

Students' Report

Introduction: translating Vermeer

As a part of our [German-English translation class] held this summer semester [2011], [we] took part in the Vermeer Reader Project at the School of Translation and Interpreting Studies, Linguistics and Cultural Studies of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz [in Gernersheim]. We were asked to translate the text “*Übersetzen als kultureller Transfer*” by Hans J. Vermeer (1994). The translated text will eventually be published in a Vermeer reader. Since we were translating a text by Hans J. Vermeer, a major part of our task was also to apply the *skopos* theory of translation that was developed by him [to our work].

(Prajakta Kuber)

Translating in line with a *skopos*

According to Vermeer, *skopos* is the aim or purpose of a translation and all translations need to be assigned a *skopos* (2000/2004: 227, 236). However, this does not mean that a source text is limited to one particular *skopos*. In fact, Vermeer said that many different *skopoi* are possible and, therefore, one text can have many different translations (Schäffner 1998/2001: 237). *Skopos* theory [challenges] the belief that translators need to adhere to the source text at all costs, although Vermeer pointed out that imitation of the source text can be a *skopos* (2000-2004: 229). Thus, overall, *skopos* theory promotes the view that translation is a purpose-oriented action: “The theory campaigns against the belief that there is no aim (in any sense whatever), that translation is a purposeless activity” (Vermeer 2000/2004: 237). *Skopos* theory in no way restricts the choice of translation strategies. Rather, it provides translators with a freedom in their actions which, according to Vermeer, also comes with a certain responsibility (1998: 45, 54). Despite its immediate relevance for the translation process, *skopos* is often not [taken into account] in practice (Vermeer 2000/2004: 236). However, in [our] general translation class, *skopos* played a crucial role, since the commissioner ([or client], our lecturer Marina Dudenhöfer) specifically asked us to translate the text in accordance with the following *skopos*: “translate the German text into British English in a reader-friendly manner, whilst doing justice to Vermeer’s complex ideas”.

(Elizabeth du Preez)

Preparing for the translation

Translating ‘complex ideas’ and turning them into a ‘reader-friendly text’ definitely called for some groundwork. Since our translation was pertaining to something very specific, we could not simply start translating. Some amount of preparation was inevitable in order to gain a better understanding of what we were translating. While different students were entrusted with doing different tasks for the project, one thing that was common for all was reading some background information and parallel texts on *skopos* theory. Our commissioner/teacher had given us some additional texts written by Hans Vermeer

himself, as well as other [...] translation scholars such as Christina Schäffner and Anthony Pym [...], which helped us [to] understand *skopos* theory better. Some other students who had been working on this project for a longer time were also a part of the terminology team and had prepared a glossary for this project, which was a great help while translating the text. Apart from terminology specific to *skopos* theory, the glossary also contained other sources of information such as internet links, which made the translation work slightly easier. In addition to the glossary, we were also to follow a style-guide that was drawn-up specifically for this project. So, before we actually got going with the translation, we were supposed to read through all these documents to further our knowledge of the topic and our *skopos*. After reading the parallel texts and background information, we discussed what we had read with the others in class. Discussing the parallel texts in class helped me [to] understand concepts that I was not clear about.

(Prajakta Kuber)

Terminology work

Before we started to translate the text, there were some tasks that needed to be completed to help us prepare for the translation process. For example, I was given the task of creating a glossary for the text, [which expanded the existing glossary put together by four students in the previous semester, and] which could then be used by other students in the course and anyone else who may participate in the project in the future.

The first step when creating the glossary was selecting the terms that should be recorded. Although I had been involved in glossary work in the past, the subject areas had usually been more technical, so the task of selecting relevant terms had been more straightforward. In Vermeer's text "*Übersetzen als kultureller Transfer*", it was slightly more difficult to differentiate between terms that simply posed a problem for translation and terms that should be recorded in the glossary. My commissioner had already chosen some terms from the text for the glossary, however, I also chose to add some [...] terms. For example, I chose to add the terms '*Übersetzen*' and '*Dolmetschen*': anyone studying translation would [probably] feel that the English for these terms is obvious and that everyone will be aware of how to translate them. However, I felt that they should be recorded in the glossary as the German language includes the term '*Translation*' which covers both activities (*Übersetzen* and *Dolmetschen*) and Vermeer tends to apply this term regularly. I found that, in his English texts and in English translations of his German texts, Vermeer applies specific terms to distinguish between the two separate activities. I therefore recorded this in the glossary so that we would be able to distinguish between them in our text and that the terms would then be standardised for all future texts in the project. [...]

In order to find the English terms for the selected German terms, I read a range of other texts by Vermeer, which he had either written in English himself or which had been translated into English. These texts proved to be very useful and I was able to find the majority of the English terms in texts

‘written by’ Vermeer himself. However, there is not a great deal of primary literature for Vermeer in English, so I had to extend my reading to texts discussing *skopos* theory and texts about Holz-Mänttari’s theory of translatorial action, which, although not entirely identical to *skopos* theory, does cover similar ground and is often discussed by Vermeer.

While the parallel texts helped me to find an English term for the large majority of terms, several terms did prove more difficult. For example, on page 38 of “*Übersetzen als kultureller Transfer*”, Vermeer discusses a *verfremdende Übersetzung* and I was therefore supposed to record the term ‘*verfremdend*’ in the glossary. As Lawrence Venuti’s theory of ‘foreignization’ and ‘domestication’ has been a dominant idea in English-language translation theory over the past few decades, my initial choice for ‘*verfremdend*’ was ‘foreignizing’. However, while I was reading the parallel texts and after discussion with Anna Bubenheim [a native German speaker with a great deal of experience with Vermeer and translation theory texts], I discovered that, in his text *A skopos theory of translation (some arguments for and against)* (Vermeer 1996), Vermeer uses the terms ‘alienation’ and ‘assimilation’. The task was then to decide whether to use the more recognisable term [for English speakers] ‘foreignizing’ or to keep in line with Vermeer’s own choice of ‘alienating’. After discussing the problem with the course leader and Anna, I was able to make a decision. I was informed that, although foreignizing and domesticating [are terms] largely associated with Venuti, a similar idea was also discussed by the German philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher in the early 19th century under the terms ‘*das Fremde eingemeindet*’ and ‘*das Eigene verfremdet*’ (see Robinson 1997). It [seems clear] that Vermeer based his idea of ‘*verfremdend*’ more on Schleiermacher’s ‘*das Eigene verfremdet*’ [than on] Venuti’s ‘foreignizing’. I therefore decided to keep Vermeer’s own choice of ‘alienating’ as this term is also used in English to discuss Schleiermacher’s ideas (see Baker and Saldanha 2009: 416).

(Beth Skinner)

Translating the introduction (in groups)

The introduction of the text (pages 30-32) was translated in groups and I personally think that my understanding of the text was significantly enhanced by translating the first section in a group. When reading a text, you often tend to interpret it in a certain manner and it can help to discuss it with someone else, who might see it from a completely different point of view. Vermeer believed that our translations are based on our receptions or interpretations of the source text (1998: 44) and it is therefore a very good exercise to translate in a group, since you [see] different interpretations of the same text. Our group was unique in that my [team mate] was a German native speaker and, accordingly, she intuitively recognised nuances in the German, which were not immediately apparent to me. Despite the fact that she was not a native English speaker, her translation suggestions were never based on [mere] ‘faithfulness’ to the source text. Rather, after explaining the meaning in German, she always asked me how we could translate it in such a way that a British audience would easily be able to understand it, i.e. so that our translation is in line with our *skopos*. Thus, my [team

mate] further encouraged and challenged me to translate according to the given *skopos*, which I really appreciated, because I sometimes tend to translate a section more literally (i.e. imitate the source text) if I have trouble understanding it. However, this approach is [often not in line] with [the] *skopos*, since imitation of the source text [often] leads to translations which are not at all reader-friendly to the target culture (Vermeer 1998: 44).

In the introduction, Vermeer raised and answered the question whether we really need a translation theory. In our section, he addressed the misconception that theory cannot be directly put into practice, which is related to the belief that “the more theory you know, the better you can perform a task”. Vermeer questioned whether the phonological similarity between the German verbs for ‘can’ (*können*) and ‘know’ (*kennen*) might lead to interference in colloquial language. He then compared a German and Dutch sentence using the verbs ‘can’ (*ich kann Englisch*) and ‘know’ (*ik ken Engels*). After discussing this particular section with the commissioner, we decided to add an explanation in our translation that the German and Dutch sentences are translations of the English sentence “I can speak English”. Our *skopos* allowed us the freedom to add an explanation, since the explanation makes the section more reader-friendly to a British English audience who might not understand Dutch or German.

Although the introduction was primarily translated within the individual groups, the groups also coordinated with each other on the translation of a few key terms. In our case, the phrase ‘*Gegenstände bzw. Sachverhalte*’ had already appeared earlier in the introduction and, after discussing it with the group who translated the [earlier] section, we all agreed to use the translation suggestion our group researched. We found that the way Vermeer used this phrase in the introduction corresponded closely with his use of ‘facts and cultural habits’ in a lecture he held at a translation conference (2007). [...]

(Elizabeth du Preez)

When dealing with complex texts such as this one about *skopos* theory, I think that two heads are always better than one! One specific example I can think of to justify that statement is when we were trying to translate the term ‘*Sprachgenossen*’ (Vermeer 1994: 30) in our part of the text. When we read the word for the first time, it took us some discussion to come to [a] consensus about its meaning. We were debating about whether it was ‘English/German-speakers’ or ‘native speakers’ of a language. While English-speakers or German-speakers would have been too specific, native-speakers was far too vague and did not prove to be the optimal solution to understand the German term. On further discussing the word with our teacher, she [suggested] the solution ‘linguistic community’, which seemed a very good solution at the time. However, during a later stage, when our part was re-read by another group, their research led them to the term ‘speech community’, which expressed exactly what Vermeer wanted to say with the word ‘*Sprachgenossen*’. ‘Speech community’ is defined as “any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction by means of a shared body of

verbal signs and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language usage” (<http://courses.essex.ac.uk/lg/lg232/SpeechComDefs.html>). In my opinion, it would have been difficult and much more time consuming to come up with such a great solution if I were working alone. According to Vermeer, translation is a matter of interpretation and working in a group gave me the chance to see how others interpret the same bit of text and how that influences the [...] *translatum*.

(Prajakta Kuber)

What I also found interesting when doing the group work was seeing how we all rationalised our decisions. I agree [...] with Vermeer when he states that every translator comes from a certain background and culture, thus their decisions are based on this and, of course, on their own personality and taste. Although we were all native English speakers in our group, we came from three different cultures, i.e. Irish, Indian and English. Our different cultures did lead to a variation of vocabulary and taste and, at times, it was very difficult to agree upon which term we would use and what was ‘correct’. This showed me that my own English is only a variation of the English language and that just because I may not be accustomed to hearing a certain expression does not mean that it is incorrect.

(Caitliona Gallagher)

Having a non-native speaker of English [i.e. an Italian] in our group helped us to find fitting solutions in the target text. The advantage that a non-native [English speaker] could bring with regard to formulating expressions was surprising, as in previous translation classes working with non-native speakers severely impaired the text when it came to collocations and formulating expressions. Even if they may have had a [good] command of the source text language, they did not have a sufficient level of English to produce a coherent sentence that would read well for the native audience. Although the level of English in our group was good, I found that the native [English] speakers in our group were focusing too much on the German and let this influence the fluidity of the English. Many of the non-native [English] speaker’s suggestions in our group were fresh and free from interference.

(Patricia Graham)

Translating individual sections

[In the text, Vermeer] says that gestures and body language are an essential part of communication and that a translator cannot remain oblivious to this non-verbal communication process. He states that these non-verbal aspects, which also include appearance, clothing [and] hairstyle, [...] are verbalised differently in different cultures and their language(s). He explains this using the example of the famous *caballero de la triste figura*, or Cervantes’ Don Quixote. He compares the Spanish (*caballero de la triste figura*), French (*chevalier de la triste figure*), and German (*Ritter von der traurigen Gestalt*) translations of the name and shows how each language verbalises the personality. He explains how Stackelberg thinks that the German name strays from the ‘original’ name and uses the ‘incorrect’ word *Gestalt* (appearance) instead of *Gesicht* (face). The fact that every language expresses the name

differently makes Vermeer's point that every language verbalises such things differently. Using the same example, he also tells us that it would be unwise to change or 'correct' the translation and use the word *Gesicht* for face, since the name has now become a catchphrase in [...] German culture and a sudden change [...] might lead to the alienation of the recipient. While translating this example, I was slightly confused [about] whether I should keep the three given languages, i.e. Spanish, French, and German, or whether I should replace the German name with the English name and then try to explain Vermeer's point. I thought of replacing the German [example] with [the] English because we were translating the text for an English-speaking audience and, according to Vermeer, a translator must always think about the recipient and then translate (Vermeer 1994: 43). However, when I looked up the English translation for *caballero de la triste figura*, I found that the English translation *the Knight of the Sorrowful Countenance* does not offer as stark a contrast to the Spanish and French as the German does to convey Vermeer's point of verbalisation of non-verbal aspects (see <http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2004/jan/25/classics.miguelcervantes>). So, I decided to stick to the three languages [given] and elaborate on Vermeer's point [instead]. After all, the *skopos* or the aim of the example was to highlight the differences between the translations and illustrate his point regarding the verbalisation of non-verbal communication aspects.

(Prajakta Kuber)

Near the beginning of my text, top of page 51 in the source text, Vermeer discusses world changes and how they can have an effect on various things and also make it necessary for a translation to be carried out. In brackets, after this short description of world changes, Vermeer writes ("*Die Wirkungstheorie weiß darum*"). Under normal circumstances, an extensive bibliography would be available to the translator; unfortunately, in this case, there is none. So this meant that, in order to find an adequate translation, some research was going to be required. The first thing I did was refer to the parallel texts to see whether there had there been any other references to '*Wirkungstheorie*', or if there might be any clues in the bibliographies of these texts. Disappointingly, there were no references to this term in a comparable context, and so I began to search for references online. I first went to the FTSK library catalogue but I only found 'Effect theories' for '*Wirkungstheorie*' in areas which were not relevant. Next, I typed in various search terms such as 'Vermeer *Wirkung*' into Google which brought up several essays, all of which referred to a different meaning of '*Wirkung*', which would be most likely translated as 'adequacy' or 'equivalence' (cf. Vermeer glossary '*Wirkungskonstanz*'). The next terms I searched for in Google were '*Wirkungstheorie*' and 'Effect theory'. Most of the search results were from different areas, such as economics [...]. In hope of finding something that possibly was related to translation theory, I searched for published works by Vermeer and Reiß, who are regularly cited as having both worked in the same area of translation theory and having had similar ideas. I also searched through various Snell-Hornby publications but to no avail.

I then decided on a different strategy. I reread the [sentences which come] directly before the reference to '*Wirkungstheorie*' and I searched, based on my reading, for 'reasons for translation – effect theory'

[...] and then I found that I was making progress. Articles that came up seemed to be more in the area of what I needed, key words like ‘Surrealismus’ came up (<http://kunstwerke-kunst.info/surrealismus-1.html>). I then came across the following website (in relation to Reiß/Vermeer – search ‘Reiß/Vermeer & Wirkungstheorie’) <http://related.springerprotocols.com/lp/de-gruyter/reviews-gDNvRjJ0B0> where I searched for ‘Wirkungstheorie’ which came up as ‘Wirkungstheorie seit Kant’.

I used Wikipedia to get a quick overview on Kant (Immanuel Kant), who he was, and what his achievements were. Another useful website about him is <http://www.iep.utm.edu/kantmeta/>. One word that came up regularly was ‘causality’, which seemed to fit in with what Vermeer was talking about in the source text and also avoided the word ‘effect’, which is not favoured by Vermeer (see glossary), <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/philosophy/courses/100/100kant.htm>. On another website, I found ‘principle of causation’ <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08603a.htm> after searching for ‘Immanuel Kant cause and ‘effect’’. Finally, after searching for ‘Immanuel Kant – causation’, I came across the following website <http://science.jrank.org/pages/8539/Causality-Kant.html>, which described what the ‘principle of causality’ means. After reading the definition, I was satisfied that it corresponded to what was meant by Vermeer in the source text when he wrote ‘Wirkungstheorie’, and it had the added advantage of avoiding ‘effect’.

The definition of ‘principle of causality’: Kant tried to demonstrate that the principle of causality, i.e. “everything that happens, that is, begins to be, presupposes something upon which it follows by rule” (1965 ed., p. 218) is a precondition for the very possibility of objective experience. For more, see [Causality - Kant - Sequences, Principle, Objective, Mind, Impressions, and Rule http://science.jrank.org/pages/8539/Causality-Kant.html#ixzz1PzgFg4L9](http://science.jrank.org/pages/8539/Causality-Kant.html#ixzz1PzgFg4L9).

My next big issue was that, towards the end of my section, Vermeer, when discussing the role of culture and symbolism in translation, uses an example of an English book, Rudyard Kipling’s *The Jungle Book*, which has been translated into German. As the book is set in India, certain words used evoke certain emotions, connotations and ideas which are prevalent in the Indian culture e.g. ‘bullock’, which in India is a symbol of strength and is a placid animal; to kill a bullock is almost a sin. However, the German translation of this word, which [...] Vermeer states is ‘correct’, [...] does not have the same images or emotions attached to it. Here, Vermeer is emphasizing the importance of culture and symbolism, and that sometimes the literal translation is not always the best one. My problem here was that this paragraph was in a sense ‘untranslatable’. I could not simply translate word for word what was before me due to the fact the Vermeer used an English book, namely a book from a foreign culture (to him), which was translated into his native culture. I needed to achieve the same task and present my audience with a foreign book that was translated into English [culture]. With the help of Anna [Bubenheim] and my commissioner, I [chose] a famous children’s story *Struwwelpeter* which was written by Heinrich Hoffmann and published in 1845 and translated into English in 1848 (there are other English translations from later years). One of the stories in the book tells of a cute little ‘Häschen’ who one day gets revenge on the hunter by stealing his gun and chasing him away. The

German word ‘*Häschen*’, with its diminutive ending ‘-chen’, evokes an image of a cute, fluffy and innocent animal in the mind of the German reader. However, the 1848 English translation uses the word ‘hare’, which does not evoke any image of cute, innocent or fluffy in the mind of the English reader, in fact the words ‘bunny’ or even ‘rabbit’ would have been more suitable here [and the English reader would have many cultural references to rabbits, such as Peter Rabbit, Bugs Bunny and the Easter bunny]. The above example was, in my opinion, adequate and expressed the same ideas that Vermeer discusses in the source text.

(Caitliona Gallagher)

Towards the end of my section, Vermeer gave a few culturally specific examples, which are meant to illustrate how the function of a translation can differ from that of the source text, with regard to the target culture (1994: 39, 40). He described how socially critical novels by the Colombian Nobel prize winner, Gabriel García Márquez, cannot possibly have the same impact in a German translation, since the target audience is too far removed, not only geographically but also culturally, from the original Columbian audience (1994: 39, 40). Vermeer explained how, in a translation, criticism of the familiar is turned into information about the exotic and he went on to list various German translations of *cachaça*, as an example of how something, which is familiar to the source culture (Brazilian), can be completely exotic to the target culture (Germans in Europe) (1994: 40).

In my translation, I considered the possibility that a British audience might not necessarily know what *cachaça* means and I therefore decided to add a footnote, which explains what *cachaça* is and highlights its importance for the Brazilian culture. I also decided to add a short paraphrase as a translation for each of the German terms referring to *cachaça*, in order to avoid possible confusion for readers who cannot speak German: “*Zuckerrohrbranntwein* (a phrase apparently coined by Wilhelm Giese for wine made from sugar cane), *Zuckerrohrschnaps* (spirits made from sugar cane) or *Schnaps* (spirits).” In the source text, Vermeer simply placed ‘Giese’ in brackets next to *Zuckerrohrbranntwein* and I only learned that Wilhelm Giese is believed to have coined this term, when I read an inaugural dissertation on the language of the popular Brazilian author, José Lins do Rego (“Die Sprache José Lins do Rego”). I therefore inserted a footnote for Wilhelm Giese, in which I explicitly refer to this book, in order to clarify the connection, which might not be immediately apparent to a British English audience. In my section, Vermeer stressed that translators need to be pluricultural experts and I can honestly say, that the *cachaça* example made me realise how important it is to thoroughly research cultural references and, if necessary, explain them to the target audience (1994: 39, 40).

(Elizabeth du Preez)

One section that I found problematic was the paragraph beginning “*Beispiel: Man nehme [...]*” on page 50. From the German source text, it is hard to tell whether the contrast that Vermeer is describing is between readers from the two different cultures (source and target cultures) or between non-experts from the two cultures, or even between experts and non-experts within the same culture. Perhaps he

intentionally left this ambiguity in the text in order to suggest that many different comparisons and contrasts between these ‘characters’ are possible and to ensure that this idea would occur to the reader. I considered various ways of trying to convey this in my translation and came to the conclusion that it would not be sufficient merely to put ‘than’ between two of the characters, as this would suggest a definite contrast either between cultures or between experts and non-experts, effectively obscuring the other possible comparisons that can be made using these figures. My solution was to write “a different world for the source-culture reader and the target-culture reader respectively, as well as for the non-expert from each culture.” I felt that, although perhaps not perfect, this was the closest I could get to expressing in English the different ‘worlds’ imagined by Vermeer.

(Nicola Murray)

Rereading stages

After finishing our part of the translation, we were given one of our classmates’ parts for revision. The revision was also done at two levels, i.e. in a group and individually. After we [had finished] translating our assigned [sections] in groups, we revised another group’s translation and vice versa. In the same way, after every individual finished translating their [section], it was given to another person for revision. While revising, we were told to follow four main steps:

1. Compare the source text to the target text and look for omissions or errors;
2. Compare the source text to the target text and check the formatting for any inconsistencies and other problem-spots [usually several smaller stages, each time focusing on one aspect];
3. Revise the target text alone and make sure that it sounds natural [i.e. look for source language interference];
4. [Finally], check the target text against the source text [again] to ensure that the target text has not strayed [too far] away from the source text and still conveys the essence of what the source text wants to say.

(Prajakta Kuber)

Conclusion: skills for the future

Although I have been taking translation classes for the past year and a half, the three month-translation internship, which I completed after my second semester, showed me that the day-to-day reality of a translator is a completely different kettle of fish. Fortunately, the Vermeer Reader Project offered me a further opportunity to gain practical experience by working on a real translation project. In the context of the project, we discussed various aspects of practical translation, which are very rarely mentioned in other translation classes. For example, rereading, which is an integral part of the overall translation process, has never been discussed in such depth in any of my other classes. Moreover, the cooperative

nature of the rereading process was representative of a common practice in many German translation companies, by which a translation is reread by at least one or two other translators (*Vieraugenprinzip*).

Thus, translation is more often than not a collaborative process. However, in non-project related classes, students rarely get to see this side of the translation process. In this project, we were introduced to many other practical aspects of translation, for example, we were given a translation brief and we were responsible for formatting and submitting our own translations (via an online learning platform). Our lecturer was also our commissioner and I really admired the way she balanced her roles. When we had questions on a particular section, she would not simply suggest translation strategies; instead, she pointed us in the right direction and encouraged us to research further. As professional translators, we could also not expect a commissioner to give us detailed advice on translation strategies. On the contrary, according to Vermeer, translators are the real experts in the field of transcultural communication and should be able to negotiate a *skopos*-oriented solution with the commissioner (1998: 50, 51).

[...] Vermeer believed that “in order to enable the student to become an expert and to work professionally, the existing translation (again including interpreting) curricula need to be urgently ‘overhauled.’” (2007: 13) I think that project work is a major step in this direction, since it brings the practice closer to students and prepares them to take their place in the translation industry as responsible, informed and culturally sensitive translators.

(Elizabeth du Preez)

Overall, I found the experience of translating “*Übersetzen als kultureller Transfer*” to be a positive one. Not only did we get to learn more about, in my opinion, one of the more practical translation theories, we also got to put this theory into practice and know that our efforts would be published. For me, one of the most valuable parts of the process was being involved in the glossary work. Whenever I had completed glossary work in the past, I had never found it to be wholly beneficial to the translation process; in this case, however, I had to do so much reading in the area and make sure that I completely understood what the term and the ideas surrounding the term meant that it made the translation process a lot easier. I understand that in the ‘real world of translation’, the translator may not always have time to do a lot of parallel reading if he is faced with an unfamiliar subject area, but I have learnt how useful it is even just to read one short text to help you get into the right mind-set for translating.

While translating “*Übersetzen als kultureller Transfer*”, I also learnt the importance of teamwork - not only for making sure that terminology is kept consistent throughout a text, but also to hear some fresh opinions on your work. Sometimes when you are working on a text so intensively, it is difficult to look at your translation from a new perspective so I found that is very helpful to get other people to look at the text so you can see the problem from a new light.

(Beth Skinner)

In this class, we not only learnt about a very practical translation theory, we also got to apply it to our translation. The background reading and research involved in the project has certainly added a lot more to our knowledge of translation and translation theories. For me, the most valuable lesson I have learnt from this project is the importance of research and the ways and means to go about it. [...]

[...] Although the amount of time spent on one text in this class may be considered a rare luxury, the exercise has taught me skills that are applicable to my translation process as a whole. This project has made me a more alert, better-informed, more perceptive, and a culturally aware person and translator.

(Prajakta Kuber)

This report is an abridged compilation of several reports and was put together by Marina Dudenhöfer.

Bibliography

Publications

Baker, Mona and Saldanha, Gabriela (eds) (2009) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, Second Edition. Abingdon/New York: Routledge

Robinson, Douglas (ed.) (1997) *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester: St Jerome

Schäffner, Christina (1998/2001) “Skopos theory”. In: *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, first edition, Baker, Mona (ed.). London/New York: Routledge, 235-238

Vermeer, Hans J. (2007). “Is translation a linguistic or a cultural process?”. In: *Ausgewählte Vorträge zur Translation und anderen Themen*. Berlin: Frank & Timme, 19-29

Vermeer, Hans J. (2007) “No ‘State of the Art’”. Transcript of lecture held at the “Translation and translation – des faux amis” conference at the University of Boğaziçi, Istanbul

Vermeer, Hans J. (2000/2004) “Skopos and commission in translational action”. In: *The Translation Studies Reader*, Venuti, Lawrence (ed.), Chesterman, Andrew (translator). London/New York: Routledge, 227-238

Vermeer, Hans J. (1998). “Starting to unask what translatology is about”. In *Target* 10:1

Vermeer, Hans J. (1996) *A skopos theory of translation (some arguments for and against)*. Heidelberg: *TEXTconTEXT*, Reihe Wissenschaft, Band 1

Vermeer, Hans J. (1994) “Übersetzen als kultureller Transfer”. In *Übersetzungswissenschaft – Eine Neuorientierung*, Snell-Hornby, Mary (ed.). Tübingen: Franke Verlag, 30-53.

Vermeer, Hans. J (1978) “Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie”. In: *Lebende Sprache* 23/1978, 99-102

Vinay, Jean-Paul and Darbelnet, Jean (2004) "A Methodology for Translation". In: *The Translation Studies Reader*, second edition, Venuti, Lawrence (ed.). Abingdon/New York: Routledge, 128 -137

Internet

Causality – Kant (2009) <<http://science.jrank.org/pages/8539/Causality-Kant.html>> (as at 22.06.2011)

De Gruyter, Walter (2009) *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* , Volume 23 (1-4) <<http://related.springerprotocols.com/lp/de-gruyter/reviews-gDNvRjJ0B0>> (as at 22.06.2011)

Immanuel Kant: Metaphysics (2005) <<http://www.iep.utm.edu/kantmeta/>> (as at 22.06.2011)

Kant's Theory of Ethics (2011) <<http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/philosophy/courses/100/100kant.htm>> (as at 22.06.2011)

Philosophy of Immanuel Kant (2009) <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08603a.htm>> (as at 22.06.2011)