

Reorientation of the English Translation of Korean Theater*

Lee, Hyung-Jin

(Sookmyung Women's University)

I. Introduction

The history of the English translation of Korean literature dates back to as early as 1889 when *Korean Tales*, a collection of Korean folkloric stories, was translated by Horace N. Allen and published by Putnam's Son's Press in the United States (Bong 356). The date of anything first in the history is always subject to change upon a new discovery. For instance, a recent discovery of a 1838 German translation by Philipp Franz von Siebold of the Korean manuscript of Chinese language learning material 'Yuhap'(類合), supposedly used as widely as 'Cheonjamun'(千字文) during the Joseon Dynasty ("Lui Ho,"

* This research was supported by the 2005 Sookmyung Women's University Research Grants.

2006), is likely to push back the date of the first translation of a Korean writing into a foreign language.

Since the publication of *Korean Tales*, a considerable number of Korean literary works have been translated into English, and the number has increased greatly over the past couple of decades, as a result of the globalization initiative for Korean literature that has been actively promoted by government and private sectors in Korea. However, the statistical growth of the globalization of Korean literature does not always necessarily mean a corresponding growth in quality.

Problems related to the English translation of Korean literature have been investigated and analyzed in depth by many scholars. When it comes to genre-specific literary translation, however, it is not surprising to discover that most attention has been paid to popular literary genres such as the novel and poetry, in scholarly research as well as actual translation.

A quick review of the database of the National Assembly Library of Korea, which boasts an extensive collection of scholarly journals and books, reveals some of this reality. While the keyword search of 'poetry translation' or 'novel translation' retrieves more than 20 journal articles, the number for 'drama/theater translation' is less than half that of other genres, and even among them, most articles are focused on the reception of translated drama such as the reception of Shakespeare in Korea, rather than about theater translation itself. Only two articles by Oh Se-Gon (2000) and Cathy Rapin (1995), examine the related issues of the topic. Further to this, while more than a dozen articles have been written about the process and problems of translating Korean poetry or novels into English, not a single article about the English translation of Korean theater can be found.

These unbalanced circumstances are a reflection of various literary factors such as the low visibility and proportion of theater in literature category and the performance-oriented nature of theater, as well as non-literary factors, including the reader/audience relationship and marketability. This paper intends

to examine and analyze these factors, and expects to offer a series of starting points for the future direction of the English translation of Korean theater.

II. Status of the English Translation of Korean Theater

The lack of scholarly research on this subject is a natural reflection of the near absence of English translations of Korean theater. This premise can be supported by several meaningful statistics. According to the comprehensive bibliographical work by Bong (2004), which compiles a long list of the translations of Korean literature into foreign languages published in book format between 1899 and 2003, only five among 399 English translations fall into the category of theater translation (see Table 1). Even among these five, two translations are of the same play, *Wedding Day* by Oh Young-Jin, and three of the five works were published more than twenty years ago, and at least two translations were published in Korea.

Table 1: List of the Korean Plays Translated into English

Title	Author	Translators	Publisher	Year
<i>Wedding Day: A Comedy of Old Korea in Two Acts</i>	Oh Young-Jin	Phil Marshal R.	Unknown	1962
<i>Plays from Korea</i>	Yoo Chi-Jin & others	Jeong In-Seop & others	Chung-Ang University Press	1968
<i>Wedding Day and Other Korean Plays</i>	Oh Young-Jin & others	Song Yo-In	Si-Sa-Yong-O-Sa	1983
<i>Traditional Korean Theatre</i>	Anonymous	Cho Oh-Gon	Asian Humanities Press	1988
<i>Metacultural Theatre of Oh T'ae-Sök: Five Plays from the Korean Avant-Garde</i>	Oh Tae-Sok	Kim Ah-Jeong & R. B. Graves	University of Hawaii Press	1999

As translation is subject to change over the course of time as a result of the different usage of language and expression in different time periods by different translators—a key characteristic that helps to prolong and immortalize the life of the original work—it is less likely that a translation of more than 20 or 25 years ago would effectively accommodate the needs of contemporary readers and audiences, except, perhaps, for a handful of classics lovers. Also, it is difficult to expect English translations of Korean literature published in Korea, to be effectively poised to target and serve English-speaking readers and audiences—this is because most translated literary works published in Korea have only a slim chance of being accessed by Western readers due to the weak overseas marketing network.

Given these circumstances, I postulate that among the five works above, only *Metacultural Theatre of Oh Tae-Sok: Five Plays from the Korean Avant-Garde* appears ready to be accessible to a Western readership: "Given the succinct and clear style of translation by Kim Ah-Jeong and R. B. Graves, these translations can be used both as texts for world drama courses and as performance scripts for the stage" (Nichols 292).

While Bong's bibliographical work covers the literary works already published, a quick review of the list of the works awarded translation grants by the government or private sectors seems to reasonably indicate a future trend of the translation of Korean literatures. For the past couple of decades, government and private foundations such as the Korea Literature Translation Institute (KLTI) and the Daesan Foundation have actively promoted and financially supported the translations of Korean literature. Most 'to-be-published' English translation works have received translation or publication grants from one of the organizations that have helped to accelerate the globalization of Korean literature. Thus, a quick look at their awardee list would help to foresee the near-future direction of the English translation of Korean literature.

According to the KLTI's data of 2006, a total of 78 awarded translation book projects are under publication, and among them only two are theater

translations: *Theatre of Lee Yun-Taek*, translated by Kim Dong-Uk and Richard Nichols, and *Theater of Kang-Baek Lee*, translated by Alyssa Kim and Lee Hyung-Jin. The lack of visibility of theater translation is not a complete surprise if one reviews the '2005 KLTl Reference List of Modern Korean Literature for Future Translation'. Among the 78 suggested works for translation there is only one theater work by Choi In-Hun. The situation is a little more promising in the Daesan Foundation. The foundation has awarded grants to 43 English translation projects since 1993, and among them five are theater translations (see Table 2).

Table 2: Daesan Grants for the Translation of Korean Theater (1993-2005)

Year	Total Number of Awarded Works (Number of Drama)	Drama Translation: Title (Translators)
1993	4 (0)	
1994	3 (1)	Selected Plays by Oh Tae-Suk (Kim Ah-Jeong & Robert B. Graves)
1995	2 (0)	
1996	3 (0)	
1997	3 (0)	
1998	3 (0)	
1999	2 (0)	
2000	5 (0)	
2001	3 (2)	Selected Plays of Yoo Chi-Jin (Chang Won-Jae & Richard A. Cave) Selected Plays of Choi In-Hoon (Kim Jeong-Su & Shery Holman)
2002	4 (1)	A Grand Retreat by Lee Gun-Sam (Lee Soo-Young & Cremilda T. Lee)
2003	3 (0)	
2004	3 (0)	
2005	5 (1)	Selected Plays of Park Sang-Hyun (Kim Jin-Hee & Rebecca Thom)
Total	43 (5)	

III. Problems of Theater Translation

The near absence of English translations of Korean theater is not an unexpected phenomenon once we consider the small proportion of Korean theater texts in Korean literature. Nevertheless, the proportion of Korean theater translations is far lower than the actual proportion of Korean theater texts in Korean literature. This leads us to speculate that theater translation is either less popular or more difficult than that of other literary genres.

There are several reasons accounting for the low number of English translations of Korean theater, and some of them are directly related to theater's performance-oriented nature. First, it is important to consider textuality vs. performability. Theater translation needs to consider not only textuality but also theatricality. Nevertheless, an overemphasis on theater's performability has been an insurmountable challenge to theater translators. Unlike other literary genres, whose reception and appreciation are completed by readers, the experience of a theater text is to be completed by theater audiences as well as readers. This presents an interesting challenge for translators, whose job has become not only translating the text for aesthetic effect, but also visualizing the text as it will be performed and spoken by actors on the stage. The challenge of translating performability demands that theater translators consider additional performance-related dimensions, including, but not limited to, careful consideration of the right length of a dialogue for actual speaking, the selection of appropriate vocabulary and collocation for easy pronunciation, adding or adjusting stage directions for further clarification, etc. (Oh 2000, 37).

As far as performability is concerned, however, a more serious challenge is that a theater text is not considered as complete and final unlike the texts of other literary genres. Instead, the aesthetic completeness of a play is often supposed to be tested on the stage before it reaches readers. This is because theatrical totality is believed to be completed through non-verbal as well as verbal communication on the stage: "drama lives in its theatrical performance,

the total experience expressed in oral and non-verbal language and appreciated by all physical senses as well as the intellect and emotions" (Zeber-Skerritt 5). In many instances the non-verbal elements take more credit for the success of the play, which would contribute to deepening the low esteem of theater texts, and thus translation publication more difficult.

A practical answer to this problem is that, the concept of performability needs to be considered in relation to the original manuscript. As theatrical dynamics are considerably controlled by character's dialogues, it is important to keep the dynamics in the source text intact as much as possible. Therefore, translators' intervention for the sake of performability needs to be limited to clarifying stage directions as well as making minor adjustment to the dialogues for actors' speaking.

In other words, translation needs to be carefully designed to reflect what is already in the original text, which means that if the original theater text lacks a certain quality including performability, the translation is not supposed to intentionally increase that quality. As Edward Seidensticker, translator of Yasunari Kawabata, 1968 recipient of the Nobel Prize in literature, emphasizes, "if someone tells you your translation is better than the original, you should consider it an insult because that is not what you're supposed to be doing. You are not supposed to be improving" ("Winds Interview," 2003). Though polemical by its very nature, which needs to be dealt with in a separate study, this statement reiterates the importance of the translator's ability and responsibility in choosing the right and quality work for translation.

Secondly, it is important to examine the playwright/director relationship. Traditionally, the mechanism of producing theatrical totality has been influenced by the traditional privilege of the written text over the spoken. As Bassnett (2002) points out, "the pre-eminence of the written text leads on to an assumption that there is a single right way of reading and hence performing the text, in which case the translator is bound more rigidly to a pre-conceived model than is the translator of poetry or prose texts" (120). However, the

relationship between the written text and the spoken one is no longer hierarchical in contemporary theater. While theatrical textuality is created and maximized by a playwright, performability would be more directly managed by a director on the stage. The new supremacy of director over playwright is referred to as one of the most dominant features, though controversial, in contemporary theater:

In many ways the hegemony of the director, the director seen as an authority separate and separable from either actor or dramatist, is problematic. Reliance on this authority can too often sap the creativity, intelligence, and initiative of the player; while for the playwright, production more and more usurps the power once held by the play (Read 280).

The power shift of authority on the stage and the dual structures of generating theatrical totality present continuous challenges to translators. The reality is that not every theater director staging a play reveres and blindly follows the theater text as it was written. Often this results in modification of the original text according to the director's own interpretation or aesthetic preference. Under the circumstances, also the translation process could be influenced by the already visualized perspective or interpretation of the director, especially once translators have a chance to watch an actual performance before the translation of the play. This experience substantially influences the translator's personal visualization of the theater text under translation, and thus the translation could be a mere reflection of the director's particular perspective of interpretation.

Thirdly, it is necessary to consider commerciality over textuality. While this case does not always apply to every theater culture in the world, sometimes theater translation is often subject to the systematic rewriting during the editing process for the sake of commercial success. Bassnett (1991) provides a stark example of the contemporary British theater policy, practiced by the National

Theatre:

translators are commissioned to produce what are termed 'literal' translations and the text is then handed over to a well-known (and most often monolingual) playwright with an established reputation so that larger audiences will be attracted into the theatre. The translation is then credited to that playwright, who also receives the bulk of the income (101).

This process inevitably makes theater translation supplementary and even incomplete while restricting the presence and contribution of translators.

Fourthly, there is the consideration of marketability over textuality. The publication of theater texts has been marginalized in today's profit-oriented publication market due to the theater texts' weak marketability. Thus, the instability or even absence of theater texts restricts the selection range of theater translators. One good example is Jang Jin's play, *Welcome to Dongmakgol*. A movie with the same title was a box office hit in Korea in 2005; the play has been performed since 2002, yet the text has still not been officially published. This instance starkly reflects the practical supremacy of performability over textuality in contemporary theater. In addition, due to profit-oriented nature of publication it has become a general trend that the marketability of translated works is seriously limited in English-speaking countries. Venuti (1998) asserts that,

publishers keep the volume of translations low because such books are financially risky: they are so costly to produce, requiring a significant initial outlay for translation rights, the translator's fee, and marketing, that publishers generally regard them as inevitable losses ... [*only*] useful to enhance the variety of their lists (124, italic addition for emphasis).

The premises discussed above have stressed the complexities as well as

practical difficulties of theater translation. However, this does not necessarily forecast a gloomy future for the English translation of Korean theater, but rather suggests the necessity of a redirection of the task in reaching a realistically desirable outcome.

IV. Future Direction of the English Translation of Korean Theater

Elam (2002) summarizes the dialectic nature of theater text and performance by asserting that,

the 'incompleteness' factor suggests that the dramatic text is radically conditioned by its performability. The written text, in other words, is determined by its very need for stage contextualization, and indicates throughout its allegiance to the physical conditions of performance its ability to materialize discourse within the space of the stage (190-191).

Despite the emergence of a more radical view about performability, such that "a real translation takes place on the level of the *mise en scène* as a whole" (Pavis 41), the hegemonic view of performability over textuality is not necessarily received favorably. Bassnett (1991) argues against the notion of 'translating performability' by asserting that,

the task of the translator thus becomes superhuman-he or she is expected to translate a text that *a priori* in the source language is incomplete, containing a concealed gestic text, into the target language which should also contain a concealed gestic text. And whereas Stanislavski or Brecht would have assumed that the responsibility for decoding the gestic text lay with the performers, the assumption in the translation process is that this responsibility can be assumed by the translator sitting at a desk and imagining the performance dimension. Common sense should tell us that this cannot be taken seriously (100).

These arguments lead to my first premise for the reorientation of the English translation of Korean theater: while theater translators are not only asked to acquire target language proficiency and a professional level of understanding of the target culture, at least they need to be familiar with the mechanism and semiotics of the theater stage.

Any literary translation cannot escape being labeled as a reflection of the translator's own interpretation. Thus, expecting the most objective, neutral and personal-interpretation-free translation is as absurd as expecting Harold Pinter to learn the Korean language and write a play in Korean to receive another Nobel Prize. Literary translation inevitably reflects the translator's own interpretation; a variety of interpretative approaches are, hopefully, expected to result in a better translation. While this plurality of interpretation in translation is valued, the interpretation should be established on the grounds of stage theatricality, though performability may be left up to theater directors, because of theater's inherent dualistic nature. Thus, the theater translator's appropriate knowledge of performance as well as stage mechanism is not an optional or additional condition, but something indispensable. Otherwise, theater translations would always remain as something that 'needs-to-be-revised-anyway' in relation to performance, which will minimize the presence and visibility of the translator.

Secondly, while translating a literary text into another language would not be the same as selling a commercial product to consumers in a different culture, the two approaches might cross somewhere in relation to the goal of drawing critical attention to the product from as many readers/consumers as possible. If this is the case, there might be lessons to learn from commercial marketing strategy. For instance, once a company decides to sell a product to international consumers, the first step would be to identify the preferences and demand patterns of potential consumers before they produce a product that can effectively attract their attention. Success can only be achieved after an arduous process of trial-and-error; it is not always the case that what appeals to us most will be the same as what *they* like most. Once this process has resulted

in success, it is likely that more people will buy and enjoy the product with their interest and satisfaction increased, which leads them to shift their attention to other models or types of product of the same brand. In the case of a cell phone, for instance, it may be other colors, designs or special features, and sometimes it could be different models and new products, only available in the original country of production. This is what has happened in the export of Korean TV programs to Asian markets in the name of the 'Korean Wave'.

Though literary translations are substantially different from profit-oriented commercial products, I do not believe that the marketing strategy for the English translations of Korean theater should be fundamentally different. In this context, translators need to be able to select theater texts that have the potential to appeal to the target readers/audience, not the works Korean people are most proud of. This ability requires translators' keen eyes for the selection of appropriate texts, in addition to the evaluation of literary aesthetics. This is why translators should make every effort to stay current with the rapidly changing theater trend in the target culture. One good example is the recent performance of a modernized, experimental version of *Chunhyang* in Amsterdam by Ahn Eun-Mi, a Korean traditional choreographer. She admitted that her performance was not even mediocre to her eyes, yet she received a rare standing ovation from the audience ("Choreographer," 2006).

The globalization of Korean theater still needs to go through an iterative trial-and-error process before it begins to generate meaningful results. On the other hand, it is also worthwhile critically speculating about whether it is always necessary for every Korean theatrical or literary work be recognized and appreciated by international audiences or readers through translation, and if so, what its just cause would be. One important thing is that the favorable reception of Korean literature in foreign countries is not the ultimate purpose of or justification for Korean literature itself.

Thirdly, practical consideration needs to be made regarding the form of publication. Due to the unfavorable marketing reality of theater translations in

English-speaking countries, in the initial stage an anthology may be better received than a single playwright's work, with realistic potential offered by publishers in the target language. While this is not ideal per se, it is necessary to understand that this is the common process for introducing foreign, especially less-known, literature into an English-speaking cultural context, and is what the English translation of Japanese literature has already gone through. This circumstance is clearly reflected in the responses from American publishers to my translation book proposal of a Korean playwright's works. While considered typical pleasantries in these rejection letters, these examples allow us to take a glimpse at the publication reality of theater translation in the US:

"Letter #1: Thank you for sending us the proposal for your book on [Korean playwright's] plays. Unfortunately, we do not believe we could devise a workable publication plan for your book. Under the circumstances, we cannot offer to publish your book at this time. Please understand that this is a marketing/commercial decision and not an editorial one. I would, perhaps, be able to make a case for an anthology of Korean plays by various playwrights. (P. Loo, personal communication, June 17, 2004)

Letter #2: Thank you for your book project. It sounds interesting, but I'm afraid I can't take it on here. It is very difficult these days to sell enough copies of a study such as yours to earn back the cost of publication. Library budgets have plummeted, and reliance on inter-library loans has dramatically increased, so that we now have to rely on sales of books to individuals, and I couldn't project enough to make the numbers work." (J. Crewe, personal communication, March 5, 2004)

As far as marketability is concerned, the major target buyers of the translations of Korean theater are not the general audience or readers, but people with special interest in the subject, like critics or students. If so, an anthology is a

more feasible choice especially as textbook materials in Asian literature-related college courses. It is necessary to recognize that college classrooms are one of the key starting points for the introduction and circulation of foreign literature in the US.

Fourthly, performance often matters more than book sales in the promotion of theater translations. There are various factors that are used to determine the quality of any writing. One practical factor is the number of people who read it. In the case of newspapers it refers to the number of subscribers; in the case of novels, the number of books sold matters, upon which major bookstores' weekly bestseller charts are based. However, while these figures are relevant in the sale of novel or poem translations, they would not be significantly valid in theater translations. Very few people, except perhaps theater critics or students, would buy theater texts for personal reading, and even this number would not be considered to be a decisive factor in evaluating the quality of a theatrical work. Thus, more practical attention should be paid to performance-related records such as the number of performances on domestic as well as international stages, the sizes of audiences, the number of awards received from theater festivals, etc.

This finding helps to set a new direction for the future of the English translation of Korean theater. In addition to the translation of theater texts, more attention needs to be directed toward how to develop and relate theater translations to actual amateur or professional performance of the play in English-speaking countries. This effort includes active participation and promotion of Korean theater in various international theater festivals. While there is a slim chance that translated Korean theater will be recognized instantly in mainstream theater venues in English-speaking countries, it is common practice that many international playwrights' works are premiered at US university playhouses, often becoming the point of recognition for contemporary international plays in the US.

For instance, Hirata Oriza's *Tokyo Notes*, which received the 1995 Kishida

Kunio Award, Japan's highest honor for new drama, was premiered on campus by the Fairfield University student theatre company in 2004. It is worth mentioning that many Asian playwrights' works are being introduced through college courses like 'Topics in Asian Theatre' (University of Hawaii), 'Chinese Fiction and Drama in Translation' (Stanford University), 'Chinese Drama in Translation' (Ohio State University), 'Japanese Drama in Translation' (UC Berkeley), 'East Asian Theater' (UCLA), 'Asian Theater Workshop' (University of Michigan), and 'Asian Theatre' (New York University), to name just a few. Even in this list the visibility of Korean theater is extremely low compared to Japanese and Chinese theater, due to the absence of translation textbooks as well as human resources who can teach the related topics, among many reasons.

In this context it is promising that some Korean plays have recently appeared on various international stages. Lee Kang-Baek's *Getting Married* and Oh Tae-Sok's *Bicycle* participated in Yellow Earth Theatre's East Asian Playreading Festival in London in June 2003, and Lee Man-Hee's *The Darkness on a Wooden Bell* was performed at Greenwich Playhouse in London in June 2004. More recently, Oh Tae-Sok and Theater Mokwah's *Why Did Shim Chung Plunge into the Sea Twice?*, though in Korean, was invited as one of the feature plays to the Comparative Drama Conference held at California State University, Northridge in April 2005, an invitation organized by Kim Ah-Jeong, professor of Theatre Graduate Studies at the university and the translator of Oh Tae-Sok's plays.

As shown in these examples, active efforts to relate theater translation to the actual staging of the play is critically needed, and this will help to draw more professional and scholarly attention to Korean theater and its translation. Once again, this reiterates the importance of a mutual and dialectic relationship between the theatrical text and its performance, from which theater translators are never free.

V. Conclusion

It is not Korean translation that has made Shakespearean plays the most popular and frequently staged works in Korea. While translation may have contributed to the success of Shakespeare in Korea, translation alone does not produce a masterpiece. Instead, it intends to help transform what are 'believed to be-quality-works' in the source language into what are 'recognized as-quality-works' in the target language context, although there may not be a correspondence between the two cultures regarding what is believed to be quality theater. However, that does not justify adjusting our criteria to suit theirs.

The near absence of the translation of Korean theater into English has been attributed to the small proportion of theater texts in Korean literature, the incomplete status of theater texts, the supremacy of performance over text, and the low marketability of theater texts. While all these problems cannot be dealt with and solved in an instant, more strategically-focused approaches are critically needed for the effective English translation of Korean theater, as well as Korean literature in general.

Because of the unique characteristic of theatricality, inherently embedded in the theater text and the dialectic relationship between text and performance, theater translators, unlike those of other literary genres, are asked to consider theatrical dynamics, in addition to literary textuality. A theater translator's professional knowledge of stage semiotics is pivotal. Furthermore, in the selection of texts to translate, translators need to be reminded that what we like most is not necessarily what appeals most to target readers/audiences. Thus, more attention should be paid to identifying and analyzing the expectations and preferences of target readers/audiences, which requires professional familiarity with current trends in world theater. As far as literary consumers are concerned, most theater translations would be only read and used by students, critics and avid theater-goers. Therefore, rather than

trying to publish an individual playwright's work, anthologies such as 'Contemporary Korean Theater' are more feasible, gaining easier access to target readers/audiences in the beginning, as they can be used as textbooks in college courses. Once these initial approaches work effectively, there needs to be more focus upon promoting theater translation through theater stages more than bookstores. It is critical to connect theater translation to actual staging of the translated play, as shown in the efforts by Kim Ah-Jeong, translator of Oh Tae-Sok's plays, and in most cases, this can take place on college theater stages.

Translation may have different purposes, but if one of its goals is to appeal to target readers/audiences, more practical and strategically-focused approaches are critically in need.

References

- Baker, Mona, ed. 2001. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Bassnett, Susan. 2002. *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Bassnett, Susan. 1991. "Translating for the Theatre: The Case Against Performability." *TTR: Traduction, Terminologies, Redaction* 4:1, 99-111.
- Bong, Jun-Su. et al. 2004. *Translation of Korean Literature into Foreign Languages: Past, Present, and Future*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press. [Korean]
- "Choreographer Ahn Eun-Mi's European Tour of 'Chunhyang.'" *Chosun Ilbo*, April 18, 2006, A23. [Korean]
- Daesan Foundation. "Grants for the Translation of Korean Literature." <http://www.daesan.or.kr/sub4-1.htm> (accessed March 1, 2006).
- Elam, Keir. 2002. *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. London: Routledge.
- Kim, Mido. 1997. "Originality and Modernity of Korean Theatre: A Study on

- Oh Tae-Suk's Dramas." *Korea Journal* 37:3, 78-92.
- Korea Literature Translation Institute. "2005 Reference List of Modern Korean Literature."
http://www.korealit.net:8080/data/2005/current_lti.pdf (accessed March 1, 2006).
- Korea Literature Translation Institute, ed. 2002. *An Annotated Bibliography of Korean Literature in Translation 1980-2002*. Seoul: Korea Literature Translation Institute.
- Lee, Hyung-Jin. 2005. "Translating Ideogram into a Culture of Phonogram in Tae-Sok Oh's Play *Bellflower*." *Translation Review* 70, 53-57.
- Lefevre, André. 1992. *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- "Lui Ho, Chinese Language Learning Material in Chosun." *Chosun Ilbo*, April 11, 2006, A23. [Korean]
- Milling, Jane and Graham Ley. 2001. *Modern Theories of Performance*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Nichols, Richard. 2000. Book review of *The Metaphysical Theater of Oh T'ae-Sök: Five Plays from the Korean Avant-Garde*. in *Asian Theatre Journal* 17:2, 292-293.
- Oh, Se-Gon. 2000. "A Study of the Frequent Mistakes in Theater Translation." *Theater Education Study* 6, 27-54. [Korean]
- Oh, Tae-Sok. 1999. *The Metacultural Theater of Oh T'ae-Sök: Five Plays from the Korean Avant-Garde*. Ah-Jeong Kim and R. B. Gravs (trans.), Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Pavis, Patrice. 1976. "Problems of Translation for Stage: Intercultural and Post-Modern Theatre." in Hanna Scolnicoy and Peter Holland (eds.), *The Play Out of Context: Transferring Plays from Culture to Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 25-42.
- Rapin, Cathy. 1995. "Traduire du theatre: sur quelques problemes de la traduction du texte dramatique." *Etudes Francophones*. 3, 5-28.

- Read, Leslie Du S. 1992. "Directing." in Martin Banham (ed.), *The Cambridge Guide to Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 280
- Reiss, Katharina. 2000. *Translation Criticism-The Potentials and Limitations*. Manchester: St. Jerome Press.
- Seidensticker, Edward George. "Winds Interview: Edward Seidensticker-A Direct Translator." *JAL's Winds* (Jan. 2003)
<http://www.jat.org/jtt/winds0301.html> (accessed March 1, 2006)
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Zeber-Skerritt, Ortrun. 1984. "Translation Science and Drama Translation." in Ortrun Zeber-Skerritt (ed.), *Page to Stage: Theatre as Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi Press, 3-12.

K C I

[Abstract]

Reorientation of the English Translation of Korean Theater

Lee, Hyung-Jin
(Sookmyung Women's University)

More than a hundred-year long history of the English translation of Korean literature has resulted in a sharp rise of the number of translation works for the past decades. However, theater translation has been marginalized more than other genres in literature, which leads to the near absence of the study on the English translation of Korean theater.

The lack of visibility of the English translation can be attributed to the performance-valued characteristics of theater, postulated by a concept that the aesthetic validity of a play is supposed to be tested on the stage before it reaches readers. This perspective considers theater text as supplementary and incomplete. Under the circumstances, the supremacy of performability, director, commerciality as well as marketability over textuality has marginalized the presence and role of theater translators.

Based on these fundamental premises, this paper intends to provide a series of starting points for a future direction of the English translation of Korean theater. First, because of the inherently dualistic structure of theater, theater translators should be, at least, familiar with the theatrical mechanism and stage semiotics. Second, if one of the purposes of translation is to approach target readers and draw their attention, theater translation needs to take a more strategic approach in order to identify the preferences and expectation of target readers while staying current with rapidly changing world theater trend. Third, as publication form is concerned, anthology rather than a single volume of the playwright's works is more feasible for publication in the beginning, suitable as

college textbooks. Fourth, once these efforts have succeeded, more attention needs to be directed toward actual staging of the translated plays either by college or professional theater companies.

While it is worthwhile critically speculating about whether it is always necessary for every Korean theatrical or literary work be recognized and appreciated by international audience through translation, on the other hand it is important to have a more genre-specific strategic approach to the globalization of Korean theater if that enhances development of Korean theater.

▶Key Words: English translation, theater translation, Korean theater, performability, textuality, marketability, globalization

이형진

숙명여자대학교 영문학부 조교수

관심분야: 문학번역

jinlee@sookmyung.ac.kr

논문투고일: 2006년 4월 26일

심사완료일: 2006년 5월 30일

게재확정일: 2006년 6월 10일

