



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

“Cannibalizing Cultures:

Schnitzler in London, Stoppard in Vienna.
The Influence of Socio-cultural, Literary, and
Power-related Norms on Drama Translation”

Verfasserin/ Verfasser

Julia-Stefanie Maier, Bakk.

angestrebter akademischer Grad
Magistra der Philosophie (Mag.phil.)

Wien, 2010

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt: | A 190 344 347 |
| Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt: | Lehramtsstudium UF Englisch UF Französisch |
| Betreuerin/ Betreuer: | Univ.-Prof. Dr. Ewald Mengel |

*To those who have showed me
what intercultural awareness
means.*

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my advisor, Univ.-Prof. Dr. Ewald Mengel, for his constant guidance and support. His expertise in the field of translation studies and literary theory has been of invaluable help and has led to many interesting discussions. His encouragement and his belief in my project have given me the chance to do something new in my field of predilection, translation studies, within the realms of the research program *Weltbühne Wien*. It is an honor for me to have been invited to contribute to this project.

Many thanks also go to Elisabeth, Heather, and Zandra for proofreading the paper.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my parents and Vincent for their inexhaustible love and support.

Declaration of Authenticity

I confirm to have conceived and written this paper in English all by myself. Quotations from other authors are all clearly marked and acknowledged in the bibliographical references within the text. Any ideas borrowed and/or passages paraphrased from the works of other authors are equally truthfully acknowledged and identified.

Hinweis

Diese Diplomarbeit hat nachgewiesen, dass die betreffende Kandidatin oder der betreffende Kandidat befähigt ist, wissenschaftliche Themen selbständig sowie inhaltlich und methodisch vertretbar zu bearbeiten. Da die Korrekturen der/des Beurteilenden nicht eingetragen sind und das Gutachten nicht beiliegt, ist daher nicht erkenntlich, mit welcher Note diese Arbeit abgeschlossen wurde. Das Spektrum reicht von sehr gut bis genügend. Es wird gebeten, diesen Hinweis bei der Lektüre zu beachten.

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| 0 | Introduction | 13 |
| I. | MODERN TRENDS IN DRAMA TRANSLATION: Laying the Foundations | 17 |
| I.1 | Translation Theory: A Historical Overview | 18 |
| I.1.1 | The Century-Old Quarrel Between the “Ancients” and the “Moderns”: Source-Text Versus Target-Text Based Translation..... | 18 |
| I.1.2 | Translation: Mission Impossible? | 21 |
| I.1.3 | Translation as Cultural Enrichment..... | 23 |
| I.2 | <i>Polysystem Theory and Cultural Transfer Theory: The Theoretical Backbone of the Study</i> | 24 |
| I.2.1 | Even-Zohar’s <i>Polysystem Theory</i> | 26 |
| I.2.2 | Espagne and Werner’s <i>Cultural Transfer Theory</i> | 28 |
| I.3 | Translation in Context | 30 |
| I.3.1 | Drama Translation and Non-Verbal Contextualization | 30 |
| I.3.2 | Cultures as Historically Constructed Entities..... | 32 |
| I.4 | On the Impossibility of ‘Equivalence’ | 35 |
| I.4.1 | Cultural Determination and its Implication for the Translation Process..... | 35 |
| I.4.2 | Meaning as an Infinitely Unstable Construct..... | 38 |
| I.5 | Translation and Power | 42 |
| I.5.1 | An Interdisciplinary Undertaking..... | 42 |
| I.5.2 | Translation as a Struggle of <i>Ideological</i> Forces rather than a <i>Subjective</i> Decision-Making Process | 44 |
| I.5.3 | The Intricate Web of Power which Lies Behind the Translation Process..... | 47 |
| I.5.3.1 | ‘Strong’ vs. ‘Weak’ Linguistic Communities | 47 |
| I.5.3.2 | (How) Can Established Power Structures Be Overcome? | 49 |
| I.5.3.3 | Backstage: Lobbying Behind the Scenes | 52 |
| I.6 | Future Trends and Perspectives: On <i>Diaspora</i>, <i>Hybridity</i> and <i>The Space In Between</i> | 56 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| II. SCHNITZLER IN LONDON: <i>Liebelei</i> and <i>Das Weite Land</i> in their English Versions by Tom Stoppard..... | 59 |
| II.1 From Theory to Practice: Implementing a <i>Descriptive, Function-based Approach to Translation</i>. | 60 |
| II.2 Arthur Schnitzler: Choice of Plays | 63 |
| II.3 On the Impossibility of Equivalence: Highlighting Translation Shifts | 65 |
| II.3.1 An Analysis on the Macro-Level of Schnitzler's <i>Liebelei</i> and <i>Das weite Land</i> in Comparison to Stoppard's <i>Dalliance</i> and <i>Undiscovered Country</i> | 66 |
| II.3.1.1 Altering Length and Structure | 66 |
| II.3.1.2 Peritext and Stage Directions | 68 |
| II.3.1.3 Dialog Structure, Rhythm, and Tempo | 69 |
| II.3.1.4 Stylistic Characteristics and Genre | 71 |
| II.3.1.5 Topics and Themes | 74 |
| II.3.2 An Analysis on the Micro-Level of Schnitzler's <i>Liebelei</i> and <i>Das weite Land</i> in Comparison to Stoppard's <i>Dalliance</i> and <i>Undiscovered Country</i> | 75 |
| II.3.2.1 Dialects and Linguistic Variation..... | 75 |
| II.3.2.2 Language, Register, and Vocabulary | 78 |
| II.3.2.3 Syntax, Punctuation, and Recurrence..... | 79 |
| II.3.2.4 Course of Conversation and Forms of Address | 80 |
| II.3.2.5 Cultural References or <i>Culturemes</i> | 83 |
| II.4 From Austria to Terranglia: Socio-Cultural Factors Governing the Translation Process..... | 84 |
| II.4.1 Different Signifying or Code Systems | 84 |
| II.4.2 Different Theatrical Norms and Conventions | 87 |
| II.4.3 Historical Considerations: Contrasting <i>Fin de Siècle</i> Vienna and London | 90 |
| II.4.4 Considering the Time Axis: From Vienna 1900 to London 2000..... | 96 |
| II.4.5 The Significance of the Degree of the Text's Cultural Content..... | 101 |
| II.5 From Austria to Terranglia: Factors of Power Governing the Translation Process..... | 103 |
| II.5.1 Translation as Negotiation: Source and Target Elements in Stoppard's <i>Dalliance</i> and <i>Undiscovered Country</i> | 103 |
| II.5.2 The Hegemony of the English: Yes, Arthur Schnitzler is a Famous Austrian Playwright... or is he German? Or English? | 106 |
| II.5.2.1 Performance is Everything | 107 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| III. STOPPARD IN VIENNA: <i>Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead</i> and <i>Travesties</i> in their German Versions by Hanno Lunin and Hilde Spiel..... | 111 |
| III.1 Tom Stoppard: Choice of Plays..... | 112 |
| III.2 On the Impossibility of Equivalence: Highlighting Translation Shifts..... | 114 |
| III.2.1 An Analysis on the Macro-Level of Stoppard’s <i>Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead</i> and <i>Travesties</i> in Comparison to their German Versions <i>Rosenkranz und Gldenstern</i> and <i>Travesties</i> | 114 |
| III.2.1.1 Altering Length and Structure | 114 |
| III.2.1.2 Peritext and Stage Directions | 116 |
| III.2.1.3 Dialog Structure, Rhythm, and Tempo..... | 116 |
| III.2.1.4 Stylistic Characteristics and Genre..... | 121 |
| III.2.1.5 Topics and Themes..... | 124 |
| III.2.2 An Analysis on the Micro-Level of Stoppard’s <i>Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead</i> and <i>Travesties</i> in Comparison to their German Versions <i>Rosenkranz und Gldenstern</i> and <i>Travesties</i> | 125 |
| III.2.2.1 Language, Register, and Vocabulary..... | 125 |
| III.2.2.2 Recurrence, Syntax, and Punctuation..... | 128 |
| III.2.2.3 Wordplay and Puns..... | 131 |
| III.3 From Terranglia to Austria: Socio-Cultural Factors Governing the Translation Process | 134 |
| III.3.1 Different Code Systems and Norms | 134 |
| III.3.2 The Influence of the Literary Period and Socio-Cultural Events | 136 |
| III.3.3 The Significance of the Degree of the Text’s Cultural Content..... | 138 |
| III.3.3.1 Intertextuality..... | 139 |
| III.4 From Terranglia to Austria: Factors of Power Governing the Translation Process..... | 143 |
| III.4.1 Translation as Negotiation: Source and Target Elements in Lunin’s <i>Rosenkranz und Gldenstern</i> and Spiel’s <i>Travesties</i> | 143 |
| III.4.2 “I forget what they were [...] Something about brave little [...] [Austria], wasn’t it?” (Stoppard, <i>T</i> , 36)..... | 145 |
| III.4.2.1 Text vs. Performance..... | 147 |
| III.4.2.2 Texts in their Own Right? | 148 |
| III.5 Tom Stoppard and The ‘Death of the Author’ Argument..... | 150 |
| III.6 Conclusion | 153 |
| Bibliography..... | 161 |
| Index..... | 175 |
| Appendix | 179 |

0 Introduction

Drama translation has been shaped by ongoing debates as to whether the *translatum*, i.e. the product of the translation process, should mirror the source text in its entirety or be seamlessly integrated into the target culture. The last decades have seen the focus shift from a source- to a target- or culture-based approach, *inter alia* due to the emergence of a considerable number of *functionalist* approaches in the field of translation studies. An overview of the research conducted in this domain shows that the dichotomy of source-based vs. target-based translation methods has been around for centuries. Interestingly, the pendulum has been swinging back and forth almost periodically, with a preference for target-based approaches giving way to source-based translations and vice versa. One of the most critical aspects which lies behind this dichotomy is the notion of *equivalence*, or the belief that a text written in one specific language (and hence culture) can convey exactly the same meaning in another language (or culture). This concept has historically been linked to a *universalist* understanding of language and the world as a whole, according to which all languages possess a common core and are hence mutually exchangeable.

Against the background of our postmodern perception of language as a culture-specific signifying system, with signifiers floating merrily instead of being bound to one specific signified, this notion, however, appears largely outdated. According to this new paradigm, language is no longer regarded as self-contained or tangible, but as a mere placeholder for a larger range of culturally determined concepts and values. In other words, the written elements of a text are nothing but the tip of the proverbial iceberg, with the more complex, often unconsciously motivated structures being hidden behind. If we now assume that these intricate, hidden webs are bound to a specific culture, it is most plausible that members of a culture B will find it extremely difficult to decrypt all the hidden structures of a culture A. As a matter of fact, these structures – let us call them conventions for the sake of clarity – have been acquired by members of culture A over an extended period of time. Put differently, in order to make sense of a written text in a given culture, the conventions of this very community are called for. In the context of translation, it would hence be short-sighted to believe that transposing the ‘obvious’ (i.e. the tip of the iceberg) into another culture will provide unrestricted access to the values and traditions of the source culture.

In contrast to the linguistic school of translation (e.g. Catford, Kade, Koller, Neumark, Oettinger) who argue in favor of textual invariance or equivalence, modern translation scholars who are considerably influenced by new trends in *cultural studies* and *sociology* (e.g. Bassnett, Even-Zohar, Toury, Lefevere, Mitterbauer, Venuti, Wolf), *ab initio* dismiss the notion of equivalence as essentially impracticable. They see shifts in meaning as a necessary by-product of any translation process, caused by socio-cultural, literary, historical, textual, and power-related factors governing the translation business.

In line with this approach, this paper sets out, in a first step, to analyze Tom Stoppard's adaptations *Dalliance* and *Undiscovered Country* of Schnitzler's corresponding works *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* from a *descriptive* and *function-oriented* perspective, further comparing Stoppard's plays *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* and *Travesties* with their Austrian stage productions (based on Hanno Lunin's and Hilde Spiel's translations, respectively). As considerable research has shown, this approach to translation studies is hardly ever adopted (cf. Even-Zohar, "Theory Today", 48; Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 139; Holmes, "The Name and Nature", 177; Wolf, Introduction, 6), while a myriad of *prescriptive* and *product-based* studies exist (cf. Dangel in Spencer 374; Daviau; Jörg; Mandana; Schmid; Stern; Zajic). Assuming an *equivalent* relationship between the source and the target text as an aesthetic ideal, a *prescriptive* and *product-based* approach dismisses each translation shift as a qualitative aberration which is, in turn, attributable to the translator's inability or lack of precision. Statements such as, 'The translator *should have* translated X differently, in close correspondence with the original text' are omnipresent in such studies. The approach which this paper endorses relies on a considerable shift in focus: Accordingly, the changes in meaning which each translation naturally entails are no longer regarded as a loss of quality (cf. Bassnett and Lefevere, "Proust's Grandmother", 12; Wolf, Introduction, 30), but as indicators of the socio-cultural norms and conventions of the linguistic communities in which the texts occur. By extension, the analysis of texts and their translations must be understood as a major tool in eliciting relations of norms, conventions, and power between two given cultural communities.

A relationship of *equivalence* or *invariance* is impossible to achieve in the process of translation, as linguistic formations (such as texts) are firmly bound to the very norms and conventions of the culture in which they are produced. As meaning is unstable, multiple interpretations exist, making it impossible for the translator to 'retrieve' the exact

intention of the original author. Again, this notion considerably challenges the claim that equivalence can be achieved in translation. Shifts, in this sense, are necessary occurrences caused by cultural factors, rather than by individual decisions or misinterpretations.

In a second step, the dichotomy of source vs. target-based translations is called into question. In line with modern translation scholars and further relying on sociological findings (e.g. Bhabha, Mitterbauer, Wolf), translation must be understood as a virtual crossroad, where multiple cultural values converge and combine. As a result, translations are hardly ever purely source- or target-oriented, but take up a middle ground between both extreme positions. This consideration has led some scholars to argue that culture *per se* should not be understood as being bound to a nation state, but that globalization trends have led to the formation of hybrid cultural formations. Some scholars further suggest that English, as today's *lingua franca*, leads to a homogenization of cultural values on a global stage. This notion of homogenization must, however, be taken with a grain of salt, as differences prevail among the various linguistic systems. Claims made by Bassnett and Lefevere and other post-colonial translation scholars that a focus on the source culture will automatically entail a better understanding of the latter in the target environment are likely to be premature. Source elements which are introduced into the target culture will be interpreted by the latter in relation to their linguistic system, the result being that the semantic quality of the linguistic elements will be inevitably altered. In other words, elements taken from another cultural background will automatically be related to the self, in a reductionist, or stereotypical way. As a result, everything foreign remains within the realm of the 'self'.

Naturally, cultural transfer trajectories do allow for a certain linguistic exchange among the given cultures. The incorporation of foreign elements, however, depends largely on global webs of power. Accordingly, more powerful nations (which are traditionally marked by their considerable size, the predominance of their language, together with an important literary repertoire) will find it easier to construct the right platform for propagating their values. In an Anglo-Austrian context, the hegemony of the Anglophone world will result in a greater acceptance of British culturemes on the Austrian side, whereas Britain can take the liberty of blocking Austrian elements to a large extent, or only using them in a stereotypical way.

Finally, the theatrical institution is presented as a highly power-ridden arena, where the needs and wishes of the spectator and other financial sponsors are valued to a high degree. Research has shown that plays which incorporate too large a number of foreign effects are likely to be rejected by the audience. As an *ad-hoc* performance, drama must be easily comprehensible in order to be appreciated by the spectator. All these factors combined imply that an original play can hardly ever be rendered *invariantly* in another cultural environment. It thus seems legitimate to claim that translations should no longer be regarded as pale reflections or perfect incorporations of 'the original', but as texts in their own right which should be valued as such both by the spectator and the literary critic.



Modern Trends in Drama
Translation: Laying the
Foundations

I.1 Translation Theory: A Historical Overview

I.1.1 The Century-Old Quarrel Between the “Ancients” and the “Moderns”: Source-Text Versus Target-Text Based Translation

The field of translation studies offers a myriad of facets which merit further exploration and analysis. At the heart of this century-old discipline figures the debate as to whether an original text should be translated into another language slavishly or whether the translator should be given a certain amount of leeway in adapting the source text to the target audience’s needs (cf. Newmark 6; Stolze 13). In Popovic’s words:

There [has] in fact [always been] an interpolar tension between two types of norms: one type derives from the original, the other from the translation ideal. [...] The first type of norms is emphasized in those periods in literary history when stress is placed on the author’s originality and faithfulness to the original [...] The second type demands from the translator that he should aspire to match the author in his achievement, or even surpass him in his own way. (80)¹

The age-old belief that the ultimate prerequisite for a successful translation is to establish a relation of *equivalence* between the source and the target text dates back to a rather static and linear perception of the translation process, “which prevail[s] in Europe from the late eighteenth century until the 1960s” (Anderman, *Europe*, 21). First introduced at the time of St. Jerome, who is commissioned to translate the sacred text of the Bible, this method of translation aims at utmost fidelity, achieved through an interlinear translation of God’s *spirit* (cf. Bassnett and Lefevere, “Where are we?”, 2). The idea of preserving the original *intention* of an author figure “ha[s] to reduce thinking about translation to the linguistic level only” (*ibid.* 2). Ideally, the original wording of the source text ha[s] to be maintained verbatim in the translated target version, given that the “scriptures they [are] translating [are] inspired by God himself” and thus to be retained unchanged (Lefevere, “Chinese and Western Thinking”, 19).

In the 1960s, translation is still considered a subcategory of the overarching branch of linguistics. Hence, many eminent linguistic scholars set out to define the translation process as an ‘item-and-arrangement model’, based on the belief that “texts [are] strings of words (or ‘lexical items’) which [can], in the main, be translated item by item” (Holmes, *Translated!*, 82). In other words, linguists such as Catford, Kade, Koller,

¹ Cf. also Levý 68.

Newmark, and Oettinger – to name but a few – believe that languages are universal codes and that hence linguistic material from a given language can be feasibly replaced by linguistic material from a different language (cf. Levý 66). In line with Newmark’s perception, only “[a] bad translator will do anything to avoid translating word for word [whereas] a good translator only abandons a literal version when it is plainly inexact” (qtd. in Stolze 78). As a result, translated literature must be understood as a ‘minority business’, as no concessions whatsoever are made to the reader who is plunged, quite unpremeditatedly, into the world of the original which he senses to be light years apart from his familiar environment (cf. Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 71-73). Not surprisingly, the idea of having machines do all the translation work sounds promising at that time; the above-mentioned codes are thought to be smoothly deciphered by any computer, the original words feasibly replaced by their equivalents in the target language (cf. Stolze 49; Bassnett and Lefevere, “Where are we?”, 1).

Catford and Wills finally argue in favor of perceiving “translation [as] [...] a process of substituting a *text* in one language for a text in another” (Catford qtd. in Stolze 53; my emphasis)². However, despite their relocating the translational operation to the textual level, ‘textual material’ is still believed to be exchanged in a proportion of relative equivalence, irrespective of non-verbal or pragmatic features. The emergence of translation as “textbezogen” (Wills qtd. in *ibid.* 63) leads translation scholars including Koller, Nord, and Reiß to distinguish between various ‘text types’ which all apparently require specific translation methods (cf. *ibid.* 105-113). Accordingly, more than one translation strategy has to be authorized (cf. Bassnett and Lefevere, “Where are we?”, 4) and the years to follow witness the advent of the famous faithful/free dichotomy. Countless designations indicate that it is henceforth “perfectly possible that [the translation] ha[s] to be faithful in some situations and free in others” (Bassnett and Lefevere, “Where are we?”, 3). Schleiermacher’s famous quote (qtd. in Biguenet and Schulte 6) which requires that either the source text be approached to the target audience, or that the latter be brought closer to the source text finds its equivalent in House’s distinction between “covert” and “overt” translation (Stolze 58), Nida’s “dynamic” and “formal” equivalence (*ibid.* 88), Nord’s “instrumenteller” and “dokumentarischer” Translation (Nord, “Übersetzungshandwerk”, 56), Newmark’s “communicative” and “semantic” approach to translation (Venuti, “1960s-1970s”, 121), and Venuti’s

² Cf. also Wilss qtd. in Stolze 63.

“alienation” vs. “foreignization” method (Megrab 65), respectively. Despite a theoretical possibility of a ‘freer’ translation procedure, House, Nida and Schleiermacher keep holding on to “the original [...] ‘shin[ing] through’ the translation” as the more privileged translation method (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 18).

It is only with the advent of the ‘pragmatic turn’ in the 1970s that more target-based, or *functionalist*, approaches to translation allow for the fossilized structures of the then long-established item-and-arrangement theories to gradually loosen up. Surprisingly, the beginning of target-oriented translation procedures is commonly associated with this very historical period; however, translation as it took place in Ancient Greece and Rome already cautioned against entirely source-based translations, which led Cicero to claim: “Ich gebe es nicht nur zu, sondern bekenne es frei heraus, daß ich bei der Übersetzung [...] nicht ein Wort durch das andere, sondern einen Sinn durch den anderen ausdrücke” (qtd. in Stolze 19). Renaissance translators also frequently opted for “additions, omissions or conscious alterations” in their translations as compared to the original version (Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 61), and Samuel Johnson, when translating Homer in the 18th century, acknowledged adopting the original to “his own age and his own nation” (Anderman, *Europe*, 17).

Apart from these early target-oriented translation methods, Vermeer’s *Skopostheorie* must be understood as the preminent theoretical foundation of prescriptive, product-based *functionalist* translation theories of the 20th century, claiming that

[e]ine Translation [...] nicht die Transkodierung von Wörtern oder Sätzen aus einer Sprache in eine andere [ist], sondern eine komplexe Handlung, in der jemand unter neuen funktionalen und kulturellen und sprachlichen Bedingungen in einer neuen Situation über einen Text (Ausgangssachverhalt) berichtet, indem er ihn auch formal möglichst nachahmt. (Vermeer qtd. in Mandana 21)³

The function – or *skopos* – of the target text takes precedence over the source text’s authority, allowing for deviations when deemed necessary (cf. Reiß and Vermeer qtd. in Zajic 21; Snell-Hornby, “Linguistic Transcoding”, 82). “Übersetzt wird also jeweils für eine Zielsituation mit ihren determinierenden Faktoren (Empfänger, Ort, Zeit der Rezeption, etc.)” (Nord, “Loyalität”, 102)⁴.

³ Cf. English version in Snell-Hornby, *Linguistic Transcoding*, 82.

⁴ Cf. also Kohlmayer 148.

Other translation scholars, particularly from the German-speaking branch of the translation studies field, including Hönig and Kussmaul, Holz-Mänttari, Reiß, and Snell-Hornby (cf. Snell-Hornby, “Linguistic Transcoding”, 81), share this communicative, purpose-based method, which sees all text embedded in, and influenced by, a socio-cultural context. The formerly endorsed relation of perfect *equivalence* is now called into question, as texts are understood as being culturally encoded. As a consequence, “the translation [i.e. the transcoding or transposing] of individual words can almost never fully reproduce the meaning they have in the original” (Benjamin 21). Taught throughout the last decades in German-speaking translation departments, this functionalist approach, however, keeps up the idea of a clearly definable author figure (‘Ausgangssachverhalt’), and pictures the translator or commissioner as those who *actively* decide according to which function and in line with which culture (source or target?) the translation is going to be ‘manufactured’ (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 69-73; Kupsch-Losereit 12): “*The translator*, as an expert in translational action, must [*actively*] interpret ST information ‘by selecting those features which most closely correspond to the requirements of the target situation’” (Shuttleworth and Cowie 156; my emphasis).

Both notions, as shall be shown throughout the paper, must, in the context of poststructural trends⁵, be relegated to the backburner and give way to a deconstructionist understanding of translation: a trend which apparently only finds its way sluggishly into the German-speaking field of translation studies.

1.1.2 Translation: Mission Impossible?

Closely linked to the question of faithfulness and freedom figures the age-old moot point of *whether* a text – which, according to modern beliefs is perceived as closely anchored in a specific culture – can be adequately, or equivalently, translated. As with the faithful/free dichotomy, the trend seems to alter between a relativist and a universalist perception of translation processes.

The most commonly known perception of cultural groups as having their very specific understanding of the world dates back to the famous *Sapir-Whorf hypothesis*, which goes hand in glove with Wilhelm von Humboldt’s understanding of language as invariably

⁵ For further information on the philosophical trend of ‘poststructuralism’ cf. Moebius and Reckwitz 23.

determined by cultural values. This would imply that “the gap between views of the world held by different linguistic communities [what Humboldt calls ‘internal forms’ (cf. Ortega y Gasset 96)] is almost unbridgeable”, hence rendering successful translation impossible (cf. Hatim and Mason 105). The period of the German Romanticism generally acknowledges “den eigentümlichen Geist der Sprache und [sieht] das Übersetzen künstlerischer Werke als nur unvollkommen möglich [aufgrund] der unüberwindlichen Strukturverschiedenheit” (Stolze 25) - a conception equally shared by 20th century scholars Roman Jakobson, and Katharina Reiß (cf. Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 23; Reiß and Vermeer qtd. in Stolze 183).

Other pundits from the linguistic field, who have already been introduced as belonging to the *sourcier* tradition in translation studies, believe in the possibility of perfect equivalence on the basis of a *tertium comperationis*, i.e. a common core which all languages supposedly share (cf. Friedrich 15). Starting with Ferdinand de Saussure, the grand linguistic thinker, and followed by Benjamin, Chomsky, Koller, Nida, and Wills (cf. Benjamin 17; Gentzler, *Translation Theories*; Stolze), languages are believed to have originated from one common source, to feature similar underlying grammatical structures – what Chomsky calls ‘kernels’ and Nida defines as ‘deep structures’ (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 55-64; Newmark 6) –, and hence to be potentially translatable “[da] alles in jeder Sprache ausdrückbar ist” (Stolze 45). Put differently, “languages [are believed to] differ essentially in what they *must* convey and not in what they *may* convey” (Jakobson qtd. in Biguenet and Schulte 7).

Following an extended period of universalist trends, the poststructural era revives Humboldt’s understanding of culture as an unmistakably relative construct. Among the leading personalities of this recent tendency figures French philosopher Jacques Derrida who, as the pioneer of ‘deconstructionism’, “die These von der Unübersetzbarkeit wieder aufgegriffen [hat]” (Stolze 32). According to the idea of deconstructionist thought, meaning is never fixed or stable; as a result, the popular understanding of the *author’s intention* crumbles, giving way to the essential question of *what* has to be translated if meaning is no longer inherent in the text *per se* (cf. *ibid.* 32). Compared to Sapir and Whorf’s interpretation of linguistic relativism, “[h]ere the problem is not so much the incommensurability of cultures [...] as the inherent indeterminacy of language, the unavoidable instability of the signifying process” (Venuti, “1980s”, 218). Another decisive innovation concerns the fact that cultures – or nation states *per se* – are no longer

regarded as essentially fixed systems; that cultures interpret the world in various ways is hence not a-historically determined, but constructed (cf. Celestini and Mitterbauer). When Edward Sapir hence claims that “[n]o two languages are *ever* sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality” (Sapir qtd. in Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 21; my emphasis), he perceives of culture as eternally fixed and stable, a notion which is clearly rejected by modern translation scholars. These stress that in the future cultures may converge, leading different languages to purport identical perceptions of the world, if so *constructed*.

I.1.3 Translation as Cultural Enrichment

The conception of translation as a creative force which allows for gaps of the target culture to be filled with new, exotic material from the source text’s environment, is as old as the ‘translation business’ *per se*. Roman scholars already understood translation as a means of incorporating alien elements into their own language, thereby enriching and embellishing the latter:

The transferral of the foreign from other languages into our own allows us to explore and formulate emotions and concepts that otherwise we would not have experienced [...] the act of translation continuously stretches the linguistic boundaries of one’s own language. In that sense, translation functions as a revitalizing force of language. (Biguenet and Schulte 9)

This approach clearly re-values the act of translation, which not only allows for the original to live on in its ‘afterlife’ (cf. Benjamin qtd. in Nord, “Übersetzungshandwerk”, 55; Derrida qtd. in Bassnett, “Not a translation”, 25), but also fosters intercultural exchange. Linguistic communities can hence no longer be understood as parochial or closed systems, but as entities which are subject to constant flux and exchange. Consequently, the ultimate determining factor is no longer located in the translation product *per se*; rather, the focus is widened in order to encompass the cultural systems between which the translation process takes place. This, of course, brings up questions of power among the various systems – an aspect which traditional translation manuals often forget to mention.

In line with what has been said so far, a revival of a more transparent form of translation which “does not cover the original, does not block its light, but allows the pure language [and cultural diversity]” (Benjamin 21) to shine through can be felt in very recent

translation trends, promoted *inter alia* by scholars such as Benjamin, Schleiermacher, Derrida, Jakobson, and Nossack (cf. Biguenet and Schulte). Too much of a *functionalist* – i.e. target-system based – orientation is henceforth dismissed as perpetuating the hegemony of the powerful systems, while edging out less hardy cultures. Furthermore, the reader should not be duped into being sold a translation that more or less sounds like yet another work written in the target language (cf. Schleiermacher qtd. in Levý 87). It must be asked, however, whether a source-based approach which introduces the foreign into the target system, can really be understood as an act in favour of the *source* culture. Is not the ‘other’, as it were, molded into the ‘self’ in order to advance the ‘self’ rather than effectively cherishing the ‘other’? And will foreign elements, once they are introduced into the new system, not automatically be altered through naturalization and incorporation into the target code system, hence losing all affiliation with their original meaning?

As regards the moot point of equivalence, a more relativistic approach seems to be favored, which rejects the idea of linguistic universals, thus rendering fully identical translations impossible. “The original gives itself (*aufgeben*) in the very modifying of itself”, argues Derrida (qtd. in Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 163), “it [only] survives by its mutation, by its transformation”

.

1.2 *Polysystem Theory and Cultural Transfer Theory: The Theoretical Backbone of the Study*

A considerable number of theoretical research papers in the field of translation studies⁶ limit their scope to a rather *prescriptive, product-based* analysis of the texts to be analyzed (cf. Hatim and Mason 3; Mengel 3). They enumerate the shifts that have occurred during the translation process, often by evaluating their quality as well as that of the translation product as a whole, further commenting on how an *ideal* translation would have possibly looked like. Although the vast majority does no longer rely on a linguistic interlingual understanding of translation, the question as to *why* shifts occur in an intercultural transfer process is all too often left unanswered (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 139; Hatim and Mason 3).

⁶ Cf. Jörg, Kupitsch-Losereit, Mandana, Schmid.

In this research paper, the focus has deliberately been placed on a *descriptive, function-oriented* approach to translation – in line with Holmes’ understanding of the terms –, which does not aim to analyze the texts at hand from a qualitative point of view, but which is rather interested “in the description of their function in the recipient socio-cultural situation: it is a study of contexts rather than texts” (Holmes, “The Name and Nature”, 177)⁷. Not surprisingly, this approach is not as commonly used as the product-oriented method, as according to Holmes, “this area of research is one that has attracted less concentrated attention than the area just mentioned [i.e. product-oriented DTS]” (*ibid.* 177). In line with most recent translation theory⁸, however, it is apparent that a more comprehensive approach which sees translation as a way of analyzing cultures – in terms of power relations and sociological implications – is probably more accurate than holding on to the no longer valid prerequisite of *equivalence*:

What [is] needed [...] [is] [...] an approach that accept[s] translation in all its inaccuracies and inadequacies, one “concerned not with unreal ideals and fictional absolutes but actualities” and one that would “not so much attempt to impose a rigid pattern on the facts as we at present see them but rather serve as a device for the better understanding of them”. (McFarlane qtd. in Genzler, *Translation Theories*, 104)

The technique must be inversed: Socio-cultural implications are no longer used in order to evaluate translation shifts, but translation shifts are studied and analyzed in order to learn more about the socio-cultural contexts which govern them (cf. Bassnett and Lefevere, “Where are we?”, 6; Genzler, *Translation Theories*, 201). According to Raymond Williams, such an approach will help reveal “the shared attitudes and values of a particular society, community or group” (qtd. in Giles and Middleton 23).

Additionally, translations are no longer evaluated according to their ‘faithfulness’ or the ‘freedom’ the translator has taken in rendering the original in the target language. In other words, translations are no longer evaluated as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ translations owing to the fact that the idea of an ‘ideal’ (*equivalent*) translation must be dismissed altogether (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 8; Genzler, *Translation Theories*, 125; Karoubi). In Susan Bassnett’s words:

⁷ Cf. also Mengel 19.

⁸ E.g. Anderman, Bassnett, Genzler, and Lefevere.

Whereas previously the emphasis ha[s] [...] been on comparing original and translation, often with a view to establishing what ha[s] been ‘lost’ or ‘betrayed’ in the translation process, the new approach t[akes] a resolutely different line, seeking not to evaluate but to understand the shifts of emphasis that [...] [take place] during the transfer of texts from one literary system into another. (*Translation Studies*, 7-8)

This being said, a systemic approach which understands translations as inherently governed, or produced, by their socio-cultural and ideological contexts will be employed throughout this study. Translation is regarded as a site for ideological encounters – if not as a battleground – where source and target ideologies collide and converge. Two translational trends – *Polysystem theory* and *Cultural transfer theory* – shall provide the theoretical background.

1.2.1 Even-Zohar’s *Polysystem Theory*

Polysystem theory, as pioneered by Itamar Even-Zohar, Gideon Toury, and Raymond van den Broeck in the 1970s (cf. Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*, 1) and consolidated at the Leuven seminar of 1976 (cf. Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 6; Bassnett, “Translation Turn”, 124) understands translation as “kind of a language transfer [which] is embedded in larger systems or grids” (Gentzler, “Foreword”, xiii). Centered in Israel, the Netherlands and Belgium, this movement analyzes the influence of translation on the target literature, by taking into account the latter’s norms, traditions and genre conventions (cf. Newmark 6).

However, the systemic nature of translation was first acknowledged by the Russian Formalists in the 1920s (cf. Bassnett, “Translation Turn”, 125; Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*, 1; Lefevere, *Rewriting and Manipulation*, 9) whom Even-Zohar explicitly mentions as the theoretical forerunners of *Polysystem theory* (Bassnett, “Translation Turn”, 125). They – i.e. Popovic, Lévy, and Miko (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*) – were also the first to explain the impossibility of *equivalent* translation by highlighting differing norms governing both the source and target literary system (cf. Stolze 138). However, formalism exclusively focused on literature as an elitist project, understanding the literary polysystem as independent from other relations of power and ideology (cf. Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*, 2; Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 84): “[L]iterature was still perceived as cut off from the rest of the [...] world; literature was viewed as developing autonomously, adjacent to the real world” (Gentzler, *Translation Theories*,

113). *Polysystem theory* finally perceives translation shifts as a result of ideological and literary constraints of the target system, hence subsuming the literary system under all ideological systems, instead of stressing its independency (cf. *ibid.* 91/138). Even-Zohar alludes to power hierarchies among the existing systems, claiming that ‘young’, ‘peripheral’, or ‘weak’ literatures are more likely to integrate foreign elements than their stronger counterparts (cf. Even-Zohar qtd. in Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 116). As a result, Even-Zohar and his colleagues no longer understand translation shifts as being the result of differing linguistic features, but as purely and entirely provoked by ideological webs of tension.

The gros of modern translation scholars in the English- and Dutch-speaking world (Bassnett, Hermans, Lambert, Lefevere, Gentzler, Toury, and Tymozko) take up the initial outline of *Polysystem theory*, yet varying some of its original tenets (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 105). One of the most often uttered critiques against Even-Zohar’s rationale is the fact that it only considers the norms and poetics of the *target culture*, while disregarding processes taking place simultaneously in the *source system* (cf. Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 7; Bassnett, “Translation Turn”, 128). “Translating as a teleological activity *par excellence* [as practiced by polysystem theory]”, claims Toury, “is to a large extent conditioned [...] by the prospective receptor system(s). Consequently, translators operate first and foremost in the interest of the culture *into* which they are translating, and not in the interest of the source text, let alone the source culture” (qtd. in Kohlmayer, 147). Gentzler redefines the object of translation study as the analysis of a text “within the network of literary and extra-literary signs in *both* the source and target cultures” (“Foreword”, xi; my emphasis). Additionally, *Polysystem theory*’s understanding of central versus peripheral systems as binary oppositions as well as its exclusively anti-humanist approach to power have drawn critique especially from the branch of sociology, which sees power relations as emanating from defined stakeholders or agents and institutions rather than something floating dynamically in open air (cf. Wolf, “Introduction”, 7).

Finally, Lefevere utters a word of criticism against the theory’s concept of the nation state which, he claims, is regarded as a closed entity, rather than a fluctuating structure subject to constant intercultural exchange (cf. Lefevere, “Programmatic Thoughts”). In his essay, *Poetics Today*, of 1990, Even-Zohar, however, comments systematically on this issue, acknowledging that it is undoubtedly easier to regard systems as homogeneous, one-

dimensional, and closed formations; at the same time he stresses the importance of understanding the term “polysystem” as “dynamic and heterogeneous” (Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*, 12). Systems in that sense are interdependent. In line with the sociologist Niklas Luhmann’s notion of “structural coupling”, they can “coexist while retaining their own identity” (Hermans 65).

1.2.2 Espagne and Werner’s *Cultural Transfer Theory*

The second theoretical pillar on which this study relies is Michel Espagne’s and Michael Werner’s *Cultural Transfer Theory*. Despite the fact that *Cultural Transfer* and *Polysystem theory* emerge in different contexts, overlaps between the two exist. Even-Zohar foregrounds that “[t]ranslation theory would be more adequate if it were to become part of general transfer theory” (“Theory Today”, 6), thereby stressing the importance of bringing transfer theory and polysystem theory closer together (cf. also Heilbron and Sapiro 94). At the same time, *Cultural Transfer Theory* must be understood as leaning more toward the discipline of sociology, while the new generation of *Polysystem theory* is more inspired by *cultural studies* trends. While *Polysystem* scholars perceive of the power webs which penetrate the process of translation as anti-humanist formations (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 136), *Cultural transfer theory* takes heightened interest in the social groups, agents or “Vermittlerfiguren und Vermittlungsinstanzen” (Mitterbauer, “Kulturtransfer”, 23), who shape and govern intercultural exchange through intricate webs of power.

After the group’s foundation in 1985, the initial aim of *Cultural Transfer Theory* is to determine “comment la pensée allemande s’était diffusée en France. [...] L’une de[s] [...] premières recherches [du groupe] a concerné l’étude de la réception de la philosophie allemande dans la première moitié du XIXe siècle en France”⁹ (Noiriel 146). Later, the trajectory from Germany to France is extended to Franco-German transfer processes. Analysis should be achieved through comparing approximately identical cultural systems, “also nicht Paris und Mainz oder eine Rede Robespierres mit ihrer Interpretation durch Fichte” (Lüsebrink et al. 30).

⁹ “how German thought circulated in France. One of the group’s first research aims was to study the reception of German philosophy in France during the first half of the 19th century” (my translation).

Just as with *Polysystem theory*, the focus is unambiguously placed on the economic needs of the receiving culture, as one major aim is to determine “comment les emprunts faits à la culture d’un pays sont déformés en fonction des *nécessités* propres à l’autre pays [sous-entendu, le pays de reception]¹⁰ (Noiriel 153; my emphasis)¹¹. Again, this unidirectional orientation meets with criticism; Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink and Rolf Reichardt caution that *Cultural Transfer Theory* pays too much attention to the target culture, whereas the source culture’s specific structures are neglected to a large extent (13). According to their perception, cultural transfer must not limit itself to the receiving end of the transfer process, but offer a more comprehensive analysis of both the source and target culture (cf. *ibid.* 16). In a later publication, Espagne returns to this moot point, conceding that cultural transfer processes hardly ever take place between two cultures in a unidirectional way. Most of the time they are tri-or plurilateral and hence of heightened complexity (qtd. in Lüsebrink 139).

Coincidentally, *Polysystem* and *Cultural Transfer theory* are also simultaneously criticized for picturing cultural transfer as taking place between homogeneous cultural systems, or ‘nation states’ (cf. Kokorz 120-123; Suppanz, “Transfers”, 22-23; Werner 87; Wolf, “Cultures do not hold still”, 90). Again, this critique must be rejected as Espagne explains “[dass] [d]ie Transfertheorie [...] nach Möglichkeiten [sucht], um die nationale Segmentierung zu überwinden [...] [und] Verflechtungsmöglichkeiten zwischen den Kulturräumen [als] [...] historisch nachgewiesene [...] Mischformen [anerkennt]” (310). *Cultural Transfer theory*, according to Espagne, does not in the least aim to describe culture as essentially stable, but focuses rather on what ‘lies in between’, i.e. the fluid part of cultures (cf. Mitterbauer, “Third Space”, 53).

As a bottom line it must be stated that the modern trend goes beyond the realms of both *Polysystems* and *Cultural Transfer theory*, cautioning against a too unilaterally target-oriented approach. Taking only one side into account reinforces established ideological hierarchies, and allows for the original text to be *cannibalized* by the target culture. By extension, “translation works in a two-way flow, influencing both source and target cultures” (Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 179). Another weak point of 20th century systemic approaches appears to be their understanding of cultures as ‘national entities’.

¹⁰ “how the elements which are borrowed from the culture of one specific country are altered in line with the necessities of the other country [i.e. the receiving country]” (my translation).

¹¹ Cf. also Spillner 105; Werner 94.

These are believed to exist ahistorically, and in clear differentiation to one another. In line with poststructuralist, post-colonialist and deconstructionist thought, an essential conception of culture must be dismissed in favor of a historically constructed understanding thereof. As Homi Bhabha sees translation as taking place in a ‘space in between’ or ‘third space’, where source and target conventions converge (cf. Wolf, “Translation Field”, 113), it becomes evident that the idea of an exclusively source *or* target-oriented translation must by definition be abandoned. Rather, translation, as a passageway between multiple cultural influences and norms, must be understood as an ongoing dialog which inevitably results in a blend of elements of both the source and target culture.

1.3 Translation in Context

A poststructuralist approach to translation studies must *per definitionem* go beyond the substitution of linguistic elements from one language into another. Even though the various cultures that exist throughout the world can no longer be regarded as ahistorically stable formations, each culture constructs its very own ‘code system’ according to which it interprets and understands the world. Hence, each text must be understood as determined and contextualized by the ‘code system’ in which it appears: texts cannot be thought of, let alone interpreted or translated, without taking into account their contextual setting. They must be understood as “Texte-in-Situation” (Stolze 134).

1.3.1 Drama Translation and Non-Verbal Contextualization

Dramatic texts are contextualized not only by their socio-cultural environment, but also by their actual dramatic performances. These include paralingual features which in turn add the finishing touches to the purely textual script of the play. According to Snell-Hornby, “[ist der Text] als Spielpartitur aufzufassen [...] von der Sprache nur einen Teil bildet; [als] eine Partitur, die erst in der leibhaftigen Realisierung auf der Bühne ihre eigentliche Form gewinnt und erst in ihrer Wirkung auf das Publikum zur vollen Bedeutung gelangt” (“Sprechbare Sprache”, 104)¹².

¹² Cf. also Spencer 376.

She understands dramatic texts as *audiomedial text types* (*ibid.* 104) which, apart from linguistic features – such as syntax, grammar, lexicon, etc. – encompass a variety of non-verbal elements; these, in turn, are pivotal to the texts’ overall dimension of performance. Snell-Hornby cites the importance of sentence rhythm (*ibid.* 106), tempo, word repetition, gesture, voice, and movement, which all add to the question of whether a dramatic text is perceived as playable, speakable, and/or breathable or not (cf. *ibid.* 107). Other scholars, such as Levý, Spencer, Übersfeld and Zuber-Sklerrit agree that it does not suffice to consider – or translate – the verbal elements of a play, but that movements, postures, intonations, music and other sound effects, lights, stage scenery and the performance of the actors must equally be taken into account (cf. Levý 153; Spencer 375-377; Zuber-Sklerrit qtd. in Jörg 17).

Snell-Hornby, Spencer, and Zuber-Sklerrit even go as far as to privilege the performance aspect over the merely verbal script, in line with George Mounin, who claims that the stage effects have to be translated in the first place, “bevor man sich um die Wiedergabe der literarischen oder poetischen Qualitäten kümmert [...] [...] [W]enn dabei Konflikte entstehen, [...] [muß] man der Bühnenwirksamkeit den Vorzug geben” (Mounin qtd. in Snell-Hornby, “Sprechbare Sprache”, 101). This understanding of drama translation again sways toward a more *functionalist* or *target-oriented* approach, which sees the translated play as embedded in the dramatic conventions of the receiving culture. In Ansgar Haag’s words: “Der Vorrang der Spiel-und Atembarkeit bewirkt [...], daß auch ‘falsch‘ oder ‘frei‘ übersetzt werden mag; nur langweilig darf ein Bühnenstück in der Darstellung nicht sein” (Haag qtd. in Jörg 16)¹³.

In her book *Translation Studies*, Susan Bassnett endorses this translation procedure, pleading that the theatre translator must above all consider the performance aspect of a dramatic text, an approach which in turn justifies all modification he or she has to introduce while translating the text (131). In a later publication, however, she revises her initial viewpoint, this time demanding the translator “to work with the inconsistencies of the text and [to] leave the resolution of those inconsistencies to someone else”. To render the translation speakable or playable, she continues, “is not the responsibility of the translator” (Bassnett, “Still Trapped”, 105). This about-face is not surprising, given the

¹³ Cf. also Anderman who claims that “[t]he failure to ‘translate’ direction and acting style may in fact have more serious implications for the reception of a foreign play than verbal mistakes in the translation of a play text” (*Europe*, 324).

modern tendency away from purely *functionalist* translation procedures (an approach also endorsed by Fischer-Lichte 131), as adapting the original to the theatrical conventions of the receiving culture would be tantamount to cannibalizing the original. It is my personal view, however, that – in line with a poststructuralist understanding of the ‘writer’ – many translation decisions are not controlled by the ‘author as subject’, but that they rather occur unconsciously. I would claim that each translator will at least to some extent adapt a given text to his or her ‘natural discourse’, hence turning the aspect of cannibalization into an omnipresent byproduct in any form of translation work.

A close cooperation between author/translator – writer – stage director – dramatic advisor, and – actor can therefore only be to the benefit of the overall dramatic performance. The fact that both Arthur Schnitzler and Tom Stoppard consider drama as a collective production¹⁴ clearly suggests that they would have wanted their translators to follow a similar approach, i.e. to take concerted action with all other stakeholders involved in the performance process of their plays.

1.3.2 Cultures as Historically Constructed Entities

Non-verbal features aside, texts are firmly embedded in the signifying system of the culture in which they are written. In this context, it is vital to introduce modern poststructuralist trends concerning the notion of *culture*. Although cultural contexts can no longer be understood as universally fixed truths, poststructuralist thought believes that various languages construct various ‘regimes of truth’ (cf. Foucault qtd. in Barker 20), which allow different cultures to structure and interpret the world accordingly. Since specific cultures interpret the world in various ways, the world *per se* can no longer be regarded as fixed or stable (cf. Barker 20-21; Celestini, “Um-Deutungen”, 37; Suppanz, “Transfers”, 21). To sum up, “[a]nti-essentialism does not mean that we cannot speak of truth or identity. Rather, it points to them as being not universals of nature but productions

¹⁴ Cf. ad *Arthur Schnitzler*: “Denn bei den Proben, bei denen Schnitzler, wenn immer es geht, anwesend ist, diskutiert er mit Schauspielern und dem Regisseur Verbesserungsvorschläge. Er ist durchaus bereit, zu kürzen und zu streichen“ (Butzko 28); “Die kritischen Meinungsäußerungen der Freunde, der Regisseure und Schauspieler, die Reaktion des Publikums beeinflussen den Werdegang des Stückes entscheidend” (*ibid.* 29); cf. also Sabler 118; Yates 250.

Cf. ad *Tom Stoppard*: “In my view the event which occurs on the stage is a very complicated equation of which the text is only one factor [...] an uncut version in a foreign language [...] could be one of the most boring events [...] Therefore I think [...] the [...] directors should feel [...] free to shorten the play” (Stoppard qtd. in Lakner 112); “In preparing for the 1967 National Theatre premiere of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* [...] the cast ‘turned more and more from the director to Tom Stoppard’” (Stride qtd. in Delaney 6); cf also Hudson et. al 70.

of culture in specific times and places [...] [;hence] knowledge is not metaphysical, transcendental or universal but specific to particular times and spaces” (Barker 21). Only mistakenly, members of one cultural group tend to universalize what they perceive as the truth at a given time and in a specific place.

Several scholars have used their individual terminology to refer to roughly the same phenomenon. For Althusser, the code system which one culture agrees upon in order to interpret the world in a ‘standardized’ way is best explained through the term of ‘ideology’: “Ideology [...] constitutes the world views by which people live and experience the world [...] ideology forms the very categories and systems of representation by which social groups render the world intelligible” (Barker 57). Gramsci, Williams, Barthes and Foucault prefer the terms ‘hegemony’(cf. *ibid.* 59-61), ‘structure of feeling’ (cf. Giles and Middleton 23), ‘myth’ (cf. Barker 69-71) and ‘discourse’ respectively. Despite slight variations in meaning, all these notions boil down to precisely the same understanding of culture: namely, an artificially fixed group of people who at a very precise time agree on one code – or signifying system – which will allow them to interpret the world in roughly similar ways (cf. Hall qtd. in Giles and Middleton 59). In other words, people of one culture – termed ‘interpretive community’ by Stanley Fish (cf. Bennett 42-43) – need to agree on conventions to understand one another; at the same time, agreeing on a specific code system, sets them off against other cultural groups (cf. Megrab 61; Schultze 55):

Mitglieder einer Gesellschaft stimmen in grundsätzlichen Vorstellungen über geltende Normen [...] überein, so daß Gesellschaft sich in erster Linie über einen normativen Konsens ihrer Mitglieder reproduziert. Soziales Handeln ist nur vor dem Hintergrund dieses normativen Konsenses [...] verstehbar. (Bonacker 28)

Seen from a different angle, language and – by extension, texts and literature as a whole – help perpetuate social norms and hence determine “was gesellschaftlich als ‘normal’ zu gelten hat” (Hörn 372).

Language as a signifying system, in this sense, is merely the ‘placeholder’ for the conventions agreed upon by a specific culture and hence reductionist in nature. Without the knowledge of the conventions which lie behind the mere encoded signs, the signs themselves will not suffice to make communication possible (cf. Feldmann 277f.). In other words, one single word bears in itself a myriad of associations which each person belonging to a specific cultural group has acquired throughout his or her acculturation

process (cf. Feldmann 277-278; Lüsebrink 130; Rorty qtd. in Barker 92). Or, as Bertrand Russell suggests, “no one can understand the word ‘cheese’ unless he has a nonlinguistic acquaintance with cheese” (qtd. in Jakobson 144). The mere word ‘cheese’, however, bears no meaning in itself (cf. Celestini, “Um-Deutungen”, 47; Hall qtd. in Giles and Middleton 59).

Naturally, signifying practices are not limited to the written word, but also include paralingual or non-verbal signs, which, as should have been made apparent above, are vital for each dramatic production (cf. Barker 11; Giles and Middleton 58). Finally, language – including verbal and non-verbal features – “is the medium through which shared meanings or structures of feeling are communicated” (Williams qtd. in Giles and Middleton 23).

By the same token, texts – as strings of culturally determined codes [i.e. words] – only function as a trigger or stimulator of culturally specific concepts and understandings. It must, however, be pointed out that some texts or signifying codes are more culture-specific than others. In her manual, *Problem-bewußtes Übersetzen: Französisch-Deutsch*, Käthe Henschelmann distinguishes between ‘unilateral’, ‘multilateral’, and ‘global’ texts. Whereas ‘unilateral’ texts employ a vast number of culture-specific terms and concepts which only one of the two cultural groups (i.e. either the source or the target culture) can interpret correctly, ‘multilateral’ texts are firmly anchored in a third culture, irrespective of source or target specificities. Finally, ‘global’ texts include textual elements which are internationally known and hence more readily understood by both cultures (cf. 140-143). However, despite a more comprehensive understanding of global phenomena, it should not be overlooked that various cultures may have diverging feelings about, and approaches to, varying ‘global’ concepts (cf. Lüsebrink 47). Nonetheless, Henschelmann’s classification is of utmost importance regarding Arthur Schnitzler’s and Tom Stoppard’s plays. While Schnitzler’s texts are unequivocally ‘unilateral’, Stoppard’s texts are more ‘multilateral’ in kind – an aspect which has profound consequences for the translations of the plays at hand (cf. Mandana 5; Matter-Seibel 109).

I.4 On the Impossibility of ‘Equivalence’

*Put five translators onto rendering even a syntactically straight-forward, metrically unbound, imagically simple poem [...] The chances that any two of the five translations will be identical are very slight indeed. Then set twenty-five other translators into turning the five Dutch versions back into English, five translators to a version. Again, the result will almost certainly be as many renderings as there are translators. To call this equivalence is perverse. (Holmes, *Translated!*, 58)*

I.4.1 Cultural Determination and its Implication for the Translation Process

Compared to composers, poets are at a great disadvantage; their music does not cross linguistic frontiers. (Weightman qtd. in Anderman, “A l’anglaise”, 275)

Given that languages are culture specific – and hence only decoded successfully by their respective ‘interpretive community’ – translation that operates on a purely linguistic level cannot prove successful:

I do not think that the patient collation and comparison of source text and target text on the linguistic level only, the kind of work that provides us with a sense of security and honest craftsmanship, will do much to help us discover new things. I suppose (in fact I propose) that we should rather direct our attention mainly to culture and tradition. (Lefevere, “Programmatic Thoughts”, 48)

If transcoding means to substitute elements of the linguistic code of a culture A with seemingly ‘equivalent’ linguistic material of the code of a culture B, what we end up with is a mere signifier which in the receiving culture does not possess a respective signified. As a reductionist placeholder, the linguistic code conjures up associations among the source culture; as, however, the receiving culture may not have agreed on the same meaning or concept for this very linguistic signifier, communication is essentially slanted or skewed (cf. Bassnett and Lefevere, “Proust’s Grandmother”, 3; Benjamin 79; Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 57; Schopenhauer 33; Venuti, “Translation, Community”, 470-473). Since, as a result, the conventionalized linguistic codes – or signifying systems – of two cultures can never be exactly alike (cf. Toury qtd. in Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 126), hundred percent equivalent translations are *ab initio* impossible to achieve. Even if the target culture struggles to decode the linguistic signifier of the source culture, the minute details as well as the manifold associations that a member of culture A has acquired

throughout his or her acculturation process will remain forever out of reach for members of culture B. Indeed, the element of culture A, newly incorporated into the signifying system of culture B, will now be interpreted in relation to the rest of the code system or other texts in the target culture (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 85/93): It will not be understood, but decontextualized and appropriated (cf. Celestini, “Um-Deutungen”, 47).

From this point of view, translation *equivalence* as once requested by linguistic scholars such as e.g. Catford, Koller, or Nida (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 53 ff.), must by definition be ruled out. This being said, statements which require a translation to be ‘faithful’ and to ‘mirror the source text in its entirety’ are just as foolish as they are fallible, as they ignore “[dass,] was ein Angehöriger der Kultur AK ‘meint’ und in der Sprache AS ‘ausdrückt’, ganz spezifisch von dieser Kultur geprägt ist, so daß ein ‘Übersetzen’ von Sprache zu Sprache keineswegs die Invarianz des je und je kulturspezifisch ‘Gemeinten’ impliziert” (Nord, “Loyalität“, 100). This modern view is shared by Rainer Kohlmayer who explains

[dass] die totale Symmetrie zwischen Input und Output auf jeden Fall verhindert [wird], [was] [...] die Literaturübersetzung notwendigerweise zu einer ewigen Sisyphusarbeit, zu einem in jeder Generation aufs neue zu leistenden Annäherungsprozeß [macht], bei dem es durchaus qualitative Unterschiede im Ergebnis, niemals jedoch die endgültig richtige Wiedergabe des Originals geben kann. (145)

While Kohlmayer acknowledges that invariance in translation is impossible, he nonetheless insists on a qualitative evaluation of the translation product. This approach, which is shared by Jiri Levý, suggests a certain adherence to linguistic translation tendencies, as translation is still regarded as the pursuit of an ideal ‘translation product’ instead of a reflection of cultural trends. Levý describes translation as a poor counterfeit of the original, explaining that the translator tends to generalize stylistic terms in order to make explicit to the target reader what the original author deliberately left encoded (cf. 110-119). He thereby pictures the translator as a perfectly autonomous writer or author who – irrespective of his cultural anchorage – fails in bringing the original across. It is as though he blames the translator for the impossibility of rendering *equivalent* translations. Rather, however, translation shifts must be regarded as culturally conditioned instead of as errors or slips on the part of the translator (cf. Hatim and Mason 12). Given the cultural gap elicited above, even the most assiduous translator will have to accept that wanting to “reproduce an identical equivalent text in another language” is a foolish undertaking at

best (Bassnett, “Not a translation”, 26). Or, as José Ortega y Gasset claims “rather than blame them [the translators] for their failure, I would suggest that none of these things [i.e. achieving invariance in translation] can be done, for they are impossible in their very essence” (93).

What Friedrich ascribes to “[p]eople of limited intellectual abilities” (34) probably applies to human nature as a whole: Instead of acquiring the ‘spirit’ of the original culture, people’s thinking will always be marked by the understanding of the world codified in their mother tongue. Consequently, elements which will be brought in from the outside will always be regarded and interpreted in relation to the ‘self’, i.e. the native signifying system. This in turn suggests that the ‘other’ will be understood and pictured in a reductionist, often stereotypical¹⁵ way. According to Gunilla Anderman, “[w]hat a theatre audience in one country is in a position to know about the people and culture of another often amounts to little more than broad generalizations and, as a result, a certain amount of cultural stereotyping is difficult to avoid” (*Europe*, 329). In other words, by making the target audience believe that what they get is a transparent rendering of the original, they assume that their cliché-ridden view of the ‘other’ *indeed is* the ‘other’, which is as absurd as it is dangerous, as it adds to the fossilization of existing stereotypes (cf. Bachmann-Medick, “Fremddarstellung”, 42 f.). Hence, once a foreign theatre performance is assimilated into the target culture’s theatrical conventions, “[t]his might provide a more recognizable type of theatre for the [target] [...] audience, but it will accrue meanings which would be unavailable and incomprehensible to the audience of the originating culture” (Bennett 102). To give the readers the feeling that they are reading “the real thing”, is to dupe them, as “something will almost inevitably slip in” (Bell 59). In effect, what ‘slips in’ is what Hans-Georg Gadamer calls “the tyranny of hidden prejudices” (qtd. in Hermans 71), or a perception of the foreign which reinforces the ‘self’, while ruling out characteristics which the ‘self’ fails to concede to the ‘other’ (cf. Celestini, “Um-Deutungen”, 41).

¹⁵ For a more detailed definition and classification of different forms of ‘stereotypes’, see Lüsebrink 88ff..

I.4.2 Meaning as an Infinitely Unstable Construct

Es liegt ein Ton von tiefem Grauen über dem Abschied des Künstlers von seinem Werke, denn wenn er es wiederfindet, gehört es nicht mehr ihm, es ist preisgegeben, es ist wehrlos. Er selbst steht ohnmächtig daneben und hat kein Recht mehr darüber. Es gehört nicht mehr ihm, es gehört mehr allen. (qtd. in Butzko 10)

If translation, in its traditional understanding, means to produce an equivalent or invariant copy of the original text, this is also due to the fact that the original is believed to convey a clearly definable meaning or intention (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 95). The latter, in turn, is believed to be bestowed upon the text by its very author who, as the genius or ‘creator’ of his *oeuvre*, is in the position to decide on how his text has to be interpreted and understood. If, hence, the translator fails to ‘extract’ the author’s intention and to transcode it reliably into the target language, his or her translation is *ab initio* doomed to failure: It is ‘false’ because it does not respect the author’s intended meaning (cf. Boase-Beier and Holman 5); and it is ‘bad’ because it dupes the reader of the translation (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 147).

This rigid understanding of translation as mirroring the ‘holy original’ prevails long into the 20th century. Endorsed primarily by the linguists Chomsky, Nida, Wills, etc. who champion a perfectly invariant translation product, this notion is based on the belief that “meaning and response have been completely identified by the translator. [...] They are pulled out of history, translated into a new context, and made to work in the *same manner*” (Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 54). Accordingly, Nida “presumes some underlying ‘meaning of the original text’ which is accessible” and [which] can be transferred into a new context “without altering the original *intention*” (qtd. in *ibid.* 59; my emphasis). Even contemporary translation scholars keep holding on to the idea of a clearly definable meaning intended by the author of the original. Snell-Hornby speaks of the translator’s reception of the author’s intention (qtd. in Matter-Seibel 110), further claiming that translation – as opposed to adaptation – confines the translator to the “Intention des Autors und der Aussage des Textes” (Snell-Hornby, “Sprechbare Sprache”, 155). By the same token, Christiane Nord requires the translator not to distort the meaning originally determined by the text’s author figure (cf. “Loyalität”, 102), and Daviau blames most of the English re-creations of Schnitzler’s originals for “fail[ing] to render the meaning and spirit of the original” (“Reception”, 148)¹⁶.

¹⁶ Spencer also finds fault with Daviau’s approach to translation criticism (378).

Only within the context of poststructuralist thinking is the focus relegated from a clearly definable meaning – inherent in the text *per se* – to meaning as an infinitely instable and flexible concept (cf. Barker 18; Mengel 4). Poststructuralist scholars go one step beyond the notion of culturally determined signifier-signified constructs: They claim that a signifier can never be bound to a specific signified, as the concept conjured up by the former varies according to the context in which it appears (cf. Hatim and Mason 109). Accordingly, a strain of signifiers – i.e. a text – cannot possess a defined meaning either; rather, “there will always be gaps, room for different interpretations, and variable reception” (Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 57). This conception is primarily linked to Jacques Derrida’s theory of *différence* (*difference and deferral*) (cf. Barker 19), as well as to Stuart Hall’s principle of *encoded* and *decoded meaning* (cf. *ibid.* 270 f.), and later also associated with Luhmann’s *second-order observation* (cf. Hermans 72-73) and the notion of *linguistic polyphony* (cf. Tabakowska).

While Derrida sees “the chain of signification [...] [as] one of infinite regress” (Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 147), with the signifier being continuously deferred, changed, and/or deformed (cf. Kneer 133), Hall focuses on the meaning given to a specific signifier by (a) the producer of the message (i.e. the encoder) and (b) the various receivers of the latter (i.e. the decoders). He challenges the hierarchical relation between the ‘holy author’ on the one hand, and the ‘passive reader’ on the other, claiming that the receiver “is never passive [...] but [...] an active producer of meanings” (Gardner qtd. in Bennett 32). Read against the background of theater performance, this implies that every reader interprets the play in their very own way, causing divergent audience response to exactly the same play, at different moments (cf. *ibid.* 22). In exactly the same vein, the translator’s reading is just one among many and may – or *must* – diverge from that of the author and countless other readers (cf. Hatim and Mason 11; Hermans 60). The encoded message can hence be interpreted in a ‘dominant’ or ‘preferred’, ‘negotiated’, or ‘oppositional’ way (cf. Barker 271; Giles and Middleton, 64). Whereas the preferred interpretation comes closest to the encoded meaning, the oppositional or resisting reader rejects the ideology in which the text is embedded (cf. Bennett 60).

Foucault and Toury, however, caution against an understanding of meaning as being infinitely deferrable. In line with the idea of meaning as a culturally determined concept, they foreground the repercussions that the dominant discourse has on the people of a given cultural community (cf. Barker 78; Karoubi). “[A]ll human beings have an inherent

tendency toward socializing and social acceptability; as a result, under normal conditions, people tend to avoid behaviors which are prohibited or sanctioned as well as to adopt behaviors which are considered as being appropriate within the group they belong to” (Karoubi). As a result, not all interpretations of a message will be accepted at a given time. Indeed, some will be more likely than others (cf. Hall’s notion of *preferred reading*), while some will be dismissed as ‘unacceptable’ altogether (cf. Bennett 43): e.g. “[t]o understand a picture of a horse as representing a motor car is an error of seeing which could result in being seen as insane or visually impaired” (Giles and Middleton 80). The implication that this bears for the process of translation can be explained as follows: Encoding and decoding will converge if the author and the reader of the message share the same socio-cultural background; conversely, if the encoder and the decoder do not depend on some shared cultural understanding, diverging interpretive strategies are more likely to occur, hence further undermining the principle of *equivalence* in translation (cf. Bennet 151; Megrab 59).

Critique of the traditional understanding of the author as ‘genius’, determining the essential meaning of his text, is also uttered by Roland Barthes, who “concludes that reading texts in terms of authorial intention or what we think the author meant by such and such a statement, and referring the source of meaning and authority of a text back to its author (as the creator of the text) is no more acceptable” (Royle 7). The author is no longer understood as an autonomously, gifted subject, but as the product of the time and era – i.e. the discourse, in Foucauldian terms – in which he lives and writes. It is hence no longer the author writing his text, but intertextual influences of his time and age which guide the author’s hand across the empty paper (cf. Mallarmé qtd. in Clarke). What an author writes can never fully be ascribed to his genius, but will inevitably be influenced or - more accurately stated - *created* by the discourses, ideas, and conventions that exist during his lifetime (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 151; Roman qtd. in Karoubi), “According to Foucault, the author’s work is not the result of spontaneous inspiration, but is tied to the institutional systems of the time and place over which the individual author has little control or awareness” (Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 150). Consequently, “the meaning of a text becomes what individual readers extract from it, not what a supreme Author put in” (Hermans qtd. in Karoubi). In Barthes’ words: “The birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author” (Barthes qtd. in Bennett 63). Just as Derrida and Hall before him, Barthes sees the reader as the active producer of meaning who does not content himself with passively ingesting the writer’s intention (cf. Clarke).

As a counter argument to Barthes' concept, it could be claimed that the author's unique style and capacity to play on words is no longer acknowledged in postmodern times. Put differently, a poststructuralist approach that understands language as writing the author – and not *vice versa* – would suggest that all texts produced under the same dominant discourse will inevitably sound alike. Such a perception is especially problematic when it comes to Tom Stoppard who is first and foremost known for his very personal style and inexhaustible linguistic imagination. Even then, Barthes claims that the author can only be admired for “the mastery of the narrative code”, and never for his genius (Barthes qtd. in Clarke). This argument sounds plausible as Stoppard's literary material indeed depends considerably on other textual material which he barely ‘feeds on’; what distinguishes him from other authors of his time is *indeed* ‘nothing else’ but a comprehensively developed ‘mastery of the narrative code’.

Finally, it is not surprising that the poststructuralist concept of meaning has only been sluggishly integrated into the field of translation studies, as it seriously challenges the traditional understanding of translation. If ‘false’ or ‘bad’ translations no longer exist, the translation product is granted much more leeway than has originally been the case. This brings up the question of whether translator training in its traditional form also has to be revolutionized, an aspect which naturally rubs many translation scholars the wrong way (cf. Genzler, *Translation Theories*). Additionally, the fact that meaning is no longer seen as being inherent in a text brings up the question of *what* has to be translated in the first place (cf. Stolze 33). If we accept that *equivalent* or *faithful* translations are impossible, the traditional division into translations vs. paraphrasing vs. adaptation vs. imitation vs. version¹⁷ has to crumble all the same (cf. Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 81; Bassnett, “Not a translation”, 38; Mengel 3). Rather, each type of ‘rewriting’ – the umbrella term chosen by Lefevere to refer to any kind of textual revision (cf. Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting*)– has to be acknowledged as a text in its own right (cf. Godard 93; Mengel 2/6), which, *just as an original*¹⁸, uses already existent textual material, yet never being able to reproduce an already existent text in its entirety: “[T]he source text will simply serve as a source of inspiration”, whereas the translator “produces a text which must be considered ‘a different work’” (Lefevere qtd. in Dimitriu 81). In other words, no two literary works can ever be

¹⁷ Cf. Koller qtd. in Stolze 97; Nabokov 77; Nord, “Loyalität”, 104; Spillner 122 ff.

¹⁸ Cf. Mengel who claims that “each literary work in some way inscribes itself at the moment of its birth into a context of other, pre-existing, works which it quotes, imitates, or varies implicitly or explicitly. Viewed from this standpoint, Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, Dante's *Divina Comedia*, or Joyce's *Ulysses* could be considered ‘derived’ texts or adaptations. Nobody, however, would want to call them unoriginal or second-rate works of art” (2).

exactly alike. As a consequence, it is misleading to make the receiver of a translation – or adaptation – believe that what he or she gets is indeed the original. If hence Griffith scorns the English translations of Chekov for producing “an English Chekov” by adapting the original to the English conventions, he fails to acknowledge that producing “a Russian Chekov” in the English language constitutes a Sisyphean task at best (cf. Bassnett, “Still Trapped”, 95).

1.5 Translation and Power

As with original works, so with translations, there is no land where there are no constraints, no controls, no watchdogs, no filters, no pre-existing poetic patterns, no guardians of public morality.
(Boase-Beier and Holman 11)

1.5.1 An Interdisciplinary Undertaking

In this modern day and age, translation studies can no longer exist without a sustained cooperation with a wide variety of fields, “including linguistics, literary study, history, anthropology, psychology [...] [,] economics” (Bassnett and Lefevere, “Preface”, ix)¹⁹ and “postcolonial studies” (Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 195). Apart from these disciplines, the translation field has been substantially influenced by cultural studies and sociology, two subject areas which show a heightened interest in issues of power and ideology (cf. Bassnett, “Translation Turn”, 125; Moebius and Reckwitz 18-19). In this context, “linguistic aspects of the translational process” are relegated in favor of a thorough analysis of “the literary, theatrical, and social norms and conventions” which embed translation activity (Mengel 2).

While the cultural studies area is first and foremost associated with the works of Michel Foucault (cf. Celestini, “Archäologie”, 67), Antonio Gramsci, and Louis Althusser (cf. Barker 56-80), sociology has introduced a number of recent translation scholars to the theories of Homi Bhabha, Pierre Bourdieu and Niklas Luhmann (cf. Wolf, “Introduction”, 12). Furthermore, sociological considerations have stressed the importance of influential institutions and “realer Vermittlerpersönlichkeiten” as maintaining a privileged position in society (Espagne and Werner 506)²⁰, whereas cultural studies have described intercultural transfer as determined by abstract ideological fluctuations and intellectual constellations

¹⁹ Cf. also Bassnet, *Translation Studies*, 2.

²⁰ Cf. also Celestini, “Um-Deutungen” 46; Giles and Middleton 37.

(cf. Espagne and Werner 506; Kneer 135). In other words, cultural studies scholars consider power as an abstract web of conventionalized signifying practices (cf. Pym 1) – an aspect regarded as problematic by most sociologists who doubt that questions of power and ideology can be understood without the implication of ‘actual people’ (cf. Agorni 127). “[W]e might surmise that social factors tend to have a quantitative aspect and can be associated with relations between people. Cultural factors, on the other hand, are more predominantly qualitative and can be related to signifying practices (texts, discourses)” (Pym 14). Aside from these existential factors which set the sociological and cultural notions of power apart, both disciplines “have arrived at many similar conclusions” (Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*, 3)²¹, adding to the understanding of translation as a field subject to struggles of power and domination. In the course of this study, the perception of power as a collectively perpetuated construct is generally favored over its notion as a unilateral force emanating from the most influential agents and institutions only. Power is perceived as an anti-humanist force which – in the form of ‘discourses’ – embeds the individual and clearly influences him or her in their personal choices. According to Foucault’s notion of ‘discourse’, the ideology of a time and age encompasses “eine [...] Folge von Aussagen” (Celestini, “Archäologie”, 67) uttered by influential social groups and accepted by every member of the cultural community. Put differently, discourses are beliefs or ideas which have become institutionalized or naturalized as self-evident or common sense among a given cultural group (cf. Giles and Middleton 68). As a result, power is never bound to one social class, nor to a single group, but perpetuated dynamically among the community as a whole (cf. Celestini, “Archäologie”, 79; Moebius 162): “Das Machtverhältnis ist die Gesamtheit der Kräfteverhältnisse, die ebenso durch die *beherrschten* wie durch die *herrschenden* Kräfte hindurchgeht” (Deleuze qtd. in Celestini, “Archäologie”, 80; my emphasis). Power, in this context, is anonymous. Nobody possesses or exerts it. It cannot be grasped or located, yet it influences every single member of society.

Apart from this conception, however, it shall be made apparent that institutions and agents, as well as their individual ‘capitals’ and ‘habitus’ – in line with Bourdieu’s theory – do play a pivotal role in the field of drama translation (cf. Pym 15). Therefore, an understanding of ‘social’ and ‘cultural’ aspects as being inherently connected can only be to the benefit of translation studies.

²¹ Cf. also Pym 16; Wolf, “Introduction”, 6.

1.5.2 Translation as a Struggle of *Ideological* Forces rather than a *Subjective* Decision-Making Process

“[T]he transubstantiation of th[e] [...] norm [of the original] into the norm of the translation depends on the *subjective* view and creative *initiative* of the translator” (83; my emphasis), claims Popovic. Against the background of poststructuralist thinking, however, the understanding of the author as an autonomous and creative *subject* has been declared null and void. In line with Barthes’ concept of ‘the death of the author’, not only the creator of the original must be regarded as unambiguously influenced by the dominant discourse of his time and place, but the same equally holds true for the translator who, by extension, figures as the creator of the *translatum* (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 151-152). Consequently,

[a] translator, just like an author, is not simply ‘a person’ but a socially and historically constituted subject. [...] [Accordingly,] translators interpret texts by setting them against their backdrop of known words and phrases, existing statements, familiar conventions, anterior texts, or, in other words, their general knowledge which is ideological. [...] Translators are hardly (maybe never) aware of ideological factors governing their process of the source text interpretation. (Karoubi)

Inversely, *functionalist* theories, such as Vermeer’s *Skopostheorie* which delineate the author as the one in control of all translation decisions whatsoever keep holding on to a *Cartesian* understanding of the subject, chiefly endorsed at the time of the Enlightenment period (cf. Maier 163-164). They consider the ‘author’ in accordance with the ‘cogito ergo sum’ maxim and respect him as an entirely autonomous subject, irrespective of historical or cultural constraints. Vermeer claims that “the translator has to make critical decisions as to how define [sic!] the translation *skopos* and which strategies can best meet the target recipient’s requirements” (Karoubi).

Even critics of Vermeer’s target-focused theory who expose his functional translation theory “[als] das richtige Rezept, wo Literatur als Konsumgut für stabile, homogene Kundenbedürfnisse funktioniert” and further “[als] die Theorie der Gebrauchs- und Trivalliteratur” (Kohlmayer 152), understand the translator as someone standing outside the discourse of his or her culture²². Accordingly, he or she is expected to *decipher* the needs and wishes of the latter and to censor unwanted information (*ibid.* 151/153), instead

²² This culture is in most cases tantamount to the target culture, as it is common practice to translate into one’s *first* instead of a foreign language.

of integrally, and automatically being him- or herself influenced by the norms and conventions at hand. Rightly, Fuchs counters that the translator never watches the translation from the outside, but that he or she – “als kulturelles und soziales Wesen” – is existentially *involved* in the very rewriting process (315)²³.

From this point of view, other tenets by modern translation studies scholars²⁴ which – in line with Kohlmayer’s statement – request the original to shine through the translation in order to revalue the source culture within the realms of the target context (cf. Stolze 146) are just as dubious as they, again, picture the translator as being in a position to decide on the very translation method which he or she wishes to employ. If Bassnett and Lefevere hold the translator²⁵ responsible for colonizing, culturally appropriating, or even *cannibalizing*²⁶ the source text, they pretend that he or she *could*, as an a-historical and unbiased being, produce an entirely source-oriented translation, which in turn would be immune to all cultural influences of the target context (cf. “Proust’s Grandmother”, 11).

In fact, the translator is caught between the discourses which pervade the translation process. On the one hand, the ‘alien’ nature of the original will most possibly allow for some elements of the source text to ‘sneak through’; on the other hand, the cultural anchorage of the translator in the target language will influence him or her at least to a certain extent. As a result, the translation most probably features both source and target elements and in turn challenges the age-old dichotomy of *entirely* source- vs. target-based translations. If the translator in some rare cases has acquired the ‘code system’ of the source language, it can be assumed that the fact that he or she is translating for a ‘foreign’ audience will equally require him or her to adapt the original to the target conventions at least to some degree. Again, a blending of source and target elements will result from the translation process. Consequently, all translation work “necessarily involves some ad hoc combination, or compromise between” the norms of both cultures involved in the translation process (Toury 201). A translation must hence at all times be understood as a “zone of contact” between the foreign and the self, or the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) (cf. Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 83; Boase-Beier and Holman 7; Friedrich 14; Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 126; Mitterbauer, “Third Space”, 63f.;

²³ Cf. also Jörg 27; Levý 25-26.

²⁴ Cf. e.g. Gellerstam 202.

²⁵ Note that we again understand this very translator as being anchored in the context of the target culture.

²⁶ Cf. “Die Vertreter postmoderner übersetzerischer Ästhetik [...] verwenden gerne die Metapher des ‘Kannibalismus’. In ihrer Sicht bedeutet Übersetzen ein Verschlingen des Originals“ (Stolze 147).

Popovic 80; Venuti, "Translation, Community", 477). Put differently: "Das übersetzte Werk ist ein gemischtes, hybrides Gebilde. Die Übersetzung ist kein einheitliches Werk, sondern die Verschmelzung, das Konglomerat zweier Strukturen" (Levý 72).

Most naturally, however, the ratio by which source and target elements are weighted in the translation varies. The translator's cultural anchorage, for instance, appears to be a decisive factor: "[L]orsque le traducteur traduit vers sa seconde langue-culture son *habitus* peut plus volontiers le porter vers le champs source que vers le champs cible, et l'inciter à conserver dans la traduction les marques d'étrangeté du texte source, dont il est plus proche par son *habitus*"²⁷ (Gouanvic 86). Whether the strategy of having native speakers of a weaker source culture translate into a dominant target culture proves successful remains questionable nonetheless. Not only would this approach stand on its head the common practice of having native speakers of the target language translate for *their* culture; it would also suggest that the "features (both principles and elements) [which] are introduced into the home literature [and] which did not exist there before" (Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*, 47) retain the meaning which they conveyed in the original. We have, however, already declared this belief untenable above, as the foreign text will be automatically incorporated into the linguistic repertoire of the target group, and hence inevitably reduced to a stereotypical level (cf. Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*, 70; Fischer-Lichte 130; Miller 210). As a result, "the asymmetry between the foreign and domestic cultures persists, even when the foreign context is partly inscribed in the translation" (Venuti, "Translation, Community", 485). Moreover, it must be assumed that the relative prestige and power of the cultural groups involved in the translation process has an even greater impact on the ratio of source and target traits than the translator's cultural anchorage *per se*. Translation is always tantamount to "power struggles which entail negotiation" (Wolf, "Translation Field", 113)²⁸. Not surprisingly, more powerful cultures are more likely to win these negotiations than their smaller counterparts. Hence, even *native speakers* of a weaker source group will have to conform to the conventions of the stronger target culture if they want to see their texts published.

To conclude, the image of the translator who decides autonomously on the degree of 'faithfulness' of his or her product can no longer be upheld. Just as the author of an

²⁷ "If the translator works into his second language/culture, his *habitus* is more likely going to approach him to the source culture than the target culture; by the same token, it will lead him to retain in his translation the foreign elements of the source text, to which he is more closely bound by his *habitus*".

²⁸ Cf. also Mitterbauer 59; Wolf, "Cultures do not hold still", 95.

original, the translator can only be made responsible for the mastery of the text's linguistic code. Regarding the issue of source- vs. target-based translations, however, "[t]ranslators, to lay the old adage to rest once and for all, *have to be traitors*, but most of the time they don't know it, and nearly all of the time they have no other choice, not as long as they remain within the boundaries of the culture that is theirs" (Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting*, 13)²⁹. Hence, the balance of power between the individual on the one hand, and society on the other cannot be regarded as a symmetrical one: rather, "[o]ne factor [- in this case society,] is somehow bigger or of more weight than the other [- in this case the individual]" (Pym 11). Furthermore, it would be naïve to assume that all societies around the world wield exactly the same power. Rather, translation must be understood as a battlefield of ideological encounters and political struggles (cf. Bassnett, "Translation Turn", 137). In Bassnett and Lefevere's words, "[w]hat the development of Translation Studies shows is that translation, like all (re)writings is never innocent. There is always a context in which the translation takes place, always a history from which a text emerges and into which a text is transposed" ("Proust's Grandmother", 11)³⁰. By the same token, Fischer concludes that translation not merely takes place "across languages and cultural borders but among interest groups and discourses competing for hegemony within social arenas, be they local, national, or translational" (qtd. in Bachmann-Medick, "Einleitung", 4).

1.5.3 The Intricate Web of Power which Lies Behind the Translation Process

1.5.3.1 'Strong' vs. 'Weak' Linguistic Communities

Power relations among various cultural groups are hardly ever symmetrical or equal, but hierarchized according to the groups' political, linguistic, cultural, economic, and literary prestige (cf. Heilbron and Sapiro 95). Accordingly, politically dominant nations – such as the US, Britain, and France – tend to perceive translation work as peripheral and hence subordinate to the "norms already conventionally established [...] in the target literature" (Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*, 48). Consequently, translation into the linguistic codes of these nations is most often oriented toward the target conventions rather than toward the norms of the source text (*ibid.* 49-50). Inversely, smaller and hence politically less

²⁹ Cf. also Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 150; Wolf, "Textuelle Repräsentation", 143.

³⁰ Cf. also Bassnett, "Translation Turn", 135; Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting*, vii.

influential nations - including the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, and Austria - are more likely to adopt models and conventions from dominant source cultures, thereby “violat[ing] the home conventions” (*ibid.* 51)³¹. As stated by Lefevere, “a culture with a low self-image will welcome translation (and other forms of rewriting) from a culture or cultures it considers superior to itself” whereas a self-confident culture will block outside influence to a maximum degree (*Translation, Rewriting*, 88). Lüsebrink speaks of a “polycentric strategy” in the case of more powerful nations, and of an “ethnocentric strategy” regarding less influential cultural groups (165). This being said, it should be made apparent that the size of a nation is not always directly proportional to its political power or self-esteem. As Herder puts it,

the French, who are overproud of their natural taste, adapt all things to it, rather than try to adapt themselves to the taste of another time [...]. But we, poor Germans, who still are almost an audience without a fatherland, who are still without tyrants in the field of national taste, we want to see him [Homer] the way he is. (qtd. in Lefevere, “Genealogy”, 18-19)

Ergo the aspect of patriotism and of cultural self-awareness also seems to play a non-negligible role when it comes to translation (cf. Lefevere, “Chinese and Western Thinking”, 13; Linn 28).

Statistically speaking, politically strong nations equally dispose of an important linguistic and literary activity (cf. Anderman, “A l’anglaise”, 277; Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*, 48). Once a cultural group possesses an old, or heterogeneous literary repertoire – i.e. many different literary publications – it is also less likely to translate from other languages, cultures, and, by extension, literatures (cf. Kujamäki 41). Young or peripheral literary systems on the other hand depend considerably on material from other systems and are thus more prone to borrowing and import (cf. Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*, 26/40/48; Heilbron and Sapiro 96; Linn 28). Furthermore, relatively homogeneous cultures are also more resistant to translation than their heterogeneous counterparts (cf. Lefevere, “Chinese and Western Thinking”, 14). Toury, however, points out that this normative and dichotomous opposition must not be taken at face value and that a hundred percent valid generalizations cannot be made across all cultures (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 142).

³¹ Cf. also Anderman, *Europe*, 13; Anderman, “A l’anglaise”, 278.

In her manuals, *Europe on Stage* and *In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse?*, Gunilla Anderman specifically addresses the issue of the supremacy of the *English* language in the translation field, featuring among others an article by Stuart Campbell in which he claims that “in the professional translation enterprise there is an illusion that English is just one of a set of replaceable codes of equal value” (27). Americanization as well as the status of the English language as *lingua franca* have introduced an international audience to a wide range of typically Anglo-American features, at least on a superficial level. It is hence not surprising that, in translation, these elements are nowadays readily integrated into various other languages (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 15). Inversely, the feeling of supremacy leads British and American publishers to slanting translations toward their home repertoire or, more radically stated, to a tendency toward complete non-translation (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 16; Anderman and Rogers 3; Bassnett and Lefevere, “Where are we?”, 4). This can be explained by the fact that the knowledge about “the everyday life and customs of many of the smaller nations in Europe” is relatively limited in the Anglo-American world (cf. Anderman and Rogers 17).

It can hence be stated that, even if translations are never fully target, nor source-text based, the varying proportion of source versus target elements in translation does say much about power structures among the various nation states: Whereas smaller nations are forced to take in foreign input, mightier nations are in the position to block outside influence to a large extent (cf. Boase-Beier and Holman 10).

1.5.3.2 (How) Can Established Power Structures Be Overcome?

Naturally, the aspect of translation as perpetuating existent webs of power, thereby adding to the dominant position of strong and patriotic nations – especially of the English language – has drawn criticism from a number of modern translation scholars³². Gentzler views translation activity as “guilty of perpetuating certain cultural values at the expense of others” (“Foreword”, xvii). The wish to find a way of preserving the cultural variety of less dominant civilizations can be commonly felt (cf. Bassnett and Lefevere, “Where are we?”, 11), and the fact that ‘weak’ literatures frequently have to adapt themselves to the conventions of ‘stronger’ literary systems is regularly deployed (cf. Lefevere, “Gates of Analogy”, 76). Kohlmayer declares “[dass] keine Zielsprache und Zielkultur so *statisch*

³² Cf. Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 4-5; Berman in Venuti, “1980s”, 219; Niranjana in Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 177; Venuti qtd. in Spencer 380; Wolf, “Textuelle Repräsentation”, 13.

und lernunfähig [ist], daß der Übersetzer gezwungen wäre, all das, was aus historischen Gründen in der Zielsprache und -kultur unbekannt, ist in Altbekanntes zu verwandeln” (151). The ‘only’ problem appears to be that it is far from easy to challenge, let alone, convert existing power relations. Understandably, stronger nations will do everything to maintain their power by blocking foreign cultural elements in order to uphold the distinction between the ‘self’ and the ‘other’ (cf. Suppanz, “Transfers”, 22/29). However, as has been claimed above, power structures are never stable or essentially fixed and must hence be liable to change (cf. Barker 61; Kneer 128; Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting*, 38; Toury 204). As reported by Fuß, “[sind] Institutionen [...] Kreationen. Deshalb ist der Mensch zu ihrer Überschreitung fähig” (qtd. in Celestini, “Um-Deutungen”, 39-40). *Avant-garde* movements which eventually overcome seemingly entrenched structures serve as an illustrative example for this phenomenon: “Es kommt immer wieder eine neue Avantgarde, die die alte, bereits etablierte zu vernichten sucht und am Ende auch ihr Ziel erreicht” (Sauerland 146)³³. This, however, raises the question of whether *translation* is the right medium for such a revolutionary undertaking; more accurately stated: can *drama translation* revise previously established structures and conventions?

This consideration meets with considerable resistance. First, it soon becomes apparent that sustainable change requires concerted action. If one single translator decides on surging ahead on his own initiative, by introducing a myriad of source text conventions to the target system, he or she is most likely going to be scorned and jeered by the long-established audience of the target culture. In order to incorporate new norms into the age-old literary repertoire of a culture, at least a small group of people will have to agree on this change. According to experience, *avant-garde* movements are first bound to play in fringe theaters only. Subsequently, it takes a lot of time and effort to make the new elements palatable to a more traditional audience. This implies that effective and long-lasting modifications rely on consistent repetition and reiteration before they can be incorporated into an already existing system. In this regard, Judith Butler’s model of ‘performative power’ seems appropriate. Even if she concentrates first and foremost on sex and gender, the mechanisms which lie behind her theory help understand how ideologies and commonly accepted conventions are brought to life. Butler points out that norms can only be generated and produced through “stetige Wiederholung” (Moebius 168) or the “reiteration of hegemonic norms” (Barker 245). This implies “[dass die

³³ Cf. also Sabler 88.

Macht] [i]n Butlers Modell [...] auf die Wiederholung angewiesen [ist]; erst durch die Repetitivität von diskursiv-normativen Anweisungsstrukturen entfaltet und konstituiert sich die Produktivität der Macht” (Moebius 169). Applied to the literary field, this suggests “[dass] [d]er Leser [...] bei der ersten Gedichtsammlung ihren objektiven künstlerischen Wert nicht verstehen [wird]. Sobald er jedoch den fünften oder zehnten in dieser Form geschriebenen Band gelesen hat, wird er das Konventionelle bereits fühlen” (Levý 75).

Although this sounds convincing, the theatrical institution as a place of *ad-hoc* performance (cf. Fischer-Lichte qtd. in Jörg 32; Mandana 49), where the spectator does not have time to look up unknown concepts or words (cf. Mandana 24) – a privilege granted to the reader of prose or poetry –, does not appear to be the right field for revolution (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 7). Of course, it could be claimed that after having seen five or ten plays which follow the new conventions, the audience will eventually welcome these with open arms. Due to extensive lobbying, however, the lifespan of unsuccessful plays is radically limited in the drama business. It is very unlikely indeed – especially for an established theater – to stage five or ten plays following the structure of a play which didn’t sell in the first place (cf. Bennett 56; Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 66-67/74/351).

Apart from the claim for reiteration, we must not forget that translation has traditionally been regarded as a sub-field and does hence not wield immense economic power (cf. Gouanvic 89; Wolf, “Introduction”, 21). It is thus rather unlikely that change will be initiated by a *translator*. If Pinter, Beckett, and Schnitzler (cf. Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 88) – who at first disappointed audience expectations – finally “became accepted as modern classics as th[e] audiences became familiar with the necessary receptive strategies” (Bennett 105), this does not necessarily hold true for translators, who have historically been regarded as the poor copy of the original author only. If Lefevere hence claims that each rewriter is free to choose “to oppose the system, to try to operate outside its constraints” (*Translation, Rewriting*, 13) he most obviously fails to consider the powerful network which lies behind the business of translation.

To take stock, one translation which attempts to break up fossilized structures will hardly ever cause substantial change. In order to destabilize existing webs of power among the various nation states, political and economic forces will have to join efforts. Minimal

alterations within the realms of the literary field will however not suffice to entail far-reaching modifications. Or, as Constanzo explains, “the belief in artistic avant-garde that could forge revolutionary change by functioning on a purely aesthetic level has [...] [to be] substantially [dismissed]” (7). While Sauerland acknowledges the possibility of norm-breaking decisions, she specifies that the theater cannot be the right place for them to come about. Rather, new conventions are introduced “[i]m Leben bzw. in der sogenannten Wirklichkeit[...] [.] [W]enn sich Menschen entschließen, etwas Neues zu spielen, vorzuspielen, eine neue Lebensmöglichkeit [...] zu eröffnen [...] [.] [s]etzt sie sich durch, wird sie zur Konvention” (149). The theater, however, cannot be instrumentalized for such a change, as the audience quite frequently refuses to cooperate (*ibid.* 151). This stance is equally endorsed by Mc Grath who sees the theatre as never being able to “*cause a social change*” (qtd. in Bennett 167).

1.5.3.3 *Backstage: Lobbying Behind the Scenes*

*If you want to influence the masses,
a simple translation is always best.
(Goethe qtd. in Lefevere, “Genealogy”, 17)*

To further illustrate this claim, the various networks of power which permeate drama productions have to be made apparent. It is naïve to believe that economic factors can be disregarded when dealing with theatrical performances (cf. Gouanvic 103; Linn 33). A short sketch should help to illustrate this: On the final end of the production chain figures the audience which, economically speaking, finances a non-negligible part of the spectacle. Entrance fees aside, sponsoring as well as state subsidies (in the case of nationally financed theaters)³⁴ provide further support (cf. Bennett 4; Jörg 23). Non-subsidized theaters, on the other hand, rely almost exclusively on their audiences. Not surprisingly, they have a considerable say in the decision-making process (cf. Lefevere, “Translation Practice(s)”, 45). In other words, a play fully depends on its audience “[da das] Theater [...] es sich aus reinen Existenzgründen nicht leisten [kann], sein Stammpublikum zu verlieren” (Jörg 12)³⁵. For this reason, it is the spectator and no longer the playwright (and even less so the translator) who takes center stage as “the interests of the audience [as a whole] have assumed [...] vital significance” (Bennett 6).

³⁴ *Ad* London: “In Britain, the Arts Council, as the major distributor of government subsidy for the theatre and other arts, has had a decisive role. A large proportion of the costs for London’s National Theatre is met through government subsidy” (Bennett 124); Concerning the situation of Vienna, Sabler specifies that in Vienna only the ‘Burgtheater’ relies on state subsidy. All other theater companies rely exclusively on entrance fees (*Ecriture Dramatique*, 66).

³⁵ Cf. also Bennett 19; Sabler 75/352.

Consequently, in order to appeal to a maximum number of people, the theater will do anything to fulfill the spectator's *theatrical* expectations (cf. Bennett 16/107; Lüsebrink 140; Sabler, *Écriture Dramatique*, 74; Snell-Hornby, "Sprechbare Sprache", 108) which, in turn, are inevitably bound to his or her culture-specific presuppositions and conventions (cf. Bassnett, "Still Trapped", 92; Jörg 24; Mandana 35). Inversely, "[bedingt] die Beibehaltung der fremdkulturellen Referenzen im Translat eine wesentliche Informations- und Wissenslücke für das zielsprachige Publikum" (Mandana 50)³⁶. As a result, the spectator will remain aloof or undetached while watching the play (cf. Jörg 34; Mandana 49). If, hence, drama opposes the dominant discourse of the target system, it runs the risk of appealing to a small, probably more progressive group of people only (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 27). More radically stated, the audience "has always held the power of making or breaking a play by attendance or abstention" (Bums qtd. in Bennett 19) as without an audience a play cannot survive (cf. *ibid.* 59). Put differently, theater performances are firmly attached to their audiences. If hence, through translation, a play is transposed into another environment, it loses its audience, and hence its original spirit (cf. Sauerland 150). The English, for instance, require the wieldy language of the Germans "to 'flow' more" and to add emotion and humor "where [...] [it] is too patently lacking" (Lefevere, "Acculturating Brecht", 117-118)³⁷. It can hence be concluded that in drama translation, even more than in any other form of literary translation, the original text *must* be altered regarding its linguistic structures and the cultural concepts which it contains at least to a certain degree (cf. Mengel 3; Snell-Hornby, "Sprechbare Sprache", 113; Zajic 78). It *must* additionally be brought in line with the target culture's genre and performance conventions (cf. Levý 137; Popovic 81) since if the audience does not identify with the play, the latter will, most probably, be removed from the repertoire (cf. Popovic 81). "Die sprachliche 'Einbürgerung' [...] ist Bedingung des Markterfolgs – und ohne diesen kann kein Literaturübersetzer überleben" (Kohlmayer 146)³⁸. Theater managements, for their share, "have learnt from past reactions to translated plays that the public do not like an overly source-oriented approach to translation which, through its cultural and linguistic unfamiliarity, is accessible only to the initiated and converted, lacking in mass appeal" (Anderman, *Europe*, 27).

³⁶ Cf. also Anderman, *Europe*, 10; Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 118; Jörg 35; Venuti, "Translation, Community", 483.

³⁷ Cf. also Anderman, *Europe*, 10.

³⁸ Cf. also Bassnett and Lefevere, "Proust's Grandmother", 6; Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 125.

This raises the issue of ‘selection’³⁹. Matter-of-factly, the plays which are staged over a sustained period of time are not necessarily those which are most assiduously arranged or performed, but those which are economically successful, i.e. attended by a large number of people (cf. Bennett 117; Heilbron and Sapiro 98; Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 66/75-76). Not surprisingly, these plays are generally conventional in kind, causing the repertoire to be “highly resistant to change” (Martorella qtd. in Bennett 119). In order to better understand the power relations which exist among the various cultures, it does often not suffice to study the texts which have been chosen for translation by various social institutions⁴⁰ (cf. Bennett 56; Hatim and Mason 88 f.); rather, a systematic analysis of those works which were refused translation is equally called for (cf. Bassnett, “Translation Turn”, 126; Lüsebrink 130). Hermans demonstrates that

what is translated is always profiled against what is left untranslated. But silence can also communicate: it may communicate an inability or an unwillingness to translate. Moreover, just as, in speaking, the words a speaker selects push back other words, those that could have been spoken but were not, a translation offers its particular choice of words by obscuring other choices [...] In doing so, it activates one mode of representation at the expense of alternative modes. (70)

What is selected/not selected hence always depends on “ideological [...] [and] economic [...] viewpoints” (Bennett 56)⁴¹. In other words, “[t]hose in a position of economic (and thus cultural) power control what is available through mainstream channels” (*ibid.* 115)⁴².

Moreover, the venue of the performance also influences the process of selection (cf. *ibid.* 127). While smaller theater companies which do not depend on government subsidies are more likely to show less conventional pieces, national theater companies – in other words, ‘mainstream venues’ – rely heavily on plays which respect the common norms of the target culture (cf. *ibid.* 134). This foregrounds the influence which the government gains through financial support. As a result, some theaters deliberately turn down state money in order to escape the ideological pressure which accepting it would entail (cf. *ibid.* 124).

³⁹ For further information on the selection process, see Lüsebrink 132 f.

⁴⁰ As such Bennett lists “publishing houses, bookstores, and libraries, as well as [...] literary criticism and propaganda, literary institutions in schools, the study of literature, and all other institutions which mediate, materially or ideally, between the work produced and the reader” (56); Even-Zohar names “‘critics’ (in whatever form), publishing houses, periodicals, clubs, groups of writers, government bodies (like ministerial offices and academies), educational institutions (schools of whatever level, including universities), the mass media in all its facets, and more” (*Polysystem Studies*, 37); for the influence of literary criticism on drama, cf. also Butzko.

⁴¹ Cf. also Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 119.

⁴² Cf. also Schäffner qtd. in Karoubi.

The popularity of the translated work – and its author – are as decisive as the above-mentioned aspects may be. “Writers and their work are translated differently when they are considered ‘classics’, when their work is recognized as ‘cultural capital’, and when they are not” (Bassnett, “Still Trapped”, 109)⁴³. This aspect is most crucial when it comes to translating economically weighty authors, as is the case with rendering Arthur Schnitzler and Tom Stoppard into another language. Translators, as being directly influenced by the power structures which surround them, “do not work in ideal and abstract situations nor desire to be innocent, but have vested literary and cultural interests of their own” (Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 131)⁴⁴. Translating the work of well-known authors undoubtedly adds to the translator’s cultural and economic capital, especially when they, themselves, are already publicly known⁴⁵ (cf. Heilbron and Sapiro 103). Against this background, Tom Stoppard’s excessive use of intertextual references is not surprising, as the latter help establish a significant link with some of the most significant English playwrights of all times, including Shakespeare, Wilde, and Joyce (cf. Bennett 120-122). By the same token, the presence of “actors or directors with ‘star’ recognition” (*ibid.* 109) also adds prestige to the play on stage. In this light, casting “the public’s favorite actors and actresses, such as Paula Wessely, Alma Seidler, Robert Lindner, Attila Hörbiger, and Wolf Albach-Retty” (Deutsch-Schreiner 67) definitely added to the popularity of Schnitzler’s plays at the Burgtheater.

Furthermore, the leading director essentially influences the selection of the plays to be staged in his or her theater. Schnitzler, who is introduced to the ‘Burgtheater’ under the era of Max Burckhard, is granted relative leeway as to the form and design of his plays. This is largely due to the fact that Burckhard must be understood as one of the most revolutionary and vanguard directors that the ‘Burgtheater’ has seen in its long career. If Paul Schlenhner, Burckhard’s conservative successor, had pulled the strings when Schnitzler was hoping for his play *Liebelei* to be staged, probably nothing would have guaranteed the play’s performance (cf. Vacha, “1”, viii-xiv). Finally, effective marketing strategies, as well as favorable reviews can additionally boost a play’s popularity among its spectators (cf. Linn 36; Vacha, “1”, 129-130;).

⁴³ Cf. also Heilbron and Sapiro 103.

⁴⁴ Cf. also Sabler 88.

⁴⁵ Note that this can be undeniably claimed of Tom Stoppard and Hilde Spiel.

By way of conclusion, theater production – and, by extension, theater translation – cannot be regarded as abstract linguistic transcoding (cf. Mengel 2). Rather, the translated text is the result of economic and political games of power which, in turn, dwarf the translator's proper decisions and ideas.

1.6 Future Trends and Perspectives: On *Diaspora*, *Hybridity* and *The Space In Between*

*Jeder von uns ist
der andere
für die anderen.*

(Laing qtd. in Wolf, "Textuelle Repräsentation", 138)

The newest trend in the translation studies field consists of critically reviewing the conception of culture as a closed system. Many translation scholars believe that due to increased mobility figures large-scale cultural exchange is fostered, thereby narrowing the gap which up to now has clearly kept different cultural groups apart. Culture, in this sense, is tantamount to the notion of the *floating signifier* and hence never stable or fixed but in constant flux and motion (cf. Bonacker 31; Kokorz 118; Suppanz, "Transfers", 26). Accordingly, the translation process does not take place between a determined source and target culture, but in a space where various cultural influences overlap and converge (cf. Celestini and Mitterbauer, "Einleitung", 12). In this context, the concept of *diaspora* foregrounds world-wide travel, suggesting that people nowadays no longer remain influenced by a single culture, but have multiple identities due to extensive mobility (cf. Barker 200-201; Bhabha in Mitterbauer, "Third Space", 54-55). The existence of multiple identities, in turn, leads to the phenomenon of *hybridity*, which sees 'culture' as a synthesis of various influences and traditions (cf. Barker 202-203). Hence, according to this approach, cultural transfer adds to the blending of different cultural traits, thereby reducing the distance between the respective cultural groups (cf. Celestini and Mitterbauer, "Einleitung", 12; Suppanz, "Transfers", 25). Homi Bhabha's theory of the *Third Space* or *Space in Between* finally defines this *locus* of convergent cultural constructions, meanings, and conceptions as the major scene for translation activity (cf. Fuchs 312; Mitterbauer, "Third Space", 57). Accordingly, the transfer process is no longer conceived of as taking place between two cultures, but as "ein permanenter diskursiver Austausch zwischen" various cultural concepts (cf. Mitterbauer, "Third Space", 59; Wolf, "Cultures do not hold still", 85) in a "Raum ohne fixen Grenzverlauf" (Wolf, "Cultures do

not hold still”, 94). The ‘self’ and the ‘other’ are thus subject to continuous re-negotiation which entails complex compounds of various life styles and conceptions (cf. Reckwitz 241).

Of course, “the globalization of consumer capitalism [...] dominated by US-controlled corporations” (Barker 115) can hardly be denied these days (cf. Miller 210). In precisely the same vein, “the European Union can be seen as an attempt at cosmopolitan governance by accommodating the ever-increasing erosion of national boundaries through economic market forces and transnational patterns of migration and cultural exchange” (Konzett 349). However, when Barker goes on to claim that this phenomenon has inevitably led to “cultural homogenization” or “a loss of cultural diversity” by stressing “the growth of ‘sameness’” (115) among the various nation states, he at best depicts a utopian scenario, the realization of which most probably lies yet another hundred years ahead. In order to be able to speak of what Snell-Hornby refers to as “the ‘McLanguage’ of our globalised ‘McWorld’, or the ‘Eurospeak’ of our multinational continent” (“Global Village”, 17) all cultures would have to rely on exactly the same linguistic code system and, by extension, on exactly the same understanding of the world. Even though such a thought cannot - *per definitionem*- be ruled out (as the concept of the ‘nation state’ is by no means ahistorically fixed, but contingent on our current understanding of the term (cf. Barker 197; Bonacker 32;40-41)), it would be foolish to describe the world, in its momentary form, as completely homogenous. Rather, the persistence of national stereotypes testifies to a continuous delimitation of the ‘self’ against the ‘other’. In approximately the same vein, American cultureemes which have been taken over by other linguistic signifying systems must be understood in relation to the native code systems and hence purport different things in various countries. The meaning of ‘McDonalds’, for instance, can most certainly not be claimed to be the same all over the world; the connotations that the famous fast-food restaurant bears in itself are highly divergent. As a result, it would be preposterous to claim that all languages – and by extension their respective cultures – can be reduced to one single signifying system. This approach is endorsed by Anderman and Rogers who point to the fact that while English is being used as a *lingua franca*, the “different cultural backgrounds, with their own traditions and [...] national understandings” of the world prevail (23). “The styles have converged, but the histories have not” (Motzkin 266).

In the same vein, the ‘nation state’ *per se* can, of course, not be understood as a fully homogenous structure (cf. Suppanz, “Transfers”, 27). Not every single British person will decipher Tom Stoppard’s plays in precisely the same way; neither will every Austrian give exactly the same meaning to Arthur Schnitzler’s masterpieces. However, some sort of conventionalization is needed in order to render communication possible. In this sense, “[n]ational identity is a form of imaginative **identification**” (Barker 197)⁴⁶ and the nation *per se* is to be understood as what Anderson refers to as “imagined community” (qtd. in *ibid.* 199). In fact, nothing would *a priori* point to the fact that members of the same ‘nation state’ are essentially bound to have more in common with one another than with members belonging to another nation. Indeed, “the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them” (Anderson qtd. in *ibid.* 198). A feeling of solidarity between them is only artificially structured, “centred on the sharing of norms, values, beliefs, cultural symbols and practices” (*ibid.* 195). Hall specifies that “[i]nstead of thinking of national cultures as unified, we should think of them as a discursive device which represents difference as unity or identity. They are cross-cut by deep internal divisions and differences and ‘unified’ only through the exercise of different forms of cultural power” (qtd. in *ibid.* 198). According to Moebius and Reckwitz this unification, as some sort of delimitation of the ‘self’ from the ‘other,’ is needed for each social or symbolical structure to exist independently (16).

It is thus my contention that any study of transfer processes in our time and age cannot be carried out irrespective of the power relations which continue to exist among the various nation states. It would be reductionist, at this point, to claim that a translation from an English-speaking background into an Austrian environment does not entail any intercultural discrepancies whatsoever, but that the text simply floats in a homogenous, globalized sphere. As Barker rightly points out, “[t]hrough the concepts of globalization and hybridity are more adequate than that of cultural imperialism, because they suggest a less coherent, unified and directed process, this should not lead us to abandon the exploration of power and inequality” (119).

⁴⁶ Cf. also Bonacker 34-35.

III

**Schnitzler in London:
Liebelei and *Das weite Land*
in their English Versions by
Tom Stoppard**

II.1 From Theory to Practice: Implementing a *Descriptive, Function-based* Approach to Translation.

“The level of interest in Schnitzler, evidenced by the continued performance, publication, and filming of his works is, in effect, a powerful museum in its own right” (Wisely 1-2). Indeed, references delineating Schnitzler’s time and age (i.e. *fin de siècle* Vienna), his career, his philosophical orientation, as well as the recurrent motifs of his *oeuvre* continue to thrive both in English and in German. Although, due to Tom Stoppard’s tender age, the number of theoretical references portraying his literary career is less comprehensive, a satisfactory amount of useful material on his style of writing, his philosophical orientation, and his plays in general can be found. Compilations of interviews conducted with the Anglo-Czech author further help to better grasp his very personal motivations and considerations on various topics including the performance aspect of his plays, authors having influenced his writing, and the ‘death of the author’ debate delineated above.

On the contrary, systematic contrastive analyses of Schnitzler’s original plays and their English rewritings – to use Lefevere’s umbrella term – are generally limited to diploma and dissertation papers (cf. Mandana; Schmid)⁴⁷, or figure only marginally in published translation manuals, in the form of short research articles (cf. Daviau, “Reception”; Mengel 99-120/167-181; Spencer; Stern). The situation is even less satisfying in Tom Stoppard’s case: Whereas some unpublished theses compare the English and the German versions of *Travesties* – with the main focus being placed on the performance aspect of the respective plays (cf. Lakner; Sieder, “1”&”2”) – no comprehensive study of Stoppard’s *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* in its German rendering has as yet been undertaken. Moreover, the vast majority of the above-mentioned studies content themselves with an enumeration of the translation shifts which occur in the German versions, briefly commenting on the effects which they entail, such as character alteration and a shift in style and atmosphere. More often than not the translator is held responsible for these deviances. As Spencer rightly points out, “[t]ranslation of Schnitzler’s work [...] is to a large extent dominated by criticism which describes translation in terms of right or wrong, faithful or deviant and in terms of inadequacy and loss” (373).

⁴⁷ Heidi Zojer is the only exception in this context.

In her analysis of Schnitzler's plays *Reigen*, *Das weite Land*, and *Liebelei* in their English translations, Schmid claims to focus on the performance aspect of the foreign versions, i.e. "Wie werden die Schnitzler'schen Theaterstücke als dramatische Texte in die Fremdsprache übertragen?" (6). However, a discussion of theatrical conventions and norms in the respective cultures is not included in her analysis. In spite of her initial aim to disregard translation mistakes and "Möglichkeiten der Übersetzung von Phänomenen des Deutschen, für die es im Englischen kein Äquivalent gibt" (*ibid.* 6), she continuously comments on the quality of the English translations, as in: "Warum aber die beiden englischen Interpreten nicht den Wiener Dialekt durch einen englischen, wie zum Beispiel Cockney, ersetzen [...] erscheint mir weniger einleuchtend" (*ibid.* 43). The simple fact that she mentions phenomena which do *not* possess an *equivalent* in the English language suggests that she believes that all other words and sentences can be *equivalently* rendered in the target language. She even confesses that she understands translation as a "Verhältnis der Äquivalenz" (*ibid.* 3), and later praises Stoppard for having been faithful to Schnitzler's original *intention* at least in some instances (*ibid.* 16/86). She thereby holds on to the possibility of a perfect, equivalent translation based on the transcoding of the author's original meaning into a foreign language. Despite her understanding of her analysis as a non-linguistic based study of Schnitzler's English versions, she very much remains trapped within traditional translation theory. In precisely the same vein, Daviau denounces the translator for mutilating the original text (cf. "Reception", 148), and Stern accuses him of employing strategies which are "artistically questionable" (182)⁴⁸.

Honegger, Mengel and Spencer are one of the few who turn to a more *descriptive* approach to translation analysis, taking into account the aspect of cultural, social, and theatrical norms governing the translation process (cf. Mengel 2). In his introduction, Mengel lists a number of factors which render an *equivalent* translation of an original play in a foreign language *ab initio* impossible, further specifying *why* shifts of meaning are unavoidable in each and every translation (15-18). Honegger addresses the fact that each and every translator is "ethnic and [hence] deeply rooted in local culture and mentality" (22), and concludes that translation from Austrian German into English almost always amounts to stereotypical representations of the Austrian culture.

⁴⁸ Cf. Spencer 374.

In line with these authors and in the light of the theoretical findings of this study, a *descriptive* and *function-based* analysis of Arthur Schnitzler's *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* in comparison to their respective English versions *Dalliance* and *Undiscovered Country* by Tom Stoppard, and of Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* and *Travesties* in contrast to their German translations by Hanno Lunin and Hilde Spiel shall focus on the socio-cultural, economic, political, and theatrical norms which in each case cause the foreign versions to depart considerably from the original plays.

In the following it shall hence be proven that

- a) the notion of translational *equivalence* has to be dismissed in favor of socio-culturally determined communicative practices (i.e. language and non-verbal features) and the understanding of meaning as infinitely unstable.
- b) the translation shifts which inevitably occur hence reflect socio-cultural trends and power relations among the respective cultures instead of resulting from inattention and carelessness on the part of the translator.
- c) the dichotomy between 'free' and 'faithful' translations has to be done away with as both source and target elements can usually be found in the translation product.
- d) the foreign elements which are incorporated into the target culture are mainly understood in relation to the 'self' and not as the 'other' *per se*, and consequently reduced to a stereotypical level.
- e) the ratio of source and target elements depends on the cultural background of the translator as well as on the existent power relations among the nation states.
- f) drama translation must conform to the home conventions at least to a certain degree in order to be accepted by the established audience; an aspect which seriously challenges the theater's position of causing social and political change.
- g) all in all, translations, as much as their respective originals, have to be perceived as texts in their own right. If there is hence one thing which can and must be required of them, it is that they should no longer pretend to be *equivalent* to their originals.

II.2 Arthur Schnitzler: Choice of Plays

Schnitzler's works "are among the few German-language plays translated and performed regularly in Britain during the period of his lifetime" (Bartholomew and Krebs 1242), and they continue to enthrall audiences both on the English and the German stages today. Between 1899 and 1911 Schnitzler is among the most frequently staged playwrights in all German-speaking countries combined. During this period, the Burgtheater alone features 249 Schnitzler plays (cf. Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 79; Vacha, "1", xxiii), and "by 1914 he [is] [...] the most frequently performed author in the Burgtheater" (Ametsbichler 187).

After Schnitzler's *Märchen* (1891) and *Anatol* (1893), Schnitzler's play *Liebelei*, which premieres at the Burgtheater in 1895, finally turns the Austrian into a highly demanded playwright. The play is immediately hailed as Schnitzler's major breakthrough (and still acknowledged as such today)⁴⁹, and quickly turns into the yardstick against which all his other plays to be written in the future are going to be measured (cf. Butzko 41). This immediate success must be understood as a mixed blessing for Schnitzler (cf. Ametsbichler 196). Although he is now celebrated as the new star of the Burgtheater, the shallow haze of *fin de siècle* Vienna, the stilted chit-chat "der süßen Mädels und der dekadenten Lebemänner" (Butzko 40)⁵⁰, as well as the Freudian love-death opposition is going to haunt him for a long time to come (cf. Butzko 61; Daviau, "Reception", 162). "Wie er sich auch bemüht, andere Themen in seinen Werken anzuschneiden, wie er auch danach verlangt, einen ähnlichen Erfolg mit seinen weiteren Stücken zu erringen, die Kritik sieht in den meisten doch nur eine Variation des 'ewigen Lieds von der Liebe, eine Variation der *Liebelei*'" (Butzko 41)⁵¹. Paradoxically indeed, the anti-Semitic journal *Reichspost* belongs to the few papers which foreground Schnitzler's inexhaustible thematic diversity (cf. Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 138).

For many years to come, Schnitzler's plays either shock the audiences (as is the case with his notorious *Reigen*) or leave them relatively unmoved – Thimig even speaks of the "Ruhe eines Friedhofs" in relation to this theatrical period (qtd. in Vacha, "1", 111). It is only in 1911 that *Das weite Land* deems promising to live up to the success once enjoyed

⁴⁹ Cf. Ametsbichler 196; Butzko 40-41; Gay 234; Kammeyer 21; Lorenz 3; Scheible 57; Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 56/136; Vacha, "1", 26/48 (for more detailed reviews on *Liebelei*, see Vacha, "2", 11-43).

⁵⁰ Cf. also Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 135; Vacha, "1", xxxv.

⁵¹ Cf. also Beniston 224; Butzko 59-61/76; Dukes qtd. in Daviau 150-151; Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 22.

by *Liebelei* (cf. Butzko 59). Simultaneously premiering on thirteen⁵² German-speaking stages, *Das weite Land* constitutes one of Schnitzler's big breaks in his career as a dramatist (cf. Butzko 86; Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 36; Vacha, "1", xviii/115/117). Positive reviews of the play are abundant⁵³, and even Schnitzler himself – known as an assiduous perfectionist – seems to acknowledge the mastery of his play (cf. Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 128).

Outside Austria, where Schnitzler's novels are at least as renowned as his plays, Schnitzler is primarily known as a playwright in Britain (cf. Bartholomew and Krebs 1242). Indeed, Tom Stoppard is not the first to transpose Schnitzler's *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* into the English language (cf. *ibid.* 1242). Rather, "multiple translations exist of his most famous works" (Lorenz 13). Stoppard's adaptation *Undiscovered Country*, which follows the earlier English versions *The Wide Country* and *The Vast Domain* - translated in 1923- (cf. "Arthur Schnitzler"; Ketels 344), is "commissioned by Britain's National Theatre, which present[s] the work in 1979 in a monumental production, directed by Peter Wood and starring John Wood" (Gussow, "Schnitzlerland", 4). *Liebelei* is "entitled variously *Flirtation*, *The Reckoning*, *Playing with Love*, *The Love Game*, *Light-o'-Love*, and *The Lovers and the Losers*" (Daviau, "Reception", 149) before being taken up by Tom Stoppard under the title *Dalliance*. Stoppard's version is again created in close cooperation with Peter Wood and the National Theatre and premieres at the Lyttleton in 1986 (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 207; Mengel 167). Although some critics acknowledge that Stoppard's plays cannot be understood as *equivalent* renderings of Schnitzler's originals (cf. Bartholomew and Krebs 1243; Daviau, "Reception"; Spencer), most of them foreground their positive reception on the British stage (cf. Bartholomew and Krebs 1242; Gussow, "Schnitzlerland").

The reason for choosing Schnitzler's *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* for analysis is hence threefold: First, the plays' indisputable success turns them into an interesting object for study. Second, both plays are rendered into the English language by Tom Stoppard; and last but not least, all four plays (i.e. the German and the English versions combined) are commissioned and staged by the national theaters in both Austria and Britain. This aspect is of importance given that Lüsebrink et al. request the objects of analysis to be comparable in order to guarantee unflawed results (30).

⁵² Vacha mentions only nine ("1", xviii/112).

⁵³ Cf. Sabler who quotes the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* and the *Reichspost* (*Ecriture Dramatique*, 182); (for more detailed reviews on *Das weite Land*, see Vacha, "2", 92-123).

II.3 On the Impossibility of Equivalence: Highlighting Translation Shifts

In a first instance, the shifts which set the German versions and their respective English translations apart have to be analyzed in some detail. This juxtaposition of Schnitzler's and Stoppard's plays is, however, not intended as a qualitative assessment of either of the plays. Rather, the fact that the texts at hand diverge considerably must be understood as a first proof of the impossibility of *equivalence* in any translation process whatsoever. In Bassnett's words, "[o]nce the principle is accepted that sameness cannot exist between two languages, it becomes possible to approach the question of *loss and gain*" (*Translation Studies*, 36). In a second step, socio-cultural, political, and theatrical conventions and norms of both the Austrian and the British culture will be drawn upon in order to *account for* the alterations listed below.

The analysis will be based on the analytical model suggested by Lambert and Van Gorp, Nord (qtd. in Zojer 33-35), Vannerem and Snell-Hornby (qtd. in Stolze 165), and Gerzymisch-Arbogast (qtd. in *ibid.* 119), according to which various criteria that make up a text can be broken down into macrostructural and microstructural elements. These include both linguistic and cultural aspects which run the risk of being altered or lost in translation (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 8). Bassnett cites "speech rhythms, the pauses and silences, the shifts of tone or of register [...] in short, the linguistic and paralinguistic aspects of the written text that are decodable and reencodable" ("Still Trapped", 107) as examples; Nord distinguishes between stylistic elements, including rhythm, syntax, structure, metaphors, and symbols, and more general aspects such as character constellation, themes, and atmosphere ("Übersetzungshandwerk", 54). Additionally, Stolze mentions "Satzstrukturen und Länge, Informationsarrangement, Frequenz von Verbalphrasen versus Nominalphrasen, Frequenz der Adjektiva" (170) as well as active/passive constructions, stress and accentuation, and focus in sentence constructions (224).

In a more systematic order, macrostructural elements to be analyzed will include length, structure (number of acts), peritext and stage directions, rhythm and tempo, dialog/monolog structure, style, genre, and themes. Subsequently, dialects and linguistic variation, language (including vocabulary and register), syntax, repetition, and

punctuation, forms of address and conversational patterns, as well as culturemes⁵⁴ will be addressed from a microstructural perspective. It must of course be pointed out that these various aspects cannot be treated independently, but rather have to be understood as closely interrelated and continuously interacting concepts which, globally speaking, account for the overall atmosphere of the texts. Partial overlaps among these categories are hence going to be frequent in the subsequent analysis.

II.3.1 An Analysis on the Macro-Level of Schnitzler's *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* in Comparison to Stoppard's *Dalliance* and *Undiscovered Country*

II.3.1.1 Altering Length and Structure

Starting with a comparison of the **macrostructural** particularities of Schnitzler's *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* on the one hand, and Stoppard's respective English versions, *Dalliance* and *Undiscovered Country* on the other, a stark imbalance regarding the texts' length can be observed⁵⁵. Compared to Schnitzler's original text, Mengel speaks of a reduction in length of 25% in Stoppard's *Undiscovered Country* (110). Indeed, Stoppard equally tinkers with much of *Liebelei*'s original linguistic material, omitting most of Schnitzler's verbose and all-too-often lofty chitchat (cf. Gussow, "Schnitzlerland", 4). In other words, Stoppard shortens Schnitzler's texts by "sharpen[ing] the dialogue and teas[ing] more humour out of it" (Stoppard qtd. in Mengel 167). Admittedly, Stoppard does not alter the overall storyline of the original plays through elimination, but he nonetheless changes the atmosphere and style of Schnitzler's plays, chiefly regarding character constellation, as his *dramatis personae* "miss the plenitude of" their originals (Gussow, "Schnitzlerland", 4)⁵⁶. The juxtaposition of the following scenes taken from *Das weite Land* and *Undiscovered Country* shall further illustrate this claim:

⁵⁴ These are also termed "cultural terms" or "cultural references" and describe "konkrete Einheiten, die an eine Kultur und/oder an einen geographischen Raum gebunden sind" (qtd. in Zojer 59/62). For a more detailed discussion as well as possible ways of translating them see for instance Markstein.

⁵⁵ Stoppard himself admits that the final versions are "considerably shorter" (qtd. in Gussow, "Cartwheels", 132).

⁵⁶ This aspect is also mentioned by Mandana who asserts that Stoppard's "knapper Tonfall" considerably alters the overall atmosphere of the plays (90). By the same token, Schmid notices a modification regarding the characters' attitude which she ascribes to the cuts introduced in the English versions (29); cf. furthermore Bartholomew and Krebs 1243; Mengel 109-110/115-116.

GENIA. Ich hab die Geschichte eben der Frau Wahl erzählt. Sie hat sich sofort erkundigt, wo die Zigaretten hingekommen sind, die du ihm am nächsten Tag geschickt hast. (Schnitzler, *WL*, 25)

GENIA. Mrs Wahl wanted to know what became of the cigars. (Stoppard, *UC*, 92)

By omitting linguistic material, Stoppard also does away with Schnitzler's characters' typical trait of favoring small talk over more serious issues⁵⁷. When Schnitzler's Fritz asks Theodor out of the blue, "Sag, findest du das Zimmer nicht wunderlieb?" (Schnitzler, *L*, 73), he desperately tries to digress from the awkward subject of his affair with an older lady. In precisely the same vein, he avoids a straightforward answer when Christine asks him about the other lady at the theater. By ascertaining that he remembers what Christine wore on several occasions, he cleverly turns the focus away from the important matters, instead engaging in mindless chit-chat about superficial details (cf. Schnitzler, *L*, 22; Schmid 34). Stoppard, on the other hand, has his characters talk shop right away, hence ignoring this very aspect. Finally, Mengel mentions a loss of psychological depth caused by Stoppard's omissions in *Undiscovered Country*. Freud, who as Schnitzler's 'Doppelgänger' (cf. Magris 71) considerably influences the latter in his writings, does not play an equally important role in Stoppard's version (Mengel 112).

However, Stoppard's predilection for cutting and pruning does not mean that he refrains from "adding a flick here and there" (Stoppard qtd. in Stern 171). In *Dalliance*, Stoppard inserts a scene of Fritz "practicing marksmanship with a duelling pistol" (7), thereby foreshadowing the character's tragic death in the end of the play. By locating the last Act to the *Josefstadt*, he introduces additional characters (cf. Schmid 69), adds rehearsal scenes and generally turns the structure line of Schnitzler's *Liebelei* upside down.

While Stoppard retains *Liebelei*'s three-act structure in writing, he recounts in an interview that "Peter Wood [...] was insistent that he wanted to do [...] [the play] with one intermission"⁵⁸ (Stoppard, "Event and Text", 203), i.e. in two acts only, thereby

⁵⁷ In this context, Baumann illustrates that "Beiläufiges [...] grüblerisch-bohrend behandelt, [während] Abgründiges bewußt ausweichend abgefälscht, oft nur im Parlando berührt [wird]" (36).

⁵⁸ Surprisingly, Stoppard mentions *Das weite Land* as Schnitzler's three-act play, stating, "I did an adaptation of a play by Schnitzler; it's called *Das weite Land* (we called it *Undiscovered Country*). It's a big play, and Schnitzler wanted it done in three acts, with two intermissions" ("Event and Text", 203). As I can only interpret this as an error on Stoppard's part, given that *Das weite Land* has five acts, I assumed that he was actually referring to *Liebelei*, where the stage directions of Act Three clearly specify that "[t]he transition between Act Two and Act Three should be made without an intermission" (*D*, 60; cf. Stern 176).

further compressing the structure of the play (cf. Gussow, “Schnitzlerland”, 4). In his version of *Das weite Land* he does not tinker with the traditional five-act structure of dramatic works, yet the above-delineated cuts and omissions undoubtedly interfere with the play’s initial texture.

II.3.1.2 Peritext and Stage Directions

Regarding the peritext, i.e. all elements which are not part of the play’s storyline *per se* – “Titel, Zwischenüberschriften, Illustrationen, Vor-und Nachwort” (Lüsebrink 145), as well as the stage directions employed by both authors⁵⁹ – again considerable imbalances can be found. In the case of *Das weite Land*, Schnitzler establishes himself as the careful planner who even makes use of these extra-textual elements in order to bestow a certain atmosphere on his tragicomedy. The title – *Das weite Land* – is taken up again in the play itself, where Aigner describes the human soul as such. It is thus in perfect tune with the play’s overall subject matter, i.e. the incapability of seeing through one’s fellow men who hide their soul behind the masks they are wearing. In contrast to this atmosphere, Stoppard’s title refers back to Hamlet’s famous soliloquy of Shakespeare’s homonymous play (cf. Schmid 15-16; Stern 171). Hamlet contemplates suicide, yet shirking from taking the ultimate step as “the dread of something after death/ The undiscovered country, from whose bourn/ No traveller returns, puzzles the will” (*Hamlet* 3.1.78-80). For the English spectator this connection conjures up an atmosphere or a “weitere Sinnschicht” of death (Weikert 55), which corresponds to Schnitzler’s motif of ‘thanatos’, frequently opposed to his more positive counterpart ‘eros’ and reminiscent of Freud’s love-death metaphor. However, this connotation is inappropriate and misleading in the context of Stoppard’s play, as the latter generally sways towards farce and parody, rather than mirroring the tragicomical atmosphere of the original (cf. Mengel 120).

While the stage directions of Act One in Schnitzler’s *Das weite Land* run on over thirty lines, Stoppard reduces them to a fifth of the original, and as result also effaces the claustrophobic atmosphere created in Schnitzler’s version where “[e]in grüner, ziemlich hoher Holzzaun [...] den Garten ein[schließt]” and “[l]ange Schatten der Gitterstäbe [...] in den Garten [fallen]” (Schnitzler, *WL*, 9)⁶⁰. In this context, Thompson specifies

⁵⁹ Schmid’s analysis of Schnitzler’s plays in their English version focuses primarily on these aspects (7).

⁶⁰ Cf. Schmid 20.

Schnitzler's artistic skill of conveying the "characters' gestures, movements and facial expressions [...] in detail in the stage directions, which clarify their true feelings, and so make a vital contribution to an understanding of the dialogue which is taking place" (114). Again, Stoppard falls short of this criterion in his version.

For once, Tom Stoppard's choice of title for the English version of *Liebelei – Dalliance* – does not diverge considerably from the original (cf. Schmid 15). However, he can not resist toying with the play's stage directions, but this time he inverses his technique. Instead of pruning them to a minimum – as in the case of *Undiscovered Country* – he inflates them with additional material. Accordingly, Schnitzler's three-line introduction takes up almost one page in the context of *Dalliance*, delineating Fritz's maniac shooting session. In the middle of Act Two, Stoppard further adds the following lines:

She turns to go and finds that Fritz has appeared in the doorway. He looks at her inquiringly. She jerks her head towards the door leading to the roof. Fritz comes further into the room. Mizi offers him her hand. Fritz raises her hand to his lips and bows over it. Mizi kisses him passionately on the mouth. He is taken by surprise, disconcerted, and he pushes her away. She laughs at him and leaves, still laughing. Fritz looks carefully around the room and then approaches the piano. He lifts the lid and plays a tune with one finger. Christine hears this and comes to the door and sees him. (Stoppard, UC, 50)

As a result, the play takes on a much more sexually explicit undertone than Schnitzler's original "*Vorige. Fritz ist eingetreten*" (Schnitzler, L, 64). It also conveys a more lively and carefree atmosphere, hence turning Schnitzler's serious and romantic melodrama into a laughing matter.

II.3.1.3 *Dialog Structure, Rhythm, and Tempo*

By the same token, the dialog/monolog structure of the German and the English versions diverges dramatically (cf. Mengel 118-119/167). Whereas Schnitzler relies almost exclusively on idle eloquence, typical of the upper slices of *fin de siècle* Vienna, rendered in lofty, lengthy conversational tone, Stoppard's style of dialog sways toward quick repartee and absurd talk (cf. Weikert 241-274). In the following scene, Schnitzler's characters tend to monologize their speech, reflecting upon deep feelings and emotions, whereas Stoppard's *personae* engage in a somewhat uncommitted, absurd exchange of short utterances:

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>OTTO. Wenn du mir doch vertrauest, Genia. Auch früher könnt ich wieder da sein. Viel früher. Es gibt ja andre Möglichkeiten für mich... Du weißt es... Ich müßte gar nicht fort, Genia.</p> <p>GENIA. Du mußt. Vielmehr du sollst, das ist ein stärkeres Gebot.</p> <p>OTTO. Wie soll ich leben – ohne dich!</p> <p>GENIA. Du wirst es können. Es war schön. Lassen wir's daran genug sein. Glück auf die Reise, Otto, und Glück fürs weitere Leben. <i>(Pause.)</i></p> <p>OTTO. Was wirst du tun, wenn ich fort bin?</p> <p>GENIA. Ich weiß es nicht. Heute weiß ich's nicht. Was wußten wir zwei vor wenigen Wochen, vor Tagen!.. Man gleitet. Man gleitet immer weiter, wer weiß wohin.</p> <p>OTTO. Wie kannst du... Oh, ich verstehe dich! Du redest heute so, um mir das Scheiden leichter zu machen. Genia... Erwinnere dich doch, Genia...</p> <p>GENIA. Ich erinnere mich. O ja, ich erinnere mich. <i>(Bitter.)</i> Aber das Vergessen fängt auch nicht anders an. <i>(Schnitzler, WL, 104)</i></p> | <p>OTTO. And how am I to live... without you?</p> <p>GENIA. You'll live. It was lovely. Let's call it a day. Pleasant journey, Otto, and good luck for the future.</p> <p>OTTO. Will you remember me, Genia?</p> <p>GENIA. Oh, yes. And I'll forget you too. <i>(Stoppard, UC, 158)</i></p> |
|---|---|

As a result, Schnitzler's characters perfectly reflect the author's idea of superficial types, who use a lot of pathos in order to influence and manipulate the other (cf. Schmid 29). The characters' nasalized way of speaking is hence nothing but an attempt at masking their true intentions, thereby conforming to the public morals of the then upper-class society. Stoppard's characters do not mince matters, and are hence much more direct, but also more candid than Schnitzler's originals (cf. *ibid* 29). Sabler even goes as far as to claim that Schnitzler's *dramatis personae* only exist through their narrative art, i.e. the conversational tone which they employ (*Ecriture Dramatique*, 337) – an aspect also addressed by Ametsbichler who senses an emphasis of dialog over action in all of Schnitzler's plays (195).

Indeed, it is not due to a hustling and bustling performance full of vivacity that *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* hold audiences enthralled all over the world (cf. Schmid 24). As Le Rider rightly observes: “[I]n *Das weite Land* geschieht auf der Bühne beinahe gar nichts” (30). Rather, dramatic tension in Schnitzler's plays is created though cleverly thought out dialog momentum and psychological profundity, “welche die Gewalt und die verborgenen

Leidenschaften hinter der urbanen Fassade dieser guten Wiener Gesellschaft bloßlegen” (*ibid.* 30). Needless to say that this “meticulous description of the mindset of the individual [...] simultaneously delay[s] the symbolic act” (Kuttenberg 328). Stoppard, for whom tempo and witty entertainment is everything, relies on another strategy: by spicing up Schnitzler’s long-winded talk, he quickens rhythm and tempo (cf. Lichtenberg 271). This is achieved “through an arbitrary revision of the punctuation” (Berman 292), a reduction of fillers, and divergent syntax patterns⁶¹ and automatically builds up suspense. Compare, for instance, the following scenes taken from *Liebelei* and *Dalliance*:

FRITZ (*leise*). Gibt’s was Neues? –
Hast du etwas über sie erfahren?
THEODOR. Nein. Ich hol dich nur da
herunter, weil du leichtsinnig bist.
Wozu noch diese überflüssigen
Aufregungen? Schlafen sollst du dich
legen... Ruhe brauchst du! ...
(Schnitzler, *L*, 73)

FRITZ. Is there any more news?
THEODORE. What?
FRITZ. About her.
THEODORE. Who? Oh, no. I only
came to collect you because you’re
so irresponsible. What’s all this
excitement? You ought to be
resting, this is no place for you.
(Stoppard, *D*, 58)

Furthermore, Stoppard grafts his very personal pun character on his plays – as in “hail-fellow-well-m – maybe that means he knows” (Stoppard, *D*, 11), “I am at your disposal [...] And I shall dispose of you” (*ibid.* 31), “You young know-it-alls... take-it-alls... My box, my table, my – You grab – brag – strut – rut like dogs in the street – and you’ll be shot down like dogs” (*ibid.* 32), and “frantically – or romantically” (Stoppard, *UC*, 133) or “members of the fair sex [...] [o]r unfair sex” (*ibid.* 114) – thereby bestowing his very unique rhythm on his performances. Not surprisingly, Stoppard’s proponents frequently praise him for his breath-taking, linguistically explosive roller-coaster rides to Stoppardland, whereas his critics miss a certain maturity when it comes to his characters and themes (cf. Bratt). Accordingly, Schnitzler and Stoppard employ entirely contrary dramatic strategies which both have their merits, but which clearly show how absurd it would be to sell Stoppard’s plays as Schnitzler’s *equivalents*.

II.3.1.4 Stylistic Characteristics and Genre

It should have been made apparent that Stoppard’s style is generally faster, sharper, wittier, more sarcastic, and much more direct than the superficial banter employed by

⁶¹ I shall come back to these aspects when discussing the microstructural elements of the plays.

Schnitzler (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 209-211; Barholomew and Krebs 1243, Mengel 167; Schmid 49/75). Another aspect which sets the German and the English versions apart is the fact that Schnitzler meshes comic and tragic elements (cf. Mengel 108-109; Sabler, “Österreichische Identität”, 86), whereas Stoppard reduces the melodramatic and sentimental quality to a minimum (cf. Mengel 167; Schmid 75). In other words, the tragic dimension of Schnitzler’s play which traces the human soul as a deep abyss is almost lost in Stoppard’s play, the tone of which is lighter and reminds one more of a bitter farce (cf. Mengel 120). According to Lichtenberg, Stoppard sacrifices melodrama at the expense of sharp humor (271). Mengel understands Stoppard’s technique of inserting “sarcasms, witty aphorisms, repartee, strong lines and puns” (117)⁶² as a means of “achiev[ing] an additional comic effect” (114)⁶³.

While in *Das weite Land*, Schnitzler’s Mauer deploys “[dass d]ie Zigarre [...] übrigens wirklich keine Luft [hat]” (26), Stoppard’s counterpart sarcastically pictures it as “just about ready to join [the newly deceded] Korsakow” (Stoppard, *UC*, 93). Schnitzler’s Genia explains in a distinguished way “[wie e]in Freund [ihres] Mannes, ein gewisser Doktor Bernhaupt, [...] direkt von seiner Seite weg von einem Felsen abgestürzt und auf der Stelle tot geblieben [ist]” (Schnitzler, *WL*, 16), Stoppard’s Genia, on the contrary, sloppily recounts Bernhaupt’s death as having happened when the latter “crashed right past him [her husband] on a rock-face” (Stoppard, *UC*, 85). By the same token, Stoppard’s Theodore turns Mizi’s plain statement “It’s not a double-bass, it’s a violin” into a downright joke, by adding, “Well, I said he was small” (Stoppard, *D*, 14), while Fritz concludes that “it helps if you can’t see the actors” (*ibid.* 17) and Mizi admonishes Christine that “only a fool would look for [the perfect man] in Vienna” (*ibid.* 49) – attitudes which are all but alien to Schnitzler’s original characters. In *Dalliance*, Stoppard’s characters also take on a more sexually explicit way of proceeding, compared to Schnitzler’s originals (cf. Mengel 169). Hence Theodore openly invites Mizi to “give [him] a hand” (Stoppard, *D*, 18), and Mizi subsequently admits to having spent intimate hours at “Dory’s place” (*ibid.* 48) while deploying that men are “all the same when they’re waiting for their trousers” (*ibid.* 50).

⁶² Cf. also Mengel 167.

⁶³ Cf. also Mengel 168.

As a result, Schnitzler's and Stoppard's plays cannot even be understood as belonging to the same genre type. While Schnitzler's *Das weite Land* is officially tagged as a tragicomedy (*Tragikomödie*)⁶⁴ – meshing comedy and tragedy, situational comedy, psychological depth, and realism (cf. Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 211) – no specific type of genre has been assigned to *Liebelei*⁶⁵. However, with Christine committing suicide in the final act, the play undoubtedly ends on a tragic note (cf. Vacha, “2”, 43). Mengel describes it as leaning toward the genre of “domestic tragedy (*bürgerliches Trauerspiel*)”⁶⁶ in line with Lessing's *Miß Sara Sampson* and Schiller's *Kabale und Liebe* (177). Vacha further specifies that numerous genre classifications have been attached to *Liebelei*, ranging from “Volksstück bis zur Tragödie” (“1”, xxxiv). Generally speaking, humorous scenes are less common in this play than in *Das weite Land*.

Apart from the official genre descriptions, Schnitzler's plays are often associated with French *boulevard* theater conventions of his time (cf. Vacha, “2”, 12). Sabler explains this connection with the fact that both French *boulevard* theater and Schnitzler hold on to “Situationen, die Erotik mit Komik vereinen” (“Österreichische Identität”, 95). This parallel is not always to the benefit of Schnitzler's plays (cf. Le Rider 30). Rather, it entails critique in the sense that the Austrian author relies too heavily on the French *sujets* (cf. Sabler, “Boulevardtheater”, 90). The image of Schnitzler “[als] Autor von leicht lasziver Boulevarddramatik in süßlich-donaumonarchischer Szenerie” (*ibid.* 91) indeed has a rather pejorative connotation attached to it. Additionally, the genre of the *boulevard* theater suggests mere superficial entertainment at the expense of more serious subject matters (cf. *ibid.* 93; Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 16-17/52-55). As delineated above, however, Schnitzler's style cannot be brought in line with trivial entertainment matters only. The melodramatic touch which marks all of his writing (cf. Mengel 175) cannot be ignored and has led several critics to refer to his *oeuvre* as ‘decadent literature’ (cf. Macris 109). Ritzer even demonstrates “[wie] das ‘frech’ komische Spiel [...] in Schnitzlers Werkbiographie [...] eine Episode [bleibt]” (293), and how most of his plays do not end on a very happy note (*ibid.* 294). She further concludes: “‘Humoristisch’ in der genannten Intention ist dagegen nur eine sehr kleine Gruppe [von Schnitzlers Werken], ja vielleicht nur ein einziges Stück [i.e. *Professor Bernhardt*]” (*ibid.* 296).

⁶⁴ Cf. Baumann 31; Kammeyer 65; Ritzer 295; Vacha, “2”, 93; Scheible who specifies that Schnitzler uses this genre name for the first and last time in connection with *Das weite Land* (98).

⁶⁵ Anderman, *Europe*, 211, Scheible 57, and Yates 248 specify that it was originally intended to be a “Volksstück” or a “dialect folk play, a genre primarily intended for the less-educated sections of the theatergoing public” (Anderman, *Europe*, 211).

⁶⁶ Cf. also Vacha, “2”, 14.

In sharp contrast, both of Stoppard's adaptations must be labeled as comedies, or ironic farces, if not as travesties or parodies (cf. Mengel 116; 172). In an interview, Stoppard openly admits to subjecting the originals to irony, claiming that he "want[s] to marry the play of idea to farce. Now that may be like eating a steak tartare with chocolate sauce, but that's the way it comes out" (Wetzsteon 83). Fritz's melodramatic and impassioned speech – "Gewiß ist die lieb!... So lieb!" (Schnitzler, *L*, 12) – is leveled down to a half-hearted "She was rather sweet actually" (Stoppard, *D*, 12)⁶⁷. Likewise, the dramatic final scene which led Mengel to understand *Liebelei* as a tragedy, is turned on its head in Stoppard's version. Mengel rightly remarks that a girl shouting, "What? That I loved him? You shit-bucket, Theo. You fat, ugly lecherous, dirty-fingered God's gift to the female race, your breath stank of stale women when you kissed me, I was nearly *sick!*" (Stoppard, *D*, 70) "will not commit suicide" (Mengel 175).

II.3.1.5 Topics and Themes

Regarding the choice of topics and themes, Schnitzler is rumored to recycle his *sujets* (cf. Beniston 224; Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 136), with each of his plays exploring "the compulsiveness of Eros, its satisfaction, its delusions, its strange affinity to Thanatos" (Schneider 29)⁶⁸, thereby "bringing socially taboo subjects into the open" (*ibid.* 29). Indeed, most of his plays revolve around the intricacies of interpersonal or marital relationships, moral issues, betrayal, or infidelity – in other words – problem matters which Schnitzler attributes to the prevailing norms and conventions of *fin de siècle* Vienna (cf. Ametsbichler 201; Kammeyer 21; Lorenz 3; Macris 109; Thompson 105; Wisely 72). Not infrequently, Schnitzler takes issue with the strict corset of his time and age, discussing questions of mendacity, hypocrisy, and exposing the practice of dueling as a mindless undertaking (cf. Ametsbichler 189; Derré 357; Lorenz 3; Schlein 28; Wisely 72). In *Das weite Land*, he continuously uses the image of the 'tennis game' as a symbol for the way of living enjoyed by Vienna's *grand bourgeoisie* at his time (cf. Le Rider 120). "[T]he human psyche" (Ametsbichler 201) is another topic which has kept Schnitzler busy during his lifetime. His psychological interest again brings up the dichotomy of love and death. According to Stamon and Lawson, Schnitzler's "characters are [always] involved in some sort of love triangle, and then die, commit suicide, or are killed" (266). They also sense an "oedipal situation" (*ibid.* 268) in *Dalliance*,

⁶⁷ Cf. Schmid 74.

⁶⁸ Cf. also Daviau 162; Derré 329; Kammeyer 5-16; Stamon and Lawson 267.

understanding Fritz's relationship to the older, married lady as one between a child and his mother. In *Das weite Land*, the same can be said of Erna's relationship with Friedrich, where young Erna likewise intrudes into the 'father-mother' constellation of the married couple, Genia and Friedrich. In this context, Macris speaks of Schnitzler's focus being placed on "the subconscious, contradictory and even pathological components of man's amorous pursuits" (109).

Apart from being a writer of sentimental romances and flirtations, Schnitzler also juxtaposes "illusion and reality" (Ametsbichler 189)⁶⁹ and further discusses the fallacy of language (cf. Skreb 80) – issues which Lorenz classifies as being of interest also for later centuries (cf. Ametsbichler 189). Indeed, a certain affinity in this respect can be established between the Austrian author and Tom Stoppard, who frequently opposes reality and illusion and uses language as a means of misunderstanding. Ametsbichler goes on to claim that "the crisis of language is linked to the crisis of identity" (190), an aspect which has also inspired Stoppard in many ways. Hence, although Schnitzler's aim of highlighting the system's weaknesses and taboos cannot be brought in line with Stoppard's objective of provoking wild laughter and amusement, it is not at all surprising that Stoppard takes to Schnitzler's malleable plots, which he subsequently turns into his very personal stories (cf. Kleist xi; Lorenz 16).

II.3.2 An Analysis on the Micro-Level of Schnitzler's *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* in Comparison to Stoppard's *Dalliance* and *Undiscovered Country*

II.3.2.1 *Dialects and Linguistic Variation*

In view of the linguistic embedding of Schnitzler's original plays in a typically Viennese context, it is not surprising that dialectal variations play a pivotal role (cf. Mandana 59). The Viennese dialect at the turn of the 19th century marks a whole society which, as Keller puts it, is above all a culture of banter and talk: "[D]er[...] Lebensstil [der Charaktere in Schnitzlers Dramen ist] von der Konversation bestimmt [...]" (qtd. in Schmid 44). Schmid further specifies that Schnitzler's plays conform entirely to this linguistic code, and hence do not rely on stylized or invented 'theatrical speech' (8). This

⁶⁹ Cf. also Daviau 162; Wisely 72.

is however not to say that the language of Schnitzler's day and age is natural in itself. Rather, it follows very strict norms and conventions which provoke a certain "Unspontaneität und Angelernteheit der Ausdrucksweise" (Schmid 31)⁷⁰. As an example Schmid cites "Frau Wahl, über die es da heißt: 'Sie näselte ein wenig, spricht ein nicht ganz echtes Aristokratisch-Wienerisch' [WL,10]" as well as the latter's son "Gustl, in dessen Fall die Regieanweisungen lauten: 'spricht mit einer gewissen affektierten Schläfrigkeit' [WL, 80]" (31). The language of Schnitzler's contemporaries is hence to be understood as an 'illusory world of words' (cf. Keller 52-53), full of charm and "hintergründige[r] Beiläufigkeit" (*ibid.* 34), or, as Sabler puts it, as "kunstvolle[r] [...] Wiener Sprachduktus" ("Österreichische Identität", 85)⁷¹. Where Schnitzler's originals speak with a typically Viennese drawl, Stoppard employs a dialectally unmarked language:

ERNA. Schon als siebenjähriges
Mädel hab ich ihn geliebt.
(Schnitzler, WL, 12;
my emphasis)

CHRISTINE. [...] Der Vater hat
mich *ein bisschen* unterrichtet –
aber ich hab nicht viel Stimme.
Und weißt du, seit *die Tant'*
gestorben ist [...], da ist es
noch stiller bei uns wie es
früher war. (Schnitzler, L, 29;
my emphasis)

FRAU WAHL. *Na – sein S' so
gut!*

ROSENSTOCK. Oh bitte... Das
bezieht sich *selbstredend* nicht
auf *Fräulein Tochter*.
(Schnitzler, WL, 72;
my emphasis)

FRITZ. Fährt *denn* da je ein
Wagen vorbei? [...] Was sind
denn das für Bilder?

CHRISTINE. Geh!

FRITZ. *Ah*, die möcht ich mir
ansehn. (Schnitzler, L, 66; my
emphasis)

ERNA. I've loved him since I was seven
years old. (Stoppard, UC, 81)

CHRISTINE. [...] Father taught me a bit
but I haven't got much of a voice. And
there hasn't been a lot of singing in the
house since my auntie died.
(Stoppard, D, 25)

MRS WAHL. Look – would you please
mind!

ROSENSTOCK. Oh sorry, I need hardly
say that that does not apply to your
daughter. (Stoppard, UC, 129)

FRITZ. Do you get much traffic going by?
[...] What are those pictures?

CHRISTINE. No – don't!

FRITZ. But I'd like to see them.
(Stoppard, D, 52)

⁷⁰ Cf. also Skreb 80; Thompson who speaks of "marionettes, performing roles imposed upon them by social conventions and the requirements of good taste" (130).

⁷¹ In this context, Thompson appears to be the only one who describes Schnitzler's plays as being "generally presented in standard German, with just a tinge of Viennese accent and local colour" (183-184).

This juxtaposition also shows Schnitzler's predilection for short fillers – such as 'na', 'denn', 'da', and 'ah' – which do not carry any meaning whatsoever, but simply have the function of indicating the particularity of the Viennese dialect employed by the characters.

In *Das weite Land*, Schnitzler also introduces some regional Austrian dwellers apart from the Viennese character of the play, most notably the mountain guide Penn who speaks with a distinctive regional dialect as opposed to the nasalized way of proceeding, typical of the Viennese group of characters: "Freili. [...] Gnädig Frau, mir sein schon alle wieder da. Brav hat sich das gnädig Fräulein gehalten" (Schnitzler, *WL*, 78-79). Stoppard at first has Penn speak with a Scottish dialect, "Aye" (*UC*, 136), but immediately has him switch back to RP, "They're all back here with me, Mrs. The young lady managed splendidly" (*ibid.* 136). This very obviously changes the character of the original Penn, turning him into a derisory or ridiculous personage at best. While in the original version his thick dialectal coloration unmistakably relates him to the lower rungs of Austrian society at the time Schnitzler's play was written (cf. Schmid 44), he is turned into a hybrid character in Stoppard's play who is farcical, but inconsistent, and hence does not represent a specific social class in England.

The same holds true for the German characters introduced in Act Three of *Das weite Land*. They employ a very harsh, direct tone as opposed to the verbose, uncommitted chatter of their Austrian counterparts in Schnitzler's version. In contrast, the verbal virtuosity of the Viennese society is further accentuated. This adds up to the deep-rooted – often comradely playful – resentment between the Austrians and their bigger cousin, Germany. As Sabler points out, "[findet sich] [i]m dritten Akt der Tragikomödie [...] das Porträt des schlesischen Touristen Serknitz, einem idealtypischen Reichsdeutschen des leichten Genres, Objekt der Belustigung" ("Österreichische Identität", 86). Additionally, the two hikers of Act Three are clearly German which Schnitzler again expresses through their linguistic behavior, "Was machen ma nu? [...] Also, was sollen ma machen?" (*WL*, 68). In the English version, Stoppard again suggests a Scottish linguistic coloration, which, as with Penn above, proves inconsistent, as they only utter one line with a distinguishable Scottish dialect, "Nay, lad, that we aven't" (*UC*, 126) before they again assume the unmarked British standard language. What is more, Stoppard fails to make a distinction between the Tyrolian figure Penn and the German tourists, two cultural groups which in an Austrian environment will most likely appear at odds with each other.

As a bottom line, it can be stated that Schnitzler paints a portrait of an entire society, where different people belonging to various social classes express themselves in distinct ways (cf. Kammeyer 60; Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 276). In contrast to Schnitzler, who employs dialect as a means of characterization as well as of social and cultural affiliation (cf. Mandana 59/87; Schmid 8-11), Stoppard sees it as an exclusively comical device. Rather than creating consistent individuals, he has all of his *dramatis personae* speak approximately the same kind of language (cf. Mengel 117, Schmid 44). Instead of varying the linguistic features from one individual to another, Stoppard “takes a lively interest in the difference of register *within* one speaker” (Hunter, *Plays*, 106).

II.3.2.2 Language, Register, and Vocabulary

A more detailed contrastive analysis of the register and language use in the four plays reveals that Stoppard generally tends to employ a much more modern or contemporary language than Schnitzler. This again contrasts Stoppard’s texts with the archaic, highbrow vocabulary of Schnitzler’s *fin de siècle* Vienna. On the far highbrow end of the spectrum are Schnitzler’s expressions: “Auch neulich, wie wir mit den zwei herzigen Mäderln zusammen waren, bist du ja sehr nett gewesen” (*L*, 9), “Ich bin nämlich wie zerschlagen” (*ibid.* 46), or “Man darf doch einen jungen Menschen einer solchen Kleinigkeit wegen nicht in den Tod treiben” (*WL*, 122) which Stoppard renders in more or less colloquial English: “Even since then when we went out with those two popsies you were good fun” (*D*, 9), “Actually I’m dead beat” (*ibid.* 38), and “One mustn’t drive a young chap to blow his brains out over a trifle like one’s virtue” (*UC*, 175). Accordingly, it is not surprising that Stoppard has Weiring and his daughter Christine trade insults, such as “Don’t be stupid” (*D*, 66) and “Listen, damn you!” (*ibid.* 66), where Schnitzler’s Weiring continues to protect Christine as best he can (cf. Mengel 177). By the same token, “Christine resorts twice to the curse “Damn you, Theo” [...] [(*D*, 68/70)], an expression Schnitzler’s Christine would never use” (Mengel 177), and the Tenor of Act Three curses his tunic – which apparently is far too tight for him – as “this bloody thing” (*D*, 64). Stoppard thereby bestows a funny atmosphere on Schnitzler’s original play (cf. Mengel 178).

The use of French expressions in both of Stoppard’s plays figures in contrast to the otherwise sharp and trendy vocabulary employed on the part of the British author. This strategy helps bridge the gap between the original and Stoppard’s characters at least

partially “[da] ein weiteres Merkmal des Österreichischen dieser Zeit [i.e. the turn of the 19th century] in bestimmten gesellschaftlichen Kreisen [...] die Verwendung französischer Ausdrücke [ist], [...] um de[ren] ‘gehobene’ Ausdrucksweise zu demonstrieren” (Zojer 126).

II.3.2.3 Syntax, Punctuation, and Recurrence

Schnitzler makes use of syntactic devices in order to further characterize Vienna’s society. He frequently employs repetition as well as syntactic distortion, in which a clause constituent is deferred and placed at the end of a sentence. The unmarked sentence structure: “Ich habe nämlich das scharlachrote Automobil draußen stehen gesehen” is turned into a syntactically marked one, namely “Ich habe nämlich das Automobil draußen stehen gesehen, das scharlachrote” (Schnitzler, *WL*, 41). This is even more important as “das scharlachrote” conveys the main information of the sentence. By doing so, the characters appear as shirkers who avoid committing themselves and hence relegate the vital information to the very end of their utterances. This characteristic is also mentioned by Mengel who notes that “[t]he relevant information [...] is given fairly late in the course of the[...] conversation” (115).

Once more, Stoppard does not integrate this stylistic device in his version, adhering to unmarked sentence structures as in “I saw the scarlet motor car outside” (*UC*, 103-104). Hence, again, Stoppard’s characters miss the typically Viennese evasive dimension of Schnitzler’s originals. When Schnitzler has his characters repeat their words as in “Und später... später um noch weniger” (*WL*, 57), he additionally stresses their reluctance of getting to the point. Stoppard omits this recurrence⁷² – “Later on... for even less” (*UC*, 117); in his plays, repetition generally has another purpose, namely to inject humor and pun-like wit (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 88), as in “ever and ever makes me ever so nervous” (*D*, 20), or as with the slightly varied repetition, “in the plate cupboard” (*ibid.* 21), “in the condiment cupboard” (*ibid.* 23), “In the corkscrew drawer” (*ibid.* 24), and “the cigar cupboard” (*ibid.* 37), which has Fritz appear as a ridiculously pedantic character (cf. Mengel 169; Schmid 76).

⁷² Hatim and Mason describe the repetition of items as recurrence which “is usually a symptom of intentionality (whether conscious or not) and as such is significant” (199).

Shifts in punctuation can also seriously alter the character of a play (cf. Schultze 74). According to Thompson,

Schnitzler's frequent use of dashes and dotted lines is a feature of his dramatic style, and provides a visual indication of the importance which he attaches to the significant pauses in conversation, with their half-spoken messages and suggestions of undisclosed emotions. They are also illustrative of the tact and discretion with which he normally treats sexual feelings and behaviour. (184)

When Stoppard hence omits the three dots '[...]', currently used in Schnitzler's version in order to delay the conversation, he automatically quickens the tempo, thereby sharpening the conversational tone of his plays.

II.3.2.4 Course of Conversation⁷³ and Forms of Address

This characteristic is further intensified by a number of additional alterations introduced on the part of the British playwright. As mentioned before, the conversational style typical of Schnitzler's "madhouse of hypocrisy" (Schlein 32) is characterized by an uncommitted aloofness on the part of the "sophisticated, shallow" characters (*ibid.* 32). This nasal, chanting Viennese way of proceeding is initiated through exuberant addresses of politeness and courtesy, coupled with aloof small talk. The shallow chitchat is then sustained over almost the entire conversation, at times punctuated by occasional serious talk emerging from the unconscious, which is however quickly re-suffocated by a more conversational style (cf. Schmid 45). In this sense, "[sind d]ie auf der Bühne vonstatten gehenden Gespräche [...] nur der Schleier über den Geheimnissen, die von einem jeden sorgsam gehütet werden" (Le Rider 32)⁷⁴. The characters natter "ohne daß jemals etwas Explizites geäußert wird" (*ibid.* 32). Weigel accurately speaks of conversations "[wo] wenig gesagt und viel zerredet [wird]" (qtd. in Deutsch-Schreiner 65); Baumann observes "[e]ine Welt der Täuschungen und Selbsttäuschungen" in which "[d]ie Menschen trennt, was sie scheinbar vereint, und sie vereinigt, was sie einander verschweigen" (14). In other words, Schnitzler's characters "'talk past' each other: 'sie reden aneinander vorbei'" (Ametsbichler 189)⁷⁵.

⁷³ This refers to what Lüsebrink terms "Gesprächsorganisation" which he further defines as "Formen der Organisation von Konversationen [...] [die] von den Konventionen der Begrüßungsformeln und der Gesprächsbeendigungspassagen über den Regelapparat von Redezügen bis hin zur Länge von Redepausen, zu den Konventionen zur Behebung kommunikativer Störungen [...] und zum kulturgebundenen Zeitmanagement von Gesprächen und Gesprächssequenzen [reichen]" (51).

⁷⁴ Cf. also Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 228.

⁷⁵ Cf. also Keller 90; Mengel 111; Thompson 109.

Starting with the resounding, almost exaggerated friendliness that characterizes the salutatory phrases employed by Schnitzler's individuals (cf. *Le Rider* 32), its total absence can immediately be felt in Stoppard's plays. Viennese standard forms of address such as "Küss die Hand, gnädige Frau", "Grüß Sie Gott" (Schnitzler, *WL*, 11), "Habe die Ehre" (*ibid.* 68) or the plain "Servus" (*ibid.* 112) are leveled down to mediocre English expressions, such as "Good evening, madam" (or even "ma'am" at certain points of the play) (Stoppard, *UC*, 86), "Bless you" (*ibid.* 80), "Your humble servant" (*ibid.* 125), and "I'm glad to see you" (*ibid.* 165) respectively, the result being that the Viennese style of Schnitzler's play is derogated anew. By the same token, the overly affectionate sobriquets employed by Schnitzler's male characters ("du Kind" (*L*, 16), "Schatz" (*ibid.* 13), "Du Katz" (*ibid.* 27), "Naschkatz" (*ibid.* 15), "Engerl" (*ibid.* 20)...) – which admittedly add to their patriarchal attitude (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 211) – are all but unmarked in the English versions. As a result, Stoppard's characters, who refuse to pay compliments and to assert "[dass] man den anderen lieb hat" (Schmid 46/49), break the linguistic conventional norms of *fin de siècle* Vienna.

In this context, the relevance of the 'telling names'⁷⁶ employed by Schnitzler should equally be briefly commented on. The German term 'Natter' literally denotes a nonvenomous snake – a colubrid in English – and thereby mirrors the snakelike behavior of both Mr. and Adele Natter. Perfectly integrated in the dishonest Viennese upper society, they proceed without committing themselves (cf. *Le Rider* 228). On the other hand, Dr. Mauer – literally denoting a wall – appears to be "nüchtern, uninteressant im besten Sinne des Worts. Man denkt bei der Nennung [seines] Namen[s] [...] [an] ein gediegenes Grau [und] Farblosigkeit" (Vacha, "1", xxvi). Stoppard retains the German denominations which, as a consequence, do not carry any connotation whatsoever for the British spectator. On the other hand, some German names are slightly altered in the British translations. Schnitzler places 'Herr' or 'Frau' in front of the characters' last names in very rare occasions only. Stoppard, however, frequently inserts the English titles 'Mr' or 'Mrs', at some points even holding on to their German counterparts.

The T/V structure which is characteristic of the German language can again not be rendered satisfactorily in the English language system. As a consequence, the social act of "Bruderschaft [trinken]" (Schnitzler, *L*, 16/32) is all but unknown to the British audience.

⁷⁶ For a more detailed discussion of this translation issue, cf. Levý who suggests to translate 'Natter' as 'Snake' (88 ff.); cf. also Kelletat.

When Theodor furthermore addresses Christine variably with ‘Sie’ and ‘du’, the Austrian spectator senses an inconsistency on the part of the male character which Mandana explains as follows: “[O]ft wird das freundschaftliche, fast vertraut klingende Du vor dem Geschlechtsakt durch ein distanzierteres Sie nach der sexuellen Befriedigung eingesetzt” (106). Hence the pretended friendliness must again be understood as a mere means to an end. Again, this aspect cannot be made explicit in the English language (cf. Schmid 77), just as another connotation is lost when Stoppard renders “ich hab dich lieb” (Schnitzler, *L*, 23) as “I love you” (Stoppard, *D*, 20).

Concerning the main course of conversation *per se*, Stoppard’s *dramatis personae* are characterized by a completely artless straightforwardness. Accordingly, Schnitzler’s conversational structure is again turned on its head. Where Stoppard’s characters can openly discuss issues and do not shirk back from carrying out a fight – as the last act of *Dalliance* perfectly illustrates – Schnitzler exposes his personae as being incapable of addressing, and by extension, also of solving the problems which they face. Inversely, however, Stoppard’s society misses the elegance and delicacy conveyed by Schnitzler’s texts and hence appears as coarse or even ill-bred and uneducated (cf. Mengel 169). However, it must be noted that Schnitzler’s personae are, for their part, equally unable to display continuous eloquence. When it comes to addressing more serious matters, their dialog suddenly loses momentum and stammering, corrections, and problems of articulation are not infrequent as a result (cf. Schmid 35). This shows “[dass ihre] bezaubernde Leichtigkeit [lediglich] das Unheimliche und Abgründige überspielt” (Baumann 38). Stoppard’s characters, on the other hand, do not vary their way of expressing themselves in these situations.

Another element which typically characterizes the conversational style of Schnitzler’s plays is the personal implication that the *dramatis personae* hold on to (cf. Mengel 176; Schmid 45). On the surface level of the conversation, they appear as overly friendly and courteous characters, who address their opponent personally instead of employing impersonal, detached statements (cf. Schmid 45). Again, Stoppard does not make use of this stylistic device which has the effect that his characters emerge as rather raw and uncouth compared to Schnitzler’s genteel society (cf. Mengel 177). The following passages illustrate this explicitly:

FRAU WAHL. Sie haben schon recht gehabt, daß *Sie* lieber zu Hause geblieben sind. (Schnitzler, *WL*, 11; my emphasis)

THEODOR. [...] *Schau, Fritz*, wenn du eines Tages “jenes Weib” nicht mehr anbetest [...]. (Schnitzler, *L*, 9; my emphasis)

MRS WAHL. You did quite right to stay at home. (Stoppard, *UC*, 80)

THEODORE. [...] Honestly, if you could get out of her spell [...]. (Stoppard, *D*, 10)

II.3.2.5 Cultural References or Culturemes

Cultural references which are firmly anchored in the Austrian linguistic repertoire include expressions such as “[das] Imperial” (Schnitzler, *WL*, 14), or the “Kaffeehaus” (Schnitzler, *L*, 69)⁷⁷, the former denoting one of Vienna’s *chicest* and most expensive hotels, the latter constituting a typically ‘Viennese institution’. When Stoppard speaks of “the Imperial *Hotel*” (Stoppard, *UC*, 83; my emphasis), the British audience learns to approximately classify the term, but is still left in the dark as to the gilded luxury of the five-star hotel. The image of the ‘Kaffeehaus’ is altogether omitted in Stoppard’s version. Apart from these two cultural references, the most famous ‘cultureme’ which runs like a red thread through Schnitzler’s plays is the *süßes Mädel*, “a character type that was made popular by the Austrian playwright and actor Johann Nestroy around the middle of the 19th century” (Mengel 173-174). Living on the outskirts of the city, this personage is clearly opposed to the *crème de la crème* of the inner city. As such, she figures as the gentlemen’s plaything with the latter using and disposing of her at will (cf. *ibid.* 174)⁷⁸. Most naturally, Stoppard has a hard time incorporating this social character on the British stage. His women refuse to be treated as mere toys; rather, they can be described as emancipated and independent characters that have a mind on their own and do not hesitate to contradict their male companions (cf. *ibid.* 174). It is hence not surprising that Stoppard’s Christine turns to four-letter words every now and then and that Genia takes on a much more snappish and sarcastic tone, as in “Spare the celebration. I said I might” (Stoppard, *UC*, 108), and “Why? Did they dig up a light bulb?” (*ibid.* 93)⁷⁹.

⁷⁷ For a more detailed discussion, cf. Keller.

⁷⁸ Cf. also Gay 65; Le Rider 113; Mandana 83; Sabler, “Österreichische Identität”, 90; Thompson 60.

⁷⁹ Cf. also Schmid 84.

To take stock, it should have been sufficiently proven that Stoppard's *Dalliance* and *Undiscovered Country* cannot be understood as *equivalent* representations of Schnitzler's *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land*, respectively. Whereas other contrastive analyses frequently end on this note, attributing the translation shifts described above to the translator's incapacity, this study sets out to illustrate the reasons *why* these modifications have occurred by referring to both socio-cultural and theatrical norms, as well as to the webs of power which permeate the translation process.

II.4 From Austria to Terranglia: Socio-Cultural Factors Governing the Translation Process

II.4.1 Different Signifying or Code Systems⁸⁰

As socially and culturally conditioned beings, both Arthur Schnitzler and Tom Stoppard are, of course, highly influenced by their respective socio-cultural environments (cf. Honegger). Despite what could be termed their *hybrid* family background – Schnitzler is influenced by the Jewish culture at least to a certain extent, while Stoppard is born in Czechoslovakia – both authors have their feet firmly grounded in the Austrian and the British culture respectively. In the light of the theoretical findings of this study, their texts must hence be understood as products of these socio-cultural settings. In a next step, it is indispensable to shed light on the divergent signifying systems of these two cultural environments, both from a temporal, as well as from a national perspective. In other words, the fact that both authors live and work in a different time and place will have to be accounted for, diachronically and synchronically (cf. Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 80; Kupsch-Losereit 2; Spencer 380; Spillner 111; Werner 90/131). This will, in turn, help provide a plausible explanation of why Stoppard's English versions diverge considerably from Schnitzler's original storylines.

Austria's dialectal landscape is rich and complex at the same time. In the context of Schnitzler's plays, we have to distinguish between dialectal and sociolectal variation (cf. Levý 101; Moser 254); additionally, as linguistic variation is subject to constant change,

⁸⁰ In this regard, Stolze speaks of “[s]prachenpaarspezifische Übersetzungsprobleme” (195).

the fact that Schnitzler's texts employ an archaic language must be taken into account⁸¹. As Scholz and Ohff explain, dialectally marked speech is always employed to serve a very specific purpose (qtd. in Moser 255). Clearly, the purpose varies from nation to nation as dialectal landscapes of various countries are hardly ever, if at all, congruent (cf. Hatim and Mason 41). Of course this complicates the translation of works which "require the use of dialects or less elevated forms of standard language" (Anderman, "A l'anglaise", 283)⁸². Pym even goes as far as to claim that the Viennese dialect of Schnitzler's plays is untranslatable, and if translated, loses at least some of the connotations it originally bears (qtd. in Zojer 71-73). Schmid's suggestion of translating Schnitzler's dialect with any British dialect – e.g. Cockney – is hence highly delusive. As the Cockney dialect does not in the least have the same social and cultural connotation as Schnitzler's highbrow Viennese variation, the effect would be misleading and inappropriate (cf. Hatim and Mason 40; Slobodnik 142).

According to Stolze, problems arise if syntactically marked constructions are to be translated from German into English. The German syntax is – due to case markers – much more flexible than the English structure (110) and also relies on "unterschiedliche Fokussierungsstrukturen" (224). Grammatically distorted constructions which are frequent in Schnitzler's plays are hence less common in the English versions. This may be due to the fact that Stoppard does not realize the emotional potential of the German syntactic structures since emotionality is not rendered in the same way in English (cf. *ibid.* 110/129-130).

A closer look at the salutatory addresses typical of *fin de siècle* Vienna shows that their modern English counterparts are more down-to-earth and hence do not convey the same amount of emotionality. As a result, the English versions fail to live up to the light "Tonfall des Geplauders" of the German originals (Schmid 47)⁸³. However, as Mandana rightly claims, a literal translation of the German expressions would not conform to the conventions of the English home system. It is indeed uncommon to employ expressions such as 'I kiss your hand' in English (102).

⁸¹ Cf. Hatim and Mason who distinguish geographical, temporal, social, (non)-standard, and ideolectal language variation, the latter of which is not of great importance in Schnitzler's plays (39).

⁸² Cf. also Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting*, 57.

⁸³ Cf. also Mandana 90.

Levý further explains that in German plays, characters are only referred to as ‘Herr...’ or ‘Frau...’ if they are to be mocked or caricatured (95; Matter-Seibel 116). Instead, titles, such as “Herr Professor, Herr Direktor” are frequently employed – an aspect which shall be discussed in more detail below. In this light, the fact that Stoppard employs ‘Mr’ or ‘Mrs’ on a much more frequent basis than Schnitzler does must not be interpreted as a translation mistake on the part of the English author, but can be explained by the socio-cultural systems and conventions which govern the transfer process.

As has already been made apparent, the T/V structure cannot be rendered in the English language – an aspect which can first and foremost be explained by the divergent linguistic systems of both languages (cf. Hatim and Mason 28; Huntemann 82/91; Levý 151; Matter-Seibel 116; Schmid 69). It is hence not the fault of the translator if he or she fails to introduce this aspect into the home system, as it simply does not exist in the latter. Shand who translates Schnitzler’s *Liebelei* as *Playing with Love* (1914) tries to prove the opposite by “dogmatically transl[ate] the play line for line [...] particularly with regard to the informal and polite forms of address in German, which are difficult to render in English” (Bartholomew and Krebs 1243). Subsequent critique does however not praise him for ‘having been faithful to the original’, but literally tears his text to shreds. It is described as “irritating [...] absurd [...] stilted and lacking in sophistication” (*ibid.* 1243).

As pointed out above, Schnitzler cares a great deal about his characters’ social standing – a technique which is employed by all Austrian playwrights at the turn of the 19th century (cf. Honegger 22). Some of his personae hence do not carry individual names, but are merely characterized by the roles which society has assigned to them (cf. Schmid 56). David Hare, who translates Schnitzler’s *Reigen* into the English language, does not establish a connection between the characters’ social background and their linguistic behavior, just as Stoppard does not make use of dialectal features to socially mark his personae (cf. Schmid 67/88). As Lüsebrink points out, Austria and Germany hold on to a comparatively high “Machtdistanz- und Maskulinitätsindex” (56). This entails that people of these countries frequently use titles (professional positions, PhD titles, etc.) when addressing one other, whereas in the Anglophone world people stick to the other person’s first name, and do not use academic titles or refer to the person’s social background (cf. *ibid.* 56). This can additionally be explained by the fact “[dass] [i]n leistungsorientierten Kulturen wie [z.B.] [...] Großbritannien [...] soziale Herkunft und Titel (akademische

Titel beispielsweise) eine eher untergeordnete Rolle [spielen], im Gegensatz zu den deutlich *herkunftsorientierten Kulturen* [wie z.B.] Österreich” (*ibid.* 27). This clearly explains why Schnitzler attaches so much importance to the social provenance of his *dramatis personae*, whereas Tom Stoppard does not focus on societal constellations in his plays.

Most naturally, elements which are firmly anchored in the Austrian culture and which are not at all known to the British spectator, will cause shifts and deviations when being transposed into the other culture. Thompson points out that “[w]hen Fritz looks out of Christine’s window towards the Kahlenberg, he does not describe what he sees. Clearly Schnitzler did not need to add such details for his Viennese readers” (180). As a result, “he evokes, rather than describes the atmosphere of his native city” (*ibid.* 181). On the contrary, for the British audience, the word “Kahlenberg” (Stoppard, *D*, 50) remains an empty shell, as the linguistic signifier does not form part of their code system (cf. Matter-Seibel 134).

II.4.2 Different Theatrical Norms and Conventions⁸⁴

Apart from the diverging socio-cultural code systems in both countries, theatrical norms and conventions also vary considerably among the various nation states. As Ametsbichler points out, “[a] brief overview of the reception of *Professor Bernhardt* (1912) [...] offers a case study of how context, historical events, and reception do indeed shape audience understanding of a work” (198). By the same token, Mengel specifies the important role played by “the traditional and/or predominant theater trends of [the] [...] time and the literary tradition in which an adaptation has been placed” (106). As a result, shifts in the dramatic repertoire and the norms governing the performance process are inevitably going to influence the dramatic texts to be staged (cf. *ibid.* 11/14/106; Berman 296; Lambert qtd. in Kohlmayer 147; Scherer qtd. in Konstantinovic 276; Thurnher 271). Furthermore, each dramatic performance will automatically refer back to all other plays written and staged in the respective culture – it is hence at all times intertextually determined (cf. Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 36). Wisely notes that “[e]ach community, risking being called ‘reductive’ or ‘superficial’ by some other community, successfully writes the text or texts demanded by its own interpretive strategy” (14).

⁸⁴ In this context, Stolze speaks of “[k]ulturpaarspezifische Übersetzungsprobleme” (195).

To begin with, long-winded plays are not common on the British stage (cf. Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 125). Indeed, the tone of the German plays is often sensed as being “too long-winded, stilted, or rhetorical” by many English translators, “so that cutting and pruning become unavoidable” (Mengel 15). In other words, German plays – other than their English counterparts – tend to “circumvent[...] rather than aim[...] at the point” (Honegger 23). This is not surprising as “the German language is known for its extremely long compound nouns” (“German language”) as well as its tendency of ‘accommodating’ elongated and inflated dialog structures – which are often perceived as tedious and dull by audiences across the British empire. As a result,

[a]nyone translating a play [...] from German [into English] has to wrestle with this problem. The phrases in which emotions, particularly in scenes of love and death, are expressed in th[is] language[...] seem impossibly, even reprehensibly, florid to the English speaker. They have to be toned down. If not, the translator runs the risk of producing a text that is laughably stilted in English. (Wellwarth qtd. in Mengel 16)

This can be explained by the fact that the British audiences “expect a play to run for roughly two and a half hours, with an interval of an additional half an hour” (Bassnett, “Still Trapped”, 106). German audiences, on the other hand, do not shy away from much longer plays (*ibid.* 106). It is hence perfectly understandable that “Stoppard [...] felt that Schnitzler’s dialogue was moving too slowly, and that he had to speed it up to retain the audience’s attention” (Mengel 112). Schnitzler’s characters – as representatives of an important Austrian societal trend – are not interpreted as such by the British spectator. Rather, their lengthy, unspectacular talks would run counter to the English tradition of engaging and suspense-laden tales which are primarily marked by stichomythia and fast-moving verbal battles. The psychological profundity, as well as the sentimentality which inversely characterizes Austrian literature⁸⁵, is not as commonly employed by British playwrights, as “allusions to political and social events [...] are likely to cause nothing but consternation in translation into English” (Anderman, *Europe*, 20). Thus, momentary action and suspense – Mengel speaks of “paradigmatic comic action” as opposed to the syntagmatic sophistication of Schnitzler’s plays (17/119) – is what the British spectators demand, and Stoppard does not hesitate to give it to them. If Stoppard’s characters are hence more direct than their Austrian counterparts, this can be explained by the fact that the English theater has historically preferred directness over continuous digression (cf.

⁸⁵ Cf. Grillparzer who mentions “Bescheidenheit, gesunde[n] Menschenverstand und wahres Gefühl” as those characteristics which set the Austrian authors apart from other nations (qtd. in Konstantinovic 278).

Lüsebrink 53), which is *inter alia* proved by Pinter's exchange of "knappster, stakkatohafter Dialogzeilen" (Stoll 247).

What is more, the British theater looks back on a rich tradition of burlesque and ludicrous stage comedy. Strong lines, quick repartee and witty conversations have been prominent in English stage productions from Shakespeare onward (cf. Mengel 15/168). The Restoration rake as well as Oscar Wilde's dandy continue in the same vein (cf. Mitchell 83), employing "[u]nermüdliche[n], oft epigrammatische[n] Witz" (Barth 25), further turning to "satiric jabs" (*ibid.* 37). Other world-famous exponents of the British comedy include Shaw, Eliot, and Pinter, who all impress with "pointierte[m] Witz" and "schlagfertige[n] Antworten nach Art der *Comedy of Manners*" (*ibid.* 72). All of these authors frequently turn to stylized, jocular, as well as to satirical and ironical innuendos in order to appeal to an intellectual spectatorship (cf. *ibid.* 10). By the time that Tom Stoppard ascends to the British stages, the genre of the "*social comedy/society comedy*" – which continues the tradition of the *comedy of manners* – is already firmly established in the British theater scene (*ibid.* 9). His plays are proof enough "[dass] der klassizistische Anspruch auf 'delight', der besonders in der Restorationsepoche galt, bis heute in [...] sprachgewandter, witziger Satire fortbesteht" (*ibid.* 129). When Stoppard hence adds "new material for comedy's sake" (Mengel 117), including puns and verbal wit, to Schnitzler's melodramatic originals, this can most obviously be explained by the fact that British theatre productions rely more on humor and wit than Austrian plays do (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 19-20/330-332; Mengel 17). As Anderman points out, "the local humour of the original Viennese text has been replaced by the verbal wit more customarily found on the English stage" (*Europe*, 332). This trend is mirrored in Gussow's review which praises Stoppard's adaptation of *Das weite Land* as "witty, acerbic and rueful" ("Schnitzlerland", 4).

In the light of what has been said so far, it is obvious that the British theater is more open toward scenes which stimulate laughter, and, by extension, also more tolerant regarding curse words and other taboo expressions. As Mengel specifies, "sexual innuendo, or *double entendre*" are firmly anchored in the British dramatic tradition (15). This is evidenced by the fact that Stoppard is not the only one to inject these terms into original German plays. In translating *Reigen*, Hare relies on a similar strategy. Apart from labeling their companions as "bloody heathen[s]", his characters also do not shrink away from

openly cursing their opponents, as in “Fuck Fritz. Oh fuck, fuck Fritz” or “You’re so fucking shallow, do you know that?” (Hare qtd. in Schmid 66). Similarly, Shaw’s play *You never can tell* pictures the English as those who “*don’t bother much about dress and manners [...] because, as a nation, [...] [they] don’t dress well and [...] [have] no manners*” (qtd. in Barth 45). Pinter’s texts, for their part, do not infrequently feature pun-like curses either (cf. Stoll 249), and although it might take some by surprise, even Shakespeare did not shy away from introducing four-letter words in his dialogs (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 99). If Stoppard hence chooses to employ more daring language than Schnitzler, this is not surprising “[da d]ie Thematisierung bzw. Nicht-Thematisierung von Gesprächsthemen [...] zugleich auch auf kulturbedingte Tabuzonen [verweist]” (Lüsebrink 51).

In this context, the following example shall prove that the same set of signifiers does not automatically have to encode exactly the same things, as Snell-Hornby suggests when labeling the English language as ‘McLanguage’. In other words, groups sharing the same language do not necessarily interpret the world in precisely the same way. As has been shown, British audiences appreciate witty, sarcastic, and sexually explicit repartees on stage. In contrast, Schnitzler’s risqué play *Reigen* “could not be given in New York” (Eysoldt qtd. in Schneider 50). As a matter of fact, “from an American viewpoint”, staging this play “is absolutely impossible. It would not even be decent for an American reviewer to try to tell the story” (Shepherd qtd. in Schneider 50). The immediate juxtaposition of these two apparently linguistically congruent countries shows that language is not everything. Rather, what matters is the socio-cultural and political apparatus which lies behind.

II.4.3 Historical Considerations: Contrasting *Fin de Siècle* Vienna and London

It is not without reason that Schnitzler’s characters - strolling leisurely through the streets of Vienna - speak with stilted aloofness and distinguished delicacy, while harboring a snake pit of psychologically unconscious intrigues and infidelities. They perfectly reflect the social world in which the Austrian author lives and works (Thompson, v). “Meine Werke sind lauter Diagnosen”, claims Schnitzler himself (qtd. in Schmid 56). Indeed, literature at all times reflects the society in which it emerges. In order to understand the theatrical conventions delineated above, it is hence of importance to study the societal

trends which mark both Austria and Britain from Schnitzler's time onward in more detail. Such an analysis will, in turn, account for the Austrians' predilection for lofty, inflated chit-chat with a certain psychological depth, as well as for the witty and comic repartees to which the British theater keeps holding on.

Despite the relative proximity of the British and the Austrian culture, it would be erroneous to assume that both cultures can be put on the same footing. A journey back into *fin de siècle* Vienna and London shall highlight some of the differences which exist between these two cultural environments. To begin with, the feeling of *malaise* that can be felt in both Britain and France at the turn of the century is much different from the Viennese decadence which is often described as a curious mixture of tragedy and detached levity (cf. Mennemeier 17). This *lightness of being* – Keller speaks of the “walzerhaft-leichtsinnige[n] Metropole des Scheins” (10) and “sinnlich-ästhetische[r] [...] Genußkultur” (32) – turns Vienna into a city which is highly “tolerant of sexual license, provided [...] one never openly discusses the topic” (Schneider 29). Infidelity, dishonesty, and playful amusement flourish in Vienna more than elsewhere and soon conjure up “the myth of gay Vienna, singing and dancing” (Thompson 11); at the same time, official moral standards retouch the dark, troubled conscience of its dwellers (cf. Derré 474; Ritzer 290; Thompson 2/130). For Baumann, Vienna's society holds on to a peculiar form of “Augenblicksgenuß” which includes unsteady and illusory relationships in order to escape the emptiness which surrounds them (5). According to Sabler, Schnitzler's drama is embedded in this peculiar Viennese misery characterized by a society that views life as something categorically accidental, instead of something to take active part in (cf. *Österreichische Identität*, 91; Keller 30/41; Scheible 7). This can be explained by Vienna's proportionally conservative attitude which even literary circles of the time cannot fully eschew. In an article that attempts to dethrone Vienna as “the birthplace of the modern world” (665), Beller describes the city situated at the heart of Europe as the smaller, conservative, at times even backwards brother of Paris or Moscow, marked by a “culture much more connected to the past. Instead of being 'independent' of the Establishment, of tradition, artists in Vienna 'seceded', that is to say, felt themselves still in relation to the past” (*ibid.* 668)⁸⁶. In the same vein, Sabler sees Vienna's institutional framework as much more rigid than that of the French and German capitals (*Écriture Dramatique*, 92). In this regard, “the loyalty of Vienna's bourgeoisie to the Kaiser” (qtd.

⁸⁶ Cf. also Keller 36/ 43-44; Vacha, “1”, ix.

in Gay 30) must be specified. Contrary to the situation in Great Britain, Vienna's *bourgeoisie* is enfeebled and remains largely attached to the country's aristocratic caste (cf. Gay 20; Keller 24/27/31/43). This in turn adds to the survival of "repräsentativer Formen von Öffentlichkeit, wie sie sich im Mittelalter und der Renaissance, vor allem aber im Barock herausgebildet haben" (Keller 31).

That this blending of detached levity and conservative solidarity cannot be felt to the same extent in London, is best explained by turning to Schnitzler's own experience:

Wir kamen bei London Bridge an. Das läßt sich nun gar nicht schildern. Es ist großartig und ekelhaft. Der Verkehr auf der Londoner Brücke ist bekanntlich (ich weiß es seit zwei Stunden) der colossalste, der existiert. Ununterbrochen wird man überfahren, überholt, zertreten. [...] [D]ie Menschen hasten davon mit Cylinder, Tabakspfeife, Zeitung und gloves in der Hand. Weit und breit kein weibliches Wesen, außer letzte Classe. Die Kaufläden unschön, nirgends ein wirkliches Wohnhaus; Geschäfte bis in den zweiten, dritten Stock [...] Paris ist der Traum, London das Erwachen. (qtd. in Brinson and Malet 73-74)

The Viennese act of "leisurely 'Bummeln'" (*ibid.* 75) is immediately destroyed. As a mere observer, Schnitzler sees the busy and hectic life of London zip past him. "Man eilt und flieht immer; hier gibt es keine Ruhe, keinen Stillstand" (Schnitzler qtd. in Keller 85). Schnitzler misses the long, aimless walks of his fellow citizens, and clearly experiences London as marked by "a less relaxed mode of enjoyment than that to which he is accustomed" (Brinson and Malet 75). This can be explained by the work ethics of the Victorian bourgeois which emerge in England at that time and which clearly oppose the Viennese *dolce far niente* attitude (cf. Gay 192). If Thompson hence claims that Schnitzler's Vienna is not unique in itself and that his concept of the *süßes Mädchen* can be extended to Berlin and London (89), he apparently fails to take these aspects into account.

Against this background, the fast and witty style of the British plays as opposed to the lengthy Austrian dialogs no longer appears as a pure coincidence. Rather, it is obvious that England's revolutionary context must generate different texts than that of conservative Vienna. At first sight, the peculiar blending of comic and tragic elements (cf. Mengel; Sabler, *Österreichische Identität*, 86) which typically characterizes Schnitzler's dramatic style seems to find its British counterpart in Oscar Wilde, who himself is often described as *the* dramatist of British *fin de siècle* comedy (cf. Small 97). It is hence not surprising that Wilde's plays, seen as a "juxtaposition of the comic and the serious" (*ibid.*

109) seemingly constitute the perfect pendant for Schnitzler's tragicomical atmosphere. Affinities can also be detected between Schnitzler and George Bernard Shaw. It must however be mentioned that Shaw's plays are characterized by much sharper social criticism (cf. Barth 38-41; Mayer 167-168) and that Wilde holds a much more revolutionary view regarding the rights of women and the free choice of one's sexual orientation than Schnitzler does. Wilde's homosexuality has him meet with great resistance; consequently, he is frequently shunned as a 'social outcast'. As a result, he clearly opposes the conservative British leadership, declaring himself an Anarchist, with strong connections to the revolutionary literary movements of *fin de siècle* Paris (cf. Eltis 15-17; Mitchell 84-87). Shaw, for his part, does not focus on the tragic element as much as Schnitzler does. In line with the British tradition of *social comedy*, he delights his audiences, "solange nicht ernste Dinge behandelt werden" (Mayer 166). He, too, affiliates himself with socialist circles (Barth 39), and favors fringe theaters over main dramatic venues – an aspect which clearly sets him apart from Schnitzler's attitude (cf. *ibid.* 43; Butzko 13).

While other "radical stylistic innovators" (Lorenz 21) demonstrate against a rigid system in desperate need of overhaul, joining socialist-marxist circles (*ibid.* 7)⁸⁷, Schnitzler avoids any kind of communist, socialist⁸⁸ or revolutionary spirit (cf. *ibid.* 12). A closer look at Schnitzler's life indeed shows that Schnitzler's etiquette is not so much different from that of the upper class society which he so openly denounces in his plays. "[B]orn in Vienna's Second District, then a fashionable part of the city" (*ibid.* 1), he "graduat[es] in 1879 from the renowned Vienna *Akademie-gymnasium*" (*ibid.* 2) and generally continues in this elitist vein when he enrolls at the University of Vienna to study medicine (cf. Gay xxii/3; Loentz 81; Vacha, "1", 4). His relative affluence further allows him "[r]egular visits to coffee-houses, theaters, and dance-halls, [...] dinners at hotels and restaurants, [and] trips to the nearby mountain resorts and across Europe" (Lorenz 10). In this light, his topics must be understood as being at least partially autobiographically motivated and can hence not be interpreted as mere 'critique from the outside' (cf. *ibid.* 13; Butzko 12; Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 247). Being integrally affected by the mentality of the bourgeoisie or the upper-middle class society (cf. Beniston 218; Daviau, "Ophuls", 330; Gay, xxii; Keller 55/63; Thompson 192), Schnitzler's *oeuvre* remains largely within the realms of

⁸⁷ "From a Marxist [...] perspective [...] Schnitzler [...] enjoyed the class privileges of the high bourgeoisie and would therefore have to be considered politically conservative" (Konzett 349).

⁸⁸ Beniston mentions Schnitzler's dislike for the Social Democrats (227).

the “traditional value system” (Lorenz 21)⁸⁹. Given that his father’s patients additionally have close affinities with the Burgtheater, “Schnitzler ha[s] privileged access to theatrical circles” (Gillman 146)⁹⁰. The Burgtheater – which is commonly referred to as a rather traditional venue (cf. Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 62-63) – in turn stages bourgeois issues for a bourgeois audience (cf. Beniston 222; Daviau, “Reception”, 163; Daviau, “Ophuls”, 330; Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 61; Thompson vi/91), deliberately ignoring “[d]as dunkle, rauchige, elende und dreckige Wien” (Maderthaner and Mussner qtd. in Schneider 30)⁹¹. Relatively high ticket prices keep lower classes away from the playhouses (cf. Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 149). These hence continue to stage plays which appeal to the upper slices of society, by featuring “[g]racious, melancholy, elegant Austrian-speaking characters” who allow them to “escape the [...] hectic outside world for a few hours” (Deutsch-Schreiner 70)⁹². Thus, apart from Schnitzler’s wish to expose the immoral attitude of his co-citizens, he also largely relies on their approval and consent (cf. Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 35/78/86).

Schnitzler’s semi-identification with the bourgeois Viennese society is equally shared by Sigmund Freud, who undoubtedly assumes a vital role in the construction of Vienna’s specific identity around 1900 (cf. Gay 66; Le Rider 43-56; Magris 71; Wisely 123-131). “Schnitzler was called the secular alter ego of Freud. He used his understanding of Freudian psychology to develop a theatrical portrait of a decadent and deceitful society” (Lichtenberg 271). Indeed, both men share a strikingly similar biography, both working as doctors and showing a peculiar interest in psychoanalysis (cf. Foster and Krobb 15). Freud even admits to having avoided Schnitzler for fear of finding his *Doppelgänger* in him (cf. Magris 71): “So habe ich den Eindruck gewonnen, daß Sie [Schnitzler] durch Intuition [...] alles das wissen, was ich in mühseliger Arbeit an anderen Menschen aufgedeckt habe”, Freud concedes to Schnitzler in a letter of 1922 (qtd. in Rella 202). What Freud wants to express with this letter is that Schnitzler intuitively incorporates the human natural drives, most notably “den Eros und den Todestrieb” (*ibid.* 203), the interrelatedness of which constitutes life’s most intricate enigma according to Freud. Billington resumes this idea when he states that, “the conflict between Love and Death runs through the Austrian dramatist’s work just as much as it does through Freudian

⁸⁹ Cf. also Fliedl 38; Foster and Krobb 13; Keller 17; Konzett 360; Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 20/26/64/189;

⁹⁰ Cf. also Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 36/56; Thompson 6.

⁹¹ Cf. also Thompson 149.

⁹² Cf. also Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 52; Sabler, “Boulevardtheater”.

casebooks” (136). In London, Freud’s influence is, of course, less significant. Another aspect which can be felt in a much stronger way in *fin de siècle* Vienna than in London at the same time, is the “Jewish intellectual life [which] flourished in Vienna more so than elsewhere” (Lorenz 9)⁹³. As a result, “[t]he names of writers, artists, and thinkers associated with Viennese modernity – Freud, Gustav Mahler, Kraus, Zweig [...] – are those of Austro-Hungarian Jews” (*ibid.* 9).

All aspects depicted above have added to the character of the Austrian and the British society, as well as to their literary traditions. A very recent article, published in *Die Presse* on May 17, 2009, shows how the societal trends of Schnitzler’s era largely continue to mark today’s Austria. In line with what has been said above, Fritsch describes the modern Austrian society as being marked “[durch einen] ungeheure[n] Sinn für Theatralik und eine[r] tiefgründige[n] Ironie” which she equally explains by the fact “[dass e]ine bürgerliche Revolution wie in Frankreich [...] ausgeblieben [ist]” (40-41). She further concludes that Austria’s citizens use their outward charm in order to repress and block out their darkest fears, asking, “Ist Österreich ein Land der Wegschauer?” (*ibid.* 40). The article also mentions psychoanalysis as well as an incapability of openly carrying out conflicts as typically Austrian phenomena. By citing other examples from Austrian literature, such as *Herrn Karl* who understands democracy as “Die Pappen halten und lächeln” (*ibid.* 41) and Ödön von Horvath’s *Geschichten aus dem Wienerwald* “[wo] nichts so [ist], wie es scheint” (*ibid.* 41), Fritsch highlights that the Austrian mentality of Schnitzler’s hypocritical society continues to influence Austrian writers today. If Stoppard’s text is hence more daring, sharper, quicker, less superficial and more direct than Schnitzler’s originals, this is to a large part attributable to the divergent societal and literary systems of the Austrian and the British nation.

⁹³ Cf. also Butzko 17; Thompson 7.

II.4.4 Considering the Time Axis: From Vienna 1900 to London 2000

Das erste – das ist doch immerhin ein Erlebnis. Oder bedeutet das auch nichts mehr? Sie müssen mir darüber Aufschluß geben, Erna. Ja! Ich finde mich nämlich nicht mehr zurecht. Das Leben ist um so viel leichter geworden in der letzten Zeit. Als ich so jung war wie Sie, nahm man gewisse Dinge noch furchtbar ernst. Es sind nicht viel mehr als zehn Jahre seither vergangen, aber mir scheint, die Welt hat sich seitdem sehr verändert. (Genia in Schnitzler, WL, 128)

Naturally, signifying systems (i.e. the commonly employed communicative practices) do not only diverge among various nation states as a good many contrastive analyses which juxtapose Schnitzler's works and their English versions suggest. They limit themselves to one dimension of interculturality, namely the transfer of the source text into another *linguistic* community. It can however hardly be ignored that the intercultural trajectory does not only take place between various countries but also between different eras or generations (cf. Bennet 53; Fischer-Lichte 130; Werner 89). It often happens that an original - "written more than a hundred years ago" (Mengel 14) - has to be retranslated, or rather readjusted in order to preserve its "communicative function as a work of literature within a continually shifting cultural system" (Snell-Hornby, *Translation Studies*, 114)⁹⁴. As Mengel argues, "[t]his requires adjustments which have nothing to do with the problem of interlingual translation," but rather with "the necessity of embedding the translated plays into a new literary context" (14), or, differently put, into another philosophical or theatrical tradition (cf. Bennett 156-159; Levý 26). Thus, even if some traits mark societies over centuries – as Fritsch's article suggests – some discourses obviously give way to more modern considerations.

Arthur Schnitzler lives and writes at a time which is commonly referred to "[als die] österreichische [...] Kultur der Jahrhundertwende" (Zojer 175)⁹⁵, or, following the French tradition, *Fin de Siècle* Vienna (cf. Beller 665). This era is predominantly marked by a certain feeling of decadence due to rapid changes in Vienna's societal composition, most notably by the consistent downward spiral of the bourgeoisie. This tendency which has its origin in the feeling of French *malaise* and the decline of *la belle époque*, nurtures literary traditions such as symbolism, impressionism, and surrealism, which exist alongside the trends of naturalism and realism. Even if Schnitzler is influenced in part by this French

⁹⁴ Cf. also Dimitriu 73; Foster and Krobb 14; Jesenská qtd. in Popovic 81; Schmid 69.

⁹⁵ Cf. also Vacha, "1", xxx.

à-la-mode tendency in his later prose works, his plays *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* generally remain within the *realist* tradition. Daviau sees Schnitzler as someone who “is, at times, viewed as a realist and even as a naturalist” (“Reception”, 163)⁹⁶; Derré classifies Schnitzler among Austria’s greatest realists (475); Schmid describes *Das weite Land* “[als] ein Gesellschaftsstück, das sich, was Personendarstellung, Milieuzeichnung, Sprachbehandlung angeht, durchaus noch der Tradition des Realismus/Naturalismus zuordnen läßt” (87)⁹⁷, and Sabler pictures Schnitzler as someone who has a realistic conception of his *dramatis personae* (*Ecriture Dramatique*, 167-173), further citing the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* which describes *Liebelei* as being “wahr bis auf den Grund” (qtd. in *ibid.* 182). While Schnitzler’s distinctive style by all means shows realist tendencies, his classification as a naturalist must be taken with a grain of salt. Butzko specifies his distancing himself from this literary tradition (72), and Sabler demonstrates how Schnitzler’s plays primarily portray the upper slices of society, hence running counter to the naturalists’ technique of mirroring the misery of the less affluent classes (*Ecriture Dramatique*, 189-194; Thompson 180).

Seen from a larger perspective, Schnitzler’s *oeuvre* can be classified as belonging to the *modernist* era (cf. Vacha, “1”, xxxvii) – Sabler mentions the Austrian author “[als] eine[n] der wichtigsten Repräsentanten der Wiener Moderne” (“Boulevardtheater”, 91)⁹⁸ – which shows a heightened “interest in language and questions of representation” (Barker 137) and which already pictures the subject as a fragmented being (cf. *ibid.* 137; Baumann 4; Derré 432) – a trend later taken up and consolidated by postmodern thinkers.

As such, Stoppard lives and writes in a literary age which is unquestionably different from Schnitzler’s creative period. As a writer of the 20th/21st century, Stoppard is unequivocally influenced by societal and literary paradigms other than those prevalent in Schnitzler’s time. Stoppard is indeed often pictured as a *postmodern* British dramatist, even though some claim that he does “not [...] fully inhabit the postmodern terrain” (Vanden Heuvel 213). However, in his approach to language as an unstable, unsteady system which he manipulates at will through “pastiche, parody, bricolage, irony, and playfulness” (Klages)⁹⁹ he takes on a clearly postmodern dimension, just as much as when he gathers

⁹⁶ Cf. also Daviau, “Ophuls”, 337; Le Rider 57; Schneider 29; Wisely 25.

⁹⁷ Cf. also Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 180.

⁹⁸ Cf. also Foster and Krobb 15; Gay xx.

⁹⁹ Mengel speaks of “pastiche, parody, and a dense web of intertextual allusions and references” (105).

old literary material in order to incorporate it into his very own play through intertextual allusions (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 127). Finally, Stoppard is at his best when he invents fragmented individuals which are all too often torn between fiction and reality, or between different levels of communication, styles, and registers (cf. Weikert 128), thereby showing all traits which Barker mentions as being typical of postmodern writers¹⁰⁰.

Against this background, Stoppard's stylistic device of character fragmentation in *Dalliance* and *Undiscovered Country* sounds perfectly plausible. Hence, the sudden mood swings experienced by Stoppard's female characters – who alternate between Schnitzler-style subordination and twenty-first-century independence; the changes in register or regional variation made explicit by Penn and the German tourists; as well as the *potpourri* of German and French language games (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 108; Stern 170; Weikert 39-41) must not be understood as distracting deviations from Schnitzler's original plays, but as natural occurrences in a postmodern time and age.

Intertextual references also abound in both of Stoppard's plays. Apart from the title which he takes from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, he turns Friedrich's German, "Habe die Ehre, meine Herrschaften" (Schnitzler, *WL*, 105) into a part of Mark Anthony's speech taken from Shakespeare's *The Life and Death of Julius Caesar*: "Friends, Romans, and countrymen!" (Stoppard, *UC*, 159)¹⁰¹. In *Dalliance*, he again makes use of Shakespeare's popularity among the British theater-goers, describing the age in which the play is set as "the toothache age, [which is] rotten to the teeth" (*D*, 15), thereby conjuring up Marcellus' highly famous quote, "Something is rotten in the state of Denmark" (*Hamlet*, 1.4.90)¹⁰². Finally, Theodore's utterance, "Seams, madam? I know not seams" (Stoppard, *D*, 25) refers back to Hamlet's original: "Seems, madam! nay it is; I know not 'seems.'" (*Hamlet*, 1.2.76)¹⁰³.

In *Das weite Land*, the postmodern concept of panfictionality is first and foremost signaled through the character of Mrs. Aigner, who, as an actress, according to Stoppard,

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Barker's definition of postmodernism which lists "the fragmentary, ambiguous and uncertain quality of the world [...] the blurring of cultural boundaries [...] bricolage and intertextuality [...] [and] [fractured] subjects" (22) as typically postmodern traits. For more detailed information on postmodernism, cf. e.g. Barker 130-158.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Stern 172.

¹⁰² Stoppard makes use of this reference in his only novel – i.e. in *Lord Malquist and Mr Moon* – where he states that "Moon knew there was something rotten" (qtd. in Hunter, *Plays*, 132).

¹⁰³ Cf. Stern 174.

is no longer able to distinguish between fiction and reality (cf. Stern 172). This is symbolized by two Stoppardian additions made to Schnitzler's play:

MAUER. Yes, her husband was a bit of a devil with the ladies, and she wasn't as resilient as you. Perhaps after all those years in the theatre, real life took her by surprise. (Stoppard, *UC*, 89)

GENIA. Actually, I'm just asking myself, when you made that very – forgive me – melodramatic remark about people in general – whether that doesn't have something to do with the roles you have to play, so that life and melodrama sometimes seem a little difficult to separate. (*ibid.* 118)

In *Dalliance*, Stoppard employs another strategy of which he also makes use in his play *The Real Inspector Hound*: He introduces a 'play-within-the-play' by "remov[ing] [the third act] to the wings and stage of the Josefstadt theatre" (Stoppard qtd. in Mengel 167). Accordingly, the reality of Christine, Fritz and co. is blended with the illusionary world of the theater, and in the end the spectator is no longer able to tell whether the whole story is nothing but a dramatic production, or whether there is a difference between the reality depicted in Act One and Two and the show of Act Three. In Stoppard's plays, this is however not of great importance, as reality frequently fades into illusion, while the illusionary world of the theater continues to be "[s]o true to life" (Stoppard, *D*, 48)¹⁰⁴.

The above-mentioned strategies employed by the British author generally suggest a deconstruction of the original plays (cf. Barker 258; Mengel 168/171/179). This is not surprising given that a typical postmodern strategy consists in parodying the original, with the aim of turning "strenuous art into tea-time small talk" (Hunter, *Plays*, 131). In this sense "the parodist exaggerates and consequently reduces the stature of events and characters [... and] turns tragedy into a farce and heroes into clowns" (Robinson 86). As already mentioned above, Freud's idea of Eros and Thanatos as the two naturally opposing powers that mark human existence considerably influence Schnitzler's plays. Pollitzer perceives this Freudian love-death metaphor in *Liebelei* "[wenn d]ie Liebenden beim Mahl, Gesang, Tanz [weilen] bis der Tod als dunkler Herr [...] die Glocke zieht" (qtd. in Schmid 79). In *Das weite Land*, the dichotomy is being foreshadowed through the juxtaposition of the oxymorons "Liebe und Trug" – "Treue und Treulosigkeit", "Anbetung [...] und Verlangen" as well as "Ordnung [...] [und] Chaos" (Schnitzler, *WL*, 88), and later reestablished via the symbol of the Aignerturm which *per se* constitutes a

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Mengel 177-180.

typically Freudian phallus symbol (cf. Mengel 112-114). On the one hand the mountain top symbolizes proximity to death as Friedrich's friend, Doktor Bernhaupt, loses his life by falling off a cliff (cf. Schnitzler, *WL*, 16). On the other hand, however, the Aignerturm unites Friedrich and Erna in a scene of sexual desire after their perilous climb (cf. *ibid.* 93). Stoppard does not dwell on this dimension as much as Schnitzler does (cf. Mengel 108/112). Rather, he deconstructs the Freudian dimension of Schnitzler's texts when he has Friedrich say, "Well, shall we start? [...] But no more excuses! Or change your vocation – take up some local pastime – light opera – or psychoanalysis..." (Stoppard, *UC*, 107) where Schnitzler's Friedrich speaks of "einen andern Beruf [...] ... Advokat... oder Raseur..." (Schnitzler, *WL*, 44).

Apart from the literary traditions which change over time, socio-cultural factors are equally subject to continuous modification. Societal events which at times trouble a whole nation – such as particular social hierarchies¹⁰⁵, female repression, or the act of the infamous duel¹⁰⁶ – are no longer relevant to people a century or more later. This is due to the fact that dominant discourses fluctuate over time. The societal realities of Schnitzler's century – in the sense of a-historical, anti-essential constructs – have given way to other, more topical issues. In that sense it is understandable "[dass] Anspielungen auf Fakten, die in der Zeit und im Land der Entstehung des Originals allgemein bekannt waren, dem Milieu, in das das Werk übertragen wird, [...] unbekannt sind" (Levy 98) which makes it difficult – if not impossible – to bring them across. As Kelly and Demastes point out, "the simplicity of linearity [...] of straight or naturalist drama [...] is something that simply doesn't satisfy an audience that has become more and more aware of the complexities of existence" (12).

In this regard, female emancipation – as displayed by Schnitzler's female characters (cf. Mengel 170)¹⁰⁷ – is not at all bewildering in a century where the patriarchal attitudes of Schnitzler's contemporaries (cf. Ametsbichler 192; Arens 258; Le Rider 112; Macris 109; Thompson 58) have been seriously challenged and subsequently replaced by our modern *fifty-fifty society* (cf. Mengel 174-175; Spencer 386; Wisely 115). As Anderman points out, "Stoppard has placed his version firmly in contemporary history: no longer are

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Sabler who mentions that most of the plays written around 1900 revolve around problems resulting from the prevalent social structure of that time (*Écriture Dramatique*, 274) and compare Spencer who mentions that the social confines are considerably loosened up in the context of Stoppard's plays (386).

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Le Rider who addresses the tradition of the "*Pistolenduell*" (96-100).

¹⁰⁷ Stoppard himself admits to "having added something of a feminist manifesto" to *Liebelei* (qtd. in Stern 170).

women passively accepting their fate at the hands of men” (*Europe*, 212). Likewise, Schnitzler’s aim of unmasking “die ach so moralische Gesellschaft” (Mandana 56) of *fin de siècle* Vienna loses its relevance in the context of Stoppard’s plays.

Since taboo matters have also shifted (cf. Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting*, 34), Stoppard’s sexually explicit language cannot only be explained by referring to the British tradition of relative directness, but also by taking into account the fact that modern societies are much more tolerant toward sexual matters and the act of cursing in public than Schnitzler’s. Understandably, the linguistic system equally changes over the years. The language employed in Stoppard’s modern versions of Schnitzler’s plays will hence automatically diverge from the words Wilde would have used, if asked to render *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* in English (cf. Mengel 15). Mengel also mentions Stoppard’s “pruning and toning down” as necessary changes for texts spoken by modern actors, as these days “easily speakable texts” constitute the norm in theatrical productions (16).

II.4.5 The Significance of the Degree of the Text’s Cultural Content

Last but not least, the fact that Schnitzler’s texts are firmly anchored in the Austrian culture must not be overlooked. Many critics¹⁰⁸ classify Schnitzler’s texts as being most intricately embedded in the Viennese context in which they emerge, claiming “[dass] Schnitzlers Talent, seine Form, sein dramatischer Geist, seine Art zu charakterisieren, sein Humor [...] durchaus wienerisch [sind]”, further perceiving in Schnitzler’s *Das weite Land* “den Walzer eines Reigens [...], der das Leben mit dem Tode, die Jugend mit dem Alter, den leichten Scherz mit dem schweren Ernst mit Grazie verbindet, wie er nur in Wien erklingen konnte” (qtd. in Sabler, *Österreichische Identität*, 84-88). Keller perceives Schnitzler as being more intrinsically bound to the typical way of life and the social spectrum of the “Donaumetropole” (54) than all other Austrian authors combined. Le Rider mentions Schnitzler as a typically Viennese writer (17), while Thompson foregrounds the frequency with which “names of Vienna’s streets, parks, squares, districts and buildings, full of associations for those who know the city well” occur in the former’s works (31). In line with Henschelmann’s classification, it should thus not come as a jolt to anyone that Schnitzler’s plays’ high degree of cultural anchorage complicates the act of

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Ametsbichler 197-199; Daviau, “Ophuls”, 330; Deutsch-Schreiner 69; Keller 12-18; Konstantinovic 282; Kuttentberg 335; Pollard in Daviau, “Reception”, 152; Sabler, *Écriture Dramatique*; 137; Schmidtbronn qtd. in Schmid 2; Swales 21; Thompson 1/183; von Weilen qtd. in Sabler, *Écriture Dramatique*, 139.

translation for stage productions abroad. Although some critics foreground the universal character of Schnitzler's *oeuvre* which "represent[s] human problems regardless of the social setting in which they are cast" (Kann qtd. in Daviau, "Reception", 146)¹⁰⁹, it cannot be ignored that a Viennese audience will better understand and interpret Schnitzler's *oeuvre* than spectators outside Vienna (cf. Schmid 2; Vacha, "1", xxix).

Reconsidering the argument of 'hybridity', Schnitzler's Jewish background does, of course, provide food for thought. When Gay goes on to describe him as a cosmopolitan dweller who devours Modern French as much as English literature, being "equally receptive to music and art from many countries" (xx), we seemingly have found the prototype of a 'hybrid subject', in line with postmodern thought. Jumping to conclusions would however prove ineffective in this context. Gay does not hesitate to label Schnitzler as being "Viennese to his bones", further emphasizing Schnitzler's few travels, and determining Vienna as the center of his life (xx). Concerning Schnitzler's Jewish background, it is not surprising that Anti-Semitic circles have tried to attach the label of "Jewish identity" to the thoroughly Austrian author, claiming that a Jewish person can never understand the intricacies of the Viennese population (cf. Sabler, "Österreichische Identität", 102; Sabler, *Écriture Dramatique*; 137). Nowadays however many critics point to Schnitzler's relative ignorance of his non-Austrian roots: "Ich betrachte mich nämlich keineswegs als einen jüdischen Dichter, sondern als einen deutschen Dichter" (Schnitzler qtd. in Sabler, "Österreichische Identität", 100). This conformity can be explained by a certain "pressure [which was] exerted upon Jewish individuals [...] to conform to the Christian mainstream" (Lorenz 9). As a result, "[t]he Schnitzler family maintained [...] only the barest vestige of Jewish religious practice" (Loentz 83). This shows that cultural constellations must be understood as being governed by power relations. A person's hybrid background does hence not automatically suggest that this person will want to be regarded as a multicultural subject. Not infrequently, less popular cultural traits will be ruled out at the expense of the more popular culture which influences the person. In this context, it is perfectly understandable that Schnitzler refuses to "retreat into the voice of a minority", affirming his "position as a writer of Vienna's mainstream" (Konzett 350/358).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. also Reinhardt qtd. in Sabler, "Österreichische Identität", 89; Schnitzler who himself highlights that Hofreiter's most prominent feature is not his Viennese ancestry. While he deplores the Northern German accent employed by the German actors which runs counter to the Viennese dialect, he believes that his plays can nonetheless be successful abroad (qtd. in *ibid.* 87/90-91); and the *Neue Freie Presse* which specifies: "Wienerisch ist nur das Kleid des Stückes; aber der Leib, den es birgt, der arme zuckende Menschenleib, ist völlig international, ist ewig, wenn man das pathetische Wort im Zusammenhang mit dem Theater überhaupt gebrauchen darf" (qtd. in *ibid.* 94).

II.5 From Austria to Terranglia: Factors of Power Governing the Translation Process

It is always politics, not science and culture that determines a country's atmosphere.
(Schnitzler qtd. in Gay 102)

II.5.1 Translation as Negotiation: Source and Target Elements in Stoppard's *Dalliance* and *Undiscovered Country*

If we believe Schleiermacher who claims that a translator must at all times decide on either a source- or a target-oriented translation, as “everything would turn out to be unintelligible and unsuccessful if one were to switch methods within the same project” (42) – an aspect also addressed by Mandana (81) – Stoppard’s English versions would *ab initio* fail to constitute ‘decent’ translations, as a blending of source and target elements can be perceived throughout both of his adaptations. However, Honegger’s question of whether “it [is] possible in the theatre to present ‘foreign’ characters in their native landscape, but in another language, without confusing realms” (25) reverts to the notion of the hybrid *translatum*. Accordingly, a negotiation between various source and target aspects takes place, leading to a translation product which neither reads like typically source-culture texts, nor like perfectly ‘natural’ texts in the target language. As summed up by Fuchs, “[behält] [d]er Vermittler [...] seine Stimme (und seine Sprache), wenn auch diese nicht unverändert bleibt und nimmt dazu die ‘Stimme der Anderen’ auf, die sich beide polyphon überlagern [...], reflexiv brechen und in einem Dialog verstricken” (325).

If we focus on Stoppard’s *Dalliance* and *Undiscovered Country*, a number of Germanic elements can be found which contrast sharply with the otherwise British tradition to which the texts undoubtedly hold on to (cf. Stern 174)¹¹⁰. Stoppard preserves the Austrian names of the characters to a large extent (cf. Mengel 169); he adopts Schnitzler’s Austrian setting – i.e. both of his plays are set in an Austrian environment (cf. Mandana 18); his song ‘The False Hussar’ is undeniably based on “the superannuated German hit-song ‘Der treue Hussar’ (‘The Faithful Hussar’)” (Stern 175); and he even goes as far as to inject German expressions into his otherwise English manuscript. Finally, the English spectator will

¹¹⁰ Stoppard has some of his characters speak with a distinctive Scottish dialect and he incorporates intertextual allusions to major British playwrights, thereby approaching his versions to the British dramatic scene.

automatically identify Stoppard's *Undiscovered Country* as at least partially 'foreign' when Friedrich exclaims in Act One: "It would be damned selfish to interrupt all that fagging and cricket and bring him back *here* where they educate you in every kind of sentimental brutality" (Stoppard, *UC*, 94; my emphasis). The immediate juxtaposition of England and Austria undoubtedly causes some confusion for an English audience who – in this very moment – has to identify with Austria (*here*), while rejecting England as the cricket-playing 'other'.

Focusing on the source elements which Stoppard retains in his English versions, a more detailed analysis shows that the representation of Austria on the British stage takes place on a purely stereotypical level only (cf. Bartholomew and Krebs 1243)¹¹¹. In line with Edward Said's notion of *Orientalism*, what the British audience is presented with is a peculiar form of *Austrianism*, where what is said about Austria has less to do with the Austrian culture *per se* than it does with the British world. In other words, Austria, as Tom Stoppard presents it, "is directly indebted to various [...] [British] techniques of representation that make [...] [Austria] visible" (Said 22). Mengel speaks of an ethnocentric perspective which borders on cultural imperialism where "all understanding implies the dissolution of alterity or the other and its incorporation into one's own realm of ideas" (183-184). This complies with Sabler's perception according to which the 'other' is perceived as exotic, peculiar and caricatured and, by extension, always interpreted according to already existing schemes of representation ("Österreichische Identität", 85). Honegger witnesses the same phenomenon in Stoppard's adaptation of Nestroy's *Einen Jux will er sich machen*. Stoppard's version "seems [...] [to be] a foreigner's dazzled, amused response to another culture and its signs" (23). She detects the same strategy in other Anglophone adaptations of Austrian plays, where the original plot is reduced to the standard cliché of Germans eating "knockwurst"¹¹² while wearing "lederhosen, laced shoes and thick socks" (*ibid.* 24). "Translated into [...] [the translator's] personal obsessions and indulgences, foreignness simply reads as

¹¹¹ In this context Lüsebrink speaks of "[r]eduktionistische Formen der Fremdwahrnehmung [,die sich] [...] überwiegend in [...] textuellen Kurzformen wie Anekdoten, Sprichwörtern, Setenzen, Witzen [...] [finden]" (87).

¹¹² The term in itself is a prototypical example of how foreign elements are 'molded' into the home system, thereby being semantically bleached. *Knockwurst*, which is defined as "a short, thick, highly seasoned sausage" ("knockwurst"), is said to be derived from the German term *Knackwurst*, the German term being used interchangeably with the English version, *knockwurst*. The German term conjures up the verbal image of "*knack(en)* to crack, break" (*ibid.*). This reference is, however, entirely lost in the term *knockwurst*. Hence, the English term, although being a loan word, cannot be understood as an element which brings the English culture closer to the Germanic source culture.

strangeness, [and] the German signs are con(per)verted into American stereotypes which reinforce popular myths of ‘Germanness’” (*ibid.* 25).

This being said, it is not surprising that the German language-games employed by Stoppard – “wanderlust *Wunderkind*” (Stoppard, *UC*, 85), “Not really, Fraulein” (*ibid.* 86); “*Auf Wiedersehen, Doctor*” (*ibid.* 86) – make use of originally Germanic words which are (1) already incorporated into the English language system, or (2) basic words which each tourist visiting a Germanic country, or each student having had their first German class, has already incorporated. As Gussow’s review of *Undiscovered Country* suggests, David Jenkins – responsible for the play’s set design – relies on “a landscape that takes its inspiration from the paintings of Gustav Klimt” (“Schnitzlerland”, 4), thereby providing a highly cliché-ridden representation of Austria which – just like the above lederhosen – is conform to a tourist’s perception of Vienna. By the same token, Bartholomew and Krebs interpret “[t]he introduction of the operetta into the final act [of *Dalliance*] [...] [as] an unfortunate and clichéd comment upon Viennese life” (1243). Finally, Stoppard’s presentation of Fritz as an assiduous pedant reminds one of the “national stereotype or cliché” of “the ‘Prussian’ love order” (Mengel 169). This also shows that in a British environment, no distinction is being made between Austria and Germany¹¹³. As a result, Stoppard’s image of Austria can at times not even be interpreted as *Austrianism*, but as *Germanism*. In this context, Konstantinovic’s findings regarding politically powerful nations, which perceive Austria as a part of Germany is of heightened interest:

Deutsche Literatur ist für die Franzosen alle Literatur deutscher Sprache [...] Zwar werden Besonderheiten des österreichischen Kulturkreises eher bemerkt als solche der deutschen Schweiz, aber alles das zusammen bildet doch in der Literatur das, was General de Gaulle gerne ‘la chose allemande’ nannte. Das hat [...] [u.a.] mit französischer Unkenntnis der Verschiedenheiten innerhalb des deutschen Sprachgebietes zu tun. (285)

The same also holds true for Britain, “[wo] der Versuch, die österreichische Literatur zu spezifizieren und von der Literatur des übrigen deutschen Sprachraums abzugrenzen [,] [fehlt]” (*ibid.* 286). Austria *per se* thus takes on a farce-like marginal role which Stoppard deliberately exploits - by means of his *postmodern* language-games and other means of satire – in order to strengthen his texts’ ironic and deconstructive potential (cf. Anderman, *Europe*, 337).

¹¹³ This has already been pointed out by the fact that the linguistic distinction between the Austrian and the German characters of *Das weite Land* is not sustained in Stoppard’s play.

II.5.2 The Hegemony of the English: Yes, Arthur Schnitzler is a Famous Austrian Playwright... or is he German? Or English?

That Schnitzler's typically Viennese traits are reduced to a minimum in Stoppard's adaptations can be explained by the political power which the Anglophone countries wield over the rest of the world. Especially in contrast with a small country like Austria "in dem die Angst herrscht, dass die eigene Kultur untergeht" and which is hence dominated by a minority complex (Fritsch 40-41), the hegemony of the British allows them to admit to never having had a passionate interest in Austria, Austrian drama or Schnitzler for that matter, as Stoppard concedes in an interview (cf. Gussow, "Cartwheels", 132; Gussow, *Conversations*, 36). He subsequently goes on to confess "to never having heard of [...] Nestroy" (Pendennis 18) – which comes as a relief to his equally ignorant British interview partner: "In this, at least, we were equal" (*ibid.* 18). David Hare, for his part, even goes as far as "to set *The Blue Room*, his version of Arthur Schnitzler's *Reigen* [...] in an unspecified English-speaking metropolis" (Anderman, "A l'anglaise", 276). Swales attributes the British strategy of cultural blocking to the country's "heavily insular" quality (19), which might indeed play a certain role, but cannot be put on the same footing with the Anglophone hegemony, which in my eyes constitutes the main reason for Britain's rejecting foreign cultural influences. This is confirmed by Honegger when she claims that "[p]laying with a foreign culture seems to permit Stoppard to be even more outrageous than usual in his exhibitionist display of verbal acrobatics which turn Imperial Kitsch upside down with naughty Anglo-Saxon silliness" (23-24). It immediately becomes apparent that in the British culture, foreignness is often equated with inferiority.

Stoppard, who is firmly embedded in the socio-cultural discourse of today's Britain, automatically approaches his text further toward the theatrical conventions which prevail in his home country at the time he writes his plays (cf. Mengel 168). The relative hegemony of his country has also left its marks on the British author himself. First and foremost, he takes up the challenge of translating three German plays – Schnitzler's *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* as well as Nestroy's *Einen Jux will er sich machen* (Guppy 189) – for the British stage, although he has never taken a German course, let alone studied Austria's cultural peculiarities (*ibid.* 189). To round off the stereotypical picture of the language-shy Briton, Stoppard goes on to confess that he does not "read any other languages" (*ibid.* 189). The frequent claim – chiefly uttered by German translation

scholars affiliated with the *skopos tradition* – which requires a translator to be culturally versed¹¹⁴, are hence far from being fulfilled in Stoppard’s case (cf. Mengel 105). If we believe Anderman, Stoppard is not the only English translator who relies on this strategy (*Europe*, 26).

II.5.2.1 Performance is Everything

DER DICHTER zum Direktor. *Mir kommt vor, die Leut’ langweilen sich.*
DIREKTOR Ich hab’ Ihnen g’sagt, Sie sollen die Figur rausschmeißen. Noch heut vormittag hab’ ichs’ Ihnen g’sagt.
DER DICHTER Könnt’ man vielleicht nicht noch jetzt - ?
 ... Ich werd g’schwind ein paar Verse streichen.
DIREKTOR Aber schnell – schnell – eh’s zu spät ist
 (Schnitzler – *Zum großen Wurstel* –
 qtd. in Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 41)

While relying on someone else’s translation¹¹⁵, Stoppard puts all his focus on the performance aspect, which is not at all surprising in a British context, where the *mise en scène* frequently takes precedence over the initial manuscript (more so than in the German-speaking drama business and definitely more so than during Schnitzler’s time¹¹⁶). In an interview, Stoppard hence mentions Peter Wood’s direction as the main enticement for translating Schnitzler (Gussow, “Cartwheel”, 132; Gussow, *Conversations*, 36). While “Schnitzler could devote up to twenty years to completing a drama [text]” (Daviau, “Ophuls”, 336; my emphasis), Stoppard’s aim is to produce drama *performances*¹¹⁷ which “pursue[...] the dramatic potential of the play[s] more than [...] [their] fin-de-siècle quality” (Spencer 388) in a relatively short time (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 93). “I don’t take that long [to write my plays] – perhaps a year [for] each”, Stoppard admits in an interview (Guppy 189). “[T]he time between [...] [the] completion of a script and its production is nearly always only a matter of months or even weeks” (Bratt xiii). What counts is the event, not the text (cf. Pendennis 18).

¹¹⁴ Cf. Bassnett and Lefevere, “Proust’s Grandmother”, 11; Boase-Beier and Holman 7; Gentzler, *Translation Theories*, 90; Kupsch-Losereit 6; Levý 13; Vermeer qtd. in Stolze 182 and Mandana 15.

¹¹⁵ Anderman specifies that Stoppard “acknowledged the services of John Harrison, [a] [...] German linguist provided by the National Theatre, in the Introduction to the 1986 published version of [*Undiscovered Country*]” (*Europe*, 26-27); Cf. also Stern 168.

¹¹⁶ Note that “[a]ls ‘Liebelei’ [sic] aufgeführt wurde, [...] das Burgtheater noch keinerlei regieler Ambitionen [hatte]. Die rangältesten Schauspieler bekamen den Titel ‘Regisseur’ zuerkannt [...] das Bühnenbild [war] von sekundärer Bedeutung. [...] Dem Autor, seinem Stück und den Schauspielern gilt [...] [das ganze] Augenmerk, die szenische Ausstattung wird überhaupt nicht, die Regie kaum beachtet” (Vacha, “2”, 18-19).

¹¹⁷ Cf. also Gordon 20; Hunter, *Plays*, 93; Pendennis 18; Schmid 4; Stern 176.

Despite Stoppard's retaining of some Austrian elements on a stereotypical level, his plays must be understood as being perfectly embedded in the British theatrical tradition (cf. Mengel 7/184). To this end, Stoppard makes use of intertextual references to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and *Julius Caesar*, and further integrates the uncommitted dialog typical of the Absurdist drama of the 20th century and reminiscent of Pinter¹¹⁸ and Beckett into his plays (cf. Barth; Gordon 21; Hunter, *Plays*, 128/242; Iser; Mengel 109-110; Richards; Weikert 241-274). He equally relies on Charlie Chaplin's and the Marx Brothers' music hall effects (cf. Mengel 172). Finally, Stoppard's use of quick repartee, battles of wit, and double entendre often found in the English drawing-room comedies of the Restoration period and equally employed by Wilde¹¹⁹, Shaw, and Eliot in the 19th century (cf. Barth; Gussow, *Conversations*, x-xi; Hunter, *Plays*, 96-97/131; Mayer; Mengel 18/108) further moves Stoppard's *Dalliance* and *Undiscovered Country* away from the Austrian culture toward the English home system. This is evidenced upon studying the reviews of Schnitzler's plays on English soil, which foreground Friedrich's "rakish but charming character" (Lichtenberg 172; my emphasis); which speak of "rakes with their conscience well under control" (Gay 65; my emphasis) or which identify Fritz and Theo as "young *m[e]n about town*" (Anderman, *Europe*, 207; Spencer 386; my emphasis). These denotations are perfectly reminiscent of British Restoration comedy and hence suggest a further move toward the British system. By the same token, a description of Schnitzler's male characters as "careless and witty dandy womanizer[s]" (Konzett 353) or "decadent dand[ies]" (*ibid.* 359) reminds one more of Wilde than of Schnitzler himself (cf. Mengel 168)¹²⁰.

Furthermore, Stoppard's definition of drama as "a two-man or two-woman job" (Gussow, *Conversations*, 86)¹²¹ suggests his being indebted to his British 'team' rather than to the Austrian original texts. In his interviews he repeatedly mentions the opinions and interests of the whole theater crew: "Peter Wood started with the idea that the third act should be transferred to the wings of the opera" (Guppy 190); "[T]he director, Peter Wood, was insistent that he wanted to do it with one intermission" (Stoppard, "Event and Text", 202);

¹¹⁸ Weikert perceives a mimesis of Pinter's "stockende[n], eliptische[n] Reden" in Stoppard's style (130); Richards mentions the blurring of what is real and what is unreal as a typical feature of Pinter's plays which undoubtedly reminds of Stoppard's style (579).

¹¹⁹ Hunter detects a parallel between Wilde's and Stoppard's characters who all "try to speak as much like each other as possible" (*Plays*, 103).

¹²⁰ Note in this regard, that the French – as a dominant nation – also tend to mold Schnitzler's male character into their pre-existent model of the "Don Juan" (Derré 356; Le Rider 120), further describing Schnitzler as "le 'Maupassant autrichien'" – the Austrian Maupassant (Derré 478).

¹²¹ Cf. Also Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 28/90/122.

or “the National theatre fire officers said, ‘Get that fucking pudding out of here!’” (*ibid.* 209). Stage effects and performance hits are everything (cf. Barber 15; Gussow, “Schnitzlerland”, 4) – Schnitzler’s originals, in comparison, appear to be of secondary interest, if not altogether forgotten (cf. Sabler, *Ecriture Dramatique*, 84). Instead of reflecting upon the dubious morals of *fin de siècle* Vienna, Stoppard’s audience, when leaving the theater, is enthusiastic about “that fog [which] came in and the mountaineers...”. “That was wonderful” (Stoppard, “Event and Text”, 204). On the other hand, Schnitzler’s name is “frequently misspelled in the commentaries and reviews” (Daviau, “Reception”, 150). However, that does not matter in the least: the audience loves Stoppard’s plays – and that, according to Sabler, is all that counts, since as long as the theater produces stories which are in line with what the audience wants, everything goes (*Ecriture Dramatique*, 33). Artificially distorted translations – as the reception of the earlier English versions of *Liebelei*, *Flirtations* and *Playing with Love* shows¹²² – are often not to the audience’s liking. Their “minds don’t work like that. They just see a contrived sentence [...] and will blame the translator for lack of clarity rather than praise him for wit or sensitivity to the peculiarities of” the original (Mira 199).

Nonetheless, no attempt is being made at calling the British spectators’ attention to the fact that they are not watching plays by Schnitzler, but by Stoppard (cf. Mengel 167/180/183). In reference to *Undiscovered Country*, reviewers refer to “the Stoppard-Schnitzler tragicomedy”, and even speak of “a kaleidoscopic study of hedonism in turn-of-the-century Vienna”, while five sentences later the “witty, acerbic and rueful” atmosphere – typical of Stoppard’s plays – is praised (Gussow, “Schnitzlerland”, 4). Billington even claims that “Stoppard has not unduly imposed his own style on the text [...] you wouldn’t know it was by Stoppard unless the programme-credits told you so” (134). Reviews of *Dalliance* equally suggest that “Stoppard manages to invoke the shades [...] of Schnitzler himself” (Morley qtd. in Stern 177), and Stoppard himself asserts that he has been “largely faithful to Schnitzler’s play in word and [...] more so in spirit” (qtd. in Mengel 106)¹²³. This may be explained by the fact that many critics just as Stoppard himself lack “a thorough knowledge of both the German and the English language, together with the respective literatures” (*ibid.* 1), and are hence incapable of sensing the different atmosphere which the German and the English versions conjure up. Another

¹²² Cf. Bartholomew and Krebs 1243; Spencer 383-389.

¹²³ In an interview he again reiterates his having been faithful to Schnitzler’s original *Das weite Land*: “I thought of Schnitzler as a modern classic, not to be monkeyed about with” (Guppy 190).

explanation would have to be that translations have traditionally been regarded as “second-hand, ‘derived’ literature [...] hav[ing] little or no aesthetic quality” (*ibid.* 1)¹²⁴. As a result, they are automatically identified with the original works from which they depart. In the light of the above findings this approach must however once and for all be ruled out (cf. Mira 198). In Stoppard’s case, where virtually all of his plays are marked by intertextuality (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 131), it would be even more aberrant to distinguish between his “‘own’, his ‘original’, his ‘real’ work” and his ‘adaptations’ (Schippers qtd. in Stern 168; Meyer qtd. in Stern 170). It would consequently be desirable if the unique quality of each form of rewriting was accepted as a ‘text in its own right’ which can, *per definitionem*, not be equated with the original (cf. Mengel 3/13-15; Schmid 92). This being said, it would be equally felicitous if foreign drama productions would care to inform their audiences about the dual quality of the translations and their respective source texts (cf. Honegger 26; Mengel 18). Maybe then, spectators would realize that the prevailing Anglophone “image of a light-hearted, carefree Schnitzler” (Daviau, “Reception”, 163) has nothing to do with an Austrian understanding of Schnitzler as “a serious moralist and as a masterful psychologist and psychoanalyst” (*ibid.* 163).

¹²⁴ Cf. also Spencer 375.

III

**Stoppard in Vienna:
*Rosencrantz and
Guildenstern are Dead* and
Travesties in their German
Versions by Hanno Lunin and
Hilde Spiel**

III.1 Tom Stoppard: Choice of Plays

Schnitzler's plays *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* have their counterparts in Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* and *Travesties*. Just like Schnitzler's *Liebelei*, Stoppard's early play *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* presents a significant breakthrough in the literary career of the then debuting Anglo-Czech author (cf. Cahn 35). In other words, Stoppard's "first full-length stage play" (Karwowski 1) turns him into a "precocious star of the National Theatre" (*ibid.* 1) almost overnight.

The first version of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* which Stoppard writes "while attending a colloquium in West Berlin" (Bratt xii) first appears at a fringe theater in Germany (the Theater am Kurfürstendamm) in 1964 (cf. Sieder, "2", 911). Already built around Shakespearian material (Stoppard makes use of *King Lear*), the one-act burlesque written in verse (cf. Brassell 36; Cahn 25; Easterling 11; Lakner 51; Sieder, "2", 911) does not prove successful. "I mean, the whole thing was unspeakable", Stoppard confesses in an interview (Hudson et al. 57). The second and more mature version of the play which is now intended as a pastiche or parody of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* while equally mirroring Beckett's absurdist verbal battles (cf. Bratt xvi) premieres at the Edinburgh Festival in 1966 (cf. Bratt xii; Cahn 25; Dodd 12; Lakner 54; Sieder, "2", 911). Ronald Bryden immediately describes the play as "the most brilliant debut ... since John Arden's" (qtd. in Bratt xii). Following its success on the Fringe, the play is finally staged at the National Theatre in April 1967 (cf. Bratt xii; Cahn 25; Delaney 6), where critics praise it as "one of the best plays written by the new generation of English playwrights" (qtd. in Easterling 14) as well as the "[...] most important event in the British professional theatre of the last nine years" (Hobson qtd. in Reitz 157)¹²⁵. As a consequence, Stoppard becomes the "youngest playwright ever to have a play put on at the National Theatre" (Dodd 12).

The years to follow witness the advent of a number of less captivating Stoppard plays, including *Enter a Free Man* and *After Magritte*, which both hold on to the Beckettian absurdist tradition of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern*. In 1974, Stoppard's play *Travesties*, which embarks on a different strategy regarding form and content (cf. Weikert 182) while still making use of the plot of an English classic (in this case Wilde's *The Importance of*

¹²⁵ Cf. also Hobson in Barth 110; Brassell 35.

Being Earnest), is performed at the Aldwych Theatre in a production by the Royal Shakespeare Company and directed by Peter Wood (cf. Brassell 136; Bratt xiii; Orlich 1; Sieder, “2”, 562). Apart from Wilde’s literary background, Stoppard equally draws on historical personalities – including James Joyce, Tristan Tzara, and Lenin – who, in direct juxtaposition to the less famous character Henry Carr, appear as objects of ridicule and laughter (cf. Barth 115; Galens). Just as Schnitzler’s *Das weite Land*, Stoppard’s *Travesties* ensures immediate success; it is hailed as a “masterpiece of serious wit” as well as “a miraculous display of verbal fireworks” (Wetzsteon 80) and “reinforce[s] Stoppard’s reputation as one of the twentieth century’s most innovative and clever playwrights” (Galens). Brassell describes Stoppard’s play as “one of the most architecturally complex plays ever written in the English language” (260) which earns the “*Evening Standard*’s Best Play Award of 1974” (*ibid.* 136), and Kelly even goes as far as to declare *Travesties* “the best Stoppard play to date” (qtd. in Lakner 108). In 1993 the Royal Shakespeare Company again takes up Stoppard’s play, this time under the direction of Adrian Noble who places the main focus on the visual stage design. As Sieder explains, “[t]he play has stood the test of time” (“2”, 590) and is again applauded by critics and spectators¹²⁶.

In the same year as *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* is performed at the National Theatre in London, the Viennese Akademietheater successfully stages the German version *Rosenkranz und Gldenstern* based on a translation by Hanno Lunin (cf. Lakner 50). Only two years after its British premiere, *Travesties* is first performed in Vienna in 1976 – again at the Akademietheater and under the direction of Peter Wood, following the German translation provided by Hilde Spiel (cf. Sieder, “2”, 624)¹²⁷. Sieder acknowledges the play’s success in Austria, while pointing out its affinities with the boulevard theater (cf. “2”, 625). Generally speaking, Austria features two Stoppard plays in the 1960s, six in the 1970s, eight in the 1980s, four in the 1990s (cf. Lakner 3), and a revised version of *Rosenkranz und Gldenstern* is currently performed at the theater *Scala* under the direction of Bruno Max.

¹²⁶ For more detailed reviews of both productions of *Travesties*, see Sieder, “2”, 562-573; 589-609.

¹²⁷ For more detailed information and reviews on the Austrian premiere of *Travesties*, see Sieder, “2”, 624-665.

III.2 On the Impossibility of Equivalence: Highlighting Translation Shifts

Shifts can equally be found when contrasting Stoppard's plays with their German renderings. The approach adopted in the following chapters is hence in perfect line with the one used when comparing Schnitzler's plays to their English versions. While in the first instance, divergences on the macro-level of the texts will be addressed, translation shifts on the micro-level will be discussed in more detail afterwards. Other than in Schnitzler's case, where linguistic variation as well as culturemes play a pivotal role, the focus in comparing Stoppard's plays with their German versions will be placed on punning and wordplay as well as on intertextual allusions employed in the texts.

III.2.1 An Analysis on the Macro-Level of Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* and *Travesties* in Comparison to their German Versions *Rosenkranz und Gùldenstern* and *Travesties*

III.2.1.1 *Altering Length and Structure*

Regarding the number of acts as well as the overall structure, Tom Stoppard's three-act play *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* as well as his two-act play *Travesties* have not undergone considerable alterations in their respective German text versions. Max's production, however, omits a considerable number of passages, tuning the original three-act structure into two acts only. Stoppard's quirk of incorporating two concurrent story lines into almost all of his plays¹²⁸ is taken up by Hanno Lunin and Hilde Spiel in the respective German versions. In *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* one narrative strand is based on the plot of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, which pictures the two *personae* Rosencrantz and Guildenstern as Hamlet's good friends who are going to lose their heads in the end of the play. The second strand which still shows the two as headless, aimless, if not completely lost beings takes place outside the *Hamlet* action (cf. Brassell 39; Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 20; Keyssar-Franke 87). In the latter case, both assume a different, more colloquial and more absurd voice, hence strongly resembling the Beckettian duo of *Waiting for Godot*, *Happy Days*, or *Endgame*. In Act I, both characters are the perfect copy of Beckett's absurd dwellers, being relatively remote from the storyline of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. As a result, the audience does not immediately understand them as

¹²⁸ Cf. Hunter (*Plays*, 136) and Stern who points out "the dual stage-reality of *The Real Inspector Hound*" (173).

being determined by the plot of Shakespeare's famous play. In Act II, however, the two strands intertwine, and the spectator all of a sudden realizes that Rosencrantz and Guildenstern's death is inevitable. By the end of the play, the Beckettian strand is fully absorbed into the *Hamlet* storyline: both Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are fated to die (cf. Keyssar-Franke 94-96). In *Travesties* part of the action hinges on Oscar Wilde's famous play *The Importance of Being Earnest*. At certain moments Stoppard's *personae* appear as characters straight out of Wilde's play, assuming certain lines verbatim which, in comparison to the rest of the dialog, take on a curious tinge of exaggerated stiltedness. At other moments, however, they employ Stoppard's very personal punning style, equally uttering taboo four-letter words which would at best make Wilde's characters blush.

The German versions take over this two-strand structure. However, for an Austrian audience who is less familiar with Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and even more so with Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest*, this dual opposition is clearly less distinctive. In Lunin's version, a clear distinction can be achieved by juxtaposing Shakespeare's (i.e. Schlegel and Tieck's) blank verses and Lunin's more colloquial dialog – an aspect which is, however, not fully exploited by Max as the transition from the *Hamlet* scenes to the absurdist *Beckettian* passages is not clearly marked by the characters' language. Hilde Spiel finds it even more difficult to introduce a clear-cut distinction between the two strands. As a matter of fact, no pronounced linguistic differentiation can be felt by an Austrian spectator unless he or she has overdosed him- or herself on the German version of Wilde's *Importance*, i.e. *Bunbury*.

Lunin at least to some extent manages to bring across *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern's* "dramatic structure [...] [which is] devoid of order, symmetry, and purpose" (Cahn 21). Spiel's text, on the other hand, misses the verbal virtuosity of the original text. Stoppard's gunpowder-like verbal fuel is not infrequently brought to a halt. Instead of swirling assonances and alliterations, Spiel relies more on rhyme schemes à la Goethe and other German-speaking Romanticist writers¹²⁹. Her flowery language unmistakably slows down Stoppard's linguistic firework – an aspect which is commonly deployed in various reviews of the Viennese production of *Travesties* (cf. Sieder, "2", 652/789). These understand the length of the German version as a paralyzation of Stoppard's levity. (cf. Lakner 118). Stoppard himself admits to being "fearful of the length of the play in

¹²⁹ Cf. Punning and Wordplay below for a more detailed analysis.

German”, further pointing out that “German translations [generally] add to the length” of the original English plays (qtd. in Lakner 112). At least at certain moments in the play, Lunin equally turns to longer renderings; he uses a number of German fillers, such as “also” (RG, 13), “[ü]berhaupt” (*ibid.* 15), “denn” (*ibid.* 20), etc., thereby violating the verbal brevity of Stoppard’s original.

III.2.1.2 Peritext and Stage Directions

The stage directions are not considerably altered in the German versions of Stoppard’s plays (cf. also Sieder, “1”, 388). Some additions should however be pointed out: Hilde Spiel adds that the play is set in Zurich (“*Das Stück spielt in Zürich, auf zwei Schauplätzen*” (T, 6)), further translating Nadja’s Russian “*prostitje*” into German (*ibid.* 8). She thereby pays more attention to the underlying meaning of the foreign language game than Stoppard does. His aim is clearly not to render Nadya’s and Lenin’s Russian conversation understandable to the English spectator, but rather to add to the foreign potpourri of his play. When Spiel has Tzara enter with gladioluses in his hand (cf. Spiel, T, 20; Sieder, “1”, 394), she alters Tzara’s character who does not bring any flowers whatsoever in the English play (cf. Sieder, “1”, 394). Lunin, for his part, again inflates his stage directions with fillers and hypotaxes where Stoppard employs mere parataxes.

The titles of both Stoppard plays are equally left relatively unaltered in their German versions. However, while an English audience immediately relates *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* to Hamlet’s friends, an Austrian spectator will probably fail to associate Shakespeare’s famous play with the title. As for *Travesties* – which is left completely unmodified in German – Sieder points to the rumors which the title fuelled in Austria, where people expected “a show of transvestites” (“2”, 645).

III.2.1.3 Dialog Structure, Rhythm, and Tempo

Both Lunin and Spiel do their best to keep up the dialog/monolog structure employed by Stoppard in *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* and *Travesties* respectively. However, cumbersome grammatical and syntactical constructions which are typical of the German language frequently upset their plans. The structure of absurd stichomythia to which *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* hold on in the English version requires an employment of short, staccato-like terms (cf. Easterling 148). “[T]ransition[s] from one topic to another

can be abrupt”, illogical and non-associative (*ibid.* 49). Baumgart speaks of a peculiar, ongoing rhythm which clearly contrasts the fluent Shakespeare passages of blank verse (596). “Dieser Grundrhythmus ist von apokopierender Kürze, ein Schlag-auf-Schlag-Dialog [...] Die Schlag um Schlag folgenden Repliken erfordern rasches Tempo. Durch wiederholte Unterbrechungen (*Pause, Beat* [...]) wird der psychologische Effekt noch gesteigert” (*ibid.* 596). Keyssar-Franke mentions tennis as “an apt metaphor for the verbal volleying which occurs between Rosencrantz and Guildenstern” (89); the image of the tennis game as characteristic of Stoppard’s style of dialog is also taken up by Brady (102), and Orlich speaks of “verbal fireworks” (1). Longer constructions in German hamper the quickly flowing verbal battle of the two characters, thereby slowing down the “brief, fast, [and] cleverly and skillfully manipulated [exchanges]” (Keyssar-Franke 93) typical of the English versions. As a result, the German *personae* are more articulate than their English, laconic counterparts, and hence a tinge less absurd than the latter. Compare for instance:

| | |
|--|---|
| ROS. [...] Well, I won – didn’t I? (Stoppard, <i>RG</i> , 9) | ROS. [...] Kurz und gut, ich habe gewonnen. Oder nicht? (Lunin, <i>RG</i> , 12) |
| ROS. It’ll take some beating, I Imagine. (Stoppard, <i>RG</i> , 10) | ROS. Jetzt wirst du mich einige Male schlagen müssen, könnt ich mir vorstellen. (Lunin, <i>RG</i> , 12) |
| GUIL. Where are you going? PLAYER. [...] Home, sir. GUIL. Where from? PLAYER. Home. (Stoppard, <i>RG</i> , 25) | GÜL. Wo geht ihr hin? SCHAUSPIELER. [...] Nach Hause, mein Herr. GUIL. Und von wo kommt ihr? SCHAUSPIELER. Von zu Hause. (Lunin, <i>RG</i> , 23) |
| PLAYER [...] Not yet! [...] You left us. (Stoppard, <i>RG</i> , 66) | SCHAUSPIELER. Aber noch nicht! [...] Sie haben uns im Stich gelassen. (Lunin, <i>RG</i> , 57) |

This can also strongly be felt in Max’s version of the play, where the actors Leopold Selinger and Bernie Feit who play *Rosenkranz* and *Güldenstern* respectively are much too articulate to be truly absurd. However, Lunin and Max do not fail to illustrate the fallacy of verbal communication in their plays (cf. Cahn 42). In many instances, both characters talk past each other – i.e. they monologize their talk. As a result, their dialog-like conversation is more of a constant interweavement of two monolog structures (cf. Easterling 119). This strategy which Stoppard borrows from Beckett is, however, blended

with highly lucid Stoppardian wordplay. The following verbal exchange between Ros and Guil, which at first sight might be interpreted as absurd chatter conceals a cleverly thought out verbal code which Lunin does not decrypt successfully in his German version:

| | |
|---|--|
| ROS. And with her husband's brother. GUIL. They were too close. ROS. She went to him – GUIL. Too close – ROS. – for comfort. (Stoppard, <i>RG</i> , 53) | ROS. Und mit dem Bruder ihres Mannes. GÜL. Sie standen sich sehr nah. ROS. Sie ging zu ihm – GÜL. – Zu nah – ROS. – Und suchte Trost. (Lunin, <i>RG</i> , 46) |
|---|--|

While, as Easterling explains, the English version can be combined in three possible ways: “She went too close”; “She went to him for comfort”; “She went to him too close for comfort” (122), this cannot be said of Lunin’s construction.

Most naturally, forms of address have to be introduced in dialog. Interestingly, Lunin has the Schauspieler address Ros and Gül with a formal “Sie” (*RG*, 22), whereas Ros replies using the less formal “du” (*ibid.* 22). Lunin thereby introduces an asymmetry between both characters which cannot be felt to the same extent in the original English version.

Verbal tennis games in which an argument is followed by “a refutation, then a rebuttal of the refutation, then a counter-rebuttal, so that there is never any point in this intellectual leap-frog at which [...] the speech is [going to] stop” (Scott Robinson 38), are less common, although not altogether absent in *Travesties*. The use of longer monologs in this play does however not imply a revelation of the characters’ inner thoughts and feelings, but rather suggests “a manic loquacity punctuated by silences or metaphysical jokes” (Hinden 401) on the part of each persona (cf. Sieder, “2”, 633). Old Carr’s monologs, for instance, are full of “contradictions, puns, inaccurate quotations and humorous wordplay” (Brassell 138). As a result, Stoppard’s plays are hardly ever long-winded, but full of buzzing activity and punning wit (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 79; Keyssar-Franke 85). They rely on “twists of action [...] [and] abrupt flashbacks through time” (Brassell 262), thereby creating a quick-moving, action-laden potpourri of verbal wit.

This, in turn, bestows a very unique rhythm on Stoppard’s plays, which Hunter describes as a sequence of “grating sound-music – mostly monosyllabic, short-vowelled and

consonantal [...] [and] made up largely of four-letter words” (*Plays*, 99). Music is indeed an apt symbol to describe Stoppard’s rhythmic style. Stoppard chooses most of his dialogs because they form a perfect melodious ensemble which Hunter terms “percussive music” (*Plays*, 100). This gives the impression that Stoppard is more of a musical entertainer, keen on producing a perfect cadence of assonances and consonances, than a careful planner of character and plot constellations (cf. Orlich 2). The following examples perfectly illustrate the rhythmic progression so typical of Stoppard’s plays. A direct juxtaposition with the German versions shows that the latter remind one more of Goethe’s romantic atmosphere conjured up, for instance, in *Der Erlkönig*. This connection is reinforced by words suggesting a dim, dusky sky, as well as by the symbol of the riding cavalier.

ROS. That’s it – pale sky before dawn, a man standing on his saddle to bang on the shutters – shouts – What’s all the row about?! (Stoppard, *RG*, 16)

ROS. [...] lights in the stableyard, saddle up and off headlong and hotfoot across the land. (Stoppard, *RG*, 17)

TZARA. Eel ate enormous appletzara key dairy chef’s hat he’lllearn oomparah! Ill raced alas whispers kill later nut east, noon avuncular ill day Clara! (Stoppard, *T*, 18)¹³⁰

CARR. [...] There was a young man from Dublin, tum-ti-ti-tum-ti-ti troublin’. (Stoppard, *T*, 21)

ROS. Stimmt... *Blasser Himmel vor dem Morgengrauen*, ein Mann steht in seinem *Sattel*, donnert gegen die Fensterladen – schreit... Was soll dieser Lärm da draußen? (Lunin, *RG*, 17; my emphasis)

ROS. [...] Also, Licht an im Stall, *Sattel* aufgelegt, und los ging’s Hals über Kopf, mit *dampfenden Hufen* quer durchs ganze Land. (Lunin, *RG*, 17; my emphasis)

TZARA. *Zuckungsreiterin* antikenschubfach tief dort *dämmerung* der pfirsich bewacht eisige opfergabe *nachtlicht* unfroh. (Spiel, *T*, 7; my emphasis)

CARR. [...] Ein schneidiger Jüngling aus Dublin, tan ti tam *ritt gemächlich im Trab hin*. (Spiel, *T*, 9; my emphasis)

¹³⁰ Note that the poem which at first sight appears to be nonsensical does have a clear underlying meaning which is not rendered convincingly in the German version. Phonetically speaking, it reads in French: “Il était un homme où [sic!] s’appelle Tzara/ qui de richesses a-t-il un embarras/ Il reste à la [sic !] Suisse/ parce qu’il est un artiste/ nous n’avons que l’art/[là]/ Il declara” (cf. Sieder, “1”, 62). – In English: “There is a man called Tzara/ Who of riches had an embarrassment/He stays in Switzerland/Because he’s an artist/’We have nowhere else,’ he declared” (Cahn 107). Cahn only translates the possible rendering “nous n’avons que là”, not taking into account that it could also refer to ‘art’. Hunter detects the following underlying French poem in Stoppard’s version: “Il est un homme, s’appelle Tzara/ Qui des richesses a-t-il le nonpareil [??]/ Il reste a la Suisse/ Parce qu’il est un artiste/ ‘Nous n’avons que l’art’, il declara” (*Rosencrantz*, 135) which, however sounds less convincing than the above-mentioned versions.

At other points in the plays, both Lunin and Spiel try to render Stoppard's consonances in their German versions, however opting for different sounds, thereby again altering the texts' atmosphere. Stoppard's predilection for /p/-/b/ consonances (cf. "banking bouncing" (*T*, 24), "sixpounders pounding [...] picked out – plucked out – blessed by the blood" (*ibid.* 25), "bellicosity [...] punctuality of public clocks" (*ibid.* 26)) is replaced by /k/-/g/-/ʃ/ sounds in the German versions. It is obvious that the plosives /p/ and /b/ conjure up a more vivid and dynamic atmosphere than the German sounds, which are rather associated with sounds of suffocation and the harshness typical of the German language. The atmosphere is hence severely altered:

GUIL (*musings*). The law of probability, it has been oddly asserted, is something to do with the proposition [...].
(Stoppard, *RG*, 7; my emphasis)

CARR. [...] A prudish, prudent man [...] in no way profligate or vulgar, and yet convivial [...] yet still without primness towards hard currency in all its transmutable and transferable forms [...]. (Stoppard, *T*, 22; my emphasis)¹³¹

GÜL *nachdenklich*. Das Gesetz der Wahrscheinlichkeit – das ist oft genug behauptet worden – hängt irgendwie mit der Regel zusammen [...].
(Lunin, *RG*, 10; my emphasis)

CARR. [...] Ein prüder, schlauer Mann [...] keineswegs ausschweifend oder ordinär, und doch gesellig, ohne verschwenderisch zu sein, gleichwohl nicht spröde gegenüber harter Währung in all ihren eintauschbaren und übertragbaren Formen [...]. (Spiel, *T*, 11; my emphasis)

In other words, Stoppard approaches language with a "craftmanlike attitude" (Easterling 121), "treat[ing] sentences as if they were toy constructions which can be dismantled at will" or made to "enter into a maximum number of combinations" (*ibid.* 121). Another example of such a rhythmic figure is the *polyptoton*, i.e. "the repetition of words differing only in termination" (qtd. in *ibid.* 152), or the use of words which have the same suffix, but a different prefix, as in "[...] enigmatic, magnetic, but not, I think astigmatic [...] dynamic, gnomic and yet not, I think, anaemic" (Stoppard, *T*, 23)¹³².

In the German versions Stoppard's "effervescent, witty dialogue and clever, provocative exchanges" (Orlich 7) are tuned down, both in rhythm and in speed. While Stoppard's plays rush along with ease (cf. Sieder, "1", 2), Lunin's and Spiel's texts are less vivid and

¹³¹ Cf. also Tan who points to the "alliterative adjectives used in Carr's description of Joyce" (156), further suggesting that these adjectives were probably merely used "for alliterative effect" (*ibid.* 156).

¹³² Cf. also Tan 157.

speedy, thereby diverging considerably from Stoppard's "superb command of rhythm and high-speed comic detail" (Wardle qtd. in Sieder, "2", 604). Other than Stoppard who focuses primarily on the form [i.e. the signifiers] of his utterances, Lunin and Spiel work on the level of the signifieds, hence altering rhythm and atmosphere of the original plays. This can also strongly be felt in Max's performance, where the main focus is indubitably placed on the topics and themes of Stoppard's original *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*. The metaphor of probability illustrated by various absurd games, panfictionality, multiple identities and the ominous question of death is omnipresent, whereas Stoppard's formal sophistication is widely ignored.

III.2.1.4 Stylistic Characteristics and Genre

The above-mentioned alterations also have a considerable impact on the style of the various plays. The change in dialog structure, tempo, and rhythm also alters the overall tenor of the plays. One of the most frequently addressed changes as regards Spiel's translation of Stoppard's *Travesties* which is described as "a masterpiece of serious wit" (Orlich 1) featuring "insolent humor and outrageous nonsense" (*ibid.* 1)¹³³ is the loss of humor which the German version entails (cf. Lakner 112; Sieder, "1", 419). The comical atmosphere of Stoppard's plays is most frequently created through "misunderstandings, mistaken identity, [...] plot twists" (Galens), mind slips (Hunter, *Plays*, 81; Sieder, "1", 58), "unexpected appropriateness" (Hunter, *Plays*, 83), repetition with slight variation (*ibid.* 88-89), and other linguistic manifestations such as heated debates of vulgarity (*ibid.* 94-95/98) or semantically incongruent onomatopoeic terms (cf. Sieder, "1", 50). Spiel herself admits to a "Verlust an Humor, den er [Tom Stoppard] in der deutschen Fassung so beklagt" (qtd. in Lakner 44). She can however not understand Stoppard's obsession with punch lines and laughs and frequently deploys the latter's penchant for dramatic performance, rather than dramatic textuality (cf. *ibid.* 111). As Stoppard explains in an interview, he usually looks for "comic possibilities" which he can "exploit dramatically and theatrically in terms of comedy" (Taylor 28). Reviews of the English productions of *Travesties* unanimously highlight the light and frivolous atmosphere of a play "full of laughter" (qtd. in Sieder, "2", 591), equally speaking of "a revelation of [the text's] full comic power" (qtd. in *ibid.* 608).

¹³³ Cf. also Shields Hardin who speaks of Stoppard's "politics of laughter" (154).

Most naturally, the length of the German version also interferes with Stoppard's epigrammatic style which he borrows from Wilde (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 96), and which Sieder describes as an

exaggerated use of alliterations, homophones and onomatopoeic effects [which] makes the reader feel like under the influence of too heavy perfume used too lavishly. The effect of being dazzled and surprised soon gives way to a clear view of what lies behind all that – Nothing! (“1”, 100)

Stoppard is obsessed with or “hooked on” style as he himself confesses (qtd. in Scott Robinson 47), whereas Spiel cares more about the deeper textual level of the play. Genre-wise, Stoppard's play is referred to as “a blending of 'stream-of-consciousness technique' [...] Dadaist collage, [...] comedy of manners¹³⁴ and ideas, [...] memory play, [...] [and] well-made play” (Sieder, “1”, 30). Being devoid of Stoppard's linguistic lightness, Spiel's play leans more toward a military history play as war terminology and slogans are frequently incorporated into her text (cf. Sieder, “1”, 387/403/415/429).

Again, Stoppard's characters are more sexually explicit than Spiel's counterparts. While Stoppard's Cecily accuses Carr of “imagin[ing] how [she]'d looked stripped off to [her] knickers” (*T*, 78), Spiel's pendant prudishly exclaims, “[Sie] stellen [...] sich vor, wie ich wohl aussehe, wenn ich nichts am Leibe habe als meine blauen Strümpfe” (*T*, 61). The passage “Snowballs in hell. Snowballs at all” (Stoppard, *T*, 24) which, on the surface level appears to be highly decent, actually hides an allusion to the not-so-decent Second World War song ‘No balls at all’ (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 138) – a melody which does not ring a bell for the German spectator and hence misses any sexual connotation whatsoever in the German version.

An aspect which has already been touched upon briefly in the preceding sections regards Spiel's trend of employing Romanticist-style passages. By rendering “now I've lost my knack for it. Too late to go back for it. Alas and alack for it” (Stoppard, *T*, 22) with “Zu spät, zu spät, die Zeit vergeht, Talent verweht, auch wenn der Wunsch noch besteht” (Spiel, *T*, 11), she dismantles Stoppard's rhythmic roller coaster ride by molding his original text into Goethe's predetermined paths. As a result, the deliberately incorporated Romantic passages of Stoppard's play – “The dawn breaking over no-man's-land –

¹³⁴ Sieder further mentions Stoppard's ability of toying with words which she likens to the Comedy of Manners (“1”. 193).

Dewdrops glistening on the poppies in the early morning sun!” (*T*, 41), which in the English version clearly contrast with the rest of the play (cf. Tan 170), almost go unnoticed in the German version. Sieder’s general description of Spiel’s version as being “far more prosaic and far more literary than the original play” (“1”, 443) efficiently summarizes the main changes which the English version underwent by being transposed into German. “Da haben uns die Engländer einiges voraus”, muses Blaha (qtd. in Sieder, “2”, 638), and Sieder further explains that Stoppard’s play “was too intellectually British” – holding on to typically English irony and humor – to be fully successful in Vienna (“2”, 650/651/655).

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead is alternately referred to as ‘existentialist metadrama’ (cf. Easterling 13; Lakner 50) or ‘Theatre of the Absurd’ (Hinchcliffe qtd. in Easterling 13) and hence, just as Schnitzler’s *Liebelei* the less comic and more serious of the two Stoppard plays. However, this is not to say that “quick wit” (*ibid.* 75), comical twists and “farcical music-hall effects” (*ibid.* 82)¹³⁵, as well as “double entendre[s]” (*ibid.* 108) are altogether absent from this play (cf. *ibid.* 60/63/83/96; Hinden 401; Hunter, *Plays*, 87). Indeed, reviews of the play’s English performances mention “richness of humor which creates a crackling atmosphere” (Cuyler 551), and classify the play as “funny, poignant, spooky” (*ibid.* 552), “sturdy, witty” (Mc Elroy 94) or “comically absurd” (Brady 103). Stoppard’s “series of comical confusion” (Scott Robinson 37) can again not always be felt to the same extent in Lunin’s text. Lunin’s characters are, just like Spiel’s, less daring than Stoppard’s. Even though they do not shy away from sexual innuendo, their way of expressing themselves is usually less saucy than that of their English pendants. When the Player suggests that his crew can give Rosencrantz and Guildenstern “a tumble” (Stoppard, *RG*, 21), he is clearly ambiguous, whereas the German Schauspieler mainly proposes: “Wir können Ihnen was vorgaukeln” (Lunin, *RG*, 20), which has a completely different connotation. In Bruno Max’s production, the sexual connotations which are missing on a purely linguistic level in Lunin’s version are made up for by daring and lively poses which are often relatively unambiguous as to their sexual content.

It should also not be overlooked that the comic element of Stoppard’s plays (commonly used adjectives to describe Stoppard’s style include “amusing”, “dazzling”, “witty” (Bratt

¹³⁵ Cf. also Scott Robinson 43; Sieder, “1”, 13/193.

xxiii), and “burlesque” (Sieder, “1”, 13)) largely relies on the farcical, parodying approach to the three parental plays, *Hamlet*, *Waiting for Godot*, and *The Importance of Being Earnest*. Both English plays are generally interpreted as comic farces¹³⁶, parodies¹³⁷, pastiches¹³⁸, montages, collages, or travesties¹³⁹ (cf. Barth 112; Brassell 35/137; Easterling 135/144; Hinden 404; Lau 1/5; Orlich 1; Scott Robinson 37/45; Sieder, “1” 193/199)¹⁴⁰. Scott Robinson even goes as far as to claim that Stoppard “is at his best in parody” while being “at his weakest when he wants his characters to express a meaning or feeling of their own” (47). This dimension can, of course, not be felt to the same extent by an Austrian audience, as parody only works if the spectator has a profound knowledge of the parodied texts.

III.2.1.5 Topics and Themes

A systematic analysis of all research studies on Tom Stoppard combined has shown that most has been said and written about the topics and themes of his works. However, as Bratt rightly claims, “[i]t is hardly necessary to read all of these critics’ articles in order to become acquainted with the[...] central issues [of Stoppard’s plays]: as few as six items will do” (xvi). The earlier of Stoppard’s plays – *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* – generally follows the line of absurdist drama (cf. Cahn 36/64), discussing issues such as the existence of God (cf. Easterling 54; Karwowski 2), the meaningfulness of life as opposed to an inevitable death (cf. Easterling 168-172), the dual nature of language, randomness vs. fate (cf. Sparknotes Editors), “the Truth of the human condition” or the smooth transition between reality and illusion (Karwowski 1/3). Scott Robinson further mentions “anxiety and confusion of life, [...] the helplessness of the individual caught up in forces impervious to reason, [...] [and] the loss of identity and faith” (37)¹⁴¹.

Travesties - which according to Victor L. Cahn goes beyond absurdity (141) - is

¹³⁶ Abrams defines farce as “a type of comedy designed to provoke the audience to simple hearty laughter – ‘belly laughs, in the parlance of the theater” (qtd. in Sieder, “1”, 14).

¹³⁷ Easterling refers to OED’s definition of parody as “[a] composition in prose or verse in which the characteristic turns of thought and phrase in an author or a class of authors are imitated in such a way as to make them appear ridiculous [...] an imitation of a work more or less closely modeled on the original, but so turned as to produce a ridiculous effect” (135); Scott Robinson speaks of “a way of reducing the stature of characters and events, of destroying a known model and revealing its absurdity, of looking at ideas from an angle which fractures their meaning” (45).

¹³⁸ Pastiche, as a term generally employed in art, refers to “a patchwork or potpourri”, i.e. a collage of various literary strands (cf. Sieder, “1”, 201).

¹³⁹ “‘Travesty’, like parody mocks a particular work; but it does so by treating its lofty subject in a jocular and undignified manner and style” (Abrams qtd. in Sieder, “1”, 206).

¹⁴⁰ Barth equally speaks of “Gesellschaftskomödie[n]” (121).

¹⁴¹ Cf. also Barth 112-113; Brassell 266; Keyssar-Franke 85; Pearce 1139/1148; Sieder, “1”, 133/916; Sparknotes Editors.

frequently described as showcasing the collision of politics and art (cf. Brassell 140; Galens; Lakner 101; Sieder, “2”, 570). In this play, Stoppard has accepted absurdity as an essential part of life which must not lead to resignation, but to determined revolt (Bratt xvii; Cahn 153). However, topics such as the blurring of lines between what is real and what is invented – as well as the deconstruction of other binaries prevail also in Stoppard’s later plays. Accordingly, Stoppard refuses “to submit to one single style” (Lau 1), he mixes real and fictional figures, incorporates extracts from both high and low literary examples into his texts (ranging from Shakespeare to Gilbert and Sullivan, Dadaism and pop songs), and further puts present and past happenings on one footing (Lau 2-3/40). In *Travesties*, even the authorial voice is split into many different voices, i.e. that of young and old Carr, as well as those of the other *dramatis personae* of the play who all display “mutually exclusive opinions and views”, hence “contribut[ing] to multiple perspectives and narratives” (*ibid.* 40)¹⁴².

The general topical strands of absurdity and art vs. politics can equally be felt in the German versions. However, the notion of oppositional deconstruction – especially prevalent in *Travesties* – is generally not as pronounced in Spiel’s play since the distinction between different styles, registers and high and low literary examples cannot be felt to the same extent. As Sieder points out, “the nostalgic Scottish traditional tune, also familiar as soldier’s song of the First World War, i.e., of *Auld Lang Syne* known in German under the title *Ein schöner Tag zu Ende geht* and Beethoven’s *Appassionata* are the only acoustic allusions to the ‘old style’ taken over from the original” (“1”, 392).

III.2.2 An Analysis on the Micro-Level of Stoppard’s *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* and *Travesties* in Comparison to their German Versions *Rosenkranz und Gölldenstern* and *Travesties*

III.2.2.1 Language, Register, and Vocabulary

“Tom Stoppard made his reputation in the late Sixties and early Seventies as a talented wordsmith and playwright with hypnotizing linguistic brilliance and a penchant for witty word-play” (Macris 111). Indeed, Stoppard’s linguistic mastery is probably the most outstanding characteristic of all of his works (cf. Easterling 74; Sieder, “1”, 2/172).

¹⁴² Cf. also Lau 14/17.

Reviews which foreground the playwright's verbal capacity are hence abundant. In the *New York Times*, Clive Barnes states about *Travesties* that Stoppard "has constructed a whole ballet of words, wit and oddly disturbing literary echoes" (qtd. in Galens); Delaney describes Stoppard as an author who "values 'well chosen words nicely put together'" (2); Hunter praises Stoppard's "craftsmanship" as well as his "brilliance of the verbal polish" (*Plays*, 93); and Stoppard himself admits to "dig[ging] words more than [...] [he] can speak them" (Taylor 26). "There are no words to say how much I love them. (Isn't that nice?)", he concludes in an interview (*ibid.* 26). As a writer who is fascinated by "the way language and logic can be used or misused" (Kerensky 87), Stoppard naturally sends all his characters on a verbal roller coaster ride. Consequently, his *dramatis personae* speak for the sake of uttering witty and provocative sentences, rather than in order to develop distinctive character traits marked by psychological profundity (cf. Barth 125; Sieder, "1", 45; Sparknotes Editors). "All my people speak the same way, with the same cadences and sentence structures", Stoppard admits in an interview (Gussow, *Conversations*, 35). In *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* both characters lack distinctive qualities, and appear as "everyman' figures" (Sparknotes Editors) rather than cleverly thought out individuals: "An die Stelle von Individuum und Gestalt treten Ziffern und Schablonen. [...] Am Ende steht, unbeschönigt und unverhüllt, 'niemand'" (Baumgart 589). It is hence not surprising that the borderline between the two characters is rather thin, if not inexistent (cf. Cahn 39-40; Hunter, *Plays*, 124-126; Keyssar-Franke 90-91). "Nobody, including the men themselves, seems able to tell Rosencrantz from Guildenstern, which [...] comments on the difficulties of establishing a firm identity in a chaotic world" (Sparknotes Editors). To add confusion Stoppard blends "real and unreal characters" (Pearce 1156) in *Travesties* and splits Carr's identity into Young and Old Carr (cf. Lau 17).

The aspect of 'multiple identities' is further stressed by the variant language use of Stoppard's characters. As in his Schnitzler adaptations, Stoppard varies the register of each single character in his plays *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* and *Travesties*. This effect is achieved through a blending of Stoppard's own style on the one hand – i.e. a language full of puns and wordplay which is yet brought relatively close to everyday speech (cf. Brassell 25) – and the style of other English playwrights whose language Stoppard incorporates into his own plays (cf. Cahn 132; Easterling; Lakner 102; Lau 7-8; Sieder, "1", 173; Sparknotes Editors). Stoppard "fuses the two kinds of language with great panache [...] establishing two linguistically remote styles and yoking them with

considerable dexterity” (Brassell 42-43). As a result, Shakespeare’s, Beckett’s, Joyce’s, and Wilde’s idiomatic mode (as well as that of many other famous authors) is weaved into the texture of Stoppard’s plays (cf. Brassell 150; Easterling 145/150; Pearce 1149). As Hunter points out, the juxtaposition of two utterly remote styles can equally add to the comic character of a play (*Plays*, 99)¹⁴³. This distinction is not always upheld in the German texts. Where Stoppard contrasts “our guests outstripped in breakneck pursuit” (*RG*, 17) with “Fearful lest we come too late!” (*ibid.* 17), Lunin does not introduce contrasting linguistic styles in his passage: “die Führer abgehängt, in halsbrecherischer Ausübung unserer Pflicht! Vor lauter Angst, zu spät zu kommen” (*RG*, 17); neither does Max’s production focus on this linguistic contrast as much as Stoppard does in his original.

Stoppard equally retains his famous multilingual language games in the two plays (cf. Barth 109; Lau 7; Sieder, “1”, 51). “Joyce and Gwendolen chant Latin and early English [...] and the Lenins chatter animatedly in Russian” (Hunter, *Plays*, 101). Surprisingly, the language games are not always kept up in the German texts. Stoppard’s Latin “Matri, patri, fratri, sorori, uxori” (*RG*, 33) is rendered as “Mutter-, Vater-, Bruder-, Geschwister-, Gatten-“ (Lunin, *RG*, 30), and Ros’s “*non sequiturs*” (Stoppard, *RG*, 47) are turned into “[f]alsche Schlußfolgerungen” (Lunin, *RG*, 40). “Tarsus-Schmarsus” (Stoppard, *RG*, 77) which in English has a clearly Germanic connotation, remains unchanged in the German version, thereby missing the ‘exotic’ feel of the original. By the same token, Spiel incorporates the German phrase “Und alle Schiffe brucken...” (Stoppard, *T*, 19) into her version.

A comparison of the vocabulary employed in the English versions on the one hand, and the German texts on the other shows that Spiel generally tends to employ a more elevated style than Stoppard. “Hilde Spiel refrains from colloquialisms, abbreviations and, only in a few cases helps herself with dialect” (Sieder, “1”, 418). Lunin’s play is generally more ‘colloquial’, although some highly formal expressions can be detected which clearly contrast with the rest of the play. Where Stoppard speaks of a “band” (*RG*, 18), Lunin mentions “eine[...] Kapelle” (*RG*, 18). By the same token, “stuff” (Stoppard, *RG*, 28) is rendered as “Repertoire” (Lunin, *RG*, 25), and “I can’t remember” (Stoppard, *RG*, 44) is turned into “Ich kann mich nicht besinnen” (Lunin, *RG*, 37). Sieder mentions Spiel’s

¹⁴³ Cf. also Tan 160.

tendency of using “more aggressive vocabulary” (“1”, 403) than Stoppard, which can be explained by the fact that war terms or other allusions to militarism abound in her text (cf. *ibid.* 404). In doing so, she at times destroys the typically British, polite atmosphere of Stoppard’s *Travesties* (cf. *ibid.* 404). At some points, Lunin’s language is also much cruder than Stoppard’s daring, but not obscene utterances: “Ihr perversen Schweine” (Lunin, *RG*, 26) is clearly less distinguished than “*perverts*” (Stoppard, *RG*, 29). On the other hand, daring language is not infrequently translated with less provocative terms, as in the case of “The very *air* stinks” (Stoppard, *RG*, 32) which is translated as “Sogar die Luft ist verpestet” (Lunin, *RG*, 29) and “[S]hut up” (Stoppard, *RG*, 82/135) which Lunin variously renders as “[B]itte halt jetzt deinen Mund” (*RG*, 69) and “Hör auf!” (*RG*, 111). In the Viennese production by Max, Lunin’s harsh passages, such as the above-mentioned “Ihr perversen Schweine” (Lunin, *RG*, 26) are altogether omitted. This tendency can also be felt in Spiel’s play, when she renders “The classics – tradition – vomit on it! [...] Beethoven! Mozart! I spit on it!” (Stoppard, *T*, 35) as “Die Klassiker muß man zerreißen! [...] Beethoven! Mozart! Und wie sie auch heißen!” (Spiel, *T*, 22). Eight lines later, Gwen prudishly exclaims, “Und ich dachte schon, er will sagen ‘zum Scheißen’” (*ibid.* 23) which definitely fits the English version better. The same holds true for the passage:

| | |
|--|--|
| TZARA. [...] For your masterpiece [...] I have great expectations [...] | TZARA. [...] Ein Meisterwerk – Ich bin davon verrückt |
| For you I would eructate a monument [...] | GWEN. [...] Oh – Berückt! |
| Art for art’s sake – I defecate [...]. (Stoppard, <i>T</i> , 48) ¹⁴⁴ | TZARA. Welch grandioser Tiefstand! GWEN. Oh!- Tiefgang! |
| | TZARA. L’art pour l’art – ist das nicht bescheißternd! (Spiel, <i>T</i> , 35) |

Apart from “bescheißternd”, the German version is rather unspectacular compared to the English original.

III.2.2.2 Recurrence, Syntax, and Punctuation

The repetition of certain elements in a text can have a number of different purposes. In Tom Stoppard’s plays, recurrence is mainly employed in order to achieve a comic effect (cf. Berger 36; Hunter, *Plays*, 88). The fact that Stoppard’s characters tend to “repeat [certain lines] over and over again” (Berger 36), can often be attributed to their faulty

¹⁴⁴ Cf. also Berger 34-35; Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 144.

memory – a typical trait of the theater of the Absurd (cf. Sieder, “1”, 58). Upon hearing the same sentence being uttered again and again in the play, the spectator will unmistakably understand it as a humorous device (Berger 36). However, in order for this to happen the repeated sentences have to follow a very similar structure so as to be recognized as a repetitive device by the spectator. It can be varied to a certain degree – an effect frequently employed by Stoppard and alternately referred to as *transmutation* (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 89) or *repetition with variation* – but a core element has to be retained verbatim. Sieder speaks of “variations of a theme in major and minor” (“1”, 56).

In *Travesties*, “[t]he exchange between Bennett and Carr [Yes, sir. I have put the newspapers and telegrams [...]] occurs five times¹⁴⁵ [...] [and] Carr’s exchange of conversation with Cecily [I don’t think you ought to talk to me like that [...]] occurs twice in his memory” (Lau 18). Additionally, Tzara’s lines “Pleasure, pleasure” are repeated four times – with slight variations – throughout the play¹⁴⁶. Finally, a parallel can be established between the biographical volumes of Lenin, Joyce, and Tzara: “Lenin As I Knew Him. The Lenin I Knew [...]]” (Stoppard, *T*, 23); “Memories of James Joyce. James Joyce as I Knew Him [...]]” (*ibid.* 22); “Memories of Dada [...]]” (*ibid.* 25)¹⁴⁷. In *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*, the phrase “a man standing on/in his saddle [...]]”¹⁴⁸ is repeated three times in the play. Similarly, the phrase – taken from the Bible – “Give us this day our daily [...]]”¹⁴⁹ is taken up with a certain variation over and over again, just as “What is he doing? [...]] Talking [...]] To himself?”¹⁵⁰ recurs like a *leitmotif* in the play.

A similar effect is achieved through the use of what Easterling terms “stereotyped phrases” or “clichés” (21-23). “[S]tereotypy produces a high degree of predictability” and leaves the spectator with “an experience of *déjà vu*” (*ibid.* 27). When an English spectator hears the words “to make up your” (Stoppard, *RG*, 42), he or she immediately knows that the phrase is going to end in “mind” (*ibid.* 42). Lunin chooses the phrase “entscheide dich” (*RG*, 36) which entirely destroys this effect. The same holds true for “Give them a shout” (Stoppard, *RG*, 63), which Lunin translates as “Ruf sie doch mal” (*RG*, 54).

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Stoppard, *T*, 26, 27, 29, 31, 95 (cf. also Sieder, “1”, 13).

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Stoppard, *T*, 32, 36, 41, 63 (cf. Sieder, “1”, 13/20).

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Sieder, “1”, 132-133.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Stoppard, *RG*, 16; 18; 42.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Stoppard, *RG*, 43; 49; 104; 113; 127.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Stoppard, *RG*, 55; 80*; 99*; 104; 106; 113* [* = repetition with variation].

While Sieder claims that Spiel “follows faithfully [sic!] Stoppard’s linguistic parallel construction for the character description of Joyce and Lenin” (“1”, 389), she does not point out the many alterations which Spiel introduces in the other recurrent lines. Lunin, too, does not always prove consistent in the rendering of Stoppard’s repetitions. “Talking [...] To himself?” is variously translated as “Reden [...] Mit sich selbst?” (Lunin, *RG*, 47) and “Er spricht [...] Mit sich selbst?” (*ibid.* 86). “Give us this day our [...]” is again altered in “Und gib, daß man auch heute sein täglich Stichwort hört” (*ibid.* 94). Lunin additionally renders the English quote verbatim, whereas the German version would flow more naturally as ‘Unser tägliches Stichwort gib uns heute’. In Max’s production, all Biblical references are omitted, and the ‘Talking to himself’ passage is not frequently repeated throughout the play.

Sieder describes Stoppard’s syntax as “violated”, marked by “free association [...], non-logical and non-chronological order” (“1”, 187). Laconic constructions further characterize Stoppard’s syntactic constructions, which are generally elaborated in the German version. Hence, “*Guldenstern [...] takes a coin out of his bag, spins it, letting it fall*” (Stoppard, *RG*, 5) is turned into “*Güldenstern [...] nimmt eine Münze aus seinem Geldbeutel, wirft sie in die Luft und läßt sie dann zu Boden fallen*” (Lunin, *RG*, 9). Just like Schnitzler, Lunin distorts sentences - “Es kann aber gar nicht sein, in Wirklichkeit” (*RG*, 18) - where Stoppard uses an unmarked syntactical construction: “It couldn’t have been real” (*RG*, 18).

The punctuation in the following passages also considerably alters the style of the English text in the German version. The English passages are more indeterminate (an aspect indicated by the many question marks) than their German counterparts:

ROS. Game¹⁵¹?
 GUIL. Were they [the monkeys]?
 ROS. Are you? (Stoppard, *RG*, 7)

GUIL. [...] But it’s this, is it?
 (Stoppard, *RG*, 27)

ROS. Weiterspielen!
 GÜL. Die Affen?
 ROS. Nein, du. (Lunin, *RG*, 10-11)

GÜL. Aber nun ist es das.
 (Lunin, *RG*, 24)

¹⁵¹ The wordplay on ‘game’ is also lost in the German version.

III.2.2.3 Wordplay and Puns

Stoppard's unique linguistic style is in large part attributable to the author's extensive use of punning and witty wordplay (cf. Brassell 138; Hunter, *Plays*, 77; Lau 19; Pearce 1149). In languages such as English and German, wordplay is generally based on paronymy, homonymy, polysemy, or double entendre or misunderstanding. In other words, terms which have a similar form but divergent meanings are often used to create wordplay or puns (cf. Delebastita 285; Easterling 100/116; Sieder, "1", 50/94/224). Stoppard also lets "familiar-sounding phrases emerge in unfamiliar combinations and contexts" (Easterling 63), he introduces "slight changes in set idioms or phrases" (*ibid.* 74), and he relies on the use of figures of speech such as *oxymorons* and *polyptotons* (cf. *ibid.* 152). The enumeration "Matri, patri, fratri, sorori, uxori" which Ros continues with "Saucy" (Stoppard, *RG*, 33) lists terms which all end in the same phoneme, /i/. The German version, on the other hand, does not retain the same rhythmic progression. "Mutter-, Vater-, Bruder-, Geschwister-" all end in the same end sound, whereas "Gatten- [and] keß" (Lunin, *RG*, 30) do not.

In the following passage, the signifier 'yet' is understood in two divergent ways: "I have influence yet [...] Yet what?" (Stoppard, *RG*, 26). The wordplay does not translate readily into the German language; the homonymic quality of the original is entirely lost: "Ich habe wirklich Einfluß [...] Aber was für einen wirklich?" (Lunin, *RG*, 23). The same phenomenon can be noticed in the following extracts:

GUIL. Are you going to – come on?
 PLAYER. I am on.
 GUIL. But if you are on, you can't come on. Can you?
 PLAYER. I start on.
 (Stoppard, *RG*, 35)

GUIL. Got it in your head?
 ROS. I take my hat off to you.
 GUIL. Shake hands.
 (Stoppard, *RG*, 48)

ROS. Are we? I can't see a thing.
 GUIL. You can still *think*, can't you? (Stoppard, *RG*, 107)

GÜL. Willst du nicht gehen? Du trittst doch gleich auf?
 SCHAUSPIELER. Ich bin schon draußen.
 GÜL. Wenn du schon draußen bist, kannst du ja gar nicht auftreten. Oder?
 SCHAUSPIELER. Wenn es anfängt, bin ich schon draußen. (Lunin, *RG*, 31)

GÜL. Hast du kapiert?
 ROS. Hut ab vor dir.
 GÜL. Deine Hand.
 (Lunin, *RG*, 41)

ROS. Tatsächlich? Ich kann überhaupt nichts sehen.
 GÜL. Du kannst aber noch d e n k e n, oder nicht? (Lunin, *RG*, 89)

The following English scene blends homonymy with paronymy, also turning set phrases upside down. The German passage, on the other hand, sounds rather stilted and ridiculous, as the rhythm of the original is entirely lost. The only paronymic elements can be found in “Hause” – “daheim” – “Heia”. Additionally, Lunin, other than Stoppard, does not turn existent wordplay upside down; his utterance is absurd, but not rhythmically appealing.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>GUIL. We'll soon be home and high – dry and home – I'll – ROS. It's all over my depth – GUIL. I'll hie you home and – ROS. – out of my head – GUIL. – dry you high and – ROS (<i>cracking, high</i>). – over my step over my head body! – I tell you it's all stopping to a death, it's boding to a depth, stepping to a head, it's all heading to a dead stop – (Stoppard, <i>RG</i>, 40-41)</p> | <p>GÜL. Bald sind wir zu Hause, im trocknen [sic] – daheim, in der Heia – und... ROS. Mir ist das alles zu hoch... GÜL. ... ich treibe dich heim, und... ROS. ... alles wächst mir über den Kopf... GÜL, ... und ich reibe dich trocken, und... ROS <i>schnappt über; seine Stimme überschlägt sich</i>: ...alles läuft mir davon, das geht mir an den Leib! ... Ich sage dir: das alles endet im Tod, im leibhaftigen Ende, alles geht über Kopf, alles treibt auf die Spitze, laufend spitzt es sich zu, zu einem Ende im Tod ... (Lunin, <i>RG</i>, 34-35)</p> |
|--|---|

This can even be topped off by a construction in *Travesties*, where entire phrases are constructed according to a homonymous pattern:

God's blood!, the shot and shell! – graveyard stench (Stoppard, *T*, 27)
[*combines with*]
oxblood shot-silk cravat, starched (*ibid.* 27)

Christ Jesu! – deserted by simpletons (*ibid.* 27) [*combines with*]
creased just so, asserted by a simple pin (*ibid.* 27)

they damn us to hell – ora pro nobis – quick! (*ibid.* 27) [*combines with*]
the damask lapels – or a brown, no, biscuit (*ibid.* 27)

no, *get me out!* (*ibid.* 27) [*combines with*]
no – get me out [...] (*ibid.* 27)¹⁵².

Spiel, on the other hand, grapples with this parallel structure and ends up with a completely different rendering where Goethe's “Morgenrot” (*T*,15) reoccurs, as well as a number of war terms, including “Krieg”, “Schützengraben”, “Kameraden”, “Kampfgeist”,

¹⁵² Cf. Tan 172.

“Schlamm und Stacheldraht”, “Soldat”, and “Schuß und Schirm” (*ibid.* 15). The line “mucus mutandis” (Spiel, *T*, 12; Stoppard, *T*, 23) alludes to ‘mutatis mutandis’ (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 137; Tan 157)¹⁵³ on the one hand, and to ‘mucus’ on the other. While ‘mutatis mutandis’ will ring a bell for an educated Austrian audience, ‘mucus’ is definitely not as commonly employed in German as in English, and hence not fully understood by the Austrian spectator. Stoppard’s clever rendering “who’d have thought big oaks from a corner room” (Stoppard, *T*, 13) where ‘a corner’ is almost homonymous with ‘acorn’, thereby referring back to ‘oak’ (cf. Tan 159), is reduced to “wer hätte gedacht, daß die Bäume in der Spiegelgasse 14 so in den Himmel wachsen würden?” (*T*, 13) in Spiel’s version. Another Stoppardian linguistic particularity, i.e. the use of “real blue [...] empirical purple [...] [and] sultry violets” (*T*, 22) which replaces the more common colors royal blue, imperial purple, and ultra-violet (cf. Tan 155) is rendered by enumerating perfectly normal colors in German: “marineblau, [...] kaminrot, [...] ultraviolett[...].” (Spiel, *T*, 11). Finally, the parallelism between “hock [...] post hock, propter hock” (Stoppard, *T*, 36) and the juridical expression ‘post hoc, ergo propter hoc’ (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 141) is entirely lost in Spiel’s text (cf. *T*, 24).

Additionally, Joycean limericks are scattered among the chapters of *Travesties*. These rhymes are equally difficult to be rendered into the German language. The literary critics Plattner and Pizzini complain about Spiel’s translation of these limericks, claiming that they would have needed excessive revision (Plattner qtd. in Lakner 111), even admitting that they “cannot be translated into German without sacrificing rhymes or alliterations” (Pizzini qtd. in Sieder, “2”, 628). The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* on the other hand praises Spiel for her elegant translation of these typically Irish rhymes (qtd. in Sieder, “1”, 120). Reimann and the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* even go as far as to compliment her on the rendering of all of Stoppard’s puns combined (*ibid.* 120). “Stoppard[s] [...] geschliffene[s] geistreiche[s] Wortspiel [...] konnte von der Übersetzerin Hilde Spiel [...] bewahrt werden” confirms West (qtd. in *ibid.* 215).

As clever verbal constructions make up almost two thirds of Stoppard’s plays, it can be concluded that form indubitably takes precedence over content in his writing (cf. Barth 111; Hunter, *Plays*, 93; Orlich 2; Shields Hardin 157). Scott Robinson speaks of “plays without plot” (38) which show “no necessary progression of events” (45). According to

¹⁵³ Sieder further detects in this expression an intertextual reference to David Campton’s *Mutatis Mutandis* (“1”, 86).

Reiß's classification of various text types which, in turn, call for different translation methods, Stoppard's punning must be understood as 'expressive' language. What matters is a relative harmony of the signifiers (qtd. in Stolze 114). Differently put, "[ist die Bewahrung des Wortspiels] [w]ichtiger als die Genauigkeit der einzelnen Bedeutungen im Detail" (Levý 104). Spiel and Lunin, however, focus more on the level of signifieds, thus trying to establish content-related analogy, thereby automatically causing a shift on the level of signifiers. Indeed, as two linguistic code systems generally employ very different signifiers, it is almost impossible to reproduce assonances, consonances or other forms of linguistic harmony of one language in another linguistic environment. Hence, as Cowley suggests, whatever is lost of a pun in translation must be compensated for at another moment in the play (qtd. in Levý 105). Spiel makes use of the German word 'da' which she puts in relation to 'Dada' when she states, "wo Begriffe fehlen, dada stellt ein Wort zur rechten Zeit sich ein" (*T*, 13), and Max introduces a wordplay based on the homonymy of 'denen' and 'Dänen' in his production.

III.3 From Terranglia to Austria: Socio-Cultural Factors Governing the Translation Process

III.3.1 Different Code Systems and Norms

Relying on the categories discussed in section II.4, the comparison of Stoppard's plays with their German versions further supports the above findings, i.e. that socio-cultural factors have a considerable impact on the translation process. In a letter to Stoppard, Spiel speaks of "some unknown factor which prevents [...] [him] from having the success on the German speaking stage which [...] [he] obviously deserve[s]" (qtd. in Lakner 47-48). When she further suggests that "a racier, snappier [...] perhaps cruder [...] rendering [...] might do the trick" (*ibid.* 48), she indirectly underscores the tendency of the Germans to write less racy, less snappy, and less crude plays than the English do.

Indeed, both German versions are longer than Stoppard's originals – if we do not take the omissions of Bruno Max's staged version into account. This impression is amplified by longer exchanges uttered by the various characters, which in turn impair the stichomythic and epigrammatic rhythm of the English plays (cf. Zajic 38). Whereas a "policy of no cuts no matter what" (Mc Elroy 95) is not necessarily appreciated in the English dramatic scene, French producers of *Travesties* also didn't shy away from staging "Cecily's speech,

top of Act Two” (Stoppard, “Event as Text”, 206) in its full length. While Stoppard recounts having “cut it down to one paragraph [in London]” (*ibid.* 206), the French producer insists on a longer version to be staged in Paris which would turn out to be “magnifique [...] [f]ormidable, superbe” (*ibid.* 206-207). And so it did since Cecily was “stark naked!” (*ibid.* 207). This again shows that theatrical approaches vary among different countries. Wagner, for instance, mentions about Spiel’s *Travesties* “[dass] [d]as Publikum [...]jeiner nahezu dreieinhalbstündigen, aber nie ermüdenden Aufführung [...] ausgesetzt [war]“ (qtd. in Lakner 124). Others, however, stress that the play was too long, even for a German-speaking audience (cf. Sträter qtd. in Sieder, “2”, 652; Bäcker in *ibid.* 789), which might be explained by the lack of wordplay and humor which characterizes the German version.

The beat of the series of assonances and consonances in Stoppard’s play is equally altered since the German authors – Lunin and Spiel – rely on rhyme and simple alliteration, rather than creating a whole harmony of sounds. As Honegger points out, the German system has historically relied on “playing with language rather than playing with words”, further employing “acoustic masks [rather than] [...] punning” (23). The technique of punning is generally more frequently employed in English than in German comedies – especially by Joyce (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 107/146; Pearce 1149-1150; Sieder, “1”, 224; Snead 226) – where it is “probably the most widely used technique[...] of linguistic humor” (Berger 34). Even Shakespeare frequently turns to this technique in his writing (cf. Easterling 85-104). It is hence not surprising that the German punning techniques diverge from those employed in the English versions.

Additionally, the phonemes which appear on a frequent basis in the German language do not occur with the same regularity in the English language. The most common vowel sound of the English language is the ‘schwa’. The most common consonantal letters appear to be <t>, <s>, and <r> (cf. Shortz). If we take into account that <r> is frequently dropped in British English, and if we additionally consider Stoppard’s predilection for /p/-/b/ sounds, we end up with a chain of /t/, /d/, /p/, /b/, and /s/ sounds. The German language, on the other hand shows a higher frequency of the post alveolar fricative [ʃ], further using the palatal [ç] and the velar [x] sound which are both absent in the English sound system. A direct juxtaposition of both systems thus clearly suggests that the atmosphere created cannot be the same in both cases. As a result, the German rhythm is generally harsher and less vivid and speedy than the English sound constellations. What is

more, differences in syntax as well as regarding the forms of address in both languages have again been detected. Generally speaking, Stoppard's linguistic style is so peculiar and unique that it seems as though a German Stoppard simply does not exist. Just as Mira's editor warns him against creating a "Spanish Wilde" as the Wildean expressions and rhythms would simply not "flow naturally" in Spanish (196), Stoppard's music does not seem to be readily absorbed by the German linguistic system.

Lunin's and Spiel's style is generally less humorous and jocular than that of the English plays which again confirms the general pattern presented in section II.4. Heinrichs who writes for the German newspaper *Die Zeit* complains about this humorous tendency of Stoppard's plays: "Statt an Konflikten sind die meisten dieser Stücke nur an Pointen interessiert" (qtd. in Lakner 117). This again shows that German theaters follow different conventions than most English plays. Additionally, taboo words as well as sexual innuendo are found less frequently in the German texts than in the English originals. In Spiel's *Travesties*, the military element can be felt very strongly, and both German plays use Romantic expressions which are reminiscent of Goethe's and Schiller's style. In an interview, Stoppard explains that the German production of *Travesties* in Vienna indeed "had a very different feel" (Eichelbaum 104). At another point he specifies that "it was really refreshing to see [...] [*Arcadia*] in German, where comedy wasn't really the primary idea" (Kelly and Demastes 10), concluding that everything "depends on where the play is done" (Stoppard, "Event and Text", 207).

III.3.2 The Influence of the Literary Period and Socio-Cultural Events

Although both Lunin's and Spiel's texts are written and performed immediately after their presentation to the English theater world and hence changes along the time axis can be ruled out to a large extent, the influence of the literary period in which all four texts emerge should not be overlooked. Indeed, characteristics typical of the modernist as well as the postmodernist literary era can be detected throughout the plays at hand.

Absurdism, existentialism and the literary school of the Theater of the Absurd¹⁵⁴ – chiefly represented in Britain by Beckett's or Pinter's plays – exert a significant impact on

¹⁵⁴ For a more detailed discussion on The Theater of the Absurd, cf. Cahn 17-23; Esslin.

Stoppard's texts (cf. Brassell 259; Bratt xvi/xxi; Easterling; Gordon 15; Hinden 401-403; Hunter, *Plays*, 81/128/149-150; Keyssar-Franke 85; Scott Robinson 42; Sieder, "1", 214). Other modern literary influences seem to come from "Pirandello" (Cahn 42-43; Keyssar-Franke 85), "Laurel and Hardy" (Brady 102; Sparknotes Editors), "Abbot and Costello" (Brady 102), "Trevor Nunn, and the Marx Brothers" (Mc Elroy 95). Modern literature is marked by a general feeling of breakdown and deconstruction which first makes its appearance in Modernism, and is further consolidated during the period of Postmodernism. The feeling of uncertainty which clearly contrasts with the atmosphere expressed by the well-made play of earlier centuries (cf. Galens) can be felt in Stoppard's texts in a variety of ways. He clearly moves away from a fixed narrative voice in favor of "multiply-narrated" storylines; he blurs various styles; he puts "an emphasis on fragmented forms [...] and random-seeming collages"; he rejects "the distinction between 'high' and 'low' or popular culture" (Klages) and generally blends reality and fiction (cf. Karwowski 3; Pearce; Sieder, "1", 133). What is more, characters no longer possess an immutable identity and frequently lapse into different linguistic registers, language no longer purports one single meaning (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 94/101), and elements of the past and the present are put on one footing (cf. Lau). Finally, an extensive use of "repetition and verbal rhythm" (Snead 226) adds a flavor of oblivion and absurdity to the given texts. The notion of absurdity, "fragmentation and discontinuity" (Klages) is taken up by postmodern writers. Postmodernism however "differs from modernism in its attitude" (Klages). If modernism presents all sorts of fragmentation and deconstruction "as something tragic, something to be lamented and mourned as a loss [...] [p]ostmodernism, in contrast, doesn't lament the idea of fragmentation, provisionality, or incoherence [...]. The world is meaningless? Let's not pretend that art can make meaning then, let's just play with nonsense" (Klages). Or, as Hinden describes it, postmodern tendencies exhibit "a peculiar [sort of] [...] world-weariness buoyed by wit" (404).

In the light of these tendencies, many writers of the 20th century have experienced a turning point in their career, where the general feeling of depressing and burdensome absurdity suddenly gives way to an attitude of revolt and playfulness. The French author Albert Camus, for instance, turns from his absurdist viewpoint in *The Stranger* to a pronounced concern for revolt in his later works, such as *The Plague*. It is hence not surprising that Stoppard's later play *Travesties* shows a stronger postmodern influence than *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* does, which is still largely influenced by

modernist trends (cf. Billington in Sieder, “2”, 602; Sparknotes Editors). “[P]astiche, parody, bricolage, irony, and playfulness” which Klages mentions as typical traits of postmodern literature assume a more crucial role in *Travesties* than in *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* (cf. also Brassell 34). However, the method of including intertextual references in one’s writing can be felt in both of Stoppard’s plays (cf. Sieder, “1”, 99/117).

Naturally, extra-literary trends equally have significant repercussions on literature *per se*. Marxism, Communism, Dadaism (cf. Galens; Orlich 3-4; Sieder, “1”, 145) and the general problematic of war – especially in line with World War II – considerably influence modern writing. In this context, it should be mentioned that the question of war has marked the Germanic world in a different way than the British Empire. The military style of Spiel’s play, for instance, is clearly attributable to this phenomenon. The misery and the trauma that the war entails for many German and Austrian writers explain why the hypocrisy and lofty chatter of Schnitzler’s noble characters is nowadays frequently replaced by a more embittered war-like atmosphere in many German-speaking plays.

III.3.3 The Significance of the Degree of the Text’s Cultural Content

In contrast to Schnitzler’s plays, both of Stoppard’s plays are not geographically anchored in the British culture, but are set in Denmark and in Zurich, Switzerland respectively (Barth 115; Galens; Lakner 104, Sieder, “1”, 12). According to Henschelmann’s classification they are hence both ‘multilateral’ in kind.

Just as with Schnitzler, Stoppard’s cultural heritage allows for speculation: Is he, too, a hybrid subject and not typically British? “It is [indeed] tempting to speculate whether Stoppard’s Czechoslovakian origin” (Orlich 7) has had a serious influence on his writing. A born Czech, he soon moves to India where he attends an American school, finally settling down in England at the age of nine (Hardin 162; Hunter, *Plays*, 92). It is only later in his life that he will be reminded of having Jewish origins (cf. Lakner 63). When confronted with his Czech origins, Stoppard immediately retorts, “English is my language [...] By the time I got to England, I wasn’t speaking Czech at all” (Gussow, *Conversations*, 59-60). When asked if he thinks of himself “as an Englishman”, he replies, “Of course. [...] I don’t think of myself as a foreign writer at all. I became literate in

English” (*ibid.* 60). In another interview, he answers to the question of whether he feels British, “Oh, absolutely. I am, for all intents and purposes. I was educated here from the age of eight, and I’ve never lived anywhere else” (Shields Hardin 162). By the same token, he does not want to be addressed as a Jewish writer (cf. Lakner 67). It seems as if Stoppard, just as Schnitzler, refuses to “retreat into the voice of a minority” (Konzett 350/358). His stepfather frequently drums the fact “that to be born an Englishman [...] [is] to have drawn first prize in the lottery of life” (Hunter qtd. in Lakner 53) into young Stoppard’s head. As a result, Stoppard is fully aware of the privilege which being a *British* author entails.

III.3.3.1 Intertextuality

In his novels and plays Stoppard mainly draws on famous *British* forerunners (cf. Hunter, *Plays*, 127; Sieder, “1”, 3/169/182) which leads Bratt and Jameson to assume that he in fact *cannibalizes* other’s works (cf. Bratt xix; Jameson in Lau 2). As a matter of fact, it is the myriad of intertextual allusions that he holds on to which turns his texts into typically British stories. In this context, we have to distinguish between intratextuality and intertextuality. The former refers to “relationships which exist between elements of a given text”, whereas the latter describes those types of intertextual references “which exist between distinct texts” (Hatim and Mason 125). As intratextuality has already been mentioned at least to some extent in connection with the phenomenon of recurrence, this section primarily focuses on intertextual relationships in Stoppard’s plays.

In *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* Stoppard makes use of the storyline of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, incorporating a number of passages from the famous play, without altering them considerably (cf. Barth 112; Cahn 50; Easterling 12; Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 21-23; Scott Robinson 40; Sieder, “1”, 53; Sparknotes Editors). Stoppard takes over the comic elements of the original, inflates them and prunes the more serious and dramatic parts (cf. Cahn 51; Sparknotes Editors) – a technique which is undoubtedly reminiscent of his method employed when adapting Schnitzler to the English stage. The atmosphere of the play is largely inspired by Beckett’s style of relative absurdity, although some differences between Stoppard and Beckett can, of course, be observed (cf. Brassell 62; Cahn 35-37; Easterling 58; Hunter, *Plays*, 147-150; Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 24-25; Karwowski 1). Many critics limit themselves to Beckett’s most famous play, *Waiting for Godot*, not mentioning the parallels which the play obviously has with other Beckett

plays, such as *Happy Days* or *Endgame*. If we combine both approaches it could be claimed – in line with Cahn – that *Hamlet* is turned into an absurd play (64). Similarly, Bratt mentions *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* as a play which blends *Hamlet*'s seventeenth-century and *Waiting for Godot*'s twentieth-century views (xvii)¹⁵⁵. Brassell also detects parallels with James Saunders' *Next Time I'll Sing To You* (65), and Easterling mentions Pinter's *The Caretaker* as another source of influence (15/29-43). Without going into too much detail by quoting all the scenes which Stoppard takes from Shakespeare, it should suffice to remember that “[f]rom a total of nine significant encounters in *Hamlet* between Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and either Hamlet or the king and queen, Stoppard incorporates six in full and omits two entirely” (Brassell 44). All dialogs apart from the *Hamlet* scenes are reminiscent of Beckett's style. Apart from these two major plays, Stoppard also quotes from other sources, such as John Osborne's *The Entertainer* (“Don't clap too loudly – it's a very old world” (RG, 22) in line with the original “Don't clap too hard - it's a very old building” (*ibid.* 146)); Shakespeare's *As You Like It* (“[...] if you look on every exit being an entrance somewhere else” (*ibid.* 28) in line with “All the world's a stage/ And all the men and women are merely players;/ They have their exits and their entrances” (*ibid.* 146)); and the Bible. Max's production perfectly shows that almost all of the English intertextual references go unnoticed on an Austrian stage. The line “Bitte klatschen Sie nicht zu laut – die Welt ist sehr alt” (Lunin, RG, 21), despite having an absurd connotation, does not conjure up whatsoever for an Austrian spectator, just as the utterances “bedenkt, daß jeder Ausgang auch einen Eingang darstellt” (*ibid.* 25) and “Worte, Worte” (*ibid.* 38) do not ring a bell.

Stoppard's play *Travesties* incorporates Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest* to a large extent (cf. Barth 116; Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 111-114; Scott Robinson 41), further relying on Joyce's *Ulysses* (e.g. in making use of a cuckoo-clock to indicate Carr's time slips, in incorporating Joycean limericks, or by quoting “Deshill holles eamus” (Stoppard, *T*, 18)¹⁵⁶, “tum-ti-ti-tum-ti-ti troublin” (*ibid.* 21) and part of Joyce's poem *Dooleysprudence* (*ibid.* 49-50)) (cf. Brassell 139/147; Hunter 145-146; Lau 5; Sieder, “1”, 240-44; Snead 226). Gilbert and Sullivan's operettas (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 141/144;

¹⁵⁵ Cf. also Brassell 46.

¹⁵⁶ These lines refer to the fourteenth chapter of *Ulysses*, “The Oxen of the Sun” which allegorically represents the birth of the English language, depicting its development up to Modern English (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 135).

Sieder, “1”, 3/14/19/53/104/137/170; Tan 189), a number of Shakespeare’s works¹⁵⁷, as well as many other less well-known British authors, both classic and popular¹⁵⁸, are equally present in the play. Apart from these British authors, Stoppard also quotes from the Bible (“Because man cannot live by bread alone” (Stoppard, *T*, 46)), “feeds on writings of Lenin¹⁵⁹ verbatim [...] [and] takes in the ideas of the Dadaist movement” (Sieder, “1”, 14/73). It should equally be mentioned that Stoppard refers back to some of his own earlier plays (cf. *ibid.* 182); Sieder and Cahn mention the influence of Stoppard’s radio play *Artist Descending a Staircase* as well as of his other play *The Real Inspector Hound* (Cahn 131-132/142; Sieder, “1”, 29/182). The backbone of Stoppard’s parody is, however, Wilde’s *The Importance of Being Earnest* from which he repeatedly quotes verbatim, while at some points travestyng the original storyline to a certain extent (cf. Sieder, “1”, 16/24). Thus, at certain moments Tzara is turned into Jack Worthing, Carr assumes the role of Algernon (cf. Cahn 132), Bennett follows the persona of Lane (cf. Sieder, “1”, 77), Joyce assumes the identity of Lady Bracknell (cf. *ibid.* 72), and Gwen and Cecily impersonate their name mates Gwendolen and Cecily (cf. Brassell 139). All in all “Wilde’s artistic and literary positions” (Sieder, “1”, 223) as well as the characteristics of “the Wildean dandy” (*ibid.* 223) can be felt to a large extent in Stoppard’s play.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. “[C]aviar for the general public” (Stoppard, *T*, 22) – *Hamlet* (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 137; Sieder, “1”, 82); Pages 53-54 assemble a number of Shakespearian quotes (cf. Barth 118; Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 145; Lau 8-9; Pearce 1156): Various passages are taken from *Sonnet 18*; others, such as “You tear him for his bad verses?” from *Julius Caesar*; “These are but wild and whirling words, my lord” from *Hamlet*; “Truly I wish the gods had made thee poetical [...] I do not know what poetical is. Is it honest in word and deed? It is a true thing?” from *As You Like It*; “Sure he that made us with such large discourse, looking before and after, gave us not *that* capability, and god-like reason to fust in us unused” from *Hamlet*; “I was not born under a rhyming planet” from *Much Ado about Nothing*; “Those fellows of infinite tongue that can rhyme themselves into ladies’ favours, they do reason themselves out again.” from *Henry V*; “And that would set my teeth nothing on edge – *nothing* so much as mincing poetry” from *Henry IV*; “They honesty and love doth mince this matter” from *Othello*; “Put your bonnet for his right use, ‘tis for the head” from *Hamlet*; “I had rather than forty shilling my book of songs and sonnets here” from *The Merry Wives of Windsor*; “But since he died, and poet better prove, his for his style you’ll read, mine for my – love” from *Sonnet 32* (cf. Sieder, “1”, 89-91/209-210).

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Arthur Calahan’s popular Irish song *Galway Bay* (Stoppard, *T*, 21) (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 136); The Cole Porter song which goes “my heart belongs to Daddy, coz’ Daddy treats it so” rendered as “my art belongs to Dada, ‘cos Dada ‘e treats me so” (Stoppard, *T*, 25) (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 138); The movie or Second World War slogan ‘What did you do in the Great War, Daddy?’ rendered as “What did it do in the Great War, Dada” (Stoppard, *T*, 25) (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 138; Tan 159); Francois Villon’s English version ‘Where are the snows of yesteryear’ rendered as “I well remember as though it was yesteryear (oh where are they now) [...] Oh the yes-no’s of yesteryear” (Stoppard, *T*, 25) (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 138; Sieder, “1”, 40; Tan 161); A line from a poem by the Romantic poets Wordsworth and Coleridge “Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive/But to be young was very heaven” rendered as “Bliss it was to see the dawn! To be alive was very heaven!” (Stoppard, *T*, 27) (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 139); Erich Maria Remarque’s novel *All quiet on the Western Front* (*ibid.* 28) (cf. Hunter, *Rosencrantz*, 139), etc.

¹⁵⁹ “Nearly everything spoken by Lenin and Nadeshda Krupskaya herein comes from his *Collected Writings* and from her *Memories of Lenin*” (Stoppard qtd. in Sieder, “1”, 74).

Now, in order to make sense of the intertextual relationships in a text, the “readers’ knowledge of previous texts is appealed to” (Hatim and Masion 124). If the spectator is familiar with the text which the author refers to, it will “activate [...] knowledge and belief systems well beyond the text itself” (*ibid.* 124). Or, as Sieder puts it, Stoppard relies on the fact “that the landmarks set by Oscar Wilde will be recognized by the audience” (“1”, 24). By the same token, Keyssar-Franke believes that “*Hamlet*[‘s] [...] mythical place in [...] [the English] culture” (88) explains why Stoppard draws on this play so extensively¹⁶⁰. Even if Stoppard himself believes that an understanding of the parodied works is not crucial (an approach also taken up by Sieder (“1”, 7/17)), Brassell rightly suggests that if the intertextual allusion is not understood as such, the atmosphere which is conjured up by the text is no longer the same (50)¹⁶¹. As such, intertextual references firmly anchor a text in a specific culture. A text written in another language is clearly influenced by different textual material. Lefevere lists literary allusions as “the final, real aporia of translation, the real untranslatable” (*Translation, Rewriting*, 56), a view equally endorsed by Stolze (118). Lefevere further describes them as the “shorthand” specific to a given culture, which cannot be interpreted successfully by another cultural group (*Translation, Rewriting*, 56). Resultantly, Hilde Spiel frequently drops Stoppard’s original references, at times replacing them with Germanic ones (cf. Sieder, “1”, 443). It is assumed that the German dada poem which she uses to replace “Tzara’s bi-lingual - English/French – Dada poem” is not her own creation, just as the German rendering of Shakespeare’s sonnet dates back to Stefan George (*ibid.* 388). Bruno Max, for his part, pantomimically incorporates a scene from the famous movie *Titanic* in his stage production, when Rosenkranz and Guildenstern are on board of the ship to England. The potential of the intertextual references used in the original texts is however considerably weakened.

As a counter argument, Sieder mentions the fact that *Bunbury* – the German version of Wilde’s *The Importance of Being Earnest* – is staged at the same time as Spiel’s *Travesties*, hence guarding against problems of interpretation (“2”, 655). Stoppard himself assumes that *Hamlet* “is the most famous play in any language” (Gordon 18), further suggesting that both *The Importance of Being Earnest* and *Hamlet* are plays which everyone knows (cf. Eichelbaum 105). In this context, Anderson’s concept of the ‘imagined community’ has to be taken up again, as it suggests that individual beings

¹⁶⁰ Cf. also Hunter, *Plays*, 143.

¹⁶¹ Cf. also Barth 117; Baumgart 598; Hunter, *Plays*, 143; Sieder, “2”, 608; Sparknotes Editors.

belonging to one culture are only brought together by adhering to a common, standardized code or communicative system. As a matter of fact, individual traits persist, adding to the fact that interpretations of Stoppard's plays will most probably not be homogenous across the UK. This can first and foremost be explained by the fact that Stoppard's plays are generally referred to as highly complicated *oeuvres* which have to be watched "in a state of intellectual alertness" (Keyssar-Franke 88). Other scholars label Stoppard a "mere 'university wit'" (Cahn 24), a writer of "smart-ass, pretentious [...] plays" (Bratt xx), an expert of "intellectual leap-frogging" (Scott Robinson 48), "a conservative with high regard for traditional culture" (*ibid.* 128), "Einstein of the playwrights" (Sieder, "2", 940), and the list goes on (cf. Easterling 67; Karwowski 1; Sieder, "2", 651-654/786). Hence, "an audience [...] that has not previously overdosed itself, at the very least, on Hamlet, Waiting for Godot, and the Importance of Being Earnest [sic!]" (Brater qtd. in Lakner 100) will probably interpret the play differently from people who know these plays inside out. This brings up the question of whether two literate spectators from the UK and Austria will not put a more similar interpretation on the play than a literate and a non-literate spectator who are both from the UK will. The following review legitimizes this approach, as Nightingale wonders whether "all the first-nighters were as familiar with Wilde as Stoppard assumes and requires?" as "[f]or once, [...] [he] found [...] [him]self laughing more than those around [...] [him]" (Sieder, "2", 606). On the other hand, it must of course not be overlooked that *Bunbury* does certainly not enjoy the same success among Austrian viewers as *The Importance* does among British audiences. This can be shown by reviews of Spiel's *Travesties* which highlight that the cucumber sandwich scene is probably the only element which reminds Austrian spectators of Wilde (cf. Sebestyèn in Lakner 114), whereas Nightingale concludes that "there were times when [...] [the play] reached us all" (Sieder, "2", 606).

III.4 From Terranglia to Austria: Factors of Power Governing the Translation Process

III.4.1 Translation as Negotiation: Source and Target Elements in Lunin's *Rosenkranz und Gùldenstern* and Spiel's *Travesties*

The above analyzed German plays show – just like Stoppard's adaptations of Schnitzler's originals – a number of overlaps between the British culture on the one hand, and the Austrian on the other. In Spiel's *Travesties* a generally British perspective is maintained as the library which in Stoppard's play includes "English" books (*T*, 43) in the Foreign

Literature Section, also has “englische Bücher” (*T*, 30) instead of German books in Spiel’s version. When Stoppard’s Joyce deplores the fact that Zurich shows a number of foreign influences “– but nothing from England” (*T*, 50), Spiel’s Joyce equally bemoans “[daß] nichts aus England [existiert]” (*T*, 37). By the same token, Lunin translates Stoppard’s typically English “Yes, sir. [...] Nothing, sir. [...] No, sir” (*RG*, 32) as “Ja, Herr. [...] Nichts, Herr. [...] Nein, Herr” (*RG*, 29) which, according to Levý is not frequently employed in German (95), and which in Lunin’s context is more reminiscent of a prayer addressed to God above. It hence reduces the English influence to a stereotypical level, which would, however, have been even more pronounced if Lunin had translated it as ‘Ja, sir. Nichts, sir. Nein, sir’.

On the whole it can be said that the Austrian – and even the German culture, which must be perceived as a powerful one – are much more tolerant toward Anglophone influences than the British are toward Germanic elements in their linguistic system. Stereotypes hence occur less frequently. This can, of course, be at least partly explained by the fact that the global knowledge of English has contributed to a much better understanding of Anglophone culturemes, whereas the monolingual strategy of the Anglophone world has largely blocked foreign influence. On stage, however, British traits are also commonly exaggerated in the German-speaking world. Henry Carr is “the impersonation of the bone-dry British consular official” (Sieder, “2”, 633), and Lunin speaks of “England [...] [als] eine Finte der Kartographen” (Lunin, *RG*, 99), a line which generates loud laughter among the Viennese audience of the production by Bruno Max. The latter additionally turns Lunin’s original “daß die in England anders sind” (*RG*, 105) into ‘daß die in England nicht sehr anspruchsvoll sind’, i.e. an utterance which provokes laughter at the expense of the ‘other’. It must hence be understood as a stereotypical device. Finally, Max strongly relies on the phrase ‘Sein oder nicht sein, das ist hier die Frage’ which is probably the only *Hamlet* line with which the Austrian audience is familiar, thereby strengthening the stereotypical dimension of the British play. As a result, the Britishness which is introduced to the Austrian stage can never be a hundred percent British, as “[w]e always operate metaphorically, always stand ready to relate the new to the familiar. [...] We smile when we recognize that the other we see is actually ourselves in the mirror” (Pearce 1140).

Even though the Austrian spectator is probably more open to Anglophone influences than Britain is to Austria's cultural heritage, some elements are inserted into the German texts which align the latter with the German and Austrian literary conventions and norms. This is necessary as it would probably not prove very successful to translate Stoppard's countless allusions to the British literary repertoire into the German language. The references would be there on a superficial level, but the background knowledge would be completely lacking; as a result, this strategy would not deliver. To make up for the incurred loss, both Spiel and Lunin make use of German intertextuality which evokes familiar concepts for a German-speaking audience. In line with Stoppard's predilection for more ancient English works, Spiel keeps holding on to the German literary icon, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. She quotes part of his *Diner zu Koblenz*, which in the original version reads, "Prophete rechts, Prophete links, Das Weltkind in der Mitten" (Goethe 470; Sieder, "1", 390-391), and which Spiel turns into "Entente rechts, Entente links, das Weltkind in der Mitten" (*T*, 14). Lunin, on the other hand, resorts to a famous German nursery rhyme, when he quotes, "Lirum, larum" (*RG*, 50), which is so familiar to the German ear that the spectator will immediately want to continue the rhyme with 'Löffelstiel'. Surprisingly, modern Austrian influences (e.g. by "Kafka, [...], Handke und Thomas Bernhard" (Konstantinovic 284)) cannot be felt in the texts *per se* although Becker describes the performance of *Travesties* in Munich as "similar to Peter Handke's and Thomas Bernhard's" (qtd. in Sieder, "2", 789).

III.4.2 "I forget what they were [...] Something about brave little [...] [Austria], wasn't it?" (Stoppard, *T*, 36)

In spite of Swales' listing a number of English-speaking *oeuvres* which are apparently influenced by Schnitzler's literary genius (20), questions such as "Welcher österreichische Autor übte einen Einfluß auf einen fremden Dichter oder Schriftsteller aus und in welcher Weise wurde über diesen Einfluß etwas spezifisch Österreichisches vermittelt und auch erkannt?" (Konstantinovic 283) will most probably yield disappointing answers. Generally speaking, Austria's literary importance – albeit not completely insignificant – cannot compete with the immense prestige which the English literary canon has acquired in the last couple of decades at a global scale. Suppanz describes the Austrian culture as one which has historically been subject to various influences from different places. Situated at the heart of Europe, Austria has traditionally occupied the double role of bridging the gap between various nations and blocking foreign elements to a certain extent

(“Österreichische Kultur”, 231). “Gerade d[ieses] jahrhundertlange Zusammenleben mit anderen Nationen hat den Österreicher weicher, duldsamer, verständnisvoller für fremde Kulturen gemacht” (Dollfuß qtd. in *ibid.* 229)¹⁶².

As mentioned above a relative openness toward the British culture can be felt in the context of the given Germanic plays. This can best be illustrated with a contrastive example: Both Schnitzler’s play *Liebelei* and Stoppard’s text *Travesties* contain an enumeration of Germanic and British authors, respectively: “Ah! Schiller... Hauff... Das Konversationslexikon” (Schnitzler, *L*, 67) and “Allingham, Arnold, Belloc, Blake, both Brownings, Byron, and so on up to, I believe, G” (Stoppard, *T*, 42). In Stoppard’s *Undiscovered Country* Hauff is replaced with “Goethe” (*UC*, 53) who is definitely more famous, and hence better known to the British audience than the former. Spiel, on the other hand, does not alter the English version (*T*, 30), although the Austrian spectator might be more familiar with other British authors¹⁶³. Another aspect which shows that Austrian audiences are probably more open toward influences from the Anglophone world than vice versa is that “[t]he Viennese première [of *Travesties*] had Peter Wood as director accompanied by his standard crew, only the actors were local” (Sieder, “2”, 610). Sieder further explains that “[t]he closer the play remained within its cultural background, i.e., familiarity with English literature [sic], the more successful it seemed to be” (*ibid.* 610)¹⁶⁴. Peter Wood’s Anglophone background naturally pulls the production more toward the British conventions, an aspect which clearly foregrounds Britain’s superiority as compared to Austria’s. As a result, the focus is placed on performance rather than the text *per se*. This Anglophone tendency of accentuating the performance aspect over the written text can be felt in a number of reviews of Stoppard’s plays (cf. Cuyler 551; Keyssar-Franke 85). While Stoppard, himself, in a sense laments the idea of viewing theater as an economic equation (cf. Kelly and Demastes 7-8), he states that his “absolute primary aim is that what [...] [he] write[s] should be engrossing” (Taylor 25) and “prevent people from leaving their seats before the entertainment is over” (*ibid.* 25)¹⁶⁵.

¹⁶² Note, however, that Suppanz mentions that elements which are brought in from outside are immediately assimilated into the Austrian core system, hence being used in order to further the Austrian “Wesenskern” (“Österreichische Kultur” 233), rather than adding to the country’s hybridity (*ibid.* 234).

¹⁶³ It should, however, be mentioned that Spiel muses in a letter about turning King Solomon into King Lear, Edith Sitwell into Virginia Woolf and Augustus John into Henry James in her German version of Stoppard’s *Artist Descending a Staircase* (cf. Sieder, “1”, 384).

¹⁶⁴ Cf. also Lakner 124.

¹⁶⁵ There are a number of critics who interpret this technique as a means of ‘chameleonization’ with Stoppard’s “chang[ing] his color to whichever hue is popular at the moment” (Bratt xix).

Of course, the cultural background of the translator plays an equally important role. Hilde Spiel, who is born and raised in Austria (cf. Lakner 29), moves to Britain only at a later point in her life (cf. *ibid.* 30), also spending some years in Berlin, Germany (cf. *ibid.* 34). It is hence not surprising that Sieder mentions having detected Austrian expressions in Spiel's text (cf. "1", 414/441). Lunin, on the other hand, is German, which can equally be felt in his play (e.g. in the exclamation "Wieheißenoch!" (RG, 64))¹⁶⁶. Both translators are cultural experts and are thus fluent both in German and in English (cf. Sieder, "2", 628). On the other hand they are not famous playwrights and thus naturally approach the texts in a different way than Stoppard does. Spiel, who is a famous journalist, translator and essayist (cf. Lakner 28) places her emphasis on the written text and frequently finds fault with Stoppard's loose approach to the dramatic script as well as the latter's obsession with the performance aspect of a play (cf. *ibid.* 56-57/110-112). When Spiel does not turn up at the first night of one of her translated plays (cf. *ibid.* 49), Stoppard is not very amused, as he considers it vital to *watch* a play instead of limiting oneself to reading the script. The relationship between Spiel and Stoppard again highlights the power relations which exist between Britain and Austria, as Stoppard's ideas generally prevail over Spiel's. These are then communicated to Spiel via the publishing company – in a sort of condescending way (cf. *ibid.* 42).

III.4.2.1 Text vs. Performance

Stoppard's and Spiel's unfortunate relationship culminates in serious disagreements and controversies which result in the end of their co-operation after the translation of *Travesties*. Their divergent approaches to the dramatic text clearly mirror the conventions and norms of their respective cultural backgrounds. Although exaggerated stage productions are generally less common in the Germanic theater scene (which becomes evident by the fact that the actors of the Burgtheater¹⁶⁷ are not used to Peter Wood's style of directing (cf. Sieder, "2", 628/632/645)), Peter Wood's performance which – in line with the British tradition – places its main focus on design and stage direction, is very well received by the Austrian spectatorship (cf. *ibid.* 632/634/655/661)¹⁶⁸. This again shows that foreign (especially English-speaking) casts are usually received with open

¹⁶⁶ Note that Max's Viennese version does not include typically German expressions, such as "irre" (Lunin, RG, 35), "blöde" (*ibid.* 42), etc. – which again supports the claim that socio-cultural factors influence drama to a large extent.

¹⁶⁷ Note that Peter Wood refers to them as "retired, old pensioners" (Sieder, "2", 629) who lack the enthusiasm of his British crew.

¹⁶⁸ Only a very limited number of reviews criticize Stoppard's obsession with punch lines at the expense of individual character development (cf. Heinrichs qtd. in Lakner 117).

arms and cheers in Vienna – another indication of the asymmetrical relationship between the British and the Austrian culture. Spiel’s initial wish to stage her text in line with the Austrian theatrical conventions¹⁶⁹ is not respected by the more powerful English crew. Due to the relative cultural hegemony of the Anglophone world, the ‘British production’ is nonetheless acclaimed by the subordinate and hence insecure Austrian spectator. Other than the confident Anglophone visitor who prefers to be presented with whatever is familiar, less risky and hence more comfortable, ‘little Austria’ looks up to whatever is bigger and more powerful, longing to feel literate and cosmopolitan, even at the risk of understanding little of the typically British play. This attitude of the average Austrian theater goer also reflects, at least partly, the above-discussed two-faced mentality so typical of Vienna’s upper class society. It is fashionable to *pretend* to fully understand a *foreign* play (even if half of the punch lines go unnoticed as Spiel complains in a letter to Juncker (qtd. in Lakner 43)). As Pizzini rightly points out, “wird [Stoppard’s *Travesties*] überall dort bejubelt werden, wo Zuschauer es genießen sich einen Abend lang im Glanz ihrer mitgebrachten universellen Bildung sonnen zu dürfen” (qtd. in Sieder, “2”, 646). Hahnl speaks of “Klugschwätzerei für Vielgebildete, deren Bildungsbewußtsein gekitzelt wird. Womit ich den rauschenden Erfolg der Akademietheaterpremiere schon vorweggenommen habe” (qtd. in *ibid.* 647). This phenomenon is of interest, as generally speaking a certain amount of “background information is needed” (Sieder, “1”, 121) as “a lack of understanding may result in an unsuccessful play” (*ibid.* 121). In some cases, however, prestige is obviously more important than understanding: in order to *appear* as literate and educated, the Viennese spectatorship accepts to miss out on certain jokes and allusions.

III.4.2.2 Texts in their Own Right?

The fact that Peter Wood directs both the British, and the Austrian première leads Sieder to assume that all three productions are “identical” (“2”, 627) or “identical cop[ies]” (*ibid.* 639). At a later point she again claims that Spiel’s Viennese version of Stoppard’s *Travesties* should be regarded as “an authentic one” (*ibid.* 656) and that it should hence “come closest to the author’s original idea” (*ibid.* 656). Surprisingly, she nonetheless describes “the productions in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain,

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Spiel who claims “[dass] der [...] Text [...] immer wieder der theatralischen Wirkung [...] zum Opfer gebracht [wird]” (qtd. in Lakner 111). She continues, “Ich meine, daß dies bei einer deutschsprachigen Aufführung wenig häufiger der Fall ist, weil Mitteleuropäer weit mehr Geduld mit Ideendramen haben und nicht unaufhörlich, wie das in England geschieht, durch amüsante Bühnentricks in ihrem Prozess des Mitdenkens angeheizt – oder auch unterbrochen – werden müssen” (*ibid.* 111).

Switzerland and the United States” (*ibid.* 940-941) as “different [...] altogether” (*ibid.* 941), due to divergent audience responses. Generally speaking, Sieder’s approach is more of a traditional kind, as she clearly distinguishes between “the original plays” and “Stoppard’s [...] pastiches, parodies and travesties” (*ibid.* 950), stating that the former will probably outlive the latter. This suggests that she introduces a qualitative hierarchy according to which original plays are perceived as ‘better’ than their derivative texts.

Reimann equally terms Spiel’s play “eine[...] Nachdichtung” (qtd. in Lakner 120) and other reviews praise *Stoppard* for his brilliant, clever and outstanding performance in Vienna: “Daß der Brite Tom Stoppard zu den brillantesten und geistreichsten Autoren des heutigen Theaters gehört, hat *er* (auch hierzulande) [...] eindeutig bewiesen. [...] Mit *seinem* nun am Wiener Akademietheater deutschsprachig erstaufgeführten Bühnenspiel ‘Travesties’ [sic!] beweist er es neuerlich” (West qtd. in Lakner 119; Sieder, “1”, 386; my emphasis). As a matter of fact, it is not Stoppard who enralls the Viennese audience; neither is it *his* play *Travesties* which achieves a very positive effect (cf. Lakner 118/220). Rather, the play is entirely Spiel’s who airs her grievances regarding Stoppard’s condescending attitude “nachdem [...] [*ihre*] Übersetzungen im deutschen Sprachraum gerühmt worden waren” (qtd. in *ibid.* 45). She further believes that her “literary abilities and reputation may have helped more than hindered [...] [Stoppard’s] success on the German speaking stage” (Spiel qtd. in *ibid.* 47). What it is that enticed the Viennese audience to go and see *Travesties* remains unclear. Spiel is however right in claiming that what the spectators got to see was her play, or, at best, Peter Wood’s theatrical production, and not Stoppard’s wit or British humor. Stoppard might even agree with Spiel in this regard, as he openly states in an interview that “[t]he only thing which depresses a writer as a matter of fact, if he chances upon a play of his own years later, is to see a production which tries to mimic the original” (Stoppard, “Event and Text”, 206). The reason for this is straightforward, as mimicking the original is impossible. In Thomsen’s words, “[a] view which sees a dramatic work as a means of access to another work is extremely limited, for it fails to see the dramatic work as an access to life” (1235). Unfortunately contemporary translation criticism largely continues to hold on to this approach. I hence consider it vital to stress that Spiel’s play is as much a unique play as Lunin’s play cannot be put on the same footing as Stoppard’s *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*, just as Stoppard’s plays are *not* Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* or Wilde’s *The Importance of Being Earnest* although they incorporate much of their storylines.

III.5 Tom Stoppard and The 'Death of the Author' Argument

*Rien n'appartient à rien, tout appartient à tous.
Il faut être ignorant comme un maître d'école
Pour se flatter de dire une seule parole
Que personne ici-bas n'ait pu dire avant vous*¹⁷⁰.
(Alfred de Musset qtd. in Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting*, 26)

Upon reading the word 'unique' in connection with the various plays discussed above, some might argue that in line with Barthes' notion of 'the death of the author' the word 'unique' can no longer be used in order to define a literary piece of work. I have generally argued in favor of Barthes above, but would like to bring up some potential objections to his theory as a concluding remark. Stoppard appears to be one of the best objects of study in this context. His work (a) incorporates already existing literary material to a large extent, but (b) adds his very own – and, I would argue – 'unique' style to the original texts. Stoppard's plays *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* and *Travesties* indeed show a number of parallels with other British plays – not only regarding their plot structures, but also as far as stylistic characteristics are concerned. At the same time, Stoppard's linguistic rhythm is *very* peculiar and can be told apart from that of many contemporary British writers. If we hence rule out the potential influence of an author *per se* on the literary system, we negate the fact that it is the authors who *contribute* to the pool of literary ideas in the first place. These, in turn, are going to influence new writers to come. This notion is taken up by Said who "unlike Michel Foucault [...] believe[s] in the determining imprint of individual writers upon the otherwise anonymous collective body of texts constituting a discursive formation" (23). "Foucault", he continues, "believes that in general the individual text or author counts for very little" (*ibid.* 23), whereas indeed there exists a "dialectic between individual text or writer and the complex collective formation to which his work is a contribution" (*ibid.* 24). In other words, the literary pool which Barthes and Foucault understand as the only source of influence consists of various authorial statements. As a result, meaning is probably not determined by the author him- or herself, but their stylistic features must nonetheless be regarded as individual characteristics which are at least partly subjectively motivated. In other words, "[s]tylistic effects are, in this sense, traceable to the intentions of the text producer" (Hatim and Mason 10). By the same token, Mengel speaks of "the idiosyncratic

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Lefevere's translation: "Nothing belongs to nothing, all things belong to all/ Ignorant as a schoolmaster must you be called/ To flatter yourself that you have said one single word/ Nobody else did not say before you on this earth" (Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting*, 26).

temperament” of the text producer (14), an argument also taken up by Brassell who senses Stoppard’s “own, idiosyncratic tribute to the play [*Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are dead*]” (62). If the individual author was not permitted to add any finishing touches to his or her play, this would have to suggest that plays written by authors at the same time and place would have to be almost equal in style. Easterling, however, points to “the deep gulf that separates [...] [Stoppard and Pinter] stylistically” (76), and Hinden cautions against comparing Pinter, Stoppard, and the American playwright Sam Shepard, as “each playwright has evolved a quirky dramatic vision [...] [and as] no one would confuse their distinctive theatrical habitats” (400). Fleming concludes that “[i]n comparison to [...] [most] prominent contemporary British playwrights, the tone, style and subject matter of Stoppard’s theatrical vision is striking” (qtd. in Lau 1).

In Tom Stoppard’s case, opinions differ considerably as to whether he should be understood as a writer with an innovative spirit or a mere copier of others. Some critics “suggest[...] that the verb to *stoppard* be added to drama criticism to describe his innovative adaptations” (Billington qtd. in Stern 182), labeling Stoppard “a talented wordsmith and playwright with hypnotizing linguistic brilliance and a penchant for witty word-play” (Macris 111) or as someone who despite his tendency of “cannibalizing old situations [...] has been expanding his scope all the time” (Clive qtd. in Sieder, “1”, 186)¹⁷¹. Others, however, picture Stoppard as a parasite who feeds on others’ ideas and who lacks a voice of his own (cf. Brustein in Bratt xvi; Gardner in Bratt xviii; Weightmann in Bratt xix; Hinchliffe in Cahn 60), as “second-hand Beckett, [and] third-hand Kafka” (Gardner qtd. in Bratt xvii). Lau sees *Travesties* as an exemplification of the “notion of the death of the author” (14) as no over-arching voice or meta-narrative can be detected, and as multiple authorial voices are included in the play. Some take a middle-ground position, like Sieder, who cannot decide on “whether Stoppard should be seen as a genius or a plagiarist” (“1”, 4), as “Stoppard’s way of handling an established work gives the impression of watching the original simply from a different angle” (*ibid.* 170). At the same time, she argues that “a postmodernist view of the ‘death of the author’ would not be applicable to Stoppard’s case” (*ibid.* 108). She explains that his *ideas* (i.e. the content of his plays) are those of others, but that these very thoughts are “executed with zest and brilliance” (*ibid.* 936). This stance is taken up by Barth who mentions Stoppard’s difficulty of creating plot structures, at the same time stressing the fact that the latter’s

¹⁷¹ Cf. also Bratt; Marowitz in Bratt xviii; Tynan in Cahn 60.

plays must nonetheless be regarded “ [als] selbstständige künstlerische Leistungen” (111) due to a certain degree of remodeling (cf. *ibid.* 111; Hunter, *Plays*, 98).

Stoppard’s stance is in itself rather muddy: At some points he states that everything that Lenin says in his play *Travesties* is taken from the latter’s texts and that not a single word is written by himself (Stoppard qtd. in Sieder, “1”, 73). Asked whether he feels more like an innovator or like “a dramatist writing as [...] [he does] because it comes out of [...] him” (Taylor 25), he immediately opts for the latter, claiming that “[o]ne is the victim and beneficiary of one’s environment, history, subconscious” (*ibid.* 25). At the same time, he explains that he likes to assist at his plays in order “to prevent oneself from being misinterpreted” and that his texts can only be spoken in one particular way only “to achieve an optimum effect” (Gordon 20) – a stance which still very much echoes the traditional understanding of the author as a ‘genius’. In another interview, he concedes however that a work of art must not necessarily “communicate X to everybody” (Taylor 28). These contradictions show that the passage from the paradigm of the author as ‘genius’ to the paradigm of the author as a dead man or woman has as yet not been fully implemented. Naturally, this trend comes as a jolt to most authors who are desperate when watching new versions of ‘their’ plays which “have nothing to do with what [...] [they] wrote! Nothing to do with it!” (Wetzsteon 84), and who are at times tempted to “move[...] in with [...] [their] lawyer and stop[...] it” (Stoppard, “Text and Event”, 205), as Harold Pinter did when his *Betrayal* was staged in a boxing-ring (*ibid.* 205).

For the time being Stoppard’s statement which specifies that “one’s output is bound to be to some degree an expression of input” (Shields Hardin 164) best sums up the current state of knowledge. What I have tried to show is that outward influences determine a writer to a large degree, but that room is nonetheless left for a small amount of individual freedom. This has been shown by the analyses above. All texts are to a large extent influenced by socio-cultural, power-related, theatrical and other literary factors. To provide but two examples, Stoppard’s play *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* is commonly referred to as an absurd and existentialist play. Stoppard, however, claims “that he did not know what the word existentialist meant until it was applied to *Rosencrantz*” (Gordon 15). He equally admitted to “know[ing] very little about [Pirandello]” and that he “really wasn’t aware of that as an influence” (*ibid.* 21). We hence have to do away with the common belief that the author controls his piece of writing to a hundred percent. Much of

what goes on in writing is unconsciously motivated. When Stoppard hence claims that “bad art is [...] [when] the artist knows exactly what he’s doing” (Bratt xxvi), he suggests that, by extension, good art – or rather art in general – is a conglomerate of a myriad of different factors. Although Barthes’ notion of the ‘death of the author’ is probably too strong a stance – as individual factors prevail at least to some degree – socio-cultural, historical, literary, and power-related aspects make up the lion’s share of potential influences on the literary business.

III.6 Conclusion

Socio-cultural, historical, literary, and power-related norms and conventions influence translations, and texts in the widest sense of the word, as a *descriptive* and *function-oriented* analysis of Schnitzler’s *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* in juxtaposition to Tom Stoppard’s versions of these texts, as well as a comparison of Stoppard’s *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* and *Travesties* with their German versions has shown. This approach which is first introduced by James Holmes, is put into practice in connection with *Polysystem Theory* and *Cultural Transfer Theory* and consolidated by modern translation scholars in close co-operation with other disciplines, such as sociology and cultural studies. Accordingly, shifts which occur throughout the translation process must be understood as being mainly motivated by social, rather than individual factors, and are hence not chiefly attributable to the translators’ lack of capacity or minuteness¹⁷². Rather, the comparison of texts which are firmly anchored in a specific cultural environment will provide salient information about the relationship between these communities.

Since each cultural community holds on to a set of conventionalized *communicative practices*, members of different cultural groups interpret the world in largely different ways. As a result, the notion of *equivalence* as well as a *universalist* understanding of the very translation process have to be dismissed in favor of a more *relativist* approach. Indeed, the analyzed British and Austrian plays must be defined according to a notion of

¹⁷² This conception dates back to Barthes’ concept of ‘the death of the author’ according to which the author is no longer regarded as an individual genius, but as a product of the time and age in which he or she lives and writes. I have, however, tried to point out that individual ideas and thoughts cannot be declared null and void altogether. Indeed, authors and writers must be understood as subjects rather than objects at least in as far as their individual ideas are added to the literary pool which in turn will influence new authors and writers to come.

difference rather than sameness. From a macrolinguistic perspective, shifts mainly occurred regarding the length, the rhythm and the tempo, as well as the overall tenor and genre conventions of the various plays. Alterations on the microlevel of the texts included changes in language, register, and vocabulary; syntactic variation as well as deviations regarding punctuation and recurrence patterns; shifts in wordplay; and discrepant conversational styles which were initiated by different forms of address. Additionally, culturemes in the case of Schnitzler's plays and intertextual references in Stoppard's plays - as highly culture-specific communicative practices - further impeded the translation process.

A more detailed look at the English and the German linguistic systems has shown that both cultures rely on different syntactic constructions, sound patterns, and salutatory conventions. The use of case markers in the German language allows for a larger variety of syntactic constructions than the English unmarked case system does. Different frequency patterns of the phonemes of both languages make a certain alteration in tone and rhythm inevitable, and set forms of address in both languages as well as the T/V structure of the German language which does not find an equivalent in the English language further account for translation shifts.

Naturally, textual and theatrical conventions also diverge among various countries. Accordingly, German plays are traditionally longer and more content-based than English plays are. The latter rely on a long tradition of witty, quick-moving dialog, where lengthy passages merely hamper the intended notion of repartee and sharpness. This, in turn, implies the use of comic, stichomythic exchanges, which build up suspense and provide an action-laden stage production. Finally, sexual allusions and taboo expressions such as four-letter words and obscenities are more tolerated on an English stage than in an Austrian stage production. This can naturally be explained by the fact that English drama productions have historically swayed toward the comic rather than the purely serious. In other words, England's comedy tradition is rich and prestigious; the witty plays of the Restoration period, Wilde's, Shaw's, and Pinter's plays provide but some examples. The Germanic drama tradition, on the other hand, relies on a syntagmatic understanding of 'action', with the focus being placed on plot and character development. Resultantly, the rhythm is tuned down, and quick 'tennis game-like' exchanges are replaced by more melodramatic and serious constructions. Additionally, wordplay and puns are generally

more frequent in English than in German/Austrian drama. Whereas the English playwright generally relies on a series of assonances, consonances and word-based puns, the Germanic tradition rather turns to rhyme schemes, and sentence-based wordplay.

Indeed, a general conformity between these conventions and the patterns used in the analyzed plays can be detected. Schnitzler's plays *Liebelei* and *Das weite Land* are generally longer, employing lofty chit-chat and small talk, where Stoppard's adaptations *Dalliance* and *Undiscovered Country* use direct and sharp conversational exchanges, cutting both plays down in length. The same holds true for Spiel's *Travesties* and Lunin's *Rosenkranz und Gldenstern*, both of which are longer than Stoppard's plays. A similar pattern can be noticed regarding the plays' stage directions; whereas the Germanic plays employ generally lengthier, more carefully formed instructions, Stoppard's texts keep them less explicit, and hence shorter. This tendency can also be felt in the choice of dialog structures, as well as the rhythm and the tempo of the various plays. Schnitzler's texts are marked by lengthy exchanges which hold on to the conversational tone typical of *fin de sicle* Vienna. Similarly, Lunin's play makes use of a number of fillers, thereby lengthening the quick rhythm of Stoppard's original play. Spiel, for her part, equally turns to a less vivid style than Stoppard does in *Travesties*, which is further accentuated by the changes in rhythm which the German play entails. Finally, Stoppard's pun-centered exchanges which flow naturally like tennis games are not infrequently brought to a halt in Spiel's and Lunin's plays.

The above-mentioned differences in the sound pattern of the English and the German language cannot go unnoticed either, as they automatically alter the rhythm and atmosphere of the various plays. As a result, the overall style of the texts diverges considerably. In line with the conventions delineated above, the German plays are more serious, melodramatic and sentimental than Stoppard's humorous farces which are punctuated with irony, wit, and satire. This mirrors the deep-rooted tradition of comedy in the Anglophone world, where epigrammatic style and double entendre are just as common as jocular repartee and strong lines. The German plays which focus on philosophically and ethically vital issues, hence giving priority to the content rather than the form of the texts, are alternately described as 'tragicomedy', 'domestic tragedy', 'history play', and 'absurd, existentialist play'. These genres suggest some sort of profundity, whereas the English plays are best described as parodies, farces, travesties, pastiches, and collages. By the same token, the British predilection for sexual explicitness and curses on stage are

reflected in Stoppard's productions, whereas the German plays are generally more prudish and distinguished, also avoiding the use of too obscene terms on stage.

Apart from linguistic and theatrical norms, literary trends and socio-cultural events further mark the texts at hand. Schnitzler's plays show a strong influence of realism and the beginnings of modernism, as topics such as multiple identities, the blurring of illusion and reality, as well as the fallacy of language show. Additionally, the socio-cultural atmosphere of *fin de siècle* Vienna runs like a recurrent theme through his *oeuvre*. His characters stroll along the streets of Vienna, refusing to commit themselves to anything political or moral. Socio-culturally speaking, questions of feminism which are omnipresent today are less important in Schnitzler's patriarchal society, which is more concerned with the practice of the duel, Freudian psychology, and the societal relationship between the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the less privileged classes. As a result, Schnitzler's plays focus much more seriously on these aspects, whereas Stoppard's adaptations are more marked by (post-) modernist trends. Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* is largely marked by modernist tendencies, including the question of God's existence, life as being meaningless, and deconstruction as a trigger of *malaise*. *Travesties*, which is written almost ten years after *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* already largely integrates itself into the literary period of postmodernism, as questions of deconstruction are treated in a more jocular way. Additionally, socio-cultural trends such as Marxism and Dadaism are discussed in detail. Spiel's play *Travesties*, which appears after World War II, is largely influenced by this socio-political event.

All in all, this means that culture-specific interpretations, based on culture-bound signifying systems, continue to shape texts around the world. Accordingly, linguistic material which is transposed into another linguistic system is automatically molded into the latter, thereby being semantically bleached and hence no longer equivalent to the original concept. As a result, translations must *per definitionem cannibalize* the original; what is expressed in the new culture will be interpreted in relation to the 'self', and not to the 'other'. To suggest "[dass] auf der Bühne eine fremde [...] Wirklichkeit authentisch dargestellt wird" is hence illusionary at best (cf. Fischer-Lichte 135). Seen from another angle, the meaning of the original term cannot be fixed or stable, as meaning always depends on the context in which the very term occurs. This concept is taken up by Derrida and Hall who understand meaning as being composed of floating signifiers, which depending on the individual interpretation of someone will take up a myriad of different

signifieds. Foucault argues that possible interpretations are limited, as too illogical an interpretation will *ab initio* be ruled out as impossible by a given cultural community.

This brings up the question of how homogeneous a culture can be, and whether ‘culture’ linked to the concept of the nation state exists at all. Modern scholars, including Bhabha, Wolf, and Mitterbauer claim that the notion of a specific, homogeneous national culture must be dismissed in favor of a hybrid space, where various cultural elements merge and compete. Indeed, a cultural group is hardly ever homogeneous. Individual interpretations and perceptions exist, which has best been shown in the context of Stoppard’s plays *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* and *Travesties*. As a matter of fact, it may happen that a literate person from the UK and a literate person from Austria will interpret the plays in more similar ways than a literate and a non-literate person, who were both born and raised in the UK will. However, the modern stance which pictures the world as a hybrid and culturally indefinable conglomerate as such does not as yet exist. Put differently, even if different cultural elements merge, we are not yet faced with a universal system of communicative practices. Rather, different signifying practices persist, and stereotypical views of the ‘other’ have not been dismantled, even if a sustained transfer of cultural goods allows for a number of modifications and shifts in the existing cultural spheres (cf. Mengel 18).

This is where the aspect of power among the various cultural conglomerates comes in. Although the modern individual might get in touch with a wider range of cultural influences than people did some decades ago, this does not necessarily imply that they will feel committed to each cultural aspect to exactly the same extent. Schnitzler and Stoppard who have both hybrid origins nonetheless refuse to be regarded as hybrid subjects. Both of them identify with the more powerful of their cultural backgrounds, avoiding to be labeled ‘minority writers’. In her article, Honegger who, despite her Austrian origins, has lived in the US most of her life admits to finding it easier to portray a character in German than in English. Her English personae, as she explains, “become strangers in foreign territory” (22); Honegger is clearly influenced by two cultures, but does not feel attached to both of them to the same degree.

To take stock, Bhabha’s notion of the ‘third space’ or ‘the space in between’ is relevant in the context of translation studies only inasmuch as it challenges the age-old dichotomy of source- vs. target oriented translation. In what Bhabha terms ‘third space’, elements of both

‘cultures’ merge, which could also be documented in the analyzed texts above. However, and this is where Bhabha’s notion seems to fail, the meaning of these elements cannot be equivalent in English and in German, as the British will relate the German items to the rest of their signifying system, whereas the Austrians will interpret the English words in relation to their system of communicative practices. As a result, the understanding of the ‘other’ remains partial, and hence stereotypical to a large extent. This is exemplified by Stoppard’s highly cliché-ridden productions in the Anglophone world, where the Austrians are subsumed under the general rubric of the Germanic people, and stereotypically portrayed as pedantic country dwellers wearing lederhosen and eating ‘knockwurst’¹⁷³. In Austria, the British traits of Stoppard’s original plays are equally accentuated. Accordingly, Carr appears as a typically British gentleman, and Max introduces jokes like ‘Die Engländer sind nicht sehr anspruchsvoll’ into his production of *Rosenkranz und Gldenstern*.

This, again, brings up the question of power. It has been shown that the ratio of source and target-based elements in the translated texts varies according to the relative power that a country wields on a global scale. Stuart Campbell is right in claiming that “in the professional translation enterprise there is an illusion that English is just one of a set of replaceable codes of equal value” (27). The hegemony of the English language and the Anglophone culture has allowed the British to block foreign influences to a large extent. Since other countries and cultures are eager to learn more about their culture, the British citizens do not necessarily feel the need to learn about foreign cultures or to acquire other languages. As a result, anything which is too exotic will be blocked and replaced by what seems familiar. Austria, which, due to its small size, naturally wields considerably less power, is interested in anything that comes in from the Anglophone world and will hence integrate English elements more readily into its home system. This could be shown by the fact that Peter Wood, a British director, was invited to take charge of the Austrian stage production of both *Rosenkranz and Gldenstern* and *Travesties*. His wish to place the focus on the performance aspect of Hilde Spiel’s text was respected, whereas Spiel’s objections were largely ignored. In the end the British approach to the text was largely hailed by the Viennese audience.

¹⁷³ Note that this term perfectly illustrates how originally foreign words (‘Knackwurst’) are assimilated, beyond recognition, to the home system.

Bhabha and modern translation scholars like Bassnett and Lefevere, who criticize that translation largely *cannibalizes* foreign works, do not take into account these questions of power, further ignoring the lobbying which tends to take place in the field of drama. Theaters like to invest in plays which ‘sell’. In order to prove economically successful, plays have to amuse the spectator, which basically goes hand in glove with the fact that he or she must be able to understand what happens on stage. This, in turn, does not easily combine with the claim that as many foreign elements as possible must be retained in translation. English theaters very much rely on this strategy. Eager to meet the spectators’ expectations, they prune and cut what would surpass their presuppositions. Only in less powerful nations will spectators willingly watch plays which they don’t understand in their entirety, if these plays come from relatively powerful nations, such as England, America, or France, etc. This does however not comply with Bassnett’s and Lefevere’s claim of supporting the less powerful. According to current belief, powerful discourses can indeed be dismantled. Drama translation does, however, not seem to be the right field for change. The transient quality of drama productions which *ab initio* prevents the spectator from being able to look up unknown concepts of the play, as well as the weak position which translators have historically occupied prevent the initiation of far-reaching changes to a large extent. Even smaller countries, such as Austria, which are more open toward influences from outside, shift the foreign text toward the home system at least to some degree. Both Spiel and Lunin make use of German texts which they incorporate into Stoppard’s original in order to naturalize the British play. It seems that Anderman’s question of whether “the translation [should] stay as close as possible to the original or [whether it] should [...] be adjusted to better meet the expectations of the target actors and speakers” (*Europe*, 16) must be answered with a tendency toward the latter, at least in drama translation.

Due to enormous power webs which influence drama translation, and any act of writing in the largest sense, texts adhere to the socio-cultural, historical, and literary norms and conventions of the culture from which they originate. Just like Rosencrantz and Guildenstern who are inevitably bound to the *Hamlet* plot – without being aware of it in the beginning – every writer (i.e. every author and translator) is bound to his or her society. Just like Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are fated to die, each translator is fated to *cannibalize* whichever text he or she attempts to transpose into his or her own culture. What this study hopes to achieve is to encourage greater awareness among spectators of

foreign drama productions by informing them about the factors governing the translation process delineated above (cf. Bassnett and Lefevere, “Where are we?”, 8): One, it is not the translator’s fault if his or her version does not equal the ‘original’. Two, the factors which have been discussed in detail above prevent the translation from being equivalent to this ‘original’. Three, each translation should be valued as a text in its own right, instead of being dismissed as the smaller, ridiculous brother of the source text. Translation, then, relates to the original just as the mirror image or the photograph relates to the ‘real object’. Both rely on “the principle of similarity *and* difference” (Pearce 1149; my emphasis), rather than on complete equivalence.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

- Goethe**, Johann Wolfgang von. *Berliner Ausgabe: Poetische Werke I*. Berlin: Aufbau, 1964. 20 Oct. 2009. <<http://www.textlog.de/18229.html>>.
- Schnitzler**, Arthur. *Das weite Land: Tragikomödie in fünf Akten*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2002.
- *Liebelei: Schauspiel in drei Akten*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2002.
- Shakespeare**, William. *Hamlet*. London: Penguin, 1996.
- Stoppard**, Tom. *Rosencranz und Guildenstern: Schauspiel*. Trans. Hanno Lunin. Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1967.
- *Travesties*. London: Faber & Faber, 1975.
- *Travesties*. Trans. Hilde Spiel. Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1976.
- *Tom Stoppard: Plays Four: Dalliance, Undiscovered Country, Rough Crossing, On the Razzle, The Seagull*. London: Faber & Faber, 1999.
- *Rosencranz and Guildenstern are Dead*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005.

Secondary and Tertiary Literature

- “**Arthur Schnitzler**”. *The Columbia Encyclopedia*. 6th ed. New York: Columbia UP, 2004.
- “**German language adds 5,000 words**”. *BBC News* 22 July 2009. 27 Sep. 2009. <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/8163541.stm>>.
- “**knockwurst**”. *Dictionary.com Unabridged*. Random House, Inc. 03 Feb. 2010. <<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/knockwurst>>.
- Agorni**, Mirella. “Locating Systems and Individuals in Translation Studies”. *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers*. Ed. Federico Celestini and Helga Mitterbauer. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003. 123-134.
- Ametsbichler**, Elizabeth G. “A Century of Intrigue: The Dramatic Works of Arthur Schnitzler”. *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler*. Ed. Dagmar C. G. Lorenz. Rochester: Camden House, 2003. 187-204.
- Anderman**, Gunilla. *Europe on Stage: Translation and Theatre*. London: Oberon Books, 2005.
- “A l’anglaise or the Invisible European”. *In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse?*. Ed. Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2005. 275-285.
- , and Margaret Rogers. “English in Europe: For Better, For Worse?”. *In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse?*. Ed. Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2005. 1-26.
- Arens**, Katherine. “Schnitzler and the Discourse of Gender in *Fin-de-Siècle* Vienna”. *A companion to the works of Arthur Schnitzler*. Ed. Dagmar C. G. Lorenz. Rochester, Camden House, 2003. 243-264.
- Bachmann-Medick**, Doris. “Einleitung: Übersetzung als Repräsentation fremder Kulturen”. *Übersetzung als Repräsentation fremder Kulturen*. Ed. Doris Bachmann-Medick. Regensburg: Erich Schmid, 1997. 1-18.
- “Fremddarstellung und Lüge: Übersetzung als kulturelle Uebertreibung am Beispiel von Muenchhausens *Luegengeschichten*”. *Übersetzung als Repräsentation fremder Kulturen*. Ed. Doris Bachmann-Medick. Regensburg: Erich Schmid, 1997. 42-68.

- Barber**, John. "Tragi-Comical Study of a Philanderer". *Daily Telegraph* 21 June 1979: 15.
- Barker**, Chris. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage, 2000.
- Barth**, Adolf. *Moderne englische Gesellschaftskomödie*. Munich: Artemis, 1987.
- Bartholomew**, Kevin and Katja Krebs. "Arthur Schnitzler 1862-1931: Austrian dramatist, novelist and short-story writer". *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English* 2. London: FitzRoy Dearborn, 2000. 1241-1243.
- Bassnett**, Susan. *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 1980.
- , "When is a Translation not a Translation?". *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 25-40.
- , "Still Trapped in the Labyrinth: Further Reflections on Translation and Theatre". *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 90-108.
- , "The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies". *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 123-140.
- , and André Lefevere. Preface. *Translation, History and Culture*. By Bassnett and Lefevere. London: Pinter, 1990. ix.
- , and André Lefevre. "Introduction: Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights". *Translation, History and Culture*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. London: Pinter, 1990. 1-13.
- , and André Lefevere. "Where are we in Translation Studies?". *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 1-11.
- Baumann**, Gerhart. *Arthur Schnitzler: Die Welt von Gestern eines Dichters von Morgen*. Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1965.
- Baumgart**, Wolfgang. "Hamlet's Excellent Good Friends: Beobachtungen zu Shakespeare und Stoppard". *Englische Dichter der Moderne: Ihr Leben und Werk*. Ed. Rudolf Sühnel and Dieter Riesner. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1971. 588-598.
- Bell**, Anthea. "Translation: walking on the tightrope of illusion". *The Translator as Writer*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and Peter Bush. London: Continuum, 2006. 58-70.
- Beller**, Steven. "Modern Owls Fly by Night: Recent Literature on Fin de Siècle Vienna". *The Historical Journal* 41.3 (Sept 1988): 665-683.
- Beniston**, Judith. "Schnitzler in Red Vienna". *Arthur Schnitzler: Zeitgenossenschaften/Contemporaneities*. Ed. Ian Foster and Florian Krobb. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. 217-232.
- Benjamin**, Walter. "The Task of the Translator: An introduction to the translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens* 1923". *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti, 2000/1923. 15-22.
- Bennett**, Susan. *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Berger**, Arthur Asa. *The Art of Comedy Writing*. New Brunswick: Transaction, 1997.
- Berman**, Antoine. "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign". *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000. 284-297.
- Biguenet**, John, and Rainer Schulte. Introduction. *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. By Biguenet and Schulte. London: Chicago UP, 1992. 1-10.
- Billington**, Michael. *Stoppard. The Playwright*. London: Methuen, 1987.

- Boase-Beier**, Jean, and Michael Holman. "Introduction: Writing, Rewriting and Translation: Through Constraint to Creativity". *The Practices of Literary Translation: Constraints and Creativity*. Ed. Jean Boase-Beier and Michael Holman. Guildford: St. Jerome, 1999. 1-18.
- Bonacker**, Thorsten. "Gesellschaft: Warum die Einheit der Gesellschaft aufgeschoben wird". *Poststrukturalistische Sozialwissenschaften*. Ed. Stephan Moebius and Andreas Reckwitz. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 2008. 27-42.
- Brady**, Owen E. Rev. of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* by Tom Stoppard. *Theatre Journal* 39.1 (March 1987): 102-104. *JSTOR. The Johns Hopkins UP*. 2009. Vienna University Library. 20 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3207630>>.
- Brassell**, Tim. *Tom Stoppard: An Assessment*. London: Macmillan, 1985.
- Bratt**, David. Introduction. *Tom Stoppard: A reference guide*. By Bratt. Boston: Hall, 1982. xi-xxvi.
- Brinson**, Charmian and Marian Malet. "'Die sonderbarste Stadt, die man sich denken kann?': Arthur Schnitzler in London". *Arthur Schnitzler: Zeitgenossenschaften/Contemporaneities*. Ed. Ian Foster and Florian Krobb. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. 71-88.
- Butzko**, Ellen. *Arthur Schnitzler und die zeitgenössische Theaterkritik*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, 1991.
- Cahn**, Victor L. *Beyond Absurdity: The Plays of Tom Stoppard*. London: Associated UP, 1979.
- Campbell**, Stuart. "English Translation and Linguistic Hegemony in the Global Era". *Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. Ed. Anthony Pym, Miriam Schlesinger, and Zuzana Jettmarová. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2006. 27-38.
- Celestini**, Federico. "Um-Deutungen: Transfer als Kontextwechsel mehrfach kodierbarer kultureller Elemente". *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers*. Ed. Federico Celestini and Helga Mitterbauer. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003. 37-52.
- , "Archäologie und Mikrophysik des Transfers: Versuch einer Instrumentalisierung". *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers*. Ed. Federico Celestini and Helga Mitterbauer. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003. 67-83.
- , and Helga Mitterbauer. *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003.
- , and Helga Mitterbauer. Einleitung. *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers*. By Celestini and Mitterbauer. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003. 11-17.
- Clarke**, Richard. "Roland Barthes: 'The Death of the Author'". *Department of Language, Linguistics, and Literature*. Bridgetown, West Indies. 31 Aug 2009. <<http://www.rlwclarke.net/Courses/LITS3304/2004-2005/09ABarthesDeathoftheAuthor.pdf>>.
- Constanzo**, Dennis. "Artists and Anarchism in Fin-de-Siècle Paris". *Fin de siècle: 19th and 20th Century Comparisons and Perspectives*. Ed. Jürgen Kleist and Bruce A. Butterfield. New York: Peter Lang, 1996. 1-10.
- Cuyler**, Richard R. Rev. of *Hamlet* by William Shakespeare and *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* by Tom Stoppard. *Theatre Journal* 31.4 (Dec. 1979): 550-552. *JSTOR. The Johns Hopkins UP*. 2009. Vienna University Library. 20 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3219430>>.
- Daviau**, Donald G. "The Reception of Arthur Schnitzler in the United States". *The Fortunes of German Writers in America: Studies in Literary Reception*. Ed. Wolfgang Elfe, James Hardin, and Gunther Holst. Columbia: South Carolina UP, 1992. 145-165.

- , "Arthur Schnitzler's *Liebelei* and Max Ophuls's film adaptation". *Arthur Schnitzler: Zeitgenossenschaften/Contemporaneities*. Ed. Ian Foster and Florian Krobb. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. 329-384.
- Delaney**, Paul. Introduction. *Tom Stoppard in Conversation*. By Delaney. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1994. 1-11.
- Delebastita**, Dirk. "Wortspiele". *Handbuch Translation*. Ed. Mary Snell-Hornby, Hans G. Höning, Paul Kußmaul, and Peter A. Schmitt. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1999. 285-288.
- Derré**, Françoise. *L'oeuvre d'Arthur Schnitzler: imagerie viennoise et problèmes humains*. Paris : Didier, 1966.
- Deutsch-Schreiner**, Evelyn. "...nothing against Arthur Schnitzler himself...": Interpreting Schnitzler on Stage in Austria in the 1950s and 1960s." *A companion to the works of Arthur Schnitzler*. Ed. Dagmar C. G. Lorenz. Rochester, Camden House, 2003. 59-75.
- Dimitriu**, Rodica. "From *Robinson Crusoe* to *Robinson in Wallachia*: The intricacies of the reception process". *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. Ed. Anthony Pym, Miriam Schlesinger, and Zuzana Jettmarová. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2006. 73-82.
- Dodd**, John. "Success Is the Only Unusual Thing about Mr. Stoppard". *Tom Stoppard in Conversation*. Ed. Paul Delaney. Ann Arbor, U of Michigan Press, 1994/1967. 12-14.
- Easterling**, Anja. "Shakespearian Parallels and Affinities with the Theatre of the Absurd in Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*". Diss. U of Umeå, 1982.
- Eichelbaum**, Stanley. "So Often Produced, He Ranks with Shaw". *Tom Stoppard in Conversation*. Ed. Paul Delaney. Ann Arbor, U of Michigan Press, 1994/1977. 103-106.
- Eltis**, Sos. *Revising Wilde: Society and Subversion in the Plays of Oscar Wilde*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Espagne**, Michel. "Die Rolle der Mittler im Kulturtransfer". *Kulturtransfer im Epochenumbruch 1*. Ed. Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink and Rolf Reichardt. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1997. 309-329.
- , and Michael Werner. "Deutsch-Französischer Kulturtransfer im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert: Zu einem neuen interdisziplinären Forschungsprogramm des C.N.R.S". *Francia 13* (1985): 502-510. *Perspectivia.net*. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. 2009. 14 Nov. 2009. <http://francia.digitale-sammlungen.de/Blatt_bsb00016288,00518.html>.
- Esslin**, Martin. *The Theatre of the Absurd*. London: Cox & Wyman, 1961.
- Even-Zohar**, Itamar. "Theory Today: A call for Transfer Theory". *Poetics Today* 2.4 (1981): 1-7. *JSTOR*. Duke University Press. 2009. Vienna University Library. 1 Apr. 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1772481>>.
- , *Polysystem Studies = Poetics Today* 11.1 (1990). *JSTOR*. Duke University Press. 2009. Vienna University Library. 1 Apr. 2009 <www.jstor.org>.
- Feldmann**, Susanne. "Kulturelle Schlüsselbegriffe in pragma-semiotischer Perspektive". *Übersetzung als Repräsentation fremder Kulturen*. Ed. Doris Bachmann-Medick. Regensburg: Erich Schmid, 1997. 275-280.
- Fischer-Lichte**, Erika. "Die Inszenierung der Übersetzung als kulturelle Transformation". *Soziale und theatralische Konventionen als Problem der Dramenübersetzung*. Ed. Erika Fischer-Lichte, Fritz Paul, Brigitte Schultze and Horst Turk. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1988. 129-144.

- Fliedl**, Konstanze. "'O du mein Österreich': Schnitzlers schwierige Heimat". *Arthur Schnitzler: Zeitgenossenschaften/Contemporaneities*. Ed. Ian Foster and Florian Krobb. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. 33-42.
- Foster**, Ian and Florian Krobb. "Einleitung: Arthur Schnitzlers synchrone und diachrone Zeitgenossenschaften". *Arthur Schnitzler: Zeitgenossenschaften/Contemporaneities*. Ed. Ian Foster and Florian Krobb. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. 13-18.
- Friedrich**, Hugo. "On the Art of Translation". *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Ed. Biguenet John and Rainer Schulte. London: Chicago UP, 1992. 11-16.
- Fritsch**, Sibylle. "Ein Land auf der Couch". *Presse* 17 May 2009: 40-41.
- Fuchs**, Martin. "Übersetzen und Übersetzt-Werden: Plädoyer für eine interaktionsanalytische Reflexion". *Übersetzung als Repräsentation fremder Kulturen*. Ed. Doris Bachmann-Medick. Regensburg: Erich Schmid, 1997. 308-328.
- Galens**, David. "Travesties". *Enotes. The Gale Group*. 2002. 18 Oct. 2009. <<http://www.enotes.com/travesties>>.
- Gay**, Peter. *Schnitzler's Century: The Making of Middle-Class Culture 1815-1914*. New York: Norton & Company, 2002.
- Gellerstam**, Martin. "Fingerprints in Translation". *In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse?*. Ed. Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2005. 201-213.
- Gentzler**, Edwin. Foreword. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. By Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. ix-xxii.
- . *Contemporary Translation Theories*. 2nd ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- Giles**, Judy, and Tim Middleton. *Studying Culture: A Practical Introduction*. Cornwall: Blackwell, 1999.
- Gillman**, Abigail. "'Ich suche ein Asyl für meine Vergangenheit': Schnitzler's poetics of memory". *Arthur Schnitzler: Zeitgenossenschaften/Contemporaneities*. Ed. Ian Foster and Florian Krobb. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. 141-156.
- Godard**, Barbara. "Theorizing Feminist Discourse/Translation". *Translation, History, and Culture*. Ed. André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett. London: Pinter, 1990. 87-96.
- Gordon**, Giles. "Tom Stoppard". *Tom Stoppard in Conversation*. Ed. Paul Delaney. Ann Arbor, U of Michigan Press, 1994/1968. 15-23.
- Gouanvic**, Jean-Marc. "Objectivation, réflexivité et traduction: Pour une re-lecture bourdieusienne de la traduction". *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Ed. Michaela Wolf. London: Sage, 2000. 79-92.
- Guppy**, Shusha. "Tom Stoppard: The Art of Theater VII". *Tom Stoppard in Conversation*. Ed. Paul Delaney. Ann Arbor, U of Michigan Press, 1994/1984. 177-192.
- Gussow**, Mel. "With Stoppard in Schnitzlerland". *New York Times*, 27 Feb. 1982: 4.
- . "Stoppard's Intellectual Cartwheels Now with Music". *Tom Stoppard in Conversation*. Ed. Paul Delaney. Ann Arbor, U of Michigan Press, 1994/1979. 129-134.
- . *Conversations with Stoppard*. London: Nick Hern, 1996.
- Hatim**, Basil, and Ian Mason. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman, 1990.
- Heilbron**, Johan, and Gisèle Sapiro. "Outline for a sociology of translation. Current issue and future prospects". *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Ed. Michaela Wolf. London: Sage, 2000. 93-108.

- Henschelmann, Käthe.** *Problem-bewusstes Übersetzen: Französisch-Deutsch: Ein Arbeitsbuch.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1999.
- Hermans, Theo.** "Translation, irritation and resonance". *Constructing a Sociology of Translation.* Ed. Michaela Wolf. London: Sage, 2000. 57-78.
- Hinden, Michael.** "After Beckett: The Plays of Pinter, Stoppard, and Shepard". *Contemporary Literature* 27.3 (Fall 1986): 400-408. JSTOR. University of Wisconsin Press. 2009. Vienna University Library. 20 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1208353>>.
- Holmes, James Stratton.** *Translated! Papers on Literary translation and translation studies.* Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994.
- "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies". *The Translation Studies Reader.* Ed. Lawrence Venuti, 2000/1972. 172-185.
- Honegger, Gitta.** "Acts of Translation". *Performing Arts Journal* 7.1 (1983): 21-26. JSTOR. MIT Press/PAJ. 2009. Vienna University Library. 20 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3245291>>.
- Hörn, Eva.** "Literatur: Gibt es Gesellschaft im Text?". *Poststrukturalistische Sozialwissenschaften.* Ed. Stephan Moebius and Andreas Reckwitz. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 2008. 363-381.
- Hudson, Roger, Catherine Itzin, and Simon Trussler.** "Ambushes for the Audience: Towards a High Comedy of Ideas". *Tom Stoppard in Conversation.* Ed. Paul Delaney. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1994/1974. 51-72.
- Huntemann, Willi.** "Anredepronomen als bedeutungsschaffender Faktor in der deutschen Übersetzung von Harold Pinters *The Caretaker*: Eine Fallstudie zum Problem der Übersetzung pragmatischer Kontexte". *Soziale und theatralische Konventionen als Problem der Dramenübersetzung.* Ed. Erika Fischer-Lichte, Fritz Paul, Brigitte Schultze and Horst Turk. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1988. 81-93.
- Hunter, Jim.** *Tom Stoppard's Plays.* London: Faber & Faber, 1982.
- *Tom Stoppard: Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead, Jumpers, Travesties, Arcadia.* New York: Faber & Faber, 2000.
- Iser, Wolfgang.** "Samuel Beckett (1906)". *Englische Dichter der Moderne: Ihr Leben und Werk.* Ed. Rudolf Sühnel and Dieter Riesner. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1971. 560-577.
- Jakobson, Roman.** "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation". *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida.* Ed. Biguenet John and Rainer Schulte. London: Chicago UP, 1992. 144-151.
- Jörg, Udo.** "Kulturelle Adaptation bei der Bühnenübersetzung". Diss. U of Vienna, 1993.
- Kammeyer, Max-Peter.** "Die Dramaturgie von Tod und Liebe im Werk Arthur Schnitzlers". Diss. U of Vienna, 1960.
- Karoubi, Behrouz.** "Ideology and Translation: with a concluding point on translation pedagogy". Arak: Islamic Azad University. 30 Aug 2009. <http://www.appliedlanguage.com/translation_resources/translation_articles/ideology_and_translation.aspx>.
- Karwowski, Michael.** "All right an assessment of Tom Stoppard's plays". *Contemporary Review.* (March 2003). Bnet. 18 Oct. 2009. <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2242/is_1646_282/ai_100141506/>.
- Keller, Ursula.** *Böser Dinge hübsche Formel: Das Wien Arthur Schnitzlers.* Berlin: Guttandin & Hoppe, 1984.
- Kelletat, Andreas F.** "Eigennamen". *Handbuch Translation.* Ed. Mary Snell-Hornby, Hans G. Höning, Paul Kußmaul, and Peter A. Schmitt. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1999. 297-298.

- Kelly**, Katherine E. and William W. Demastes. "The Playwright and the Professor: An Interview with Tom Stoppard". *South Central Review* 11.4 (Winter 1994): 1-14. *JSTOR. The Johns Hopkins UP*. 2009. Vienna University Library. 20 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3190110>>.
- Kerensky**, Oleg. "Tom Stoppard". *Tom Stoppard in Conversation*. Ed. Paul Delaney. Ann Arbor, U of Michigan Press, 1994/1977. 85-88.
- Ketels**, Violet B. "Schnitzler, Arthur". *McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of World Drama. And International Reference Work in 5 Volumes*. 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill, 1984.
- Keyssar-Franke**, Helene. "The Strategy of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*". *Educational Theatre Journal* 27.1 (March 1975): 85-97. *JSTOR. The Johns Hopkins UP*. 2009. Vienna University Library. 20 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3206344>>.
- Klages**, Mary. "Postmodernism". English Department. University of Colorado. Boulder, 2003. 28 Dec. 2008. <<http://www.colorado.edu/English/courses/ENGL2012Klages/pomo.html>>.
- Kleist**, Jürgen. Preface. *Fin de siècle: 19th and 20th Century Comparisons and Perspectives*. By Kleist and Butterfield. New York: Peter Lang, 1996. ix-xiii.
- Kneer**, Georg. "Institution/Organisation: Über die Paradoxie des Organisierens". *Poststrukturalistische Sozialwissenschaften*. Ed. Stephan Moebius and Andreas Reckwitz. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 2008. 124-140.
- Kohlmayer**, Rainer. "Der Literaturübersetzer zwischen Original und Markt: Eine Kritik # funktionalistischer Übersetzungstheorien". *Lebende Sprachen* 33.4 (1988): 145-156.
- Kokorz**, Georg. "Ethnologische Perspektiven in der Kulturtransferforschung". *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers*. Ed. Federico Celestini and Helga Mitterbauer. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003. 117-136.
- Konstantinovic**, Zoran. "Widerspiegelung literarischer Selbstkenntnis: Einige komparatistische Anmerkungen zum Phänomen des 'Österreichischen'". *Studien zur Literatur des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts in Österreich: Festschrift für Alfred Doppler zum 60. Geburtstag*. Ed. Johann Holzner, Michael Klein, and Wolfgang Wiesmüller. Innsbruck: H. Kowatsch, 1981. 275-290.
- Konzett**, Matthias. "The Difficult Rebirth of Cosmopolitanism: Schnitzler and Contemporary Austrian Literature". *A companion to the works of Arthur Schnitzler*. Ed. Dagmar C. G. Lorenz. Rochester, Camden House, 2003. 349-369.
- Kujamäki**, Pekka. "'Of course Germans have a certain interest in Finland, but...': Openness to Finnish Literature in Germany in the 1920s and 1930s". *Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. Ed. Anthony Pym, Miriam Schlesinger, and Zuzana Jettmarová. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2006. 49-60.
- Kupsch-Losereit**, Sigrid. "Übersetzen als transkultureller Verstehens- und Kommunikationsvorgang: andere Kulturen, andere Äußerungen". *Sprachtransfer-Kulturtransfer: Text, Kontext und Translation*. Ed. Nikolai Salnikow. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1995. 1-15.
- Kuttenberg**, Eva. "Suicide as Performance in Dr. Schnitzler's Prose". *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler*. Ed. Dagmar C. G. Lorenz. Rochester: Camden House, 2003. 325-345.
- Lakner**, Antonina Cordelia. "Die Rezeption der Bühnenwerke Tom Stoppards: zur Untersuchung der deutschen Übersetzungen Hilde Spiels". Diss. U of Vienna, 2007.
- Lau**, King. "Postmodern Performance in Tom Stoppard's *Travesties* and *Arcadia*". Diss. U of Hong Kong, 2003. *Hong Kong University Theses Online*. 20 Oct. 2009. <<http://sunzi.lib.hku.hk/hkuto/record/B26832501>>.

- Lefevere, André.** “Programmatic Second Thoughts on ‚Literary‘ and ‚Translation‘: Or: Where Do We Go from Here”. *Poetics Today* 2.4 (1981): 39-50.
- , “Translation: Its Genealogy in the West”. *Translation, History and Culture*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. London: Pinter, 1990. 14-28.
- , *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- , “Chinese and Western Thinking on Translation”. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 12-24.
- , “Translation Practice(s) and the Circulation of Cultural Capital: Some Aeneids in English”. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 41-56.
- , “The Gates of Analogy: The Kalevala in English”. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 76-89.
- , “Acculturating Bertolt Brecht”. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 109-122.
- Le Rider, Jacques.** *Arthur Schnitzler oder die Wiener Belle Epoque*. 2nd ed. Trans. Christian Winterhalter. Vienna: Passagen, 2008.
- Levý, Jiri.** *Die literarische Übersetzung: Theorie einer Kunstgattung*. Frankfurt/Main: Athenäum, 1969.
- Lichtenberg, Debora.** Rev. of *Undiscovered Country* by Tom Stoppard. *Theatre Journal* 34.2 (May 1982): 270-271. *JSTOR. The Johns Hopkins UP*. 2009. Vienna University Library. 14 Nov. 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3207469>>.
- Linn, Stella.** “Trends in the Translation of a Minority Language: The Case of Dutch”. *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. Ed. Anthony Pym, Miriam Schlesinger, and Zuzana Jettmarová. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2006. 35-48.
- Loentz, Elizabeth.** “The Problem and Challenge of Jewishness in the City of Schnitzler and Anna O.”. *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler*. Ed. Dagmar C. G. Lorenz. Rochester: Camden House, 2003. 79-102.
- Lorenz, Dagmar C. G.** Introduction. *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler*. By Lorenz. Rochester: Camden House, 2003. 1-24.
- Lüsebrink, Hans-Jürgen.** *Interkulturelle Kommunikation*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 2008.
- , and Rolf Reichardt. “Kulturtransfer im Epochenbruch. Fragestellungen, methodische Konzepte, Forschungsperspektiven: Einführung”. *Kulturtransfer im Epochenbruch 1*. Ed. Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink and Rolf Reichardt. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1997. 9-26.
- , René Nohr, and Rolf Reichardt. “Kulturtransfer im Epochenbruch – Entwicklung und Inhalte der französisch-deutschen Übersetzungsbibliothek 1770-1815 im Überblick”. *Kulturtransfer im Epochenbruch 1*. Ed. Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink and Rolf Reichardt. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1997. 29-86.
- Macris, Peter J.** “The Elusive Quest: Schnitzler’s *Liebelei* becomes Stoppard’s *The Real Thing*”. *Fin de siècle: 19th and 20th Century Comparisons and Perspectives*. Ed. Jürgen Kleist and Bruce A. Butterfield. New York: Peter Lang, 1996. 109-114.
- Magris, Claudio.** “Arthur Schnitzler und das Karussell der Triebe”. *Arthur Schnitzler in neuer Sicht*. Ed. Hartmut Scheible. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1981. 71-80.
- Maier, Donald M.** “Descrying the Truth of the Moment”. *Fin de siècle: 19th and 20th Century Comparisons and Perspectives*. Ed. Jürgen Kleist and Bruce A. Butterfield. New York: Peter Lang, 1996. 163-178.

- Mandana**, Taban. "Kulturreferenzen in der Bühnenübersetzung". Diss. U of Vienna, 2000.
- Markstein**, Elisabeth. "Realia". *Handbuch Translation*. Ed. Mary Snell-Hornby, Hans G. Hönig, Paul Kußmaul, and Peter A. Schmitt. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1999. 288-291.
- Matter-Seibel**, Sabina. "Kulturspezifika bei der literarischen Übersetzung anhand einer Betrachtung von William Faulkner's *The Hamlet*". *Sprachtransfer-Kulturtransfer: Text, Kontext und Translation*. Ed. Nikolai Salnikow. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1995. 109-134.
- Mayer**, Hans. "George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950)". *Englische Dichter der Moderne: Ihr Leben und Werk*. Ed. Rudolf Sühnel and Dieter Riesner. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1971. 165-179.
- Megrab**, R.A. "Ideological Shifts in Cross-Cultural Translation". *The Practices of Literary Translation: Constraints and Creativity*. Ed. Jean Boase-Beier and Michael Holman. Guildford: St. Jerome, 1999. 59-70.
- Mc Elroy**, Bernard. "Hamlet and *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern* at the New Jersey Shakespeare Festival". *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40.1 (Spring 1989): 94-96. *JSTOR*. *Folger Shakespeare Library*. 2009. Vienna University Library. 20 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2870757>>.
- Mengel**, Ewald. *On First Looking Into Arden's Goethe: Adaptations and Translations of Classical German Plays for the Modern English Stage*. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1994.
- Mennemeier**, Franz Norbert. "Aspekte des naturalistischen Dramas der Jahrhundertwende: von Emile Zola bis Arthur Schnitzler". *Drama und Theater der Jahrhundertwende*. Ed. Dieter Kafitz. Tübingen: Francke, 1991. 1-19.
- Miller**, J. Hillis. "Border Crossings, Translating Theory: Ruth". *The Translatability of Cultures: Figurations of the Space Between*. Ed. Sanford Budick and Wolfgang Iser. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1996. 207-223.
- Mira**, Alberto. "Being Wildean: a dialogue on the importance of style in translation". *The Translator as Writer*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and Peter Bush. London: Continuum, 2006. 196-207.
- Mitchell**, Erin. "Aestheticism and Activism: Modes of Cultural Critique in Oscar Wilde's Time and Our Own". *Fin de siècle: 19th and 20th Century Comparisons and Perspectives*. Ed. Jürgen Kleist and Bruce A. Butterfield. New York: Peter Lang, 1996. 83-94.
- Mitterbauer**, Helga. "Kulturtransfer – ein vielschichtiges Beziehungsgeflecht". *Newsletter Moderne* 2.i (March 1999), 23-25.
- ."Acting in the Third Space': Vermittlung im Spannungsfeld kulturwissenschaftlicher Theorien". *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers*. Ed. Federico Celestini and Helga Mitterbauer. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003. 53-66.
- Moebius**, Stephan. "Macht und Hegemonie: Grundrisse einer poststrukturalistischen Analytik der Macht". *Poststrukturalistische Sozialwissenschaften*. Ed. Stephan Moebius and Andreas Reckwitz. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 2008. 158-174.
- , and Andreas Reckwitz. Einleitung. *Poststrukturalistische Sozialwissenschaften*. By Moebius and Reckwitz. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 2008. 7-23.
- Moser**, Hans. "Grenzen des Dialekts als Grenzen der Dialektliteratur". *Studien zur Literatur des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts in Österreich: Festschrift für Alfred Doppler zum 60. Geburtstag*. Ed. Johann Holzner, Michael Klein, and Wolfgang Wiesmüller. Innsbruck: H. Kowatsch, 1981. 253-261.

- Motzkin**, Gabriel. "Memory and Cultural Translation". *The Translatability of Cultures: Figurations of the Space Between*. Ed. Sanford Budick and Wolfgang Iser. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1996. 265-281.
- Nabokov**, Vladimir. "Problems of Translation: 'Onegin' in English". *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000. 71-83.
- Newmark**, Peter. "Modern Translation Theory". *Lebende Sprachen* 34.1 (1989): 6-8.
- Noiriel**, Gérard. "Transferts culturels : l'exemple franco-allemand. Entretien avec Michel Espagne". *Genèses* 8.1 (1992): 146-154. *PERSEE. Le Ministère de la jeunesse, de l'éducation nationale et de la recherche, Direction de l'enseignement supérieur, Sous-direction des bibliothèques et de la documentation*. 1998. Vienna University Library. 03 July 2009. <<http://www.persee.fr>>.
- Nord**, Christiane. "Übersetzungshandwerk – Übersetzungskunst: Was bringt die Translationstheorie für das literarische Übersetzen?". *Lebende Sprachen* 33.2 (1988): 51-57.
- , "Loyalität statt Treue. Vorschläge zu einer funktionalen Übersetzungstypologie". *Lebende Sprachen* 3 (1989): 100-105.
- Orlich**, Ileana Alexandra. "Tom Stoppard's travesties and the politics of earnestness". *East European Quarterly*. (September 2004). *Bnet*. 18. Oct. 2009. <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_7063/is_3_38/ai_n28231340>.
- Ortega y Gasset**, José. "The Misery and the Splendor of Translation". *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Ed. Biguenet John and Rainer Schulte. London: Chicago UP, 1992. 93-112.
- Pearce**, Howard D. "Stage as a Mirror: Tom Stoppard's *Travesties*". *MLN* 94.5 (Dec. 1979), 1139-1158. *JSTOR. The Johns Hopkins UP*. 2009. Vienna University Library. 20 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2906569>>.
- Pendennis**. "Dialogue with a Driven Man". *Observer* 30 Aug. 1981:18.
- Popovic**, Anton. "The Concept 'Shift of Expression' in Translation Analysis". *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*. Ed. James S. Holmes and Anton Popovic. The Hague: Mouton, 1970. 78-87.
- Pym**, Anthony. "Introduction: On the Social and the Cultural in Translation Studies". *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. Ed. Anthony Pym, Miriam Schlesinger, and Zuzana Jettmarová. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2006. 1-25.
- Reckwitz**, Andreas. "Moderne: Der Kampf um die Öffnung und Schließung von Kontingenzen". *Poststrukturalistische Sozialwissenschaften*. Ed. Stephan Moebius and Andreas Reckwitz. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 2008. 226-244.
- Reitz**, Bernhard. Nachwort. *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*. By Tom Stoppard. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005. 157-172.
- Rella**, Franco. "Freud und Schnitzler". *Arthur Schnitzler in neuer Sicht*. Ed. Hartmut Scheible. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1981. 200-206.
- Richards**, Michael. "Harold Pinter (1930)". *Englische Dichter der Moderne: Ihr Leben und Werk*. Ed. Rudolf Sühnel and Dieter Riesner. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1971. 578-587.
- Ritzer**, Monika. "'Weltschmerz? Nein, Weltironie'. Zur Funktion von Schnitzlers Komödien". *Arthur Schnitzler: Zeitgenossenschaften/Contemporaneities*. Ed. Ian Foster and Florian Krobb. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. 289-306.
- Robinson**, Gabrielle. "Nothing Left but Parody: Friedrich Dürrenmatt and Tom Stoppard". *Theatre Journal* 32.1 (Mar 1980): 85-94. *JSTOR. The Johns Hopkins UP*. 2009. Vienna University Library. 20 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3206500>>.
- Royle**, Nicholas. *Jacques Derrida*. London: Routledge, 2003.

- Sabler**, Wolfgang. "Moderne und Boulevardtheater: Bemerkungen zur Wirkung und zum dramatischen Werk Arthur Schnitzlers". *Text + Kritik* 138/139 (April 1998): 89-101.
- "Die Frage der österreichischen Identität". *Literatur im Kontext Robert Musil. Littérature dans le contexte de Robert Musil. Colloque international – Strasbourg 1996*. Ed. Marie-Louise Roth and Pierre Béhar. Bern : Peter Lang, 1999. 83-113.
- *Arthur Schnitzler: Ecriture dramatique et conventions théâtrales*. Bern : Peter Lang, 2002.
- Said**, Edward W. Introduction. *Orientalism*. By Said. New York: Vintage, 1979, 1-28.
- Sauerland**, Karol. "Brecht, Handke und das Publikum als Konvention". *Soziale und theatralische Konventionen als Problem der Dramenübersetzung*. Ed. Erika Fischer-Lichte, Fritz Paul, Brigitte Schultze and Horst Turk. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1988. 145-152.
- Scheible**, Hartmut. *Arthur Schnitzler: mit Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten*. 12th ed. Hamburg: Rohwolt, 2000.
- Schleiermacher**, Friedrich. "From 'On the Different Methods of Translating'". Trans. Waltraud Bartscht. *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Ed. Biguenet John and Rainer Schulte. London: Chicago UP, 1992. 36-54.
- Schlein**, Rena R. "The Motif of Hypocrisy in the Works of Arthur Schnitzler". *Modern Austrian Literature* 2 (1969): 28-38.
- Schmid**, Susanne. "Übersetzung und Adaptation: Arthur Schnitzlers Dramen ‚Reigen‘, ‚Liebelei‘, und ‚Das weite Land‘ in englischer Fassung". Diss. U of Vienna, 2000.
- Schneider**, Gerd K. "The Social and Political Context of Arthur Schnitzler's *Reigen* in Berlin, Vienna, and New York: 1900-1933". *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler*. Ed. Dagmar C. G. Lorenz. Rochester: Camden House, 2003. 27-57.
- Schopenhauer**, Arthur. "On Language and Words". *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Ed. Biguenet John and Rainer Schulte. London: Chicago UP, 1992. 32-35.
- Schultze**, Brigitte. "Innerfamiliäre Anrede und andere Formen der Beziehungsdefinition als Problem der Dramenübersetzung: Slawomir Mrozek's Tango deutsch". *Soziale und theatralische Konventionen als Problem der Dramenübersetzung*. Ed. Erika Fischer-Lichte, Fritz Paul, Brigitte Schultze and Horst Turk. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1988. 55-80.
- Scott Robinson**, Gabriele. "The Theatre of Tom Stoppard". *Educational Theatre Journal* 29.1 (March 1977): 37-48.
- Shields Hardin**, Nancy. "An Interview with Tom Stoppard". *Contemporary Literature* 22.2 (Spring 1981): 153-166. *JSTOR. University of Wisconsin Press*. 2009. Vienna University Library. 20 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1208185>>.
- Shortz**, Will. "Sunday Puzzle". *NPR*. 19 July 2009. 18 Oct. 2009. <<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=106774188>>.
- Shuttleworth**, Mark, and Moira Cowie. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997.
- Sieder**, Erika. "Travesties by Tom Stoppard 1". Diss. U of Vienna, 1998.
- "Travesties by Tom Stoppard 2". Diss. U of Vienna, 1998.
- Skreb**, Zdenko. "Arthur Schnitzlers Kunst des Aphorismus". *Studien zur Literatur des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts in Österreich: Festschrift für Alfred Doppler zum 60. Geburtstag*. Ed. Johann Holzner, Michael Klein, and Wolfgang Wiesmüller. Innsbruck: H. Kowatsch, 1981. 79-88.

- Slobodnik**, Dusan. "Remarques sur la traduction des dialectes". *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*. Ed. James S. Holmes and Anton Popovic. The Hague: Mouton, 1970. 139-143.
- Small**, Ian. *Oscar Wilde: Recent Research: A Supplement to 'Oscar Wilde Revalued'*. Greensboro: ELT Press, 1993.
- Snead**, James A. "Repetition as a Figure of Black Culture". *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures*. Ed. Russell Fergusson, Martha Gever, Trinh T. Minh-ha, and Cornel West. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT, 1990. 213-232.
- Snell-Hornby**, Mary. "Sprechbare Sprache – Spielbarer Text: Zur Problematik der Bühnenübersetzung". *Modes of Interpretation: Essays presented to Ernst Leisi on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Ed. Richard J. Watts and Urs Weidmann, Tübingen: Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 260, 1984. 101-116.
- *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1988.
- "Linguistic Transcoding or Cultural Transfer?: A Critique of Translation Theory in Germany". *Translation, History, and Culture*. Ed. André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett. London: Pinter, 1990. 79-86.
- "Communicating in the Global Village: On Language, Translation and Cultural Identity". *Translation in the Global Village*. Ed. Christina Schäffner. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2000. 11-28.
- Sparknotes Editors**. "Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead." *SparkNotes.com*. SparkNotesLLC. 2006. 18 Oct. 2009.
<<http://www.sparknotes.com/lit/rosencrantz>>.
- Spencer**, Cathrine. "Translating Schnitzler for the stage: Losing *Liebelei*?" *Arthur Schnitzler: Zeitgenossenschaften/Contemporanities*. Ed. Ian Foster and Florian Krobb. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. 373-390.
- Spillner**, Bernd. "Methoden des interkulturellen Sprachvergleichs: Kontrastive Linguistik, Paralleltextanalyse, Übersetzungsvergleich". *Kulturtransfer im Epochenumbruch 1*. Ed. Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink and Rolf Reichardt. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1997. 103-130.
- Stamon**, Peggy and Richard H. Lawson. "Love-Death Structures in the Works of Arthur Schnitzler". *Modern Austrian Literature* 8 (1975): 266-281.
- Stern**, Guy. "From Austria to America via London: Tom Stoppard's Adaptations of Nestroy and Schnitzler". *The Fortunes of German Writers in America: Studies in Literary Reception*. Ed. Wolfgang Elfe, James Hardin, and Gunther Holst. Columbia: South Carolina UP, 1992. 167-183.
- Stoll**, Karl-Heinz. "Text und Subtext: eine Analyse von Pinters *The Homecoming*". – *Kulturtransfer: Text, Kontext und Translation*. Ed. Nikolai Salnikow. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1995. 245-265.
- Stolze**, Radegundis. *Übersetzungstheorien: Eine Einführung*. 4th ed. Tübingen, Günter Narr, 2005.
- Stoppard**, Tom. "The Event and the Text". *Tom Stoppard in Conversation*. Ed. Paul Delaney. Ann Arbor, U of Michigan Press, 1994/1988. 199-211.
- Suppanz**, Werner. "Transfers, Zirkulation, Blockierung: Überlegungen zum kulturellen Transfer als Überschreiten signifikatorischer Grenzen". *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers*. Ed. Federico Celestini and Helga Mitterbauer. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003. 21-35.
- "Die Konstruktion 'österreichischer Kultur' als Resultante von Zirkulation und Blockierung". *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers*. Ed. Federico Celestini and Helga Mitterbauer. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003. 229-252.

- Swales**, Martin. "Schnitzler revisited". *Arthur Schnitzler: Zeitgenossenschaften/Contemporanities*. Ed. Ian Foster and Florian Krobb. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. 19-32.
- Tabakowska**, Elzbieta. "Linguistic Polyphony as A Problem in Translation." in *Translation History and Culture*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. London: Pinter, 1990. 71-78.
- Tan**, Peter K.W. *A Stylistics of Drama: with special focus on Stoppard's Travesties*. Singapore: Singapore UP, 1993.
- Taylor**, John Russel. "Our Changing Theatre, No.3: Changes in Writing". *Tom Stoppard in Conversation*. Ed. Paul Delaney. Ann Arbor, U of Michigan Press, 1994/1970. 24-29.
- Thomsen**, William F. Rev. of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* by Tom Stoppard. *The English Journal* 57.8 (Nov. 1968): 1234-1236. *JSTOR*. *NCTE*. 2009. Vienna University Library. 20 May 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/812507>>.
- Thompson**, Bruce. *Schnitzler's Vienna: Image of a Society*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Toury**, Gideon. "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation". *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000/1978. 198-212.
- Thurnher**, Eugen. "Das Problem der Periodenbildung in der Österreichischen Literaturgeschichte". *Studien zur Literatur des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts in Österreich: Festschrift für Alfred Doppler zum 60. Geburtstag*. Ed. Johann Holzner, Michael Klein, and Wolfgang Wiesmüller. Innsbruck: H. Kowatsch, 1981. 271-274.
- Vacha**, Brigitte. "Arthur Schnitzler und das Wiener Burgtheater 1895-1965 1". Diss. U of Vienna, 1966.
- "Arthur Schnitzler und das Wiener Burgtheater 1895-1965 2". Diss. U of Vienna, 1966.
- Vanden Heuvel**, Michael. "Is postmodernism?: Stoppard among/against the postmoderns". *The Cambridge Companion to Tom Stoppard*. Ed. Katherine E. Kelly. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 213-228.
- Venuti**, Lawrence. "1960s -1970s". *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000. 119-125.
- "1980s". *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000. 213-220.
- "Translation, Community, Utopia". *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000. 468-488.
- Weikert**, Heidrun-Edda. *Tom Stoppards Dramen: Untersuchung zu Sprache und Dialog*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1982.
- Werner**, Michael. "Dissymmetrien und symmetrische Modellbildungen in der Forschung zum Kulturtransfer". *Kulturtransfer im Epochenumbruch 1*. Ed. Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink and Rolf Reichardt. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1997. 87-101.
- Wetzsteon**, Ross. "Tom Stoppard Eats Steak Tartare with Chocolate Sauce". *Tom Stoppard in Conversation*. Ed. Paul Delaney. Ann Arbor, U of Michigan Press, 1994/1975. 80-84.
- Wisely**, Andrew C. *Arthur Schnitzler and Twentieth Century Criticism*. Rochester: Camden House, 2004.

- Wolf, Michaela.** “Übersetzen als textuelle Repräsentation: Dialogischer Diskurs und Polyphonie im Übersetzen zwischen den Kulturen”. *Text-Kultur-Kommunikation : Translation als Forschungsaufgabe. Festschrift aus Anlaß des 50jährigen Bestehens des Instituts für Übersetzer- und Dolmetscherausbildung an der Universität Graz*. Ed. Nadja Grbic and Michaela Wolf. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1997. 137-151.
- . Introduction. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. By Wolf. London: Sage, 2000. 1-38.
- . “The Location of the ‘Translation Field: Negotiating borderlines between Pierre Bourdieu and Homi Bhabha’”. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Ed. Michaela Wolf. London: Sage, 2000. 109-119.
- . “‘Cultures do not hold still for their portraits’: Kultureller Transfer als Übersetzen zwischen Kulturen’”. *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers*. Ed. Federico Celestini and Helga Mitterbauer. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003. 85-98.
- Yates, W.E.** “Schnitzler’s theatre-going”. *Arthur Schnitzler: Zeitgenossenschaften/Contemporanities*. Ed. Ian Foster and Florian Krobb. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. 245-258.
- Zajic, Susanne.** “Atembarkeit, Spielbarkeit, Sprechbarkeit”. Diss. U of Vienna, 1994.
- Zojer, Heidi.** *Kulturelle Dimensionen in der literarischen Übersetzung: Eine übersetzungstheoretische Untersuchung mit exemplarischer Analyse von Arthur Schnitzlers ‚Reigen‘*. Stuttgart: Hans-Dieter Heinz, 2000.

Index

A

absurdist · 112, 115, 124, 137
 adaptation · 38, 41, 64, 67, 87, 89, 104
ad-hoc performance · 16, 51
 Akademietheater · 113, 149
 alliteration · 115, 122, 133
 Althusser, Louis · 33, 42
 assonances · 115, 119, 134, 135, 155
 audience · 16, 18, 19, 37, 39, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 62, 81, 83, 87, 88, 94, 100, 102, 104, 109, 114, 115, 116, 124, 133, 135, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 149, 158
audiomedial text types · 31
avant-garde · 50, 52

B

Barthes, Roland · 33, 40, 41, 44, 150, 153, 179
 Bassnett, Susan · 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 31, 37, 41, 42, 45, 47, 49, 53, 54, 55, 65, 88, 107, 159, 160, 179, 180
 Beckett, Samuel · 51, 108, 112, 114, 117, 127, 136, 139, 151
 Beckettian · 112, 114, 115
 Bhabha, Homi · 15, 30, 42, 56, 157, 159, 179
 Bible · 18, 129, 140, 141
boulevard · 73, 113
 Bourdieu, Pierre · 42, 43, 179
 bourgeoisie · 74, 91, 93, 96, 156
 breathable · 31
 bricolage · 97, 98, 138
Bunbury (Oscar Wilde) · 115
 Burgtheater · 52, 55, 63, 94, 107, 147
 Butler, Judith · 50

C

Camus, Albert · 137
 cannibalization · 32
cannibalize · 156, 159
 cliché · 37, 104, 105, 158
 code system · 24, 30, 33, 36, 45, 57, 87
 comedy · 73, 89, 92, 108, 121, 122, 124, 136, 154, 155
 Comedy of Manners · 89, 122
communicative practices · 62, 96, 153, 157, 158
 communicative system · 143
 consonances · 119, 120, 134, 135, 155
 conventions · 13, 14, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 40, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 61, 62, 65, 73, 74, 76, 85, 86, 87, 90, 106, 136, 145, 146, 147, 153, 154, 155, 159
 cultural references · 66, 83
cultural studies · 14, 28, 42, 153
 cultural transfer · 15, 29, 56

Cultural Transfer Theory · 24, 28, 29, 153, 179
 culture · 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 53, 54, 56, 61, 62, 65, 75, 84, 87, 91, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 108, 137, 138, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159
 cultureme · 83

D

Dada · 129, 134, 141, 142
 Dadaism · 125, 138, 156
Dalliance (Tom Stoppard) · 14, 62, 64, 66, 67, 69, 71, 72, 74, 75, 82, 84, 98, 99, 103, 105, 108, 109, 155, 179
 dandy · 89, 108, 141
Das weite Land (Arthur Schnitzler) · 14, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 84, 89, 97, 98, 99, 101, 105, 106, 109, 112, 113, 153, 155, 179
 death of the Author · 40
 Derrida, Jacques · 22, 23, 24, 39, 40, 156, 179
descriptive translation studies · 14, 25, 61, 62, 153
diaspora · 56
différence · 39
 discourse · 32, 33, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 53, 106, 141
 domestic tragedy · 73, 155
 double entendre · 89, 108, 123, 131, 155
 drama · 16, 31, 32, 43, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 62, 91, 100, 106, 107, 108, 110, 124, 147, 151, 154, 159
 drama translation · 50, 53, 159
dramatis personae · 66, 70, 78, 82, 87, 97, 125, 126
 duel · 100, 156

E

Eliot, T.S. · 89, 108
encoded and decoded meaning · 39
 equivalence · 13, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 35, 36, 40, 62, 65, 153, 160
 equivalent · 14, 19, 25, 26, 35, 36, 38, 41, 61, 62, 64, 84, 154, 156, 158, 160
 Eros · 74, 94, 99
 Even-Zohar, Itamar · 14, 26, 27, 28, 43, 46, 47, 48, 54

F

faithfulness · 18, 21, 25, 46
 farce · 68, 72, 74, 99, 105, 124
 farcical · 77, 123, 124
fin de siècle · 60, 63, 69, 74, 78, 81, 85, 90, 91, 92, 95, 101, 109, 155, 156
floating signifier · 56
 Foucault, Michel · 32, 33, 39, 40, 42, 150, 157, 179
 fragmentation · 98, 137
 Freud, Sigmund · 67, 68, 94, 99
 Freudian · 63, 94, 99, 156

fringe theater · 50, 93, 112
functionalist translation studies · 13, 20, 21, 24, 31, 32, 44
function-oriented translation studies · 14, 25, 153

G

Gilbert and Sullivan · 125, 140
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von · 52, 115, 119, 122, 132, 136, 145, 146
 Gramsci, Antonio · 33, 42

H

Hall, Stuart · 33, 34, 39, 40, 58, 156, 179
Hamlet · (William Shakespeare) 68, 98, 108, 112, 114, 115, 116, 124, 139, 141, 142, 144, 149, 159
 hegemony · 15, 24, 33, 47, 106, 148, 158
 history play · 122, 155
 homogeneous · 27, 29, 48, 157
 homonymy · 131, 132, 134
 homophones · 122
 hybrid · 15, 77, 84, 102, 103, 138, 157
 hybridity · 56, 58, 102, 146

I

ideology · 26, 33, 39, 42, 43
 imagined community · 58, 142
 intended meaning · 38
 intention · 15, 18, 22, 38, 40, 61
 intercultural · 3, 23, 24, 27, 28, 42, 58, 96
 interculturality · 96
 interpretive community · 33, 35
 intertextual references · 40, 55, 97, 98, 103, 108, 114, 133, 138, 139, 140, 142, 154
 intertextuality · 98, 110, 139, 145
 intratextuality · 139

J

Joyce, James · 55, 113, 127, 129, 130, 135, 140, 141, 144
 Joycean limericks · 133, 140

K

kernels · 22

L

language games · 98, 127
 Lefevere, André · 14, 15, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 35, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 60, 85, 101, 107, 142, 150, 159, 160, 179, 180

Liebelelei (Arthur Schnitzler) · 14, 55, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 73, 74, 75, 84, 86, 97, 99, 100, 101, 106, 107, 109, 112, 123, 146, 153, 155, 179
lingua franca · 15, 49, 57
 linguistic · 14, 15, 18, 22, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 35, 36, 39, 41, 42, 46, 47, 48, 53, 56, 57, 61, 65, 66, 67, 75, 77, 78, 81, 83, 84, 86, 87, 96, 101, 105, 114, 115, 121, 122, 123, 125, 127, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 144, 150, 151, 154, 156
 linguistic code · 35, 75
 linguistics · 18, 42
 London · 92, 95, 113
 Luhmann, Niklas · 28, 39, 42, 179
 Lunin, Hanno · 14, 62, 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 123, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136, 140, 143, 144, 145, 147, 149, 155, 159

M

macro-level · 114
 macrostructural · 65, 66
 Max, Bruno · 55, 113, 114, 115, 117, 121, 123, 127, 128, 130, 134, 140, 142, 144, 147, 158
 meaning · 13, 14, 21, 22, 24, 33, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, 46, 57, 58, 61, 62, 77, 116, 119, 124, 137, 150, 156, 158
 memory play · 122
 micro-level · 114
 microstructural · 65, 66, 71
 Mitterbauer, Helga · 14, 15, 23, 28, 29, 45, 46, 56, 157, 179
 modernism · 137
 multiple identities · 56, 121, 126, 156
 music-hall effects · 123
 myth · 33, 91

N

nation state · 15, 27, 57, 58, 157
 National Theatre · 109
 naturalism · 96
 norms · 14, 18, 26, 27, 30, 33, 42, 45, 47, 50, 54, 58, 61, 62, 65, 74, 76, 81, 84, 87, 134, 145, 147, 153, 156, 159

O

Orientalism (Edward Said) · 104
 original · 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 32, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 53, 60, 61, 62, 66, 68, 69, 72, 75, 77, 78, 84, 86, 89, 96, 98, 99, 104, 108, 109, 110, 114, 115, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 131, 132, 139, 141, 142, 144, 145, 148, 149, 150, 151, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 180
 Osborne, John · 140

P

panfictionality · 98, 121
 parody · 68, 97, 112, 124, 138, 141
 paronymy · 131
 pastiche · 97, 112
 performance · 16, 31, 32, 37, 39, 51, 53, 54, 55, 60, 61, 70, 87, 107, 109, 121, 145, 146, 147, 149, 158
 performative · 50
 Pinter, Harold · 51, 89, 90, 108, 136, 140, 151, 152, 154
 playable · 31
 play-within-the-play · 99
polyptoton · 120
 polysemy · 131
Polysystem Theory · 153, 179
 postmodern · 13, 41, 97, 98, 99, 102, 105, 137
 poststructuralist · 30, 32, 39, 41, 44
 power · 14, 15, 16, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 62, 84, 102, 106, 121, 147, 152, 153, 157, 158, 159
prescriptive translation studies · 14, 20, 24
product-based translation studies · 14, 20, 24
 psychoanalysis · 94, 95, 100
 puns · 72, 89, 118, 126, 131, 133, 154

R

rake · 89
 realism · 73, 96, 156
 recurrence · 79, 128, 139, 154
 reiteration · 50, 51
 relativism · 22
 relativistic · 24
 repartee · 69, 72, 89, 108, 154, 155
 repertoire · 15, 46, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 83, 87, 145
 Restoration · 89, 108, 154
 rewriting · 41, 45, 48, 110
Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead (Tom Stoppard) · 14, 32, 60, 62, 111, 112, 114, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 129, 137, 139, 149, 150, 179
Rosenkranz und Gildenstein (Hanno Lunin) · 113, 114, 125, 143, 155, 158, 179
 Russian Formalists · 26

S

Said, Edward · 104, 150
Sapir-Whorf hypothesis · 21
 Schiller, Friedrich · 73, 136, 146
 Schnitzler, Arthur · 14, 32, 34, 38, 51, 55, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108, 109, 112, 113, 114, 123, 126, 130, 138, 139, 143, 145, 146, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157
 selection · 54, 55
 sexual innuendo · 89, 123, 136

Shakespeare, William · 68, 89, 90, 98, 108, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 125, 127, 135, 139, 141, 142, 149
 Shaw, George Bernard · 89, 90, 93, 108, 154
 shifts · 14, 24, 25, 26, 27, 36, 60, 61, 62, 65, 84, 87, 114, 153, 154, 157
 signified · 13, 35, 39
 signifier · 35, 39, 87, 131
 signifying practices · 34, 43, 157
 signifying system · 13, 32, 33, 36, 37, 57, 158
skopos · 20, 44, 107
Skopostheorie · 20, 44
social comedy · 89, 93
 socio-cultural · 14, 21, 25, 26, 30, 40, 62, 65, 84, 86, 87, 90, 100, 106, 134, 147, 152, 156, 159
 sociology · 14, 27, 28, 42, 153
 source culture · 13, 15, 27, 29, 35, 46, 104
 source text · 13, 18, 19, 20, 23, 27, 35, 36, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 96, 160
 space in between · 30, 157
 speakable · 31, 101
 spectator · 16, 51, 52, 53, 68, 81, 82, 87, 88, 99, 103, 115, 116, 122, 124, 129, 133, 140, 141, 143, 145, 146, 148, 159
 Spiel, Hilde · 14, 31, 55, 62, 73, 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 155, 156, 158, 159
 stereotype · 105
 stereotypical · 15, 37, 46, 61, 62, 104, 106, 108, 144, 157, 158
 Stoppard, Tom · 14, 32, 34, 41, 55, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159
süßes Mädel · 83, 92

T

T/V structure · 81, 86, 154
 target culture · 15, 29, 30, 34, 35, 37, 44, 46, 53, 56
 target text · 14, 18, 20, 35
tertium comperationis · 22
 texts in their own right · 16, 62
 Thanatos · 74, 99
 the 'other' · 24, 37, 50, 57, 62, 104, 144, 156, 157, 158
 the 'self' · 15, 24, 37, 50, 57, 58, 62, 156
The Importance of Being Earnest (Oscar Wilde) · 112, 115, 124, 140, 141, 142, 149
 theater · 39, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 62, 67, 73, 87, 88, 89, 91, 98, 99, 108, 112, 113, 124, 129, 136, 146, 147
 Theater of the Absurd · 136
 third space · 30, 157
Titanic · 142
 tragicomedy · 68, 73, 109, 155

translation · 5, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24,
25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43,
44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 58, 60, 61,
62, 65, 81, 84, 85, 86, 88, 96, 102, 103, 106, 107,
113, 114, 121, 133, 134, 142, 147, 149, 150, 153,
154, 157, 158, 159

translation shifts · 25, 27

translation studies · 5, 13, 21, 43

translatum · 13, 44, 103

Travesties (Tom Stoppard) · 14, 60, 62, 111, 112, 113,
114, 115, 116, 118, 121, 124, 125, 126, 128, 129,
132, 133, 134, 136, 137, 140, 142, 143, 145, 146,
147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157,
158, 179

U

Undiscovered Country (Tom Stoppard) · 14, 62, 64, 66,
67, 69, 75, 84, 98, 103, 105, 107, 108, 109, 146,
155, 179

universalist · 13, 21, 22, 153

V

Vienna · 52, 60, 63, 69, 72, 74, 78, 79, 81, 83, 85, 90,
91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 101, 102, 105, 109, 111, 113,
123, 136, 148, 149, 155, 156

W

Waiting for Godot (Samuel Beckett) · 114, 124, 139,
143

well-made play · 122, 137

Wiener Moderne · 97

Wilde, Oscar · 55, 89, 92, 101, 108, 112, 115, 122, 127,
136, 140, 141, 142, 149, 154

wit · 79, 89, 108, 109, 113, 118, 121, 123, 126, 137,
143, 149, 155

Wolf, Michaela · 14, 15, 27, 29, 30, 42, 43, 46, 47, 49,
51, 55, 56, 157, 179

Wood, Peter · 64, 67, 107, 108, 113, 146, 147, 148,
149, 158

wordplay · 114, 118, 126, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 154

German Summary

Die vorliegende Arbeit beschäftigt sich mit dem Einfluss soziokultureller, historischer, literarischer, theatraler, sowie machtbezogener Faktoren auf die wissenschaftliche Domäne der Dramenübersetzung. In Anlehnung an die von James Holmes eingeführte Bezeichnung der *deskriptiven, funktionsorientierten* Translationswissenschaft, deren Ziel es ist, Translate hingehend ihres soziokulturellen und literarischen Hintergrundes zu untersuchen, werden Dramentexte aus dem anglosächsischen Raum mit ihren österreichischen Übersetzungen, sowie umgekehrt, hinsichtlich ihrer allgemeinen Normen und Konventionen verglichen. Dabei wird der Fokus gezielt auf Arthur Schnitzlers Werke *Liebelei* und *Das weite Land* in Gegenüberstellung zu Tom Stoppards englischen Adaptionen derselben Stücke, *Dalliance* und *Undiscovered Country*, sowie auf Tom Stoppards Texte *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* und *Travesties* im Vergleich zu deren deutschen Versionen, *Rosenkranz und Gildenstein* und *Travesties* gelegt.

Der erste Teil der Arbeit bietet eine allgemeine Übersicht der wichtigsten Theorien und Trends in der modernen Translationswissenschaft. Behandelte Themen umfassen u.a. die Dichotomie von Ausgangstext – und Zieltexitorientierung, sowie von universalistischen und relativistischen Translationstheorien, die Problematik des Äquivalenzbegriffes im Laufe der Zeit, sowie moderne Entwicklungen im Rahmen der *Translation Studies*, v.a. in Anlehnung an ein postmodernes Translationsverständnis. In diesem Zusammenhang wird gezielt auf aktuelle Studien eingegangen, die sich auf Even-Zohars *Polysystem Theory* sowie Espagnes und Werners *Cultural Transfer Theory* berufen und weiters in enger Zusammenarbeit mit anderen Disziplinen (v.a. *Cultural Studies* (vgl. Hall, Derrida, Barthes, Foucault) und Soziologie (vgl. Bhabha, Luhmann, Bourdieu)) entstanden sind (vgl. z.B.: Bassnett, Lefevere, Mitterbauer, Wolf, Venuti). Ein spezielles Augenmerk wird außerdem auf kulturelle und literarische Machtverhältnisse, v.a. im Bereich der Dramenübersetzung gelegt.

In weiterer Folge werden die oben angeführten englischen und deutschsprachigen Stücke hinsichtlich Abweichungen auf deren Makro- und Mikroebene verglichen. Anstatt den Übersetzer für diese Veränderungen verantwortlich zu machen, wird versucht, jene Modifikationen als natürliche Erscheinungen aufzufassen, die durch die Konventionen und Normen des jeweiligen kulturellen Umfeldes bedingt werden. Dadurch soll bewiesen werden, dass übersetzte Texte keineswegs als Äquivalente ihrer Originaltexte aufgefasst

werden können. Viel eher kommt es zu einem Konglomerat zieltext- und ausgangstextbezogener Elemente, wobei letztere jeweils in Anlehnung an die Interpretationsschemen der Zielkultur verstanden werden. Die Annahme, dass kultureller Transfer automatisch zu einer Annäherung der Interpretationssysteme zweier Kulturen führt, muss daher aufgegeben werden, da fremde Elemente durch ihren Bezug zum zielkulturellen Sprachsystem semantischen Veränderungen unterliegen. Diese Modifikationen führen oft zu einem reduktionistischen bzw. stereotypen Verständnis des ‚Anderen‘ im Verhältnis zum ‚Eigenen‘.

Wie stark diese Stereotypisierung einsetzt, hängt meist von dem Wissensstand einer Kultur über eine andere ab. Im Rahmen der Studie kann davon ausgegangen werden, dass die Machtposition einer bestimmten kulturellen Gemeinschaft die Blockierung fremdkultureller Elemente weitgehend erlaubt, wohingegen weniger einflussreiche Kulturen eher dazu neigen, Konzepte aus fremden, v.a. prestigeträchtigen Kulturen zu übernehmen. Dies konnte durch die Gegenüberstellung der oben angeführten anglosächsischen und österreichischen Dramentexte bewiesen werden, wobei die österreichischen Dramenproduktionen mehr typisch britische Elemente zuließen als dies auf der englischen Bühne in Hinblick auf Schnitzlers österreichische Komponente der Fall war.

Die Forderung einiger moderner Translationswissenschaftler (vgl. Bassnett, Lefevere, Venuti), diese Machtverhältnisse durch ausgangstextorientierte Translate zu brechen, erscheint vor allem im Bereich der Dramenübersetzung schwer realisierbar. Dies erklärt sich v.a. durch die starke finanzielle Abhängigkeit der Theater von deren Stammpublikum, das zumindest eine gewisse Einhaltung der landesüblichen Konventionen erwartet. Da ein Machtwechsel meist nur über lange Zeit bewirkt werden kann und Theaterstücke, die nicht den allgemeinen Normen entsprechen, oft schnell vom Spielplan verschwinden, kann das Theater nicht als ideale Brutstätte für *avantgardistische* politische Vorhaben gesehen werden. Weiters erklärt sich diese relative Ohnmacht durch die wenig prestigebehaftete Stellung der meisten Übersetzer und Übersetzerinnen. Daraus ergibt sich, dass Änderungen vor allem im Bereich der Dramenübersetzung oft unumgebar sind und ein original aufgeführtes Werk oft nur wenig bis gar nichts mit seiner übersetzten Version gemeinsam hat. Es wäre daher wünschenswert, diese Abweichung dem Publikum zu kommunizieren, anstatt ihm zu vermitteln, dass es tatsächlich das Original geboten bekommt.

Curriculum Vitae

I. Persönliche Daten

Name: Julia-Stefanie Maier, Bakk.
Geburtsdatum: 4. März 1985
Geburtsort: Wien
Staatsbürgerschaft: Österreich

II. Ausbildung

ab Oktober 2006

Lehramtsstudium für Englisch und Französisch an der Universität Wien

Oktober 2003 – April 2007

Bakkalaureatsstudium Übersetzen und Dolmetschen am Zentrum für Translationswissenschaft in Wien, mit Auszeichnung abgeschlossen

September 1995 – Juni 2003

BG 18 Klostergasse, Wien: Neusprachlicher Zweig mit 2. lebender Fremdsprache Französisch. Matura in den Fächern Englisch, Französisch, Mathematik, Psychologie und Philosophie mit ausgezeichnetem Erfolg bestanden

Erfolgreiche Teilnahme an Sprachwettbewerben in Englisch und Französisch

III. Berufserfahrung

Mehrsprachige Fremdenführungen
Nachhilfetätigkeit

IV. Fremdsprachenkenntnisse und Forschungsinteressen

- Englisch, Französisch, Italienisch, Schwedisch, Spanisch
- Translationswissenschaft
- Interkulturelle Kommunikation
- Sprache, Identität und daraus resultierende Machtverhältnisse
- Komparistik
- Poststrukturalismus, Postmoderne, Postkolonialismus
- Zeitgenössisches Britisches Drama