

Linguistics, translation and interpreting in foreign-language teaching contexts

Anthony Pym and Nune Ayvazyan

Version 1.2. July 2016

Draft written for the forthcoming The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Linguistics. A more detailed version of the nineteenth-century material is available in the text “Nineteenth-century discourses on translation in language teaching”.

The relations between linguistics, translation (here including interpreting) and foreign-language teaching can be seen as a play of three separate histories that, although once loosely entwined, have been following progressively different paths since at least the 1970s. That history is now one of separate disciplines, each with its own dynamics and debates, whose relative mutual ignorance can be seen as a source of partial misunderstanding.

The modern history of foreign-language teaching

When adults sign up to learn a foreign language, they are making a considerable investment in an essentially unknown product: languages are vast, complex and daunting, so much so that it is difficult for any learner to compare the virtues of different teaching methods. Approaches thus demarcate themselves by manipulating a limited set of signals. A course may offer rapid progress, limited effort, proven success, an authoritative source, naturalness and above all, in the age of modernity, newness. On any or all of these points, a new approach must score better than all previous approaches. Further, since there are not many more actual values in play, that essential newness requires a clearly visible distinguishing mark with regard to exactly *what* is supposed to be new, habitually selected from the shortlist of things that can be included or not: grammar, pedagogical progress, orality, written correctness, structural repetition, contextualization, and of course translation. Not surprisingly, the appeals to “translation” in this discourse have remarkably little to do with what the term might mean for the various linguistic approaches to translation, or indeed with what translators actually do.

The history of language-teaching methods is fairly well rehearsed in the literature (see Kelly 1969/1976, Byram and Hu 2000/2013, Howatt 2004). Kelly notes that the use of grammar was in vogue in the European Middle Ages and the eighteenth and nineteenth century, while “during the classical era, the Renaissance, and the early twentieth century it was intuitive command of the target languages that was required” (1969/1976: 7). The modern era has seen a broad movement from the use of the “grammar translation” method in the nineteenth century toward a clearer focus on the spoken use of language in situation. The nature of this development, with its implications for translation activities, can best be approached from a few representative coursebooks, whose introductions and exercises tell a rather more varied story.

Teaching with translation

Since bilingual glossaries date back to 2500 BCE (Kelly 1969/1976: 24), one might assume that some kind of translation has long been associated with some kind of language learning. The clearer association of multilingual dictionaries with translation in the European Renaissance was part of a mode of text-based language learning where Greek and Latin were the essential elements of humanistic education. By the sixteenth century, classroom learning was closely associated with translating those key texts. Roger Ascham, Greek and Latin tutor to Elizabeth Tudor, famously recommended teaching a foreign language via a double translation method:

Let the master read vnto hym the Epistles of *Cicero* [...]. First, let him teach the childe, cherefullie and plainlie, the cause, and matter of the letter: then, let him construe it into Englishe [...]. After this, the childe must take a paper booke, and sitting in some place, where no man shall prompe him, by him self, let him translate into Englishe his former lesson. Then shewing it to his master, let the master take from him his latin booke, and two pausing an houre, at the least, than let the childe translate his owne Englishe into latin againe, in an other paper booke. (1570: 26)

As expressed, this method actually uses three moments of translation, to which we can add a fourth:

1. *Initial translation*, when the learner confronts the L2 text and construes it mentally into L1, either with or without textual prompts (bilingual glossaries and the like).
2. *Concretizing translation*, a spoken or written translation into L1, here used to ground understanding in L1.
3. *Checking translation*, going back into L2 orally or in written form, which in Ascham is an overtly checking process that in effect tests how well the Latin text has been remembered. The union of this activity with translation into L1 can be called, as in Ascham, “double translation”.
4. *Communicative translation*, understood as a translation that goes beyond the checking function and is intended primarily as a mode of expression, where the translator can draw on a wide range of resources in order to communicate a message. This kind of translation can be used to illustrate grammatical *differences* between languages, although it is not clear if that was done in Ascham. Ascham’s pupil, as Elizabeth I of England, would nevertheless move beyond her language exercises and translate a sizeable body of works to be read by others.

It is not clear how Ascham’s use of double translation was to connect with this kind of communicative translation. Indeed, what takes a back seat in this method is close attention to pedagogical *progression*: if the aim is to read and understand Cicero, the beginner is being thrown into the deep end of the pool.

The seventeenth century saw an influential variant on initial translation for beginners. The Moravian bishop Comenius (Jan Amos Komenský) devised a method for learning Latin that emphasized the importance of direct sensorial knowledge. His *Orbis Pictus* of 1658 had images of everything a child might wish to know about, with a series of short parallel bilingual texts and noun phrases under each image. The prompt was thus

initial translation, but the pedagogy did not stop there: where possible, the child should be shown the real thing, then study the picture, speak the names, copy the image and colour it in, in a pedagogy that sought to unite the senses. The first edition of the *Orbis Pictus* was in German and Latin, and then in all major European languages. Tellingly, an edition of Hoole's English translation of the *Orbis Pictus*, published in 1777, adds the sub-title "and the English made to answer word for word to the Latin", with the editors advertising that they have made it easier to pair the English and Latin words by imposing Latin literalism on the English of previous editions (1658/1777: 5). At this initial stage of learning, the pairing of words was clearly more important than any differences in syntax. Such was learning by translation. But it was far from what was to be called "grammar translation".

In both Ascham and Comenius, translation was at work without any close alliance with grammar. This would change with Meidinger's *Praktische Französische Grammatik* of 1783, which became the best-selling textbook of its age, spawning many imitations for the learning of European languages. Meidinger starts from the proposition that "learning from rules is the shortest and safest way to learn French" (1783/1799: 2) and then offers comparative grammar lessons, going from simple to complex relations, with each step being checked by having the learner translate short texts, which also go from simple to complex. So we find pedagogical progression, comparative grammar, and then translation being used to teach the grammar, not to teach classical texts or sensorial objects. Meidinger explains that the pedagogical work on each text should start from an *oral* question-and-answer routine between student and teacher, in the L2, to ensure that the text has been understood. Once the text has thereby been grasped orally, "I read them the story word-for-word in German [L1], and they translate it into French [L2]" (1783/1799: ix). There is thus double translation at work, as in Ascham. There follows a revision phase based on the checking translation: "Should the learner make a mistake [in the written translation], one does not correct them but underlines the error in red ink and reminds them of the rules, so that they can correct themselves" (1783/1799: viii). A version of Meidinger's method was applied to the learning of English in Johann Christian Fick's *Praktische englische Sprachlehre* (1793/1800).

These grammar-translation methods were modified in several successful textbooks in the course of the nineteenth century. Seidenstücker's *Elementarbuch zur Erlernung der französischen Sprache* (1811/1833) begins with the Romantic claim to be following nature: "imitating, as closely as possible, the natural way in which children come to gain knowledge and use their mother tongue" (1811/1833: iii). Although this claim is ideologically almost the inverse of Meidinger's insistence on grammatical rules as offering a quick and sure path, it does not involve a lesser use of translation, just a change in order. Seidenstücker presents the learner with a bilingual glossary, a text, and translation exercises *prior* to working on any formal grammar. This inductive approach to the teaching of rules effectively makes translation part of the work of discovery. The change significantly alters the nature of the texts to be translated: instead of longish continuous texts, Seidenstücker presents the learner with disconnected sentences, designed to indicate the grammatical rule to be discovered. For example:

Vous, ihr, avez, habt, livre, Buch, acheté, gekauft

Vous avez un bon père et une bonne mère. Avez-vous un livre? Le livre est bon.
Nous avons acheté un bon livre. Le livre que vous avez acheté, est bon. [...]
(1811/1833: 2)

The first lines give the French words with their German equivalents, then the series of French sentences are to be read aloud and translated. The first sentence uses the grammar points previously required; the following sentences use the new words to illustrate new grammatical structures.

Carl Ploetz first published his *Elementarbuch der französischen Sprache* in 1848. His approach is initially inductive, like Seidenstücker's, although he introduces several innovations designed to help students in their translations. First, in the French sentences, the words pertinent to the grammar point are put in italics. Second, syntactic differences between French and German are marked as clues in parentheses in the German sentences. And third, different word orders are also marked by inserted numbers, indicating the order in French. This pedagogical presentation effectively embedded the grammar lessons within the translation tasks.

The French used much the same method for learning German. H. G. Ollendorff's *Nouvelle méthode pour apprendre à lire, à écrire et à parler une langue en six mois, appliquée à l'allemand* (1836/1838) seeks to present sentences that learners might actually want to ask about, and to base his method on interaction around those examples: "I was not guided by arbitrary laws, but by the manner in which the child begins to learn his mother tongue" (1846: vii). But then, these exemplary dialogues begin with: "Have you the bread? – Yes, Sir, I have the bread. – Have you your bread? – Yes, I have my bread" (1846: 10; our translation), which would certainly be a strange way for any child to begin learning L1. The learner is also required to render the sentences into L2, which no doubt explains why the L1 English has been made to fit French syntax (avoiding "Do you have the bread?" or "Have you got the bread?", for example). An American French textbook written by H. G. Sanders to prepare younger students for the Ollendorff method is rather clearer about what "naturalness" actually involves: "Young persons will more readily follow an example than a rule" (Sanders 1848: 4) – translation is once again being used inductively, in order to lead to grammar. The originally German-language method had thus reached the United States, where it was initially known (and opposed) as the "Prussian method".

The French pedagogue Claude Marcel also radically opposed the "grammar and dictionary" method, which he held to be "in direct opposition to nature" (1853: 93). Yet he devised an ingenious argument to make translation akin to what he assumed was the natural acquisition process. Marcel argued that foreign languages should only be taught at the *advanced* stages of education, since the young mind first had to learn how to think in L1. Learning an L2 then works, for Marcel, from the *written* language forms, the meaning of which is given not by situational context (as in L1 acquisition) but by translation:

The native expressions addressed to [the child learning L1] are always accompanied by tones, looks, and gestures, which explain them at once. The translation attached to the text [by the advanced learner of L2] interprets the foreign

words at once, as the language of action interprets the native [language]. (1853: 93; cf. 1867/1869: 23)

Translation thus somehow parallels “natural” language acquisition. Indeed, Marcel argues that translation is *superior* to L1 learning, since the meaning is given immediately.

Interestingly, Marcel assumes that L1 acquisition progresses inductively through understanding speech, speaking, understanding writing, then writing (1867/1869: 11, 14). In L2 acquisition, on the other hand, the assumed order is *reading*, hearing, speaking and writing (1867/1869: 22). In this way, Marcel limits the advantages of his initial translations explicitly to reading (the first phase), then includes checking “double translation” exercises in his section on writing.

Marcel was not above envisaging a commercial virtue in his use of matching pairs: “these reciprocal translations may thus serve both peoples to learn each other’s language” (our translation) – the one text might serve two markets. Not surprisingly, the matching equivalents are explicitly contrived, once again, by starting from structures shared by the two languages and bending natural syntax where possible (1880: 14). Marcel also sees a definite advantage in having L2 expressions translated in different ways in different situations, since the differences will lead to greater understanding (1853: 93). Here it is clear that literal translation has become context-sensitive. Yet translation *into* L2 is not required of the beginner (1867/1869: vi), and all translation is to be phased out at advanced stages of reading. Translation thus operates as what we these days call “scaffolding”, to be removed once competence has been constructed.

Line up Meidinger, Fick, Seidenstücker, Ploez, Ollendorff and Marcel, and you find a series of rather flexible ideas: 1) translation is to be used alongside other methods, especially spoken interaction, 2) it can be adapted to suit the criteria of pedagogical progression, 3) the relation between translation and grammar, as examples and rules, can be inductive, deductive, or a mixture of both, and 4) L2 acquisition involves a “second nature”, which is quite unlike L1 acquisition. All these writers were working in or for secondary schools; they were concerned with training learners above the age of 12 or so.

Teaching without translation

When Marcel argues that an L2 should not be taught to children younger than about 12, his idea harks back to Rousseau, whose *Émile* (1762) affirms that clear ideas are naturally formed in L1 only, so there is no sense in disturbing them with any L2: “you may give children as many synonyms as you please; you will change the words, not the language; they will never know any but one [language]” (1762/1979: 109).

Rousseau’s ideology of the natural subject fed into language education via other routes as well. One of them was in Switzerland, where his influence on the educationalist Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi led to a properly Romantic approach to language teaching. Pestalozzi insisted on teaching language as an integral part of all other skills, with special attention to “the gradual progress of lessons from sound to word, from word to speech, to attain to the formation of clear idea” (1801/1894: 71). Pestalozzi’s main application of psychological progression was in teaching young children to read. Later in his career, he applied his method to the teaching of classical languages to older children. It seems, however, that Pestalozzi’s Latin teacher Stern also gave grammatical overviews and used

back-translations (Roth 1984: 182). Thus, even within a radically naturalistic spoken-language approach, we find methods being drawn from grammar translation and Prussian New Humanism, which similarly sought to engage the student in the inductive discovery of grammar.

Apparently independently of Pestalozzi, the French Latinist François Gouin began working on a teaching method that radically excluded translation. In his *Essai sur une réforme des méthodes d'enseignement* (1880), Gouin gives a colourful account of how he tried to learn German using the available methods, all of which failed miserably – apparently he sought no human teacher, trying instead to do everything from one book after another. Among much else, he found that a week of translating had led nowhere: “Translation might be suitable for learning Latin and Greek, but not for living languages” (1880/1894: 16-17). Then came communicative epiphany. Gouin by chance witnessed how his three-year-old nephew was learning French by repeating over and over actions he had done. Gouin immediately understood the importance of repeated speech. His method is then based on carefully concocted “series” of sentences, connecting a result with a logical set of actions. Students have to repeat and memorize the sentences. Gouin claims he can teach “universal grammar”, common to the (European) languages involved. Gouin nevertheless remained a strangely marginal figure. Commercial success was to come from elsewhere.

Gottlieb Heness migrated to the United States in 1841 and started teaching German. In explaining his method (1867), Heness interestingly starts from something *between* L1 and L2 acquisition: he explains that children in Germany are brought up speaking local dialects, then go to school and have to learn High German. They do this through what Heness terms “object-teaching”, adapted from Pestalozzi, which involved using a psychologically ordered sequence of activities. Heness argues that the same thing can be done when teaching German to speakers of English (1867/1884: 4-5).

Having established himself in New Haven, Heness opened a German-language school in 1866. Two years later he employed the Frenchman Lambert Sauveur to teach using the same method, and in 1871 the two were working in their new school in Boston. The course actually starts from the teacher naming the fingers of their hand (Heness 1867/1884: 23). It then moves from objects or pictures to intensive question and answer routines, with much repetition (Heness 1867/1884: 16-17). Heness stipulates that his course is for *young* children, for whom the teacher is like a parent. Why? Because “it is very difficult for the adult to understand and speak without translating” (1867/1884: 10), and translation, including mental translation, is precisely the thing to be avoided, along with a dependence on rules.

In contradistinction to the “Prussian” method, Heness and Sauveur designed their courses for students whose first aim was to *speak* the foreign language. This language learning was for four hours a day, five days a week. Heness and Sauveur, as immigrants (along with the critical Marcel, who had learned his English when in Ireland), were speaking from the experience of the displaced person. Their courses were not imitating nature, but immersion abroad.

The American Maximilian Berlitz, an immigrant of German Jewish origins, opened his first language school in Rhode Island in 1878 and expounded his method in a series of publications in the 1880s. As in Heness and Sauveur, use of L1 was excluded, and with it disappeared translation as well. Berlitz initially presented his method as “an

imitation of the process followed by nature in teaching a child its mother tongue” (1888: 1). Berlitz nevertheless also makes an appeal to the “second nature” known by the immigrant: “Instruction by the Berlitz method, is to the student what the sojourn in a foreign land is to a traveller” (1888/1916: 4).

The principles of Berlitz’s method are: 1) “Teaching of the Concrete by Object Lessons” (as in Pestolazzi, Heness, Sauveur, perhaps Gouin), 2) “Teaching of the Abstract by the Association of Ideas” (as in Gouin), and 3) Teaching of Grammar by Examples and Ocular Demonstration (as in almost everyone since Seidenstücker). In practice, Berlitz’s system is a clearly ordered sequence of object-based dialogues – as in Pestalozzi, Gouin, Heness and Sauveur – that starts from objects in the classroom, then colours, positions, numbers, and so on, with possible accompaniment by large wall pictures showing the objects mentioned – as in Comenius.

Berlitz’s position with respect to translation was clear: “translation as a means of acquiring a foreign language is entirely abandoned” (1888/1916: 3). He gives three reasons for disliking translation:

1. In all translation methods, most of the time is taken up by explanations in the student’s mother tongue [...].
2. He who studies a foreign language by means of translation, neither gets hold of its spirit nor becomes accustomed to think in it [...].
3. A knowledge of a foreign tongue, acquired by means of translation, is necessarily defective and incomplete; for there is by no means for every word of one language, the exact equivalent in the other. (1888/1916: 3-4)

The translation concept here is clearly one of exact word-for-word matching, of the kind offered in initial prompts in previous methods.

These nineteenth-century arguments for and against translation did not fundamentally alter in the twentieth century. The “against” team did however gain academic respectability.

Enter some linguists

What the Americans called the “Prussian” method came to be known as “grammar translation”, although the term seems never to have been used by the writers themselves. It was very probably coined in Wilhelm Viëtor’s 1882 treatise *Der Sprachunterricht muß umkehren!* (Language teaching must be turned around!). In the early twentieth century, the term “grammar translation” was then used loosely to refer to any method that taught grammar and translation, often with the clearly erroneous assumption that this is all that those methods set out to do (Siefert 2013: 1-30).

Viëtor’s arguments were picked up by the English phonetician Henry Sweet in 1884, in his Presidential address to the Philological Society, and they then became part of a concerted intervention by university phoneticians: Sweet in England, Otto Jespersen in Denmark, and Paul Passy in France. Together with Viëtor, these heavyweights became the Reform Movement (Howatt and Smith 2002).

Even though their insistence on giving speech pride of place chimed in with the L2-only methods of the American language schools, the phoneticians were by no means

all against translation. They found translation suitable in the right place and time. Passy actually argued *against* Berlitz's banishment of L1, allowing that translations into L1 and L2 could be useful exercises where advanced students can use them to explore the differences between language systems, and that, at beginner levels, checking translations could be useful if and when they saved time (1899/1903: 42-43). Passy thus implicitly recognizes several kinds of translation: initial word-for-word (which he rejects), explanatory spoken checking into both L1 and L2 (which he accepts), and full (transformational) translation for advanced students.

Sweet, in his *Practical Study* (1899), was even more open to translation. He saw it as enabling a "full understanding" of the L2, to be divided into several stages: the first would be "initial translation"; the second is part of what Sweet sees as contextual "explanation" in L1 and L2, similar to what we have termed "concretizing" translation; the third stage is then the use of translation to highlight *differences* between the languages, and here the reference to "free idiomatic translation" is key: we are approaching a fuller concept of what translation can do, although its function here is ultimately to check on acquisition, with exercises going into both L1 and L2 (1899: 207). And in the fourth stage, translation in an *application* of the skills acquired.

Jespersen's *How to Teach a Foreign Language* (1901/1904), on the other hand, accords a far greater role to inductive work on grammar, and thereby severely limits the role of translation. Jespersen nevertheless admits that "there are many words where an English translation gives the information required more quickly and more clearly than it could be given in a long explanation in the foreign language" (1901/1904: 70-71).

If at this point we look back at the various nineteenth-century discourses, it seems clear that there was never a stage where translation was held up as the *only* teaching method: translation was always to be used alongside spoken activities, visual or situational supports, carefully graded exercises and, from Prussian New Humanism, inductive grammar. The actual textbooks were remarkably eclectic, suggesting something of a "pre-method" era, even as their covers promulgated one new method after another. And the radical *exclusion* of translation would seem to date from the immigrant experience in the United States.

A measure how complete this break was is found in an anecdote recounted by Heness. A student who speaks only German at school comes home to his mother, who naturally asks what the boy has done all day. The boy "began to stammer, unable to speak intelligibly", then confesses: "'Mother, if you will let me talk in German, I will tell you all;'" and he gave a full account of the day's adventures in German" (Heness 1867/1884: 6). This is presented as a hallmark of the method's success: the student is rendered unintelligible in L1... in a world that would apparently require no bilinguals, and no translators.

Developments in the twentieth century

The Swiss linguist Charles Bally developed a diachronic stylistics that, in privileging spoken interaction, found little place for translation. Bally dismisses in very negative terms the kind of "mechanical translation" performed at the beginning of language acquisition, which he sees as moving from "form to form" rather than passing through the

“idea” (1909/1951: 1.2). However, he elsewhere sees his stylistic analyses as preparing the student for quite a different mode of translation, to be used in the final stages of the acquisition process (1905: 163). He then goes so far as to describe his own linguistics as providing “a veritable method of translation” (1909/1951: 1.138). Bally’s *Traité de stylistique française* comprises numerous exercises for learning French stylistics, many of which do indeed involve translation of the more communicative kind. Bally’s terms and approach were later picked up by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1972), who turned comparative stylistics into one of the foundational pillars of Translation Studies.

A similar double game can be found in Eastern Europe, where the memorization of spoken L2 dialogues became one of the mainstays of foreign-language learning, in principle excluding the use of L1. Extensive use of translation nevertheless remained. In the classical “Bonk” textbooks (such as Bonk, Kotiy and Lukyanova 1961) translation activities into both L1 and L2 are a part of all lessons, alongside oral practice. In that part of the world, it seems that translation never actually went away.

Audiovisual teaching methods were developed in France from the 1950s. As in the Russian tradition, there were dialogues to be repeated and remembered, but in this case using tape recordings and slides or filmstrips, fleshing out the context in which the L2 utterance was to be understood. The exclusion of L1 was in this case more radical, however. Harvey (1996: 46) reports that ministerial guidelines banned translation from language teaching methods in the 1950s, although the Association des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes condemned the ban in 1987. Harvey sees this as a conflict “between teachers faced with the day-to-day reality of the classroom, and official policy makers” (1996: 46).

The reported French ban remains an exception, however. Elsewhere in the world, the grammar-translation method has remained in force. Adamson and Morris (1997) explain that audiolingual methods and grammar-translation were both used from the founding of the People’s Republic (as indeed they were in the Soviet Union), although grammar translation became dominant after the Cultural Revolution, among other reasons because the audiolingual method was apparently seen as being American.

With the rise of English as a global lingua franca, the teaching methods used around the world have increasingly tended to coincide with those being used to teach English. And in that particular area, the traditional arguments against translation steadily accrued force, albeit through simple repetition rather than conceptual sophistication (see Malmkjær 1995-96: 58-60; Pym, Malmkjær and Gutiérrez 2013: 12-14). Gatenby (1948/1967: 66) assumed that children learn L1 without translation, so translation is a “departure from the conditions of the natural process of acquiring speech”. The argument is backed up by a small cost-benefit analysis: translation is described as “a deceptive process in that, being laborious, it persuades teacher and pupil that a great deal has been accomplished” (1948/1967: 69). Mackey (1953-5/1967: 34) added that translation can only produce “mental confusion” due to L1 interference. And Lado (1964: 54) insisted that initial translation was misleading because it relied on word-to-word equivalents. Indeed, the general abstract arguments against translation were so overwhelming that Morris (1957/1967: 61) expressed legitimate surprise that the level of foreign-language skills could be so high in Scandinavia and the Netherlands despite their “excessive resort to translation”.

One voice in favour of translation in this period was Carl J. Dodson's *Language Teaching and the Bilingual Method* (1967/1972), which combined spoken practice with printed text, picture strips and initial translations as complementary inputs that enabled the learner to act out a given situation in L2. Translation was one input among many, while the goal remained communicative performance. This approach was picked up in Germany by Butzkamm (1980), who argued more explicitly for a "sandwich technique" where the learner is given the L2 expression, the L1 translation, and then the L2 expression again:

Teacher: Was geht hier eigentlich vor?
What's going on here?
Was geht hier eigentlich vor?
Student: Was geht hier eigentlich vor? (from Butzkamm 1980)

The aim of the method is for the student to grasp as quickly as possible what the foreign sentence means, without relying on form-for-form translation (the German word "eigentlich", meaning "actually", finds no equivalent here) and assuming that the adult learner would be engaged in mental translation in such cases anyway.

Communicative Approaches

What we today call the Communicative Approach emerged during the 1970s as a method that advocated real and meaningful communication based on the learners' immediate needs (Brumfit and Johnson 1979, Krashen 1982). Once again, that simple idea can be found in various forms scattered throughout the nineteenth-century discourses, albeit mostly with some presumption to restrict or fabricate the learner's "needs" by assuming some natural relation to pictures, to immediate objects, to simple actions in the world, and indeed to the spoken word. Anything could be considered a "need" in the eyes of the pedagogue, except translation, apparently.

The adjective "communicative" probably owes much to Dell Hymes' concept of "communicative competence" (1966), which stressed that knowing a language system was rather different from being able to interact efficiently in the language. We thus find Wilkins (1973) shifting attention away from the categories of grammar-based teaching and towards "categories of communicative function".

It would nevertheless be wrong to say that the Communicative Approach was completely against the use of translation in classrooms. Widdowson, for example, sought to identify and defend the communicative use of translation:

What we are aiming to do is to make the learner conceive of the foreign language in the same way as a communicative activity. This being so, it would seem reasonable to draw upon the learner's knowledge of how his own language is used to communicate. This is to say, it would seem reasonable to make use of translation. (Widdowson 1978: 159)

Similarly, Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983: 92) note that in the Communicative Approach “judicious use of native language is accepted where feasible”, and “translation may be used where students need or benefit from it”.

From the late 1980s we find a diffuse questioning of communicative approaches from various quarters. Swan (1985a: 1), for example, points out that the Communicative Approach “fails to take account of the knowledge and skills which language students bring with them from their mother tongue and their experience of the world”. He thus advocates the moderate use translation activities, even when they “seem to have no immediate 'communicative' value” (Swan 1985b: 83). Alan Maley, who at the time was Director-General of the Bell Educational Trust in Cambridge, provided a more radical questioning of that supposed lack of communicative value:

Only recently, as the communicative movement has begun to run short of ideas, has there been a resurgence of interest in traditional practices such as translation. Could it be that it serves some useful purpose after all? Could it be renovated, reinterpreted, humanized, made communicative? (Maley, in Duff 1989: 3)

This particular question astutely avoids preconceptions of what translation is. The question is instead how the traditional translation concept can be revamped and put to work, not in opposition to communicative approaches but as part of them.

One of the most significant attempts to reintroduce translation in this way was made in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)* (2001), where “mediation”, presented as one of the five basic language skills, includes translation and interpreting, alongside activities such as providing “a paraphrase, summary or record” (CEFR 2.1.3). A very wide communicative kind of translation is thus one of the skill sets that the learner is supposed to acquire, in accordance with a vision where the aim of language education is to produce a polyglot who not only knows languages but can move between them. The schoolboy that Heness held up as a model of success because he could not explain himself in L1 would, in terms of the *Common European Framework*, epitomize failure.

In their survey of the use of translation in language learning in ten countries, Pym, Malmkjær and Gutiérrez (2013) find that the Communicative Approach is the most popular method in virtually all countries, while Grammar-Translation is among the least popular approaches in all countries. That said, translation activities are reported as being used in classrooms in particular ways: the older the students, the more translation is used (possibly because adults tend to pass through mental translation anyway), and the higher the education system’s general foreign-language skills, the more frequent the use of translation. The notable exception to this latter tendency is Germany, where language skills are high yet instructors report not using translation in class: instead they use “mediation”, in accordance with the terms established in the *Common European Framework*. That is, translation continues to be used in classrooms, but under a different name and along with a very wide range of cross-language communicative activities.

Connections with Translation Studies

The various debates for and against the use of translation have taken place within Foreign Language Teaching circles; they have not become an issue within Translation Studies or indeed in linguistics as a wider discipline. This is not for want of early contacts between these fields. As noted, Bally's stylistics drew on the practical experience of translating with students and provided the basic terms for Vinay and Darbelnet's "method of translation" (1958). Bally, however, did all he could to shun "mechanical translation" from the classroom, and Vinay and Darbelnet filled their method with examples that are mostly parallel texts, not actual translations. The mistrust of mechanical translation was carried over.

A more intriguing disconnect can be dated from James S. Holmes' article "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" (1972), sometimes regarded as the founding document of Western Translation Studies. Holmes' research programme actually recognized that "priority should be given to extensive and rigorous research to assess the efficacy of translating as a technique and testing method in language learning" (Holmes 1972: 190). Yet this whole question is mysteriously absent from the graphic representation of Holmes presented by Toury (1995/2012: 12): the priority was recognized, then quickly forgotten about.

Not by chance, this was a period when Translation Studies was struggling to establish itself as an independent discipline, in part by insisting that professional translation required skills over and above the learning of a foreign language: language learning thus became the rival other. Without any significant exchange, the experts in communicative language teaching were free to assume that translation was not communicative, at the same time as translation scholars were quick to presuppose that language learning had nothing to do with translation.

Had there been dialogue, of course, the exchanges might have dealt with the facile arguments being tossed about both for and against the use of translation, and there would hopefully have been more attention to the many different *kinds* of translation that can be used in class. As it was, once the translation scholars withdrew from the scene, English-language communicative ideologies were able to rule the roost virtually unchallenged. This separation of disciplines may have obscured some very positive developments. For example, Alan Duff's excellent 1989 compendium of translation activities for the teaching of English was virtually ignored by translation scholars, while it struggled to find an audience among foreign-language teachers. A decade or so later, though, the translation scholar Kirsten Malmkjær edited two collective volumes on the role of translation in language teaching (1998, 2004), the applied linguist Guy Cook had his arguments in favour of using translation published in the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1998), and since then Cook's *Translation in Language Teaching* (2010) has had an impact on both disciplines.

Empirical research

Dodson's bilingual method (1967/1972) was ostensibly backed up by empirical testing: numbers showed that the multiple inputs led to learning faster than just one. This general finding is reported as being supported by a series of control-group studies (for example

Walatara 1973, with others reviewed in Caldwell 1990). However, none of these studies appear to isolate translation as a variable, since the focus is on the method as a whole.

Other empirical studies have been able to demonstrate the negative effects of translation. Ulanoff and Pucci (1993) tested a situation where the primary-school teacher translates everything as it is said, with the predictable result that the student stopped paying attention to what was said in their weaker language. Much depends, obviously, on the particular *kind* of translation that is used in class, and exactly *when* it is used.

There have been a good many studies on what students and teachers think of translation as a classroom activity (e.g. Altan 2006; Carreres 2006; Liao 2007; Boakye 2007; Fotovatnia 2010; Kelly and Bruen 2014), most of them finding that students generally regard translation as a useful tool. The semi-standardized questionnaires nevertheless include the statement “Learning English is mostly a matter of translating from my mother tongue” (with variants), with which students are requested to agree or disagree. The extreme nature of the statement, which fails to specify what kind of translation is involved or what other kinds of activities might be considered, gives results that seem of little benefit to any seriously balanced discussion of when and where translation can be of real benefit.

Other surveys have focused on instructors’ opinions of translation. As mentioned, Pym, Malmkjær and Gutiérrez (2013) found that, except for the special case of Germany, the most negative opinions of translation were in countries where the Communicative Approach and Immersion scored highest, which also happened to be the countries where the foreign-language skill scored the lowest (notably France and Spain). This, of course, does not mean that translation itself enhances language skills, since there are numerous other factors involved. But it does suggest that the presence of translation activities in language classrooms in countries like Finland and Croatia, or of mediation activities in Germany, is doing no harm.

Most of the arguments for and against translation have nevertheless tended to remain on the ideological level, without seeking justification in experiments of any formal kind. Indeed, the teaching community has tended to shun empirical testing across the board, since there are always numerous complex factors involved and much depends not just on what is done in the classroom, but what instructors and learners *think* should be done. Rather than put one method against another and see what the numbers say, there has thus been growing adhesion to a “post-method” condition, where it is accepted that since no one method can definitely be demonstrated to be superior to any other, there should be no need to restrict oneself to the use of just one method (see Stern 1983, Prabhu 1990, Kumaravadivelu 1994). The rejection of rigorous empirical testing has thus led to situations where very significant social resources are being invested in teaching methodologies whose effectiveness is often no more than a question of beliefs. At the same time, however, acceptance of “post-method” ideology has coincided with a movement away from single teaching methodologies, which has happily welcomed renewed interest in translation.

References

Adamson, Bob, and Paul Morris. 1997. “The English Curriculum in the People’s Republic of China”. *Comparative Education Review* 14(1): 3-25.

- Altan, Mustapha X. 2006. "Beliefs about Language Learning of Foreign Language-Major University Students". *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* 31(2): 45-52.
- Ascham, Roger. 1570/1870. *The Scholemaster*. First edition 1570, collated with the second edition of 1571. London: Muir & Patterson.
- Bally, Charles. 1905. *Précis de stylistique. Esquisse d'une méthode fondée sur l'étude du français moderne*. Geneva: A. Eggiman.
- Bally, Charles. 1909/1951. *Traité de stylistique française*. Seconde édition. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Berlitz, Maximilian. 1888/1916. *The Berlitz Method for Teaching Modern Languages. English Part*. Revised American Edition, New York: Berlitz.
- Boakye, Naomi. 2007. 'Investigating students' beliefs about language learning'. *Per Linguam* 23(2): 1-14.
- Bonk, N.A., G.A. Kotiy and N.A. Lukyanova. 1961. *Uchebnik Angiyskogo Yazyka* [Textbook of the English Language]. Moscow: Vneshtorgizdat.
- Brumfit C.J., and Johnson K. (eds). 1979. *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Butzkamm, Wolfgang. 1980. *Praxis und Theorie der bilingualen Methode*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
- Byram, Michael, and Adelheid Hu (eds). 2000/2013. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Caldwell, John A.W. 1990. "Analysis of the theoretical and experiential support for Carl Dodson's bilingual method". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 11(6): 459-479.
- Carreres, Ángeles. 2006. 'Strange bedfellows: Translation and language teaching. The teaching of translation into L2 in modern languages degrees; uses and limitations'. *Sixth Symposium on Translation, Terminology and Interpretation in Cuba and Canada: December 2006*. Canadian Translators, Terminologists and Interpreters Council. <http://goo.gl/BMs4eK>. Accessed March 2016.
- Comenius, J.A. 1658. *Orbis Pictus*. Nuremberg.
- Comenius, J. A. 1658/1777. *Orbis Sensualium Pictus* [. . .] *Joh[n] Amos Comenius's Visible World*. 12th ed., translated by Charles Hoole. London: Printed for S. Leacroft, at the Globe, Charing Cross.
- Cook, Guy. 1998. "Use of Translation in Language Teaching." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker, 117–20. London: Routledge.
- Cook, Guy. 2010. *Translation in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Cambridge University Press.
- Dodson, C.J. 1967/1972. *Language Teaching and the Bilingual Method*. London: Pitman.
- Duff, Alan. 1989. *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fick, Johann Christian. 1793/1800. *Praktische englische Sprachlehre für Deutsche beyderley Geschlechts* (Practical English Language Course for Germans of Both Sexes). Third edition. Erlangen: Walther.
- Finocchiaro, Mary and Brumfit, Christopher. 1983. *Functional-Notional Approach: From Theory to Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Fotovatnia, Zahra. 2010. "The Effect of Individual Differences on Learners' Translation Belief in EFL Learning." *English Language Teaching* 3(4): 228-36.
- Gatenby, E. V. 1948/1967. "Translation in the classroom". Reprinted in W. R. Lee (ed.) *ELT Selections 2: Articles from the Journal English Language Teaching*. London: Oxford University Press. 65-70.
- Gouin François. 1880/1894. *Essai sur une réforme des méthodes d'enseignement. Exposé d'une nouvelle méthode linguistique. L'art d'enseigner et d'étudier les langues*; trans. Howard Swan and Victor Bétis as *The Art of Studying and Teaching Languages*. Second edition. London: George Philip and Son; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Harvey, Malcolm. 1996. 'A Translation Course for French-speaking Students'. In P. Sewell and I. Higgins (eds) *Teaching Translation in Universities. Present and Future Perspectives*. London: Association for French Language Studies & Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research. 45-65.
- Heness, Gottlieb (1867/1884) *Der Leitfaden für den Unterricht in der deutschen Sprache, ohne Sprachlehre und Wörterbuch, mit einer englischen Einleitung über die Lehrmethode der Schule moderner Sprachen in Boston*. Fourth edition. New York: Holt; Boston: Schönhof.
- Holmes, J. S. 1972. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by L. Venuti, 180-92. New York: Routledge.
- Howatt, A. P. R. and R. C. Smith (eds). 2002. *Modern Language Teaching: The Reform Movement*. 5 vols. London: Routledge.
- Howatt, A. P. R. 2004. *A History of English Language Teaching*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hymes, Dell. 1966. "Two Types of Linguistic Relativity." In *Sociolinguistics*, edited by W. Bright, 114-58. The Hague: Mouton.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1901/1904. *Sprogundervisning*, trans. Sophia Yhlen-Olsen Bertelsen as *How to Teach a Foreign Language*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Kelly, Louis G. 1969/1976. *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*. Rowley MA: Newbury House.
- Kelly, Niamh, and Jennifer Bruen. 2014. "Translation as a Pedagogical Tool in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Qualitative Study of Attitudes and Behaviours". *Language Teaching Research* 19(2): 150-168.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1982. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. 1994. "The Postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching". *TESOL Quarterly* 28(1): 27-48
- Lado, Robert. 1964. *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Liao, Posen. 2006. "EFL Learners' Beliefs about and Strategy Use of Translation in English Learning". *RELC Journal* 37(2): 191-215. <http://goo.gl/gUksYP>. Accessed Marvh 2016.
- Mackey, William F. 1953-5/1967. "The meaning of method". Reprinted in W. R. Lee (ed.) *ELT Selections 2: Articles from the Journal 'English Language Teaching'*. London: Oxford University Press. 9-48
- Malmkjær, Kirsten. 1995-96. "Translation and language learning". *AILA Review* 12: 56-61.

- Malmkjær, Kirsten (ed.). 1998. *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Malmkjær, Kirsten (ed.). 2004. *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmes*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Marcel, Claude. 1853. *Language as a Means of Mental Culture and International Communication; Manual of the Teacher and Learner of Languages*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Marcel, Claude. 1867/1869. *The study of languages brought back to its true principles, or, The art of thinking in a foreign language*. American edition. New York: Appleton.
- Marcel, Claude. 1880/2013. *Rational Method, Following Nature Step By Step, to Learn How to Read, Hear, Speak, and Write French*. London: Forgotten Books.
- Meidinger, Johann Valentin. 1783/1799. *Praktische Französische Grammatik wodurch man diese Sprache auf eine ganz neue und sehr leichte Art in kurzer Zeit gründlich erlernen kann*. Fifteenth edition. Frankfurt: Meidinger.
- Morris, I. 1957/1967. 'The persistence of the classical tradition in foreign-language teaching'. Reprinted in W. R. Lee (ed.) *ELT Selections 2: Articles from the Journal 'English Language Teaching'*. London: Oxford University Press. 58-64.
- Ollendorff, Heinrich Gottfried. 1836/1838. *Nouvelle méthode pour apprendre à lire, à écrire et à parler une langue en six mois, appliquée à l'allemand*. Fifth edition. London: Vize Slater.
- Ollendorff, Heinrich Gottfried. 1846. *New Method of Learning to Read, Write and Speak the French Language*. New York and Philadelphia: Appleton.
- Passy, Paul. 1899/1903. *La Méthode directe dans l'enseignement des langues vivantes*. Brussels: Alfred Castaigne.
- Pestalozzi, Johann Henrich. 1801/1894. *How Gertrude teaches her children. An account of the method*. Trans. Lucy E. Holland and Frances C. Turner. Syracuse NY: Sonnenschein & Co.
- Ploetz, Carl. 1848/1877. *Elementarbuch der französischen Sprache*. Berlin: Herbig.
- Prabhu, N.S. 1990. "There is no best method – why?". *TESOL Quarterly* 24(2): 161-176.
- Pym, Anthony, Kirsten Malmkjaer and Mar Gutiérrez. 2013. *Translation and Language Learning*. Luxembourg: European Commission.
- Roth, Alfred. 1984. "Die Gestaltung der altsprachlichen Methode Pestalozzies durch St. L. Roth". *Pädagogica Historica: International Journal for the History of Education* 24(1): 177-207.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1762/1979. *Emile, or, on Education*. Trans. Alan Bloom. New York: Basic Books.
- Sanders, G. J. Hubert. 1848. *The French Student's First Book; after an Improved and Enlarged Plan based on Ollendorff's New Method*. Philadelphia: Griffith & Simon.
- Seidenstücker, Johann H. P. 1811/1833. *Elementarbuch zur Erlernung der französischen Sprache*. 8th edition. Hamm und Soest: Schulz.
- Siefert, Thomas Raymond. 2013. *Translation in Foreign Language Pedagogy: The Rise and Fall of the Grammar Translation Method*. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Stern, Hans Heinrich. 1983. *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Swan, Michael. 1985a. "A Critical Look at the Communicative Approach (1)." *ELT Journal* 39(1): 1-12.
- Swan, Michael. 1985b. "A Critical Look at the Communicative Approach (2)." *ELT Journal* 39(2): 76-87.
- Sweet, Henry. 1899. *The Practical Study of Languages. A Guide for Teachers and Learners*. London: J. M. Dent.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995/2012. *Descriptive Translation Studies - and beyond*. Second edition. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ulanoff, Sharon, and Sandra Pucci. 1993. "Is Concurrent-Translation or Preview-Review More Effective in Promoting Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition?". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. <http://goo.gl/VW9GYz>. Accessed March 2016.
- Viëtor, Wilhelm (Quousque Tandem). 1882/1905. *Der Sprachunterricht muß umkehren! Ein Beitrag zur Überbürdungsfrage*. Third edition. Leipzig: Resiland.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. 1958/1972. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: méthode de traduction*. Nouvelle édition revue et corrigée, Paris: Didier.
- Walatara, Douglas. 1973. "An experiment with the Bilingual Method for teaching English as a complementary language". *Journal of the National Science Council of Sri Lanka* 1: 189-205. <http://goo.gl/9CoRGL>. Visited March 2016.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1978. *Teaching Languages as Communication*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, D. A. 1973. "The Linguistic and Situational Content of the Common Core in a Unit/Credit System." In *Systems Development in Adult Language Learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. 129-45.