

ON COMBINING TRANSLATOR TRAINING WITH FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

*L. Boyko*¹

¹ Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University,
14 Nevskogo Str., Kaliningrad, 236016, Russia
Submitted on May 27, 2019
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-9

Contemporary methodological landscape in translator training (TT) is dominated by the competence-based principles whose epistemological roots are found in social constructivism asserting learners' active participation in knowledge accrual. The paper gives a brief account of the status quo of TT and revisits the controversial issue of appropriateness of combining TT with foreign language teaching (FLT). The author maintains that FLT may, and quite often has to, be part of TT course, the share of linguistic component in TT depending on the curriculum design and teaching circumstances. Centred solely around the linguistic aspect of TT, the paper proposes combining training methods that serve the purposes of both TT and FLT. TT practices aimed at developing linguistic and translational competences simultaneously are subdivided into analytical and reinforcement training techniques, the latter being the focus of this paper. The author argues that exercise-type activities beneficial for both TT and FLT can be practiced in full harmony with the competence-based student-centred teaching principles.

Keywords: translator training (TT), foreign language teaching (FLT), translation, trainer, trainee, exercise, competence.

1. Introduction

It is no secret that for a very long time there was – and someplace is – strong prejudice against translation didactics per se. Meanwhile, translator training (TT) has existed for centuries, if in a rudimentary ‘master-apprentice relations’ form, as A. Pym notes in his comprehensive historical overview [Pym 1992:1; Pym 2012]. In recent decades, more thought has been given to the research into the methodology of TT. It is primarily due to the fact that Translation Studies (TS) is now recognized as a full-fledged area of study in quite a number of societies, owing to a great degree to the strengthening of the philosophical premises of TS and TT. Even more important is the fact that the number of training programmes has considerably grown in the last four decades.

Contemporary TT rests on the principles of competence-based training. Many have convincingly and justly argued for concentrating on other-than-linguistic trade-relevant competences in TT. Meanwhile, the role and share of linguistic competence in TT has been apparently played down. A departure from language-based methodology in TT is explained by the generally shared assumption that translation should be taught to linguistically competent trainees. I will argue that the relationship between foreign language teaching (FLT) and TT begs a wider debate, and particular circumstances of



TT deserve closer attention. I will also show that, once a balanced distribution is achieved among classroom activities, teaching techniques can complement each other in fostering translational competences alongside linguistic ones without disrupting the principles of student-centred, text-based teaching.

2. Translation through the students' eyes

With the long-lasting stereotype of the translator as a self-exiled bookworm, the many-faceted nature of translation practice is seldom realized by laymen and novices and even by students taking up translation as their major. Newcomers to translation are often totally unaware of the complexity and versatility of the needs and skills the translation profession involves. Quite often, students joining a T&I university course appear to be vaguely or even wrongly motivated – suffice it to recall “the unbeatable ‘I love to travel’” motive [Gouadec 2007: 341]). To validate this observation and obtain a real-life motivation profile of T&I students, a small-scale free-response survey was conducted among 71 undergraduates of the T&I department at the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russia. The questionnaire sought to identify the students' initial inspiration for joining the course and to elicit their preferences, should they face a choice between translation and interpreting as their potential careers. With only a few (10) exceptions, the reason for enrolling with the T&I department was predominantly described (if variously worded) as ‘love for languages’. Among the ten exceptions, four respondents spoke of the desire to help people communicate, while the remaining six mentioned either a prestigious, well-paid profession (interpreting), or just a random choice. All those who explicitly excluded the option of specialising in translation (12) said it was ‘boring’; the rest were either equally prepared for taking up translation and/or interpreting finding both interesting (36) or remained undecided (23). These quick data confirm that students are largely ill-informed about their future profession, and when faced with direct questions they are drawing on the long-standing clichés and prejudices. Another interesting observation comes from the commentaries in which translation is described as a solitary occupation dealing with texts and dictionaries. The take on translation as a process reduced to its linguistic aspect alone is nowhere better felt than in the translation classroom where trainees seem to invariably expect a finished translation by the end of the class. Such a view also prevents translation learners from appreciating the trainer's digressing from ‘translation proper’ into other classroom activities meant to demonstrate various – other than linguistic – aspects of translator's work [Pym 2003: 21].

Should this one-dimensional perception of translation as a purely linguistic transfer come as a surprise? Hardly so. In Russian universities, for example, translation has always been taught at both BA and MA students only within the Linguistics degree programme. BA students enrol to study languages and linguistics alongside translation, not vice versa. The curriculum contains a substantial share of linguistic theories, and the sought degree is termed as ‘linguist; translator/interpreter’. These circumstances alone prompt interest to look into the relationship between FLT and TT.



3. Approaches to TT

Perception of translation as a purely linguistic transfer has had a long history. For decades since its very emergence, TS was a branch of linguistics, thus defining the pertinent teaching principles and strategies. No sooner than in the late 20th century did TT scholars articulate that “being a language specialist is simply not enough for expert translation behaviour” [Wilss 1992: 392]. For some time now, the attitudes to, and the very philosophy of TT have been revised, for today translation process is viewed as a complex cognitive and psychological activity whose participants are also heavily involved in social interaction. Indeed, because of its complexity, heterogeneity and multidimensionality, translation process differs from other types of language-related activity as there are many more facets to the translational occupation than just dealing with words. The translator’s identity as that of a bilingual individual will presumably be first manifested through competent language use; however, he/she will also act as a researcher, a cultural and intercultural mediator, a communication agent, a computer-user; and, above all, a life-long learner. Also counter to the false and dated stereotype depicting the translator as a lone wolf, present-time translators are no longer confined to their studies. They extensively use electronic media discussing difficult issues with their peers or seeking advice from native speakers and specialists in various areas; they often work in teams, technologies allowing them to align their translations to achieve consistency in word use and style; they also need to do plenty of networking and negotiations. Professional translation is becoming even more dependent on the useful technological time-savers such as CAT, MT, corpora, word banks and translation memory tools. All these and many more resources are an absolute must in the profession, and therefore need to be taught.

It was the dynamic changes in all the spheres of modern society that necessitated revising TT approaches to align them with the present-day translator’s professional profile. Contemporary TS thoroughly investigate translator’s linguistic, communicative, cognitive, social and technological behaviour in search of a most comprehensive grasp of the competences translation learners should be taught. Although the first translation competence models appeared in the last decades of the 20th century, it was not until the early noughties that the training paradigm saw a radical change – namely, a turn to the competence-based model whose foundations rest on cognitive-constructivist and socio-constructivist learning theories [PACTE 2017: 14, Venuti 2017]. The translation competence is, in most general terms, defined as “the underlying system of knowledge, abilities and attitudes required to be able to translate” [PACTE 2000: 100]. Elaborating on the crucial role of translation competence in the TT curriculum design D. Kelly views it as a multi-dimensional macro-competence [Kelly 2005: 14–15] comprising communicative, textual, cultural, intercultural, professional, instrumental, strategic, interpersonal, attitudinal, and subject area (sub)competences. [Kelly 2005: 32–33]. Contrary to the multi-componential competence approach promoted and expanded on in many a research, A. Pym comes up with a



minimalist principle, in which he proceeds from the necessity to train a translation professional who is capable of a) generating a target text and 2) confidently selecting a viable target text from a series of variants. The author contends that “specifically translational part of their practice is strictly neither linguistic nor solely commercial. It is a process of generation and selection, a problem-solving process that often occurs with apparent automatism” [Pym 2003: 489].

The emphasis on text generation and problem-solving cannot be overestimated in TT. This alone could trigger the changeover from ‘teacher-centred, product-oriented transmissionist and prescriptivist approaches’ to ‘student-centred, process-oriented one’ [PACTE 2017] – another momentous turn in the training paradigm. Before the issue of the epistemological grounds of TT was raised [Pym 1993], the literature on TT hardly contained any in-depth analysis of teaching models. Meanwhile, the general shift to the human dimension in education required reconsidering the philosophical foundations of the training *modus operandi*. The traditional ‘sage on the stage’ practice had dominated the landscape of teaching methodology for years on end, with the ultimate authority in the classroom vested in the teacher. The approach apparently proceeded from the doctrine that the trainer is a certain Mr. Know-All, the unquestionable source of knowledge. For the students, the only other revered staple was a dictionary, preferably a bilingual one. This looking-up-to-an-authority attitude reflects an apparently objectivist perception of knowledge existing independently of our minds – the assumption shattered convincingly in [Pym 1993]. Indeed, once we depart from this erroneous belief, we would logically arrive at the idea that creating meaningful messages requires independent thinking and interpretation skills, as meanings in translation may “go beyond our knowledge, beliefs and observable behaviour of the speakers” [Raatikainen 2012: 166]. Explicating the crucial difference in the objectivist (positivist) and social constructivist approaches to TT methodology D. Kiraly argues that knowledge does not exist independently of human cognition [Kiraly 2000; Kiraly 2003]. Advocate of process-oriented pedagogy, the author contends that, as we understand the world, meanings in this world are construed by us humans (“At the heart of the social constructivist perspective is the belief that there is no meaning in the world until we human beings make it – both individually and collectively” [Kiraly 2003: 26]). Translation viewed as a process seems to be the most vivid example of how meanings are created. Drawing on cognitive- and socio-constructivist thinking, Kiraly’s philosophical analysis reveals that changes in TT methods of recent years resulted firstly in the classroom setup with the focus redirected from teacher to students, and, secondly, in the choice of teaching material made in favour of ‘message-carrying’ texts rather than isolated sentences taken out of context. The trainee who is challenged with having to make choices and take decisions thus gets some freedom to be creative and develop critical thinking instead of being spoon-fed with ready-made solutions. The U-turn in the classroom relationship between students and teacher brought about the empowerment and collaboration model of TT [Kiraly 2000]. However, it would be an overstatement to



say that there is full consensus on the basic methodology of TT, and even though there is a shift from a teacher-oriented to a learner-centred approach, there is rather a mixture of approaches. [Gambier 2012: 163].

4. TT scholarship in Russia

In the Russian translation thought, the didactics of translation appears to be the least investigated field in TS. With little attention paid to the theoretical premises of TT, most publications in this field so far have been strictly grammatically-pragmatic by nature, the better part of them being collections of exercises designed to overcome lexical and grammatical difficulties in translation and carry out transformations. This approach to TT apparently rests on the firmly established linguistic theory of equivalence that has dominated the TS scene in Russia for decades. In her review of unresolved issues in TT, Korolyova [Korolyova 2015] characterizes the state of TT research field as eclectic, lacking in a generally accepted methodological base and unified conceptual approaches. Translator training remains torn away from practice and 'intuitive' rather than scientifically based. A thorough analysis of the approaches to TT given in [Korol'kova 2013] clearly shows that up until recently the common feature of all didactic materials in the Russian school of TT was its pronounced 'drilling' bent.

However, it would be unfair to overlook an observable change in the attitude to TT principles in the Russian methodological literature. Russian TT scholarship today shows more interest in state-of-the-art methodology: it is generally acknowledged that translational competences should be formed, and translators-to-be should also be taught the metalanguage of translation and reflective reading [Bazylev 2013]. In [Alexeeva 2006, 2008; Latyshev 2013; Korol'kova 2013], the training principles are based on text type diversity, with a strong emphasis on the analytical side of TT. Due attention is paid to the formation of an all-round personality of the translator [Gavrilenko 2004]. The text-typological approach consistently pursued in [Alexeeva 2006; Korol'kova 2013] reveals the implementation of the constructivist principles in TT. The overall picture of the status quo of TT in Russia shows that there is largely, if not universally, shared theoretical understanding of methodological developments in the field. Although the current body of research into the theories underlying TT remains to be scarce [Alexeeva 2008], there are tangible changes in the organization of TT process both in terms of work material selection, and in terms of teaching strategies, with the analytical aspect of TT gaining noticeable impetus.

5. TT and language teaching

On the whole, contemporary TT is aimed to raise the trainees' awareness of the multiple facets of translation, to develop trade-relevant competences, and to create an independent decision-maker yet in the classroom. The translation competence is no longer viewed as just summation of two languages [Pym 2003]; therefore, the linguistic competence, if a crucial component, is viewed as only part of the translational one [Colina 2003b: 46]. All current



trends in TT proceed from the underlying presumption that language (sub)competence is a pre-requisite of TT. Since it is broadly accepted that translation should be taught to linguistically competent students so that they do not have to struggle linguistically in the translation process [See: Colina 2003a:38], the language (sub)competence is apparently played down in most TT studies. In this framework it is not surprising that Foreign Language Teaching (FLT) is denied any presence in a translation class. Nevertheless, it is admitted that interaction of and relationship between translation and language competences are much under-researched [Colina 2003b: 46], and questions remain. What if adequate language competence is not the case in a particular teaching situation? Does FLT have to be divorced from TT? Can the challenges of TT be met if the curriculum by definition combines linguistic education with translation? Considering the circumstances, can FLT be integrated in TT? If the answer is 'yes', will the use of FLT methodology – such as reinforcement exercises – violate the principle of student-centred TT only because they allegedly narrow down creative opportunities? What kind of teaching materials can fit in the multi-competence approach to teaching?

At this point, it is time we discussed the role and share of the linguistic component in TT in the context of teaching circumstances which may vary greatly, as the case is in Russia. In spite of the longstanding belief that TT makes sense only when trainees have reached the required command of two languages [Lederer 2007: 146, Gouadec 2007: 335; Pym 1993, 2003], it not uncommon that in universities translator training starts with the students' linguistic competence still underdeveloped (at BA level) [Kelly 2005: 115, Careres 2014].² Even MA-level enrolment for a university translation course, although meant to be competitive enough, does not always fully meet the requirement of sufficient language competence. MA translation trainees come from a wide range of spheres – law, psychology, aviation, music – to mention but a few (the case of 2017 and 2018 enrolments at BFU). With their former other-than-linguistic background, such students often make the trainers go 'back to square one' in term of language teaching. So, we should be realistic about our trainees starting positions and try to bridge the 'linguistic gap' on the go. [Korol'kova 2013]. Indeed, compared to their peers of 20 years ago, today's students on the whole enjoy a much better command of L2 owing to a better exposure to the anglophone world. However, we are now being at the beginning of this long journey to gaining foreign language confidence through experience; therefore, A. Pym's recommendation to "let them learn languages from the road" [Pym 2005: 6] appears a bit premature. So does D. Kelly's vision of the TT curriculum design aimed at enhancing language learning through participation in exchange programmes and foreign internships [Kelly 2005]: in Russia, for example, such practices remain to be few and far between, mostly being just a student's good luck. Here I cannot agree more that the issue of TT curriculum design deserves "a situation analysis including societal, institutional, learner, and teacher factors"

² Unless it is a highly selective – non-degree – postgraduate vocational training course like, for example, the one in the St. Petersburg School of Conference Interpreting and Translation, Russia.



[Kearns 2006: 166–175] and that “it is simply unfair and impractical to impose the same model on a culture with both a long history of institutionalized language learning and translator training [...] with a culture where these institutions may be less developed...” [Kearns 2006: 138]. The only minor addition to this could be: not necessarily less developed but based on different principles, as the case is with TT in Russia – as it has been mentioned, in Russia TT and language teaching have been inseparable for more reasons than just the above-mentioned firmly-established tradition of language-oriented TS.

Although formation of other skills may be of greater relevance for the training process, linguistic competences cannot be underestimated either: firstly, because translation is still very much about language, and secondly, because its development will enhance command of the foreign language if there is a need for it. That said, and in view of the circumstances described above, I have to disagree with the assumption that it is impossible to teach languages and translation simultaneously [Lederer 2007: 143]. The long-standing teaching practice proves to the contrary too. Moreover, being a committed lifelong language learner, the translator cannot but constantly develop his/her linguistic competences alongside translational ones. Since text comprehension and production are the translational competences requiring trainees’ awareness of language and speech norms, we should not – most often cannot, and in certain circumstances, must not – discard systematically the possibility of combining FLT with TT. Consequently, the methods traditionally used in language teaching can and should be used to the best advantage to develop both linguistic and translational skills.

The methodology of mutually beneficial FLT and TT has two major constituents – analysis and training (‘drilling’) proper. The analytical part of TT is undoubtedly holistic by nature: it involves divergent thinking, informing, interpretative skills, linguistic and background knowledge, decision-making, and much more. Analytical activities in a TT course are meant to introduce students to the intricacies and complexity of translation process as a highly demanding cognitive and psychological endeavour. It is certainly the most essential and interesting part of both teaching and learning translation, and it is worthy of special attention. This paper, however, focuses on the other part, which includes reinforcement exercises as a training method with a long history and plenty of potential in the combined language and translation teaching methodology. Although exercises are thought to be more appropriate for language teaching than for TT, it would be still unwise to condemn such practices offhandedly in TT. The now-seldom-spoken-of benefits of reinforcement techniques may help us to find a middle ground for the mutually complementary approaches to TT. Indeed, the main disadvantage of most traditionally designed translation exercises is that they consist of sentences taken out of context. It is certainly inconvenient because they do not constitute a continuum, and, unless carefully selected, may simply lead to a translation deadlock. This latter pitfall is quite avoidable if the patterns (words / phrases) are nested in more extensive contexts ensuring disambiguation. Another limitation is that the traditional ‘read-and-



translate' exercises usually find their resolutions in the key or the authority of the trainer. Does it have to be an inevitable blow to the student-centred principle? Not necessarily, if a way to diversify them is found thus reinforcing their relevance.

Let us look at some of such activities. The 'training' component of TT consists of two major types of exercises, according to the resources used: sentence-based reinforcement ('drilling') ones, more appropriate for earlier stages of learning (BA level); and text-based ones, equally appropriate for lower and more advanced levels. The first type is based on the assumption that habits are formed through reinforcement. Exercises consisting of similarly structured sentences or stretches of texts containing targeted lexical units or syntactical structures can be used in TT to train an automatized skill of spotting and resolving typical challenging situations. The importance of this ability should not be underestimated, since students have trouble with identifying a problem [Kusssmaul 1995: 17]. It is crucial for the teacher to realize this latter observation. The exercises in question give the student an opportunity to focus on resolving a problem already pinpointed for them. Such materials are especially useful for obtaining and consolidating specific skills required in particular translation situations, such as dealing with transliteration, syntactical conversions, numeric expressions, false cognates, clichés, etc. Here is just one case of many.

Among many systemic differences between English and Russian there is a broader semantic relationship between the components in English AdjN structures because English attributive groups often convey adverbial ideas of cause, location, purpose, action-object relationships, etc. Such subtle inferential and distributional properties are not immediately observable, but in English-Russian translation typical English adjectival phrases most often have to be restructured depending on the semantic relationships between the two components. Thus, in the English sentence '*Unemployment contributes to social exclusion*' the AdjN structure requires conversion into a Russian prepositional noun phrase NPrepN ('*отчуждение от общества*') while in '*Reasons must be given if the head teacher decides to make a temporary exclusion permanent*' the AdjN structure can be retained in Russian ('*временное исключение*') (examples modified from British National Corpus). What is achieved through persistent practicing such transformations? The trainees obtain awareness of such structural dissimilarities and prepare themselves for dealing with them in an informed way. The translational competence formed this way includes quick identification and (near-)automated resolution of such cases. Simultaneously, such exercises are targeted at enhancing idiomatic language use in both L1 and L2. In the classroom, discussion should ensue on the nature of such patterns and their differential treatment in translation to answer why conversion required in the first case is not needed in second, where the pattern is the same.

Once the pattern is grasped, viability of alternative solutions can be discussed – for example, in different stylistic or situational contexts, displaying the attitude to the situation, revealing the axiological dimension, etc. Here are a few examples with the English pattern *to earn somebody something*:



The restructuring earned him a reputation for ruthlessness, but it won him praise from his boss.

Abraham Lincoln's reputation for telling the truth earned him the nickname "Honest Abe."

Comedian Tom Arnold's anti-Trump tweets earned him a visit from the Secret Service.

This 18-year-old's hacking hustle earned him \$100000 – and it's legal. (Examples modified from the Internet)

The pattern will have to be treated differently in Russian with either positively connotated vocabulary, such as *удостоить(ся) снискать, заслужить* (to be honoured, to be awarded) or neutral words (*заработать, завоевать, получить/принести*); it can also get a negative interpretation *доиграться* (implying danger). It important to discuss what triggers the choice of variant, what necessitates changes of the syntactical structures, and what role interpretation plays in translation. Thus, the translational problem is spotlighted alongside enhancing the students' linguistic knowledge. Reversing the directionality of translation will only contribute to achieving the goal of the enhancement of both translational and linguistic skills. A better involvement of TT trainees in such activities can be ensured by asking the students to amass similarly patterned structures for classwork.

The second type of exercises to be discussed here is the text-based one. Short texts or extracts are perfectly suitable for being converted into exercises in this type of training routine. What turns short texts into training pieces of work is the focus on one or more selected translation challenge – cultural, linguistic, info-mining, textual, communicative – and many more. Such exercises also serve both ways – teaching the language and training translation techniques. The exercises can come in monolingual and bilingual forms, and among virtually infinite work forms there can be: retelling in the other language, rephrasing; choosing among synonyms, restoring the text with the use of key words in the other language; using the given thematic vocabulary in translation; restoring stretches of text written in the other language; choosing different strategies for different clients; a short text to be translated using given words and phrases in the target language, or alternating rendering of a text in L1 and L2 in succession – the list is far from complete. Both the language and translational competences are thus formed through text comprehension, developing flexibility of expression and text production; additionally, translational skills are attained through code switching. This type of exercises is not of a 'hammering' nature: they are rather flexible activities requiring plenty of cognitive effort, memory and judgement. Such activities are intended to provide linguistic support to TT too. This two-way methodology, if it is not overused, can perfectly well complement the major analytical component of TT.

Below is an excerpt that was made into an exercise primarily aimed to show how to deal with parataxis in translation. The targeted issue is a linguistic one: it will involve the discussion of the nature of such discrepancies between English and Russian and the use of idiomatic expression to deal with them. However, the text also contains plenty of material that can be used to form cultural, info-mining and textual competences. In the info-searching and cultural references the trainees will have to deal with most of



the capitalized words in the text; the textual competence will be needed for bringing the target text in line with the conventions of the target culture; the false cognate 'ironically' will require special attention too.

When 3,000 British teenagers were surveyed in 2008, 20 per cent expressed the opinion that Winston Churchill was a fictional character. While this statistic might expose the inadequacies of the British history curriculum, it ironically reflects how Churchill seems unbelievable – a sort of Edwardian superhero. Before he became prime minister in 1940, he survived a school stabbing, a sadistic headmaster, Dervish spears, Cuban bullets, tsetse flies, Boer and German artillery, a near-drowning, two plane crashes, three car accidents and a house fire. He was an aristocrat, soldier, novelist, journalist, Hollywood screenwriter, Nobel prizewinner and, of course, politician. [From: Churchill – Edwardian superhero The Times. Sept. 29, 2018]

Text-based exercises apparently give more freedom to both trainer and trainee, and they are obviously student-driven, if teacher-directed. They should be designed so that they involve plenty of independent search on the student's part, but it is important that the relevant instances are clearly signposted in the task. The difference between this exercise-shaped and analytical activities is that texts for exercises should be short enough to ensure that they are targeted to deal with one or two features meant to be trained (see above: a selected translation challenge). The ultimate aim of such activities is to have these texts translated by the end of the day, in contrast to purely analytical tasks which do not necessarily involve this final stage.

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to challenge the pedagogical and methodological divide between TT and FLT. I have tried to show that although it is wrong to approach TT only from its linguistic side, it is even less beneficial to disconnect TT from language learning, because a required language competence is not always a given in TT. Thus, my answer to the question whether language learning has to be divorced from TT is an emphatic 'NO'. Linguistic education can be combined with TT not only because such may be the circumstances, but also because the life-long process of language learning and translation are inextricable: the translator will never stop evolving as a language user and translation learner. Moreover, the crucial text-comprehension and text-production (translational) competences are inseparable from the language competence. Adopting a flexible approach to ensure adaptability to concrete circumstances and the changing environments can help to achieve the ultimate goal of training a competent translator.

The exercise-based practicing component in TT fits in the combined teaching model making the best use of both constructivist and objectivist perspectives. Without disrupting the main principles of learner-centred approach, it gives TT methodology another dimension. Exercises as a training technique are essential in TT pedagogy; they should remain part and parcel of TT making translation teaching and FLT mutually contributing. It is cru-



cial, however, to creatively design them so that they meet communicative needs and serve both ends. That way it would become possible to involve students more in the generating new knowledge, both translation- and language-wise. The share of this exercise-based methodology should be determined according to circumstances, but the sum total is that 'productive exchange' [Carreres 2006: 29] between teaching language and TT is well justified. It is also important to strike the right balance among various differently targeted activities aimed at the acquisition of relevant competences.

References

- Alexeeva, I.S., 2006. *Pis'mennyi perevod. Nemetskyi yazyk* [Translation. The German language]. St. Petersburg.: "Soyuz" Publishing House (in Russ.).
- Alexeeva, I.S., 2008. The current state of translation theory in Russia (critical review). *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta* [Bulletin of S. Petersburg University], (9) 1, pp. 26–38 (in Russ.).
- Bazylev, V.N., 2013. *Didactica perevoda* [Didactics of Translation]. Moscow. Flinta. Nauka (in Russ.).
- Carreres, Á., 2006. Strange Bedfellows: Translation and Language Teaching. The Teaching of Translation into L2 in Modern Languages Degrees: Uses and Limitations. In: *Sixth Symposium on Translation, Terminology and Interpretation in Cuba and Canada, Canadian Translators, Terminologists and Interpreters Council*. Available at: <http://cttic.org/ACTI/2006/papers/Carreres.pdf> [accessed 10 September 2018].
- Carreres, Á., 2014. Translation as a means and as an end: reassessing the divide. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8(1), pp. 123–135.
- Colina, S., 2003a. *Translation Teaching, from Research to the Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Colina, S., 2003b. Towards an Empirically-based Translation Pedagogy. In: B.J. Baer and G.S. Koby, eds. *Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking Translation Pedagogy*. Vol. 12. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 29–59.
- Gambier, Y., 2012. Teaching translation/training translators. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 3. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 163–171.
- Gavrilenko, N.N., 2004. The main objectives of teaching to translate scientific and technical texts. *Vestnik Rossiiskogo universiteta družby narodov. Seriya: Russkii i inostrannye yazyki i metodika ikh prepodavaniya* [Bulletin RUDN. Series: Russian and foreign languages and teaching methods], 1(2), pp. 102–107 (in Russ.).
- Gouadec, D., 2007. *Translation as a profession*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kearns, J., 2006. *Curriculum Renewal in Translator Training: Vocational challenges in academic environments with reference to needs and situation analysis and skills transferability from the contemporary experience of Polish translator training culture*. Dissertation. Available at: http://doras.dcu.ie/17625/1/John_Kearns_20121129165721.pdf [accessed 12 February 2019].
- Kelly, D., 2005. *A Handbook for Translator Trainers: A Guide to Reflective Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Kiraly, D., 2000. *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education. Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Kiraly, D., 2003. From instruction to collaborative construction: A passing fad or the promise of a Paradigm shift in translator education? In: B.J. Baer and G.S. Koby, eds. *Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking Translation Pedagogy*. Vol. 12. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. pp. 3–28.



Korol'kova, S.A., 2013. Translation didactics. In: V.A. Mityagin, ed. *Obucheniye perevodchica. Kommunikatsionnyye i didakticheskie aspekty* [Translator training. Communicative and didactic aspects. Collective monograph]. Moscow. Flinta. Science. pp. 214–272 (in Russ.).

Korolyova, D.B., 2015. *Metodika obucheniya perevodu na sovremennom etape. Sovremennyye metody obucheniya perevodu* [Methods of teaching translation at the present stage. Modern translation teaching methods]. Available at: <http://www.gramota.net/materials/2/2015/9-1/24.html> [accessed 10 September 2018] (in Russ.).

Kussmaul, P., 1995. *Training the translator*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Latyshev, L.K., 2013. *Perevod: problemy teorii, praktiki i metodiki prepodavaniya*. [Translation: problems of theory, practice and teaching methods]. M.: Kniga po trebovaniyu (in Russ.).

Lederer, M., 2007. *Perevod segodnya* [La traduction aujourd'hui. Le modèle interprétatif]. Translated by N. Fenenko and E. Alekseeva. St. Petersburg.: Publishing House of the Herzen RGPU (in Russ.).

PACTE, 2000. Acquiring translation competence: hypotheses and methodological problems of a research project. In: A. Beeby, D. Ensinger and M. Presas, eds. *Investigating Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 99–106.

PACTE, 2017. *Researching Translation Competence by PACTE Group*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pym, A., 1992. Translation error analysis and the interface with language teaching. In: C. Dollerup and A. Loddegaard, eds. *The Teaching of Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 279–288.

Pym, A., 1993. *Epistemological problems in translation and its teaching: A seminar for thinking students*. Caminade.

Pym, A., 2003. Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age. *Meta*, 48 (4), pp. 481–497.

Pym, A., 2005. Training translators – ten recurrent naiveties. *Translating Today*, 2 (1), pp. 3–6.

Pym, A., 2012. Training Translators. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297128820_Training_Translators [accessed 10 March 2019]. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.013.0032>.

Raatikainen, P., 2012. Philosophical Issues in Meaning and Translation. In: A. Aejmeleus and P. Pahta, eds. *Translation – Interpretation – Meaning Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences 7*. Helsinki: Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies. pp. 157–167.

Venuti, L. ed., 2017. *Teaching Translation: Programs, Courses, Pedagogies*. London/New York: Routledge.

Wills, W., 1992. The Future of Translator Training. *Meta*, 37(3), pp. 391–396.

The author

Dr Lyudmila Boyko, Associate professor, Institute for the Humanities, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Kaliningrad, Russia.

E-mail: boyko14@gmail.com

To cite this article:

Boyko, L. 2019, On combining translator training with foreign language teaching, *Slovo.ru: baltic accent*, Vol. 10, no. 3, p. 114–128. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-9.



О СОВМЕЩЕНИИ ПОДГОТОВКИ ПЕРЕВОДЧИКОВ И ПРЕПОДАВАНИЯ ИНОСТРАННЫХ ЯЗЫКОВ

Л. Бойко¹

¹ Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта
236016, Россия, Калининград, ул. Александра Невского, 14
Поступила в редакцию 27.05.2019 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-9

Современные подходы к обучению переводчиков основаны на компетентностных принципах, эпистемологические корни которых обнаруживаются в концепциях социального конструктивизма, утверждающего активное участие учащихся в обретении знаний. В статье кратко представлена современная методологическая картина подготовки переводчиков и поднят уже не раз дебатировавшийся вопрос о целесообразности сочетания обучения переводу с языковой подготовкой. Обосновывается, что обучение иностранным языкам может, а зачастую должно и даже вынуждено быть частью курса подготовки переводчиков в вузе, при этом доля лингвистического компонента в подготовке переводчиков должна определяться в зависимости от учебного плана и конкретных обстоятельств обучения. Ограничиваясь рассмотрением только лингвистического аспекта обучения переводу, автор предлагает сочетать приемы и методы, направленные на одновременное развитие лингвистических и переводческих компетенций. Эти методы подразделяются на аналитические и тренировочные, и последним уделяется основное внимание в данной статье. Автор утверждает, что тренировочные упражнения, полезные как для обучения переводу, так и для языковой подготовки, могут практиковаться, не вступая в противоречие с компетентностным подходом к обучению, ориентированным на студента.

Ключевые слова: подготовка переводчиков, обучение иностранным языкам, перевод, преподаватель, студент, упражнение, компетенция.

Список литературы

- Алексеева И. С. Письменный перевод. Немецкий язык. СПб. : Союз, 2006.
- Алексеева И. С. Современное состояние теории перевода в России (критический обзор) // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. 2008. Сер. 9 : Язык и литература. Вып. 1. С. 26 – 38.
- Базылев В. Н. Дидактика перевода. М. : Флинта ; Наука, 2013.
- Гавриленко Н. Н. Основные цели обучения переводу научно-технических текстов // Вестник РУДН. Сер.: Русский и иностранные языки и методика их преподавания. 2004. Вып. 1 (2). С. 102 – 107.
- Королькова С. А. Дидактика письменного перевода // Обучение переводчика. Коммуникативные и дидактические аспекты / под ред. В. А. Митягина. М. : Флинта ; Наука, 2013. С. 214 – 272.
- Королева Д. Б. Методика обучения переводу на современном этапе. Современные методы обучения переводу. 2015. URL: <http://www.gramota.net/materials/2/2015/9-1/24.html> (дата обращения: 10.09.2018).
- Латышев Л. К. Перевод: проблемы теории, практики и методики преподавания. М. : Книга по требованию, 2013.
- Ледерер М. Перевод сегодня / пер. Н. Фененко и Е. Алексеевой. СПб. : Изд-во РГПУ им. А. И. Герцена, 2007.



Carreres Á. Strange Bedfellows: Translation and Language Teaching. The Teaching of Translation into L2 in Modern Languages Degrees: Uses and Limitations // Sixth Symposium on Translation, Terminology and Interpretation in Cuba and Canada, Canadian Translators, Terminologists and Interpreters Council. 2006. URL: <http://cttic.org/АСТП/2006/papers/Carreres.pdf> (дата обращения: 10.09.2018).

Carreres Á. Translation as a means and as an end: reassessing the divide // The Interpreter and Translator Trainer. 2014. Vol. 8, №1. P. 123–135.

Colina S. Translation Teaching, from Research to the Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers. N. Y. : McGraw-Hill, 2003a.

Colina S. Towards an Empirically-based Translation Pedagogy // Baer B.J., Koby G.S. (eds.). Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking Translation Pedagogy. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2003b. Vol. 12. P. 29–59.

Gambier Y. Teaching translation/training translators // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Handbook of Translation Studies. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2012. Vol. 3. P. 163–171.

Gouadec D. Translation as a profession. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2007.

Kearns J. Curriculum Renewal in Translator Training: Vocational challenges in academic environments with reference to needs and situation analysis and skills transferability from the contemporary experience of Polish translator training culture: diss. 2006. URL: http://doras.dcu.ie/17625/1/John_Kearns_20121129165721.pdf (дата обращения: 12.02.2019).

Kelly D. A Handbook for Translator Trainers: A Guide to Reflective Practice. Manchester : St. Jerome, 2005.

Kiraly D. A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education. Empowerment from Theory to Practice. Manchester : St. Jerome, 2000.

Kiraly D. From instruction to collaborative construction: A passing fad or the promise of a Paradigm shift in translator education? // Baer B.J., Koby G.S. (eds.). Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking Translation Pedagogy. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2003. Vol. 12. P. 3–28.

Kussmaul P. Training the translator. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1995.

PACTE. Acquiring translation competence: hypotheses and methodological problems of a research project // Beeby A., Ensinger D., Presas M. (eds.). Investigating Translation. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2000. P. 99–106.

PACTE. Researching Translation Competence by PACTE Group. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2017.

Pyun A. Translation error analysis and the interface with language teaching // Dollerup C., Loddegaard A. (eds.). The Teaching of Translation. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1992. P. 279–288.

Pyun A. Epistemological problems in translation and its teaching: A seminar for thinking students. Caminade, 1993.

Pyun A. Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age // Meta. 2003. Vol. 48, №4. P. 481–497.

Pyun A. Training translators – ten recurrent naiveties // Translating Today. 2005. Vol. 2, №1. P. 3–6.

Pyun A. Training Translators. 2012. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297128820_Training_Translators (дата обращения: 10.03.2019). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.013.0032>.

Raatikainen P. Philosophical Issues in Meaning and Translation // Aejmelaeus A., Pahta P. (eds.). Translation – Interpretation – Meaning Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences 7. Helsinki : Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, 2012. P. 157–167.



Venuti L. (ed.). *Teaching Translation: Programs, Courses, Pedagogies*. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2017.

Wills W. *The Future of Translator Training* // *Meta*. 1992. Vol. 37, №3. P. 391–396.

Об авторе

Людмила Бойко, кандидат филологических наук, доцент Института гуманитарных наук, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Калининград, Россия.

E-mail: boyko14@gmail.com

Для цитирования:

Boyko L. On combining translator training with foreign language teaching // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, №3. С. 114–128. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-9.