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Abstract
The study analyzes the semantics of the concept of interpretation in the environment of theater communications. Its core is the analysis of the meaning of this term in various understandings - in dictionary references and in the theatrical, theoretical, historical and artistic contexts. It also indicates changes in understanding the content of this term depending on the position of the user. The study outlines not only the main aspects of understanding of this term in the environment of theater communications but also the main features of the theatrical form interpretation.
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Introduction
The notion of interpretation (from lat. interpretatio – explanation, interpretation) in Slovakia and in the Czech Republic is presently most often used in the theater science in its two basic meanings. The first is related to the phrase of the interpretative theater. The second one deals with the understanding of interpretation as creative or somehow unique, special way of interpreting a dramatic or other text in a staging concept. The understanding of interpretation as one of the genre of nonfiction or other theatrical genre is less common.

The first term – the interpretative theater - most often refers to theatrical productions created on basis of theatre plays – or in the broad sense - any type of dramatic text. Meaning – “the interpretation” – replaces older semantically identical term of Literary Theatre, which can have also a pejorative meaning in a term of Reproductive Theater. A term dramatic theatre in this respect is used in German and Polish theatre theory and some others. Slovak theory has the same tradition in using the term of interpretation as the Czech one.

The second semantic meaning is used in various contexts and shifts of understanding. Term the interpretation mainly refers to the process of origin and creation of theatrical form. This term is not established so well in the area of receptive reflection. It can be expressed with the following phrases:
- theatrical character in his/her interpretation, director’s interpretation, director’s interpretation of Strindberg, director’s interpretation of dramatic texts, interpretation of classical plays or study is the interpretation of the theatrical performance, etc.

What is the meaning of these terms:
- “character in somebody’s interpretation” (meaning the actor’s interpretation) puts the stress on the personal understanding of the actor when playing the character that is based on the dramatic text. It is quite often used as a synonym of the older term “the actor’s portrayal of the character”;  
- “director’s interpretation” refers not only to the form of the performance, but also to director’s portrayal in terms of style and expressive uniqueness of his interpretation. The term also indirectly refers to the theoretical understanding of director and of the theater performance model;  
- “director's interpretation of Strindberg” means that when referring to the directing of Strindberg's theatre play there is a comparison of director’s concept with the chosen theatre play, while taking into consideration the whole playwright’s work (it is the most common meaning, but it can also refer to some of Strindberg’s prosaic works);
"staging interpretation of the dramatic text" is a reference that is focused on the word component and its interpretation in the theatrical production. At the same time this phrase points to the semantic changes in the dramatic text, starting with its pretext form, all the way to the final form.

Genre understanding of interpretation as a phrase is expressed most often by the following word sequences:
- “concept is interpretative,” “interpretative approach”, “the study is the interpretation of theatrical performance” etc. All expressions mean that the basic reception approach to staging text lies in the explanation of understanding of its nature by the recipient, and that the chosen strategy of writing is primarily a question of the decision for a particular literary genre (i.e. the interpretation).

In each combination the phrase the interpretation gets some different shade. In its essence, however, it still applies to and describes the method of approaching the text, which makes it possible to explain it by other means, such as language of interpreted text. Despite their different contexts and different understanding, it always provides a stable communication basis for understanding.

**Semantics of Interpretation (Theatre)**

In accordance with the theory of the text and the reception aesthetics, we can understand this concept in a different way as an act related to the essence of the existence of theatrical work. The concept of interpretation in a theater environment may not be only naming of one of the method of how to access the text, or naming a literary genre (Zilka, 2006: 180) in which the testimony of the text is realized. This means that the interpretation is present both in recipient’s as well as author’s understanding of theatrical work (either at the level of origin, creation, or realization).

We can therefore say that the interpretation is present in every type of interpretation of the text, in each phase and also in each form of its existence.

First, let us have a look at understanding the term interpretation by starting from the general definition in basic dictionaries and then to more specific understanding as it is used in various areas of humanities, and finally move toward the narrowest one in the theory of theater. This approach will allow us to define more clearly the meaning, function and status of the interpretation in the theater and it will help us to define more precisely its theatrical form. Later we will move to its content definition, which is relevant in theater.


We can divide them into two groups. On this basis we can consider the interpretation to be a scientific term, originally a Latin expression, referring to:

1. Aesthetic interpretation, explanation or clarification (analysis) of artwork (text in a broad sense) etc.;
2. Performance of an artwork in public, in the meaning of embodiment of the theater character, performing music etc.¹

---

¹ Slovník cudzích slov from 1979 provides one more different explanation when interpretation is clarification of the meaning of the legal Act, interpretation of a legislative norm.
In addition to these above mentioned basic meanings, the word *to interpret* could also have other meanings. These meanings not only deepen the initial understanding of this term, but they describe also more accurately its current practical use in theatrology. The first group has the following synonymic variants:

- specify more concrete circumstances to make it more clear, understandable, comprehensible, to interpret explain
- to interpret the work of an author, describe, clarify the rules of the play, convey, express, communicate on behalf of someone, to give an explanation, to provide an explanation about the art work.

The second group of meanings is specified by verbs such as: introduce, perform an art work, play, reproduce, act, present successfully character roles.

Latin translations of the word *interpretation*, whether in the form of noun or verb, are enriching by now the well-established and widely accepted line with new and very interesting meanings for us.

Noun *interpretatio* has, in addition to the prevalent meaning, the explanation, also another meaning - translation. (Spanar – Hrabovsky, 1987: 320, Tvrdy, 1923: 420, Wzentek, 1923: 393)

Similar verb *interpretari* has a broad range of translation equivalents explain, translate, interpret, understand, know, etc. (Prazak – Novotny – Sedlacek, 1955: 720). Among them, there are more verbs that are related to the translation of the original text into another language, or they touch this meaning only marginally.

According to the citation of the literary theorist Anton Popovic, *the translation* means “...transcoding a language text, which provides for the creation of new language form and stylistic form, with maximum respect for the expressive and semantic information of the original...” (Popovic, 1983: 171) The translation is also “...a stylistic model and in this respect the translation activity is an experimental process (metacreation)...” (Miko – Popovic, 1978: 362)

In the environment of theatre we can hardly talk about a maximum respect for expressive and semantic information in relation of the original and translation, as it is understood by the literary science as far as issues of translation are concerned. If we would like to define an exact definition of translation in the context of exact theatrical content and maintain its formulations, we would have to replace the word translation by world transformation (changing, transforming). The linguistic form of the term has to be free of a narrow literary focus and should be extended by understanding the language in the broadest aesthetic and philosophical sense, especially in the theatrical sense. The above definition by Popović, however, brings to our attention the presence of creativity throughout the whole interpretative process while significantly clarifying what type, form or manner of theatrical creativity it may appear in theatrical interpretation. It also tells us where exactly and in which situation the creative understanding of situation is achieved by theatrical means: and that precisely in the “translation” of the original information into theatrical language.

Coming back to the dictionaries of Latin language, the word *interpretation* appears in the sense of translation with additional meaning. In this type of dictionaries the explanation of this term from the etymological point of view will help us in understanding one more specific position that this term has in theater and understand more clearly one of the basic characteristics of the interpretative process in theatre. During the theatrical communication what happens is not only explanation of the text or part of the performed piece to another recipient. It is not only demonstration or the interpretation of a dramatic text (and its content) on the stage, the depiction of character by an actor on the stage that reflects the staging concept. *The translation* is also the essence of these interpretative activities. In a literary sense: translating a
particular part or information of the whole initial (original) work into another language code. (This is in no case a new language code.) A thing (fact, element, event, character, theme etc.), which we would like keep from the original work in the theatrical performance, we translate into a theatrical system of signs (the original is transformed creatively). We are trying to clarify that particular thing, reveal it, and depict it by a different expression system, which is different from the original. We explain and clarify the theatrical art work in time and space, for example through speech or writing styles in which we use completely different creative processes for capturing the semantic substance. The actor is then verbally depicting the character on the stage under the dramaturgic and directorial concept.

Theatre Context

In the history of theoretical thinking about theater the term interpretation is the most commonly defined as the opposite of the traditional staging approach to dramatic texts that are based on the pursuit of their full respect at a stage.

In the context of author - theatrical reflection French director Jean Vilar agrees with this view. He says that if the dramatic text has the main text, the directing is its interpretation. Even in the case if in directing process the interpretation is absent, the presence of an actor on stage is just hypocrisy. (Vilar, 1966: 27) Italian director Luca Ronconi went even further in thinking on the relationship of text and direction as its interpretation. In his works he favors such a construction of staging, which takes into account several interpretations, which are stimulated directly by the text itself. (In connection with staging of Oresteia by Aeschylus. Ronconi, 1978: 133) Russian theater and film director Sergei Eisenstein, however, by the term interpretation describes a type of work of actor, which is based on a clear vision of the character and its stage image. (Ejzenstejn, 1998: 286)

The Polish theater theoreticians Ratajczak Dobrochna and Andrzej Hausbrandt follow the same discourse as well. R. Dobrochna does not think that anti-literary staging of dramatic texts only partially fulfill the vision represented by the theater. He deems it is necessary to fully admit autonomy to dramatic literature as well as to theater. Theater (staging dramatic texts) is for him the interpretation "...completed through the artifact, using artwork that has a different set of signs." (Ratajczakowa, 1988: 418) For A. Hausbrandt interpretation is a means by which the text is expressively enriched, or opening. The final form of staging a dramatic text is the result of interpretative work not only of director, but also an actor and it is based on a deep analysis of texts and discussions about them. He considers the interpretation of short stories and other prose texts freer than interpreting dramatic text. (Hausbrandt, 1982: 171, 173 etc.)

Thinking of theater historian and theater theoretician Irena Sławinska in this context refers to postmodern thinking about the types and importance of interpretation in the history of the theater thinking. She agrees with P. Ricoeur and his concept of two basic styles of interpretation 1. hermeneutics of suspicious and demystifying style and 2. hermeneutics of reconstruction and recollection (concentration). She believes, however, that: "All kinds of interpretations must mutually cooperate and to draw on with each other, and also complement each other. (...) Philosophy of subject must take "semiotic challenge" (Sławinska, 2002: 402-403), the question of interpretation, however, is not the central issue for I. Sławinska.

Theater theoretician Jan Cisar considers the notion of interpretation for the concept that belongs to direction because the objective of directorial component is to interpret the verbal subsystem (drama, dramatic text). Exegesis as secondary sign quality of interpretation is present mainly in dramaturgical area. In the implementation of the artwork, the secondary sign quality of interpretation is present when in it the different types of interpretation are overlapped or combined. (Cisar,
1986: 42-43) Interpretation is an updated in that case, if it wants to interpret the text as current one. Then "... increases meta creative nature of operations which are carried out by stage subsystem" (Cisar, 1986: 45). Interpreting ability to "express some thing appropriately" (Ejzenstejn, 2001: 92), not just demonstrate it, considers the Russian film director Sergei Eisenstein as a natural feature of theatrical interpretation and thus of their main carriers – actors/interpreters. Czech theatrologist Vladimir Mikes also speaks negatively about interpreters in connection with the Sophists – those who change meanings in a way that the thing "recedes, objectifies, ceases to speak - when its interpreter or "Sprecher" usurps it for himself." (Mikes, 2005) Analyses of interpretation borders in interpretative theater as a reflection about the form and means of non-interpretative theater is made by the Czech theatrologist and dramaturgist Jan Sotkovsky. The reason for his studies were "approximate, inaccurate, incoherent interpretations." (Sotkovsky, 2007: 9). As an interpretative theater he understands analogously to Peter Pavlovsky such a theater, which is based on the dramatic text and what he has in mind is mostly drama theatre.

American theatre scholar Marvin Carlson in his Dejiny divadelnych teorii (Theories o Theater History) (Carlson, 2006) is working significantly o with the concept of interpretation. History of theoretical thinking about theater is for him the history of different types of interpretations of the central concepts of theatrical aesthetics in each stylistic period (mimesis, catharsis, conflict, confusion, ethos etc.). He covers the range from etymology to use in non-theatrical context.

French theatre scholar Patrice Pavis in his Divadelny slovnik (Theatre Dictionary) understands the interpretation of as a critical approach to the text or the scene or the reader / viewer, which is based "... in determining the meaning (sense) and purpose (signification). (Pavis, 2004: 214) It also includes “…author’s process of creating performances, as well as the process of reception by the audience.” (Pavis, 2004: 214) This concept also applies to the actor's work on stage, which creates the meaning through interpretation and the theatrical signs emerging as the result of structuring the system, and not as the result of its existence. P. Pavis extends also three types of receptionist’s interpretation: hermeneutical-semiotic, semantic and pluralistic. (Pavis, 2004: 214-215) It is for him also the art of misunderstanding, which is based on the belief that "... text only turns to me. (Simkova, 2007: 245) The viewer, however, admits legitimacy of text, because when reading the text or watching the dramatic work penetrates into phantasmal job of creators (manuscript sources of text etc.) and the viewer himself develops his own imagination. (Simkova, 2007: 245) His interpretative reasoning Umberto Eco addressed the issue of semiotic interpretation of theatrical performance (understood in a broader context). (Eco, 1988: 44-53, Eco, 2001: 7-10, Eco, 2004: 112-122 etc.)

Using the story of Argentine writer Jorge Luis Borges of Averroes, the important medieval Arab philosopher, Eco came to the interpretation of a theatrical performance (staging, drama) from the perspective of the traditional classification of signs. In this short story Averroes finds out about works of Aristotle, and consequently two unknown words - comedy and tragedy, which the philosopher could not define even with the help of direct experience of the theater with his discussion partner. While thinking about these unknown notions, boys were playing the game on muezzin in the ground floor of the same building. The boys played on muezzin so that one boy was standing on the shoulders of another boy, and said: "I am muezzin." This is the most typical example of understanding the theater nature and its sign substance. Umberto Eco understood the semiotic interpretation of theatrical performances by the way of example of American semiotician Charles Spenser Pierce about the drunkard, who was unveiled by the Salvation Army as a public warning against alcoholism.

Eco’s conclusions are as follows:
- There is no difference between the figure of the drunken and the word drunken, because the drunken man (of Pierce) is sign (it is represented by "some" drunk, his physical presence refers back to something absent);
- Drunken character may also refer to a number of other contents; the interpretation of physical presence of a drunk under any of the options depends on theatrical conventions and complexity of theatrical performances;
- By the presence of drunken character was selected from existing physical bodies, it is shown, demonstrated, it means it is ostension (method of de-realization of the object so that it can represent the entire class);
- Drunken is a sign of second square (the semiotic square), because the drunkard plays that he is not drunk;
- In the case of an actor it is this "the semiotic square" that in his dramatic performances are present two speech acts: 1. it is a performativ statement - "I play the role." Implicitly, he is telling the truth, but also is announcing that from this point on he will be lying; 2. the actor is represented by pseudo statement, in which the actor is already playing the character. (This is based on Russian ethnographer and folklorist Pyotr Grigorievich Bogatyrev, who indicates that in the theater the signs are signs of things.) In the theatre the denotation can refer to connotation and vice versa.

In the Czech theatre science Zdeněk Hořínek studied in depth the problem of interpretation in his article Interpretace a tvorba (Interpretation and Creation). (Horinek, 1990: 3-11) It discusses the importance of the concept of interpretation in sense of interpretation-definition, grasping the actor’s role and translation. Semantics of the word interpretation and its comparison with the situation in a theatrical environment brings him to the argument about the importance of distinguishing between interpretation and creation. He also believes that every work of realized art, and also theatrical one, means interpretation. We however, do not consider its creative nature as specifics of staging interpretation, but it is due to the fact that: „The objective of theatrical work is not exact interpretation of dramatic texts, but to create appellative, it means, resonant live theater.” (Horinek, 1990: 10)

More fundamental way is also the issue of theatrical interpretations expressed by the theater scholar Peter Pavlovsky in the definition of Interpretační divadlo (Interpretative Theatre) in the dictionary Základní pojmy divadla (Basic Theatre Definitions), where he understands the notion of interpretation as "... either interpretation of artworks (exegesis, for example, in the theater critical review), or its media realization (which is also to some extent an interpretation).” (Pavlovsky a kol., 2004: 125, Pavlovsky, 1999: 72–73) Where: "The work of interpretative theater is an interpretation of some literary or musical-literary artwork (...). Nearly every performance is the implementation (interpretation) of its production, but in the interpretative theatre the staging is the interpretation itself." (Pavlovsky a kol., 2004: 125)

Semiotician Miroslav Prochazka says that an important prerequisite for dramatic text interpretation "... - whether of literary science or theatrological one – it is the idea that speech in dramatic work is actually part of a larger dramatic event, in which the means of nonverbal and verbal communication are connected." (Prochazka, 1989: 228) He also suggests that any kind of interpretation or analysis of the dramatic text must always count on his duality. Duality of its function means that it is always the text which is primarily determined by "... the tendency to theatrical portrayal.” (Prochazka, 1989: 232) Secondary it can work also in literary communication as object of reader’s reception.

From the literary-communication point of view therefore dramatic text is heading to the theater, it is a theater -production basis, and it is a component of the theater communication and literary reading. Because the dramatic text is, in terms of
literary communication mostly fragmentary and hybrid, its semantic unification is realized by the author’s notes. (Prochazka, 1989: 226-227) In terms of the text theory M. Prochazka considers the dramatic text as a link of the text continuity; it means a text type, which naturally builds relationships with other kinds of art. It is also a text that reflects "... problems of artistic practices, themes, topics, means of expression etc., just as well as literary and theatrical ones." (Prochazka, 1989: 233)

Dual targeting of dramatic text on literary and theatrical area is as follows (Prochazka, 1989: 233–234):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dramatic text as literature</th>
<th>Dramatic text as theater text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic text as literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking</td>
<td>demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>torso-like</td>
<td>integral action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hybridity</td>
<td>symbiosis of verbal and non-verbal means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monologization /past/</td>
<td>dialogization /presence/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on the written language resources /analytical/</td>
<td>focus on speaking skills /elipticity, para-lingual resources etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>various forms of notes literary style /if present /</td>
<td>notes as scenic description of theater space, actors’ means, director’s instructions etc. /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech as action</td>
<td>speech as part of the action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character definitively defined or outlined in a note or hinted in a speech</td>
<td>confrontation of a speech and a remark with a scenic vision / character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pursuit of compactness and unity of expression in the language level</td>
<td>concept of dramatic character .../</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happening as a flow</td>
<td>confrontation with the forces of theatrical expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dramatic person /character /</td>
<td>story as an immediate action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative autonomy of the text</td>
<td>aiming towards a dramatic character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aestheticization of language</td>
<td>non-independent: process text director’s book – staging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confrontation with literary genres</td>
<td>aestheticization of language / occasional /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confrontation with literary genres</td>
<td>only depending on the function within a wider and aesthetic shape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theoretician of scenography Albert Prazak in his monograph Interpretace scénografického prostoru (Interpretation of Scenographic Space) dealt with the problem of interpreting a scenographic space. He says that the scenographic space exists as the interpretation as "... viewer entering into its imagination (Czech metaphorical). ..." (Prazak, 2003: 45) when unification of an artwork happens, an actor and a viewer in time and space. Thus, the precondition of formation of scenographic space is its interpretation and the interpretation happens always in terms of ideological concepts - thus in line with the spirit of the scenographic program. Scenic area, as a space inserted into the stage, is always only a product of a scenographic space. (Prazak, 2003: 56–60)
Theatrologist Vaclav Cejpek in his work titled *Cerny andel (Black Angel)* (Cejpek, 1994) used a holistic theatrological interpretative approach. When interpreting the meaning of the dramatic works of Austrian playwright Thomas Bernhard he took into consideration not only his resume, but also his literary work, literary, philosophical and other influences. Cejpek also analyzed the structure and language of Bernhard’s plays, including the analyses of playwright’s attitude to life and the one of his drama characters. The final part of his work is a typical interpretation. Cejpek considers Bernhard’s characters as metonymic expression of black angels, symbols of people with growing humanity, but who ‘...do not lose their gloomy view of the world...’ (Cejpek, 1994: 50)

Martin Bažil understands interpretation as a separate method of approaching text, he includes among the basic ones literary interpretation, where - for example - can be a problem its "very nature of the text, both at the level of preservation and the level of its origin." (Bazil, 2010: 8) In the debate about types of interpretations we can add also defining of theatrical interpretation of drama by Peter Pavlovský, arising when it is "read loudly to the audience." (Pavlovsky, 2001: 71) Or characteristics of tragedy in ancient texts made by Zdenek Horinek, which arises only "metaphysical interpretation of human intentions and actions. The tragic events - death, fall, sacrifice of a tragic hero – they receive positive and liberating meaning only when they are viewed in the context of impersonal and timeless system, whether its basis is a myth, religion, or secular normative system of unconditionally valid commands and prohibitions." (Horivek, 2001: 73)

In the Slovak theatrological context theatre scholar Peter Karvaš worked significantly with the concept of interpretation in connection with directing and dramatic work. In his opinion director's work with theater plays is director’s interpretation, because the director is not only a performer of drama, but also its interpreter. Text is the result of complex operations and a director makes complicated decisions, on the basis instructions that are encoded in the text, while during the performance the audience always influences the final theatrical concretization, which is always "... a distinctive and inimitable and non-transferable interpretation of drama ..." (Karvas, 1982: 42) Director interprets drama to actor; the actor interprets drama to the audience. For the actor it is a form of personal interpretation of drama.

Directorial interpretation is also for P. Karvaš always a critical reading of the dramatic text. (Karvas, 1982: 42-51) in the actor’s role, in the dramatic character, the actor’s dramatic interpretation is extremely personal and subjective and the actor is also not only interpreting, but also interpreted creative subject of artwork. (Karvas, 1984: 187)

Theater historian and critic Pavol Palkovič uses the concept of interpretation in a similar sense in relation to the drama as P. Karvas. He considers the drama to be a potential theater, which has to be read creatively "... reading’ means to hear and see the dramatic text in theatrical, time-spatial dimensions ..." (Palkovic, 1985: 4, Palkovic: 1997: 6, 25 etc.) He also suggests that that is a big difference between theatrical interpretation of older and more recent dramatic texts. While theatrological school considers a text as a non-binding working material, so-called literary (philological) approach is strongly historicist and the text is considered as binding, peculiar, and untouchable. (Palkovic, 1982: 9-10)

Palkovič considers critical reviews to be the interpretation and actors are also interpreters according to him. (Palkovic, 1982: 78) He is also the author of numerous studies and research papers in which he deals pragmatically with the interpretation as a way of adaptation linking. (Palkovic, 2005: 27-70)

Theatrologist Karol Horak speaks not about actors, but about interpreters when he talks about his theater of poetry and his experimental authors’ student theater. (Horak, 1982) He analyzed the notion of interpretation in more details. In his study
Zapas o novu kvalitu, (Struggle for the New Quality) (Horak, 1986: 88-99) he adapted the communication model of A. Popovic and created a theoretical theatrical text model of interpretation,\(^1\) which expresses the relationship between literary texts and staged play.\(^2\)

An initial communication process of Popovic that takes place also during a theatrical performance:

**author – text – recipient**

K. Horak redefined a secondary theater communication process by meta-communicative optics:

**author – metatext – recipient.**

Theatrical interpretation of a literary text is a metatext according to Horák and the author's text is an invariant (it means, the dramatic text, note of the author).

This way the theater production is thus a derived, secondary text that "...arose as a result of special dramaturgical directorial operations in the particular type of literary communication. More specifically: meta communication - a special type of literary communication in the sign system of performing arts." (Horak, 1985: 95)

In many Horak’s theater studies, theater and literary works we can find a lot of examples on the author's interpretive strategies which he explicitly explains.\(^3\)

M. Zilkova works significantly with the concept of interpretation in the field of critical, professional or scientific theatrological work. Thus, for example, she made a genre definition of afterword of the theatrologist Vladimír Stefka’s to the publication of Karol Horák’s dramas entitled *Pať hier, alebo Hrdina menom hra* (Five Plays or a Hero Named a Play), where she refers to the afterword as a detailed interpretation of Horák’s plays. (Zilkova, 1995: 80)

Theatrologist Miroslav Ballay in his monograph *Ticho v divadelnom diele* (The Silence in the Theater Work) understands the theatrical interpretation of a theatrical work as the possibility how to "...eventually deepen particularly aesthetic effectiveness and receptionist impact of silence on the viewer in the audience." (Ballay, 2006: 73)\(^4\) In this work he deals, inter alia, with the issue of the presence of various interpretative levels in theater texts, the silence is interpreted in three ways - acoustic, psychological and semantic (archetypal level). (Ballay, 2006: 73-96)\(^5\)

When analyzing the interpretation concept, aesthetician Michal Babiak looks into its fundamental determinants. He considers the interpretation primarily as "...a critical component to discuss an artwork." (Babiak, 2009: 154) In this context he raises the historical and present issues related to the constantly emerging "...very substantial interpretative signal noises, confusion and anomalies." (Babiak, 2009: 154)

Director Lubomir Vajdicka considers the director’s work with text to be in the first place an exegesis and explanation which contains elements of implementation as well as elements of a possible implementation. (Vajdicka, 1996: 8, 101 etc.) Director's interpretation of the dramatic text is mainly work with the dramatic text in

---

\(^1\) In the broadest sense, i.e. from the aspect of the text theory.


\(^3\) More on that for example in Institorisova (2007).

\(^4\) For more on that see Ballay (2006).

the space which is done in accordance with the French term mise en scène (within the meaning of fr. mise en scène - "putting on the scene") in line with its understanding in Russia, where it is, thanks to Eisenstein, enriched by another meaning. It is understood also as a reasonable story plot in play’s space and time, which arises from its contents, meaning and emotions. (Vajdicka, 1996: 7)

Director Juraj Nvota considers the interpretation in the context of theater plays in a similar way as Czech theatrologist Zdenek Hořínek. He considers it an expression of reader’s concretization; it means analogically, the implementation of each specific production of a play is interpretation. He applies it also to texts as the Bible or the plays of William Shakespeare. He says that they are permanently interpreted but one has to note that "...neither bad nor wrong interpretations didn’t hurt neither the Scriptures nor Shakespeare. On the other hand both believers and theater audiences were hurt. Or at least in a way how their precious time has been wasted." (Nvota, 2008: 8)

Regarding the translation of plays (and also in relation to the theory of translation by A. Popovic which is based on his meta-texts theory) there is an interesting finding of Jan Vilikovsky. When analyzing three translations of Shakespeare’s Hamlet done by Pavol Orszagh Hviezdoslav, Vladimir Roy and Jan Kot, he came to the conclusion that "... new translation only reflects a changed communication situation, it interprets the work in accordance with the particular period of time; emphasizing those components that seem particularly urgent and immediate for contemporaries." (Vilikovsky, 1981: 170, Vilikovsky, 1984: 103-117) Hviezdoslav’s translation was primarily the literary work from the point of view of his time aesthetics. Roy’s translation already started to take into account the nature of theatrical art, while that aspect became the most crucial for Jan Kot. It was to such an extent, that when Kot was translating Hamlet he modified his routinely used translation strategy for prose. (Vilikovsky, 1981: 170) In his understanding he is close to the French deconstructionist Jacques Derrida, who was explaining translation in relation to the transcendental signified, due which the translation can occur, but in practice it is always a difference between signified and signifier. Translation for him is controlled transformation of one text by other one. (Derrida, 1993: 33-34) Translation in his concept of “différance” is like writing, or other facts and is the result of synthesis and references which "... do not allow that at any moment and in some sense can be an element which is simply present just itself and aiming only at it." (Derrida, 1993: 38) The translation is writing, which is denoting residual of simulacrum. (Derrida, 1993: 70)

In terms of understanding the interpretation as a set of "... practices that help to detect semantic invariant of the original text ..." (Vilikovsky, 1984: 102) in its historical and individual conditionality, in accordance with the opposite of the ongoing cultural situation of the translator, Derrida says about the major limitations of the translator in translating a dramatic text. Since it is an artistic text, type of translation is interpretive. What is maintained "...the correspondence between the key semantic essence, while other components of the statement shall be supplemented in accordance with the possibilities of the target language and interpretation of objective ... " (Vilikovsky, 1984: 124) but since the text by definition for staging is not autonomous, the translator has much more restricted choice of means. (Vilikovsky, 1984: 125-126)

Shakespeare scholar Jana Wild mentions the translation as the interpretation and understands it as communication of text already in the form of communication, it is "...the first interpretation of the text, the first instruction to the reader ..." (Bzochova-Wild, 1998: 105) As a matter of intersemiotic translation it is understood by the Czech theatrologist Iva Sulajova, for whom then "intersemiotic translation refers to the interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal
sign systems or, expressed more broadly, it is "translation of meaning from communication which is formed in one semiotic system". (Sulajova, 2004)

Conclusion

In the theatrical environment interpretation has of course its specifics. Their essence lies in the fact that interpretation is not only the genre through which the imager of theatrical text is explained (it means it is becoming obvious to another participant of the theatre communication), but also a procedural way of existence of recipient in the work, as well as its creators. The viewer is involved in receptive process as direct, active interpreter of sign structures of theatrical works and not just like its passive recipient or just receiver. His communication situation, it means the way the work is understood in the context of personal and social relations, is interpretative.

Viewer's participation in the show or in the reading of dramatic text is also always act of creating the text because text newly interpreted in its vision of the shape and the result of this reinterpretation is semantic reaction to theatrical expression, with the help of which the viewer is consciously "reading" (it means he is decoding the text).
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