

An Analytical Study of Schleiermacher's Essay "On the Different Methods of Translating"

*Prof. Kadhim Khalaf Al-Ali (Ph.D.)
Mohammed Hmood Le'ibi
University of Basrah / College of Arts*

Abstract:

Friedrich Schleiermacher's 1813 essay *On the Different Methods of Translating* is repeatedly reread by many translation scholars. In that essay, Schleiermacher introduces his translation theory and his methods of moving the author towards the reader or moving the TT reader towards the author. Schleiermacher is credited as the founder of this translation method though he is not the first one to discuss it; he presents it with ample elaboration, and his essay is seen as one of the longest letters written at that time. The purpose of this paper is to analysing *On the Different Methods of Translating*, showing how Schleiermacher approached his theory, how that theory affects modern translation theory, the criteria he introduces to follow his preferred method, his hermeneutical view of translation, and how some of Schleiermacher's ideas are bent to suit certain modern contexts. Other conclusions bring to light unrevealed ideas of Schleiermacher such as his instructions to translators to handle the difficulties in certain text types, and his clarification of the two types of comprehension which translators have to choose to render.

دراسة نقدية وترجمة الى العربية لدراسة فريديك شلايرماخر "في الطرق المختلفة للترجمة"

الاستاذ الدكتور

كاظم خلف العلي

الباحث

محمد حمود لعبيبي

جامعة البصرة /كلية الآداب

المخلص:-

تقدم هذه الدراسة عرضاً شاملاً للدور الذي قام به فريديك شلايرماخر بوصفه مُنظراً وممارساً بارزاً في تاريخ الترجمة. اذ يتم تحليل دراسة شلايرماخر (في الطرق المختلفة للترجمة) تحليلاً نقدياً، كي نكتشف بعض من مفاهيمه غير المعروفة. كما وتقدم هذه الدراسة ترجمة الى اللغة العربية لدراسة شلايرماخر، وهي ترجمة عن النص الانكليزي الاحداث لهذه الدراسة والذي قامت به سوزان بيرنوفسكي. وتم التوصل لنتائج من شأنها ايضاح كيف ان بعضاً من مفاهيم شلايرماخر كانت قد كُيِّفَتْ لكي تناسب بعض السياقات الحديثة كتغيير جورج شتاينر للهدف الاخلاقي لنهج شلايرماخر الهرمنيوطيقي للترجمة وذلك للوصول لهدف معين في حركته الهرمنيوطيقية واعتبار لورانس فينوتي ان تحريك القارئ نحو الكاتب هي طريقة ابتكرها شلايرماخر للوصول لأهداف سياسية معينة . كما وتم التوصل لنتائج أخرى تسلط الضوء على افكار شلايرماخر التي لم يتم الكشف عنها من قبل كإرشاداته للمترجمين للتعامل مع الصعوبات التي يواجهونها في أنواع معينة من النصوص وتوضيحه لنوعي الفهم الذي على المترجم ان يختار بينهما.

1. Introduction:

Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) is considered as one of the most notable theologians, classicists, and translators. After more than two centuries, his translation of Plato's works into German is still widely used and admired (Forster, 2015: WWW). Schleiermacher represents his theory of translation in his seminal essay *On the Different Methods of Translating* (*Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens*). Pym (1995: 5) states that Schleiermacher's essay, which was delivered to the Royal Academy of Science in Berlin on 24 June 1813, "has become a *locus classicus* for much thought on translation" (italics in the original). Schleiermacher's translation methods are widely analyzed: Venuti, for instance, is considered as one of the most prominent translation scholars who reread those methods in many of his works like his 1991 essay "*Genealogies of Translation Theory: Schleiermacher*". Pym (1995, 2012) also gives a critical appraisal on some of the topics discussed in that essay. Other significant studies include Berman's *The Experience of the Foreign*, Robinson's *Schleiermacher Icoses*, and many others. Moreover, Schleiermacher's methods are seen as a source for most of the dichotomies suggested in modern translation theories (Kittel and Polterman, 2011).

Alongside his translation methods, Schleiermacher also discusses hermeneutical issues about translation process. Indeed, he is hailed as the founder of modern hermeneutics (Munday, 2016). He also explains some of the difficulties translators may face when dealing with different text types.

2. Schleiermacher's Contributions to the Field of Translation

Like his Hermeneutics and language philosophy, Schleiermacher's translation theory is based mainly on Herder's principles of language. Additionally, his practical experience as a skillful translator, translating Plato's dialogues into his mother tongue, gives his theoretical perspectives "a certain prima facie authority" (Forster, 2011: 260). The following subsections exhibit his most important achievements to translation studies.

2.1. Theory of Translation

Bernofsky (1997: 176) posits that among the writings discussing theory of translation in the early nineteenth-century Germany, three come to the fore: "Schleiermacher's 1813 lecture *On the Different Methods of Translating*, Wilhelm von Humboldt's introduction to his translation of *Aeschylus's Agamemnon* (1816), and Goethe's note on translation from the *West-ostlicher Divan* (1819)". The first one is recognized as the most significant amongst others. The reason behind that is that Schleiermacher enlarges "the same major points on modes of translation raised in the other two essays" to the degree of "integrating them into a unified, if utopian, vision of the future in which translation becomes a vehicle of national aesthetic education" (Bernofsky, 1997: 176). Schleiermacher insists on the strong connection between the linguistic and cultural aspects of source and target texts, and accordingly the 'impossibility' of rendering a text faithfully. That insistence results in an epistemological transference which distinguishes "Romantic [translation] theory, as well as the entire tradition

of nineteenth- and twentieth-century translation theory, from its predecessors” (Lianeri, 2002: 6).

2.2. Translation of Plato’s Works

Schleiermacher’s theory of translation which is mentioned in detail in his 1813 lecture is developed through the years he spent in translating; the most prominent work is the translation of Plato’s works into German which is initially intended to be accomplished together with Schlegel.

Though he anticipated that his version would be overshadowed through half a century by other translations, Schleiermacher’s version still “not only dominates sales of paperback editions of Plato in Germany but also remains an authoritative translation for scholars” (Lamm, 2000: 206). Hermans (2015: 79-81) mentions a number of translations which Schleiermacher worked on before his engagement in the Plato project; these are seen as a good practical underpinning, giving Schleiermacher ‘confidence as a translator’. Schleiermacher’s translation of Plato “changed the entire course of Plato studies and continues to reverberate even now, ... [and] its influence extended beyond the field of Plato scholarship inasmuch as it led Schleiermacher to develop a theory of interpretation” (Lamm, 2005: 92). As for the translation itself, Schleiermacher wants to interpret Plato accurately, prior to translating. To do this, he intermingles two ‘methods’ which were adopted by two of his contemporaries: his former partner Friedrich Schlegel and Wilhelm Gottlieb Tennemann. While the former was confident that applying an ‘*internal* method’ would be the best method to understand Plato, the latter thinks of an ‘*external*’ one (our italics).

Schleiermacher invests both methods in a well-balanced way that he would not lean on any of the two. Additionally, Schleiermacher sees that criticism is an essential condition to prevent different inclinations and attractions to emit from the original writings and, accordingly, to bring in ‘foreign meanings’ (Lamm, 2005: 94-8). Besides the translation itself, Schleiermacher wrote an introduction to each dialogue and a general introduction to the whole project. These introductions were appreciated independently and rendered into English in 1836 (Hermans, 2015: 82).

2.3. Translation and Hermeneutics

Cercel, Stolze, and Stanley (2015: 18) state that Schleiermacher, who is recognized as the father of modern hermeneutics, can be hailed as the pioneer “of a school of thought...[called] *translational hermeneutics*” (my italics). For Schleiermacher, the primary purpose is to surmount the notion of conventional pedagogy of hermeneutics by establishing an array of procedures for interpreting accurately particular paragraphs of different writings. It is seen that there are four different features which are fundamental to Schleiermacher’s hermeneutical theory of translation (Cercel, Stolze, and Stanley, 2015: 18-21):

1. at the level of hermeneutical reconstruction of textual meaning, any translator begins perpetually at his own understanding. That is to say, what is already apprehended is the ‘only’ meaning that can be rendered.
2. The act of translation is introduced as a triadic ‘subject-oriented’ activity; an interaction of writer, translator, and receiver.

3. all language usage has an individual moment, viz., language utterances must be regarded as a combination of the central message to be deduced from the overall structure of language and the innovative character an interlocutor conveys in the meaning intended.

4. Schleiermacher argues that comprehension, language, and individual are to be viewed as ‘historical phenomena’.

Contemporary research on Schleiermacher’s translational hermeneutics is incorporated in three separate fields. For philosophers such as Heidegger, Gadamer, and Ricoeur, it “stands in close connection with the primary linguistics nature of philosophical debates at that time”; “translation” is principally conceived “in an ontological sense” (Cercel, Stolze, and Stanley, 2015: 22). Secondly, there are scholars who think that translational hermeneutics needs more systematic, academic underpinnings. It is suggested that hermeneutical thinking has to be embraced by “the language of linguistics, i.e. the language of scientific linguistics” (Cercel, Stolze, and Stanley, 2015: 24). The third area in which translational hermeneutics is illustrated is in literature. “George Steiner’s *After Babel* (1975) and Friedmar Apel’s *Sprachbewegung* (The Movement of Language, 1982)” are the most significant contributions in this context (Cercel, Stolze, and Stanley, 2015: 23).

2.4. Foreignization and Domestication

Although differentiating between the two translation methods dates back to Cicero, it is posited that Schleiermacher is the one who inaugurates this tradition for modern translation studies. Nida’s formal and dynamic equivalence, Newmark’s

semantic and communicative translation, House's overt and covert translation, and Venuti's resistant and transparent translation are just a few examples of that tradition. In addition, a number of translations of Schleiermacher's 1813 essay as well as "public readings and commentaries" by leading translation scholars like Lefevere, Berman, and Venuti make Schleiermacher's translation methods "embedded in our contemporary context" (Pym, 1995: 6-7). Notwithstanding, these methods are widely manipulated so as to fit the context a translation scholar wants to reach. It is Venuti's critique of foreignization and domestication which is considered as the most influential (Tee, 2015: 141). Venuti (1991: 131) sees that Schleiermacher's preference of a foreignizing method is to allow 'educated elite[s]' govern the shaping of 'a national culture'. That is to say, that elite class is given the authority to promote a particular idiosyncratic "mode of expression, ... [and affect] the whole evolution of a culture" Venuti (1991: 131). Venuti (2008: 94) also criticizes Schleiermacher's 'author-oriented' view in that it "psychologizes the translated text and thus masks its cultural and social determinations". Furthermore, he (2008: 95) assumes that that view is more compatible with domestication; however, "Schleiermacher's psychologization of the text assumes transparency, the illusory presence of the foreign author in the translation".

3. An Analysis of Schleiermacher's Essay⁽¹⁾

Schleiermacher, through his 1813 essay, inspired, and still inspires, translation scholars to write about his theory of translation two centuries after first being read in Berlin. Trying to identify Schleiermacher's point of view about his favorite

translation method, significant scholars, like Berman, Venuti, Pym, etc., reread that essay over and over. An analytical study of *On the Different Methods of Translating* is executed in the following subsections⁽²⁾ to fulfill the goal of this research. Since the essay is originally written in the German language, the most recent English translation of the essay, and available in Venuti's book *The Translation Studies Reader* (2012), by Susan Bernofsky, is used to conducting the analysis.

3.1. Translation Importance

Schleiermacher starts his essay with the confirmation on how important translation is. He sees it as something crucial by the fact that we translate in every aspect of life. In doing so, he stresses two things: firstly, how translation gives the chance to different languages to revive their antiquities and classical works. The second thing is that translation is an activity that can be found within the limits of any certain language, (Schleiermacher, 2012):

[f]or not only do the dialects of the different clans that make up a people, and the different ways a language or dialect develops in different centuries, already constitute different languages in a stricter sense, between which it is often enough necessary to translate; even contemporaries who share a dialect but belong to different classes that rarely come together in social intercourse and diverge substantially in their education are commonly unable to communicate save through a similar mediation. (43)

That is, Schleiermacher refers to how variant languages are, as well as to how that variety, which can be illustrated by the different dialects of the same language, gives a room to translation.

3.2. Interpreter vs. Translator

After discussing briefly the kind of translation that can take place between the speakers of the same language or dialect, Schleiermacher prefers to restrict what is next in his paper to translation between two different languages, literally between his mother tongue and other languages. Schleiermacher first differentiates between two types of translation: interpretation and translation proper. The following subheadings are devoted to discussing how Schleiermacher introduces the interpreter's as well as the translator's work.

3.2.1. Interpretation

At this stage, Schleiermacher starts to mark the boundaries between interpretation and translation. He states that what makes the difference between interpretation and translation is mainly attributed to the nature of the texts dealt with in each case. First, he defines interpretation as what is meant with spoken texts, and he sees the trade field as the proper one for interpretation. Previously organized patterns and identified terms to help making the interpretation of business dealings possible even for those with fair knowledge in source and target languages. "all negotiations are... arithmetical or geometrical in nature, and numbers and measures come to one's aid at every step; and even in the case of notions that... are indicated by a graded series of terms that vary in ordinary usage... serve to fix the usage of the individual terms" (Schleiermacher, 2012: 44) After that, Schleiermacher refers to the elusiveness of interpreting written texts, especially those written for academic and literary purposes. He adds that interpreting such texts would be futile. He calls for

differentiation between these sorts of texts and the ones written for routine activities and are intended to document what is orally mentioned in business transactions, explaining that oral arrangements are the core mode of business dealings (Schleiermacher, 2012):

interpreting scientific or artistic products aloud would be not only useless but also, it seems, impossible. For business transactions, writing is only a mechanical means; verbal negotiation is their original mode, and every written interpretation should be seen only as the record of a spoken exchange. (44)

3.2.2. Translation Proper

Schleiermacher discusses interpretation side by side with translation. He first determines that academic and literary writings are the main works a translator can work on. That is where the translator finds his author in his most elegant form; the author of such writings expresses himself everywhere in the texts so that making it a formidable task for the translator to render such texts. Schleiermacher also adds that such texts are governed by figurative language where a word or an object may not mean what it refers to in an ordinary language or stand for different meanings. He thinks that a translator needs to be too professional so that he must be acquainted with the author, knowledge about his language and style, and enough ability to deal with such factors. This is why Schleiermacher posits that rendering such types of writings gives the translator the right to say that his work is creative and equals other artistic works. Schleiermacher states that there are two factors every translator must take into consideration:

1. the translator should be aware that there are no two words in a pair of languages that correspond perfectly in terms of the effect they produce, meanings, etc. so that he can render it with ease. Otherwise, if the role of rhythm and rhyme is brushed aside, translation is as mechanical as interpretation: “if in any two languages each word in the one were to correspond perfectly to a word in the other... then all translation in the areas of art and science... would be as purely mechanical as in business transactions” (Schleiermacher, 2012: 45).

2. The second factor that has to be taken into account is that the translator needs to understand his author as completely as possible. What makes Schleiermacher stress such a matter is his viewpoint that any person’s expressive power occurs absolutely within the limits of his mother tongue. In other words, both the translator and his author cannot think and form their ideas outside their mother tongue which may result in a gap between what the translator thinks and translates and what the author originally intended: “[e]very human being is... in the power of the language he speaks; he and all his thought are its products... the form of his ideas, the manner in which he combines them, and the limits of these combinations are all preordained by the language in which he was born and raised: both his intellect and his imagination are bound by it” (Schleiermacher, 2012: 46). Such a hermeneutical problem, which Schleiermacher elaborates on sporadically through his essay, is discussed in Hermeneutics subsection.

3.2.3. Imitation

Tourist brochures and newspaper articles are the examples given by Schleiermacher to illustrate such type of translation. He sees that the absence of the original author gives the translator a room to manipulate, add, and delete what he thinks is best for the target text. Schleiermacher considers such translations as far less important than those of literary and other creative writings: “the translator of newspaper articles and ordinary travel literature tends to make common cause with the interpreter, and it will soon become ridiculous if he claims for his work too high a status and wishes to be respected as an artist” (Schleiermacher, 2012: 44). He also classifies them as a mere interpretation since the translator deals with the original text as a pattern and tends to translate the way he likes. By doing so, it can be said that Schleiermacher, although he does not mention it clearly, hints at some literary translations which were produced at that time to fulfill marketing aims. Such a kind of translation is called *service translation* (italics in the original) (Bernofsky, 2005: 2).

3.3. Hermeneutics

After discussing interpretation, translation proper, and imitation, Schleiermacher moves to a more complicated area, viz., and hermeneutics. For Schleiermacher, the translator should take into account two aspects before translating:

1. the linguistic aspect: By this aspect, Schleiermacher refers to the use of the terms, their figurative meanings, their syntactic and semantic relations to other terms, as well as to the exceptional positioning of them: “every...utterance must be grasped in two different senses, first in terms of the genius

of the language from whose elements it was derived, as an expressive means tied to and determined by this spirit that brought it to life within the speaker” (Schleiermacher, 2012: 46-7). He also argues that the translator’s knowledge of the SL, as well as the TL, is to be almost perfect to the degree that he has to know about the etymology of the languages he deals with in order to translate as perfectly as possible.

2. the individual aspect: Schleiermacher states that all the linguistic factors are required to be comprehended by the translator in relation to the ST author’s intentions: “yet it must also be understood in terms of the speaker himself, as an act that can only have emerged out of...his particular being” (Schleiermacher, 2012: 47). The translator needs to understand, for example, the author’s choice of certain linguistic items and his special use of different terms, giving them new meanings.

Schleiermacher believes that both aspects must be grasped not only separately, but also in relation to each other. That is due to identifying which aspect is more effective for the terms in question. Therefore, Schleiermacher assumes that if the translator wants to comprehend what the original author intended by a certain expression, he must comprehend the linguistic dimension of that expression as well. On the other hand, if the translator wants to apprehend that expression linguistically, he should take into account the author’s intention, Schleiermacher (2012):

every utterance of this sort will be understood in the higher sense of the word only when these two sets of relationships are conceived of both together and in their true connection to one another, so that no question

remains concerning which of the two dominates in the utterance as a whole and in its individual parts. (47)

It can be said that there is a similarity between Schleiermacher's rules of hermeneutics of translation and Ferdinand de Saussure's Langue and Parole. By langue, de Saussure refers to language as a system and that is what the German philosopher refers to with the linguistic aspect of hermeneutics. Parole is meant to define the linguistic product of an individual within the limits of the linguistic system, and Schleiermacher also refers to such a matter with the individual aspect, urging translators to combine both aspects so that a successful translation is achieved.

As it is explained previously, Schleiermacher's hermeneutics of translation is considered as the theoretical underpinning for various studies in this realm in the 20th century. However, it can be said that most of these studies, including Steiner's hermeneutic motion which is viewed as the most effective one (Munday 2016: 275), are dedicated to study translation through understanding. In other words, scholars of this type of study do not pay attention to what Schleiermacher discusses in his essay after explaining his hermeneutical approach to translation, that is- his approaches to bring the original author and the TT reader together. Except for Steiner who mentions that an imbalance between the meaning of ST and TT is an absolute result when a translator renders that meaning. He states that either complete domestication or foreignization; and he thinks that balance will be restored by the fact that the readers of the text will be increased. But this is a huge difference between Schleiermacher's and Steiner's ethical aim.

Schleiermacher thinks that what is important here is to convey the same impression the readers of the original text have, while Steiner looks for increasing the number of the readers without paying attention to what the author originally intended to convey. Namely, Steiner does not have a problem, whether a text is rendered with a completely smoothed language or vice versa, while Schleiermacher looks forward to resolving this problem by suggesting two different paths. These are discussed in the following subsection.

3.4. The Two Paths:

Schleiermacher begins introducing his two methods of translation by asking about whether the translator has to translate an SL text which is completely distant from TT readers. That is to say, the translator has to take into consideration that he either brings the ST text author and the TT reader together, or he intends to convey the exact comprehension which he received while reading the SL text. Considering what is at the translator's fingertips, Schleiermacher states that it is very difficult to carry out such a task. For him, if the translator wants to transmit what he understood previously, two important aspects are to be conveyed:

1. The TL text receiver should perceive and feel the artistry and brilliance of the SL. It means that the reader of the TT would have a clear idea about how the ST reader receives the original text and how the author has dealt with his mother tongue to write his text.
2. The translator ought to render the original text in a way that the original author's thoughts and feelings are clearly

transmitted to TT readers. Hence, they can understand the author's viewpoint as precisely as the author's natives: "they must grasp the genius of the language that was native to the writer... [and] be able to observe his characteristic manner of thinking and sensibility" (Schleiermacher, 2012: 47).

Schleiermacher opines that there are a number of factors which may impede the translator's efforts to achieve a complete rendition of the above mentioned aspects. The first one is the TT reader's language, that is- he refers to the discrepancy between every pair of languages and how the translator is obliged to handle such a problem. The second factor is the translator's own understanding of the text which may vary from time to time. In addition, Schleiermacher sheds light on the relation between the translator and the text in question. If the translator enjoys reading a particular part of a text, then he would translate it in a better way than another of a less amusement.

To secure the above mentioned aspects, Schleiermacher mentions that there are two translation methods which have been developed for that purpose; these are paraphrase and imitation. Schleiermacher sees both methods as perfect for scientific and artistic purposes, but not for those who look for aesthetics in language and literature. He thinks that while these methods solve some of the problems mentioned, they also raise some others, Schleiermacher (2012):

...methods that eliminate by force some of the difficulties mentioned above, cunningly circumvent others, and in any case altogether abandon the notion of translation we have been proposing. (48)

Paraphrase is meant to solve the problem of equivalence between two different languages; this can be reached by, for example, “adding restrictive and amplifying modifiers” to the TT (Schleiermacher, 2012: 48). In spite of the precision carried out with that method, paraphrasing a text into another language would mean abandoning the effect of the original. That is due to the over-detailed version the ‘paraphrast’ produces. As for imitation, Schleiermacher realizes that it is always used to make the TT readers receive, as much as possible, the same effect of the ST on the readers. Notwithstanding, to reach to that effect, the ‘imitator’ replaces the original text by a completely different version in the TL; but he uses that original text as a guideline to produce the TT. That is to say, the general idea of the SL text would govern that of the TL one, but not its particulars. To put it differently, Schleiermacher posits that using this method would give the impression that languages are inefficacious to correspond verbatim, especially in literary texts. This way, neither the original text itself nor the way the original language used in it to pique the readers’ curiosity can be considered as existents in the TT. The foreignness of the original text is also replaced by different constituents.

As a result, Schleiermacher discerns that both methods would be insufficient to broaden the range of the foreignness of the original text nor its language significance. He (2012) states that:

[b]oth these procedures, however, will fail to satisfy someone who, filled with admiration for the excellence of a foreign masterpiece, wishes to enlarge the sphere of its influence to include fellow speakers of his language and has in mind a stricter notion of translation. (48)

A contradiction can be seen here between what Schleiermacher aims, i.e. his intention to broaden the horizon of the foreignness of a translated text, and what Venuti reckons about such an issue. Venuti believes that Schleiermacher has coined his model of moving the reader towards the original author due to resisting the domination of French culture at that time. Notwithstanding, broadening the horizon of the original text means giving the opportunity to that text to penetrate the TL culture. In other words, that method, as explained in the following subsection, would allow what is foreign in French texts to find its way to Prussian readers. Instead, it can be suggested that, if Schleiermacher wants to resist the French invasion as Venuti sees, an imitation and the use of domestication are the proper ones to resist.

3.4.1. Moving the Reader

By this, Schleiermacher explains that the translator has to “leave the writer in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him”, that is- toward the author of the original text (Schleiermacher, 2012: 49). Following this method, the translator, Schleiermacher states, is to seek to clarify the original text for the TL text readers so that they would understand it as the readers of the original understood the SL text, (Schleiermacher, 2012):

the translator is endeavoring, in his work, to compensate for the reader’s inability to understand the original language. He seeks to impart to the reader the same image, the same impression that he himself received thanks to his knowledge of the original language of the work as it was written, thus moving the reader to his own position, one in fact foreign to him. (49)

The translator, whose aim is to move the reader towards the writer, has to deal with:

1. a comprehension of individual terms and sentences. This kind of comprehension deals with the nuances of the text in question and never looks at it as a whole. Schleiermacher thinks that this kind of comprehension can be attached to beginner students of language. He recommends translators not to render texts with such a comprehension since it would never be understandable to TT readers. Furthermore, he urges that such a procedure will help make lay people, at that time, read and acquaint themselves with other cultures. In a footnote about this issue, Schleiermacher gives an example of Goethe's recommendation that translations into German, poetry in particular, are to be preferably tackled with the same procedure, for the same reason Schleiermacher refers to. Not only are adult people the ones that Schleiermacher recommends to be encouraged to become readers, but even children and youngsters. He suggests that already translated poetic and other types of texts should be 'adapted' for such a purpose.

At this point, Schleiermacher's call to consider children, young people, and adults as targets while translating 'foreign literature' proves wrong Venuti's view that Schleiermacher's reader-to-writer method enables 'educated elite[s]' control the limits of 'a national culture'. Besides, two of Schleiermacher's principles⁽³⁾ of language theory agree with what Schleiermacher suggests, i.e. Venuti's view that reader-to-writer, or what he names foreignization, is coined to serve the bourgeois minority of that time is against what Schleiermacher

already believes. Schleiermacher's encouragement to translate for these classes of people can be traced back to one of his language principles in which he sees that 'language is social in nature'. Thus, he thinks that adapting foreign texts means socializing them to reach most TT readers. In addition, adapting foreign texts to become appropriate TTs is compatible with what Schleiermacher states in another principle of his language theory: 'the *principle of interpretive difficulty and discerning word-usage*' (Forster, 2011: 253-4). That is, to understand translated classics, like Homer, is difficult for children and youngsters. Therefore, an appropriate word-usage and adaptation to such texts would help these receivers apprehend them easily.

2. The other comprehension a translator faces is the one that Schleiermacher describes as an unattainable. That unattainability is attributed to the fact that some of the TT readers are so acquainted with the language and culture of the ST to the degree that they live and think in that foreign culture's style. Likewise, there are others who respond to foreign texts as if they were written to 'suit' their mentality. Such people, who already learned the foreign language, can read STs without the influence of their own language. Therefore, translating to those people is unprofitable, i.e. a translator cannot make his translation reach the level of those people's comprehension.

With this, Schleiermacher prefers that any translation that comes in between these two extremes. A translator's aim in this case should be to give TT readers the impression that they are receiving an exact image of the original text. This way,

readers of this type of translation would be, as Schleiermacher describes, 'amateur and connoisseur'. Schleiermacher (2012) further identifies the TT reader of such a translation as:

a man who is well acquainted with the foreign language, yet to whom it remains nonetheless foreign, who must no longer think each detail through in his mother tongue like a schoolboy before he is able to grasp the whole, yet who, even where he can take pleasure unhindered in the beauty of a work, remains ever conscious of the differences between this language and his mother tongue. (51)

The above mentioned description is compatible with what Venuti states that Schleiermacher's main target is the educated people. However, a partial compatibility can be seen here since, as mentioned earlier, Schleiermacher does not target the 'bourgeois minority' only as Venuti views.

Schleiermacher's encouragement to translate between these two types of comprehensions also shows how Schleiermacher's translation methods, i.e. reader-to-author and author-to reader, are different from word-for-word and sense-for-sense which are invented a long time before Schleiermacher's. They are different in the sense that moving a TT reader towards an ST author is carried out not by translating single words and sentences, as is the case with the first type of comprehension which is also seen as the most extreme version of literal translation; nor by attempting to render an exact comprehension of the original. In other words, the midway point Schleiermacher still it is an awkward sentence allows them to render as artists. This is what Schleiermacher emphasizes when he renders Plato and deals with him as an 'artist' as well. Thus, his choice, as he assumes,

should preserve the art of the original, his touch, smell, and music through the target text.

3.4.2. Moving the Author

This is the case when the translator “leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the writer toward him” (Schleiermacher, 2012: 49). Schleiermacher states that the translator who translates according to this method would not only make the original author as if he has written the text as a native speaker of the TL, but also making him as if he has been born in that TL culture. Translators following this method assume that TT readers will receive the original text as exactly as SL readers did. There are a number of issues regarding this method. The first one is that the TL would not be affected by what is rendered according to this method. Additionally, the best way to show to translators who prefer the other method how the work of the original author is important to his mother tongue is by giving the opportunity to that author to reach TT readers as if he had done himself. The chance for a translator to meet such a translation is better when the SL is as developed when the author has written his work as the TL when a translator translates that ST. Schleiermacher confirms that the success of such a process is difficult to achieve. Otherwise speaking, a translator’s ability to comprehend and think as the original author would have done is still limited. This is attributed to the effect of the translator’s mother tongue: any native speaker, in general, and translator, in particular cannot get rid of his mother tongue completely. Thus, thinking and understanding in a foreign language will always be part or within the borders of the processes of

thinking and understanding in one's mother tongue as a whole. That mixed area can be called *mental sublanguage*⁽⁴⁾ (our italics). It means that the translator's attempt to think in an SL in order to understand an ST results in a mental area where that thinking and understanding is within his mother tongue.

3.4.2.1. Authenticity

Schleiermacher moves to another issue which translators following author-to-reader method forget about. He discerns that any text which is translated according to this method is unauthentic. An opinion which is against Schleiermacher's view refers to works which are written by authors using their second languages. In other words, it is believed that these writings are considered as authentic since they are written directly by authors themselves without using their mother tongues. Schleiermacher replies to this viewpoint by tracking the ideas these writings contain. He explains that the roots of any author's ideas and feelings cannot be planted anywhere but in his mother tongue's soil. He (2012: 58) shows that the translation process in such cases takes place in the mind of the author; "he merely begins to translate them while the embryo is still in an early stage of development". Schleiermacher also conceives that some of these works are written only for the purpose of entertaining the author himself. Therefore, Schleiermacher finds it difficult to consider these writings as authentic. In this sense, Schleiermacher presumes that this method has nothing to do at all with translation. It is more like an imitation than a translation. However, Schleiermacher reveals applying the other method, i.e. reader-to-author, is not the preferred one at that time. The reason behind that is the

difficulties translators face to reserve the text's authenticity. Thus, most of the translators of that time resort to imitation and paraphrasing. Yet, Schleiermacher urges German translators to translate according to his preferred method, insisting that it can be used to strengthen German language. He looks forward to making his mother tongue a cynosure for European intellectuals with translators applying reader-to-author method for all types of texts.

3.4.3. In Between

Schleiermacher (2012) affirms that any translator who tries to use these two methods in a single text will ultimately face a very inaccurate outcome:

any attempt to combine them being certain to produce a highly unreliable result and to carry with it the danger that writer and reader might miss each other completely. (49)

As a result, the potential to fail to catch the original author's point of view is high for TT readers. More precisely, Schleiermacher attempts to highlight the difference between reader-to-author and author-to-reader methods. He states that there are no other methods alongside these two. The midway point Schleiermacher hints at is the point where the author and TT reader meet; he thinks that it is the translator himself that can be considered as the point where these two persons meet at. Otherwise, one of the two should move towards the other. Namely, Schleiermacher figures that every translation method is confined under his two methods: literal, faithful, free, or whatever else occurs under these two headings. That is what Kittel and Polterman (2011: 417) confirm almost two centuries after Schleiermacher's essay first read.

3.4.4. Translation Difficulties

Translation difficulties Schleiermacher discusses in his essay are the ones which a translator may face while applying reader-to-author method. There are difficulties which a translator faces because of the type of a text he deals with, i.e. academic and literary texts, or due to the foreignness of these texts. These can be discussed as follows:

3.4.4.1. Academic Texts

The first difficulty in translating this type of texts is that most of TT readers of such type of texts have a familiarity with the original language, but without getting specialized. Rendering academic texts becomes more and more difficult when these texts are very significant for the SL culture. However, a translator ought to venture such a type of texts since his objectives are in such features. What makes the translator's task more difficult is the historicity of the language. Academic and literary writings enrich languages and allow them to reach their perfection. Therefore, a reader with enough expertise about these sides of an SL language would immediately feel about the status of the text in question in the original language. As a result, he would also be able to identify new uses of words and juxtapositions that the translator uses to transfer the author's viewpoint and feeling. Subsequently, the reader will comprehend the author on the basis of these expressions. Schleiermacher states that rendering such parts is important for the translation, otherwise a big portion of the author's viewpoint would not be conveyed to readers of the TT. Schleiermacher explains how to deal with these difficulties. First, he posits that a complete

correspondence between a pair of languages is not possible. He gives an example of how a translation of a new word in the SL can be best rendered with an archaic term in the TL. In such a situation, the translator has two options, either he tends to show a foreign spirit in the TT or to distort the ST and imitate it. Schleiermacher (2012) prefers the first option since he assumes the translator need to take into consideration that he is going to find similar cases in the text:

the translator must always compel himself to replace impartially, wherever the opportunity presents itself, that of which he has had to deprive the reader, not letting himself slip, even unconsciously, into a pertinacious one-sidedness because his inclinations bid him favor one artistical element above all the others. (52)

Therefore, it is necessary for the translator to believe that the text in general will better convey the author's point of view than each single instance. But then, Schleiermacher states that the translator need to consider his success in translating individual cases rather than in the text as a whole. This would happen when the author uses an extremely complicated context which is full of terms which are very creative and their etymological background is very different from that of their TL equivalents. The translator, in this case, hopes that TT readers will not compare his translation to the ST.

3.4.4.2 Literary Texts

Schleiermacher here pays special attention to translation of poetry. He thinks that the translator should render every rhythms, rhymes, and tones which are effective on the meaning of the text. Despite that, it happens that conveying musical aspects of language result in a disagreement with

syntactical as well as propositional ones. Therefore, it is important for the translator not to let himself lean to one of these aspects, neglecting others. Schleiermacher explains, on the one hand, that a translator who likes conveying the message of the text will not notice his unfaithfulness to the musical sides. Consequently, he will be satisfied with a translation that is much more like paraphrasing. On the other hand, if the translator prefers to render rhythms, tones, and rhymes of a text, it would result in distorting the content of that text. Comparing such a translation with its SL text would show how trivial that translation is. In both cases, the outcome will be an alteration in the original impression.

3.4.4.3. Foreignness of the Text

Schleiermacher sees that translating according to his method, i.e. reader-to-author, gives rise to another difficulty, i.e. conveying the spirit of the foreign. He states that to convey the foreignness of the STs, German translators at that time tended to stick to the SL texts as much as possible. Notwithstanding, Schleiermacher thinks that this tendency would produce completely vague texts. Thus, he (2012) believes that any translator who follows this method is obliged to make a number of ‘sacrifices’:

[t]his undertaking would appear to be the most extraordinary form of humiliation to which a writer of some quality can subject himself. Who would not like to make his native tongue appear everywhere displaying the most splendid characteristic beauty allowed by each genre? Who would not prefer to beget children who would purely represent their fathers’ lineage, rather than mongrels? Who would suffer himself to be seen moving with far less lightness and grace than that of which he is capable, and to appear at least occasionally harsh and stiff so as to

displease the reader just enough to keep him conscious of what one is about? Who would gladly consent to be considered ungainly for striving to adhere so closely to the foreign tongue as his own language allows, and to being criticized, like parents who entrust their children to tumblers for their education, for having failed to exercise his mother tongue in the sorts of gymnastics native to it, instead accustoming it to alien, unnatural contortions! And who, finally, would wish to see himself smiled upon with utmost condescension by precisely the greatest masters and connoisseurs, who assure him that they would be entirely unable to understand his laborious, ill-considered German if they had not their knowledge of Greek and Latin to come to their aid! (53)

These points are better explained by the following:

1. his use of the TL should be appropriate enough to give TT readers the sense they are reading a foreign text.
2. he ought to convey the foreignness of the text exactly rather than imitating it.
3. The translator must keep TT readers completely aware about the subject matter at the expense of fluency.
4. He has to stick himself to the SL text as much as the TL allows, being ready to be criticized for adjusting it so that the foreign impression is conveyed.
5. The translator should not underestimate his readers. Instead, taking into account their knowledge and witness, the TT will be comprehended adequately.

All the above discussion about translation difficulties can be considered, alongside the hermeneutical approach to translation, as rules for translators to follow Schleiermacher's translation theory. As long as Schleiermacher does not explain, as Herman (2015: 83) states, his approach to translate Plato, his discussion about overcoming translation difficulties

can also be presumed as the way he used for handling Plato's works. This is especially true since his translation of Plato's works preceded his 1813 essay. In short, his essay can be seen as a display of his experience in the practical side. However, he does not illustrate that side with concrete examples in his essay. But if he does so, then he would limit his translation method to a small scale which would be drawn with reference to these examples. Schleiermacher neglects such a procedure, describing translation as "an art...[and] [a]rt must learn to conquer its difficulties, of which we have made no secret, to the greatest extent possible" (2012: 59-62).

4. Conclusions

In light of the above critical appraisal of Schleiermacher's essay, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. In terms of Schleiermacher's hermeneutics of translation, it can be said that his hermeneutical view is applied by Steiner, amongst others, in a way which contradicts his ethical aim. While Steiner thinks that compensating the original author for the inevitable distortion of his text can be reached through increasing the number of the readership, Schleiermacher believes that the author need to get the atonement through conveying the same impression the original text left on its readers to TT readers. In other words, Schleiermacher insists on applying his preferred method, i.e. reader-to-author, while Steiner does not bother whether it is reader-to-author or author-to-reader.
2. One of the motives which led Schleiermacher to prefer moving the TT reader towards the original author is giving that reader the opportunity to feel the foreignness of the ST. In

this way, he encourages translators to render that foreignness into the TT language so that readers get enough acquaintance with it. Venuti's view, then, that Schleiermacher has made this method to resist the domination of French culture at that time is incorrect. If Schleiermacher had such intention, then the other method, i.e. author-to-reader, would be suitable to prevent transmitting any foreign feature into his mother tongue. Another important aim which lies beyond preferring this method is that Schleiermacher looks at developing his mother tongue. He states that only through monumental academic and literary writings as well as translations of foreign texts which are significant in the SL culture languages are enriched and developed. Therefore, moving the author towards the TT readers results in hiding that significance, while putting the foreignness of a text in front of those readers helps bring new items to the TL culture.

3. Venuti also gives another ambivalent view, seeing that Schleiermacher's reader-to-author method is intended to serve the minority of educated people which Schleiermacher belongs to. As is stated earlier, two of Schleiermacher's principles of his theory of language as well as his call for translators to target different classes of people show that he considered translating into people from almost every single class and not only to people he lived amongst.

4. There are two types of comprehension from which a translator can choose to translate. However, Schleiermacher urges translators to choose an in-between point, confirming that translators have to translate as artists and not merely

render words or meanings. It is that point which differentiates between Schleiermacher preferred method and word-for-word one.

5. A translator cannot get rid of his mother tongue completely. Schleiermacher confirms that the effect of the mother tongue on every single person is inevitable. This is the case even for translators who are very professional to the degree that they have the ability to think and comprehend in a language other than their mother tongue. That ability is still part of these mental processes as whole. The term mental sublanguage is suggested here to refer to that part. This term can stand for the attempt of the translator to think and comprehend in an SL in order to understand an ST results in a mental area where that thinking and understanding occurs within his mother tongue.

6. Unlike what many translation scholars believe that Schleiermacher did not prescribe certain principles which are to be followed when applying his favorite method, Schleiermacher discusses the difficulties translators may face when translating. Beside that discussion, he exhibits a number of principles which are intended to overcome these difficulties, especially in academic and literary texts and those which take place when transferring the ST foreignness as well.

Bibliography

- 1- The full analysis, as well as an Arabic translation, of the essay can be found in the imminent thesis.
- 2- Schleiermacher does not divide his essay into chapters. Therefore, titles of the subsections are chosen according to the sequence of the topics discussed in the essay.
- 3- See Forster (2011: 253-4).
- 4- According to Etzkorn, Davis and Bowen (2001: 1731) “a sublanguage is a subset of a natural language such as the English language. Sublanguages tend to emerge gradually through the use of a language in various fields by specialists in those fields. Some such sublanguages are the ‘language of biophysics’ and the ‘language of naval telegraphic transmissions’”.

Works Cited:

- Bernofsky, Susan. "Schleiermacher's Translation Theory and Varieties of Foreignization." *The Translator* 3.2 (1997): 175-92. Print.
- Bernofsky, Susan. *Foreign Words: Translator-authors in the Age of Goethe*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2005. Print.
- Cercel, Larisa, Radegundis Stolze, and John Stanley. "Hermeneutics as a Research Paradigm". *Translational Hermeneutics: The First Symposium*. Radegundis Stolze, John Stanley, and Larisa Cercel (eds.). Bucarest: Zeta, 2015. 17-40 Print.
- Etzkorn, Letha H., et al. "The language of comments in computer software: A sublanguage of English." *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 33, no. 11, 2001, pp.1731–1756.
- Forster, Michael N. *German Philosophy of Language: From Schlegel to Hegel and beyond*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.

Hermans, Theo. "Schleiermacher and Plato, Hermeneutics and Translation."

Friedrich Schleiermacher and the Question of Translation (2015): 77-106.

Kittel, Harald, and Andreas Polterman. "The German Tradition." *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (eds). 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2011. 411-18. Print.

Lamm, Julia A. "Schleiermacher as Plato Scholar." *The Journal of Religion* 80.2(2000): 206-39. Print.

Lamm, Julia A. "The Art of Interpreting Plato." *The Cambridge Companion to Friedrich Schleiermacher* (2005): 91-108. Print.

Lianeri, Alexandra. "Translation and the Ideology of Culture Reappraising Schleiermacher's Theory of Translation." *Current Writing* 14.2 (2002): 1-18. Print.

Mariña, Jacqueline. *The Cambridge Companion to Friedrich Schleiermacher*.

Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.

Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 4th ed. London: Routledge, 2016. Print.

Pym, Anthony. "Schleiermacher and the Problem of Blendings." *Translation and Literature* 4.1. (1995): 5-30. Print.

Robinson, Douglas. *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2014. Print.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "On the Different Methods of Translating." Trans.

Susan Bernofsky. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2012. 43-62. Print.

Selbie, W. B. *Schleiermacher: A Critical and Historical Study*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1913. Print.

Tee, Carlos G. "In Defense of Schleiermacher: A Critique of Venuti's

Foreignization and Domestication." 翻譯學研究集刊19期 (2015): 141-154. Print.

Venuti, Lawrence. "Genealogies of Translation Theory: Schleiermacher." TTR:

traduction, terminologie, rédaction 4.2 (1991): 125-50. Print.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.