

**A PROPOSED CONTEMPORARY REWRITING
OF *MACBETH* IN AFRIKAANS FOR THE SENIOR
SECONDARY LEARNER AS READER**

Nelda Pretorius

**A PROPOSED CONTEMPORARY REWRITING
OF *MACBETH* IN AFRIKAANS FOR THE SENIOR
SECONDARY LEARNER AS READER**

by

NELDA PRETORIUS, M.A.

Thesis submitted for the degree Philosophiae Doctor in English of the
Potchefstroomse Universiteit vir Christelike Hoër Onderwys

Promoter: Prof. Annette L. Combrink

Assistant Promoter: Dr. M.J. Wenzel

May 2001

Potchefstroom

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation to

- especially Prof. A.L. Combrink for her continual time, patience and support throughout the years;
- Dr. M.J. Wenzel for valuable inputs;
- my husband, children and parents for their understanding, love and support;
- the staff of the Ferdinand Postma Library for assisting me in finding the necessary sources;
- the University for making it financially possible for me to continue my studies;
- Hanel Leask for her illustrations used in the translation of *Macbeth*;
- my Heavenly Father for talents and opportunities without Whom this study would not have been possible.

No utterance is ever complete, or can be completed,
the final word can never be spoken.

- G. Hall

Aan my man en dogters.

The following abbreviations are used in this study:

ST: Source Text

TT: Target Text

SL: Source Language

TL: Target Language

DTS: Descriptive Translation Studies

L2: Second Language

Please note:

- In this study the generic *he* is used to refer to both male and female.

- It is recommended that *Macbeth* in Afrikaans should be read first.

SUMMARY

The main purpose of this thesis has been to demonstrate that Shakespeare can indeed be a contemporary for the senior secondary learner as reader should his needs be acknowledged and accommodated in the OBE syllabus.

It was crucial to investigate why Shakespeare should be read and studied and whether the need still exists to study his works. As a holistic artefact *Macbeth* would be easier to relate to if the reader can read the text in the register and jargon located more firmly in his framework of reference. This is the precise reason why *Macbeth* was rewritten into Afrikaans, keeping in mind that the play can and should be extrapolated to other languages as well. It should be reiterated that the intention with a rendition of *Macbeth* is not to replace the original but to provide a bridge to an eventual happy encounter with the original.

In order to reach this point it was necessary to investigate the influence of textual communication due to the fact that textual aspects will influence the senior secondary learner as reader's perception of Shakespeare. Shakespearean language is quite often mentioned as the reason for not studying Shakespeare at school. But, if Shakespeare is understood in the same manner he was hundreds of years ago then the reader will be able to identify crucial issues of life and literature as well as deal with them according to the rules of society. The domain of discourse analysis is extended to include the language of complex literary texts and offers a descriptive account of the relationship between linguistic form and contemporary point of view.

After identifying the role the text plays when studying Shakespeare in the senior secondary phase the focus should shift to the reader himself. Therefore, it is an aim to be a voice interpreting the needs of the learners in question and to introduce a paradigm shift that will necessarily exclude conservative teaching methods. In this instance the primary aim will be to facilitate the understanding and enjoyment of Shakespeare for non-mother tongue learners at the senior secondary level.

The next important issue to be looked at is the question of drama perspectives and the learner as reader vis-à-vis these perspectives. It can be conceded that rewriting will have a profound influence on the senior secondary learner as reader. It is of utmost importance to find a universe of discourse and investigate the role a cultural model of translation will play, especially in a South-African context.

If one wants to deal with Shakespeare within the context of our present times in South Africa the influence exerted by contemporary literary and linguistic theories needs to be included. A definite correlation between Shakespeare's time and that of the senior secondary learner as reader has been identified, thus creating a solution to issues regarding the learner in question. After all these issues have been investigated, recommendations and results follow, emphasizing the definite need for further study in this regard.

OPSOMMING

Die hoofdoel van hierdie proefskrif was om aan te toon dat Shakespeare inderdaad 'n tydgenoot kan wees vir die senior sekondêre leerder as leser as mens hulle behoeftes erken en 'n plek gee binne die UGO-sillabus.

Dit was belangrik om ondersoek in te stel na waarom Shakespeare nog gelees en bestudeer behoort te word en ook of daar nog 'n behoefte is om sy werke te bestudeer. Dit sal makliker wees om met *Macbeth* in gesprek te tree as dit as 'n holistiese artefak aangebied word en die leser die teks kan hanteer binne sy eie verwysingsraamwerk. Dit is hoekom *Macbeth* oorgeskryf is in Afrikaans (en hou in gedagte dat die metode wat hier gebruik word ook na ander tale uitgebrei kan word). Dit moet beklemtoon word dat die doel met die voorgestelde weergawe van *Macbeth* nie is om die oorspronklike te vervang nie, maar om 'n brug te slaan na 'n uiteindelijke gelukkige ontmoeting met die oorspronklike teks.

Om hierdie doel te bereik was dit nodig om ondersoek in te stel na die invloed van tekstuele kommunikasie omdat tekstuele aspekte die senior sekondêre leerder se persepsie van Shakespeare sal beïnvloed. Shakesperiaanse taal word dikwels voorgedhou as die rede hoekom Shakespeare nie op skool bestudeer moet word nie, maar as Shakespeare sou kon verstaan word op dieselfde manier as honderde jare gelede sal die leser nog altyd die belangrike lewenslesse en letterkundige impak kan beleef en daarmee kan omgaan as synde tekenend van samelewingsreëls. Die domein van diskoersanalise is ook uitgebrei om die taal van komplekse literêre tekste in te

sluit en bied 'n beskrywende weergawe van die verhouding tussen talige vorm en hedendaagse sienswyses.

Nadat die rol van die teks in die studie van Shakespeare deur die senior sekondêre leser nagespeur is, verskuif die fokus na die leser self. Dit is daarom ook 'n doel van die studie om die behoeftes van die lesers in ag te neem en om te probeer om 'n paradigmaskuif te bewerkstellig wat konserwatiewe onderrigmetodes sou uitskuif. In hierdie geval is die primêre doel om die begrip en genot van Shakespeare vir die nie-moedertaalspreker op die senior sekondêre vlak, te fasiliteer.

Die volgende belangrike aspek hou verband met dramaperspektiewe en die leerder as leser vis-à-vis hierdie perspektiewe. Dit moet toegegee word dat herskrywing 'n sterk invloed sal hê op die senior sekondêre leerder as leser, en dit is daarom belangrik om 'n diskoerswêreld te skep en ook ondersoek in te stel na 'n kulturele model van vertaling wat binne die Suid-Afrikaanse konteks val.

As mens wil kyk na die rol van Shakespeare binne die huidige tydsgewrig in Suid-Afrika sal hedendaagse taal- en literêre teorie ingesluit moet word in 'n studie van hierdie aard. Daar is 'n definitiewe korrelasie tussen die historiese tydperk van Shakespeare en die wêreld waarin die voorgestelde leser hom bevind, en dus kan die leser uit Shakespeare put vir response op die huidige sosiale/politieke problematiek. Nadat hierdie aspekte behandel is, volg 'n bespreking van die aanbevelings en resultate en word sterk klem geplaas op die noodsaaklikheid van verdere studie in hierdie veld.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1:

IDENTIFICATION OF RESEARCH PROBLEMS

1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Contextualisation and problem statement	4
1.2.1	The influence of textual communication	4
1.2.2	The role of the senior secondary learner as reader	6
1.2.3	The role of drama perspectives in drama translation	9
1.2.4	Creating a contemporary Shakespeare	12
1.3	Aims of study	14
1.3.1	Questions that arise	14
1.3.2	Aims	15
1.4	Hypothesis/thesis statement	15
1.5	Method	16
1.6	Envisaged contribution of study	17
1.7	Provisional chapter outline	17

CHAPTER 2

TEXTUAL COMMUNICATION AND THE SENIOR SECONDARY

	LEARNER AS READER	19
2.1	Introduction	20
2.2	Linking discourse analysis and textual communication	22
2.3	Semiotic perspectives and textual communication	26
2.3.1	Semantics	28

2.3.2	Syntactics	30
2.3.2.1	Register	30
2.3.2.2	Jargon	31
2.3.2.3	Text	32
2.3.2.4	Actor	33
2.3.2.5	Semiotic reading	34
2.3.3	Literary pragmatics and textual meaning	36
2.4	Deixis	40
2.4.1	Consciousness and context-building	42
2.4.2	Reader priming	43
2.4.3	Priming inferences and anaphoric theory	44
2.4.4	Cultural complexity	45
2.5	Macro textual comparison and the senior secondary learner as reader	
2.5.1	Stage-and-page translations	47
2.5.2	Verbal and non-verbal communication	48
2.5.3	The dual nature of the play	49
2.5.4	Historicity and actuality	51
2.5.5	Text and implied realisation	51
2.6	Levels of speech	52
2.6.1	Contemporary speech	52
2.6.2	Dialect	53
2.6.3	Second language translation	53
2.7	Number of different contexts	54
2.7.1	Style as meaning	56

2.7.2	Specific problems of literary translation	57
2.8	The preconceived perception of the literary character	59
2.9	Conclusion	61

CHAPTER 3

	THE SENIOR SECONDARY LEARNER AS READER	63
3.1	Introduction	63
3.2	Literary competence and the senior secondary learner as reader	65
3.2.1	The nature of literature competence	65
3.2.2	The senior secondary reader's reception of literature	67
3.2.2.1	Reception and aesthetics	68
3.2.2.2	Verbal cues and reception	71
3.2.3	Literary analysis engaging with psycho analysis	74
3.3	The senior secondary learner as reader: processes	76
3.3.1	The reading process	80
3.3.2	Reading as experience	84
3.3.3	Language-based approach to reading	86
3.3.4	From the subject of reading to the reading subject	88
3.3.5	Reader's response and textuality	89
3.4	<i>Macbeth</i> in the second language classroom	91
3.4.1	Second language in context	91
3.4.2	Developments in the literature classroom	92
3.4.2.1	Representational teaching and learning	94
3.4.2.2	<i>Macbeth</i> and the senior secondary learner as reader	96

3.4.3	Is there a senior secondary reader in <i>Macbeth</i> ?	100
3.5	The postulated consequences of reading radical rewritings	104
3.6	Conclusion	106

CHAPTER 4

PERSPECTIVES ON DRAMA AND TRANSLATION AND THE SENIOR SECONDARY LEARNER AS READER		
		108
4.1	Introduction	109
4.2	Rewriting and the role of the senior secondary learner as reader	112
4.3	Translation of literary aspects for the senior secondary learner as reader	
4.3.1	Language aspect	115
4.3.2	Creative aspect	117
4.3.3	Psychological aspect	121
4.4	The cultural status of <i>Macbeth</i> and the passage of time	125
4.5	Finding a universe of discourse	129
4.5.1	Ethnocentricity	133
4.5.2	Universal culture	134
4.6	The illusion of equivalence and its influence on drama translation	136
4.7	Drama translation and the senior secondary learner as reader	140
4.8	Finding a cultural model of translation	144
4.8.1	Even-Zohar and the poly-system	145
4.8.2	Toury and his quest for norms	150
4.8.3	Lefevere and his notion of rewriting	154
4.8.4	Sapir-Whorf hypothesis	157
4.8.5	Notes on Venuti	160

4.8.6	Notes on Steiner	162
4.9	Conclusion	163

CHAPTER 5

SHAKESPEARE AND THE SENIOR SECONDARY LEARNER AS READER

	WITHIN A CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT	165
5.1	Introduction	165
5.2	Contemporary Shakespeare	166
5.2.1	The language issue	167
5.2.2	The character issue	176
5.3	<i>Macbeth</i> as a contemporary	177
5.3.1	The demonic metaphysics of <i>Macbeth</i>	178
5.3.1.1	Fair and foul	179
5.3.1.2	Sleepwalking and ghosts in <i>Macbeth</i>	184
5.3.2	Disorder in <i>Macbeth</i>	186
5.4	Contemporary allusions and the senior secondary learner as reader	
5.4.1	<i>Macbeth</i> and updated dress	188
5.4.2	Dramatic and theatrical reality	190
5.4.3	Style	193
5.5	Is Shakespeare still our contemporary?	194
5.6	Is Shakespeare (ultimately) translatable?	196
5.7	Conclusion	198

CHAPTER 6

THE WAY AHEAD 201

6.1 Introduction 201

6.2 Textual communication and the senior secondary learner as reader 201

6.3 The senior secondary learner as reader – résumé 203

**6.4 Drama perspectives and the senior secondary learner as reader –
recapitulation 207**

**6.5 Shakespeare as a contemporary and the senior secondary learner as
reader 209**

6.6 Conclusion 211

LIST OF SOURCES 212

APPENDIX A: *MACBETH* IN AFRIKAANS

APPENDIX B: SHAKESPEARE IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

CHAPTER 1

IDENTIFICATION OF RESEARCH PROBLEM AND CONTEXTUALISATION

*New honours come upon him:
Like our strange garments, cleave not to their mould
But with the aid of use.*

1.1 Introduction



SHAKESPEARE **IN THE CHANGING CURRICULUM** EDITED BY LESLEY AERS AND NIGEL WHEALE

Do we need Shakespeare?

The seemingly innocuous question as to whether we need Shakespeare served as the initial impetus and ultimate motivation to translate *Macbeth* into Afrikaans keeping in mind that this radical and contemporary rewriting approach and method can be extrapolated to other languages, such as isiZulu or Setswana.

At this stage it is deemed crucial to state whether the need exists to read and study Shakespeare or not. As a holistic artefact¹ *Macbeth* will be easier to relate to if the reader can read a text that is written in the register and jargon located more firmly in his framework of reference. Wilson (1986) states that Shakespeare's plays are read and performed all over the world and adds that he was for all places and races. Reid (1982:76) strongly feels that Shakespeare's plays can fulfil all the aims of increasing love/appreciation of literature, developing the capacity to think and make moral judgements and contributing to the understanding of human nature.

Shakespeare's work is also universal. In other words, his plays are not set only in his own country and definitely not necessarily in his own time. His plays are not tied to a particular culture and can be seen to exist in the imagination rather than in history. Shakespeare's themes are timeless and wide-ranging and include love, jealousy, old age, the struggle for power, and so forth. Needless to say, these issues will exist until the end of time. What is actually important is that facilitators should present Shakespeare enthusiastically to their learners. Facilitators need to expand and experiment with their repertoire of methods and strategies that can make Shakespeare more accessible to learners. In other words, Shakespeare should be "sold" to the class (Aers & Wheale, 1991:35) in order to create a positive and meaningful learning

¹ Meaning that the text is more than the sum of its parts. It has to be studied and appreciated in its full context.

experience.

Take Shakespeare out of English lessons and one is left pondering on the Gryphon's words in *Alice in Wonderland*: 'That's the reason they're called lessons, because they lessen from day to day' (Shee, 2001:6).

It is absolutely irresponsible to say that there is no relevance for the senior secondary learner as reader in Shakespeare. I cannot agree more with Shee (2001:6) that there is plenty of subtle and not so subtle dialogue for youngsters to enjoy due to the fact that Shakespeare's characters are so close and vivid even within the context of contemporary society. Nallileke (2001:6) feels that students should be exposed to literature of various countries and cultures in order to earn their stripes as literary scholars. Ann Smith at Wits University states (in Nallileke, 2001:7) that if the intention is to replace classical literature with African literature, it will be impossible for students to study African literature in isolation due to the fact that you cannot substitute one literature for another and also due to the fact that no literature develops in a vacuum. Even African literature to a large extent developed against the backdrop of the metropolitan or least the colonial models.

Percival (2001:25) states that it will be a sad day when Shakespeare is dropped from the school syllabus. He adds that although the language may seem to be archaic it is never dull or boring. Interesting enough, more or less 8 000 words that were used in Shakespeare's plays occur in today's standard dictionaries (Percival, 2001:25).

One needs to emphasise the fact that our understanding of virtue, morality, corruption and ambition is enhanced and our horizons extended by the reading of the Bard (Percival, 2001:25). Percival (2001:25) concedes that linguistic change is inevitable,

but it does not mean that the old and trusted should without further ado be scrapped for the new and impermanent peculiarities of the present.

Far more people are still in favour of studying Shakespeare. Unfortunately, the greatest stumbling block when reading Shakespeare is the language his plays are written in. This means that we have to discover a culture that will appeal to all our divergent cultural awarenesses, “but insisting on chucking out anything that pulsates with a foreign beat will be incredibly silly” (Clarke, 2001:25).

It is the central intention of this study to find ways to make Shakespeare accessible to learners from diverse cultures. Therefore, it seemed that one way of contributing to this heated debate was to rewrite *Macbeth* in such a way that Afrikaans readers will find it easier to understand.

There are indeed two forces that carry light to all corners of the world – the sun in the heavens and great literature in the hearts of our scholars (Percival, 2001:6).

1.2 Contextualisation and problem statement

The purpose of this section is to identify and contextualise the research problems that form the focus of enquiry in this thesis.

1.2.1 The influence of textual communication

The cardinal role of textual communication² needs to be investigated in order to determine how knowledge of Shakespearean literature will influence the contemporary acceptability and accessibility of a *Macbeth*-translation in

2 In other words, how the text communicates with the reader.

particular. It goes without saying that drama is written to be performed. Therefore, one is dealing with a combination of the written and the spoken medium that gives rise to all kinds of problems for both the drama theorist and the translator. Kruger (2001:1) emphasises the fact that dialogue in a drama text can either be written to be spoken by actors during a performance or written to be read as if heard. The combination of the written and the spoken medium gives the drama its typical dual nature. The manipulation of the drama text, including verbal and non-verbal communication and how these processes will affect the TT needs to be examined. Due to the fact that written language is perceived differently from spoken language it is thus necessary to differentiate between stage-and-page translations and how stage directions and so forth will influence understanding of the written text.

Because the translator is dealing with the translation of a play, deictic elements need to be considered in order to make Shakespeare our contemporary. Therefore, factors such as who is speaking where and when will form deictic points of reference that will be of crucial importance for the translator of a contemporary *Macbeth* version. According to Green (1995:12), deixis functions pragmatically, but it is also controlled by semantic determination and as these two issues go hand in hand it is by and large inevitable that the drama translator should implement both these facets when translating *Macbeth*. It could perhaps be argued that by translating drama, an act of risky imprudence may be committed. The responsibility of the drama translator is immense and the fidelity of the translation itself a risky proposition. Nevertheless, it will be demonstrated that textual communication of *Macbeth* is possible and this process will expand conservative, restricted views as well as introduce new dimensions to cultures across the globe.

The issue of linguistic manipulation in this play is and involves the deliberate and premeditated manipulation of language in order to obscure the truth. According to Elsom (1989:35), Shakespeare delights in many different meanings that could be compacted into a word or a phrase, which is one reason why he uses so many puns. He relies on his ear and common usage and the associative logic of a language,

including the invention of new words. The drama translator will be faced by the fact that it is impossible to translate all the puns especially if Shakespeare is translated as a contemporary to whom the senior secondary learner as reader can relate. Although it is impossible to regain all the meanings, it is possible to gain more subtle meanings if the endless possibilities of equivocation are recognised and acknowledged.

1.2.2 *The role of the senior secondary learner as reader*

What is at stake in the call to readers to take back some of their authority? (Freund, 1987:13)

In asking the question in the motto above, Freund (1987:13) raises the issue of the role and responsibility of the reader. The issue of the reader has been in the forefront of critical concern in the immediate past decade, and it is an issue that will be addressed in chapter 3. To view the text as a thing-in-itself is to spatialise and formalise what is essentially an ephemeral and temporal experience (Fish, 1987:92). The text³ should be presented in such a way that the reader/learner can relate to it on levels that are immediate, open and contemporary as well as in language that is understandable and thought-provoking.

The pre-question should start from what the learners understand. No matter how complex the text is assumed to be, a pre-reading question can be formulated to give the learners confidence in what they do. From this stage a growing language awareness will develop which becomes the second stage in representational learning development. Representational language learning allows closer involvement with the

3 In order to create a text that the senior secondary learner as reader can relate to it was deemed necessary to translate *Macbeth* into contemporary Afrikaans. This would emphasise the focus mentioned in this section.

target culture and from this text awareness the jump to drama as genre is almost an imperceptible one. The latter should be approached from a different angle than the one used in the case of fiction and poetry. This implies that *Macbeth* can be studied in such a way that it will elicit different responses from different kinds of readers in a senior secondary culture.

In the new teaching dispensation in this country the issue of suitable reading matter for senior secondary learners remains a crucial question. It goes without saying that the importance of reading suitable texts needs no substantiation, and the contextualisation for the study will therefore depart from an assumption that reading is important and that suitable texts are crucial. It will also depart from the fact that the Shakespeare text remains a standby and popular choice for facilitators and learners alike.

The call for a learner-centred approach (such as OBE) to drama proceeds from a strongly defended and unified point of view. It goes without saying that when learners themselves are permitted to make meaning, the classroom becomes a more meaningful place to be in.

It is therefore an irreducible necessity, first of all, to take cognisance of the response of the senior secondary learner as reader when reading a dramatic text such as *Macbeth*. According to Tompkins (1980:224) the reading experience in the classroom treats meaning as the goal of critical inquiry and the text as the primary unit of meaning. She states that it

... still performs its operations on the same texts that were used to illustrate irony, paradox, ambiguity, complexity, organic unity and the use of the *persona*. Therefore, the text remains an object rather than an instrument, an occasion for the elaboration of meaning rather than a force exerted upon the world (Tompkins, 1980:225).

Being confronted with and required to comprehend and interpret Shakespearean idiosyncrasies and ambiguities (including imagery and complex linguistic patterns) is an alienating experience for the average Afrikaans-speaking senior secondary learner as reader (from diverse cultural backgrounds as well). In a special and circumscribed sense

the work of reading is thus a creative process of “concretization”; it bridges the gaps in the structure and fills out the schematized aspects of the text, determining the places of indeterminacy and actualizing the potential of the schemata. This activity ... draws on the reader’s personal experience, and requires both skill and imagination, since no two readers are identical, no two concretizations will be identical, even when they are the work of the same reader (Iser, 1987:141).

The senior secondary learner as reader of today must be encouraged to be both the reader and the theatre-goer of tomorrow and this reader must begin to be aware that

a literary text must be conceived in such a way that it will engage the reader’s imagination in the task of working things out for himself, for reading is only a pleasure when it is active and creative. In this process of creativity, the text may either not go far enough, or may go too far, so we may say that boredom and overstrain form the boundaries beyond which the reader will leave the field of play (Iser, 1980:51).

It is also true that different readers in the senior secondary phase will probably “interpret” or “misinterpret” *Macbeth* differently - should either of these terms exist in the true sense of the word. For the reader who is not sufficiently competent to deal with the complex language of an original text, translations of the text can ease the entry into the text and make available the first knowledge of the text in question. It is the task of the drama translator, when dealing with the written text, to ensure that

most of what is being said is rewritten⁴ in a natural way in order to reinforce and bridge cultural distinctions existing between two diverse, but not irreconcilable, worlds and times. Therefore,

a tentative solution would be *radical rewrites* (my italics) and more stage translations to introduce learners to Shakespearean drama before being confronted with the “real thing”. It is therefore Shakespeare who must *adapt or die* (my italics) in the new South Africa (Kruger, 1996:427).

Contemporary rewriting of Shakespeare, more specifically, *Macbeth*, is an important weapon in the arsenal of anybody wanting to ensure the literary future of Shakespearean plays. It is crucial to accept that interpretations of Shakespeare’s plays made accessible through contemporary rewriting of a given Shakespearean play, can open up immense opportunities to translators from all cultures. Shakespeare must thus become our contemporary in more than one way and challenge the translator to explore these endless cultural and deictic possibilities.

1.2.3 The role of drama perspectives in translation

What remains incontrovertibly true is that Shakespeare did not intend to write literature-as-literature, but rather performances-for-actors. Thus, the translator of a play should not merely translate words and their meanings but should also produce contemporary translations embodying fundamental views of a culture. It can be conceded that

the task of a translator as well as that of a producer of a modern play should be to *transpose* (my italics) the play in such a manner, that the message of the

⁴ By rewriting is meant that the story is kept intact in the transfer from the ST to the TT by retaining the narration of events and by changing the lexical structure as well as the cultural context, where necessary, in order to create cultural continuity and acceptability of the target text for the senior secondary learner as reader.

original and the dramatist's intention be adhered to as closely as possible and be rendered, linguistically and artistically, into a form which takes into account the different traditional, cultural and socio-political background of the recipient country (Zuber, 1980:95).

It could be argued that the fundamental question in drama translation is not *whether* to rewrite Shakespeare but rather *how* to translate a play that is more than four hundred years old. Although this seems to be a relevant question it has already been answered by the splendid Schlegel/Tieck German translators of Shakespearean plays (Elsom, 1989:38) as well as the "Shakespeare in Blue Jeans" approach. It is deemed necessary that the drama translator needs to ask and answer contemporary questions when dealing with these plays. Fortunately, *Macbeth* has increasingly impressed twentieth-century critics as a play with a peculiarly modern and contemporary impact. Seen in this light it becomes clear that its protagonist speaks with a modern voice; from within a modern political situation and about modern matters (Hawkes, 1977:1) making it easier for the senior secondary learner as reader to relate to.

Thus, rewriting plays a vital role when one acknowledges the role of the senior secondary learner as reader. When translating literary aspects for this reader it is deemed necessary to take into account linguistic, creative and psychological aspects which could influence either the text or the translator. The cultural status of a text, such as *Macbeth*, should be re-cast or transposed for the senior secondary learner as reader within a South African context. This means that a suitable and sustainable universe of discourse should be found.

One would be justified in arguing that it is entirely conceivable not to say inevitable that questions regarding drama perspectives and the appropriateness as well as the effectiveness of a cultural model of translation should be formulated for the present

project. A cultural model of translation is essential seeing that translation occurs across cultures and when translating texts contexts are drawn into the target culture they are forced to interact. Meaning takes on a new perspective, enlightening the original context and affecting the current world situation in many ways. The theory for a cultural model of translation rests on the assumption that cultures deal with similar concerns and solve similar types of problems. A cultural model of translation should shed light on cross-cultural as well as on inter-cultural phenomena encountered in a contemporary translation such as *Macbeth*. *Landeskunde* is therefore implemented because the main objective is to appreciate differences and to present an effective translation that takes these differences seriously. The use of a cultural model therefore serves to redefine the translation process in terms of cultural awareness with respect to the entire context affecting that process. It would be very important to deal with crucial socio-historical issues when translating a play such as *Macbeth* due to the differences in time and historical background the two cultures purport. It will have to be conceded that

translators function in a given culture at a given time. The way they understand themselves and their culture is one of the factors that may influence the way in which they translate. Translations can be potentially threatening precisely because they confront the receiving culture with another, different way of looking at life and society, a way that can be seen as potentially subversive, and must therefore be kept out (Lefevere, 1992:14).

Furthermore, normative models (saying whether it is “good” or “bad”) of translation based on the formal concept of equivalence⁵ need to be replaced by a historically-relative and socio-cultural model of translation. Heylen (1993:4) is accurate in assuming that normative approaches, unfortunately, offer no insight into the specific rationale behind certain translation practices. Fokkema (1977:6) adds that normative

views of literature cannot do justice to contemporary and ancient literary texts in foreign cultures, where different traditions and ideologies reign. Crudely summarised, contemporary translations should pay more attention to cultural constraints in order to make one more aware of the reasons behind translators' decisions.

Although there are a variety of cultural models to choose from, they must be carefully scrutinised to ensure that the most contemporary model is selected. The applicability in this context of the following views needs to be considered:

- Even-Zohar's idea of the polysystem.
- Toury's notion of translational norms.
- Lefevere's notion of translation as a form of rewriting which makes use of Jameson's concept of the master code as a means of interpreting the translation of texts as an exercise in manipulation.
- The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis or principle of linguistic relativity, which maintains that thought does not "precede" language but is rather conditioned by it.
- Venuti's code-abiding process within the context of a capitalist society.
- Notes on Steiner.

1.2.4 *Creating a contemporary Shakespeare*

In order to make Shakespeare a contemporary, and to have the senior secondary learner as reader relate to his work, it is deemed necessary to introduce a link between the world of the senior secondary learner as reader and Shakespeare's living reality. According to Danson (1977:134) the entire action of *Macbeth* oscillates between a metaphysical horror and a meta-linguistic mistake, which could unconsciously encourage the drama translator to bring *Macbeth* closer to the senior secondary learner as the reader's contemporary world. The statement uttered by the witches in the opening scene that *fair is foul, and foul is fair* evokes strong political nuances, one that the present-day senior secondary learner as reader can relate to, but coming from

⁵

The term that will be used at this stage to indicate the sameness between ST and TT.

the witches it makes *the right wrong and the wrong right* (my interpretation). As prophets they are imperfect speakers. The evil that they represent and encourage in the character of especially Macbeth can also be seen as a contemporary issue and therefore the senior secondary learner as reader will be able to strongly relate to *Macbeth*.

Kott states that

the writing of history and, above all, literary criticism can, and must, always be understood as an attempt to find in the past aspects of human experience that can shed light on the meaning of our own times (1964:xi).

Many contemporary critics agree that the play reveals a real compatibility with the diagnosis of evil in the modern world. Therefore, *Macbeth's* world, language and politics should instantly appeal to the senior secondary learner as reader, and what is more, when investigating behavioural patterns in Shakespeare and his profound understanding of the psychology of his characters, it becomes clear that *Macbeth* is not outdated at all. In other words,

he may not be our contemporary in the sense of being topical, but he is contemporary to our deeper behaviour patterns, and therefore he is very often able to show how society moves, how allies are betrayed out of fear and out of weakness. Shakespeare is our contemporary and lives in no particular place. Shakespeare was so thorough in describing his characters and in showing the situation from all sides. He was the one who wanted us to do our own thinking and he places some very vital questions before us (Elsom, 1989:180).

On the other hand Morton (1981:33) argues that the Elizabethan language, period humour, religious traditionalism and social mores all go against the basic ability of the modern school learner. He advocates the teaching of the “moderns” of the offering of an English course that is relevant to the learners and their limited experience. Sherman (1984:4) echoes the argument of Morton when he states that the problem of

teaching Shakespeare lies in the problem of language. Both Reid (1982:82) and Pienaar (1987:69) lay the responsibility for the interpretation and enjoyment of the text on the shoulders of the facilitator.

It can be conceded at this stage that

in concrete historical terms Shakespeare can never be 'our contemporary' except by the strategy of appropriation, yet the protean values which subsequent generations of critics have discovered in the texts themselves can be demonstrated to be in large part the projections of their externally applied values (Drakakis, 1985:24).

Given this background and the research problems that will be encountered in this thesis the following aims can be considered.

1.3 Aims of the study

In order to accomplish the aims of this study it is deemed necessary to formulate essential questions.

1.3.1 Questions that arise

In order to find solutions for the problems facing anybody wanting to familiarise learners at this level with Shakespeare, I will attempt to answer the following questions that arise:

- 1 To what extent will factors such as textual communication affect the translating of *Macbeth*?
- 2 To what extent could senior secondary reader-response impinge on the interpretation of *Macbeth* when it comes to a translation of the text?
- 3 What are the essential issues centring on drama perspectives when it comes to an attempt to translate *Macbeth* into Afrikaans?
- 4 Is Shakespeare a contemporary of the senior secondary learner as reader?

1.3.2 Aims

The aims of the study, arising from and prompted by the questions outlined above, would be to:

1. determine the extent to which adjustments in terms of textual communication and deixis would affect the intended translation;
2. determine to what extent the issue of senior secondary reader-response could impinge on the way *Macbeth* is interpreted for purposes of an Afrikaans translation of the text for the target group in question;
3. determine why drama perspectives should be considered in an attempt to translate *Macbeth* into Afrikaans for this particular target group;
4. to demonstrate that Shakespeare is indeed a contemporary and that contemporary rewriting is a real possibility.

After investigating all these crucial issues, it may be realised that Shakespeare is still our contemporary (in more than one way) and that a contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* is one way of proving it.

1.4 Hypothesis/thesis statement

It is postulated that the senior secondary learner as reader will have specific needs that have to be fulfilled in order to develop a love of reading of a text such as *Macbeth*. It is also postulated that the use of a specific type of translation of the text of the play would create a facilitatory bridge between the senior secondary reader and the text, and it is maintained that a particular kind of translation, in which creative use is made of drama perspectives, deixis and various elements of textual communication will aid in the facilitation process and create a text that is both accessible and highly enjoyable. This view will definitely add to the possibility that Shakespeare will “adapt and not die” in South African schools.

1.5 Method

The study will commence by focusing on aspects that will shed light on the meaning of the text, such as verbal and non-verbal communication, equivocation and the overall influence of deixis in order to make it possible to regard Shakespeare as a contemporary the senior secondary learner as reader can relate to.

In the ensuing sections the focus will in turn be on the fact that Shakespeare is indeed a contemporary and taking cognisance of the senior secondary learner as reader. In this regard three important aspects will form the basis of the relationship between the senior secondary learner as reader and the text, viz. the process of anticipation and retrospection, the consequent unfolding of the text as a living event, and the resultant impression of lifelikeness (Iser, 1980:64). These issues will demonstrate that the response of the senior secondary learner as reader will form the foundation of the reading process.

The influence of drama perspectives as well as the liability of various cultural models will form a further cornerstone for this thesis. A conclusion must be reached whether drama translation can be regarded as a culturally regulated activity.

After reaching a conclusion it might (or might not) be that a cultural model might serve as a vehicle for textual communication. Therefore, a contemporary translation of *Macbeth* will largely be determined by acculturation and the dominant role the text plays when translating drama.

Furthermore, *Macbeth* will be translated and illustrations based on contemporary visual semiotics will be included to demonstrate that a holistic contemporary rewriting

is indeed possible and will contribute to the understanding and accessibility of Shakespearean plays regarding the senior secondary learner as reader. Needless to say, a contemporary rewriting will shed light on cultural issues demonstrating that this Afrikaans translation may be extrapolated effectively to other languages.

1.6 Envisaged contribution of the study

The envisaged contribution of the study can probably be identified as being located in the application of aspects such as the influence of textual communication, a greater awareness of the role of the reader, the consequences of a careful consideration of issues involving drama perspectives as well as how Shakespeare can be dressed as a contemporary.

It is part of the envisaged contribution of the study that it will be demonstrated that a contemporary *Macbeth* translation can indeed lend further credence to the need to study Shakespeare should the real value of such a rewriting be acknowledged by the senior secondary learner as reader, the facilitator and last but not the least, the authorities.

1.7 Provisional chapter outline

Chapter 1: Research question and contextualisation

Chapter 2: Textual communication plays a vital role when rewriting *Macbeth* for the senior secondary learner as reader. Therefore, various issues need to be accounted for in order to make Shakespeare a contemporary that the senior secondary learner as reader can relate to. Furthermore, semiotic perspectives, the influence of deixis and the various levels of speech need to be discussed in detail.

- Chapter 3:** The emphasis in this chapter will be on concomitant issues regarding the responses of the senior secondary learner as reader. It is postulated that when reading and interpreting *Macbeth*, the needs of these readers should be understood and solutions to their contemporary problems need to be acknowledged and found.
- Chapter 4:** Cognisance will be taken of issues regarding drama perspectives and the profound role the latter play in creating a contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans. It goes without saying that a cultural model needs to be introduced in order to focus on the way ahead.
- Chapter 5:** It is deemed necessary to find a way to make Shakespeare a contemporary that the senior secondary learner as reader can relate to. To be able to reach this objective contemporary issues regarding Shakespeare need to be discussed and analysed. Furthermore, *Macbeth* needs to be seen as a contemporary and this can only be accomplished if issues in the play are analysed and scrutinised. Only after these two main streams in this chapter have been linked contemporary allusions can be formalised.
- Chapter 6:** This chapter presents the research findings and the interpretation thereof in terms of the full corpus of the study.

There will also be the Afrikaans translation of the study, appended as an appendix. It should be stated most emphatically that the rendition of *Macbeth* does not serve to replace the English play but should be seen as a text in which the dramatic economy has been stringently observed.

CHAPTER 2

TEXTUAL COMMUNICATION AND THE SENIOR SECONDARY LEARNER AS READER

*Two truths are told ...
These thoughts shake so my single state of man ...
and nothing is, but what is not.*

Research problems	<i>Textual communication and the senior secondary learner as reader</i>	The senior secondary learner as reader	Perspectives on drama and the senior secondary learner as reader	Shakespeare and the senior secondary learner as reader within a contemporary context
-------------------	---	--	--	--

In the opening chapter cognisance was taken of the whole complex of issues involving Shakespeare and contemporary readers as well as the important role that the senior secondary learner as reader in particular plays in the reading process. Within this context it will have to be demonstrated that textual communication plays a central role in contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth*, and that attitudes within the school fraternity as a whole need to change if we want to safeguard the tomorrows of the senior secondary learner as reader.

As a starting point the focus in this chapter will be placed on the various textual aspects that influence the senior secondary learner as reader's perception of Shakespeare.

2.1 Introduction

It has to be kept in mind that Shakespeare wrote his plays for his contemporaries. In other words, the language, socio-historical background, humour, puns, register, and so forth, will cohere in an essentially late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century pattern. What makes Shakespeare such a fascinating playwright is the fact that he had a vision that made him accessible for all times and ages.

Unfortunately, Shakespeare is in a sense outdated due to the fact that textual communication is one-sided in a certain sense and a text needs to be re-examined and rewritten in order to make Shakespeare a contemporary that the senior secondary learner as reader can relate to. If Shakespeare is understood in the same manner he was hundreds of years ago then the reader will be able to identify crucial issues of life and literature and deal with them according to the rules and laws of society.

When one deals with a Shakespearean play, such as *Macbeth*, it is crucial that the Afrikaans-speaking senior secondary learner as reader should understand the following:

- The immense influence imagery, such as power and blood, has in the play;
- the role of the supernatural;
- secularisation within the characters, especially Macbeth;
- the plot;

Furthermore, the senior secondary learner as reader should appreciate Shakespearean language whether it is in verse or prose. One of the ways to achieve this goal is by

reading a contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans which could necessarily be extrapolated to other languages in South Africa.

The influence of Shakespeare translations on European literatures seems to have been well-documented, especially from the Romantic era onwards, when Shakespeare's style and his worldview rather than his dramatic plots (which had largely been taken over from a wide variety of sources, anyway) generated widespread interest (Kruger, 2000:50).

According to Engler (1991:179), text has at least three different meanings. It refers to:

- the arrangement of certain shapes in black ink on the page;
- a mental entity derived from these shapes as signs; and
- something that seems to carry its interpretations within itself and therefore has authority over those using it.

This chapter extends the domain of discourse analysis to include the language of complex literary texts and offers a descriptive account of the relationship between linguistic form and the contemporary point of view. Translating drama means facing most of the difficulties encountered in translating any other literary genre. It is not only the meaning of a word or sentence that must be translated, but also the connotations, rhythm, tone and rhetorical level, imagery and symbols of association (Zuber, 1980:92). The reader must be able to understand it immediately and directly as well as accepting it as an organic communication.

To recapitulate, the following issues will be discussed in this chapter:

www.230r

- discourse analysis and textual communication;
- semiotic perspectives and textual communication;
- deixis;
- macro textual comparison and the senior secondary learner as reader;
- levels of speech;
- number of different contexts;
- the preconceived perception of the literary character.

2.2 Linking discourse analysis and textual communication

It is important to note that the translator always has to work with two texts, an ST and its translation (the TT) and therefore both texts need to be taken into consideration. As has been said, the TT is never produced in a vacuum; it derives from the ST and like the ST is expected to be a text in its own right. Furthermore, it has a communicative need to fulfil. Seen in this light, a translation is then “an offer of information formulated by a translator in a target culture and language about an offer of information formulated by someone else in the source culture and language” (Nord, 1997:32). Thus, the term *discourse* is used superordinately to refer to the coherent communicative event; to language beyond sentence, in any context (including the context of linguistic analysis), in any form (including two made-up sentences in sequence; a tape recorded conversation, meeting, or interview; a novel or play). Ulrych (1992:150) states that such a view envisages text and discourse as being particular instances of communication within a more general context of discourse, and provides a useful terminological distinction since it provides an opportunity to see how particular instances of discourse may be realised in actual texts.

Lefevere (1980:132) feels that one needs to think in concentric circles: in the centre is the play or the source text (*Macbeth*) that must be translated. Through the play’s linguistic

elements (puns, register, verse, and so forth) they belong to the SL (Middle English) and through that SL it partakes of the whole of the source culture (Elizabethan culture). It also belongs to the source literature (Shakespeare and his contemporaries) which has a code of its own. Therefore, construction and consequent articulation of understanding “how” and “why” the reading process takes place cannot be done in a non-committed, a-political, neutral way due to the fact that language is an integral part of a complex social process. Therefore, when taking these dominant, socio-historical issues into account it goes without saying that a contemporary translation of *Macbeth* requires radical invention from the contemporary literary translation in order to create an alternative path for the senior secondary learner as reader to understand what *Macbeth* is actually all about.

Writing is often considered to be secondary to speech. However, for many societies writing becomes the primary medium for the preservation of knowledge and tradition which can then be passed on with some expectation of objective validation. This emphasises the fact that it is crucial for the senior secondary learner as reader to be able to understand what is read within the time-frame known to him otherwise the beauty of Shakespeare’s plays will go unnoticed and will remain senseless words on a page. It is further important to keep in mind that the mother-tongue is the best way to communicate even though the senior secondary learner as reader is able to communicate fluently in English. Van Peer (1991:8) substantiates this argument when he states that

a text may be relatively well understood at the level of words and sentences. But how the meanings of words and sentences ‘add up’ when they occur in a text as a whole is less well known.

In literary pragmatic terms, the drama becomes a meaningful discourse only at the time when it is being read, that is, when the reader starts to construct semiotic and socio-cultural which could have given rise to the dramatic discourse gradually taking shape. For a better understanding of the socio-cultural contexts, the reader should also have experience of institutionalised stylistic registers developed from literary genre conventions (Verdonk, 1991:96). According to Carter and Simpson (1989:7) literary stylistics is a form of academic investigation that provides for a fuller understanding, appreciation and interpretation of avowedly literary and writer-centred texts. One has to keep in mind that

literature is an art form which is dependent, like all art forms, on a specific medium. Without such a medium no artistic communication is possible. The concrete medium of literature is language. Without language there can be no literature (Van Peer, 1991:127).

Thus, literature is a linguistic form of art. According to Halasz (1987:1) discourse means speech, talk, conversation, and so forth. In other words, having “discourse” is to say things or to give information. Literary discourse is the way the story is communicated. Thus,

discourse may be defined here as a context-dependent interpersonal linguistic activity whose form depends on its social purpose, which in our case is a message in a certain literary form transmitted from author to reader (Verdonk, 1991:95).

The operation of discourse is implicit in the regulation of what statements can and cannot be made and the forms that they can legitimately take. Attention to discourse moves the focus from the interpretative problem of meaning to questions of instrumentality and function. Instead of having meaning, statements should be seen as performative of meaning, not as possessing some portable and universal content but as instrumental in the

organisation and legitimation of power relations which involve, as one of its components, control over the constitution of meaning (Barker & Hulme, 1985:196-7).

Serpieri (1985:119) states that the literary sign is powerfully over-determined and takes on meaning from the historical, cultural and pragmatic contexts within which it is produced. The literary sign brings together a complexity of meanings at the crossroads between different routes of signification. *Macbeth*, for instance, may be conveyed in various ways (such as speech, writing or actions), but also, according to the various semiotic and discursive modes predicted by different genres. For example, according to dramatic modes, articulated in the peculiar forms of these genres expressed by a given age. The genre offers specific types of presentation, structure and convention for the actualisation of the material in discourse.

According to Paltridge (1984:106), the concept of genre is an instance of a particular communicative event. The communicative event occurs in a particular social and cultural setting and has a particular communicative function. Genre is a convention that is constituted on the basis of both pragmatic and perceptual aspects of the communicative event as they hold true for that particular point in time which may change and evolve. Thus, genres are dynamic rather than static and are closely bound to the social and cultural contexts in which they are embedded.

On the other hand, Hodge (1990:13) states that genres can be defined in formal texts, through a set of observable properties of texts. This merit becomes a disadvantage in the

light of the overall purpose of a genre regime, which is to organise behaviour and thought, not simply to classify existing texts. A system of genres is the product of an act of classification and the latter is always a strategy of control. Genres are classified in terms of semiotic and mimetic dimensions.

To recapitulate, Verdonk (1991:95) states that literary genres can be regarded as verbal compositions which represent an utterance or discourse between author and reader defined by borders of convention. Discourse refers to the field in and through which texts are produced. It is not an easy concept to grasp due to the fact that it is never simply observable and is only approachable through its effects. Thus, in the ensuing section the role that semiotic perspectives play in textual communication will be considered.

2.3 Semiotic perspectives and textual communication

When translating a play embedded in socio-historical realities such as *Macbeth*, it is inevitable that one should be dealing with the interpretation of signs on different levels. These signs, or the way the text is speaking to the reader, should be taken into serious consideration when translating a Shakespearean play. Obviously, all the complicated and integral facets of the richness of the original will be impossible to translate, but a contemporary translation on the level of the senior secondary learner as reader will be possible and make a real contribution to the survival of Shakespeare at this level. It is interesting to note that *Macbeth* portrays a literary paradox, in other words, Macbeth is not a “real” person outside Shakespeare’s play who is described within the play; he is

simultaneously invented and portrayed inside the play as such. Consequently, Barthes' insistence is illuminating, viz. that literature should not conceive of itself, nor be conceived from the outside but should rather be seen as a paradox within a paradox (Harvey, 1980:149). Therefore, it is essential that Macbeth the character and *Macbeth* the play should be portrayed in such a significant way that the semiotic perspective in general compliments the translation of the play as a whole. Kristeva (1980:36) states that

rather than a discourse, contemporary semiotics should take as its object several semiotic practices which it considers as translinguistic; that is, they operate through and across language, while remaining irreducible to its categories as they are presently assigned.

Within this perspective, *Macbeth* is defined as a translinguistic apparatus that redistributes the order of language by relating communicative speech. Its relationship to the language in which it is situated is redistributive and can be better approached through logical categories rather than linguistic ones.

Hervey (1982:13) states that semiological systems are those systems that have the purpose of enabling their users to communicate by means of arbitrary signs. It goes without saying that

signs are the particular forms by means of which semiological systems achieve their characteristic function of mediating between the substance of thought and the substance of physical expression. Therefore, signs are mediators between messages and signals (Hervey, 1982:13).

In order to understand the notion of semiotics better it can be seen as a three-dimensional phenomenon that could be subdivided into:

- semantics - the study of the relation between signs and designata;
- syntactics - which examines the relation between signs and other signs; and
- pragmatics - which studies the relation between signs and interpreters.

2.3.1 Semantics

Again, *two truths are told*: On the one hand semantics must be seen from the translator's point of view and on the other hand from the linguist's point of view. Both of these should be taken into account in order to demonstrate the influence the one has on the other.

From the linguist's point of view, semantics is concerned with meaning and the latter is realised in language (in the form of *Macbeth*). It is shaped in response to the context or situation in which it is used, in other words, for the senior secondary learner as reader. Therefore, when taking semantics into consideration, especially when translating *Macbeth*, one also needs to explore how *Macbeth* is systematically representing a social end. Such a linguistic theory is also a social theory for it proposes that it is in the nature of human behaviour to build reality and/or experience through complex semiotic processes and that the principal semiotic system available to readers is language. In this sense, to study language is to explore some of the most important and pervasive of the processes by which senior secondary learners as readers build their world (Halliday & Hasan, 1989,vii).

According to Halliday and Hasan (1989:3), social-semiotics can be thought of as indicating a general ideology or intellectual stance. As has been said, semiotics can be

defined as the general study of signs. Unfortunately, the sign has at times tended to be seen in isolation, as a thing in itself, which exists first of all in and of itself before it comes to be related to other signs. Rather, it should be considered as the study of sign systems, in other words, as the study of meaning in its most general sense. Therefore, linguistics is a kind of semiotics. It is an aspect of the study of meaning. But there are many other modes of meaning, in any culture, which are outside the realm of language. One can also see culture as a set of semiotic systems, a set of systems of meaning, all of which interrelate.

From the translator's point of view, a semantic translation takes more account of the aesthetic value, compromising on "meaning", where appropriate, so that no assonance, word-play or repetition create a jarring effect in the finished version. Further, it may translate less important cultural words by culturally neutral functional terms although they are not necessarily cultural equivalents. Newmark (1995:46) argues that

a semantic translation is more flexible, admits the creative exception to 100% fidelity and allows for the translator's intuitive empathy with the original.

In semantic translation the translator has to take into consideration certain aspects when translating a literary text. The first problem is that there are individual readers rather than a readership. Secondly, while the reader as constituent component is not entirely neglected, the translator is essentially trying to render the effect the SL text has on himself and not on any putative readership. Therefore, the reaction is individual rather than cultural or universal (Newmark, 1995:49).

2.3.2 *Syntactics*

By syntactics is meant the grammatical arrangements of words. In other words, the specific order of words will necessarily influence various adjacent issues in a socio-historical play and the register as well as jargon used by Shakespeare and the translator respectively. Furthermore, these issues will contribute to a semiotic reading of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans. It becomes a simple mnemotechnic device allowing the senior secondary learner as reader to create a new entity that will contribute to the meaning of the play.

2.3.2.1 Register

Register studies involve descriptive analysis of actually occurring discourse; they aim to characterise language varieties, rather than either the linguistic styles of individuals or specific linguistic structures; they present formal linguistic characterisation of language varieties; and also analyse the situational characteristics of language varieties, and functional or conventional relationships between form and situation are posited (Atkinson & Biber, 1994:352).

As with equivalence, there does not seem to be general consensus in the literature as regards the use of the concept of register. It can be seen as a semantic concept. According to Halliday and Hasan, (1989:38) register can be defined as a configuration of meanings that are typically associated with a particular situational configuration of field, mode and tenor. But it also includes the expression, the lexico-grammatical and phonological features that typically accompany these meanings. Biber (1994:51) feels that “most researchers agree in using register to refer to situationally defined varieties, as opposed to dialect, which refers to varieties associated with different speaker groups”.

When facing a particular text, such as *Macbeth*, the translator has to assign to it some form of register in order to interpret it in relation to its context. Even if the same words have been written thousands of times before, each instance is in a certain sense unique due to the unique time difference that exists. *Macbeth* is a text that is valued in its own right and time and will therefore differ from other text types. It is also true that every text is in some sense like another. This indicates that there are classes of texts within a specific register. The feeling one has that the one text is like another is simply a recognition that it belongs in some respect to the same register.

Translation of register is crucial for the revival of Shakespeare's works. If the senior secondary learner as reader is unable to identify with the register used in the drama it will most probably have no sense or meaning. If Shakespeare can be presented as a consumer friendly writer, as someone who is actually real, as someone who is not seen as alien to teenage readers, then only can the facilitator and learner meet each other halfway in order to bridge the gap.

2.3.2.2 Jargon

It is an irreducible fact that the drama translator will have to reduce jargon, meaning that redundant words that are semantically too broad for the features they are describing should be reconsidered. According to Newmark (1995:210) reducing jargons will depend on two factors:

- the degree of authoritativeness of the SL; and
- the norms of the SL and TL.

In translating *Macbeth* for the specific purposes as will become clear from the body of the study, it was deemed necessary to reduce characters as well as words in order to capture the essence of the play for the proposed target readers. This might seem a radical departure, but as will emerge, in order to appeal to and be accessible to the proposed target reader, it is important to communicate at ground level in such a way as to make sense of that which could be regarded as senseless through the eyes of the senior secondary learners as readers. It is essential that *Macbeth* be introduced as a “cool” character who is tangling with real and immediate moral and political issues in almost the same way the senior secondary learner as reader is experiencing it at this time in history. It should be mentioned at this stage that the proposed rendition of *Macbeth* is not comprehensive, but intended to act as a pointer to highlight the important aspects that constitute a reading/viewing of *Macbeth*.

2.3.2.3 Text

One can state that the text consists of language that has functional meaning and that the language presents certain functions in certain contexts as opposed to isolated words or sentences. Carstens (1997:79) extracts some features that can be used to describe a text broadly as a coherent unit of language usage with a specific syntactic and morphological structure that fulfils a clear semantic function in a certain context, that is, enabling

communication between people. On the other hand, Nida and Taber (1974:200) define a text as “a specimen of linguistic material displaying structural and semantic coherence, unity, and completeness, and conveying a message”.

The important notion about the nature of a text is that it is made up of meanings that need to be expressed in words and structures. It has to be coded in such a way in order to be communicated as a thing in itself and as a semantic unit. The text is a form of exchange and the fundamental form of a text is that of dialogue or interaction between speakers. Every kind of text in every language is meaningful due to the fact that it can be related to interaction among speakers and ultimately to ordinary everyday spontaneous conversation. A text is both an object in its own right and an instance of social meaning in a particular context or situation (Halliday & Hasan, 1989:11).

Drama is in itself a highly conventionalised mode of presenting speech and discourse. It is the genre convention that portrays human action deviating from the normal, everyday state of the world (Ryan, 1991:106). What emerges in *Macbeth* is that the imagery of power is inscribed directly and powerfully in the use of language.

2.3.2.4 Actor

In direct contrast to reading drama the actor can use voice, expression and other resources to either reinforce or disrupt the semiotic effects of the words, but these effects remain at least part of the meaning of the play. They actually become part of the semiotic content

of the performance.

The writer's attitude towards the audience also plays an important part in the communication situation. The translator must be aware of who the original text was written for and for whom it is intended now, in translated form. Therefore, both of these audiences/readers will come into play as he works on the translation. The translator should also try to establish the state of social interaction in which the original message was expressed and then try to replicate the process of communication that the original writer had gone through with his audience.

Due to the lack of sameness between the knowledge bank of the original audience and the knowledge bank of the receptor audience/readers, it will be necessary to make a good deal of information explicit that Shakespeare left implicitly due to the fact that his audience already knew this information. At the same time the translator must be very careful that by adding this information he is not changing the intent of the original writer (Larson, 1984:429).

2.3.2.5 Semiotic reading

A semiotic reading of the dramatic text must be aware not only of the cultural pragmatics of its historical context, but also of the potential pragmatics of the *stage* relationships that are inscribed in the strictly verbal make-up of the text itself in accordance with the codes and conventions (both general and historical) of the genre (Serpieri, 1985:122).

In other words, the drama narrates through the direct interplay of utterances: that is, not

the narration of facts from a particular perspective but the unfolding of a dynamic development of speech acts. In speaking within situations (or scenes) defined according to specific conventions, the *dramatis personae* influence each other and come into conflict (thereby representing opposing models of the world, ideologies or existential attitudes).

Relyea (1976:4) states that

according to both the playwright's and the reader's historical situations, according to the notions about signs that influence them both, any one of several systems of interpretation, all of which define the critic's rhetorical and ideological framework, may emerge from such a 'semiotic' reading of dramatic texts.

Therefore, the linguistic kinds of actions remain far and away the dominant mode that is performed through words. This means that drama is structured verbally and it refers to the situation as well as the space in which it is pronounced (deictic level).

In dramatising history, Shakespeare is careful not to declare allegiance to one side or the other - he thus refrains from transmitting an overtly ideologically charged message. It is interesting to note that he limits himself to an attentive comparison of the ideologies in question and anchors them to discourse as well as to the speaking subjects. Furthermore, he always reveals in them components of partiality and blindness (Serpieri, 1985:126).

According to Serpieri (1985:123), Shakespearean tragedy is marked by the prevalence, in the construction of the drama, of institutionally referential tropes such as irony, hyperbole, paradox and so forth. The fulcrum of his linguistic stage action lies in

equivocation, that is, in the collision of levels of meaning or isotopies, with suppression or substitution that is expressed by his antagonists. The drama draws on linguistic, deictic and rhetorical syntagmatics in the task of presenting the clash of epistemic ideological and psychological models.

One therefore has to go along with Serpieri (1985:143) when he maintains that

Shakespearean dramaturgy remains one of the most stimulating tests for semioticians of drama, both for the theoretical returns it offers regarding dramatic operations, at the highest possible level of complexity and of semiotic polyvalency, and for the critical-interpretative paths it opens to a coherent, but at the same time problematic, textual exploration.

2.3.3 *Literary pragmatics and textual meaning*

It is impossible to investigate textual communication without taking cognisance of literary pragmatics. The vital role it plays in drama cannot go unnoticed as pragmatics forms part of crucial questions, such as:

- How does one make sense of literary texts?
- What does one do in the quest for meanings?

First of all, one can only make sense of literary texts, such as *Macbeth*, by identifying the literary code of signs. As Pilkington (1991:45) states, and one cannot help but agree, all communication operates through codes or systems of signs so there are specific literary codes, structures and systems of signs which enable one to make sense of literary communication.

Indeed, what does the reader do to discover Shakespearean meaning? Give up? No! The only way the senior secondary learner as reader will be able to articulate meaning would be to move the interpretation of *Macbeth* to another plane, namely to the pragmatic. The play itself should be seen as a symptom of Shakespeare's contempt of tradition. It is only when the senior secondary learner as reader is able to make this paradigm shift that interpretation of *Macbeth* will be possible and the investigation of further, deeper structures become fruitful.

In pragmatics most people subscribe to the principle of expressibility, which states that anything that can be meant can be said. This boils down to the belief that human beings can find a way of putting into words anything they need to say (Thomas, 1995:122).

The facilitator should take cognisance that

literary pragmatics takes for granted that no account of communication in general will be complete without an account of literature and its contextualization, and that no account of literature will be complete without an account of its use of the communicative resources generally available (Sell, 1991:xiv).

Furthermore, pragmatics has influenced semantics to the extent that a typology of meanings has emerged which will influence the drama translator as well as the reader. However, the role of the drama translator will be more eminent seeing that these meanings should be incorporated into the translation process and should contribute to the various levels of meaning. Lefevere (1980:156) feels that it is necessary to distinguish between:

- *conceptual meaning*, in which the identity of semantic representation as opposed to the difference in semantic expression makes transfer of meaning from ST to TT possible;
- *stylistic meaning*, which also says something about the relationship between the participants in a text; and
- *the way the speaker/hearer sees himself* playing his part, or establish himself inside the cultural conventions regulating a text.

It is important to make a distinction between stylistic category (being the social meaning expressed) and stylistic function (being the phonological, syntactic or semantic way in which that category is expressed). As will be said and stressed several times in this thesis, one of the most useful ways to help the senior secondary learner as reader to cope with *Macbeth* would be to establish him inside the cultural domain of the reading experience.

If one accepts that the definition of translation should not be determined by a certain practice that is limited to a certain place and time, one can look at the role translated literary texts play inside the literary system of a given language. There can be no doubt whatsoever that translated literature is the channel through which most inter-literary communication passes or even has to pass (Lefevere, 1980:159) in order to create literature that is for all ages.

It would seem that the study of translated, dramatic literature would do well to eschew all normative pretensions. It might productively concentrate on two main fields (Lefevere, 1980:160-161):

- the pragmatics of production, in which the way a play is produced. This can also be

- seen as a type of text processing; and
- the way in which certain productions influence the target dramatic literature.

Furthermore, next to these two fields, there will always be a need for the production of meta-literary translations of dramatic literary texts. Therefore,

literature is a relative and social concept, and feelings about the value of texts arise, not simply as a result of characteristics of the text, but through the operation of such characteristics within the particular social system of evaluative overtones embraced by the reader (Sell, 1991:xv).

Needless to say, literary pragmatics is not hermeneutically sceptical. It is more interested than deconstruction in the non-ideational and social dimensions of language and literature and is alive to the pragmatic conventions by which words in a particular milieu are usually interpreted. One has to keep in mind that cognitive operations are essential for the interpretation of literary texts and that literary communication is definable only in relative, social terms - not in absolute, linguistic or textual ones.

Enkvist (1991:11) feels that

the prevailing circumstances, including the situational context and the receptor's purpose and his knowledge of the message producer and his environment, inevitably affect the interpretation. Interpretability of discourse depends on the receptor's ability under prevailing circumstances to build a scenario, a text world, around the text, a world in which that text makes sense.

Furthermore, *Macbeth* is intelligible to those who can recognise in it phonological, lexical and syntactic structures. This is one more reason why *Macbeth* could usefully be translated into Afrikaans – these complicated language structures are difficult and complex making it even more difficult for the senior secondary learner as reader to follow. Enkvist (1991:7) states that intelligibility thus presupposes pattern recognition.

A text is furthermore comprehensible to those who can assign to it a definite meaning, a semantic structure. It is interpretable to those who can build around that text a scenario, a text world and a set of states of affairs in which that text makes sense. Seen in this light, it is crucial that the senior secondary learner as reader should be educated in reading Shakespeare's plays and it should not be accepted that he will automatically understand what is going on. It is utterly unfair and actually somewhat ridiculous to literally throw the play at the reader that constitutes a lifetime's values and concepts. It is proposed that Shakespearean knowledge should be investigated beforehand in terms of a contemporary rewriting in Afrikaans in order to make Shakespeare consumer friendly. Thus,

intelligibility is the syntactic component of interpretability (which includes phonology, lexis, and syntax); comprehensibility is its semantic component including syntax plus semantics; and interpretability its pragmatic totality involving pragmatics as well as semantics and syntax (Enkvist, 1991:8).

Seen in this light, the influence deixis has on textual communication and the senior secondary learner as reader needs to be demonstrated.

2.4 Deixis

Deictic terms are not devoid of semantic meaning, but rather form a link between truth-conditional semantics and context-dependent pragmatics. In formal logic this indicates that most human communication has a deictic aspect. These points, such as who is speaking, where and when, are deictic points of reference. Pragmatics is seen as logically prior to semantics, with deixis seen as a variable. Deictics have both an indexical and symbolic meaning. The symbolic meaning of a deictic term refers to its place in the

language system.

Green (1995:11) defines deixis as follows:

A Greek word meaning 'pointing', deixis has been adapted by linguists and philosophers of language to refer to the encoding of the spatio-temporal context and the subjective experience of the encoder in an utterance. ... Deixis is that phenomenon whereby the tripartite relationship between the linguistic system, the encoder's subjectivity and contextual factors is foregrounded grammatically or lexically. There is both a semantic and a pragmatic element to deixis, although the relationship between these elements is complex.

Thus, the text world, as opposed to the discourse world in which the language event takes place, is the situation depicted by the discourse (Werth, 1995:53). Therefore, the text world can be seen as the "story" which is the subject of the discourse, together with all the structures necessary to understand it. In a written text, such as *Macbeth*, where the writer, translator and reader are separated in time and space, knowledge of the participants is active due to the fact that the discourse itself is the key to both kinds of information. According to Werth (1995:54), the information present in a given discourse is the product of both these sources - in other words, the overt meaning of the text together with information evoked by the text from memory.

The discourse worlds of written texts are almost always split: Since the writer and putative readership occupy different spatio-temporal points, there will be very little which is mutually perceivable. This is precisely where the translator fits in. It is the profound purpose of the drama translator to create a mental path for the senior secondary learner as reader to walk on. Even if the writer is writing about his discourse world, this will not correspond to anything in the reader's discourse world. *Again two truths are told:* On the

one hand there is the discourse world of the senior secondary learner as reader and on the other, Shakespeare's world. There is no way whatsoever that Shakespeare can ever have realised that "contemporary" indeed has two separate time frames and two separate socio-historical values. One way to bridge this gap is by introducing a contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* to the senior secondary learner as reader.

Werth (1995:55) states that there is a parallel discrepancy between the text-function for the writer and that for the reader. In other words, what is recapitulative for the writer might be informational for the reader especially when looking at this difference in time and history. However, the immediate situations, respectively, of writing and reading are presumably less important than the shared baggage of cultural assumption, general knowledge, and so forth, collectively known as frame knowledge. The farther apart in time and space the writer and reader are, the less of this type of knowledge there might be. Shakespeare might have intended to "evoke" a particular kind of situation that could be entirely unfamiliar for the senior secondary learner as reader. Thus, instead of recapturing an existing memory for his contemporaries it will be totally new information for today's contemporary reader.

2.4.1 Consciousness and context-building

According to Emmott (1995:83) consciousness does not only involve emotional response to the environment, but also one's basic awareness of it. In real life one is always located in some context or other, usually with an awareness of the place, the approximate time

and the surrounding people. Drama likewise locates events in a context or a series of contexts. According to Emmott (1995:84), this similarity allows one to become involved in the plot. Therefore, it is obvious that consciousness plays a dominant role in this process. Readers need to imagine a fictional context by amalgamating information from different parts of the text in order to build a mental representation of the context. When names of characters are mentioned, senior secondary learners as readers must not only register the use of these particular linguistic items, but actively think of the characters denoted by the names and places within the drama context. This approach to drama puts the emphasis on the active role of the senior secondary learner as reader who maintains certain information in consciousness even when it is not being explicatively mentioned by the text.

2.4.2 *Reader priming*

The term “priming” is used for the inferencing that enables the reader to assume that a character remains in a context over a certain period of time. Within the text itself, the character may throughout the period of priming be, at any point, either explicitly mentioned, textually overt, or not mentioned, textually covert (Emmott, 1995:87). While reading the text, the reader is continually conscious of the character’s presence. In other words, priming sets a group of characters together in a context and allows the reader to continue to assume their presence whether or not they are mentioned.

2.4.3 *Priming inferences and anaphoric theory*

By the anaphoric use of an expression is meant that use which can be correctly interpreted by knowing what other portion of the same discourse the expression is coreferential with (Fillmore, 1971:40).

Priming inferences can sometimes contribute directly to the interpretation of pronouns. Pronouns such as “we” and “everyone” refer to all those who are present, the full set of primed participants. According to Emmott (1995:91-92) these would assume that the reader was tracing back several pages to the beginning of the scene. Instead, one should view the reader’s consciousness of all the characters present as supplying readily available mental antecedent. These pronouns are particularly deictic. There is no need for an antecedent to linguistically gesture towards part of the context, since the whole participant set is being referred to. Place and time adverbs, such as “here” and “now” function in much the same way in drama. The only sense in which these items are anaphoric is that the primed context is built initially from the text.

As has been mentioned, language occurs in a specific location, at a specific time, is produced by a specific person and is (usually) addressed to some specific other person or persons. Only written language can ever be free of this kind of anchoring in the extra-linguistic situation (Tanz, 1980:1). This will necessary influence the reading of drama since the text is not only read but also performed.

2.4.4 *Cultural complexity*

There is much diversity in the experience of the speakers of languages both in their uses of language and their general cultural experience. According to Perkins (1992:65) language is used differently in different cultures and it is argued that those differences in language use have implications for the grammars of languages.

Concerning Afrikaans, there are two separate and distinct aspects of interaction. Firstly, there are the overt products and indicators of our shared knowledge and second, that shared knowledge itself. The characteristics of Afrikaans that seem most plausibly to be implicated in differences in language structure are those that have to do with the cultural context of language use. In Afrikaans, where much communication is performed by means of writing, styles develop that are different than those for spoken communication and reference will often be made to entities and events that are not visible to the writer or reader. Writing may have effects on Afrikaans but the language must have undergone some fairly substantial complexification processes before writing is included as part of the cultural repertoire (Perkins, 1992:89). The connection between language differences and writing can be seen as largely due to their both being related to cultural development. The language differences may be either spoken language differences or written language differences. Differences between spoken and written texts usually occur in different cultural contexts.

If a culture becomes more complex, communication in general involves a requirement for

decreasing dependence on context for the interpretation of messages. When reading *Macbeth*, it has to be kept in mind that communication is characterised by considerable time-pressure, pre-planning, absence of face-to-face monitoring and lack of an assumable shared background of knowledge and context. Communication can only be successful to the extent that the senior secondary learner as reader decodes the message into a code that is similar to the original code emphasising the precise reason why there is a need for a contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans.

It is clear by now that deixis plays an important role when translating drama into Afrikaans. As could be seen, various issues had to be taken into account. It is now deemed necessary to concentrate more specifically on drama translation for the senior secondary learner as reader.

2.5 Macro-textual comparison and the senior secondary learner as reader

When translating *Macbeth*, it is essential that a whole complex set of facets should be taken into account. In this thesis the putative readership is the senior secondary learner as reader and therefore issues that involve this specific learner should be acknowledged. Seeing that a lot of these learners might not of their own volition read Shakespeare ever again in their lives, I find it an important target group for purposes of effecting the familiarisation with Shakespeare which is an integral concern of the study. This can only be done if *Macbeth*, the character, can be the “cool” guy they can relate to, the guy who struggles with the same moral and political issues everyone is facing in South Africa

today. This is an excellent example of the power relationships operating in our society. I feel that a word-for-word translation, such as those of Eitemal (1965) and Coertze (1948), will, sadly, probably only succeed in losing this precious readership forever. Another path should be followed and obvious as it may seem, there will be a price to pay. Be it as it may, the senior secondary learner as reader has great expectations and if one can reach out to this reader and make *Macbeth* comprehensible to him by introducing a contemporary rewriting that will take cognisance of register and cultural issues one may actually be surprised of the results. It should be emphasised that the ultimate aim is definitely to create an eventual reader of the original *Macbeth* and to inculcate in the senior secondary learner as reader an appreciation of the beauty, puns, humour, and so forth of Shakespearean language.

When taking cognisance of drama translation, it is furthermore important that categories have to be singled out to demonstrate their position within the structure of interdependence while in reality they hardly appear in isolation.

2.5.1 *Stage-and-page translations*

The dramatic text, as written text, addresses a context of performance which requires a change in the mode of discourse – the transformation and transmutation of the written lines into the dynamics of spoken speech, which involve more than the recitation of the lines of the text by actors (Herman, 1995:13).

This combination of the written and the spoken medium gives drama its typical dual nature. A Shakespearean page translation is usually an “integral” translation, in that it

contains “no additions or deletions transcending the sentence level” (Van Leuven-Zwart, 1989:154). In contrast, a Shakespearean stage translation is a play that is translated exclusively for performance, i.e. “written to be spoken as if not written”. Kruger (2000:2) states that stage translations of Shakespeare plays that are prescribed as setworks for schools in particular are non-poetic, fairly free and idiomatic with instances of linguistic and cultural adaptation of foreign elements to make the play more accessible to the target audience. It seems therefore as if page-and stage translations of Shakespeare plays are similar in many respects, but that their functions as acts of communication in generating theatrical meaning differ.

Crudely summarised, a stage translation is predominantly for the stage and privileged minority and a page translation is for the majority and those who take an interest in reading drama. *Macbeth* in Afrikaans is written for the Afrikaans speaker and is not necessarily intended for the stage due to the fact that various writing techniques are used to give additional information of the setting and characters. In other words, it is intended as a medium to help the senior secondary learner as reader to visualise the play.

2.5.2 *Verbal and non-verbal communication*

Gostand (1980:1) states that drama is a constant process of translation. If there is a plot then the raw material of life has been translated into a pattern of events. If there is not a plot there is communication of an idea, a feeling, a need, an aspiration, a feat that may be interpreted in different ways by the participants.

If an author chooses to translate or adapt a work from another culture, particular problems occur. Translation from one language to another will involve questions of idiom, slang, tone and style, and at least the spirit informing irony, double entendre, word play and puns must be communicated if the true sense of the original is not to be lost. The position that a word occupies in a sentence may subtly influence the meaning of the original passage or may be vital to the characterisation.

Symbolism is basic to all drama and can be used for both verbal and non-verbal communication. Translations may bring problems of interpretation when the readers lack the background to appreciate the allusions or analogies; yet often there is an effective non-verbal level of emotional communication in spite of incomplete communication at the intellectual, verbalised level (Gostand, 1980:2). This is the turning point where the guidance of the facilitator is crucial and indispensable.

Although various issues need to be taken into account when translating drama it is crucial that cognisance should be taken of the influence the various levels of speech have.

2.5.3 *The dual nature of the play*

In the dramatic text there is more than meets the eye, “for a play is much more than a literary text, it is a combination of language and gesture brought together in a harmonious frame of timing: (Bassnett-McGuire 1978:161). Thus, *two truths are told* regarding the

literary as well as the theatrical systems of a particular culture. In this regard Link (1980:49) observes that

dramatic art has so far been considered as a mixed art, considering the dramatic text as literature and the production as a performing art.

Furthermore, Mouton (1988:4) contends that, although traditional theorists acknowledge the performance orientation of the dramatic text and thus also study the relation between the text and the performance, it is safe to assume that the dramatic text enjoys preference in their studies. Elam (1978:157) is correct in maintaining that “we are dealing with different kinds of text which have an intimate relationship with each other”.

One can read *Macbeth* and visualise the play. Due to this particular kind of communication, the relation between the language used by the characters on the stage and that of the reader is different from that used by the narrator and his readers. Being present at the action as immediate witness gives the impression of participation in the same system of communication or linguistic contemporaneity. Unfortunately (or fortunately) one is dealing with the reader as part of a putative readership and with the senior secondary learner as reader, as an individual. Therefore, the individual reader should use his imagination to visualise the play. This can only be done if the reader truly understands what he is reading in order to grasp the next level of understanding, namely, visualisation.

2.5.4 *Historicity and actuality*

Contemporaneity can be achieved in two ways, either by presenting the text as if it were contemporary to the time of the audience or by asking the latter to travel into another time (Link, 1980:25). Accordingly, the play may be produced as the playwright would have done it in his time or as he would have done it had he lived at the time of a later production. The first case is called historicism and the second case actualisation. In the case of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans, contemporaneity is achieved by retaining the socio-historical context but by rewriting the language into an Afrikaans that is acceptable and comprehensible for Afrikaans speaking readers. This has also been done with a difference: Instead of rewriting the play as a whole into Afrikaans, specific clauses and phrases were left (some unchanged and some translated into everyday English) in order to introduce the original Shakespeare to the senior secondary learner as reader.

2.5.5 *Text and implied realisation*

The dramatic text is incomplete or represents the full play only by implication. When writing for the stage, the writer assumes that his text will be produced according to the theatre conventions of his time or to what he would like those to be. If the participants in the action of a play and the audience share a common system of communication this may consist of different sub-systems. The characters in the play are using a language that the audience understands in direct contrast with the readers where they have to use their imaginations to visualise the play according to their own worldviews.

2.6 Levels of speech

According to Link (1980:26) it can be assumed that the normal way of communication in a play is that of the language used by the writer although there are various deviations from what may be called normal and they often represent deviations for dramatic purposes. The latter need to be seriously considered when translating *Macbeth* into Afrikaans for the senior secondary learner as reader.

2.6.1 *Contemporary speech*

The writer usually makes his characters speak the language of his own time and country, even if they represent either people of another time or from another language group. Communication becomes a problem as soon as the language of the text is no longer understood by the readers which is precisely the case with Shakespearean plays. To bring the original text of *Macbeth* to the level of communication of a present-day audience it has to be translated into present-day language.

If present-day language is so far removed from that of the original text, communication is no longer possible and it becomes a matter similar to that of translation from one into another language. A special problem arises when the language of the text may by and large be still understood, but is no longer considered as contemporaneous which might be the case with readers in the senior secondary phase. Link (1980:27) states that

Shakespeare's English can, in modern pronunciation, still be understood by modern audiences although they will miss many details. Communication on the level of the original text should not be distorted by possible misunderstanding and therefore a contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans can indeed be fruitful for the stronger as well as weaker learner in the senior phase.

2.6.2 *Dialect*

The language of the original text has either to be translated into the poetic language accepted by the learners or into language used in everyday reality. The closer the writer tries to keep to reality the sooner the language drifts away from it in terms of time. Though colloquial speech may be recognised and accepted by the readers as belonging to the period when the play was written, dialect of a former period is usually considered as wrong. Therefore, *Macbeth*, which is written in a specific language variety needs to be translated into the idiom of the time (Link, 1980:28). Thus, the play must be translated into the language variety that is recognised by the readers as being used by their peers and corresponding social group.

2.6.3 *Second-language translation*

Reid (1980:83) feels that

any translator of any play is likely to consider at some point the possibility of departing from a strictly faithful rendering of the original text in order to clarify certain issues for his/her readers or audiences although translators and producers alike need to be responsibly aware that tinkering with the surface of a text can have profound consequences.

On attempting a translation of *Macbeth*, it was my sole purpose to use language the Afrikaans senior secondary learner as reader could relate to. The translated version of *Macbeth* is an interpretation of the play to the extent that language is determined by a particular society and time. Complete understanding of a play is only possible if information supplied by the text is sufficient and if the general knowledge of the senior secondary learners as readers supplement each other. The further the readers move away from particular events of their own history the less they are informed about the details of these events. Shakespeare could have expected his audience to know many details of England's wars with France, and so forth, in contradiction with today's English readers or audiences. Furthermore, the number of different contexts also plays a crucial role regarding textual communication.

2.7 Number of different contexts

The discourse of drama has a particularly complex set of contexts and a number of different contexts are required to interpret drama:

- context of *dramatis personae*;
- context of audience or reader;
- synchronic versus diachronic context;
- local versus global context; and
- context of critical interpretation.

There is the context of *dramatis personae*, meaning that one treats the characters as persons and determines what beliefs they bring to the utterance in order to enact and

comprehend the fictional speaker's communicative intentions. By determining such patterns of character-beliefs, one constructs fictional personalities embedded in fictional social contexts. By understanding how they interpret utterances, one constitutes the minds of the characters.

The senior secondary learner as reader can be seen in a privileged position with respect to the characters and has more and different kinds of information about each character than the characters have about each other. Furthermore, the reader draws on his/her assumptions about the actual world in constituting the world of the text. These two worlds may diverge, as they do in *Macbeth*, but the very process of reader interpretation guarantees that the text world is an analogue of the actual world. Each utterance of the text world is interpreted as relevant to the world in which the reader lives.

As for the synchronic and diachronic context, the reader can interpret each utterance locally in its immediate context of utterance or these contexts can utilise their privileged global position with respect to the play as a whole. As for the local versus global context, interpretation can be used synchronically, using background knowledge from the time of performance or reading. Alternatively, the time of the play's composition, its diachronic context, can be used in interpretation. Diachronic context is important due to the fact that linguistic changes have occurred between then and now.

Finally, there is the context of critical interpretation. To comprehend an utterance in performance is a different process from submitting a text to the practice of criticism. In

the latter, the theories brought to an interpretation reflect the interests of criticism and will generate as products of different kinds of readings of the same utterance. A dramatic text is not strictly communicative in this sense. Rather, the reader interprets the text world as relevant to his own critical and personal interests. In this sense, although there are constraints imposed by the text's literal meanings and obvious or strong implications, if any, there is no correct, intended critical interpretation.

2.7.1 Style as meaning

There are at least six terms, namely, style, form, manner, grammar, accent and tone, which are concerned with different but overlapping aspects of the same general semiotic phenomenon, each representing a common object in different ways to different users.

The question that jumps to mind is: if so much content is encoded in style how can the average reader understand another literature in another language? Every translation will seem too inadequate to be worth studying and the original will be inaccessibly shrouded in its alien language and form. Hodge (1990:101) points out the paradox in this kind of respect for the otherness of other languages and cultures because it leads to their elimination from English and the centre of the curriculum. He states that this is a serious loss if one of the values of studying literature is to increase understanding across national and cultural boundaries.

Any study of the transformational work that has constituted literary texts will soon

recognise that the relation between a text and what it is about is never more than one part of a broader transformational phenomenon. Texts always refer to the continuous process of intertextuality.

Furthermore, intertextuality is the consequent alternative to analyses determined by a text (Birch, 1989:261). Barker and Hulme (1985:197) emphasise the fact that intertextuality has usefully directed attention to the relationship between texts: Discourse moves one towards a clarification of just what kinds of relationships are involved.

The act of reading situates one text among others related to one another in terms of genre, context or purpose. When translating *Macbeth* it has to be kept consciously in mind that the word “reading” itself ambiguously refers to two semiotic acts, one an act of interpretation that attempts to reconstruct the original act of production, the other a piece of writing which incorporates that text-as-read into a new text.

2.7.2 *Specific problems of literary translation*

Unfortunately, the failure of many translators to understand that a literary text is made up of a complex set of systems existing in a dialectical relationship with other sets outside its boundaries has often led them to focus on particular aspects of a text at the expense of others (Bassnett, 1993:77). It has to be kept in mind that a theatre text is read differently from other texts, even from other literary texts. It is read as something incomplete rather than as a fully-rounded unit, since it is only in performance that the full potential of the

text is realised. In the senior primary phase it is only expected of the learner to visualise and interpret a play in such a way that he understands what it is all about and as I have said, the main overall purpose is to read for enjoyment. Moreover, the written text is a functional component in the total process that comprises theatre and is characterised in ways that distinguish it from a written text designed to be read in its own right. Furthermore, the dialogue will be characterised by rhythm, intonation patterns, pitch and loudness. These elements may not be immediately apparent from a straightforward reading of the written text in isolation. Therefore, it may be assumed that most of these barriers can be crossed by an actual reading by the facilitator in the learning area in order for the senior secondary learner as reader to use all his senses when actually experiencing a Shakespearean play. Consequently, the task of the translator must be to determine what those structures are and to translate them into the TL, even though this may lead to major shifts on the linguistic and stylistic planes as was the case when translating *Macbeth* into Afrikaans. Obviously, although not necessarily relevant, it has to be kept in mind that a contemporary production of a Shakespearean text will be devised through the varied developments in acting style, playing space, the role of the audience and the altered concepts of tragedy and comedy that have taken place since Shakespeare's time. Moreover, acting styles and concepts of theatre also differ considerably in different national contexts and this introduces yet another element for the translator to take into account (Bassnett, 1993:123).

With theatre translation, the problems of translating literary texts take on a new dimension of complexity, for the text is only one element in the totality of theatre

discourse. A central consideration of the theatre translator must therefore be the performance aspect of the text and its relationship with an audience and this suggests that the translator must take into account the function of the text as an element for and of performance (Bassnett, 1993:132).

2.8 The preconceived perception of the literary character

Halasz (1987:4) explains that the reader weighs and measures whether the work comes up to his expectations concerning the given literary form. The reader starts processing information, often subliminally, before laying a hand on the text. He sifts it, arrives at judgements and draws conclusions while building up certain expectations. He carries this on when reading the title. It is enough to know only by hearsay a few characteristics of the time, space, aspect and atmosphere of the writer's world to involuntarily start shaping preliminary impressions. The latter should be formed prior to the reading of *Macbeth*.

Anticipating what the writer and the title suggest, the reader is extraordinarily open to receive information in harmony with his expectations. A glance at the opening lines, which are utterly striking in *Macbeth*, is a further significant step towards making the contours more contrastive.

After reading the opening lines thinking is put into motion by visual, auditive, and other impressions. The senior secondary learner as reader will automatically realise that unlike real people, the literary protagonist does not react to him although they share common

real-life situations. Thus, he cannot be influenced in one way or another whether he (Macbeth) likes the reader, finds him attractive, or not, and what he thinks of him at all. The literary protagonist is much more at the mercy of the reader although the reader has to be guided by the facilitator to be more tolerant and flexible with him, not rushing judgements but waiting freely for events to develop.

By means of scenes and events described in the work, the senior secondary learner as reader interprets his own psychological response on the basis of his former experience. At the same time he identifies himself with the writer, which helps uphold the continual experience. Since the writer cannot present all the details, he endeavours to make the reader fill in the gaps with other words to demonstrate gestalt-formation. (If one considers the major role the facilitator plays in guiding and educating the senior secondary learner as reader one cannot help wondering what the outcome of computer education will eventually be.) Imaginary representations formed between readings, or following reading can be the nuclei of a stronger identification with the literary character. There is no doubt that it is easier for the reader to identify himself with literary characters whose self-concepts and personality traits are similar to his own. Literary characters can revive the lives and traits of real persons without experiencing their situations. They have meanings as embodiments of definite experience, in the light of the analogy perceived by us (Halasz, 1987:6).

Simonton (1987:193) states that

one must recognize that a literary work is ultimately a form of communication, an aesthetic expression, by which one person attempts to have an impact on the

thoughts and feelings of another person. A successful creative product is one that establishes an interaction between artist and appreciator where the artist's intentions are realized in the appreciator's reactions. Each drama has both a biographical and a historical background.

In other words, plays are composed by a writer at a certain age and special set of life experiences and circumstances. In the second case, definite political or cultural events may impinge upon the creative mind during the process of conceiving a play. For literature to exist as a social practice there must be writers and readers and texts. Less obviously, these indispensable elements do not normally exist in the same time and place (Hodge, 1990:48).

2.9 Conclusion

If discourse analysts are to study reading, they must at the same time consider the active role of the reader. The reader is aware of information about the fictional characters and context at different levels of consciousness. The reader needs constantly to update mentally-monitored information. The mental representations of characters are always being added to, characters will come in and out of focus, they may enter and leave a primed context at different times and the reader's attention may switch to a newly-primed context. This constant flux means that mental representations of characters and contexts must be regarded as dynamic constructs.

All learning is a process of contextualisation: a building up of expectations about what will happen next. Learning takes place through language and the linguistic expectancies

are critical to its success. One has to keep in mind that learners depend on language in order to be able to learn.

According to Emmott (1995:93) the study of how the mind processes the drama text has important practical applications. Educational psychologists (Oakhill & Garnham, 1988; Yuill & Oakhill, 1991) have discovered that up to 10% of all children have particular problems with their overall comprehension of a text, even though they may be able to decode individual words satisfactorily. This appears to be linked with problems in building and monitoring fictional contexts, with the result that the information required to interpret pronouns and other pro-forms is not readily available in the child's mind. Difficulties with pro-forms are common among poor readers and can be regarded as indicators of problems with the whole process of comprehending a text, providing an insight into why some individuals are less competent readers than other. A theoretical model of anaphora which takes full account of context-building should therefore be of value to educationalists.

In the ensuing chapter particular attention will be given to the senior secondary learner as reader, and the anticipated problems of this chapter will be given particular cognisance for purposes of establishing the profile of the reader for whom this intended translation is being devised.

CHAPTER 3

THE SENIOR SECONDARY LEARNER AS READER

*Stars hide your fires;
Let not light see my black and deep desires.*

Research problems	Textual communication and the senior secondary learner as reader	<i>The senior secondary learner as reader</i>	Perspectives on drama and the senior secondary learner as reader	Shakespeare and the senior secondary learner as reader within a contemporary context
-------------------	--	---	--	--

In the previous chapter the attention was directed to issues centring on textual communication and the senior secondary learner as reader. In this chapter the focus is now narrowed down to the senior secondary learner as reader in preparation for the actual engagement with drama and the proposed translation of the dramatic work in question.

3.1 Introduction

The emphasis in this chapter will be on issues regarding the responses of the senior secondary learner as **reader**. When reading and interpreting *Macbeth*, the needs of these readers should be understood and solutions to their problems need to be acknowledged and found.

If one wanted to be fanciful and to borrow liberally from Shakespeare himself, there is no reason for the senior secondary reader to wish that *stars should hide their fires*. Rather, learners must be encouraged to dress themselves in the *borrowed robes* of the

imagination and flee from the *instruments of darkness* into the external light of understanding. If the senior secondary learner as reader can accomplish this paradigm shift it will demonstrate that Shakespeare is not for an age but for all times – because of the way in which, due to rewritings and more specifically radical rewritings, he can be made contemporary and accessible.

Unfortunately, the senior secondary reader, like other readers in the school system, has for too long been ignored in the sense of reading needs and deficits not being recognised and remedied. With the *talk and chalk* method being the easy way out, the more fundamental concerns of readers in the reading stakes were not addressed. It is the essential aim of this chapter to be a voice interpreting the needs of the senior secondary learner as reader and in order to cast off conservative teaching methods and to opt for creative methods. In this instance, more specifically, to facilitate the understanding and enjoyment of Shakespeare for non-mother tongue learners at the senior secondary level.

It is important to note that a proper understanding of the senior secondary reader can be effected - but for that purpose, it is essential that the following issues be explored in this chapter:

- literary competence and the senior secondary learner as reader;
- various processes when reading literature;;
- *Macbeth*'s place in a second-language classroom;
- some postulated consequences of reading radical rewritings.

These issues will now be explored in turn.

3.2 Literary competence and the senior secondary learner as reader

3.2.1 *The nature of literary competence*

When taking cognisance of the senior secondary learner as reader, it is essential that drama as a genre should be approached from a different angle than one used in the case of fiction and poetry. It would be most unfortunate if one were to assume that learners already knew how to “read” drama, a state of affairs which could lead to basic aspects of reading drama, such as how to read and understand the structure of a plot or how to recognise themes such as power and jealousy, are generally overlooked (Holst, 1989:39). This is due to the fact that a lot of time is usually spent simply explaining the “story” of *Macbeth*, whereas a contemporary version in Afrikaans (in this particular instance, given the mother tongue of the learners in question) could have the effect that the dramatic aspects could enable the facilitators to utilise time more effectively. It should be noted that it is not the function of the facilitator to “translate” the play - rather it is his duty to guide the learner towards the point where he can gain insight and understanding in Shakespeare’s plays in a more independent way and as a result of active involvement in the act of exploring the play. There should be a real understanding on all sides as to why *Macbeth*, or any other play for that matter, is being read.

If learners really enjoy reading *Macbeth* in their own language, it would be clear that they understand it. Therefore, one could urge that this process could be enhanced through the provision of radical rewritings of the play that would facilitate the first encounter with the play so as to inculcate this kind of understanding and enjoyment -

provided that they fulfil certain expectations that will be discussed in the following chapters. Fish (1989:68) agrees that in order to increase the intensity of interaction between a learner and a text it is possible and often advisable, **to alter the original text in some way**. I am convinced that it may be a tedious expectation to read literal translations such as those written by Eitemal (1965) and Coertze (1948) (although they are excellent translations in the literal sense of the word) and therefore radical rewriting of *Macbeth* may bring Macbeth's living reality closer to that of the senior secondary learner as reader. The focus point should not be the translation itself, but rather the easy movement between the world of the original text and that of the rewritten version.

It has to be conceded that

literary competence, then, involves a recognition that language can be used in a deliberately irresponsible way to create metaphorical meanings that illuminate our self-awareness. It involves a reasonably sophisticated knowledge of the particular kind of language employed in a given text, and an awareness of particular literary styles and conventions (Brumfit, 1989:27).

Literary competence further implies a degree of familiarity with particular cultural conventions. Thus, should the learner take cognisance of the socio-historical composition of *Macbeth* and can furthermore relate to the text due to the fact that it can be read in the contemporary mother-tongue, and relating to the socio-cultural background of the reader, it demonstrates why it is more than enough reason to justify radical rewritings of Shakespeare's plays. Other cultures and times have placed different values on literature and continue to do so in various parts of the world. Although cultural safeguards are necessary, they relate to social structures and not to substantive arguments (Brumfit, 1989:29).

3.2.2 *The senior secondary reader's reception of literature*

The beginning and end of literary wisdom is the hermeneutic circle. According to the hermeneutic approach, translation means interpretation, the uncovering of the meaning of the text, and in this sense the translator becomes the **mediator** between two texts and no longer merely the **finder of equivalence**. The circular movement of understanding runs backwards and forwards along the text, interpreting the whole in the light of the parts and the parts in the light of the whole. One can decipher the individual parts of a text only if one anticipates, in however diffuse and incomplete a manner, an understanding of the whole; and conversely, one can correct this preliminary understanding only to the extent that one explicates individual parts of the text (Connerton, 1983:110).

It is important to focus on the way that *Macbeth* is received by the senior secondary learner as reader. In the classroom context drama should be seen as literature rather than a performance-based activity. McCarthy (1996:89) makes the persuasive remark that drama finds itself in a situation where learners either *do* drama as a meaningful language-learning activity (meaning that they create and improvise) or else they study texts of plays as “literature”. Therefore, it is essential to emphasise the fact that literature should be seen in its holistic context and should not be placed in an either-or context. According to Fokkema and Kunne-Ibsch (1977) reception theory allows for historical and cultural relativism since it is fundamentally convinced of the mutability of an object. Furthermore, the theory of reception, even though it is interested in the aesthetic object, focuses on the artefact as the point of departure for all *konkretizations*. Reception theory can be regarded as indispensable to the total

reading experience in that it investigates and demonstrates how socio-cultural expectations can be dealt with within the framework of the aesthetic implications of the reading process. Holub (1984:xiii) states that reception theory refers to a general shift in concern from the author and the work to the text and the reader. This statement demonstrates the powerful position of the reader but neglects the fact that, for example, a radical rewriting of *Macbeth* would indeed make an old text new.

Fish (in Freund, 1987:93) proposes relocation of meaning in the reader by replacing the illusory objectivity of the text with the experience of a reading subject. A sentence, he claims, is an event, something that happens to and with the participation of the reader. Other significant points are that literary texts provide authentic, unsimplified reading material. The latter construct ways that give voice to complexities and subtleties. A further feature of literary texts is that ambiguities and indeterminacies in experience are preserved, thus providing many natural opportunities for discussion and for resolution of differing interpretations (Carter & McRae, 1996:xxiv). A contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth*, it is contended, takes cognisance of the importance of all these crucial aspects.

3.2.2.1 Reception and aesthetics

Thus an important question is: What is the difference between a drama, such as *Macbeth*, and a newspaper article? According to Rosenblatt (1994:23) the differentiation of the literary work of art from other types of verbal expressions has been a perennial theoretical problem.

In order to throw light on this problem it is necessary to start right at the beginning by stating that the text is an essential element of any reading act. This is then followed by certain processes that are activated when reading different kinds of texts. At this stage it is necessary to distinguish between aesthetic and non-aesthetic readings due to the fact that the contrast derives from the difference in the reader's focus of attention during the reading event.

According to Rosenblatt (1994:23), in non-aesthetic reading the reader's attention is focussed primarily on what will remain as the residue after the reading - the information to be acquired, the logical solution to a problem and the actions to be carried out. Therefore, it could be that when reading *Macbeth* the senior secondary learner as reader responds to the printed words or symbols and attention is directed toward concepts to be retained, ideas and images tested, leading to certain actions to be performed after the reading process.

According to Rosenblatt (1994:27)

the distinction between aesthetic and non-aesthetic reading derives from what the reader does, the stance that he adopts and the activities he carries out in relation to the text.

Needless to say, at the aesthetic end of the spectrum the reader's primary purpose is fulfilled during the reading event as he fixes his attention on the actual experience he is living through. Therefore, it can be conceded that the reader's attention is centred directly on what he is experiencing through the active relationship with *Macbeth*.

If this notion is understood, it will be realised that the facilitator should first facilitate the learner in terms of *how* to read before the *reading* can actually start. I feel that too

much attention is focussed on the interpretation of the words and too little on actually how to read any work of literature, including *Macbeth*. Language has a life of its own and the reading process will determine whether *Macbeth* is read efferently or aesthetically. In other words, an efferent reading of the text involves the analysis of syntax (reading for the sake of reading) and an aesthetic reading of the text focuses on the qualitative living-through of the text. It is essential that the senior secondary learner as reader should learn to focus his attention on the content of consciousness itself as he evokes the text. It is also important to note that different aesthetic transactions with the same text may produce different levels of experience depending on the nature, state of mind and past experiences of the reader.

At the extreme efferent end of the spectrum, the senior secondary learner as reader disengages his attention as much as possible from the personal and qualitative elements in his response to the verbal symbols. Therefore, he concentrates on what the symbols designate or what they may be contributing to the end result - be it the information, the concepts, the guides to action, that will be left with him when the reading is over. Towards the aesthetic end of the spectrum, the reader's primary purpose is fulfilled during the reading event, as he fixes his attention on the actual experience he is living through. This permits the whole range of responses generated by the text to enter into the centre of awareness and out of these materials he selects and weaves what he sees as the literary work of art (Rosenblatt, 1994:27-28).

According to Rosenblatt (1994:79), the emphasis in school is (too strongly) on the efferent stance. Comprehension in reading tests is assumed to be mainly of this type. Therefore, the learner as reader unconsciously and inevitably wants to approach

drama in a similar fashion - and the potentially rich spectrum of his insight tends to collapse. The senior secondary learner as reader needs to implement ways in which extraneous cues are given in order to adopt a more creative and fruitful stance in relation to it. As has been mentioned in chapter 1, one of the notions involved in this study is to help *create and cultivate* theatre-goers and this is another definite prior choice of stance, implying a readiness to adopt an aesthetic attitude. Thinking of the total literary transaction, recognition must be given to the fact that the reader adds to the non-verbal or socio-physical setting throughout his whole past, present and future experiences of life and literature. Only then will it become obvious that memories, present preoccupations, sense of values, aspirations enter into a relationship with the text.

3.2.2.2 Verbal cues and reception

In information theory, the listener is said to have decoded the message when he has reconstructed the sounds and has recognised them as a pattern of words. The non-verbal setting can be understood to include all of the possible factors outside the verbal symbols themselves that might influence the interpretation of meaning. Rosenblatt (1994:81) states that verbal cues are ultimately the most pervasive. When turning from the broader environment of the reading act to the text itself, one needs to recognise that a very important aspect of a text is the cues it provides as to what stance the reader should adopt. The printed text serves as a signal to trigger the reader's imaginative activities. The divisions into acts, the printing of dialogue with the names of each speaker, the descriptions of stage settings and the parenthetical stage directions alert the reader to adopt the aesthetic stance.

In the aesthetic transaction the text possesses an especial importance whereas in the efferent situation a paraphrase may be as useful as the original text. In the evocation of drama, openness of the text (see Elam, 1978) takes on special importance, while at the same time the senior secondary learner as reader must pay close attention to the exact words of the text. It goes without saying that when reading *Macbeth* the reader must bring more than a literal understanding of the individual words and should be led to reconstruct the various meanings of the text.

In other words,

he must bring a whole body of cultural assumptions, practical knowledge, awareness of literary convention, readiness to think and feel these provide the basis for the weaving a meaningful structure around the cues offered by the verbal symbols.... The reader respects the limitations set by the verbal cues and draws on his own resources to fill in the gaps, to realise the blueprint provided by the text (Rosenblatt, 1994:88).

A concept such as plot offers another illustration of this view. It involves a series of actions or events, which can be efferently itemised, implying a certain kind of activity on the part of the reader. As *Macbeth* unfolds, the senior secondary learner as reader should be able to move into a new (more aesthetic) mode of action, feeling consciously or unconsciously related to what he has already been participated in.

When focussing on the senior secondary learner as reader, it is essential to focus attention on exactly what is expected of the reader when reading *Macbeth*. Certain terminological terms and their implications should be fully understood if any response of the reading event can be expected. According to Combrink (1998:2) principles of selection and economy are most important. The dramatist has to select only those

actions and events which will contribute most to the play, those which are in fact indispensable, and arrange them into a coherent and dramatically feasible whole. Therefore, plot is often discussed in terms of exposition, rising action, crisis, falling action and dénouement. On the other hand, climax refers to the highest point of interest and is related to a reader's lived-through response. Furthermore, the climax of the play can be described in various ways. It can be seen as (Combrink, 1998:8):

- the culmination of the course of action;
- the maximum disturbance of the equilibrium;
- the moment of the most intense strain; and
- the point of no return, the most crucially decisive moment.

Following the more purely structural notions involved in drama as outlined above, the issue of dramatic language as a dramatic device also needs to be given special cognisance. In broad terms metaphor is the notion that has to be grappled with satisfactorily if aesthetic understanding is to be effected. Metaphor refuses to remain embedded in the text. Even when a metaphor is expressed in the grammatical form of a comparison it is still a metaphor only by virtue of a very special mode of eliciting creative interactivity (cf. Gräbe, 1979) on the reader's part. It can be tacitly understood that metaphor requires awareness of personal responses. Rosenblatt (1994:95) feels that metaphor ultimately derives from or depends on the capacity of readers to hold disparate ideas or images and their overtones or associations as focus of attention and to create from this a qualitatively unique state of mind. Thus, it is impossible to find criteria for activating the myriad allusive possibilities of metaphor entirely within the text itself. If the implications of the plot, climax and metaphor (to mention a few) are fully understood in the mother-tongue by the senior secondary learner, a suitably complex and varied response will follow as a natural reaction to the

reading event.

3.2.3 *Literary analysis engaging with psycho-analysis*

It goes without saying that psychological meaning underlies all other meanings and that some engagement with notions of psycho-analysis in the teaching of literature can aid readers to achieve an understanding of their unconscious selves via a greater understanding of the unconscious life of characters in a play. Therefore, psychological preparation involves helping learners to make the leap from dependence to independence and to understand why it is useful (Sinclair, 1996:143). Literary interpretation has resorted to various implications of the psycho-analytic conceptual framework in order to engage with each of these possibilities. The reader is free to fill in the blanks but is at the same time constrained by the patterns supplied in the text. In other words, the text *proposes* or *instructs*, and the reader *disposes* or *constructs*. Psychological preparation when reading *Macbeth* in Afrikaans is essential and should include discussion sessions in class where the senior secondary learners as readers consider the extent to which they act independently in different areas of their lives and how they feel about this (Sinclair, 1996:143).

Since the gaps in a text can be filled in many different ways, every text is potentially capable of many different realisations and no reading can exhaust the text's full potential which is always infinitely richer than any of its realisations. What transmutes the text into an experience for the reader, is a process of ideation (the formation of ideas in the mind) regulated by an active interweaving of anticipation and retrospection by which the impressions gathered result in something called

experience (Freund, 1987:146). One should also be aware of the fact that certain insights from psycho-linguistics can be used in specific ways in the entire reading experience. Smith (1994:143) feels that it would be logical to involve the field that associates linguistic theories with theories trying to explain acquisition and performance within linguistic frameworks as psychological phenomena.

Iser (1974:ix) believes that literary texts in general constitute a reaction to a contemporary situation, bringing attention to problems that are conditioned though not resolved by contemporary norms - this is to say that prior to the text/reader interaction there has already been an interaction between the author and the social and historical norms of his environment. Literary texts are thus acts of communication whose purposes are to reformulate existing thought-systems in order to bring about the imaginary correction of deficient realities (Freund, 1987:146). Reading is thus an active process of becoming conscious of otherness as it brings about a questioning and probing of the validity of received norms and systems. In brief, it is an event of personal and social significance, an expansion of the self (Freund, 1987:147).

The reader-response critic shifts the scene of operations from a timeless, objective, self-sufficient text to a multi-layered reader's mind and questions the text's autonomous existence, thereby also putting into question orthodox assumptions about the distance or difference between text and reader. It is impossible for the reader to control the text or the meaning within. The reader can only perform roles inscribed in the text's apocreptic doubleness (Freund, 1987:153).

3.3 The senior secondary learner as reader: processes

One cannot but agree with Carter and McRae (1996:xxiii) who suggest that the consistent argument by literature facilitators with no marked linguistic interests is that language-based and process-oriented approaches to the teaching of literature are reductive. In so far as they succeed, they succeed only by reducing the text to its language and consequently fail to recognise that literary texts are holistic artefacts which are situated within cultural traditions, are historically shaped and grow out of the lived experiences of the writer. The facilitator should actively demonstrate that literary texts are much more than their language. This insight should be revealed throughout, otherwise a complex literary text like *Macbeth* will remain a cluster of linguistic symbols. According to Rosenblatt (1994:ix), a text is simply paper and ink until a reader elicits from it a literary work of art through the co-constitutive activity of the reader engaging with the text and turning it into an aesthetic object.

He (Rosenblatt, 1994:33) states that

words, the medium of the literary work, are used in our everyday life; moreover, as we have seen, words, unlike musical sounds, point to something outside themselves, often to something that has a separate existence in real life.

This statement may be true to a certain extent, but words and their various interpretations are part of the living reality leaping into vibrant life if the text is understood by the senior secondary readers. By refocusing attention on the senior-secondary learner as reader, questions such as the following need to be answered:

- How does the reading process influence the psyche and the imagination of the

senior secondary learner as reader?

- After reading and rereading *Macbeth* the concomitant question that springs to mind is centred on what happens consciously or unconsciously, cognitively or psychologically during the reading process due to the fact that reading is never innocent and is always affected by suppressed or unexamined presuppositions?

Therefore, as has already been emphasised in the first chapter, it is necessary to call on readers to reclaim some of their authority due to the fact that the return of the reader could resemble the return of the repressed. In this regard, reading can be compared to Duncan's ghost: a past action leading to dramatic and far-reaching consequences in the historic present. After the senior-secondary learner as reader has returned to the act of reading, this influential process will consequently lead to a specific reaction or reactions galloping from self-discovery to insight into age old, but ironically, contemporary problems.

One necessarily reaches the conclusion that

reading, as in the analytic situation, encompasses both text and interpreter and may be seen as a species of transference, a mode of interaction in which the analyst's reading of the analysand has the uncanny effect of turning into the analysand's reading of the analyst (Freud, 1987:14).

One should keep in mind that an understanding of the drama and its meaning go hand in hand. Therefore, meaning is the result of the interaction between the reader and the text. In other words,

the readers contribute to the meaning of a text when they match their own experiences and knowledge to that implied in the text. In the case of literary text, the multi-faceted nature of the interpretation of meaning is particularly complex (Fish, 1989:69-70).

It is essential that *Macbeth* as a holistic artefact should focus on the

full appreciation of literature *and that it* (my italics) requires an extensive, detailed and disciplined study which acknowledges that product-based, which in turns draws on historical, socio-cultural and biographical information about

texts, is a key component in any approach to the teaching of literature as literature (Carter & McRae, 1996:xxiii).

Without reader-identity the learner will not be able to identify with crucial issues, such as dealing with drama as genre and seeing vividly-evoked characters as contemporaries. In this process Shakespeare is stripped of immediate meaning and topicality, whereas the situation can so easily be reversed if facilitators realise and understand the important role of the reading-process in all its various facets. It is crucial that emphasis must be on the senior secondary reader's contribution in this unique interactive and co-constitutive relationship with Macbeth, the character, as well as with *Macbeth*, the contemporary play. This process should lead to the position where the senior secondary learner as reader realises his active position in the drama itself.

The reader's position that needs to be discovered in drama texts will form the essence of his response. This proves that the reading process of *Macbeth* has a life of its own and that age-old problems will turn out to be contemporary issues that need to be dealt with on a daily basis. In other words, problems of the past will eventually turn out to be problems of the present. The senior secondary learner as reader will find it easier to relate to *Macbeth* if he initially engages with the play by way of a contemporary translation in the mother-tongue that the reader can fully identify with. Shakespeare can become a peer and solutions to certain life-like situations may become more evident and easier to extrapolate to real-life situations if the reading process fully becomes this co-constitutive activity outlined above (Dussé, 1995:234).

Therefore, reader response is the crucial underlying factor in the consideration of this

enterprise, and the seemingly automatic process of reading will become a more overtly analysable act within the framework. It cannot be emphasised enough that new ways of thinking by the facilitator as well as the senior secondary learner as reader need to be induced in the engagement with drama – ways that acknowledge the unique individuality of the mind and emotions of each and every senior secondary learner as reader in a far fuller sense than has been the case up to now.

Iser (1974:xi) claims that

reading is an attempt to lay the foundations for a theory of literary effects and responses based on the novel (*in this instance, drama*), since this in the genre in which reader involvement coincides with meaning production. Therefore, it must have its foundations in actual text, for all too often literary critics tend to produce their theories on the basis of an aesthetics that is predominantly abstract, derived from and conditioned by philosophy rather than by literature - with the regrettable result that they reduce text to the proportions of their theories to fit in with the texts.

Iser's statement demonstrates that theories tend to place boundaries on the reader's scope and that drama should be seen as a holistic artefact and not as a process that is externally dominated by a theory. It needs to be emphasized that drama, more specifically *Macbeth*, is not about theory, but about reliving reality through the imagination of the senior secondary learner as reader.

In order to perform the role of devil's advocate, it is necessary to view the senior secondary learner as reader as an alien. This means that the learner is equipped with linguistic knowledge and is to some extent capable of interpreting the text. As a holistic artefact, *Macbeth* will be easier to relate to if the reader can read the text that is written in the register and jargon located more firmly in his framework of reference. Should the translator be capable of accommodating these needs it will most likely

inspire the reader to read other rewritings as well as *Macbeth* in its original form. Should this stage be reached, the possibilities are unlimited and this is proposed as the most constructive way forward.

But at this stage it is important to state categorically and unequivocally that serious emphasis on the reader's role does not in any way negate the importance of the text. Furthermore, it is also a truism of reception studies that a text has different effects at different times. This means that *Macbeth* can be studied in such a way that it will elicit different responses from different kinds of readers in a senior secondary culture¹ and environment. This reinforces the fact that it is an inescapable necessity to study the readers' value systems, while preventing the translator's own value system from intervening, although the translator's own style and creativity cannot be ignored when translating Shakespeare. Such a confrontation may reveal the relativity of existing value systems and provide alternative solutions to familiar problems that the reader may have experienced in his past or at present. According to Fokkema (1977:7), this method can be called cultural relativism. Drama is therefore an (inter-)active transaction between an author and a reader that could be strengthened in various ways, including via radical rewritings of *Macbeth* in the mother-tongue.

3.3.1 *The reading process*

Throughout the history of humanity readers have experienced various shifts of emphasis when reading, rereading and interpreting texts. This process, as has been stated, should be an active two-way relationship where the reader could then become

¹ Emphasis, in this sense, being on the environment and diversities of the senior secondary learner as reader.

the dominant force, where he is able to manipulate and interpret the text with only certain textual imperatives impacting on the act of reading – engaging with new “decorum of interpretations and self-awareness, eventually leading to new constellations in interpretations” (Rosenblatt, 1994:1). Critical theory and practice both suffer from a failure to recognise that the reader carries on a dynamic, personal and unique activity (Rosenblatt, 1994:15). *Radical rewriting of Macbeth* and renewed emphasis on the senior secondary learner as reader will force this attitude to change for the better. The freedom to interpret and gain self-knowledge as an equal partner in drama must be the point of departure and this notion will be a mainstay throughout this thesis.

Although it is true that Aristotle (*Poetics*), Horace (*Epistles*) and Longinus (*On the Sublime*) referred to the reader in their various essays, the incontrovertible fact remains that the reader, especially the senior secondary learner as reader, has not been taken seriously enough for far too long (the main shift to the reader has now become, in literary theory, the central concern, but in spite of this, the extrapolation of these concerns to the reader within the secondary school environment has not been robust enough).

According to Rosenblatt (1994:4), the reader is often mentioned, but is not given the centre of the stage due to the fact that the reader is usually cast as a passive recipient of the impact of drama. The unfortunate fact remains that the inculcation of reading skills is still seen far too strongly as a one-way communication alley where attempts at building and crossing bridges are constantly (if unconsciously) burned by the lack of reliable knowledge and insight by facilitators and learners. Furthermore, emphasis

of the learning experience could be on mass-interpretation where only one answer qualifies and individual input could also be underestimated seeing that uninformed views, as has been mentioned, force the reader to follow a categorised direction. Due to OBE, the focus should radically shift to the individual, disregarding diverse cultural, social and mental backgrounds. It is about time that the reader's voice is heard due to the fact that it is only if the reader can experience the full dramatic impact of *Macbeth* that he is able to enter the world of the play and resonate with the elements of the play as intended by Shakespeare.

The implications of phenomenological theory are that one must take into account not only the actual text, but also the actions involved in responding to that text, which is, according to Iser (1974:274), an action of *Konkretisation*.

He feels that the literary work has two poles:

- the artistic, referring to the text created by the author and
- the aesthetic, referring to the realisation accomplished by the reader. The senior secondary reader will only be able to associate with these poles if both are clearly understood and interpreted in contemporary, mother-tongue language.

One should always keep in mind that

the work is more than the text, for the text only takes on life when it is realised and furthermore the realisation is by no means independent of the individual disposition of the reader - though this in turn is acted upon by the different patterns of the text (Iser, 1974:274).

As the reader uses the various perspectives offered to him by the text, he sets the work in motion and this very process results ultimately in the awakening of responses within himself. Reading causes the literary work to unfold its inherently dynamic character (Iser, 1974:275). The reader then plays a game of the imagination and this

comes to life when the reader reads *Macbeth* in his own language. Drama must therefore be conceived in such a way that it will engage the reader's imagination in the task of working things out.

Furthermore, Iser (1974:276) states that sentences link up in different ways to form more complex units of meaning with a very varied structure. Whatever has been read sinks into the memory and is foreshortened. It may later be evoked again and set against a different background with the result that the reader is enabled to develop unforeseeable connections. One has to keep in mind that the memory evoked can never reassume its original shape. The new background brings to light new aspects of what has been committed to the memory. When reading *Macbeth*, the reader, in establishing these inter-relations between past, present and future causes the drama to reveal its potential multiplicity of connections. These connections are the product of the reader's mind working on the raw material of the text, but they are not the drama itself - for the drama, in the true sense of the word, consists just of sentences, statements and information that need to be interpreted by the imagination of the senior secondary learner as reader.

Due to certain gaps, the reading of all literary texts is selective and the potential text is infinitely richer than any of its individual realisations. Reading *Macbeth* will produce a different impression from the first. The reading process always involves viewing the text through a perspective that is continually on the move and constructing what is called the virtual dimension (Iser, 1974:280). However, reading *Macbeth* a second time will result in a different time sequence and therefore a different interpretation. It goes without saying that the second reading is not truer than the first, only different.

According to Iser (1974:281), the reader establishes the virtual dimension of the text by realising a new time sequence. However, realisation may go unnoticed and the facilitator should emphasize the importance of reading *Macbeth* for a second and more times.

During the process of reading there is an active inter-weaving of anticipation and retrospection which on a second reading, may turn into a kind of advanced retrospection. The impressions that arise from this process will vary from reader to reader. As has been said, the *stars* in a literary text are fixed and the lines that join them are variable. Shakespeare is an expert in dealing with the reader's imagination and this visualisation is only one of the activities through which one forms the *gestalt* of drama.

Crudely summarised, three aspects form the basis of the relationship between the senior secondary learner as reader and *Macbeth*:

- the process of anticipation and retrospection;
- the consequent unfolding of the text as a living event; and
- the resultant impression of life-likeness.

3.3.2 *Reading as experience*

The ultimate aim of interpretation is to reach understanding. When reading *Macbeth* as compared to a non-literary text, the main difference resides in the way the reading process commences. Although there are similarities, such as metaphor, ornate style, verse, and so forth which can be found in literary as well as non-literary texts, the ontological question would focus on the constitution of a text as a literary work rather

than on a psychological question about actual behaviour.

Therefore,

our selection of theories and their presentation is shaped by certain assumptions that will not be shared by every reader. One of these assumptions is that there are various ways towards knowledge, whereas we may never reach the certainty of perfect knowledge. Another assumption is that it is worthwhile to aim at the highest possible level of knowledge, since not to do so would throw the door open to subjectivism and irrationalism (Fokkema & Kunne-Ibsch, 1977:xi).

One has to agree with Freund (1987:3) when he maintains that the inherent privacy and silence of reading have encouraged a tendency to suppress the embarrassment of subjectivity, placing it beyond the pale of a critical decorum which aspires to be objective. It is therefore deemed necessary that the conspiracy of silence surrounding the supposed impersonality of critical reading needs to be unmasked.

When dealing with language, it can be conceded that language is unstable, double, duplicitous and therefore subject to misinterpretation. Nevertheless, it is crucial to understand that reading focuses on the message and therefore focuses on the poetic function (according to Jakobson's well-known interpretation of the reading process). This demonstrates why it could be extremely fruitful for any reader to read a drama, such as *Macbeth*, first of all in his own language in a contemporary register before attempting to read it in the (difficult and often opaque) language and distant socio-historical context in which it was created. Thus, it draws attention to the message rather than its referent, a function that thereby promotes the palpability of the sign and deepens the dichotomy between sign and referent (Fish, 1987:74).

The main thrust of the argument emphasises the fact that literature, more specifically

drama, does not exist in a vacuum but in a semiotic network of vast and complex proportion. The most important notion when reading drama is that the reader should realise that he should free himself from the text and start focussing on the inner, aesthetic affect the text has on him. In other words, the approach when reading drama should change radically because then only Shakespeare will become a contemporary and the active relationship between the senior secondary learner as reader and *Macbeth* will be realised.

Iser (1974:xiv) claims that the reader is forced to discover the unconscious expectations that underlie all his perceptions and also the whole process of consistency-building as a prerequisite for understanding. He states that the reader may then be given the chance of discovering himself, both in and through his constant involvement in “home-made” illusions and fictions. One has to realise that although drama deals with historical norms, this does not mean that it simply reproduces contemporary values, rather, it intensifies the need for a fixed moral and value system.

Therefore,

the reading of a text is an event occurring at a particular time in a particular environment at a particular moment in the life history of the reader. The transaction will involve not only the past experience but also the present state and present interests or preoccupations of the reader. This suggests the possibility that printed marks on a page may even become different linguistic symbols by virtue of transactions with different readers (Rosenblatt, 1994:20).

3.3.3 *Language-based approach to reading*

Reading drama may mean learning to see the world in the way the speakers of that world perceived it. The reader does not adopt this perception as his own, but becomes

capable of recognising the weight given to certain images and through differences in perception, becomes aware that there is no standard way of interpreting events. It is incorrect to assume that language and literature are equal partners when reading literature. It is essential for the literature lesson to succeed as the primary literary experience. This literary experience will not survive unless the magical act of self-surrender to the text which Coleridge termed the *willing suspension of disbelief*, has taken place and been sustained.

Formalism concentrates on the words on the page, the literary artefact – an approach that detracts to some extent from the importance of the role of the reader and the writer of those words. For a large part of the previous century this view dominated the teaching and study of literature world-wide, and it was only with the advent of reader-oriented and more fully worked-out semiotic approaches that a crucial shift occurred. Language understanding is essential, it should not dominate the dramatic and other effects of the text. Hall (1989:32) claims that learner-centred activities must be derived that utilise response in a holistic way to semantic content, including where necessary, investigation of historical-cultural reference and background, as well as socio-linguistic features of style, especially register. Bakhtin (1985:20) also accepts that in order to say anything of more than negligible or stylistic interest about any utterance one should move beyond the purely linguistic level to a meta-linguistics of discourse.

On the other hand, Brumfit (1989:26) contends that

literature can be considered as a means of induction into such a serious view of our world, and it is a means which is peculiarly suited to the classroom.

The primary assumption is that the more closely learners attend to the language of a text the more confidently they will be able to account for its meanings. It is the main objective of stylistic analysis to account for meanings rigorously and systematically by attending to language (Carter & Walker, 1989:3).

3.3.4 *From the subject of reading to the reading subject*

According to Fish (1987:81)

the reader of literature is able to make sense of what s/he reads because s/he has internalised a system of rules and conventions of interpretation without which s/he would be unable to recognise a literary text, let alone understand it. This is the case because a literary text is not inherently meaningful: It is an utterance that has meaning only with respect to a system of conventions which the reader has assimilated.

Therefore, translation of drama will go from strength to strength due to the fact that the reader applies certain acquired and implicit rules or expectations about the nature of literary organisation. Furthermore, this process is culturally determined by making the reading process accessible and legitimate. Fish (1987:82) argues that the question is not what an individual reader might do, but what the *ideal reader* does. As soon as this stage is reached, *Macbeth* may become a well-known member in the framework of reference of the senior secondary learner as reader and Shakespeare, hopefully, a household name.

In the reading process one needs to free oneself from unscrutinised assumptions implicit in the usual terminology and in the very structure of language. An important point Rosenblatt (1994:15) emphasises is that the reader interprets the text and the text produces a response in the reader and according to him, this phrasing (due to the fact

that it implies a single line of action by one separate element on another separate element) distorts the actual reading process. He argues that

the relation between reader and text is not linear. It is a situation, an event at a particular time and place in which each element conditions the other (Rosenblatt, 1994:16).

In other words, in ecological terms the text becomes the element of the environment to which the individual responds, or to be more precise, each forms an environment for the other during the reading event. Due to this transactional phrasing of the reading process, the essential importance of both reader and text in any reading event is emphasised. The senior secondary learner becomes a reader by virtue of his activity in relationship to a text, which he interprets pragmatically.

3.3.5 *Reader response and textuality*

Iser's (1980:27) main concern is to determine under what conditions a text has meaning for the reader. On the other hand, Fokkema and Kunne-Ibsch (1977:137) argue that the object of literary research appears to its *konkretization*, not the artefact² but the aesthetic object³. Therefore, they want to see meaning as the result of an interaction between text and reader.

Iser (1980:28) maps out three domains of exploration:

² The artefact is the materially given symbol of meaning.

³ The aesthetic object comes into being at the interface of the text and the reader and is the result of the co-constitutive act of the reader in engaging with the text creatively (Iser, 1980:45).

- the potential of the text to allow and manipulate the production of meaning;
- the processing of the text within the reader; and
- the communicatory structure of literature to examine the conditions that give rise to and govern the text-reader interaction.

Iser's ultimate aim is to clarify meaning and the effects literature has on the reader (in Holub, 1984:84). In engaging with the translated version of *Macbeth* (in Afrikaans in the given instance), the reader is placed in a communicative situation that is likened to the illocutionary act. This is due to the fact that literature tells the senior secondary learner as reader something about reality by ordering its conventions so that he become objects of the reader's reflection (Holub, 1984:86).

When reading a text, the senior secondary learner as reader is continuously evaluating and perceiving events with regard to certain expectations for the future and against the background of the past. An unexpected occurrence will therefore cause the reader to reformulate his expectations in accordance with the reading event and to reinterpret the significance that has been attributed to what has already occurred (Holub, 1984:90).

In the reading process, the senior secondary learner as reader will often become aware of the norms of the social system in which he lives. Most literature - especially the kind valorised in Iser's theory - has the function of calling into questioning these norms. Through filling in gaps on the syntagmatic level, the reader acquires a perspective from which previously accepted norms could begin to appear obsolete or invalid and inculcate in the reader a questioning attitude that might lead to enriched awareness.

Iser (1980:34) implies that good literature is characterised by the negation of specific elements and the subsequent search for a meaning that is unformulated, but nevertheless intended in the text. He states that the intention of a text is realised in the reader's imagination.

As has been demonstrated, it is essential to take cognizance of the role of the senior secondary learner as reader. Seeing that there can be no misunderstanding in this regard, it is now deemed necessary to focus more intensively on the role *Macbeth* could well play in this context in the second-language classroom.

3.4 *Macbeth* in the second-language classroom

3.4.1 Second language in context

The study of *Macbeth* can only commence properly once the learner understands exactly what is meant by the word **text**. According to Rosenblatt (1994:13) this word designates a set or series of signs interpretable as linguistic symbols. As has been said, it is important to note that the senior secondary learner as reader should first of all understand that the text refers simply to a set of black marks on ordered pages or to a set of sounds vibrating in the air that awaits the reader to interpret it as verbal symbols. No wonder the senior secondary learner as reader may experience *Macbeth* as evil and as supernatural as the witches themselves, if one expects them to read it in English at first.

Therefore, pragmatically, the text

has experienced a long delay in L2 studies. Although clearly of both practical and theoretical interest, it is a tricky area where a long established theoretical tradition is lacking. While applied linguists might immediately appreciate the importance of pragmatics in designing teaching courses and actually try to adapt current insights from pragmatics to that end, the problem here is how pragmatic and sociolinguistic information are actually acquired (Smith, 1994:140).

Having the text on the one hand and the pragmatic interpretation on the other, cognisance should be taken of the primary concepts between the processes of teaching and learning in order to create order in this usually disordered living reality in which the senior secondary learner as reader finds himself in. The latter should be able to interpret *Macbeth* in the multifarious contexts that it is written in demonstrating that the facilitator has an immense task. According to Payne (1993:165), this formal conception of language, which has dominated linguistics from Saussure to Chomsky, eclipsed any viable conception of the human subject which activates the need to expose the senior secondary learner as reader to the written text and then to the semiotics beyond.

3.4.2 *Developments in the literature classroom*

The classroom plays a central role in the frame of reference of the senior secondary learner as reader. It is inescapable that the learner should experience a positive flow of energy due to the fact that *Macbeth* must be approached from a different and more practical angle in order to achieve maximum effect with regard to understanding and enjoying the learning experience. A paradigm shift is therefore essential.

It is crucial at this stage to summarise some of the central problems encountered in the

second-language classroom (Van Lier, 1988:viii):

- the procedural one of obtaining detailed case-study information which focuses on utterances in the context of their production;
- concentration on the senior secondary learner as reader that necessarily leads one to start with the text as given.

According to Rosenblatt (1994:76), the relationship between author and reader is too often and exclusively, considered from the point of view of the writer. His problem is to find words that he hopes will communicate his intended meaning to a reader since the reader ultimately has only the text to guide him. In order to decode the message he must also re-create from the text a *persona* and sometimes behind that a writer.

Therefore, one has to agree with Van Lier (1988:6) that

the diversity of contexts of language development is part and parcel of research into bilingualism and first-language acquisition and it is one of the reasons why progress in these areas is painfully slow.

It is therefore also important to keep in mind that when dealing with drama, one of the aims should be a communicative approach in order to give learners at least part of the responsibility for the planning of literature activities. The facilitator then becomes more of a guide than a master of ceremonies (Van Lier, 1988:165).

In order to illustrate the prominent role that drama could and should play in the second language classroom, it is deemed necessary to focus on the following:

- Representational teaching and learning; and the question as to whether there
- is a senior secondary reader in *Macbeth*.

3.4.2.1 Representational teaching and learning

Representational language is language used in a way that second-language acquisition theorists often ignore. It involves discussion, reflection and consideration of meaning. Carter (1996:7) believes that in two important respects, work at the interface of language and literature has responded to developments in contemporary literary theory. Firstly, it has responded to the challenges against canonicity by embracing a central notion that canons are not just there but have rather been naturalised within academic communities. Secondly, there is concern with the selection for analysis and interpretation of texts not normally considered to be literary.

Every facilitator is aware that learners like to know what the outcomes of the learning experience are and that is usually conceived on a referential basis. It goes without saying that it takes imagination to interpret drama and this aspect needs to be stimulated by, for example, reading a text like *Macbeth* in a contemporary version in a linguistic code closer to the mother-tongue. The necessity of imaginative engagement with drama and the concomitant development of language awareness in a contrastive way between native and target language, become crucial precisely at the point where the language learning process begins to become more than an exercise in learning the application of rules. McRae (1996:18) states that it is language itself that demands a more representational approach to learning and teaching. For as soon as language begins to *mean*, it begins to *expand* its meaning and as soon as this happens, questions of interpretation and response are brought into play. As has been mentioned, *Macbeth* can only be enjoyed properly by the senior secondary learner as reader if he understands it. It is important to note at this stage that the intellectual development

and language skills of the senior secondary learner as reader are not underestimated due to the fact that it is taken for granted that the learner has the required knowledge and skills for the senior phase. It should be noted that the proposed contemporary mother-tongue version is one of the ways that will enable learners eventually to grasp images and language better in the first language. The mere understanding of what is read and heard when reading *Macbeth*, is little more than construing meaning out of foreign words and phrases. Therefore, the development of language competence in a learner has to allow for imaginative interaction, for an element of creativity and for an affective element of subjective, personal development, all of which go well beyond the limitations of referential language (McRae, 1996:19). The relevance of learner autonomy⁴ should be reconsidered and promoted (Sinclair, 1996:138). What is now required is a fuller integration of text into teaching, the mixing of the representational with the referential and the development of language awareness concurrently with knowledge **about** language.

Sinclair (1996:23) states that language is open to all and that the language/literature interface is probably the richest vein of learning potential for learners at all levels of language. It cannot be accentuated enough that learners should engage with drama as a text of speech and this is not an easy matter due to the fact that the anodyne script that faces learners on the page can be very distracting. Therefore, one needs ways of appreciating what is special about a dramatic text so that activities can be designed to facilitate learners' appreciation of the text. At this analytical stage, the facilitator is primarily faced with the task of converting the text to everyday language. As has been mentioned, *radical rewriting* into the second language might well open up new

⁴ Learner autonomy is about potential learner behaviour, that is, the capacity or ability to learn independently.

perspectives and cognisance of the drama text.

According to McCarthy (1996:91) the techniques of pragmatics and discourse analysis allow the analyst to identify mechanisms that generate tension, conflict, irony, etc. He asks the crucial question as to **how** the senior secondary learner as reader can be helped to experience those qualities within the text during the reading process. His whole argument is based on the fact that learners should first experience (reconstruct) and then analyse and understand (deconstruct) the drama.

It almost goes without saying that

pre-reading reconstruction activities by their nature encourage the personal response of the participants, and ask questions of the text rather than merely expect it to deliver up its on 'correct' meaning (McCarthy, 1996:97-98).

3.4.2.2 *Macbeth* and the senior secondary learner as reader

First of all, it should be noted that the focus of the present study is on the premise that reading and understanding *Macbeth* can be promoted by having the text transmuted into a creative version in Afrikaans. A further stage would be to introduce the living realities of Shakespeare's original *Macbeth* to the senior secondary learner as reader. In other words, this section can be implemented when reading *Macbeth* in Afrikaans as well as when reading *Macbeth* in its original form.

The pre-question or stimulus should always start from what the learners can understand. No matter how complex the text, a pre-reading question can be formulated to give the learners confidence in what they do know rather than allowing them to be distracted and disheartened by what they do not know. The focus should

be on what strikes them, e.g. the supernatural and the possession of power. The pre-question or stimulus can be used to lead where the facilitator wants to go - towards the teaching aim of understanding and insight.

From this stage will develop a growing language awareness, which becomes the second stage in representational learning development. As confidence in handling texts grows the third stage, text awareness, will be reached. The enabling language which helps them express judgements and discuss, justify, challenge and contradict, is at this stage a fundamental part of language acquisition. Already beyond the purely referential, it has become the language of choice and of processes of evaluation and selection.

Furthermore, attention must be given to verbal or visual elements, to the morphology involved in punning wordplay, to the sounds evoked to what is new to learners as well as to what is known. Representational language learning allows closer and closer involvement with the target culture, mind frame and language, while not seeking to impose historical, literary or cultural studies. From text awareness, the jump to literature is almost an imperceptible one in that, according to McRae (1996:29), "literariness" is almost impossible to categorise and define.

This issue brings one to the point that

when teaching literature, whether with a small or large 'l', the teacher's ultimate aim is, presumably, to develop in the students the ability to read and understand the meanings embedded in the language and contexts of a wide number of text types and to encourage in them an interest in reading *the text* (my italics) ... which will motivate them to choose and read independently with understanding and enjoyment (Sinclair, 1996:142).

To ensure sufficient impact on the senior secondary learner as reader, the eyes of the facilitator should forever be on the reader. According to Iser (1974:118), the reader is constantly forced to think in terms of alternatives as the only way in which he can avoid the unambiguous and suspect position of the characters. Thus, it is essential that the senior secondary learners as readers should be able to visualise the possibilities which they have and in this process, free themselves from the restrictions of their own outlooks. Shakespeare's magic lies in the recognition that his more than two thousand characters are not merely reflexes either of the Elizabethan and earlier world or of our own, but an extension of both (Jackson, 1952:50).

What makes Shakespeare especially interesting for the senior secondary learner as reader is the fact that Shakespeare's plays have an essential, culture-reinforcing, morally-uplifting and context-free set of meanings (Hawkes, 1992:9). Rosenblatt (1994:49) states that in re-creating the work the writer's creative role re-enacts superficially and ignores actuality.

When the actual reading process starts, the reader follows a pattern of verbal signs keeping in mind that the relationship to the text is different from the writer's. Each reader, assuming that the signs before him represent an organised verbal structure, feels his way toward a vital principle of coherence for his own inner responses to these particular words in this particular order. Rosenblatt (1994:50) postulates that the reader involves an impalpable experiential structure that he apprehends as drama. Throughout the reading process he will be conscious that the words of the writer are guiding him. In other words, two-way communication is indirectly created. Rosenblatt (1994:50) states that the differences between the activities of writer and

reader require as much attention as the similarities. As has been mentioned, the reader perceives cues and clues offered by verbal symbols when reading drama. Thus, there is an element of creativity in even the simplest reading act. Reading a literary work of art, more specifically *Macbeth*, requires something more than an ordinary combination of these cues and clues mentioned. I fully agree with Greenwood (1989:95) that classroom time can be spent talking about and experimenting with the text. Learners cannot be expected to respond with sensitivity and confidence to a prescribed examination text if this is the first time that anything like this has been brought into the classroom. The thrust of the argument is that literature teaching attempts to foster personal response to the text by sensitising learners to the linguistic means by which texts achieve their effects. It involves an exploration, not just of what the text says and how its meaning is negotiated, but also of what could have been said but was not (Phillips, 1989:112). The aesthetic stance provides the differentiating factor as the reader builds up and contemplates a unique synthesis of his responses. This active, synthesising aspect of the reading process goes unnoticed in the senior secondary classroom. It is as if the learner as reader is being literally forced to walk before he is even shown how to crawl. I have personally experienced that the senior secondary learner as reader is conscious of the resulting images, ideas, states of mind and even physical states that are generated by his reading, but he is not aware of the individual responses or of much of the process of selection and synthesis that goes on as his eyes scan the page. It needs to be emphasised that the verbal symbols of the text are part of a linguistic system by virtue of their potential to evoke referents commonly accepted by those sharing the same reading experience in readers.

3.4.3 *Is there a senior secondary reader in Macbeth?*

After studying the previous section, this question involuntarily interposed itself. As the reading process starts, decoding of the opening lines takes place and the reader begins to develop a tentative sense of a framework within which to place what will follow. Take the witches for example, as *imperfect speakers* they introduce their demonic characters, forcefully grabbing the immediate attention of the senior secondary learner as reader and the latter can indeed subliminally start asking the as-yet unspoken question: *Is foul fair or fair foul?* When reading *Macbeth* it is clear that there are certain fixed, yet unknown, expectations about the themes, the kind of text that will be forthcoming. Each sentence, each phrase and each and every word will signal certain possibilities and exclude others, thus narrowing the bridge of expectations. In other words, the reader needs to respond to the cues on the page, the written words elicit certain expectations and reveal the unknown future. In this instance it is difficult not to regard Shakespeare as a contemporary. The reader wants to see what happens although these visual images will differ from each reader to reader. The reading process can only be attractive if the reader can relate his personal experiences, both emotional and intellectual, to the written words on the page. When the reading process takes place, the verbal symbols activate this process as a structure of ideas and attitudes that grow out of and around the concepts of social life and experience.

One reason why a senior secondary learner as reader can lose track of the essential structure of *Macbeth* is through some or other form of misreading. It has been determined that the latter is often due to the development of misguided and therefore

misleading expectations or frameworks rather than to the simple mistaking of individual words. Yet the tendency is to speak of interpretation as construing meaning of the text. According to Rosenblatt (1994:69), this conceals the nature of the reader's activity. In a complex process of transacting with the sign, the reader transforms the multiplicity of signs into verbal symbols, with their sensed auras and thus organises a lived experience and meaning. Therefore, interpretation primarily involves an effort to describe in some way the nature of the lived-through evocation of the work.

Rosenblatt (1994:59) states that an alternative for a view of Shakespeare as a contemporary would be:

- to accept the historical associations and nuances and to draw them into the centre of awareness, seeking then also to relate it to the primary level of meaning; or
- to leave it as a peripheral association, an echo felt to be emotionally in tune with the ideas and attitudes; and/or
- to repress and reject the association as irrelevant or even disturbing or inharmonious.

He states that these decisions are constantly and often being made automatically and used subliminally within the reading process.

It is important for the facilitator to take cognisance of the fact that he is dealing with an inexperienced reader in this genre. Therefore, the reader must literally be shown the way before forcing him to understand Shakespearean imagery, diction, rhythm, and so forth.

What is evident in *Macbeth* is the fact that the reader can catch glimpses of the socio-

historical background of that time. Therefore, in a contemporary sense, the literary transaction may embody an interplay between two sets of codes or values. This makes it even more liable to translate *Macbeth* for the senior secondary learner as reader, due to the fact that readers will understand diversities in personalities better should they share the same idiosyncrasies in language use. In other words, they live in the same social group at the same time and *Macbeth* directly reflects that culture and uniqueness as well as stressing individuality. It can be conceded that the framework of references between the reader and the text needs to coincide in order to make Shakespeare a contemporary to whom the senior secondary reader can relate and enjoy.

It has therefore to be persuasively reiterated that literature is not simply an object but an active continual interpreting process by the reader in question. It is worthwhile to speculate whether Shakespeare's *Macbeth* or the reader qualifies as the generative source of the primary fantasy. The recognition that reading has a psychology and that the subjectivity of reading is a constitutive part of the aesthetic experience is in itself a significant and original departure (Freund, 1987:123). This issue will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4.

The obvious next step would be for learners unable to approach literature analytically to focus on reader response due to the fact that it offers exciting new possibilities. The call for a learner-centred approach (such as OBE) to drama proceeds from a strongly defended and unified point of view. It goes without saying that when learners themselves are permitted to make meaning, the classroom becomes a more meaningful place to be. When following this new approach, learners ignore

formalistic concerns and respond subjectively to what they read. Rather than analysing texts, they discuss or write about characters whom they admire, events they relate to, or parts they find difficult or confusing.

Delia (1989:333) advocates that

in the reader-response classrooms, the goal is radically altered: students do not read literature as a text to be analysed but as a 'catalytic converter' for locating meaning within themselves.

In other words, emphasis is on the individual, focussing on his perceptions, feelings and associations. It is important to note that what the facilitator thinks is no longer of any importance due to the fact that he only facilitate learners' exploratory activity in the attempt to find and expand new analytical horizons.

When learners leave high school they know virtually nothing about literature due to the fact that the reading-comprehension-method is followed rigidly, producing right and wrong answers. Instead, the facilitator's aim should be to educate learners to realise their inner power more fully if they can internalise the material inculcated in them in the literature class.

Therefore, literature helps to divert thinking activities and skills into two general types: critical thinking and creative thinking. Delia (1989:336) states that senior secondary learners cannot with any degree of real skill and understanding read the most accessible of poems, cannot distinguish metaphor from simile, or even describe how poetry differs from prose.

So interwoven are the aesthetic responses to a text, that when the response to one

word is changed, it might well affect the organisation or structure of the whole work. It is conceivable that our perceptions of what literature is and what constitutes a literary work will change as the culture through which we create meaning itself changes. More speculatively, there is a school of thought that even suggests that the text was never totally determined by Shakespeare.

3.5 The postulated consequences of reading radical rewritings

At this stage it is necessary to emphasise the fact that a fundamentally “new” contemporary rewriting is only one of the ways that could be used to introduce Shakespeare to the senior secondary learner as reader. It is important to note that diversity among learners is indeed a major challenge to facilitators to introduce new and different teaching methods. It is essential and advisable that full cognisance should be taken of different personalities, socio-cultural backgrounds, diverse psychological attitudes and gender. It is only when the reader and all his complexities are understood to some extent that *Macbeth* can be enjoyed and understood by the senior secondary learners as readers.

The role of reading contemporary rewritings in the mother-tongue should not be underestimated due to the fact that such a reading practice and experience will enhance complexities not usually acknowledged. Kruger (1996:409) feels that the integration of foreign texts into a receiving culture is determined by the culture itself.

She states that

if the literary and theatrical systems of such a culture have not yet developed their own drama genre, the chances are greater than otherwise that translations

of plays will tend to be more 'faithful' to the original text's structure and textual relations (1996: 410).

The problem at this stage is accessibility and the fact that the value of contemporary rewritings is not (yet) acknowledged or encouraged by authorities. Although I agree with Idol (1987:28) who warns that researchers and facilitators should not place the cart before the horse when developing techniques for improving reading comprehension, the ultimate task is to require the senior secondary learner as reader to engage in a final form of integrative thought.

When studying literal translations of *Macbeth* by Eitemal (1965) and Coertze (1948), the inescapable truth is that both writers succeeded in meticulously translating the tragedy as a linguistically-based text, but failed to reach a reader such as the senior secondary learner as reader due to the following:

- literal translations tend to be tedious;
- the senior secondary learner as reader will not be able to relate to the scrupulously evoked but still alien socio-historical environment of *Macbeth*;
- it may be impossible for the senior secondary learner as reader to relate to the choice of words used in the translations;
- the level of discourse is problematic and the language is complex in the sense that language structures do not make logical sense; and
- the translations are simply too literal and textbound to make real dramatic sense.

It will be postulated that some of these problems may be mediated if interventions are made, for example through the introduction of characters such as Einstein and the Verteller being introduced into a contemporary translation of *Macbeth*.

The translations of Eitemal (1965) and Coertze (1948) place the emphasis on the translations themselves and not on how the reader would respond. By introducing a

contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth*, the senior secondary learner as reader has the opportunity to be an equal partner in the literature experience.

It can be contended that a contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* in the mother-tongue has a place in the OBE classroom, seeing that the focus is no longer on right and wrong answers, but rather on outcomes and individual reader-response. Although OBE has not yet been implemented at this stage for the senior secondary phase, it can be highly recommended due to the fact that the reading of contemporary rewritings will indeed *jump this life* and open new horizons for the senior secondary learners as readers.

3.6 Conclusion

It was the aim of this chapter to emphasise the primary role of the senior secondary learner as reader in the reading process. Furthermore, the needs of the readers were dealt with and a proposed paradigm shift introduced focussing on the role of the reader instead of focussing on the role of the text – a movement that has been strongly foregrounded in developments in literary theory in the twentieth century. In order to incorporate this paradigm shift it was deemed necessary to focus on the role of the facilitator as well as the reader. Therefore it is crucial to realise that the needs of the senior secondary learner as reader regarding his understanding of literature can no longer be underestimated.

If the current trends continue, learners will soon exit high school better-trained in responding to literature at their personal and subjective level, but will be completely

unprepared for university courses requiring them to analyse it from either traditional or challenging new interdisciplinary perspectives (Delia, 1989:333). It is time that facilitators, especially in South Africa, should follow the approaches of Rosenblatt, Iser and Fish who argue for a new approach to literature that emphasises not texts, but responses to texts. Therefore, the response of the senior secondary learner as reader is crucial when reading literature in the contemporary second language classroom.

The next chapter will illustrate how crucial it is to give attention to aspects of the study centring on drama as a genre. Due to the fact that various views of drama translation exist, it is deemed essential to incorporate the most apposite theories in this regard in the study in order to create a useful paradigm within which the senior secondary learner as reader can comfortably fit.

CHAPTER 4

PERSPECTIVES ON DRAMA AND TRANSLATION AND THE SENIOR SECONDARY LEARNER AS READER

Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow ...

Research problem and contextualisation	Textual communication and the senior secondary learner as reader	The senior secondary learner as reader	<i>Perspectives on drama and the senior secondary learner as reader</i>	Shakespeare and the senior secondary learner as reader within a contemporary context
--	--	--	---	--

In the previous chapter the focus was on the senior secondary learner as reader as well as the specific influence of the text on the reader and vice versa. The next important issue to be looked at is the question of drama perspectives and the senior secondary learner as reader vis-à-vis these perspectives. The specific outcomes and the envisaged contribution of this chapter can be seen as involving the influence rewriting will have on the senior secondary learner as reader. The specific mode of translation of literary aspects for this specific learner plays a vital role. Therefore, it is deemed necessary to find a universe of discourse and discussing the role a cultural model of translation will play, especially in a South African context. It should be reiterated at this stage that the intention with a “rewritten” version of *Macbeth* is not to replace the original but to provide a bridge to an eventual happy encounter with the original.

The main emphasis of this chapter can be seen as follows:

Once a poetics is codified it exerts a tremendous system-conforming influence on the further development of a literary system. Translations not only project an image of the work that is translated and, through it, of the world that work

belongs to; they also protect their own world against images that are too radically different, either by adapting them or by screening them out (Lefevere, 1992:125).

4.1 Introduction

It can be conceded that an easy, readily implementable solution to the translation of Shakespearean drama, in this instance, *Macbeth*, has not yet been found. One of the ways in which translation can be used to make the play more accessible to the senior secondary reader is to render¹ *Macbeth* in such a way that the reader is eased into the play. Frankly speaking, Eitemal (1965) and Coertze's (1948)² word-for-word translation strategy will bore the contemporary learner, thus defeating the purpose of creating a bridge to the world of Shakespeare (with all due respect for these invaluable translations that formed the stepping-stone of my own version and vision of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans).

At this stage the need arises to state that unfortunately

the conventional approach to literary translation starts from the assumption that translations are not only second-hand, but also generally second-rate, and hence not worth too much serious attention. A translation may have its limited use as a stepping-stone to an original work, but it cannot presume to form part of the recognised corpus of literary texts (Hermans, 1985:8).

This is definitely not the way to go. An exciting new way of reading and experiencing *Macbeth* should be introduced into the classroom as soon as possible in order to encourage the senior secondary learner as reader to literally rush from one

¹ This can indeed be done on different analytical and other levels (as will be demonstrated in this thesis) in order to introduce the paradigm shift effectively to the senior secondary learner as reader.

² See Appendix B for more examples.

exciting scene in *Macbeth* to the next. This can be achieved by finding a challenging and alternative route as proposed in this thesis.

A note of caution is appropriate here - Snell-Hornby (1991:13) points out that “one shall be doomed to over-generalisation and simplification in a field of endeavour that thrives on depth and detail if one is not sufficiently careful to find and retain the essence of a text”. It is important, however, for a contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* as proposed here, to be both accessible and respectable (Toury’s term).

When translating literature it is essential that the translator should feel an affinity with the writer and therefore translating a work of literature essentially requires good writing skills – but there is more. Translating Shakespeare’s works for the kind of reader and context envisaged in this study, requires a keen understanding of the needs of the senior secondary learner as reader on the one hand and knowledge of and affinity with Shakespeare’s works on the other.

One cannot help noticing when considering the wealth of meaning and enjoyment contained in Shakespeare’s work that Shakespeare can be for all ages and times (in Jonson’s terms). A shift in the subject policies, as proposed by OBE would be most welcome to ensure the literary survival of Shakespeare’s plays – it would help to strengthen the general acceptability of the plays by the readers envisaged in this study. In an attempt to address the issue of accessibility, a study was made of various approaches to a radical rewriting of Shakespeare in general - such as those by Charles and Mary Lamb, A.P. Brink, Marowitz and so forth - and *Macbeth* in particular.

Therefore, it will be demonstrated and emphasised that a contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans will give the senior secondary learner as reader new eyes to see, new ears to hear and new senses to experience Shakespeare in the way that he had probably intended.

In this chapter various issues regarding drama perspectives will be explored and new ways of interpreting old problems will be introduced in order to guarantee “endless tomorrows” for Shakespeare’s works. When introducing drama perspectives, it is deemed necessary to consider the translation of the language of literature as well as the historical framework within which it is located. My own translation will necessarily occupy a cultural paradigm within a universe of discourse. Unavoidably, the question of equivalence needs to be considered. Finding a universe of discourse will serve as a conclusive purpose in this chapter and culminate in the next chapter. Therefore, contemporary views of various prominent translators and theorists, such as Even-Zohar, Toury, Venuti, Lefevere and so forth, will be investigated in order to form an overall framework for a contemporary, socio-historical model of translation. After considering these issues, a conclusion will be reached as to the extent to which the senior secondary learner as reader will benefit from reading *Macbeth* in his mother tongue (in this instance, Afrikaans – although the style of rewriting and the approach advocated could and should easily be extrapolated to other languages).

To recapitulate, the issues that will be addressed in this chapter are as follow:

- rewritings and the role of the senior secondary learner as reader;
- translation of literary aspects;
- the cultural status of *Macbeth*;
- finding a universe of discourse;

- the illusion of equivalence;
- drama translation and the senior secondary learner as reader; and
- finding a cultural model of translation.

4.2 **Rewriting and the role of the senior secondary learner as reader**

It should be emphasised that translation is not *only* rewriting but

a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language. Each exercise involves some kind of loss of meaning, due to a number of factors. It provokes a continuous tension, a dialectic, an argument based on the claims of each language. The basic loss is on a continuum between over-translation (increased detail) and under-translation (increased generalization) (Newmark, 1982:7).

The role of the senior secondary learner as reader has been ignored to a large extent due to a rigid inescapable syllabus that was forced upon learner as well as facilitator. Therefore, while the Shakespearean text remained as a non-negotiable in the process of inculcating a love of reading, it was not surprising that so many learners literally feared Grade 12 and Shakespeare.

This view needs to change radically and as soon as possible otherwise more learners of the new generation might lose the experience of reading and enjoying Shakespeare. This thesis will attempt to demonstrate that such a fear is unjustified and that a viable option can be proposed as the answer to this problem (see chapter 1). Contemporary rewritings, such as the one presented in this study, could well offer new and exciting challenges to the facilitator, the learner and the OBE subject policy.

Although it is an incontrovertible fact that contemporary rewritings sacrifice nuances and niceties of language structures to some extent, it is fortunately also true that other

benefits accrue to the reader to offset this (temporary) loss.

One point that should always be kept in mind is the fact that

literature is not a deterministic system, not 'something' that will 'take over' and 'run things', destroying the freedom of the individual reader, writer and rewriter..... Rather, the system acts as a series of 'constraints', in the fullest sense of the word, on the reader, writer, and rewriter (Lefevere, 1992:12).

Translation cannot but be a form of (radical or less radical) rewriting and will inevitably reflect a certain ideology and poetics. It manipulates literature in a specific way to function in a given society in a given way (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1993:vii). Rewriting is manipulation of the source text undertaken, in the view of some translation theorists (as discussed by Bassnett & Lefevere, 1993). This aspect will not receive primary focus, but will be kept in mind in the consideration of the pertinent issues in this thesis.

4.3 Translation of literary aspects for the senior secondary learner as reader

It can be said that the primary task of literary translations is not to replace the SL to the TL, but to find the means that answer to the usage of the SL in the original, bearing in mind its surroundings (Hochel, 1991:41).

Therefore, contemporary rewritings make every effort to communicate the meaning of the SL text in the natural forms of the TL text. When rewriting *Macbeth* in Afrikaans an idiomatic, contemporary approach is used - the goal being to reproduce a text in Afrikaans which will communicate the same message (more or less) as the original but using various "natural choices". Larson (1984:17) is correct in maintaining that the ultimate goal is an idiomatic translation, for the simple reason that it is easy to

relate to and carries the message in such a way that the expectations of the senior secondary learner as reader are not hampered. If the latter can feel an affinity for the text he is reading the learning experience will necessarily and unconsciously improve due to the fact that the learner may feel that he is actively involved in the text itself. Seeing that the text has to be studied as a holistic artefact, it is essential that the whole of the relevant text (*Macbeth*) has to be studied and definitely not only certain individual aspects.

According to Breytenbach (in Dimitriu, 1997:68),

if you translate a text, the person reading it in another language can get a glimpse and a feel of the culture out of which the translation comes, but you cannot really produce a total translation.

It is my considered opinion that if *Macbeth* can be rewritten in such a way that the reader has an affinity for the text, incompetence or lack of understanding will definitely decrease for the logical reason would be that the learner would be reading for enjoyment - leading to understanding that would furthermore stimulate the inquisitive as well as the lazy mind. Should the learner understand the text in his mother-tongue then imagery, language structures and so forth in the original text can be studied as a natural result of empowered knowledge gained by the learners. It is too often been a discouraging experience in the literature class that various structures, whether language or imagery, are studied off by heart and that the actual play was never read by some of the learners. If a paradigm shift can be inculcated by means of contemporary rewritings the road ahead can only be an adventure for both learner and facilitator.

In order to gain competence in the field of contemporary rewriting and literature education, it is essential to investigate crucial aspects regarding:

- the language aspect;
- the creative aspect; and
- the psychological aspect.

4.3.1 *The language aspect*

In general, literary translations have the advantage that they tend to look at texts as holistic artefacts and this positive point should be carried encouraged in the learning experience.

In spontaneous speech, meaning is associated more or less unconsciously with the linguistic signs that carry it. The signs transmit meaning as the speaker produces them. The hearer apprehends the meaning of words as he perceives them. In verbal communication, the movement from language system to language use is unconscious and instantaneous (Delisle, 1988:24). As has been said, contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* need not necessarily be either prose, poetry or in free verse as it can be a discouraging experience, but should rather be a combination of these different forms. Contemporary rewriting of the text adds to its own mystery and sense of ritual and emphasises the witches' supernatural acquaintances. Therefore, when translating drama it is important to work from the macro-structural to the micro-structural level. In other words, from the text as a text to the text as a serial continuation of sentences and words (Van der Voort, 1991:66).

According to Van der Voort (1991:66) the hypothesis is that the macro-structural meaning of a literary text as a whole, rather than deriving meaning from the micro-structural level would define these partial meanings. Thus, from a macro-structural level it was deemed necessary to concentrate on the plot of *Macbeth*. Therefore, “minor” conversations which could influence the concentration span of the learner and did not essentially concentrate on Macbeth, the character, were left out. This modus operandi is furthermore based on studies concerning the reading process - the reader of a text does not make a mental addition sum of the isolated meanings of words and sentences, but transforms in his mind these micro-structural elements into a macro-structural entity, the so-called memorial synthesis. Van der Voort continues his argument by stating that translators build their memorial synthesis during the reading process, but unlike the ordinary reader they have to use it again in their translations. In this second operation the words and sentences on the micro-level will obtain a structured semantic meaning only if they are continuously related to the text as a whole (Van der Voort, 1991:67). It goes without saying that this aforementioned operation will lead to a *perpetuum mobile* of new meanings due the fact that the continuous generation of new meanings is inherent to the nature of literary texts as well as to the nature of man. One should always keep in mind that drama translations are always macro-structural interpretations, in other words, interpretations which are inherent in the object of translation as well as in the nature of the reading and translating subject itself. This is the exact point I am trying to illustrate when rewriting *Macbeth* in Afrikaans for the senior secondary learner as reader. But,

as translators we have all come across text or passages in texts where we cannot rely on linguistic norms and conventions, where set patterns, fixed collocations or typical idioms are not adequate when formulating the target text (Kusmaul, 1991:92).

Due to the fact that language is the expression of a culture, many of the words in a language are inextricably bound up with that culture and therefore very hard to transfer in their totality to another language (Lefevere, 1992:17). Therefore, translators have to rely on the memorial synthesis when translating drama. Thus,

translations not only project an image of the work that is translated and, through it, of the world that work belongs to; they also protect their own world against images that are too radically different, either by adapting them or by screening them out (Lefevere, 1992:125).

This statement is even truer when one thinks of a contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* seeing that the element of creativity plays a dominant role. Breytenbach (in Dimitriu, 1979:77) states that translation is more than a version and that it is indeed a new creation. The paradoxical quality of creativity in general and the creative translation process go hand in hand justifying long term issues such as equivalence.

4.3.2 *The creative aspect*

Contemporary rewriting necessarily resembles creativity and *Macbeth* includes radical³ creativity due to the fact that the characters of the literary text necessarily involve a higher as well as a more complex level of creativity. According to Lilova (1993:8) creativity in translation should be understood as:

- creativity on the level of language, and
- creativity on the level of artistic and imaginative thinking and recreation.

As has been said, creativity on the level of language can take various forms, for

3 This is due to the fact that every creative means should be incorporated in order for the translation to be successful.

example verse, prose or blank verse, but in order to create language, creative thinking will automatically form the origin of any literary translation. Should the imaginative mind be excluded from attempting to translate *Macbeth*, translation will indeed be a *tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing*.

Raffel (1996:54) states that

translation is most certainly a kind of creation, ... but by its irreducible nature as the reflection in some secondary language and literary culture of what was created in a different language and literary culture, translation cannot help but be secondary rather than primary art.

He furthermore advocates that translation is not and cannot be the original and that the **original will remain the primary source and the translation the secondary source**.

There should be balance between responsibility and creativity in the translation of drama. When translating Shakespeare the translator must start by knowing how to write drama in his or her own language. Therefore, style is an essential aspect of all literature and a translator who lacks stylistic competence is fatally handicapped. What should always be kept consciously in mind is the fact that words and phrases die and change. On the other hand, different cultures could manipulate lexical forms differently (Raffel, 1996:61).

Kline (1991:4), on the other hand, states that

in the translation process, there are no definite answers, only attempts at solutions in response to states of uncertainty generated by the interaction of the words' semantic fields and sounds.

When a translator encounters a word in the text, especially a word that by its very nature does not yield immediately to a clearly-defined boundary of connotations, he

has to free himself of the notion that words are entities of fixed meanings. He should focus on the dynamics of change that reveal themselves in any prolonged act of interpretation. It goes without saying that the primary activity of translation takes place somewhere between the SL and the TL. Therefore one realises that all writing does in fact occur in the Great Between⁴ (Kline, 1991:7).

Hedges (1980:87) argues that “literal” versus “free” translation presents a confused picture of what translation actually is – and these terms miss the point in that they do not allow one to become aware of the opportunities of choice which offer themselves to the translator at several junctures in the translation process. More importantly, the literal/free distinction does not allow one to consider which elements are retained in a so-called “literal” translation and which are transformed in a so-called “free” translation. In fact, every translation will be to some extent free (since no two languages exactly correspond) and to some extent, literal (since a translation derives in some way from an original) (Hedges, 1980:87).

Translation is a creative process in the sense that the translator seeks to provide the same experience for the senior secondary learner as reader as the original provided for the translator. The original should be so well assimilated into the target language that there should be no explicit markers within the text that could make the reader aware that he is reading a translation. Although reading *Macbeth* in Afrikaans will be a conscious experience and the aim of this translation is to (ultimately) make the original comprehensible for the senior secondary learner as reader. Thus, this

4 In other words, that space between the ST and the TT, between the text interpreted and the words attempting to formulate it.

philosophy is reader-oriented and somewhat circumscribed since the experience of the original depends on the subjective interpretation of the translator. Hedges (1980:89) feels that the danger of such cultural translations⁵ is that the resultant text may lack those qualities of “otherness” which would make the reader want to become acquainted with a foreign work in the first place. Nevertheless, there is a wide measure of creativity allowed for the translator who addresses himself to the task of enriching his TL with SL material. Here translation begins to play a historical role in the evolution of language. A language that is permeable to this kind of enrichment will repeatedly demand new translations of the same works since translations may date rapidly.

Furthermore, creativity is one of the many paradoxes of translation that is claimed to be a creative activity or process, when it appears to be in essence imitative (Newmark, 1993:11). Newmark claims that all decision-making is creative and only literal translation is imitative and non-creative. The paradox is that literal translation and transference are sometimes the most creative elements in translation since they enrich the TL and subsequently the TL culture (Newmark, 1993:11).

As has been said, the creative element in translation is circumscribed. Although persuasive – and literature texts are creative, creativity in persuasive texts often lies in converting SL cultural components neatly into their cultural equivalents. However, in literature texts words represent images and connotations rather than facts and at this point creativity comes into play. It goes without saying that puns, metaphors and other images (such as blood and power) become creative as is demonstrated in

5 The name of “cultural translation” has been given to the “free” translation.

Macbeth in Afrikaans. In order to capture the senior secondary learner as reader's attention the value of creativity cannot be stressed enough. Obviously, creativity in translation starts where imitation stops (Newmark, 1993:41). The wider and the more numerous the choices, the more (in quality and in quantity) creativity is required. Therefore, when attempting a contemporary rewriting of a drama, creativity is unlimited and the choices numerous. Although various views can be taken into consideration, Newmark's (1993:41) view is useful for he maintains that the most successful translation is the one that can convincingly transfer the most important components of the ST into the TT.

4.3.3 *The psychological aspect*

The psychological category is clearly an imperative in the (contemporary) rewriting of *Macbeth* for the senior secondary learner as reader. Lilova (1993:8) states that it informs translation as a whole, both in the manner of its production and in the manner of its reception, in the types and genres of translation as well as in the degree of creativity.

Therefore, it is deemed necessary to refer to the various brain activities in order to understand how a literature text, especially *Macbeth*, can be made comprehensible for the senior secondary learner as reader. One must keep in mind that the brain consists of two independent mental systems (or the right and left hemispheres).

The right hemisphere's function is to create and this is precisely why it should be stimulated in the correct manner in order to produce maximum performance and

comprehension of the literature text. This side of the brain focuses on non-verbal skills, emotions, intuition, synthesis, holism and imagination. The mode of processing is rapid, complex, whole-pattern, spatial and perceptual. Innovative thinking is a dominant right brain activity (Delgado, 1985:7). Furthermore, creativity and imagination are inter-linked due to the prerequisite that in order to create a person should be imaginative. This form of visualisation is known as seeing with the mind's eye (the eye of the right hemisphere), a magical aspect of the right brain that can conjure up new and exciting inventions (Crossett, 1983:268).

The left brain's function is to evaluate. In other words, where the right brain's focus will be on understanding *Macbeth* as a whole which necessarily includes puns, imagery, word-play and so forth, the left brain function will be to evaluate these and to reach more precise conclusions as to what the text is all about. Thus, symbolic functioning is also part of the left brain's repertoire. This entails using symbols (or imagery) to represent something else. Convergent thinking abilities are a dominant left-brain activity (Stringer, 1987:34). The muse of the left hemisphere is powerful, a force that creates our reality as one sees it and is described as the analyst within us (Gerngross & Puchta, 1992:15). Kehoe (1996:7) adds to this by focussing on the hemisphere's powerful influence on a person's life by stating that one becomes dominated by the outer world of appearances.

Jackendoff (1992:3) elaborates on this by stating that this half of the brain is

the seat of conscious awareness, the experiencing of the world and our own inner lives that each of us carries on, inaccessible to others.

Furthermore, the left hemisphere is also responsible for drawing conclusions based on

logical thought. This form of thinking is important when a facilitator, for example, attempts to make a well-stated argument or to persuade someone with logic (Edwards, 1979:40). Bly (1990:18) defines the function of the left hemisphere as the breaking down of an already-made thing into components so one can actually see those components.

Although one deals with different functions regarding the left and right hemispheres it has to be kept in mind that both hemispheres of the brain are active in the process of creating fiction, for as Hooper (1992:14) states:

I believe excellence occurs when we do the right things right. Efficiency denotes left-brain activity, involving concrete sequential thinking, while effectiveness denotes right-brain activity involving creativity and vision.

Furthermore, evaluation of a text, such as *Macbeth*, does not necessarily need to be evaluated consciously. This process can take place unconsciously and the so-called unconscious is in fact a manifestation of the right hemisphere and its mental functioning (Joseph, 1992:21).

The senior secondary learner as reader should be guided in creative thoughts. The facilitator should always keep in mind that learners differ and should never assume that creative thinking will be the same for all learners. In order to emphasise the ability to think creatively, the facilitator should seriously reconsider the immense power that creativity has in literature and should stimulate creativity in grappling with the text. When one takes the witches, the sleepwalking scene, the appearance of Banquo's ghost, Birnam Wood and so forth into account, it should be quite easy to stimulate creative thinking by way of activating the imagination.

When reading (and hopefully performing) *Macbeth* in Afrikaans, it will necessarily mean that the senior secondary learner as reader will be more relaxed due to the fact that the stress that accompanies a second - as well as Shakespearean - language will not be present. It is essential that this precise state of mind should be reached due to the fact that relaxation and meditation are the most valuable skills in unlocking the subconscious mind. Delgado (1985:29) argues that this state of mind will cause the brain to produce alpha waves that have been associated with creativity.

When translating Shakespeare's works the psychological experience of the reader and translator needs to be acknowledged. The way the reader sees and experiences the text will influence his conception of *Macbeth*. There are various ways to dominate and manipulate this conception in order to create the necessary paradigm shift within the senior secondary learner as reader.

Some of the ways that have been introduced in my own translation include a contemporary, radical rewriting of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans by using verse, prose and free verse. It also includes an exciting feature that is often used in everyday speech, and that is to retain some of the most memorable expressions in the play in English in order to create a bond between Shakespearean language and the reader himself. This serves a further invaluable contribution in that it links Shakespeare's language and its meaning when the time comes to introduce the "original" *Macbeth*.

Furthermore, the worldview of the translator will evidently influence his vision and version when translating literature. Therefore, it is important that translators (and I

believe they do) take cognizance of this important fact in order to create sameness between the SL text and the TL text as accurately as possible.

In the ensuing section the cultural influences of the text as well as its influence in the South African time frame will be investigated.

4.4 The cultural status of *Macbeth* and the passage of time

Translators need to understand the position of the source text in the source literature and the source culture; without such knowledge they cannot cast around for the relevant analogies in the target literature and the target culture (Lefevere, 1992:92).

At this stage it needs to be emphasised that the “cultural turn” (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1993:4) did not occur overnight. Kruger (2000:28) states that translation has traditionally been considered to be a secondary or derivative activity whose very existence depended on other primary text productions. In other words, translators were given precise rules to adhere to which are discussed in Bly’s (1983) book, *The eight stages of translation*. This emphasis gives translation a normative character and has led to thinking that translation can be done in terms of “right” or “wrong”. From there translation thinking began to move away from literary texts and looked towards linguistics for answers. Linguists who played a profound role in this approach are Catford, Reiss, Wilss and Neubert. Due to this specific linguistic outlook, translation theory was dominated by creating equivalent texts and criteria were established against which translations could be judged. Catford (1965) is an excellent example due to the fact that he focussed on the very possibility of rule-giving and in so doing he essentially reduced the study of translation to the study of translatability. Instead of looking at existing texts, and describing these, he tried to establish criteria against

which translations could be judged (Kruger, 2000:29). Fortunately, it was soon realised that this approach to equivalence was too limiting. Nida and Taber (1974) then introduce the concept of dynamic equivalence to ensure that the message of the original text was so transported into the target language that the response of the receptors would be similar to that of the original receptors. Unfortunately, this view also had its limitations. Furthermore, Newmark (1982) distinguishes between semantic and communicative translation where communicative translation is more or less equivalent to a cultural adaptation of the source text in order to be read more easily. Lefevere (1992:10) concludes that the main problem with equivalence was that translators and scholars alike could not agree on either the kind or the degree of equivalence.

Time is an important factor in translation and can be manipulated by writers of original texts. It has to be kept in mind that people of a given culture look at things from their own perspective and this is exactly why it is essential that translators should know and identify their putative readerships. It is also important to note that words have special connotations and that cultures have different focuses at different times when interpreting specific words. Newmark (1993:94) states that where there is cultural focus⁶, there is a translation problem due to the cultural “gap” or “distance” between the source and target languages. Furthermore, a few general considerations govern the translation of cultural words. He (Newmark, 1993:96) states that one’s ultimate consideration should be recognition of the cultural achievements referred to in the SL text. Another point to emphasise is that *Macbeth* in Afrikaans, as translated

⁶ Meaning that when a speech community focuses its attention on a particular topic.

by myself, could play a particular facilitative role in OBE subject policy, but the translation(s) will need to be revised on an ongoing basis in order to remain a contemporary rewriting suiting the needs of the senior secondary learner as reader in South Africa at a specific time. This is the precise difference between a contemporary rewriting and translations by Eitemal (1965) and Coertze (1948). Although both translations will stand the test of time as linguistically-based translations, they may unfortunately not form part of the framework of reference of the senior secondary learner as reader.

Due to the fact that translators devise different approaches to the solution of the problem of historical distance in time, it is regarded essential to investigate the notion of historical distance in literature as presented by Vladova (1993:14-16) seeing that it plays an integral part in the contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* in a South African context:

- there is a distance in time between the writer's concrete historical world that serves as a source for the refraction that results in the original and the world in which the translator lives, works and translates;
- historical distance also obtains between the concrete historical reality that served as the source of refraction for writers and the concrete historical reality in which they were brought up and shaped their individual creative consciousness. Therefore, the language of the translation will be shaped not only by the contemporary state of the national language of the receiving culture, but also by elements that belong to its passive resources;
- the events narrated in the original take place in one concrete period of time, keeping in mind that the writer's world is part of another period, and the translator lives in yet another period. This type of historical distance is manifested in the original in a very peculiar way: Not only does it reflect the author's concept of history, but it also reflects the changes that have taken place in the language as the result of the objective laws of history; and
- historical distance constitutes the question: "Why do translations grow old?" This is due to the fact that there is a peculiar distance between two concrete historical periods that each make their own demands on translation, and those demands originate in the aesthetic needs of their respective periods in time, since human

society carries out a revaluation of its values in every stage of its development. Language plays a major part in the process of this evolution since it is influenced by the time factor and subject to different changes.

The twenty-first-century senior secondary learner as reader in a South African context would expect to read what appears to be a seventeenth-century text, even if the translation is a contemporary rewriting. It is common knowledge that translation studies should take a “cultural turn” so that the study of translation is the study of cultural interaction. Gentzler (1993:xi) recapitulates it perfectly when he states that

it was then [1990s] that translation studies officially took the ‘cultural turn’, the authors redefining the object of study as a verbal text within the network of literary and extra-literary signs in both the source and target cultures.

On the other hand, Hewson and Martin (1991:51) refer to the concept of “cultural equation” and refer to the translator’s conception of translation and his role in cross-cultural relationships. Translators do not just translate words they also translate a universe of discourse, a poetics and an ideology. Their decision whether or not to translate something is likely to be based much more on considerations of the levels of ideology and poetics than on the level of illocutionary use of language or universe of discourse.

According to Lefevere (1992:5), contemporary emphasis should include recognition of various text types and implementation of different translation strategies. In contrast with Gentzler he refers to the “cultural capital” of a given culture, accentuating the world culture that a drama translation should adhere to. I cannot agree more with Lefevere (1992:7) that

it is the domain of cultural capital that translation can most clearly be seen to construct cultures. It does so by negotiating the passage of text ... devising

strategies through which text from one culture can penetrate the textual and conceptual grids of another culture.

It is clear that the main thrust of the argument is that translation is the process of acculturation and takes place not just between cultures, but also inside any given culture and that another aim of this study is to learn more about the symbiotic working together of different kinds of rewriting within this process.

4.5 Finding a universe of discourse

In the previous chapter the dominant role of the senior secondary learner as reader has been emphasised and acknowledged. It has been succinctly stressed that the active role of the senior secondary learner as reader is indispensable for the survival of Shakespearean literature, more particularly, *Macbeth*. Needless to say, what writers describe is always filtered through a poetics and a universe of discourse that includes the spectrum of knowledge, ideologies, persons and objects belonging to a particular culture and a certain time, to which writers are free to allude in their work. Due to the fact that the universe of discourse and the cultural status of a contemporary rewriting are so closely linked it is considered essential to connect this crucial issue in this chapter as well as the next.

As has been said, translation (rewriting) is the manipulation of power that necessarily reflects an ideology and a universe of discourse. According to Bassnett and Lefevere (1993:ix) rewriting can introduce new concepts, genres and devices. Furthermore, the history of translation is the history of literary innovation and the shaping of power of one culture upon another. On the universe of discourse level, drama translators may

be faced with things, customs and concepts that are immediately intelligible to the readers of the original but are no longer intelligible to putative readers, including the senior secondary learner as reader, of the translation. Therefore, translators need to translate in contemporary language and style in order to create sameness between the original and translated text.

One of the first things investigated when rewriting *Macbeth* was to identify the discourse genre. Different discourse types are appropriate for writing about different subjects. The translator will choose the discourse type which best communicates the purpose in writing (Larson, 1984:426).

Furthermore, identifying the putative readership in a South African context forms part of the discourse processing. Hatim and Mason (1991:48) distinguish three basic aspects of register which need to be accounted for when rewriting *Macbeth*, namely:

- field, or the reference to “what is going on”, thus resembling the social function of the text;
- mode, referring to the medium of language activity. Thus, it is the manifestation of the nature of the language code being used; and
- tenor, in other words relying on the relationship between the translator and the reader. This kind of variation is relevant in translation between languages which are culturally distinct from one another especially when taking time and socio-historical consequences into account.

Therefore, it involves the reader in a reconstruction of context through an analysis of what has taken place (**field**), who has participated (**tenor**), and what medium has been selected for relaying the message (**mode**). All these factors have influenced my own contemporary rewriting of *Macbeth* and should carefully be reconsidered by translators.

Therefore, it can be conceded that

translators have to make decisions over and over again on the levels of ideology, poetics and universe of discourse and those decisions are always open to criticism from readers who subscribe to a different ideology - who are convinced of the superiority of the poetics dominant in their time and culture and who are dissatisfied with the strategies translators have chosen to make universe of discourse elements intelligible or more easy to intuit (Lefevere, 1992:88).

It is felt that Lefevere is correct in surmising that translators do not just translate words but also a universe of discourse. Their decisions whether or not to translate something is likely to be based much more on considerations of the levels of ideology and poetics than on the level of illocutionary use of language. In other words, translators tend to reach decisions on the translatability of a given work on a level that is much more encompassing and more “global” than that of illocutionary language use (Lefevere, 1992:94).

Once a translator has decided either to leave the original untranslated for ideological reasons or to use a specific strategy to translate it after all, they face problems concerning a universe of discourse. Sometimes a genre cannot easily be transplanted into another literature or another culture. In the source literature the genre may automatically trigger a set of expectations in its readers that will not be present in the readers of the translation. In a drama such as *Macbeth* it is therefore essential that the facilitator should guide the senior secondary learners as readers towards an understanding of the tragedy implicit in the life of the main character and the concept as well as the nature of tragedy when reading the play.

On the discourse level the clash between two cultures can result in various forms of misunderstanding. It should be stated that this “clash” should only be temporary for the translator and that the senior secondary learner as reader should be exempted from this misunderstanding. Fortunately, the problem of acculturation tends to solve itself as cultural environments grow closer together. Primarily a cumulative process, it has to go through the explanatory phase until what is explained becomes part of the conceptual environment of the target culture (Lefevere, 1992:127).

Translators need to understand the position of the source text in the source literature and the source culture - without such knowledge they cannot cast around the relevant analogies in the target literature and the target culture. Once translators decide they are going to translate a literature text it is advisable that they should try to fit it into the target culture. When *Macbeth* was translated into Afrikaans for the senior secondary learner as reader, it felt as if something was lacking due to the time gap and socio-historical distance in the drama of the target culture. Lefevere (1992:95) states that usually this lack is not felt in absolute terms. To be considered culturally literate, the senior secondary learner as reader must have at least some introductory knowledge of the works of Shakespeare, for example by reading Shakespeare’s poetry the previous year.

It is essential that translators should compensate in one way or another: they could add features that do not match features in the original as has been done when rewriting *Macbeth*. Lefevere (1992:105) feels that this compensation occurs because translators feel they have not been able to produce the right analogue at the right place and therefore add analogues where they are not necessarily warranted. When

studying these features it is recommended that factors such as ethnocentricity and a universal culture should be accounted for.

4.5.1 *Ethnocentricity*

By ethnocentricity is meant the attitude that uses one's own culture as the yardstick by which to measure all other cultures. An ethnocentric attitude allows members of a culture to remake the world in their image without realising how different the reality of that world is. This is an important consideration when rewriting *Macbeth* for the senior secondary learner as reader in South Africa. It is felt that if the senior secondary learner as reader does not only understand the written word but also the ethnocentricity underlying the interpretive process, a lot of uncertainties will actually disappear. Therefore, translation forces a language to expand and that expansion may be welcomed as long as it is kept in check by the linguistic community at large.

Furthermore, an ethnocentric attitude allows the senior secondary learner as reader in South Africa to remake the world in their image, without realising how different the reality of that world is (Lefevere, 1992:120). This allows the focus to be placed on crucial issues in *Macbeth* instead of "wasting" time to figure out what *Macbeth* is all about.

4.5.2 *Universal culture*

There is no sense in taking only the ethnocentricity of any culture into consideration

without realising that the universal culture also needs to be emphasised. The universal culture is based on respect for human, animal and ecological rights. The translator uses both the universal language of deep structures and non-cultural words and the universal culture of equal rights as a point of comparison, a *tertium comparationis*, a mental criterion between source and target language texts.

Newmark (1993:35) states that

cultures have their good and bad sides, and the bad ones are exposed in the light of the universals by the deculturalising force of close translation.

It is essential that the senior secondary learner as reader should be able to read *Macbeth* in contemporary Afrikaans to the extent that a bridge of cultural and socio-historical knowledge can be mentally formed due to the fact that meaning can be culturally conditioned. Therefore, the response to *Macbeth* will automatically be culturally conditioned if the needs of the senior secondary learner as reader are taken into serious consideration. It goes without saying that each reader will interpret *Macbeth* in terms of his own culture and background. Therefore, the senior secondary learner as reader will decode the translation in terms of his own culture and experience, not in terms of the culture and experience of the translator.

One should always keep in mind that a culture forms part of a complex of beliefs, attitudes, values and rules. Shakespeare intuitively took the beliefs, attitudes, values and rules of the audience for which he wrote into account. Therefore, the translator will need to take them into account in order to adequately understand the source text and adequately translate it for the senior secondary learner as reader who has a different set of beliefs, attitudes, values and rules. It is inevitable that Shakespeare's

worldview would be evident in what he wrote. Therefore, it is an undeniable fact that not only the drama is to be translated but also the socio-historical culture⁷ in order to suit the needs of the contemporary learner as reader. It should be obvious by now that the reader is shaped by the socio-cultural patterns of society.

It has to be kept in mind that no two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached. Therefore, translating into a specific culture will necessarily mean translating the semiotics of that specific culture. This then also represents the heart of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (that will follow later in more detail) that language is the heart within the body of culture and it is the interaction between these two that results in the continuation of life-energy. It is also a well-known fact that Jakobson claims that translation is only an adequate interpretation of an alien code unit and that equivalence is impossible. Furthermore, creative transposition is possible as is illustrated throughout this thesis and especially in chapter 2 where the notion of textual communication will be dealt with. When thinking and rethinking these crucial issues one cannot help to reach the conclusion that formulating equivalent words and not taking various crucial factors of *Landeskunde* into account is indeed demoralising and stripping this discipline of its heartbeat. Knowing what the influence of these preconceived notions is, drama translation can now focus on equivalence and its influence on drama translation.

⁷ The socio-historical culture in a South African context refers to the way the senior secondary learner as reader experiences his world and society. Elaboration on this issue will follow in

4.6 The illusion of equivalence and its influence on drama translation

It will soon be clear that drama translation should not short-sightedly be seen as a simple matter requiring simple equivalence, but rather as a complex phenomenon involving cultural differences and deictic shifts (that will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter) since it entails a goal-oriented decision-making process of negotiation among a complex network of semiotic codes and systems.

Traditionally, translation was defined in terms of equivalent - implying replacement or substitution of an utterance in one language by a semantically or pragmatically equivalent utterance in another language. But, problems arose as soon as the concept was considered more closely. According to Hermans (1991:157),

a strict definition of the term, as in mathematics, would imply complete reversibility and interchangeability of the source and target utterances which would therefore have to be regarded as synonymous.

Seen in this light equivalence is indeed an illusion, but on the other hand Alexieva (1993:109) feels that

two texts can be defined as translationally equivalent if the functional content of the source text as a hierarchically layered structure of different types of meaning in which one type plays the dominant part is rendered in the target usage in the production of a text and therefore ensures a reception by the target language receiver of the functional content of the source text that is the same, or approximately the same, as the source text receiver's reception of that functional content.

The translator is constantly looking for lexical equivalents between the source language and the target language. Due to the fact that the target language is spoken by people of a culture which is often very different from the culture of those who

speak the source language will automatically make it difficult to find lexical equivalents (Larson, 1984:153).

Nida and Taber (1974) distinguish two types of equivalence, namely formal correspondence and dynamic equivalence, where formal correspondence focuses attention on the message and dynamic equivalence is based on the principle of equivalent effect, that is, that the relationship between receiver and message should aim at being the same as that between the original receivers and the source language message.

Neubert and Shreve (1992) postulate that from the point of view of a theory of texts, translation equivalence must be considered a semiotic category, comprising a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic component (following Peirce's categories). What is important here is that Neubert and Shreve (1992:142) explicitly state that textual equivalence is not semantic equivalence between words but rather *a new order of pragmatic or communicative equivalence between texts*.

Bassnett (1991:29) indicates that equivalence in translation should not be approached as a search for sameness, since sameness cannot even exist between two target language versions of the same text, let alone between the source language and the target language version. Bassnett-McGuire, (1985) singles out two related problems as being particularly problematic for the translator, that is, the "gestural subtext" and the performability of the actor. In other words, the translator is expected to transfer from one language to another not only linguistic but paralinguistic features as well (Bassnett-McGuire, 1985:87). The second issue, performability, seems to suggest

that a particular translation is more congenial to eventual performance than other translations which do not adhere to this criterion (Kruger, 2000:43). Influenced by cultural translation studies, Bassnett-McGuire (1991:102) seems to have reversed her opinion altogether. She starts arguing that performability must be set aside “as a criterion for translating too”. Therefore, the written text “is the raw material on which the translator has to work and it is with the written text, rather than a hypothetical performance, that the translator must begin” (Bassnett-McGuire, 1985:102).

These various complex opinions demonstrate that translation equivalence cannot be easily defined and that there are in fact only degrees of translation equivalence. Heylen (1993:4) makes sense when maintaining that conditions required to produce equivalence differ from period to period and from language culture to language culture. According to Snell-Hornby (1988:15), the linguistically-oriented schools of translation have the central concept of translation equivalence in common which shifted the focus of translation theory away from the traditional dichotomy of “faithful” or “free” to a presupposed interlingual *tertium comparationis*. With the realisation that translation equivalence cannot be viewed in terms of absolute symmetry, attempts were made to rethink the concept to qualify and classify it leading to what can only be described as an explosive proliferation of equivalent types. She argues that

equivalence is unsuitable as a basic concept in translation theory: the term equivalence apart from being imprecise and ill-defined (even after a heated debate of over twenty years) presents an illusion of symmetry between languages which hardly exists beyond the level of vague approximations and which distorts the basic problems of translation (Snell-Hornby, 1988:22).

Toury (1980:43) starts from the position that a translation is a text which is regarded

and which functions as a translation in a particular culture. According to Toury, there are no longer any absolute criteria for equivalence, nor should equivalence necessarily be defined in general terms. Rather, a construct can be found that is the adequate translation for every given original. This *tertium comparationis* is the objective yardstick that makes meaningful comparison possible between the original and the translation. But his *tertium comparationis* is in reality a construct in the translation scholar's brain, a construct that claims objectivity while reflecting the scholar's own insights, prejudices, shortcomings, limitations, wishes and hopes. In fact, the scholar can be said to become the norm (Lefevere, 1992:10). Thus, equivalence is merely the name given to the "translational" relation that exists between two texts - there are no longer any absolute criteria for equivalence.

According to Bassnett and Lefevere (1993:5), the existence of a grid is more appropriate since the textual grid a culture uses consists of the collection of acceptable ways in which things can be said. I tend to fully agree with Heylen (1993) as well as Bassnett and Lefevere (1993) that translation is a form of cultural negotiation.

Hermans (1985) feels that a new paradigm should be introduced and this has been labelled "Descriptive Translation Studies: or DTS. Kruger (2000:39) states that

DTS is first and foremost target-oriented, i.e. the role played by translations in the target culture is examined first, secondly historical and cultural, i.e. the point of departure is that specific texts at a specific moment in time are regarded as translations and function as translations in the target culture and thirdly, it is descriptive, i.e. the specific characteristics of one or more translations are described (in terms of norms).

Kruger (2000:39) advocates the notion that the aim of DTS theorists is not to prescribe how translations ought to be done, but rather to describe how translations

have been done in practice (in a specific culture and at a specific historical moment). Therefore, a descriptive study of existing translations can be considered one variant of metatext (among others).

It is a truism that translated literature occupies a unique position and has the potential to demonstrate and intensify characteristics of the source as well as of the target literature. It is my opinion that the ultimate aim of a contemporary rewriting should be accessibility and acceptability by the putative readership if a translation is to function successfully in the target literature. Therefore, the translator must do more than the interlinear ordinary and reach for the arresting extraordinary. It is my view that the term equivalence is only a yardstick to create a translational creation between the source and target texts. This important notion may never be ignored when translating drama for the senior secondary learner as reader.

4.7 Drama translation and the senior secondary learner as reader

By denying the existence of Truth, Origin and Center, deconstruction deprives us of the comfortable fallacy of living in a simple and understandable world. We lose security, but we gain endless possibilities, the unlimited play of meanings (Koskinen, 1994:446).

Deconstruction directly affects the way one looks at drama translation in that it challenges drama to expand borders as well as encouraging the latter to consider its own limitations, psychology, unconscious restraints and the implications of its rhetoric (Gentzler, 1993:153). It should be stated clearly that deconstruction does not exist on its own. It needs a reader to interpret or implement it. Derrida (1979) coins the term *différance* not in terms of what is there (language), but on what is absent here

and thus calls into question any ontological approach that attempts to determine a notion of being based on presence (Gentzler, 1993:158-159). This notion plays a very important role in contemporary rewriting seeing that what is actually not said (the mind's eye) in *Macbeth* forms part of the translation and influences the way one perceives the world.

Begam (1992:876) points out that *différance* moves along two essentially opposed trajectories of meaning: on the one hand, it gestures towards presence or self-identity and on the other hand it gestures towards absence or difference. This means that to think *différance* is to think what is simultaneously same and other or what is simultaneously itself and its opposite. This aspect of the concept is of particular importance to translation since it touches on the essence of translation and the relation between original and translation. Furthermore, Koskinen (1994:447) states that *différance* also means that meanings are based on differences and on their relations to other signs. He advocates that meanings are always delayed and are never completely present. Therefore, contemporary rewriting can play an essential role in the literature classroom seeing that the sign (whether it may be speech or writing) is forever changing. Sarup (1993:36) states that

unlike writing, which is hopelessly mediated, speech is linked to the apparent moment and place of presence and for this reason has had priority over writing.

Therefore one essentially agrees with Gentzler (1993:69,131) that if these notions are considered, it becomes clear that the view of an original having priority over a translation is also premised on metaphysical notions of original meaning and of truth. This concept is evident in Nida's idea of the deep structure, in Neubert's invariant of

comparison and in Toury's ideal *tertium comparationis*. Therefore, the translation must pay its debt to the original by taking its directives from the original (Bannet, 1993:586).

Derrida (1979:102) makes a very important statement when he says

a text lives only if it *lives on* (my italics), and it lives on only if it is at once translatable and untranslatable. ...Totally translatable, it disappears as a text, as writing, as a body of language. Totally untranslatable, even within what is believed to be one language, it dies immediately.

The central aspect concerning deconstruction that Gentzler (1993:146) points out, is related to Derrida's suggestion that

deconstruction and translation are inexorably interconnected, intimating that in the process of translation, that elusive impossible presence he refers to as *différance* may, to the highest degree possible, be visible.

Gentzler (1993:147) draws attention to the fact that the subject of translation theory has traditionally involved some concept of determining meaning that can be transferred to another system of signification. Thus, Derrida's theory of translation is not a theory in a traditional sense - it rather suggests that one should think less in terms of copying or reproducing and more in terms of how languages relate to each other.

Macbeth, as drama, is a much more complex entity that may at various points be informative, vocative, expressive or for that matter meta-lingual or meta-literary. According to Holmes (1988:82), a fundamental fact about texts is that they are both serial and structural, meaning that after one has read a text, one retains an array of data about it in an instantaneous form. On these grounds, it has more recently been

suggested that the translation of literary texts takes place on two planes:

- a serial plane, where one translates sentence by sentence; and
- a structural plane, on which one abstracts a “mental conception” of the original text, then uses that mental conception as a kind of general criterion against which to test each sentence during the formulation of the new, translated text.

Language and cultures go hand in hand and there is no way whatsoever that a definite distinction between these two extremes is possible. Therefore, the only way to link these factors is by building a bridge in order to find a correlation between translation and language and translation and culture.

Furthermore, it has to be kept in mind that a play is more than a literary text, it is a combination of language and gesture brought together in a harmonious frame of time (Bassnett-McGuire, 1978:161). Consequently it has a dual role in both the literary and the theoretical systems of a particular culture. In this regard Link (1980:49) observes that

dramatic art has so far been considered as a mixed art, considering the dramatic text as literature and the production as a performing art.

Therefore, the relationship between the two texts can best be described in Kristeva's terms as *intertextual* because “we are dealing with different kinds of text which have an intimate relationship with each other” (Elam, 1978:157). Bassnett (1990:72) says that one of the obstacles to research on drama is that it is studied separately in two different camps and that the literary and theatre scholars usually ignore each other's work. Mouton (1988:4,37) contends that, although traditional theorists acknowledge the performance orientation of the dramatic text and thus also study the relation

between the text and the performance, it is safe to assume that the dramatic text enjoys preference in their studies.

It is now deemed necessary to take an in-depth look at various existing models in order to find proof that *Macbeth* can be rendered differently from the existing versions.

4.8 Finding a cultural model of translation

In the ensuing section an in-depth study will be undertaken in order to find an acceptable cultural model of translation. As has been stated in chapter 1 a cultural model of translation is essential seeing that translation is across cultures and when translating texts contexts are drawn into the target culture they are forced to interact. Meaning takes on a new perspective, enlightening the original context and affecting the current world situation in many ways. The theory for a cultural model of translation rests on the assumption that cultures deal with similar concerns and solve similar types of problems. A cultural model of translation should shed light on cross-cultural as well as on inter-cultural phenomena encountered in a contemporary translation such as *Macbeth*. It goes without saying that specific guidelines should be set and accounted for, thus, popular views of Even-Zohar, Toury, Lefevere and so forth will be included in order to reach a viable conclusion in this section. A cultural model makes provision for a comparative analysis and description of the source text in the source culture. This includes any number of translations in the target culture, taking into account the translation norms and conventions of the target system which different translators adhere to at the time of production (Kruger, 2000:20). According

to Heylen (1993:1), the shift of attention in literary studies regarding considerations such as impact, reception and communicative function of a literary work of art has acted as the motivating factor behind the study of literary translations and the role they play in the literary process. Most contemporary theories of translation could be called prescriptive. This is partly due to the hybrid role of translation, which is both a technique for teaching and learning a foreign language. This will mean that in order to explain the time- and culture-bound criteria, especially in a socio-historically situated play such as *Macbeth*, a non-prescriptive, intercultural communication model would be essential due to the fact that a descriptive, historical model of translation offers no insight when the ultimate aim is contemporary rewriting of drama. The latter only investigates the underlying constraints and motivations that inform the translation process and will soon prove insufficient and outdated. Therefore, I cannot agree more that conditions required to produce “sameness” differ from period to period and from language culture to language culture. In this respect various theorists to be discussed below, have various opinions to substantiate their personal views. These views need to be taken into consideration in order to form a contemporary view for contemporary rewriting that will suit the needs of the senior secondary learner as reader.

4.8.1 *Even-Zohar and the poly-system*

One of the most influential theorists is Itamar Even-Zohar. Although he cannot be regarded as a translation theorist, he is definitely a cultural theorist. He coined the

term “poly-system” (Even-Zohar, 1990:12) to refer to the entire network of correlated systems (literary and extra-literary) within society and developed an approach called the poly-system theory to attempt to explain the function of all kinds of writing within a given culture. In other words, the term “poly-system” emphasises the concept that includes both the idea of a closed set of relations and that of an open structure consisting of several concurrent networks or relations. Cultural systems are correlated with the social and the political (Hermans, 1991:108). The term “poly-system” is thus a global term covering all literary systems, both major and minor, that exist in a given culture (Gentzler, 1993:115). Even-Zohar sees translation as a process of negotiation between two cultures. Therefore, translation represents acculturation (Lefevre, 1992:11).

Thus, if translation is acculturation the phenomenon can be approached from two angles:

- translation can teach one about the wider problem of acculturation; and
- translation can teach one about translation.

Even-Zohar (1990:15-17) regards literature as a complex and dynamic system rather than a static collection of independent texts. The theory makes use of a few binary concepts to account for contact and interference among systems co-existing within a designated macro-system (Kruger, 2000:33). In essence Even-Zohar explores the relationship between the translated texts and the literary poly-system along the following lines:

- how texts to be translated are selected by the receiving culture; and

- how translated texts adopt certain norms and functions as a result of their relation to other target language systems.

He reformulated some basic insights stemming from Tynianov especially and developed the notion of literature as a poly-system. Even-Zohar's approach is based on the working hypothesis that it is more convenient to take all sorts of literary and semi-literary texts as an aggregate of systems or a poly-system. He focuses on the relationships between various types of literature and their synchronic and diachronic interaction. Furthermore, he observes that the part played by translations in a literature is inherently connected with the historical evolution of that literature and necessarily exists as an evolution that forms inescapably part of a systemic nature. Individual literary translations and their intrinsic meanings are no longer considered relevant object of literary studies. According to Heylen (1993:7), Even-Zohar encourages the investigation of translation in their systemic relationship with the surrounding literary poly-system. What is especially encouraging is that this theory conceives of literature as a stratified whole, itself a poly-system whose main components are "canonised"⁸ as opposed to "non-canonised"⁹ literature where each one consists in its turn of separate sub-systems or genres. Since the literary poly-system is correlated with other cultural systems and embedded in the ideological and socio-economic structures of society, its dynamism is far from mechanistic (Hermans, 1985:11).

The dichotomy Even-Zohar refers to also denotes the tension between official and

⁸ It indicates what is generally considered major literature and is usually preserved by the community as part of its cultural heritage.

⁹ It refers to those kinds of literary works that are usually rejected by the literary establishment as lacking in 'aesthetic value'.

unofficial cultural state of a society which used to be mistranslated due to the extreme emphasis on theory. It is therefore important that translated literature should be included in the literary poly-system so that its interaction with other literary systems may be studied. Whether translated literature becomes primary or secondary depends, according to Even-Zohar, upon the specific circumstances operating within the poly-system.

As has been said, translated literature is itself stratified and it is from this vantage point of the central stratum that all other relations within the system are observed. Furthermore, all poly-systems are structured in the same way and cultures differ significantly, especially in their openness toward other literatures or in the flexibility with which they negotiate cultural differences.

The translator should always keep a bird's eye view on the position contemporary translated literature occupies at a given point in time as it will also have its crucial influence on translational norms. The distinction between a translated work and an original work in terms of literary behaviour is a clear function of the position assumed by translated literature. When the latter takes up a primary position, the borderlines between translated works and original works are diffuse. When translated literature occupies a secondary position, the translator's effort will be to concentrate upon finding the best ready-made poetic model through which to represent the foreign text in the receiving literature. Not only is the socio-literary status of translation dependent upon its position within the receiving literary system but also its very practice.

Translation is not a phenomenon whose parameters are fixed once and for all, but an activity dependent on the relationships within a certain cultural system. Key concepts such as adequacy and equivalence cannot be dealt with fairly unless the implications of poly-systemic positions are taken into account. According to Even-Zohar, neglect of these poly-systemic positions is one of the major defects of contemporary translation theories that lean too heavily on static linguistic models or undeveloped theories of literature. This view provides a viable framework for the study of translation and more specifically, for the study of translated literature.

The objection to thinking in terms of systems is that every system necessarily generates its own counter-system and that change or evolution is an inherent feature of any system. According to Heylen (1993:9), the problem with Even-Zohar's thinking in terms of a system is that evolution is not always of a systemic nature.

Yet, Even-Zohar stresses that the primary versus secondary opposition is a historical-typological notion and that very notion is conducive to evaluation since all texts are defined from the point of view of the "centre" of the poly-system. The advantage of the poly-system theory is that it allows for its own augmentation and integrates the study of literature with the study of social and economic forces of history.

Even-Zohar's theoretical framework remains useful for the development of a socio-cultural and historical-relative study in that it rejects normative approaches on the basis of their *a priori* and ahistorical conception of translation. His functionalist view of translated literature does not determine in advance what a translation is, instead, it examines various questions from the standpoint of conditions operative in the

receiving literature. Poly-system theory is sufficiently inclusive and adaptable to stimulate research in a variety of fields, not least that of literary translation.

Poly-system theorists have changed the perspective that governed traditional translation theory and have begun to address a whole new series of questions. Not only are translations and inter-literary connections between cultures more adequately described, but inter-literary relations within the structure of a given cultural system and actual literary and linguistic evolution have also been made visible by means of the study of translated texts. A very important point is that according to poly-system theorists, the problem with translation studies is that it attempts both to theorise about the process of translation and to evaluate the success of individual texts in terms of literariness. It purports to have a diachronic component seeing that it considers the historical context as well as the target culture, yet this component tends toward the ahistorical due to the fact that the theory has hypothesised the possibility of a direct importation of an isolated function across centuries. A synchronic evaluation, like Van den Broeck's attempt to recuperate the concept of translation equivalence for translation studies was in direct contradiction to a comprehensive diachronic description which would relativise rather than universalise any concept of equivalence (Gentzler, 1993:108).

4.8.2 Toury and his quest for norms

Toury, a younger colleague of Even-Zohar, adopted the poly-system concept, isolated and defined certain translational norms that influence translators decisions and incorporated these factors into a larger framework of a comprehensive theory of

translation. Therefore, Toury contributes another element to the study of translated literature that describes existing translations. Supporting the poly-system hypothesis, he analyses the nature and role of norms in literary translation in his book entitled *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. These norms are not absolute, but socio-historical. They draw our attention to the fact that choices and decisions are made at several levels of the translation process and that the results of these choices can be detected in the translation product which can be described with the help of Toury's model. Toury contends that norms determine what type of translational relation will exist and at what textual level there will be between a source and target text. It has to be kept in mind that translation norms represent an intermediate level between competence and performance (Baker, 1993:239). According to Delabastita (1993:47-48), a norm is both a sort of performance instruction and a criterion for evaluating the performance afterwards - it acts as a constraint on the members of a community whenever they want to carry out the kind of behavioural activities that the norms bear on. For translation scholars, norms determine the way foreign material is imported and domesticated. Seeing it in this light, it may be assumed that the concept of norms replaces the concept of equivalence. Toury (1980:56) states that

the study of norms is a vital step in establishing the actual realization of the equivalence postulate - in one translation, in the work of a certain translator or school of translators, in certain periods, or in any other selection serving as a corpus.

Toury (1980:53-56) distinguishes three kinds of translation norms, viz. preliminary, initial and operational norms. Preliminary norms relate to extra-textual factors such as the position of translation within the poly-system of a target culture and the choice of languages and texts to be translated. According to Toury (1980:55) the initial norm governs the basic choice a translator makes between adherence to the source text's

structure and the source culture's norms and strives to meet the linguistic, literary and cultural norms of the new readership. The assumption is that the initial norms may be revealed through investigations of operational norms, which are, textual features. These norms concern actual decisions made in the translation process: additions, omissions and textual norms revealing linguistic and stylistic preferences. Norms can therefore be seen not as just a descriptive category but to also be providing a functional, socio-historical basis for the structure of the discipline (Lambert, 1991:34).

From the translator's point of view, every act of translating and every instance of decision-making in the translation process are governed by certain positive and negative norms. This will determine whether a translation is to be primarily source-oriented or target-oriented. According to Hermans (1991:160)

the role of norms in socio-cultural systems can be seen in this context of feedback and self-regulation. In their essential function, norms are ways of allowing such systems, and the subgroups and individuals within them, to cope with stress by reducing the complexity and contingency of the impulses coming from the environment.

Toury's introduction of norms radically shifts the focus of attention. He starts from the position that a translation is that utterance or text which is regarded as a translation by a given cultural community. This view allowed him to dissolve the concept of equivalence to be understood as a prerequisite for translation. In other words, the term "equivalence" is merely the name given to the translational relation that exists between two texts, one of which is a translation of the other. Thus,

'equivalence' is the term denoting the 'translational relation' that we postulate as existing between two texts by virtue of the fact that we have observed that one of these texts is regarded, i.e. functions, as a translation of the other text in a given socio-cultural system or a section thereof (Hermans, 1991,157).

Furthermore, Toury (1995:26) states that a translation cannot share the same systemic space with its original - not even when compared physically side by side. On the other hand, translation activities and their products cause changes in the target culture. Thus, cultures resort to translating precisely as a major way of filling in gaps whenever and wherever such gaps manifest themselves. He states that

what we need, however, is not isolated attempts reflecting excellent intuitions and supplying fine insights ... but a systematic scientific branch, seen as an inherent component of an overall discipline of translation studies, based on clear assumptions and armed with a methodology and research techniques made as explicit as possible (Toury, 1985:17).

Toury argues (1985:18) that the investigation of translational phenomena should start from the empirical fact, that is, from the translated text itself. I cannot agree more that translators operate first and foremost in the interest of the culture into which they are translating and not in the interest of the source text. Therefore, translations are facts from one system only and that is the target system (Toury, 1985:19).

Toury states that textual norms are either purely linguistic or purely literary. That is to say, he omits to outline the socio-cultural dimension of the text. In order to adopt Toury's notion of norms for the purposes of a cultural model, it would be necessary to make his linguistic and literary norms part of an overall poly-system of cultural norms and codes. According to Heylen (1993:11) he considers the product of translation to be more accessible to the analyst than the process by which it was produced.

It can be conceived that

the corpus can be enlarged still further if we examine not only the different translations of one source text within one particular literature, but different translations of a particular original within different literatures and cultures. An investigation of a series of translations of the same original within different literary systems and cultures allows one to arrive at conclusions with respect to the relative position translated literature occupies and the function it assumes within and among these different cultures. Translations play an active role in the contact and communication between different cultures. Each culture receives a foreign text differently. Toury's translational norms are an important tool for a descriptive model, which views translation as a form of cultural intercommunication and negotiation, since these translation norms reveal the national prejudices and cultural characteristics which underscore translational practice (Heylen, 1993:12).

On the other hand, Toury (1985:36) states that

the notion of equivalence ... differs from current concepts of translation equivalence in that it is not one single target-source relationship established on the basis of this or that type of invariant, but another functional-relational concept, namely that relationship ... which distinguishes translation and non-translation in certain specific socio-cultural circumstances of the target language i.e. between adequate and inadequate instances of performance with respect to the governing model(s) and to the norms deriving from these models.

It is therefore the entire set of possible relationships that functions as potential equivalence, placing the notion of equivalence in the theoretical branch of the discipline. He argues that the notion of equivalence is of little importance in itself and should not be regarded as all-inclusive. It is furthermore most likely to be used as a basis for the establishment of the overall concept of translation underlying the corpus under study, if only at a semi-conscious or even entirely unconscious level (Toury, 1985:37).

To recapitulate, the implications of translational norms are as follows (Hermans, 1991:165-168):

- without norms the translator would be unable to decide in favour of one solution rather than another. Given that language is made up of discrete units and that translating is a process of constant decision-making, every choice at every turn is motivated by a norm;
- translational norms act as a kind of grid that determines the way in which “foreign” material is integrated into the recipient culture. Norms reduce the complexity and thus *domesticate* (Venuti, 1995) the “otherness” of the exogenous text;
- being a goal-oriented activity, models provide the incentive for the adoption of particular norms. The models and norms are those of the socio-cultural system in which the translator works;
- norms are part of the workings of the socio-cultural system. The study of norms is a descriptive, not a prescriptive or normative activity;
- socio-cultural systems are not monolithic and mechanistic things but diversified and adaptive entities, made up of different, interlocking, interacting subsystems, all developing in multi-linear fashion;
- it is also this interactive complexity, both within and between systems, that gives rise to competing norms and to norms conflicts which are acted out as part of a changing historical series. As competing norms coexist and overlap, observing one norm may mean infringing on another; and
- in view of the structural complexity of most larger socio-cultural systems it will be far from easy for the translator to establish the exact relations between individual translational norms and the models and correctness notions standing behind them.

4.8.3 *Lefevere and his notion of rewriting*

It goes without saying that the poly-system theory as well as Toury’s notion of norms has contributed in many ways to the field of translation studies. Nevertheless, translation will always, notwithstanding the further refinements of theoretical concerns, remain the rewriting of a text and therefore it is essential to include Lefevere in this study seeing that his main contribution is on the meta-theoretical level. He strongly advocates the integration of translation studies into the study of the many types of rewriting and refraction that shape a given culture. At the same time he argues in favour of a more determined effort to incorporate the poly-system concept. In other words, the notion of a controlled mechanism which he proposes to

call “patronage” often regulates and manipulates the literary system from inside the socio-economic and ideological structures of society. Rewriting remains a cultural given at a given time.

Lefevere (1985:219) postulates that

literary theory would try to explain how both the writing and the rewriting of literature are subject to certain constraints, and how the interaction of writing and rewriting is ultimately responsible, not just for the canonization of specific authors or specific works and the rejection of others, but also for the evolution of a given literature, since rewritings are often designed precisely to push a given literature in a certain direction.

Furthermore, translation operates under the constraint of the original, itself the product of constraints belonging to a certain time. The latter will influence the way one rewrites a source text due to the fact that attitudes and behaviour change from time to time. Second, the universe of discourse very often poses insuperable problems of any kind of so-called “faithful” translation. He states that a universe of discourse features involves those features particular to a given culture and are almost untranslatable by definition or at least very hard to translate (Lefevere, 1985:235).

According to Lefevere (1985:234), translation is probably the most obvious instance of rewriting. Yet, all different forms of rewriting tend to work together in a literary system.

He (Lefevere, 1992:38) propagates that

rewritings, mainly translations, deeply affect the inter-penetration of literary systems, not just by projecting the image of one writer or work in another literature or by failing to do so but also by introducing new devices into the inventory component of a poetics and paving the way to changes in its functional component.

In order to understand Lefevere's notion of rewriting it is crucial to implement the two components of poetics: one is an inventory of literary devices, genres, characters and situations and the other a concept of what the role of literature is or should be.

Once a poetics is codified it exerts a tremendous system-conforming influence on the further development of a literary system. Translations not only project an image of the work that is translated and, through it, of the world that work belongs to; they also protect their own world against images that are too radically different, either by adapting them or by screening them out (Lefevere, 1992:125).

Conservatively speaking, cultures may resist a contemporary *Macbeth* translation as a eurocentric text (see chapter 1) within a South African context because they may feel that it is threatening their self-image in various respects. This bridge needs to be crossed in order to make literature accessible to all the people of the globe. In fact, translation provides probably the best way to gauge the influence of a poetics at a certain time in history since it shows the degree to which translators have interiorised that poetics (Lefevere, 1992:128).

When rewriting literature, the conservative translators, for example Eitemal (1965) and Coertze (1948) in their respective translations of *Macbeth*, worked on the level of the word or the sentence, whereas the contemporary rewriter, being freed from conservative ideologies and creating a fresh approach, works on the level of the culture as a whole and on the functioning of the text in that culture and period of time. It goes without saying that this is one of the crucial ways to follow if one is

determined to communicate Shakespeare on the level of the senior secondary learner as reader. Therefore,

translated texts as such can teach us much about the interaction of cultures and the manipulation of texts (Lefevere, 1992:51).

4.8.4 *The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis*

Although these theories influence contemporary rewriting to some extent, it is important to incorporate the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis in order to provide an overall perspective of contemporary rewriting that will influence the living reality of the senior secondary learner as reader. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, or principle of linguistic relativity, maintains that thought does not precede language but on the contrary is conditioned by it. The principle of linguistic relativity has far-reaching implications for translation. Taken to its extreme, the notion that language conditions thought and that both are inextricably bound up with the individual culture of the community that speaks the language concerned would mean that ultimately translation is impossible. Linguistic determinism would suggest that one is a prisoner of the language spoken and incapable of conceptualising in categories other than those of the native tongue. According to Hatim and Mason (1991:29) it is widely recognised that such a view is untenable. The very fact that people are capable of learning a second language to a high degree of competence and fluency considerably weakens the hypothesis.

The influence of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis on the cultural aspects of translation has been acknowledged by various translation theorists, such as Bassnett-McGuire (1991). Sapir's hypothesis reads as follows:

human beings do not live in the objective world alone, .. but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society ... The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached to it (Mandelbaum, 1949:162).

This hypothesis addresses far more than just the cultural aspects of translation due to the fact that it refers primarily to the relation between language and thought. According to Penn (1972:13), this hypothesis that concerns language and thought may be interpreted in two ways: the extreme interpretation would be that language determines thought, while the cautious interpretation would be that language influences thought. If the language you speak influences your mental activity, it would seem to follow logically that it will also influence creative activity, such as painting, writing or even translating. In the case of literature, language does not only influence the creative process but also represents the very medium of creation.

As it is the intention of this study to focus on contemporary rewriting for the senior secondary learner as reader, it is deemed necessary to examine the concept of the literary text as well. De Beaugrande (1988:7-8) briefly examines the various ways in which the literary text has been defined in the past and singles out four possible approaches:

- literature consists of language with “distinctive features”, in other words, literary language differs from ordinary language;
- literature has “special content”, in other words, certain texts contain certain ideas;
- literature is fictional; and
- literature is rhetorical, in other words, composed by various stylistic devices.

De Beaugrande (1988:8) suggests that one should refrain from asking “What is literature?” and instead ask “What happens when people either produce or respond to

a literary text?” This is exactly the reaction that I want to unlock within the minds and thoughts of the senior secondary learner as reader. Cloete (1984:16) regards literature’s multivalence¹⁰ as an essential characteristic of literature. Thus, the literary text is not only an object in the world, it also constitutes an alternative world. If one accepts, as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis implies, that the language one speaks influences one’s perception of the world, one must necessarily accept that the reader’s language will also influence the perception of this textual world. This has important implications for literary translation where a more or less “equivalent” world must be called into being by means of different language. Thus, the translator of drama has the special task of re-creating the “world” postulated in the original text. After reconsidering the input of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis it has become eminently clear that the communicative value of the items under scrutiny in this particular context has not been considered.

In contribution to the comprehensiveness of this section it is regarded as essential to include the views of Venuti and Steiner.

4.8.5 *Notes on Venuti*

Venuti (1992:5) states that

translators rewrite in different languages to circulate in different cultures, but this very process results in a self-annihilation, ultimately contributing to the cultural marginality and economic exploitation which translators suffer today.

¹⁰ By *multivalence* is meant the fact that the literary text is composed of various linguistic and conceptual elements that are integrated with each other. It includes the organisation of the text and the perspective from which it is written.

When rewriting, the fluent strategy performs a labour of acculturation which *domesticates* (Venuti, 1995) the foreign text, making it intelligible and even familiar to the target-language reader, providing him with the narcissistic experience of recognising his own culture in a cultural other. However, for Venuti (1995:15) domestication has negative connotations as it is identified with a policy common in dominant cultures such as English which are “aggressively monolingual, unreceptive to the foreign: accustomed to “fluent translations that invisibly inscribe foreign text”. Venuti (1995:20) argues that since domestication serves broader domestic agendas, it is necessary to challenge and resist its domination by consciously adopting other translation strategies, such as *foreignizing*. Venuti (1992:8) furthermore feels that a translation canonises the foreign text, validating its fame by enabling its survival.

A translation is never quite ‘faithful’, always somewhat ‘free’, it never establishes an identity, always a lack and a supplement and it can never be a transparent representation only an interpretive transformation that exposes multiple and divided meanings in the foreign text and displaces it with another set of meanings, equally multiple and divided (Venuti, 1992:8).

A translation emerges as an active reconstitution of the foreign text mediated by the irreducible linguistic, discursive and ideological differences of the target-language culture. Since cultural practices are always already social in their significance and functioning, translation can also include its ideological and institutional determinations, resulting in detailed studies that situate the translated text in its social and historical circumstances. Venuti (1992:11) stresses the fact that the translator is the agent of a cultural practice that is conducted ~~under~~ continuous, self-monitoring and often with active consultation of cultural rules and resources.

4.8.6 Notes on Steiner

According to Steiner's hermeneutic approach, translation means interpretation and the translator is the mediator between two texts and no longer the finder of equivalences. In Newmark's (1995) terms, translators with this orientation produce communicative rather than semantic translations. Paradoxically, the most productive insights generated by this school of translation studies is the conclusion that no perfect translation is possible. If this is so, acceptance or rejection of translation in a given culture may well have much more to do with ideology and manipulation than with knowledge and wisdom.

Lefevere (in Genzler, 1993:74) claims that

the hermeneutic approach of translation, used primarily by individual thinkers who try to arrive single-handedly at universally valid ideas, truths and grammatical forms, tends to be non-scientific, bases its system of ideas on epistemological assumptions which are 300 years out of date, and is contradicted at every turn by findings of other disciplines.

Although the hermeneutic approach may be outdated at times, I feel that its strength lies in the fact that it tends to concentrate on interpretation and communication. The ways in which these theories tend to provide guidelines for contemporary rewriting and rethinking of literature offer invaluable insight to the translator of literature. Therefore, they cannot be disregarded or underestimated seeing that these views were incorporated into my own version of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans.

4.9 Conclusion

Translations are never produced in a vacuum but are produced to fulfil a certain communicative function.

If a work of literature is not rewritten in one way or another, it is not likely to survive its date of publication. It is also a fact of literary life that works of literature not rewritten in either English or Russian do not stand a great chance of being included in any canon of world literature. The power of these rewriters should be analysed as well as the various ways in which they tend to exercise it (Lefevere, 1992:14).

Newmark (1993:47) makes a very valid and acceptable point that except in matters of moral and factual truth, which is the bottom line in any translation, there is always room for eclectic thinking and a plurality of views, and none for dogma.

When taking all these factors into account it is clear that drama perspectives play a central role in contemporary rewriting of literature. For far too long the literary needs of the senior secondary learner as reader have been neglected or have not even been realised. Attitudes need to change as soon as possible if we want to safeguard the tomorrows of the youth in our country. Seen in this light, it is crucial that a paradigm shift should occur in schools. The OBE subject policy for the senior phase may form an introduction into the real world but the role of the facilitator in the literature class cannot be emphasised enough. Facilitators need more explicit guidance and courses in order to introduce this paradigm shift to them first hand. If existing problems can explicitly be addressed and a shift in thinking can be introduced, it will soon become clear (and acknowledged) that contemporary rewriting of especially Shakespearean plays might well form a stepping-stone in the literary future of the youth of South

Africa when it comes to the process of reversing the demonising of Shakespeare in the minds of the relevant readers.

In order to form a global view of contemporary rewriting of literature, more specifically Shakespeare, for the senior secondary learner as reader it is deemed necessary to give attention now to the issue of Shakespeare and the possible contemporary rewriting of the play in question for the particular target reader introduced up to this point.

CHAPTER 5

SHAKESPEARE

AND THE SENIOR SECONDARY LEARNER AS READER

WITHIN A CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT

We'd jump this life to come.

Research problem and contextualisation	Textual communication and the senior secondary learner as reader	The senior secondary learner as reader	Perspectives on drama and the senior secondary learner as reader	<i>Shakespeare and the senior secondary learner as reader within a contemporary context</i>
--	--	--	--	---

5.1 Introduction

As has been demonstrated in chapter 1, Shakespeare is that remarkable literary phenomenon in western literary history, a man for all times and ages. Therefore, it is essential to keep in mind that his verse and prose are a vehicle of his particular mode of thinking. When translating Shakespeare for the senior secondary learner as reader, one furthermore has to keep in mind that he represents the style and thematic concerns of a very specific age.

If one wants to deal with Shakespeare within the context of our present times in South Africa, this chapter must necessarily concern itself with some of the influences exerted by

contemporary literary and linguistic theories. Therefore, some of the most influential theories considered to have a bearing on a contemporary rewriting will form a stepping-stone for this chapter. It goes without saying that these various perspectives will automatically influence the way one perceives the world in terms of linguistic and psychological development.

While dealing with the issue as to whether Shakespeare can be made more contemporaneously accessible to the senior secondary learner, it was interesting to discover and explore some similarities between two very different socio-historical times. Due to the fact that Shakespeare's age and the world of the senior secondary learner as reader are closely connected with regard to considerations such as religion and politics as well as attitudes and behaviour patterns, it should not be impossible to achieve a correlation to make these ages overlap. Furthermore, the above-mentioned concerns allow the target reader of this exercise to enter into the rich and complex world created by Shakespeare and peopled by characters made familiar by the very recognisable features that they possess.

5.2 Contemporary Shakespeare

In order to see Shakespeare as a contemporary to whom the senior secondary learner as reader can relate, one needs to discuss contemporary theories on Shakespeare as these theories have to a large extent shaped the way in which literary theory has developed and the ways in which people think. In thinking of Shakespeare as a more immediate and

accessible contemporary two main streams can be distinguished. These two will be looked at in order to form an overall impression of this specific issue.

5.2.1 *The language issue*

For the purpose of this study consideration will only be given to certain theories that have influenced notions associated with contemporary radical rewriting. Therefore, the views of Saussure, Derrida, Halliday and Hasan, and Wilson and Sperber need to be investigated.

The Saussurian perspective looks to writing for illustrations of the nature of linguistic units, despite its assertion that writing exists for the sole purpose of representing speech and is a secondary, not a primary, linguistic phenomenon (Tallis, 1988:169). Saussure's notions about language have contributed to the development of twentieth-century literary theory in a number of ways and it is essential to realise that his theory of language implies an interplay between the speaking subject and the community which shares *langue* as a sum of impressions deposited in the brain, like a dictionary (Vickers, 1993:6). In other words, the *langue* is the property of the community, beyond the influence of the individual. The individual is therefore unable to influence and change the *langue* in any significant way (Kress, 1976:x).

Saussure's structuralism makes use of two crucial and related categories: *Syntagm* and *paradigm*. Relations between a particular item and other items present in a structure are

syntagmatic (this linear). Relations between an item and other items not present in the structure are *paradigmatic* (non-linear and complex – a forerunner of the intertwined and complex notion of semiotics). These two categories thus represent two basically different principles of organisation for any linguistic theory. Furthermore, Saussure and his followers saw the linguistic sign as an indivisible unity. The most radical and fertile feature of Saussure's thought rests on the idea of an essential disjunction between the world of "reality" and the world of *langue*.

Vickers (1993) makes the illuminating remark that one unsatisfactory feature is Saussure's attempt to define the linguistic sign purely in terms internal to the language-system, avoiding all reference to an extra-linguistic reality (and this is precisely the kind of feature that is crucial when studying a play from the senior secondary learner's point of view).

As has been discussed in chapter 4, Derrida subsequently used the etiolated Saussurian categories as passed down through structuralism, but then attempted to destroy them by a series of *a priori* denials. The notion of "structure" presupposes a "centre" of meaning of some sort. People desire a centre because it guarantees being as presence (Selden & Widdowson, 1993:144).

Selden and Widdowson (1993:144) argue that

if we try to undo the centring concept of 'consciousness' by asserting the disruptive counterforce of the 'unconscious', we are in danger of introducing a new centre, because we cannot choose but enter the conceptual system (conscious/unconscious) we are trying to dislodge.

According to Tallis (1988:167), deconstruction dismantles implicit or explicit philosophical positions by showing how the texts in which they are advanced undermine themselves from within and betray an unconscious commitment of views precisely opposite to those that they overtly propound. Derrida (1981) thus sets out to catch notable phonocentrics¹, actually privileging writing over speech. This phonocentric bias is believed to originate from a deep need to conceal the disturbing truth that writing, and not speech, is the primary manifestation of language – and the further implications this has in terms of the external referent.

According to Derrida (1981:7) the text exists

as something written - a past- which, under the false appearance of a present, a hidden omnipotent author (in full mastery of his product) is presenting to the reader as his future.

Derrida (Selden & Widdowsen, 1993:147) gives writing three characteristics:

- a written sign is a mark which can be repeated in the absence not only of the subject who emitted it in a specific context but also of a specific addressee;
- the written sign can break its “real context” and can be read in a different context regardless of what its writer intended; and
- the written sign is subject to “spacing” in two senses:
 - It is separated from other signs in a particular chain;
 - it is separated from “present reference” (that is, it can refer only to something not actually present in it).

Therefore, a deconstructive reading (see chapter 4 as well) tries to bring out the logic of

the text's language as opposed to the logic of its author's claims. It will tease out the text's implied presuppositions and point out the contradictions in them. A deconstructive reading of this kind, then, will take the metaphysical, phonocentric oppositions at work in a text, reverse them and then question them in such a way as to "neutralise" them (Derrida, 1981:117). Derrida needs to postulate the absence of a signified, since he wishes to deny language any possibility of meaning located in an external referent. He explicitly states that there is nothing outside the text (Derrida, 1981:xiii), but one has to keep in mind that language is much more than a system of differences. Meaning inheres in each linguistic sign, subject to the normal hazards of ambiguity or misunderstanding. The latter is fully realised in language through the joint operations of semantics, grammar and syntax.

According to Selden and Widdowson (1993:149)

the power of the deconstructive movement can be gauged by the fact that many other major intellectual traditions have been forced into radical reassessments.

Yet the crucial point remains that Derrida, like Barthes, Foucault and Lacan never invoked the normal, everyday experience of speaking and understanding, therefore, stressing the notion of misunderstanding when one takes into consideration the way in which a second language, more precisely, a drama, is experienced and interpreted by a reader (such as, in the present case, the senior secondary learner).

¹ It refers to systems of thought which are reliant upon what Derrida, following Heidegger, terms the metaphysics of presence - that is, a belief in an extra-systemic validating presence or centre which underwrites and fixes linguistic meaning but is itself beyond scrutiny or challenge.

Unfortunately, having reduced language to a sign, and then emptied it of meaning, the Structuralists were free to assign any significance they wished to the original categories. Derrida's form of reading believes that it cannot legitimately transgress the limits of the text toward something other than it or toward a signified outside the text whose content could take place outside of language representing writing in general.

A theory that offers intriguing possibilities within the scope of the present study is that of Halliday and Hasan, who take their basic orientation from semantics, understood as the totality of meaning in language whether such meaning is encoded in the form of vocabulary or not. According to Kress (1976:vi), Halliday's recent writings are characterised by a strong functional bias. In these terms, a text

typically extends beyond the range of structural relations, as these are normally conceived of. But texts cohere; so cohesion within a text – texture – depends on something other than structure. There are certain specifically text-forming relations which cannot be accounted for in terms of constituent structure; they are properties of the text as such, and not of any structural unit such as a clause or sentence (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:7).

Halliday and Hasan's position would be that the statement of the totality of all systems in one language would differ from that of another language. The search for universals is then best conducted through a comparison of the full systemic potential of different languages (Kress, 1976:xx).

On the other hand Stotsky (1983:433-435), criticises Halliday and Hasan's categorisation as lacking comprehensiveness and being capable of explaining cohesion in all text types due to the fact that they do not provide text-forming relations or explain the cohesive tie formed between superordinates. In other words, it is not clear what useful information

about text construction is gained by classifying the use of a superordinate word as one type of cohesion. They (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:13) systematise the concept of cohesion “by classifying it into a smaller number of distinct categories ... which have a theoretical basis as distinct types of cohesive relation, but which also provide a practical means for describing and analysing texts”.

When taking these theoretical considerations into account, it is possible to combine linguistic, contextual and general world knowledge as the basis for inferring an appropriate interpretation. The meaning then comes from the text, although the linguistic features in the text do not constitute meaning in themselves. According to Short (1996:8), they constrain readers from inferring unreasonable meanings and prompt them towards the various kinds of information at our disposal. When writing (or rewriting), various kinds of knowledge are used and shared with the reader to constrain the reader in the sense of interpreting what he reads in a particular way. The concentration on how we understand texts means that stylistic analysis can often be of help when one finds it difficult to come to grasp, for example, puns and other linguistic manipulations in *Macbeth*.

Literature is prototypically written language, but writers often create special effects by writing in ways that borrow characteristics associated with speech. Thus, the use of deixis (see chapter 2) is one of the important ways in which writers persuade readers to imagine a fictional world when they read poems, novels and plays.

Drama is the literary genre that is most like naturally-occurring conversation, although characters' conversations stem from the fact that dramatic dialogue is written to be spoken (Short, 1996:168,174). Drama largely consists of character-to-character interaction. Character talk is embedded in this discourse, allowing the audience to "listen in" to what the characters say. It is felt, within the context of this study, that education should be correlated with the "real" world of the learner and that literature is therefore important. Fortunately, as spin-off of the new OBE subject policy incorporated by authorities, the school system is becoming more practically-orientated, concentrating on subjects with a more overtly practical application. Therefore, the emphasis is on what a learner can do with a subject, and not what the subject can do with or for the learner (Coetzee, 1997:6). This might have important ramifications for the teaching of literature, unless one could situate the teaching of literature within the context of that which is relevant to the development of a learner.

Kilfoil and van der Walt (1989:133) listed several advantages of studying literature of which the following are considered to be of most value:

- it is stimulating and interesting;
- it engages the imagination and creativity of the learners;
- the truth behind the fiction becomes available to the learners, making what they read relevant to them;
- it can lead to cultural enrichment and insight into human nature; and
- literature gives depth and meaning to the language-learning experience which might otherwise be superficial.

Added to this, there is the imperative that the literary experience must also be a pleasurable one.

However, to balance this view, Morton (1981:33) expresses doubt as to the value Shakespeare's plays might have as school networks. He argues that the Elizabethan language, period humour, religious traditionalism and social mores all go against the basic ability of the modern school learner. He advocates the teaching of the "moderns" and the offering of an English course that is relevant to the learners and their limited experience. Sherman (1984:4) echoes the argument of Morton when he states that the problem of teaching Shakespeare lies in the problem of language. He strongly feels that it is only the linguistically gifted learner who will enjoy and benefit from the reading of Shakespeare. Both Reid (1982:82) and Pienaar (1987:69), pursuing this avenue of thought, lay the responsibility for the interpretation and the inculcation of enjoyment of the text on the shoulders of the facilitator.

Once progressing to the stage of using language as a symbol system independent of the immediate environment, the learner begins to construct what Halliday and Hasan (1989) calls a social semiotic, a model of the culture of which he is himself a member. Where the semiotics of Barthes separated sign from meaning and deprived the individual of any power with regard to the system, Halliday draws attention to the semantic properties of language (Halliday & Hasan, 1989). As against Lacan and others who see mankind as trapped by language, Halliday's assertion is that one is not a prisoner of a cultural semiotic and anyone can learn to move outside it. This is especially important when studying drama. In order to focus on Halliday's assumption, one can take imagery in *Macbeth* as an example: the learner reads the words on the page (representing the sign)

and understands them, realising that this image also forms part of another culture (representing a cultural-semiotics), but interprets them not only literally but also visually as being part of a bigger system as represented by the social semiotics as proposed by Halliday.

Vickers (1993:69) states that many contemporary thinkers on language emphasise the act of comprehension as well as the process by which the hearer construes the speaker's intention. The knowledge that *Macbeth* does not follow the same habits and conventions of thought as nowadays, together with observation of his behaviour, gives one the basis of analogy and the rule of inference enables one to form a reasonably accurate impression of Shakespeare's thoughts and views.

Another contributing theory considered to be especially encouraging is that of Sperber and Wilson (1986). According to them, a key concept in understanding communication is the context of an utterance. Linguists usually mean by it the immediate speech situation, but Sperber and Wilson (1986) widened it to describe a psychological construct - including general cultural assumptions and beliefs about the mental state of the speaker. As has been discussed in chapter 4, certain psychological aspects will influence the reception and interpretation of linguistic signs. It can be said that it introduces an element of explicitness where non-verbal communication can never be more than implicit.

In the classroom situation it would be ideal if the facilitator could create an atmosphere

where the conception of Shakespeare can impact on the emotions and moral attitudes of the senior secondary learner as reader. Even more, if the process of reading *Macbeth* can be presented as an enjoyable and engrossing activity to which the learner as reader is prepared to devote a great deal of time, the reading and viewing of literature would be experienced as a constructive and enjoyable enterprise. It would be ideal if learners could believe that the literary experience would not only enrich but also impinge on his consciousness and provoke a reconsideration of local and universal human situations and reactions.

5.2.2 *The character issue*

Shakespeare's characters exist in an individualised fashion and are an involution of the universal in the individual (Felperin, 1990:13). Each and every character, whether it be Duncan, Macbeth, Lady Macbeth, Banquo, or for that matter the ghost of Banquo falls in an individualised class of their own. Although

in concrete historical terms Shakespeare can never be 'our contemporary' except by the strategy of appropriation, yet the protean values which subsequent generations of critics have discovered in the texts themselves can be demonstrated to be in large part the projections of their own externally applied values (Drakakis, 1985:24).

It is interesting to note and should be emphasised in the classroom that even

the most impressive characters in Shakespeare's political world are not the winners but those who have confronted and absorbed the experience of loss, whose achievement is not to order a state but to assert themselves against inevitable ruin. This is the political thinking of a playwright. It will not help us to control the economy, achieve social justice, win or prevent war. But it tells us something about human power and the endless fascination it has for us in the face of our own mortality (Leggatt, 1988:243).

It is important to be aware of the fact that Shakespeare watches, moment by moment, the way his political figures impress others and themselves, the means they use to do so as well as the price they have to pay. Shakespeare's treatment of politics is exploratory rather than prescriptive. By our standards he is little concerned with the practical implications of political life. His interest is not in examining what political structures best serve the general good, but in watching how people behave within the structures they have. Leggatt (1988:238) states that politics for him is not a search for solutions to social and economic problems but a search for power and authority by the politicians themselves. Seeing that the emphasis in the study has been on Shakespeare as a contemporary with regard to various aspects including those touched on above, it is now deemed necessary to focus more intensely on *Macbeth* and the influence the play will have on the senior secondary learner as reader.

5.3 *Macbeth* as a contemporary

It is essential to note that one's frame of reference is constructed and delimited by the prevailing ideas of one's own time, but at the same time it is important to consider that Shakespeare was intensely interested in time and the ways in which it affects human behaviour (time is one of the crucial thematic concerns of *Macbeth*).

Turner (1971:128) emphasises the fundamental question that

since the time past is now no more, and the time future is not yet come. And as for the present, if it could be for ever present and not pass on to become time past, truly it should not be time but eternity?

There is the transitory and illusory world of past and future, which limits one's perception of reality. In other words, the world of *tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow*, and on the other hand there is the vision of the perpetual today which is the milieu of *man's true destiny when time shall be no more* jumping this life to come.

In the ensuing section an investigation will be undertaken to investigate how specific issues will influence *Macbeth*, the play in general and the ways in which it will influence characters and related issues.

5.3.1 *The demonic metaphysics of Macbeth*

Much of *Macbeth's* hold on us possibly derives from the oblique but penetrative insights it offers into the nature of that world as judged by the standards of an older, yet still living medieval one (Hawkes, 1977:2).

According to Curry (1977:30), evil used to be considered both a subjective and a non-subjective reality. In other words, evil manifested itself subjectively in the spirits of men and objectively in a metaphysical world whose existence depended in no mean degree upon the activities of the human mind. Therefore,

this objective realm of evil was not governed by mere vague and irrational forces; it was peopled and controlled by the malignant wills of intelligences - evil spirits, devils, demons, Satan, *witches* (my italics) - who had the ability to project their power into the workings of nature and to influence the human spirit (Curry, 1977:30).

In order to regard *Macbeth* as a contemporary that the senior secondary learner as reader can relate to it is regarded as vital to indicate the influences of the witches then and now as well as their relationship with Macbeth, the character.

5.3.1.1 Fair and foul

Language in *Macbeth* is the mirror and even in a sense the cause of the extremity of the moral situation. Macbeth's deed is an overturning of normal values and relationships, and the language of the play (the Weird Sisters' speeches being only the most obvious examples) follows the action into the chaotic world he establishes, into the realm of impossibility, beyond the powers of ordinary conception, beyond the proper sphere of words (Danson, 1977:134).

Paradoxes are used quite strikingly in this play. There are especially two that need to be mentioned due to the fact that the evil that they represent and the notorious causes thereof can clearly be seen in our contemporary society.

They are:

- “fair is foul and foul is fair” (Act I, Sc. 1, line 11); and
- “so fair and foul a day I have not seen” (Act I, Sc. 3, line 38).

Both statements can be seen as metaphysical statements that carry one beyond the normal

limits of logical thought. The statements may be metalinguistic paraphrases indicating that that which has been called fair will now be called foul. It can clearly be seen that *equivocation* is the badge of subversion in *Macbeth*. It involves the deliberate and premeditated manipulation of language in order to obscure the truth. In *Macbeth*, the principle of equivocation can be seen to extend itself throughout the whole structure of a society in which all values are overturned (Hawkes, 1977:8).

One may suppose that Shakespeare's Weird Sisters are intended to symbolise or represent the metaphysical world of evil, and through the appearance of the witches one is reminded that the moral order is vulnerable to unknown forces of evil whether or not those forces are external or buried deep within the human psyche. In any event, the question of their reality or unreality points to one of the major themes of the play: that what appears to be the truth is very often just the opposite; that what would seem to be fair is very often foul. Thus, it is essential that one should investigate the purpose that the witches serve in the play:

- for Shakespeare's audience the presentation of actual devils as opposed to witches upon the stage could suggest the terror and sublimity of a metaphysical world of evil;
- witches do not have comic associations, as for example, in *Dr Faustus*, where the play contains a disproportionate amount of physical comedy;
- they represent the element of evil and thus contribute towards the conflict between good and evil;
- they draw on all that is horrific, destructive and disorderly in nature;
- by prophesying to Macbeth that he will be King, they enkindle his ambition;
- by speaking equivocally they contribute to the theme of the discrepancy between appearance and reality and demonstrate that what often appears to be fair is in reality foul; and
- they contribute to the betrayal of Macbeth's *better part of man*.

Macbeth's first words are a prophecy when he states that *so fair and foul a day I have not seen*. The human preoccupation with the sensational and the temporal has transformed these words from their proper sense to the sense of mere prognostication (Turner, 1971:130). The words *fair* and *foul* aptly represent their principal objective: the reversal of accepted values. Danson (1977:133) states that these words represent a double sense, one of which is paradoxical and extraordinary, another simple and reasonable. Farnham (1977:61) stresses the fact that although the witches have the forms of repulsive old women, they are not mortal witches such as the law might get its hand upon and put to death. They are indeed "Weird Sisters", but this does not imply that they have control over Macbeth's destiny and can compel him to do all that he does. Macbeth, in choosing evil, creates physical misfortune and a spiritual hell on earth for himself - it is important to realise that within the Renaissance concept of individual freedom he has the freedom to damn himself. They are simply supernatural *agents* of evil and in working to make *fair* into *foul* they reveal both the capacities and the incapacities that the Christian tradition attributed to devils. One must always keep in mind that they are imperfect speakers (Farnham, 1977:61) and definitely not prophets. One could rather see them as cheap but dangerous fortune-tellers.

Turner (1971:132) states that the Witches have a real objective existence in the play, but it is equally obvious that there exists a very special relationship between Macbeth and the Witches, which can be illustrated by a comparison between the Witches' effect on Macbeth and their lack of effect on Banquo. He will remain loyal to Duncan, whereas Macbeth will not. It would be easy for the senior secondary learner as reader to relate to

these imperfect speakers and the situation in general due to the fact that he “sees” them and can be influenced by them. Although they no longer see them as witches they are represented as evil influences. Following these influences will eventually lead to self-destruction of Macbeth as well as for the senior secondary learner as reader should s/he be unable to do what is right in his own life.

Macbeth’s relationship with the Witches is not just a psychological dependence, but also a dramatic symbiosis. He internalises the Witches so that they become a principle of his own conduct. What the Witches say to Macbeth is in some respects what Macbeth says to himself.

Once more the senior secondary learner as reader will be able to identify with this issue seeing that usually one tends to justify one’s deeds in one’s own eyes. Thus, the Witches deal with the future that can psychologically be seen as representing the imagination. But Macbeth does not imagine the Witches, they represent his imagination. One cannot, in Shakespeare’s view, disturb the moral structure of the universe without the possibility of a convulsion among its physical laws. If one commits a crime that is morally utterly repugnant (killing the King), one should not be surprised by the sheer horror of the physical consequences (the image of Birnam Wood coming to Dunsinane). Mack (1977:27) states that though the political and personal questions remain important, in Macbeth’s experience one comes to see killing the king as a dramatic correlative for the thrust of anarchies of every kind against authority both external and internal. He becomes imprisoned in the tyrannical authority of his own unrestricted ambition and

egotism. Killing the king gradually becomes a kind of lens in which all manner of political, social, moral, psychological, metaphysical and religious questions are focussed.

The blasphemy of Macbeth is that he rebels against sacred and essential ordinances of creation. According to Danson (1977:134) in Macbeth's world of apparently inherent ambiguity, the one perfectly unambiguous thing is the murder of Duncan. From the start it is conceived as just that: Not sacrifice or revenge, but murder. The sin of Macbeth is not merely against the sacred human statute, but against the laws of creation itself. From the moment of the murder to the end of the play, life increasingly ceases to hold any human significance or meaning for *Macbeth*. Ironically, the *tomorrow* for which Macbeth committed his crime will never come and because Macbeth has been living on a construct of false meanings, his life has become meaningless.

In Macbeth history, as well as crime, is shown through personal experience. It is a matter of decision, choice and compulsion. Crime is committed on personal responsibility and has to be executed with one's own hands. Macbeth murders Duncan himself (Kott, 1964:76).

Having suppressed a rebellion, Macbeth is placed near the throne. He can become king and in pursuit of this ambition and because it seems that things will not come right for him, he kills the rightful sovereign. He then kills the witness to the crime and those who suspect it. He kills the sons and friends of those he has killed. Later he must kill everybody, for everybody is against him. In the end he will be killed himself. Thus,

in literary terms, tragedy is the drama of high seriousness. It deals with the most profound and universal problems of man, and especially with man's relationship to forces greater than himself. Tragedy is relentlessly honest in the way in which

it faces these fundamental issues: there is no comforting softening of the impact of the truly tragic (Combrink, 1998:20).

The plot of *Macbeth* does not differ from those of the Histories. Shakespeare illustrates with relentless honesty that Macbeth is history's nightmare.

It goes without saying that

if the catharsis of the tragedy is to be complete, we must be made to feel both that Macbeth is being killed in a just cause and that his state of mind and the circumstances of his death are such as befit a man who, for all his crimes, has not altogether lost our pity and good will (Crane, 1977:73).

The persuasive dramatic representation of the ambiguous theme of fair and foul demonstrates to the senior secondary learner as reader the universality of the notion of bringing down upon oneself a retribution on a scale that is hard to imagine. It holds the spectator/reader spellbound, and effects the kind of catharsis suggested by Aristotle (1967). In no uncertain terms it indicates that society has rules which need to be obeyed in order to live in peace and harmony with yourself and those around you. What it boils down to is the fact that *Macbeth* will immediately become a contemporary when these real-life issues are recognised and their intrinsic value appreciated.

5.3.1.2 Sleepwalking and ghosts in *Macbeth*

It goes without saying that dreams, ghosts and apparitions were, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, among the greatest dramatic delights in the works of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, and these delights will be enjoyed equally by the senior

secondary learner as reader once the full dramatic significance of their involvement becomes clear. What makes Shakespeare even more astonishing is that he had the superb imagination to give them a multitude of forms and to discover contrivances for their use that are as charming or awesome in spectacle as they are rich in meaning (Arthos, 1977:9). This particular issue can form an exciting starting point in the literature class.

Shakespeare thinks of the visionary as inherent in the character and it includes the supernatural in the representation of history. Arthos (1977:9) argues that if one acknowledges the suggestion of powers one is induced to think of them as apparitions of fate or destiny. Yet, he warns that one must never settle for abstractions.

When in a crisis many people are inclined to rely on visions, dreams and even superstitions for moral support. In Elizabethan times the trust in a recourse to the soul's pure truth was rooted in aspiration as much as in knowledge. The assurance of satisfaction or the possibility of defeat was defined in the extremes of heavenly rewards and hellish deprivations (Arthos, 1977:11). When one is drawn to consider philosophical as well as metaphysical matters one is inevitably reminded that once it was common to admire Shakespeare's learning while denying him intellectual power.

What comes strikingly to the fore is that most scenes take place at night - indeed, at all hours of the night. There is late night, midnight and the small hours of dawn. Night is ever-present. Macbeth has murdered sleep and can sleep no more (Act 2, Scene 2, lines 41-43).

According to Knights (1977:87), Macbeth defines a particular kind of evil - the evil that results from a lust for power. It is certainly not an abstract formulation, but lies rather in the drawing out of necessary consequences and implications of that lust both in the external and the spiritual world. Its meaning is revealed in the expansion and unfolding of what lies within the initial evil in terms of direct human experience. Only when intellect, emotion and a kind of direct sensory awareness work together can one enter fully into the exploratory and defining process. Although night is ever-present in *Macbeth* the evil forces that accompany the night will demonstrate to the senior secondary learner as reader how easily wrong choices can be made and how difficult it could be to then do what is morally right. Throughout the play Lady Macbeth and then Macbeth dedicate themselves formally to evil, and more specifically to the powers of evil.

5.3.2 *Disorder in Macbeth*

Banquo describes the witches as “wild” and thus prepares the way for another important theme in the play: that of order and disorder. At the political level this is demonstrated by Macbeth’s tyrannical reign of terror that is replaced by the legitimate restoration of the throne of Malcolm. This political disorder is accompanied by a complete breakdown of moral order within the soul of Macbeth that is initiated, nurtured, sustained and represented by the witches. As has been said one of the central concerns in *Macbeth* is the disunity and disorder that the murder of King Duncan brings to Scotland. The play is

very explicit in the connection it insistently forges between the actions of Macbeth and those of Lucifer (as vividly portrayed in the contemporary play by Christopher Marlowe, *Dr. Faustus*). The figure of the former angel who had fallen from heaven, found himself brought down to hell. At its most fundamental level, the murder of Duncan results in the overthrow of a social structure based on principles of one sort and its replacement by another structure based on principles of an opposite sort (Hawkes, 1977:4). The urge to strive for political power makes Shakespeare indeed a contemporary due to the fact that the political stage in South Africa tends to dominate excessively at times in our country. The senior secondary learner as reader will definitely be able to identify with *Macbeth* and the problems that characters encounter.

After the murder, and because of it, the traditionally ordered society in which the guarantee of each man's position resides in the monarch's own supremacy is replaced by a society in which the only guarantee seems to reside in the exercise of brute force. Thus, disorder replaces order. The play's imagery recurrently presents Scotland as sick, incapacitated and wholly diseased.

The rhythms, phrases and metaphors seem to embody an established and accepted scheme of values and an organic authenticated harmony pertaining between humanity and the natural world. When attempting a translation of *Macbeth* it is essential to maintain the rhythm, especially when dealing with the witches. The most outstanding phrases were kept in English in order for the senior secondary learner as reader to identify with the original *Macbeth*. Metaphors as well as imagery were kept alive throughout where

possible in order to retain the uniquely Shakespearean characteristics embedded in *Macbeth*. It goes without saying that all these features can indeed make Shakespeare a contemporary the senior secondary learner as reader can relate to.

5.4 Contemporary allusions and the senior secondary learner as reader

In order to make Shakespeare “real” for the senior secondary learner as reader, and not only senseless words on a page, strategies had to be devised to make *Macbeth* a life-like character who can be enjoyed by anyone in Afrikaans. To achieve this goal I found that it is not sufficient to deal only with linguistic problems that may be experienced but rather the drama had to be seen as a holistic artefact. In order to achieve the proposed paradigm shift it was regarded as indispensable to invoke other options in order to make *Macbeth* more accessible for the senior secondary learner as reader.

5.4.1 Macbeth and updated dress

Macbeth, being a historical play, posed some unique problems. Updated dress was considered and reconsidered until the conclusion was reached that it was not the intention of the translation to strip *Macbeth* of his socio-historical background. Therefore, other ways had to be found to make *Macbeth* a contemporary with whom the senior secondary learner as reader could relate. Thus, another option was considered and the conclusion reached that *Macbeth* should indeed remain a socio-historical play although contemporary illustrations were used to help with the visualising process. Furthermore,

when looking at the illustrations in *Macbeth* the idea that will hopefully cross the mind of the senior secondary learner as reader will be that this person lived a long time ago, but still we are still encountering similar problems. Indeed, this makes Shakespeare a writer not for a time, but for all ages. One has to keep in mind that significant changes in costume can cause significant changes in character interpretation and behaviour that can bring to light new facets of character and new insight into the meaning of the play as a whole (McMullan, 1974:145). It is important that the characters of *Macbeth* should be visualised as people representing the present. This need not be achieved by updated dress, rather, it will influence the way they walk and talk as well as their perception of the world. Thus, the content of Shakespeare's plays tends to be seen, heard and felt more realistically and should be experienced with more immediacy and applicability. The crux of the problem lies in a play's meaning and purpose as written by Shakespeare and communication of the play which will bridge the centuries between the age for which it was written and the age for which it is being produced (McMullan, 1974:149).

The purpose of interpretation is to find a play's essential reality and its viable application to the present time. It has to be kept in mind that Shakespeare speaks to each age differently and this makes him the angel of vision as someone once said.

Great works of art have autonomous existence, independent of the intention and personality of their creators and independent also of the circumstances of the time of their creation, that is the moral of their greatness (Esslin, 1964:xi).

McMullan (1974:150) states that without logical, or at least, conventional form, recognisable characters, intelligible dialogue or a precisely enunciated or demonstrated

theme, the plays can be felt and understood only by an audience/reader who can escape from conventional standards.

It is a truism that Shakespeare has spoken to man in every age in more persuasively permanent terms than is normally possible within the framework of the transient innovations of theatrical production, and his insight into human nature, the beauty of his expression and the depth of his thoughts have survived theatrical vagaries (McMullan, 1974:171).

Felperin (1990:6) asks the crucial question:

With a fully 'methodised' neo-classicism in place, why not adapt Shakespeare's own textual and theatrical practices to it, thereby releasing the light of his genius from the Elizabethan archaisms that partly obscure it?

And answers:

the result, at every level of his Augustan cultural processing, is a radical contemporisation of Shakespeare, a contemporisation that is seen at the same time as a liberation of the eternal form of his work from Elizabethan awkwardness and barbarism.

The act of achieving this contemporisation, then, is the challenge to be achieved within this study, working at various levels at once – language, and dramatic concerns such as style of discourse and the dressing of the stage and the characters.

5.4.2 *Dramatic and theatrical reality*

It has to be kept in mind that there are two very different experiences involved in reading

a play and seeing it performed. This profound difference has to be kept in mind when translating/rewriting a play. Performability is the ultimate goal, but due to various difficulties that might arise it has to be kept consciously in mind that the play will first and foremost most probably be read by the senior secondary learner as reader and then (hopefully) be performed.

A play has no constant theatrical reality. In theatre one can never see Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, one can only see a succession of approximations of it, each of them nearer to or further from some kind of ideal performance, varying from one person to another and likely to be modified each time one hears or sees the play. I personally regard it as essential that a play must first be read due to the fact that one is likely to measure the performance against the impression formed from the printed page. Furthermore, reading will be coloured by personal memories of the performance and one shall be obliged to acknowledge that the potential theatrical effect of a play is part of its significance.

When translating a play one can respond to the possibility that the translation will grow once it has left one's hands and that the play's potential meaning is not limited as the translator is limited, but may profitably expand even in ways that one has not foreseen.

Wells (1970:84) feels that for the senior secondary learner as reader, the point that may emerge is the desirability that plays intended for performance should be approached with an openness that allows for effects not explicit in what is written and consequently also for variety of interpretation. Wells (1970:102) furthermore emphasises that now that

Shakespeare is no longer a popular dramatist in the sense that he was a time ago, extensive cutting is less common than it used to be.

If Shakespeare is, in Jonson's phrase, for all time, this is partly because he demands the collaboration if not the complicity of those who submit themselves to him. He demands not merely intelligence of response, but a more creative response and it demands it from the reader as well as the performer. It is interesting to note that a film, like a naturalistic painting, is closed, final of its age, a period piece, but plays go on growing and developing, having a life of their own. The works of Shakespeare owe something of their power to the fact that they are plays and therefore have no finally defined form. They owe it too to the fact that they are so difficult to grasp in their totality. The pattern of each play is a series of superimposed patterns so complexly interrelated that they can never finally be distinguished one from another. What is not there is difficult to interpret due to the fact that it requires an exercise of the imagination. The plays will continue to be productive of new meanings as long as people continue to perform and to read them. No one will ever tell the final truth about them because there is no final truth to be told. But, if there is no final truth, there are temporary ones that ask to be observed. Keeping in mind that a play is not an allegorical presentation of a philosophical proposition, but there is likely to be an unwritten dimension that can take different forms in the minds of a variety of readers and spectators.

It is a truism that

great plays are inexhaustible, and that we can constantly renew our appreciation of them by reading them, by reading about them, and by seeing them performed (Wells, 1970:113).

Our modern texts represent a reasonable approximation of what Shakespeare wrote. In most cases it will no doubt be what he actually wrote, although one cannot always be sure just what the words sounded like on stage or how closely drama recaptured the spoken idiom. Drama selects from the language of its time and the essence is to sound spontaneous, to be spoken as if it were not written. The features of the spoken language it contains will be partly deliberate and partly unconscious (Hussey, 1982:9).

5.4.3 *Style*

Elizabethan style reflects less on the speaker than on the occasion, thus representing register. Literary language has already consciously been selected from normal usage so that register and style can be seen to overlap.

Drama does not readily lend itself to a continuous use of technique. What Shakespeare often does is to use deliberate colloquialism to deflate rather obviously poetic language. Puns are common in Shakespeare although they are by no means confined to the funny situations. Hussey (1982:140) feels that Shakespeare's imagination sometimes worked through puns and that the puns frequently have not only a local significance but also a wider dramatic function such as characterisation or emphasising a dominant idea in the play. Shakespeare also made considerable use of features of contemporary colloquial English, many of which correspond to those of our own day as can be seen in the

translation of *Macbeth*. But he was also sensitive to the vocabulary and syntax of special registers. He fused these to achieve a literary idiolect of considerable complexity but of an immensely persuasive nature. Thus, translation of style and register in Shakespeare's plays contributes to make *Macbeth* a contemporary the senior secondary learner as reader can relate to.

5.5 Is Shakespeare still our contemporary?

Crucial contemporary issues have been dealt with in this chapter, but the need remains to answer the final question and that is whether Shakespeare has become a contemporary for the senior secondary learner as reader?

Zurowski (1989:169) postulates that Shakespeare has sometimes been our contemporary and could be so in future, but only on condition that he be translated into the questions of our time and takes on the colour of our historical personality. If one wants to say that Shakespeare is our contemporary today, one has to describe how he reflects changes that are happening now.

What makes Shakespeare even more fascinating is the fact that he tells everything, but he does not tell it to the end. The riddle of Shakespeare is the riddle of our times and so Shakespeare is not (yet, really) our contemporary, but he is waiting for us to make him contemporary, as he has always waited in the past (Zurowski, 1989:171).

One has to keep in mind that Shakespeare lived at a time, as we do now, of grand transformations. Schumacher (1989:174) states that he was a contemporary of those who were destroying the Ptolemaic system. He was a contemporary of those who were, for the first time, going round the world. We share with Shakespeare that sense of living in a time of radical and irreversible change.

Robertson (1989:175) feels that one is always in the process of recreating Shakespeare in one's own image and to that extent he will go on being our contemporary. Another point that needs mentioning is the fact that Shakespeare was utterly thorough in describing his characters and in showing the situation from all sides. In many plays by Shakespeare, one finds the interesting fact that people who are innately good, such as Macbeth, Hamlet and so forth, blunder all the time. They destroy themselves and those around them. It is indeed a paradox, but it is the paradox of Shakespeare (Anikst, 1989:180).

Interestingly and contemporary enough, Shakespeare is the one who wants us to do our own thinking and he placed a lot of vital issues before us. Therefore, the worst way of interpreting Shakespeare is to say that he meant this or that and to give a formula for interpreting his work. All that the senior secondary learner as reader has to do is believe in Shakespeare, believe in his greatness, believe in his broad outlook and believe in his ability to put into one play a whole world with all its contradictions, contrasts and problems.

5.6 Is Shakespeare (ultimately) translatable?

There can be no doubt whatsoever that Shakespeare is translatable. Kruger (2000) investigated this issue thoroughly when she compared the lexical cohesion of three translated versions of the *Merchant of Venice*. Various translations into different forms demonstrate persuasively that the texts can be translated, but the pointed question is whether one can translate the text in a way that will specifically appeal to the senior secondary reader.

It goes without saying that there will be a price to pay when translating *Macbeth* into Afrikaans in the sense that metaphor and puns may be sacrificed in order to achieve more immediate understanding. Thus, to make Shakespeare more accessible, part of the common parlance, it is the duty of literary translators to translate Shakespeare's works in such a way that they become comprehensible and contemporary for the putative readership. The common advantage we share with Shakespeare is that it remains incontrovertibly true that languages have more in common than meets the eye. When translating drama, the most important facet is that it should not sound like a translation and should obviously never be translated in the third language². Derrida's (1981) description recapitulates it best when he states that the verbal body cannot be translated. Dropping that body (and therefore emphasising the internal knowledge that accompanies literature) is the essential energy of literary translation.

Deprats (1989:52) advocates that the letter and the meaning be tightly linked and in this

sense translation can only be a betrayal, even if this kind of betrayal is necessary for cultural exchange and communication in general. Therefore, translation can come close to the demands of the original, but there can be no total circumscription. He feels that the translator experiences the urge to translate and the impossibility of translation although I personally feel that bridging the gap is the ultimate challenge for the literary translator.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to recognise and/or to translate all the puns in Shakespeare's works. To me, this is not the main issue although it cannot be disregarded completely. When translating puns you either have to stick to the philological translation and leave out some of the puns, or you decide not to impoverish the text and put in another pun near the one which you couldn't translate, persuading yourself that this is the way in which Shakespeare might have punned under the circumstances (Fried, 1989:36). This was also improvised in the *Macbeth* translation in Afrikaans where imagery of clothing did not translate as fluently and was replaced by imagery of feathers at times due to the fact that it is closer to the Afrikaans idiom.

Anikst (1989:44) argues that Shakespeare is no longer staged in the complete text. He substantiates his argument by stating that directors cut him at the National Theatre, at the Royal Shakespeare Company and even more with six-act tragedies. This is exactly one of the reasons why it was decided, in the present rewritten version, to cut certain parts of *Macbeth*. It is also quite credible that the drama translator should consider the needs of the putative readership rather than making equilinear³ translations that will neither be

² In other words the idiom has to be correct otherwise it would sound artificial.

³ Line by line translations.

fully understood nor read.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to translate a Shakespearean text and do justice to the original at the same time, but it is possible to do an appealing rewritten version (translation) of Shakespeare, more specifically *Macbeth*, that the senior secondary learner as reader can relate to. Lastly, Shakespeare translates well due to the fact that if one looks at the behaviour patterns in Shakespeare and his profound understanding of the psychology of his characters, it goes without saying that his plays are not outdated and that the behavioural patterns of his characters tend to coincide with general behaviour.

5.7 Conclusion

The issue that once again comes to mind is indeed how to make Shakespeare, more specifically *Macbeth*, a contemporary in the true sense of the word. There is no doubt in my mind that Shakespeare is indeed a contemporary and this issue has been demonstrated in chapter 1.

As has been said, the senior secondary learner as reader in this time of South Africa's history is experiencing antagonism in reading Shakespeare for the obvious reason that he or she does not understand Shakespearean language and style – indeed, the unmediated Shakespearian text is often an impenetrable wall to the reader in this category. Therefore, it is crucial that a mediation be effected in order to provide a bridge to jump this chasm. It has to be kept in mind that the ultimate goal remains the reading and enjoying of

Macbeth in English.

It may be argued that it takes a year to study a Shakespearean play and studying it in Afrikaans might take another year and that it is therefore too time-consuming. This is definitely not the case and indeed not the intention of this study.

In order to understand exactly why it is crucial and valid to study *Macbeth* in Afrikaans the following rationalisation is provided:

- it presupposes a better understanding of the plot in *Macbeth*;
- learners will be able to understand the language, encouraging them further to visualise the play more naturally;
- the *Verteller* and *Einstein* have the predominant purpose to give additional information and to stimulate essential thoughts regarding *Macbeth*;
- contemporary illustrations make visualising of the plot in *Macbeth* a natural experience for the senior secondary learner as reader;
- due to the fact that less important scenes (meaning that they don't contribute to the main plot in the play), characters and lines were left out give the senior secondary learner as reader ample opportunity to concentrate on the main characters as well as on the plot in *Macbeth*;
- the latter serves another important function: due to the fact that the play is indeed shorter (in acknowledgement of the fact that the concentration span of the senior secondary learner as reader will be more intense if not extended unduly) as well as the fact that it is immediately comprehensible (seeing that the learner is able to experience *Macbeth* first-hand in the mother-tongue) will mean that it would take no longer than four weeks to study the play as an introduction to *Macbeth* in English;
- it goes without saying that learners will be more eager to read the original in less time than planned due to the fact that crucial obstacles have been dealt with in Afrikaans;
- Although *Macbeth* in Afrikaans might be used for a certain period of time, it can be regarded as invaluable throughout the year to refer to issues that might have slipped the reader's mind; and
- furthermore, the OBE subject policy for the senior secondary phase leaves efficient opportunity in class for role play, dramatisation, introducing life skills and values, and so forth. In other words, *Macbeth* in Afrikaans need not be restricted to literature education in English, but can be expanded to various fields of learning.

To recapitulate, Shakespeare can be seen as a contemporary the senior secondary learner as reader can relate to. The principal aim of reading or for that matter, performing, is not just to illuminate and become the brief chronicle of the time. It is also to aid the process of social change.

In the ensuing chapter the threads will be brought together, and the final rationale provided for the particular method and approach chosen for the present rewriting of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans for the particular target audience.

CHAPTER 6

THE WAY AHEAD

*I have begun to plant thee, and will labour
To make thee full of growing.*

6.1 Introduction

To recapitulate, in this thesis various issues were investigated in order to demonstrate that Shakespeare can and should be rewritten in contemporary Afrikaans. The main objective was to introduce Shakespeare as a contemporary to the senior secondary learner as reader. I was only able to translate *Macbeth* as a true companion after the following issues had been addressed:

- Literary competence and the senior secondary learner as reader;
- Focussing on the senior secondary learner as reader;
- Drama perspectives and the senior secondary learner as reader;
- Textual communication and the senior secondary learner as reader; and
- Shakespeare as a contemporary in relation to the senior secondary learner as reader.

In this chapter a recapitulation of these issues will form a framework for the recommendations that will also follow, the emphasis being on the paradigm shift introduced throughout this chapter as well as on the envisaged contribution of this study.

6.2 Textual communication and the senior secondary learner as reader

As has been said, translating drama means facing most of the difficulties encountered

in translating any other literary genre. When translating drama, not only the meaning of a word or sentence must be translated but a whole transformations process takes place which includes translation of connotations, imagery, jargon, register and style. It is essential that these statements need to be taken into consideration when translating drama due to the fact that the senior secondary learner as reader must be able to understand the drama immediately and directly.

After considering aspects of textual communication closely, it was realised that it is not only the written word but also the spoken word that counts. In literary pragmatic terms the drama only becomes a meaningful discourse at the time when it is being read. In other words, it is crucial that the reader builds an interpersonal and socio-cultural context with the text. Thus, one is indeed dealing with the interpretation of signs on different levels due to the fact that these signs are speaking to the reader and should be taken into serious consideration when translating *Macbeth*. It goes without saying that pragmatics plays an indelible role in literary translation. It is crucial to realise that it is not only the text that communicates to the reader but also that the reader learns to communicate ideas and beliefs because of the text.

Furthermore, the influence of deixis must not be underestimated. It has to be realised that deictic terms are not devoid of semantic meaning, but definitely form a link between truth-conditional semantics and context-dependent pragmatics. Therefore, pragmatics is seen as logically prior to semantics, with deixis seen as a variable. The symbolic meaning of a deictic term refers to its place in the language system.

It was demonstrated that it is essential that the text should communicate with the

senior secondary learner as reader. This can only be done if cognisance is taken of all the various aspects mentioned in chapter 4. Furthermore, it is clear that if the present-day-language is so far removed from that of the original text communication is no longer possible. Furthermore, the number of different contexts has to be taken into account when translating *Macbeth*. The leading role of the facilitator cannot be underestimated in the teaching of drama. Yet, it should always be kept in mind that the main aim of the translation is to serve as an introduction to the original *Macbeth*.

6.3 The senior secondary learner as reader - résumé

Throughout this thesis drama as genre was approached from an angle that would make it possible to introduce *Macbeth* as a contemporary. Emphasis was on the senior secondary learner as reader and how the reading process will influence his/her way of thinking and interpreting the text. As has been said, literary competence implies a degree of familiarity with particular cultural conventions. Although other cultures and times have placed different values on literature it was regarded as crucial to scrutinise the way that the contemporary senior secondary learner as reader would experience Shakespeare in order to introduce the paradigm shift. Therefore, it was important to focus on the way *Macbeth* was received in the classroom by the senior secondary learner as reader. It goes without saying that the text (*Macbeth*) is the essential element in the reading act - if the latter can be enjoyed understanding will follow in a more natural way. If this notion is understood, one could then urge that the facilitator should first facilitate the learner in *how* to read before the *reading* can actually start. It should be realised that literary texts are definitely much more than the printed words on the page. In order to complete this circle of understanding

literary – as well as psycho-analysis of the text and the reader formed integral issues of this study.

It was emphasised that new ways of thinking by the facilitator as well as the senior secondary learner as reader have to be introduced in the study of drama so as to acknowledge the unique individuality of the mind and emotions of the role players. It was emphasised that the learner can only become a reader by virtue of his/her activity in relationship to the text, which he interprets pragmatically.

Macbeth as a network is controlled by the classroom situation. Therefore, it is essential that a positive flow of energy should be experienced when reading and interpreting this play. In other words, emphasis was not on mass or impersonal interpretation, but on acknowledging the perceptions, feelings, associations and interpretation of the individual senior secondary learner as reader. One way of creating this force of energy could be by reading and enjoying as a pre-reading activity a contemporary translation of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans.

Although it has already been mentioned it is essential to reiterate that a contemporary rewriting is only one of the ways that can be used to introduce Shakespeare to the senior secondary learner as reader. It goes without saying that diversity among learners is indeed a major challenge and this point indeed creates a gap to introduce new and different teaching methods. *Macbeth* in Afrikaans has a place in the subject policy seeing that the focus is no longer on right and wrong answers, but rather on individual response and the way in which learning experiences can accrue and lead to a new and integrated view of the world.

Learners should be psychologically prepared when reading literature. They should be encouraged to see literature as a holistic artefact in order to appreciate the aesthetic value of a play such as *Macbeth*. The conclusion arrived at is that the senior secondary learner as reader will gain literature competence by understanding what is read. One of the ways to gain competence and enjoyment when reading Shakespeare is by radical rewriting in the mother-tongue. Learners should take cognisance of the socio-historical composition of *Macbeth* and be able to relate to the play on its various levels. Therefore, literature competence is essential and the gap between reader and text will widen if the paradigm shift is longer ignored by facilitators and authorities.

Senior secondary learners as readers should be guided on how to take back their authority when reading literature. They should be led to realise their reader-identity and that it implies reader-responsibility. This will lead to insight in literary work as well as the realisation that literature can no longer be seen as linguistic symbols but rather as a holistic artefact where various meanings can be evoked. *Macbeth* will literally jump to life if this paradigm shift is realised and when reading is done from a holistic angle. In other words, focus should be on the role of the individual reader and the active role of the imagination in the reading process in order to gain insight in drama as genre. Thus, it is conceivable if not inevitable that readers should take back some of their authority when reading literature, more specifically, *Macbeth* in the mother-tongue.

Therefore, it is essential that a communicative and representational approach should be followed in the classroom. This will imply discussion, reflection and consideration

of meaning when reading *Macbeth*. Drama is a text of speech and learners should be encouraged to reconstruct and then deconstruct this genre. This can only be fully implemented and understood if a pre-reading question is formulated to encourage learners to discover what they do know. This will prevent the active, synthesising aspect of the reading process to go unnoticed in the senior secondary classroom. Thus, if their frameworks of reference coincide Shakespeare can indeed become a contemporary they can relate to.

Foulkes (1975:15) enumerates more common approaches that describe literary understanding:

- a literary text is the product of a given community which exists at a certain time, its meaning is determinate and should be identified with the meaning attached to it by its historical contemporaries. The task of the translator is to reconstruct these time-bound meanings with the greatest possible degree of demonstrable accuracy;
- the meaning of a literary work is determinate, but is to be identified with the linguistic intentions of the writer;
- since one usually possesses only the text itself, and can merely speculate on authorial intention or contemporary reception, one can construe meaning only by looking at the text. Interpretation is a hypothesis about meanings inherent in the semantic and syntactic structure of the text; and
- there is no such thing as determinate meaning which can reasonably be accepted as the object of an interpretive method. If a reader succeeds in construing any meaning which s/he deems interesting or valuable, then s/he has enjoyed an aesthetic experience with which prescriptive approaches should not try to interfere.

Clearly, there are no impassably distinct lines of demarcation between any two historical periods. It is my view that the translator needs to accommodate these needs and it is assumed that it will most likely inspire the reader to read *Macbeth* in Afrikaans as well as in English.

6.4 Drama perspectives and the senior secondary learner as reader - recapitulation

It has been demonstrated that various and dominant views influence drama translation and that the profound role of the senior secondary learner as reader needs to be succinctly emphasised. Therefore, contemporary rewritings definitely have a place in the subject policy if the paradigm shift should be successfully introduced. Furthermore, it was demonstrated that translation will always be rewriting and will reflect a certain ideology and poetics. The aim of a contemporary rewriting is to communicate the meaning of the SL text in the natural form of the TL text. It goes without saying that the corpus text has to be studied as a holistic artefact and definitely not individual aspects. From this point onwards language structures and imagery can be studied as natural result of empowered knowledge gained by the learners.

It was found that contemporary rewriting necessarily resembles creativity that influenced various facets and aspects of this thesis. Translation is indeed a creative process in the sense that the drama translator seeks to provide the same experience for the reader as the original provided for the translator. It has been realised that creativity is one of the many paradoxes of translation. Therefore, left- and right-brain functioning has to be realised and acknowledged by the facilitator. Furthermore, authorities have to realise that contemporary translations grow old and need to be revised regularly in order to keep track of the senior secondary learners' and readers' changing needs. This means that it is virtually impossible to create an Eitemal-and-Coertze translation due to the reason that certain features need to be added when

translating *Macbeth* and certain features need to be left out. It is my view that the translation of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans can be used fruitfully in the senior secondary phase and, furthermore, I believe that learners will enjoy the new and exciting approach. It goes without saying that the putative reader's socio-historical background can no longer be ignored but needs to be acknowledged. This will necessarily mean that when one acknowledges certain truths about the learners the literature experience will need to be adapted accordingly. It is the aim of the translation not only to reach the "brainy" learners but actually to reach the majority. Shakespeare can be enjoyed by everyone providing that they understand the language and register it is written in.

Unfortunately,

translation has tended to be regarded as the poor relation, as an activity involving little talent and creativity, as something that could be carried out by trained hacks and financially rewarded accordingly (Bassnett, 1993:138).

After taking these various drama perspectives and views into account it is now deemed necessary to provide a framework for a cultural model of translation that focuses especially on the needs of the contemporary senior secondary learner as reader for drama translation in Afrikaans:

- a non-prescriptive, intercultural communication model for a socio-historical play, such as *Macbeth*, is the way to go;
- equivalence between the ST and the TT will necessarily differ from period to period and from language culture to language culture. As Lefevere said, rewriting remains a cultural given at a given time. Therefore, a radical rewriting of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans will differ from my own version in time to come;
- contemporary literary translation should be seen as a holistic artefact and not as separated clusters of functions and ideas. Therefore, the translator should work on the level of the culture as a whole;
- the translator should operate in the interest of the culture within which s/he

translates;

- the translator should concentrate on the socio-literary status of the text due to the fact that translation parameters are not fixed;
- whether the translator uses the terms norms, equivalence, sameness, etc. they all refer to the translational relation that exists between the ST and the TT;
- when rewriting a play, such as *Macbeth*, the translator continuously and unconsciously tries to fill the cultural gaps. Therefore, linguistic and literary norms must be made part of an overall polysystem of cultural modes and codes; and
- last but not the least, the translator will always remain the mediator between the ST and the TT.

What is therefore presented is a new and exciting way of introducing Shakespeare to the senior secondary learner as reader. Various views were scrutinised and different translation methods considered. Being a facilitator myself it was easy to pinpoint weaknesses in literature teaching. Furthermore, the knowledge gained in this thesis convinced me that there is a bigger and greater alternative to literature teaching. Being introduced to the OBE methods as well also encouraged me to expand my expectations in the literature class and it soon became apparent that there is a way ahead if only authorities could realise that Shakespeare's tomorrows need to become Shakespeare's todays in order to create a Shakespeare that is indeed for all times and ages.

6.5 Shakespeare as a contemporary and the senior secondary learner as reader

It was demonstrated in this chapter that it is essential that the senior secondary learner as reader should be able to relate to Shakespeare in order to regard him as a contemporary. It was felt that it is crucial to take full account of various theories and issues in order to relate to Shakespearean development. The influence Shakespeare

had on the various theories will always be immense and should not be underestimated. *Macbeth* can only be regarded as a contemporary if the translator takes full cognisance of the theories that have impinged on drama and literature. Although the senior secondary learner as reader will not be aware of what is going on back stage the translator will definitely not be able to disregard influential views.

Furthermore, it is essential that the translator should not only have knowledge of the various theories, but should also be in touch with Shakespeare's world and ideas. This means that s/he should have in-depth knowledge of Shakespeare's plays in order to translate humour, puns and Shakespeare's language.

If cognisance is taken of the theories and the drama itself one can reach the conclusions that Shakespeare is indeed a contemporary and needs to be introduced in a new and exciting way to the senior secondary learner as reader.

It was demonstrated that Shakespeare can be our contemporary and can indeed be for all ages and times. But, this is only possible if Shakespeare is translated into different languages. Furthermore, it is my humble view that Shakespeare can only be a contemporary for the senior secondary learner as reader if s/he is able to relate to the drama. One way of creating a brand new relationship between the senior secondary learner as reader and Shakespeare is by means of contemporary rewriting on the level of the reader. This is not only possible but can strongly be recommended. Fortunately, the subject policy introduces a new paradigm shift and the time to introduce this change is now.

6.6 Conclusion

The main findings of this research, viz. that issues such as the role of the reader, the influence of drama perspectives, textual communication as well as the fact that Shakespeare should be dressed as a contemporary do have an effect on contemporary rewriting for the senior secondary learner as reader. The contribution of this study has hopefully been to demonstrate that these findings should be acknowledged and implemented in the interests of viable and exciting teaching of Shakespeare in South Africa. Furthermore, it was demonstrated in this thesis that various issues play a role when translating *Macbeth* for the senior secondary learner as reader. Suggestions have been made and conclusions reached in this chapter and the translation itself is intended to act as an example of the type of translation considered suitable, within the framework of this study, to inculcate in young readers an interest in and enthusiasm for Shakespeare. One can only hope that authorities will realise the importance of accommodating this mode of thought into thinking on the subject policies in question and move towards the kind of paradigm shift advocated here. Due to the fact that more crucial issues need to be investigated in contemporary rewriting further studies in this field can strongly be recommended.

One can indeed not help but state that

no utterance is ever complete, or can be completed, the final word can never be spoken.

LIST OF SOURCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

LAMB, C & M. s.d. Some tales from Shakespeare. London: Review of Reviews.

SHAKESPEARE, W. s.d. The children's Shakespeare. (*ed.* Mee, A. London: Amalgated Press.)

SHAKESPEARE, W. 1948. Macbeth. Translated by Coertze, L.I. London: Review of Reviews.

SHAKESPEARE, W. 1965. Macbeth. Translated by Eitemal. Kaapstad: Human & Rousseau.

SHAKESPEARE, W. 1979. Macbeth. *ed.* F.C.H. Rumboll. Cape Town: Maskew Miller.

STOPPARD, T. 1980. Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth. London: Faber & Faber.

SECONDARY SOURCES

AERS, L. & WHEALE, N. 1991. Shakespeare in the changing curriculum. London/New York: Routledge.

ALEXIEVA, B. 1993. A cognitive approach to translation equivalence. (*in* Zlateva, P. *ed.* Translation as Social Action. London/New York: Routledge. pp.101-109.)

ANIKST, A. 1989. Should Shakespeare be buried or born again. (*in* Elsom, J. *ed.* Shakespeare is still our contemporary. London/New York: Routledge. pp.169-184.)

ANIKST, A. 1989. Does Shakespeare translate. (*in* Elsom, J. *ed.* Shakespeare is still our contemporary. London/New York: Routledge. pp.35-63.)

ARTHOS, J. 1977. Shakespeare's use of dream and vision. London: Bowes & Bowes.

ATKINSON, D. & BIBER, D. 1994. Register: A review of empirical research. (*in* Biber, D & Finegan, E. *eds* Sociolinguistic Perspectives on register. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.

351-373.)

BAKER, M. 1993. Corpus linguistics and translation studies; implications and applications. (in Baker, M., Francis, G. & Tognini-Bonelli, E. eds *Text and Technology: In honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's, pp. 233-250.)

BAKHTIN, M.M. 1985. *The formal method in literary scholarship: a critical introduction to sociological poetics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

BANNET, E.T. 1993. The scene of translation: After Jakobson, Benjamin, de Man and Derrida. *New Literary History*, 24:577-595, Summer.

BARKER, J. & HULME, PP. 1985. Nymphs and reapers heavily vanish: The discursive contexts of *The Tempest*. (in Drakakis, J. ed. *Alternative Shakespeare*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.191-205.)

BASSNETT, S. 1990. Translating for the theatre – textual complexities. *Essays in Poetics*. 15(1):71-83.

BASSNETT, S. 1991. *Translation studies*. London/New York: Routledge.

BASSNETT, S. 1993. *Comparative literature: A critical introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

BASSNETT, S. & LEFEVERE. A. 1993. General editors' preface. (in Gentzler, E. *Contemporary translation theories*. London/New York: Routledge. pp. ix-x.)

BASSNETT, S. & LEFEVERE, A. 1993. General editor's preface. (in Zlateva, P.P. *Translation as social action*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.vii-viii.)

BASSNETT-McGUIRE, S. 1978. Translating spatial poetry: an examination of theatre texts in performance. (in Holmes, J.S. Lambert, J. & Van den Broeck, R (eds) *Literature and translation: New perspectives in literary studies*. Leuven: Acco. pp. 161-176.)

BASSNETT-McGUIRE, S. 1985. Ways through the labyrinth: strategies and methods for translating theatre texts. (in Hermans T. *The manipulation of literature: studies in Literary*

Translation. London: Croom Helm, pp 87-102.)

BASSNETT-McGUIRE, S. 1991. Translation Studies. 2nd revised edition. London: Methuen.

BEGAM, R. 1992. Splitting the *Différance*: Beckett, Derrida and the Unnamable. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 38(4): 873-892. Winter.

BIBER, D. 1994. An analytical framework for register studies. (in Biber, D. & Finegan, E. (eds) *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*.) Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 31-56.

BIRCH, D. 1989. 'Working effects with words' - Whose words?: Stylistics and reader intertextuality. (in Carter, R. & Simpson, eds. *Language, discourse and literature*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.259-277.)

BLY, C. 1990. The passionate, accurate story. Milkweed Editions: Minneapolis.

BLY, R. 1983. The eight stages of translation. Boston: Rowan tree press.

BRUMFIT, C. 1989. A literary curriculum in world education. (in Carter. C, Walker, R., et al. eds *Literature and the learner: Methodological approaches*. London: Modern English Publication. pp. 25-29.)

CARSTENS, W.A.M. 1997. Afrikaanse tekslinguistiek: 'n Inleiding. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

CARTER, C. & WALKER, R. 1989. Literature and the Learner: Introduction. (In Carter. C, Walker, R. et. al. eds *Literature and the Learner: Methodological Approaches*. London: Modern English Publications. pp. 1-9.)

CARTER, R. 1996. Look Both Ways Before Crossing: Developments in the Language and Literature Classroom. (In Carter, R. & Mc Rae, J. *Language, Literature and the Learner*. London/New York: Longman. pp. 1-15.)

CARTER, R. & MC RAE, J. 1996. Introduction. (In Carter, R. & Mc Rae, J. *Language, Literature and the Learner*. London/New York: Longman. pp. xix-xxviii.)

- CARTER, R. & SIMPSON, PP. 1989. Introduction. (*In* Carter, R & Simpson, PP. *ed.* Language, Discourse and Literature. London/New York: Routledge. pp.1-22.)
- CATFORD, J. 1965. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CLOETE, T.T. 1984. What is Literatuur? Potchefstroom: Dept. Of Central Publications, PU for CHE.
- CLARKE, L. 2001. Let's not be so Afrocentric that we overlook the value of Shakespeare. *Sunday Tribune*, Feb. 25.
- COETZEE, A.S. 1997. Justifying the Teaching of Shakespeare to ESL in the Junior Secondary Phase. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE. (Dissertation) pp. 121.
- COHEN, D. 1996. The Secret Language of the Mind: A Visual Enquiry into the Mysteries of Consciousness. Duncan Gaird Publishers: London.
- COMBRINK, A.L. Drama: An Outline Guide. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE. pp. 146. (study guide 10/86.)
- CONNERTON, P.P. 1983. Gadamer's Hermeneutics (*In* Schäffer, ed. E.S. Comparative Criticism. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press. pp.107-128.)
- CROSSETT, B. 1983. Using Both Halves of the Brain to Teach the Whole Child. *Social Education*: 47(4):266-268, Apr.
- CURRY, W.C. 1977. The Demonic Metaphysics of Macbeth. (*In* Hawkes, T. *ed.* Twentieth Century Interpretations of Macbeth. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc. pp. 22-29.)
- DANSON, L. 1977. The Language of Macbeth. (*In* Hawkes, T. *ed.* Twentieth Century Interpretations of Macbeth. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc. pp. 133-135.)
- DE BEAUGRANDE, R. 1988. Critical Discourse: A Survey of Literary Theorists. Norwood, N.J: Ablex.
- DELABASTITA, D. 1993. There's a Double Tongue: An Investigation into the Translation

- of Shakespeare's Wordplay, with Special Reference to 'Hamlet'. Rodopi: Amsterdam.
- DELIA, M.A. 1989. High School vs. College English: Radical New Theory Widens the Gapp. *Clearing House*, 62(8):333-336, April.
- DELGADO, R. 1985. Acting with Both Sides of Your Brain: Perspectives on the Creative Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- DELISLE, J. 1988. Translation: An Interpretive Approach. Ottawa/Canada: Ottawa Press.
- DEPRATS, J. 1989. Does Shakespeare Translate (*In* Elsom, J. *ed.* Shakespeare is Still our Contemporary. London/New York: Routledge. pp.35-63.)
- DERRIDA, J. 1979. "Living On" and "Border Lines", trans. James Hulbert (*In* Bloom, Harold *et al.* eds Deconstruction and Criticism. New York: The Seabury Press.)
- DERRIDA, J. 1981. Dissemination. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- DIMITRIU, I. 1997. Interview with Breyten Breytenbach. *Approaches to Translation*, 9(1):68-96, April.
- DOWNES, W. 1991. Discourse and Drama: King Lear's 'question' to his Daughters. (*In* Van Peer, W. *ed.* The Taming of the Text. London/New York: Routledge. pp.225-257.)
- DRAKAKIS, J. 1985. Introduction. (*In* Drakakis, J. *ed.* Alternative Shakespeares. London/New York: Routledge. pp.1-25.)
- DUSSE, C. 1995. The metaphors in Song of songs and adolescents: a reception-theoretical investigation and proposed translation. Proefskrif. PU vir CHO. Potchefstroom.
- EDWARDS, B. 1979. Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain: A Course in Enhancing Creativity and Artistic Confidence. Los Angeles: J.P.P. Tarcher, Inc.
- ELAM, K. 1978. Language in the theater. *Sub-Stance* 18/19: pp. 139-161.
- ELSOM, J. 1989. Is Shakespeare still our Contemporary. London/New York: Routledge.
- EMMOTT, C. 1995. Consciousness and Context-Building: Narrative Inferences and

- Anaphoric Theory. (*In* Keith, G. *ed.* *New Essays on Deixis: Discourse, Narrative, Literature.* Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi. pp. 81-98.)
- ENGLER, B. 1991. Textualization. (*In* Sell, R.D. *ed.* *Literary Pragmatics.* London/New York: Routledge. pp.179-189.)
- ENKVIST, N.E. 1991. On the Interpretability of Texts in General and of Literary Texts in Particular. (*In* Sell, R.D. *ed.* *Literary Pragmatics.* London/New York: Routledge. pp.1-25.)
- ESSLIN, 1964. Introduction. (*In* Kott, J. *ed.* *Shakespeare our Contemporary.* New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc. pp. 241.)
- EVEN-ZOHAR, I. 1990. Polysystem Studies. *Poetics Today* 11(1):1-94.
- FARNHAM, W. 1977. The Witches. (*In* Hawkes, T. *ed.* *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Macbeth.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc. pp. 60-63.)
- FELPERIN, 1990. *The Uses of the Canon: Elizabethan Literature and Contemporary Theory.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- FERGUSSON, F. 1977. Macbeth as the Imitation of an Action. (*In* Hawkes, T. *ed.* *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Macbeth.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc. pp. 67-69.)
- FILLMORE, C.J. 1971. *Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis.* Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- FISH, S. 1987. Literature in the Reader. (*In* Freund, E., *ed.* *The Return of the Reader.* London, New York: Methuen. pp. 90-111.)
- FISH, H. 1989. Playing with Plays: Increasing Student Involvement with Dramatic Texts. (*In* Carter, R. & Walker, R. *et.al.* *eds Literature and the Learner: Methodological Approaches.* London: Modern English Publications. pp. 55-67.)
- FOKKEMA, D.W. 1977. *Theories of Literature in the Twentieth Century.* London: C.

Hurst & Company.

FOKKEMA, D.W. & KUNNE-IBSCH, E. 1977. Theories of literature in the twentieth century: structuralism, Marxism, aesthetics of reception, semiotics. London: Hurst.

FOULKES, A.R. 1975. The Search for Literary Meaning. Bern/Frankfurt: Verlag Herbert Lang.

FRANCESE, J. 1997. Narrating Postmodern Time and Space. New York: State University Press of New York.

FRIED, E. 1989. Does Shakespeare Translate (*In* Elsom, J. *ed.* Shakespeare is Still our Contemporary. London/New York: Routledge. pp.35-63.)

FREUND, E. 1987. The Return of the Reader. London/New York: Methuen.

GENTZLER, E. 1993. Contemporary Translation Theories. London/New York: Routledge.

GERNGROSS, G. & PUCHTA, H. 1992. Creative Grammar Practice. Getting Learners to Use Both Sides of the Brain. Harlow: Longman.

GOSTAND, R. 1980. Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication: Drama as Translation. (*In* Zuber, O. *ed.* The Languages of Theatre: Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama. Oxford: Pergamon Press. pp.1-9.)

GRABE, I. 1979. Teoriee oor hoofaspekte van poetiese taalgebruik. Proefskrif. PU vir CHO. Potchefstroom.

GREEN, K. 1995. New Essays in Deixis. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

GREEN, K. 1995. Deixis: A Revaluation of Concepts and Categories. (*In* Keith, G. *ed.* New Essays on Deixis: Discourse, Narrative, Literature. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi. pp.11-26.)

GREENWOOD, J. 1989. The Problems of Purity: Observations on Prescribed Texts with Special Reference to Greece. (*In* Carter, R. & Walker, R. et. al. eds Literature and the Learner: Methodological Approaches. London: Modern English Publications. pp. 90-111.)

- HALASZ, L. 1987. Cognitive and Social Psychological Approaches to Literary Discourse: An Overview. (*In Halasz, L. ed. Literary Discourse: Aspects of Cognitive and Social Psychological Approaches. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.*)
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. & HASAN, R. 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. & HASAN, R. 1989. Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HALL, G. 1989. Mikhail Bakhtin's Language Based Approach to Literature: A Theoretical Intervention. (*In Carter, C, Walker, R. et. al. Literature and the Learner: Methodological Approaches. London: Modern English Publications. pp.30-38.*)
- HARVEY, S. 1980. Semiotic Perspectives. London: Geare Allen & Unwin.
- HATIM, B & MASON, I. 1991. Discourse and the Translator. London/New York: Longman.
- HAWKES, T. 1977. Twentieth Century Interpretations of Macbeth. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- HAWKES, T. 1992. Meaning by Shakespeare. London/New York: Routledge.
- HEDGES, I. 1980. Translation and Creative Process. *Pacific Quarterly*: 5(1):87-93, Jan.
- HERMAN, V. 1995. Dramatic Dialogue: Dialogue as Interaction in Plays. London: Routledge.
- HERMANS, T. 1991. Translational Norms and Correct Translation. (*In Van Leuven-Zwart, K. & Naaijken, T. eds. Translation Studies. The State of the Art. Amsterdam: Rodopi. pp.155-170.*)
- HERMANS, T. 1985. Translation Studies and a New Paradigm. (*In Hermans, T. ed. The Manipulation of Literature. London/Sydney: Croom Helm. pp. 7-15.*)
- HERVEY, S.G. 1982. Semiotic Perspectives. London: Allen & Unwin.

- HEWSON, L. & MARTIN, J. 1991. *Redefining Translation: The Variational Approach*. London/New York: Routledge.
- HEYLEN, R. 1993. *Translation, Poetics and the Stage*. London/New York: Routledge.
- HOCHÉL, B. 1991. The Cross-Temporal and Cross-Spatial Factors and the Translation of Literary Language (*In Van Leuven-Zwart, K. & Naaijken, T. eds. Translation Studies. The State of the Art*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. pp.41-48.)
- HODGE, R. 1990. *Literature as Discourse*. Baltimore: John's Hopkins University Press.
- HOLMES, J. 1988. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- HOLST, J. 1989. Foregrounding in 'The Wasteland': A Stylistics Approach (*In Carter, R. Walker, R. et. al. eds Literature and the Learner: Methodological Approaches*. London: Modern English Publication. pp. 39-46.)
- HOLUB, R.C. 1984. *Reception theory: a critical introduction*. London: Methuen.
- HOOPER, D.W. 1992. Success Depends on Leaders' 'Whole Brain' Thinking. *School Administrator*, 49(6):14-17, Jun.
- HUSSEY, S.S. 1982. *The Literary Language of Shakespeare*. London/New York: Longman.
- IDOL, L. 1987. A Critical Thinking Map to Improve Content Area Comprehension of Poor Readers. *Remedial and Special Education*, 8(4):28-40, Jul-Aug.
- ISER, W. 1974. *The implied Reader*. Baltimore/London: John's Hopkins University Press.
- ISER, W. 1980. The Indeterminacy of the Text: A Critical Reply. (*In Schaffer, E.S. Comparative Criticism*. London/New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 27-48.)
- ISER, W. 1980. *The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach*. (*In Tompkins, J. ed. Reader-Response Criticism*. Baltimore, London: The Johns Hopkins University Press. pp. 50-69.)

- ISER, W. 1987. The Peripatetic Reader. (*In Freund, F. ed. The Return of the Reader. London, New York: Methuen. pp. 134-151.*)
- JACKENDOFF, R.S. 1992. *Consciousness and the Computational Mind. London: MIT Press.*
- JACKSON, B. 1952. *The Art of Dramatic Criticism. London: Pitman & Sons.*
- JOSEPH, R. 1992. *The Right Brain and the Unconscious: Discovering the Stranger Within. New York: New York Plenum Press.*
- KNIGHTS, L.C. 1977. Macbeth. (*In Hawkes, T. ed. Twentieth Century Interpretations of Macbeth. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc. pp. 107-122.*)
- KEHOE, J. 1996. *Mind Power: Into the 21st Century. Vancouver: Zoetic Inc.*
- KILFOIL, W.R. & VAN DER WALT, C. 1989. *Learn 2 Teach. A Guide to the Communicative Teaching of English as a Second Language. Pretoria: Academica.*
- KLINE, N. 1991. Writing as Translation: The Great Between. *Translation Review: 36(37):4-11.*
- KOTT, J. 1964. *Shakespeare our Contemporary. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.*
- KOSKINEN, K. 1994. (Mis)translating the Untranslatable - The Impact of Deconstruction and Post-Structuralism on Translation Theory. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs/Translators' Journal, 39(3):446-452.*
- KRESS, G. 1976. *Halliday: System and Function of Language. London: Oxford University Press.*
- KRISTEVA, J. 1980. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art. New York: Columbia University Press.*
- KRUGER, A. 1996. The Shakespearean Phase in South Africa: A Socio-cultural Perspective, *Journal of Literary Studies, 12 (4): 408-428, Dec.*

- KRUGER, A. 2000. Lexical Cohesion and Register variation in Translation: 'The Merchant of Venice in Afrikaans. Pretoria: UNISA. (Thesis – Translation Studies) pp.247.
- KUSSMAUL, P. 1995. Training the Translator. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- LAMBERT, J. 1991. Shifts, oppositions and goals in Translation Studies: Towards a genealogy of concepts. In Van Leuven-Zwart, K.M. & Naaijken. T.m(eds) *Translation Studies: The State of the Art*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 25-44.
- LARSON, M.L. 1984. Meaning-based Translation: A guide to Cross-language Equivalence. New York: University Press of America.
- LEFEVERE, A. 1980. Translating Literature/Translated Literature - The State of the Art. (In Zuber, O. ed. *The Languages of Theatre: Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. pp.153-161.)
- LEFEVERE, A. 1980. Translation: Changing the Code: *Soyinka's Ironic Aetiology*. (In Zuber, O. ed. *The Languages of Theatre: Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. pp.132-145.)
- LEFEVERE, A. 1985. Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm (In Herman, T. ed. *The Manipulation of Literature*. London/Sydney: Croom/Helm. pp.215-243.)
- LEFEVERE, A. 1992. *Translation/History/Culture*. London/New York: Routledge.
- LEFEVERE, A. 1992. *Translating Literature*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- LEFEVERE, A. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London/New York: Routledge.
- LEGATT, A. 1988. *Shakespeare's Political Drama*. London/New York: Routledge.

- LILOVA, A. 1993. Categories for the Study of Translation. (*In Zlateva, PP. ed. Translation as Social Action. London/New York: Routledge. pp.5-10.*)
- LINK, F.H. 1980. Translation, Adaptation and Interpretation of Dramatic texts. (*In Zuber, O. ed. The Languages of Theatre: Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama. Oxford: Pergamon Press. pp.24-50.*)
- LOUW, W.E. 1989. Sub-Routines in the Integration of Language and Literature. (*In Carter, R. & Walker, R. et.al. Literature and the Learner: Methodological Approaches. London: Modern English Publications. pp. 47-54.*)
- MACK, M. 1977. Killing the King: Macbeth. (*In Hawkes, T. ed. Twentieth Century Interpretations of Macbeth. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc. pp. 123-125.*)
- MAKUA, A.M. 1989. Taking the fear out of Shakespeare: Approaches to the Teaching of Macbeth. *Educamus*, 35 (6):18-20.
- MANDELBAUM, D.G. 1949 (ed.). Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture and Personality. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- MCCARTHY, M. 1996. Reconstructing and Deconstructing: Drama Texts in the Classroom. (*In Carter, R. & McRae, J. Language, Literature & the Learner. London/New York: Longman. pp. 89-114.*)
- McMULLAN, F. 1974. Directing Shakespeare in the Contemporary Theatre. New York: Richards Rosen Press, Inc.
- McRAE, J. 1996. Representational Language Learning: From Language awareness to Text awareness. (*In Carter, R. & Mc Rae, J. eds Language, Literature and the Learner. London/New York: Longman. pp.16-40.*)
- MORTON, C. 1981. A Case against Shakespeare. *CRUX*, 15(3):33-35.
- MOUTON, M. 1988. Dramateorie Vandag. Die Bydrae van die Drama- en Teatersemiotiek.

Potchefstroom: PU vir CHO. Departement van Sentrale Publikasies.

NALLILEKE, J. 2001. Keep the Bard, say SA literature experts. *Citizen*. Feb. 22.

NEUBERT, A. & SHREVE, G.M. 1992. Translation as Text. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press.

NEWMARK, P. 1982. Approaches to Translation. New York/London: Prentice Hall.

NEWMARK, P. 1993. Paragraphs on Translation. Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

NEWMARK, P. 1995. 2nd ed. A Textbook of Translation. New York/London: Phoenix.

NIDA, E.A. & TABER, C.R. 1974. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: Brill.

NORD, C. 1997. Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained. Manchester: St. Jerome.

OAKHILL, J. & GARNHAM, A. 1988. Becoming a skilled reader. Blackwell: Oxford.

PALTRIDGE, B. 1984. Genre, Frames and Writing in Research Settings. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

PAYNE, M. 1993. Reading Theory: An Introduction to Lacan, Derrida and Kristeva. Oxford: Blackwell.

PENN, J.M. 1972. Linguistic Relativity Versus Innate Ideas. The origins of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis in German Thought. The Hague: Mouton

PERCIVAL, C. 2001. To remove Shakespeare will make us poorer. *Citizen*. Feb. 23.

PERCIVAL, C. 2001. Drop the Bard from the school syllabus at our peril. *Star*. Feb. 26.

PERKINS, R.D. 1992. Deixis, Grammar and Culture. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

PFISTER, B. 1986... A Reevaluation of the Teaching of English Literature in the High School. Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation. Pretoria: UNISA.

- PHILLIPS, M. 1989. Microcomputers and the Teaching of Literature in ELT. (In Carter, R. & Walker, R. et. al. eds *Literature and the Learner: Methodological Approaches*. London: Modern English Publications. pp.112-125.)
- PIENAAR, P. 1987. Spotlight on the Bard, restored (to pristine health in EL 2 classrooms throughout the sub-continent). *CRUX*, 21(4):68-71.
- PILKINGTON, A. 1991. Poetic Effects: A Relevance Theory Perspective. (In Sell, R.D. ed. *Literary Pragmatics*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.44-61.)
- RAFFEL, B. 1996. Translation as Creativity. *Western Humanities Review*: 50(1):54-62, Spring.
- REID, I. 1980. Hazards of Adaptation: Anouilh's *Antigone* in English.(In Zuber, O. ed. *The Languages of Theatre: Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. pp.82-91.)
- REID, J. 1982. English Literature in Sout African Senior Schools: A critique of Set Books. Communications no. 7. Cape Town: Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town.
- RELYEA, S. 1976. Signs, Systems & Meanings: A Contemporary Semiotic Reading of Four Molière Plays. Middletown/Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press.
- ROBERTSON, T. 1989. Should Shakespeare be Buried or Born Again. (In Elsom, J. ed. *Shakespeare is Still our Contemporary*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.169-184.)
- ROSENBLATT, L.M. 1994. *The Reader, the Text, the Poem*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- RYAN, K. 1991. Romeo and Juliet: The Language of Tragedy. (In Van Peer, W. ed. *The Taming of the Text*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.106-122.)
- SARIJP, M. 1993. *An Introductory Guide to Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- SCHIFFRIN, D. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- SCHROENN, M.B. 1978. Moral education through the study of prescribed literature, in particular English literature, in the high school. Thesis. UNISA.
- SCHUMACHER, E. 1989. Should Shakespeare be Buried or Born Again. (*In* Elsom, J. *ed* *Shakespeare is Still our Contemporary*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.169-184.)
- SELDEN, R. 1993. *A reader's guide to contemporary literary theory*. London: Harvester Press.
- SELL, R.D. 1991. *Literary Pragmatics: an Introduction*. (*In* Sell, R.D. *ed*. *Literary Pragmatics*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.xi-xxiii.)
- SERPIERI, A. 1985. Reading the Signs: Towards a Semiotics of Shakespearean Drama. (*In* Drakakis, J. *ed*. *Alternative Shakespeares*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.119-143.)
- SHEE, L. 2001. Shakespeare would delight in today's 'global arena'. *Citizen*. Feb. 12.
- SHORT, M. 1996. *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London/New York: Longman.
- SHERMAN, J. 1984. No Literature for Anybody: A Stronger Case against Shakespeare, *CRUX*, 18 (2):3-9.
- SIMONTON, D.K. 1987. Shakespeare's Plays and Sonnets: Correlates of Differential Greatness. (*In* Halasz, L. *ed*. *Literary Discourse: Cognitive and Social Psychological Approaches to Literary Discourse*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter. pp.193-200.)
- SINCLAIR, B. 1996. Learner Autonomy and Literature Teaching. (*In* Carter, R. & Mc Rae, J. *eds* *Language, Literature and the Learner*. London/New York: Longman.
- SMITH, M.S. 1994. *Second Language Learning: Theoretical Foundations*. London/New York: Longman.
- SNELL-HORNBY, M. 1988. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Johan Benjamin's Publishing Company.

SNELL-HORNBY, M. 1991. Translation Studies: Art, Science or Utopia? (*In* Van Leuven-Zwart, K. & Naaijken, T. eds. Translation Studies: The State of the Art. Amsterdam: Rodopi. pp.5-12.)

STOTSKY, S. 1983. Types of exical cohesion in expository writing: implications for developing the vocabulary of academic discourse. *College Composition and Communication*. 34(4):430-446.

STRINGER, R.A. 1987. Mind over Matter: Value Engineering is the Key to Creative and Effective Evaluation, Decision Making and Problem Solving. *Productivity*, 13(2):34-37, Apr.

TALLIS, R. 1988. Not Saussure: A Critique of Post-Saussurean Literary Theory. London: Mac Millan Press.

TANZ, C. 1980. Studies in the Acquisition of Deictic Terms. Cambridge/London: Cambridge University Press.

THOMAS, J. 1995. Meaning in Interaction. London/New York: Longman.

TOMPKINS, J. 1980. The Reader in History: The Changing Shape of Literary Response. (*In* Tompkins, J. ed. Reader Response Criticism. Baltimore, London: The John Hopkins University Press. pp. 201-232.)

TOURY, G. 1980. The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation. London/New York: Routledge.

TOURY, G. 1985. A Rationale for Descriptive Translation. (*In* Herman, T. ed. The Manipulation of Literature. London/Sydney: Croom Helm. pp.16-41.)

TOURY, G. 1995. Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

TURNER, F. 1971. Shakespeare and the Nature of Time. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- ULRYCH, M. 1992. *Translating Texts: From Theory to Practice*. Genoa: Dideb Editrice.
- VAN DER VOORT, C. 1991. *Narratology and Translation Studies*. (In Van Leuven-Zwart & Naaijken eds. *Translation Studies: The State of the Art*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. pp.65-74.)
- VAN LEUVEN-ZWART, K. 1989. *Translation and original: Similarities and Dissimilarities*, part 1. *Target* 1(2): 151-181.
- VAN LIER, L. 1988. *The Classroom and the Language Learner*. London/New York: Longman.
- VAN PEER, W. 1991. *What is Literature? Toward a Descriptive Definition of Literature*. (In Sell, R.D. ed. *Literary Pragmatics*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.127-141.)
- VAN PEER, W. 1991. *Introduction*. (In Van Peer, W. ed *The Taming of the Text*. Routledge: London/New York. pp.1-12.)
- VENUTI, L. 1992. *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London/New York: Routledge.
- VENUTI, L. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- VERDONK, PP. 1991. *Poems as Text and Discourse: The Poetics of Philip Larkin*. (In Sell, R.D. ed. *Literary Pragmatics*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.94-109.)
- VICKERS, B. 1993. *Appropriating Shakespeare: Contemporary Critical Quarrels*. New Haven/ London: Yale University Press.
- VLADOVA, I. 1993. *Essential Features and Specific Manifestations of Historical Distance in Original Texts and Their Translation*. (In Zlateva, PP. ed. *Translation as Social Action*. London/New York: Routledge. pp.11-17.)
- WELLS, S. 1970. *Literature and Drama*. London/New York: Routledge.
- WERTH, PP. 1995. *How to Build a World (In a Lot Less than Six Days, Using Only What's*

in Your Head). (*In* Keith, G. *ed.* *New Essays on Deixis: Discourse, Narrative, Literature.* Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi. pp. 49-80.)

YUILL, N. & OAKHILL, J. 1991. *Children's problems in text comprehension: an experimental investigation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ZUBER, O. 1980. Problems of Propriety and Authenticity in Translating Modern Drama. (*In* Zuber, O. *ed.* *The Languages of Theatre: Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama.* Oxford: Pergamon Press. pp.92-103.)

ZUBER, O. 1980. *The Language of Theatre.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

ZUROWSKI, A. 1989. Should Shakespeare be Buried or Born Again. (*In* Elsom, J. *ed.* *Shakespeare is Still our Contemporary.* London/New York: Routledge. pp.169-184.)

Appendix A

Macbeth



MACBETH

MACBETH

William Shakespeare

vertaal deur

Nelda Pretorius



Shakespeare.

VOORWOORD

Deur die eeue heen het Shakespeare se dramas nie teleurgestel nie. Dit mag dalk vir die leerder na 'n holrug geryde stelling klink, maar naas die Bybel (het iemand op 'n keer gesê) word Shakespeare die meeste gelees en waarskynlik dan ook, die mees waardeer. Dit is ook 'n onomwonde (vreugdevolle) feit dat Shakespeare se dramas meer as enige ander dramaturg opgevoer word. Ek wil my verstout deur te sê dat die prentjie in die toekoms onveranderd sal bly.

Die rede is klinkklaar. Lewenslesse het deur die eeue heen onveranderd gebly. Mense verander, tye verander, leiers en sosiale gewoontes verander, tog, bly die menslike karakter onveranderd. Stereotipes sal in elke gemeenskap geïdentifiseer kan word. Shakespeare het hierdie eienskap in die menslike natuur herken en daarom konsentreer hy nie op situasies nie, maar op hoe die mens in sulke situasies reageer.

Macbeth in Afrikaans het die primêre doel voor oë om die leerder vertrouwd te maak met Shakespeare en sy benadering tot sekere kwessies. Omrede dit in alledaagse, kontemporêre Afrikaans is, bied dit vir die leerder genoegsame rede om op 'n genotvolle wyse tot dieper insigte te kom.

Dit is nie die doel van die vertaling om 'n kortpad aan die leerder te bied nie. Inteendeel, dit dien slegs as 'n lig om die ervaringswerklikheid van Shakespeare te aksentueer en sodoende genoegsame insigte aan die leerder te bied om *Macbeth* as 'n ware uitdaging, en nie as 'n hindernis, in sy pad te sien nie.

Ek hoop dat die vertaling 'n goue weg sal baan vir oorspronklike, kreatiewe literêre werke in Afrikaans.

Nelda Pretorius

YOU HAVE TO BE *COOL* TO BE KIND

Reading *Macbeth* in Afrikaans. At last! I know this is exactly what you have been waiting for all these years. This version of *Macbeth* in Afrikaans will definitely not disappoint the Afrikaans-speaking reader.

Why should this version be different from translations of the play, you may ask?

The rationale for this version and the methods adopted may be summed up in the following points:

- The play has been transposed into Afrikaans for mother-tongue speakers in the senior secondary phase.
- The rendition of *Macbeth* provided here does not serve to replace the English play. It should rather be seen as a text in which, true to the nature of drama, the principle of dramatic economy has been stringently observed, with important dramatic scenes being included and less important and therefore possibly distracting scenes being cut out so that a reading can be achieved that will convey to the reader the concentrated dramatic impact of the play.
- English expressions and/or passages have been kept in order to act as markers for the eventual reading of the full text in English, and to convey some of the flavour of the Elizabethan text.
- Contemporary illustrations, rendered in the style of comic classics and carrying vivid contemporary semiotic signs are used for purposes of locating the characters in terms of their dramatic functions – as hero(ine)s and villains.
- Certain passages are kept in verse and some are rendered in prose – for much the same reasons

that Shakespeare had for choosing the style of a given passage.

May you all enjoy this new, exciting learning experience.

*To Mr Ben Jonson demanding the reason why he
called his plays "works".*

Pray, tell me, Ben, where doth the mystery lurk:

What other call a play, you call a work?

Thus answered by a friend in Mr Jonson's defence.

The author's friend thus for the author says:

Ben's plays are works, when others' works are plays.

MACBETH

DRAMATIS PERSONAE

oftewel

al die karakters in die drama

DUNCAN: Die koning van Skotland

MALCOLM } Sy seuns
DONALBAIN }

MACBETH } Grawe in die koning se leër
BANQUO }

MACDUFF }
LENNOX }
ROSS } Adellikes in Skotland
MENTEITH }
ANGUS }

FLEANCE } Banquo se seun.

SIWARD } 'n Engelse graaf

SETON } 'n Offisier van Macbeth

LADY MACBETH
LADY MACDUFF

DRIE HEKSE
DRIE MOORDENAARS

BEDIENDE
BOODSKAPPER
DOKTER

VERTELLER: gee addisionele inligting

EINSTEIN: die bynaam van 'n begaafde senior leerder in die klas



Einstein in die klas

EERSTE BEDRYF

EERSTE TONEEL

- VERTELLER:** Op 'n onheilsplek alleen;
Waar blitse onheil uit wil ween;
- Het drie onheilshekse verskyn;
En na hulle woorde in donkernag verdwyn.
- EERSTE HEKS:** Wanneer gaan ons weer ontmoet?
Gaan dit wees in storm of in vloed?
- TWEEDE HEKS:** As ons brousel klaar gebrou is;
As ons stryd gewen en ook verloor is.
- DERDE HEKS:** Voor die son se strale kwyn;
Sal ons met Macbeth verskyn.
- TESAAM:** Sleg is reg en reg is weg;
Dit skuil in mis en ongereg.

*Fair is foul and foul is fair;
Hover through the fog and filthy air.*

EINSTEIN: Wat is die doel van die hekse?

VERTELLER: Hulle verteenwoordig boosheid en alles wat sleg is;
En waarsku teen die kwaad wat op elkeen se weg is.

Maar wag,

**die hekse verdwyn in 'n wolk van mis;
Tesame gaan hulle die goeie uitwis!**

TWEEDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Duncan is die koning van Skotland.
Dit is ook nou die elfde eeu.
Macbeth is na die front gestuur
Om die rebelle hel te laat verduur.

Die prinse, Malcolm en Donalbain, het tuis gebly
om daar te hoor hoe het Macbeth sy dapper stryd gestry.

'n Gewonde kaptein kom juis toe van die gevegsfront af
om almal te laat weet wat hulle van die rebellie kan verwag.

DUNCAN: En wie's die bebloede man?

MALCOLM: Dis ons dapper kaptein, u majesteit.....

Welkom terug kaptein!

DUNCAN: Het jy nuus oor die rebelle?

KAPTEIN: Ja, u majesteit.
Ek's daar weg met die stryd toe nog onbeslis;
Maar Macbeth is 'n dapper man, dis gewis!
Met sy swaard het hy vir niemand agteruitgestaan;
en genadeloos al wat 'n rebel is verslaan!

DUNCAN: Dis nou my dapper neef,
'n adellike, wat geen rebel sal vergeef!

Kaptein, jou woorde en wonde strek ons land net tot eer;
Jy is 'n baie dapper man!
Jy mag maar gaan sodat hulle jou wonde kan verbind.

(Kaptein verlaat die koning onder begeleiding en iemand kan gehoor word.)

Wie's hier?

MALCOLM: Dis die graaf van Ross.

ROSS: *(Ross kom binne.)*
Geseënd is u, o koning!

DUNCAN: Waarvandaan kom jy nou Ross?

ROSS: Ek kom nou net van Fife, u majesteit.
Daar het Noorse magte ons deeglik laat les opsê!

Ek dink die graaf van Cawdor het ons verraai
want hy het so wragtig die Noorse magte na ons gestuur.
Maar, gelukkig het ons tog uiteindelik gewen!

DUNCAN: Dank die hemel!

EINSTEIN: Kan jy sê waarom is daar soveel sprake van bloed?
Van mag en waag en ook van moed?

VERTELLER: Dis 'n baie belangrike vraag!
Een wat jy die eksaminator mee moet behaag.

**Moet dus nie onverskillig hieroor staan;
Want bloed is waaroor hierdie drama gaan.**

**Hou dus voortdurend, noulettend, dop;
Hoeveel bloed deurlopend, onnodig, vergiet word!**

**Dus, Cawdor het as verraaiër gesterf;
En Macbeth het, onwetend, sy titel geërf!**



Die hekse het weer in die mis verskyn;
En na hul woorde weer skielik verdwyn.

DERDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Dis weer 'n onheilsplek alleen;
Weer is blitse oral om hulle heen;

Die hekse het weer in die mis verskyn;
En na hul woorde skielik weer verdwyn.

TESAAM: Sleg is reg en reg is weg;
dit hang in mis en groot onreg.

(Naderende tromme van triomf kan gehoor word.)

DERDE HEKS: 'n Trom, 'n Trom!
Dit is Macbeth wat kom!

TESAAM: Bose geeste hand aan hand;
Sien ons al's oor see en land;
Sweef en vlieg ons van streek tot streek;
Om drie plus drie plus drie te wreek.

VERTELLER: Skielik gewaar Macbeth en Banquo hulle in die onheilsmis
en wonder hulle waarom die drie hekse daar is.

MACBETH: So 'n goor en tog mooi dag het ek nog nooit gesien nie!

So foul and fair a day I have not seen!

VERTELLER: Let op!
Dit is ironiese woorde wat Macbeth hier uiter
Kyk nou mooi hoe dit hom nog gaan treiter!

BANQUO: Macbeth! Kyk! Wie of wat is dit?
Kyk daar! Verlepte lywe in verflenterde klere
en hulle lyk nie na 'n aardse mag.

..... Vrouens, dit is hulle wel,
en tog verhoed hulle baarde
dat ek dit as die waarheid sal vertel.

MACBETH: Praat!

Wie of wat is julle?

EERSTE HEKS: Eer aan u, Macbeth, die graaf van Glamis!

TWEEDE HEKS: Eer aan u Macbeth, die graaf van Cawdor!

DERDE HEKS: Eer aan u Macbeth, die koning van Skotland!

BANQUO: Macbeth, dit lyk skielik asof jy hulle voorspellings vrees.
Dit klink dan so goed! ...

Maar van my sê hulle niks nie!

(Tot hekse)

Sou julle werklik die saad van die toekoms kon sien
wil ek weet met watter raad julle my sou kon bedien!

EERSTE HEKS: Heil aan u!

TWEEDE HEKS: Heil aan u!

DERDE HEKS: Heil aan u!

EERSTE HEKS: *(tot Banquo)*
Nou, nog minder as Macbeth;
Maar eendag veel, veel meer!

TWEEDE HEKS: Nou is jy gelukkig;
Maar eendag nog gelukkiger!

DERDE HEKS: Konings sal jy verwek;
en dis tot hier waar jou koningskap sal strek!

MACBETH: Nee, wag!
Wag!
Vertel my meer!
Ek, die graaf van Glamis?
Dit is ek tog wel!
Maar die graaf van Cawdor?
Hy leef dan?
En ek, die koning?
Dis ongelooflik!
Waar kom julle daaraan? ...
Wag!
Wag, moenie nou verdwyn nie!
Praat met ons!

VERTELLER: Die mis word dik en hulle verdwyn;
Onheilspellend gou sal hulle weer verskyn!

EINSTEIN: Voordat ons verder gaan, wil ek net weet
waarom moet ons die beeldspraak van “saad” nie vergeet?

VERTELLER: Die beeldspraak van saad dui op groei en alles wat baat
Maar soos dit met ongereg gesmoor word
En boosheid begin oorheers
So tree bloed en boosheid in en versmoor letterlik
elke mens se gees!

Kom ons hoor wat het Banquo oor die hekse te sê:

BANQUO: Soos borrels het hulle verskyn
en net so skielik weer verdwyn!

MACBETH: Jou kinders gaan konings word!

BANQUO: En jy die koning!

VERTELLER: Terwyl hulle oor alles besin
is dit Ross wat die goeie tyding bring.

ROSS: Macbeth, die koning was oorstelp van vreugde
toe hy van jou oorwinning hoor!
Hy't my gestuur om sy diepste dank te betuig
en jou onmiddellik na hom te neem.
En as blyk van sy groter eerbetoon
wil hy jou as die graaf van Cawdor laat insweer!

BANQUO: Wat? Kan dit waar wees?

MACBETH: Maar hy leef dan nog? ...
Gaan ek nou geleende klere moet dra?

ROSS: Ja, dit is so, die die graaf van leef nog wel
maar net in die skadu van doodsbevel!
Hy het ons verraai teen die Noorse mag,
en daarom sal 'n verraaierscloud op hom wag!

MACBETH: *(Tersyde)*
Die graaf van Glamis én van Cawdor?
Ek kan dit nie glo nie!
En om te dink dit is nie al -
Koningskap kom dalk bowenal!

(Vir Banquo)

Jou kinders gaan konings word!
Dit is mos so aan jou beloop?

BANQUO: Dit alles klink so vreemd!
Tog lok duistere beloftes ons na ons leed!

Die waghonde van die nag
ontbloot die waarheid wat wag!

The instruments of darkness tell us truths!

Om eers te voorspel en dan te verraai.
Daar's groter magte wat alles laat draai!

MACBETH: Twee vreemde waarhede word saam vertel;
En die onnatuurlike gekonkel is nóg sleg, nóg goed!

*Two truths are told....
This supernatural soliciting
Cannot be ill; cannot be good.*

Ek's nou die graaf van Cawdor
maar waarom ontstel dit my so?

Al die gedagtes maal en kook in my gemoed;
En ek besef dat niks wat is sal ooit weer wees nie!

*These thoughts shake my single state of man...
and nothing is, but what is not.*

Maar, as die noodlot my koning wil hê;
Moet die noodlot my maar kroon!

BANQUO: *(Aan Ross en Angus)*
'n Groot eer het hom te beurt geval;
Sy nuutgevonde titel is soos nuwe klere wat eers later lekker sal pas.

MACBETH: Laat ons maar wag en sien wat gebeur.
Kom vriende, laat ons gaan!

EINSTEIN: Die Engelse deeltjies klink vir my so mooi
Waarom is die drama daarmee opgetooi?

VERTELLER: Hoe gouer jy kan raakvat waarom hierdie drama gaan;
Hoe beter gaan jy die prag en grootsheid van Shakespeare verstaan.

VIERDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Ons is nou in die paleis en koning Duncan kom in.

DUNCAN: Is die vonnis op Cawdor al voltrek?
Is hulle wat dit moes doen al terug?

MALCOLM: Nee, nog nie, u majesteit.
Cawdor het wel sy verraad erken;
En ek sê u, niks pas ons so goed
as dat hy betaal met sy eie bloed!

DUNCAN: Ja, dit staan soos 'n paal bo water:
Dis 'n ware kuns om die hart van 'n mens in sy oë te lees.

*There's no art
to find the mind's construction in the face.*

En om te dink ek het hom vertrou!

(Macbeth, Banquo, Angus en Ross kom in.)

Welkom, my liewe neef.
Ek is sprakeloos;
Ek is op hierdie stadium meer dank aan jou verskuldig
as wat ek ooit in staat sal wees om te gee!

MACBETH: *(meer formeel)*
Ons plig is u kroon, u troon, ons diens;
deur alles wat ons verrig reg en goed te doen;
ter wille om u eer en liefde daarmee te versoen.

DUNCAN: Welkom terug, Macbeth! Baie welkom!
Ek het jou geplant en net hier sal jy tot wasdom bloei.
Banquo, en jy verdien niks minder nie!
(Die koning gee albei 'n handdruk.)

BANQUO: Sou ek tot wasdom bloei
sal die oes tot u eer, o koning, groei!

DUNCAN: My vreugde ken geen perke!
Luister almal:
Ek het besluit om vir my 'n opvolger te benoem...

en dit is my seun, Malcolm - die prins van Cumberland!
(*Tot Macbeth*)

Maar eers gaan ek jou besoek;
laat weet asseblief jou vrou dat ek op pad is.

MACBETH: Ja, harde werk lê nog vir ons almal voor.
(*Tot Duncan*)

Sal u my asseblief verskoon,
ek gaan my vrou op u koms voorberei.
Totsiens. Ek sien u almal 'n bietjie later.

DUNCAN: Jy's verskoon, my waardige vriend.

MACBETH: (*Tersyde*)

Malcolm, die prins van Cumberland!
Ek kan dit nie glo nie?
Dis nog 'n hindernis wat my kan keer;
Dit is natuurlik as die noodlot (en die hekse) die waarheid begeer ...

Sterre, word almal swart
sodat geen lig skyn in my donker hart!

*Stars, hide your fires!
Let not light see my black and deep desires.*

DUNCAN: Ja, Banquo, Macbeth is 'n baie dapper man
en sy onwrikbare trou is werklik 'n riem onder die hart.
Kom, laat ons klaarmaak en na hulle gaan.

EINSTEIN: **Glo Macbeth werklik dat hy die koning kan word?**

VERTELLER: **Onthou,
die hekse verteenwoordig alles wat boos is;
en die onheil wat hul woorde saai
wil Macbeth met onnatuurlike verwagting maai!
Daarom het sy ambisie geen perke
en gee hy hom oor aan duistere werke.**



Môre sal hy die son nie sien nie

VYFDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: In Macbeth se kasteel
Lees Lady Macbeth die brief
waarin Macbeth alles met haar deel.

LADY MACBETH: Jy's die graaf van Glamis;
En spoedig van Cawdor ook?
En eendag die koning?

Maar jou ware aard maak my tog effens bang!

Yet do I fear thy nature.

Jy's veel te sag!

Dit is so, jy wil so graag groot en magtig wees;
Maar ware ambisie, Macbeth, daarvan dink ek het jy te min.

Kom tog gou terug, my man,
dat ek jou met my krag kan aanvuur;
En jou spoedig na koningskap kan stuur!

(Die boodskapper kom in.)

BOODSKAPPER: Die koning kom vannag hier oorbly.

LADY MACBETH: Hees is selfs die kraai;
wat Duncan se koms verraai ...

Kom nou, bese geeste, kom!
Julle wat moordgedagtes dien!
Ontken my vroulikheid hier en nou
En vul my van kroon tot toon.
Ruk my hele bestaan!
En verstop elke weg tot berou
sodat geen onheilsroep
my felle doelwit soek!
Kom, bese geeste, kom!
En drink my melk vir gal!
Kom, kom, donker nag -

Bedek jou met die hel se mag!

*Come, you spirits
That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here,*

*And fill me, from crown to the toe,...
Shake my fell purpose,
nor keep peace between th'effect and it!
Come to my woman's breasts,
And take my milk for gall,...
Come, thick night,
And pall thee in the dunnest smoke of hell...*

Sodat my dolk nie die wond sien wat hy steek nie;
Ook nie die hemel kan deur die donker vir my loer nie!
En my stop deur te skreeu: "Wag!" nie.

(Macbeth kom binne.)

MACBETH: My liefste vrou.
(Hulle soengroet.)
Duncan kom by ons oornag!

LADY MACBETH: En wanneer is hy van plan om te vertrek?

MACBETH: Blykbaar weer môre.

LADY MACBETH: Môre sal hy die son nie sien nie!
Macbeth, jou gesig spreek boekdele
Wat 'n mens al te maklik lees.

*O, never
shall sun that marrow see!*

*Your face, my Thane, is as a book,
Where men may read strange matters.*

Daarom, om die tyd uit te koop
moet daar 'n verwelkoming in jou oë skyn!

Ja, jou hand, jou tong, lyk nes 'n onskuldige blom
maar 'n slang skuil diep daaronder!
Toemaar, vannag sal ek na Duncan omsien
en sy gevolg met alles bedien!

MACBETH: Ons sal weer praat ...

LADY MACBETH: Macbeth, laat jou voorkoms helder wees
want die aartsverraaier van sukses is vrees!

EINSTEIN: Hoekom word die prentjie só duister, só donker?

VERTELLER: Einstein onthou, die nag is simbolies van die kwaad;
Want dan word baie mense koelbloedig geskaad.

**Jy sal sien, min slegte dinge gebeur in helder dag;
Want onheil triomfeer meestal in die donker nag.**

SESDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Daardie aand arriveer Duncan by Macbeth se kasteel.
En Macbeth beplan nog steeds om Duncan se lewe te neem.

MACBETH: As dit dan moet
Hoe gouer, hoe beter!
As hierdie sluipmoord maar net die gevolge saam kon vat
en met sy afloop sukses kan bring...
Dan kan ons met tyd
spring tot in ewigheid!
So leer ons aan ander die wet van bloed en straf
en dit keer terug na ons met alle mag.
En om te dink, Duncan is hier uit dubbele trou:
Eerstens, is ek sy bloedverwant en onderdaan
Tweedens, is ek sy gasheer wat die deur teen sy moordenaars moet sluit
inplaas daarvan dat ek self die dolk dra!
Hy het sy pligte deeglik nagekom...
Selfs die engele sal vir sy lewe smeek!

*If it were done ...
It were done quickly: if th'assassination
Could trammel up the consequence, and catch
With his surcease, success; that but this blow
Might be the be-all and the end-all ...
Upon this bank and shoal of time,
We'd jump this life to come.
But, in these cases we teach bloody instructions
to plague the inventor.
He's here in double trust:
First, as I am his kinsman and his subject,...
Then, as his host,
Who should against his murderer shut the door,
Not bear the knife myself. Besides, this
Hath borne his faculties so meek, hath been
So clear in his great office, that his virtues
Will plead like angels, ...
Against the deep damnation of his taking-off;*

Die daad sal definitief groot verskrikking saai...
Die wind sal in sy smart verdrink!
Tog, kan niks my meer keer nie;
dat staatsug sal maak dat ek sy lewe neem nie!

EINSTEIN: Met alle respek, hoekom is dit so erg om die koning te vermoor?

VERTELLER: Onthou, die koning verteenwoordig die hoogste gesag
daargestel deur God se Allerhoogste mag.
Macbeth weet al hierdie dinge wel
daarom dat dit hom so diep ontstel.

TWEEDE BEDRYF

EERSTE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Dit is al aand in Macbeth se kasteel;
Steeds bedink hy sy donker onheilsdaad;
En sien hy voor sy geestesoog;
Die wapen, die dolk, van hoogverraad!

MACBETH: Is dit 'n dolk wat ek hier voor my sien?
Of is dit 'n dolk van die verbeelding?

*Is this a dagger that I see before me, ...
Or art thou but a dagger of the mind?*

Kom, laat ek jou gryp ...
Nee, daar sweef jy nog steeds ... of is dit net
die bloedige geweldsdaad wat so voor
my eie oë vorm aanneem!

Ja, bese drome skuil binne die slaap soos 'n sluier -
spookagtige skimme - die moord word gewek
deur 'n wolf se getjank wat die ure aftel.

En terwyl ek aanhou dreig, leef hy!

My woorde waai 'n ysige asemtog op sy lewensgloed;
wat straal uit daadkrag en uit moed!

VERTELLER: Lady Macbeth lui die klok as teken
dat dit tyd is vir Macbeth om met Duncan af te reken.

MACBETH: Ek gaan, dis reeds gedaan ... verby;
Die klok roep my ... nooi my!

Duncan, luister asseblief nie na dit wat onheil spel;
Daardie klok roep jou hemel toe ... of na die hel!

(Macbeth gaan by 'n sydeur uit en stadig op met die trappe. 'n Doodse stilte heers.)



DINK AAN JOU DOEL!
Gee die dolk vir my!

TWEEDE TONEEL

(Lady Macbeth kom binne met 'n beker in haar hand.)

LADY MACBETH: *(Tersyde)*
Dis nou tyd!
Die deure is oop.
Duncan se lyfwagte is niks werd nie!
Ek het hul bedwelms en hulle snork nou rustig voort!
Nou worstel die dood en die natuur of hul moet leef of sterf.
As Duncan nie so baie na my pa gelyk het nie
sou ek maklik self die daad kon pleeg.....

A, Macbeth is hier!

(Macbeth kom in.)

MACBETH: *(fluisterstemme)*

Hy's dood!

Kon jy iets hoor?
Wat 'n aaklige gesig!

LADY MACBETH: Moenie daaraan dink of jou verder daaroor ontstel nie!
Die gedagte sal ons gek maak as ons aanhou om ons daaroor te kwel!

MACBETH: Ek het stemme gehoor wat sê:
"Macbeth, slaap nooit weer nie,
jy sal slaap nooit weer beheer nie!"

Ek hoor dit deur die hele huis:
"Jy sal nie weer slaap nie!"
Glamis, jy het slaap vermoor!
Cawdor, jy sal nooit weer slaap nie!

MACBETH, JY SAL NOOIT WEER SLAAP NIE!"

LADY MACBETH: My liewe man
Vergeet dit, moet asseblief nie daaraan dink nie!
Gaan was gou die grusame getuienis van jou hande.
(Sy kyk na die dolk in sy hande.)
Hoekom het jy nie die dolk daar gelos nie?
Neem dit terug en besmeer die lyfwagte met bloed.

MACBETH: Nee, ek kan nie!

Dit maak my bang om daaraan te dink!
Ek wil nie daaraan dink nie!

LADY MACBETH: DINK AAN JOU DOEL!
Gee die dolk vir my!

(Sy gaan na die kamer.)
Slapendes en dooies lyk soos prente;
Dit is 'n kind se oog wat 'n geskilderde duiwel vrees.
As Duncan nog bloei sal ek die lyfwagte daarmee verf
want dit is hulle wat ons skuld sal erf.

EINSTEIN: **Waarom moet Macbeth sy hande gaan was?**

VERTELLER: **Hy wil graag die kwaad van sy hande was;
Maar ongelukkig gaan hy nog swaar dra aan hierdie las.**

(Daar 's 'n klop aan die een deur.)

MACBETH: Wie's dit?..
Waarom skrik ek so vir alles?

(Hy kyk onwillekeurig na sy hande.)
En dié hande?

Ek wonder of die magtige Neptunus se see
ooit die bloed van my hande sal kan afvee?

(Lady Macbeth kom terug. Haar hande is met bloed besmeer.)

LADY MACBETH: Kyk, my hande is nou net so rooi soos joune;
Maar vir spierwit hande sou ek my skaam!

(Daar 's weer 'n geklop.)

Iemand klop aan die suidedeur!
Kom ons gaan gou-gou kamer toe.
Net 'n bietjie water en ons skuld is afgewas!
Makliker kan dit tog nie wees nie!
Kom! Iemand klop weer!

MACBETH: *(Tersyde)*
Om my daad te erken
sal ek my bestaan moet ontken!

Klop! Klop!

Klop vir Duncan wakker!
Ek wens julle kon! ...

(Hulle gaan na hul kamer.)

DERDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Die geklop duur voort.
'n Dronk lyfwag maak die deur vir Macduff en Lennox oop.

MACDUFF: Hoe laat het julle in die bed gekom?
Dit lyk my julle het te veel gekuier!
Is sy majesteit al op?

(Macbeth kom binne in sy kamerjas om hul na die koning te vergesel.)

Sy majesteit het my beveel om hom te roep.
Kyk, dis al laat!

MACBETH: Kom, ek sal julle na hom toe neem.

LENNOX: Vertrek sy majesteit vandag?

MACBETH: Ja, ek het so verneem.

LENNOX: Wat 'n mislike nag!
Daar waar ons geslaap het, het die skoorstene skoon omgewaai.
Hulle sê 'n droeweklag het in die nag weergalm
en doodsroggels het die nag gevul met smart.
Voorspellings is glo gebore in 'n beklemmende toon.
Talle nagvoëls en uile kon tot gehoor word!
En daar was selfs 'n ligte aardskudding!

MACBETH: Ja, dit was 'n rowwe nag!

(Macduff verskyn opeens.)

MACDUFF: Kom help, asseblief! Iemand kom help!
O, verskriklike afgrysligheid!

MACBETH EN LENNOX: Wat? Wat is dit?

(Macbeth en Lennox storm na die koning se kamer terwyl Lady Macbeth inkom. Hulle maak vir Donalbain, Malcolm en Banquo wakker.)

MACBETH: Word wakker! Word wakker!
Hier is moord en hoogverraad gepleeg!
Toe, toe, Banquo en Donalbain, staan op!
Malcolm, staan op!
Komaan, staan op! Staan op!
Sy grote majesteit is vermoor!

LADY MACBETH: Wat? In ons huis?

MACBETH: Het ek maar 'n uur voor hierdie ramp gesterf
dan sou ek salig geleef het!

*Had I but died an hour before this chance,
I had lived a blessed time;*

(Malcolm en Donalbain storm by Duncan se kamer in en sien hulle vader is vermoor.)

DONALBAIN: Wat's fout?

MACBETH: Jou bron van lewe, asook syne, sal nooit weer vloei nie.

The spring, the head, the fountain of your blood is stopped!

MALCOLM: Wie het dit gedoen?
Sê my wie!
Ek wil nou weet!

LENNOX: *(Gaan na lyk.)*
Kom kyk, dit lyk asof die lyfwagte dit gedoen het
want hulle hande en gesigte is met bloed besmeer!
Kyk, hier is die bloedbevleekte dolk!
Ons moes nie sy majesteit se lewe aan hulle toevertrou het nie!

MACBETH: *(Tersyde)*
Wat het ek gedoen?
Ek moes hulle nie in my woede vermoor het nie!

EINSTEIN: Wat nou, ek verstaan nie?

VERTELLER: **Onthou Einstein, Macbeth is 'n tipiese tragiese held,
Wat beteken dat hy met beter insig na sy einde jaag;
Maar tot dan sal vele onheil geskied;
En dit is wat Macbeth die drama bied.**

MACBETH: Wie kan op een slag verskrik, kalm, wys en woedend wees?

Geen mens!

Die voortvarendheid van my haas
het alle rede in my verbygesnel
en hier lê Duncan ...
sy silwer gelaat getooi in goue bloed.

... *his silver skin laced with his golden blood!*

(Wys na lyfwagte.)

Daar's die moordenaars, geskilder in die kleure van hul werk!

VERTELLER: Opeens besef Malcolm en Donalbain dat alles nie pluis is nie;
En dat hulle in lewensgevaar verkeer.

**Daarom besluit hulle om inderhaas te vertrek.
Voordat die moordenaar sy haatveldtog kan voltrek.**

DONALBAIN: *(Malcolm en Donalbain in gesprek.)*
Ek dink ek moet na Ierland gaan.
Ons sal veiliger wees as ons nie saam gesien word nie
want hier skuil dolke in elke lag!
Hier is dit te naby aan bloed en te naby aan ons eie gevaar!

MALCOLM: Ja, die moordenaar se pyl is definitief op koers.
Kom ons moet onmiddellik gaan
en nie eers tyd mors om almal te groet nie!

VIERDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: 'n Paar dae later ontmoet Macduff en Ross mekaar.
Hulle bespreek die tragedie van Duncan se dood.

ROSS: Weet hulle al wie die moord gepleeg het?

MACDUFF: Blykbaar was dit die lyfwagte wat doodgemaak het.
Hulle sê Malcolm en Donalbain het gevlug,
en dit laat hulle glo baie skuldig lyk.

ROSS: Dit beteken dus dat Macbeth nou koning gaan word!

MACDUFF: Ja, hy is alreeds as koning benoem
en hy is na Scone om ingehuldig te word.

ROSS: Gaan jy ook na Scone?

MACDUFF: Nee, neef, ek is op pad na Fife;
Maar ek hoop alles verloop goed by Scone.
Ek hoop maar van harte die koningskleed pas goed!

Lest our old robes sit easier than our new!

VERTELLER: Onthou Einstein, Macduff se kasteel en familie is by Fife.
En inderdaad beledig hy vir Macbeth
deur nie na sy inhuldiging te gaan nie!
Buiten dit, is Macduff nog 'n hindernis op sy weg,
daarom sal Macbeth alles doen
om hom met die dood te versoen!

DERDE BEDRYF

EERSTE TONEEL

VERTELLER: En so, volgens die hekse se voorspellings word Macbeth wel as koning gekroon.

By Fores: 'n Paar weke later.
Macbeth, Lady Macbeth en ander kom in.

BANQUO: *(Hy dink)*
Jy't dit als!
Jy's koning, die graaf van Glamis en van Cawdor.
Dit is presies net soos die hekse dit voorspel het!
Maar wat meer is - jy het alles met vuilspel gekry!

Tog sal my nageslag die land regeer!
Sou daar waarheid in die hekse se voorspellings steek
dan is jy 'n skitterende bewys van hul betroubaarheid.
Tog, versinneeld hulle die hoop wat in my moet herleef ...
Maar wag, dis genoeg

(Trompetgeskal kan gehoor word. Macbeth en Lady Macbeth kom in.)

MACBETH: *(Aan Banquo)*
Vannag vier ons fees
en jou teenwoordigheid sal hoog op prys gestel word!

BANQUO: *(Meer formeel.)*
U majesteit, u kan vry oor my lot beskik;
Ek is aan u toegewy en u woord is my bevel.

MACBETH: Vertrek jy vanmiddag?

BANQUO: Ja, u majesteit.

VERELLER: Later, dink Macbeth weer terug aan daardie voorspellingsdag.

MACBETH: Banquo staan nog in my pad.
Net hy! ...
Vir niemand anders is ek bang nie!
Profeties het die hekse hom vereer as vader van 'n koningshuis;
en 'n kinderlose kroon is vir my beskore.
Daar is geen seun om my op te volg nie!
Vir Banquo het ek my siel verdoem!

Vir hom het ek Duncan doodgemaak!

Ek het my ewige juweel aan hom gegee.
en om te dink, die saad van Banquo gaan regeer!

Nooit!

Die noodlot mag maar eerder tot die stryd toetree;
En hiervoor sal ek tot die dood toe veg!

(‘n Geklop kan gehoor word.)

... Wie’s daar?

VERTELLER: Twee moordenaars word na Macbeth gebring.
Hy het gereël dat hulle ‘n einde
aan Banquo en Fleance (sy seun) se lewens maak.

MACBETH: Nou ja, het julle goed daaroor nagedink?

TWEEDE MOORDENAAR: Ja, u majesteit.
..... Ek is een van daardie mense
wat al die stampe en stote van die wêreld
in oormaat moes verduur.
En daarom voel ek baie bitter
dat niks wat ek verrig my meer kan traak -
daarom sal ek boosheid my eie maak!

EERSTE MOORDENAAR: Ek is net so siek en sat vir teëspoed!
Ek is keelvol tougetrek met Geluk.
Daarom sal ek hierop my lewe waag;
Om tog net voorspoed my eie te maak!

MACBETH: Julle besef Banquo is eintlik die vyand?
Daarom moet ons hom uit die pad kry!
Ek kan hom persoonlik met my mag wegvee
maar ek kan dit onder geen omstandighede waag nie!
Julle sien, ons het gemeenskaplike vriende wat vir my baie werd is.
Juis daarom moet ons die moord verdoesel!
Ek glo die redes is nou vir julle voor die hand liggend!
Ek gaan julle tot sê waar om hom in te wag
want vannag is die nag!

(Na ‘n ruk verlaat hulle Macbeth.)

Banquo, dis klaarpraat met jou!
Sou daar ‘n hemel op jou wag,

sal jy dit vind vannag!

*It is concluded. Banquo, thy soul's flight,
If it find heaven, must find it out tonight.*

TWEEDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Later vind Lady Macbeth die koning alleen en bekommerd.

LADY MACBETH: My man, hoekom sit jy hier so alleen met ellendige gedagtes
wat saam met Duncan begrawe moes word?
Jy moet onthou, wat ons nie kan genees nie moet ons liefste vergeet;
Jy besef mos gedane sake het geen keer nie!

MACBETH: My vrou, besef jy ons het die slang gewond, maar hy's nog lank nie dood nie?
Hy sal herstel sodat ons ellendige boosheid weer voor hom kan staan!
Laat ons eerder die samehang van die kosmos breek,
as wat ons vrees met elke maaltyd eet!
Ek kry nagmerries elke nag ...
Verraad het beslis 'n prys!
Tog kan geen opstand of stryd;
Duncan nou meer raak nie!



Die drie moordenaars

DERDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Daardie nag terwyl die twee moordenaars vir Banquo en Fleance lê en wag verskyn 'n derde persoon skielik in hulle midde.

EERSTE MOORDENAAR: En wie't jou na ons gestuur?

DERDE MOORDENAAR: Macbeth!

TWEEDE MOORDENAAR: Los hom, daar's geen rede om hom te wantrou nie.
Hy weet wat maak ons hier
en hy kan ons help om met hulle klaar te speel!

EERSTE MOORDENAAR: Nou goed. Kom hier!

DERDE MOORDENAAR: Sjuut! Ek hoor perde!

EERSTE MOORDENAAR: Nou!

(Die eerste moordenaar blus die fakkels en die ander val Banquo aan.)

BANQUO: Verraad, verraad!
Vlug, Fleance, vlug!

DERDE MOORDENAAR: Ons het hom, maar sy seun het wragtig weggekom!

VIERDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Terwyl die gaste in die eetsaal sit
word die koning eenkant toe ontbied.

EERSTE MOORDENAAR: *(Aan Macbeth)*
My heer, Banquo is van kant!
Ek het sy keel afgesny!
Maar Fleance het ongelukkig ontsnap!

MACBETH: *(Aan moordenaar)*
Banquo is veilig weggebêre! Dankie tog!
Jy het jou goed van jou taak gekwyt!
Jy het geen gelyke nie!
Jy sê Fleance het ontsnap!
Daardie uitgegroeide slang sal wel 'n giftige wurm voortbring
maar vir eers is hy tandoos.
Maar jy sê Banquo is veilig weggebêre?
Dis goed! ...
Gaan maar, ons sal môre weer praat!

MACBETH: *(Aan gaste)*
Vriende, as Banquo nou hier was
sou die room van die land hier bymekaar gewees het!

LENNOX: *(Aan Macbeth)*
As dit u behaag, neem asseblief plaas, u majesteit.

VERTELLER: Macbeth keer terug na die tafel.
En meteens verskyn Banquo se gees op die leë stoel.
Niemand kan hom egter sien nie
net Macbeth - want dit is vir sy oë bedoel!

MACBETH: Maar hier's nie 'n oop plek nie!

LENNOX: *(Wys na die oop plek)*
Hier's 'n oop plek, u majesteit.

MACBETH: Waar?

LENNOX: *(Wys weer.)*
Hier, u majesteit!
Waarom lyk u skielik so ontsteld?

MACBETH: *(In gesprek met leë plek.)*
Man, ek het dit nie gedoen nie!
Moenie jou bloedbevlekte krulle so vir my skud nie!

ROSS: Menere, kom ons gaan, sy majesteit voel nie wel nie!

LADY MACBETH: Sit gerus liewe vriende!
My man word dikwels so van kleins af.
Sit, asseblief. Dis net tydelik.
Hy sal nou-nou beter voel.
Ignoreer dit net, anders gaan hy aanstoot neem.
Eet gerus en ignoreer hom!
(Tersyde)
Wat vir 'n man is jy?

MACBETH: Ek smee jou, kyk!
Kyk daar!

(Weer in gesprek met leë stoel.)
Wat sê jy? Moenie net knik nie, praat!
(En meteens verdwyn die gees.)

(Aan Lady Macbeth.)
Sowaar as wat ek leef, ek het vir Banquo gesien!
Verby is die dae dat 'n mens sterf as jou brein verbrysel is.
Vandag staan jy op met twintig moordsteke in die kop en al.
Dit is nog vreemder as die moord self!

LADY MACBETH: My man, ons dierbare vriende besef nie wat aangaan nie!

MACBETH: Ek vra verskoning, liewe vriende.
Moenie julle aan my steur nie.
Ek ly aan 'n kwaal, 'n vreemde swakheid, dis 'n nietigheid.
Kom, gesondheid en kameraadskap vir almal.
Skink vir my wyn!
Ek drink op julle almal se geluk en op Banquo, vir wie ek baie mis.
Ek wens hy was ook hier!
Ons drink op hom, vir hom, op u almal.
Gesondheid!

(Net toe verskyn die gees van Banquo weer.)

MACBETH: Gaan weg! Aarde sluk jou in!

*Quit my sight!
Let the earth hide thee!*

Jou bene is sonder murg;
Jou bloed is reeds koud;
Daar's nie meer lewe in jou oë nie!

LADY MACBETH: *(Aan Macbeth)*
Bly om hemelsnaam net stil asseblief!
(Aan gaste)
Hy word al hoe erger!
Ons moet julle ongelukkig nou verlaat en julle moet ook asseblief gaan.
Goeie nag.
(Lady Macbeth en Macbeth verlaat die vertrek.)

(Nadat die gaste vertrek het.)

LADY MACBETH; Jy't die aand bederf!
Jy het ons samekoms met jou gekkespel omvergegooi!

MACBETH: Dit soek na bloed. Hulle sê mos bloed lok bloed.

*It will have blood, they say;
blood will have blood.*

Môre gaan ek na die hekse -
Ek moet meer weet!

Ek is vasbeslote om selfs nog erger dinge te doen.
Ek het myself nou so diep in hierdie bloedige gemors begewe
dat as ek nou enigiets sou oorsien
ek maar van al my moeite kan vergeet!

LADY MACBETH: Kom ons gaan slaap!
Die vreemde selfbedrog van gees
is net 'n groentjie se vrees!

VIERDE BEDRYF

EERSTE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Weer op 'n onheilsplek alleen;
Weer is daar blitse wat onheil uitween;

Weer het drie onheilshekse net verskyn;
Om weer eens na hul woorde onheilspellend te verdwyn.

HEKSE TESAAM: Dubbel, dubbel, sukkel, trippel
Vure brand en ons moet wikkel.

*Double, double, toil and trouble;
Fire burn and cauldron bubble.*

(Macbeth kom nader.)

MACBETH: En toe, onheilshekse,
wat prakseer julle hier?

(‘n Gebrul van donderslae weerklink en ‘n gewapende kop verskyn.)

EERSTE HEKS: *(Wys na brousel)*
Hy’s bewus van al jou denke;
Hoor hom uit, en luister na sy wenke.

EERSTE VERSKYNSEL: Macbeth, Macbeth, vrees Macduff!
Dis genoeg. Ek gaan.
(Verdwyn)

MACBETH: Dankie, wie jy ook al is, vir die goeie raad.

(Meteens verskyn ‘n tweede beeld van ‘n bebloede kind.)

TWEEDE VERSKYNSEL: Macbeth! Macbeth! Macbeth!
Staan bloedig en moedig vas;
Spot met gevaar van mensemag.
Geen man deur ‘n vrou gebaar
Bied vir jou enige gevaar!
(Verdwyn)

MACBETH: Leef maar, Macduff! Waarom sou ek jou vrees?

Maar net in geval, glo ek jou dood sal noodlottig wees!

(‘n Derde verskynsel verskyn. Dit is ‘n gekroonde kind met ‘n boom in sy hand.)

MACBETH: Wat is dit wat voor my verrys soos ‘n koningskind
en die kroon van ‘n heerser dra?

HEKSE TESAAM: Luister net en swyg!

DERDE VERSKYNSEL: Wees leuehartig, trots en slaan geen ag
op hulle wat saam sweer op verraad.
Daar’s geen oorwinning oor Macbeth aleer
Die Birnamwoud beweeg en Macbeth beleër
in hooggeleë Dunsinaan.
(Verdwyn)

MACBETH: Dit sal die dag wees!
Wie kan ‘n woud beveel om sy wortels te versit en te loop?
Tog wil ek net weet:
Sal Banquo se kinders ooit regeer?

HEKSE TESAAM: Moenie ons verder uitvra nie!

MACBETH: Alles wil ek weet of julle is vervloek!

**VERTELLER: Die heksemag het op Macbeth se versoek
die toekomstige konings laat verskyn.**

EERSTE HEKS: Wys hom!

TWEEDE HEKS: Wys hom!

DERDE HEKS: Wys hom!

HEKSE TESAAM: Wys hom dit en gee hom pyn;
Verrys soos skimme en verdwyn!

MACBETH: Jy lyk soos Banquo se gees. Gaan weg!
Jou kroon verskroei my oë;
Jou hare en goudgekroonde hoof
lyk soos die eerste ... en die tweede ... en die derde ...
Julle vieslike, vuil hekse!
Waarom het julle dit gewys!
‘n Vierde ...Nee, nog een!
‘n Sewende! Nee, gaan weg!
Nog ‘n agste ook met ‘n spieël;
Met dubbele sferen en driedubbele septers!

Afskuwelik! Nou weet ek dit is waar!
Die bebloede Banquo kyk my laggend aan;
Hy weet dis koningskap waarom dit gaan!

VERTELLER: **Die hekse dans en begin verdwyn;
Nooit weer sal hulle aan Macbeth verskyn.**

TWEEDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: **Uit die voorspellings van die hekse
weet Macbeth dit is Macduff wat nou die vyand is.
Daarom besluit hy om sy hele familie uit te wis
maar Macduff het onheil begin vermoed.
Daarom het hy saam met ander adellikes na England gegaan
om van Macbeth se bloeddorstigheid te vlug.
Ongelukkig het hy sy vrou en gesin by hulle kasteel in Fife gelos
en dit sou spoedig hulle lewens kos.**

Op 'n dag kom 'n boodskapper na Lady Macduff.

BOODSKAPPER: **Goeie dag, mevrou.
U ken my nie, maar u verkeer in lewensgevaar!
Neem asseblief 'n nederige man se advies en vlug onmiddellik!
Moenie langer hier bly nie!**

LADY MACDUFF: **Waarheen sal ek gaan?
Ek het niks verkeerds gedoen nie.
Maar, so is dit! Hier vier die kwaad mos deesdae hoogty!
Ag, waarom verset ek my? Dit gaan my tog niks help nie!**

VERTELLER: **Nadat die onbekende boodskapper vertrek het, storm gehuurde
moordenaars die paleis binne en almal word koelbloedig uitgemoor!**

DERDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: In England, by Koning Eduard I se paleis, bespreek Malcolm en Macduff hulle land se verknorsing.

MALCOLM: Kom laat ons 'n stil plekkie soek
om alleen ons hartseer uit te woed!

MACDUFF: Nee, laat ons eerder vasberade na ons swaarde gryp
en ons vertrapte geboortereg met geweld gaan terugneem.

Ja, elke dag verrys nog 'n weduwee se jammerklag;
Basuin wese hulle nuwe hartseer uit;
Elke dag bring nuwe pyn
tot die hemele ween saam met Skotland in hierdie tyd van smart!

VERTELLER: Intussen het Malcolm getroue vriende gevind
en Macduff meegedeel dat oorlogsplanne beraam word
en daarom moet hulle na Skotland terugkeer.

**Die graaf van Ross het juis by hulle aangesluit
om die verskriklike bloedbad tuis met hulle te deel.**

ROSS: Goeie dag julle!

MACDUFF: Goeie dag, neef. Staan Skotland nog?

ROSS: Ons arme land!
Dis nie meer ons geboorteland nie, maar ons graf!

It cannot be called our mother, but our grave

Niks en niemand, behalwe oningeligtes lag;
Kreune, versugtinge en weeklagte vul elke oomblik die lug
en droefheid is volop.
Ons vra nie eens meer vir wie die doodsklok lui nie!
In Skotland is alles deesdae tevergeefs!

MALCOLM: Van watter nuwe gruwels kom jy ons nou weer vertel?

ROSS: Terwyl ek hierheen op pad was om die tyding te bring
was daar 'n gerug van diegene op die gevegsfront

dat die tyd definitief nou ryp is om in te gryp!
Kom asseblief nou terug, want jul teenwoordigheid in Skotland
sal nog soldate lok;
Dit sal tot vroue laat veg om die storm van smarte te stuit.

MALCOLM: Laat dit die mense troos;
Ons is met tienduisend man op pad!

ROSS: Kon my antwoord maar vir jou troos bring!
Maar my tyding wil ek in die woestyn uitgil
waar niemand my kan hoor nie!

MACDUFF: Wat's dit?
Wat's fout?
Praat, man! ... Praat!

ROSS: Ek is baie jammer om jou mee te deel,
maar jou kasteel is aangeval en al jou mense is uitgemoor!

MALCOLM: O, nee! Hemele, wees ons genadig!
Geen mens kon 'n hartseerder tyding bring nie!

MACDUFF: My kinders ook?

ROSS: Hulle is almal uitgemoor!

MALCOLM: Ons het 'n afspraak met die koning!
Ons magte staan gereed!
Niks behalwe die afskeid bly nog oor nie;
Die tyd is ryp om Macbeth uit te wis!
(Aan Macduff)
Vind troos waar u kan.

Lank is skielik nou die nag;
waar ons tevergeefs op dagbreek wag!



Sy klink beswaard!
Sy dra baie swaar aan haar hart se las!

VYFDE BEDRYF

EERSTE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Terug in Skotland het Macbeth hom tuisgemaak in Dunsinaan.
‘n Dokter is intussen laat kom
om na Lady Macbeth se vreemde toestand om te sien.

BEDIENDE: (*Aan dokter.*)
Sy staan op uit haar bed,
trek haar kamerjas aan, sluit die kabinet oop,
haal papier uit, skryf iets, lees en verseël dit
sy keer terug na haar bed;
en dit alles terwyl sy slaap!

DOKTER: Dit is definitief nie normaal om te slaap én te werk nie.
Het u haar ooit hoor praat terwyl sy so in haar slaap loop?

BEDIENDE: Sy raak dinge kwyt wat ek nie
aan u of aan enigiemand anders durf oorvertel nie!
Niemand sal in elk geval kan getuig dat ek die waarheid praat nie!

(*Lady Macbeth kom in met ‘n kers in haar hand.*)

BEDIENDE: Wag! Kyk, hier kom sy!
Dis soos sy gewoonlik lyk.
En kan u glo, sy is vas aan die slaap!
Kom, dokter, staan nader!

DOKTER: Wat maak sy nou?
Kyk hoe vryf sy haar hande!

HOFDAME: Dit is deesdae ‘n obsessie by haar.
So asof sy haar hande was
en so hou sy vir ‘n kwartier aan en aan.

LADY MACBETH: Wag, hier’s nog!
(*Kyk na haar hande*)
Wyk verdomde kol!
Wyk, sê ek!
Nagdonker die hel;
My arme man!
‘n Krygsman, maar bang!
Wie sou ooit verwag dat die ou man soveel bloed sou hê!
Die die graaf van van Fife het ‘n vrou gehad - ek wonder waar’s sy nou?

(Kyk na haar hande.)

Sal ek nooit weer hierdie bloedreuk van my hande afkry?
Ek ruik nog steeds die bloed!
Al die parfuum van Arabië
sal nie eers die bloed van my hande kan afvee nie!

*What, will these hands never be clean?
Here 's the smell of the blood still.
All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand!*

DOKTER: Sy klink beswaard!
Sy dra baie swaar aan haar hart se las!

LADY MACBETH: Was jou hande!
Trek aan jou kamerjas!
Moenie so bleek lyk nie!
Ek sê jou Banquo is begrawe!
Hy kan nie uit die dood opstaan nie!
Iemand klop! Kom! Kom!
Laat ons bed toe gaan!

TWEEDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Van al die kastele en provinsies regoor Skotland het die graaf vans en hulle volgelingen begin om suidwaarts te beweeg om Siward, 'n Engelse graaf en sy tienduisend manskappe te ontmoet sodat hulle wraak kon neem.

Op die vlaktes van Dunsinaan.

MENTEITH: Die Engelse manskappe van Malcolm en sy oom Siward is naby.
Hulle is lus om wraak te neem en om tot hierdie bloedige stryd toe te tree!

ANGUS: Hulle kom van Birnamwoud se kant.
Ons kan hulle daar inwag.

DERDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: In die kasteel by Dunsinaan maak Macbeth staat op die hekse se voorspellings om sy lewe te red.

MACBETH: Geen nuus meer nie. Laat almal maar vlug!
Van Birnamwoud tot by Dunsinaan sal vrees my nie besmet nie!
En wie's die seun Malcolm nou eintlik?
Is hy nie ook maar van vlees en bloed nie?
Hekse wat die toekoms ken het uitdruklik voorspel -
VREES GEEN MAN DEUR VROU GEBAAR NIE!
My gees, my hart wat oor my lot beskik;
Sal nooit vertwyfel of bewe van skrik.

('n Boodskapper kom op.)

MACBETH: Wat lyk jy so verskrik?

BOODSKAPPER: Daar's derduisende, my heer!

MACBETH: Wat? Ganse?

BOODSKAPPER: Nee, my heer. Soldate!

MACBETH: Ek het lank genoeg geleef!
My lewe is soos blare wat vergeel, verdroog;
Maar dit wat hand aan hand gaan met die ouderdom -
liefde, eerbied, trou en vriende -
kan ek nie nou meer op staatmaak nie.
Net vervloekinge, gesmoord en diep ...
Seton

SETON: Ja, u majesteit.

MACBETH: Is daar nog nuus?
Ek sal tot die bitter einde veg!
Bring nou my wapens!

VIERDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: In Birnamwoud rapporteer Siward aan Malcolm.

SIWARD: Ons verneem die tiran lê vol selfvertroue by Dinsinaan en wag.

MALCOLM: So, dit is waarop hy hoop!
Daar steek tog voordeel in sy plan.
Maar almal verag hom en nêrens gaan hy steun vind nie.
Net 'n paar kruipers wat hy dwing, maar hulle harte is in elk geval elders.

VYFDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: In die kasteel by Dunsinaan berei Macbeth hom voor vir oorlog.

MACBETH: Hang die fakkels buite, hulle is op pad.
Die kasteel sal met veragting terugveg!
Laat hul maar lê tot hongersnood en pes hulle verteer.
As ons eie afvalliges hulle nie versterk het nie
Sou ons hulle man teen man kon ontmoet
en hulle tot by die huis gemoker het!

(Skielik weerklink vroue gille.)

Wat hoor ek?

SETON: Dis vroue wat daar gil, my heer.

MACBETH: Ek het al amper die smaak van vrees vergeet!
Op 'n tyd wou my hart gaan staan as ek 'n geskreeu in die nag gehoor het.
My hare het met die aanhoor van gruwelstories gerys.
Ek is siek en sat van gruwels.
Verskrikking en moordgedagtes ontstel my nie meer nie.

..... Wie gil so?

SETON: Die koningin my heer ... is dood!

MACBETH: Sy sou in elk geval die aanval nooit kon oorleef nie!
Elke nuwe dag
kruip moeisaam van dag tot dag
tot by die laaste letter van tyd;
en al ons gisters het net gekke geleer
om op die stofpad van die dood hulle weg te kry.

Brand uit, kort kerslig!

Die lewe is 'n skim, 'n armsalige akteurtjie
wat so vir 'n uur of wat kan spog en raas.
Dan is hy tjoepstil, vir ewig weg!
Dit is 'n sotlike verhaal
sonder ywer en sin!

*tomorrow, and tomorrow and tomorrow,
creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
to the last syllable of recorded time;
and all our yesterdays have lighted fools*

*the way to dusty death.
Out, out, brief candle!
Life is but a walking shadow; a poor player,
that struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
and then is heard no more.
It is a tale told by an idiot
full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.*

(’n Boodskapper storm in.)

BOODSKAPPER: My heer, ek het nie woorde nie!
Terwyl ek wag gestaan het op die koppie en uitkyk op Birnamwoud
Begin die bos so wragtig voor my oë aangeloo kom!

MACBETH: Leuenaar! Skurk!

BOODSKAPPER: Ek sweer dit! U kan u op my wreek as ek lieg!
Ek belowe, sewe kilometers van hier kom die bos letterlik aangeloo!

MACBETH: As jy lieg hang ek jou lewendig op aan die naaste boom!
Maar as dit waar is kan jy dieselfde aan my doen!

So, die duiwelsmagte het dan gelieg:
Hulle het kamstig gesê: “Vrees nie Birnamwoud wat opruk na Dunsinaan nie!”
Nou kom die woud gewapend na my toe aangestap!
Hou wat hulle dan sê die waarheid in?
Ons moet onmiddellik hier wegkom!

SESDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Macbeth vlug van die kasteel en bevind hom stoksielalleen in die woud.
Hy word nou selfs deur sy eie manskappe verag en verwerp.
Daar is vir hom net een uitweg, maar op pad ontmoet hy vir Siward.

SIWARD: Wie's jy?

MACBETH: Ek is Macbeth!

SIWARD: Die duiwel self
kon nie 'n viesliker naam geuiter het nie!

*The devil himself could not pronounce a title
more hateful to mine ear.*

MACBETH: Jy's uit 'n vrou gebore!
Ek lag vir jou wapens en die swaard se gevaar;
want jou hande is deur 'n vrou gebaar!
(*Daar is 'n geveg en Siward word gedood.*)

SEWENDE TONEEL

VERTELLER: Macduff soek in die woud na Macbeth.

MACDUFF: Kom uit, jou tiran! Kom uit!
As ek jou nie vandag doodmaak met my swaard nie
sal die dood van elke vrou en kind by my bly spook!
Of jy, of my swaard gaan die prys betaal.
Ja, vir jou gaan ek kry!

Asseblief, laat ek hom kry.
Dit is my gebed.

(Toe skielik, sien hy vir Macbeth.)

MACDUFF: Draai om, jou vark, draai om!

MACBETH: Ek het jou bo almal vermy.
Gaan weg!
My siel is reeds te veel met jou bloed belas!

MACDUFF: Ek het niks vir jou te sê nie.
My swaard sal die praatwerk doen!

VERTELLER: 'n Tweegeveg met swaarde breek uit;
maar geen een laat hom in sy woede stuit;
Macbeth het hard probeer om die geveg te wen
om berekend en koud, Macduff neer te pen.

MACBETH: Jy veg tevergeefs!
Jy sal in die lug rondkap maar nie aan my nie!
Laat val jou swaard,
want my lewe word deur bonatuurlike krag bewaak!

Geen man deur vrou gebaar sal my kan dood nie!
Dit sê die hekse, dit was hulle laaste woord!

MACDUFF: Wanhoop is nou die towerkrag waarop jy moet hoop;
Maar jou dierbare hekse het nagelaat om te sê
EK IS UIT MOEDERSKOOT GESKEUR EN NIE GEBAAAR NIE!

MACBETH: Vervloek is jou woorde!
Jy maak my mal!
Ek glo geen woord meer van daardie dubbelsinnige hekse nie!
Ek wil nie verder veg nie!

MACDUFF: Lafaard!

Gee oor!
Leef - dat ek jou kan uitstal
op 'n paal met dié woorde daarby:
HIER'S DIE TIRAN, KOM KYK!

MACBETH: Nooit! Ek sal nie oorgee nie!
Nooit sal ek Malcolm se voete soen nie!
Ek word getart deur die gespuis se gevloek!
Hier staan ek voor die man wat nie deur 'n vrou gebaar is nie!
Hier waag ek my lewe!
My skild is reg hier voor my bors: Macduff is jy reg?
My vloek rus op hom wat sê hy't genoeg geveg!

VERTELLER: **Hulle het 'n hele ruk verwoestend geveg totdat
Macduff vir Macbeth verslaan het.
Vandaar is hy na Malcolm om hom
as die nuwe koning van Skotland te vereer.**

AGSTE TONEEL

VERTELLER: **Macduff verskyn met Macbeth se kop in die kasteel by Dunsinaan.**

MACDUFF: (*Aan Malcolm*)
Heil, op die koning want dit is u wel!
Hier's die hoof van die vervloekte tiran.
Uiteindelik is ons land weer vry!
Kyk, hier staan al die pêrels van u ryk
wat u nou as hulle koning begroet.
In een magtige stem salueer ek u
Heil! Heil, op die koning van Skotland!

ALMAL TESAAM: Heil, op die koning van Skotland!

MALCOLM: Ek sal julle elkeen afsonderlike beloon;
Verbanne vriende moet teruggeroep word uit die vreemde;
en wrede helpers moet onmiddellik aangekeer word.
En so sal ons met die guns van God's genade streng
alles op die regte tyd en maat en plek volbring.
Met dank nooi ons u een en almal hier
Om saam die kroningsfees op Scone te vier!

VERTELLER: **Nou weet 'n ieder en 'n elk waarom die storie van *Macbeth* gaan;
Nou is die tyd ryp om *Macbeth*
in Engels te lees, te geniet en te verstaan!**

EINDE.

Appendix B

Shakespeare in Southern Africa

Editorial

Who really needs conservative Shakespeareans? Come to think of it, what is a conservative Shakespearean?

These thoughts crossed my mind while brooding on programme notes prior to the curtain going up on a recent Shakespearean production. The writer was hyping away in the usual steamy fashion of those devising programme notes which must both inform and entice: "This production may distress traditional Shakespeareans," he or she proclaimed (for 'traditional' one could supply any of the following: purist, fuddy-duddy, historical/hysterical, bardolatristic or, yes, conservative), "but it gets to the heart of Shakespeare's text as no other in recent years."

Behind the rhetorical gesture lies an undiscovered realm from whose bourne no traveller has returned — probably because nobody went there in the first place. How many conservative Shakespeareans do you know? People who object in principle to anything other than a stuffy early nineteenth century costume-drama approach to staging Shakespeare? Who insist on "full-text or nothing." Who refuse to countenance re-interpretation, and defend to the death the embalmed memories of some favorite stage or film performance as both definitive and final?

If there are people like this — and there are — you can bet your bottom Rand that they don't go regularly to the theatre.

All show-bizz relies on novelty, on turning the perennially human into something edgy, anti-habitual, resplendent. We live in an artistic world where to be *avant garde* is to be normal.

There's the rub. The 'traditional Shakespeareans' can exist only if they seldom visit the theatre, never read reviews, never read relevant books — in other words, if they are so outside the reach of the theatrical enterprise that their critique borders on the fictional. Their disapproving noises are so far off as to be inaudible. One poke in the ribs and the monster vanishes into air, into thin air — and what is left? The people who do go to the theatre, read the books and reviews, and talk about them. They have been living with experimental Shakespeare for the whole of their theatre-going lives. What concerns them is not compliance with some notion of conservative Shakespeare, but whether or not the on-stage result makes for good theatre.

They know that renaissance costume and quasi-Gielgudian enunciation are no more the guarantee of good theatre than would be green-wellied Gonerils and Regans driving range-rovers outside genteel old-age homes. (Actually, that seems rather a plausible sub-text — any volunteers?) They also know that, having sat through numbers of productions, that weak theatre, impoverished interpretation, plain intellectual gormlessness, can also mask themselves as inspiring innovation.

So, who needs the myth of the conservative Shakespearean? Why, the theatrical directors, the promoters, the ad-sters, the actors, the set and costume designers, the musicians and lighting technicians — the full panoply of the theatrical world. The conservative Shakespearean, though he or she rarely darkens a theatre door, is needed so that the theatre can feel on track in its mission to shake up society. If no-one can be found to be shocked or appalled or horrified, how can one be *avant-garde*? And if one can't be *avant-garde*, one can't be an artist, can one? So we need the conservative Shakespearean. If he doesn't exist, then we must create him in the programme notes.

This will be my last editorial for the Journal. I look forward to enjoying the publication from a more detached vantage point. While I hope still to write for it, on occasion — subject to the refereeing process — my role will mainly be to oversee the production of the publication, which will still be carried out for the Shakespeare Society by the Institute for the Study of English in Africa.

I wish my successor well for the future of the journal: may you have as abundant and conscientious support from contributors as I have had.

Laurence Wright