CHAPTER V
RETHINKING TRANSLATION PEDAGOGY

Problematizing Context in Translation Pedagogy

My research stems from the need to elaborate principled translation pedagogy that teachers might adopt to fit their specific teaching needs. This teaching method aims to provide humanist education, translational competence, and social skills to the students. In this dissertation, I argue that this teaching method should be interdisciplinary and should open future translators at the onset of their education to a broader range of translation perspectives and to various skills displayed by professional translators could be an answer to the various problems that undermine the development of applied translation or translation pedagogy. It is a teaching approach that, in my view, foregrounding humanist, social-constructivist, and empowering approaches to education on the one hand, reconciling linguistic-oriented and non-linguistic-oriented translation stances on the other hand, and integrating emerging skills such as writing and computer literacy. For one thing, translation studies as I discussed at the beginning of this dissertation has been undermined by several issues. These problems have adversely affected translation teaching, which has been neglected and relegated to a scaffolding status for learning other disciplines. Teachers have approached it by minsticking their own college teachers who had little translation teaching experience and whose concerns were to deliver what Jean Réné Ladmiral had named the "performance magistrale" (1977) in which the raaster
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transmitted his or her knowledge to an inactive apprentice. Translation practitioners and scholars have made little attempt to communicate among themselves and exchange information related to their practices. They have worked from the perspectives of their disciplines and have talked about others only to stigmatize their work. These conflicting viewpoints have heightened ideological and political problems to translation studies.

Another issue has been the institutional locations of translation studies in the departments of Linguistics, English, and Comparative Literature. Territoriality has brought up unequal power relations problems between translation studies and the traditionally established disciplines that have hosted them and have relegated them to ancillary roles. As a result of their secondary status, translation scholars have received little attention and funding to develop their discipline. Beyond all of the above issues, translation has been the space that has helped powerful states and institutions to orchestrate and perpetuate various social, cultural, ideological, and political agendas both in the past and in the present, contributing to raise philosophical and psychological questions about what it means and how it is performed. To put it in a nutshell, translation is a problem in itself, a problematic that induces concomitant actions of various forces and factors: translator, commissioner, institution, education, and culture. The constellation of difficulties in translation calls for an integrative teaching method, a strategy designed to reconcile all the susceptibilities in a unity in diversity so that teachers move forward to tackle absolutely major pedagogical problems such as "the lack of clear objectives, curricular materials, and teaching methods" (Donald Kiraly, 1995: 5). Indeed, translation studies is a
wide unitarian territory that can accommodate various linguistically, culturally, ideologically and politically oriented strands just like a state would do with a variety of political parties significant or not. But the analogy stops there. Unlike political parties, translation studies is an intellectual territorial superstructure that provides space to archetypes of epistemologies that enabled its blooming and at the same time its fragmentation, a fragmented context to which future translators and teachers of translation must be sensitive to thrust diversity in unity. While it is believed that fragmentation of the field is a source of hindrance to and inhibition of translation studies, I argue that it is a regular process that increases the ways of knowing and diversity, just as in other disciplines like literature, mathematics, sociology. Translation is a multifaceted task the teaching of which calls for an efficient pedagogy that equip the students with philosophical, theoretical, practical, ethical knowledge of the discipline and professional practices often required of employers in job ads and workplaces so that they are fit to adapt to any translating situation and to be interested, for the sake of their profession, in other lenses of translation to stretch the boundaries of the culture of the discipline (Newman, 1852). The teaching of translation has evolved from its ancillary status in the past to full-fledged status in the present and teachers have drawn from new insights in foreign language teaching and linguistics to sketch pedagogical models.

Historicizing Translation Teaching: Past Teaching Methods

The "Rhetoric Springboard Method"

In the past, teachers have used various methods based on the linguistic equivalence, correspondence, persuasion, and reflectivity. From ancient Rome until the
1960s, translation has been used as a tool to facilitate learning or improvement of skills in disciplines such as rhetoric, grammar, and foreign language teaching. Famous Greek orators such as Cicero, Pliny the Younger, and Quintilian, consider translation as a pedagogical method of invention of new and effective speeches. Thus Latin versions of Greek speeches were used to teach rhetoric. Also, because of the bilingual nature of Roman education, Greek and Latin were taught in schools, translation tests were customarily administered in language learning and literary study (Venuti, 2004).

Linguistic analysis and sentence exposition techniques were used by grammarians and foreign language teachers. These different ways of teaching translation call for a number of questions: Were teachers aware that translation is a problematic issue? What practical knowledge did they teach to their students that they can use to solve real-life translating problems? How broad were the translation experiences that students of rhetoric and foreign languages received? Was it the context and the very limited knowledge of translation problems that led teachers to rely on the above methods of teaching this subject as is suggested in Gagne? In The Conditions of Learning, Gagne believes “human learning varies according to the context and subject matter being learned.” The context of interest is that of teaching translation as a discipline rather than as a subject.

The Grammar Translation Method

By the nineteenth century, the demise of Latin as a living language in schools had set the stage for a new method of language study modeled on the Latin teaching method which was believed to be an intellectual booster (Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers, 2001). In Teaching Foreign Languages: An Historical Sketch, Tuine, R., citing
V. Malison, explains that "...once the Latin tongue had ceased to be a normal vehicle for communication, ... it most speedily became a "mental gymnastics," ... a disciplined and systematic study of which was held to be indispensable as a basis for all forms of higher education" (1968: 26, qtd. in Richards and Rodgers, 2001). In the eighteenth century in European schools, the teaching of modern languages duplicated the very method used to teach Latin, making an opening to the teaching of translation. This method, which consists in parsing the grammar of a foreign language and rendering various uncontextualized sentences to fixate the rules of grammar in the minds of students, became known as the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM).

In the United States, the same method was known as The Ciceronian or the Prussian method of Teaching the Elements of the Latin Language (Kelly, 1969). This method of teaching, as discussed in Richards and Rodgers (2001), had distinctive features that made it become popular. Among other things, the goal of foreign language study was to read its literature or to promote the growth of intellectual capabilities. Students study in-depth discrete grammar items and apply them through translating of sentences and texts into and out of the target language. These strategies were known as "theme" and "version" in French foreign language teaching circles. The Grammar-Translation method has promoted rote learning of rules and facts so as to understand and manipulate the morphology and syntax of the foreign language (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). While rote learning helped students play around with rules of grammar, it did little to equip them with the communicative language skills needed in real life situations. Students acquired mastery of the structure of language by translating pre-fabricated, decontextualized, and
bookish sentences and texts, which, at the end of the day, incapacitated them to perform in normal life settings. Another feature of the Grammar-Translation method is its privileging of reading and writing to the detriment of speaking and learning which results in the inability of students to use the four language learning skills: speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

The Vocabulary Acquisition Process

Rather than providing authentic and meaningful contexts to teach vocabulary, words are sorted out from the reading passages assigned and presented in bilingual and decontextualized form to students, who, in turn, memorize them together with grammar items studied and then proceed to the translation of pre-woven sentences and texts. The sentence has become the basic unit of teaching and practice to facilitate language learning (Howatt, 1984: 131). The reason for teaching students in this manner was to make them proficient in translation in order to do well in the ever increasing number of written examinations (1984: 132). Grammar was then taught in a graded and systematic way. Rules were learned and practiced through translations of sentences and texts. Finally, the mother tongue was the medium of instruction; new concepts were explained in that medium, and students learn to compare grammar items between the first and second language. Stern, quoted in Richards and Rodgers (2001), pointed out that the first language was maintained as the reference system in the acquisition of the second language” (1983: 455). From the 1840s to 1940s, the Grammar-Translation method was popular in foreign language teaching circles in Europe; however, it was a method of teaching based on experience only, an experience derived from the teaching of Latin. According
to Richards and Rodgers, neither a language teaching theory informed it nor a body of research rationalized or justified its use (2001). Despite its high status in teaching translation as a subject, the Grammar-Translation method confined itself to teaching grammatical and lexical skills in a way that was lifted from our daily routines but consistent with its goal of preparing students to read and write so that they would be fit to take written exams.

Re-Envisioning the Goals of Translation Pedagogy

The experience of the Grammar-translation method triggers the following fundamental question: What is the goal of a translation education? In other words, what is that we want our students to become and/or to do with their education? Our goal is to prepare our students who at the end of their education display the competence and skills of professional translators. In "Empirically-based translation pedagogy," Sonia Colina suggests that the goal of translation teaching is to promote the acquisition of "communicative translational competence," which the translator scholar and teacher Donald Kirkby defines as the "ability to interact appropriately and adequately as an active participant in the communicative translational tasks" (1990: 215). Unlike the role of the passive translator who receives ready-made solutions and applies them to translating situations as exemplified in the Grammar-Translation method, "communicative translational competence" entails that the translator is an active individual who accounts for the original text in context, the translation norm, and the stakeholders in the process (client, translator, author, target audience) in order to render a translated text that is relevant to the requirements of the task and the intended setting. While Kirkby's approach
to translational competence is significant, it is limited in its scope, a shortcoming that lead Colina (2003) to draw from Wilts's (1976) concept of “supercompetence” and to propose that a translational communicative competence should include interlingual and intercultural communicative competences (2003: 31). However, because translation is a multi-faceted task, that excludes improvisation and approximation, I argue that translation pedagogy must have several goals that should be taken into account all together in order to expose students to the rich varieties of skills that will build their confidence as translators and to take them to the level of expertise inherent in professional translators. Thus, I propose that the goals of translation education are to foster 1) “communicative translational competence” (Colina, 2003), 2) “interlingual and intercultural communicative competence” (Colina, 2003), 3) pragmalinguistic translational competence, 4) ideological and political translational competence, 5) critical discourse translational competence, and 6) attentiveness and professional behavioral translational competence.

Searching For the Appropriate Teaching Method

Translation is a complex activity that requires of the practitioners to tap from their schema, contextual, pragmatic, pragmatic, cognitive, and communicative knowledge in order to perform appropriately in any translational situation. As the Grammar-Translation accounts for none of these skills, linguists began to distance themselves from it and challenged it by proposing other methods of foreign language teaching. In the mid and late nineteenth century, several European states realized the shortcomings of the Grammar-Translation method and started to explore linguistic and
language learning theories to inform foreign language teaching. These new insights that became known as the Reform Movement rejected translation teaching as a tool for teaching foreign languages (Richards and Rodgers, 2001) because of its misuse. However, the loss of interest in teaching translation didn’t last long. Translation teaching gathered momentum thanks to the strained international situation with the United States offensive in World War II. The United States administration needed language specialists in different languages to help with translation tasks and, upon its request, fifty-five American universities began to develop foreign language programs for military personnel (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Nonetheless, this frenzy for translation specialists didn’t lead to the formal integration of translation courses in foreign language teaching. Subsequent methods that were developed by linguists in France, Germany, England, and the United States, prioritized the teaching of aural-oral language skills and pronunciation and translation was overlooked or taught when it was needed. However, these new methods have provided efficient theoretical frameworks that could be appropriated and adapted to the teaching of translation. One of these theoretical underpinnings is the communicative competence derived from second language acquisition theory (SLA). This method which has gained momentum since the late 1960s and continues until now around the world came into being as a result of the conjunction of events in foreign language teaching: Noam Chomsky’s (1957) criticism of structural linguistic theory, British applied linguists’ observation that approaches in language teaching at that time failed to integrate the functional and communicative aspect of language, and drawing on research in functional linguistics, sociolinguistics, and
philosophy, Christopher Candlin (1973) and Henk Widdowson's (1978), call for a language teaching method that emphasizes communicative proficiency rather than mastery of structures. Hence the push for the communicative language teaching approach which has provided translators with powerful theoretical frameworks to inform their teaching.

Current Teaching Methods

The 1990s have seen the tale-tell sign of revival in translation pedagogy. Teachers interested in pedagogy have turned to new methodologies elaborated for foreign language teaching that disrupts the traditional ones highlighted in the Grammar-translation method. As evidenced in Richards and Rodgers’s "Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching" and Brian James Baer and Geoffrey S. Kyby’s (2003) "Introduction: Translator. Pedagogy: The other theory," breakthrough in foreign language teaching during the last two decades has been characterized by the switch from behaviorist models (Skinner 1957, Brown, 1980) to cognitive models (Bloom, Dewey, 1938, Vygotsky, ) of language acquisition has provided teachers with new methodological insights, an awareness that the students’ higher level critical thinking abilities could be used to express, interpret, and negotiate meaning in the process of acquisition of language.

As a discipline, translation deserves considerable attention in relation to its leverage in society and among other disciplines of the humanities. In Translation Teaching: From Research to the Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers, Soma Colna (2003) approaches translation teaching from a linguistic vantage point. Based on the premise that teaching must rely on research conclusions, she circumscribed her area of research within the
larger framework of the discipline as drawn in Holmes’s (1988) and Toury’s (1980, 1995) maps, which I will not include in this study since they are out of scope. Briefly speaking, in “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies,” Holmes defines translation studies as an empirical discipline that has two main orientations, which Carl G. Hempel expressed as to “to describe particular phenomena in the world of our experience and to establish general principles by means of which they can be explained and predicted” (Venuti, 2004: 184).

Holmes split Translation Studies into two broad areas of research: the pure and the applied branches. The pure translation studies branch is a series of objective-oriented hierarchies: descriptive translation studies and translation theory. The descriptive has three levels of concentration while the theoretical is divided into two levels, general and partial, with the partial level split into six specific objectives. The applied branch has three levels of hierarchy: translation training, translation aids, and translation criticism. While Holmes’s map focuses on objectives only, Toury’s (1995) map favors interaction between the pure and applied extensions and objectives. Colina’s map has been a revision of the two previous maps to allow translation pedagogy to interact with all other levels of hierarchy within the applied extensions, an interaction that makes room for the missing link, that is, the “subarea” that utilizes the findings of theoretical and descriptive research to elaborate teaching methods that practitioners can use to create their own teaching aids.

Today, reflexive, pragmatic and experiential methods which consider the individual learner as the central part of the learning process (Jarvis et al, 1998) have come
to the fore. In *Experience and Nature*, John Dewey (1958) argued that in order to be effective, education must provide the learner with much more than "predigested facts or bodies of knowledge." It must rather allow the learner to become part of the activity of learning, making knowledge as well as receiving it. To achieve this goal, an interdisciplinary pedagogy will be more effective than translation teaching. The problem of interdisciplinarity in higher education is not a novelty. It has surfaced to defy the domination of the single disciplines as a manner to structure curricula (John Goodlad, 1979). However, in translation teaching, interdisciplinarity is a vital avenue to explore because it involves extensive knowledge and culture to render texts with efficiency.

Translating today is no longer a matter of word, phrase, and sentence, correspondence or equivalence. It encompasses many more variables such as denotations, ideologies, power relations and extends to other forms of knowledge to include social, historical, psychological, cognitive, and pragmatic aspects. Recently, feeble attempts have been made to implement interdisciplinary translation pedagogy.

Interdisciplinary Curricula in Colleges

In *Interdisciplinary Curricula: Challenges to Implementation*, Sam Wineburg and Pam Grossman (2000) treat interdisciplinarity as a process that allows "students to see patterns in chaos, transcend surface detail, and see the 'big picture' that so often eludes us as [teachers of translation]." (5). As teachers of translation, our goal is not only confined to the "big picture" but also to reach beyond our own niche to make sense of the critically vital part of what is happening in other disciplines that is pertinent to our own work without losing focus of our objectives. In *Interdisciplinarity: History, Theory,*
Practice, Klein (1990) has articulated that pioneer curricula such as Robert Maynard Hutchins’s at the University of Chicago, the Western Civilization courses at Columbia, or the “Social and Economic Institutions” courses developed at Amherst College, emerged in response to the phobia of specialization that came along with the outburst of scientific knowledge in the 20th century. It was then believed that a learned person needed a panoramic knowledge to cope with the fast and ever increasing knowledge of this century. Thus an integrated curriculum was implemented to help students expand their panoramic knowledge of different disciplines rather than focusing on a single one (Wineburg and Grossman, 2000). However, in translation studies the particulars are different. They are about developing the competence of translation students. In “Humanities computing as interdisciplinary” (1999), Willard McCarty, in Munday (2001), conceives interdisciplinary in a challenging role:

A true interdisciplinary is … not easily understood, funded or managed in a world already divided along disciplinary lines, despite the standard pieties. Rather it is an entity that exists in the interstices of the existing fields, dealing with some, many or all of them. It is the Phoenician trade among the settled nations. Its existence is enigmatic in such a world: the enigma challenges us to rethink how we organize and institutionalize knowledge (McCarty, 1999).

Thus an interdisciplinary interpolates us to think unnaturally about translation and to bridge the gap between knowledge derived from other disciplines and translation studies. In its new shape, interdisciplinary needs wide acceptance in academia but at the same time it needs circumspection from traditional disciplines. I argue that
Interdisciplinarity is part of a package that translation scholars should embrace to inculcate in their students the sense of responsibility to cultivate the habit of exploring knowledge from other disciplines to inform their own. Translation studies has become the "Phoenician trader" that reached out to not only traditional disciplines such as linguistics, semantics, but also emerging disciplines such as cultural studies, postcolonial studies, gender studies, hermeneutics, deconstruction, critical discourse analysis. Moreover, the "Phoenician trader" must strive to establish dynamic ties with its partners and to remain open to anything that reinforces or consolidates it.

Current Interdisciplinary Translation Teaching Approaches

In the context of what Munday (2001) has called "globalized information-rich society," interdisciplinarity is an avenue that promises to keep pace with the swift creation and dissemination of knowledge by filling in the information gap. In recent years, translation scholars have approached interdisciplinarity in specific ways. In Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach, the Vienna-based scholar, teacher and translator Mary Snell-Hornby has attempted to combine linguistic and literary constructs in an "integrated" approach to translation. She drew from German theorists the concept of prototype and organizes texts by types. Snell-Hornby's strategy of translation was contingent upon text type and a corresponding translational mode, which included cultural history, literary studies, socio-cultural and area studies, and for specialized translation, the study of the appropriate subject was required. She viewed translation as a continuum which started with the general to the most specific genre of translation and was supported by a hierarchical model stratified from levels A to F. level A encompasses
Literary, general, and technical translation on the same line, level B indicates prototypes of text types, level C features peripheral disciplines associated with translation such as cultural history, literary studies, socio-cultural and area studies, and the study of focused subject, legal, economic, and level D includes translating, comprehension of the rhetorical situation of the original text, the purpose of the translated text, and its communicative function. Level E integrates areas of linguistics pertinent to translation, and level F, the lowest end of the scale, treats problems such as alliteration, rhythm, and oral rendering on stage and film dubbing. Snell-Hornby's model promises to unite several areas of translation and to reduce difference between what Schleiermacher (1813) has described as commercial and artistic translation.

While recognizing that Snell-Hornby's model innovates translation pedagogy, one must wonder if an inclusive analytical framework is efficient. Rather than empowering translators to take charge of their professional development, her model prescribes and ascribes text types to specific genres of translation so that practitioners who have mastered those rules apply them mechanically. It also fails to account for the fact that an original text might be rooted in cultural history, sociocultural context while being focused on a given subject. On the other hand, she makes a positive move by making no clear-cut distinction between different types of language of translation as it happens in literary and functional approaches and echoes other voices that call for translation studies to develop as "models and conventions" and to emphasize the network of ties between text in context, situation, and culture rather than the linguistic approach to the single word (35).
Other attempts to introduce interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies

Along the line of interdisciplinary approaches, in the 1990s several attempts were made to introduce them in translation studies — such as *Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Communication* (Tirkkozen-Condit 1991), *Translation Studies: An Interdisciplinary* (Snell-Hornby et al. (eds) 1994), *Translation as Intercultural Communication* (Snell-Hornby et al. (eds) 1996) — but without significant success. Papers presented at conferences were confined within disciplines and translators found interest in migrating across the borders. Nonetheless, recently, translation studies has begun to elaborate its own models such as Toury’s descriptive translation studies.

Cultural concerns have been introduced in discourse analysis by Harim and Mason who linked linguistic decisions to key ideology in texts as in their example of the history of the native peoples of the Americas (Harim & Mason 1997: 15-24). The translator and teacher Anthony Pyt has appropriated the terms “interdisciplinary” and “intercultural” to portray the work of translation history.

Other scholars have approached translation from the cultural vantage point by migrating across the borders of disciplines. In 1992, Ninanjana (1992) looked at postcolonial translation through the lens of poststructuralism. The literary translator Lawrence Venuti (1995, 1998) has drawn on alternative lenses while criticizing linguistic methods that “project a conservative model of translation that would unduly restrict its role in cultural innovation and change” (Venuti 1998:21). While Venuti criticizes linguistics, Keith Harvey (1998, 2000) has recourse to linguistic analysis and cultural
theory to survey the homosexual discursive practices of "camp" in English and French texts and in translations.

At the dawn of 2000, interdisciplinary researchers have attempted to blend linguistic approaches of analysis of literature with cultural theory to examine the social and ideological milieu that conditions interaction as demonstrated in Harvey's (1998-2000) study. In this study "Translating camp talk," Harvey investigates the homosexuals' discursive practices of camp in English and French writings in translations through the lenses of the linguistics of contact and politeness theory. Drawing from Pratt's (1987) model of contact according to which "A linguistics of contact will be deeply interested in processes of appropriation, penetration or co-optation of one group's language by another" ((1987: 61), Harvey applies the theory of contact to the behavior of "gay men and lesbians work within appropriate prevailing straight (and homophobic) discourses (404) to show the richness of their repertoire of discursive practices that span a wide range of "communities" categorized by "ethnicity, class, age, or regional background" (Ibid.). At this juncture, Pratt's model of community differs from the traditional "linguistic community" hailed in dialectology, which claims that homogeneous language practices derive from widely accepted process whereby the individual is socialized by the society.

Essentially, while reading Toni Kushner's *Angels in America*, in which two gay male characters, both one time lovers, Belize and Prior, the former Black and the latter White, engage in a conversation during Belize's visit to Prior who has been admitted at the hospital for AIDS-related illnesses, Harvey has identified the use of girl talk and
Southern Belle accorns "Oh my, adorable." French expressions "Comme ça, ma bébé, je t'adore, ma belle Nègres" and a medley of formal and informal register by gay characters. These features are common in camp talk in English. Likewise, he observes that French camp is incited to use English words and phrases in the same fashion. One would wonder why gay camp talks would choose the insertion of foreign words in their speech? One way to read this attitude is language snobbism, the desire to assert and situate themselves culturally and distinguish themselves from other members of the gay community and to construct a differentiating identity. Another way is that foreign words are used to educe their speech and make them sound sophisticated as explained in Harvey's article (407).

Rethinking Translation Teaching: The Interdisciplinary Case

Translation teachers have realized the deficit that exists in translation teaching methods and have begun to fill in the gap by calling for organized and inter-disciplinary approaches to teaching this discipline. The call for interdisciplinary translation pedagogy has several advantages. It stems from the fact that original texts do not exist neatly inscribed in specific theoretical frameworks, each derived from a given discipline. It follows that translating problems that engage and nurture our interest as translators demand a competent combination of methods and bodies of knowledge. For example, an original text that was produced by the translator by a computer-assisted translation (CAT) required an integration of skills and types of knowledge. Similar to writing (see Leevere, 1992a), it could be argued translating is the outcome of the coordination of social, contextual, historical, cultural, and intellectual knowledge and skills. This type of
orchestration of knowledge and skills is welcome in translation pedagogy. Other reasons derive from the conjunction of events such as budgetary constraints and the burst of knowledge that came along with the Internet, which position interdisciplinarity as an alternative to the narrow and expensive specializations.

In a Third World country like Chad (Central Africa), where economic and human resources are very limited, interdisciplinarity could be associated with cost-effective access to knowledge and provision of the maximum of services with a minimum of manpower. As a cost effective access to knowledge, it allows the state to rely on meager human resources to increase the number of subjects taught in colleges and universities and to create new departments to respond to the ever growing need to have a qualified workforce. As for the provision of services, interdisciplinarity breeds generalists that can be used to create new services when needed without waiting for the training of local specialists or having to hire highly paid experts from foreign countries, which in both cases, will contribute to deplete further the financial resources of the state. And on personal and individual levels, it means openness to other forms of knowledges and ability to enter into conversation with varied audiences.

The Capstone Pedagogy

This study seeks to promote translation pedagogy by exploring the rich landscape of theories and practices inherent to traditional disciplines in the humanities and in social sciences as shown in my literature reviews in chapter two and chapter three. It will draw from classical humanistic philosophical and pedagogical underpinnings, from social constructivist methodologies, and from critical-radical thinkers' input. Within these
Theoretical foundations, I believe, the contours of this translation pedagogy are circumscribed and its roadmap articulated. This translation pedagogy aims to educate translators so that they develop on their own initiative "communicative translational competence," critical thinking skills, the best human qualities, and the ability to maintain independence and integrity during their practice. Such a teaching method that I envision is a principled one, one that is systematic, integrative, and accretive.

Rather than the traditional method of teaching that uses discrete linguistic items, interdisciplinarity focuses on providing a holistic view of translational issues and perspectives. Proceeding this way allows the teacher and the students to exploit various aspects of translating problems in a text during a class session while it helps the students to develop their social skills by leaning on each other through discussions to understand the concepts at issue.

During the discussions specific relevant areas of linguistics such as pragmatics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and their related subfields will be highlighted and discussed over several periods to allow the students to better assimilate them. These linguistic areas address issues of cross-cultural miscommunication, issues that are very important to ESL/EFL learners because they treat the very problems they will experience in translating situations. This pedagogy is not an all-inclusive pedagogy but it is, indeed, a pedagogy that is informed by appropriate theories drawn from disciplines such as literary theory, cultural studies, anthropology, ethnography, historiography, colonial and postcolonial theory, and critical discourse analysis, to increase the awareness of the learners of the complexity of the task of translation, and to pave the way for further
experiences with translation issues within translation studies and translation practices from other fields.

**Integrative**

It is integrative because it aims to fuse the blurred borderlines of translational approaches, approaches that all seek to articulate the various processes in which meaning can be revealed, to understand the different uses of language in different contexts to fulfill desired goals. These approaches will be brought together in a crucible in view to promote and to nurture real life experiences that prepare the students to survive in any translation context. Such experiences may include the ability to explain and justify their translating choices, the ability to collaborate with other translators and experts to better grasp an unfamiliar concept that they are to translate. Like behavioral experiences, the integration of methods of translation teaching will not only broaden the students' horizons of the various strategies available to solve translational problems, but also maximize their skills in solving those problems on their own.

**Accreptive**

It is accreptive to borrow Peter Stockwell's (2007, 78) "schema accretion" theory, a theory according to which new facts are added to an existing schema, enlarging its scope and its explanatory range. Such accretion principle opens an avenue to new experiences informed and transformed by the previous ones (Dewey), develops the learners' learning for excellence (Newman), and generates "critical consciousness" (Freire, 1970), and transforms them into translation problem-Posers (Freire, 1970). The process of accretion of new perspectives is methodical and highlights stances relevant to translators because
of their applicability to solving real life problems and their ability to help trainees transcend practical problems and reflect on the abstract ones as well. Acquisition of new perspectives in translation teaching could be a means to open future translators to what their colleagues from other disciplines are doing in their field that might enrich translation pedagogy, and pave the way to mutual respect among colleagues, one of the problems that undermine translation pedagogy.

I propose a Capstone Pedagogy that takes a "counterhegemonic" stance, a standpoint that opens translation pedagogy to lenses different from the traditional ones geared towards linguistics only. Linguistic theories have dominated translation theory from the 1960s to the 1970s before linguists began to lose interest in translation and translators began to think outside the linguistic framework only to solve their translating problems. One of the goals of the Capstone Pedagogy is to help bridge the gap between different translation schools of thought by exposing students to what has been done in different disciplines about translation, helping them to overcome psychological barriers that prevent them from being attentive to differing voices. Another goal is to provide a rigorous theoretical and practical translation education while promoting what Baer and Koby have described as "professional conduct and the development of the student's self-esteem as a translator" (Baer and Koby, 2003: 10).

Limitations of the Capstone Pedagogy

The Capstone Pedagogy might not, a priori, run smoothly for it might be received negatively because of cultural and institutional reasons. This method needs political and administrative support of policy-makers, administrators, curriculum designers, and
teachers of translation to remain current and competitive. It demands that teachers be capable of treating complex and diverse cultural issues, issues that represent a challenge for a number of teachers. On the other hand, since teachers of translation tend to resolve translation problems from the viewpoint of their disciplines, they will be reluctant to the idea of change in their teaching methods. Thus as a result of the changes that will be fostered by this pedagogy, there will be a strong resistance from both teachers and students for such an innovative and ambitious enterprise. Such resistance has been depicted in Pierre Bourdieu as a “special form of anti-intellectualism” (1988: 94-95), which he expressed as “secret resistance to innovation and to intellectual creativity” (1988: 94-95). Though this type of pedagogy will cause a stir in translation teaching circles because of its theoretical underpinnings, my dissertation will nonetheless contribute toward the institution of a principled pedagogy that many faculty members and scholars (Newmark, Colinas, Calzada-Perez, 2005) wish to see.

In this study, I will present a syllabus to teach a course on translation designed for graduate students who come from different educational backgrounds but who want to receive instruction to embrace translation practice as their job. This course integrates theory and practice to enhance the students’ understanding of translation problems and processes while helping them to develop professional reflexes and skills expected of translators. Throughout the course the students will complete every other week a minor project and by the end of the semester, they will complete a major project in collaboration with a professional translator and assessed jointly. A portfolio that stems from the semester’s activities of the students will be submitted by the end of the course for
grading. The portfolio represents the achievements of the student throughout the semester.