

Igor Burkhanov (*Rzeszów*)

Some properties of drama translation as a particular type of discourse

✦ Кључне речи:
dramatic speech, discourse type, artistic translation, drama translation, performability, stylistic properties (of dramatic speech), playtext.

Овај чланак је покушај да се превођење драме одреди као тип дискурса. Током превођења потребно је обезбедити:
a) усклађеност драмских текстова са савременим књижевним или позоришним нормама; *б)* усклађеност драмског говора са савременим правилима изговора; *и)* усклађеност између стила драмског говора и норми књижевног и разговорног језика; и *г)* усклађеност драмског говора са темпом и ритмичком организацијом драмске радње.

The objective of the present paper is to discuss peculiarities of translating playtexts as a particular form of mediated bilingual communication. Thus, our major concern in this publication is to outline certain characteristics of this type of discourse. Exemplification is occasionally provided solely to illustrate general considerations; this article is by no means intended to evaluate a particular translation or translations.

The main purpose of this paper can be achieved by attaining smaller goals: a) to specify the notion of artistic translation; b) to outline major properties of playtexts as

artistic artefacts; c) to discuss communicative, stylistic, pragmatic and aesthetic properties of dramatic speech as a particular form of communicative interaction; and d) to discuss, at least in a preliminary fashion, certain requirements for an adequate translation of a playtext.

These goals organize and structure this paper. Section 1 is concerned with the specification of the notion “artistic translation”. Section 2 examines properties of playtext as an aesthetic product. Section 3 is dedicated to the description of main characteristics of dramatic speech, whereas Section 4

 2004

attempts to outline peculiarities of translating dramatic works and discusses the issue of target playtext evaluation.

1. Artistic translation as a communicative act

402

The term “artistic translation” is not very common in publications on translation theory written in English. A question immediately arises in this connection: Why not implement the commonly favoured terminological solution “literary translation”? First and foremost, the predominantly used terminological units “literary translation” or “translation of literature” account only for the process and/or the result of mediated bilingual communication when the source text and the target text are pieces of literary writing, fiction in the first place. Nevertheless, there are specific instances of discourse in which the source text and/or the target text are produced in the spoken mode. Certain phenomena of mediated bilingual communication, thus, turn out to be beyond the scope of translation in the written mode, for instance, the translating of feature films. It is intuitively clear that the latter is closer to translation of literature than to other forms of translation in the oral mode, for instance, specialized (technical, academic, political, etc.) translation at conferences, i.e. conference interpreting, nevertheless it does not fit the scope of the notion “literary translation”.

The concept of artistic translation (*художественный перевод*) was introduced in the former USSR. Leighton (1991: 49–50) presented a brief account of that translation school and specified its basic categories. In particular, she noted the emphasis that was placed on the quality standards in the practice of translating literature. Leighton also praised the achievements of Soviet transla-

tion theorists who developed “well-devised, consistent, and uniform principles” of artistic translation and claimed that “they were far ahead of the world in this area” (Leighton 1991: 49). The latter statement seems to be questionable, since research areas differ from sportive events, and it is difficult to say whether one translation school is “far ahead”, and if so, two questions immediately arise: “How far?” and, given the heterogeneous character of contemporary translation theory, “In which direction?”

In my estimation, the matter of primary importance for the present discussion is that the aforementioned principles of artistic translation were consistently implemented. In fact, it could not be otherwise in the given social, cultural and political situation which comprised: a) editorial policy that was influenced, or rather determined, by current political beliefs, censorship, governmental control of “political correctness”, etc.; and b) the culturally-embedded, long-standing tradition of high esteem of literary translation shared by both professional writers and the reading public.

It should be emphasized that the last factor were operational not only in Russia, but also in some other Slavic countries. As Zlateva (1993) has pointed out, the same attitude to literary translation is characteristic for Bulgaria. Simultaneously, the analysis of both translation criticism and theoretical works published on the subject in Poland amply demonstrates that high esteem of literary translation governs translation practice in this country, for instance translating poetry. It is only natural in view of the fact that at various stages in the development of Polish literature a considerable part of literary writings of many leading Polish poets (A. Mickiewicz, J. Słowacki, L. Staff, Cz. Miłosz and many others) was dedicated to translating poetic works from other languages.

It should be mentioned that principles of artistic translation were used as guidelines for translation practice and translation criticism as well as formed theoretical foundations for modelling the process of literary translation. In a way, they were bridging the gap between translation theory on the one hand, and actual literary translation and translation criticism as elements of the receptor culture on the other.

Leighton (1991: 50) emphasized that those principles constituted an approach that “places artistic quality above other values”, “excluded from the translation spectrum libertarian interpretation at one extreme of the gradation, and literalism at the other”, i.e. the target text should be neither precise, exact, literal, nor a kind of reinterpretation. In addition, she mentions other requirements imposed on the target literary text. The latter should be a) adequate; b) full-valued (*полноценный*); c) faithful to both the form and the meaning of the source text (*верный*); and d) expressive of distinctive national character of the source text, i.e. capable of communicating cultural traditions and values of the source culture represented in the literary text (*своеобразие*) to the target-language readers.

The foregoing discussion shows that ‘artistic translation’ in this interpretation is not only a *descriptive concept*, but also, at least to some extent, a *prescriptive one* (cf.: the requirements of “adequacy”, “full-valuedness”, “faithfulness”, etc.). In fact, the very term implies positive evaluation of the target text in terms of its adequacy to the specific norms operational in the receptor culture at a given period of its development. In the following, the notion of artistic translation seems indispensable, though it will be implemented as a primarily descriptive category intended to denote a certain class of discourse types. Nevertheless, it is assumed that the target

playtext should answer the requirements of the receptor culture contemporary to the act of translating.

Thus, in the present paper the term “artistic translation” is used for a twofold reason. Firstly, as has been pointed out, certain forms of aesthetically-oriented mediated bilingual communication presuppose the implementation of the oral mode of communication and are beyond the scope of literature; hence the terminological unit “literary translation” is not quite adequate as an umbrella term. Secondly, the very use of the category “artistic translation” signifies that the discussion is centred on aesthetically adequate works of art. As will be shown below, the term “literary translation” does not imply that and can be interpreted in at least two ways.

It should be noted in this connection that the term “literary translation” is not monosemous. Toury (1993) rightly pointed out that this terminological unit is afflicted by a systemic ambiguity, since it can refer to two closely related, but not identical notions: a) the translation of texts which are regarded as “literary” *in the source culture*; and b) the translation of a text in a way that the final product be acceptable as “literary” *to the target culture* (Toury 1993: 12–13). In other words, the distinction between *the translation of texts of a certain kind* and *a certain kind of translation* should be introduced.

The discussion above brings us to the question of primary significance for literary translation understood as a form of artistic translation, namely: what are the properties of a literary text that differentiate it from a non-literary text, or a kind of discourse that is referred to as verbal art from other types of verbal interaction? Jakobson (1987) in an article originally published in 1960 argued that a characteristic feature of literary text is that the latter “focuses on the message”. The term “message” here denotes the organisation

of the text, its internal structure, i.e. its formal aspect, which outgrows in importance its content.

Bauman (1984) incorporates Jacobson's considerations concerning peculiarities of literary texts into the functional approach to language and views the literary text within the framework of performance when it is presented to the *Recipient*, i.e. an audience. From this viewpoint, the *Transmitter (Author)* has to demonstrate that the performance presented to the *Recipient (Audience)* corresponds to a particular system of rules in accordance with which this performance has to be evaluated. Those rules should be made clear, which is achieved when the literary text, as Jacobson maintains, communicates its own message.

As Fabb (2000: 448) rightly pointed out, though Bauman mostly focuses on oral performance, those considerations are also applicable to the literary text, since the latter can also be viewed as performance communicating a description of its own form. It should be emphasized that the considerations above are accordant with the centuries-long interpretation of a literary text as an aesthetic product. Moreover, the approach at issue is particularly suitable for our present purposes, since the play is a literary text whose major part is specifically designed for oral performance.

Thus, the distinctive feature of any literary text is that it presupposes a kind of aesthetically-oriented discourse in which its formal aspect (in the widest sense, inclusive of phonological and graphemic forms, the choice of syntactic structures, morphemes, and lexical items, their arrangement within the text, etc.) is actually communicated by the *Author* to the *Recipient*.

At this stage we can formulate a working definition of literary translation that will suit our purpose in this article. *Literary transla-*

tion is a kind of aesthetically-oriented mediated bilingual communication, i.e. artistic translation, which aims at producing a written target text intended to communicate its own form, correspondent to the source text, and accordant with contemporary literary and translational norms of the receptor culture.

As will be shown below, correspondence to multifarious contemporary norms of the receptor culture – including theatrical norms – is a matter of primary significance in the process of translating playtexts.

2. Plays as a text type

Translation of dramatic works can be properly understood only on condition of adequate interpretation of plays as artistic artefacts. A play (hence, its translation) is an aesthetic product of a dual nature. On the one hand, a dramatic text is a piece of literary fiction, and as such, can be said to be an element of the system of literature. In practical terms, it means that a playtext can be, and actually is, read as any other literary work and should be evaluated as such.

On the other hand, a dramatic piece of writing is a kind of "raw material" for its staging at the theatre. This implies that a playtext, in addition to being a literary fact, is a kind of script that is meant to be performed on stage. Moreover, it should, at least ideally, be specifically designed to be as suitable as possible for its further theatrical interpretation. Thus, a playwright as a primary communicant (*Author*) should make a special effort to ensure performability of the resulting text in the process of writing a play. From this viewpoint a playtext may be said to be a reverse projection of a conscious or subconscious mental performance going on in the *Author's* mind.

The orientation of dramatic pieces of literature for staging determines a number of spe-

cific features of drama differing it as a literary genre from other kinds of literary works. The plot, or the dramatic action, forms the plane of content of the playtext; whereas its form of expression comprises stage directions, list of *dramatis personae*, i.e. characters of the play, and, primarily, verbal interaction between those characters. A play is, then, a work of literature in which the characteristics of *dramatis personae* are to a greater extent overtly or covertly represented by their participation in the events that form the plot of the playtext, and, particularly, in the communicative interaction of its characters.

Since the text of a play is primarily made up of dramatic dialogues and monologues (soliloquies) accompanied with stage directions and provided with the list of *dramatis personae*, it becomes obvious in view of the considerations above that communicative events, their sequence and inner structure are matters of primary importance in our evaluation of both the original play and its transposition into another language and culture.

The aforementioned distinctive features of playtexts imply specific properties of dramatic speech as a particular functional style. Those matters will be discussed in the next section.

3. Dramatic speech

It is worthy of noting that linguistic properties of dramatic speech events have not been fully described yet. In fact, the attempts to specify those properties are few and far between (e.g., see Veltruský 1976; Larthomas 1972; Budagov 1974; Efendieva & Burkhanov 1989).

Before we proceed, a terminological issue of primary significance should be resolved. Larthomas (1972) designated, dialogues and monologues of characters in playtexts as *le*

langage dramatique, literally ‘dramatic language-behaviour’, whereas Budagov (1974) used the term *сценическая речь*, literally ‘stage speech’, for this purpose.

The terminological solution suggested by Larthomas seems to be more attractive, since it is placed within the widely accepted in French linguistics Saussurian concept of *langage* which encompasses *langue* ‘language-system’ and *parole* ‘speech’. Thus the term *langage dramatique* emphasizes that what is meant here is not the actual dialogues and soliloquies in a given playtext or playtexts, but all of them considered in aggregate as well as their characteristic features as a variety of language. For lack of a better equivalent, we shall further use the term “speech” to account for *langage*.

From this viewpoint, Budagov’s term “stage speech” may appear adequate. Nevertheless, it contains a very important methodological error, namely: equation of drama and theatre. As Veltruský (1977) reminded those of us who may have forgotten about it, theatre is not another literary genre but another art. Theatre uses language as one of (perhaps the major) means of expression – “materials” in his terminology, whereas for all the literary genres, including drama, language (or rather appropriate choice of language) is the only means of artistic expression.

From this it follows that it is necessary to distinguish: a) “dramatic speech” as a particular functional style manifested in those parts of playtexts which represent language behaviour of *dramatis personae* and b) “stage speech” as utterances produced by actors during their performance.

Since it is dramatic speech that is apt to cause major difficulties in the process of translating, the observations made in the available publications concerning dramatic speech will be summarized below. First and

foremost, dramatic speech, as much as direct speech in literary texts of other genres, particularly those written in prose, is aesthetically-oriented, and in this respect differs from everyday communication in the spoken mode.

Moreover, dramatic speech has its own peculiarities even when it is addressed to another character, since it is ultimately directed to the other recipient – the audience in the theatre. Thus, dramatic speech is simultaneously directed not only to the communicant(s) in the play, but also and more importantly, to the primary communicants: the *Audience* in the process of staging and the *Reader* in the case of reading the playtext.

Functionally, dramatic speech displays, at least in contemporary playtexts, a compromise between the characteristics of conversational interaction in the spoken mode and the peculiarities of the written mode of communication. Dramatic speech, being an element of the microcosm created in the play, imitates conversational interaction in real life. Simultaneously, dramatic speech forms a major constructive element of playtexts, and as such, represents the content of playtext and expresses its message. The latter aspect of dramatic speech unavoidably influences its peculiarities; basically it is more “literary” than ordinary interaction between interlocutors in everyday life. In the following we shall specifically deal with the properties of the two major forms of dramatic speech (dialogues and monologues) that are particularly important for translation theory and practice.

Dramatic dialogues are characterized by the following specific features. Firstly, there are certain temporal limitations on the former, whereas in real-life situations a conversation may be, in principle, never-ending. Secondly, a usual everyday conversa-

tion is spontaneous, whereas a dialogue in a play is artificial; the playwright composes it. Thirdly, an instance of dramatic speech is incorporated into the playtext along with other dialogues and soliloquies; in fact, they are all adapted to form a unified whole. Fourthly, the structure of a dramatic dialogue is determined by the rhythm and tempo of the prospective performance. In the process of writing the *Author* (playwright) is doomed to take into account the tempo-rhythmic organisation of the latter.

It should be mentioned that the last two points are particularly important for the process of translating the source playtext, since the target playtext should by all means answer those two requirements superimposed by the very nature of drama as a kind of literature.

The other form of dramatic speech is a monologue or soliloquy. Though sparingly used in contemporary drama, it still remains a very powerful means of expression, and every playwright realizes its scope of application and implements it when needed. First and foremost, the use of monologue as a form of spoken discourse in everyday life is restricted to a small number of situational contexts: a lecture at university, a formal social gathering, such as a political meeting or a statement to mass media, a state of extreme agitation or mental disorder; etc.

Though all those types of discourse can be represented in a play, dramatic soliloquy has been used for quite a different purpose. In the history of European theatre soliloquy has become an established dramatic practice based on a corresponding theatrical convention. A character, often alone on the stage, expresses his thoughts and feelings aloud; often they are addressed directly to the *Spectator*. In accordance with this convention, the playwright incorporates an appropriate stretch of dramatic speech into the playtext.

It is noteworthy that Wales (1989) draws a parallel between a soliloquy and an aside, the latter being “a dramatic and theatrical convention in which an actor turns to address the audience directly”, cf.:

“WILLIAM: Jack Cade, the Duke of York hath taught you this.

CADE: [*aside*] He lies, for I invented it myself –” (Shakespeare, *The Second Part of King Henry the Sixth*, IV, ii).

Nevertheless, it is important to attract attention to the differences between those types of dramatic text. If an aside represents an immediate emotional reaction and usually is a short remark which happens to be a comment on the developing action including dramatic speech of other characters, often of a sarcastic nature; a soliloquy is and functions as an elaborate representation of not only the character’s emotions or states of mind, but also a detailed specification of his or her intentions or plans. Moreover, the soliloquy may be addressed not only to the *Spectator*, but also to other characters, which is usually not the case with the aside that is primarily directed to the *Spectator*.

It is obvious enough that the aforementioned constructive, pragmatic and stylistic properties of dramatic speech should be taken into account in the process of translating a dramatic text. In the next section we shall specifically deal with the major requirements for the target playtexts.

4. Drama translations and the issues of their evaluation

It follows from the considerations above that in the case of drama translation the target text should be tailored for its theatrical performance. From this viewpoint, a translated play is also a script that has to be eventually performed; hence it should be necessarily adapted for staging in the receptor culture.

Moreover, there are also literary norms of the receptor culture, and probably even more importantly, contemporary theatrical conventions and norms, including the characteristic for the target language linguistic parameters of communicative interaction in the spoken and written mode. It is evident enough that culturally and historically motivated alterations of literary and theatrical norms and conventions trigger discrepancies between the source playtexts and the corresponding target texts.

It has been repeatedly mentioned that new translations of classical plays are commissioned for theatrical performance at the interval of about 10 years (e.g. see Carlson 1989). Jänis (1993) in her research dealing with Finnish translations of Chekov’s *The Three Sisters* noted a similar tendency in Finnish culture. Heylen (1993) wrote a monographic study of six French translations of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*. As the result of the detailed analysis of those target playtexts she came to the following conclusion. In addition to the impact of the receptor culture on the “acculturation” of the source playtext in the form of “naturalising” it, the reverse process can be observed: the influence of translations on the development of French theatre (Heylen 1993: 139).

It should be noted that the observations above concerning a larger number of translations of dramatic texts, as compared with pieces of poetry and prose, are not of a universal character even in the European culture. For instance, it does not seem to be the case in Poland, at least in the 20th century. Translations of plays, particularly those of classical plays, are regarded, whether consciously or subconsciously, as elements of the receptor culture. Due to the previously mentioned attitude to artistic translation, first translations often become if not canonical, then at least widely accepted as facts of literary

culture that, in principle, are supposed to be left intact.

Art directors may use new theatrical techniques, ignore stage directions, eliminate certain elements of dramatic speech in the play, etc., but re-writing the playtext is out of the question, neither on their own nor with the help of a new *Translator*. These considerations may be justified by a rather cautious attitude (sometimes mixed with a tinge of antagonism) every new translation of a classical play has to weather. Simultaneously, if an original play may be written for a particular theatre, a translated play usually has to be published first, and only then considered for staging.

Thus, the assumption that regularly repeated acts of translating playtexts are inevitable due to the alterations of theatrical norms does not seem to be of a universal value. In fact, those facts are historically and culturally determined. In certain cultural environments new translations of playtexts do not appear so often. A comparative study of several translated texts in this respect as well as factors motivating those instances of mediated bilingual communication within different literary and theatrical traditions seems to be a very promising direction of translational research.

It is noteworthy that various parts of the playtext vary with respect to their translatability. For instance, let us consider stage directions which are playwright's descriptions or commentaries explicating the setting or *dramatis personae's* emotional states and peculiarities of behaviour. There also are stage directions indicating "stage business", i.e. physical actions or movements performed by a character, intended to establish appropriate atmosphere, reveal his or her state of mind or explain a situation. In most cases stage directions as a part of playtext do not cause special problems in the proc-

ess of translating. It is the instances of dramatic speech forming the verbal exchanges between the characters that need the translator's ultimate attention and effort.

Now we shall turn to the discussion of evaluation of drama translations. The concept of "performability" or "speakability" appears to be a descriptive notion of vital importance in the evaluation of translated playtexts, particularly the instances of dramatic speech that can be found in them. It is interesting to note that S. Bassnett criticized this category in a very interesting article specifically dedicated to the issues of translating drama. She writes:

"It seems to me that the term has no credibility, because it is resistant to any form of definition. It is often used by the reviewers to evaluate translations, when it is claimed that a translation by x is somehow more 'performable' than the translation produced by y. ... There will always be many factors involved which can range from simple incompetence on the part of a translator to changes in the expectations of the target readership and divergence in the theatre or social systems." (Bassnett 1998: 95).

Bassnett is perfectly right that performability is a vague category, since it allows for, or rather has been subject to, a wide scope of interpretations. Nevertheless, there is the need to designate our pre-theoretical intuitions that one playtext, whether original or translated, is better suited for staging than the other, and to pinpoint all those factors, including specification of what translator's incompetence manifests itself in. Probably a better solution could be to specify this category in order to give it the required terminological precision; then it would find its proper place in the system of translational concepts. In the following, a tentative attempt to distinguish at least several aspects of performability is made.

An important aspect of performability is the property of dramatic speech that can be referred to as “speakability”. The appropriate balance between the spoken and the written mode of communication should allow the actor or the actress to utter his or her part on stage. From the viewpoint advocated here, speakability may be regarded as a particular quality of communicative interaction between *Dramatis Personae* and the *Spectator*, which, potentially, exists in the target playtext. Thus, the *Translator* of a play should constantly keep in mind that his target text is intended to be actually presented on stage. The sentences comprising the conversational exchanges between characters (and their soliloquies and asides, if there are any in a particular play) should be easily pronounceable, and no less importantly, easily understood by the *Audience*, when the play is being staged.

For instance, the comparison of two Polish translations of O. Wilde’s play *A Woman of No Importance* – the first one produced by B. Beaupré (1908) and the second one made by J. Pudełek (1956) – demonstrates the following. The obsolete spelling of a number of words in the first translation, for instance: *rezydencyi*, *sympatyi*, *antypatyi*, etc., in the second translation was either substituted by their contemporary orthographic forms corresponding to modern spoken mode of communication or eliminated by means of interlingual paraphrases in order to compile with the contemporary norms of pronunciation.

A very important aspect of performability is motivated by the aforementioned principle of obligatory correspondence between the style of dramatic speech and the contemporary norms of literary language on the one hand and contemporary norms of conversational interaction on the other. One may say that an aspect of multifarious concept of performability of the translated playtext

is the requirement of stylistic correspondence of dramatic speech to contemporary conversational norms of the receptor culture. Very often this requirement outweighs the translator’s genuine desire to account for the peculiarities of the source text.

For instance, the original sentence from the play under consideration *They get their clothes in Paris* (act 1, scene 4) was rendered quite differently in the Polish translations, cf.: *Tualety ma prosto z Paryża* (Beaupré 1908) and *Ubiera sie bez zarzutu i, jak wszystkie Amerykanki, w Parużu* (Pudełek 1956). The word *tualety* that stands for *clothes* in the first one denotes public toilets in contemporary usage. Though the *Audience* is supposed to know that this lexical item can also designate garments, the latter sense is rather obsolete. Hence, the word can produce an unwanted effect in the course of theatrical performance. For this very reason the second *Translator* used interlingual paraphrase *ubiera sie bez zarzutu* (literally, ‘dresses impeccably’).

Another aspect of performability is the correspondence of verbal interactions between characters to the tempo-rhythmic organisation of the dramatic action, eventually the future performance. For instance, syntactic properties of utterances, such as sentence length, i.e. the use of elliptic constructions or longer linguistic expressions, can have a very significant impact on the development of dramatic action. From this standpoint even purely phonological parameters, like sentence stress and intonation patterns of the target language, should also be taken into account both in the course of translating a playtext and in the evaluation of the final product. To give but one example, as an equivalent of the original sentence *She is very pretty, is she not?* (act 1, scene 4) the first *Translator* provided the linguistic expression *Urocza bo jest nieprawdaż?*, whereas the second *Translator* made another choice,

cf.: *Prawda, że ona jest ładna?* The second solution seems to be more appropriate nowadays for stylistic reasons, since the syntactic construction used in the first translation is syntactically obsolete. Moreover, the second solution, due to its intonational pattern, fits into the tempo-rhythmic organization of the conversational exchange between the characters.

410 Conclusions

Translation of dramatic works is a particular kind of discourse characterized by specific properties. Those properties are determined by the very nature of playtexts that are literary works on one hand and raw material for further theatrical presentation on the other. The orientation of dramatic pieces of literature for staging determines a number of specific features of drama differing it as a literary genre from other kinds of literary works. Simultaneously, those properties

determine the requirements for translations of playtexts.

The present article has shown that evaluation of translated playtexts should be primarily based on the notion of performability, which has not yet been specified in specialist publications. It has been demonstrated that, among other things, performability of the translated playtext implies the following: a) correspondence to contemporary literary and/or theatrical norms and conventions; b) correspondence of conversational exchanges between characters (as well as their soliloquies and asides, if there are any) to contemporary pronouncing norms; c) correspondence between the style of dramatic speech and the contemporary norms of literary language on the one hand and contemporary norms of conversational interaction in the receptor culture on the other; and d) correspondence of verbal interactions between characters to the tempo-rhythmic organization of the dramatic action.

резюме



Перевод драматургических текстов как особый тип дискурса

Целью данной статьи является определение основных характеристик перевода драматургических произведений как особой разновидности опосредованной двуязычной коммуникации. Драматургический текст, с одной стороны, представляет собой законченное литературное произведение – артефакт, обладающий определенными эстетическими свойствами, с другой стороны, своеобразный суррогат, предназначенный для последующей актуализации на сцене. Данные свойства пьесы определяют основные параметры перевода драматургических текстов как особой разновидности дискурса. Различные элементы текста пьесы в разной степени поддаются переводу. Например, ремарки переводятся легче по сравнению с драматургической речью. В стилистическом плане драматургическая речь персонажей представляет собой своеобразный компромисс между нормами письменной речи и речи устной. Кроме того, драматургическая речь обращена не только от одного персонажа к другому, но и к основному реципиенту высказывания – зрителю. Указанные свойства драматургической речи во многом определяют стратегию перевода текста пьесы. Оценка адекватности перевода драматургических произведений должна опираться в первую очередь на понятие «легкость инсценизации» (*performability*), которое, в частности

включает: а) соответствие перевода современным литературным и/или театральным нормам; б) соответствие диалогов (а также монологов и реплик) персонажей современным произносительным нормам; в) соответствие стиля драматургической речи современным нормам литературного языка и нормам разговорного языка в культуре доцеловой; г) соответствие речевого поведения персонажей темпо-ритмической организации драматургического действия.

Translated Playtexts

Beaupré 1908: **Wilde, O.** *Kobieta bez znaczenia* (transl. by **Beaupré, B.**) Warszawa: E. Wende i Spółka.
 Pudełek 1956: **Wilde, O.** *Kobieta bez znaczenia* (transl. by **Pudełek, J.**) Warszawa.

411

Bibliography

- Bassnett 1998: **Bassnett, S.** Still Trapped in the Labyrinth. – Further Reflections on Translation and Theatre. – In: **Bassnett, S., Lefevere, A.** *Constructing Cultures. – Essays on Literary Translation.* – Clevedon, Philadelphia, etc.: Multilingual Matters, 1998. – pp. 90–108.
- Bauman 1984: **Bauman, R.** *Verbal Art as Performance.* – Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
- Budagov 1979: **Будагов, Р. А.** О сценической речи. – In: ндвш, фн, Nr. 6. – pp. 6–29.
- Carlson, M. 1989: **Carlson, M.** Local Semiosis and Theatrical Interpretation. – In: *Semiotica* 73–3. – pp. 249–261.
- Efendieva & Burkhanov 1989: **Эфендиева, А. Д., Бурханов, И. Ю.** О семиотическом аспекте драмы. – In: *Вопросы теории и истории литературы (Тематический сборник научных трудов).* – Баку. – pp. 52–63.
- Fabb 2001: **Fabb, N.** Linguistics and Literature. – In: *The Handbook of Linguistics.* – Oxford: Blackwell. – pp. 446–465.
- Heylen 1993: **Heylen, R.** Translation, Poetics, and the Stage. – *Six French Hamlets.* – London & New York: Routledge.
- Jakobson 1987: **Jakobson, R.** Linguistics and Poetics. – In: *Roman Jakobson: Language in Literature.* – Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press. – pp. 62–94.
- Jänis 1993: **Jänis, M.** The Validity of Drama Translations. – In: *Recent Trends in Empirical Translation Research.* – University of Joensuu: Joensuu. – pp. 39–50.
- Larthomas 1972: **Larthomas, P.** *Le langage dramatique. – Sa nature, ses procedes.* – Paris: Larousse.
- Leighton 1991: **Leighton, L.G.** The Soviet Concept of Time and Space. – In: *Translation: Theory and Practice. – Tension and Interdependence.* – American Translators Association Scholarly Monograph Series. Volume 5. – SUNY. – pp. 49–62.
- Toury 1993: **Toury, G.** “Translation of Literary Texts” vs. “Literary Translation”. – A Distinction Reconsidered. – In: *Recent Trends in Empirical Translation Research.* – University of Joensuu: Joensuu. – pp. 10–24.
- Veltruský 1976: **Veltruský, J.** Basic Features of Dramatic Dialogue. – In: *Semiotics of Art: Prague School Contributions.* – Cambridge (Mass.) & London: MIT Press. – pp. 128–133.
- Veltruský 1977: **Veltruský, J.** *Drama as Literature.* – Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.
- Zlateva 1993: **Zlateva, P.** Introduction. – In: *Translation as Social Action. – Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives.* – London & New York: Routledge. – pp. 1–4.