

Translating Rudolf Steiner's Lectures

ANNA R MEUSS

SOME OF us were discussing ways of studying Steiner lectures in a group. One proposal was that members would study the lecture before coming to a meeting and present what they had read in their own words. 'Never!' said one of the group, 'I want to have nothing but the actual words of Rudolf Steiner!' This came as something of a shock to me, for I knew him to be an intelligent person. Did he really believe the translation we were reading gave Rudolf Steiner's actual words? I remember someone at the Rudolf Steiner Nachlassverwaltung (literary executors) in Dornach saying: 'If only people did not take everything printed in the volumes of lectures for gospel!' He was speaking of the German editions, but this holds even more true for the English editions.

Every translator has to live with the knowledge that there is no such thing as a perfect or complete translation. Perhaps it is equally important that readers recognise the fact that a translation is not the original – which is not necessarily a bad thing.

It is commonly believed that translation is essentially a skill to do with languages, when in fact near-native knowledge of the source language is only one of three equally important elements:

- *knowledge of the source language*, including the history, culture, way of life and thinking it reflects;
- *knowledge of the subject*, and, most importantly, your limits of knowledge in this regard, and where to find the knowledge that you do not have;
- last, but not least, the *ability to write well in the target language*, for translators are the authors of their translations, legally and in every other respect. I am a member of the Society of Authors, for instance,

which has special interest groups such as medical writers, translators, educational writers, etc. Writing is a communicating skill and to be a good writer you have to have a clear image of your readers, of what you may assume them to know and not to know, how they will respond to particular phrases, etc.

Past translations

Until not very long ago, many of Rudolf Steiner's works were translated with much love, but often dictionary in hand, by individuals who wanted the other members of their study group to have access to a book or a course of lectures. These translations often ended up in published form without having been intended for that purpose. Many were written in excellent English, but those translators lacked the professional training that makes you aware of the problems and the pitfalls of translation, and so a special anthroposophical language has developed which is based on faulty translation. Terms that come to mind are 'metabolic limb system' (who has ever heard of a 'metabolic limb' except in anthroposophical translations? – why not write 'metabolism and limbs?'); 'willing' used as a noun which does not exist in the English language – it also suggests 'will intent' rather than the 'will activity' meant by Steiner (the two 'i' sounds take us very much into the 'nerve vowels', whilst using an 'a', 'o' or 'u' helps to bring in the 'blood' aspect). 'Striving' and its plural 'strivings' have become jargon, as Owen Barfield pointed out in the October 1987 issue of *Word for Word*,¹ where 'effort' or 'endeavour' might be the better term.

We have, of course, also been fortunate to have had some excellent 'natural' translators in the past. Some of their work has served us well and will continue to do so for some time, even if the English is in some respects getting a little out of date.

I think powers higher than those of the human mind are watching over Steiner's work and it is often remarkable how well the content comes across in spite of inept translation, editing and publishing. This does not mean that we can go on in the old, careless way, for having gained new insight into the issues involved we must act accordingly.

Typical problems

Every language is complete in itself and capable of rich and varied expression. The problems come with translation. Essentially a text given in one language reflects a particular point of view, and if it is given in another language the subject is considered from a different point of view. This is why learning a new language can be so enriching, for we come to see things from a new angle. It is also one of the major problems

in translation, for the original text only presents one angle, and we have to bridge the gap, or make the jump, to another angle, sometimes with some of the necessary information missing. After all, if you look at a tree from one side, there may be a whole branch that is hidden from view; looking from another side, that branch will be visible. We translators sometimes have to provide those extra branches!

German and English are relatively closely related languages but nevertheless reflect very different views on life and different cultures, so that similarities are not always what they seem to be. Rudolf Steiner sought to present the things he had to say in a German that was accessible to every open-minded German-speaking person.

Aspects of style

One thing of which translators must beware, for instance, is letting the English become too abstract. The words of the German language are largely of the same origin as words that come from the Anglo-Saxon stream in the English language. They are still full of vitality, often with a rich image-quality. It is frequently necessary for German speakers or writers to subdue this vitality by changing verbs into nouns, for example, nouns being more abstract and less vital by nature than verbs are. Conversely the rendering of a powerful German verb may be given more strength in English by using a noun.

It goes with the job that translators have an above-average vocabulary in the target language, and in our eagerness to achieve precision we are easily tempted to use rather abstruse words. Thus the German verb *durchdringen* packs real power with its 'u' sound and the repeated *d-r* followed by *-g-*; the all too frequently used rendering 'permeate' is rather bloodless by comparison. Possible translations suggested in the *Extended Glossary*² are: in contexts relating to human thought, to mind and intellect, 'penetrate/penetrating'; in the sphere of the heart, 'a heart full of love' rather than 'permeated with love'; in the sphere of the will, 'children who are all will' may carry more power than 'permeated with will'. There are, of course, also occasions where 'permeate' is the best term to choose. My main objection is the routine translation of *durchdringen* as 'permeate'.

Steiner used ordinary German (except for 'technical' terms such as 'astral', 'ether', etc.) and there is no reason why we should not use ordinary English. There is no need for 'in'-terms that have no meaning in English and present real hurdles to anyone new to anthroposophy. Let us do away with 'anthro-speak', therefore. Even *Gemüt* can be translated. The key is to translate not words but the meaning they hold.

Another thing to be taken into account is that German is a very explicit language, and in Steiner's day this was even more so the case than it is today. It means that logical links are fully expressed in words, so that the German-speaking reader is more or less taken by the hand and the line of reasoning made quite explicit. English, on the other hand, is more implicit, i.e. much is said between the lines, and indeed an English-speaking reader may find a text didactic and wordy and become irritated if all the link terms – 'thus', 'therefore', 'hence', 'due to this', etc. – are fully translated.

Added to this is the fact that German has a wonderful facility for forming compound words, and since the compound exists authors and speakers will tend to use it each time the concept comes up. Again, if such compound nouns are fully translated each time, we get heavy, turgid English. It is usually better to use a shorter term for repetitions.

Example: Within four lines of the German text we may find *Himmelsgewölbe* mentioned three times. One English rendering of this is 'vault of heaven', i.e. three words. Repetition of the whole phrase may make the English text very heavy and it is often better to reduce it to 'vault' and perhaps even to 'this' the second and third time, providing the meaning is clear.

The meaning of words

Translations made at the level of words may be misleading. Recently I picked up a copy of the well-known German paper *Die Welt*. One section of this was headed: *Geistige Welt*. If we translate the words, we get 'spiritual world'; of course it was no such thing but, in fact, the section on the arts. In the same way I seriously doubt if Rudolf Steiner really meant that theologians and physicians were members of two different 'spiritual professions' when he addressed them at the beginning of his course on pastoral medicine. I'd say he was speaking of people from two different academic disciplines. The term *geistig* means 'academic' as well as 'spiritual', 'mental', 'intellectual', etc., etc. *Geist* and *geistig* always need careful consideration and have to be translated out of the context.

Another word much used by Steiner and which needs very careful consideration each time it comes up is *Welt*. Members of our study group were quite puzzled by a reference to 'cosmic warmth'. Steiner was speaking of the way we catch a cold, which happens if we are unable to convert the *Weltwärme* into our own *Wärme*, meaning not 'cosmic warmth' but the 'outside temperature' which has to be brought up to our 'body temperature'. What is more, the transition from calling something 'warm' to calling it 'hot' occurs at a different point between the

two languages (Germans have a *warme Mahlzeit* and readers may sometimes find it helpful to think in terms of 'heat' rather than 'warmth' in passages where 'warmth' does not make much sense. Thus ancient Saturn was 'hot' rather than 'warm', and there are many instances where 'heat' would be the more appropriate term. At other times, *Wärme* may be 'temperature', as shown above.

Words that have come into both English and German from a third language frequently show differences in spelling. Thus the English may have mahogany furniture and drink 'cocoa' whilst their German-speaking counterparts may sit on *Mahagoni* chairs as they enjoy their cup of *Kakao*. No wonder, then, that *Ahura Mazda* in German is 'Ahura Mazda' in English, and *Ormuzd* becomes 'Ormazd'.

These are just some of the traps that lie in wait for the unwary.

Producing a translation today

The actual process of translation involves a number of stages: preparation, first draft, work on the draft, searches, editing and in many cases also proof-reading.

I am going to limit myself to Rudolf Steiner's lectures, which form the bulk of his collected works. His written works are relatively few in number and essentially do not require the same bridging of a gulf as the lectures, while the verses and mantras are a different field, ideally translated by poets rather than prose translators.

Preparation

Professional translators do not normally translate unless commissioned to do so, and it is not really acceptable for anyone to translate anything today without first asking permission from the original author and/or publishers. As a rule, the English-language publishers decide on the work to be published in translation and get the necessary permissions before approaching a translator. They will have had a good look at the work in question, and the translator does the same before deciding whether to accept the commission or not. If it is accepted, a contract is drawn up, which deals with areas such as the rights of the author and publishers of the original (dealt with by the commissioning publisher), responsibilities of both publisher and translator, fees, royalties, copyright, the form in which the translation is to be produced (often on disk nowadays), editing and proof-reading details. One important clause says that the publishers cannot change any part of the translation without the translator's consent. If the two parties cannot come to an agreement, the translation can still be published, but the translator has the right to withdraw his or her name. This is vital, for translators' reputations and

livelihood depend on what appears in print under their names. It also means that by putting your name on the title page you accept responsibility for the work, which obviously cannot be the case if someone has introduced changes without consulting you.

Good publishers will allow time for a meeting with the translator, or at least for a telephone conversation or an exchange of letters. At the meeting the publishers will present their idea of the purpose and aims of the work and the intended distribution, which means the intended readership, for something different is needed if the book will be on sale in the UK only, in all English-speaking countries or world-wide. The translator needs to discuss the extent to which changes may be made to the original content, e.g. omitting material unlikely to interest the readers, or cutting out repetitions if the original was a lecture to be heard by human ears, while the target text will be a book to be read by human eyes. Technical details will also be discussed. Most publishers have a style sheet which the translator, like any other author, will be asked to follow (z-spelling, for example, that is whether to write 'recognise' or 'recognize'; use of capitals, etc.). If the translation is to be delivered on disk with the text coded for typesetting, the codes need to be discussed.

With non-anthroposophical translations, this usually concludes the preparatory stage. However, when we translate the works of Rudolf Steiner, and above all his lectures, the gap in time and culture between source and target texts is such that quite a bit of additional work has to be done.

Thus it is necessary to enter more deeply into the situation from which the source text originated and become very conscious of the gulf that has to be bridged. The earliest of Steiner's writings that are available go back to 1888, more than a hundred years. At the same time the books we translate will be in Steiner bookshops for the next 20 or 30 years, that is, well into the next millennium! We therefore need to do background research. With a course of lectures, we try to find out as much as possible about the situation, e.g. who were the audience, what other things was Steiner involved in at the time (other lecture cycles given at the same time, travels, work with teachers, doctors and patients, etc.), and what was happening in European history, politics, social and cultural life at the time.

Those of us who are older may have met people who actually knew Rudolf Steiner, and we may know something of the atmosphere of the time from our parents or grandparents. This immediately brings up the question of how far it is legitimate to reflect such knowledge in the translation. Translators who come after us will be further removed from

44 *Anthroposophy Today*

the time of Rudolf Steiner, and their readers even more so. I'd say that background knowledge, while necessary, must not actually intrude into the work. The right balance has to be found.

Before a lecture is translated, the translator usually looks at its overall structure. What did Rudolf Steiner really want to convey? Where does the emphasis lie? Did he use key words that recur every now and again, so that the translator must find a way of rendering them in a way that also makes them emerge as key words in the translation (not always easy, as the same German words may translate quite differently in different sentence contexts)? Did Steiner go into asides, which should perhaps be left out or set aside in the form of a note?

You try and find the way the lecture 'breathes', for that can help you with the translation. And you look for the 'shape' given by such elements as the end reflecting the beginning. These are some of the things to look for, and each time a decision has to be made as to how far it should be reflected in the translation. Some aspects have to be left out, or the translated text may be cluttered and fail to convey the really important things.

Another part of preparation, and perhaps of the discussion with the publishers, is to consider the style most appropriate for the intended readership. This is where we have particular problems when translating anthroposophical works into English. Our prospective readers include not only native English-speakers around the world but people on all continents and with every possible cultural background who have learned English as a foreign language and do not know German. This makes our image of the reader so diffuse that one sometimes feels it is best not to think about it! It is an issue we are currently working on in our Translators and Editors in Anthroposophy group.

First draft

Translators differ in the way they produce their first draft. Physically, some write by hand, though most use a typewriter if not a word processor. Some like to 'do a fast run', as they feel this gives more 'flow' to their style, others review every sentence, or at least paragraph, before going on to the next, and others again do a mixture of the two. This stage can be quite rapid. With the first method, which produces text that merely serves as a basis for further work, it is possible to write a first draft of a lecture in a day.

Work on the draft

Non-anthroposophical texts usually need just one quick revision before they are sent off. This is not so with anthroposophical texts.

This is the stage where most of the hard work is done. The major problem the translator faces is that of gaining distance from the source language. The text has to be stripped of the characteristics of that language and recast in the target language. There are variations in degree to which this is, and should be, done, and these are the subject of much discussion within the profession.

Information texts – commercial, public sector and most scientific material – need to be stripped and recast completely. At the other end of the scale are literary texts, where something of the 'flavour' of the source language is often retained with benefit. With every translation one has to consider where its position between the two extremes should be. Again it is a matter of finding the right balance.

Distancing yourself from the source text is a skill that grows with experience, providing the translator is aware of the need for this and is prepared to work at it. Some translators work with another person, someone who'll provide the necessary feedback for them. This is to be highly commended, though translators who have had professional training are less in need of this. They may, however, ask a colleague to look at a difficult passage and comment on it. This help given by a member of the peer group is invaluable. It has to be kept within limits, of course, for it costs time and for a freelance time is a commodity that needs careful management.

By the way, it is a common misconception that translators are always, and often unreasonably, critical of the work of other translators. In my experience this applies only to amateur translators. Professionals are too aware of the problems we all share, and they are able to make distinction between errors relating to content (e.g. writing 'up' when it should be 'down') and style, which is a matter of taste. I may not like another translator's style, but I would not criticise it.

It is also necessary, and this is something we have in common with other authors, to distance ourselves from the target text. It is vital to be highly critical of your own writing style, for it is only too easy to get into bad writing habits such as over-using one term and under-using another. This is where a good editor can be such a help.

One fascinating question relating to style is how far the personality of the translator should come to expression. It is common experience that texts written by groups of journalists, or translated by a group of people, are more difficult to take in. The individual style of the writer is the vehicle that conveys the meaning to the mind of the reader, and this is important. There can be any number of different translations of one and the same text and they can all be equally good. When we do group

46 *Anthroposophy Today*

translations at our translators' meetings, therefore, it is as an exercise only. It is good to work within a peer group and note how one colleague has considered an aspect you did not think of, another has noted something else, and so on. It helps you to keep up standards.

This is another example of the need to find the right balance. You have to keep self back and not allow it to intrude, yet at the same time you are, and should be, part of the translation. It is good to ask for help from the world of the spirit with this.

The translator is the author of the translation. The book that results is therefore the work of two authors and the name of both should appear on the title page and in every reference to the book. (In a way, having the translator's name displayed like this is like having the Boiler House outside the Goetheanum, which is there to make us conscious of the technology – with all its Ahrimanic implications – that is necessary for the work done in the main building.) With a translation we have to be aware that it is the work not only of Rudolf Steiner but of another individual as well. It is, of course, quite another question if the contribution of the second individual has benefited the work or done it harm.

Steiner texts, and especially lectures, usually need to be worked through several times – three or four times seems to be the average. At one stage you check your text carefully against the source text, to see that your translation reflects both the content and the mood of the original and conveys these to the reader. One of the nightmares from which translators suffer is the fear of omitting a sentence or even a paragraph, which happens all too easily. So you have to consciously focus on this aspect for one reading.

For another, you put yourself in the shoes of an imaginary reader or group of readers and try to experience if the text conveys to them what Steiner intended it to convey. One of our problems is that Steiner's lectures have to serve so many purposes. I've already mentioned the diffuse reader image. But there is more to it, for those readers, whoever or wherever they may be, will be studying a lecture on their own, or they may be reading it aloud, or have it read to them. Readability is therefore another important element.

The decision as to whether notes should appear as footnotes or endnotes is the publisher's. The extent to which a text is annotated is a matter for discussion between publisher/editor and translator. This is another instance where the right balance has to be found for a particular work. In the case of Steiner's lectures, notes should be limited, as one is not producing a work for scholars but a book for people to read. People

should understand the translation and not have to work things out by consulting the notes. Essentially, therefore, notes would be limited to additional information on people mentioned in the lecture and to literature references (most of this information has already been supplied by the German editors and only needs to be checked for accuracy and translated). Fascinating aspects of language, etc., must be held back.

Searches

Quoted material can prove a real headache. The original text may have been written in German or in English or another language. The work to be done differs accordingly.

If the original was in English and is quoted in German you may be in for a long hunt. The cardinal rule is never to back-translate, for this is bound to take us well away from the original English version. The German author will probably only give the German translation of the title of the book from which the quote is taken and perhaps the page number. Titles are often quite different in translated works, and when you've finally worked it out, you have to get hold of a copy and then find the quote which the German author may say is on page 193, but which will probably be on page 167 or 209 in the original English work. I remember having to go to the local library twice until they were able to tell me that the only copy of a particular work by Emerson in the London area library system was in Westminster Library, who would not let it out of their hands. I had to travel up to London and spend two hours in Westminster Library until I found the one sentence I needed. It turned out to be a costly exercise. But unless you are fortunate enough to have a publisher who has the resources to have this research done in-house, this is simply part of the job and part of a translator's responsibilities; it is a chore that has to be done.

If you fail to track down a quotation that was originally in English, the way out is to do your own translation and omit the quotation marks, writing something like 'F Twitter stated/reported/wrote that ...' But it is only an emergency solution.

If a quotation was originally written in German or any language other than English, we have to find out if there is an existing translation and, if it is at all reasonable, use it, making proper acknowledgements. However, if we can't find an existing translation it is reasonable to make our own translation.

Editing

Having produced your translation, you submit it to the editor appointed by the publisher. Basically there are two kinds of editors: editors and

copy editors. The latter are concerned with making sure the spelling and punctuation are right and the text complies with the house style. Editors in the proper sense read the text to see if the author conveys the information/message/content in a way that is comprehensible to the intended reader. They usually do the copy editing part as well, but the importance of their work for the translator is that they spot the passages where you've not put things clearly, or have assumed knowledge which the intended reader may not have. They will mark those passages and/or comment on them, and the translator then reviews them. The dialogue between a good editor and a translator can be very fruitful, and I think all of us feel much indebted to some of our editors.

Editors should not, of course, make changes relating to content without consulting the translator. Even with knowledge of the source language they are more than likely to go further away from the original author's intention rather than come closer to it. And sometimes the translator just has to say to the editor: Look, this is exactly what the German text says. If the statement is very unusual or startling, a footnote may be needed to indicate that this is not a mistranslation.

In the end you have an agreed text which goes to be typeset.

Proof-reading

Texts submitted in manuscript form are typeset at the printers. It means that the whole has to be keyed in again – a rich source of errors. The printers then produce galley proofs which have to be checked, a job that should always be done by at least two separate individuals, for it is surprising how easily printer's errors are overlooked, even by experienced proof-readers. Today it is usually part of the package that the translator reads one set of the proofs. Again discipline is needed. Corrections done at the printers are time-consuming and expensive, and this is therefore not the time to change what you have written. The contract between publisher and translator includes a clause that says that changes, rather than corrections of printing errors, that go beyond a certain level will be charged to the translator.

Texts submitted on disk do not generally show that kind of printer's error, but computers also have their off-moments. You have to be wide awake when working with a computer, or things will happen that you do not intend. At the same time the text usually has to be transferred from one disk and software system to another, which provides plenty of scope for words, sentences or whole paragraphs to disappear, sometimes to reappear again in quite unexpected places. Proof-reading is therefore needed, but it is different in kind.

The marked galley-proofs go back to the publishers and some time later, usually months later, the book will appear.

The translators's groups

Some of us who work as translators in the field of anthroposophy today are professionally trained translators, while others who have not had formal training are usually aware of the issues involved and of the standard that is now required. We know how important it is for us to work together so that we may serve our readers in the best way possible.

In the autumn of 1986, a number of translators and publishers from both sides of the Atlantic met Dr Virginia Sease at the Goetheanum. This was a wonderful occasion, and I particularly enjoyed meeting Ruth Pusch whose zest and sheer enjoyment of language inspired us all. It was decided to establish one group in the UK and another in the USA, with the two groups keeping in touch and producing a newsletter.

Translators working in anthroposophy in this country meet twice a year on a Saturday. In the early years we always met at Rudolf Steiner House, but we now accept invitations from local translators or from study groups and meet in different places. We like to use the opportunity to meet the local members and friends who are our readers and discuss translation issues with them. Editors and publishers are invited to our meetings, and the publishers do attend. Much work has been done over the last seven years to establish a good relationship between translators and publishers. Sadly, we do not see the editors at our meetings, but we enjoy the improved relationship with the publishers and hope that the editors will join us one day.

The work of the group and the support of our peers is most important. Having met in the group, we can always be in touch and consult one another individually. A colleague told me recently that when asked to interpret at an educational conference, an American attending the conference was keen to have a go at interpreting. 'He was coming up with all the old jargon,' my colleague said. 'Listening to him, I really saw how far we have come in the years we have been working together.'

Our American colleagues of the Anthroposophical Translators and Editors Association (ATEA) also meet.³ They receive some funding from individual members and I believe also the Society, which enables them to meet for whole weekends and occasionally even rent a house and work together for a week.

Together the two groups produce the quarterly *Word for Word* which is also available to others who are interested.⁴ An offspring of

50 Anthroposophy Today

Word for Word is the *Extended Glossary*, which contains short paragraphs discussing the origins, usage and possible ways of rendering a particular term or phrase. This now covers 60 items published in *Word for Word* over the last six years. Copies are available from either group.²

Recently we were approached by translators in other European countries and out of this has grown the idea of a European translators' conference, possibly in the spring of 1994. We are trying to contact more of our colleagues and will be delighted to hear from both established and intending translators.

Conclusion

You have been taken through the whole process of translating a book, seeing it through the eyes of a translator. I have tried to show the skills that are required and the discipline that is essential in the field of translation, and you may have realised that our work offers many opportunities to practise some of the virtues that anthroposophists are generally advised to develop.

The work is hard, it can be exasperating and there are tedious elements to it, just as with any other kind of work. On the other hand, it is always fascinating. Every text, every paragraph, sentence and word presents problems that have to be solved. Translators have to make decisions at every stage, and be aware of their responsibilities, which are considerable. They cope by doing their preparatory work and by intense inner work, asking for help and guidance from their guardian angel and the spirits of the higher hierarchies, above all Michael.

When the UK group meets, we like to start by reading a particular passage from an essay by Rudolf Steiner, for it makes us aware of the way he was translating the language of the spirit into the German language. The way he speaks of this work is a real help to us. Part of the passage is given below:

Finding the genius of a language

Intuitive perceptions are so far removed from anything that can be put in words that initially one finds it impossible to give them expression. The words we try to use immediately make us feel that the content changes into something else. If we nevertheless desire to communicate our intuitions, then the struggle with the language begins. We try to use everything the language has to offer so as to convey an idea of what we have perceived, search for anything – from sound qualities to turns of phrase. It is a hard inner struggle, and there comes a moment when one has to admit that the language has something of a

will of its own and brings all kinds of things to expression just because of the way it is. We are thus forced to surrender to that self-will of the language and let it take into itself what comes through our intuitions. Then we find, as we try to cast in words what we perceive in the spirit, that rather than working with an indeterminate wax-like element that can be shaped to our will, we are dealing with a 'living spirit' – the genius of language.

A struggle thus honestly taken up can have the best and most satisfying outcome. For a moment will come when we feel that the genius of the language is accepting what we have intuited, and that the words and phrases that come to us gain a spiritual dimension; they cease to 'mean' what they usually mean and slip into what has been perceived. Something of a living dialogue with the genius of the language then develops. The language becomes like a person; we are able to work with it through dialogue just as we do with another person.³ □

Anna Meuss, Fellow of the Institute of Linguists, works as a freelance translator and medical editor. She is an Honorary Fellow of the Faculty of Human Sciences at Kingston University where she teaches scientific German and translation.

NOTES

- 1 Owen Barfield, 'Streben, Bestreben, Bestrebung', in *Word for Word*, October 1987. Translators and Editors in Anthroposophy, c/o Rudolf Steiner House, 35 Park Road, London NW1 6XT.
- 2 *Extended Glossary*. Sixty terms discussed by translators working in the field of anthroposophy. Looseleaf edition 1992, 41 A4 pages. Available from Translators and Editors in Anthroposophy, c/o Rudolf Steiner House, 35 Park Road, London NW1 6XT.
- 3 Address: The Secretary, ATEA, 136 Neck Road, Rt 6, Old Lyme, CT 06371, USA.
- 4 *Word for Word*, Communications of Translators and Editors in Anthroposophy. Minimum annual subscription for readers in Europe, Africa, Asia, New Zealand and Australia £5 (cheques payable to J Collis) from Translators and Editors in Anthroposophy, c/o Rudolf Steiner House, 35 Park Road, London NW1 6XT. For subscriptions in North and South America, please contact the Secretary of the ATEA (see above).
- 5 From Rudolf Steiner's essay 'Sprache und Sprachgeist' in *Das Goetheanum*, 23 July 1922, now in GA 36. English by Anna Meuss.