

RADEGUNDIS STOLZE

10.15290/cr.2018.20.1.02

Technische Universität Darmstadt TUD

Phenomenology and Rhetoric in Hermeneutic Translation

Abstract. Translational Hermeneutics as a discipline is central in Translation Studies. It redirects academic interest from language structures and cultural differences onto the person dealing with them, the translator. The translator, with intellectual, social and individual aspects of identity, combines intuition with reflection in the mediating process. S/he has in his or her strategy a dual perspective on the texts: s/he asks for their socio-cultural background, and analyses holistically the level of the text's language structure, never proceeding in a word-for-word manner. Comprehension requires relevant cultural and specialist knowledge guiding the phenomenology in understanding, whereas proficiency in specific text genres and styles, textual logic, and semantic webs with cultural key words is rhetorically necessary for writing a translation. The application of this dynamic translation competence is demonstrated using an example.

Keywords: hermeneutics, phenomenology, comprehension, translation, rhetoric, competence, hermeneutical circle.

1. Understanding the text

The act of translating is embedded in cultures, which are symbolic reproduction systems containing various discourse fields. Translation is a task performed by persons in a society to enable communication. Before we can write a translation, we will ask what the text is actually saying. Translation is not an inter-lingual transfer of language structures, nor a mapping operation of sentences, but the presentation of a message understood. And we will never present in a translation other than what we have understood. The reason is that we can only express what is cognitively present in our mind. Cognitive science analyzes human thinking: "The evolution of human cognition has been much more gradual and incremental than previously assumed. It accords crucial roles to cultural evolution, techno-social co-evolution and gene-culture co-evolution. These have produced domain-general developmental processes with extraordinary power—power that makes human cognition, and human lives, unique" (Heyes 2012: 2091). Translation starts as an encounter with the unknown.

Hermeneutics as a modern language philosophy "offers a way to understand understanding itself – how we apprehend and process meaning, how we make use of meaning, and indeed go in search of it. On this score, the hermeneutic approach is relevant to virtually any social discipline one cares to name. Translation Studies, for instance, seeks to define how translators understand their practice" (Stanley et al. 2018: 7).

The main objects of hermeneutics are written texts, as their message requires a back transformation into language in order to be intelligible. Friedrich Schleiermacher (1998) has defined understanding as a reversed act of writing: a person talks to me through a text, and I want to understand that message. Hans Georg Gadamer (1990: 390) has described the act of understanding—when I am touched by the idea of the foreign text, when the message addresses me—as a medial act of experiencing truth in reading or being attracted by a scene. Truth is not a result of information mining, rather, truth reveals itself when we are reading texts, and comprehension plays a central role.⁷

Historicity in language is ever present, since we all are embedded in a certain tradition of world interpretation. However, this idea, which was strongly underlined by Gadamer, has also been criticized. Focusing only on the tradition may also block interpretation against new insight, individual reaction, a grasping of foreign cultural ideas. This has been one of the main criticisms against hermeneutics (Stanley 2005: 339). A critical self-evaluation by the translator is therefore necessary, since translation requires “responsible reading and expertise” (Stolze 2011: 75). Instead of only looking at tradition, one has to self-critically ask whether the interpretation is really convincing. The language structure is a reference here, and Schleiermacher (1998) proposed some methods of combining “hermeneutics and criticism”. Paul Ricoeur (1969) pointed out the fact that meaning is carried by words in texts and interpretation is actually induced by the linguistic structures. Ricoeur’s observation of a permanent “translation” within a language community—in the form of commentaries in other words to previous discourse—refers to the work of the language “on itself”. An “identical sense” can nowhere be found, simply because of the fact that one may express the same message with different words just as well. Against this backdrop, an interpretation is no uncritical subjective affair; it may rather be backed up and justified by analyzable linguistic structures. The point here is how a translating person deals with these structures when understanding a textual message and reformulating it in another language. We are never “navigating on a sea of words between languages and cultures” (Bassnett 2000: 106). These cultures and the languages as their reflection do not exist objectively outside; there are people who act and speak and translate within their culture.

2. Cultural phenomenology

Translation, as a responsible process of mediation among nations, is embedded in cultures which are symbolic reproduction systems containing various discourse fields. The so-called cultural turn in the Humanities is an answer to the change in society and world order. As Aleida Assmann says: “The transformation of the traditional humanities into a cultural perspective is reflected

⁷ This idea, which plays a role in all modern hermeneutical theories of translation, was first formulated clearly by Schleiermacher: “Whoever has mastered this art of understanding through the most diligent cultivation of a language, through precise knowledge of the whole historical life of a nation and through the lively representation of single works and their authors, he and he alone may wish to lay open the same understanding of the masterpieces of art and scholarship to his contemporaries and compatriots” (Schleiermacher 1977: 72).

meaningfully in the substitution of the key concept of ‘arts subject’ by new key words such as ‘symbol’, ‘medium’ and ‘culture’” (Assmann 2004: 7)⁸. Older objects of scholarly observation such as “text”, “translation” or “space” now themselves become a category of analysis (Bachmann-Medick 2009: 8).

“Cultural studies move their interest now onto structures, processes and practices in an environment imagined as being technomorphic. In the center of this new paradigm there is the axiom of the constructivity of the media, which are no longer understood as forms of representation, but as original ways of creating a world” (Assmann 2004: 8). The medial determination of culture focuses on memory techniques and forms of communication, and also on translation as a medium. Hence the “question of the media can be linked with the question of the cultural memory which is a core aspect of the self-thematizing of societies” (Assmann 2004: 11). Identities today are marked by cultural discourse, and cultures are set down in languages. Now it is clear how much translators have as a responsibility in their work and what the role of culture-specific phenomenology is here.

Phenomenology reflects the fact that objects appear as a phenomenon to individuals in their life-world in an ever specific way. There is no objective reality valid for all and ever (Stolze 2015: 87). All objects in the world are bound to their cultural background, and seen “in the light” of a culture one may understand them, and interpret them in a socially adequate way. A member of one ideological group understands their text within their phenomenology, while others will stay outside. Translators will have to learn about the characteristics of a foreign culture in order to be able to avoid misinterpretation of their texts. The same is valid for specialist texts which are only comprehensible from the perspective of a scientist. Cultural phenomenology means the reflection of the cultural background of phenomena as objects appearing to individuals, and in a foreign text they may be “strange” at first sight.

Paul Ricoeur’s early work in hermeneutics dealt with bringing phenomenology, that is the study of human consciousness, into dialogue with hermeneutics. He claimed not to be interested in synthesizing the two into one new philosophical system—an impossibility anyway, according to hermeneutics—but he did emphasize the importance of how the two together can aid interpretation. Building on Freud, Marx, and Nietzsche, Ricoeur developed a “hermeneutics of suspicion,” thus strengthening Schleiermacher’s approach to interpretation that stressed the presence and effects of false consciousness in the beliefs that people form. Ricoeur’s work is influenced, among others, by the phenomenologist Edmund Husserl. He focuses on overcoming naïve misinterpretation (Ricoeur 1969: 22) and searches for a “hidden sense behind the obvious sense”. So, if consciousness is our fundamental access to the world of meaning, but consciousness can be deluded or deceived, then our access to meaning may be blocked or distorted. What we take for conscious beliefs and decisions may be the product of the inner workings of our unconscious. As the unconscious affects the reader, it also affects the writer.

⁸ All quotations from A. Assmann are my translation from the German language.

In looking at texts, we have to distinguish between a traditional, i.e. philological-linguistic concept of texts, and a cultural-semiotic concept of texts. In the latter case, “text” is a materially fixed fabric of symbolic codes, “performance” concerns all those sign processes that are manifested in actions. This corresponds with our concept of translation as a dynamic task of representing a message. Translators as persons acting in the medium of a language and in society are also situated within a society and a culture. Cognitively, we are able to analyze objects and to learn new things. Socially, we can exchange with other people, even feel into other forms of life, and individually there is ever a specific level of experience and emotional attitude towards the text. The alleged neutrality of the translator, who would simply report about the text, is an illusion.

Translators, then, have a double perspective on the text: one will ask about the socio-cultural background as the context, and one analyzes the language level in a holistic approach. This is relevant in positioning texts as a condition for translation, because understanding may be backed-up by certain signals in the text, an idea that text linguistics has long suggested (Coseriu 1980: 150; Ricoeur 1969). We distinguish three levels of culture (Vermeer 2006: 162): Para-culture – the culture of a nation, dia-culture – a regional professional socio-culture, and idio-culture – the behavior of an individual. Whilst in the framework of a para-culture, like for instance in Germany or in Poland, various dia-cultures, such as scientific disciplines, the law, political groups, fan clubs, etc. are found, there are always some individual differences in behavior and communication within those dia-cultures.

3. The Translator’s Subjectivity

Acting in society, one has to apply reasonable strategies and justify one’s action taking up responsibility. Readers rely on the rendition of translators and expect that it presents to them the text’s message truthfully as a whole.

The translator as a person, in her subjectivity, is herself rooted in one society and culture, but she is able to enter into other worlds of life by learning. In doing this, one does not only have a cognitive self, but there are also the social interaction and constantly growing experiences, as well as individual emotions and feelings (Robinson 2013), not least by interest in the subject dealt with. Prescribing the correct behavior in social action is not absolutely possible, because a different behavior of the individual cannot be excluded. That is why responsibility is needed to motivate one’s action. Translations are not made in my own interest but as a mediator.

Subjectivity is a fundamental human concept. It includes cognitive, existential and individual aspects (Stanley 2012: 252), and we might speak of “embodiment”. Translation is an act in between rules and play. Regarding the *intellectual* subject, one may analyze how persons grasp phenomena, how translators think, how they work with their tools, what they research. Regarding the *social* existence of persons, there are studies analyzing concrete language usage: analyses of parallel texts, of text genres, of stylistic forms, intercultural semantics, metaphors, terminology, etc., because we are rooted in and influenced by our culture. There is no detached, subjectivist communication. The results of such scholarly studies must be part of translation didactics. And for the *individual*

subject reception studies analyze the creative reaction of a translator to his or her text that shows in deviations from literalism, and follows traces of translations in foreign literary systems. The familiar and the foreign are not seen xenophobically, but this is simply the individual world view of a person. All the aspects are interrelated in the translator's mind. So the alleged "eurocentric" translation of marginalized texts is not a political strategy as some have criticized (Tymoczko 2006), but an unconscious, even naïve phenomenological lack of knowledge of the foreign culture. What we need is grounded understanding (Stolze 2011: 68), based on relevant cultural and technical knowledge.

In practice, we often observe that different translators render a somewhat different translation, even from a simple text. The reason is that they dispose of different pre-knowledge. And when we read our own translations some time later, we immediately spot errors or inadequate formulations because we have learnt something in the meantime.

Comprehension is a mixture of intuitive schematic evidence based on grounded understanding and subsequent precise analysis (Stefanink 1997: 170), and this requires self-criticism due to translational responsibility. Akbari and Segers (2017: 242) have empirically analyzed diverse personality traits with their effect on translation quality. They found out that "openness-to-experience" is an important characteristic of good translators. The authors state (2017: 261): "open-to-experience people tend to be more imaginative and curious", and that "translation and creativity are interwoven particularly in texts requiring a high degree of imagination and originality", so that "it is quite unwise to adopt a prescriptive approach". They conclude: "Translation trainees have to be well acquainted with their own personality characteristics" (2017: 262), a requirement that has long been stressed in hermeneutic Translation Studies (Stolze 2011: 77).

4. The hermeneutical and other circles

Hermeneutics had originally been a method for correctly understanding some specialist texts – in theology, in jurisprudence, in politics, etc. It was only Friedrich Schleiermacher who, at the beginning of the 19th century, turned the philosophical interest back onto the problem of individual understanding as such, because this is never a matter of fact. And he offered some criteria for justifying one's understanding by "hermeneutics *and* criticism" (Schleiermacher 1998).

4.1. Hermeneutical circle

Hermeneutics says that we understand all phenomena "in the light" of what we know already, on the basis of given knowledge, even an ideology (Gadamer 1990: 269). This is the so-called "hermeneutical circle" linking persons to content, and outside of it there is no good understanding. We can always enlarge that circle by learning, but there is no truth to be determined objectively for all. Signs do refer to the external background in the world, but we understand them when we view them against that background.

The role of the hermeneutical circle determines the significance of phenomenology, which, as a philosophy, asks how people understand and see things (Stanley 2012: 259). Various persons don't

understand a text in a fully identical manner, and even one person may see different meanings in a temporally later reading. The responsible translator activating his or her knowledge base views the text already from the perspective of the task and does some cognitive operations that are important for the later strategy and that are omitted in a merely interested reading (Kupsch-Losereit 2012: 43).

4.2. Circle of understanding

And Schleiermacher pointed out even another circle, the “circle of understanding” (1998: 187), which says that the sense of a text is a global entity and the parts have their meaning in relation to the overall meaning of that text. This is a two-dimensional and closed circle. Just as texts are placed within a culture or a scientific domain, a word in a sentence is related to the whole of the text. For understanding, we therefore cannot only concentrate on reading a text in a phrase-by-phrase manner with the help of dictionaries. We will instead keep in mind that texts always appear to us as an individual global message, as an integral entity offering multifarious perspectives. The relationship between a lexeme and a sentence, between cognitive scenes and linguistic frames is relevant here (Fillmore 1977: 55). The thematic cohesion in a text reflects on the language level in the isotopic web of semantic coherence (Stolze 2011: 157).

The detection of the overall structure and arrangement of a text is often the first step to its interpretation. That is why the translational reading should be a holistic approach that passes from the whole message down to the individual lexematic structures and the syntactic order. The common practice in didactics to explain meaning always with a word or sentence only is questionable.

4.3. Hermeneutical helix

And there is finally a kind of “hermeneutical helix”. This relates to the cognitive aspect of understanding as a process. There is a constant interplay between the input of textual content while reading and its interaction with the given knowledge in one’s mind. Psycholinguistic researchers speak of “bottom-up and top-down processes in understanding” (Hörmann 1981: 124). This movement is like a cognitive spiral circling around the truth sought for, and it proceeds gradually deeper into the message of the text. The process of understanding has been defined as a dialogue, a kind of spiral of conversation with the content going back and forth, which should in the end lead to a “fusion of horizons”, the reader’s and the author’s one (Gadamer 1990: 306). Repeated reading of multiple texts changes the perceptions of the reader, and every change opens a new situation, a new point of understanding and interpretation, which may again be developed. The hermeneutical helix is a dynamic movement towards better understanding, guided by both intuition and active intellectual outreach. The attempt to express an idea is an autopoietic impulse (Stolze 2011: 128) circling around the pleasing formulation that does not always come up at the first attempt. The translator’s creativity as a personality characteristic (Akbari and Segers 2017: 262) is working here. The adequacy of a solution found can then be justified by means of rhetorical criteria.

Hermeneutic translation, hence, is a dynamic task to be performed in a process. There are no algorithms in the sense of a step-by-step procedure. The notion of the “embodiment” of the translator includes the idea that he or she deals individually as a subject with the texts, applying his or her knowledge and observing the external conditions of the work. In practical hermeneutics, of course, the text-immanent circle of understanding works within our text-external hermeneutical circle of knowledge to go forward in the hermeneutical helix on our way to a satisfying comprehension and reproduction. This is a dynamic process. Cognitive and psycholinguistic research into mental processes of comprehension could give even more insights here, a field of research so far neglected in Translation Studies. Important impulses are offered by, among others, Elżbieta Tabakowska (1993), and these also need to be integrated by hermeneutical studies.

No operationalization of any transfer processes is possible, as had been taught in traditional translation didactics. With a view to words and syntactic elements teachers had claimed that various specific transfer procedures were applied, called “translation rules” (Newmark 1988). Generations of translators were analyzing grammar structures, thus losing the awareness of the overall text message. Such rules are of no use in the work of translation, because what we write in the translation depends on what we have understood beforehand, and everything can also be formulated in a different way, as Paul Ricoeur had observed. This is due to the freedom of mankind in life. The wish does not lead in a logically compelling and fully guaranteed way to the respective action, and neither does command. Regulations are not always direct instructions for the individual (Stolze 2011: 31). However, the translator needs some orientation in the world of texts, in order to reflect and to justify his or her translational solutions.

5. Fields of orientation

The translators’ responsibility requires that the work be not only a subjective affair. The question, then, is where we can look within our hermeneutical circle to understand, and within the hermeneutical helix of gradually producing adequate formulations in a translation. Instead of a linear syntactic and semantic analysis we might approach the text holistically.

5.1. Holistic understanding of text

We can use certain fields of attention for understanding within the entity of a text (Stolze 2011: 127) regarding the situational background, the discourse field, the meaning dimension and the predicative mode found in the text to be translated. Like in a dialogue we pose questions to the text that will be answered.

	<i>Translator's reading</i>	<i>Literature</i>	<i>Specialist communication</i>
Understanding	Situational background	Country, epoch, editor, author, cultural community, realia, geographical names	Area of sciences or humanities with state of development, time, author, medium of publication
	Discourse field	Social setting in culture, author's ideology, world view in text, genre, kind of text presentation	Domain with special discipline, text type, level of communication (expert/lay), text function
	Meaning dimension	Titles, key words, isotopic web, cultural associations, metaphors, thematic strings	Terminological conceptualization (definition/ deduction vs. convention/ interpretation), metaphors
	Predicative mode	Speaker's perspective, idiolect, sentence subjects, deixis, focusing, verbal tense, irony, quotations, intertextuality, register	Speech acts, phrase construction, passive form, standard text blocks, anonymous voice, directives, cohesion markers, formulae, footnotes

Once we have understood the text in a general way, when we know what it is saying to us, then we may write down a draft translation. This will then be revised according to rhetorical criteria also in holistic application. We will explain this using an example below.

5.2. Translational strategies

In understanding a text, the translator creates a global cognitive plan for the accepted assignment of representing that message in empathy (as if it were his own communication). Tentative creative writing and reviewing in a problem-solving strategy are repeated several times in a helical movement, until a final text is produced that corresponds to the initial writing goal. Translations are not derived from their "source text", but rather messages cognitively present that are expressed with disregard to the linguistic structures in that source text (Stolze 2011: 150). The translational writing strategy is based on the results of prioritizing the main characteristic of the source text.

The process of writing is first oriented selectively to certain points of difficulty; it is a data-driven bottom-up process. This must always be followed by revision in a top-down process feeding back towards the whole of the message. Writers dispose of global structures as a kind of cognitive "production scheme" for their working process (Antos 1989: 21), focusing on pragmatic features such as the intelligibility and functionality of the text, with the aim of reaching a responsible presentation of that message to be expressed in empathy. They have to cope with insufficient

knowledge, limited proficiency in language and genres, problems of activating and focusing their knowledge, etc., which all are aspects of rhetoric.

In practice, this proves to be a process of coordinating the writing goals on the macro and the micro level of the text. The specific problem in translational text production, then, is the adjustment of the various rhetorical features that will all contribute to the intended meaning of the target text as a whole. Such features are formed gradually in a constant reviewing and reformulating process of the first draft. The problems to be solved at certain points gradually change, since any modification at one point results in some other consequent transformation at another point.

The translator's work will follow rhetorical criteria such as issues of genre, of coherence, stylistics and function of the target text (Stolze 2011: 175). The translation has to be adequate in all of these fields. The model of the fields of attention in writing can be a help in the concrete work of translating. We will explain this using the example below.

	<i>Translational writing</i>	<i>General language</i>	<i>LSP</i>
Formulating	Genre	Genre, fiction or non-fiction, shape of text, pictures, verse order, printed appearance	Medium of text type, layout, space available, illustrations, script fonts, legal prescriptions, markers
	Coherence	Titles, isotopy, paradigmatic compatibility, synonyms, synsemantic context, thematic strings, allusion, proper names, geographical places	Status of equivalence of terms, concepts in humanities, specific word formation, logic in text structure, names
	Stylistics	Verbal tense, mode, numerus, prosody of emotion, direct speech, condensing forms, characteristics of milieu, suspense, word play, metonymy, alliteration, rhyme	Typical text blocks, functional style, phraseology, passive voice, impersonal expression, communicative metaphors, controlled language, style guide
	Function	Author's intention, text structuring, intended group of readers, intertextuality, visualizing the scene	Communicative goal, macrostructure, addressees' expectation, norms of intelligibility, vision of the topic debated

6. An example with translation

English text:

Water wars are coming to the boil in Florida

Scott Morrison and Henry Hamman report on a city versus country dispute that has parallels in several other US states

Florida's urban developers are a (5) thirsty lot. They need billions of gallons of fresh water to sustain their housing projects, shopping malls, and office parks in the populous southern half of the Sunshine State. (...) Florida is already (10) running out of water and some hope the state's rural north can fill the deficit.

The issue has simmered for years but appears set to boil into a full-blown water war after a group of influential (15) Florida business leaders issued a report recommending that the state divert some of the north's water to the urban south.

"The powerful business community sees growth and development as (20) inevitable, but environmentalists and rural residents want to preserve what's left of a subtropical paradise," says Roy Carriker, a resource economist at the University of Florida.

(25) Both sides agree that north Florida is south Florida's only readily available source of extra water; they disagree over the economic and ecological impact of water diversion, Prof Carriker says. (...)

(30) Jim King, the Republican president of Florida's senate, who hails from northern Jacksonville, puts it more simply: "This is as close to North versus South as you're going to get since the civil war."

(35) The eastern front is just opening up in the fierce US water wars, with droughts, development and population pressures all playing a role.

Florida is fighting Georgia and (40) Alabama over each state's allocation from the shared Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint river basin.

Further north, South Carolina is also fighting two water wars – one with north (45) Carolina (over reduced flows in the Pee Dee River) and the other with Georgia (over the Savannah River). (...)

But a recent settlement in southern California offers hope. The accord – a (50) complex series of 30 interlocking agreements – ends years of infighting over who gets to use water from the Colorado River, the primary source of fresh water for seven southwestern US states.

(55) Each state along the Colorado River agreed to usage limits in the 1930s when the Hoover Dam was built. But more recently, California's growing cities pushed the state to rely on excess (60) Colorado River water to feed the state's booming south.

That practice eventually drew protests from neighboring states and the federal government, which this year (65) prohibited California from exceeding its limits.

Farmers in southern California were wasting water, the federal government said. To give the cities more, the state (70) would have to divert water from agricultural users. The farmers were loath to give up first-use rights to the bulk of California's water supply, which they had held for decades.

(75) Last week, after nine years of sporadic negotiations, enormous federal pressure and generous economic incentives from San Diego, the region's farmers agreed to sell as much as 90bn (80) gallons a year to the city's water authority for 75 years. (...)

Water experts say the agreement gives new impetus to the creation of water-sharing agreements between cities (85) and rural areas. (...) Such deals are essential, experts say, because continued fighting over water will only make it scarcer.

“You cannot do it through the court (90) system,” says Pat Mulroy, general director of the southern Nevada Water Au-

thority. “You will be without water before it is resolved.”

Florida, Alabama and Georgia do (95) not seem to be heeding that advice. After a decade of litigation and five years of negotiations, culminating in a tentative agreement in July, the tri-state fight is back before a federal judge in Alabama.

(100) (*Financial Times*, 25 Oct. 2003)

German translation:

In Florida eskaliert der Streit ums Wasser

Scott Morrison und Henry Hamman berichten über einen Stadt-Land-Konflikt mit Parallelen in mehreren anderen US-Bundesstaaten

Die Stadtentwickler in Florida sind ein durstiger Haufen. Sie brauchen Milliarden Kubikmeter Süßwasser, um ihre Wohnungsbauprojekte, Einkaufszentren und (5) Büroviertel in der dicht besiedelten Südhälfte des Sonnenschein-Staats zu unterhalten. (...) Südflorida geht schon jetzt das Wasser aus und manche hoffen, der ländliche Norden des Staats könne das (10) Defizit auffüllen.

Das Problem hat jahrelang vor sich hin geköchelt, doch jetzt scheint es in einen regelrechten Wasserkrieg auszuarten, nachdem eine Gruppe einflussreicher (15) Geschäftsleute in Florida einen Bericht veröffentlichte, in dem vorgeschlagen wird, der Staat möge Wasser aus dem Norden in den städtischen Süden umleiten.

„Die mächtige Geschäftswelt sieht (20) Wachstum und Entwicklung als unausweichlich an, doch Umweltschützer und die Landbevölkerung möchten erhalten, was von einem subtropischen

Paradies noch übrig ist“, sagt Roy (25) Carriker, ein Ressourcenökonom an der Universität von Florida.

Beide Seiten sind sich einig, dass Nordflorida die einzige leicht zugängliche Quelle zusätzlichen Wassers für Südflorida (30) darstellt; uneins sind sie über die wirtschaftlichen und ökologischen Auswirkungen einer Wasserumleitung, so Professor Carriker.

Jim King, der republikanische (35) Senatspräsident von Florida, der aus Jacksonville im Norden stammt, drückt es noch einfacher aus: „Das ist so nahe an Nord gegen Süd, wie wir es seit dem Bürgerkrieg nicht mehr hatten.“

(40) In den heftigen Kriegen ums Wasser in den Vereinigten Staaten, wobei Dürren, Entwicklung und Bevölkerungsdruck alle eine Rolle spielen, eröffnet die Ostfront gerade das Feuer.

(45) Florida streitet mit Georgia und Alabama über die Zuteilung eines jeden

Staates aus dem gemeinsamen Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint-Flussbecken.

(50) Weiter nördlich führt South Carolina ebenfalls zwei Wasserkriege: einen mit North Carolina (wegen reduzierter Stromflussmengen im Pee Dee River) und einen gegen Georgia (um den Savannah (55) River). (...)

Aber eine kürzlich im südlichen Kalifornien erzielte Übereinkunft gibt Anlass zur Hoffnung.

Der Vergleich – ein komplexes Paket (60) von 30 ineinandergreifenden Verträgen – beendet das jahrelange Gerangel darüber, wer das Wasser aus dem Colorado River nutzen darf, der primären Süßwasserquelle für sieben US-Bundesstaaten im Süd- (65) westen.

Jeder Staat entlang des Colorado River stimmte seinerzeit Nutzungsbegrenzungen zu, als der Hoover-Damm (1931-35) in den 1930er Jahren (70) gebaut wurde. Doch neuerdings drängten Kaliforniens wachsende Städte den Staat, auf überschüssiges Wasser des Colorado zurückzugreifen, um den boomenden Süden zu versorgen.

(75) Diese Praxis zog schließlich Proteste benachbarter Staaten und der US-Zentralregierung nach sich, welche dieses Jahr Kalifornien untersagte, seine Limits zu überschreiten.

(80) Die Farmer in Südkalifornien würden Wasser verschwenden, stellte die Zentralregierung fest. Um den Städten mehr zu geben, würde der Staat eben Wasser von landwirtschaftlichen Nutzern

(85) abzweigen müssen. Die Farmer freilich waren nicht gewillt, Erstnutzungsrechte am Hauptteil von Kaliforniens Wasserversorgung aufzugeben, die sie seit Jahrzehnten inne gehabt hatten.

(90) Letzte Woche nun, nach neun Jahren sporadischer Verhandlungen, enormem Druck seitens der US-Zentralregierung, und großzügigen wirtschaftlichen Anreizen aus San Diego willigten die Farmer der (95) Region ein, für die nächsten 75 Jahre ungefähr 340 Mio. Kubikmeter jährlich an die städtische Wasserbehörde zu verkaufen.

Wasserexperten meinen, dass das (100) Abkommen der Entstehung von Wasseraufteilungsabkommen zwischen Städten und ländlichen Gebieten neuen Auftrieb verleihe. (...) Solche Abkommen seien unbedingt erforderlich, so meinen (105) Fachleute, denn ein anhaltender Streit ums Wasser wird dieses nur noch knapper werden lassen.

„Man kann das nicht über den Gerichtsweg lösen“, meint Pat Mulroy, (110) Generaldirektor der Wasserbehörde für Südnevada. „Man steht nämlich ohne Wasser da, bevor es entschieden ist.“

Florida, Alabama und Georgia scheinen diesen Ratschlag allerdings nicht (115) zu beherzigen. Nach einem Jahrzehnt des Prozessierens und fünf Jahren Verhandlungen, die im Juli in einem provisorischen Vertrag gipfelten, ist der Drei-Staaten-Konflikt jetzt wieder vor einem (120) Bundesrichter in Alabama gelandet.

(German translation by R. Stolze, 2014)

7. Discussion of the example for understanding

The following is a critical discussion of how to work with the above-mentioned “fields of orientation”. Untrained students often proceed word-by-word in dealing with the text, and this easily leads to simple errors, as the following examples may show: *city versus country dispute* (2) was in the German classroom translated with “Stadt gegen Nation-Streit”, the *office parks* (7) became “Bürogrünanlagen”, the *readily available source* (26) became “bereitwillige Quelle”, *who hails from northern Jacksonville* (31) became “der aus dem Norden von Jacksonville grüßt”, *economic incentives* (77) became “wirtschaftliche Prämienlöhne” or “Leistungszuzahlungen”, the *tri-state fight* (98) became a “Kampf mit drei Zuständen”, just to mention a few mistakes. This of course is due to a lack of understanding the text in its whole message. And looking up words in the dictionary will not help here, as studies have shown.⁹ Therefore, the translator needs orientation, and some basic pre-understanding about the typical American background of neighbor cities battling over water must be built-up before the translation job can begin.

7.1. The situational background

The relevant fields of orientation for understanding are the SITUATIONAL BACKGROUND, the DISCOURSE FIELD, the MEANING DIMENSION and the PREDICATIVE MODE. Regarding the situational background we should be aware of the national organization of the United States of America. There is politically a cooperative federalism, there is the *federal state* (Nationalstaat) with the *federal government* or *administration* (Zentralregierung) and the *states* (Bundesstaaten, Einzelstaaten), which should not be mistaken for the German *Bundesländer* with the *Bundesregierung* in Berlin. A look at the map is helpful to understand the discussion in the text, also regarding the river systems mentioned.

Part of this background is also history, and we have here an allusion to the American Civil War in the 19th century (1861-65), when northern and southern states – or the North versus the South (in capital letters) – were fighting against each other over the issue of slavery and the black race. Looking out for a relevant holistic semantic web, we see lexemes like *fighting*, *wars*, *eastern front*, etc. as a mirror on the text level. In reading the text, this semantic web arouses our pre-knowledge (if it is given). Research work is needed when we feel lacunae.

7.2. The discourse field

Then there is the legal system as a dia-culture within the American para-culture, with its individual case law decisions by regional and federal judges. This is mentioned several times in the text, mainly towards the end. Since there are no general precise laws in the U.S.A. defining

9 Cf. F. Prassl: “The majority of consultation processes did not prove to be helpful for either students or professionals. This was mostly due to a lack of proper perception of the source text and consequently of inappropriate knowledge integration” (Prassl 2011: 23).

the use of water, like, for instance, in the E.U. and Germany, all conflicts have to be regulated by negotiation and litigation. This legal system as a DISCOURSE FIELD within the cultural background reflects in a textual word field around lexemes such as *infighting, settlement, accord, agreement, compromise, negotiation, deals, court system, litigation, federal judge, etc.* (lines 39, 48, 49, 51, 76, 82, 85, 90, 96, 99). The one who knows that system will recognize this word field and be able to translate accordingly. For the purpose of translation teaching, this would mean that the American legal system has to be taught beforehand, in order to adequately deal with a newspaper text like the one in this example. (The possibility to present cultural aspects in texts has long been the main reason for using newspaper texts for translation classes.)

7.3. The meaning dimension

A third important aspect in texts is the MEANING DIMENSION, that is the question which primary semantic fields become visible in reading the text. We see: the topic is about fighting for water, a city versus country(side) dispute on the amount of water that individual areas may take from the rivers. The respective word field is visible in the text as a macrostructure. However, it's not only about water. The conflict is between economic urban development with high population, business issues, boom, wasting of water (8, 15, 18, 58) on the one hand, and environmental issues in rural areas with farming (20, 22, 67, 79) on the other hand. With this notion in mind the "city versus country dispute" becomes clear and is translatable. Of course, the word *country* in another context can also mean "Land" in the sense of a nation state. But we know that polysemantic lexemes on the system level only become concrete in their usage in a certain situation/text/sentence. This proves that some linguistic and grammatical knowledge about languages should also be part of the translator's knowledge base.

7.4. The predicative mode

Finally, we will have to take a closer look at the text structure, not least regarding its characteristics as a text of specialist communication. At this point well-known linguistic analyses come to the foreground. There are proverbial sayings typical for the genre as a newspaper text (33: *this is as close to North versus South as you're going to get*), metaphors (2: *water wars are coming to the boil*, 5: *thirsty lot*, 12: *the issue has simmered for years*, 35: *the eastern front is just opening up*). Such expressions have the function of catching the interest of readers by appealing to their cultural knowledge in history and cooking, for example. By the end of the text they get rarer.

Besides these aspects of general language in a newspaper text, also underlined by several direct quotations to raise confidence ("says Mr. ..."), there is also special language, i.e. regarding the business world and the environmental issues. The respective terms that have to be translated correctly are: 5: *urban developers*, 7: *housing projects, shopping malls, office parks, populous*, 14: *business leaders*, 18: *business community*, 56: *usage limits*, 58: *growing cities*, 61: *booming south*, 77: *economic incentives*, 80: *the city's water authority* – and 6: *fresh water, rural north*, 20: *environmentalists, rural residents*, 23: *resource economist*, 27: *extra water*, 36: *droughts*, 42:

river basin, 45: flows, 53: source of fresh water, 59: excess water, 68: farmers were wasting water, 70: agricultural users, 6/80: gallons of water, 82: water experts, 84: water-sharing agreements.

On the text level these technical terms appear side by side in a lexical web indicating the interrelatedness of both conflicting issues. These issues (city vs country) as the main topic of the text are already mentioned in the subtitle, which is always a key to understanding a text. As a preparation for translating, one may list the adequate specialist target language equivalents for such words, see *Stadtentwickler, Wohnungsbauprojekte, Einkaufszentren, Büroviertel, dicht besiedelt, Geschäftsleute, Geschäftswelt, Nutzungsbegrenzungen, wachsende Städte, boomender Süden, Limits, wirtschaftliche Anreize, die städtische Wasserbehörde – and Süßwasser, ländlicher Norden, Umweltschützer, Landbevölkerung, Ressourcenökonom, Dürren, Flussbecken, Durchfluss, Süßwasserquelle, überschüssiges Wasser, die Farmer verschwendeten Wasser, landwirtschaftliche Nutzer, Kubikmeter Wasser, Wasserexperten, Wasseraufteilungsabkommen.*

There is a special terminological problem with *business leaders* (15). In German “Wirtschaftsführer” are *bosses*, “Geschäftsführer” are *managing directors*, “Geschäftsleute” (*business leaders*) is the general term for what is meant here, “Geschäftswelt” is the *business community* (18) mentioned here, and “Unternehmergemeinschaft” would be an *association of entrepreneurs*, a “Geschäftsgemeinschaft” a *joint business*. The translator will have to choose from a relevant discourse field in the target culture. This is only possible with specialized knowledge.

Another problem of ESP language is word compounding. The *primary source of fresh water* (53) allows several translations according to the language system, but not all are adequate:

primäre Süßwasserquelle
 wichtigste Süßwasserquelle
 *
 Frischwasserhauptquelle
 Hauptfrischwasserquelle
 Hauptquelle für frisches Wasser
 primäre Quelle frischen Wassers
 primäre Frischwasserquelle
 primäre Quelle an Frischwasser
 Primärquelle von frischem Wasser.

The problem is that only the first or second solutions correspond to the technical style in German (Stolze 2011: 202); the other versions (from students’ work) are either clumsy or too literary or unclear. On top of that, the terminological content has to be observed. “Frisches Wasser” is an interference from the English *fresh water*, “Süßwasser” is the water from rivers and lakes compared with the salty seawater, “Frischwasser” is non-polluted water carried on ships, “Trinkwasser” is treated water for human consumption.

8. Rhetorical text production

After having determined an adequate understanding of the source text, which in the translator's opinion gives a meaningful message and has no lacunae, we can proceed to a translation. Here again, we may follow some fields of attention as were presented earlier.

8.1. The genre

The present translation could be imagined once again as a newspaper article informing about water problems in the United States. This would mean that the direct quotations from persons (Prof Carriker, Pat Mulroy, and others) should also be integrated, as this is part of the GENRE in German texts as well. Differences in the quotation marks between the English and the German languages have to be observed.

The newspaper text is informative for the readers, so the technical terms must be translated correctly. At this stage the preparation for the lexematic translation made above will be useful. Realia such as river names, states etc. are linguistically preserved and will not be translated, except where a familiar version is well-known, like "Kalifornien" instead of "California".

8.2. Coherence

A specialist text will only then be convincing and acceptable for target readers when it is a coherent piece of language, when the message becomes visible. Such COHERENCE is mainly created by the word field as we have already mentioned. There are three word fields composed of compatible lexemes, namely the legal system, the economic development, and the rural landscape. Here again, the linguistic preparation for translation from our list of words can now be used for revising the draft translation. Even if an initial translation follows the text sentence by sentence, the adequate word field is better seen when observing the message as a whole (circle of understanding). A revision is then possible. A correct equivalent translation of technical terms is also part of coherence.

8.3. The stylistics

The aspect of STYLE in specialist communication mainly concerns word compounding, formulae and syntactic complexity. In our text the syntax is not very complex and can be preserved. Word compounding is relevant for terms like "Süßwasserquelle" instead of the literal translation "Quelle frischen Wassers" more apt for literary texts. The linguistic function of adjectives is important and should be meticulously preserved. "Southern California" is translated with "Südkalifornien", whereas "northern Jacksonville" (a relational adjective) means "Jacksonville im Norden", since "das nördliche Jacksonville" is a bit unclear. That is the state's capital in the north part, as one can see from the map.

Measures and weights are also an important feature of specialist communication. In America we read about "billions of gallons", whereas in Europe the amount of water is measured in cubic meters or tons: "Milliarden Kubikmeter Wasser". In a text for the general public this "cultural

transfer” should actually be made,¹⁰ not least because “Gallonen” (3,78 l) is no technical term in German. The “90bn gallons a year” (line 80) would then be “340 Mio. Kubikmeter jährlich”.

8.4. The function

Since translators work like co-authors by representing the message understood from the source text, the FUNCTION of the target text has to be determined, like in authoring an original text. In most cases of specialist communication the function does not change, the translation assignment requires to preserve it, but the translator has to know how the respective function is being realized in the target language. In our case here, the stylistic aspects and the needs for intelligibility of the text for the general public have to be realized. Any wrong expressions within a draft translation might at the end still be eliminated, this for instance regarding the “city versus country dispute”, which is not about cities and the nation state, and the “tri-state fight”, which does not mean three different statuses.

The function of the metaphorical title “Water wars are coming to the boil in Florida” is to raise interest and describe the fact in a lively way. Many students have translated helplessly, like for instance: “Allmähliches Aufkochen von Wasserkriegen in Florida”; “Streit um Frischwasser erreicht Siedepunkt in Florida”; “Wasserkriege in Florida erreichen Siedepunkt” or the like. The problem is that the two metaphors of “war” and “boiling” do not suit together in German. Therefore, we have to formulate creatively in a different way: “Streit eskaliert” or “Neuer Höhepunkt im Wasserstreit” or “Wasserkonflikte erhitzen die Gemüter in Florida”. The creative potential of a translator must not be restricted, and this is an example of the helical movement in searching for words. Finally, the language difference between German and English is also relevant. In the English language the focus is at the end of a sentence: “Water wars in Florida”, in German this is often put at the beginning: “In Florida eskaliert ...”.

9. Translation competence: integrating various aspects

As we have seen in the explanation of this hermeneutic approach to translation, the work is directed towards a holistic view of the text, both in understanding the text and in formulating the translation. In this, the translator has to integrate concurrently all aspects encountered on the text level, regarding the language on the lexematic, syntactical, textual and cultural levels, as we have the circle of understanding here. Any new insight gained by questioning, researching or learning will change the given knowledge base and possibly lead to a correction of initial mistakes. Redundancy is growing towards the end of a text, and the final affirmations quite often explain statements found at the beginning. The various aspects are not dealt with in a linear way one after the other, but rather in a concurrent, holistic way. Any revision at one point then consequently

¹⁰ On translation as a cultural transfer see Reiß/Vermeer (1984: 26).

leads to a change at a nearby other point in a sentence. The meaning of an expression is only valid in the light of the overall message of the text.

Such a hermeneutic approach to translation will lead to more self-awareness of the translating persons in view of their knowledge base, to quicker working because less dictionary use is necessary when they already understood the message in the light of their pre-knowledge, and to more self-confidence when the translator is a master of the texts instead of being a slave of words in formulating what he or she has understood. Hermeneutics is an informed attitude of openness towards texts and thus offers more trust and freedom for the translators' independent decisions. Therefore, the presented system of orientation fields for understanding and writing can also be used in translation didactics.

Translating means understanding a text as a cognitive act of semiosis and formulating a message responsibly according to rhetoric. Writing is an autopoietic process (Stolze 2011: 128) in that the words we are looking for arise often intuitively. This idea has meanwhile been proved by empirical analyses regarding the translators' cognition as a "super-competence" (Scarpa/Orlando 2017 : 27). The bases of that hermeneutic translation competence are: a historical awareness of the cultural integration of language – an ethic of responsibility for precision in reframing the content of the message – a holistic approach proceeding from the overall entity to the single part – an openness for critique and new information in order to overcome naïve subjectivity – an epistemological effort to grasp the textual content by integrating specialist and cultural knowledge – an empathy with the message of the text in order to write authentically – the reflection on the phenomenological effect of linguistic signs that is different in every person and in various cultures and special domains – a certain functional proficiency in discourse fields for rhetorical formulation – a conscious interlinking of knowledge by constant learning – the ability of prioritizing to recognize the specific problem of a single text – a tendency for specialization in certain domains where knowledge is given – pursuing the goal of a well-grounded attitude towards texts (Stolze 2011: 187). What we may observe here is the life-long growth of the translator.

Translational Hermeneutics offers a model for practice that is sufficiently complex to include many aspects, and apt for didactics, because the complexity is reduced by the intuition of a translator disposing of relevant knowledge. Hermeneutic translation competence includes various aspects (Stolze 2015: 341):

- Communicative competence (understands and writes texts in their own and the foreign language)
- Intercultural competence (understands strange cultures and sees differences to their own one)
- Linguistic awareness (knowing the grammar and structural rules of a language and applying them)
- Textual competence (knowledge of text type conventions in the source and target texts)
- Terminological competence (applies relevant pre-knowledge in the respective specialist domain with terminology)

- Writing competence (ability to produce adequate texts in the target language according to the translation commission)
- Research competence (appropriate usage of dictionaries, parallel texts, Internet)
- Technical competence (ability to use modern tools adequately, project management)
- Social competence (dealing with clients, legal knowledge, membership in associations)
- Networking competence (learning from previous translations, exploiting experiences)
- Change competence (ability and interest to get into new fields and to practice lifelong learning).

Every text is different, and not all problems arise in a translation assignment in the same way. Translation remains a dynamic task since it is a social activity, a touchstone act for what we see, do, and say in a world of endless human interaction.

References

- Akbari, Alireza and Winibert Segers. 2017. Diverse Personality Traits and Translation Quality. Preselected Items Evaluation (PIE) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory. *Trans-kom Zeitschrift für Translationswissenschaft und Fachkommunikation*. [hrsg. v. Leona van Værenberg und Klaus Schubert], 10 [2] 2017. 242-270. (www.trans-kom.eu)
- Antos, Gerd. 1989. Textproduktion: Ein einführender Überblick. In: Gerd Antos & Hans P. Krings (eds.), *Textproduktion. Ein interdisziplinärer Forschungsüberblick*, 5-17. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Assmann, Aleida. 2004. Die Unverzichtbarkeit der Kulturwissenschaften. *Hildesheimer Universitätsreden, Neue Folge Heft 2*, ed. Der Präsident, 3-27. Hildesheim: Hildesheimer Universitätsverlag.
- Bachmann-Medick, Doris. 2009. *Cultural Turns. Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Bassnett, Susan. 2000. Authenticity, travel and translation. In: M. Kadric & K. Kaindl & F. Pöchhacker (eds.), *Translationswissenschaft. Festschrift für Mary Snell-Hornby zum 60. Geburtstag*, 105-114. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1980. *Textlinguistik. Eine Einführung*. [Edited by Jörn Albrecht]. Tübingen: Narr.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1977. Scenes- and-frames-semantics. In: A. Zampolli (ed.), *Linguistic structures processing*, 55-81. Amsterdam: New Holland.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1990. *Truth and Method*. [Second revised edition. Translation by W. Glen-Doepel and revised by Joel Weinsheimer & Donald G. Marshall]. New York: Crossroad.
- Heyes, Cecilia. 2012. New thinking: the evolution of human cognition. *Philosophical Transactions B*, [publ. The Royal Society], 2091-2096. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2012.0111
PMCID: PMC3385676
- Hörmann, Hans. 1981. *Einführung in die Psycholinguistik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

- Kupsch-Losereit, Sigrid. 2012. Übersetzen als Verhandlungs(spiel)raum und Sinngebungsprozess. In: L. Cercel & J. Stanley (Hrsg.) *Unterwegs zu einer hermeneutischen Übersetzungswissenschaft. Radegundis Stolze zu ihrem 60. Geburtstag*, 39-67. Tübingen: Narr.
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. London/New York: Prentice Hall.
- Prassl, Friederike. 2011. Übersetzerisches Rechercheverhalten von Profis und Novizen auf dem Prüfstand – Empirische Befunde aus der Analyse von Konsultationshandlungen und ihren Auswirkungen auf die Qualität des Zieltextes. *Trans-kom – Zeitschrift für Translationswissenschaft und Fachkommunikation*. [hrsg. v. Leona van Værenberg und Klaus Schubert], Band 4, Nr.1/2011, 23-48. (www.trans-kom.eu).
- Reiß, Katharina and Vermeer, Hans J. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1969. *The conflict of interpretations*. [French original: Editions du Seuil 1974]. Chicago: Northwestern University Press.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1991. The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text. In: Mario J. Valdés (ed.) *A Ricoeur Reader: Reflection and Imagination*, 144–167. Toronto: University Press.
- Robinson, Douglas. 2013. *Feeling Extended: Sociality as Extended Body-Becoming-Mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Scarpa, Federica and Orlando, Daniele. 2017. What it takes to do it right: an integrative EMT-based model for legal translation competence. *JosTrans The Journal of Specialized Translation*, Issue 27 – January 2017, 21-42.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. 1977. On the different methods of translating. In: A. Lefevere (ed.), *Translating literature: the German tradition. from Luther to Rosenzweig*, 66-89. Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. 1998. *Hermeneutics and Criticism and other Writings*. [German original 1838. Translated and edited by Andrew Bowie.] Cambridge: Univ. Press.
- Stanley, John W. 2005. *Die gebrochene Tradition. Zur Genese der philosophischen Hermeneutik Hans Georg Gadammers*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Stanley, John W. 2012. Das Dilemma der Subjektivität in der Hermeneutik. In: Larisa Cercel & John Stanley (eds.): *Unterwegs zu einer hermeneutischen Übersetzungswissenschaft. Festschrift für Radegundis Stolze zu ihrem 60. Geburtstag*, 246-273. Tübingen: Narr.
- Stanley, John, O’Keeffe, Brian, Stolze Radegundis and Cercel, Larisa (eds.). 2018. *Philosophy and Practice in Translational Hermeneutics*. Bucharest: ZETA Books.
- Stefanink, Bernd. 1997. ‘Esprit de finesse’ – ‘Esprit de géométrie’: Das Verhältnis von ‘Intuition’ und ‘übersetzerrelevanter Textanalyse’ beim Übersetzen. In: Rudi Keller (ed.) *Linguistik und Literaturübersetzen*, 161-184. Tübingen, Narr.
- Stolze, Radegundis. 2011. *The Translator’s Approach – Introduction to Translational Hermeneutics. Theory and Examples from Practice*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Stolze, Radegundis. 2015. *Hermeneutische Übersetzungskompetenz. Grundlagen und Didaktik*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

- Stolze, Radegundis, Stanley, John W., Cercel, Larisa (eds.). 2015. *Translational Hermeneutics. The First Symposium*. Bucharest: ZETA Books.
- Tabakowska, Elzbieta. 1993. *Cognitive Linguistics and Poetics of Translation*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.
- Tymoczko, Maria. 2006. *Enlarging Translation. Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Vermeer, Hans J. 2006. *Versuch einer Intertheorie der Translation*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.