

Schiller's *Don Carlos* in a Version by Mike Poulton, Directed by Michael Grandage:

The Multiple Names and Voices of Translation

Geraldine Brodie

Theatre provides an overt display of the protagonists and processes of translation but has its share of hidden participants. This case study reviews the multiplicity of voices active in translation, the extent of their contributions, and their visibility to the reader of the published text, or audience of the performance.

Keywords : theatre translation, adaptation, version, literal translation, indirect translation

Au théâtre, les processus de traduction ainsi que leurs protagonistes se manifestent ouvertement, mais il ne faut pas pour autant oublier l'existence de participant(e)s caché(e)s. Cette étude de cas examine la multiplicité de voix impliquées dans la traduction, l'ampleur de leur contribution ainsi que leur visibilité, soit pour les lecteurs du texte publié soit pour les spectateurs de la représentation.

Mots clés : traduction théâtrale, adaptation, version, traduction littérale, traduction indirecte.

Introduction

A modern adapter must redesign the architecture of an eighteenth-century play, and make provision for updating its tone, its style, and the method of delivery of its lines, before approaching his work on the words themselves. [...] I owe a great deal to the excellent cast and director of the first production of *Don Carlos*.¹

In his brief introduction to his new version of Friedrich Schiller's *Don Carlos*, Mike Poulton sets out his approach to the translational task of shifting a playtext into English for production on stage. Revealing the performance considerations and collaborative inputs which are prominent features of theatre translation, he acknowledges the variety of voices which combine to form the presented translation. The cover of the published text echoes this theme of collaboration, displaying a photograph of the distinguished British actor, Derek Jacobi, in his role as King Philip II of Spain, emphasising the actor's contribution to the visual aspects of performance. Furthermore, the names Friedrich Schiller and Mike Poulton feature both on the front cover, where Schiller takes precedence above the title and in a larger font, and on

the spine of the book, where the rubric “Schiller/Poulton” conveys equal representation. Purchasers of this volume are left in no doubt that what they are about to read is a joint creation, and, if they study Poulton’s note, they may also reflect on the contributions of the cast and director to the translated text within. The book’s cover follows the publicity for the performed text in naming playwright and adapter prominently, exemplifying the different treatment of performed dramatic translations from the overwhelming majority of published translations. But while theatre performance may engender a more overt display of the protagonists and processes of translation than other published work, it has its own share of hidden participants. The variety of the terminology available for the transference process - *translation*, *version* and *adaptation* feature prominently – provides evidence of the differing creative tensions in (re)writing for the stage. There is also the collaborative procedure inherent in theatre performance which influences translation outcomes: the identity and roles of the participants from project inception to press night, and beyond. The published text, like a financial balance sheet, serves as a snapshot of the translation’s progression. And, as with any set of accounts, it is necessary to look behind the face value of the text to form an understanding of the activity it represents.

This article reviews the participants in the 2004-5 production of *Don Carlos*, first written in German by Schiller in 1787 and translated into English by Georg Heinrich Noehden and John Stoddart in 1798, then subsequently retranslated into English on at least a dozen occasions. For the purposes of this 2004 production, the play was indirectly translated into English by the writer Mike Poulton, using a literal translation expressly commissioned from an uncredited German-speaking theatre practitioner, and directed by Michael Grandage. Taking this production as a case study, I provide an initial discussion of the terminology and practices of theatre translation, before examining the multiplicity of voices in this translation, the levels at which they intervened in the translation, and the extent of their visibility for the

reader of the published text, or the audience of the performance. What traces are left by the collaborators in the presented translation and how are they received? In addressing this question, I follow Bettina Göbels, who queries scholarly criticism which, when comparing theatre translation with its source, “overlooks the reality of the theatrical world.”² However, I differ from Göbels in her desire for “more faithful versions,”³ and contend, with examples, that each new translation contributes to the afterlife of the original, reinforced by its multiply-voiced interpretation.

Translation/Version/Adaptation

The terms *version* and *adaptation* feature prominently within the translation vocabulary of English-speaking dramatic performance. When a play is staged in translation, it is a frequent practice in London theatre to commission a familiar name to be attached to the translation. This name will usually be that of a playwright or director who has a track-record in commercially and critically successful productions. However, this person may not command the source language of the original play. In such circumstances, the translator will have recourse to a translation prepared by an expert in the source language. This might be an extant translation either from an earlier production or prepared for academic literary purposes but, if the production budget is sufficiently accommodating, a new literal translation will be commissioned by the theatre’s literary department from a *literal translator* who provides substantial notes on linguistic, cultural and theatrical features in the text, thus to some extent, as Manuela Perteghella asserts, performing the function of dramaturg.⁴ The status and visibility of these apparently complementary occupations may be starkly contrasted: on the one hand, a widely-recognised theatrical name is frequently prominently credited alongside the original playwright; on the other hand, it is not unusual to find the literal translator mentioned in the smallest print of the theatre programme, if at all. Helen Rappaport, the author of twelve literal translations for theatre from Russian, admits to feeling “cynical and

discouraged about the position of the much-underrated literal translator.”⁵ Nevertheless, the preference for commissioning a fresh literal translation to support a new English-language version of an established classic play demonstrates the integral place of the literal translation in the theatre translation process.

Although *literal* is a label regularly applied by theatres in the two-stage process I describe, theatrical vocabulary does not precisely or consistently distinguish between writers who command a play’s source language and those who do not, as I discuss in the next paragraph. I therefore employ the term *direct* translation to describe translations created without an intermediary linguist and the term *indirect* translation to denote those which have been prepared using a literal translation. This production of *Don Carlos* was created using an indirect translation. This is the practice most commonly found in *mainstream* theatre, that body of theatres situated around the West End of London which stages a broad range of productions from different periods and genres, aiming to attract a wide audience made up of both regular and occasional theatre-goers. Although this is frequently assumed to be the preserve of commercially-owned theatre, it includes a number of high-profile theatres, among which the Royal National Theatre is prominent, subsidised by a combination of public funding and private donations. These organisations produce work which competes in the mainstream sphere, and may go on to appear in commercially-owned venues, if successful critically and at the box office. *Don Carlos* is an example of such a production, originating from the publicly-funded Sheffield Theatres in the north of England (commissioned by an artistic director who maintained a London presence, as I shall explain) before moving to the privately-owned Gielgud Theatre, London in 2005. Although the indirect method is the preferred option for most retranslated plays intended for mainstream theatre, there is little awareness of this procedure outside the academic and practising theatre translation

community. This is partly due to the credit imbalance of the indirect and literal translators, and partly generated by the lack of precision in terminology.

The terms *version* and *adaptation* to describe an English-language translation of an original text from another language may provide a clue as to the existence of a two-step transference process. There is, however, no consensus on the definition or application of these terms.

Academically, there is a body of research around adaptation theory, although this tends to encompass a broader area of intersemiotic movement, for example, from book to cinema or television, without necessarily involving an interlingual codeshift. Perteghella has given consideration to the definition of adaptation in its relation to theatre translation, concluding that a comprehensive definition is an “impossibility,” but offering nonetheless her own solution whereby adaptation “critically supplements the source with subjective and cultural interpretations.”⁶ This approach, however, does not solve the difficulty that arises in any attempt to draw a line between translation and adaptation, and when the *version* is thrown into the mix, complications multiply. Lorna Hardwick encapsulates the problem and blurred resolution:

It is not always helpful to try to distinguish too rigidly between theoretical models for analysing ‘translations’ and ‘versions’. The processes of arriving at an acting script and then realising this in performance show how porous the boundaries are.⁷

It appears, therefore, that the translation/version/adaptation terminology has thus far defied exact definition, and this extends beyond academia to the theatre. In a series of interviews with theatre practitioners connected with translated productions, I found some agreement that a version might be closer to the original than an adaptation, but with little precision or consensus applied. At times, opposing definitions were advanced. Chris Campbell, the Literary Manager of the Royal Court Theatre, London, demonstrated the subjective nature of this terminological usage when he told me, “although it might be difficult to write a description of the difference [between translation and adaptation], I think you know it when you see it.”⁸ The *Don Carlos* theatre programmes and the published play use all three terms

to describe the English text. The producer of the London performances, Matthew Byam Shaw, remembered the discussions as to whether the production should be labelled a translation, version or adaptation being “delicate.”⁹ It would seem then that the use of translation/version/adaptation terminology serves as a reminder that translation is a site of negotiation rather than providing an indication of the detailed processes involved in creation.

Voices of Translation

As I stated in the introduction, although Poulton is the named translator of this *Don Carlos* and, indeed, according to the copyright “assert[s] his right to be identified as the translator of this work,”¹⁰ he acknowledges the contribution of other practitioners, specifically the cast and director. He also provides an insight into his working model:

Where I am competent in the language I am to work in, I make my own literal translation before beginning the serious, and lengthy, business of adaptation. In languages where I am not competent - most of them - I commission a literal translation.¹¹

Intriguingly, he does not include in his description which of these circumstances applies to the German of *Don Carlos*, and there is no other indication anywhere in the programme or published text of whether a literal translation might exist. This is not untypical, and in interview, Poulton explained that he commissioned a translation from the translator with whom he prefers to work on German-language plays, although in his experience, programme credits were not generally requested by literal translators.¹² I was unable to contact Poulton’s literal translator, but my own discussions with practising literal translators on other productions suggest that they prefer to receive public recognition of their contribution, and I perceive a growing trend towards acknowledging literal translators in programmes, forewords and on websites. The fact, however, that Poulton commissions a new literal translation, and his preference for working with a trusted collaborator, demonstrate the importance he places on the literal translation. His working methods include detailed discussions with the literal translator, and he is well aware of their contribution to the performed translation.

Nevertheless, Poulton's emphasis on the "serious, and lengthy, business of adaptation" implies his privileging of adaptation over literal translation, along with a clear distinction between the two processes. It is informative to scrutinise the terminology applied to another of Poulton's translations, the Chichester Festival Theatre's production of Eduardo de Filippo's *The Syndicate* in 2011, which is described as "a new version."¹³ As is the case for *Don Carlos*, the programme provides no indication of the composition of a literal translation. Attending a preview performance on July 22, 2011, I was able to ascertain from Poulton that he had created his own literal translation from the Italian source text. The application of the term *version* on that occasion suggests a disinclination to label the process undertaken by Poulton as *translation*, in spite of his command of the Italian language, providing further evidence of the tensions in both the terminology and the practice of theatre translation. Ultimately, however, Poulton's name is that which is primarily associated with the translation for this production of *Don Carlos*, and he assumes the responsibility for the text: its communication to the cast and creative practitioners, and its reception by the audiences and professional critics. The indirect translation process in itself predicates a second identity supporting the voice of the named translator, but the performed text represents further contributory influences. It is necessary to scrutinise the other names and roles listed in the programme (and included in the published playtext), to understand who else might be speaking in the translation.

Speech is, of course, a primary tool of the performers, who require text that can be convincingly projected in character to the audience. The necessity for speakable lines influences a translation, both in its drafting, and in rehearsal. As an example, Kate Eaton documents and theorises these processes from her own translations of the Cuban playwright Virgilio Piñera, identifying the "resonant echoes of actors' voices" in her head as she translates, followed by the development workshops on early drafts of the translated text with

actors, during which the participators “unstitch the component parts of the play text, and examine each and every one of them before sewing them back together.”¹⁴ The influence exercised by the performers is also evidenced by comparisons between the published text of a translation and the theatre’s prompt book (a loose-leaf file held backstage which blocks the text and other detail of the production for performance). Pencil alterations indicate late changes stemming from rehearsal, authenticated through inclusion in the “official” record of the prompt book. The prompt book for *Don Carlos* is not available, but the research I have conducted for other productions reveals varying degrees of intervention in the text through rehearsal, including an example of the prominent actor, Vanessa Redgrave, apparently imposing a personal political gloss on her character, Hecuba.¹⁵ These instances demonstrate the different ways in which actors influence the translation process. Indeed, most writers for theatre accept that modifications of this nature will be required, and attend early rehearsals to assist (and control) amendments.

Degrees of actorial implication indicate a further consideration in translation: the extent to which collaborators are permitted to intervene in the performance process. Eva Espasa, in her exploration of the *performability* requirement and its significance for stage translation, argues that “theatre ideology and power negotiation [are] at the heart of performability, [with] such textual and theatrical factors as speakability and playability relative to it.” She highlights the “(unequal) negotiation among the agents interpreting the text, from the point of view of translating, directing and acting alike,”¹⁶ and refers in particular to Susan Bassnett’s concerns for the relatively low status of the translator.¹⁷ My own research into the translation mechanisms of eight plays performed in London during a three-month period in 2005, of which this case study forms a part, indicates that status implications are indeed relevant to the production and performance of a translated play, *at all levels*, and not restricted to the creation of the translated text. The web of power and influence is invariably so complex that

identification of all the agents who may affect the outcome of translation decisions is challenging. With reference to *Don Carlos*, however, Poulton signals both the genesis and an important influence on the translation when he writes, “Michael Grandage commissioned this version from me and allowed me a whole year to cut, fiddle, paste and polish.”¹⁸

The Directorial Role in Translation

Grandage was the director of the production, but, in commissioning the translation, he was performing his other role as associate director of the Sheffield Theatres. This position has since been retitled “artistic director”, both by Grandage and his successor at Sheffield, and this is the title more usually allotted to distinguish the strategic management of a theatre’s artistic programme, in contrast to the direction of a single production. An instructive description of the role of artistic director is provided by the American Association of Community Theatre: “responsible for conceiving, developing, and implementing the artistic vision and focus of the organization, and for major decisions about the ongoing development of the aesthetic values and activities.”¹⁹ Grandage, filling for this production the roles of artistic director of the theatre and director of the production, was in a position to plan and programme this translated production, and then to direct its detailed presentation in performance, giving him a significant influence over the transmission of the translation, even though his name is neither included on the cover of the published playtext, nor highlighted in the programme listings. This is a standard treatment of directorial contribution. Paul Allain and Jen Harvie observe that “the public perception of theatre directors’ work is that it is often invisible”,²⁰ suggesting that visibility issues in theatre are not merely the domain of the translator. However, Maria Delgado and Dan Rebellato summarise their edited volume of essays profiling the role of contemporary European theatre directors as follows: “Directing is shown to be both a function and a profession, a brand and a process, an encounter and a

market force.”²¹ As the occupant of this multi-functioning role, Grandage’s contribution to the translation should not be underestimated, even if it is under-documented.

In his position as artistic director, Grandage was the final arbiter of which plays should be included in the theatre’s programming. *Don Carlos* opened his final season at the Sheffield Theatres and was his last production in that venue before he left to focus on his concurrent role as artistic director of the Donmar Warehouse Theatre, London. Having taken up the London position in 2002, Grandage forged a connection between Sheffield and London which was remarked upon in this production of *Don Carlos*. The theatre critic Michael Billington notes that it was an “extraordinary venture”, both as a “rare revival of a German classic” and also as a production with a large cast of fourteen actors appearing in a publicly-subsidised regional theatre, which “would have been unthinkable [...] during the previous ten years when retrenchment became a fact of life.”²² In Billington’s view, increased funding was not the sole driver of this artistic revival at Sheffield: “there needed to be someone imaginative at the helm,” and Grandage displayed the requisite leadership qualities.²³

Grandage was familiar with the play *Don Carlos*, having performed the titular role at the Royal Exchange Theatre, Manchester, in 1987, in a translation by James Maxwell. He characterises his engagement with the play as being “more about a narrative than the text.”²⁴ This overarching impression of the play and how it should be presented forms the controlling influence on the creation of the translation and its transmission, among the totality of the production’s features. As Grandage explained, “I assemble an overview, a vision of a production [...]. That’s the visual starting point. You then want to draw on people who will help you create that.”²⁵ Grandage’s reputation for critical and box office success reinforces his ability to engage preferred collaborators for productions. Billington, in a phrase which illustrates the director’s powers of persuasion, remarks that Grandage “enticed Derek Jacobi to Sheffield.”²⁶ The selection of Mike Poulton as indirect translator reflects Grandage’s

search to achieve his envisaged product. Grandage and Poulton had not previously collaborated on a production, but Jacobi, who had agreed at an early stage to play Philip II, had appeared in the production of Poulton's indirect translation of Anton Chekhov's *Uncle Vanya*, at Chichester Festival Theatre in 1996, and recommended his work. Grandage specified that, having read and seen several of Poulton's translations, he was attracted to his work by

an unusual ability to create something that felt very contemporary but classic in style. I haven't come across that in a lot of translators or adapters. I absolutely wanted *Don Carlos* to breathe for a modern audience, so that they didn't think they were watching some kind of fusty museum piece.²⁷

Grandage was therefore effectively the instigator for Poulton's stylistic reinterpretation of Schiller's creation on this occasion.

Style may not have been the only feature of Poulton's translation technique which attracted Grandage's attention: Poulton's adaptations display an ability to wield virtual scissors, whatever the language. Two examples of this facility are his adaptation of Thomas Malory's *Morte d'Arthur* for the Royal Shakespeare Company in 2010, from a prose narrative stretching over twenty-one books, and his distillation of Schiller's original trilogy of plays into *Wallenstein* for Chichester Festival Theatre in 2009. Poulton recounts that he was "faced with the task of bringing [*Don Carlos*] in at under three [hours],"²⁸ a task which he accomplished comfortably, according to the theatre programme for the London production, which provides a schedule for the performance of 2 hours 50 minutes, including a 15-minute interval.²⁹ Poulton's efficiency in condensing and cutting probably had more than artistic appeal for Grandage: depending on contractual and union agreements, overtime payments to employees may become payable after three hours; restricting the performance in accordance with this time-limit could be crucial to the production budget. Grandage's choice of Poulton as translator thus results in a wide distribution of consequences.

If Grandage was imposing boundaries on the translation at a macro-level in his position as artistic director of the theatre, evidence suggests that he may also have influenced the text at

micro-levels in his position as director of the production. Actorial modifications to the translation generated by the quest for a speakable text, discussed in the previous section, are effected in rehearsal, when the director is not only present but also in command of the proceedings. The director's approval, along with that of the writer/translator, is essential for any intervention in the textual process. The creative process in rehearsal is notoriously enclosed: the director Katie Mitchell recommends that even "peripherally involved [...] people like artistic directors or producers" should be kept out of early run-throughs.³⁰ Documentation of the extent of the director's instigation of amendments is generally scarce. However, the Sheffield Theatres website includes a Creative Development section for its productions, including an unattributed rehearsal diary. This reports Grandage's introduction of unspoken variations to the text, such as a "'silent' scene [when] he feels the audience need to know how the King has [crucial letters] in his possession,"³¹ (this scene was not ultimately incorporated into the London production). Grandage also "clarifies a stage direction with Mike Poulton"³² or, on another occasion, "amends tiny details to ensure that the audience is clear that the scene plays truthfully."³³ The tone of these notes, including the unproblematised reference to "truth", suggests that Grandage is intervening in the communication of the playtext with commanding assurance.

Grandage's imposition of his vision on the production goes beyond the text, however. Interviews with the creative team for the Sheffield Theatres Creative Resource website display a recurring theme of responding to Grandage's detailed ideas. Paule Constable, the Lighting Director, for example, who later won an Olivier award for this production, reveals that "Michael was also acutely aware of the pace that the play requires and he uses both music and light to make links and keep a rhythm of change."³⁴ The Music and Sound Score Composer, Adam Cork, also described their collaboration as follows:

What he generally does when we work together is firstly to go away and sit down with the play by himself and read and make notes. I picture him imagining very strongly how the production will be as Michael is a very intensely imaginative director. So he starts off with ideas and then he emails me a document.³⁵

But while these interviews display Grandage's orchestration of the creative output of the whole team in order to present his over-riding interpretation of Schiller's play, they also reveal the interface between the different elements which compose the whole. Text, music, lighting, design all contribute to Grandage's conception of the play, but he is dependent on the creators of these components, and their interaction, to achieve his desired effect. The multiple voices create the whole.

Theatrical Reality and the Critics

My case study demonstrates the range of voices in the development of one performed translation, an example of the extent of collaboration and multiple-intervention which takes place in the theatre translation process. These procedures are reflected in the live performance, of course, in which the presence of the actors on stage serves as a reminder of the collective interpretation taking place. The published playtext, in capturing a late stage of the development of the translation for production, also represents the incorporation of associate voices, albeit less overtly. The inclusion of cast and creative names links the text to the performance, and the potential effect of performance on textual shift is further signalled by an explicit notice to the reader that differences may be found between what is read and what is witnessed. Poulton's published playtext, for example, explains potential divergences beneath the cast list: "During the course of the rehearsal period, changes were made by the adapter, director and actors in order to accommodate the style of the production."³⁶ However, the incidence of intervening voices, whether of the literal translator, the director, the actors or other production personnel, has historically been ignored or discounted in the criticism of dramatic translation. A contemporary reaction to James Kirkup's 1959 version of *Don Carlos* suggests that performance detracts from the purity of translation: "The author of this version

seems to be an able translator, for often times the verses are well rendered, but we cannot rightly recommend this performance as a *translation*.” This response distinguishes between performance and translation, privileging “academic enlightenment.”³⁷ The implication is that text, both source and target, is paramount. Performability, and its consequences for textual interpretation, is unacknowledged. Although the reception of theatre translation has evolved in the half-century since the quoted review, echoes remain in the foregrounding of textual criticism and the terminological tensions between translation, version and adaptation, as I discussed in my earlier section.

More recent criticism takes the exigencies of performance, and their effect on translation, into account. Translation for performance, and in performance, is discussed and critically reviewed, acknowledging requirements of such theatrical concepts as speakability. For example, Francis Lamport recounts his own collaboration with Tim Albery on an adaptation of Schiller’s *Wallenstein* for the Royal Shakespeare Company in 1995, focusing on the textual translation strategies of the adaptation which he considers “was surely faithful to Schiller’s own meaning - if we may leave aside the vexed question of ‘sublimity.’”³⁸

However, Lamport’s review does not overtly take into consideration the fact that Albery directed the production in addition to working on the textual adaptation. His account of the directorial input in the translation is thus restricted to its textual manifestation rather than the holistic intervention I described above in relation to Michael Grandage’s work on *Don Carlos*. As Göbels points out, academic criticism tends to overlook the “theatrical reality” of performable dramas. However, she equates this theatrical reality with the necessity “to survive financially and therefore [...] to entertain successfully.”³⁹ In my opinion, theatrical procedures constitute more than a financial, entertaining veneer on a text-based product. The extratextual conveyance of meaning that constitutes performability, and its dependence on collaboration between translator and other theatre practitioners are underestimated when

considering the creation of a translation. Is it not possible that Schiller's *sublimity*, the "composition of melancholy which at its utmost is manifested in a shudder, and of joyousness which can mount to rapture,"⁴⁰ might be projected by the *mise en scène* of a production, with the cooperation of the translator(s) and other theatre practitioners, via, for example, acting-style, the atmosphere of the set design or the mood of the lighting?

There is, however, a growing recognition of the interplay of text and performance in academic criticism. Poulton's 2009 adaptation of Schiller's *Wallenstein*, mentioned above, is the subject of critical analysis by John Guthrie, who acknowledges that the version "is based on a literal (unattributed) translation of Schiller's plays and is the type of adaptation that makes substantial changes to the original but also preserves its core."⁴¹ In addition to addressing the method and terminology of the translation, Guthrie reflects on the staging and body language of the production, while undertaking a close comparison of the original with the translation. Guthrie concludes that:

through the skilful use of compression, restructuring, modernization of language, and a carefully judged degree of domestication for the modern British audience, Poulton remained remarkably true to the spirit of Schiller's play.⁴²

Poulton is congratulated, but the director, Angus Jackson, is mentioned briefly only once in the article, although Guthrie thanks him in the notes, implicitly acknowledging his contribution to the production. The roles of the director and other theatre practitioners in developing a performed translation are rarely formalised or theorised, and yet, as Margherita Laera summarised in her introduction to a discussion between theatre practitioners and scholars which she co-organised with Kate Eaton, Tiffany Watt-Smith and myself in 2010, "translations for the stage, if written on entirely hypothetical grounds and without directorial input, must be reworked for specific stagings. [...] Collaboration between the translator and the creators of the performance remains an imperative of good practice in theatre translation."⁴³

A roll-call of names in a critical review can be tedious for writer and reader, but to ignore the impact of the participants in the performance of a translation is to reduce the resonance of the translation itself. In my view, an appreciation of collaborative practices enables the critic to move away from the binary juxtaposition of old original with new translation and place the work in an ever-expanding field of exemplars, or afterlives. Following the example of Maria Delgado in her wide-ranging review of Federico García Lorca's "afterlives," it is possible to identify the "'remains' [...] that linger in the artefacts of others,"⁴⁴ the ripples from Schiller's original that spread his name while transporting contributory identities along the way. In addition to Poulton's adaptation of *Wallenstein*, since the award-winning and commercially successful 2004 production of *Don Carlos*, Schiller's work has been further presented in indirect translation by Poulton, with productions of *Mary Stuart*, at Clwyd Theatr Cymru, directed by Terry Hands in 2009, and *Luise Miller* (originally entitled *Kabale und Liebe*), with Grandage again as director at the Donmar Warehouse Theatre in 2011. Grandage also commissioned a further production of *Mary Stuart* in his position as artistic director of the Donmar Warehouse Theatre, this time in a version by Peter Oswald and directed by Phyllida Lloyd in 2005. Furthermore, the Poulton version of *Don Carlos* was revived in a student production at the Oxford Playhouse in 2009. Byam Shaw, the producer who brought *Don Carlos* to London in 2005, takes the view that his production revitalised Schiller for the British audience.⁴⁵ It is certainly the case that while Schiller was infrequently represented on stage during the twentieth century there was a significant increase in interest after 2004. Identifying the collaborative practitioners in this translation and tracking their work makes it possible to see how the influence of this production spread beyond its starting point in Sheffield and reached out to other theatres, plays and productions, bringing Schiller in translation to a wider audience.

Conclusion

In my introduction, I suggested that a published translated playtext resembled a set of accounts, in providing a snapshot of the state of affairs for that translation at the time of publication. Only by analysing the content and studying the notes is it possible to begin to form an understanding of what that playtext represents. I use the financial metaphor with intent, as economic imperatives are so often seen as detracting from artistic and innovative activity and yet can be the force which brings an effective group of collaborators together. This *Don Carlos* playtext not only represents one of the many strands of the continuing existence of Schiller's original, but also documents the collaboration of a number of individuals in the dynamic translation process. It captures the translation at one moment, almost immediately prior to performance, before the collaborators make additional changes and then move on to further projects. The multiple voices of collaboration highlight the names of translation/version/adaptation, interrogating the process of reaching a public translation. Critical recognition of "theatrical reality," and the examination of the consequent multiplicity of voices in the projection of translated plays, requires an expanded focus on the text within its performance, plotting each translation on the continuing trajectory of its co-existing source.

Notes

¹ Friedrich Schiller, *Don Carlos*, in a version by Mike Poulton (London: Nick Hern Books, 2005), p. xiv.

² Bettina Göbels, "In the Bard's Shadow: Shakespearian Affinities as an Obstacle to the Reception of Schiller's Plays in Britain, 1945-2005," *Modern Language Review* 102, no. 2 (April 2007): 437.

³ Bettina Göbels, "In the Bard's Shadow," p. 439.

⁴ Manuela Perteghella, "A Descriptive Framework for Collaboration in Theatre Translation" (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of East Anglia, 2004), p. 119.

⁵ Helen Rappaport, "Chekhov in the Theatre: The Role of the Translator in New Versions," in *Voices in Translation: Bridging Cultural Divides*, ed. Gunilla Anderman (Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 2007), p. 75.

-
- ⁶ Manuela Perteghella, "Adaptation: Bastard Child or Critique? Putting Terminology Centre-Stage," *Journal of Romance Studies* 8, no. 3 (Winter 2008): 63.
- ⁷ Lorna Hardwick, "Negotiating Translation for the Stage," in *Theorising Performance: Greek Drama, Cultural History and Critical Practice*, eds. Edith Hall and Stephe Harrop (London: Duckworth Publishers, 2010), p. 195.
- ⁸ Chris Campbell, interviewed by the author at the Royal Court Theatre, London, January 10, 2011.
- ⁹ Matthew Byam Shaw, interviewed by the author at Playful Productions, London, April 5, 2011.
- ¹⁰ Friedrich Schiller, *Don Carlos*, np.
- ¹¹ Friedrich Schiller, *Don Carlos*, p. xiii.
- ¹² Mike Poulton, interviewed by the author at the Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, May 26, 2010.
- ¹³ Chichester Festival Theatre, *The Syndicate* [Theatre Programme], (Chichester: Chichester Festival Theatre, 2011), np.
- ¹⁴ Kate Eaton, "You Always Forget Something: Can Practice Make Theory?" *New Voices in Translation Studies* 4, Special Conference Issue: "With/out Theory: The Role of Theory in Translation Studies Research" (2008): 57.
- ¹⁵ Geraldine Brodie, "Translation in performance: theatrical shift and the transmission of meaning in Tony Harrison's translation of Euripides' *Hecuba*," *Contemporary Theatre Review* (forthcoming).
- ¹⁶ Eva Espasa, "Performability in Translation: Speakability? Playability? Or just Saleability?" in *Moving Target: Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation*, ed. Carole-Anne Upton (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2000), p. 58.
- ¹⁷ Susan Bassnett, "Translating for the Theatre: The Case against Performability," *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction* 4, no. 1 (1991): 104-105.
- ¹⁸ Friedrich Schiller, *Don Carlos*, p. xiii.
- ¹⁹ American Association of Community Theatre, *Artistic Director* <<http://www.aact.org/people/artistic.html>>. Website consulted September 15, 2011.
- ²⁰ Paul Allain and Jen Harvie, *The Routledge Companion to Theatre and Performance* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), p. 148.
- ²¹ Maria M. Delgado and Dan Rebellato, "Introduction," in *Contemporary European Theatre Directors*, eds. Maria M. Delgado and Dan Rebellato (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010), p. 21.
- ²² Michael Billington, *State of the Nation: British Theatre since 1945* (London: Faber and Faber, 2007), p. 378.
- ²³ Michael Billington, *State of the Nation*, p. 377.
- ²⁴ Michael Grandage, interviewed by the author at the Donmar Warehouse Theatre, London, May 28, 2010.
- ²⁵ Michael Grandage, interviewed by the author at the Donmar Warehouse Theatre, London, May 28, 2010.
- ²⁶ Michael Billington, *State of the Nation*, p. 378.
- ²⁷ Michael Grandage, interviewed by the author at the Donmar Warehouse Theatre, London, May 28, 2010.
- ²⁸ Friedrich Schiller, *Don Carlos*, p. xiii.
- ²⁹ Gielgud Theatre, *Don Carlos* [Theatre Programme], (London: Gielgud Theatre, 2005), np.
- ³⁰ Katie Mitchell, *The Director's Craft: A Handbook for the Theatre* (London: Routledge, 2009), p. 186.

-
- ³¹ Sheffield Theatres, *Rehearsal Diary: First Rehearsal, Wednesday 25 August 2004*, <www.sheffieldtheatres.co.uk/creativedevelopmentprogramme/productions/doncarlos/first.shtml>. Website consulted March 23, 2011.
- ³² Sheffield Theatres, *Rehearsal Diary: First Rehearsal, Wednesday 25 August 2004*, <www.sheffieldtheatres.co.uk/creativedevelopmentprogramme/productions/doncarlos/first.shtml>. Website consulted March 23, 2011.
- ³³ Sheffield Theatres, *Rehearsal Diary: Fifth Rehearsal, Thursday 16 September 2004*, <www.sheffieldtheatres.co.uk/creativedevelopmentprogramme/productions/doncarlos/fifth.shtml>. Website consulted March 23, 2011.
- ³⁴ Sheffield Theatres, *Lighting: an interview with Paule Constable -Lighting Designer*, <www.sheffieldtheatres.co.uk/creativedevelopmentprogramme/productions/doncarlos/lighting.shtml>. Website consulted March 23, 2011.
- ³⁵ Sheffield Theatres, *Music and Sound: an interview with Adam Cork - Music and Sound Score Composer*, <www.sheffieldtheatres.co.uk/creativedevelopmentprogramme/productions/doncarlos/music.shtml>. Website consulted March 23 2011.
- ³⁶ Schiller, *Don Carlos*, p. xv.
- ³⁷ John T. Krumpelman, "Classical German Drama in Recent English Translations," *German Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (January 1966): 89.
- ³⁸ Francis Lamport, "Wallenstein on the English Stage," *German Life and Letters* 48, no. 2 (April 1995): 145.
- ³⁹ Bettina Göbels, "In the Bard's Shadow," p. 438.
- ⁴⁰ Friedrich Schiller, *On the Sublime* <<http://studiocleo.com/librarie/schiller/essay.html>> Website consulted September 21, 2011.
- ⁴¹ John Guthrie, "Classical German Drama on the British Stage: Schiller's *Wallenstein* at the Chichester Festival," *Modern Drama* 54, no. 2 (Summer 2011): 124.
- ⁴² John Guthrie, "Classical British Drama on the British Stage," p. 137.
- ⁴³ Margherita Laera, "Theatre Translation as Collaboration: Aleks Sierz, Martin Crimp, Natalie Abrahams, Colin Teevan, Zoë Svendsen and Michael Walton discuss Translation for the Stage," *Contemporary Theatre Review* 21, no. 2 (May 2011): 216.
- ⁴⁴ Maria M. Delgado, *Federico García Lorca* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), p. 175.
- ⁴⁵ Matthew Byam Shaw, interviewed by the author at Playful Productions, London, April 5, 2011.

Bibliography

ALLAIN, Paul, and Jen HARVIE. *The Routledge Companion to Theatre and Performance*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY THEATRE, *Artistic Director*.
<<http://www.aact.org/people/artistic.html>>. Website consulted September 15, 2011.

BASSNETT, Susan. "Translating for the Theatre: The Case against Performability." *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction* 4, no. 1 (1991): 99-111.

BILLINGTON, Michael. *State of the Nation: British Theatre since 1945*. London: Faber and Faber, 2007.

BRODIE, Geraldine. "Translation in performance: theatrical shift and the transmission of meaning in Tony Harrison's translation of Euripides' Hecuba." *Contemporary Theatre Review* (forthcoming 2014).

CHICHESTER FESTIVAL THEATRE. *The Syndicate* [Theatre Programme]. Chichester: Chichester Festival Theatre, 2011.

DELGADO, Maria M. *Federico García Lorca*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2008.

DELGADO, Maria M., and Dan REBELLATO. "Introduction." In *Contemporary European Theatre Directors*. Eds. Maria M. Delgado and Dan Rebellato. Abingdon: Routledge, 2010, pp. 1-27.

EATON, Kate. "You Always Forget Something: Can Practice Make Theory?" *New Voices in Translation Studies* 4, Special Conference Issue: "With/out Theory: The Role of Theory in Translation Studies Research" (2008): 53-61.

ESPASA, Eva. "Performability in Translation: Speakability? Playability? Or just Saleability?" In *Moving Target: Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation*. Ed. Carole-Anne Upton. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2000, pp. 49-62.

GIELGUD THEATRE. *Don Carlos* [Theatre Programme]. London: Gielgud Theatre, 2005.

GÖBELS, Bettina. "In the Bard's Shadow: Shakespearian Affinities as an Obstacle to the Reception of Schiller's Plays in Britain, 1945-2005." *Modern Language Review* 102, no. 2 (April 2007): 427-439.

GUTHRIE, John. "Classical German Drama on the British Stage: Schiller's *Wallenstein* at the Chichester Festival." *Modern Drama* 54, no. 2 (Summer 2011): 121-140.

HARDWICK, Lorna. "Negotiating Translation for the Stage." In *Theorising Performance: Greek Drama, Cultural History and Critical Practice*. Eds. Edith Hall and Stephe Harrop. London: Duckworth, 2010, pp. 192-207.

KRUMPELMAN, John T. "Classical German Drama in Recent English Translations." *German Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (January 1966), pp. 77-91.

LAERA, Margherita. "Theatre Translation as Collaboration: Aleks Sierz, Martin Crimp, Natalie Abrahami, Colin Teevan, Zoë Svendsen and Michael Walton discuss Translation for the Stage." *Contemporary Theatre Review* 21, no. 2 (May 2011): 213-225.

LAMPORT, Francis J. "Wallenstein on the English Stage." *German Life and Letters* 48, no. 2 (April 1995): 124-147.

MITCHELL, Katie. *The Director's Craft: A Handbook for the Theatre*. London: Routledge, 2009.

PERTEGHELLA, Manuela. "A Descriptive Framework for Collaboration in Theatre Translation." Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of East Anglia, 2004.

_____. "Adaptation: Bastard Child or Critique? Putting Terminology Centre-Stage." *Journal of Romance Studies* 8, no. 3 (Winter 2008): 51-65.

RAPPAPORT, Helen. "Chekhov in the Theatre: The Role of the Translator in New Versions." In *Voices in Translation: Bridging Cultural Divides*. Ed. Gunilla Anderman. Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 2007, pp. 66-77.

SCHILLER, Friedrich. *On the Sublime*. <<http://studiocleo.com/librarie/schiller/essay.html>>. Website consulted September 21, 2011.

_____. *Don Carlos*, in a version by Mike Poulton. London: Nick Hern Books, 2005.

SHEFFIELD THEATRES. *Music and Sound: an interview with Adam Cork - Music and Sound Score Composer*. <www.sheffieldtheatres.co.uk/creativedevelopmentprogramme/productions/doncarlos/music.shtml>. Website consulted March 23 2011.

_____. *Lighting: an interview with Paule Constable -Lighting Designer*. <www.sheffieldtheatres.co.uk/creativedevelopmentprogramme/productions/doncarlos/lighting.shtml>. Website consulted March 23, 2011.

_____. *Rehearsal Diary: First Rehearsal, Wednesday 25 August 2004*. <www.sheffieldtheatres.co.uk/creativedevelopmentprogramme/productions/doncarlos/first.shtml>. Website consulted March 23, 2011.

_____. *Rehearsal Diary: Fifth Rehearsal, Thursday 16 September 2004*. <www.sheffieldtheatres.co.uk/creativedevelopmentprogramme/productions/doncarlos/fifth.shtml>. Website consulted March 23, 2011.