Introduction

Geraldine Brodie and Emma Cole

Destabilizing the literal/performable binary

The playwright and translator Christopher Hampton recalls his commission by the Royal Court Theatre to rewrite a translation by a distinguished Russian don at Oxford University, while Hampton himself was still an undergraduate there. 'We sat down with the text, he explained what the Russian meant and I tried to write it in more speakable dialogue'. This was needed because 'academic, direct, literal translations' cannot necessarily be relied upon to provide the requisite theatrical elements (Bolt et al 1992: np). Hampton's recollection of his 1960s experience is only one example of the tension existing between theory and practice when plays in one language are translated for performance in another. The sub-text of this anecdote is that theatre translation requires a hierarchy of skills in opposition to that of academic translation: the undergraduate corrects the professor in a Bakhtinian carnival of reversal. Such subversion has an attraction in the world of performance. After all, transformation and metamorphosis, particularly of the unexpected kind, are staple elements of theatrical art.

The division between translation theory and practice is not restricted to theatre. In his introduction to the English translation of *On Translator Ethics*, for example, Anthony Pym

recounts the aim of his French original, *Pour une éthique du traducteur*, to create a dialogue between academic philosophy and the profession of translation. His assessment of this effort, with hindsight, is that '[t]he attempt certainly failed: the resulting principles were too commercial for the academics, and the discussions were simply too difficult for the professionals' (2012: 3). Another 'dialogue between the ivory tower and the wordface' co-authored by the academic Andrew Chesterman and the professional translator Emma Wagner left Chesterman 'enlightened and chastened' on the grounds that scholars 'talk too much to each other rather than a wider audience […] and should spend more time studying real translators in real action' (2002: 136). Wagner, on the other hand, remained of the opinion that the voices of translators were insufficiently attended to by academic commentators: 'ivory-tower-dwellers give higher priority to publishing their own ideas than digesting those of others' (2002: 135).

Theatre provides an unusually visible and productive site for the consideration of this wider translation debate because in theatrical translation the divide between theory and practice – the arcane and the everyday – is particularly unstable. On the one hand, Hampton's commission appears to be representative of the way that translations are often still developed in professional Western theatres. As numerous contributors to this volume demonstrate, when plays in one language are translated into another for performance it is not unusual for academic-style annotated 'literal' translations to be reworked by theatre specialists to create a 'performable' text. As a result, a degree of tension, if not mistrust, can exist between academic and theatrical worlds around the field of theatre translation. On the other hand, however, individuals working in the field of theatre translation often bridge the scholar-practitioner divide; such a dual identity is becoming increasingly common thanks to the growing status of practice-as-research within the academy. Indeed, many of the contributors

to this book defy categorization as either an academic language specialist or a theatre practitioner. In all four sections of this volume, for example, there are contributors who work as professors in university language, classics, and theatre departments whilst simultaneously authoring critically acclaimed translations for the stage. Any assumption that practitioners are more concerned with contemporary performative and reception contexts while scholars are preoccupied with the concerns of the source text's original moment of writing and staging clearly offers a limited understanding of theoretical advances in theatre and performance studies.

Translators who are equally at home in the academy as in the theatre are not the only individuals who problematize the arbitrary division of theory and practice. Developing a translation for performance and bringing it to the stage requires, much like an edited collection, a team of contributors, and one individual can occupy many roles during this process. At times, this may take the form of playing different parts in different projects; Emily Mann and Ben Power, whose works are discussed within this volume, both author their own translations and adaptations and exercise their creative vision on new work and programming in their roles as artistic director of McCarter Theatre and deputy artistic director of the Royal National Theatre respectively. There is creativity involved in programming a season of work and in reinventing a text through a new language, and there are technical demands in balancing a seasonal collection of productions and developing the skills and necessary theoretical outlook required to translate drama. In light of these overlaps, this volume attempts to change the conversation surrounding translation for the stage. The volume does not simply bring directors, translators, and academics into dialogue, but rather it allows individuals working across these three spheres to give their critical understanding of the status of translation within various dramatic movements, and to theorize these modes of

practice outside of the more traditional, often wary and compartmentalized, understandings. One of the key purposes of this volume consequently is to destabilize the 'literal/performable' binary, and to create a new theoretical model for analyzing translation, and the practical realities it involves, in contemporary theatre.

The time is ripe for this investigation. Although it has long been recognised that theatrical performance predicates a particular style of translation practice, what Jirí Levý identified in 1963 as 'the principle of selective accuracy' (2012: 162, systematic theoretical approaches to this specialized area remain scarce. Furthermore, practical guides to translating theatre are even rarer, with Phyllis Zatlin's 'practitioner's view' of theatrical translation (2005) being a notable exception. In contrast, scholars working in theatre and translation studies are placing increased attention upon the undertheorized status of translation in the theatre; investigations are conducted into, for example, the technical elements of verse and syntax within specific language pairs, or the challenges of translating theatrical performance for audiences in different cultures. The 'cultural turn' in translation theory has extended discussions of the translator's visibility, and ideas of domestication and foreignization, to theatre, along with speakability and performability issues. Sirkku Aaltonen made a major contribution to the theoretical debate with her study of the shifting ownership of theatrical texts, seeing theatre texts as rented apartments which can 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' (2000: 9). Since then translation theory has continued to investigate the nature of theatre translation, seeking to establish the extent of the translator's impact within the theatrical system, while theatre studies has tended to focus on translation and adaptation as an aspect of international dramaturgy (see, for example, Trencsényi and Cochrane 2014).

And yet the site of theatre translation remains contested between theatre professionals and academics as to which input is predominant and the most creative. Bigliazzi, Kofler, and Ambrosi, for example, noted in 2013 that 'recent books on translation for the theatre have confirmed a widespread suspicion about theory and resistance to interpretation in favour of the exuberance of the performance and of the performance (as) text' (2013: 2). Their own collection goes some way to rectifying this, investigating the 'idea of the translator as co-subject and/or co-author of the performance' (2013: 13), although they reject the legitimacy of the two-step process of literal translation and target language rewrite within the theatrical translation process: 'the coalescence of writing and translating as a secondary practice within a two-step translation process only enhances playwriting with no interlingual and little intercultural awareness, while downplaying "actual" translation' (2013: 12). Our volume takes a different view, drawing adaptation, and its practitioners, into the translation embrace. This approach permits us to engage with texts from an extended period within dramatic history, including contemporary engagements with classical texts that are more frequently examined under the guise of classical reception studies.

The role of the classics within theatre translation debates is an area where the academy and the industry especially need to be brought into dialogue. Although mastery of any non-native language requires substantial expertise, the specialized knowledge required of classical philologists working with the manuscript tradition has arguably percolated up into a broader fetishization of classical texts outside of the discipline. Theatre criticism on contemporary productions of ancient drama regularly comments on the 'faithfulness' of the translation; when reviewing the Royal National Theatre's 2007 *Women of Troy*, for example, Michael Billington commented that '[i]f Andromache compared her son to "a bird creeping under his

mother's wing", I never heard it' (2007). Such attitudes misconstrue the nature of our extant materials. As Gurd has noted, ancient dramas are made up of multiple texts compiled by a range of editors (2005: 5). There is rarely a single, definitive manuscript for an ancient tragedy, and even if there were one, the degree to which it would bear correspondence to what Aeschylus, Sophocles, or Euripides wrote is open to debate. Official versions of ancient tragedies were not written until around 330 BC, over a century after some of the texts were first staged and only because of the Lycurgus Decree, which was likely issued to curb the alteration of texts due to actor interpolations. When the state canonised these official texts, as Csapo and Slater note they were likely drawn from 'the mixed oral and written tradition that was circulating at the time' (1994: 4-5). There is clearly due reason to bring classical scholars into dialogue with translation scholars and theatre practitioners to re-evaluate ideas of authenticity and originality and reassess what, and whom, is being translated in the adaptation of the classical tradition for the modern stage.

Reminding ourselves of the changeable and dynamic performance history that initially surrounded ancient texts in many ways depedestalizes our extant classical material. Even academics open to a variety of translation styles, such as J. Michael Walton, often argue against the idea of a contemporary practitioner intervening substantially in the ancient text, perhaps anticipating the fears that Christopher Haydon voices in his foreword:

> The point at which the original ideas of the playwright get submerged or overtaken by those of the translator is the point at which the word 'version' tends to be introduced as an apology or disclaimer; or even a 'claimer', where the translators (such as Sartre) admit that the original is all very well as a starting-point, but that theirs is more

> interesting. However cogent the argument it should not be overlooked that this is often the moment when version becomes perversion (Walton 2006: 186)

The classical canon, however, is full of playwrights adapting, rewriting, and perhaps even 'perverting' one another. Matthew Wright, for example, has identified around nineteen ancient plays featuring the character of Medea (Wright 2016), and Caroline Bird references in this volume a particular instance of Euripides rewriting and reinventing an Aeschylean tragedy. What survives of the classical canon is the result of a multifaceted performance culture, as collaborative as anything we might know today. The historical context speaks to current understandings of theatre translation, proving the relevance of the classical drama to any discussion of theatre translation.

Modern engagement with ancient drama requires 'an unusual combination of *diachronic* and *synchronic* thinking', in part because subsequent directors, writers and translators are forced to contend with previous productions when approaching a new version of a text (Hall 2004a: 66 – original emphasis). The thematic grouping of chapters within this volume amply demonstrates the diachronic and synchronic processes of theatre translation across genres and periods. Contributions document the re-evaluation of texts in translation according to past and present contexts, even in the case of contemporary dramas in which cultural and political nuance can be as transformative—and as dependent on historical developments—as more evident normative shifts over centuries or millennia. Each section discusses productions which re-form a text from some other system so that it will speak to the audience of today. Our contributors embody a wide range of research and practical experience to be applied in these debates. In this, we are following the example of Baines, Marinetti, and Perteghella who, in *Staging and Performing Translation*, focus on 'translation as an empirical practice',

discussing ‘the complex web of collaborative processes involved in the translation, production and staging of translated plays’ (2011: 2). The dialogic approach of *Adapting Translation for the Stage* similarly puts collaboration back at the heart of understandings of theatre translation, but extends the definition of the theatrical translation process wider and further. The present volume advances the debate theoretically and methodologically by engaging in detailed discussion and analysis from the perspectives of academics and professional theatre practitioners and translators organized around specific productions and periods. Translation is understood here to refer not only to the idea of a translated text, but to the entire process surrounding the adaptation of the written word for performance. Complementary contributions explore the development and staging of translation from the lesser-heard perspectives of the programmer and the director, examinations are conducted into non-linguistic forms of translation, such as via sign language and visual dramaturgy, and the role of translation in the rehearsal room is interrogated by an ethnographic-style observer, an actor performing in her own translated drama, and within collaboratively written chapters by writers, translators and directors. Each essay serves to readjust our critical understanding of what it means to stage translations and adaptations in line with current practice, and paves the way for further inquiries into other intercultural forms of translated theatre. Like Pym, we believe that a cross-professional dialogue is worth pursuing, and see *Adapting Translation for the Stage* as proof that academics and professionals can productively meet.

The translation-adaptation continuum: theory and terminology

Scholars have long noted the lack of specificity and stability governing the terminology used to describe the interlingual transfer that often takes place on stage. All translation must be a form of adaptation: an unrefined word-for-word translation is unintelligible. Theatre offers

many different terms to describe the transposition of a text from one language into a performable script in another tongue – but at what point does adaptation take over from translation, and how far is that connected to the expertise (and number) of the practitioners involved in the activity? J. Douglas Clayton and Yana Meerzon sense that the pivot between translation and adaptation exists, positing that 'dramatic adaptation is located somewhere between the actual translation of the play from one language into another […] and the creation of a new work inspired by the original' (2013: 8). They do not, however, identify the exact location. Margherita Laera prefers to show rather than tell, offering a wide range of practitioner activity in translation and adaptation under the title 'Return, Rewrite, Repeat' (2014). From a theoretical stance, John Milton forecasts a narrowing of the distance between translation studies and adaptation studies. He argues that these disciplines, originally differentiating adaptation as monolingual, are establishing connections as a result of changing translation paradigms which have broadened out from the definition of 'equivalence' to an examination of the concepts of representation, transfer, and transculturation (2009). Márta Minier finds further points of connection in the discourse of translation and adaptation studies that 'problematise the kindred features of the two modes of creative and critical rearticulation of texts' while suggesting that these modes 'do not necessarily entail distinctly separate processes' (2014: 31).

Translation and adaptation may be acknowledged as 'different', but the difference is not clearly established. Brenton, for example, notes in this volume how despite not knowing a single word of German, his version of Brecht's *Galileo* was advertised as a 'translation'. It was only the critical backlash that pushed him to ensure that any subsequent adaptation endeavours were marketed under terms that did not imply foreign-language expertise. Elsewhere, Geraldine Brodie has examined an instance in which different labels were applied

to a single production of Friedrich Schiller's *Don Carlos* (Brodie 2013: 123-124). As Brodie posits in her further discussion of indirect translation, the proliferation of theatre terminology to designate a translated text suggests a dissatisfaction with the current markers within the theatre industry, which appear to be 'searching for the means to describe translation practices that indicate and provoke a recognition of collaborative activity' (Brodie 2017). The present volume consequently attempts not only to destabilize the literal/performable binary but also the translation/adaptation binary to provide critical guidance upon terminology distinctions. Whilst we are not proposing to develop a definitive framework for classifying texts which embody a form of interlingual transfer, we do aspire to reframe the terms 'translation' and 'adaptation', and to investigate the ways in which these terms interact with labels that imply other, more remote references to their sources, such as 'version of', 'based on', or 'inspired by'. Linda Hutcheon identifies a continuum of adaptation with literary translation at one end 'in which fidelity to the prior work is a theoretical ideal, even if a practical impossibility', and at the other end, spin-offs, expansions (sequels, prequels), fan zines and slash fiction' (2013: 172). Developing this theory, we propose that instead of an either/or dichotomy, translation and adaptation are understood as spectrum, or continuum, that is forever in flux and embodies the potential to loop back on itself. Conceiving of these two terms in a more flexible manner does not solve the problems surrounding terminology usage; however, it does facilitate the employment of more precise markers within this continuum. Contributors to this volume offer several such markers, including Tom Littler's concept of 'total translation', and Emma Cole's concept of 'paralinguistic translation'.

Our title consequently condenses two of the most polemic elements within theatre translation theory, to suggest that adaptation and translation can coexist on stage in mutual collaboration and as part of the same continuum. All translation involves an element of adaptation, and all

adaptation an element of translation. Our aim is to demonstrate that the polynomial nature of theatre translation should not mask the underlying activities taking place in bringing an interlingual text to the stage, nor the multiplicity of agents and practices influencing that transfer.

Foreignization and domestication

Venuti's concept of foreignizing and domesticating translations is arguably the most influential intervention in translation theory over the past three decades. The interest in this area shows no signs of waning, with a major AHRC-funded research project currently underway on 'foreignisation' in theatre practice (Translating Theatre 2017). The two terms are usually conceived of in opposition to one another, with domesticating translations understood to be those that take the source text to the target reader, potentially altering or domesticating references, names, expressions, and other linguistic or stylistic traits associated with the original language, which gives the appearance that 'the translation is not in fact a translation, but the "original"' (Venuti 2008: 1). Foreignizing translations, in contrast, take the reader (or audience) to the source text, retaining as much of the original cultural qualities as possible despite the new language and consequently serving as 'a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations' (Venuti 2008: 16).

Although recognizing the cultural and political benefits contained in the foreignization impetus, in line with the volume's aims *Adapting Translation for the Stage* seeks to destabilize the foreignization/domestication binary. Granted, Venuti does not see the two terms as diametrically opposed, claiming that all translation involves an element of

domestication; however, he nevertheless argues strongly in favour of foreignization. In contrast, our contributions show the paradoxical effect of these terms in theatre practice. Niccolai, for example, explores an instance where domestication was required to retain the political efficacy of *Accidental Death of an Anarchist*, Bullock explores an instance where a so-called domesticating choice in *The Cherry Orchard*, in which the translation departed from the source text's literal meaning, restored some of the play's early-twentieth-century naturalism, and Gregory explores the practicalities of dealing with 'internal foreignness', arguing that 'it is sometimes the case that the choice to "domesticate", prompted by the practicalities of performance, results in a "foreignizing" imperative'. Collectively, the contributions to this volume demonstrate that the two terms do not represent an either/or choice, and that foreignizing is by no means always the most politically correct strategy. Instead, it is in the dialogues between all those involved in staging and theorizing translated drama that the best approach for any individual play can be determined, as this volume demonstrates.

Constructing translation for the stage

The methodological framework that underpins this volume arose from the 2013-14 Theatre Translation Forum seminar and workshop series, run in partnership through University College London and the Gate Theatre Notting Hill[1]. The Forum initiative brought academics working in university language departments together with practitioners engaged in staging translated drama to discuss common themes and issues relating to the theatrical presentation of translated performance. Select papers containing innovative practical and theoretical advances were expanded for this volume, and are combined with a number of additional, specially commissioned contributions that broaden our discussion into a trans-Atlantic and

trans-Pacific dialogue. The chosen essays demonstrate the current, often unacknowledged areas of overlap between the two modes of practice and indicate further avenues for negotiating issues regarding translation for performance. It is structured to address certain topics of theatrical interest in dramatic genres and periods where translation is regularly practised: the role of translation in rewriting naturalist theatre; adapting classical drama at the turn of the twenty-first century; translocating political activism in contemporary theatre; and the reflexivity of modernist drama in translation and performance. Although the sections are grouped around temporal themes, the volume is not intended to be a historiographical review of period translation approaches, but rather to reflect the negotiations of the productions discussed in each section with translation for present-day performance. All the chapters confront the movement through translation to the here and now, while recognising that such negotiations are likely to vary according to the historical context of the source material.

Although our understanding of translation is one that embodies much more than simply the text, in linguistic terms our focus is upon translation into English, primarily from European and Latin-American languages, and the practice of staging such translated drama in Western - most regularly British, American, and Australian - theatres. The source texts are often, but not always, authored by playwrights who contribute to the global canon of theatrical texts circulating in translation, including Aeschylus, Chekhov, Euripides, Ibsen, Lorca, Pirandello, Schnitzler, Seneca, Sophocles, and Strindberg. Such a tight focus has obvious advantages. On the one hand, it enables us to return to specific venues throughout the volume, in particular the Gate Theatre (Bird, Brenton, Cole, Haydon, Littler, and Wood) and the Royal National Theatre (Bullock, De Francisci, Jackson and Ronder). This cross-fertilization shows the ways in which theatrical space can affect translation approaches. Furthermore, focusing on translation into one language gives us the scope to theorize the actuality of translation on

stage today, as practiced on a fixed number of continents. On the other hand, however, it has the less desirable by-product of contributing to the dominance of European and Western-centric views upon translated drama. Our concentrated focus is not intended to homogenize other practices, and we have sought to open out our discussion into other forms of language and translation through the inclusion of an externally facing afterword. We hope the focused theoretical advances contained in this volume, combined with the broader, more international and intercultural afterword, provides a springboard for subsequent work to be carried out on a more diverse range of performance practices, with the due and necessary rigour they deserve.

Each of the four sections within this volume contains contributions from actors, writers, directors, academics, and those who defy categorization, and situates chapters engaging with different methodologies of translation, different time periods, and different writers next to one another. From these multiple points of view, practitioners' and academics' voices engage in interrogating the arguments around theatrical translation, raising questions such as, for example, the significance of academic research for the creation of a production for the stage, and the extent to which theatrical elements should impose on the fine detail of linguistic transposition. We feel that this dynamic interface best serves the dialogic aim of the volume. To retain unity and rigour, and to give a bird's-eye view upon how these differing perspectives reflect broader current and future practice, we have also commissioned a leading figure within each area to author a critical introduction. These introductions set each section's debates in the context of adaptation for twenty-first-century theatre. They ensure that the contributions to individual themes, as well as the volume as a whole, alter the discourse surrounding translation for the theatre, meaning that the volume is well placed to advance discussion within not just translation theory, but each of the four topics as well.

The role of translation in rewriting naturalist theatre

Naturalism, originally a reaction to the staged formality and codified language of theatrical presentation, could itself be seen as a metaphor for the practice versus theory debate, where naturalism represents the practicalities of everyday behaviour in contrast to the abstract theoretical formulae of academe. As Dan Rebellato has argued, however, naturalism manifests itself in two contradictory strands: 'visual culture' that presents a strict and literal view of the world, and 'sociological imagination' that approaches human behaviour from a scientific, physiological perspective. Naturalist performances are both complicated and enriched by this juxtaposition, effectively turning against and undermining their creators in a foreshadowing of modernism (2010: 9-16). In similar vein, the collection of chapters in this section prises apart the naturalist myth, beginning with May-Brit Akerholt's introduction. As an accomplished translator from Norwegian with a doctorate in translation and dramaturgy, Akerholt is ideally placed to shed new light upon this topic. Akerholt frames the section through the provocative idea of 'mistranslation', with particular reference to her own work on translating and staging Ibsen, and explores the significance of understanding context to understanding language, and the ways in which misreading the context and subtext of a play can change the play itself. Her assessment of the translatorial and dramaturgical issues involved in translating the text and subtext of naturalist drama is expanded in the following four chapters from the perspective of a director, two academics, and a playwright.

Tom Littler's chapter examines his own process of staging translated naturalist drama, and explores what happens when practitioners dislocate, rather than translate, the contextual information surrounding a play. In keeping with the volume's aims, Littler expands our understanding of translation to mean not only the linguistic re-casting of one author's words

by another, but also the archaeological process of attempting to discover the author's original style, spirit, and intentions, and finding a new vocabulary in which to express the work. He analyses the challenges and benefits of such an approach with recourse to his own production of Strindberg's *Dances of Death*, and draws conclusions about the creativity that such a process might afford. Judith Beniston's contribution then places Littler's approach within a historical continuum, by investigating the way that naturalist drama, and specifically Schnitzler's *Professor Bernardhi*, has been translated over the course of the twentieth century. Beniston examines the growing trend of simplifying the play's medical vocabulary and radicalising its political context, inviting us to reflect once again upon the blurred boundaries between translation, mistranslation, and adaptation. Philip Ross Bullock turns the discussion to Chekhov, and problematizes the tendency to align Chekhov with Ibsen, rather than Russian literary figures. He investigates the reception of Chekhov on the contemporary British stage, and the ways in which these productions balance 'lyric realism' naturalism with a 'looser, funnier, grittier' Russian aesthetic. Finally, Howard Brenton returns us to Strindberg, and sheds light on the difficulties involved in capturing the essence of a naturalist drive that now appears out-dated. Brenton details the evolution of his translation method and his current process of adapting naturalist drama from Agnes Broomé's literal translations, in which he, 'trance-like', rewrites the play in the mindset of the author. The contributions together renegotiate the boundaries of naturalist theatre, disclosing numerous approaches to staging and translating the texts of Strindberg, Schnitzler, and Chekhov. Collectively, they argue for a return to context when engaging with this genre, whether that of the original play, the country in which it was written, or the present moment, and demonstrate that substantial recontextualization and adjustment can be required when translating naturalism if we are to allow it to speak to a modern audience on its own terms.

Adapting classical drama at the turn of the twenty-first century

The translation of classical drama into English has a rich history, with the first known English version of a Greek drama, Euripides' c. 405BC *Iphigenia at Aulis*, dating to between 1550-1553 and notably being authored by the then-teenage Lady Jane Lumley (1537-56) (Demers 2005: 79). Since the mid-twentieth century productions of ancient tragedy in English translation have maintained a particularly strong presence in modern theatre; Edith Hall notes, for example, that 'more Greek tragedy has been performed in the last thirty years than at any point in history since Greco-Roman antiquity' (2004b: 2). The phenomenon is often dated to Richard Schechner's watershed 1968 production *Dionysus in 69*, which combined approximately 600 lines of William Arrowsmith's translation of Euripides' *Bacchae* with a devised response to the text (Zeitlin 2004: 64). The frequency of such responses and reinventions is continually rising. In 2015, for example, the United Kingdom alone saw three new translations of the *Oresteia*, two of *Medea*, an *Antigone*, and a *Bacchae*, alongside countless other adaptations. As previously noted, however, the translation and adaptation of Greek and Latin plays has received comparably little attention by scholars of translation, with studies more commonly falling under the banner of classical reception studies. Our section on the classics, therefore, seeks to combine reception-studies expertise with current translation theory to offer theoretical insights into this burgeoning practice.

Jane Montgomery Griffiths, a classicist, theatre academic, actor, and translator, opens the classical drama section by giving her take upon the status of the classics in contemporary theatre. Montgomery Griffiths explores the seemingly impossible task that a potential translator is faced with, bringing in her own experiences translating, for example, Sophocles' *Antigone* and dealing with the 'expectations of a duty of care to a long dead corpse'. She

contextualises the section within issues of textual criticism and classical philology, and argues that staging translated classical drama requires a rhizomatic, rather than linear, model of translation and reception. The sensitivities surrounding the performance of Greek tragedy, she argues, demonstrate the on-going political and cultural power of ancient texts.

Playwright Caroline Bird turns us to a specific demonstration of the political and cultural power of ancient tragedy: the character of Hecuba in her adaptation of Euripides' *Trojan Woman*. Akin to the process of Katie Mitchell in her 2007 *Women of Troy* (see Cole 2015), Bird's approach involved creating a backstory for the character and finding contemporary parallels to flesh out a modern figure and develop dramatic conflict. Bird discusses imposing an anti-feminist reading upon Hecuba's philosophy, to contrast with that of the chorus, and questions the extent to which the classics provide a platform for exploring current societal issues. Emma Cole continues the investigation into classical drama at the Gate Theatre and explores Sarah Kane's 1996 *Phaedra's Love*. Here Cole develops a new theory for translation, termed 'paralinguistic translation', through which Kane's play, and its representation of a crisis in masculinity, is evaluated. Lucy Jackson takes us into the rehearsal room, where she conducts an ethnographic-style investigation into the development of Ben Power's *Medea*, staged in 2014 at the Royal National Theatre. Jackson continues to emphasise the broad stance upon what constitutes a translation by demonstrating the number of different figures involved in translation processes both within and outside the rehearsal room. Mary-Kay Gamel concludes the section by theorizing the role of authenticity in translation from the varied perspectives of an academic, translator, and director. Her chapter refers to the translation of both ancient comedy and tragedy, and argues for a form of authenticity not restricted to textual authenticity, but which can also encompass affective and personal authenticities. Overall, the section demonstrates how the application of

contemporary techniques and readings to ancient texts can be an overt demonstration of adaptive translation techniques that diachronically address the ancient and modern. Such strategies are not without controversy, but this controversy is seen as worthwhile given the adaptations' ability to engineer effective performative interrogations into pressing societal issues that speak to the modern audience.

Translocating political activism in contemporary theatre

Our third section turns to the translation of living (or very recently deceased) authors' texts. Here translation trumps adaptation, with contributions highlighting relevance and closeness to the source. Or does it? Theorising the translation of contemporary theatre is itself challenging because it is not always possible to make a comparison with other translations of the text. These chapters consequently take a more cautious approach to translation methodology, highlighting hypothetical pitfalls and tentative experiments. Jean Graham-Jones provides an introduction to these potential critical and cultural faults, drawing upon her own experience as a scholar and as a translator of Latin American drama. She expands upon her previous assertion that an '[a]wareness of an ethics and politics of translation should be of special concern to those of us translating from other languages into English' (Graham-Jones 2007: ix) to draw out the ethical and political dimensions surrounding the act of translating a living writer's work, with direct reference to those translations touched upon in the following four essays.

William Gregory, who has been translating plays for over a decade, continues the section with an analysis of three of his own translations, developed for the Royal Court's 2013 Chilean season. Gregory weighs up the competing demands placed upon translators of new

work, who are expected to be 'faithful' to the source text so that the target culture can appreciate the work as if concurrent. He returns to the ethical dilemma, first broached by Graham-Jones, in his exploration of 'internal foreignness' in a Chilean play focused on the Mapuche community, which simultaneously sought to engage and isolate any non-Mapuche audience in Chile or further afield. Grappling with the ethics and politics of such a practice, Gregory ultimately argues in favour of preserving the foreignizing experience, even at the risk of losing meaning. Thomas Wilks returns the discussion to Europe, and analyses the translation of Wilhelm Genazino's *Lieber Gott mach mich blind*. Genazino's work often fails to make the translation from page to stage even in German theatres, and contains proportions and properties that are particularly challenging to translate for an Anglophone audience. Wilks negotiates these difficulties, and foregrounds the necessity of placing the playtext in dialogue with the playwright's other works and adaptations. Marta Niccolai proceeds to examine Gavin Richard's translation of Dario Fo's *Accidental Death of an Anarchist*. Fo disliked the translation for reducing the political in favour of the comedic; translation scholars have followed suit, generally agreeing that Richard's radical manipulation caused a loss of the primary text's integrity. Niccolai borrows from Laurence Venuti's and Maria Tymoczko's models of the 'activist translator' to redeem the political validity of Richard's translation, and argues that Richard's radical manipulation of *Accidental Death* was an act of political engagement determined by the target audience and political circumstances of the time. Adam Versényi then returns us to Chile to conclude the section. Versényi examines his translation of four Ramón Griffero plays, and argues for a form of translation that focuses upon the orality and aurality of the target language. He advocates a holistic form of translation that requires the translator to have a theatrical sensibility, attentive to sound, lighting, costuming, set, acting, and directing. Similarly, the section as a whole demonstrates the necessity of treating translation from and for contemporary theatre holistically, always as

a work-in-progress subject to change through the rehearsal room and the eventual embodiment of the text on stage. Here, we have a form of visible translation, but where contextual adjustments remain the key to the adaptive process.

The reflexivity of modernist drama in translation and performance

The metatheatricality of modernism's interrogation of narrative provides a further, and final, metaphor for the theatre translation debate. Just as we use language to discuss language and translations to theorize translation, modernism employs theatre to dissect theatre, querying the forms and structures operating in naturalist theatre to recreate realism for the stage. Acclaimed playwright Tanya Ronder opens the section, reflecting upon and theorizing the interplay between translation and adaptation in her work, including her recreations of Pirandello's *Liolà* and Lorca's *Blood Wedding*, directed by Richard Eyre and Rufus Norris respectively. Ronder investigates the responsibilities faced by a translator and writer, and the degree of freedoms they may assume, as she charts the trajectory from the source text to the performance. Ronder demonstrates her negotiations with the literal translation, the director's vision and the actors' interpretations to create a performance text, informed by her own sense, as an actor-trained adaptor, of the ecology of the play. As such, Ronder's contribution populates and expands the practical and theoretical models of collaborative dramaturgy and translation that are discussed in this section. In breaking loose from the specifics of translation and 'prioritizing drama over literature', Ronder follows the example of the modernist dramatists who 'dug their elbows into the corners of their time', honouring the world behind the lines.

Gráinne Byrne and Kate Eaton continue Ronder's discussion by unpicking the translator's collaborative engagement with the original text when mediated through the strategies of devised theatre. Byrne and Eaton discuss their joint development of Cuban playwright Virgilio Piñera's 1948 play *Jesús*. In their shared practice, translation and direction feed on each other to develop an integrated production; they argue for a form of translation that encompasses not only the transposition of words from one language to another but also the kinesthetic impulse that underlies those words. In contrast to the implicit theoretical angle contained in Byrne and Eaton's chapter, David Johnston takes an explicit approach and seeks to develop a methodology for collaborative translation. Drawing upon Karin Barber's distinction between translation as text and translation as performance, and his own translations of the plays of Lope de Vega and Lorca, Johnston argues that a translator is a re-maker of texts who brings an immediacy to the task that is often associated with devised theatre, and as such a similar understanding of collaboration's role in this process should be acknowledged. Enza De Francisci then returns us to Pirandello. The adjective Pirandellian has become almost synonymous with modernist theatre, reflecting the author's metatheatrical exposition of staged creativity. De Francisci's contribution to the theatre as translation debate, typified by modernism, conducts a diachronic three-fold analysis of adaptations of Luigi Pirandello's *Liolà* in terms of genre, language and staging, culminating in a National Theatre production in which she was herself involved as both an academic expert and a translation practitioner. Gareth Wood investigates the approach adopted by Anthony Weigh in his radical adaptation of Federico García Lorca's *Yerma*. Wood considers Weigh's reimagining of the deliberately non-naturalistic rural tragedy into an 'issue' play with overt contemporary relevance, and argues that Weigh consequently transposes the dramatic climax of the play in a self-referential allusion to Lorca himself. Finally, Emily Mann discusses her translation of Lorca's *The House of Bernarda Alba,* and the differences between its première

production at the McCarter Theatre in Princeton, and its second production at London's Almeida Theatre, where the play was transposed to Iran. She foregrounds the significance of place to the translation and adaptation process, and provides key insights into the shifting issues of translatorial agency when writing for one's own theatre as opposed to an overseas theatre. Collectively, the chapters embody a modernist theory of translation in that they portray the reciprocal reflexivity of textual translation and practical activity in creating the staged production. Translated text and performance engage in mutual interrogation, in rehearsal and over time, to meld the many adaptive and collaborative layers of development into a holistic creation.

Encounters and intersections

To conclude the volume Eva Espasa looks out towards other areas of theatre translation awaiting theorisation. Espasa explores the degree to which performability informs the theatre translation debate and positions our own volume in context, demonstrating the ways in which it has created a dialogue and blurred the boundaries between different fields of practice. She also paves the way for an extension of our own discussion, extending the theoretical advances advocated within the volume towards ideas of acculturation and accessibility.

As an overall collection, *Adapting Translation for the Stage* assesses the value of advancing an interprofessional, interdisciplinary dialogue amongst academics and practitioners around theatre translation encounters. The contributions to the volume, and the professional identities of the contributors themselves, demonstrate that the somewhat stereotypical stance adopted by practitioners and critics may be over-polarised. The academic-practitioner divide is itself a theoretical construct, destabilized by the blurred agencies of practices and individuals. These

encounters with theatre translation demonstrate the many intersections where theory and practice can meet, and disclose and analyze the strategies and approaches of adapting translation for the stage today.

Works Cited

Aaltonen, Sirkku. 2000. *Time-Sharing on Stage: Drama Translation in Theatre and Society*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Baines, Roger, Cristina Marinetti and Manuela Perteghella (eds). 2011. *Staging and Performing Translation: Text and Theatre Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Bigliazzi, Silvia, Peter Kofler and Paola Ambrosi (eds). 2013. *Theatre Translation in Performance*. Routledge: London and New York

Billington, Michael. 2007. 'Women of Troy', *The Guardian*. 29 November <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2007/nov/29/theatre.euripides> [Accessed 25 January 2017]

Bolt, Ranjit, et al. 1992. *Translation*. London: Royal National Theatre

Bradley, Jack. 2011. 'Not Lost in Translation', in Roger Baines, Cristina Marinetti and Manuela Perteghella (eds). *Staging and Performing Translation: Text and Theatre Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 187-199

Brodie, Geraldine. 2013. 'Schiller's *Don Carlos* in a Version by Mike Poulton, Directed by Michael Grandage: the Multiple Names and Voices of Translation', in Hanne Jansen and Anna Wegener (eds). *Authorial and Editorial Voices in Translation*. Montréal: Éditions Québécoises de l'Oeuvre, 119-140

——— 2017. 'Indirect Translation in Theatre: Terminology and (In)visibility', *Translation Studies*, (forthcoming)

Chesterman, Andrew, and Emma Wagner. 2002. *Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue Between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface*. St. Jerome: Manchester

Clayton, J. Douglas and Yana Meerzon (eds). 2013. *Adapting Chekhov: The Text and its Mutations*. New York: Routledge

Cole, Emma. 2015. 'The Method behind the Madness: Katie Mitchell, Stanislavski, and the Classics', *Classical Receptions Journal*, 7: 3: 400-421

Csapo, Eric, and William J. Slater. 1994. *The Context of Ancient Drama*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press

Demers, Patricia. 2005. *Women's Writing in Early Modern England*. Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press

Gurd, Sean Alexander. 2005. *Iphigenias at Aulis: Textual Multiplicity, Radical Philology*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press

Graham-Jones, Jean. 2007. 'Editorial Comment: The Stakes of Theatrical Translation', *Theatre Journal*, 59: 3: ix-xiii

Hall, Edith. 2004a. 'Towards a Theory of Performance Reception', *Arion*, 12: 51-89

———2004b. 'Introduction', in Edith Hall, Fiona Macintosh, and Amanda Wrigley (eds). *Dionysus Since 69: Greek Tragedy at the Dawn of the Third Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-46

Hutcheon, Linda. 2013. *A Theory of Adaptation*, 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge

Laera, Margherita (ed.). 2014. *Theatre and Adaptation: Return, Rewrite, Repeat*. London: Bloomsbury

Levý, Jirí. 2011. *The Art of Translation*. Trans by Patrick Corness. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Milton, John. 2002. 'Between the Cat and the Devil: Adaptation Studies and Translation Studies', *Journal of Adaptation in Film & Performance*, 2:1: 47-64

Minier, Márta. 2014. ‘Definitions, Dyads, Triads and Other Points of Connection in Translation and Adaptation Discourse’, in Katja Krebs (ed.). *Translation and Adaptation in Theatre and Film*. New York: Routledge, 13-35

Pym, Antony. 2012. *On Translator Ethics: Principles for Mediation between Cultures*. Trans by H. Walker. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Rebellato, Dan. 2010. ‘Naturalism and Symbolism: Early Modernist Practice’, in Maggie Gale and John Deeney (eds). *Routledge Drama Anthology and Sourcebook: From Modernism to Contemporary Performance*. Abingdon: Routledge, 6-24

Translating Theatre. 2017. ‘Translating Theatre’. <http://www.translatingtheatre.com/> [accessed 25 January 2017]

Trencsényi, Katalin and Bernadette Cochrane (eds.). 2014. *New Dramaturgy: International Perspectives on Theory and Practice*. London: Methuen

Venuti, Lawrence. 2008. *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge

Walton, J. Michael. 2006. *Found in Translation: Greek Drama in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Wright, Matthew. 2016. *The Lost Plays of Greek Tragedy (Volume 1): Neglected Authors*. London: Bloomsbury

Zatlin, Phyllis. 2005. *Theatrical Translation and Film Adaptation: A Practitioner's View*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Zeitlin, Froma I. 2004. ‘Dionysus and the sex war’, in Edith Hall, Fiona Macintosh, and Amanda Wrigley (eds). *Dionysus Since 69: Greek Tragedy at the Dawn of the Third Millenium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 49-76

[1] The Forum was initiated by Geraldine Brodie and funded by a grant from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University College London. The authors wish to express their gratitude to Professor Jonathan Wolff, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities 2012-2016, for his support of this project, and also the many colleagues at University College London who contributed to the Forum. We are also grateful to Professor Theo Hermans and Professor Miriam Leonard for their encouragement. Particular thanks are due to Jorik Mol for his tireless and enthusiastic assistance in organizing the seminars and workshops.