloniser France. The existence of a native language was seen to form a prerequisite for 'Québec libre', that is, independence and sovereignty.

Brisset's aim was to study the relationship between translation and social discourse in a particular field, the theatre. Her main interest was in the way foreign texts were chosen and rewritten to meet the social function of the theatre in a specific historical and social situation.The findings of Itamar Even-Zohar are drawn from another field, the study of the literary system, and his research has centred most importantly on the position translations can occupy in literary systems and their potential as innovators in them. Even-Zohar focuses on the different ways translations relate to the aesthetics of the receiving literary system. On the basis of their characteristics, Even-Zohar divided literary systems into strong and weak, and found that the position of translations as well as their innovatory potential is tied to that.

Even-Zohar (1990: 46–49) has claimed that there are three conditions under which translated literature can come to occupy a central position in the literary polysystem. Centrality can be expected when a literature is young and in the process of being established. Translated literature then fulfils the need for a younger literature to put its newly established language to use for as many literary types as possible. Since a young literature cannot immediately create texts in all the types known to its producers, it benefits from the experience of other literatures. Secondly, centrality can be expected when a literature is either peripheral or weak, and thirdly, when there are turning points, crises or literary vacuums in a literature. This applies to relatively

established literatures whose resources are limited and whose position within a larger literary hierarchy is generally peripheral. Such literatures do not often develop the same full range of literary activities as those in adjacent literatures. They might lack something that is felt to be badly needed in terms of the presence of the adjacent literature, and this lack might be filled wholly or partly by translated literature. When translated texts occupy a central position in the literary polysystem, there is no clear-cut distinction between an original and a translation. Translations act as innovators and thus assume the role which in strong literatures would be reserved for native writing. In strong literatures, translations maintain a peripheral position and therefore constitute a peripheral system. They have no influence on major literary processes, and are modelled according to norms already conventionally established by a dominant type in the target literature. Translated literature becomes a major factor of conservatism.

According to Even-Zohar's model, we could thus expect emerging, weak literatures to be more tolerant of alterity than strong literatures, and look at foreign drama as not needing any adjustment to the target codes. The Foreign might be of primary importance in the choice of foreign texts for translation in the weak systems, whereas strong literatures would not be interested in the Foreign as a source of innovation and inspiration. They would rather try to assimilate the Other by covering up its alterity.

Even-Zohar's model, in particular his view of the behaviour of strong literary systems, has been questioned to some extent. Gentzler (1996: 117–119), for example, points out that although Even-Zohar's polysystem theory is becoming increasingly valuable as a tool for studying the literatures of emerging nations, from developing countries, or countries undergoing radical change, his arguments concerning the role of translations in strong cultures with well developed literary traditions and many different kinds of writings are less convincing. Translations, Gentzler claims, may play an important innovative role even within a seemingly strong culture. To support his claim, Gentzler refers to his own study of a literary subsystem in the USA, and also studies from Québec, for example the research by Brisset, of the role translations have played in forming identities and subverting established institutions. Translation in Québec, for example, has been less a way of introducing a foreign text than of legitimising a distinct ethnological and political entity

Gentzler (1996: 119) suggests that not enough data have been collected to make generalisations about literary translation in strong literary systems. For the study of the role of translations in strong

literary systems, he proposes a cultural studies model of evasive conformity and practices of everyday life outlined by De Certeau. According to Gentzler, translation scholars should focus on minority groups which may use translations for innovation even though they are situated far from the centre of literary innovation.

The way literary (and theatrical) systems react to foreign texts may be more predictable in emerging new systems which are in the process of being established, because these may be fairly monolithic and homogeneous structures. Established strong, but also weak, systems usually become fragmented, and minority groups in them begin to lead a life of their own, independently of large institutions. In consequence, the role translations play in them may also become diversified and tied to particular subsystems. Another consideration is the cultural hierarchy represented by either the source culture of the foreign texts or the institutions and their fixed models in the domestic system, which may lead to subversive behaviour not anticipated by the systemic type as strong or weak. Some of this was, in fact, already suggested by Even-Zohar when he claimed that a literary system may stratify its translated literature and let one section of it assume a central position, leaving other sections peripheral (1990: 49). As fragmentation of systems as well as their behaviour towards cultural hierarchies is taken into account, generalisations about the entire system become more difficult, if not impossible to make.

De Certeau's cultural studies model, as has been suggested by Gentzler, does clearly open interesting insights into how subsystems work, but also into how some weak mainstream [11] literary or theatrical systems function with respect to cultures they perceive as their superior. A useful additional consideration to the typology of theatrical systems might therefore be the fragmentation of the target system and a hierarchical relationship between the source culture and the target culture. The discussion commenced by Even-Zohar, Brisset and Gentzler about the behaviour of translations can thus be continued by directing the focus in theatre translation on the ways in which the discourse of the foreign text is integrated into the target system and society depend on the characteristics of the target system, its fragmentation, and the perception of the hierarchical position of the two cultures in the interaction.

The different translation strategies, related to the underlying codes or discourses in the target society may signal either reverence or subversion (rebellion or disregard) towards alterity, and be distinguished from each other. As suggested by Brisset, Taylor and Andrew (discussed in previous sections), a text-oriented translation repeats the

various structures of the source text and translates it in its entirety, whereas an adaptation as a translation strategy intersects the source text at what is perceived to be the essence of it, or writes a new play around some concept or theme in it. An adaptation may thus reactualise the source text by translating only parts of it, while other parts vanish or are changed. It may reactualise the foreign source text spatially and/or temporally, but in all these cases the adaptation still claims to represent the source text in the target system. Finally, and as a subcategory of adaptation, an imitation borrows an idea or theme from the foreign source text and writes a new play around it.

Apart from cultural and social considerations, the choice of a translation strategy and through that the mode of translation, may also be constrained by economic factors, which often have an immediate impact on the way a foreign text is rewritten. Economic considerations play an increasingly important role in contemporary Western theatre, where finances can both destroy as well as create entire subsystems.

Reverence

When the mode of translation is reverence, the Foreign, as represented by texts chosen for translation, is held in esteem and respected. These texts are either translated in their entirety, or an effort is made to transplant into the indigenous linguistic and cultural system certain features – often aspects of theatre aesthetics – which are deemed essential in them. Translations are used as a way of increasing cultural capital in the indigenous system, which, among other qualities, determines the position which a culture holds in the hierarchy of cultures. Cultural capital can be increased through symbolic goods, either own or foreign, which are deemed valuable by the cultures in the hierarchy. [12] When theatrical systems hope to increase their cultural capital through translation, they look for superior cultures and their canonised authors and texts.

Foreign authors, their texts, or some qualities of these texts are held in esteem, and it is hoped that through the inspiration for domestic writing translations might also be able to generate more of the desirable qualities of the source texts in the target system. As the Foreign comes from a cultural system which is regarded as superior, the hope is that the texts will eventually make it possible for the target system to share some of that superiority as well. Through the exchange, the attributes and positive qualities of the Other are introjected into the Self in order for the indigenous system to experience a oneness with

it. Reverence as a mode of translation may also include an intention to transplant the Foreign into the home system as a source of inspiration, or use it to support some issue in the social discourse of the target culture.

When the Foreign is perceived as superior, and possessing certain desirable qualities which are lacking in the indigenous system, alterity is highlighted, or no effort is made to disguise it. The Self is seen to benefit from the relationship. Reverence is demonstrated through a high regard for the 'original', and an effort may be made to avoid omissions and additions, and to repeat the narrative and actantial [13] structures of the source text. Translations may use the same number of characters, and place the scenes in more or less the same order. The spatial and temporal setting is likely to repeat that of the source text, and no effort is made to naturalise the poetics of it either. In consequence, the discourse of the translation claims that nothing but the language separates the source and its translation.

The translation strategy which has a high regard for the source text corresponds primarily to the text-oriented approach of a director, and in film theory, its counterpart is the transformation. In these strategies, the source text is perceived as a completed work which does not need further adjustment to the discourses of the target system and society. The mode of reverence also includes an element of perlocution in that it has a selfish motive to either equal or surpass the Other. The perlocutionary effect, as defined by Brisset (1996: 110), is achieved through certain choices which are used to give the target text a persuasive or injunctive function, absent in the source text, and to produce specific reactions in the receiver. For example, an identityforming view of the indigenous system may consist of efforts to improve the status of the domestic idiom whereby the foreign text can be used to prove that the indigenous system and idiom have the potential to develop, or they have already developed sufficiently to house texts from a superior culture. The suggestion can then be extended to the entire nation and culture. As Brisset (1996: 174) explains the train of thought, 'the existence of a native language presupposes that its speakers are in the world according to a culture, that is according to an ontology, which is unique to that language, and to that language only'. When reverence includes an element of perlocution, the target culture may, in fact, be seen in relation to two other cultures: there is a superior culture whose source text can benefit the target system (reverence), and there is the Other which is seen as a threat to one's ownness. Translation is then used as a means of removing the threat.

Emerging nations, whose theatrical systems are not yet fully developed, and whose social discourse is characterised by claims of sovereignty and independence, are likely to turn to some foreign cultures as desirable sources of cultural capital. Similarly translations produced at the time of national revivals aim to give voice to efforts to achieve recognition for the Self and a justification for one's own theatre, language, and culture through importing symbolic goods from sources that are perceived as suitable for the purpose. It is hoped that the developing indigenous theatre and literature acquires through translated texts some of the qualities of these superior cultures, their sophistication if not their independence. It is equally important to prove that the indigenous target system and language have the potential to equal the foreign culture, and to demonstrate this, it is important to retain all those features of the source text which are deemed important to support this claim.

A case in point is the Finnish theatre in its first steps as a national theatre in the nineteenth century. The Finns lived under the Swedish crown for nearly 700 years from 1155 to 1809, and were then annexed to Russia for another 100 years until 1917. An economic and cultural revival started as late as 1500 when Latin began to lose its status within the church, and some translation activity into Finnish was undertaken by scholars. The first Finnish book to appear in print was an ABC from around the mid-sixteenth century a few years before the translation of the *New Testament* into Finnish. The first translation of a novel into Finnish, the German *Goldmacherdorf* by Heinrich Zschokke was completed only in 1834, and it was not until the 1860s that Finnish prose works began to emerge. The first Finnish novel appeared in 1870 (Laitinen, 1981: 206).

The first production of a play in Finnish took place in the seventeenth century but audiences had to wait nearly 200 years for the first play originally written in Finnish to be put on stage. However, by 1872, the supporters of a Finnish national theatre were able to offer 88 plays either written in Finnish or translated into Finnish, either in printed form or as theatre scripts, to justify their demands for a Finnish stage. Finland got her National Theatre, and its repertoire included in the first year classics such as Holberg, Goethe and the Finns Kivi and Topelius. Some five years later, plays by Molière, Beaumarchais, Hugo, Sheridan, Schiller, Holberg, and Oehlenschläger were put on stage. At the establishment of the Finnish theatre, only one play in four was of Finnish origin (Tiusanen, 1970: 554).

Romanticism, which dominated in the theatre in Finland into the second half of the nineteenth century produced the first 'genuine'

Finnish translation of Shakespeare's play, *Macbeth*, to celebrate the tercentenary of the poet's birth on 23 April 1864. The society set up for the advancement of Finnish literature had announced a prize for the 'best' translation of a Shakespeare play, and the competition produced *Macbeth*, translated by Kaarlo Slöör-Santala. The play was hailed as an important milestone in Finnish verse literature, in particular as it had been translated from the 'original' and in verse (Aspelin-Haapkylä, 1906: 31–32, 41).

Slöör-Santala's *Macbeth* demonstrated a high respect for the 'original', and the translation was seen as a test for the vernacular. The reviews show that it was considered important that the translation followed its English source text carefully, and that it was carried out directly without the mediation of another translation. No distinction between stage and page translation was noticeable at this time, and Slöör-Santala completed his translation in anticipation of the national theatre being set up. When the theatre was established, however, tragedies were regarded as such a demanding type of play that audiences still had to wait to see the first tragedy in the Finnish language. [14] Of Slöör-Santala's *Macbeth*, only some fragments, in particular Lady Macbeth's mad scene, reached the stage, which proves the point that tragedies were seen as a test of maturity.

In the first years of the Finnish national theatre, it was considered important to integrate works by foreign masters into the repertoire of the new theatre on terms set by the foreign work, and the director himself often checked the accuracy of translations (Aspelin-Haapkylä, 1909: 15).[15] Parallels can be found in other cultures as well: in South Africa the first full Shakespeare translation into Afrikaans, *Hamlet, Prins van Denemarke*, published in 1945, was predominantly sourceoriented – most foreign elements were imported unchanged – although some attempts had been made to translate freely and idiomatically. The play was hailed as a 'milestone in the history of Afrikaans theatre', and although more than one critic at the time remarked that the translation needed polishing, it was performed to packed audiences (Kruger, 1995: 6).

The above examples support Even-Zohar's model of the behaviour of weak (in this case, theatrical) systems. Translations are seen as vehicles for innovation, and they also occupy a central position in the literary system. In both cases the source texts represented a culture which was regarded as superior to the emerging indigenous culture, and they were therefore chosen to promote a particular Foreign. And in both cases again, the theatrical systems had not yet diversified into subsystems.

The choice of language for the translation is not innocent, and it may introduce an element of perlocution to the mode of reverence. The decision to translate a particular source text into the domestic idiom may serve as a statement about the sophistication and development of the indigenous idiom, but it may also display an effort to take distance from the Other, which is perceived as a threat. The quest for a native language may be tied to the need to be different.

The identity-forming function of a language can be so significant that it may become the very subject matter of dramatic writing, as shown by Brisset (1996: 60). Jean-Claude Germain's *A Canadian Play/Une Plaie Canadienne* interweaves creation and translation, and through that illustrates the problematic relation with the Other. Similarly the falsehood of the assumption that languages are merely compatible linguistic codes is also the theme of an Irish play, *Translations*, by Brian Friel, which deals with the Anglo-Irish conflict and the decline of the Irish language under the impact of imperialism. The play emphasises the intimate relationship between a language and the community using it, and therefore also the impossibility of total translation.

The language chosen for a translation may have an instrumental function in the relation of the social and cultural discourse to alterity, and of the language pair of the source text and its translation, both or only one may fill this function. For example, the identity-forming and self-justificational function may be important in the discourse of the source text but not in the translation. The fact that standard Finnish was used in the translations of John Millington Synge's Irish—English *Playboy of the Western World* in 1948, 1969 and 1983, was not a statement about the use of the Finnish language on stage, whereas that had been an important element in Slöör-Santala's *Macbeth* some 100 years previously However, Synge's choice of Irish—English for the source text *was* a conscious effort to make a statement about its suitability for literary and theatrical purposes. The Irish Literary Revival, and Synge as its representative, had aimed at using the language of the people, the Gaelicised English of Ireland, as their medium (Todd, 1989: 70–71), and thus make a statement about the Self with it.

The identity-forming function may not be important in the language of the source text but acquire that role in the translation. One example of this is Lady Gregory's translation of the plays by Molière into her own Kiltartan dialect. When the Irish Literary Theatre was established towards the end of the nineteenth century, theatres had existed in Ireland for nearly 300 years, although their audiences had been mainly English and the plays almost exclusively so. Lady Gregory, who was one of the most prominent figures of the Literary

Revival, translated Molière's *Le Médecin malgré lui* in 1905 and the play, produced on the Abbey stage in 1906, became a popular and critical success. She followed this with a translation of *Les Fourberies de Scabin*, premièred as *The Rogueries of Scabin* in 1908, and a translation of *L'Avare*, whose première as *The Miser* was in 1909. The last Molière play that Lady Gregory translated was *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, and *The Would-Be Gentleman* had its première in the Abbey in 1926. The translation work was an act of cultural self-confidence because it highlighted the identity of the Irish, as well as the poetic possibilities of the language as a fitting vehicle for the classics of world literature (Cronin, 1996: 139–140).

The instrumental, identity-forming function may dominate both in the source text and the translation, as has been the case in the translation into Scots by Bill Findlay and Martin Bowman of the plays by the Québecois Michel Tremblay. The cultural arm of the political nationalist movement – 'the Quiet Revolution' – which arose in Québec in the 1960s sought to challenge the privileged status of English and metropolitan French, and to 'decolonise' Québec by asserting the language of the majority. In 1968, Tremblay wrote *Les Belles-Soeurs* [*](#) in *montréalais* (or *joual*), the working-class vernacular of Montreal's eastend, and since then he has written some 20 plays in it.

In 1989, Bill Findlay and Martin Bowman translated Michel Tremblay's *Les Belles-Soeurs* as *The Guid Sisters*. Until then, foreign plays translated into Scots had been few and drawn mainly from a historic repertoire, and there had been no translation into Scots of a contemporary foreign play (Delisle & Woodsworth, 1995: 85). Since 1989, six Scots translations of Michel Tremblay's work have appeared: *The Guid Sisters* in 1989, *The Real Wurld?* in 1991, *Hosanna* in 1991, *The House Among the Stars* in 1992, *Forever Yours, Marie-Lou* in 1994, and *Albertine in Five Times* in 1998. In the period 1980–1995, there were more Scottish translations produced than at any previous period in Scottish theatre history (Findlay, 1996: 191).

The relationship between Québecois and metropolitan, 'standard' French resembles that between contemporary Scots and 'standard' English. Scots and Québecois have both had a social stigma attached to them within their respective cultures. Tremblay used *joual* as a political and cultural weapon in the struggle for Québecois independence, and although the use of Scots could not have a political effect in Scotland on that scale, the success of the Tremblay translations can be seen in the context of the resurgence of political nationalism in the 1970s, increasing interest in Scotland's history and culture in the 1980s, and showing the growing appeal of works in Scots (Delisle &

Woodsworth, 1995: 86, 88). Translation into Scots has been seen as a means of contributing to the continuance of the Scots literary tradition. It has also been important to prove that Scots is an effective translation medium (Findlay, 1994: 66).

Translation may generate both indigenous writing and more translation. In national revivals, translation and indigenous writing may begin and thrive simultaneously, as the example of Québec illustrates: the year 1968 saw the success of both Michel Tremblay's *Les Belles-Soeurs* * and Elois de Grandmont's translation into Québecois of Shaw's *Pygmalion*. A particular translation may also inspire other translation work, as happened in Scotland, where the use of Scots as the language of translation in Michel Tremblay's plays has coincided with a number of other translations drawing on distinctive Scottish speech. Translation can also act as a source of innovation and inspiration for indigenous writers to experiment with unfamiliar theatre aesthetics. When new foreign elements, poetics or dramatic structures, are highlighted in the translations, they are likely to inspire domestic writers to model their own writing after them. This has been an important function not only of many world classics but also of contemporary plays representing, for example, a new style of presentation. Reverence is thus an important element in further text generation.

Finnish theatre, which in Even-Zohar's model represents a weak system, again serves as a good example of how translations have throughout its history acted as an important source of inspiration to domestic writers. For example, expressionism arrived in Finland in the 1920s in the form of a new German drama, which inspired Finnish playwrights and theatre practitioners to experiment with the new style. In the six-year period from 1921 to 1927, Finnish theatre audiences saw translations of *Die Machinenstürmer* and of *Hinkemann* by Ernst Toller, and of *Gas I* and *Gas II* by Georg Kaiser, which proved important for the development of the personal poetics of the Finnish playwrights Haarla and Olsson (Orsmaa, 1988: 24, 27). Similarly, when plays by Brecht peaked in popularity in 1967 and 1968, Finnish dramatists experimented with the new style and used the episodic structure in their plays. American drama influenced Finnish domestic drama and the dramatic and performance conventions which were prevalent at the beginning of the sixties. The influence came first of all in the dramatic form in that it allowed a freer use of chronology and the use of dramatic figures to comment on incidents in the play. This was particularly visible in *Ruoho* 'Grass' (1959) by Walentin Chorell, in which, following the examples of Thornton Wilder and Maxwell Anderson, the theatrical frame was made visible. Arthur

Miller's *Death of a Salesman* was shown in Tampere in 1957, and it inspired Lauri Kokkonen to write his play *Viimeiset kiusaukset* 'The Last Temptations' in 1959, which showed the protagonist going through his life in flashback at the moment of death. American influence was also very prominent in the 'boozing plays', which gave Finnish theatre audiences a revealing insight into the realities of middle-class life and its human relations, and broke the existing convention by explicit language. The inspiration came with *Kuka pelkää Virginia Woolfia?* (*Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*) by Edward Albee, which became one of the most influential plays of the sixties. It inspired Finnish playwrights, Eeva-Liisa Manner, for example, thematically to write plays which would culminate in the removing of masks when the party was over and reveal the disappointments and waste of life behind the bourgeois façade (Paavolainen, 1992: 109, 113, 120). Throughout its existence, Finnish theatre has been on the lookout for new ideas for domestic writing. The Foreign from Germany or from the Anglo-American world has always been admired and welcomed with reverence, and both domestic repertoires as well as indigenous writing have relied heavily on it.

Some acculturation and naturalisation will unavoidably take place in all theatre translation. The choice of language unavoidably introduces new readings to the foreign text: 'any language use is . . . a site of power relationships because a language, at any historical moment, is a specific conjuncture of a major form holding sway over minor variables' (Venuti, 1998: 10). The setting is another structural element which will always become something other than it was in the source text. In my study (Aaltonen, 1996) of twentieth century Irish realist drama translated into Finnish between the 1940s and 1980s, I found that at least partial acculturation and naturalisation of the source text always took place. Names of places and people, those of political and religious symbols, concepts of both high and popular culture were occasionally Finnicised, or generalised, although the overall setting remained Irish. Similarly, the translator Bill Findlay claimed that he and Martin Bowman had not altered the essential Québec elements of Michal Tremblay's *Les Belles-Soeurs* [*]; however, he admitted that they had modified details and adjusted the text in circumstances, when 'not doing so would have created a jarring effect in the Scots' (Findlay, 1994: 72). Occasionally, he said, they used an explanation by adding a phrase or two. In most cases they kept specific references to Québec life without further explanation, but translated into Scots those references which referred to aspects of Québec life not found in Scotland. For example, *juice* was initially used instead of *Coke* in *The Guid Sisters*, but later

changed back. Examples of minor changes include words such as *baloney* (*sandwichs au béloné*) → *luncheon meat; two quarts of milk* (*deux pintes de lait*) → *two bottles of milk; English films* (*vues anglaises*) → *American wans*, because *English films* would create the wrong effect (Findlay, 1994: 72–74). And even if the names and the phrases had not been changed or modified, they would have been named in the first instance only for members of some particular linguistic and cultural community, by identifying the 'universe of discourse' [16] in terms of the scheme of identification shared by, and perhaps partially constitutive of, that community (MacIntyre, 1991: 389).

An important encouragement for reverence of the source text and the source culture in theatre translation is provided by contemporary copyright laws. They grant the authors and translators 'moral rights' in their texts and the right to be assured that the integrity of the work will be preserved (see next Chapter). The integrity of a work is, however, a vague concept, and in the theatre it appears to acquire a new reading. Changes to the text may be made for a variety of reasons, and here, respect as a mode of translation begins to become disregard and rebellion.

A translation always rewrites the source text, and it can never be an exact replica of it. In theatre translation this is an important consideration, as by its very nature it needs to adjust written texts to the varying conditions of its productions. In the general discourse of the relationship between a translation and its source text, even considerable differences may be ignored, and the two texts regarded as identical. One of the explanations for the inconsistency may be that not all features of the foreign source text are regarded as equally important for the translation, and those that are, are taken to form the essence of the foreign play In this the translation strategy begins to merge with reactualisation, and the subversive element in the mode of translation becomes stronger and more visible. For example, to prove the sophistication of the domestic idiom, it may be important to retain the poetics but not the dramatic structure of a foreign play A case in point is some early Shakespeare translations in Europe, where it was important to retain the verse form, the blank verse, of the plays. The poetics were an important feature in Slöör-Santala's *Macbeth*, and similarly, Josef Tyl's translation of *King Lear* in Bohemia in 1835 was considered a significant 'genuine' Shakespeare translation because it used blank verse, although Tyl had abridged the play to half the length of the original (Schultze, 1993: 2). Similarly in Denmark, Peter Foersom's translations of a number of Shakespeare's tragedies and history plays into Danish (1803, 1807–1818) were considered a signifi-

cant milestone in Danish culture because Foersom used blank verse although he made adjustments to simplify the production (Smidt, 1993: 96). [17] Reverence may thus also be expressed through adaptation by emphasising the introduction of something felt to be essential in the source text into the target text.

When the Foreign is looked up to with reverence, the foreign source text or some elements in it are deemed desirable cultural goods and chosen for translation. The source culture and the target culture are seen (by the target culture) to stand in an unequal relationship to each other, and the source culture to be superior to the target one. The foreign origin of the source text is regarded as important, and the source culture as enjoying a prestigious position in the cultural hierarchy. This applies most commonly to newly established theatrical systems which integrate foreign classics into their repertoires to test the sophistication of the indigenous stage.

Subversion: Rebellion and Disregard

Some examples in the previous section, in particular those where the language chosen for the translation gave the text a new reading which responded to the social discourse in the target society, but also those which highlighted only some aspect, such as the poetics, of the foreign text showed where the target theatrical system and society began to take a more prominent and visible role in deciding on the discourse of the translations. The foreign origin of the source text still gave the translation prominence. However, when the target system no longer needs the Foreign to increase its cultural capital it may be subverted to speak for the receiver whose expectations outweigh the constraints of the source text. The introduction of the Foreign loses its importance as a motivation for translation, and the foreign text is seen more as raw material for the indigenous stage than as a finished product. The indigenous culture is not perceived as inferior, the Foreign has perhaps never been hierarchically higher than one's own culture, or its former superiority is either questioned or dismissed as unimportant.

The mode of translation may express a rebellion against the source text or against an authoritative superior culture and the fixed hierarchical order it represents, or it may suggest disregard of alterity. The foreign text may be reactualised spatially or temporally, or it may be deconstructed and a new play written as an imitation or parody of it. In subversive modes of translation, the Foreign is rewritten to serve the Self without breaking away entirely from it, and keeping it still as the reference point against which the Self is defined (Brisset, 1996: 107).

Alterity is appropriated and its significance denied. The source text is reduced to the perspective of the dominant target culture which turns the alien culture to its own ends (Pavis, 1996: 11).

As was pointed out in the previous section, the choice of texts for translation already relates to the social discourse concerning alterity. When texts are chosen from cultures which are regarded as valuable sources of cultural capital, the choice can be read as a sign of reverence towards these cultures. However, when the choice is either directly or indirectly directed to cultures which are regarded as a threat, it can be read as rebellion.

In the Finnish theatre, the choice of texts gave voice to anti-Establishment dissatisfaction in the political atmosphere of the 1960s. The decade was characterised partly by the fact that the patrons, epitomised by the President, gave their support to a theatre which had accepted a certain discourse, for example, about the socialist countries. The anti-Establishment theatre therefore took the kind of drama from the socialist countries which, although seemingly offering accounts of the political development of those particular countries, also allowed the advocacy of some criticism. This helped to integrate the plays into the Finnish theatrical system, but their anti-socialist and anti-Soviet frame also excluded them from repertoires later in the seventies, as the conditions which had found a response in the plays changed. The most remarkable plays to represent this strand were *Tango* by the Polish playwright Slawomir Mrozeck, and *Tòtin perhe, 'The Tòt Family'*, by the Hungarian Istvàn örkény (Aaltonen, 1996: 85; Paavolainen, 1992: 122, 125).

Simlarly, Annie Brisset (1996: 18, 47–49) has shown how the choice of foreign plays for translation in Québec was part of the social discourse of alterity – the effort to establish a Québecois identity and take distance from what was seen as the Foreign and representing a threat – in Québec in 1968–1988. Repertoires of prominent mainstream theatres as well as the publishing business contributed to this discourse. There was an almost total lack of interest among theatre practitioners in Anglo-Canadian plays, and they were accepted for production in Québec only if they were seen to echo certain discursive codes dominant in Québec society Distance was also taken from French drama, as the relationship was seen to reflect the old coloniser—colonised dichotomy French plays were admitted into repertoires only on the basis of their entertainment value. A number of French playwrights were involved, with only a few plays each, and classical tragedy no longer figured prominently in the repertoires, as this type of French theatre was perceived as being incapable of serving the

cause of national identity. In a sociocultural context where everything had to be directed towards creating a national identity, French drama was admitted only if it could lend itself to reactualisation, and thereby fulfil the same mirroring function as the Québecois theatre. Modern tragedies from America were viewed more favourably, and imported plays included works by Eugene O'Neill, Tennessee Williams and Arthur Miller. Their admission was motivated by their choice of subject matter: the family, dominant social forces, class conflict, the search for one's roots, and alienation in its various social and psychological manifestations, which provided a suitable thematic matrix for the major preoccupations of Québecois society In general, a foreign play stood a better chance of being admitted into translation if it had a canonical status, or if it were a comedy, both if possible.

The choice of texts is thus an important indication of the way the target culture sees itself in relation to other cultures. The way the texts become rewritten in translation so as to be compatible with the discourse of the target society adds another dimension to this discussion. A theatrical performance is especially conceived to be played in the framework of the different contexts that surround it, and its original public is assumed to know the contexts which the performance subsumes: the literary context (the whole theatrical tradition of the country where the play has been written), the social context, the moral context, the cultural context in the widest sense, and the geographical context. The context of a whole civilisation is presented at each point in the text (Mounin, 1976: 161–164). In consequence, foreign theatre texts which have been transported from another framework of contexts need to be adjusted to be able to respond to their new environment, and take part in the discourse of the target society These adjustments make adaptation a prominent translation strategy in the theatre.

Translation for the stage probably employs adaptation more frequently than does printed literature, and it can be used in theatre translation at times or with texts where it would not be acceptable in the literary system. In the discourse of theatre productions, and consequently in theatre translation, it is usually taken for granted that the pragmatics of the theatre should outweigh the constraints of the source text. In well established and fully developed theatrical systems (in particular their mainstream stages) an interest in the Foreign is rarely, if ever, decisive in the adoption of a foreign text for a production. It is more likely to be the situation within one's own culture, one's own society and one's own theatre which directs the choice of texts to other cultures. When the Foreign is not of primary interest in the selection, constraints concerning 'fidelity' to the source text and

the invisibility of the translator are not the most important criteria in translation either. A similar emphasis on the needs of the target system is also distinguishable in the ways some subgroups in strong theatrical systems use foreign theatre texts. The primary motivation there for the choice and adaptation of a theatre text is not its foreign origin but rather how it can serve the purposes of the own company Theatre texts are ideal for this use in that they are able to grow, shrink and change shape more easily than their printed counterparts.

As systems are interdependent, and the literary and theatrical systems may partly overlap in their use of texts, the discourse of theatre translations may display conflicting views of translation strategies and their acceptability in the theatre. Although contemporary Western literary discourse about translations underlines 'fidelity' to the source text and the invisibility of the translator, flexibility and fertility are generally valued as desirable characteristics of theatre texts. Texts are rewritten for each production and each audience, and it adds to their attraction if they can be used to serve new causes and masters who may be both historically and culturally far apart. As a compromise between the two criteria, of fidelity and flexibility, 'sameness' is expected to be found at some level between the two texts.

The acceptability of a translation as such, even when the text has been adjusted to the pragmatics of the target society, is assessed by the degree of sameness seen to obtain between the two texts, and contemporary copyright law which is designed to safeguard this sameness is based on the assumption that a line can be drawn between sameness and difference. Trespassing across the line is seen to involve distortion, mutilation, modification, or other deteriorating action which can damage the work or infringe the rights of the author, or owner (see next chapter).

As theatre translation has to fit in with the requirements of copyright law, it must be able to demonstrate that, even when texts have been adjusted to contemporary needs, they still meet the criteria of sameness. In consequence, attempts to define sameness between a source text and its translation have resulted in descriptions of the different levels at which it can be found, and concepts such as the 'letter' and 'spirit' have been introduced into the analysis.

When sameness is seen to be found on the level of the 'letter', the focus is on aspects such as details of the story and the plot, characters and their interrelation, the geographical sociological and cultural information providing the fictional context, and the basic narrational aspects that determine the point of view of the narrator (tense, degree of participation and knowledge of the storyteller, and so on) (Andrew,

1984: 100). 'Fidelity to the letter' thus characterises translation which does not, for some reason, need or wish to adjust the dramatic or structural discourse of the foreign texts to the target system. It can therefore be assumed to be most prominent in new developing systems looking for cultural capital to supplement their own text-production. In well established theatres and strong theatrical mainstream systems, sameness on some other level will usually be relied on to satisfy the requirements of the copyright law, or to establish the intertextuality the translation wishes to draw on.

When sameness is not extended to the entire level of the 'letter', some structural elements of the foreign theatre text may be adapted (or reactualised) to the indigenous discourse of theatre aesthetics or the social situation while others are left untouched. Sameness may be established, for example, on the level of the general structure of the work, its content, and the sequence of the dialogue, while the setting is reactualised. A case in point is Robert Lalonde's Québecois translation of Chekhov's *Three Sisters*, which preserved the structure of the original play but reset it in Québec. It showed three Côté sisters living in Abitibi in the 1950s. They were dying of boredom, and only dreamt of one thing, moving to Montreal (Brisset, 1996: 12).

The adaptation may remove entire scenes, as was the case in *The Gentleman from Olmeda*, as described by Johnston:

> In my *The Gentleman from Olmeda* I chose to cut Alonso's opening speech from thirty lines to fifteen, although not because I did not know how to translate them or through intellectual laziness or dishonesty, but because in a hothouse theatre like that of Lope's Madrid where all the actors who specialised in doing young gallants were well known to the audience, this type of opening speech was originally intended to be a sort of cameo introduction, a *tour de force*, for the gallery, rather like a sax solo in a jazz concert. With Lope still a fragile newcomer to the English boards, it seemed to me as a translator and to Laurence Boswell as director that at this time and in this place a prolonged discourse on neoplatonic correspondences would actually serve to break the complicity so exquisitely crafted by Lope and which we had striven to maintain through the pre-echo of the mysterious song. (Johnston, 1996b: 64)

Despite omissions, additions and other changes, translations in these adaptations still claim to have kept what is seen to be unique in the source texts and distinguish them from all other texts. They are therefore seen to represent them and not constitute new plays.

The elements of the 'letter' construct the general dramatic structure or the poetics of the play, and they can usually be defined in an uncomplicated manner within the same theatrical tradition, whereas differences in readings of the 'spirit' or 'theme' of a play can give rise to widely different versions of the source text. Theatre texts can generate a variety of readings because they are polyvalent synchronically by meaning different things to different individuals at any given moment, and diachronically in the course of time. One and the same theme may not be obvious to all spectators, and to some there may be no theme evident at all.

Depending on where one looks for the theme or meaning of a play, it may be possible to find agreement about it at some level. For example, Esslin (1994: 163–168) distinguishes a hierarchy of meanings, of which the lowest and most concrete level is the easiest to agree on, whereas the highest and most abstract is likely to display a great deal of variation in the readings of individual members of the audience. On the first level, the metaphorical or symbolic meaning elevates individual facts into general and generalisable perceptions about the nature of the world, life, or the human condition. In Chekhov's *Uncle Vanya* there is a map of Africa on the wall in Vanya's den, where he administers the estate. On the level of metaphor the map is a powerful sign of the absurdity of Vanya's existence, the incongruity of life itself. On another level, political ideological and/or social meanings are products of the interaction between the dramatic text emits and the spectators' competence to decode them in the context of their own personal situation, and the social and historical circumstances in which they find themselves. A play like *Waiting For Godot* was at one time attacked in France for being non-political but assumed revolutionary implications when performed for landless peasants in Algeria. In Poland the ardently expected but never materialising event was seen as liberation from the Russians. An interview (Weitz, 1989: 195) with Jewish Israelis, Israeli Arabs and Palestinian Arabs after a performance of *Waiting For Godot* in the Haifa Municipal Theatre found that the Arab spectators identified themselves with the underdog, whereas the members of the Jewish community did not identify with any of the characters. They chose to locate the events within an abstract, general and uncommitted interpretation. The third and the highest level of meaning is the spiritual or intellectual insight the spectator of a dramatic event may experience. At this level, a dramatic performance can no longer be reduced to a single definable and generally valid meaning.

The flexibility and fertility of a theatre text is likely to be measured

by themes derived from the first two levels. Efforts may also be made to justify the choice of a particular reading of the meaning or 'spirit' of a play by the intentions of the author, which are then supposedly carried over to the translation as well. Inferred authorial intentions are, however, always problematic, as they are unavoidably more a characteristic of the reading process and the reader rather than of the motives of the writer. An individual creator's conscious intention is impossible to postulate, and once it has left its creator's hands, any work of art is simply there to be read and interpreted. The meaning and its impact depend ultimately on a reader's/spectator's personality, background knowledge, prejudices, and preferences as much as, if not more than, the intentions of the author, director, designers, musicians or actors who produced the event (Esslin, 1994: 156, 174).

When sameness is searched for beyond the surface structures of the texts, the translation strategy may eventually result in concept-translations where an idea or concept is borrowed from another text and used as the basis of a new play. The most radical form of adaptation writes an imitation or parody of its source text by selecting material, ideas, or themes from it, and rearranging and combining them with new elements. For example, Michel Tremblay's *Le gars de Québec* follows the plot of Gogol's *The Government Inspector*, and Antonine Mallet's *Le Bourgeois Gentleman* imitates Molière's comedy. In both, the original work survives as an intertext (Brisset, 1996: 12). The main concern in adaptations such as these is the generality of the original and its potential for wide and varied appeal. The translation represents a continuing form or archetype in culture and, because of its frequent reappearance, claims the status of myth. The success of adaptations of this sort rests on the issue of their fertility not their fidelity (Andrew, 1984: 98–99). A new play can also be woven round an unexpected theme, which disrupts the continuity and questions the archetypal reading of a canonical play. This was the case with *Lady Macbeth*, written by Jean Binnie, whose exceptional reading of Shakespeare's play edited out *Macbeth* except as the absent husband, and centred round the passionate lovers Lady Macbeth and Lord Macduff. 'Behind every successful man LIES a "good" woman' was the theme proposed for the play in the production by The London Underground Theatre Company (the festival supplement of the *Edmonton Journal*, 1994).

Despite its vagueness, the sameness of the 'spirit' is taken seriously in copyright law, and there are cases where it has been applied to the assessment of translated theatre texts. One example of the complexity of the concept was the translation of Andrew Lloyd Webber's *Cats* for

production in Helsinki in 1986. The demand for 'fidelity to the spirit' of the source text by the T.S. Eliot Society led to the rejection, and later revision, of the translation produced for Helsinki Town Theatre. The T.S. Eliot Society in London used the authority of professionals from the academic establishment and rejected the translation, accusing it of having destroyed the 'spirit' of the original. The translation was withdrawn from rehearsal, and it had to be revised by a Finnish and an English professional from the literary system in order to be accepted by the Society (Aaltonen, 1996: 55).

When adaptation is chosen for translating a foreign theatre text, it displays a certain reaction to alterity and the hierarchy it represents. Adaptation may provide the way to take distance from fixed models – whether the constraints of the source texts, established readings of them, or established ideas about translation – and rebel against them by subverting them to the purposes of the self. Pleasure is thus derived by the very cunning involved in finding ways around the structured activity, and putting one over on the establishment on its home territory (Gentzler, 1996: 125). In adaptation, the pragmatics of the receiving system outweigh the constraints of the source text, and De Certeau's concept of *la perruque* or 'the wig', which he originally created for cultural studies, can be used to explain how translations operate both in cultural hierarchies and in popular subsystems. De Certeau (1984: 24–25) defined *la perruque* as the art of practice which makes it possible to distance oneself from the institutionalised, fixed models that rule from top to bottom. Just as workers may do their own work in the workplace and disguise it as being done for the employer, borrowing the tools or the time allocated to do a job, so translations can become *la perruque*, work disguised as that of the 'employer', that is, a superior culture and its superior author but, in fact, subverted to serve one's own purposes. If the polysystem theory is best suited for describing homogeneous systems which are in the process of being established, De Certeau's cultural studies model can account for hierarchical and fragmented systems which have already achieved some stability, and which no longer need to justify their existence.

The practice of everyday life is the practice of evasive conformity by which processes of disruption are so small that they cannot be publicly controlled, let alone eliminated, cleansed or purged. These activities are often termed mundane, secondary, or derivative by cultural and literary critics, but they can be very creative (Gentzler, 1996: 123). In the theatre, *la perruque* describes the way a foreign text can become integrated into the target repertoire and made compatible

with the pragmatics of the target society without upsetting the conditions set for such work both by the general discourse about translation and by social restrictions such as copyright law. An adaptation of copyrighted texts proposes to replicate its source text, although at the same time it is tacitly subverting it to a new reading. Within the practice of the theatre, texts can give rise to new readings which will make them instrumental in various historical and social situations relatable to the aesthetics of theatre or its social functions. An imitation – usually of texts which have reached a canonical status in the literary and theatrical systems, and are no longer copyrighted – represents on one level a continuing form or archetype in culture, but on another, it questions the fixed and established models imposed from above by introducing subversive readings. The disregard of the replication ideal and thus the constraints of the source text finds its justification in social and historical situations where adaptations are defended as important for the sake of the art, that is, theatre aesthetics (the poetological or practical 'requirements of the stage'), or for the sake of the community.

For the Sake of the Art

In the history of Western theatre translation, foreign plays have been subverted to many causes, and texts rewritten in ways determined by various historical and social situations. The earliest examples of adaptations go back to the Roman Empire, when the Romans imported, translated and adapted Greek texts and subverted them to their own purposes. While Rome had military strength and a will to expand, Greece retained its superiority in the fields of art, literature and philosophy For the Romans to have invented an alternative culture would have been nonsensical (Brown, 1995: 49).

In modern societies, theatre has become such an essential part of the make-up of society, that a national theatre is usually one of the most important aims in the struggle for independence and cultural identity However, before a national theatre can be established, theatrical activity needs to become consolidated, and repertoires and audiences created for it. In theatre history, this has usually been the role of touring theatre companies who have in many cultures prepared the ground for institutional theatres. In their behaviour, these groups are similar to contemporary popular theatre in that they are not constrained by the same expectations as instituional theatre.

A case in point is Finland, which acted as the backyard of Swedish, German and Russian professional theatre companies from 1760 to

1860. Amateur acting flourished in several languages, and the troupes toured Finnish towns, performing drama of all possible descriptions. The Finnish nobility saw French, English, German and Swedish drama both in the 'original' and as 'adaptations', 'translations' and 'travesties'. The original and its translation were not distinguished at this time, and theatrical genres were in constant flux. In the repertoires of the theatre companies, the text could be changed from a poem or novel into a play, then into a play with music or opera, and into a pantomime (Tiusanen, 1969: 59).

The repertoires of the early Finnish theatre companies were closely linked to the needs of the company and 'the requirements of the stage'. Since the companies moved from one country to another, they needed to anchor their performances to the only element which remained fixed, the actors, which meant that texts were adapted to particular actors and their acting styles.

Texts were primarily seen as material for the stage, and neither authors nor the source culture they represented enjoyed a privileged position. In fact, authors could be so unimportant that their names disappeared from the credits. A play by August von Kotzebue, one of the most popular playwrights in Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century, was first translated from German into French and then back into German, by which time the name of the playwright had disappeared from the credits altogether (Tiusanen, 1969: 59–60).

No playwright or source text received a different treatment, and translation strategies were dictated entirely by practical considerations. When Shakespeare was first introduced to Finland by these theatre troupes, his plays were performed either in Swedish or in German. The earliest performance is believed to have been the 1768 production of *Romeo and Juliet* by the Seuerling theatre company Seuerling, who was the first theatre director to perform Shakespeare in Sweden as well, performed the play in Ducis' melodramatic version (Halttunen-Salosaari, 1967: 71). In 1819 *Hamlet* was performed in Turku (which was the capital at that time) in a revised version of the Swedish translation, which was a relatively free prose translation with many omissions and a great deal of moralising. The translation had been further adapted by the director for the performance in Sweden, and then also revised by the translator for performing in Finland (Hirn, 1916: 258; Smidt, 1993: 101). *Macbeth* was first performed in Helsinki in 1838 by Torsslow's theatre company in a translation into Swedish which was based on the German version of the play by Schiller, whose translation in turn versified the old Wieland prose translation. It did not follow the source text in every detail, omitting,

for example, passages of obscenity and horror. It revised the conversation part of the Porter scene and omitted three and a half lines of the witches' incantation as well as the whole of the murder scene in Macduff's castle (Ranke, 1993: 166–167; Smidt, 1993: 101–102).

In all the early Shakespeare productions the focus was on the stories that the plays provided, not their authors or originality. Although the play texts came from the powerful European cultural centres, France and Germany, they did not enjoy any supreme position, and were further revised for each production. The English source texts played a minor role in them. The companies wanted to have suitable roles for their star actors and actresses: for example, the company directors Carl Seuerling and Pierre Deland were actors themselves, and so were Deland's brother and Seuerling's wife. Their characteristic acting style, which was pompous and declamatory, is likely to have affected the choice of plays (Tiusanen, 1969: 53–54, 59). It was thus not so much a superior culture which decided on the choice, but the material the plays provided. The translations were either in prose or verse, but all were characterised by their simplification of the action through omissions and the rearrangement of scenes.

Although theatre companies were not dependent on the constraints of the source text in their decision-making, they were monitored by the social system through its authorities. At times of censorship, the connection of a theatre performance not only with the immediate here and now but also its transient orality has sometimes played an important role in giving voice to discourse which would otherwise be impossible. Theatre productions are more difficult to monitor than printed literature, and they are therefore a more efficient means of expressing disapproval and rebellion. For example, when Tsar Nicholas I passed an Act of Censorship in Finland in 1850, banning the publication of other than religious writings and those that concerned economic matters, theatre translation was a very important tool in counteracting the law (Helleman, 1970: 424). Supporting evidence is also presented by Gentzler (1996: 125), who has argued that translating may be used to articulate something which could not be said in an 'original' work. In Russia or central Europe from the 1950s to the late 1980s, the tactics of using the system for one's own ends was most visible in translation, and occasionally it seemed as if only Party officials were unaware of the processes of creative evasion at work. Occasionally the officials were alert, and, for example, when the Finnish national theatre performed *Nummisuutarit*, 'Heath Cobblers', in St Petersburg in 1885, there were some problems with the censorship. Problems were also found with *Kultaristi* (The Gold Cross),

which had to be edited in certain parts. In the play, French soldiers returning from Russia complain about the Russian winter, the Cossacks and their spears, and one of the songs in the play is the *Marseillaise*. The authorities wanted to ban the play, but gave permission for the performance after some changes had been made to the text: Russia had to become Spain, 'dangerous' songs replaced by harmless ones, and the title *The Gold Cross* changed to *The Gold Ring* (Aspelin-Haapkylä, 1909: 234).

In established strong theatrical traditions and their mainstream theatre, adaptations for the stage have abounded throughout history It has been recognised that theatre texts differ from texts which are read as literature, and that plays may need simplifying if they are to be used on stage. For example in the German tradition, where the discovery of Shakespeare for the German language theatre in the 1770s coincided with efforts to establish a national theatre, a contemporary influential theatre critic, Johann Friedrich Schink, explained that the translator for the stage had to decide where to omit, where to substitute, and where to Germanise, thus advocating for the theatre a combination of translation and adaptation (Ranke, 1993: 165).

In strong theatrical systems, the indigenous theatre has set the terms of translation work. For example, the first French *Hamlet* by Jean-François Ducis in 1770 adapted Shakespeare's *Hamlet* to conform to the conventions operative in the French theatre and to resemble other French tragedies. Ducis' *Hamlet* was based on a French prose synopsis of the play, and he rearranged the plot, cut down the list of players, and composed an unbroken, playable text in alexandrines. The translation differed from both Shakespeare and the earlier version of the play by Antoine de La Place in that it had a different plot, altered the relationships between the main characters, and observed the unities of time, place and action. All scenes involving the slightest notion of comedy were removed, and the vocabulary was restricted to a limited number of words which were heavy with tragic connotations. Shakespeare's duality and punning were eliminated and so were any words which were deemed common or vulgar in tone. It was a play which followed the principles of classical tragedy The play was a great success with the public, and went through nine editions in Ducis' lifetime. Its record at the Comédie Française was superior to any other tragedy written in the eighteenth century, and it served as a basis for a number of Shakespeare translations outside France as well (see the above reference to the Swedish translation of *Romeo and Juliet*) (Heylen, 1993: 27–33).

The examples of Germany and France above confirm the model

outlined by Even-Zohar for the behaviour of strong systems. Translations are not likely to occupy a central role in strong systems, nor are they likely to act as innovators. Foreign theatre texts tend to be adapted to fall in line with indigenous writing and its conventions.

A strong theatrical system is in a much better position to set the terms and decide on the reception of foreign drama, particularly if the source culture is regarded as inferior, or at least not superior to one's own. The indigenous system will set the terms for translation which will often naturalise both the poetics and the politics of the source, as Lefevere's account (1982: 10–13) of the reception of Brecht's *Mother Courage* illustrates. When *Mutter Courage* was translated for the American stage in 1941 by Hays and again in the 1960s by Bentley, Brecht was not yet canonised in the West. According to Lefevere (1982: 4, 7), assimilation through adaptation follows some general principles and is related to factors such as the reputation of the writer (or the work) being translated within the system from which the translation is made as well as the need that the receiving system and society has of them. The fact that Brecht had not established his position in the American theatrical system explains the disregard for the aesthetics of the source text. Both translations rewrote the play to follow the code of the US entertainment industry, They tried to integrate the songs fully into the play to approximate the model of the musical. For example, Bentley added 'transitional lines' between the spoken text and the song, and also made the text of the songs themselves conform more to the style and the register of the musical. As Brecht's indirectness of diction was not in line with the poetics of the Broadway stage, both Hays and Bentley tried to make clear to the spectator—reader what Brecht wanted them to piece together for themselves. The poetics of the Broadway stage also decided on the redivision of Brecht's text into acts and scenes by Hays. Bentley kept Brecht's scenes but gave each of them a title. Also the Brechtian dialogue had to be made to flow more if it was to fit in with the poetics of the receiving system, and therefore lines were redistributed, as actors should not be allowed to stand around for too long without anything to say. Moreover, a little emotion was added where emotion was too patently lacking.

In the following example from the Euro-American theatre, the adaptation professes to bring out the essence of a work which is central to the source culture and thus make it available to people in another cultural tradition who would otherwise not have access to it. It is thus an example of a strong culture whose self-proclaimed aim is to introduce the Foreign. However, to bring out the essence of a work from another theatrical tradition and genre is such a complex brief

that the adaptation, in particular as it is carried out from the point of view of a dominant culture, has been received with mixed feelings. In its compromise between the constraints of the source text and the needs of the target society, it has ended up being both praised and criticised for its solutions. It has been accused of disregard of the alterity which it has acculturated and filtered through the target culture. It has also been found guilty of the philosophy of isomorphism, a belief that what can be expressed with the elements in one system can equally well be expressed with those of another. Both the praise and the criticism can be appreciated and sympathised with; an adaptation reads differently if the focus is moved from the target pole to the source one or vice versa.

The *Mahabharata* by Jean-Claude Carrière and Peter Brook has met with both extremes of criticism. The translation strategy represents a compromise between several factors: a generic change from an epic poem to a stage play, a movement of a text diachronically from ancient times to contemporary intercultural theatre, and also a cultural import from an old colony in the eastern theatre tradition to a culture which is often seen to be guilty of neocolonialism within the Western tradition.

The *Mahabharata* is a poem written in Sanskrit more than 100,000 stanzas long. The first known version of it made up of ancient stories goes back to the fifth or sixth century BC, and versions continued to be made for 700 or 800 years until in the third or fourth century AD they took a more or less definite form. The poem was entirely unknown in Europe until the eighteenth century The first edition of the *Bhagavad Gita* (a section of the poem) was published in London in 1785 in a translation by Charles Wilkins, and in Paris in 1787, translated into French by M. Parraud. The first European to immerse himself in the entire poem was a Swiss Army officer of French extraction who lived for 30 years in India, also in the late eighteenth century In the nineteenth century a French Orientalist, Hippolyte Fauche, undertook the colossal task of translating the whole epic into French. When Fauche died his work was taken up by Dr L. Balin who also died before the work was finished. There is no complete French version of what Carrière describes as 'the world's greatest poem' (Carrière, 1988: vi–vii).

The French translator Jean-Claude Carrière began the final draft of his adaptation in autumn 1982 and continued throughout 1983 and 1984. When rehearsals began in September 1984, the play was written, but there was no definite structure. During the nine months of rehearsal incessant changes were made (Carrière, 1988: ix). Carrière

had read the text of *The Mahabharata* in an academic French translation which he used as the basis of his adaptation. He added entirely new scenes but kept the proper names and the tone of the epic poem. He also kept Sanskrit terms to 'prevent any unconcious colonisation in the use of vocabulary' (Pavis, 1992: 194). He later described the process of translation in this way:

> From the beginning it seemed obvious that we would have to set aside most of the secondary strands of the story, Some of these strands go on for over fifty pages; some are shorter and may take only a single page.

> . . . It became obvious that we needed the storyteller/author.

> There are sixteen main characters, and each of them has a distinct and often complex personality and a particular story which is part of the main action with varying degrees of importance. We left out one of these, Vidura, a wise, moderate, sensible man whose effect on the plot is minor. What he brings to the poem is almost always a purely verbal contribution and it has been incorporated into other characters. (Carrière, 1988: x)

> In order to adapt *The Mahabharata* to transform an immense epic poem into a play or three plays, we had to draw new scenes from our imaginations, bring together characters who never met in the poem itself. As far as the writing itself is concerned, we dropped the notion of archaic or old-fashioned languages, because they carry with them a trail of inappropriate images of our own Middle Ages or ancient tales. On the other hand it was impossible to tell this story in modern, familiar or even slangy language. But the polish of French classic or neoclassic language was of course equally impossible. So we settled on a simple, precise, restrained language which gave us the means to oppose or juxtapose words which ordinarily are never used together. While we kept the names of characters, we found equivalents for most of the Sanskrit words. There were two exceptions: one was *Kshatriya* the other was *dharma*. (Carrière, 1988: xi–xii)

Jean-Claude Carrière's adaptation, directed and later also translated into English by Peter Brook, has been a success with Western audiences, and also inspired research into the practice of intercultural theatre.

The work has ignited severe criticism for the disregard and disrespect of the constraints of the source text and culture. Indian

into female ones to suit the staff of the theatre better (private communication from Pentti Pesä, 1996).

Amateur acting companies work under an even stricter financial control than the institutional theatre. They resemble early theatre troupes in that they need to adjust theatre texts to their own needs even more dramatically than institutional theatres, which have a larger staff, more elaborate fixed sets, and which can also offer better facilities for their audiences. Small theatre companies therefore need to choose and adapt their texts for a particular cast, set and audience.

The needs of the stage take precedence over all other considerations. This is illustrated effectively by a British handbook *Stagecraft*, by Trevor Griffiths (1982: 9–17), which aims to help amateur theatre companies with their work. For example, directors are advised that, although the production and the actors should serve the intentions of the playwright and put over the argument and ideas of the play, a play should not be treated with too much reverence. If a director wishes to make vast changes to the work of a writer whose plays are still under copyright, the alterations should be submitted to the writer's agent for approval, but if the director feels that the changes are necessary, he should not be dissuaded too easily *Stagecraft* emphasises that it is always worth considering a few things before deciding to perform an uncut play. Firstly, directors are advised to consider if the argument of the play could be streamlined by some cutting. They should also consider if it would be possible to perform a play with a large cast by combining some characters. The length of the play is an important factor, not least for the audience, which may not be able to concentrate for lengthy periods, especially if the seats are uncomfortable. Local transportation may also have a bearing on the decision: when does the last bus or Tube leave (Griffiths, 1982: 9–17)?

The motivation for an adaptation may be a change of medium; on the radio, for example, texts have to be rewritten to compensate for the lack of the visual element. Anthony Vivis recalls in an article how in his translation into English of *Der Polenweiher* (*The Pond*) by Thomas Strittmatter, the atmospheric stage directions were incorporated into the role of a narrator—protagonist, who was built up out of one of the main characters. The narrator was important since the action had to be shaped more transparently for the radio. Also, some other purely visual moments were restructured into self-explanatory dialogue, and passages from *Macbeth* were substituted where references to Goethe's *Faust* were less clear (Vivis, 1996: 43). Bassnett (1998: 96) describes how in her translation with David Hirst of Pirandello's *Trovarsi* for BBC Radio, the changes extended to names being added to the dialogue to

make it clear to listeners who was speaking to whom, and additions of lines to clarify visual signals.

The adaptations discussed in this section have been written in situations where theatre aesthetics or the 'requirements of the stage' have been the primary motivation for the adjustments to the source text, although they have also been linked with the general attitude in the target society towards alterity, and thus been ideologically connected to the social discourse. In some adaptations, ideological considerations, such as a particular world view, may accompany adjustments made for the sake of the art. This was to some extent the case with the translation of Brecht in which Hays played down the aggressive pacifism of the play, omitting whole speeches, and weakened the obvious connection between war and commerce by omitting lines which made the link (Lefevere, 1982: 14).

Small theatre companies have traditionally been more flexible in seizing the moment for social comment, but mainstream theatres too have been able to enter discussions which have been important for the target society at a particular moment in history, although they may have had to be more subtle in their comments.

For the Sake of the Community

The role of foreign plays is significant in lending a voice to a range of issues which are on the agenda of the entire society or important for some section in it. There are many examples where foreign classics have been brought into the service of a patriotic cause and subverted to serve local issues.

In Finland, the question of a right to one's own culture was an important issue in literary circles in the nineteenth century, and plans were made to set up a Finnish Literature and a Finnish National Theatre. The first Shakespeare translation of *Macbeth* into Finnish took part in the discussion by rewriting the play from within the Finnish culture as a piece of Finnish history It was given the task to demonstrate that Finns were a nation in their own right with a past that one could be proud of.

The translation of *Macbeth* by J. E Lagervall was completed in 1834, and based on the Swedish, and through that, on the German translation of the play by Schiller (Hirn, 1916: 260). Lagervall made *Macbeth* a truly Finnish play. He gave it a Finnish name *Ruunulinna* 'Crown Castle', and naturalised the source text by using the traditional *Kalevala* meter of Finnish folk poetry as well as alliteration, another characteristic of the Finnish national epic. Macbeth himself became a

general in the Finnish army who fought under the Finnish king, and Macduff a famous guerilla leader of the eighteenth century, Lady Macbeth became a strong-willed but evil Finnish woman whose persistent yearning for power was not innate but suggested by the witches. The witches embodied, both in name and behaviour, afflictions such as pain, hardship and worldliness, and, true to character, they deliberately plotted general destruction. The positive powers of Nature and Love, which appeared as forces opposed to the afflictions and to their mistress, could not prevent the disaster. The witch scene was made more prominent and had links with Finnish mythology (Aaltonen, 1997: 60–61; Paloposki, 1997: 136). The sleep-walking scene of Lady Macbeth, which became important as a dramatic fragment in the Finnish theatre some 40 years later, was omitted in this first translation of the play, and in consequence, her madness was edited out. She met her fate trying to close the gate in order to stop the supporters of Macduff from entering, and was crushed under their feet.

In his afterword, Lagervall (1834: 119) explained why he had chosen to set the play in Finland. According to him, as the story by Shakespeare obviously did not happen in Scotland (and he quotes Walter Scott in support of this claim), it could just as well have taken place in Finland. Lagervall had therefore made the necessary adjustments, and added that even Scott would not be able to dispute any of the details of the relocation. Lagervall explained that he had chosen for the play the dialect which was most commonly used and most easily understandable throughout Finland, but which was at the same time also best suited to the metre. He had modified the spelling according to the pronunciation, and, for the vocabulary, chosen words from Finnish proverbs, sayings, poems and rhymes which he considered beautiful, if not necessarily very familiar.

The title page of Lagervall's play already gives an indication of how the translation relates to its source: it shows a man – a lookalike of Elias Lönnrot, the creator of the Finnish national epic – dressed in loose fitting trousers, a shirt and a small cap. The man is depicted against a background of a stretch of water, playing the *kantele*, a traditional Finnish stringed instrument (Aaltonen, 1996: 2).

Lagervall's translation of *Macbeth* was never performed, although he had expressed a wish to that effect (Aspelin-Haapkylä, 1906: 4). His own plays were never performed either, which suggests that, although he was one of the keenest spokesmen for the Finnish theatre, he did not understand the needs of the theatrical system. Lagervall's translation strategy was, however, not the reason for the rejection of the play, as early translations in both the literary and theatrical systems

tended to reactualise their source texts (Helleman, 1970: 449). Lagervall offered his translation for publication as well and it would have been accepted with some linguistic and orthographic corrections, but he refused to make them, and had to have the play printed at his own expense.

A similar motivation to link the discourse of the play with the social discourse of the target society can also be found in contemporary Québec. When *Macbeth* was translated by Michel Garneau in 1978, he reactualised the play spatially in a Québecois context through the explicit use of the target language and temporally through the use of certain markers such as the archaic form of the language of translation. The translation retained fewer than half the place names that appeared in the original text, and they were given a vaguer designation as a great many of their attributes were left out (*The country near Dunsinane* → *Dans la campagne; Dunsinane. Within the castle* → *Chez Macbeth*). There was a systematic shift to the commonplace, and the spatiotemporal markers of the tragedy were displaced in favour of a historically recognisable Québec, and *Macbeth* was transplanted to a land resembling New France (Brisset, 1996: 109–118).

The erasure of the names of people and places that clearly set the text in a Shakespearean universe made it possible for Québecois readers or audiences to project on to *Macbeth* their own history and destiny The audience watching a production of the Québecois *Macbeth* were offered an impression that Shakespeare's play had ideological relevance with the target society Garneau's translation was the product of a society and of its history anchored in a discourse underpinned by a Québecois vision of the world. Specific passages of *Macbeth* were reinforced or suppressed to make the representation of a fictitious Scotland coincide with the spatiotemporal entity known as Québec, or more specifically Québec libre (Brisset, 1996: 158–161).

When The Little Theatre Movement burst out in Japan in the late 1960s, it was a protest against an elitist theatre which was seen to be nothing but a copy of an antiquated Western model and not in the least related to contemporary Japanese society and its problems. One of the companies in the movement was the Suzuki Company of Toga whose productions often derived from Western plays and formed particular mixtures of elements from Western and Japanese theatrical traditions. For example, their production of Chekhov's *Three Sisters* was just over an hour long, as Chekhov's text was shortened and more than half of the dialogue was cut. The four acts were revised into ten scenes. With the exception of Andrei, Suzuki merged together all the male characters, that is, military people, and distributed their speeches

between two characters called Man 1 and Man 2. The text of the *Three Sisters* was also shortened (Fischer-Lichte, 1989: 175–176).

Suzuki staged Chekhov in order to demonstrate critically what happens when a Western model is actually followed unconditionally Westernisation was shown to entail de-humanisation of life: to the men it had brought a philosophy of a better life in the future which none the less had been unable to keep them from aggression and violence. To the women westernisation had introduced dreams and hopes of happiness (in love) and self-fulfilmant (in work) which were not possible to realise in the current situation (Fischer-Lichte, 1989: 180).

Not only classic plays are suitable material for adaptations and through them compatible with the social discourse in the target society, Contemporary plays too are rewritten for this purpose, although the restrictions of copyright law have to be taken into account. An example of how an adaptation through the addition of a scene may be ideologically motivated is provided by the Finnish translation of Sean O'Casey's *The Plough and the Stars*.

Sean O'Casey set *The Plough and the Stars* in the Easter Rising of 1916, when the Volunteers paraded with the Irish Citizen Army through Dublin and took possession of the General Post Office. From the steps in front of the Post Office, Patrick Pearse read a proclamation declaring the establishment of a republic. There was heavy fighting, but one by one the strongholds fell, and though the rebels held out for a week, they had to surrender as they were not able to get any reinforcements from anywhere else in the country. The play ends in the mental and physical defeat of the freedom fighters. When the play was performed in Finland in 1972, the translation was given a new final scene in which the Irishmen decide to continue their fight against the British crown and refuse to accept defeat. This may have been aimed to take into account the resumption of fighting in Northern Ireland in 1968.

Depending on how closely the copyrights are monitored or imposed, adaptations may subvert the source text in various ways to serve the target society When Dario Fo's *Accidental Death of an Anarchist* was first produced in the West End in 1979, Fo came to see the performance. Although he does not speak English, he was aware that the pace, the momentum and the slapstick style did not represent the play he had written. In addition he heard his name mentioned in the play as an object of ridicule for his supposed refusal to introduce women characters into any of the central roles. With this particular play, Fo had done many rewrites, sometimes evening by evening, but none of his versions had featured either of the two alternative endings which

had been incorporated into the play. Finally he was aware that some of the characters had been cut, especially the bishop whose robes are one of the disguises which the madman investigator puts on in the latter part of the work (Farrel, 1996: 48).

In the dressing room, anxious friends explained that the play had been transformed in accordance with British theatrical traditions, employing music hall devices and approaches where Fo had used a 'spirit' more in keeping with Italian *commedia dell'arte*. The modified version enjoyed enormous success in Britain, and Fo's play has never been seen there in a shape which faithfully reproduces the original. *Accidental Death* has become the all-purpose radical protest play employed in Britain to support the most varied causes and decry the most diverse wrongs – to satirise the spy Anthony Blunt, to protest at the treatment of the Birmingham Six, and to attack Establishment figures like judges, Tories and policemen (Farrel, 1996: 48).

The above examples illustrate the many ways theatre texts are rewritten for new societies, their theatrical systems and political agendas. Theatre is a communal art form which reaches a number of people simultaneously and a performance is designed to have an immediate effect on them. It must therefore be tied to its theatrical and sociocultural context even more closely than its literary counterpart. Both the literary and theatrical systems may however, also be constrained by the same ideological convention, such as a particular philosophy This was the case with early Shakespeare translations, which were untouched by the ideas of giving high regard for the original in translation introduced by the Romantic movement (Schultze, 1993: 62).

The choice of foreign plays is not innocent, nor does it take place in isolation. Only those plays are chosen which are seen as capable of being brought in line with the pragmatics, and in the above examples with the social discourse, of the target society Translations are not carried out in isolation, and theatre translations even less so. The choice of adaptation as a translation strategy indicates explicitly that the compatibility between the discourse of the source text and that expected of it in the target system is built on the terms set by the receiver. The texts are chosen mainly for their contribution to the target system; the Foreign is not highlighted, and adaptation is carried out for the benefit of the target system and society alone. The Foreign text is seen to need adjustment, even to the extent where it becomes a new creation written from within the target system.

Typifying of the system as strong or weak does not seem to be decisive except in a limited number of social and historical situations.

Instead, the reaction to alterity through foreign source texts appears to depend on the view of the source text and what it is seen to represent.

The way theatre texts are translated and used for productions expresses an attitude towards alterity. It may be rebellion against a hierarchical view of cultures but also against hierarchically arranged systems. An adaptation may also show different degrees of disregard for the foreign origin of the text as a protest against fixed models imposed beyond one's control. It provides the theatrical system with a way of dodging established theatre practices, not in open revolt, but tacitly and within the confines of the social controls for such interaction.

In the theatre, texts are constantly studied for their themes and meanings in order to establish compatibility between the discourses of a text and that of the theatrical and social system. Moreover, not only are foreign texts adapted for a particular production, but also domestic writing is just as likely to have to undergo changes from one production to another. Theatre translation, like all writing for the theatre, is an extension of the stagecraft which adapts texts temporally and spatially to fit a range of contexts.

The previous sections have only briefly referred to the contribution of the translator, who acts as a filter of various aesthetic and socio-historic conventions and idiolects. The playwright is authorised to take up a certain social and economic position by his/her investment of labour, whereas the translator has been confined to the attic with a task of replication.

Notes

1. Fischer-Lichte (1990a: 17) makes this point about intercultural theatre in general.
2. Bharucha makes the latter criticism of the work of Richard Schechner.
3. Harish Trivedi made this point in his plenary lecture in a conference on translation at the University of Warwick, July 1997.
4. Venuti (1995a: 20) has defined foreignisation as ethnodeviant pressure to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text.
5. Consonance as a feature of events which are likely to become news is used in media studies (Galtung & Ruge in Palmer, 1998: 378) to describe that the event must be in accordance with the framework of understanding which typifies the culture of the potential audience.
6. As these examples illustrate, stereotyping is most often used in the negative sense. It is, however, inevitable, as there is never enough time or space to describe the world in its complexity. Stereotyping is thus inevitably a process of selection, magnification and reduction which takes one

perceived attribute of a social group, blows that attribute up until it obscures all others, then boils it down until it comes to stand for that group, summarising that group in a kind of cultural shorthand (Medhurst, 1998: 284).

7. James Holmes (1988: 47–48) uses naturalisation to refer to the process whereby the element of the original linguistic context, the literary intertext, or the sociocultural situation is replaced by one which in some way matches or is equivalent in the target context, intertext or situation. Venuti (1995a: 20) defines domestication as an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target language cultural values. I see the two concepts as interchangeable.

8. The label originates from Patrice Pavis (1996: 10–11), who describes it as one of the major forms of interaction in intercultural theatre.

9. Pavis calls the strategy 'appropriation'.

10. Andrew's description concerns the relation between a novel and a film, but I apply it here to a theatre production.

11. Brisset (1996: 33) quotes in her study a definition by Gruslin and defines institutional companies as those receiving the most grants, the best known and, historically, the oldest. I use the term 'mainstream' to describe these theatres.

12. The concept of cultural capital comes from the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1992), and here is applied to entire cultures instead of individuals.

13. The term is related to Propp's narratological analysis of Russian folk-tales. An actant is not necessarily the same as either character or actor but rather like a force spread over a number of focus-points, or embedded as internal contradiction to a named character unit. For example, Antigone may be seen as both desirer and obstacle to her own desire (Melrose, 1994: 18–19.

14. The first tragedy to be performed in the Finnish language was a translation, T. Körner's *Die Sühne* in 1865 (Aspelin Haapkylä, 1906: 18). However, only the translation of Björnstjerne Björnson's *Maria Stuart in Scotland* in 1879 was seen as a step towards Shakespearean plays (Aspelin-Haapkylä, 1909: 30).

15. This may have been partly influenced by the close connection between the literary and theatrical systems but also be related to the distinction between mainstream and fringe theatres. Before the National Theatre was established the student theatre performed, for example, *Erasmus Montanus* by Holberg in a translation which set the play in Finland (Aaltonen, 1996: 76).

16. The concept 'universe of discourse' is defined by Lefevere (1992: 41) as consisting of the objects, concepts and customs of a particular society.

17. Smidt points out that Foersom did not yield to the current fashion for adaptation. He did, however, 'obliterate some of Shakespeare's indecencies', intensify adjectives and images, and heighten the ceremonial ending of *Hamlet* (Smidt, 1993: 96).

Chapter 4—
The Translator in the Attic

'What is an author?' asks Foucault (1977: 113), and goes on to quote Beckett to answer the question with what he calls one of the fundamental ethical principles of contemporary literary criticism and philosophy, "What matter who's speaking," someone said, "what matter who's speaking?"'

Who is recognised as an author in theatre translation, and why does it matter who is speaking? In contemporary Western theatre, the writing and rewriting of texts involves a varying number of authors who all contribute to the creation of the text on stage: there is the foreign writer, there may be two or three translators, there may be a dramaturge who prepares the text for the stage, and sometimes even the stage-director may rewrite parts of it in the rehearsals. There are also others – actors, dress and light designers, set designers, prompters – who all write their own texts and deserve to be mentioned.

Authors or speakers in the theatre are thus numerous when foreign texts are translated for a production, but they are not all recognised as authors and treated equally in law. Inequality is perhaps most striking between playwrights and translators, although some problems may extend from translators to dramaturges and stage directors as well.

Authors are seen as an exceptional species, and they are credited for their labour in terms of both a particular social status and better economic rewards, whereas translators may be expected to waive their rights altogether if necessary. In this respect, dramaturges are even worse off than translators, as their contribution to the translation process is usually ignored entirely. Authorship matters because it means recognition for the investment of labour. [1] By law, only the rights of authors and translators are recognised, although those of translators are regarded as subordinate to those of authors.

Translation work is by its nature seen to involve the replication of the source text, and therefore to require less labour than original writing. If, however, it includes both a generic change and a change in medium, the need for adaptation is recognised. For example, a dramatic or film adaptation of a novel may deviate widely from the plot, characterisations and dialogue in that novel, whereas a translation is

expected to imitate these formal elements without revision or deletion (Venuti, 1995b: 15). Theatre translation, even if it does not involve a generic shift, typically employs adaptation of a foreign text. 'Fidelity to the letter' is therefore not a norm, and if it is taken to determine replication, a theatre translator's work does not differ so much from that of the playwright. In the theatre, even more clearly than in the literary system, the translator is an author who writes the text from within his/her own culture, theatre and society Theatre translation follows its own conventions, which are neither those of the source text nor those of the target literary system. In consequence, the relationship between the source text and its translation may be quite different from what would be expected of it in the literary system at the same point in time. Nevertheless, theatre translators are not usually regarded as full authors despite the similarities of their labour with those who are.

What then is required of an author and when does one qualify as one? The question has been repeatedly debated, and evidence has been gathered from explicit statements by authors, as well as from implicit assertions made in authorial practice (Nesbit, 1995: 248). In theatre translation, the question of authorship has been approached recently through statements by translators about their own work (e.g. Johnston, 1996; Aaltonen, 1998).

Another way of analysing the concept of authorship is to study the way copyright law has viewed and still views the author and his/her work. Although the law was partly a result of advances in printing technology the rules which reflect the conventions in the literary system are extended to the theatre, where orality is a central element and where productions are closely tied to their time and place of production. This chapter aims to show that, in the practice of the theatre, the investment of labour and the role played by a foreign author and the translator are so similar that the different treatment of the two in law is even more unjust there than in a literary system.

The discourse of copyright law is typically male in that it constructs hierarchies which are used as a basis for the assessment of texts. [2] It is also male in that the hierarchical order is motivated by the extent of influence of others, and thus reflects the anxiety which is typical of a patriarchal model of literary psychoanalysis (Gilbert & Gubar, 1995: 155–156). The intention of this chapter is to problematise authorship in the theatre, and to look at the implications of copyright law for theatrical practice. As the law controls text-generation from outside the theatre, and thus imposes on it a fixed institutional model, ways have been found within theatre practice to counteract the effects

of the law. Finally, it will look at the possibility of recognising theatre translators as authors in intercultural theatre.

'Who is Speaking? And Why is S/He Speaking Thus?'

The characteristic Nietzschean interrogation in the heading (see also Burke, 1995: xxv) introduces an inquiry into the ethics of authorship, but at the same time it also symbolises a Western way of thinking which is characterised by an obsession with individualism. In the West, individuals are celebrated at the cost of communities or collaborative effort. Ideas are seen to be generated in a historical vacuum, and it is seen to be important to 'de-idealize our accepted accounts of how one poet helps to form another' (Bloom, 1995: 131). Originality reflecting the creator's personality is an essential basis for esteem in a cultural system where authorship has become a kind of property which can be expressed in legal and, most importantly, in economic terms. Indebtedness to others is seen as a handicap which will decrease the value of a work which is then considered a copy of somebody else's original. Communal thinking has no place in our view of creativity.

This view of individual achievement is not unanimously accepted in all cultures, nor has it always been the predominant ideology in the West. For example, in traditional African literature, which emphasises the community and its values, literature is supposed to be anonymous and classified under the name of the community (or the tribe), not that of the individual, the author, who remains unknown. In consequence, by Western standards, traditional African literature is 'anonymous' (Lefevere 1992: 27).

In the West, discourse was not originally a possession. According to Foucault (1977: 124–131), speeches and books were assigned to their 'real' authors only when the authors became subject to punishment if their discourse was considered transgressive, although authorship carried risks long before it was integrated into a cycle of property values. Not all texts have always required authors. Authors may have owned their texts ever since the introduction of copyright, but even in medieval times they owned only the manuscripts, the physical objects they had made with their own hands or caused to be made. The author's claim ceased with the transfer of the manuscript. After it left the playwright's hands, a playscript was no more the author's property than the cloak that he might have sold to the actors at the same time. Once purchased, a script, like a cloak, might be shortened or lengthened or refurbished entirely according to the needs of the company and without consulting the author (Rose, quoting Bentley 1993:

18). There was a time when 'literary' texts were accepted, circulated and valorised without any question of the identity of their author, whereas scientific texts were only considered truthful if the name of the author was indicated. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a totally new concept was developed, when scientific texts were accepted on their own merits, and their authentication no longer required reference to the individual who had produced them. At the same time, literary discourse became acceptable only if it carried an author's name.

Even today, the name of an author is a variable that accompanies only certain texts to the exclusion of others. According to Foucault (1995: 235) a private letter may have a signatory, but one who is not usually regarded as author; a contract can have an underwriter, but not an author, and similarly, an anonymous poster attached to a wall may have a writer, though that writer cannot be an author. In this sense, the function of an author is to characterise the existence, circulation and operation of certain discourses within a society

In contemporary literary theory, the obsession with individual achievement is typical of the patriarchal discourse which sees any influence of one's predecessors as a threat that will diminish the value of one's own work. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar (1995: 157) argue that women writers do not experience this 'anxiety of influence' [3] in the same way that their male counterparts do for the simple reason that they must confront precursors who are almost exclusively male and therefore significantly different from them.

The question of authorship has, therefore, important implications for fields such as translation where, by the very nature of the work, indebtedness to the work of others cannot be avoided. Translation is always a joint venture between a foreign playwright and the translator, but it is not seen to involve equal participation from the two authors involved in the creation of the text. Only one is regarded as the author, whereas the indebtedness of the translator to the author's work makes his/her own input of labour appear to be worth less. The anxiety of influence excludes translators from authorship and confines them to an even more primary 'anxiety of authorship', which is a radical fear that they cannot create, that because they can never become precursors, the act of writing will isolate or destroy them (Gilbert & Gubar, 1995: 157). [4]

The Romantic concept of authorship, which is prevalent in the way we look at translation, maintains that only the foreign author can be a true creator who expresses personal thoughts and feelings in the work; the translator is granted no such right. The work of the foreign

author is viewed as an original and transparent self-representation, whereas a translation can never be more than a copy of somebody else's self-representation. Only the foreign text can be original and authentic, and only that can express its author's psychology or intention. The translation is always imative, potentially contaminating or false (Venuti, 1995b: 4; see also Venuti, 1998: 50–54).

As examples in the previous chapters have shown, originality in the theatre is a more flexible concept than in the discourse of the literary system. Theatre texts have always been grafted on to other theatre texts, and originality lies rather in the ways that texts can give voice to issues which arise in other societies at other points in time.

Authorship and Copyright

'Who is speaking?' The answer to that question provided by contemporary copyright law is straightforward: only authors have the right to speak, and they have total control over their words. They are their property. In fact, copyright law could not, and simply would not, exist if it could not define who the author was. Authors are owners, and the existence of the law depends on being able to determine how and in what circumstances texts become property and whose property. It was this economic condition that defined the author in the first place, and both the circulation and operation of discourses of authorship still take place within a market economy (Nesbit, 1995: 217). In the West authorship is a marketable commodity.

Copyright is a modern formation, and it developed, among other things, as a consequence of printing technology's ability to produce large numbers of copies of a text quickly and cheaply. The law is deeply rooted in our economic system. It is concerned with ownership, but the question of who owns what has received many different readings in different societies at different times. The history of the law of copyright is a continuous saga of difficulties in trying to define not only the owner but also the property.

When the object of copyright law was the actual manuscript, as in medieval times, and the owner of a manuscript was seen to possess the right to grant permission to copy it, property rights had nothing to do with authorship, and copying was seen as a straightforward activity. Even when authorial interest became one of the issues of copyright in Europe in the sixteenth century, and the law demanded that no book was to be printed or sold unless the printer secured documentary proof of the consent of the author or his (in practice it was always 'his') heirs, copying was still viewed in terms of producing

copies of an 'original' in an uncomplicated manner (Rose, 1993: 9, 20–21).

The first complication appeared when translation became an issue in copyright law in eighteenth-century England. In a court ruling, Lord Chancellor Macclesfield stated that a translation *might* be regarded as a new work. Gradually; by the nineteenth century, the emphasis of the law shifted to the abstract work, which came to be understood as equivalent to the 'essence and value of a literary composition' rather than limited to the literal language of the text (Rose, 1993: 133). At this point copyright law had eventually bitten off more than it could chew.

Translation work has imposed new demands on copyright law, and, as might be expected, discourse as property has been seen to need protection at the international level too. However, the vagueness of what copyright law provides protection for has become even more striking here. The Berne Convention (1886) defines the object of the protection in a very open-ended way, but nevertheless grants the authors ten principal rights in their work: the authors have the moral right (Article 6 *bis*); the reproduction right (Article 9); the translation right (Article 8); the broadcasting and public communication right (Article 11 *bis*); the public recitation right (Article 11 *ter*); the adaptation right (Article 12); the recording right (Article 13); the cinematographic right (Article 14), the public performance right (Article 11), and the right of pursuit (Article 14 *ter*). In addition, the Convention rules that authors always have the right to claim authorship of work and to object to any distortion, mutilation, modification or other derogatory action of the work which would cause damage to their honour or reputation. This looks simple enough, but it is complicated by the definitions of the object of protection.

Like all international treaties, the Berne Convention has to leave a great deal of freedom to the member states, who do not, for example, have to agree on whether to protect the right of the author, or the right in the work. The different approaches in national copyright laws towards the protection of authors and their works mean different philosophical views of the object of protection. The common law countries of Ireland and the UK protect works rather than authors, and assign the rights in those works to copyright owners, not authors. They are therefore prepared not only to extend protection to an almost infinitely wide range of works, but also to be much more pragmatic in limiting the rights of copyright owners, if such limitations should be deemed to be in the interest of society Countries, such as Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxemburg, The Netherlands and Spain, which protect the rights of authors, are

far more cautious about extending protection to any work whatever its nature. Explicitly or implicitly, they feel bound to be able to trace the protection afforded to the work back to the original author, who is normally considered to be a physical person, since at root the author's right is philosophically considered to be a human right. These same member states are equally cautious about limiting the rights of authors in their works, whatever the social benefits which would flow from these limitations (Commission of the European Communities, 1992: 25–26). The two approaches are not, in fact, so far from each other, as in the main, both philosophies of protection have been adapted to fit the needs of late twentieth century capitalism.

Copyright law protects a concept of authorship which is not inscribed in a material form, but is rather immaterial, a god-like essence of individuality that lacks cultural specificity and permeates various forms and media (Venuti, 1995b: 5). The ambiguity which unavoidably follows is illustrated well by the diversity of definitions (within a fairly closed regional unit such as the member states of the Berne Union) of what qualifies some work as 'literary' and 'artistic' and therefore within the jurisdiction of copyright law.

In France, the basic law regulating literary and artistic property (passed in 1957) provides protection for the rights of authors of all *intellectual* works, regardless of their kind, *form of expression*, merit or purpose; and the author's right in literary works only extends to the form of expression and not to ideas. The law does not specifically exclude protection for ideas, although the courts are considered to have betrayed the intentions of the legislators if they extend protection further than they should. There is no constraint on the free flow of anyone's ideas, and it is therefore the form of expression of those ideas which is protected by the law, regardless of the idea contained within it. However, to separate an idea from its form is not an uncomplicated matter, and some court cases have ended in verdicts whose foundations appear shaky. For example, a novelist was convicted who had based his plot on a hypothesis which an archaeologist had advanced in a learned journal after one of his investigations (Commission of the European Communities, 1992: 30–34).

An idea cannot be protected in Belgium either, and, to enjoy protection, a literary work must be *expressed in a specific form and be original*. The requirement of originality is less stringent than that of novelty, required by patent law, and a work can be original even if it is not totally new. The other requirement for protection by the Belgian law is that a work should exist in a specific form. However, the form of the work is relatively insignificant, and the work, or its rough draft,

does not have to be fixed in form. Oral works such as interviews, sermons or conferences are protected as such, since the speakers' remarks follow a certain order which they have chosen and which carry the marks of their composition (Commission of the European Communities, 1992: 39–41).

The law in Italy specifies the protection to works which have a *creative character*. The Corte di Cassazione ruled in 1946 that in order to have a creative character, a work had to have 'the organic originality of a creative work, in other words, the originality is not given by each element of the work, but by their choice, the value of their position, their coordination, in fact by their organisation' (Commission of the European Communities, 1992: 43–45).

The UK Copyright Designs and Patents Act of 1988 and the Ireland Copyright Act of 1963 define literary works very widely, as the laws reflect the traditional approach of the common law jurisdiction, which protects the rights of owners of works rather than the rights of authors in their works. They include in their definitions works which are *personal and intellectual creations* in literature and arts as well as pseudo-literary works. The definition of a literary work in British law is almost infinite, including law reports, lists of football fixtures and railway timetables (Commission of the European Communities, 1992: 56–57).

The above definitions illustrate the difficulties involved in the assessment and comparison of the labour of a foreign playwright and a translator. The old form/content dichotomy, as well as the conceptual vagueness of attributes such as 'original', 'creative', 'personal' and 'intellectual' as characteristics of authorship, rely more on the Romantic view of an author's work than any solid theoretical measure of the type and amount of labour in text-creation. This, coupled with the traditional view of translation as a copy of another person's original work, automatically gives the translator a worse deal in the bargain.

The slightest challenge to a strict boundary between the original and the version, to the identity or to the integrity of the original, would destroy the foundation of copyright law (Derrida, 1985a: 196). Copyright law relies on the distinction between form and content, by which it proposes to explain the difference between the original and its translation. The form/content, signifier/signified polarity is based on the assumption that texts have a core which remains unchangeable in translation while the form/expression changes according to each new language. Only the form can become property and not the ideas, themes, and contents, which are common and universal property.

Copyright law claims that a distinction exists between an original and a translation, and that the originality of a translation lies in the originality of expression (the form). Expression is opposed to content, and the translation, which is not supposed to touch the content, must be original only in its language as expression. However, expression is also opposed to the composition of the original, although one would normally place composition on the side of form. The form of expression is only the form of linguistic expression, the choice of words in the language, but nothing else. (Derrida, 1985a: 197)

The law presupposes the existence of the untouchable, that which remains once the translator has extracted from the text the communicable meaning and transmitted that which can be transmitted. The law also means that there can be no translation of a translation: only originals can be translated. If one could translate a translation, one would touch the untouchable of the untouchable of the original which guarantees to the original that it indeed remains the original. If the untouchable did not exist, or if it remained undiscoverable, the distinction between an original and a translation would collapse (Derrida 1985a: 195–196).

This untouchable, at the intersection of the transferable and the untranslatable would be the pure language [5] in which the meaning and the letter are no longer dissociated. Only a translation may make the core or pure language emerge and grow. Owing to translation, its linguistic supplementarity by which one language gives to another what it lacks, and gives it harmoniously, this crossing of languages assures the growth of languages. The translation will be a moment in the growth of the original, which will complete itself in enlarging itself (Derrida, 1985b: 202).

In translation the original always grows, like a child, on its own, but with the power to speak on its own which makes of a child something other than a product subjected to the law of reproduction (Derrida, 1985a: 191). A child is not only that towards which or for which a father or mother remains; it is another who starts talking and goes on talking by itself, without their help, who does not even answer them except in their fantasy (Derrida, 1985b: 157).

The translation is therefore also an original. Copyright law does not accept this, and proposes to draw lines between 'originals' and their replications. It is concerned with domains, with the separation of that which is private from that which is common. If individuals are constantly attempting to define their 'ownness' as distinct from that of the community, copyright law offers help in this.

In the theatre, copyright law defines the domains which authors

and translators as owners (although not equal) are allowed to occupy, and secures their ownness by granting them 'moral rights' in their texts. Both have, for example, the right 'to be assured that the integrity of their work will be preserved'. The integrity of a work – seen in terms of some untouchable core or the minimum sameness which must obtain in replication – is such a vague concept that, as texts built on each other gradually change mode from written to oral, it cannot be defined except on an entirely *ad hoc* basis. There is no sound theoretical basis for it, and as orality in the theatre has such high status, the integrity of a text is supplemented by concessions such as 'the requirements of the stage' or playability and speakability. Oral texts can grow, shrink, and change shape much more easily and uncontrollably than their written counterparts. The power of the copyright law diminishes with texts written in the wind, and so also does the protection it can guarantee for the owners.

Theatrical systems, like living organisms, are able to adjust to contexts which they cannot change, and they have therefore turned their rebellion into a tacit search for cracks which would give enough room for the practice of theatre. They have found ways of fitting in with the rigid rules of copyright law by justifying their typical text generation with system-specific conventions. They have not been equally clever in getting recognition for translators whose contribution to intercultural theatre is at least as important as that of playwrights.

Integrity and *La Perruque*

Copyright law is ill-equipped to cater for translation practice in the theatre. Its imperatives are much more difficult to monitor with oral texts than with printed literature. Theatre translators have always had more choice in the ways they have rewritten foreign source texts for the stage than their counterparts in the literary system. This is why the definition of the integrity of a text, which is so central in copyright law, has also received a more flexible reading in the theatre. This flexibility, which I see as *la perruque*, or making use of the framework imposed on you from up above to serve your own purposes, has led to the acceptance of a translation strategy and through that an intertextuality which would not necessarily be accepted elsewhere, but has not, unfortunately led to theatre translators being regarded as equal partners in intercultural theatre.

Although copyright is essentially an economic proposition, it can effectively constrain the way texts can be rewritten to fit in with the pragmatics of the target society. Theatrical systems have, however,

developed ways of dealing with the restrictions of the law, and usually rely either on cooperation with the playwrights or on their lack of interest in the matter. In some cases the economics of the transaction may direct the choice of texts to those which are no longer covered by copyright.

For example, summer theatres in Finland in 1995 were full of Shakespeare. Apart from the suitability of the plays for the season – an abundance of ingredients such as love, eroticism, humour and adventure which we believe go particularly well with the summer – their popularity may also have owed something to the fact that the playwright died such a long time ago. A dead writer may have been a bonus for several reasons. Not only did the 12% of admission fees which normally go to the writer stay with the theatre, but also a dead writer could not monitor the readings of his plays. Moreover, the works of a dead *foreign* writer were probably not as untouchable as those of a fellow countryman.

Living writers or their estates enjoy unconditional copyright of their work, and they can, in principle, decide on the ways that translations find their balance between the codes of the source text and the pragmatics of the target society. Copyright law gives them the power to define how their texts are used on foreign stages even beyond their own time. Samuel Beckett banned women from playing men's roles in his plays. Arthur Miller, Harold Pinter and Edward Albee are also known to have stopped some readings of their plays which they have considered incorrect. Pinter has stopped new translations into Finnish of some of his plays (*Helsingin, Sanomat* 25/7/1996). The Brecht estate is known for being difficult to deal with for anyone who wants to make any changes in the plays (Johnston, 1996a: 139).

On the one hand then, there are the rights of the authors and translators, and on the other, the constraints and expectations of the theatrical system. The need to meet the pragmatics of the target society is so strong that plays are almost without exception adapted to some extent for each performance. So while copyright law aims to protect the integrity of the texts, it may also be in the author's or translator's interest to read this protection flexibly. It is important for authors and translators to have their work accepted for production, although at the same time they do not want to be blamed for something which somebody else has introduced into the production. The fact that authors agree to changes can be seen as a sign that they care about their work and continue to take an interest in it (Griffiths, 1982: 177). Disagreements are, if possible, resolved in advance (or sometimes afterwards) and expensive court cases thus avoided.

An author's or translator's moral rights are inviolable, but not many cases have to be settled in court. Some have, however, ended up there, and the settlements illustrate the many contradictions that there are in law. For example, the Finnish copyright law of 1961 grants copyright to the creator of a literary or artistic work, and cautions against making changes in the work which would infringe the literary or artistic value or the uniqueness of the author, or making it public in any form or connection which would constitute an act of disrespect to the author (Tekijänoikeuslaki Sect.3, 1977). The translator, as the creator of the translation, has the right to claim authorship and have the integrity of his/her work protected. If the translator feels that the integrity of the work is challenged, s/he can have it tested in court. The way the case is settled in a court of law does not differ from the way an original authorship would be settled, which emphasises the artificial distinction between an 'original' and its translation, as in this case the translation is the 'original'. In one court case in Finland, the translation of a French play had been modified to suit the view the artistic and stage director held of the 'requirements of the stage', but the translator had not been approached about the modifications in advance. She considered these modifications to infringe the literary and artistic value and uniqueness of her work and sued the theatre. In court a lengthy discussion followed, in which it was shown that the first three acts had been re-translated by somebody else, although this was not mentioned in the credits. Moreover, the 'original' translation had been shortened, and words and expressions replaced by others which were felt to be more up to date. The translator felt that this infringed her moral rights. Both the director and the owner of the theatre were required to pay compensation to the translator. It was, however, felt that when the director had made changes to the text, crossed out expressions and corrected details in the translation, he had followed generally accepted practice in the theatre and not infringed the integrity of the translator's work (Selostuksia ja tiedonantoja (. . .) 1974: 122–125). The director was allowed to change the translator's text, whereas a dramaturge was not, but a director could not have his text copyrighted. Texts in a production are written in the wind, not on paper.

Although copyright law guarantees that the integrity of translated texts is not infringed, it has to be monitored in order to be effective. In practice, there is a great deal of variation in how efficiently or carefully this is done. In Finland, the monitoring is the responsibility of the agency which is buying the copyright for individual theatres, and one of the duties of the agency is to represent the copyright owner

when the texts are used as a basis for other texts, the translations.

Some copyright holders may be more alert than others. For example, when the translation – which in itself was an adaptation [6] – into Finnish of Andrew Lloyd Webber's *Cats* was challenged by representatives of the the the T. S. Eliot Society, it was accused of infringing the integrity of the original, that is Eliot's work. The Finnish translation therefore had two originals, the poetry of Eliot, and a theatre script based on it for the musical. The copyright holder (Trevor Nunn, Lloyd Webber or Cameron Mackintosh?) of the text which was translated – thus the original – did not feel the Finnish translation was infringing his rights. Instead the infringement skipped one stage and was directed to the 'first' original. The dispute was settled when the translation was withdrawn from rehearsal and revised.

The copyright holder, the author, may be upset but not want to interfere. This happened with Dario Fo's *Accidental Death of An Anarchist* when it was first performed in London's West End in 1979. The author who came to see his play hardly recognised it, but accepted the changes.

The reactions of authors (and translators) cannot be anticipated. As long as texts are property, and signatures are seen as addresses of ethical resummons by which the author may be recalled to his or her text (Burke, 1995: 289), theatres need to adjust their everyday practices according to the existing law. But however carefully copyright is monitored, as soon as a text leaves its author, it is exposed to be utilised to give rise to new texts. In a theatre production, the written text is not awarded any supreme place, nor can there be any single definite reading of it. The significance of a play will vary from age to age, from culture to culture, from reader to reader, and from performance to performance. Moreover, it varies between individual spectators or readers. The shaping process of the theatre, together with the right of every reader to 'own' the text read, negates the notion of a single intended reading (Bassnett-McGuire, 1981: 38, 40). A writer cannot claim to 'possess' one reading of the text although copyright law suggests that this is possible.

A Way Forward

Contemporary translation studies have increasingly challenged the use of the Romantic concept of authorship, and Venuti (1995b: 1, see also Venuti, 1998: 62–66) has proposed its replacement with the concept of collective authorship, which would regard the translator as a species of author. Collective authorship would see authors in

collaboration with a specific social group, taking into account the cultural values which are characteristic of that group. The form of a work is not only collaborative, constituted by a relationship with an audience, but derivative, not originating in the author's personality or productive labour carried out on raw nature, but drawn from pre-existing cultural materials. Thus if authorship is collective, and if a work both collaborates with and derives from a cultural context, then the translation and the foreign text are distinct projects because they involve different contexts. The different social situations for which the texts are written ensure that they will take different forms and carry different meanings for their readers. In consequence, a collective concept of authorship offers a precise definition of form to distinguish between a translation and the foreign text it translates: the collaborative and derivative dimensions of form result in linguistic and cultural differences that can serve not only as the basis for the translator's claim to copyright, but also for an argument in favour of restricting the foreign author's rights over the translation (Venuti, 1995b: 15–16).

Venuti's proposal is particularly justifiable in theatre translation, where adaptation ties the translation even more closely and visibly to the target society than its contemporary counterpart in the literary system. As playwrights and translators in theatre have equal inputs of labour, there is very little to justify their unequal treatment in copyright law. The writer's basic material is the language and social discourse of his/her society and the act of translation functions institutionally in the same way (Brisset 1996: 6). Foreign authors address a linguistic and cultural constituency that does not include the readers of their works in translation. Translators address a domestic constituency whose demand for intelligibility in the terms of the translating language and culture exceeds the foreign author's intentions as realised in the foreign text (Venuti, 1995b: 17). Both deserve to have their rights recognised.

If the primary ethical function of authorship is setting up a structure of resummons whereby the author may be recalled to his or her text, then the foreign playwright and the translator are summoned to different texts. This needs to be recognised in the concept of authorship as it is constructed for theatre translation.

Another issue altogether is to challenge the way copyright law is founded on the need to construct hierarchies and to place one text above the other, and in the male anxiety of influence which has confined translators to the attic with women writers. As translation work has been seen to be mainly replication rather than creation, it has

been regarded as less demanding and less in need of recognition. Translators have remained anonymous and secondary in importance to the writers. Translators have no precursors and have therefore also come to share the anxiety of authorship with women writers. However, awareness of the injustice is growing, and both groups have been encouraged to become more visible. Translators are gradually becoming accepted as a species of author, creators whose work deserves the same recognition as that of their foreign counterparts, the playwrights. Copyright law is misguided in its effort to punish indebtedness between language borders and different cultures. The indebtedness and influence also lie much closer, within one's own society and the writing that takes place there. Texts circulate on the market in a variety of ways, and the time has come to replace hierarchies with connections.

Notes

1. And thus, for example, economic reward. This relates to the Lockean concept of authorship, as described by Venuti (1998: 54–55).
2. About hierarchies as a male discourse, see, for example Deborah Tannen 1993: 38.
3. The concept of 'anxiety of influence' has been introduced into literary criticism by Harold Bloom in his work *Anxiety of Influence*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
4. Gilbert and Gubar make this point about a female poet, but it accurately describes the position of translators as well.
5. In search of a feminist alternative for myths of translation, Karin Littau has criticised the Tower of Babel myth for its belief in some originary language, a state of grace in which people understood one another because they spoke only one language, a pre-Babelian 'Adamic tongue'. The post-Babelian discourse about translation tends to describe translation in terms that have largely negative associations, and suggest a nostalgia for a mythic time when it was not necessary to distinguish between an original and a translation (Flotow, 1997: 45–46).
6. The programme for the London production of Andrew Lloyd Webber's *Cats* does not give the adapter's name separately, but it includes a 'Note on the text' by Trevor Nunn. In it, Nunn explains that 'Most of the poems comprising *Old Possum's Book of Practical Cats* have been set to music complete and in their originally published form: a few have been subject to a minor revision of tense or pronoun, and eight lines have been added to the Song of the Jellicles. However, some of our lyrics, notably *The Marching Song of the Follicle Dogs* and the story of *Grizabella* were discovered among the unpublished writings of Eliot. The prologue is based on ideas and incorporates lines from another unpublished poem, entitled *Follicle Dogs and Jellicle Cats. Memory* includes lines from and is suggested by *Rhapsody on a Windy Night*, and other poems of the *Prufrock* period. All other words in the show are taken from the *Collected Poems*.'

Conclusions

Nothing has meaning in isolation, and there is always a context in which theatre translation takes place. There is always a history from which a text emerges and into which a text is transposed. The relationship between languages is significant for the translation process, but even more significant are the ways in which cultures are perceived to relate to one another. These perceptions are the driving force behind the decision to translate (and once that has been taken), behind the selection of desirable texts and the strategies which are applied in the process. The consequences of the intercultural exchange of theatre texts should not be ignored either. We can never quite escape the myth of authenticity, the belief that we see the world as it is, not as a construction, and the dominating bias towards realism in the Western theatre strengthens the assumption that that is the way things are. Often when we believe we have caught a glimpse of the Other, we have only seen our own reflection in the mirror.

Theatre texts, like all texts, are rich and fertile. Both the 'original' and its translations are like rented apartments where renters may make substantial changes to their living quarters. Theatre practitioners and audiences redecorate the texts when they move into them, and make them make sense in the framework of their own history Texts can therefore be approached and studied in relation to their tenants, who have responded to various codes in the surrounding societies, and through this response integrated the texts (or failed to do so) into the entire sociocultural discourse of their time.

The agency of translation strategies in representing various cultural, social and theatrical codes is of primary interest for the study of what happens when texts cross cultural borders. Although texts have, in theory an infinite number of 'readings' or 'interpretations' in them, they are most commonly chosen as mirrors rather than as windows on the world. The choice is most frequently based on how they can serve us rather than a genuine interest in the Other. That is why the compatibility of discourses of the source text and the receiving target society decides on the acceptance of the Foreign into the repertoire of one's own theatre.

Translation is always egotistically motivated. The choice of a

particular text and a particular translation strategy for its translation are always a statement about alterity

These statements are not all alike. Translations may express reverence for alterity when foreign texts are either translated in their entirety, or an effort is made to transplant into the indigenous linguistic and cultural system certain features – often aspects of theatre aesthetics – which are deemed essential to them. Underlying reverence we find, however, selfish motivations. The selfishness lies in the desire to increase the cultural capital of the indigenous system through the number and qualities of foreign texts, and through these superior qualities other equally valuable features are introjected into the indigenous theatrical and cultural systems. Reverence as a mode of translation may include an intention to transplant the Foreign into the home system as a source of inspiration to spawn domestic writing. Overall, alterity is either highlighted, or no effort is made to disguise it. The Foreign is perceived to be superior to the Sell and the Self is seen to benefit from the relationship.

The choice of a particular translation strategy can also be read as a rebellion against the source text or against an authoritative superior culture and the fixed hierarchical order they represent. The foreign text is usually reactualised spatially or temporally, or the translation is written to form an imitation or a parody of it. In rebellion, the Foreign is subverted to serve the Sell without however, breaking away from it. De Certeau's model of cultural studies, in particular the concept of *la perruque*, is useful for describing the strategy in this mode of translation.

The mode may suggest a disregard of the Foreign when the source text is rewritten entirely from the perspective of the target culture by either reactualising it or writing an imitation of it. This mode reverses the one of reverence by appropriating the source text and the source culture, and thus denying its significance. Everything is reduced to the perspective of the target culture, which is in the dominant position and turns the alien culture to its own ends. The choice of a translation strategy and through that the mode of translation (inherently motivated by the perception of an asymmetry between the two cultures which reverses that underlying reverence) may be explained by economic constraints or the constraints of the media. Economic considerations play an increasingly important role in contemporary Western theatre, where capital can both destroy as well as create entire sub-systems. Similarly, media-related changes are important either when generic changes are involved in the translation of theatre texts, or when theatre texts are rewritten for the radio or TV.

The foundations of copyright law in the need to construct hierarchies and in the male anxiety of influence which have confined translators to the attic out of sight can also be challenged. As translation work has been seen to be mainly replication rather than creation, it has been regarded as less demanding and less in need of recognition. There are, however, numerous contradictions in copyright law, and its power over theatre texts is not unproblematic. The concept of collective authorship may be helpful here, as translators appear to be gradually becoming accepted as a species of author, creators whose work deserves the same recognition as that of their foreign counterparts, the playwrights.

If translation is primarily an egotistically motivated activity, the study of translations is even more so. It has its roots in the desire to understand the way one's culture works or has worked and come to terms with it. Translations are products of the receiving culture which reflect both their historical context and readership and that culture's close links with institutions of power. It has not been understood until recently that a translation is interwoven with a country's economy and trade relations at least as much as with high literary values, if not more so. Translated works provide valuable information about cultural asymmetries because texts never travel between cultures intact. They have existed in some form in another culture, but in order to survive in their new surroundings, they are recreated from within the receiving culture, using its own tools. Translation has a racist element in it, as it is always struggling to defend the domestic against the Foreign. The unknown represents a threat, if it is allowed to dominate. For this reason, a completed translation will always be a reflection of the receiving culture rather than that of its source text.

The complexity of describing and analysing what takes place in intercultural theatre makes it an inexhaustible area of study. Although many paths in the labyrinth have already been covered, there is still a great deal to be done. However, the larger the number of explorers, the larger the area they can cover. Welcome to the labyrinth.

References

Aaltonen, S. (1996) *Acculturation of the Other*. Joensuu: Joensuu University Press.

Aaltonen, S. (1997) *Macbeth* in Finland. In P. Bush (ed.) *In Other Words*, Winter/Spring no 8/9 (pp. 60–67).

Aaltonen, S. (1998) *Käännetyt illuusiot*. [Translated Illusions] Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Alasuutari, P (1991) TV-ohjelmien arvohierarkia katsomistottumuksista kertovien puhetapojen valossa. [The Hierarchy of TV Programmes as Reflected in Ways of Speaking about Them]. In J. Kytömöki (ed.) *Nykyajan sadut* pp. 232–285. Jyväiskylä: Gummerus.

Andrew, D. (1984) *Concepts in Film Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ang, I. (1991) *Watching Dallas. Soap Opera and the Melodramatic Imagination*. London and New York: Routledge.

Aspelin-Haapkylä, E. (1906) *Suomalaisen teatterin historia I*. [History of Finnish Theatre]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Aspelin-Haapkylä, E. (1909) *Suomalaisen teatterin historia Ill*. [History of Finnish Theatre]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Barba, E. (1996) Eurasian theatre. In P. Pavis (ed.) *The Intercultural Performance Reader* (pp. 217–222). London and New York: Routledge.

Bassnett S. (1990) Translating for the theatre: Textual complexities. *Essays in Poetics* 15, 71–84.

Bassnett S. (1991) Translating for the theatre: The case against performability. *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Redaction* 4 (1), 99–111.

Bassnett S. (1998) Still trapped in the labyrinth: Further reflections on translation and theatre. In S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere (eds) *Constructing Cultures* (pp. 90–108). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bassnett-McGuire, S. (1985) Ways through the labyrinth: Strategies and methods for translating theatre texts. In Th. Hermans (ed.) *The Manipulation of Literature* (pp. 87–102). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Bassnett-McGuire, S. (1981) The translator in the theatre. *Theatre Quarterly* (40), 37–48.

Bhabha, H.K. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bharucha, R. (1993) *Theatre and the World*. London and New York: Routledge.

Birch, D. (1991) *The Language of Drama*. London: Macmillan.

Bloom, H. 1995) A meditation upon priority, and a synopsis. In S. Burke (ed.) *Authorship. From Plato to the Postmodern. Reader* (pp. 131–139). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1992) *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Nice (transl.). London: Routledge.

Brisset, A. (1996) *A Sociocritique of Translation: Theatre and Alterity in Quebec, 1968–1988*. R. Gill and R. Gannon (transls). Toronto: Toronto University Press.

Brown, J.R. (ed.) (1995) *The Oxford Illustrated History of Theatre*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Burke, S. (ed.) (1995) *Authorship. From Plato to the Postmodern. Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Carrière, J.-C. (1988) *The Mahabharata*. P. Brook (transl.). London: Methuen.

Commission of the European Communities (1992) *Copyright and Information Limits to the Protection of Literary and Pseudo-literary Works in the Member States of the E.C.* Luxemburg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Cronin, M. (1996) *Translating Ireland*. Cork: Cork University Press.

Culler, J. (1975) *Structuralist Poetics*. London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

De Certeau, M. (1984) *Practices of Everyday Life*. Berkeley LA: University of California Press.

Delisle, J. and Woodsworth, J. (eds) (1995) *Translators through History*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Derrida, J. (1985a). Des tours de Babel. In J.F. Graham (ed. and transl.) *Difference in Translation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Derrida, J. (1985b) *The Ear of the Other: Texts and Discussions with Jacques Derrida*. C. McDonald (ed.), P. Kamuf (transl.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Duff, J.W. and Duff, A.M. (1962) *A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age*. London: Ernest Benn Limited.

The Edmonton Journal (1994) Festival Supplement.

Edney, D. (1996) Translating (and not translating) in a Canadian context. In D. Johnston (ed.) *Stages of Translation* (pp. 229–238). Bath: Absolute Classics.

Esslin, M. (1980) *Draaman perusteet*. [English orig. *An Anatomy of Drama*]. S. Heiskanen-Mäkelä (transl.). Gummerus: Jyväskylä.

Esslin, M. (1994) *The Field of Drama*. London: Methuen Drama.

Even-Zohar, I. (1990) Polysystem studies. *Poetics Today* 11:1 (Spring).

Farrel, J. (1996) Servant of many masters. In D. Johnston (ed.) *Stages of Translation* (pp. 45–55). Bath: Absolute Classics.

Findlay, B. (1994) Québécois into Scots: Translating Michel Tremblay. *Scottish Language* 13, 61–81.

Findlay, B. (1996) Talking in tongues: Scottish translations 1970–1995. In R. Stevenson and G. Wallace (eds) *Scottish Theatre Since the Seventies* (pp. 186–197). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Fischer-Lichte, E. (1989) Intercultural aspects in post-modern theatre: A Japanese version of Chekhov's *Three Sisters*. In H. Scolnicov and P. Holland (eds) *The Play Out of Context* (pp. 173–185). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fischer-Lichte, E. (1990a) Theatre, own and foreign. The intercultural trend in contemporary theatre. In E. Fischer-Lichte, J. Riley and M. Gissenwehrer (eds) *The Dramatic Touch of Difference* (pp. 11–19). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Fischer-Lichte, E. (1990b) Staging the foreign as cultural transformation. In E. Fischer-Lichte, J. Riley and M. Gissenwehrer (eds) *The Dramatic Touch of Difference* (pp. 277–287). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Fischer-Lichte, E. (1996) Interculturalism in contemporary theatre. In P. Pavis (ed.) *The Intercultural Performance Reader* (pp. 27–40). London and NewYork: Routledge

Fiske, J. (1993) *Merkkien kieli. Johdatus viestinnän tutkimiseen*. [English orig. *Introduction to Communication Studies*]. V. Pietilä *et al*. (eds and transls). Jyväskylä: Vastapaino.

von Flotow, L. (1997) *Translation and Gender*. Manchester, UK: St Jerome Publishing.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Language, Counter-memory, Practice*. D.F Bouchard and S. Simon (transls). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Foucault, M. (1995) From What is an Author. In S. Burke (ed.) *Authorship. From Plato to the Postmodern* (pp. 233–246). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Friedrich, H. (1992) On the art of translation. In R. Schulte and J. Biguenet (eds) *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida* (pp. 11–16). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures. Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Gentzler, E. (1996) Translation, counter-culture, and The Fifties in the USA. In R. Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal (eds) *Translation, Power, Subversion* (pp. 116–137). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gilbert, S.M. and Gubar, S. (1995) The madwoman in the attic. In S. Burke (ed.) *Authorship. From Plato to the Postmodern* (pp. 151–161). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gilula, D. (1989) Greek drama in Rome: Some aspects of cultural transposition. In H. Scolnicov and P. Holland (eds) *The Play Out of Context* (pp. 99–109). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gissenwehrer, M. (1990) To weave a silk road away. Thoughts on an approach towards the unfamiliar: Chinese theatre and our own. In E. Fischer-Lichte, J. Riley and M. Gissenwehrer (eds) *The Dramatic Touch of Difference* (pp. 151–159). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Gooch, S. (1996) Fatal attraction. In D. Johnston (ed.) *Stages of Translation* (pp. 13–21). Bath: Absolute Classics.

Griffiths, T. (1982) *Stagecraft*. Oxford: Phaidon.

Halttunen-Salosaari, E. (1967) Litterääri kuva. In *Juhlakirja Kauko Kyyrön täyttäessä 60 vuotta 24.11.1967*. [Literary Image. *Festschrift* in Honour of Kauko Kyyrö on his 60th Birthday]. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto.

Harrison, M. (1998) *The Language of Theatre*. Manchester: Carcanet.

Hartnoll, P. (1990) *The Oxford Companion to the Theatre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Healy, T. (1997) Past and present Shakespeares: Shakespearian appropriations in Europe. In J.J. Joughin (ed.) *Shakespeare and National Cultures* (pp. 206–232). Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Helleman, J. (1970) Suomennoskirjallisuus. [Translated Literature in Finnish]. In P. Tarkka (ed.) *Suomen kirjallisuus VIII* (pp. 418–484). Helsinki: Otava.

Helsingin Sanomat (Finnish Daily Newspaper) 25/7/1996.

Heylen, R. (1993) *Translation, Poetics, and the Stage*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hirn, Y. (1916). Shakespeare i Finland. In *Finsk Tidsskrift LXXXa* (pp. 245–270). Helsinki.

Holmes, J.S. (1988) *Translated!* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Jalonen, O. (1985) *Kansa kulttuurien virroissa*. [A Nation in the Stream of Cultures]. Helsinki-Keuruu: Otava.

Jeyifo, B. (1996) The reinvention of theatrical tradition. In P. Pavis (ed.) *The Intercultural Performance Reader* (pp. 149–161). London and New York: Routledge.

Johnston, D. (ed.) (1996a) *Stages of Translation*. Bath: Absolute Classics.

Johnston, D. (1996b) Theatre pragmatics. In D. Johnston (ed.) *Stages of Translation* (pp. 57–66). Bath: Absolute Classics.

Kinnunen, A. (1985) *Draaman maailma. Villiintynyt puutarha*. [The World of Drama. An Overgrown Garden]. Porvoo: Werner Söderstrom Osakeyhtiö.

Kowzan, T. (1985) From written text to performance – from performance to written text. In E. Fischer-Lichte *et al.* (eds) *Das drama und seine inszenierung. Vorträge des internationalen literatur- und kultursemiotischen Kolloquiums. Frankfurt am Main 1983* (pp. 1–11). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Kruger, A. (1995) '*Bless thee, Bottom! Bless thee! Thou art translated!*' The Shakespearean phase in South Africa. Unpublished paper, read at the Conference on Translators' Strategies and Creativity, Prague, 25–27 September 1995.

Lagervail, J. (1834) *Ruunulinna*. [Crown Castle. English orig. *Macbeth*]. Helsinki: Wasenius.

Laitinen, K. (1981) *Suomen kirjallisuuden historia*. [History of Finnish Literature]. Helsinki: Otava.

Laskowski, J. (1996) Translating the famous dead, the dead obscure, and the living. In D. Johnston (ed.) *Stages of Translation* (pp. 187–198). Bath: Absolute Classics.

Lefevere, A. (1982) Mother courage's cucumbers: Text, system and refraction in a theory of literature. *Modern Language Studies* XII, 4 (Fall), 3–20.

Lefevere, A. (1992) *Translation, Rewriting & the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.

Levy, J. (1969) *Die literarische Übersetzung*. W. Schamschula (transl.). Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum Verlag.

Loomba, A. (1997) Shakespearean transformations. In J.J. Joughin (ed.) *Shakespeare and National Cultures* (pp. 109–141). Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Maclntyre, A. (1991) Relativism, power and philosophy In K. Baynes, J. Bohman and T. McCarthy (eds) *After Philosophy. End or Transformation?* (pp. 385–411). Cambridge, MA and London, England: The MIT Press.

Medhurst, A. (1998) Sexuality. Tracing desires: Sexuality and media texts. In A. Briggs and P. Cobley (eds) *The Media: An Introduction* (pp. 283–294). Harlow: Longman.

Melrose, S. (1994) *A Semiotics of the Dramatic Text*. Houndmills, Basingstoke and London: Macmillan.

Mounin, G. (1976) *Linguistique et Traduction*. Bruxelles: Dessart et Mardaga.

Mulrine, S. (1996) 'A Man With Connections'. Adapting Gelman's *Naedine so vsemi* for radio. In D. Johston (ed.) *Stages of Translation* (pp. 123–130). Bath: Absolute Classics.

Nesbit, M. (1995) What was an author? In S. Burke (ed.) *Authorship. From Plato to the Postmodern* (pp. 247–262). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Niranjana, T. (1992) *Siting Translation. History, Post-structuralism and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Orsmaa, T-B. (1988) Suomalainen teatteri kansainvälisten virtausten vaikutuskentässä itsenäisyyden ajan alusta 1960-luvulle. [Finnish Theatre and International Influences from the Beginning of the Independence Era to the 1960s]. In P. Koski (ed.) *Teatteri ja historia* (pp. 23–32). Fondi. Teatterimuseon vuosikirja No: 2. Helsinki: Teatterimuseo.

Paavolainen, P. (1992) *Teatteri ja suuri muutto. Ohjelmistot sosiaalisen murroksen osana 1959– 1971.* [Theatre and the Great Migration Movement. Theatre Repertoires as Part of Social Change]. Kustannus Oy Teatteri: Helsinki.

Palmer, J. (1998) News production. In A. Briggs and E Cobley (eds) *The Media: An Introduction* (pp. 377–391). Harlow: Longman.

Paloposki, O. (1997). Translation discourse in early 19th century Finland. Unpublished Licentiate thesis, University of Tampere.

Pavis, E (1989) Problems of translation for the stage: Interculturalism and post-modern theatre. In H. Scolnicov and E Holland (eds) *The Play Out of Context* (pp. 25–44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pavis, P. (1992) *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*. L. Kruger (transl.). London: Routledge.

Pavis, P. (ed.) (1996) *The Intercultural Performance Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Paz, O. (1992) Translation: Literature and letters. In R. Schulte and J. Biguenet (eds) *Theories of Translation. An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida* (pp. 152–162). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

de Poorter, E. (1993) Japanese theatre: In search of the beautiful and the spectacular. In C. Barfoot and C. Bordewijk (eds) *Theatre Intercontinental. Forms, Functions, Correspondences* (pp. 43–60). Amsterdam, and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

Ranke, W. (1993) Shakespeare translations for eighteenth-century stage productions in Germany: Different versions of *Macbeth*. In D. Delabastita and L. D'hulst (eds) *European Shakespeares. Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age* (pp. 163–181). Amsterdam, and Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Rose, M. (1993) *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press.

Said, E.W. (1978) *Orientalism*. London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Salosaari, K. (1989) *Perusteita näyttelijätyön semiotiikkaan. I osa. Teatterin kieli ja näyttelijä merkityksen tuottajana.* [Grounds for the Semiotics of Acting. Part I. Language and Actor as Generators of Meaning]. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto.

Schulte, R. and Biguenet, J. (eds) (1992) *Theories of Translation. An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Schultze, B. (1990) In search of a theory of drama translation: Problems of translating literature (reading) and theatre (implied performance). In *Proceedings of the First Congress of the Associação Portuguesa de Literatura Comparada in 1989* (pp. 267–274). Lisbon: Estudos de Traducao.

Schultze, B. (1993) Shakespeare's way into the West Slavic literatures and cultures. In D. Delabastita and L. D'hulst (eds.), pp. 55–74.

Selostuksia ja tiedonantoja Korkeimman oikeuden ratkaisuista vuonna 1974. [Reports and Announcement Concerning High Court Decisions in 1974]. N.H. Sundberg (ed.). Helsinki, 1975.

Smidt, K. (1993) The discovery of Shakespeare in Scandinavia. In D. Delabastita and and L. D'hulst (eds) *European Shakespeares. Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age* (pp. 91–103). Amsterdam, and Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1984) Sprechbare Spache – Spielbarer Text. Zur Problematik der Bühnenübersetzung. In R.J. Watts and U. Weidman (eds) *Modes of Interpretation* (pp. 101–116). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Tannen, D. (1993) *You Just Don't Understand*. London: Virago Press.

Taylor, D. (1996) *Directing Plays*. London: A & C Black.

Tekijänoikeuslaki. [Copyright Law]. (1997) In E Timonen (ed.) *Suomen laki I* [Finnish Law] (pp. 659–767). Helsinki: Kauppakaari Oy. Lakimiesliiton kustannus.

Tiusanen, T. (1969) *Teatterimme hahmottuu*. [Our Theatre Comes into Being]. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.

Tiusanen, T. (1970) Teatteri ja näytelmäkirjallisuus. [Theatre and Drama]. In *Suomen kirjallisuus VIII* [*Finnish Literature VIIII*] (pp. 521–602). Helsinki: SKS and Otava.

Todd, L. (1989) *The Language of Irish Literature*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Education Ltd.

Totzeva, S. (1995) *Das theatrale Potential des dramatischen Textes*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Toury, G. (1980) *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University/The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Veltrusky, J. (1977) *Drama as Literature*. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.

Veltrusky, J. (1976) Dramatic text as a component of theater. In M. Ladislav and I.R. Titunik (eds) *Semiotics of Art* (pp. 94–117.). Cambridge, MA: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Venuti, L. (1995a) *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London, and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1995b) Translation, authorship, copyright. *The Translator* 1 (1), 1–24.

Venuti, L. (1998) *The Scandals of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Verma, J. (1996) The challenge of Binglish: Analysing multi-cultural productions. In E Campbell (ed.) *Analysing Performance: A Critical Reader* (pp. 193–201). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Vivis, A. (1996) The stages of translation. In D. Johnston (ed.) *Stages of Translation* (pp. 35–44). Bath: Absolute Classics.

Weijie, Y. (1990) Topicality and typicality. The acceptance of Shakespeare in China. In E. Fischer-Lichte, J. Riley and M. Gissenwehrer (eds) *The Dramatic Touch of Difference* (pp. 161–167). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Weitz, S. (1989) Mr Godot will not come today. In H. Scolnikov and P. Holland (eds.) *The Play Out of Context* (pp. 186–198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wickham, G. (1994) *Teatterihistoria*. (*A History of the Theatre*.) K. Nyytäjä (transl.). Helsinki: Teatterikorkeakoulun julkaisusarja nro 24.

Zuolin, H. (1990) China dream: A fruition of global interculturalism. In E. Fischer-Lichte, J. Riley and M. Gissenwehrer (eds) *The Dramatic Touch of Difference* (pp. 179–186). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Index