not always be embodied in a tragedy. For IONESCO, comic and tragic are interchangeable and cosubstantial: "A bit of the mechanical tacked onto the living, that's comical. But if there is more and more of the mechanical, and less and less of the living, it becomes stifling, tragic, for one has the impression that the world eludes us."

Further reading: Frye 1957; Guthke 1961, 1966; Styan 1962; Kott 1965; Dürrenmatt 1966, 1970; Girard 1968; Guichemerre 1981.

TRANSLATION

Fr.: *traduction théâtrale*; Ger.: *Übersetzung*; Sp.: *traducción*.

1. Specificity of Translation for the Stage

To do justice to theory of theatre translation, especially the translation of plays for staging, it must be acknowledged that there is a *situation of enunciation** specific to theatre; that of a text proferred by an actor, at a given time and place, to an audience who thereby receive a text and a production. To reflect on the process of theatre translation, we would have to talk to both the theoretician of translation and the director or actor, make sure of their co-operation and see the art of translation as part of that much larger translation that is the staging of a dramatic text. In theatre, in fact, the phenomenon of translation for the stage goes far beyond the limited problem of translating a dramatic text from one language to another. In attempting to address certain problems of translation specific to the stage and the staging, it is essential that we take into account two obvious facts – first, in theatre, translation is determined also by the actors' bodies and the spectators' ears; second, one linguistic text is not merely translated into another – situations of enunciation and cultures which are heterogeneous and separated by space and time are made to communicate. A clear distinction should be made between translation and *adaptation**, especially as in BRECHT (*Bearbeitung*, literally "reworking"). By definition, adaptation escapes any control. "Adapting means writing another play, replacing the author. Translating means transcribing an entire play in the same order, with no additions or omissions, no cuts, development, reversal of scenes, recasting of characters, changes in lines" (DEPRATS, in CORVIN 1995, 900).

2. Interference from Situations of Enunciation

The translator and the translation text are at the intersection of two sets to which they belong to different degrees. The translated text is part of both the source text and culture and the target text and culture, since the transfer involves both the source text, in its semantic, rhythmic, acoustic and connotative aspects, and the target text, in those same aspects, as adapted to the target language and culture. In addition to this phenomenon, which is standard for any translation, in the theatrical relationship there are the situations of enunciation. They are, for the most part, virtual ones, as the translator generally works from a written text; in rare cases, he may have encountered the text to be translated in an actual staging, i.e. already "surrounded" by a situation of enunciation that has been realized.

Contrary to the situation in film dubbing, however, even in the latter case the translator is well aware that the translation will not be able to keep its original situation of enunciation but will be subject to a future situation of enunciation that is not yet known, or at least not well known. In the case of an actual staging of the translated text, the situation of enunciation can be seen perfectly well in the target language and culture. But, for the translator, before the actual staging, the problem is much thornier, for in translating he must adopt a virtual but past situation of enunciation that is not (or no longer) known, or a situation of enunciation that is current but not (yet) known. Even before looking at the question of the dramatic text and its translation, we can observe that the real situation of enunciation (that of the text translated and placed in a reception situation) is a compromise between the source and target situations of enunciation; the translator has to focus a little on the source and a lot on the target.

Theatre translation is a hermeneutic art. In order to determine what the source text says, I must bombard it with practical questions on the basis of a target language. I need to ask this: placed here where I am, in this ultimate situation of reception, and transmitted in the terms of this other language which is the target language, what do you want me to say for me and for us? This is a hermeneutic act that, in order to *interpret* the source text, consists in identifying a few basic brushstrokes, translated into another language, in pulling this foreign text toward oneself, toward the target language and culture, to make all the difference between its origins and its source. Translation is not an attempt to establish the semantic equivalence of two texts but an appropriation of a source text by a target text. To describe this process of *appropriation* we must follow it along through all the stages from source text and culture to actual reception by the audience (PAVIS 1990).

3. Series of Concretizations

To be in a position to understand the transformations of the dramatic text, which is successively written, translated, analyzed dramaturgically, uttered on stage and received by the audience, we need to reconstruct that process and the changes it undergoes throughout.

The starting text (T^0) is determined by the author's choices and formulation. It cannot be read itself except in the context of its situation of enunciation, its intertextual and ideotextual dimension; that is, its relationship with the surrounding culture.

A. The text of the written translation (T^1) depends on the virtual and past situation of enunciation of T^0 and that of its future audience, who will receive the text in T^3 and T^4. T^1 is a first concretization. The translator is in the position of a reader and dramaturg, making choices among the possible virtualities and paths of the text to be translated. The translator is a dramaturg who must first carry out a *macrotextual* translation, i.e. a dramaturgical analysis of the fiction conveyed by the text. He must reconstruct the story according to the actantial logic

deemed appropriate; he reconstructs the dramaturgy, the system of characters, the space and time in which the actants move, the ideological point of view of the author or period, the specific individual traits of each character and the suprasegmental traits of the author, who tends to homogenize the speeches, and the system of echos, repetitions, recurrences and correspondences that ensure the coherence of the source text. But the macrotextual translation, although it is only possible upon a reading of the text's textual and linguistic microstructures, in turn involves the translation of those same microstructures. In this sense, theatre translation (like all literary translation or translation of fiction) is not a simple linguistic operation; it involves too much stylistics, culture and fiction to be able to do without those macrostructures.

B. The text of the dramaturgy (T^2), then, can always be read in the translation of T^0. It may even happen that a dramaturg comes between translator and director (in T^2) to lay the groundwork for the future staging through systematic dramaturgical choices, both in reading translation T^1 (which is, as we have seen, imbued with dramaturgical analysis) and, when appropriate, in making reference to the original T^0.

C. The following stage, T^3, is the test of the text translated in T^1 and T^2 in contact with the stage – it is the concretization of the stage enunciation. This time the situation of enunciation is finally realized; it is plunged into the audience, the target culture, to sink or swim. The staging, as a comparison of the virtual situation of enunciation of T^0 and the actual situation of enunciation of T^3, proposes a *performance text*, suggesting an examination of all possible relationships between textual signs and stage signs.

D. The chain is not yet complete, though, for the spectator needs to receive T^3, the stage concretization, and appropriate it in turn. We could call this last phase receptive concretization or receptive enunciation. At this point the source text has finally succeeded in its aim – to reach a spectator in

the course of an actual staging. That spectator appropriates the text only after a series of concretizations, of intermediary translations which themselves reduce or enlarge the source text at each stage, making it a text that is always yet to be found or constructed. It is no exaggeration to say that translation is simultaneously a dramaturgical analysis (T^1–T^2), a staging (T^3) and an address to the audience (T^3), all unaware of this fact.

4. Conditions of Reception of Theatre Translation

A. THE HERMENEUTIC COMPETENCE OF THE FUTURE AUDIENCE

We have seen that the translation leads, by the end of the process, to a receptive concretization that ultimately decides on the use and meaning of the source text, T^0. That is a measure of the importance of the target conditions of the utterance translated, conditions that are very specific in the case of the theatre audience who must hear the text and, specifically, understand why the translator made the choices he did, assuming a particular "horizon of expectation" (JAUSS) in the audience. It is in the evaluation of himself and the other that the translator will form an idea of the character that is more or less appropriate to the translation. But the latter depends on many other factors, specifically on a different kind of competence.

B. THE RHYTHMIC, PSYCHOLOGICAL AND AUDITORY COMPETENCE OF THE FUTURE AUDIENCE

Equivalence, or at least the rhythmic and prosodic transposition of the source text (T^0) and the staging text (T^3), is often noted as being essential to a "proper" translation. It is true that consideration must be given to the form of the text translated, particularly its duration and rhythm, which form part of the message. But the criterion of whether a text can be acted or spoken is both valid, for establishing the mode of reception of the text, and problematic, when it degenerates into a standard of proper acting or verisimilitude. True, the actor must be physically capable of acting and speaking his lines. This implies avoiding euphony, gratuitous plays on the signifier and multitudinous detail at the expense of a quick overview of the whole. The requirement that a text be capable of being *acted* or *spoken* may, however, lead to a standard of proper speaking, to a facile simplification of the rhetoric of the actor's respiratory and articulatory performance and phrasing (cf. translations of SHAKESPEARE). The staging work carries a risk of trivialization for the sake of a text that "sounds right."

As to the corresponding notion of the text that is capable of being *heard* or *received*, it too depends on the audience and on its ability to assess the emotional impact of a text or fiction on the spectators. It is clear that contemporary staging no longer recognizes such rules as phonic correctness, clarity of speech or pleasing rhythms. Other criteria have replaced those normative bench-marks of a text that rolls off the tongue and is pleasing to the ear.

5. Staging Translations

A. IMPORTANCE OF THE SITUATION OF ENUNCIATION

The translation at T^3, which is already part of an actual staging, is "plugged into" the stage situation of enunciation through a system of deictics. Once this has occurred, the translated text can get rid of terms that are understandable only in the context of their enunciation. The dramatic text makes much use of deictics, personal pronouns and silences, or places the description of beings and things in the stage directions, expecting the staging to convey the text.

This property of the dramatic text, and thus of its translation for the stage, enables the actor to flesh out his lines with all sorts of acoustical, gestural, expressive and postural means. Then the actor's entire range of rhythmical possibilities comes into play: intonation, which can speak louder than a long speech; pace, which can lengthen or shorten his speeches, structure or destructure the text; and many gestural devices that ensure the interaction between words and body.

B. TRANSLATION AS STAGING

There are two schools of thought among translators and directors as to the status of the translation in relation to the staging. This is the same debate as between the dramatic text and the staging.

1. For translators who would like to protect their autonomy and who often feel their work is publishable as is, and not tied to a particular staging, the translation does not necessarily or fully determine the staging, but leaves it to the discretion of future directors. This is position taken by DÉPRATS (in CORVIN, 1995).

2. The opposite view treats the translation as practically a staging, since the text of the translation already contains and directs its staging. This would imply that the text, whether original or translated, contains a pre-performance*, an assumption that is difficult to defend since it suggests that the pre-performance must be borne in mind to carry out the staging and prepare the translation (DÉPRATS).

6. Theory of Language-body

The alliance of gesture and word is called the language-body. It is an arrangement, specific to a language or a culture, of the (gestural and vocal) rhythm and the text. It is a question of grasping the way the source text, then its source performance, associate a kind of gestural and rhythmic enunciation with a text; then one looks for an equivalent language-body that is appropriate to the target language. To translate the dramatic text, then, it is necessary to create a visual and gestural image of this language-body of the source language and culture, to try to appropriate it based on the language-body of the target language and culture. It has often been stressed that the acting and staging must convey gesture and body in the source language to restore its physicality. The point is always to bring about a meeting between the language-body of the source language and culture and the language-body of the target language and culture.

Further reading: *Théâtre/public*, no. 44 (1982); Pavis 1987; *Sixèmes Assises*, 1990.

TRESTLE STAGE

Fr.: *tréteau*; Ger.: *Gerüst, die Bretter*; Sp.: *tablado*. See STAGE BOARDS

TRITAGONIST

Fr: *tritagoniste*; Ger.: *Tritagonist*; Sp.: *tritagonista*. See PROTAGONIST

TURNING POINT

Fr.: *point de retournement*; Ger.: *Wendepunkt, Umschlag*; Sp.: *punto decisivo, viraje*.

Point at which the play or the action takes a new turn, often in a direction opposite to the expected. Point at which the action changes direction, when a *coup de théâtre** changes the face of things and "takes the characters from misfortune to prosperity or from prosperity to misfortune" (MARMONTEL). This notion is very similar to that of *peripeteia**.

TYPE

Fr.: *type, personnage typique*; *Typus*; Sp.: *tipo*.

Conventional *character** possessing physical, psychological or moral attributes that are known to the audience in advance and remain constant throughout the play. The attributes are established by literary tradition (the generous bandit, the prostitute with a heart of gold, the braggart and all the stock characters of the *commedia dell'arte**). This notion differs somewhat from that of the *stereotype**, which is more superficial, repetitive and dull. The type represents, if not an individual, at least a *role** characteristic of a state or failing (the miser, the traitor). Although it is not individualized, it at least has some human and historical traits.

1. A type is created whenever individual and original characteristics are sacrificed to generalization and magnification. The spectator has no difficulty identifying the type