

Translation of ‘Performability’ in the English Translations of Park Jo-yeol’s *O Chang-gun’s Toenail**

Hyung-jin Lee

Sookmyung Women’s University, Seoul, Korea

jinlee@sookmyung.ac.kr

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the nature of ‘performability’ in drama translation by comparing Bruce and Ju-chan Fulton’s 1990 and 2009 translations of Jo-yeol Park’s seminal play, *O Chang-gun’s Toenail*. The analytical comparison of these two different translations done by the same translators demonstrates how the changes in the new translation reflect the more active incorporation of theatrical elements for performance purpose, and how much justification these changes could generate in identifying them as elements of ‘performability’ in drama translation. While the term ‘performability’ itself often becomes subject to controversy, its main function is to provide a drama text with more ‘performable’ elements on the stage. This study has found that effective modification of stage directions, enhanced colloquiality, and emphasis on register are the key facets of the changes between the two translations, which is a reflection of the translators’ intention to enhance ‘performability’. These changes not only transform the revised translation into a more professionally playable theater text with theatrical protocols, but also stress the colloquiality of the dialogue for the sake of actors’ effective articulation on the stage.

* This research was supported by the Sookmyung Women’s University Research Grants (1-1203-0293).

KEYWORDS

Drama translation, theater translation, performability, theatrical economy, colloquiality, Korean theater, Park Jo-yeol, *O Chang-gun's Toenail*

1. Introduction

This study aims to analyze the nature of 'performability' in drama translation by comparing Bruce and Ju-chan Fulton's two different translations, published in 1990 and 2009 respectively, of *O Chang-gun's Toenail*, a seminal Korean play written by Jo-yeol Park in 1974. While the term 'performability' often becomes subject to controversy, the analytical comparison of the two different translations by the same translators is expected to demonstrate how the changes in the revised translation reflect the more active incorporation of theatrical elements for performance purposes, and how much justification these changes could generate in the process of identifying them as elements of 'performability'.

Drama translation is significantly different from translation of other literary genres such as novel or poetry, and the difference is mainly ascribed to the unique feature of 'performability' of drama text. Kowzan has listed the following inventory of signs that constitute a drama text: 1) Spoken word; 2) Tone; 3) Bodily expression; 4) Gestures; 5) Movements; 6) Make-up; 7) Hair-style; 8) Costumes; 9) Props; 10) Scenery; 11) Lighting; 12) Music; 13) Sound (Kowzan 1968, in Mateo 21). According to Kowzan's categorization, among the 13 elements that constitute a drama text, language-related elements are only two: spoken word and tone. This reflects a dominating portion of 'non-verbal' elements in the semiology of theater, which makes attempts to define 'performability' complicated and fussy.

However, what makes the term ‘performability’ truly controversial is that the term itself refuses to be easily defined, and moreover, different scholars have coined different terms to refer to the nature of ‘performability’, such as ‘theatricality’, ‘speakability’, ‘breathability’, ‘playability’, ‘actability’, ‘stageability’, etc (Espasa 49). This leads to heavy debate among translation scholars regarding whether or not ‘performability’ is something substantial, how to define the concept if it exists, as well as how to materialize and identify it in the actual translation process.

For instance, Pavis asserts that, while consenting to the claim that ‘performability’ is not something inherent to drama text, it is something to be generated by the effective and pragmatic non-textual elements: “[performability] does not manifest itself (···) as a quality or an essence which is inherent to a text or a situation, but as a pragmatic use of the scenic instrument, so that the components of the performance manifest and fragment the linearity of the text and of the word (Pavis 1983, in Espasa 52). However, arguing against this, Bassnett problematizes the term, claiming that any “attempts to define the ‘performability’ inherent in a text never go further than generalized discussion about the need for fluent speech rhythm in the target text. . . . There is no sound theoretical base for arguing that ‘performability’ can or does exist” (102). Also, some other scholars specifically limit the term ‘performability’ to the matter of enunciability while preferring the term ‘speakability’ to ‘performability’: “Speakability may be defined as the degree of ease with which the words of the translated text can be enunciated. The writer for the stage, whether he be the playwright or his agent in the new language, must always keep in mind the fact that he is writing a scenario for production” (Wellwarth 140).

Despite all these controversies, the term ‘performability’ has been

continuously incorporated into the mainstream discourse of drama translation, largely due to the dual characteristics of drama text. Unlike novel or poetry, drama text is far from becoming a fixed and complete text at the time of publication. While novels and poetry are written for readers, drama text is mostly written for viewing audiences and live performances. As no contemporary drama text is written solely for readers, this unique 'audience-oriented' aspect often makes the notion 'performability' a pivotal requisite for drama text, and at the same time, something idea and critical that drama translation should strive to achieve.

As much as the term 'performability' is vague and abstract, 'performability' is never easy to prove in actual drama translation. Even a comparative analysis of the translation and its source text offers limited access to verifying 'performability' because the task itself faces the daunting challenge of a thorough and in-depth analysis of 'performability' both in the source and translation text. Also, due to different theater conventions in different cultures, even major criteria for identifying the elements of 'performability' could vary from culture to culture. Moreover, even a detailed analysis of two different translations done by two different translators does not always yield a meaningful comparison because different translators tend to have a different interpretation and representation of the concept 'performability'.

Given the circumstances, Bruce and Ju-chan Fulton's two different English translations of *O Chang-gun's Toenail* become an interesting case for the study of 'performability' in drama translation because the Fultons' 1990 and 2009 translations of the same work demonstrate a delicate but critical difference over the course of time, which can be attributed to the translators' different level of awareness of 'performability'. With this particular thesis in perspective, this

study is expected to serve as a more tangible means to verify the nature and characteristics of 'performability' as well as its reconstruction process in actual translation.

2. Translation of 'Performability'

The argument of how to translate 'performability' presupposes an critical condition that 'performability' indeed exists in every drama text of the source language. In other words, if it is practically impossible to identify 'performability' in the source text, it becomes meaningless to discuss 'performability' in translation because the function of drama translation, or any translation, is to transfer something already embedded in the source text into another language, not to newly create in translation something that does not exist in the source text, 'performability' in this case. Therefore, it is prerequisite for drama translators to be able to identify and discuss the 'performability' of the source text before thinking about how to transfer it in translation. In this sense, the role of drama translators is to maximize 'performability' of the source text in translation. This makes 'performability' the theatrical mechanism that transforms a literature-oriented drama text into a performance-oriented theater text.

While 'performability' is conceived as abstract and vague, the notion itself is technically 'translatable' into a couple of tangible concepts in theater once we reduce the term to its adjective form 'performable'. Given the fact that drama text is written 'to be performed' in front of a live audience, these tangible elements are inevitably related to the essential nature of a live performance,

conforming to the theatrical convention of the target culture. Marco points out the importance of accommodating the theatrical convention and protocol in the process of translation: “the text is spoken and has to be acceptable in the oral conventions of the target culture. This fidelity to conventions is all-important, but it should be added that the instantaneous character of dramatic performance lends weight to the claim that conventions exert an even more powerful influence on the stage than on the printed page” (57).

First, as a live performance is a priority for drama text, the effective use of stage directions, designed to provide a performance frame to the text, can be considered as a distinctive device of adding ‘performability’. Stage directions are expected to help make drama text as clear and detailed as possible to director, actors, stage designers, and other stage staffs who prepare for a live performance.

However, the problem for translators is that not every playwright creates stage directions with the same degree of clarity and concreteness. Thus, when a play is performed in the country of the source language, theater directors or designers could consult, if necessary, with the playwright, or other directors who have staged the play before. They could even check the play’s live performance materials of the past to verify ambiguous parts of the text. However, when working with translations only, they are faced with less favorable circumstances as they lack a direct access to these useful performance-related resources of the source language. Under the circumstances, the urgent task for drama translator is to maximize the clarity and concreteness of translation text by means of detailed and logical stage directions, making the translation text a ‘performable’ manual.

Second, as a drama text is to be read by actors on the stage for the purpose of effective and instant communication with a live

audience, an important consideration should be given to actors' oral articulation, which leads to increased 'performability'. The dialogue should be written in such a way as to be articulated by actors with ease and clarity. For instance, awkward combinations of words, the use of difficult-to-pronounce words, and even tongue twisters should be avoided. These linguistic needs require from translators the keen sense of the appropriate and effective use of register and phonetic tones of words and intonation as well.

Along the lines of the 'effective and instant communication with a live audience', cultural translation needs to be considered as a means of enhancing 'performability'. Unlike novels or poetry where readers can control the reception process of literary works—for instance, readers can pause anytime at a particular page before proceeding to the next, or return to the previous pages or re-read if they want—, theater audience cannot stop the play in the middle, nor can they return to previous scenes.

As Zuber-Skerritt insists, drama stays alive only in its theater performance, the total experience expressed in oral and non-verbal language and appreciated by all physical senses as well as the intellect and emotions (5). Thus, drama translators, when faced with cultural particularities, are asked to actively intervene to bridge the cultural gap between the source text and the translation. This intervention could lead to a wider range of changes, modifications, and replacement in translation, which eventually helps to increase the text's performable nature.

While translation of 'performability' is not easily measurable from the traditional criteria of 'faithfulness' and 'accuracy', considerations of all these elements are expected to reformat the translation text, making it more 'playable' in a different language setting.

3. Two translations of *O Chang-gun's Toenail*: from a literary text to the theatrical

O Chang-gun's Toenail, written in 1974, is Jo-yeol Park's most representative play in which an innocent countryside man named 'O Chang-gun' is mistakenly conscripted into the army and, because of his pure innocence and total inability to adapt to harsh military reality, he is used without his knowledge as a counter-intelligence bait to decoy the enemy's attack plan. Once he is intentionally left alone in enemy-held territory and captured by the enemy, the combination of his total innocence and his wrong intelligence information fabricated by his military superiors, works quite effectively in throwing the enemy into confusion. This eventually causes the enemy's defeat, but at the expense of O Chang-gun's life.

The play is considered not only as one of the most seminal plays in the history of Korean drama because of the play's aesthetic and theatrical values, but also as one of the most symbolic works as the play was censored for 15 years for its anti-war allegorical criticism against the sacrifice of innocence and humanism for the sake of ideological causes. More to this, the play is also pivotal in the translation of Korean theater because it is one of few contemporary Koreans plays officially invited to numerous international theater festivals and performed abroad several times with great acclaim.

The plays' premiere in Korea in 1988 was soon followed by performances in various international venues. It was invited to the First Asia-Pacific Theatre Festival in August 1992 in Vladivostok, Russia, staged by a Korean theater company 'Michu', and in 1994 it was invited to the First BeSeTo Theater Festival in Seoul. In 2004, the play in the English translation by Bruce and Ju-chan Fulton was

premiered at Cherry Lane Theatre in New York Off-Off Broadway by Blue Bicycle Production. It was also performed by Seinengekijo ('Youth Theater') at Kinokuniya Hall in Tokyo in 2008. All these performances at international venues have made the play one of the most frequently staged contemporary Korean plays abroad so far.

The play's success abroad, especially its premiere in New York Off-Off Broadway, is largely attributed to the efforts of the translators, Bruce and Ju-chan Fulton, for their smooth but intense, and emotionally full-fledged translation. Because of the couple's ideal combination of native English proficiency and native Korean proficiency, they have become the most representative and prolific English translators of contemporary Korean literature with their specialization in novel translation, especially anthologies, whose major works include *Modern Korean Fiction: An Anthology* (2005, Columbia Univ. Press), *Wayfarer: New Fiction by Korean Women* (1997, Women in Translation), *Land of Exile: Contemporary Korean Fiction* (1992, M. E. Sharpe), *Words of Farewell: Stories by Korean Women Writers* (1989, Seal Press), etc. They are also recipients of numerous prestigious literary translation awards in Korea, including 'Korea Literary Award' (1993), 'Korea Literary Translation Award' (1997, 2001), 'Daesan Literary Translation Award' (2009), and other numerous translation grants. Their outstanding translations of modern Korean literature have already been canonized and widely read in college classrooms of Korean literature abroad.

What makes their English translations of *O Chang-gun's Toenail* worthy of scholarly attention is that the Korean text has been translated and published twice by the same translators 20 years apart. Moreover, the fact that during this time period the translators had a chance to participate in the actual process of staging the play in New York provides a ground for interesting speculation. It is my

assertion that the translators' on-site experience in the process of staging the English translation of the play in 2004 has particularly influenced the translators' theatrical perspective and led to the revised version of 2009 with prioritizing values of 'performability' in mind.

The 1990 translation was published in *Korea Journal*, an academic journal published in English with specialization in Korean studies, mostly dealing with contemporary political, social, and cultural issues of Korea, where a translation of literary pieces is occasionally introduced. Given the general nature of the journal, the 1990 translation was seemingly intended to introduce Park's seminal play in the English translation to western readers for the first time once the political ban on the play was lifted in 1988. This particular circumstance might have led the translators to focus on a particular kind of target readership outside Korea, who seem to have interest in social, political and cultural issues of Korea with probably less knowledge in Korean literature. This particular nature of the publication venue seems to have led the translators to put more emphasis on typical literary features of the text including story line, characters, major themes and moral lessons of the drama text for the sake of general readers abroad.

On the other hand, the 2009 translation demonstrates the strong inclination toward the typical features of theater text. The translation was included in *Modern Korean Drama: An Anthology*, a seminal work published by Columbia University Press as part of the Columbia University Press' trilogy of contemporary Korean literature anthology series: *The Columbia Anthology of Modern Korean Poetry* (2004) and *Modern Korean Fiction: An Anthology* (2005). This background characterizes *Modern Korean Drama: An Anthology* (2009) as genre-oriented, which reflects that this particular anthology targets a more specialized group of readers, such as theater scholars

and students as well as theater directors and designers, who have not only professional knowledge of theater but also a desire to see the performance of the play live on stage. With the different kinds of potential readers in mind, the revised translation is expected to reflect and incorporate more theatrical and 'performable' elements which is a critical part of 'theatrical language'.

Once again, this reminds us of an important aspect of translation, which is that translation could be affected by diverse non-textual factors, and that a different kind of readership as well as a different nature of publication venue could become influential factors on the style and strategy of translation.

The characteristic pattern of changes between these two translations can be categorized into correction of miscellaneous errors, effective use of stage directions, and enhanced colloquiality.

3.1. Correction of miscellaneous errors

One of the easily observable differences between the two translations is the technical correction of numerical or grammatical errors and typos, found in the 1990 translation. It is practically impossible to identify what caused these easy mistakes or errors. Some of these errors are supposedly caused by a typesetting error at the printing press or translators themselves while other errors could be ascribed to the presence of different versions of the text because it is not unusual that theater texts are rarely published in a book format at the time of performance, and thus sometimes translators work with one of the draft versions of performance manuscript, used at the rehearsal or production process, eventually different from the to-be-published one.

The examples of the correction of miscellaneous errors include

'3,365회' in the Korean text (p. 98) being translated into '365 times' in the 1990 translation (p. 62) and later corrected into '3,365 times' in the 2009 translation (p. 86), as well as '124번지는 오 부자네 번지고, 할머니 번지는 125번입니다.' (p. 116) into 'Mr. O's family is number 123, yours is 124' (p. 71) but later corrected into 'Mr. O's family number 124, yours is 125' (p. 98) in the 2009 translation. The example of 'Have yo eaten dinner yet?' in the 1990 translation (p. 71) being corrected into 'Have you eaten dinner yet?' in the 2009 is a minor typo which could have been caused mostly by a typesetting error at the printing press.

These corrections in the revised translation imply a peculiar nature of translation that significantly differs from original literary writing. Whether caused by errors on the source text or the translator's own mistake, or even errors that occurred during the printing process, the changes made between the 1990 and 2009 translation prove the translators' privilege that authors of literary works rarely enjoy in the course of time. While authors are rarely encouraged or allowed to modify their works, or become reluctant to revise their original work after publication, worrying that it could debase their authority as the original author, translators are always entitled the opportunity to retranslate the original text at the time of a new or revised version of translation being released. The advantage of revision or rewriting by the same or different translators over the course of time could yield naturally a more refined version of translation with fewer errors. In this sense, unlike a literary work, translation reflects the fundamental nature of collective work in which different translators complement the translation to complete it in the course of time. It is a different subject to discuss, however, whether the opportunities of revision or rewriting could turn into a poisoned chalice to translators as the frequent intervention and change by

translators after the final publication could rather erode the translator's reliability and authority.

3.2. Effective modification of stage directions: theatrical convention and performability

There is another kind of change stressing the importance of 'performability' in translation. As discussed earlier, the orientation of 'performability' is geared toward transforming a drama text into a performance manual. For this purpose, stage directions become an instruction manual for directors, actors and theater personnel in terms of how to design a stage and how to utilize special effects, not to mention of how to create physical movements of actors on the stage. As different playwrights tend to have a different style of writing stage directions, it is an important task for drama translators to transform the stage directions in the source text as clearly and logically as possible for the sake of an effective communication with theater personnel in the target language while accommodating the theatrical convention and protocol of the target culture. In this respect, some of the changes in the 2009 translation clearly reflect a deliberate intention of rearrangement and concretization of stage directions.

Korean Text (2009)	English Translation (1990a, b) by Bruce & Ju-chan Fulton	English Translation (2009) by Bruce & Ju-chan Fulton
어머니: 오냐 (이미 드러렁 대는 아들에게) (p.96)	Mother: All right. (<i>O Chang-gun begins to snore.</i>) (p.61)	MOTHER: All right. (CHANG-GUN <i>begins to snore.</i>) (p.85)
‘오장군’은 장군이 아니다,... 아들이 태어나면 ‘장군’이라는 아명으로 부르면서~ (p.87)	The “Chang-gun” in the title doesn’t mean “General” but is instead a given name. (p.56)	The “Chang-gun” in the title is not the Korean word ‘changgun’, which means “military general”, but is instead a given name.

		(p.79)
무대 가운데쯤에서 멈추더니 (p.90)	<i>They stop <u>in the middle of the stage</u> and ~ (p.58)</i>	<i>They stop <u>center stage</u> and ~ (p.81)</i>
물동이에 물을 길으며 부르는 꽃분이의 노래 (p.99)	<i><u>While pretending to fill her water jar, she sings.</u> (p.62)</i>	<i><u>Pantomimes filling her water jar and sings</u> (p.87)</i>
무대 뒤에서 꽃분이를 부르는 소리가 가까워지더니 (p.99)	<i><u>The sound of O Chang-gun calling Kkot-bun approaches.</u> (p.63)</i>	<i><u>“Kkotbun!” from offstage.</u> (p.87)</i>
지뢰 폭발음과 기관총성으로 인한 정서적 혼란 및 무능력 상태 (p.105)	<i><u>a state of helplessness caused by the explosion of the mine and the sound of the machine-gun fire</u> (p.65)</i>	<i><u>a state of helplessness caused by mine explosion and machine-gun fire</u> (p.91)</i>
간호장교: (주사를 놓는다) (p.105)	<i>The nurse <u>injects O Chang-gun with the medicine.</u> (p.66)</i>	<i>The NURSE <u>injects CHANG-GUN.</u> (p.91)</i>
구름 ... 뒤따르는 클라리넷 ... (p.107)	<i><u>Humming, followed after a pause by the clarinet</u> (p.66)</i>	<i><u>Humming; pause, clarinet.</u> (p.92)</i>
인사장교만이 라이트 속에 있다. (p.107)	<i><u>At first, the stage is dark; then a spotlight on the personnel officer.</u> (p.66)</i>	<i><u>Darkness; then a spotlight on the PERSONNEL OFFICER.</u> (p.92)</i>
나무 A가 느닷없이 오장군의 총을 밟아 서고, (p.134)	<i><u>Suddenly tree A is stepping on O Chang-gun's rifle,</u> (p.55, 1990b)</i>	<i><u>Suddenly TREE B is stepping on CHANG-GUN's rifle.</u> (p.109)</i>

<Table 1: Examples of theatrical terminology and simplicity in stage directions>

The first kind of the change in stage directions is the emphasis of the theatrical convention. For example, when dealing with character names in the stage directions the 1990 translation adopts a prose style without differentiating names from the text, but the 2009 translation demonstrates the utilization of theatrical convention by capitalizing all the character names as well as making them de-italicized and bold as shown in the Table 1.

Another interesting type of change in the 2009 translation is terminology choice. The revised translation reflects the various uses of professional theater terminology in stage directions such as ‘center stage’ instead of ‘in the middle of the stage’, ‘offstage’ instead of ‘from outside’, ‘pantomimes’ instead of ‘pretending to’. Also, eliminating

redundancy in stage directions is a part of the culture of theater terminology. The examples of ‘injects’ instead of ‘injects with the medicine’, ‘Humming; pause, clarinet’ instead of ‘Humming, followed after a pause by the clarinet’, ‘darkness’ instead of ‘stage is dark’ reflect a preference for theatrical convention in terms of clarity and effectiveness. The frequent use of theatrical terminology and conventions helps the literary text transform into a theatrical text, which eventually enhances a performable nature of the text.

The case of ‘General’ being changed into ‘military general’ in the 2009 translation reflects the translators’ choice of cultural elaboration on the meaning ‘general’. This type of specification is often used when dealing with culturally less known or ambiguous references or topics. As the term ‘general’ alone could be interpreted in various ways, the translators have chosen a specification strategy in the revised translation for a clearer understanding.

Lastly, an example of seemingly innocent mistranslation of ‘나무 A’ shows the translators’ interesting interference. ‘나무 A’ was initially translated into ‘tree A’ in the 1990 translation, but into ‘TREE B’ in the 2009 translation by the same translators. The change reflects the translators’ insightful intention of making the character’s behavior consistent and logical, intending to differentiate ‘TREE A’ from the remaining tree characters ‘TREE B, C, D’. While ‘TREE B, C, D’ are low ranking enemy soldiers who respond with force to O Chang-gun at the time of his capture, ‘TREE A’, an enemy intelligence captain of the search troops, is the one who restrains ‘TREE D’s violent attack on O Chang-gun. Although it was ‘TREE A’ character who stepped on O Chang-gun’s rifle in the 1974 Korean text, the translators have chosen ‘TREE B’ for the character who stepped on the rifle and threatened O Chang-gun in the 2009 translation in order to make each character’s behavior more consistent in translation—the captain

'TREE A' as prudent and self-controlled while other 'TREE' soldiers, impulsive and violent. Though this may appear as the translators' problematic interference with the original text, the translators' intention can be understood in terms of providing a more consistent character analysis to actors and audience, eventually enhancing the text's performability.

3.3. Enhanced colloquiality: simplicity and communicability

The dialogues between characters, a main framework of drama texts, are expected to consider two kinds of readers: general readers who read the text as a literary text, and theater personnel including directors and actors who approach the text as a manual for performance. With the first type of reader in consideration, a general style of translation that emphasizes literary characteristics of the text suffices as translation, but in order to accommodate the needs of the second type of reader who wants to transform the literary text into a performance manual, an intense colloquial style is much needed. This colloquial style highly prefers short and spoken language to written expressions, which serve easier to articulate for actors, making them more speedy and dynamic. For this, the translators' intervention to reduce redundancy in dialogue and make the dialogue concise and compact is frequently observed in the 2009 translation, and the conciseness makes the text feel more intense and theatrical than literary.

Korean Text (2009)	English Translation (1990a, b) by Bruce & Ju-chan Fulton	English Translation (2009) by Bruce & Ju-chan Fulton
두 사람은 잠시 그 소리를 듣는다. (p.90)	If you listen carefully, you realize~ (p.58)	Listen carefully and you realize~ (p.81)
하긴. (p.91)	Well, maybe you're right. (p.58)	Well, all right. (p.81)

넌 우습지도 않니? (p.92)	Funny, <u>isn't it?</u> (p.59)	Funny, <u>huh?</u> (p.81)
그렇게 풀이 죽을 것까진 없어. (p.92)	No need to <u>get down in the dumps.</u> (p.59)	No need to <u>get depressed.</u> (p.81)
걱정할 것 없다. (p.95)	<u>Nothing to worry about.</u> (p.61)	Now don't you <u>fret</u> (p.84)
아암! 나두 그래야지, (p.95)	<u>You better believe I will</u> (p.61)	<u>For sure.</u> (p.85)
꿈을 꿴는데 말야. (p.97)	What a dream <u>I was having.</u> (p.62)	What a dream! (p.86)
세 가지 장애물 (p.101)	<u>three kinds of barriers</u> (p.64)	<u>three obstacles</u> (p.89)
적의 눈까지 피했다고 하자. (p.102)	We'll <u>be able to keep out of</u> their sight. (p.64)	We'll <u>avoid</u> them. (p.89)
교관: 한 번 더 차봐! (p.103)	Drill Instructor: <u>Give him a few kicks.</u> (p.64)	DRILL INSTRUCTOR: <u>Kick him.</u> (p.89)
농부가 틀림없지? (p.105)	<u>He really is a farmer, isn't he?</u> (p.66)	<u>Definitely a farmer.</u> (p.91)
나두 다른 군인들처럼 무섭게 보여? (p.106)	Do I look as <u>threatening</u> as the other soldier? (p.66)	Do I look as <u>scary</u> like other soldiers? (p.91)
오늘은 하마터면 내가 쓴 총알에 내가 맞아 죽을 뻔했단다. (p.106)	Today I <u>came close to killing</u> myself (p.66)	Today I <u>almost killed</u> myself (p.91)
그만둬, 받는 쪽이 더 기쁘단다. (p.106)	That's okay—it's better when <u>I actually get it in the mail.</u> (p.66)	No—I <u>like getting it in the mail.</u> (p.91)
그럴까? (p.108)	<u>Not a bad idea</u> (p.67)	That's a <u>swell</u> idea (p.93)
혹시 우리 아들이 아직도 훈련소에 안 갔을까봐 또 그런 편지를 보냈는지 모르겠소만, (p.115)	<u>I suppose it's possible they're afraid he hasn't arrived at the training camp yet,</u> (p.70)	<u>Maybe they don't know he arrived at training camp?</u> (p.97)
오장군이란 이름의 어디가 좋아서 두 놈이나 그 이름을 쓴단 말인가? (p.117)	Two fellows named O Chang-gun—what's so special about a name like that? (p.71)	<u>Who the hell would have thought</u> there'd be two fellows named O Chang-gun? (p.98)
천천히 한 방울도 남기지 말고 싸버려. (p.120)	Get it all out--there better not <u>be a drop left</u> (p.72)	Get it all out-- <u>every last drop</u> (p.100)
적은 ~ 알고 있음이 확실하며, (p.121)	the enemy <u>is clearly aware</u> that (p.49, 1990b)	the enemy <u>knows</u> that (p.101)
지들이 포로 심문을 할 때 그럴듯한 거짓 정보를 늘어놓게끔 공작을 꾸미게. (p.123)	a means to <u>misinform the enemy under interrogation</u> (p.50, 1990b)	a means to <u>slip the enemy this misinformation under interrogation</u> (p.102)

<Table 2: Examples of colloquial expression>

For colloquiality, two types of changes are found: first, shortening a sentence or deletion of redundant parts, and second, replacement with more colloquial terms or expressions for better articulation.

'Isn't it?'→'Huh?', 'he really is a farmer, isn't he?'→'Definitely a farmer', 'worry about'→'fret', 'be able to keep out of'→'avoid', 'give him a few kicks'→'kick him', 'came close to'→'almost', 'is clearly aware'→'knows' are examples of shortened sentences in the revised translation. These shortened sentences not only make the meaning more concise and clear, but also make dialogues tighter and speedier, helping actors articulate the lines better.

Pavis described this particular type of change as 'theatrical economy', claiming that "one might for example translate: 'I want you to put the hat on the table' by 'Put it there', accompanied by a look or gesture, thus reducing the sentence to its deictic elements" (31). Pavis proposes that the value of theatrical economy is also based on the important function of non-verbal elements in theater performance as far as effective communication with a live audience is concerned, because the potential gap to be generated by theatrical economy is supposed to be filled with actors' gestures, intonation, pitch, and other non-textual elements.

The second type, a replacement with more colloquial expressions, starts with the first example in the Table 2, which turns an ordinary stage direction into a more colloquial expression as if it were a dialogue: '두 사람은 잠시 그 소리를 듣는다'→'If you listen carefully, you realize~' and later translated into 'Listen carefully and you realize~'.

Other examples of the replacement with colloquial expressions include 'not a bad idea'→'swell idea', 'get down in the dumps'→'get depressed', 'threatening'→'scary', 'misinform the enemy'→'slip the enemy this misinformation', etc. These changes do not necessarily result in shortening sentences, but replace some of the expressions

with more colloquial and everyday ones that make actors' articulation easier. In other cases, the revised translation becomes rather longer as it adds more colloquial expressions like 'Who the hell~' as in the example of 'Two fellows named O Chang-gun'→'Who the hell would have thought there'd be two fellows named O Chang-gun?' Overall, changes for the sake of colloquiality seem to be the most common and frequent type of change in the 2009 translation.

Also, sentences like 'there better not be a drop left'→'every last drop', and 'I suppose it's possible they're afraid he hasn't arrived at the training camp yet'→'Maybe they don't know he arrived at training camp?' appear to be the examples that change literary and rhetorical sentences into spoken ones in the revised translation in order to strengthen colloquiality of the dialogue. A sentence like 'there better not be a drop left' seems quite archaic as well as Shakespearean in that, even at first glance, it appears less concerned with the actual articulation by actors on the stage.

3.4. Emphasis on register: tone and intensity

According to Merriam-Webster Dictionary, a term 'register' is defined as 'any of the varieties of a language that a speaker uses in a particular social context'. The nature of 'register' implies that words of similar meaning can be differently categorized and used according to its particular social context including speakers' age, gender, social status, region, educational background, etc. Thus, a different register can reflect a different level of tone and intensity with the similar meaning. The awareness of the importance of register has led to the translators' more delicate and selective use of register in the revised translation.

Korean Text (2009)	English Translation(1990a, b) by Bruce & Ju-chan Fulton	English Translation(2009) by Bruce & Ju-chan Fulton
욕을 퍼부었다는구나. (p.95)	<u>cussed</u> it right and left (p.60)	<u>cursed</u> it right and left (p.84)
요란스러운 까치소리 (p.100)	The <u>call</u> of magpies (p.63)	The <u>outcry</u> of magpies (p.87)
첫째, 지뢰가 묻혀 있을 가능성이 있다. (p.102)	<u>First</u> , there might be mines. (p.64)	<u>Number one</u> , mines. (p.89)
그럼 1분대부터 (p.102)	Starting with <u>squad 1</u> (p.64)	Starting with <u>First Squad</u> (p.89)
위협적인 어조로 (p.104)	speaks in a <u>threatening</u> tone (p.65)	speaks in a <u>menacing</u> tone (p.90)
첫 번째 징계처분은 중노동 2일간 (p.107)	he was <u>punished</u> with two days at hard labor (p.67)	he was <u>sentenced</u> to two day's hard labor (p.92)
훈련소장 각하께서는 ~ 대기 하셨습니다 (p.107)	The commandant of the training camp <u>had to wait</u> - (p.67)	The commandant of the training camp <u>was forced to wait</u> (p.92)
손톱을 깎으라고 했지~, (p.108)	I <u>told</u> you to cut your fingernails ~, (p.67)	I <u>ordered</u> you to cut your fingernails ~, (p.93)

<Table 3: Examples of effective use of register>

For instance, the change of ‘cuss’ into ‘curse’ in the 2009 translation demonstrates the translators’ awareness of the nature of register on the ground that ‘cuss’ would be too slang-like for the mother character, a naive countryside woman. In the similar context, the changes of ‘call’→‘outcry’, ‘threatening’→‘menacing’, and ‘had to wait’→‘was forced to’ reflect a more intense level of emotion and nuance of the context. Furthermore, some particular registers are related to military culture of the context where military hierarchy and forcible authority are strongly imbued in the dialogue, such as ‘First, there might be mines’→‘Number one, mines’, ‘squad 1’→‘First squad’, ‘was punished’→‘was sentenced’, ‘I told you’→‘I ordered you’, etc. Considering the nature and theme of the play, it is important to reflect the harsh military background of the play by means of appropriate military register, and the heightened military hierarchy and forcible authority by means of the use of effective registers are starkly but sadly contrasted with the innocence and naivety of O Chang-gun, insinuating a tragic clash between these two forces.

The changes of register in the revised translation demonstrate the critically important awareness of the context. As drama text is based on much shortened dialogue and fewer pages compared to novels, a more deliberate choice of registers in the dialogue is needed in order to set up an intended tone and nuance of the dialogue and characters. In this sense, the examples discussed above demonstrate that even the use of several appropriate and effective registers, instead of longer elaborations or narrations found in novels, can help to tighten the compressed tension and dynamics of the context, enhancing the performable nature of the text.

4. Conclusion

The term ‘performability’ often becomes subject of controversy in drama translation as the term itself is criticized for being vague and less tangible, but at the same time, the term has been frequently discussed and cited in academic discourses for its important role in drama translation. Despite extremely opposite stances on the term, one thing that is clear is that the term ‘performability’, or ‘performable’ in its adjective form, is expected to provide a drama text with practically ‘performable’ elements on the stage. In this sense, the so-called ‘performable’ elements seem geared much toward the interest of actors and theater personnel rather than readers.

As ‘performability’ easily falls into controversy due to its subjective and abstract nature, it is more difficult to discuss ‘performability’ of translation texts done by different translators as translation itself is far from being objective. This limited circumstance rather makes Bruce and Ju-chan Fulton’s two different English translations of Jo-yeol Park’s *O Chang-gun’s Toenail*, unique and analyzable as the

changes made by the same translators 20 years later reflect the significant transition from a literary text to a theatrical text.

Effective modification of stage direction, colloquiality in dialogue, and emphasis of register are major characteristics of the changes made between the 1990 translation and 2009 translation. As the changes have been made by the same translators, these particular changes are considered a reflection of the translators' awareness and intention to enhance 'performability' at two different levels: the first kind of 'performability', that makes the text more like a professionally playable or 'performable' theater text, in other words, a performance manual for professional theater personnel, and the second kind of 'performability', that helps actors better articulate the dialogue live on stage for effective and instant communication with the audience.

The theoretical research on the nature and function of 'performability' in drama translation is destined to have its limit because of the abstract conceptualization, and thus an analysis of a single case study would not prove much. More to this, as Nikolarea argues, when a play of Sophocles' *Oedipus the King* is examined as a translated, published, and performed play text respectively, it defies any theoretical polarization of 'performability' and 'readability', which proves that this polarization is only a reductionist illusion. However, as drama translation is never free from these polarized sides, the discussion on 'performability' in drama translation is expected to be substantiated only when it is based more on the thorough analysis of the actual translation texts in the future.

REFERENCES

- 박조열 (2009) 『오장군의 발톱』. 서울: 연극과 인간.
Bassnett, Susan (1991) *Translating for the Theatre: The Case Against*

- Performability. *TTR: Traduction, terminologie, redaction*. 4(1): 99-111.
- ____ (1985) Ways Through the Labyrinth: Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts. In: Theo Hermans, ed. *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London: Croom Helm, 90-91.
- Espasa, Eva (2000) Performability in Translation: Speakability? Playability? Or Just Saleability? In: Carole-Anne Upton, ed. *Moving Target: Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation*, Manchester: St. Jerome, 49-62.
- Kowzan, Tadeusz (1968) The Sign in the Theater: An Introduction to the Semiology of the Art of the Spectacle. *Diogenes*. 61: 52-80.
- Marco, Josep (2002) Teaching Drama Translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 10(1): 55-68.
- Mateo, Marta (1995) Constraints and Possibilities of Performance Elements in Drama Translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 3(1): 21-33.
- Nikolarea, Ekaterini (2002) Performability versus Readability: A Historical Overview of a Theoretical Polarization in Theater Translation. *Translation Journal* 6(4) <<http://translationjournal.net/journal/22theater.htm>>
- Pak, Choy l (2009) O Chang-gun's Toenail In: *Modern Korean Drama: An Anthology*. Trans. Bruce and Ju-chan Fulton. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 77-115.
- Park, Joh-Yeol (1990a) O Chang-gun's Toenail (I). Trans. Bruce and Ju-chan Fulton. *Korea Journal* 30(6): 56-72.
- ____ (1990b) O Chang-gun's Toenail (II). Trans. Bruce and Ju-chan Fulton. *Korea Journal* 30(7): 49-60.
- Pavis, Patrice (1989) Problems of Translation for Stage: Intercultural and Post-Modern Theatre. In: Hanna Scolnicov and Peter Holland, eds. *The Play Out of Context: Transferring Plays from Culture to Culture*. Trans. Loren Kruger. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 25-44.
- Wellwarth, George E (1981) Special Considerations in Drama Translation In: Marilyn Gaddis Rose, ed. *Translation Spectrum: Essays in Theory and Practice*. Albany: State University of New York, 140-146.
- Zuber-Skerritt, Ortrun (1984) Translation Science and Drama Translation. In: Ortrun Zuber-Skerritt, ed. *Page to Stage: theatre as translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 3-11.

Received: June 30, 2013
Revised: August 7, 2013
Accepted: August 15, 2013