



A Journal of Culture, English Language, Teaching & Literature

ISSN 1414-3320 (Print), ISSN 2502-4914 (Online)

Vol. 18 No.1; July 2018

Copyright © Soegijapranata Catholic University, Indonesia

A Labour Useful to Students: Contrasting Perspectives on Teaching
Translation Studies

Harry Aveling

Translation Studies, Monash University, Victoria, Australia

email: harry.aveling@monash.edu

Received: 25-02-2018

Accepted: 30-02-2018

Published: 21-07-2018

A Labour Useful to Students: Contrasting Perspectives on Teaching Translation Studies¹

Harry Aveling

harry.aveling@monash.edu

Translation Studies, La Trobe University; and Monash University, Australia

Abstract: Translation Pedagogy is one of the most under-developed fields of Translation Studies. This paper provides an introduction to three different approaches to the teaching of Translation: the Classical European, the “transmissionist” approach and the contemporary “social constructivist” approach. The paper shows how the relationship between teacher and student varies in each of these models.

Key words: social constructivism, translation pedagogy, transmissionist teaching

***Abstrak:** Pengajaran menerjemahkan adalah salah satu dari studi yang belum berkembang di dalam studi terjemahan. Makalah ini memberikan pengantar tentang tiga macam pendekatan untuk pengajaran terjemahan: klasik Eropa, pendekatan transmisionis, dan pendekatan kontemporer, yaitu konstruktivis sosial. Makalah ini menunjukkan bagaimana hubungan antara guru dan siswa bervariasi dengan menggunakan macam model-model itu.*

***Kata kunci:** konstruktivis sosial, pedagogi terjemahan, pengajaran transmisionis*

¹ The first part of this paper draws on my “Short History of Western Translation Theory”. I am grateful to Ms. Do Thi My Han M.A. of USSH, HCMC, Vietnam for her perception of her various teachers.

INTRODUCTION

Translation Studies has been defined as:

...a formal branch of academic study that addresses critical, creative and research issues involved in the linguistic and interpretive transferral of sense and sound from one language to another and from one cultural context to another. Translation Studies explores all dimensions of the translation process ... [Translation] is an exacting process that demands creative expression, philological precision, minute knowledge of historical and cultural contexts, and a nuanced sense of style both in the source and target languages.²

Although it is an important preparation for and dimension of “the translation process”, Translation Pedagogy is one of the most under-developed fields of Translation Studies. This paper provides an introduction to some of the different approaches to the teaching of Translation as a useful skill to be used beyond the classroom.

CLASSICAL EUROPEAN TRANSLATION PEDAGOGY

In 1963, Jiri Levy wrote in *The Art of Translation* that: “To date, writing on translation only partially belongs to the realm of theory, as most articles and monographs have been confined to empirical observation or essayistic aphorisms.” Levy noted that such essays on translation as did exist often had a humorous tone (although the jokes told were rather old, e.g. translations were like women, either beautiful or faithful, but never both), featured the frequent use of anecdotal misunderstandings, and were often focused on such abstract topics as the nature of translation, whether translation is possible, and so on (2011, p. 3)³.

The oldest European discussions of Translation and Translation Pedagogy date back to Ancient Rome, and then continue to be of major importance through to the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the rise of the early European nation states. The central language of European scholars and

² Retrieved from <http://www.utdallas.edu/research/cts/alta-htm>, ALTA, link to “Promotion and Tenure”, 19 September 2008.

³ Sonia Colina agrees that until recently discourse on translation pedagogy was “largely dominated by anecdotal evidence and case studies” (Baer & Koby 2003, p. 29).

other readers was Latin, and the core of their tradition was classical literature and Judeo-Christianity. Lefevere's words provide an accurate background to understanding the academic use of translation and how it was taught: "In such a culture, translations were not primarily read for information or the mediation of the foreign text. They were produced and read as exercises, first pedagogical exercises, and later on, as exercises in cultural appropriation - in the conscious and controlled usurpation of authority." (Lefevere, 1990, p. 16).

The first texts on the nature of translation were intended to train future orators to act in the real world, the sons of nobles who could be expected to play an active part in the life of the state. Through the training they received from an experienced elder, these young men were encouraged to work in a particular way, namely to create dynamic and non-literal versions of original works in Greek as a means for developing the fluency of their own oratorical skills. Marcus Tullius Cicero wrote as follows in *On the Orator* (*De oratore*, 55 BC):

I have judged it right to undertake a labor useful to students, although certainly not necessary for myself. That is, I have converted the most celebrated orations of two of the most eloquent Attic orators, Aeschines and Demosthenes, which they delivered in debate against each other, not recasting them as a translator (*interpres*), but as an orator, keeping the same meanings but with their forms - their figures, so to speak - in words adapted to our idiom, I have not thought it necessary to pay out one word for another in this process, but have conserved the character and the force of the language. Nor have I thought it fitting to count them out to the reader, but to weigh them out (cited in *Jerome's Letter to Pammachius*, in Venuti, 2000, p. 25).

These binary practices were also prescribed by Horace, Pliny the Younger, Quintilian, and Saint Jerome. Horace argued for the revitalisation of well-known texts through a style that would: "neither linger in the one hackneyed and easy round; neither trouble to render word by word with the faithfulness of a translator [*sic*]" . The superior translator, the gentleman and not the market translator, should not treat the original writer's beliefs with too easy a trust, and ought to avoid stylistic over-sensationalism "so that the middle never strikes a different note from the beginning, nor the end from the middle" (*Ars Poetica*, c. 20BC, Robinson, 1997, p. 15). Quintilian agreed: "In translating [Greek Authors], we may use the very best words, for all that we use may be our own.

As to [verbal] figures...we may be under the necessity of inventing a great number and variety of them, because the Roman tongue differs greatly from that of the Greeks" (*Institutio oratoria*, c. 96AD, Robinson 1997, p. 20). St Jerome called on the authority of both Cicero and Horace in his Letter to Pammachius, No. 57 (395AD), where he "freely announced" that "in translating from the Greek - except of course in the case of Holy Scripture, where even the syntax contains a mystery - I render not word for word, but sense for sense" (Robinson, 1997, p. 25).

The fullest consideration of these literal and free strategies was undertaken in Friedrich Schleiermacher's "On Different Methods of Translating" (*Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden de Uebersetzens*, 1813). Robinson describes this work as "the major document of romantic translation theory, and one of the major documents of Western translation theory in general" (1997, p. 225). Schleiermacher's essay too can be read as a work of advice for educated gentlemen on how best to translate. He too distinguished between the "interpreter (*Dolmetscher*) who works in the world of commerce", and the "translator proper (*Uebersetzer*) who works in the fields of scholarship and art".

The more a work is dominated by the author's "unique ways of seeing and making connections", he argued, the more it is "ordered by free choice or personal experience", and the more artistic it will be. For the true translator, there are only two choices: to "either (1) disturb the writer as little as possible and move the reader in his direction, or (2) disturb the reader as little as possible and move the writer in his direction" (Robinson, 1997, pp. 228-229). Schleiermacher's preference was for the former, with all its consequences: "If the target-language readers are to understand, they must grasp the spirit of the language native to the author, they must be able to gaze upon the author's inimitable patterns of thinking and meaning; but the only tools that the translator can offer them in pursuit of these goals are their own language, which nowhere quite corresponds to the author's, and his own person, his own inconsistently clear understanding of, and vacillating admiration for, the author."

To this end, he argued for the use of an intermediary language, which in following "the contours of the original" will seem "foreign" to the reader, by giving off "an aura of impediment, of having been bent forcibly into the foreign semblance". It will sound like "some specific *other thing*, something definitely other" (Robinson, 1997, pp. 232-233).

These essayistic approaches of a confident translator of a superior status giving instruction from above to those with little knowledge of how to translate have remained constant to this day. It is the practical, commonsensical nature of these distinctions, either follow the word or the sense of the sentence and beyond, that has ensured that they continue to remain the basis for much formal translator training. As a contemporary example, we may cite Peter Newmark's *Textbook of Translation*, in which he argues that the "central problem of translating...has always been whether to translate literally or freely". His answer to this problem is the distinction between semantic and communicative translation.

Semantic translation, "is personal and individual, follows the thought processes of the author, tends to over-translate, pursues nuances of meaning, yet aims at concision in order to reproduce pragmatic impact". Communicative translation, on the other hand, "attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership" (Newmark, 1988, pp. 46-47).

Informative and vocative (non-literary) texts require communicative translation; expressive (literary) texts tend more towards the semantic method of translation (Newmark, 1981, p. 44). Binary schemes - of "formal" and "dynamic" equivalence - also play an important part in the work of the still very influential Eugene Nida (1964). The teacher set the model and the rule on which it was based, the student faithfully followed him. This may have taken place through fact to face contact; more often, the student was not a student at all but read the right books, if he was sufficiently interested. If students could somehow learn to do these things, they would be considered ready to take a useful place in society.

RECENT STUDIES IN TRANSLATION PEDAGOGY

Throughout most of history, translation was the work of bilinguals, working practitioners and religious scholars. It was not considered a worthy university discipline beyond its role in the teaching of grammar. Decisive challenges to the way translators and others thought about their work and how it was done came in the 1950s, and more especially after the 1980s, when "translation" into one's own language ceased to be merely an aspect of language teaching, summarised by the directives "translate into language X" or "read and translate" (and followed by the question "Right, who will go first?")

(Davies, 2004, p. 11), and took on a new status in the academy. Translation as an object gave way to “translation as a process and to translators as subjects” (Seguinot, 2008, p. 2)

The new academic field of “Translation Studies” was decisively defined by the American scholar, James Holmes in his 1972 paper on “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies”⁴. Holmes insisted that translation studies is “as no one I suppose would deny, an empirical discipline ... a field of pure research - research pursued for its own sake, quite apart from any direct practical application outside its own terrain” (2000, p. 184). He divided Translation Studies into two major branches, “Pure” and “Applied”, and then sub-divided the “Pure” into two further sub-branches: “Theoretical” and “Descriptive” Translation Studies. He listed four fields within Applied Translation Studies: the teaching of translation, translation aids, translation policy and translation criticism. With regard to the first of these, he wrote:

The teaching of translating is of two types which need to be carefully distinguished. In the one case, translating has been used for centuries as a technique in foreign-language teaching and a test of foreign language acquisition ... In the second case, a more recent phenomenon, translating is taught in schools and courses to train professional translators. This second situation, that of *translator training*, has raised a number of questions that fairly cry for answers: questions that have to do primarily with teaching methods, testing techniques, and curriculum planning. It is obvious that the search for well-founded, reliable answers to these questions constitutes a major area (and for the time being, at least, *the major area*) of research in applied translation studies. (Holmes, 2000, p. 189)

Holmes had little to say on either translation aids or translation policy. The fourth of these fields, quality evaluation, is, according to Arango-Keeth and Koby, the least developed area of this underdeveloped field (2003, p. 117).

The role of translation in language teaching has primarily tended to be a “language exercise” rather than training for a real life vocational context. Holmes preferred to see Applied Translation Studies as being “of use” rather than “of light” (Toury 2012, p. 189). He was not alone in this. In his

⁴ James Holmes: “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies”, reprinted in Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, Routledge, London, 2000, pp. 180-192.

discussion of Holmes 'map' of the discipline⁵, Gideon Toury insisted that: "It has always been my conviction that **it is no concern of a scientific discipline, not even within the 'human sciences', to effect changes in the world of our experience**" (2012, p. 11, emphasis in the original). He vigorously rejected Peter Newmark's conviction that "translation theory's main concern is to determine appropriate translation methods" (Newmark 1981, p. 19), although he was prepared to admit that conclusions from theoretical reasoning might sometimes be useful for translation criticism and translator training.

Translator training, he insisted, derives its primary force from outside Translation Studies, "from a theory of teaching and learning, and hence (would) include notions such as 'exercise' and 'drill, or 'input' vs. 'intake'." Toury classified the major fields of Translation Studies as being "*theoretical*" and "*descriptive*", while Applied Translation was "*prescriptive* ... not intended to account either for possibilities and likelihoods or for actual facts, but rather to set norms in a more or less conscious way. In brief, to tell others what they should have done or should be doing ..." (Toury, 2012, p. 12).

THE RISE OF TRANSLATION PEDAGOGY

The enormous expansion of Translation Studies over the past half century has not been matched by an equivalent change in the amount of research conducted about the nature and effectiveness of the various approaches to educational training and education. Compared to Pure Translation Studies, Applied Translation Studies is still an underdeveloped field of study, so much so, in fact, that Translation pedagogy has in fact been described as "the *other* theory" (Baer & Koby 2003, p. vii) or, more fully, "the other, forgotten theory in translation studies" (Baer & Koby 2003, p. vii). Hermans writes that: "empirical research into [translator] training is still in its infancy" (Baer and Koby: vii).

Much of the early research from the 1960s on was carried out on a relatively small-scale, within the discipline of Linguistics. It was based on limited personal experience and anecdotes, and published as single journal

⁵ Toury, G. The pivotal position of Descriptive Studies and DTS. *Descriptive Translation Studies*, pp. 1-13.

articles or books of essays by various authors.⁶ The 1970s onwards began to see a significant growth in more sophisticated pedagogical research (published in the *Interpreter and Translator Trainer* in particular) and the appearance of longer, more detailed studies of specific research problems (Kelly, 2005). Some publications were still centred on classroom activities, many on the theory versus practice debate.⁷ Studies of actual pedagogical practices and settings formed a very valuable project but were still not plentiful.⁸ Nevertheless, an awareness of Educational Theory was growing⁹. In 1980, Jean Delisle argued for a point that was commonplace in Educational Theory. He took a step away from unthinking subservience to established practices by insisting that translator trainers should have clear and achievable teaching and learning objectives, developed around contrastive-linguistic activities, so as to achieve clear and definite outcomes (Kelly & Martin 2009, p. 298, Orlando 2016, p. 29). Christiane Nord (1991) confirmed the difference between language for the classroom and language for use beyond the academy when she suggested that training should simulate professional practice, thus leading to the production of a more professional and realistic approach to classroom work (Kelly & Martin 2009, p. 298, Orlando, 2016, p. 29). In the real world, translators work not in classrooms but in government and professional agencies, business firms, and as editors, authors and scholars (Ulrych, 2005, p. 4). As Yves Gambier has insisted: “We do not teach translation, we *train translators*” (cited in Kearns 2008, p. 207).

TRANSMISSIONIST TEACHING

A major shift in approach came in 1991 with Kiraly’s *Pathways to Translation*, and later his *Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education*

⁶ Kearns (2008, p. xiii) notes a recent move away from “papers which focus hermetically on the individual experiences of teachers arriving at their own solutions in their own classrooms”. See Kearns, J. (ed.) (2008). *Translator and Interpreter Training*, London: Continuum.

⁷ Baer & Koby (2003, p. vii) suggest that, “Much of the discussions of translation pedagogy today is drowned out by the endless debate over theory versus practice.”

⁸ Compare Maria Gonzalez Davies “Minding the process, improving the product” in M. Tennent, M. (2005). *Training for the New Millenium*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, “Much has been written about the process and product of translation, but little about class dynamics. The literature on translator training seems to lean towards a description of what happens in translation but not of what happens in the classroom. An approach which includes both issues is needed” (p. 67).

⁹ On the wide range of theory and research in Educational Studies in general, see Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K., (2007). *Research Methods in Education*, 6th ed., London: Routledge.

(2000) Kiraly's argument too was not so new in education circles but it seemed profoundly new in Translation Studies. Kiraly began with a description (some might say a caricature) of traditional translation pedagogy course types as being what he called "transmissionist", that is, based on "the transmission of knowledge from those who know more to those who know less" (2000, p. 53).

Kiraly described the conventional, unexamined and uncriticised, round of lectures, exercise classes and seminars, as simply doing what had always been done. He insisted that in these situations: "The teacher is always present, in charge and in control, filling in the knowledge not covered by the presenters and answering any questions that the otherwise silent and generally passive lecture recipients might ask" (2000, p. 51)¹⁰.

Transmissionist teaching was conventionally justified by the common sense assumption that knowledge is static and open to the individual apprehension of brute objective facts. The assumption creates the belief that skills are pre-definable, almost identical for all students and measurable. In Kiraly's opinion, these methods respect neither the individuality of the student and how knowledge is created, nor the real world in which professional translators work today. They fail "to produce translators who are capable of the flexibility, teamwork and problem solving that are essential for success in the contemporary language industry, not to mention the creativity and independent thinking that have always been the hallmark of the finest translators" (Kiraly, 2000, p. 23).

Here are two examples of "transmissionist teaching" as seen by a Vietnamese M.A student in Ho Chi Minh City, in 2014:

The best and worst translation classes I ever attended:

I have attended three translation classes: one at university (the compulsory subject at school) and two at graduate level (one taught by Mr. ABC and the other by Mr. GHI). To my experience and memory, there are no best and worst classes as I did and have learned valuable things about translation from those teachers. For me, it would be more appropriate to say "the more and the less

¹⁰ Compare the description by Witte et al. of: "The Grammar Translation Method with its focus on formal accuracy, often using translation not only in exercises but also for testing, tormenting generations of language learners with texts of absurd complexity only to show how little they knew" (2009, p. 1).

memorable classes” because the teacher himself and his methods are the ones that count.

I was introduced to translation studies in my third year at university. My translation teacher was an old, conservative man. His name is DEF (I cannot remember his full name) but we, the students, tended to call him “Dr. Anesthesia” because his little, soft voice, in spite of using the microphone, made us extremely sleepy especially in the afternoon. I have to say that his translation class was kind of boring. The teacher provided only one section of translation introduction and the rest were for “hand-on”. We were required to do a lot of translation during the course, from L1 to L2 and vice versa. The teaching process seemed to be repeated day by day: getting handout of source text from Dr. Anesthesia, producing the draft in class, completing the revised at home, submitting the outcomes verbally or in written, and finally receiving comments and feedbacks. I regard it as the least memorable class but the most memorable teacher’s nickname.

The one at graduate level was quite stunning. Actually, there were some rumors spreading around this professor, Mr. ABC: skillful, but strict, serious, and very demanding. Though I only studied with him for two sections, I myself got attracted and interested in his “strange” teaching method. He stressed on the heavy load of work I and my friends had to do during the course on the very first period, which made us experience the feelings that our seniors had suffered. I think other people were correct about his personality but I still loved attending his class: I admired his profound knowledge in the field of translation; furthermore this is TESOL class of graduate students, so he had the reasons to be strict and demanding; he was serious in class but I did smile more than I did in any previous class. He really had a great sense of humour, at least from my perspective.

Mr. ABC spoke Vietnamese with the accent of a foreigner and this was extremely funny whenever he translated English into Vietnamese. In addition, what made him different from teachers I had studied was he insisted on “team” not “group”: team work, team members, team spirit (He did spend one period explaining the difference between team and group) and he knew many popular Vietnamese songs for the youth and singers and used

them as examples. It was regret that his poor health prevented him from continuing teaching; he left a lasting impression on me about a strict but humorous Vietnamese teacher with “foreign” Vietnamese accent.

Clearly this student learnt a lot from both of these lecturers and scarcely seems to have been rendered passive or unthinking. She worked quite hard in fact and gained much from both courses. Mr ABC did not hesitate to encourage team work and he was obviously emotionally committed to his students.

CONTEMPORARY CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACHES

From a more contemporary position, following Lev Vygostky and others, Kiraly has argued that knowledge is constructed through a process of linguistic interaction between members of a community as they seek to understand the world together, based on previous experience, knowledge and motives. As he says: “there is no meaning in the world until we human beings make it” (Baer & Koby 2003, p. 9). Kiraly, therefore, looked for a type of education that is “a collaborative, acculturative and quintessentially social activity” (2000, p. 28). He argued that we ought to shift the focus of authority, responsibility and control away from the teacher and towards the learners (2000, p. 1), who in fact include (in my experience as well) both beginners and advanced levels of skill and real-world experience. He considered the change from instruction to the collaborative (or “social”) construction of knowledge as being “the promise of a paradigm shift in translator education”, and set out to “[make] a case for considering collaboration as a particularly valuable element in developing innovative methods for translator training.” (Baer & Koby, 2003, p. 9)

Knowledge includes the group development of knowledge, the testing of hypotheses about the text under consideration and its context, as well as action, the production of outcomes. In this style of teaching and learning, process matters as much as, if not more than, its products. The most effective learning is negotiated, experiential and active.

Kiraly made a distinction between “translation competence” and “translator competence”. He argued that:

Translator competence does not primarily refer to knowing *the* correct translations for words, sentences or even texts. It does entail being able to use both tools and information to create

communicatively successful texts that are accepted as good translations within the community concerned. Perhaps most importantly, it means knowing how to work co-operatively within the various overlapping communities of translators and subject matter experts to accomplish work collaboratively, to appropriate knowledge, norms and conventions, and to contribute to the evolving conversation that constitutes those communities. (2000, p. 14).¹¹

These skills can be further subdivided into such areas as linguistic competence, disciplinary competence, translation competence and technical competence (Ulrych, 2005 p. 18, see also Colina 2000, p. 32-33). Here it is sufficient to note that the act of translation involves an intricate mix of social, cognitive and cultural as well as linguistic processes.

The ideal education is not only “transactional” but indeed “transformational” (Davies 2004, p. 14). Immature translators show a tendency to incomplete and unsuccessful paraphrasing, a strong reliance on the dictionary, and an excessive fear of interference – all signs of a lack of self-awareness and self-confidence (Colina 2000, p. 40). They must overcome the doubt, self-deprecation and the despair that Alexander Gross believes is characteristic of many translators (2003, p. 84), and learn to become more self-reliant as they gain experience and the possession of appropriate expertise. In becoming “functional translators”, to use Nord’s term (2005), they must also learn how to deal with the client’s expectations, time constraints, terminological and background information, and personal experience with particular text types etc. Being translations, here is also a dimension of cross-cultural communication that needs to be considered (Olshanskya, 2003, p. 177). As a preparation for working as professional translators in a multicultural environment, Kiraly therefore recommended that translation classes should encourage the undertaking of real (“authentic”) projects, with outcomes that are acceptable to the client as an acceptable translation.

Kiraly also believed that “assessment tasks and learning activities should be able to be directly linked to the outcomes of the relevant course” (2000, p. 19). “Constructive alignment” is a long-standing principle of standard patterns of curriculum design (participants and resources – objectives/ outcomes –

¹¹ Compare Roger Bell’s statement that “translator communicative competence” is “the knowledge and ability possessed by the translator which permits him/her to create communicative acts – discourse – which are not only (and not necessarily) grammatical – but socially acceptable”. See *Translation and Translating*, London: Longmans, 1991, p. 30.

method: teaching and learning activities - assessment). There should have been no doubt that it can be applied in translator pedagogy and it is used to good effect, for example, in Dorothy Kelly's *Handbook for Translator Trainers* (2005) As summative steps towards the final product (which is essential, Kelly 2005, in Orlando 2016, p. 32), Johnson recommends that students should also keep portfolios, consisting of a selection of their work, reflective statements on goals, progress and frustrations (2003, p. 97).

The principles developed in Kiraly's work have been widely accepted by translation teachers. Mike Forcada has spoken of: "pedagogical innovation, social constructivism, collaborative learning, non-transmissionist teaching, task-based instruction, portfolio assessment", as being the key terms in current discourse¹². Most recently, Marc Orlando (2016) speaks of a student-centred, learner-centred constructivist approach to teaching/learning as a way to empower and emancipate trainees.

Here is an example of a European lecturer using constructivist principles with the same Vietnamese students in a course on Translation Theory:

The last and the most memorable translation class I have ever attended was the one with Mr. GHI. At first, when being informed by the faculty that a native English teacher was going to teach me the translation course, to tell the truth, I was quite surprised doubtful because according to my understanding, translation was a special course in which the instructor and the students should have the L1 in common for better comparison and contrast between the source and the target text. I doubted and wondered. However, my worries soon disappeared when I first met him, Teacher GHI. He was about 65 but still energetic, with gray hair and blushing cheeks (may be because he is not yet familiar with tropical climate in Vietnam), giving me the feeling of warmth and comfort. He provided us with a clear syllabus and a useful reading material composed by himself which contained major points about translation the students had better cover. The way he carried out the tasks was very "the West" and SLA (second language acquisition) relevant: theories presented first and hands-on later, 10-minute break after every 1 hour (in the class of Mr. Tuan, we had to work nonstop from 7:30 am to 11:00 am), group work and

¹² Review of Baer & Koby. (2002). *Beyond the Ivory Tower*, in *Machine Translation* 18(4), pp. 365-372.

pair work alternated, revision before any sections... I believe that he did work a lot for this course, which was reflected in his preparation of handouts and presentations. In my opinion, he also made a good choice of translation topics, ranging from easy to more challenging, from Vietnamese to Latin and of course English, which made the lessons more interesting and authentic. After taking the course, I recognized that “Wow, I can really do translation”. Perhaps my versions were not very “English” or “Vietnamese”, not poetic or accurate enough, but I was inspired to become a future Vietnamese translator in the field where men are dominating. And this is another story about Teacher GHI. I usually felt rather guilty looking at Teacher sitting on the table and observing the class. We were busy gossiping or pretended to do so as no one dare to step forward and have a talk with the Teacher. I remembered he said he had wanted to be closer with us, the students, but because of the space in the classroom, it had seemed quite formal. Actually, that space represents the power distance in Vietnamese culture: teachers are always at higher level in the society hierarchy. Nevertheless, we do respect and appreciate his time spent with us delivering lessons, explaining difficulties, and especially being patient with “not-punctual” students like us.

As a result of this different but readily recognisable approach, the student was empowered and self-confident after the course, although she probably learnt less than she would have with Mr ABC. She was also aware that the students had been able to take advantage of the lecturer in order to do less work than they did in other courses.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have considered three different types of translation pedagogy, each conditioned by its time. Classical teaching produced articulate members of the elite, particular through the practice of free translation. Transmissionist teachers ran tightly controlled classes, in which they were the source of knowledge to be passed on to their receptive students. Contemporary theorists encourage instructors to:

1. Adapt classroom organisation by transforming the classroom into a discussion forum and hands-on workshop.

2. Establish contact with the outside world by means of projects which involve professional translators, bilinguals with an aptitude for translation and professionals from the different fields of specialisation (corresponding to the texts to be translated).
3. Design syllabuses that have been thought about beforehand and sequence the material accordingly.
4. Favour an adequate learning environment which will enhance students' potential and respect different learning styles as much as possible.
5. Include as many real life situations as possible so that students have the chance "to live", however slightly, in the professional world. (Davies 2005, p. 71)

Professional translators often complain that the theories of Translation Studies are complicated and of little use in their everyday work. One sympathises with this view but it is important to note that the new sub-discipline of Translation Pedagogy attempts to make scholars and practitioners understand more about what sort of choices exist in the act of the training of new translators and what their consequences might be.

Today it is accepted that graduates should become scholar practitioners, or "practisearchers" (to use Daniel Gile's term), "practitioners-cum-researchers who (wish) to adopt a more scientific approach to their investigation of interpretation" (1995, p. 15, cited in Orlando 2016, p. 54). "Pedagogy" relates to the Greek term "pedagogue", meaning the one charged with taking the student to school and ideally to discovering truth. Our minimum aim as teachers is to remain useful to students while still being able to allow them to move on to play a successful and independent role in society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Parts of this paper have been presented at the 5th Celt International Conference in Semarang, Indonesia during 9-11th September 2017. The conference was a project funded by the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education.

REFERENCES

- Arango-Keeth, F. & Koby, G. (2003) Assessing Assessment: Translator training evaluation and the needs of industry quality assessment. In B. J. Baer, & G. S. Koby, *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking translation pedagogy* (pp. 117-134). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Aveling, H. (2004). A short history of western translation theory. *The Journal of Australian Association of Writing Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.gu.edu.au/school/art/text>
- Baer, B.J. and GS Koby (2003) *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking translation pedagogy*. Amsterdam.: John Benjamins.
- Bell, R.T. (1991) *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman.
- Colina, S. (2003) Towards an empirically-based translation pedagogy. In B. J. Baer, & G. S. Koby, *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking translation pedagogy* (pp. 29-59). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Davies, M. G. (2004) *Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Holmes, J. (2000). The name and nature of translation studies. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (reprinted ed., pp. 180-192), London: Routledge.
- Kelly, D. (2005). *A handbook for translator trainers*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Kelly, D., Martin, A & Martin. (2009). Training and education. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 100-105). London: Routledge.
- Kiraly, D. (1991). *Pathways to Translation*. Kent State University Press, Kent OH.
- Kiraly, D. (2000). *A social constructivist approach to translator education*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Kiraly, D. (2003). From instruction to collaborative construction: A passing fad or the promise of a paradigm shift in translator education? In B. J. Baer,

& G. S. Koby, *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking translation pedagogy* (pp. 3-27). Amsterdam.: John Benjamins.

Lefevere, A. (1990). Translation: its genealogy in the West. In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere, *Translation, History and Culture* (pp. 14-28). New York: Cassell.

Levy, J. (2011). *The art of translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Nord, C. (2005). Training functional translators. In Tennent, M. (Ed.), *Training for the New Millennium* (pp. 209-223). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Olshanskya, N. (2003). After [Isaac] Babel. Teaching communicative competence for translation. In Baer, B.J. & Koby, G.S. *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking translation pedagogy* (pp. 173-190). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Orlando, M. (2016). *Training 21st century translators and interpreters*. Berlin: Frank and Timme.

Robinson, D. (Ed.). (1997). *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester: St Jerome Press.

Seguinot, C (2008). Professionalization and Intervention. In J Kearns (Ed.), *Translator and Interpreter Training: Issues, Methods and Debates*. London: Continuum.

Tennent, M (Ed.). (2005). *Training for the New Millennium*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

18 **Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature**,
Volume 18, Number 1, July 2018, pp. 1 - 18

Ulrych, M. (2005). Training translators: Programmes, curricula, practices. In
M. Tennent (Ed.), *Training for the New Millennium*. Amsterdam: John
Benjamins.

Venuti, L. (Ed.). (2000) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.

Witte, A, Harden, T., Harden, T. R. O. (2007). *Translation in Second Language
Learning and Teaching*. Bern: Peter Lang.

The word 'Celt' is written in a large, light blue, stylized font with a white outline. The letters are bold and have a slightly irregular, hand-drawn appearance. The 'C' is particularly large and rounded, while the 'e' and 'l' are also quite prominent. The 't' is smaller and more upright. The overall style is modern and academic.