Translation and Language Teaching: Translation as a useful teaching Resource

Monica Randaccio

Dipartimento Scienze del Linguaggio, dell'Interpretazione
e della Traduzione dell'Università di Trieste

Arguments against the use of translation in language teaching were initially raised in the nineteenth century and were largely reiterated in the 1960s and 1970s by those who believed in the direct, natural, and/or communicative methods of language teaching. The method they were objecting to was the so-called 'grammar translation' method, which had been devised as a way of teaching modern languages in secondary schools in Prussia at the end of the eighteenth century, and also of teaching Latin and Greek in grammar schools. The scholar would study the grammar of a language, and read texts, almost invariably religious or literary, with the help of a dictionary and the acquired grammar.

The first grammar-translation course in English was published in 1793 by Johann Christian Fick (1763-1821), following the model of a course in French by Johann Valentin Meidinger (1756-1822). The method adopted by Fick used translation to and from the foreign language of individual sentences which were usually specifically constructed to exemplify certain grammatical features. This meant that the examples could be graded for difficulty and that the grammar could be taught systematically. Thus, in this typical structural syllabus[1], grammatical constructions were chosen as units, which could be ordered in terms of difficulty, and presented in constructed sentences.

---

[1] A.P.R Howatt., *A History of English Language Teaching*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984, p. 132.

This method was highly acclaimed in England in 1858 when a system of public examinations was established, controlled by the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. These examinations served to fix modern languages firmly on the curriculum along with classical languages: it was felt that for them to have the same academic respectability as the classical languages, they also had to be thought like the classical languages.

The effectiveness of the grammar translation method was initially brought into question on theoretical grounds by adherents of the Reform Movement, among whom Sweet[2] and Jespersen[3] may be included. The movement was based on three fundamental principles, each of which ran counter to the grammar-translation method of teaching: 1) the primacy of speech; 2) the importance of connected texts in teaching and learning; 3) the priority of oral classroom methodology.

However, the severest blow to the grammar-translation method came from methods of language teaching, known as Natural Method, Conversation Method, Direct Method, Communicative Approach, all based on the underlying philosophy that:

> Learning how to speak a new language... is not a rational process which can be organised in a step-by-step manner... . It is an intuitive process for which human beings have a natural capacity that can be awaken provided only that the proper conditions exist[4].

It was Maxmilian Berlitz (1852-1921) who came to apply the Natural Method on a large scale, beginning with schools for the huge numbers of immigrants who were arriving in the USA from all over Europe, mostly without a significant educational background, and in urgent need of learning to produce and understand speech. Over thirty years, Berlitz established sixteen schools in America and thirty in Europe[5], all of which, whether they thought languages as foreign or second languages, used the same methodology. In Berlitz's directions to the teacher, identical in all his books, translation is ruled out under any circumstances, with a caution against «the slightest compromise on this point»[6].

In the late 1960s, Lado and Gatenby were among the most outspoken anti-translationists. Lado recommended that translation should not be used because «[it] is not a substitute for language practice... translation is more complex, than, different from, and unnecessary for speaking, listening, reading, or writing»[7].

---

2 H Sweet, *The Practical Study of Languages: A Guide for Teachers and Learners*, London, Dent, (1889), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1964.

3 O. Jespersen, *How To Teach a Foreign Language*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1904.

4 A.P.R Howatt., *op. cit.*, p.192.

5 A.P.R Howatt., *ibidem*, p. 205.

6 M. D. Berlitz, *The Berlitz Method for Teaching Modern Languages*, New York, Berlitz, 1907, p. 7.

7 R. Lado, *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach,* New York, McGraw-hill, Inc., 1964, pp. 53-54.

Furthermore, good translation cannot be achieved without mastery of the second language and cannot be used as a testing mechanism either:

> Translation... is often no test at all of comprehension.... And there is another reason why testing by translation is bad pedagogy. We as teachers are trying to bring our pupils to use English without translating in their own minds, to say without hesitation the right thing on the right occasion... Our aim is to get our pupils... to the stage where they can use English without having to think[8].

In the 1980s, translation slowly reappeared in language classes[9] when the experts realised that they could also use translation as one of their communicative techniques and activities[10]. Gradually, translation again found a stable and consistent place in the foreign language class, where its use was recommended by specialists[11].

The long-standing and ongoing controversy on the use of translation in language teaching has engaged linguists and translation theorists alike in extensive analyses of reasons in favour or against such use. Some of the main disadvantages of translation as a teaching and testing tool in an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) situation have been clearly illustrated by Newson, whereas some of the advantages have been skilfully highlighted by Kopczynski. According to Newson, translation:

1. encourages thinking in one language and transference into another, with accompanying interference;
2. is independent of the four skills which define language competence: reading, writing, speaking, listening;
3. deprives teacher and learner of the opportunity to benefit from accruing advantages of working within one language;
4. it gives false credence to the naïve view that there is such a thing as simple word-to-word equivalence between languages;

---

8 E.V.Gatenby, "Translation in the Classroom", in: W.R. Lee (ed.), *E.L.T. Selection 2: Articles from the Journal 'English Language Teaching'*, London, Oxford University Press, 1967, pp. 69-70.

9 See M. Celce-Murcia and L. McIntosh (eds.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, Rowley, MA, Newbury House, 1979; W. M. Rivers, *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1981; D. Larsen-Freeman, *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1986.

10 See M. Finocchiaro and C. Brumfit, *The Functional-Notional Approach: From Theory to Practice*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1983.

11 See W. M. Rivers and M. S. Temperley, *A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1978;
H. G. Widdowson, *Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1985;
P. Heltai, *Teaching vocabulary by oral translation*, "ELT Journal", n. 43/4, 1989, pp. 288-293;
T. Urgese, *Translation: how, when, and why*, "Forum", n. 4, 1989, pp. 38-40;
Duff A., *Translation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990;
Z. Zohrevandi, "Translation as a resource for teaching English as a foreign language", in: R. De Beaugrande, A. Shunnaq, M. H. Heliel (eds.), *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia ,John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1992, pp. 181-187.

5. does not allow or facilitate the achievement of such generally accepted foreign language teaching aims as:
   - emphasis on initial fluency in spoken language,
   - attention on the controlled introduction of selected and graded structures (1960s style) or communicative competence strategies (1990s style),
   - attention to controlled introduction of and mastery of selected and graded lexical items,
   - the use of situationalized, contextualized language,
   - communicative language use,
   - learner-centred language learning,
   - absence of observable learning effect, either of new vocabulary or structural items. The latter is not surprising since each translation task provides normally only one (random) example of new language items; there is no repetition and practice as in classic forms of language learning and teaching, no grading and no structuring[12].

Kopczynski instead lists some of the arguments in favour of translation as follows:

1. it allows for conscious learning and control of the foreign language and thus for reducing interference;
2. learning must be meaningful and the learner should be an active participant in the process;
3. conscious learning does not preclude automatic habits;
4. learning a foreign language is not like acquiring the native language;
5. since there exists pre-knowledge, one has to assume that the learner makes use of this pre-knowledge; indeed, it frequently happens that an inadequate situational presentation causes the learner to seek an explanation in the native language;
6. one has to assume that there is a process of mental translation going on throughout the process of language learning;
7. the use of translation elicits structures that otherwise would be avoided by the learner[13].

Along the same lines, Danchev lists, like others, further arguments in favour of translation, which would help 1) natural and easy comparison between the target and the native language, thus facilitating faster decoding of difficult target language structures and elements; 2) quick and effective comprehension control; 3) to overcome and neutralise native language transfer[14].

---

12 D. Newson, "Translation and Foreign Language Learning": in K. Malmkjær (ed.), *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, 1998, pp. 63-64.

13 A. Kopczynski, "Verbal Intervention. Translation in Foreign Language Teaching": in *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching*, Paris, Round Table FIT-UNESCO, 1983, pp. 58-59.

14 A. Danchev, "The Controversy over Translation in Foreign Language Teaching": in *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching*, Paris, Round Table FIT-UNESCO, 1983, p. 35.

Danchev proposes the very sensible idea of adding another dimension to the argument in favour of translation as a «natural process»[15]. It has often been pointed out that learners tend to translate anyway, regardless of the teaching method they are subjected to. Although this idea has been challenged by Neubert, who maintains that «translation is unnatural in that it is not part of the natural performance of a competent speaker or writer of a language»[16], Danchev points to the fact that classroom experience and observations have shown that learners, especially adults, tend to translate from the target language into the native language even when asked *not* to do so. His basic theoretical argument in favour of the use of translation in foreign language teaching thus derives from its consideration as a natural and universal feature of foreign language acquisition and study[17]. Denchev also touches upon another central practical issue – the use of translation as both a means and an end of foreign language instruction. As a means, the crucial argument revolves around the claim that translation stimulates negative transfer and the couterclaim that translation helps to overcome and neutralise it. It has been argued that translation of the native language into the target language induces learners to make errors. Empirical observation however has shown that the same kinds of errors attributed to translation also occur when learners produce target language utterances without setting out from a native language (such as free composition). By applying translation consciously and systematically, Danchev therefore concludes that learners can be conditioned and helped to monitor their code switching[18].

The relevance of translation as a useful teaching resource has thus become widely accepted and translation has come to be seen, increasingly, as a complex process involving a variety of behaviours and skills together with/or based on «a variety of cognitive skills which are the building blocks of translator intelligence»[19]. It is interesting to note, however, how each expert has analysed the use of translation from the specific perspective of his/her own research field. Thus, the arguments for using translation which have been stated by linguists substantially differ from those made by the translation theorists. On the one hand, Tudor in fact maintains that «translation as the process of conveying messages across linguistic and cultural barriers is an eminently communicative activity, one whose use could well be considered in a wider range of teaching

---

15 G. Weller, "Some Polemic Aspects of Translation in Foreign Language Pedagogy Revised": in P. W. Krwutschke (ed.), *Translator and Interpreter Training and Foreign Language Pedagogy*, New York American Translators Association Series, v.iii, 1989, p. 44.

16 A. Neubert, *Translation, Interpreting and Text Linguistics*, Studia Linguistica, n. 35, 1981, p. 145.

17 D. Danchev, *cit.*, pp. 37-38.

18 D. Danchev, *ibidem*, p. 40.

19 W. Wilss, "Translation as Intelligent Behaviour": in H. Somers (ed.), *Terminology, LSP and Translation: Studies in Language Engineering in Honour of Juan C. Sager*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1996, p. 161.

situations»[20]. On the other, Neubert defines translation as first of all text production, a «text-induced activity» or, more precisely, a source text induced target text production[21]. The use of translation therefore helps the awareness and conscious reflection on all the relevant factors for the production of a target text.

The role of translation in language teaching will be thus here investigated in the light of the various positions adopted by both linguists and translation theorists, in order to show how the theoretical divide, which sometimes has irrevocably set them apart, can be easily overcome. In fact, there is a considerable overlap between communicative learning strategies and translation strategies, the former once being considered pertinent notions to linguists, the latter exclusive domain of translation theorists.

Malmkjær sees translation as *a text-production process* which might be sketched out as follows. A translator has a set amount of time in which to produce in a Target Language (TL) a text which must fulfil a specific purpose for a specific readership in a specific spatiotemporal setting. This text, the Target Text (TT), has to be based to a great extent on another text, the Source Text (ST), which exists in a language other than TL, the Source Language (SL). The ST, too, has a specific purpose to fulfil for a specific readership in a specific spatiotemporal setting, but the purposes, readerships and settings of the two texts are never quite the same.

To complete the process, the translator engages in at least five activities, which are commonly considered language learning activities. The five activities are: i) Anticipation; ii) Resource Exploitation; iii) Co-operation; iv) Revision; v) Translating.

During Anticipation, translators establish the context for the ST – who has written it, why, when, for whom – and for the TT – who commissions it, why, when, and for whom. They gather resources such as dictionaries and original, similar TL texts which are researched for terminology, phrasing, structure and layout. They define the TT and make plans for possible cooperation with other translators and other kinds of experts. All of this can take place before the translator has even seen ST.

Resource Exploitation involves analysing the texts collected during Anticipation, and using dictionaries and terminology banks appropriately.

Translating, which begins around the same time as Resource Exploitation, tends to give rise to a number of problems, some of which are often solved during phases of Co-operation between translators and other experts.

Revision will eventually depend on what has gone before, but its outcome is a final version of the text[22].

---

20 I. Tudor, *Using Translation in ESP*, "ELT Journal", n.41/4, 1987, p. 269.

21 A. Neubert, *Text and Translation*, Leipzig, Enzykopädie, 1985, p. 18.

22 K. Malmkjær, "Introduction: Translation and Language Teaching": in K. Malmkjær (ed.), *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation,* Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, 1998, p. 7.

In her description of the translation process, Malmkjær implicitly objects to some of the disadvantages listed by Newson, which have been previously mentioned. As it is impossible to produce an acceptable translation unless a good deal of reading, writing, speaking and listening have taken place, translation is not independent of the other four skills, but inclusive of them (disadvantage 2). It may be true that translation produces interference: however, practice in translation encourages awareness and control of interference, which is an important component of the skill of translating (disadvantage 1). Translating does not work within one language and implies the ability to relate two language systems to one another appropriately: minimising negative interference while maximising positive interference in selecting the most appropriate translational equivalents. The ability to move between languages should be therefore considered a natural language skill in its own right and non detrimental to competence in a foreign language (disadvantage 3). If real-life translation were emulated in the classroom, it would soon become clear to language students that expressions in the two languages do not necessarily correspond word-for-word and that even when they do, the contexts for the two texts may differ so radically that the TL expression which is usually considered the closest 'equivalent' of the SL expression is in fact unsuitable for TT (disadvantage 4).

Stibbard argues that the first language can be a valuable resource and that there is evidence to show that its use in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) settings does not hinder foreign language development. Justification for the use of translation is also found in the role assigned to it in affective-humanistic approaches in TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language), which emphasises the need to reduce anxiety in the early stages of language learning by allowing some use of the mother tongue. In support of the view that translation can be productively used in the general language classroom, Stibbard suggests that translation is a universally useful activity. Even in virtually monolingual societies, one does not have to look far to find good reasons for acquiring a translation ability. English is a lingua franca for travel and trade and many native speakers will be called upon to translate to and from their mother tongue. He therefore proposes to include «this aspect of linguistic ability as an ongoing element in a teaching programme as a fifth skill alongside the four other skills, reading, writing, speaking, and understanding speech»[23].

Like any other teaching methods, however, classroom translation must be applied within a principled theoretical framework. Students must decide whether to preserve as in the source text or to change for the new audience the individual style of the author, the conventions, format and traditions of the genre, culturally-specific items, and the referential facts given in the text. Each of the five types of equivalence devised by Mona Baker – word-level equivalence, equivalence

23 R. Stibbard, "The Principled Use of Oral Translation in Foreign Language Teaching": in in K. Malmkjær (ed.), *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation,* Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, 1998, p. 71.

above word level, grammatical equivalence, textual equivalence and pragmatic equivalence[24] – must be carefully considered if one is to avoid «the danger of translation encouraging the learner to think that structurally and lexically similar sentences in two languages mean the same»[25]. Stibbard also points out that «translation as a teaching activity should be concerned with the process and skill of translation and only with the end product in so far as it arises from sound skills development»[26] because «the general student benefits from merely working towards solutions...the final product is for our purposes of less importance than the work which went into producing it»[27].

Useful activities in successful classroom translation should also explore areas of language through contrasts between first and foreign language features. Among the most relevant areas, there are: i) common colloquialisms, for which a number of translations might be used, depending on the context; ii) ideas rooted in traditional source culture or in source local folklore, which may be rendered in a numbers of ways, by attempting a communicative translation, by replacing the cultural denotation with a near equivalent in the target culture, or by opting for explanation; iii) grammatical patterns which differ in the two languages, thus providing insights into divergent linguistic structures.

Newson proposes a model for teaching translation - specifically from the mother tongue into the target language - in an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) instructional context where translation is used as a test for assessing ability in the target language. The main criticism of translation used as a test of language competence is that it presents the examinee with random translation problems. The texts chosen provide an unpredictable sample of target language and it is impossible for the diligent student to prepare for the examination systematically and reliably. Newson suggests how this situation can be improved by fixing as many parameters as possible and by working with authentic, representative language drawn from a data bank of representative texts. His model foresees that the kind of text to be translated can be limited and thus defined in the following ways: 1) the translation texts can be selected according to crude linguistic criteria. Preliminary descriptors can be that texts shall be non-literary (only business text, or only text dealing with education theory, etc...), originally written in the source language, about English-speaking countries, of a specified length. Such simple filters narrow down the translation tasks that will face the learner and make predictable what is that has to be practised. 2) Computer programmes can be used to allow each text to be analysed in terms of word-frequency.

---

24 see M. Baker, *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, London and New York, Routledge, 1993.

25 J. P. B. Allen and H. G. Widdowson, "Grammar and Language Teaching": in J. P. B. Allen and S. P. Corder (eds.), *Papers in Applied Linguistics: The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics Vol. 2*, London, Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 91.

26 R. Stibbard, *cit.*, p. 73.

27 R. Stibbard, ivi

This enables instructor and students to be able to specify that they must at least be able to translate listed lexical items in their most frequent meanings. 3) Simple word processing measurements of readability – number of passives and average sentence length - provide another criterion for grading texts. 4) Creation of data banks of such selected texts so that translation tasks identified and chosen – vocabulary, syntax – are not isolated, chance examples, but representative examples. 5) An extra-resource at this stage are syntactical and contrastive studies of the two languages in question, which allow predictions about which structures are likely to give translation/interference problems[28].

From the translation theorist's specific perspective, Snell-Hornby widens the analysis of the use of translation in language teaching with useful remarks derived from her own disciplinary field. Although translation is, in her opinion, a poor method for the early stages of foreign language teaching, she concedes that it «presents an ideal opportunity, not merely to learn the techniques of translating itself, but above all to perfect knowledge about and active mastery of that language»[29]. The university translation course then should provide «a meeting-place for advanced language teaching, language description, and some basic aspects of contrastive semantics»[30]. She points out how the emergence of translation as a serious academic subject coincided with the rise of text-linguistics in the 1970s: translation then started to be concerned with the text, not as a chain of separate sentences, but as a complex, structured whole, whereby coherence, cohesion, focus and progression are of primary importance. Translation in fact shows how the rules of textual cohesion and progression vary from one language to another, both within the sentence and beyond the sentence boundary.

According to Snell-Hornby, one of the more elusive features of English is the dual principle of end-focus and end-weight: the translation class would provide repeatedly the opportunity to analyse end-focus and end-weight on the basis of concrete examples. In the German-English translations she has given her students, Snell-Hornby highlights how students frequently make the mistake of looking at the most obvious equivalent, resulting in unidiomatic English sentences like the following:

a) Its favourable geographical position in the heart of Europe, the proverbial hospitality of its inhabitants, who soon adapted to tourism, and the special charm of its scenic attractions, have contributed to this.
b) A dense and well-developed network of railways and roads covers the country.

28 D. Newson, "Translation and Foreign Language Learning": in K. Malmkjær (ed.), *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation*, , Manchester , St. Jerome Publishing, 1998, p. 65.

29 M. Snell-Hornby, "Translation as a means of integrating language teaching and linguistics": in C. Titford and A. E. Hieke (eds.), *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching and Testing*, Tübingen, Narr Verlag, 1985, p. 21.

30 ivi.

In both cases, the subject is longer and grammatically more complex than the predicate, thus both translations violate the principle of end-weight, whereby the final position in the English sentence is reserved for more complex parts of a clause. Furthermore, in English, the principle of end-focus requires that new information should be placed towards the end of the clause: again, this principle is clearly violated by the anaphoric pronoun *this* (a), which refers back to the foregoing sentence[31]. Both end-weight and end-focus are realised, however, and thus the principles of idiomatic English observed, if the two relevant structures, and with them the 'given' information, are placed in a weak, initial position: in (a) a causal construction is introduced, and in (b) the verb is put into the passive:

> a) This is mainly due to its favourable geographical position in the heart of Europe, the proverbial hospitality of its inhabitants, who soon adapted to tourism, and the special charm of its scenic attractions.
> b) The country is served by a well-developed network of railways and roads[32].

Snell-Hornby concludes that another area vital to translation is contrastive grammar, both in its relation to linguistic theory and as a branch of language teaching: frequently reoccurring problems concern basic grammatical phenomena such as tense, aspect, concord and types of relative clause.

The arguments promoted by Cook and Pym give completely new insights into the present topic. Instead of analysing the pros and cons of the use of translation in language teachings, the two scholars seem to accept *a priori* that translation is a useful resource for language teaching and prefer to investigate the qualities of translation itself in order to widen its possible practical application.

Cook draws a distinction between two kinds of language user - «expert users» and «foreign learners». The term «expert user» means a person with considerable skill and includes both the first language speakers who continue to use the language of their infancy in adulthood and those foreign language users who have become experts as teenagers or adults. On the other hand, «foreign learners» are those who are still at an initial stage of their language acquisition[33]. He argues that the expert users of a language have a greater tolerance of indeterminate meanings, whereas the foreign learners are more restricted to fixed meanings. Translation thus acquires a twofold function. For expert users, translation helps to exploit the indeterminacy of meanings in a creative way:

---

31 It is interesting to note that in a similar translation from Italian into English the sentences would result in unidiomatic English for the same reasons illustrated by Snell-Hornby.

32 Snell-Hornby, *cit.*, pp. 22-23.

33 G. Cook, "Making people's meanings stand still: the effect of translation on the indeterminacy of language": in R. T. Bell[ed.], *The Role of Translation in Foreign Language Teaching*, Paris, Diffusion Didier Erudition, 1991, pp.128-129.

... for expert users there are advantages in an indeterminacy of language... through metaphor, connotations, idiosyncratic associations we may stumble across new meanings, rearrange potentially rigid schemata.... For expert users of a language not only speak a language, they also change it. The most highly valued discourses in our society, those of the poet and the scientist, are full of odd, quirky extensions of meanings, odd associations between one sphere and another, and are not at all of repetitions of existing meanings[34].

For foreign learners, instead, translation encourages them to find the exact meaning, providing that feeling of certainty that the hesitant and insecure learner often needs:

> It may be that the foreign learner cannot and does not want to partake of that creative variation and indeterminacy which the expert user tolerates in secure situations[35].

As a translation theorist, Pym proposes a definitional framework for empirical research on how translation classes should relate to foreign language classes at university level. He suggests that the relation between these two general teaching activities can be formalised in a simple descriptive distinction between binary and non-binary errors. Pym describe translational competence as follows:

- the ability to generate a target-text series of more than one viable term (target text$_1$, target text$_2$, target text$_n$) for a source text;
- the ability to select only one target text from this series, quickly and with justified confidence, and to propose this target text as a replacement of source text for a specified purpose and reader.

Given this definition of translational competence, all translational errors should have the same basic form: they should all involve selection from a potential target-text series of more than one viable term:

> A binary error opposes a wrong answer to the right answer; non-binarism requires that the target text actually selected be opposed to at least one further target text$_2$ which could have also been selected, and then to possible wrong answers[36].

For binarism, there is only right and wrong; for non-binarism there are at least two right answers and then the wrong ones.

Pym discredits the simplistic hypothesis that the correction of binary errors belongs to the language classes and that of non-binary errors to the translation class:

---

34 G. Cook, *ibidem*, p. 138.

35 G. Cook, *ibidem*, p. 139.

36 A. Pym, "Translation error analysis and the interface with language teaching": in C. Dollerup and A. Loddegaarg (eds.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting. Training, Talent and Experience*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1992, p. 279.

Although all translational errors are non binary by definition (my definition), this does not mean that all non-binary errors are necessarily translational. Obviously, non-binarism is going to enter the language class at anything beyond the most basic levels, just as binary errors are going to occur in the translation class[37].

Pym recommends that both kinds of errors should be corrected in both situations and recalls that «the analysis of translation errors inevitably leads to an analysis of translation teaching»[38].

The suggestive analyses proposed by Cook and Pym ideally conclude the range of various positions on the role of translation in modern language teaching and once again show how methods in language teaching are inextricably tied up with that «gigantic crossword involving a huge number of tiny decisions», as the British playwright and translator, Christopher Hampton, has called the process of translation[39].

37 *ibidem*, p. 282.

38 *ibidem*, p. 283.

39 G. Anderman, "Finding the Right Words: Translation and Language Teaching": in K. Malm-kjær (ed.), *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation*, , Manchester , St. Jerome Publishing, 1998, p. 39.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen J. P. B. and Widdowson H. G., "Grammar and Language Teaching": in J. P. B. Allen and S. P. Corder (eds.), *Papers in Applied Linguistics: The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics Vol. 2*, London, Oxford University Press, 1975, pp. 90-105.

Anderman G., "Finding the Right Words: Translation and Language Teaching": in K. Malmkjær (ed.), *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, 1998, pp. 39-52.

Baker, M., *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, London and New York, Routledge. 1993.

Bassnett-McGuire S., *Translation Studies*, Methuen Press, London 1980.

Berlitz M. D., *The Berlitz Method for Teaching Modern Languages*, New York, Berlitz, 1907.

Celce-Murcia M., and L. McIntosh (eds.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, Newbury House, Rowley, MA 1979.

Cook G., "Making people's meanings stand still: the effect of translation on the indeterminacy of language": in R. T. Bell [ed], *The Role of Translation in Foreign Language Teaching*, Paris, Diffusion Didier Erudition, 1991, pp.127-141.

Danchev A., "The Controversy over Translation in Foreign Language Teaching": in *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching*, Paris, Round Table FIT-UNESCO, 1983, pp. 35-56.

Duff A., *Translation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990.

Finocchiaro M., and C. Brumfit, *The Functional-Notional Approach: From Theory to Practice*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1983.

Gatenby E.V., "Translation in the Classroom": in W.R. Lee (ed.), *E.L.T. Selection 2: Articles from the Journal 'English Language Teaching'*, Oxford University Press, London 1967, pp. 66-73.

Heltai P., *Teaching vocabulary by oral translation*, "ELT Journal", n. 43/4, 1989, pp. 288-293.

Howatt A.P.R., *A History of English Language Teaching*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984.

Jespersen O., London , *How To Teach a Foreign Language*, Allen and Unwin, 1904.

Kopczynski A., "Verbal Intervention. Translation in Foreign Language Teaching": in *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching*, Paris, Round Table FIT-UNESCO, 1983, pp.57-60.

Lado R., *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach*, New York, McGraw-hill, Inc., 1964.

Larsen-Freeman D., *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1986.

Malmkjær K., "Introduction: Translation and Language Teaching": in K. Malmkjær (ed.), *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation,* Manchester , St. Jerome Publishing, 1998, pp. 1-11.

Newson D., "Translation and Foreign Language Learning": in K. Malmkjær (ed.), *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, 1998, pp. 63-68.

Neubert A., *Text and Translation*, Leipzig, Enzykopädie, 1985.

Neubert A., *Translation, Interpreting and Text Linguistics*, "Studia Linguistica", n. 35, 1981, pp 130-145.

Pym A., "Translation error analysis and the interface with language teaching": in C. Dollerup and A. Loddegaarg (eds.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting. Training, Talent and Experience*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1992, pp. 279-288.

Rivers W. M., and M. S. Temperley, *A Practical Guide to the Teaching of*

English as a Foreign Language, New York, Oxford University Press, 1978.

Rivers W. M., *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press , 1981.

Tudor I., *Using Translation in ESP*, "ELT Journal", n. 41/4, 1987, pp. 268-273.

Snell-Hornby M., "Translation as a means of integrating language teaching and linguistics": in C. Titford and A. E. Hieke (eds.), *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching and Testing*, Tübingen, Narr Verlag, 1985, pp. 21-28.

Stibbard R., "The Principled Use of Oral Translation in Foreign Language Teaching": in K. Malmkjær (ed.), *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, 1998, pp. 69-76.

Sweet H., *The Practical Study of Languages: A Guide for Teachers and Learners*, London, Dent (1889), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1964 .

Urgese T., *Translation: how, when, and why*, "Forum", n. 4, 1989, pp. 38-40.

Weller G., "Some Polemic Aspects of Translation in Foreign Language Pedagogy Revised": in P. W. Krwutschke (ed.), *Translator and Interpreter Training and Foreign Language Pedagogy*, New York American Translators Association Series, v.iii, 1989, pp. 39-50.

Widdowson H. G., *Explorations in Applied Linguistics* 2, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1985.

Wilss W., "Translation as Intelligent Behaviour": in H. Somers (ed.), *Terminology, LSP and Translation: Studies in Language Engineering in Honour of Juan C. Sager*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1996, pp. 158-163.

Zohrevandi Z., "Translation as a resource for teaching English as a foreign language": in R. De Beaugrande, A. Shunnaq, M. H. Heliel (eds.), *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1992, pp. 181-187.