This is a repository copy of *The playwright as epic translator? Mother Courage and the intertextual construction of an 'English Brecht'*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/94314/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

THE PLAYWRIGHT AS EPIC TRANSLATOR? MOTHER COURAGE AND THE INTERTEXTUAL CONSTRUCTION OF AN 'ENGLISH BRECHT'

CAROLINE SUMMERS

(UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS)

ABSTRACT

Since the earliest translations of Brecht's plays into English, translators, directors and actors alike have struggled to reconcile a desire for textual accuracy with a style of performance that is considered 'Brechtian'. While the dialectic between text and performance is celebrated by Brecht's theories of theatre, his translated texts are often seen to bear sole responsibility for 'fidelity' to a concept of the Brechtian, and the continuing emergence of new translations of the plays is sometimes interpreted as a (hopeless) striving for perfection in the Anglophone understanding of Brecht. However, it is not one individual translation but rather the interaction between the translated texts that is central to an understanding of Brecht in English. If authorship can be understood as a discursive construction, 'Brecht' circulates in English as a fluid author-function that is more than the sum of the individual versions, and which shapes them in its turn. Through the example of Tony Kushner's Mother Courage and her Children (2006), a translation shaped by Brecht's Anglophone author-function but one which also enters into critical dialogue with previous translations, this paper explores the implications, for Anglophone Brecht, of the translator's attempts to observe Brechtian principles in his translatorial behaviour as well as in the translated text.

Seit den ersten Übersetzungen von Brechts Werken ins Englische ist es sowohl Übersetzern als auch Regisseuren und Schauspielern schwer gefallen, das Verlangen nach textueller Präzision mit den Merkmalen eines als 'brechtisch' verstandenen Theaterstils zu vereinbaren.

Während Brechts Theorie eine Dialektik zwischen Text und Aufführung fördert, tragen seine übersetzten Texte oft alleine der Verantwortung für 'Treue' zum Brechtschen Konzept Rechnung. Die regelmäßige Veröffentlichung oder Aufführung neuer Versionen zeugten für manche Kritiker zugleich von einem (vergeblichen) Streben nach Perfektionismus im anglophonen Brechtverständnis. Jedoch dienen nicht einzelne Texte sondern die Beziehungen zwischen ihnen als Schlüssel zum englischsprachigen Brecht. Wenn die Autorschaft als eine aus dem Diskurs stammende Kategorie betrachtet werden kann, darf Brechts im Englischen verbreitete Identität als flüssige Autorfunktion verstanden werden, welche mehr als die Summe der einzelnen Versionen ist und gleichzeitig ihrerseits Einfluss auf diese hat. Tony Kushners Mother Courage and her Children (2006) beispielsweise basiert stark auf Brechts englischsprachiger Autorfunktion, setzt sich jedoch zur selben Zeit mit früheren Übersetzungen kritisch auseinander. In diesem Artikel dient der Text als Beispiel, um zu erkunden, wie sich Kushners Versuch, brechtsche Konzepte bei seiner Herangehensweise und auch im übersetzten Text einzuhalten, in Bezug auf das englischsprachige Verständnis von Brecht auswirkt.

INTRODUCTION

'[In the English theatre] the ups and downs of Brecht's local fortunes are not so much changes in his reputation and theatrical status – seminal today, boring tomorrow – as changes in our grasp of his achievement. In Britain he has always been both seminal and boring, depending on how he is presented and understood; and what goes up and down (but on the whole more up) is our ability to understand and present him.'[1]

The distinctive relationships between language, performance and content in Brecht's plays have troubled his English-language reception from its earliest days. Translators, directors and commentators have found it difficult to maintain what is assumed to be a standardised and desirable level of 'faithfulness' both to Brecht's energetic and dynamic writing and to his critical view of society, and Martin Esslin has observed that 'the verdict and final summing

up of Brecht himself in England must be: if he is only seen without his words being heard, he is successful; if his texts are understood, he is a total failure.'[2] The challenge of doing justice to Brecht in translation is compounded for many by a sense of loyalty, as Ruth Berlau notes: 'If [translators] love Brecht – and presumably only those who do translate him – they try to copy the play in their own language. They want to be as faithful as possible – and then nothing comes of it'.[3]

The dissatisfaction of critics and translators alike suggests that Brecht's advocates in English have often found that compromise is inevitable. Elaborated in diachronic detail by Margaret Eddershaw in her study of Brecht's presence in British theatre, the text/ performance binary is at its extremes a divide between heavily politicised performance and empty spectacle. Early productions of Brecht's plays in English were solemn and earnest, with translators, directors and actors neglecting the humour in favour of the politics of the texts, while some later, more commercially successful productions have sanitised or lost sight of the political core of the plays and focused primarily on entertainment in the tradition of British or American theatrical culture.[4] The dialectical relationship between dramatic text and theatrical performance thus seems to become a binary of mutually exclusive objectives, in which the text of each translated play is faced with the seemingly impossible task of providing both linguistic accuracy and a site of encounter with 'the Brechtian' that can be demonstrated through performance.

Despite this wrangling over the translation process, Brecht's position in an international canon of theatre seems to be affirmed by the commonly received assumption that 'the epic idiom […] has become the universal language of contemporary theatre, regardless of its ideological origin'.[5] The tension this creates between the apparent impossibility of 'fidelity' to Brecht and the received notion that Brecht and his concepts are universal leads us to scrutinise more closely the translation of the authorial identity and

theatrical concepts perceived to be the source of Brecht's texts, and not just the texts themselves. A broadly circulated concept of 'the Brechtian' has perhaps been particularly influential on translators with little knowledge of the German source texts. This has been the case for the playwright Tony Kushner, whose own work is often described as 'Brechtian' and whose translations of The Good Person of Szechwan and of Mother Courage and her Children, premiered in 1994 and 2006 respectively. Significantly, it is not only interpretation of the texts that is guided by this establishment of an Anglophone concept of the Brechtian. Going beyond inviting an examination of Brecht's constructed authorship in English, this case study of Kushner's Mother Courage also explores how the translator might challenge the role typically assigned to him in order to approach translation from a Brechtian perspective, questioning how an 'epic' translation strategy in its turn contributes to an understanding of Brecht in English.

HOW 'BRECHTIAN' IS ENGLISH BRECHT? THE SYSTEM, THE AUTHOR-FUNCTION AND THE EPIC TRANSLATOR

The beginnings of an answer to these questions can be found in an approach to translation as context-dependent 'rewriting'. Within the context of systems theory, André Lefevere explores the reading and circulation (including the translation) of literature as processes that inevitably require the adaptation of the text to a host poetics.[6] Each time the text is read, or in the case of theatre also performed, it is rewritten and refracted by the social and poetic context in which the act of reading or interpretation takes place. Institutionally managed mechanisms such as circulation norms, patronage, the linguistic tools available, and dominant aesthetic tastes contribute to the reception of a text and the position allocated to it (and its author) within the literary system. Particularly in the case of translation into a powerful literary language such as English, this view assigns to the translated text a dominated position

requiring canonisation or endorsement in the new context. With its break from traditional theatrical style, Brecht's mode of epic theatre has typically challenged Anglophone theatrical culture and has also been moderated by it.

An example of this moderation is the intervention of what Lefevere categorises as economic patronage, for example in the way in which performance practices and material conditions in the target culture have contributed to the refraction of Brecht's writing: the lack of funding and resources for long rehearsal schedules, for example, has demonstrated how the economic patronage of institutions determines production values. Lefevere cites the Broadway production of Mother Courage as one example of this, in which the number of songs performed was determined by the financial resources available to fund the musicians needed.[7] The challenge of acclimatising to target-culture poetics is also reflected in studies of Brecht in performance that have identified limits to the compatibility of his theatrical practice with the host poetics of British and American culture. Lefevere's article highlights the shifts that result from the acculturation of Brecht's plays to Broadway poetics, and Dougal McNeill has discussed the status of translations of Brecht's Leben des Galilei as witnesses to dominant trends in target-culture poetics, while Margaret Eddershaw and Jim Hiley both suggest that, in spite of these difficulties, contextual factors such as a sense of humour founded in irony equip a British audience well for understanding Brecht.[8]

In particular, Lefevere identifies two main poetical considerations that shape the newly received text: 'one is an inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, prototypical characters and situations, and symbols; the other a concept of what the role of literature is, or should be, in the social system as a whole' (Translation, Rewriting and Manipulation, p. 26). The inventory of devices in the target language, for example, may not include the linguistic tools required to replicate the variation, humour or implicit meaning of the source text.[9] Early translations of Brecht in particular have been criticised for their failure to reproduce the

wit and intellectual vigour of his language, focusing instead on more explicit moral and political messages. As far as the role of the plays in the social system is concerned, Brecht's explicitly stated aim to introduce a new 'ideological superstructure' through theatre has in the past antagonised an Anglophone tradition less inclined to engage in political debate.[10] Following the Second World War and during the Cold War, the literary system in the USA in particular was an environment in which political commentary was not encouraged, and one in which Brecht himself was scrutinised for his Communist sympathies.[11] Just as cultural institutions in the FRG were condemning Brecht for his political views, early translations of the plays into English were also contextualised by institutional concerns about Brecht's politics, constituting potential obstacles to what Lefevere categorises as the ideological patronage of the writing (Translation, Rewriting and Manipulation, p. 16).[12]

The systems approach to literature and the theatre breaks with a Romantic myth of the 'poet as genius' and therefore with the positioning of the source text and author as infallible authorities, looking rather to context as a creator of meaning. The inevitability of shifts in translation is also suggested by the nature of the theatrical text as a fluid entity that is adapted for performance, resulting in a dialectical relationship between the words on the page and their production on stage. However, the use of 'the Brechtian' as a common theatrical currency indicates that there is, nonetheless, some sense in which the source text or author is perceived to have an authoritative claim over the translation. Looking beyond the text, and bearing in mind the lamentations of Brecht's translators and their critics that there is something 'un-Brechtian' about the translated plays, it is crucial to explore the relationship not just between the text and the target culture, but also between the translated writer and the host poetics, to consider how the author's perceived 'identity' authorises different translation approaches.

Reflecting on the influential power of the author and building on the assumption that knowledge and identity are discursively constructed, Foucault defines authorship as a function of discourse, in other words a category of participation that is defined and regulated by institutions and authorities beyond the individual writer.[13] The author is a contested point of confluence for different ideas about the writer and readings of his texts, in other words he or she is 'what gives the disturbing language of fiction its unities, its nodes of coherence, its insertion in the real' ('The Order of Discourse', p. 58). So the author, or the translator's understanding of him, informs the decisions taken in the translation, operating as a standard ('the Brechtian') to which the translator feels obliged to conform. Meanwhile, the author-function shifts in translation, as it moves between linguistically defined discourses or systems, since it is constructed by its textual and institutional context. The linguistic tools of literature and its social function, identified by Lefevere as formative forces, are also addressed by Foucault as characteristics of institutionally maintained discourse. He identifies the internal procedures of classification, ordering and distribution that govern the circulation of statements or the recognition of certain types of proposition by a discipline ('The Order of Discourse', pp. 56 and 60), and observes that the author-function is 'tied to the legal and institutional systems that circumscribe, determine and regulate the realm of discourses' ('What is an Author?', p. 130). A target system's definition of the author, then, may differ considerably from the author-function circulating in the source-culture, and may change over time.

In other words, the understanding of 'the Brechtian' that circulates in Anglophone discourse is seen as the unified locus for all writing on or by Brecht in English, while it is constantly re-defined through its encounters with literary institutions and systemic practices. Lefevere's work on translations of Mother Courage also adopts this perspective by regarding

each translation as a product of its time and, he explains, demonstrating how the parameters of acceptability shift between earlier and later translations:

> it would be easy to say […] that 'Manheim is good; Hays and Bentley are both bad'. It would be closer to the truth, however, to say that Manheim can afford to be good because Hays, and especially Bentley, translated Brecht before him. They focused attention on Brecht, and in so doing, they got the debate going. [14]

Lefevere contends that the earlier translators of Mother Courage, by prioritising a more literal translation strategy, performed the essential task of introducing the play to a new literary system and establishing a sense of reverence for Brecht, so that later translations were able to enjoy more freedom to vary from target-culture poetics and norms. As he observes, 'the degree of compromise in a refraction will depend on the reputation of the writer being translated within the system from which the translation is made' ('Mother Courage's Cucumbers', p. 7). However, as Kushner's translation demonstrates, translations do not always follow this trajectory of increasing freedom to contradict the target system.

Like Lefevere, Foucault leads us to the conclusion that multiple translations of a text will contribute to a cumulative sense of 'who Brecht is', as the assumed point of coherence between the competing accounts of his writing. However, the construction of Brecht's author-function in English has been a source of great discomfort to some commentators at least. Esslin complains that 'the Brechtian "era" in England stood under the aegis not of Brecht himself but of various second-hand ideas and concepts about Brecht, an image of Brecht created from misunderstandings and misconceptions', and John Willett's 1990 article on Brecht in English reveals an ongoing sense that Anglophone Brecht is unstable and flawed.[15] At the heart of this dissatisfaction seems to be a sense that the integral relationship between Brecht's theatrical principles and the texts of the plays has not been sufficiently

recognised, particularly since the theoretical dimension of Brecht's work was initially available in English only through (heavily criticised) performances of the plays.[16] While Lefevere sees the earlier translations and productions as doing essential groundwork in the establishment of Brecht's place in the Anglophone system, a Foucauldian response might consider them to have set a precedent conditioned by the target culture that has been upheld by later translators seeking to be faithful to a concept of 'the Brechtian', including Kushner.

In both Lefevere's and Foucault's models of the mechanics of literature, a gradually more established understanding of Brecht emerges with the passage of time. However, whilst there is now a greater sense of reverence for Brecht within the translated context, the understanding of the Brechtian that emerges is inevitably shaped by Anglophone literary and theatrical discourse. The argument that each new re-writing or refraction contributes positively to an accumulated understanding of the writer is accompanied by an awareness that authorial identity is an institutional construction that varies with discursive context. Significantly, Lefevere notes:

Once [the translated writer's] innovations begin to be accepted and imitated by other writers, soon to be labelled 'epigones' in supplements to literary histories, a bandwagon effect is created that more or less effectively neutralises the disturbing aspect in the novelty of their work. […] Indeed, the writers themselves simply live on and work as honoured mentors, often achieving in life the very opposite of what they set out to achieve in art. (Translation, Rewriting and Manipulation, p. 22)

This target-culture sense of (refracted) ownership of the translated writer can be seen, for example, in the case of Chekhov as described by Susan Bassnett.[17] In the case of Brecht, this neutralisation undermines the very disruptiveness at the heart of the epic theatre, and suggests that the non-German-speaking translator's understanding of the Brechtian is derived from

existing Anglophone accounts of Brecht, in which his concepts and practices are considered familiar and accepted. While Kushner's example reveals the more obvious negative implications of this shift to familiarity, it also demonstrates how the translator's approach to the translation process that can be productively guided by a commonly circulated idea of what it means to be Brechtian.

The invisibility of the literary translator is widely acknowledged and criticised in translation scholarship.[18] As Theo Hermans notes, the discursive response to the threat posed by translation to the stability and authority of the author-function has been the emergence of a restraining 'translator-function' able to 'contain the exponential increase in signification and plurivocality which translation brings about'.[19] Douglas Robinson suggests that the translator-function can be understood as 'a social construct created and wielded by the target culture as a vehicle for the "reliable" or "faithful" or "accurate" (i.e. ideologically regulated) transfer of foreign texts for domestic use', or 'a collective social construct projected onto (and educated into) any given translator in order to conform his or her professional activity to hegemonic norms'.[20] Even while speaking, the voice of the translator is typically muted by the discursive consolidation of the author as origin in the meta-language and practices of translation, in readers' expectations of translated texts and in the legal conditions under which translation takes place.

Meanwhile, a possible antidote is to view the translator explicitly as an active collaborator. Myriam Díaz-Diocaretz discusses the translator-function as a social role combining the behaviours of 'active writer' and 'omniscient reader'. She reflects on how it might be possible for the translator to exploit a position as 'dual internal addresser/ encoder' by 're-enacting' the translated text to disrupt rather than affirm a normative authorial voice, though she does not fully explore the tensions between this more subversive translator-function and the discursive institutions that typically prescribe a submissive translation and

curate the identity of the author.[21] Díaz-Diocaretz's translator-function fits the approach to

theatre translation suggested by Sirkku Aaltonen, for example, who laments the fact that,

despite considerable creative input, the translator of a play is not legally recognised as its

creator, and calls for better understanding of the translator's input as active intervention.[22]

Such an approach also seems appropriate for Brecht, whose writing on the theatre advocates a

collaborative approach to production that drives participants to challenge the text and engage

critically with it, with actors encouraged to read one another's parts and to experiment with

different modes of delivery to avoid 'fixed' character portrayal.

The emphasis on collaboration in epic theatre suggests that, like actors, designers and

director, the translator of the Brecht text is also invited to make a visible, critical and

potentially subversive contribution to the delivery of the text. Brecht's comments on the

theatrical 'Modell' support this: 'Praktisch gesprochen wird es genügen, wenn das

Arrangement, welches beim Modell die Geschichte erzählt, als Ausgangspunkt der

Probenarbeit benutzt wird' (BFA 25, p. 389). While his earlier translators aspire to 'fidelity'

to his texts, Brecht's theatrical practice encourages translators to challenge the primacy of the

source text as 'Modell', and this is the approach adopted by Tony Kushner in his translation

of Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder. However, as we will see, Kushner's status as a

playwright in his own right positions him as a powerful institutional voice in the target

culture, breaking with Díaz-Diocaretz's paradigm of the subversive translator-function and

creating tension with the crucial collaborative element of Brecht's plays.

EPIC TRANSLATION? TONY KUSHNER'S MOTHER COURAGE

In its setting, its plot and its characters, Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder (1939) embodies

what can be identified as central principles in the Brechtian approach to theatre: a dialectic of

war and peace that resonates between the distant Thirty Years War and Brecht's

contemporary Second World War and beyond; character portrayal that mercilessly exposes flaws, human failings and at times repellent motives; and events that bring suffering and yet do not invite pity through their depiction. The play is frequently cited in anthologies or criticism of Brecht in English, so its centrality to his Anglophone author-function is demonstrable, and English-language translators of the play have included H. R. Hays, Eric Bentley, John Willett, David Hare, Tony Kushner, and Tom Leonard. While earlier translators such as Bentley and Willett could claim a personal connection to Brecht, Kushner's 2006 translation, which premiered nearly seventy years after the writing of the German play, demonstrates the translator's engagement with the Brechtian from a different perspective.

A Pulitzer-prize winning American playwright, Kushner wields his own author-function and therefore brings a degree of specifically literary authority to his translation, since he is authorised and sanctioned by his own position in the target system. More powerful than, but inseparable from, his translator-function, Kushner's authorial identity contributes not only generally but also specifically to the authority of his Brecht translation, since he is often compared to Brecht on the basis of the political motivation for his writing (generally speaking, his views are socialist and humanist) and his admiration for Brecht is clear, since he regards him as 'one of the great exemplars of what social commitment in the theatre is about'.[23] Translating Mutter Courage, he was able to draw on his experience of having already translated Der gute Mensch von Sezuan (1994), and the two plays together begin to indicate a coherent function for Kushner as a 'translator of Brecht'.

However, this is not unproblematic for the status of the translation as Brechtian, since Kushner is perhaps not the sort of translator that Díaz-Diocaretz has in mind when she imagines the translator-function as a subversive role. While Kushner is a politically engaged playwright, he is also the successful and recognised proponent of an American lyrical

tradition, as James Fisher points out in his study of Kushner's plays. Looking at Kushner's Good Person of Szechwan, Fisher observes that 'where Kushner most obviously parts company with Brecht, both in his own plays and in this adaptation, is in the creation of intensely emotional, richly drawn, and empathetic characters' (The Theater of Tony Kushner, p. 157). This desire to establish empathy by drawing the audience into the emotions of the play sets Kushner's own theatrical practice apart from Brecht's more critical stance on the question of identification between actor, audience and character. What is more, as a non-German-speaker, Kushner admits a degree of reliance on the previous translations of the play, which he respects but whose perceived shortcomings he also seeks to overcome.[24] He is not alone in his status as a translator with limited knowledge of the source language, since it is not uncommon for a famous playwright to produce a translation from a literal version, as with Hanif Kureishi's Mother Courage or Howard Brenton's and David Hare's versions of Galileo. However, this is a divisive technique, even among Brecht scholars. While Bentley pre-empts Lefevere's stance in his claim that 'perhaps all good foreign plays should be published first in a very literal translation, and subsequently in various attempts at a true equivalent, even, if necessary, in "adaptations"', Willett laments that 'having the translation done by well-known writers unaccustomed to Brecht's original language […] is not a question of errors […] but of false rhythms and, above all, mistakes of tone such as lead straight to misinterpretations of character by the actors'.[25]

The potential pitfalls of the 'celebrity translator' without German skills are clear, and there is little new ground to be gained simply by presenting a comprehensive list of flaws and shifts in the various existing translations or in the production values under which they have been employed. Most relevant and far more interesting here is the observation that Kushner in particular, who claims an affinity with Brecht, is indebted for his sense of Brecht's author-function (and also his own) to the very discursive authorities he also seeks to challenge. He

positions himself in a dialectic in which he relies upon earlier versions explicitly for his understanding, but also as implicit authorisation to develop or build on the received wisdom (e.g. dominant themes to be foregrounded, performance strategies to be implemented) surrounding the text and its author. In this sense, Kushner specifically is well placed as a Brechtian translator, balancing a debt to the Brechtian author-function established in English with a desire to challenge this that emerges in part from his own authoritative author-function. His engagement with this tension is at the heart of his translation strategy, in which he prioritises the exposure of the 'dynamic instability that resists closure' both at the heart of Brecht's text and in the translation process ('Preface', xi).

Kushner's comments on the translation suggest that he considers it a Brechtian undertaking, with its roots in his personal sympathies for Brechtian theatre and his engaged agency as a translator. As well as exploiting the instability of the (translated) text, he seeks to undertake what he considers to be a 'faithful' translation by adapting Brecht's text to modern linguistic and cultural norms, prioritising its rewriting within the dominant poetics of contemporary American theatre. This departs from what McNeill calls the 'deceptive rhetoric' of assuring faithfulness by sticking closely to the German text, an approach that has been limiting for many of Brecht's previous translators (The Many Lives of Galileo, p. 79). Kushner also comments in his preface that 'a new rendition might provide opportunities for alternative readings and insights', suggesting the potential accessibility of new readings of Brecht and his text. He makes visible the dialectic of conflicts that shape his translation, which he accepts as a part of the translation process, and so implicitly seems to be framing his work as what might be termed 'epic translation'. However, as a close reading reveals, the discursive authority of his own author-function and the implications of his strategic decisions risk leading him towards an authoritative appropriation of the text that contrasts starkly with the democratic and collaborative processes Brecht sought to enact in his model of theatre.

Lefevere would encourage the reader to judge Kushner's translation not against the source text 'pur', but against the objectives he sets for himself:

> A more fruitful exercise [than evaluation against the critic's set of norms] would be for the critic to try to establish the norms that have guided the translator, and then to criticise the translator for not having adhered to his own norms.[26]

It is important, then, not to assume that the radical changes Kushner makes to the text of the play must be judged with disapproval, but to first seek to understand them as part of the strategy he claims for himself. This can be explored by looking at his treatment of the two aspects of poetics identified by Lefevere: firstly, a sample of the inventory of linguistic devices used in the translation, specifically Kushner's lexical choices and increased use of expletives in the interest of appealing to the modern American audience; secondly, attention will be turned to his negotiation of the play's role in the social system through the increased visibility of the subtext.

AN INVENTORY OF LITERARY DEVICES: KUSHNER'S OBSCENITIES

'There's a translation by Ralph Manheim and John Willett that's often used, but it seems to be set in Yorkshire, which is not helpful for American productions. I wanted to try to do a version that had something of Brecht's jumpy, modern and medieval, political and theological blending.'[27]

In his preface, Kushner describes the language of the play as 'a kind of slangy, ersatz medieval German', referring to the way in which Brecht layers meaning through the dialogue, blending expressions of the bluntness and brutality of life with the euphemistic posturing of politics and religion to reveal the contradictions that determine the existence of the characters. The use of this language as a marker for the specific socio-cultural conditions in which the events take place is central to the political function of the play. Sensitive to the quick wit and energy of Brecht's dialogue (and perhaps to the perceived failings of earlier

translations on this score), Kushner prioritises the naturalness of the language. The Brechtian value of this is suggested by statements such as Brecht's observation that it is the language of theatre 'deren ganzer Reiz verblasst, wenn sie absichtlich wirkt und willkürlich, ja schon, wo sie überhaupt Objekt scheint' (BFA 21, p. 95). Linguistic vibrancy is essential to the pace and humour of the play, and Kushner tries to preserve this by adopting a free translation strategy, as in this example, where Mother Courage is trying to sell a capon to the Cook:

[1a]

DER KOCH Sehen Sie, was ich mach? Er nimmt ein Stück Rindfleisch und setzt das Messer dran. Da hab ich ein Stück Rindfleisch, das brat ich. Ich geb Ihnen eine letzte Bedenkzeit.

MUTTER COURAGE Braten Sies nur. Das ist vom vorigen Jahr.

DER KOCH Das ist von gestern abend, da ist der Ochs noch herumgelaufen, ich hab ihn persönlich gesehn.

MUTTER COURAGE Dann muss er schon bei Lebzeiten gestunken haben.

DER KOCH Ich kochs fünf Stunden lang, wenns sein muss, ich will sehn, obs da noch hart ist. Er schneidet hinein.

MUTTER COURAGE Nehmens viel Pfeffer, dass der Herr Feldhauptmann den Gestank nicht riecht. (BFA 6, p. 20)

[1b]

The Cook Know why I'm not worried?

He spears a piece of beef with his knife and lifts it up.

A roast for roasting. I've tendered you my final offer.

Mother Courage Roast it, but hurry, it's been dead three weeks and it stinks.

The Cook I saw it running across the fields yesterday.

Mother Courage Praise Jesus, a dead dog, running around. It's a miracle.

The Cook It was a cow, not a dog, and after two hours in a stewpot, it'll be tender as a tit.

Mother Courage After five hours, it'll be glue, but say a prayer if the general comes hungry, and keep the pepper handy, I'm telling you, it stinks. [28]

Kushner's translation here aims at equivalence of effect rather than literal replication of the source, in order to create humour: alongside Courage's accusation that the meat is not fresh, he adds the insinuation that it is dog-meat and the Cook's pun on 'tender' (referring to the offer he is extending to Courage, but also suggestive of the quality of the meat), to ensure that the translation of the conversation reflects Courage's sharp wit as well as her playful relationship with the Cook.

Kushner consciously departs from Brecht's text in this way in a number of areas, in the interests of target-culture poetics. Significantly, and as shown in the above example, he frequently includes added obscenities as a specific element of this translation strategy. Kushner considers it vital that his translation make the play speak to a modern (American) audience, and is 'completely confident that whatever the playwright intended, dialogue that sounds academic, curated or polite, which effect the absence of profanity in dire circumstances produces, must have been the last thing he wanted' ('Preface', ix). In Scene Five, for example, Mother Courage encounters a soldier disgruntled by the lack of looting time allowed by his General:

[2a]

SOLDAT [...] Er ist kein Unmensch, hat er gesagt; die Stadt muss ihm was gezahlt haben.

    (BFA 6, p. 51)

[2b]

Soldier […] It'd be inhuman to allow more, he said; the city must've bribed him, the

treacherous fuck.' (TK, p. 109)

The added expletive in the translation suggests the violence of the soldier's feeling towards

his superiors, as well as reflecting the acclimatisation of the text to modern popular culture.

This effect is replicated elsewhere with the addition of sexual reference, for example in

Courage's opening exchange with the Sergeant and the Army Recruiter, where the German

text does not include the sexual suggestion implicit in Kushner's rendering:

[3a]

MUTTER COURAGE [...] Und so hat eben jedes von uns seinen Namen.

DER FELDWEBEL Was, jedes einen anderen?

MUTTER COURAGE Sie tun grad, als ob Sie das nicht kennten. (BFA 6, p. 12)

[3b]

Mother Courage […] None of us has the same name.

The Sergeant None of you?

Mother Courage Four points on the compass and I've been pricked in every direction. (TK,

p. 11)

An increase in expletives and vulgarity is not without precedent, nor without opposition, in English translations of Brecht. Reflecting on his attempt to replicate Brecht's language in his translation of Das Leben des Galilei for the National Theatre in 1980, Howard Brenton comments that 'We have an informal tradition [in English writing] which [Brecht] was trying to inject into his own German text. The result is great formal language with a dirty underbelly. All the notes of cynicism, all the ironies come out in a very un-Schiller-like German' (described in Theatre at Work, p. 7). Like Brenton, Kushner prioritises the 'dirty underbelly' of the characters as a strategy for adapting the play to a modern idiom. However, the validity of this approach is questioned in particular by Willett, who argues that 'Brecht was the reverse of snobbish, but he was not very informal and he was sparing with his obscenities, which were never pointlessly used' ('Ups and Downs of British Brecht', p. 88). This view is also held by the Brecht estate: Brenton found his choice of 'shit-eater' as a translation for 'Schneckenfresser' rejected by the estate, and revised the term to 'snail-eater'.

Kushner's use of vulgarisms also raises the question of national specificity that he himself recognises when he proposes that his text is for a modern American audience.[29] The issue is highlighted for example by his translation of Yvette's conversation with Mother Courage:

[4a]

YVETTE [...] Mutter Courage, ich bin ganz verzweifelt, weil alle gehen um mich herum wie um einen faulen Fisch wegen dieser Lügen, wozu richt ich noch meinen Hut her? (BFA 6, p. 27)

[4b]

Yvette […] I'm panicked, Mother Courage, customers avoid me like the plague, it's like I hung a sign over my cootch saying 'Remember you must die'. Why am I stitching new crap to this fucking hat? (TK, p. 49)

Beyond the coarseness of 'new crap to this fucking hat', Yvette's use of 'cootch' is much more vulgar than in other renderings of this scene, for example Willett's translation ('they're all avoiding me like something the cat brought in') or Tom Leonard's Glaswegian version ('they steer clear of me in the street as if I was stinkin like some rotten fish').[30] Kushner's choice foregrounds the unpleasantness of Yvette's character and also creates humour; however, its specificity to the North American idiom and its vulgarity risk a move towards language that is undesirably 'absichtlich' and 'willkürlich'. Kushner's translation positions itself on the boundary between language intended to make the play 'of its time' and resonate with a particular audience, and language that distracts from the message of the play.

A concern about the violence of the language in Kushner's translation, then, is that it serves to distract from the content and even to caricature the figures in the play. Willett's dislike for the coarse language favoured by translators like Kushner reflects the concern that through such language the dirty underbelly of Brecht's characters and their world will be exaggerated to unhelpfully comedic proportions. McNeill comments that the harm is done not by the vulgarity itself but by its role in 'the flattening out of differences in tone and rhetoric between the characters', which neutralises the subtle distinctions in social relationships that are reflected in the use of language (The Many Lives of Galileo, p. 80). In his eyes and in Willett's, Anglicisation or Americanisation of the dialect of the play is harmful to the articulation of social critique, since it does not create the critical and reflective distance needed for the audience's and actors' Verfremdung from the play.[31]   Kushner's tendency in his own plays towards a more emotionally explicit portrayal of character than would be expected in the epic context also suggests that the use of expletives and vulgar

language as in Mother Courage endangers the Verfremdung of the Brechtian drama, and perhaps also heightens a sympathetic response by distracting and engrossing the audience through emotive delivery.

While Kushner might consider his modernisation of the play's idiom to be a necessary step of acculturation in order to make its message accessible to his intended audience, it seems that perhaps in his very attempt to prevent language from being a stumbling block he has turned it into the 'Objekt' Brecht warns against. Although his prioritisation of the dynamism of Brecht's dialogue contributes to a fluid performance, some of the language used in the translation seems to rob the play of its ability to invite critical reflection from the audience. Kushner's intervention in the language of the play is informed not only by his attempt to observe and engage with Brecht's Anglophone author-function but also crucially by the strength of his own author-function, and the mixed success of his strategy reflects this. This same tension between Kushner's authorial function and his implied desire to be an epic translator can be seen in his treatment of Brecht's subtext.

THE ROLE OF LITERATURE IN THE SYSTEM: FOREGROUNDING THE SUBTEXT

Brecht's vision for the role of theatre as social critique presents his English translators with considerable difficulty. A crucial role in the invitation to think critically about social conditions is played by subtext in the plays: from the actors' perspective, Brecht's use of irony and implication leaves gaps for interpretation and dialectical discussion in rehearsal; from the audience's perspective, critical engagement with the play is encouraged by the observation of how characters devise their own strategies for coping with war, and how they respond when events go against them. In both cases, this engagement with the contextually defined and unspoken dimension of characters' thoughts and feelings in response to their

situation, which forces an audience to seek causality and to judge action in context, is a requirement of participation in the experience of the epic theatrical text.

Subtext and implicit meaning are widely acknowledged as a challenge in translation for theatre, where the translator's freedom to gloss or add context is considerably diminished by the (usually) spoken medium. Susan Bassnett emphasises the untranslatability of that which must be read between the lines, citing the 'gestic text' as a key element in the creation of a theatrical text that is interpreted differently by different performers.[32] This comment is of course particularly relevant in the context of Brechtian theatre, in which gestus is defined as

> einen ganzen Komplex einzelner Gesten der verschiedensten Art, zusammen mit Äußerungen, welcher einem absonderbaren Vorgang unter Menschen zugrunde liegt und die Gesamthaltung aller an diesem Vorgang Beteiligten betrifft […] oder einen Komplex von Gesten und Äußerungen, welcher, bei einem einzelnen Menschen auftretend, gewisse Vorgänge auslöst […], oder auch nur eine Grundhaltung des Menschen […]. Ein Gestus zeichnet die Beziehungen von Menschen zueinander. Eine Arbeitsverrichtung z.B. ist kein Gestus, wenn sie nicht eine gesellschaftliche Beziehung enthält wie Ausbeutung oder Kooperation. (BFA 23, p. 188)

The significance of 'Gestus' (including not just physical gesture but also spoken statements) as a link between the words on the page and their social import in performance, then, is clear for Brecht. Although he has only minimal knowledge of German, Kushner considers his understanding of Brecht's work (as refracted by Brecht's Anglophone author-function) to be sufficient to give him the authority to interpret this gestic subtext, and to guide others in this. As he explains in his preface, he is eager for his audience to be aware of 'what I believe Brecht might be up to' ('Preface', ix). In the interests of making Brecht's critical perspective

available to his audience, he draws out some of the unspoken tensions and motives that underlie the action on the stage.

At various points, Kushner emphasises the violence of war or the particularities of the characters by adding to the spoken text:

[5a]

DER KOCH Um Gottes willen, ich muss zum Feldhauptmann. Courage, ich komm nächster
    Tag einmal herüber zu einer kleinen Unterhaltung. (BFA 6, p. 32)

[5b]

The Cook Better get back to my general, if they haven't shot him he'll be screaming for dinner. Look for me, Courage, I'll be back for more political debate. (TK, p. 63)

[6a]

YVETTE Auf und ab und wieder auf ists halt gegangen. (BFA 6, p. 68)

[6b]

Yvette Touch and go, that's how I do it, up and down and up and down and etcetera. (TK, p. 153)

Kushner adds or adapts dialogue to emphasise the context of war and its impact on the characters' behaviour, through extreme violence or through prostitution. He explains that he does this 'because I wanted to emphasize, ever so slightly, that [Brecht's] characters have inner lives, that they're not flat mouthpieces for some simplistic political program' ('Tony Kushner, The Art of Theater'). Perhaps in this same spirit, Kushner adds stage directions: in Scene Two, for example, he adds an instruction in several places to specify that Eilif and the General keep drinking alcohol as the scene progresses. Ironically perhaps, whilst increasing

the actors' obligation to communicate character through gesture, this intervention in the text on the part of the translator-playwright asserts authority over the actors on the stage rather than engaging them in a dialectic. Again, this reveals tensions between Kushner's discursive authority and the collaborative behaviour of his translator-function. His additions reflect his own claim to an authoritative understanding of the play as much as they seek to disrupt the existing image of Brecht.

However, Kushner's instinctive adaptation of the play to fit in with the role of literature in the target system (emphasising the three-dimensionality of the characters rather than their political significance) sometimes occurs at the expense of ironic 'Gestus'. This is exemplified in one scene, where Yvette deliberates over whether or not to accept the generosity of the Colonel, her latest suitor:

[7a]

YVETTE Ich kanns nicht annehmen von dir. Freilich, wenn du meinst, der Fähnrich könnts
    ausnützen… Poldi, ich nehms von dir an.

DER OBRIST Das mein ich.

YVETTE Rätst dus mir?

DER OBRIST Ich rats dir. (BFA 6, p. 42)

Here, Yvette and the Colonel are both saying something other than what they really mean. Yvette feigns moral reluctance to accept the Colonel's offer to provide the money Courage needs to save her son, while Poldi for his part is aware that his gift of money to a prostitute represents more than simple altruism. Kushner adopts a more explicit approach:

[7b]

Yvette Oh, but it's indecent taking money from someone you love when you aren't married to him, though if in your opinion the lieutenant is inclined to exploit a situation, I'll let you do it.

The Colonel I insist.

Yvette I'll find some way to pay you back.

The Colonel I hate that lieutenant!

Yvette I know. (TK, p. 87)

As Charlotte Ryland explains in the endnotes to the Methuen edition of the translation, the comedic effect of Yvette's speech in English here comes not from what remains unsaid but rather from her disingenuousness in 'exposing' her own exploitation of the Colonel (TK, p. 211). In this respect, Kushner's version certainly succeeds in foregrounding the subtext. However, while Yvette's words contribute to the humour of the scene, the comedy of Poldi's helpless echoing of her manipulative request is lost ('Rätst dus mir?'/ 'Ich rats dir'), and his additional comments defuse the tension between words and intentions, and subsequently in the loss of subtlety. By making Poldi's resentment and his competition with the lieutenant explicit, Kushner makes it clear that Yvette is able to exploit Poldi's jealousy, but he also relieves the audience of the responsibility for divining motivation.

In this respect too, Kushner engages in a dialectical relationship not just with the source text but with previous translators of Mother Courage, since he is not alone in his desire to add to the words on the page in the interest of reader/ audience understanding. Lefevere, for example, is critical of added explanatory comment in the stage directions and script of both the Hays and the Bentley translations, demonstrating how they adapt the play to target-culture poetics of the musical and add emotive content ('Mother Courage's Cucumbers', pp. 12-13). Whilst an 'epic' translation strategy might espouse this dialectical approach, it seems possible that Kushner's addition of such content is motivated not only by a

desire to make clear 'what Brecht was up to' but also by his own theatrical style. Here is one example:

[8a]

MUTTER COURAGE [...] Sehen Sie, das haben Sie sich nicht gefragt, obwohls die

    Hauptsach ist, warum, im Stock ists ein Elend, wenn Sie entdecken, jetzt vertragen Sies

    Unrecht plötzlich. (BFA 6, p. 48)

[8b]

Mother Courage […] See, never occurs to you to ask yourself that, and it's the first thing

you should ask, 'cause it's no good figuring it out later, after all the skin on your back has

been flayed off with the whipping you'll get for insubordination, after the whip's blistered all

the skin off you and you're raw and bleeding, in chains praying for death it hurts so bad, then

it's a little late to realise that maybe, on second thoughts, actually you can live with being

treated unfairly. (TK, p. 101)

While Mother Courage's words in the German are concise and matter-of-fact, Kushner's

translation goes into emotive and vivid detail about the punishment faced by the soldier.

There is no doubt that the detail is shocking, but Kushner might here be accused of

sacrificing the audience's intellectual participation in the interests of emotive language that

renders them passive. The chaplain's proposal is another significant example:

[9a]

DER FELDPREDIGER tritt auf sie zu: Sie wissen, was ich mit 'enger' mein; das ist keine

    Beziehung mit Essen und Holzhacken und solche niedrigen Bedürfnisse. Lassen Sie

    Ihr Herz sprechen, verhärten Sie sich nicht.

MUTTER COURAGE Kommen Sie nicht mitn Beil auf mich zu. Das wär mir eine zu enge

    Beziehung.

DER FELDPREDIGER Ziehen Sies nicht ins Lächerliche. Ich bin ein ernster Mensch und

    hab mir überlegt, was ich sag. (BFA 6 p. 59)

[9b]

The **Chaplain** moves towards her:

The Chaplain You know perfectly well that when I use the word 'close' I don't mean

    cooking or eating or kindling.

Mother Courage Don't come at me waving that axe.

The Chaplain I'm not a figure of fun. You make me a figure of fun. I'm a man with his

    dignity and I'm tendering you a considered legitimate proposal. I'm proposing!

    Respond to my proposal! (TK, p. 129)

Kushner omits the Chaplain's appeal to Mother Courage's emotions ('Lassen Sie Ihr Herz
sprechen') and adds the explicit announcement that he is proposing. While the endnotes to
the translation see this as a compensatory trade-off, a less sympathetic reading would suggest
that the translation enhances the comedy of the scene by reducing its subtlety, making the
figures on the stage appear more foolish than they are in the German. Courage's joke about
'eine zu enge Beziehung' is lost, robbing her of the ability to make light of the situation;
meanwhile, the absence of the Chaplain's allusions to earnest Romantic sensibilities ('Lassen
Sie Ihr Herz sprechen'; 'Ziehen Sies nicht ins Lächerliche') obscures the idea that he sees
Courage as his intellectual equal, and his desperate final plea dramatically alters the dynamic
between them.

At times, it is omission rather than increased explicitness in the translation that transforms the critique reflected in the text, as in this final example:

[10a]

DER FELDWEBEL Das sieht man an deinem Messer, wie friedlich ihr seid. Überhaupt sollst du dich schämen, gib das Messer weg, Vettel! Vorher hast du eingestanden, du lebst vom Krieg, denn wie willst du sonst leben, von was? Aber wie soll Krieg sein, wenn es keine Soldaten gibt?

MUTTER COURAGE Das müssen nicht meine sein.

DER FELDWEBEL So, den Butzen soll dein Krieg fressen, und die Birne soll er ausspucken! Deine Brut soll dir fett werden vom Krieg, und ihm gezinst wird nicht. Er kann schauen, wie er zu seine Sach kommt, wie? Heißt dich Courage, he? Und fürchtest den Krieg, deinen Brotgeber? Deine Söhn fürchten ihn nicht, das weiß ich von ihnen. (BFA 6, p. 14)

[10b]

The Sergeant Yeah, you look friendly. Put up the knife, you old cunt. If there's a war, there have to be soldiers, right?

Mother Courage Somebody else's kids, not mine.

The Sergeant And there it is, your brood gets fat off the war but you think it's a one-way transaction. Maybe your sons have courage even if you don't. (TK, p. 17)

Brecht's Sergeant makes several references to the bind in which Courage finds herself: she must live off the war, but refuses to surrender her sons to the army. In the translation, this repetition is absent, and Courage's 'somebody else's kids, not mine' seems to emphasise her

motherhood, rather than suggesting her stubbornness and refusal to recognise the hypocrisy of her position.

Kushner's desire to foreground Brecht's subtext is born from a sense that the translator's task includes dialectical engagement with the source text and previous translations in order to engage with a new audience. In this sense, his approach to translation can be described as Brechtian. Paradoxically, however, his authoritative changes to the text result in a basis for performance that does not, at least on the page, oblige actors and audience to engage critically with the material in the same way that the German text can be said to do. As before, then, Kushner's desire to translate in the spirit of Brecht is fraught with pitfalls as far as the epic effect of the translation is concerned, since his understanding of the Brechtian is inevitably contextualised by his own institutionalisation in target-culture discursive practices.

CONCLUSION: THE EPIC TRANSLATOR?

'Licence to alter for the purpose of emphasising is inexcusable in a translator, and I can't make a defence of it, except to postulate that Brecht might not object to a translator making evident the fact of his imposition between German playwright and American audience.' ('Preface', xi)

Kushner makes clear in his preface that he sees his translation as a contribution to a dialectical understanding of Brecht in English. For him, inter-textual dialogue with the source text and between the different translations of Brecht's play contextualises his Mother Courage as cohesive with Brecht's existing Anglophone author-function, whilst also authorising his potentially controversial translation strategy. Implicitly, he subscribes to a Foucauldian understanding of the Brechtian as a category that is constantly revised in the context of tensions in the target culture, and his break from a typically submissive and invisible model of the translator-function demonstrates how a dialectically constructed

understanding of Mother Courage in English develops as the play and its author are refracted anew through text, performance and reception. However, the examples discussed here have shown that some consequences of Kushner's translatorial decisions work against the aims of epic theatre, as the increase in vulgarity and the shift in the audience's intellectual participation through increased explicitness and explanation move away from critical engagement with the content of the play. Whilst upholding Lefevere's assumption that growing reverence for the translated writer will lead to a greater attentiveness to practices that challenge the poetics of the target system, Kushner's translation reveals his debt to an Anglophone 'Brecht', an author-function with its basis in the very texts and practices from which he seeks to differentiate himself. Ultimately, then, his translation affirms existing models of Brecht in English as well as challenging them.

Within these concluding observations it is worth returning to the question of collaboration and inter-textuality. Lefevere describes agents beyond the translator as 're-writers' of the text, and Foucault would agree that it is not just the author or translator who constructs the authorial function through the text: the actors, producers, critics and audiences of the theatrical world are all responsible for the production and reception of epic theatre because the relationship between text and performance is a dialectical one. Kushner shows his awareness of the translator's limited power over the target text's circulation when he adds to the text to draw out tensions and content; however, such a prescriptive strategy jeopardises the potential for a dialectical process of staging and production as it allows him to exercise his own powerful author-function over the translated text. Like other celebrity translators, but particularly in view of his own specific author-function, Kushner's desire as translator to communicate what he identifies as Brecht's intention is in tension with institutional forces that lend him prestige as an author in the target culture. He does not fit the paradigm of the subversive translator-function because his engagement with the text often results in the

assertion of an author-function embedded in the target culture, whether it be his own or Brecht's.

Kushner's translation demonstrates how his understanding of Brecht, shaped by the author-function created by previous translators such as Bentley and Willett, can feed back into the discursive sense of who Brecht is. By establishing a dialogue with the source text and previous translations, by professing to pursue what he considers to be Brecht's aims, and by exploiting the instability of language, Kushner not only observes Brechtian principles but also leaves the way open for future translations to succeed his own and ultimately embraces the polyvalence of the literary text. In its shortcomings perhaps more than its successes, his translation embodies an argument against the expectation that the translated text can be a vessel for the entirety of Brecht's theatrical intention, and implicitly calls for more recognition of the dilemmas and contradictions that characterise our attempt to understand Brecht in English. Rather than offering a final version of the text, Kushner's approach with its shocks and scandals exposes the tensions in an Anglophone understanding of epic theatre and invites us to reconsider the part of the translator in the construction of Brecht in English.

---

[1] John Willett, 'Ups and Downs of British Brecht', in Re-interpreting Brecht: his influence on contemporary drama and film, ed. Pia Kleber and Colin Visser, Cambridge 1990, pp. 76-89 (p. 86); further references appear in the text.

[2] Martin Esslin 'Brecht and the English Theatre', The Tulane Drama Review 11 (1966), 63-70 (68).

[3] Quoted in Bertolt Brecht, Mother Courage and her Children. A version for the National Theatre, translated by David Hare, London 1995, p. vii.

[4] Margaret Eddershaw, Performing Brecht: Forty Years of British Performances, London 1996, pp. 4-5.

---

[5] Elizabeth Wright, Postmodern Brecht: A Re-Presentation, London 1989, p. 113. This view is confirmed by more recent statements on Brecht in English such as a video clip made by the National Theatre, which makes a similar claim that Brechtian concepts are embedded in an English-language theatrical tradition: see http://www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/video/an-introduction-to-brechtian-theatre [last accessed 29.05.15].

[6] André Lefevere, Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame, London 1992; further references appear in the text.

[7] André Lefevere, 'Acculturating Bertolt Brecht', in Constructing cultures: Essays on Literary Translation, ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, Clevedon 1998, pp. 109-22; further references appear in the text.

[8] Dougal McNeill, The Many Lives of Galileo: Brecht, Theatre and *Translation's Political* Unconscious, Bern: 2005, p. 79; Eddershaw, Performing Brecht: Forty Years of British Performances, London 1996, pp. 4, 173; Jim Hiley, Theatre at Work. The story of the *National Theatre's production of Brecht's* Galileo, London 1981; further references appear in the text.

[9] Peter Newmark, A Textbook of Translation, Hemel Hempstead 1988, p. 172.

[10] Bertolt Brecht, 'Schwierigkeiten des epischen Theaters' in Werke: Große kommentierte Berliner und Frankfurter Ausgabe, eds Werner Hecht et al, 30 vols, Berlin and Frankfurt 1988-2000, vol. 21, pp. 209-10 (p. 210). Further references to the edition (BFA) will appear between brackets in the main body of the text.

[11] Gisèle Sapiro, 'The Debate on the Writer's Responsibility in France and the United States from the 1920s to the 1950s', International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society 23 (2010), pp. 69-83 (pp. 80-81); Eudora Welty, 'Must the Novelist Crusade?', in The Eye of the Story. Selected Essays and Reviews, New York 1979, pp. 146-58.

[12] See for example Friedrich Tolberg, 'Soll man Brecht im Westen spielen?', Der Monat 14 (1962), 56-62; also the discussion in Loren Kruger, Post-Imperial Brecht Politics and Performance, East and South, Cambridge 2007, pp. 1-18.

[13] Michel Foucault, 'What is an Author?', tr. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, in Language, Counter-Memory, Practice, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, Ithaca, NY 1977, pp. 113-38 (further references appear in the text); 'The Order of Discourse', tr. Ian McLeod, in Untying the Text: A Poststructuralist Reader, ed. Robert Young, London 1981, pp. 48-78; further references appear in the text.

[14] André Lefevere, 'Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature', Modern Language Studies 12 (1982), 3-20 (13-14); further references appear in the text.

[15] Martin Esslin, Reflections, New York 1969, p. 79.

[16] The first published translation of Brecht's theoretical writings was John Willett's Brecht on Theatre, London 1964.

[17] Susan Bassnett, 'Still Trapped in the Labyrinth: Further Reflections on Translation and Theatre' in Constructing Cultures, ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, Philadelphia 1998, pp. 90-108 (pp. 93-4); further references appear in the text.

[18] See the work of Lawrence Venuti, particularly *The Translator's Invisibility*, New York 1995.

[19] Theo Hermans, 'Translation and Normativity', in Translation and Norms, ed. Christina Schäffner, Clevedon 1999, pp. 50-71 (p. 64).

[20] Douglas Robinson, 'The Translator-Function. Myriam Díaz-Diocaretz, Translating Poetic Discourse', in What is Translation? Centrifugal Theories, Critical Interventions, ed. Douglas Robinson, Kent, OH 1997, pp. 61-78 (pp. 69, 75).

[21] Myriam Díaz-Diocaretz, Translating poetic discourse: questions on feminist strategies in Adrienne Rich, Amsterdam and Philadelphia 1985, p. 34.

[22] Sirkku Aaltonen, Time-sharing on Stage: Drama Translation in Theatre and Society, Clevedon 2000.

[23] James Fisher, The Theater of Tony Kushner. Living Past Hope, New York 2002, p. 151; further references appear in the text.

[24] Tony Kushner, 'Preface' in Bertolt Brecht, Mother Courage and her Children, translated by Tony Kushner, London 2010; further references appear in the text.

[25] Bentley quoted in Anthony Mathews, 'Bertolt Brecht 1898-1956', in Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English, ed Olive Classe, London 2000, pp. 179-83 (p. 182); Willett, 'Ups and Downs of British Brecht', p. 88, emphasis in original.

[26] André Lefevere, 'Translation: Changing the Code: Soyinka's Ironic Aetiology', in The Languages of Theatre: Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama, ed. Ortrun Zuber, London 1980, pp. 132-45 (p. 133).

[27] Tony Kushner, quoted in Catherine Steindler**,** 'Interviews: Tony Kushner, The Art of Theater No. 16', The Paris Review 201 (2012), available online at http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/6153/the-art-of-theater-no-16-tony-kushner [last accessed 09.03.2015]; further references appear in the text.

[28] Bertolt Brecht, Mother Courage and her Children, translated by Tony Kushner, London 2010, p. 31; further references appear in the text.

[29] It is worth noting that, whilst he targets a specifically American audience, Kushner's translation has also found favour in the UK: it has been published by Methuen and, notably, the National Theatre staged a production directed by Deborah Warner in 2009 and Manchester's Library Theatre also produced it in 2013 under the direction of Chris Honer.

[30] Bertolt Brecht, Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder, translated by JohnWillett, London 1983, p. 23; Bertolt Brecht, Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder, translated by Tom Leonard, Middlesbrough 2014, p. 33.

[31] Willett comments that 'making Brecht's soldiers act like the British army; his clergy like the Church of England; his workers or peasants speak Cockney or yokelese' is 'cosy for the actors, but disastrous for the play' ('Ups and Downs of British Brecht', p. 88).

[32] Susan Bassnett, 'Translating for Theatre: The Case Against Performability', TTR: traduction, terminologie, redaction 4 (1991), 99-111; see also 'Still Trapped in the Labyrinth'.