Pla Христо
с проекто
vot. 1984
Cop-n

FINLANCE

Andrei Danchev

Institute for Foreign Students, Sofia

TRANSFER AND TRANSLATION

This paper consists of two parts. The first deals with certain aspects of the relation between transfer and translation, and the second with some of the implications of that relation for the theory and practice of foreign language teaching.

I. THE RELATION BETWEEN 'TRANSFER' AND 'TRANSLATION'

1. The Issue. For obvious reasons, 'transfer' is one of the most frequently used terms in applied linguistics today and 'translation' un- doubtedly holds pride of place too. This is hardly surprising, of course, as both terms evidently stand for key notions. But although a great deal has already been said and written about transfer and translation taken separately, less attention has so far been given to some interesting aspects of their relationship. Thus, for example, one of the things worth noting about these two terms is their frequently overlapping usage, although this is to be expected perhaps as a synchronic reflex of their one time synonymy.[1] Etymology apart, however, some kind of a conceptual difference seems to be taken implicitly for granted by the majority of people working in the various areas of applied (and theoretical) linguistics nowadays. And yet the said two terms are often used in similar contexts with reference to more or less identical lexical and grammatical phenomena. The instances of syntagmatic influence of one language upon another are particularly revealing.

Thus, sentences such as *I can't afford on marriage in the English interlanguage of Polish learners are explained as being due to native

---

[1]Since both transfer and translation come from different forms of the same Latin verb (transferre 'carry' and its supine translatum), the original meaning is given prominence in some dictionaries. Thus, for example, in the 1933 edition of the Shorter English Dictionary we find that the first meaning of translation is 'transference, removal or conveyance from one person, place, or condition to another', that is, a definition that can apply equally well to transfer. It is only in some more recent dictionaries that the prevailing present-day 'linguistic' meaning of translation comes first.

language transfer (Arabski 1979:50), and, similarly, the phrase *by this manner, produced by Czech learners of English, is attributed to interference (= 'negative transfer' in that paper) from the corresponding prepositional phrase in Czech (Duškova 1969:18). The evidence can easily be expanded to include all possible languages, but suffice it to refer to L. Selinker's generalizing statements that transfer (of one kind or another) is one of the major causes for the development of interlanguages (Selinker 1972).

On the other hand English phrases such as at the request of (which must have been 'incorrect' when first used) are explained as due to the influence of frequent translation from French into Middle English (Prins 1948:35). (The reverse process, from English into Canadian French, eg. in au-delà de notre contrôle from beyond our control, has been accounted for as being due to interference, cf. Darbelnet 1980:35.) To take another example, attendre sur quelqu'un in Swiss French is described as a 'loan translation' (calque) from German (Marouzeau 1951), and·here too a wide variety of cases illustrating the lasting effect of translation can be adduced from many languages (cf. eg. the data and references in Workman 1940, Weinreich 1953, Haugen 1953, Zvegintsev 1962, Fehling 1980, Birnbaum 1982, Danchev 1982a).

The question arises then: if similar and sometimes even identical examples can be attributed alternatively to transfer and to translation, would that mean that these two terms (and the notions behind them) often boil down to the same thing, after all?

In fact, as early as 1954, Z. Harris wrote of an "inherent connection between transfer and translation" (Harris 1954:259), and L. Duskova admits that her examples of syntactic interference (including the one just mentioned above) are "word-for-word translations of the corresponding Czech expressions" (Duškova 1969:18). V. Ivir too has remarked that "many instances of interference in situations of natural and/or artificial language contact can be viewed in terms of partial or complete translation" (Ivir 1979:91). The issue has also been touched upon briefly in Danchev 1982a but, despite the observations of the above mentioned and some other authors, the connection between transfer and translation does not appear to have been sufficiently explored yet. An examination of the similarities and differences between the meanings and usage of these two terms could have some important implications for applied linguistics in general and more specifically for the theory and practice of foreign language teaching. Understandably,

limitations of time and space do not permit a more extensive survey of the problem here. Therefore only some of the more outstanding points will be considered and attention will be drawn to a number of facts which, though generally well known, so far do not seem to have been related to each other explicitly enough.

To begin with, let us take a quick look at the meanings of 'transfer' and 'translation', taken separately. As is the case with many terms nowadays, there has been a lot of loose, indeterminate, and even contradictory usage in recent years.

2. Transfer. Referring to 'transfer' and 'interference', some authors have spoken of 'terminological confusion' (eg. Debyser 1970; cf. also Rattunde 1974). It is therefore somewhat difficult to offer a single definition of interlingual transfer,[1] but many people will probably accept that it is "... a process in foreign language learning whereby learners carry over what they already know about their first language to their performance in their new language" (Crystal 1980). Others will want to add the proviso that transfer affects a person's first language too and that the process is not confined to situations of foreign language learning only (cf. the broader sense it is used with in the writings of, say, U. Weinreich and E. Haugen). Although there have been quite a few reformulations of 'transfer' in recent years (eg. in Rattunde 1974, Kellerman 1977, Ahunzjanov 1981), most authors continue to speak of 'negative' and 'positive' transfer, the former synonymous with 'interference'. 'Transference' is used occasionally as an alternative term to 'transfer' (cf. eg. Lewandowski 1976, Ahunzjanov 1981), the term 'transposition' can also be met with in a similar sense, and some authors speak also of 'structural carryover' (eg. Neubert 1981).

There are obviously two main types of evidence illustrating interlingual transfer of one kind or another: (1) learners' errors and (2) the results of historical language contacts.

Every language teacher can easily produce numerous examples of first language transfer in second language acquisition and use, although there will often arise contradictory claims over the nature and extent of the process (cf. eg. Richards 1974, Dulay and Burt 1974). But apart from a seemingly

---

[1]As distinct from 'intra-lingual' and other types of transfer.

diminishing number of people who still tend to minimize or even to ignore its existence and effects, transfer is clearly recognized today as one of the basic factors that condition the process of second (third, etc.) language acquisition and use.

Concerning the second type of evidence, the question as to the relation between external and internal factors of language development and change is still controversial. Nevertheless there is a steadily increasing body of data illustrating and confirming A. Martinet's (1952) claim that language contact may turn out to be a major factor of (temporary or permanent) language change. In a considerable number of cases there can hardly exist any doubt indeed that certain changes in some languages are connected with similar changes in neighbouring or otherwise contiguous languages.

The not infrequent coincidence of learners' errors with historical language changes need hardly be elaborated upon here, except to draw additional attention to the fact that large-scale transfer may also occur from L2 to L1, this providing even stronger evidence of the impact and potential of interlingual transfer as a whole.[1] It may be recalled that numerous instances of such influence have been quoted in publications by H. Schuchardt, C. Bally, O. Jespersen and some other early scholars, and have been further documented extensively by U. Weinreich, E. Haugen, B. Havranek, A. Rosetti, V. Rosentzweig and numerous other authors (for additional references cf. Danchev 1982a), work along these lines continuing in recent years too. L2 $\longrightarrow$ L1 transfer in conditions of artificial bilingualism (second language acquisition) has been described too. A great many instances of such transfer can be found in various translations from foreign into native languages. Copious evidence of L2 $\longrightarrow$ L1 transfer has recently also been forthcoming from the numerous publications dealing with the influence of English on various languages all over the world (eg. Carstensen 1979, Darbelnet 1980, Sajavaara and Lehtonen 1981, Fillipović 1982, Danchev 1982b).

---

[1] In Dulay and Burt 1974 it is stated that this kind of evidence is invalid. Within their framework there does not seem to be place for such evidence indeed. It should be noted, however, that they tend to identify transfer with the behaviouristic notion of transfer of habits, without apparently taking into account the fact that there may also exist transfer of (creative) rules from one language into another.

Altogether there exists nowadays an enormous corpus of L2 $\longrightarrow$ L1 transfer evidence, the full significance of which still does not seem to have been sufficiently appreciated by either historical linguists and/or language teaching specialists. Thus, although nothing very new has been said here, an added emphasis may be placed on the fact that transfer is a universal feature of language contact (cf. also Toury 1982). What has been said so far obviously ties in with H. Wode's statements that "we shall have to change our thinking of transfer drastically" and "linguistic theories will have to be revised to incorporate transfer" (Wode 1982). The increasing amount of new evidence that has been forthcoming will naturally serve to reinforce the above claims.

The brief survey of the literature shows that, allowing for individual variations, there are two main types of transfer definitions, which may conveniently be described as the 'narrow' and the 'broad' ones. According to the 'narrow' definitions, transfer is mainly a negative phenomenon affecting the process of language learning in situations of artificial bilingualism. The broader definitions include any kind of transfer between any of the two (or more) languages of a person in conditions of both artificial and natural bilingualism (including historical language contacts).

3. Translation. It is an even more arduous task to offer a single definition of translation. The range of approaches to the problem is rather wide and a detailed review could run into many pages (for surveys and bibliographies of recent work cf. eg. Mounen 1976, Rado 1977, Komisarov 1980, Toury 1980, Newmark 1981). Despite the variety of definitions there are nevertheless certain points that most of them have in common, for example the consideration of translation in terms of interlingual transformations, variously described as 'operations' (Vinay and Darbelnet 1959), 'transformulation' (Bolinger 1966), 'restructuring' (Nida 1969), etc. All transformations evidently presuppose invariant preservation of the basic information content,[1] the choice between the various possible functional equivalents depending on both linguistic and extra-linguistic factors. A full specification of all the possible interlingual transformations is still lacking, but the four basic types - substitution, addition, deletion

---

[1] As is usually pointed out, there is naturally an inevitable loss of meaning, sometimes referred to as 'noises' or 'entropy'.

and transposition - often mentioned (sometimes with other names) in the literature will most certainly form the core of any more expanded descriptions.

From the point of view of the issue under consideration it is evidently necessary to outline at least tentatively the scope of the 'translation' notion. One of the main points here concerns the relation between 'conscious' and 'unconscious' translation. What has been referred to as the 'standard' theory of translation,[1] deals with conscious translation only and interlingual interference is considered merely insofar as it is the cause for poor translation. And while translation as a conscious activity has been envisaged in language change before, for example in showing the influence of the classical and other languages on the written languages of Europe and elsewhere (cf. the references in Danchev 1982a), the existence and study of unconscious translation are still largely neglected by most authors. And yet it has been shown in recent years that in situations of artificial bilingualism there occurs what has been described as 'uncontrollable' (Komisarov 1971), 'spontaneous' (Ljudskanov 1973), 'hidden' and 'unconscious' (Danchev 1978, 1980), 'internal' (Masliko and Popova 1980), etc., translation, irrespective of whether translation has been part of the teaching method or not. Adding to this the data of historical language contacts, there emerges strong evidence suggesting that unconscious translation may be a universal feature of most kinds of bilingualism.[2] It must be admitted, of course, that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between conscious and unconscious translation. On the whole it appears that while lexical and morphological translation (calquing) are often a conscious activity, the borrowing and translation of syntactic patterns is mostly unconscious (Darbelnet 1980, Danchev 1980).

_____

[1] This term has been used in Danchev 1980 and 1982a with reference to theories of translation concerned only with conscious translation from a synchronic point of view.

[2] The evidence showing that there is practically always some degree of interlingual interference, the distinction between 'co-ordinative' and 'sub-ordinative' bilingualism is not kept up here. As has been pointed out by J.D. Deseriev and I.F. Protcenko (quoted in Ahunzjanov 1981), bilingualism is a changing dynamic category. I return thus to H. Paul's broad concept of bilingualism, including both individual and collective bilingualism in conditions of both natural and artificial language contact, irrespective of the speaker's fluency in either of the two languages.

Calquing, which figures prominently in this discussion, is sometimes referred to as a certain 'kind' of translation. In fact, it is literal translation. Incidentally, its 'translational' nature comes out in its equivalents in certain languages, eg. 'loan translation' in English and 'Übersetzunglehnwort' in German. Although grammatical calquing has been considered too (eg. by U. Weinreich), lexical and compound word calquing seem to be more popular. Many authors associate calquing mainly with historical linguistics: thus, according to D. Crystal, calque is a term "used in comparative and historical linguistics to refer to a type of borrowing where the morphemic constituents of the borrowed word or phrase are translated item by item into equivalent morphemes in the new language" (Crystal 1980). But as has been pointed out by C. Mounen, the word-for-word rendering of poor translations amounts to calquing too (Mounen 1974), and at this point we may recall L. Duškova's admission that most of the instances of syntactic interference in her corpus are due to word-for-word (cf. Crystal's 'item by item') translation, that is, one may add here, to calquing. We are faced thus with one of those differences in terminological usage which conceal actual identity. If the term 'calque' should be used more frequently in the literature on foreign language acquisition, additional similarities between historical and applied linguistics will be thrown into relief, and a great deal of data relevant to both disciplines will become more readily available.

The notion of translation can thus be enlarged to include the various types of unconscious translation as well as lexical and grammatical calquing.

It is worth noting that some definitions of translation contain explicit references to transfer. Thus, E. Nida's well-known paper 'Science of Translation' begins with the assertion that translation is "a complex procedure involving analysis, transfer (emphasis provided), and restructuring" (Nida 1969:483). As a matter of fact, in several places in that paper 'transfer' and 'translation' are a bit difficult to distinguish.[1]

_____

[1] For example in the passage, "when event nouns (...) are transferred (emphasis provided) from one language into another, they are generally back-transformed into verb expressions" (Nida 1968:485). In this and some other passages the verb transfer can be replaced by translate without any apparent change of meaning. But on the whole in Nida's usage transfer emerges as more or less equivalent to 'literal translation', ie., to calquing.

According to A. Neubert, "translation amounts to the transfer of messages (emphasis provided) from one language to another" (Neubert 1981:130). The reference to 'message' is to be found in many definitions of translation, but since any speech act by both monolingual and bilingual individuals, even when erroneous in one way or another, is intended to convey some kind of a message, this is hardly to be regarded as specific to translation only.

The connection of transfer with translation is viewed from a somewhat different angle in G. Toury's insightful observation that "there is something in the nature of translating itself which encourages the occurrence of interference forms by realizing the potential language contact in the speaker's brain and triggering the transfer mechanism" (Toury 1982). Some of the implications of the above statement will be discussed at some length a little further on.

As with transfer, there emerge again two main types of definitions, 'narrow' and 'broader' ones. The narrow definitions deal with conscious translation only, whereas the broader ones include also various types of unconscious translation.

4. On Some Differences and Similarities between Transfer and Translation. It is time now to take a somewhat closer look at the differences and similarities between the two notions, some of which have already emerged in the course of the foregoing discussion. The following possible distinctions can be considered.

(a) A conscious vs. an unconscious process. A quick survey of the available literature seems to suggest the possibility of regarding transfer as an unconscious process and translation (in its narrow definition) as a conscious activity. Indeed, in the majority of publications, transfer is described as an uncontrollable process, whereas translation is mostly controlled. However, a number of authors have pointed out that transfer can be intentional too, eg. as a communication strategy in various kinds of 'foreigner talk' (Ferguson 1975) and for other purposes as well (cf. eg. Kellerman 1977, Neubert 1981, Toury 1982). It might also be recalled that U. Weinreich has mentioned the 'conversion formulas' of bilingual speakers and that this kind of natural code switching has been exploited in the 'transfer grammar' of Z. Harris (1954), which may actually be viewed as an instruction of how to translate certain utterances from one language into another (Harris himself speaks of a "proceduralized system of translation"). On the other hand, as

was just pointed out, some authors have pointed to instances of 'uncontrollable', 'spontaneous', 'hidden', 'unconscious', 'internal' and other similar types of partial and complete translation. So on closer examination this distinction turns out to be one of prevailing usage rather than of actual substance.

(b) A 'natural' vs. an 'unnatural' process. This distinction is closely connected with the preceding one, but it will nevertheless be considered separately as this issue has turned out to be controversial. It has been claimed, for example, that "translation is unnatural in that it is not part of the 'natural' performance of a competent speaker or writer of a language" (Neubert 1981:142), that it is "a complex, artificial and unnatural process" (Newmark 1981:97) and that "learners hardly ever translate of their own initiative" (Toury 1982:14).

Empirical observation has shown, however, that learners tend to translate even when asked not to do so. Actually, it is a well-known fact of classroom reality that regardless of the teaching method learners resort to partial or complete translation in order to better understand difficult passages in the target language text. In fact, learners do not seem to feel reassured until they have translated the foreign language text into their own language, and if their teacher refuses to help them, they will do this by themselves. It has been pointed out indeed that "If one is taught a second language, (...) even by something approaching the 'direct method', one usually sets up patterns of translation equivalence" (Halliday et al 1964: 125), and also that "it is difficult to deny an element of translation in most forms of second language learning" (Lewis 1974:75), etc. One feels strongly tempted here to repeat once again L. Ščerba's well-known words that translation can be banned from the classroom, but not from the heads of the learners (Ščerba 1947).

The existence of both artificial and natural translation in a somewhat different setting has been described in a recent publication on multilingualism in Nigeria (Alaba 1981). The view that translation can be regarded as an "innate skill in bilinguals" (Harris and Sherwood 1977) thus has certainly got something to recommend it. The reference to the "notorious incapacity or awkwardness of certain bilinguals to translate from one to the other of their languages" in Newmark 1981 (cf. a similar brief statement in Rosetti 1966), holds true of conscious and correct translation, which certainly requires special training and experience. It may be added, of

course, that the effective use even of one's first language also requires special training and skill. An examination of the speech production of bilinguals who cannot translate properly is nevertheless likely to reveal many instances of partial and/or complete unconscious translation.

To sum up then, whereas transfer seems to be mostly 'natural', translation can be regarded as being both 'natural' and 'unnatural', depending on the scope of the translation notion one is operating with. Basically, however, the above distinction does not seem to be a fundamental one.

(c) Scope. Transfer and translation could also be distinguished by taking into consideration their scope. On the one hand it was seen that definitions of translation often include the notion of transfer as practically identical with literal translation (calquing), translation thus emerging as a broader notion than transfer. On the other hand, however, interlingual transfer affects all language levels, including phonetics and phonology, whereas translation is usually regarded as functioning on the sign levels of language only (although some authors have spoken of 'phonological' translation, cf. eg. Catford 1965). One way or another, it is obvious that within the framework of the broader notion of translation there does not exist any basic distinction between transfer and translation. What regards 'intralingual' transfer ('overgeneralization', 'analogy', etc.), this can be compared to intralingual translation (paraphrasing) and register-switching.

(d) A written vs. an oral activity.[1] It has been suggested that 'translation' is usually taken to refer to the written process in a historical context, whereas 'transfer' is used predominantly in connection with foreign language acquisition. Though undoubtedly true up to a point, this is obviously a distinction of usage and not of substance. Moreover, it is common knowledge that 'transfer' has also been used in connection with historical language contacts, whereas 'translating' (and 'interpreting') is naturally the subject of the essentially synchronically oriented (like language teaching) discipline of translation theory. So here too the distinction does not seem to go very deep.

---

[1] It will be recalled that most languages do not have different words for written and oral translation, as eg. 'translation' and 'interpreting' in English.

In summary, it can be said that if translation is taken to consist mainly of interlingual transformation(s), transfer can then be regarded as isomorphous translation, where the obligatory transformations have not been carried out. What is often called 'negative' transfer normally amounts to partial translation only, distorting the structure of the second language and leading to erroneous utterances. Whereas transfer is often equivalent to calquing, translation usually involves more than one language level and requires a number of transformations. To put it otherwise, in the case of negative transfer the respective utterance has not been fully monitored. The instances of positive transfer are practically indistinguishable from translation, while negative transfer is more or less identical with poor translation. As a matter of fact, according to P. Newmark, "interference, however plausible, is always mistranslation" (Newmark 1981:12).

Transfer may thus be regarded as an incomplete translation process, arrested midway, as it were, where only the substitutions with the 'dominant functional equivalent'[1] have been carried out on the same language level, whereas a complete translation will require additional transformations which will usually cut across more than one language level. Transfer amounts to more or less literal translation and if that happens to be sufficient, then well and good.

Both transfer and translation (in the broad sense) are conscious and unconscious communication strategies on the part of bilingual speakers (including incipient bilinguals) in both naturalistic and tutored settings. What has been said so far seems to warrant the following conclusions:

(1) Both transfer and translation are universal features of any kind of language contact.

(2) There is a certain difference between the narrow definitions of transfer and translation, but there is no essential difference between their broader definitions as discussed above.

The fact that the strong affinity between transfer and translation has not received enough recognition is probably due partly to differences of terminological usage in different linguistic disciplines. The preference for 'transfer' may also be due to the somewhat dubious connotation that 'translation' has acquired over the years in the course of occasionally

---

[1] This term is used in Danchev 1979 and corresponds to 'basic counterpart' in Arabski 1979.

heated arguments over the role of translation in language teaching and acquisition. Moreover, 'transfer' seems to have a more terminological and professional ring about it.

The failure to recognize more explicitly the connections between transfer and translation is very likely also due to the fact that no explicit theoretical connection between the problems of bilingualism and interlingual interference, on the one hand, and translation theory, on the other, would seem to have been established so far. This is probably due to the circumstance that by the time that the main aspects of bilingualism and interference had already been studied extensively, translation theory had still not developed sufficiently to attract wider attention. In fact, many linguists and language teaching specialists (actually most teachers) still do not seem to be aware of translation theory and its implications for both theoretical and applied linguistics.

If the above inferences are correct, one might perhaps rush to the conclusion that it does not matter very much which of the two terms will be used in the future. However, once we realize that most instances of transfer (excluding phonetics and phonology) can be identified with one kind of translation or another, this will inevitably determine one's teaching strategy. If we know that we are dealing with translation, we will look to translation theory to provide us with the appropriate concepts, methodology and terms. This will naturally imply a serious reconsideration of the role of translation in foreign language teaching. It will also become apparent that the relevance of translation theory (which has antedated some of the recent developments in contrastive linguistics, notably its widening of scope so as to include pragmatics, sociolinguistics, etc.) to foreign language teaching has still not been given sufficient attention. In the next section I shall take a brief look at some of the more practical issues arising in this connection.

II. SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

The arguments for and against the use of translation in foreign language teaching have been reviewed periodically over a long period of time (for references and details cf. eg. Beljaev 1965, Dodson 1967, Muskat-Tabakowska 1973, Benediktov 1974, Pasov 1978, Danchev 1978). So instead of repeating

all the points again I shall single out for reconsideration only two of them. The first is based on the consideration of translation as a universal feature of bilingualism, which can be subsumed under 'they do it anyway' formula, and the second concerns translation as an end in itself. It has long been recognized, of course, that as well as being a means to the learning of a foreign language, translation may also be the end towards which the study of the foreign language is directed (cf. eg. Halliday et al 1964, Beljaev 1965).

Once it has been accepted that there does not exist any fundamental difference between the broad notions of transfer and translation and, by common consensus transfer being considered as an important factor in second language acquisition, the same will obviously apply to translation as well. It turns out thus that the role of unconscious/hidden/internal/spontaneous translation in language learning is much greater than is usually assumed, not to mention the fact that many authors and teachers are apparently not even aware of its existence. The fact that translation can be viewed as a natural process stands out then as the central argument in favour of a thorough reconsideration of its use. And if translation is a process that cannot be checked, the obvious thing to do is to try to capture, channel and exploit it. It has been pointed out indeed that "teachers should devise their teaching materials and teaching methodology to accord with, and not to go counter to, the learner's natural abilities" (Wode 1982) and, more specifically, that "the teacher's translation is naturally to be preferred to the pupil's (Taylor 1972:56). Of the numerous similar statements on transfer one can quote A. Leontiev's, according to whom "the phenomenon of transferring skills and habits of the mother-tongue onto a second language takes place independently of our efforts to limit it by a special method and that this kind of transfer is deeply rooted in some general principles of the transfer of knowledge"(Leontiev 1970:19). This view is shared by W. Marton (1973) and others.

The second important argument in favour of translation stems from its constantly increasing social and public importance: it has even been said that we live in the century of translation. In fact, the amount of translation from one language into another is growing rapidly and an increasing number of bilingual people are faced almost daily with the necessity to translate various texts. Statistics and the results of an official inquiry held in France in 1972 indicate that "by the end of this century the demand

for translation will be <u>three times</u> (emphasis provided) as large as it is today" and that "the lack of translations - at the right time and place - will be one of the three main obstacles to the progress of science and technology, the other being the lack of raw materials and the shortage of specialized labour" (Hendrickx 1975:103-4). Bearing in mind all this it is obvious that while learning a foreign language students will only gain if they have also acquired some translation skills, as every bilingual speaker is also a potential translator.

It is important to note the marked difference between the translation needs of the speakers of what may be referred to as 'major' and 'minor' languages.[1] While the normal functioning of minor language societies is inconceivable today without a constant flow of translated information, this applies relatively less so to the major language countries. Thus, for instance, the English-speaking countries are obviously much more self-sufficient informationally,[2] than smaller countries, whose language is spoken only by several million people or so. This is why relatively less public and scholarly attention has been given to translation (and interpreting) in Britain than in a number of smaller European countries. As could well be expected, this is also reflected in the respective attitude to language teaching. And under the influence of most British and American publications on foreign language teaching, in which translation is usually touched upon fleetingly (often negatively) and is sometimes not even mentioned at all (one of the conspicuous exceptions here being Dodson 1967), translation has for a long time been neglected in some smaller countries too, where there has been a considerable and steadily mounting public demand for it. There are cases, of course, for example in English language courses in Britain where the teacher does not know the native language(s) of the learners, in which translation is ruled out for purely practical reasons. Yet such a practice need not be transferred to situations where translation can be performed. Be that as it may, the fact remains that in many quarters there is still scant awareness of the social importance of translation.

In order to remedy this situation it is preferable that translation should be practiced both as a means and end of second (third, etc.) language study.

While under the pressure of circumstances and with the waning popularity of the various direct methods fewer teachers nowadays are likely to reject translation out of hand, most of them still do not seem to know exactly what to do with it. There is still not sufficient clarity concerning some of the temporal, qualitative and quantitative parameters of translation. To put it simply, it is still not quite clear WHAT, WHEN, HOW MUCH and HOW to translate. Since it would obviously be quite impossible to answer all these questions exhaustively here, only some of what would seem to be the more relevant points will be discussed briefly below, proceeding from some recent experience.[1]

1. <u>WHAT should be translated?</u> Two types of texts, from and into the second language, come under consideration here. The L2 —> L1 translation is naturally easier and should therefore precede the L1 —> L2 translation. However, the latter must not be delayed too much, as two-way translation has come to be regarded as more effective than uni-directional translation (Barhudarov 1966). The two types of translation are used for the following purposes:

L2 —> L1: for (1) comprehension control after the introductory text has been decoded in all possible ways - audio-visually, through contextual cues, etc. As has already been pointed out, the rationale behind this is 'they do it anyway, so it had better be under the teacher's control'. (2) The second aim of translation at this stage is the gradual acquisition and training of translation skills.

L1 —> L2: By proceeding from a L1 text the learner is induced to generate all the new grammatical and lexical material he is supposed to have internalized so far. By being confined to a specific text the learner is prevented from going into avoidance tactics of difficult constructions. It has been claimed that this kind of translation amounts to setting traps

---

[1] The distinction between 'major' and 'minor' languages is, of course, purely in terms of statistics (numbers of speakers).

[2] This is probably one of the reasons why many British and especially American authors often fail to quote publications from outside Britain or the United States and/or written in languages other than English.

---

[1] My own observations on the use of translation are based on a six-term classroom testing period of An English Course for Bulgarians by A. Danchev, E. Nachkova, B. Vousheva, N. Stoilova, T. Kmetova, I. Angelova, P. Benatova, E. Todeva (under the supervision of A. Danchev) (publ. forthcoming, Sofia, 1983), which proved more effective than the British and American courses used at the Foreign Language Centre at the Institute for Foreign Students in Sofia.

and that it only reinforces interference. Observation has shown, however, that a learner is likely to fall into those 'traps' anyway and that, by teaching him how to switch languages/codes correctly, he can be shown how to avoid the traps, consciousness raising helping him to develop his inner self-control (cf. also Bouton 1974). Admittedly, L1 —> L2 translation does invite interference indeed, but this is done in order to overcome it and to create anti-interference immunity and resistance, so to speak (cf. Bogin 1970). Translation is used to neutralize the incorrect transfer virus, to use figurative language.

Within each lesson or unit a TEXT to TEXT cycle is thus completed. The learner sets out from a L2 text which he gradually decodes and internalizes through appropritate drilling and exercising, in the course of which he is also able to use his first language, and the final text is designed to make him produce a second language text. Thus, whereas at the beginning of the teaching cycle the learner starts with L2 text analysis, at the end of the cycle he should be able to synthesize a similar target language text.

It goes without saying that the texts ought to be well selected and communicatively motivated from the very beginning, so as to sustain interest throughout the exercise. This is important, as it has been observed that "translation passages are usually poorly selected and graded" (Green 1970: 218). Learners must naturally translate only texts within their ability and fiction should be given only to very advanced students. Rather than using isolated sentences, it is advisable that the passages for translation should be communicatively complete.

2. WHEN should learners translate? Opinions vary here. Thus, for example, translation can and should be used during the initial stages (Taylor 1972), after the initial stages (Muskat-Tabakowska 1973), and towards the final stages (Bouton 1974). In fact, all possible views are to be met with. However, since transfer sets in with the very first instants of language contact, translation should begin at more or less the same time too, so as to capture and channel the transfer process. This is, of course, not to be taken to mean that a lesson should begin with translation. As has been indicated above, the L2 —> L1 translation should come only after all the other procedures for text decoding and explicitation have been exhausted. Concerning the L1 —> L2 translation, the optimal time seems to be at the end of a learning cycle.

3. HOW MUCH time should be given to translation? If the introductory text has been well written and has also been competently presented by means of both ostensive and contextual devices, its translation should not take up more than a few minutes of classroom time.

The L1 —> L2 translation can be assigned for homework, and then its correction and discussion in class need not take up more than ten to fifteen minutes. The time devoted to translation thus does not take up more than five to ten percent of the overall teaching time.[1] In special translation classes the percentage will be much higher, of course.

4. HOW should learners translate? Two problems emerge here. The first consists of striking the right balance between literal (interlinear) and functional (adequate) translation. For obvious reasons, learners (and sometimes teachers, too) tend to translate literally. It is part of their intuitive search for 'one to one' identification, which leads to simplifications in their interlanguages. By means of functional translation, learners are made more keenly aware of the fact that certain elements in one language may have several equivalents in another language, often forming a whole 'fan' (Danchev 1979). The 'fan of correspondences', as the paradigm of translation equivalents may also be called, is headed by the dominant functional equivalent. This is usually recognized correctly, but is then overgeneralized as the sole equivalent of a given element in the language from which one translates.

Although literal translation is mostly rejected (cf. Green 1977:218), it may be used occasionally (cf. Mackey 1965, Rivers 1968, Rogova 1975) as a temporary explicitation device for the clarification of constructions specific to a certain language. For example, the English construction What was the weather like? is sometimes rendered by Bulgarian learners through a semi-literal translation Kato kakvo beše vremeto? where the initial element kato is used to make explicit the function of like. Learners usually demonstrate their awareness that such a construction is stylistically clumsy in Bulgarian and, after it has served its purpose, they discard it in favour of the correct one (Kakvo beše vremeto?). Similar translations have been

---

[1] The average lesson in the above mentioned English Course for Bulgarians takes up ten to twelve classroom periods (of 45 minutes each).

recorded of English constructions with the prop word one. Such meta-linguistic
practices have a reassuring effect as they help learners to internalize more
speedily the structure of the second language. A contrastive analysis of the
literal and functional translations may prove a useful teaching device (cf.
also Mackey 1965), showing what further transformations must be performed.
This can obviously be used as a consciousness-raising exercise in self-
monitoring.

The second question here is whether translation theory should be given
to learners in any explicit form. The answer to this question is usually
negative, but the opposite case could be argued as well. The introduction
of certain of the concepts and terms of translation theory can be helpful.
To begin with, without using any terminology the process and result of
translation cannot be described and discussed adequately, nor can they be
related explicitly enough to what learners usually know about language in
general. There is also the fact that as a whole people nowadays are more
'terminologically minded' than in the past and that this trend can be
expected to continue. Indeed, it has been found that learners react favour-
ably to the limited use of translation theory terminology as it enables them
to rationalize about what they have been doing.

The following concepts and terms could be adopted for classroom use.
First of all it is useful to introduce the universal translatability
postulate, combined with the compensation principle, applied in the case of
lexical, grammatical, stylistic, pragmatic and other gaps. This makes
learners realize at an early stage that practically everything in their own
language can be rendered into any other language, provided they go about it
in the right way. Learners can also be made familiar with the notion of
functional equivalent, which helps them to distinguish more clearly between
literal and functional translation. The teacher may also describe and name
the basic translation transformations, mentioned above. The fact that the
output text may sometimes be shorter or longer than the input text tends to
puzzle and disturb some learners. They can be told then that text
compression and decompression are frequent concomitants of the translation
process, etc.

The use of translation as outlined somewhat sketchily in this paper
differs significantly from the traditional grammar-translation method, where
translation is the basic teaching device. Translation should by no means be

central in the overall approach, although it must constitute one of its
important ingredients. To administer translation is 'easy' (cf. Mackey
1965:153) at first sight only. The truth of the matter is that the
competent handling of translation requires a sound knowledge of both its
theory and practice.

The issues considered in this paper should not lead one to the conclusion
that transfer and translation are complete synonyms, although they have more
in common than is usually assumed. The closer identification of transfer
with translation offers some new insights into the scope and importance of
the latter. The obvious inference to be drawn from this is that translation
theory is relevant not only to the study and teaching of translation as a
utilitarian pursuit, but that it can also be useful to language teaching
specialists. Every foreign language teacher will therefore be well advised
to familiarize himself at least with the rudiments of translation theory.
It is one of the disciplines that illustrate quite conspicuously the swing
towards macrolinguistic as against microlinguistic models of language and
language teaching.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahunzjanov, E.M. 1981. Obščee jazikoznanie (General linguistics).
    Kazan: Izdatelstvo kazanskogo universiteta.

Alaba, O. 1981. Natural versus artificial translation: a case for folk
    etymology, Babel 27, 17-20.

Arabski, J. 1979. Errors as indications of the development of interlanguage.
    Katowice.

Barhudarov, L. 1966. Rol perevoda kak sredstva razvitija ustnoj i pismenoj
    reči na starsih kursah jazikovogo vuza (The role of translation in the
    development of the oral and written speech of students in higher
    university courses), Tetradi perevodčika 3, 82-87.

Beljaev, B.V. 1965. Očerki po psihologii obučenija inostrannim jazikam
    (Outlines of the psychology of foreign language teaching). Moscow.

Benediktov, B.A. 1974. Psihologija ovladenija inostrannim jazikom (The
    psychology of foreign language acquisition). Minsk: Višejšajá škola.

Birnbaum, H. 1982. Notes on syntactic change: cooccurrence vs. substitution,
    stability vs. permeability, in J. Fisiak (ed.), Trends in linguistics:
    Historical syntax, The Hague & Paris: Mouton (publ. forth.).

Bogian, G. 1970. O zadačah i metodike obučenija perevodu s rodnogo jazika na inostrannij na pedagogičeskih fakultetah jazikovih vuzov (On the aims and methods of teaching native to foreign language translation at the pedagogical faculties of language teaching universities), Tetradi perevodčika 7, 98-108.

Bolinger, D. 1966. Transformulation: structural translation, Acta linguistica hafniensia 9, 130-144.

Bouton, C.P. 1974. L'acquisition d'une langue étrangère. Paris.

Carstensen, B. 1979. The influence of English on German - syntactic problems, Studia Anglica Posnaniensia 11, 65-77.

Catford, J.C. 1965. A linguistic theory of translation: an essay in applied linguistics. London: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D. 1980. A first dictionary of linguistics and phonetics. London: André Deutsch.

Danchev, A. 1978. Otnovo po vaprosa za prevoda pri čuždoezikovo obučenie (Again on translation in foreign language teaching), Ruski i zapadni ezici (Sofia) 5, 21-32: 6, 21-29.

Danchev, A. 1979. Kontrastivna lingvistika, analiz na greškite i čuždoezikovo obučenie (Contrastive linguistics, error analysis and foreign language teaching), Sapostavitelno ezikoznanie i čuždoezikovo obučenie, I, Veliko Tarnovo, 11-31.

Danchev, A. 1980. Za razširen obseg na teorijata na prevoda (For a broader scope of translation theory), Izkustvoto na prevoda 4, 56-69, Sofia: Narodna kultura.

Danchev, A. 1982a. Translation and syntactic change, in J. Fisiak (ed.), Trends in linguistics: Historical syntax, The Hague & Paris: Mouton (publ. forthc.).

Danchev, A. 1982b. English-Bulgarian language contacts - findings and problems. Paper presented at the English-Bulgarian Symposium, London University, July 6th-9th.

Darbelnet, J. 1980. Bilinguisme et traduction. Le français moderne: revue de linguistique française 4, 319-326.

Debyser, F. 1970. La linguistique contrastive et les interférences, Langue Française 8, 31-61.

Dodson, C.J. 1967. Language teaching and the bilingual method. London: Pitman.

Dulay, H.C. and M.K. Burt 1974. You can't learn without goofing: an analysis of children's second language 'errors', in Richards 1974, 95-123.

Duškova, L. 1969. On sources of errors in foreign language learning, IRAL 7, 11-36.

Fehling, D. 1980. The origins of European syntax, Folia linguistica historica 1, 353-387.

Ferguson, C.A. 1975. Toward a characterization of English foreigner talk, Anthropological linguistics 17, 1-14.

Fillipović, R. 1982. The English element in European languages. Reports and studies 2. Zagreb.

Green, J.F. 1970. The use of the mother tongue and the teaching of translation, English language teaching 24, 218-219.

Halliday, M.A.K., A. McIntosh and P. Strevens 1964. The linguistic sciences and language teaching. London: Longmans.

Harris, Z.S. 1954. Transfer grammar, International journal of American linguistics 4, 259-270.

Harris, B and B. Sherwood 1977. Translating as an innate skill, NATO Symposium on language, interpretation and communication, New York and London: Plenum Press (quoted from Newmark 1981).

Haugen, E. 1953. The Norwegian language in America. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hendrickx, P.V. 1975. Should we teach translation? Babel 3, 101-106.

Ivir, V. 1979. Remarks on contrastive analysis and translation, in H. Raabe (ed.), Trends in kontrastiver Linguistik 1 (2nd. rev. ed.), Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 93-104.

Kellerman, E. 1977. Towards a characterization of the strategy of transfer in second language learning, Interlanguage studies bulletin 2/1.

Komisarov, V.N. 1971. Obučenie inostrannomu jaziku i perevod (Foreign language teaching and translation), Ruskij jazik za rubežom 2, 49-59.

Komisarov, N.N. 1980. Lingvistika perevoda (The linguistics of translation). Moscow.

Leontiev, A.A. 1970. Nekotorie problemi obučenija ruskomu jaziku kak inostrannomu (Some problems of teaching Russian as a foreign language). Moscow: Izdatelstvo moskovskogo universiteta.

Lewandowski, T. 1976. Linguistisches Wörterbuch 3. Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer.

Lewis, E.G. 1974. Linguistics and second language pedagogy: a theoretical study. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

Ljudskanov, A. 1973. K voprosu o naučnoj osnove "perevodčeskih" upražnenij v učebnike po izučeniju ruskogo jazika inostrancami (On the scientific basis of "translation" exercises in the Russian language textbook for foreigners), MAPRJAL, 153-160, Sofia.

Mackey, W.F. 1965. Language teaching analysis. London: Longmans.

Martinet, A. 1952. Diffusion of language and structural linguistics, Romance philology 6, 5-13.

Marouzeau, J. 1951. Lexique de la terminologie linguistique. Paris.

Marton, W. 1973. Contrastive analysis in the classroom, Papers and studies in contrastive linguistics 1, 15-22.

Masliko, E.A. and T.V. Popova 1980. Vnutrjonnij perevod v obučenii govorenju na inostrannom jazike (Internal translation in teaching foreign language speaking), Metodika obucenija na inostrannom jazike 10, Minsk, 83-89.

Mounen, G. (ed.) 1974. Dictionnaire de la linguistique. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Mounen, G. 1976. Linguistique et traduction. Bruxelles: Dessart et Mardaga.

Muskat-Tabakowska, E. 1973. The function of translation in foreign language teaching, Papers and studies in contrastive linguistics 1, 131-140.

Neubert, A. 1981. Translation, interpreting and text linguistics, Studia Linguistica (Lund) 35, 130-145.

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

Nida, E. 1969. Science of translation, Language 45, 483-498.

Pasov, E.I. 1977. Osnovi metodiki obučenija inostrannim jazikam (Basic methods of foreign language teaching). Moscow: Izdatelstvo russkij jazik.

Prins, A.A. 1948. French phrases in English, Neophilologus 32, 28-39, 73-82.

Rado, G. 1977. An international bibliography on translation, Babel 2, 88-96.

Rattunde, E. 1974. Transfer - Interferenz? Probleme der Begriffsdefinition bei der Fehleranalyse, Die neueren Sprachen 1, 4-14.

Richards, J. (ed.) 1974. Error analysis. London: Longman.

Rivers, W. 1968. Teaching foreign-language skills. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rogova, G.V. 1975. Methods of teaching English. Leningrad: Prosveščenie.

Rosetti, A. 1945. Langue mixte et langues mélangées, Acta Linguistica 5.

Sajavaara, K. and J. Lehtonen. 1981. English influence on modern Finnish. in S. Johansson and B. Tysdall (eds.), Papers from the First Nordic Conference for English Studies, Oslo, 385-397.

Ščerba, L.V. 1947. Prepodavanie inostrannih jazikov v srednej škole. Obščie voprosi metodiki (Teaching foreign languages in secondary schools. General questions of methods). Moscow and Leningrad.

Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage, IRAL 10, 209-231.

Taylor, C.V. 1972. Why throw out translation? English language teaching 27, 56-57.

Toury, G. 1980. In search of a theory of translation. Jerusalem: Academic Press.

Toury, G. 1982. Transfer as a universal of verbal performance of L2 learners in situations of communication in translated utterances. Jyväskylä 1982 Cross-language analysis conference paper. Published in this volume.

Vinay, J.P. and J. Darbelnet 1958. Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Paris and Montréal.

Weinreich, U. 1953. Languages in contact: Findings and problems. New York.

Wode, H. 1982. Aspects of language acquisition. 1982 Jyväskylä summer school of linguistics lecture. Published in this volume.

Workman, S.K. 1940. Fifteenth century translation as an influence on English prose. Princeton studies in English, XVIII.

Zvegincev, V.A. 1962. Očerki po obščemu jazikoznaniju (Outlines of general linguistics). Moscow: Izdatelstvo moskovskogo universiteta.