Abstract
This article presents and discusses the state of the art of the study of play translation, including reader-oriented and performance-oriented translation. Taking over from a previous article that dealt with the same field’s history until the early 2000s, it covers the last decade, a period of remarkable development. In discussing this development, it follows an overall chronological organisation, which has been combined with thematic arrangement for ease of reading. Both articles together provide a comprehensive overview of what was once a neglected field but is not so anymore.

Introduction
As indicated in Part I of this series of articles, research into theatre translation accelerated in the 2000s, with over twenty books published and six special journal issues. The late 2000s show, in fact, a blossoming interest in the area, which is still current—suffice it to remember that four further special journal issues appeared between 2010 and 2013.

The study of theatre translation has thus gathered momentum. It is my hope that this article will contribute to maintain this momentum, which in turn might lead to progress in what is, possibly, the greatest challenge ahead: developing stronger theoretical frameworks. While the holistic

---

1 The author would like to thank Prof. David Johnston (Queen’s University Belfast), Prof. Dirk Delabastita (Université de Namur) and Dr Sara Ramos Pinto (University of Leeds) for their generous bibliographical assistance during the preparation of this overview.

2 In “Status Quaestionis” 5 (2013).
approach advocated by Snell-Hornby has gained a foothold and, therefore, the translator is now generally considered as part of the production team, the development of this approach has been very limited. In addition, the new approaches embraced, which build on both the holistic and the semiotic frameworks identified by Snell-Hornby\(^3\), are in their infancy. Furthermore, after the achievement of a remarkable involvement in/of practice, theory is being questioned vigorously\(^4\).

This article provides an account of the area’s state of the art. Like its predecessor, it is organised chronologically (covering roughly from 2004 to 2014); however, the studies that share the same topics or approaches have generally been grouped together for the sake of readability. As a result of this, fifteen thematic sections structure the article forming a chronological sequence. They are as follows:

1. Strengthening the bridge between theory and practice
2. Reaching further: new geographical locations, new forms of translation
3. Theatre journals pay greater heed to theatre translation while linguistic journals set eyes on it
4. Marginalized social groups receive increased attention
5. Further topics and approaches emerge; old ones are revisited
6. Research into the translation of theatre classics is revitalised (I)
7. The complexity of theatre translation research is uncovered
8. Research into the translation of theatre classics is revitalised (II)
9. Theory is contested
10. Cross-cultural theatre vs intercultural theatre

---


\(^4\) Just to give an example, in the introduction to the collection of essays *Theatre translation in performance*, the editors of this volume affirm that a number of issues debated of late «can only entail, or, derive from, distrust of theory», and continue: «accordingly, recent books on translation for the theatre have confirmed a widespread suspicion about theory» (Silvia Bigliazzi, Peter Kofler, Paola Ambrosi, *Introduction*, in S. Bigliazzi, P. Kofler, P. Ambrosi (eds.), *Theatre translation in performance*, Routledge, New York, 2013, p. 2).
11. Revisiting old debates: translation vs. adaptation, performability, literals
12. The practitioners’ turn
13. The role of the translator
14. Innovating the methodologies
15. Theatre translation and ethics

This sequence is topped up with a set of final reflections that close both the article and the series to which it belongs.

1. Strengthening the bridge between theory and practice

Whereas Part I of my review started by showing a marked disconnect between theatre translation theorists and theatre translators, Part II begins on a more positive note as regards the gap between theory and practice. In 2004 and 2005, three books came to follow Johnston’s *Stages of translation* (1996) and Upton’s *Moving target* (2000) in promoting the narrowing of this gap. The first one is the collective volume *Drama translation and theatre practice*\(^5\), which arose from a 2002 conference of the same title focusing on translation for the English-speaking (British/US) stage. The second book to be mentioned, Gunilla Anderman’s *Europe on stage: Translation and theatre*\(^6\), similarly centred on translation for the British stage (of European drama, specifically). By contrast, the third volume, Phyllis Zatlin’s seminal *Theatrical translation and film adaptation: A practitioner’s view*\(^7\), was not restricted to any given context or language of reception, which, in my opinion, is one of its major assets, given the concentration of studies around the English-speaking stage, but I will come to this issue later in order to elaborate one by one on the three books mentioned.

---

Drama translation and theatre practice gathered close to forty essays written by researchers, translators and theatre directors. Most of these essays are case studies, like the one authored by Cynthia Marsh\(^8\). As the translator and director of Gorky’s *Egor Bulychev*, Marsh shows the negotiation of a target text between translator, director and actors.

David Johnston and Manuela Perteghella are the authors of two of the most widely quoted contributions to the volume. Johnston\(^9\) looks at the notion of performability, highlighting the need for the stage translator to attend rehearsals. The author places great emphasis on the translation process and on its links to reception, two aspects that he will not tire of reminding us in later publications, and for good reason, I think. Like Lefevere\(^10\) and, also, Regattin\(^11\), Johnston advocates the descriptive branch of Translation Studies, and it is within this branch that Perteghella’s\(^12\) work is situated. The researcher proposes an anthropological model for the description of drama translation. The model takes into account a number of socio-cultural and economic factors that may influence the translated text. Additionally, it distinguishes four main social functions that the text may serve: the dissemination of the original work; a propaganda or protest function; the introduction of alien theatrical practices; and the introduction of alien or new dramaturgy.

Also from a descriptive, socio-cultural perspective, in *Europe on stage*, Anderman examines the performance history of modern European drama in the United Kingdom. Major playwrights such as Anouilh, Ibsen,


Chekhov, Brecht, Pirandello and García Lorca are the subject of her study, and the analysed translations extend over the whole continuum between the “adequacy” and “acceptability” poles (to use Gideon Toury’s\textsuperscript{13} terminology). The researcher, a stage translator herself, pays particular heed to the specific translation problems posed.

*Theatrical translation and film adaptation*, written by another scholar and stage translator, brings practice to the fore (while showing appreciation of theory). The book offers a wealth of details about theatre translation, which are grounded in the experience of both its author and several dozens of other translators who responded to a questionnaire devised by her. These translators are either from the US or from a big European country (France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Spain or Italy). Combined, they translate into the following languages: French, English, German, Spanish, Catalan, Italian, Polish and Swedish; and have as source languages: French, English, German, Spanish, Catalan, Portuguese, Italian, Russian, Hebrew, Polish, Romanian and Swedish. All of this means that the book’s scope does not extend beyond Western theatre; however, the variety of theatrical systems represented is to be saluted, given that still today, certain theatrical systems, i.e. the British, Canadian and Finnish, seem to be considerably more researched than others (the case of the British is particularly noteworthy, given the resistance to translated theatre in the UK\textsuperscript{14}).

Regarding the topics covered, they range from the translator’s role and (low) standing in the theatrical system, to the skills required for translating plays, common translator profiles, different outlets for translations (e.g. publication and radio broadcasting) and new forms of translation, such as surtitles and simultaneous interpreting. The translation of bilingual plays is also tackled by the author, in a pioneering, dedicated chapter. One year after this was published, Marvin Carlson, from the discipline of Theatre Studies, raised attention to the coexistence of more than one language in the same play with his monograph *Speaking in tongues: Languages at play in the*


\textsuperscript{14} See section 12, note 142.
What Carlson terms «heteroglossia in the theatre», an increased phenomenon in today’s theatre that places translation centre stage, has since been the object of significant research within Translation Studies.

Another work coming from Theatre Studies that has proven to be influential is Ric Knowles’ Reading the material theatre, which draws attention to the material conditions that shape both what appears on stage and how it is read. Zatlin is well aware of this materiality, as reflected, for example, in her emphasis on the influence on the target text of the acting style, the actors and the audience, and the influence on the reception of the context (e.g. recent events).

The researcher sees the translator as a dramaturge: «a consultant to a theatre company who knows the text well and can clarify details for the actors and director». The translator-as-dramaturge is an image evoked by Patrice Pavis in 1989 that is finding much support in the 21st century.

Needless to say, for Zatlin, drama translation is firstly for performance. She makes it clear in the following statement, which could be taken to represent current thinking in theatre translation studies (as opposed to the ideas of half a century ago): «It is my belief [...] that theatrical translation...”

---

18 Phyllis Zatlin, Theatrical translation and film adaptation cit., p. 5.
20 The following articles are good examples of such support: Stefano Muneroni, Culture in text and performance: The translation and dramaturgy of Osvaldo Dragón’s Tres historias para ser contadas, in “Translation Studies”, 5, 3 (2012), pp. 296-311; Alinne Balduino Pires Fernandes, Travelling plays, travelling audiences: From Carr’s Irish Midlands to somewhere lost and found in Brazil, in “Quaderns” (Special section “La traducción en escena”), 19 (2012), pp. 77-85.
should be intended precisely for performance. If a play translation is nothing but ink on a page, it is not theatre»

Throughout the book, the author relies on Nida’s concept of «dynamic equivalence» to support her ideas about the relationship between source and target: it is the effect of the play that must be maintained. In achieving this translation goal, the actors may help by commenting on the impressions left by certain utterances. The translator, according to Zatlin, should bring to the theatre: theatrical experience, writing talent and knowledge of the source and target languages and cultures.

Between adherence to the source play and acculturation, a middle ground is suggested by the author, as a general rule subject to exceptions. With regard to this suggestion, which is shared by Anderman, it should be mentioned that Zatlin often adopts a prescriptivist stance. Interestingly, many other studies of the last decade are characterised by their prescriptivism, despite persistent calls for descriptive approaches.

To conclude my commentary about the book under discussion, I would like to underline the broad array of topics addressed in the volume. Only a selection of these has been mentioned here; passing references to others will be made later.

2. Reaching further: new geographical locations, new forms of translation

Joseph Che Suh and Jennifer Lindsay further opened the area of study to new geographical locations by looking at Africa and Asia, respectively (more in particular, at Sub-Saharan countries and at Indonesia, Singapore,
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21 Phyllis Zatlin, *Theatrical translation and film adaptation* cit., p. vii. For contrastive purposes, see Levy’s opinion in Part I (section 2).
22 *Ivi*, p. 31.
23 *Ivi*, p. 9.
24 *Ivi*, pp. 81-82.
Malaysia and, to a lesser extent, Thailand, India and China). Che Suh\textsuperscript{28} has found that African writers use foreignising strategies when they write in (or translate their works into) European languages, in order to preserve the «Africanness» of their writings. Lindsay’s edited volume foregrounds heteroglossic theatre as well as traditional performance types where translation (in the form of interpreting or commentary, for example) stands as a performance device. The political dimension of (non-)translation is thrown into relief in the book.

Griesel’s monograph \textit{Die Inszenierung als Translat: Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Theaterübertitelung}\textsuperscript{29} also deals with forms of translation taking place on stage, such as surtitling, interpreting and synopsis. It should be mentioned that surtitling is a recurrent topic throughout the last decade, as will be evidenced in this article. Other new forms (or uses) of translation (including creative surtitles) have received a certain heed in the same period\textsuperscript{30}. Additionally, in the last couple of years, the whole range of possibilities that translation can offer for access to live performances has been examined for disability inclusion (particularly as regards visual and hearing impairment)\textsuperscript{31}. It is worth pointing out that Disability Studies may well contribute to progress in the field of theatre translation, as suggested by Pedro de Senna\textsuperscript{32}.

\textsuperscript{28} Joseph Che Suh, \textit{A study of translation strategies} cit.
\textsuperscript{30} See, for example, the following articles or other studies by the same authors: Louise Ladouceur, Nicole Nolette, Cow-boy poëtré: \textit{A bilingual performance for a unilingual audience}, in R. Baines, C. Marinetti, M. Perteghella (eds.), \textit{Staging and performing translation: Text and theatre practice}, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2011, pp. 155-169; Louise Ladouceur, \textit{Surtitles take the stage in Franco-Canadian theatre}, in “Target” (Special issue “Translation in the theatre”), 25, 3 (2013), pp. 343-364.
3. Theatre journals pay greater heed to theatre translation while linguistic journals set eyes on it

In 2005, the Portuguese periodical *Cadernos de Literatura Comparada* became the first journal from a linguistic—as opposed to theatrical—discipline to devote a special issue to drama translation. In the realm of Theatre Studies, three special journal issues had appeared by then: the first in France in 1982, within *Théâtre/Public*; the remaining two in Canada in 1990 and 2003, within *Jeu* and *Theatre Research in Canada*, respectively.

Topics covered in these specials vary widely. Shakespeare has a dedicated section in *Théâtre/Public*, with contributions by Jean-Michel Déprats and Yves Bonnefoy. *Jeu* places the accent on translating Québécois. *Theatre Research in Canada* addresses the translation of both Shakespeare and Canadian plays, as well as, on the one hand, surtitling, and on the other, adaptation to film. As far as *Cadernos de Literatura Comparada* is concerned, its looks predominantly into the Irish and Portuguese theatrical systems, although several other cultural contexts are dealt with, as illustrated by Aaltonen’s contribution “Ecce Homo” reactualized (see Part I, section 5, note 121).

In 2007, another linguistic journal—*Linguistica Antverpiensia*—paid heed to performing arts’ travel across languages and cultures. It did so within an issue devoted to audiovisual translation and social integration. Only one contribution to this issue, however, concerns theatre. This contribution is focused on surtitling, for both theatre and opera (incidentally, opera

---

surtitling is the concern of the other article about performing arts included in the special).

Also in 2007, two US theatre journals—American Theatre and Theatre Journal—published specials on drama translation, and a third one—The Mercurian—was born with the aim of publishing English translations of plays written in any language. The latter, founded by the Professor of Dramatic Art Adam Versényi, is open to production histories of theatrical translations as well as to theoretical articles.

Returning to the US specials, American Theatre's concentrated around a series of initiatives for intercultural exchange between the US and other countries (Argentina, Mexico, France, Romania, Slovenia and Japan). The editor of the special saw stage translation as a collaborative activity consisting in understanding, interpreting and recreating a play, that is, as «a performance, an interpretation akin to acting or dancing». This image recalls the jazz metaphor commented on in Part I (section 3).

Within Theatre Journal, economic and ethical considerations were foregrounded. They include, for example: the fact that producers favour the foreign plays that contain fewer words; or the implications of the choice between foreignisation and domestication, as pointed out by Venuti. In this latter regard, resistance to domestication is advocated by Spencer for translations aimed at the Anglophone world (as the dominant culture). The same case is made by Taviano in another volume that will be discussed.

later\textsuperscript{43}. Similarly, Versényi argues in the special\textsuperscript{44} that translation can become a method of performing in the world, of challenging audiences through the provocation of unease as a means towards discovery. After three brief case studies which explore theatre in the Americas (Argentina, Mexico and the US), the author concludes: «Translation is not only about what we do with other languages, as theatre is not only about the performance text; both translation and theatre are also, fundamentally, about how we experience and think about ourselves».

Interestingly, signs of the so-called “performative turn” in Theatre Studies are visible in the two US specials (most notably, in the one that is now under discussion). This turn has recently been embraced by Translation Studies theatre research, as will be shown later.

Three articles of the \textit{Theatre Journal} special remain to be mentioned. Bay-Cheng’s\textsuperscript{45} is an original contribution that looks at avant-garde theatre. It studies a drama text that, through typographical play, challenges performance in such a manner that both text and performance are incomplete and depend on each other.

The two other articles in the special continue extending research into Asia, dealing specifically with Japan and China. For reasons of space, I will not elaborate on them, except to indicate that one, authored by Beverley Curran, sets eyes on marginalised groups. This brings me to the next section.

4. Marginalised social groups receive increased attention

Few studies on theatre translation have addressed the marginalised in society. The last-mentioned article, or David Kinloch’s \textit{Lilies or skelfs}:

\textsuperscript{44} Adam Versényi, \textit{Translation as an epistemological paradigm for theatre in the Americas}, in “Theatre Journal” (Special issue “Theatre and translation”), 59, 3 (2007, October), pp. 431-447.
Translating queer melodrama\textsuperscript{46}, are two of them. However, the most noticeable one is possibly Beverley Curran’s 2008 monograph Theatre translation theory and performance in contemporary Japan: native voices, foreign bodies\textsuperscript{47}. Here, the researcher analyses six 20\textsuperscript{th} century Western plays that have been translated and performed in Japan from the 1960s onwards and are characterised by their giving voice to marginalised groups such as indigenous minorities, blacks and homosexuals.

5. Further topics and approaches emerge; old ones are revisited

Returning to the year that best illustrates the burgeoning of theatre translation research, in 2007, other new approaches and topics were undertaken, while better known territories were further explored. With respect to new approaches, Katja Krebs\textsuperscript{48} analysed the figure of the stage translator from a sociological perspective, within the field of cultural production as understood by Bourdieu. This led the researcher to claim recognition of the role that translators play in the formation of national (theatre) cultures.

As regards new topics, Karen Bennett\textsuperscript{49} looked at ballet as intersemiotic translation of drama, a subject broached by Nancy Isenberg\textsuperscript{50} that today remains under-researched, despite later work by both of these authors\textsuperscript{51}.


\textsuperscript{47} Beverley Curran, Theatre translation theory and performance in contemporary Japan: Native voices, foreign bodies, St. Jerome, Manchester, 2008.


\textsuperscript{50} Nancy Isenberg, Accommodating Shakespeare to ballet: John Cranko’s Romeo and Juliet (Venice, 1958), in L. B. Lambert, B. Engler (eds.), Shifting the scene: Shakespeare in European culture, University of Delaware Press, Newark, 2004, pp. 129-139.

\textsuperscript{51} Nancy Isenberg, Feminist movement and the balance of power in John Cranko’s ballet The Taming of the Shrew (Stuttgart, 1969), in D. Delabastita, J. De Vos, P. Franssen (eds.),
The translation of humour in drama is also under-researched, as pointed out by Windle. Brigid Maher has analysed successive renderings of Dario Fo’s comic style, lamenting its loss in a totally acculturated text.

Among the old approaches and topics revisited in 2007 are Brisset’s “sociocritical approach”, re-examined by Brisset herself, and literals, with a contribution by a “literal translator”. Each of these studies came to light in a different collection of essays that dealt with a variety of topics: Teatro e tradução: palcos de encontro, which resulted from the ACT 15 Congress (Lisbon, 2006), and Anderman’s Voices in translation: Bridging cultural divides. Of these volumes, other aspects could be highlighted. While in the latter Farrell underlines the importance of the playwright’s style, in Teatro e tradução Aaltonen draws attention to the need for planning and marketing, as well as for acculturation, if drama from “small cultures” is to travel to


Previous works on the translation of humour in drama are: Marta Mateo, _La traducción del humor: las comedias inglesas en español_, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, 1995; Cristina Marinetti, _The limits of the play text: Translating comedy_, in “New Voices in Translation Studies”, 1 (2005), pp. 31-42.

Annie Brisset, _Translation, theatre and society: Quebec’s American dream_, in M. J. Brilhante, M. Carvalho (eds.), _Teatro e tradução_ cit., pp. 31-51.


María João Brilhante, Manuela Carvalho (eds.), _Teatro e tradução_ cit.


Sirkku Aaltonen, _Space and place in theatrical contact zones: How to find audiences for untapped reservoirs of contemporary drama from small cultures_, in M. J. Brilhante, M. Carvalho (eds.), _Teatro e tradução_ cit., pp. 53-75.
foreign stages\textsuperscript{60}. Johnston has contributions in both volumes\textsuperscript{61}. In these essays, the researcher and translator highlights the role of the audience. In order to be able to offer the spectators, within historical plays, «cultural memory in the present»\textsuperscript{62}, he suggests using recreative strategies, so as to «promote hybridity, a hybrid text that simultaneously moves between and across different historical moments, locating and uprooting the historical imagination of the spectator»\textsuperscript{63}. Hybridity and liminality are notions frequently resorted to in the literature of the last decade. As far as the role of the audience is concerned, it has received remarkable renewed attention in the same period. In this regard, it should be mentioned that, in the Theatre Journal special (see above), Langworthy\textsuperscript{64} reported making adjustments to his translated play text based on the audience response; Bufferi\textsuperscript{65}, on her part, emphasises the diversity of spectators in the audience.

6. Research into the translation of theatre classics is revitalised (I)

In 2007, another collective volume raised attention to Spanish Golden Age drama. The Spanish Golden Age in English: Perspectives on performance\textsuperscript{66} was inspired by a Royal Shakespeare Company season of Spanish classical

\textsuperscript{60} Helena Bufferi has also tackled the challenges facing the internationalisation efforts of the theatre of small cultures. Bufferi examines the Catalan case, pointing out the receiving cultures’ difficulties in grasping the plays’ multidimensionality (e.g. their Catalan-Spanish hybridity and their trade-offs between the visual and the textual) (Helena Bufferi, Negotiating the translation zone: Invisible borders and other landscapes on the contemporary “heteroglossic” stage, in “Translation Studies”, 6, 2 (2013), pp. 150-165).


\textsuperscript{62} David Johnston, Translation, performance and the New Historicism cit., p. 18.

\textsuperscript{63} Ivi, p. 17.


\textsuperscript{65} Helena Bufferi, Negotiating the translation zone cit., p. 159.

theatre, and as its title suggests, focuses on the translation of this historical drama for today’s English-speaking audiences. Considerable work on the same theatrical tradition has followed it, as I will show when I return to theatre classics in section 8—now Shakespeare claims his space, and will be succeeded by two small studies on particular productions of contemporary plays.

As can be expected, the Bard was present in the 2007 literature, with, for example, the following monographs: *The breach and the observance: Theatre retranslation as a strategy of artistic differentiation, with special reference to retranslations of Shakespeare’s Hamlet (1777-2001)*[^67], *Traduir Shakespeare: les reflexions dels traductors catalans*[^68] and *Teatro y traducción: aproximación interdisciplinaria desde la obra de Shakespeare*[^69]. The titles of the two former are self-explanatory[^70]. In the latter, a model is proposed for the pre-translation analysis of drama texts. The model integrates communicative, pragmatic and semantic approaches and distinguishes between two communication systems: one external, where communication is established between the author and the audience, and another internal, within which communication occurs between the fictional characters.

The translation of theatre classics as a research domain (including Latin and Greek theatre—especially the latter) experienced a revitalisation at the end of the 2000s, as the present article will evince. Mention should, perhaps, be made that progress in this domain may well contribute to other, more contemporary, domains. For example, the volume above on Spanish Golden Age drama, or the subsequent collection *The comedia in English*:

---


[^70]: The second could be translated as “Translating Shakespeare: The Catalan translators’ thoughts”. 
Translation and performance\textsuperscript{71}, offer as one of their key themes the translation of verse, and, therefore, may well have something to say to researchers of contemporary theatre about verse translation, a subject that has been deemed to be neglected: «little has so far been said about the translation of verse [...]», which is a crucial topic in posing a number of questions regarding its relation to prose, the available measures in the target language and culture, and the current perception of conventional forms on stage\textsuperscript{72}. Naturally, other examples can be found in the wealth of studies on Shakespeare translations, to which I will return in section 8.

7. \textit{The complexity of theatre translation research is uncovered}

I would like to conclude my overview of the 2007 feast of studies by commenting on two articles that evidence the complexity of theatre translation research, as well as the benefits, in this field, of hands-on experience. Each of them gives an account of the process of rendering a specific drama text into another language. Their respective authors were involved in this process in their capacity as translators.

Carolyn Shread\textsuperscript{73} explains that when she and Tom Shread set out to translate \textit{Les co-épouses} (1990) by Franco-Algerian playwright Fatima Gallaire for an American audience, they intended to avoid domestication. By this, she means exactly to «reject a traditional fluency model which Venuti has argued “effaces the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text”»\textsuperscript{74}. The researcher elaborates: «Our overriding concern and dominant ethic was to seek out ways for the English language of the translation to be affected by the “difference” represented by Gallaire’s Arabic-modulated French»\textsuperscript{75}.

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Ivi}, p. 130.
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Ivi}, p. 134.
The reality was, nonetheless, that, at times, they found in the source text an insurmountable degree of resistance to their strategy. For example, although they retained repetitiveness and a degree of formality, they felt it necessary to do away with the profusion of exclamation marks that, in their opinion, characterises the writer’s style, on the grounds that, when interpreted by the actors, it would come across as a "somewhat ridiculous barking out of orders". Furthermore, they gave in to socio-political pressures: in agreement with the playwright, they toned down or even left out some of the demeaning language towards women, «so as to be sure that the play was not seen to authorize negative American stereotypes of the Arab world». This was actually one of their main concerns, despite the fact that the translation was carried out before 9/11, as Shread highlights. Retaining certain misogynistic language «would have been an injustice to the intentions of the author», explains the researcher, pointing out that Gallaire «was extremely concerned about the play being turned against her and becoming a mouthpiece for anti-Arab sentiments». Their concern was such that a pre-production colloquium was organised to prepare and educate the audience.

It might be worth further considering—in line with Ó Cuilleanáin (see Part I, section 5)—the broader socio-cultural implications of the self-censorship measures taken jointly by them and the playwright. On the other hand, their translation moved back and forth in space in a similar way to David Johnston’s moving «between and across different historical moments».

Roger Baines and Fred Dalmasso also dealt with acculturation; however, the play that they rendered presented a different challenge to Translation Studies, namely, its cultural indeterminacy. If Exécuteur 14
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76 Iri, p. 133.
77 Iri, p. 131.
78 Iri, pp. 131-132.
80 David Johnston, Translation, performance and the New Historicism cit., p. 17.
81 Roger Baines, Fred Dalmasso, A text on trial cit., pp. 229-257.
(1990), by the Franco-Egyptian-Lebanese playwright Adel Hakim, is rooted somewhere, it is not in a particular culture but, instead, in the experience of civil war. It gives an account of one person’s journey from being a victim of civil conflict to having the role of executioner in the same conflict. The translators, who were targeting stagings in the British Isles, saw in the play an invitation to refer to multiple civil wars, and pursued this objective by rewriting the beginning of the drama so that it was staged as an interpreted sequence which evoked, in a direct way, the Milosevic war crimes trial, and indirectly, other accounts of civil war; that is to say, they imposed a particular reading on the drama that reduced its indeterminacy and enhanced its universality. Mention must be made that Dalmasso was one of the two co-directors of the production and its only actor (the play being a solo, staged by the victim-executioner).

The translation process was informed by performances of both the source play and its translated counterpart in draft form. The original was performed by Dalmasso, a native speaker of French (who mastered English); the draft translation, by Baines, an English native (who mastered French). It is these performances that they found most fruitful, for enabling them to reproduce the rhythm of the original.

It may have been noticed that the actor was a native speaker of the source—not the target—language. For the translators, this guaranteed access to the original’s gestic text; furthermore, it did not shut off as many desirable potential identities of the character as would have been the case if an English native had performed the target play. More generally, what the decision tells us is that theatre translators may well have something to say as regards cast choice—as, on the other hand, has been suggested by Zatlin and seems to be implicit in Taroff.

Particularly noticeable in the transformations undergone by the play is the change of function of the second main language used. Both the original and the translation are hybrid texts, mixing a variety of languages but, most

82 Phyllis Zatlin, *Theatrical translation and film adaptation* cit., pp. 82-83.
notably, French and English. While in the French original «the foreign lexis of English represents what is foreign and what is dominating [the character], what is exteriorised, the world of war», in the English translation, «for what is a French character, the French lexis is his own world, his own story and so what is interiorised».

The fact that, in the original, English carries political weight (it is portrayed as a military, perhaps even imperialist, language) further complicates matters. Two solutions were found: the use of an evidently French character (as conveyed by his accent and by his use of French at the beginning of the play) and the character’s being forced to speak English in trial after he rejected the interpreter.

Regarding languages other than French and English, the number of them and, especially, their respective weight (on the basis of the quantity of words used of each language) were increased so that the audience could infer reference to civil war in a wider range of cultures.

On a slightly different subject, the translators associate certain linguistic features of the original with emotional, psychological states; for example, slang is taken to be used by the character as a means to cope with tense situations. In future research, it might be worth looking into disciplines such as Pragmatics and Sociolinguistics to study the way in which people with different cultural backgrounds react verbally to specific emotional states, with a view to analysing the implications for theatre translation—culturally-determined reactions can result in translation shifts, and emotions obviously play an essential role on the stage. In this regard, a recent book by Maria Sidiropoulou is to be highlighted for its exploration of a pragmatic-discoursive approach to the translation of theatre. To my knowledge, this approach remains practically unexplored today despite the fact that it was already encouraged by Gunilla Anderman in the late 1990s.

Research carried out by Fernando Poyatos may facilitate progress. As the
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84 Ivi, p. 243.
linguistic anthropologist has pointed out, «even reflexes like coughing or sneezing [...] are performed differently by each person right after their onset, as they are controlled by certain ‘display rules’ differing across cultures and social ranks».

To conclude my commentary on Baines and Dalmasso’s article, I would like to highlight two aspects considered in it: intertextuality and reception. The former, which is gaining attention in the literature, occupies a prominent place in the article and, like all the above in this section, testifies to the complexity of theatre translation research. Following Elam and Balme, the authors understand intertexts as traces not only of other texts but also of other performances by the same actors, of the scenery of previous performances, of other directorial styles, etc. In Balme’s words, in the theatre, «the potential for textual interplay is widened to include any of the sign systems at work in the staged text». For Baines and Dalmasso, translation further multiplies intertexts: «the span of potential intertextual meanings [...] is clearly increased by the transfer of the original text»; in addition, translators are not necessarily aware of all of the potentially operating intertexts.

As regards reception, so far, very few studies have contrasted decisions made by drama translators with the results of those decisions in terms of audience reception. The article under discussion does this by using reader and spectator responses such as a refusal to grant permission to stage the play at a given hall, a spectator's e-mail and a production review in a newspaper.

---

87 Fernando Poyatos, Nonverbal communication across disciplines. Volume 1: Culture, sensory interaction, speech, conversation, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2002, p. 6. For other publications by Poyatos that might be of interest, see Part I (section 4, note 85).
90 Roger Baines, Fred Dalmasso, A text on trial cit., p. 237.
91 Ivi, p. 238.
After 2007, the interest in theatre translation studies has not ceased, as anticipated in the introduction. Returning to theatre classics, before the turn of the decade, studies proliferated. On the Shakespearean front, we find the collective volume *Shakespeare and European politics*[^92], of which a couple of contributions have already been mentioned[^93]. I would like to highlight a third one, Wilhelm Hortmann’s *Hybridization: A new trend in German Shakespeare productions*[^94]. Here, Hortmann criticises what he considers random eclecticism in contemporary productions of Shakespeare in Germany—in his own words, «the most incongruous and arbitrary combinations» (of languages, melodies, costumes…)[^95].

Regarding the book as a whole, *Shakespeare and European politics* derives from a conference held in 2003 and adds to a long list of collective volumes devoted to Shakespeare’s presence in non-Anglophone cultures[^96]: *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary performance*[^97], *European Shakespeares: Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age*[^98], *Shakespeare in the new Europe*[^99], *Shakespeare and national culture*[^100], *Shakespeare and the language of translation*[^101], *Translating Shakespeare and European politics* (eds.), *Shakespeare and European politics* cit.

[^92]: Dirk Delabastita, Jozef De Vos, Paul Franssen (eds.), *Shakespeare and European politics* cit.
[^93]: See note 50 above.
[^95]: *Ivi*, p. 205.
[^101]: Translating Shakespeare and European politics (eds.), *Shakespeare and European politics* cit.
Shakespeare for the twenty-first century\textsuperscript{102} and Latin American Shakespeares\textsuperscript{103}. As it will have been noticed, the start of the series is concurrent with the publication of Heylen’s \textit{Translation, poetics, and the stage: Six French Hamlets}\textsuperscript{104} (see Part I, section 4), as well as with Delabastita’s well-known \textit{There’s a double tongue: An investigation into the translation of Shakespeare’s wordplay, with special reference to Hamlet}.\textsuperscript{105} The development of research into Shakespeare translation from the 1990s onwards is, on the other hand, indebted to the scholarly journal \textit{Shakespeare Translation}, which has encouraged investigation of non-Anglophone Shakespeare since it was founded in 1974.\textsuperscript{106}

Both Shakespeare’s theatre and Spanish Golden Age drama were the concern of \textit{Reading performance: Spanish Golden-Age theatre and Shakespeare on the modern stage},\textsuperscript{107} while a special issue of the \textit{Journal of Romance Studies}\textsuperscript{108} focused on translations for English-speaking audiences of Marivaux’s and Spanish Golden Age plays. A special issue on theatre translation of the \textit{Translation Studies} journal \textit{TRANS}\textsuperscript{109} privileged classics in general\textsuperscript{110}, and just after the

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotetext[102]{Rui Carvalho Homem, Ton Hoenselaars (eds.), \textit{Translating Shakespeare for the twenty-first century}, Rodopi, Amsterdam, 2004.}
\footnotetext[103]{Bernice W. Kliman, Rick J. Santos (eds.), \textit{Latin American Shakespeares}, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, Madison, New Jersey, 2005.}
\footnotetext[105]{Dirk Delabastita, \textit{There’s a double tongue: An investigation into the translation of Shakespeare’s wordplay, with special reference to Hamlet}, Rodopi, Amsterdam, 1993.}
\footnotetext[106]{It should be added that the journal has been renamed twice: first in 1986, to \textit{Shakespeare Worldwide: Translation and Adaptation}; then in 2003, to its current title \textit{Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance}.}
\footnotetext[107]{Susan L. Fischer, \textit{Reading performance: Spanish Golden-Age theatre and Shakespeare on the modern stage}, Tamesis, Woodbridge/Rochester, 2009.}
\footnotetext[108]{Margaret Andrews (ed.), “Journal of Romance Studies” (Special issue “Translation, Adaptation, Performance”), 8, 3 (2008, winter).}
\footnotetext[109]{Pilar Ezpeleta Piorno (ed.), \textit{De la traducción teatral} (feature section), in “Trans”, 13 (2009), pp. 11-136.}
\footnotetext[110]{The special was not restricted to classics, though. It included contributions on censorship (Raquel Merino Álvarez, \textit{Traducciones (censuradas) de teatro inglés en la España de Franco. TRACE: una perspectiva histórica}, in “Trans”, 13 (2009), pp. 19-31), performability (Joan Sellent Arús, \textit{Funcional e invisible}, in “Trans”, 13 (2009), pp. 83-93; Eva Espasa, \textit{Repensar la representabilidad}, in “Trans”, 13 (2009), pp. 95-105) and surtitling. The latter}
\end{footnotesize}
turn of the decade another special issue and a collective book were devoted to Greek classics (and Latin classics in the case of the special).111

9. Theory is contested

At the end of the 2000s, vehement voices questioning theory started to be heard. Zuccato112 challenged the supporters of a foreignising strategy by arguing that this strategy is not an option when translating Shakespeare into Italian dialects, which lack the linguistic resources required for the corresponding foreignisation. Furthermore, the author cautioned against following a foreignising strategy when working into «endangered languages»113, a caution also issued by Sidiropoulou114 for non-hegemonic cultures in general.

In the same line, the actor and translator Kate Eaton has stated: «I find it impossible to squeeze theory into practice [...] But maybe I can envisage the space to squeeze theory out of practice»115.

10. Cross-cultural theatre vs intercultural theatre

topic was the object of no less than three contributions, which tackled it both in a general manner and in relation to specific contemporary plays. These three contributions are: Sirkku Aaltonen, Noni sosökokeror alolotoså asyl? Constructing narratives of heteroglossia in the Swedish performances of Utvandrarna on the Finnish stage, in “Trans”, 13 (2009), pp. 107-118; Yvonne Griesel, Surtitling: Surtitles an other hybrid on a hybrid stage, in “Trans”, 13 (2009), pp. 119-127; and Louise Ladouceur, Bilingualism on stage: Translating francophone drama repertoires in Canada, in “Trans”, 13 (2009), pp. 129-136. Of them, those that deal with particular plays are the ones by Aaltonen and Ladouceur; incidentally, these have heteroglossia as another key topic.


113 Ibidem.

114 Maria Sidiropoulou, Translating identities on stage and screen cit., p. 257.

Some studies from the end of the 2000s show how, in recent theatrical productions, cultures interweave. The plays with interwoven cultures have little in common with the intercultural plays of the 1970s, the 1980s and, partly, the 1990s, as has explained Erika Fischer Lichte\textsuperscript{116}. In the latter plays, the stage director was firmly rooted in a given tradition and “simply” selected elements from other cultures to include them in his/her productions\textsuperscript{117}. On the contrary, interwoven cultures are in dialogue with each other, negotiating their relationships, which gives rise to «something completely new and beyond the scope of any single participating culture»\textsuperscript{118} (a “third culture”, so to speak; Fischer-Lichte makes, in fact, use of Homi Bhabha’s term \textit{third space}\textsuperscript{119}, as well as of the notion of liminality).

The interweaving of cultures in play translation has been addressed by Graham Holderness in his study of the Shakespeare adaptations by Sulayman Al-Bassam\textsuperscript{120}. It also features in a collective volume that concentrates on the translation, adaptation and playwriting work carried out by Britain’s dramatist Timberlake Wertenbaker\textsuperscript{121}. This book, which originates in Theatre Studies, foregrounds the cross-cultural nature of all of Wertenbaker’s plays.

11. \textit{Revisiting old debates: translation vs adaptation, performability, literals}

As regards old debates, two articles by translation scholars\textsuperscript{122} have undertaken a review of the different conceptualisations of the terms

\textsuperscript{117} \textit{Ivi}, p. 398.
\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Ivi}, p. 400.
\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Ivi}, p. 397.
\textsuperscript{121} Maya E. Roth, Sara Freeman (eds.), \textit{International dramaturgy. Translation \& transformations in the theatre of Timberlake Wertenbaker}, P.I.E. Peter Lang, Brussels, 2008.
\textsuperscript{122} Manuela Perteghella, \textit{Adaptation: ‘bastard child’ or critique? Putting terminology centre stage}, in “Journal of Romance Studies” (Special issue “Translation, Adaptation, Performance”), 8, 3 (2008, winter), pp. 51-65; and Jorge Braga Riera, \textit{¿Traducción, adaptación o versión?:}
translation, adaptation and/or version, providing insights into the factors behind those conceptualisations and into the relationships between these terms.

A third article has attempted to bridge the disciplines of Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies, lamenting the paucity of research on translation published within the *Journal of Adaptation in Film & Performance*, which explicitly encourages submission of manuscripts from Translation Studies. Efforts in the same direction as this third article have redoubled in the last years and certainly show the benefits of the bridging, as does a mere glance at the above-mentioned journal.

Another old debate is that surrounding the notion of performability. This debate was revitalised around the turn of the decade. After a review by Espasa of the discussion, performability was foregrounded in several articles. Fernandes provided a new definition for it that underlines the roles of both the actors and the audience: «To translate performability may be interpreted as to translate a playtext with a view towards making it speakable to actors, and shaping language in a way that entices its audience into the here and now of the performance».

The author particularly stressed the role of the audience: «performability encompasses and goes beyond speakability in the sense that it is concerned with both actors and audience». She proposed a co-operative method of translating that would

---


128 *Ivi*, p. 131.
empower the translator vis-à-vis the production’s theatrical group (director and actors).

In the same line, Taroff\textsuperscript{129} emphasised how, in performance, a wealth of possibilities is available; for example, domestication and foreignisation can be achieved not only through verbal devices but also through the actors, visual elements, etc.\textsuperscript{130} A similar idea to this one is conveyed in the collective volume \textit{The Spanish Golden Age in English}, whose contributors unanimously considered that:

Theatre allows the greatest opportunity for delivering cultural difference, for allowing that difference to be present and for offering multiple access to meaning [...] The fact that the word is not alone on the stage, that, at the moment of enunciation, it is one of the many different signifiers, allows the translator and director to judge how far to dare with difference\textsuperscript{131}.

Muneroni has addressed the same question, as the following words reflect: «theatre relies on multiple aesthetic idioms to bring the source text closer to the target culture while also showing its foreignness. The mise en scène can achieve the contradictory objective of locating and dislocating culture by a mere light change, projection, costume choice, sonic device or scenic shift»\textsuperscript{132}.

From another perspective, Xu and Bo Cui\textsuperscript{133} attempted to determine the requirements of performability by applying Jin Di’s theory of equivalence to a set of English translations of a Chinese play. Lastly, in his doctoral dissertation, Konstantinos Kritsis\textsuperscript{134} has explored whether the Stanislavskian method of acting would help the translator and how.

\textsuperscript{129} Kurt Taroff, \textit{Whose play is it anyway?} cit., pp. 241-254.
\textsuperscript{130} Ivi, pp. 247-248.
\textsuperscript{132} Stefano Muneroni, \textit{Culture in text and performance} cit., p. 308.
Before bringing this section to a close, mention should be made of the debate on the appropriateness of using literals (translations that, according to Zatlin’s survey, are rejected by most translators\(^ {135} \)). This debate was continued with publications such as the doctoral thesis *Plays in translation on the London stage*\(^ {136} \) and the interview with Natalie Abrahami, former director of the Gate theatre in London\(^ {137} \). Strikingly, Abrahami stated that if the literal translation used in a production of the Gate had not been commissioned (and, therefore, communication with the literal translator was non-existent), the theatre did not recognise authorship.

12. *The practitioners’ turn*

After the “re-emergence of performability”, the need to bring theory closer to practice was voiced ever more strongly. For Fernandes, the conference «Invisible Presences: Translation, Dramaturgy and Performance» (Belfast, 2011) was probably a milestone in this respect\(^ {138} \). Another wake-up call was the collective book *Staging and performing translation*\(^ {139} \), which encouraged practice-led research. Topics covered in this volume range from performability\(^ {140} \) and collaborative practices\(^ {141} \) to the


\(^{137}\) Márta Minier, ‘To only use text where absolutely necessary’: An interview with Natalie Abrahami about director-led adaptations of classics, her work at the Gate Theatre and Yerma, in “Journal of Adaptation in Film & Performance”, 5, 2 (2012), pp. 197-213.

\(^{138}\) Aline Balduino Pires Fernandes, *Travelling plays, travelling audiences* cit., p. 78.


\(^{141}\) Carole-Anne Upton, *The translator as metteur en scène, with reference to Les Aveugles [The Blind] by Maurice Maeterlinck*, in R. Baines, C. Marinetti, M. Perteghella (eds.), *Staging and performing translation* cit., pp. 31-48; Roger Baines, Fred Dalmasso, *Musical realizations: A performance-based translation of rhythm in Kallos‘ Dans la solitude des champs de coton*, in R. Baines, C. Marinetti, M. Perteghella (eds.), *Staging and performing translation* cit., pp. 49-71. It should be noted that, in Upton’s essay, the analysed production’s translator and director are one and the same person (Upton herself); this does not prevent the essay, however, from providing valuable insights into collaboration between translators
translator’s empowerment\textsuperscript{142}, the resistance to alien theatre in the UK\textsuperscript{143} and new forms of theatre translation\textsuperscript{144}—the latter examined as methods for multilingual plays to reach an audience with diverse language skills.

13. The role of the translator

The role of the translator (and of other agents, including the audience) seems to be the highlight of the last few years in terms of topics of discussion. The process (as opposed to the product) has in fact taken centre stage.

When dealing with the process, what is generally in hand is translation for the stage and not for the page, which means that the long-held observation that «the majority of writing focuses on translation for the page and not for the stage»\textsuperscript{145} has now become obsolete—the opposite happens to be true.

As already mentioned\textsuperscript{146}, Stefano Muneroni\textsuperscript{147} and Alinne Balduino Pires Fernandes\textsuperscript{148} argue that the translator should have the skills of a dramaturge, which Muneroni summarises as follows:

While a dramaturg’s tasks can vary enormously [...], it is common for a dramaturg to assist the director with editorial cuts; research the playwright, the historical context of the play and its previous productions; and help the actors and directors. In Baines and Dalmasso’s article, collaboration with the translator concerns mainly the actor.

\textsuperscript{142} Anthony Meech, Brecht’s The Threepenny Opera for the National Theatre: A 3p opera?, in R. Baines, C. Marinetti, M. Perteghella (eds.), Staging and performing translation cit., pp. 126-138; Margaret Rose, Cristina Marinetti, The translator as cultural promoter; or how Renato Gabrielli’s Qualcosa Trilla went on the road as Mobile Thriller, in R. Baines, C. Marinetti, M. Perteghella (eds.), Staging and performing translation cit., pp. 139-154.


\textsuperscript{144} Louise Ladouceur, Nicole Nolette, Cow-boy poétre cit., pp. 155-169.

\textsuperscript{145} Roger Baines, Fred Dalmasso, A text on trial cit., p. 232.

\textsuperscript{146} See note 19.

\textsuperscript{147} Stefano Muneroni, Culture in text and performance cit., pp. 296-311.

\textsuperscript{148} Alinne Balduino Pires Fernandes, Travelling plays, travelling audiences cit., pp. 80, 84.
and designers navigate textual and cultural issues related to their crafts. A dramaturg may also undertake close textual analysis\textsuperscript{149}.

It is interesting to note that Marinetti and Rose fulfil these functions in their capacity as translators of the play whose translation process they themselves analyse in \textit{Process, practice and landscapes of reception: An ethnographic study of theatre translation}\textsuperscript{150}. It should be highlighted that Muneroni and Fernandes were also engaged as translators in the productions analysed in their respective articles. This insider’s role allows direct observation of the process, something that is usually lacking in the studies whose authors did not participate in the process. In one of the most recent studies of this type, Sirkku Aaltonen has encouraged direct observation on the grounds that it enables the identification of the decision-makers and allows cause and effect links to be established:

> In looking at translation as \textit{performance}, ideologies and power relations could also be explored in more depth. Who wields power and what are the ideological roots of the hierarchies? In my case study, the existence of hierarchies already became visible […] but who made the final decision? Such considerations would require direct observation. In my material, all the changes had been registered but not always how the final decision was reached.

> Direct observation could also help solve the problem with the timeline. As I was only able to study the process a posteriori, I did not have enough information about the cause and effect links\textsuperscript{151}.

Baines and Dalmasso have, in effect, been able to demonstrate cause and effect links between their translation decisions and audience reception\textsuperscript{152}. It would indeed be desirable that more connections of this type be made in future research.

Participation comes nonetheless with its own disadvantages, as Marinetti and Rose have acknowledged: «when as researchers we are

\textsuperscript{149} Stefano Muneroni, \textit{Culture in text and performance} cit., p. 296.
\textsuperscript{152} Roger Baines, Fred Dalmasso, \textit{A text on trial} cit., pp. 229-257.
involved in our object of study it then becomes difficult to disentangle that object from our own subjective experiences»\textsuperscript{153}.

14. Innovating the methodologies

Marinetti and Rose\textsuperscript{154} draw on Ethnography to analyse the negotiations between playwright, translators, director, actors and audience in a particular translation/production process. Other novel approaches have been tested in the last couple of years. Aaltonen\textsuperscript{155} combines Sociology (more specifically, Bruno Latour’s actor-network theory) and Performance Studies (i.e. Richard Schechner’s framework of analysis of cultural phenomena as performance) with a view to providing a “thick description” of a translation process. On her part, the Theatre Studies scholar Emer O’Toole has extended the sociological enquiry into theatre translation by pointing out the significant impact that “cultural capital” may have on translated theatre, compared to the also Bourdieusian concept of “habitus”. As an “external observer” of an Irish play’s English into Chinese translation/production process, O’Toole has been able to uncover power relations between the Western director and other agents (especially the Chinese translators). This led her to conclude that an agent’s capital may not allow them to act in accordance with their habitus: «We do not live in a homogenous world. No habitus equips an agent [the director] for success in all cultural systems»\textsuperscript{156}. For O’Toole, the Chinese translation was «a site of competing aesthetic, cultural and ethical discourses»\textsuperscript{157}.

Of the novel approaches, it is Performance Studies that has received the greatest attention of late, with the support of two major works: the journal Target’s special issue on stage translation (to which the above contributions

\textsuperscript{153} Cristina Marinetti, Margaret Rose, Process, practice and landscapes of reception cit., pp. 169-170.

\textsuperscript{154} Cristina Marinetti, Margaret Rose, Process, practice and landscapes of reception cit.

\textsuperscript{155} Sirkku Aaltonen, Theatre translation as performance cit.

\textsuperscript{156} Emer O’Toole, Cultural capital in intercultural theatre: A study of Pan Pan theatre company’s The Playboy of the Western World, in “Target” (Special issue “Translation in the theatre”), 25, 3 (2013), p. 422.

\textsuperscript{157} Ivi, p. 409.
by Aaltonen and O'Toole belong) and the collective book edited by Bigliazzi, Kofler and Ambrossi *Theatre translation in performance* (with whose «distrust of theory» this review article started). In the latter volume, the holistic approach advocated by Snell-Hornby is explicitly embraced, and taken further with influence of the “performative turn” in Theatre Studies: the translator is considered as «co-subject and/or co-author of the performance, competent both in textuality and stage-performativity, in verbal and gestic style, as well as acting conventions: an indispensable figure of cultural and theatrical mediation»\(^{158}\). Marinetti explains in her capacity as editor of *Target*’s special issue that, from this perspective, «theatrical performance, far from being determined by the text, “is understood to frame, contextualize, and determine the possible meanings the text can have as performed action, as an act with *force*”\(^{159}\). The researcher proposes to stop seeing theatre translation as a subfield of Translation Studies and, instead, consider translation and the theatre as a new circuit that encompasses different disciplines\(^{160}\).

15. *Theatre translation and ethics*

The role of the translator is closely related to ethical issues, which are featuring more prominently in the literature over the years (with cultural theorists like Lawrence Venuti, Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhabha as evident sources of inspiration). Muneroni’s essay could be taken as an example, as reflected in the author’s description of his translated performance text: «a third space which allowed two theatrical texts and cultures to come under the same lens, converse with each other and obliterate their borders»\(^{161}\). Muneroni continues: «The mise en scène [...] constructed the foreignness of the staging as the foundation for a newly


\(^{160}\) *Ivi*, p. 309.

\(^{161}\) Stefano Muneroni, *Culture in text and performance* cit., pp. 308-309.
formed third culture which situates itself at the crossroads of cultures\textsuperscript{162}. Other already quoted studies could have fulfilled the same illustrative purpose, but, moving forward, the ethical dimension of translation is very much present in many of the contributions to the special issue “La traducció en escena” (translation on the scene) of the Translation Studies journal \textit{Quaderns}\textsuperscript{163}. In this set of contributions\textsuperscript{164}, translation is seen as an ethical practice that promotes dialogue between past and present and between the dislocated, cultural Other and the located self. Sarah Maitland takes a hermeneutic approach to the performance of difference: «The place of the original play is uniquely time-bound», she argues, «and every performance exists within, and forms part of, a particular social, historical and geo-political context»\textsuperscript{165}. «The task of the translator», Maitland concludes, «is to interpret the fleeting moments of theatrical potential within this context and to create opportunities for new potentials to arise in translation»\textsuperscript{166}. In other words, «the task of the translator is to connect with what the play was and also what it can become […] but not to the detriment of the difference of the original […]». This means placing trust as readers […] in the potential of the play to speak to them\textsuperscript{167}.

\textsuperscript{162} Ibidem.
\textsuperscript{163} Anna Corral, David Johnston (eds.), \textit{La traducción en escena} (special section), in “Quaderns”, 19 (2012), pp. 9-122. This special issue also includes, among other articles which revolve around either theatre or opera, a study of surtitles at the Teatre Lliure de Barcelona: Eduard Bartoll Teixidor, \textit{La sobretitulació d’obres teatrals}, in “Quaderns” (Special section “La traducción en escena”), 19 (2012), pp. 31-41.
\textsuperscript{165} Sarah Maitland, \textit{Performing difference} cit., p. 66.
\textsuperscript{166} Ibidem.
\textsuperscript{167} Sarah Maitland, \textit{Performing difference} cit., p. 65.
Final reflections

Given that there are still voices that point to theatre translation as an under-explored area, the first conclusion to be drawn from the above is that the area is not neglected anymore. As this article has demonstrated, it is burgeoning, after decades of consolidation (for the latter, see the previous article in the series). In recent times, research has deepened into old topics, has been extended into new ones and into other geographical areas, new approaches have been tested, and institutional attention has increased (as reflected not only in journal space but also in initiatives like the project Out of the Wings, funded by the British Arts and Humanities Research Council168, and the Theatre Translation Forum of University College London169).

Whether we have found the way out of the labyrinth170, as suggested by the 2012 volume Depois do labirinto (After the labyrinth)171, is, perhaps, debatable, given the great challenges ahead (particularly, the lack of strong theoretical frameworks). However, considerable progress has been made. There is consensus that translation for the stage should be a collaborative process, between the translator and the theatrical group “at least” (the role of the audience in shaping the translation is increasingly being recognised). There is also agreement that the resulting product is a work of art in its own right, though the translation solutions belong to the framework of possibilities offered by the original play rather than being arbitrary (a rebalancing towards the source text can be observed in recent literature, in opposition to the previous focus on the target culture and the related ideas of translation egotism, appropriation, etc.172).

170 For more details on this metaphor for theatre translation, see Susan Bassnett in Part I (sections 3 and 4).
172 Note, for example, Muneroni’s criticism of the pre-eminence of the target culture (Stefano Muneroni, Culture in text and performance cit., pp. 297, 300-301); for the author,
The complexity of “the task” of translating plays has been further revealed—and I enclose the task in quotation marks because the forms or uses of stage translation are multiplying to include surtitles, interpreting, commentary and creative surtitles, among others (with more still to come, such as translation/interpreting in sessions of introduction to the performance).

Moreover, the key role that the theatre translator plays (not only because of the possibilities that they can open up but also on account of those that they may foreclose\(^{173}\)) has been demonstrated. Likewise, diverse ways in which research into translation can be relevant to the theatre and to society in general have been substantiated\(^{174}\).

In my opinion, the developments of the last decade are largely due to the increased imbrication of theory and practice, and would possibly prove illuminating for other areas in Translation Studies.

To conclude, it is perhaps on the theoretical front where progress has been less evident, as already suggested. Nonetheless, advances in this regard are to be expected if the current pace of research is maintained. Aspects that have barely been explored despite their importance are stage directions

\(^{173}\) Kurt Taroff, *Whose play is it anyway?* cit., p. 252.

\(^{174}\) In this regard, the following studies should be highlighted: Cristina Marinetti, Margaret Rose, *Process, practice and landscapes of reception* cit.; Louise Ladouceur, Nicole Nolette, *Cow-boy poétré* cit.; Louise Ladouceur, *Surtitles take the stage* cit.; Lorna Hardwick, *Translating Greek plays for the theatre today: Transmission, transgression, transformation*, in “Target” (Special issue “Translation in the theatre”), 25, 3 (2013), pp. 321-342; Helena Bufferi, *Negotiating the translation zone* cit.
and play titles. Disciplines that would possibly contribute to progress include Pragmatics and Sociolinguistics, Adaptation Studies and Disability Studies, besides Theatre and Performance Studies, Sociology and Ethnography.

As mentioned in Part I (section 4), Sophia Totzeva has addressed the former. As regards the latter, they have been tackled by Philip Robinson (Marivaux’s Le Jeu de l’amour et du hasard: what’s in a title?, in “Journal of Romance Studies” (Special issue “Translation, Adaptation, Performance”), 8, 3 (2008, winter), pp. 67-75). Alfredo Michel Modenessi has also dealt with the subject in relation to constraints imposed on the translation of classics by the language variant of the usual title of the play(s) in the target language (Of shadows and stones: Revering and translating ‘the word’ Shakespeare in Mexico, in “Shakespeare Survey”, 54 (2001), pp. 155-156).
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