



AN ECLECTIC APPROACH TO TRANSLATION TEACHING: A PEDAGOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Ramadan Ahmed Almijrab

English Department, Faculty of Languages, Benghazi University, Libya

Email: ramahamdmegrab@yahoo.com

Cite this article:

Ramadan Ahmed Almijrab (2022), An Eclectic Approach to Translation Teaching: A Pedagogical Perspective. International Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics 5(2), 1-12. DOI: 10.52589/IJLLL_P6XPWT1Y

Manuscript History

Received: 24 April 2022

Accepted: 21 May 2022

Published: 24 June 2022

Copyright © 2022 The Author(s).

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits anyone to share, use, reproduce and redistribute in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

ABSTRACT: *In teaching translation, each individual method has its strengths and weaknesses and a single method has a narrow theoretical basis, a delimited set of activities and therefore inflexible. The motivation to write this paper is to present the conceptualization of the eclectic method. Further, the paper adopts the rhetorical typology to be an instrument for applying the eclectic approach to translation teaching. An eclectic approach has been suggested whereby the suitable theory of translation (solution) is determined according to the situation of the text, i.e. the choice of a translation problem should precede the development of the theory. Instructors need to identify and make their students recognize where their skills are lacking when support is needed and what measures are to be taken. This can be achieved by being able to demystify text-type forms through the application of a broad view of the text typological model that incorporates insights from other models of translation.*

KEYWORDS: Pedagogy, Eclecticism, Teaching Translation, Rhetorical Typology.



INTRODUCTION

The arrival of discourse analysis and text linguistics models of translation has been very influential in the way trainees and researchers alike are now made aware of the number and range of factors that need to be taken into consideration in text analysis for the purpose of the translation. Hatim and Mason's (1990) approach to text linguistics has been particularly interesting for the elaboration of the eclectic approach in that it supplies a well-grounded theory on the text analysis which is one of the stages involved in the approach. The main feature of their model is that it brings together communicative, pragmatic, and semiotic values, and demonstrates their importance for the development of text and the way in which communicative value takes place. The eclectic approach to translation teaching has become common and fashionable in modern language teaching. However, not much has been done to explain what eclecticism is in the context of teaching translation. The eclectic method, founded by Sweet and Palmer during the 1920s-1930s, is a language teaching method that combines various approaches and methods to teach language depending on the objectives of the course and the abilities of the learners. It is also known as mixed-methods. The motivation to write this paper is to present the conceptualization of the eclectic Method. Further, the paper adopts the rhetorical typology to be an instrument for applying the eclectic approach to translation teaching. Nowadays, eclecticism becomes so widely accepted and many good instructors use it as a method in its own right. In teaching translation, each individual method has its strengths and weaknesses and a single method has a narrow theoretical basis, a delimited set of activities and therefore inflexible. Eclecticism can be considered the pioneering one because it combines and uses different techniques and methods in order to achieve the main aims and objectives. This variety and combination of techniques resemble a recipe that contains many flavours, then it will never have been boring.

Theoretical Underpinning

This article attempts to discuss the translation teaching models and to what extent these available models are useful and effective in teaching translation. Different theories, models, methods and approaches have been proposed and subjected to heated debate amongst theoreticians. To this effect, students are often confused as to what translation theory is and what is the best model that can consolidate their translation skills? As a result, teaching translation has been seriously impeded by the great gulf between translation theory and practice. This gap can be traced back to the way models of translation are presented by their creators. The translation theorist develops a model and argues that his or hers is the most workable and effective one. Therefore, the issue remains an area of an open-ended discussion with no explicit consensual theory. An eclectic approach has been suggested whereby the suitable theory of translation (solution) is determined according to the situation of the text, i.e. the choice of a translation problem should precede the development of the theory.

In the move away from instructors following one specific methodology, the eclectic approach is the label given to an instructor's use of techniques and activities from a range of language teaching approaches and methodologies. The instructor decides what methodology or approach to use depending on the aims of the lesson and the learners in the group. In this domain, Kumar (2013, p. 1) notes that "the eclectic method is a combination of a different method of teaching-learning approaches. This method effectively works for any kind of learners; irrespective of age and standard". The eclectic method also involves the use of a variety of language learning activities which are mostly different characteristically and may be motivated by different



underlying assumptions of language teaching. Gao (2011, p. 1) describes the eclectic approach “not as a concrete, single method, but as a method which combines all skills and includes some practice in the classroom”. He advises instructors to take advantage of all other methods whilst avoiding their disadvantages. Wali (2009) adds that one of the major principles of eclecticism is that teaching should serve learners not methods. Thus, instructors should feel free in choosing techniques and procedures inside the classroom. Thus, no method is unique and instructors should realize that they have the right to choose the best methods and techniques that fulfil the students’ needs and learning situation. Instructors can adopt a flexible method and technique so as to achieve their goals. They may choose whatever works best at a particular time and in a particular situation.

In anticipation of potential areas of difficulty, cross-linguistic and cross-cultural variation, which may be encountered by translation students, instructors can devise a teaching programme for their students. This in fact does not remove the instructors' doubts and uncertainties about the course of the teaching/learning process which Kussmaul (1995, p. 5) conflates in a cluster of questions, “do we really put enough emphasis on the right areas? Or could it be that we stress problems which are not problems for our students after all and that we actually disregard areas where they encounter difficulties? He (1995) claims that our students might perhaps have found successful ways in dealing with problems which may serve as models for our teaching. In this context, Snell-Hornby (1983, p. 105) states that teaching translation has been impeded and “students express frustration at being burdened with theoretical consideration which they feel have nothing to do with the activity of translating, scholars talk scathingly of translators who are unwilling to investigate the theoretical basis of their work, thus reducing it to a mere practical skill”. This problem, raised by Snell-Hornby (1983), can be traced back to the way scholars have presented their models of translation, i.e. each one praises his own inimitable model. Hence, compromise can be adopted from language teaching methods to solve the problem of multiplicity in translation theories.

In this respect, an eclectic approach could be considered a workable solution because it encompasses various approaches and methodologies to teach translation depending on the abilities of the learners. Different teaching methods are borrowed and adapted to suit the requirement of the learners and break the monotony of the class. A conceptual approach does not merely include one paradigm or a set of assumptions. Instead, eclecticism adheres to or is constituted from several theories, styles, and ideas in order to gain a thorough insight into the subject, and draws upon different theories in different cases. Nowadays, eclecticism is common in many fields of study such as psychology, martial arts, philosophy, teaching, religion and drama. This means that the analysis and assessment of the students’ performance becomes a useful tool to check the (in)validity of such doubts. Yet, assessment is not merely a tool for judging the wrong performance of the students but should be to appraise the effectiveness of the total teaching programme. Before going any further, a finger should be laid on the most common and practicable translation methods which could contribute to the idea of introducing eclecticism in teaching translation.

Translation Teaching Models

Teaching methodology in translation and foreign language teaching alike revolves around the same dichotomy of competence and performance. In other words, teaching the linguistic aspects of the language over (or without) the functional aspects and vice versa. A third model could be added that seeks to combine both aspects. In fact, these approaches constitute a



continuum rather than distinct clear-cut typologies. Translation is a complex process and all theories can make useful contributions in many different ways to an integrated perspective. According to Halliday (1992), two kinds of translation theories can be identified: the linguist's and the translator's. In the linguist's, the theory is descriptive, what happens when we translate? To the translators, a theory of translation refers to how they should translate and what is the best way to achieve an accurate and effective translation. In this respect, Chomsky (2000) states that a theory should fulfil the three levels of adequacy. He puts them in a cluster of questions: (i) observational adequacy, does the theory fit the facts? (ii) Descriptive adequacy, does the theory adequately describe the facts? (iii) Explanatory adequacy, does the theory explain the facts? However, Widdowson (1979) stresses the fact that linguistic theories are factious and that like fiction, they are not to be judged by how true they are but by how convincing they are, i.e. nothing is absolute where only one theory could be said to contain the ultimate truth about translation. Halliday agrees (1964) with Widdowson (1979) when he stands against the absolutist position that only one theory could be said to contain the ultimate truth about language.

The Linguistic Model

The structural theory of language constitutes the backbone of the linguistic model and the study of language is thought of as an analysis of the text at different levels of structural organization viz. phonology, morphology and syntax. This scientific approach to language analysis is believed to lay the foundations for the ideal approach to translation teaching. Translation training, it is assumed, entails mastering elements or building blocks of the languages in question, (that are being taught) and acquiring the rules by which these elements are combined from phonic, graphic, lexical and grammatical units. Catford (1965, p. viii) holds that "since translation has to do with language, the analysis and description of translation processes must make considerable use of categories set up for the description of languages". He (1965) views translation as a replacement of each textual element in the SL by an equivalent textural element in the TL. Accordingly, this replacement can be achieved by making the structure of a language, which is seen as a set of universal scales, operate at four levels: first, phonic-substance for the spoken medium, graphic substance for the written medium, and situation or situation-substance, both of which are, in fact, extra-linguistic. He (1965, p. 3) states that the internal levels of language are phonology and graphology which are the medium-firm, "arrived at by a process of abstraction from the phonic and graphic substance, and the differently abstracted levels". The relationship between the units of grammar/lexis and situation (substance) is that of contextual meaning.

However, the linguistic model has been proved by Catford (1965) to be limited because when moving from one linguistic system to another, the translator is likely to face grammatical or lexical non-correspondences, especially between Arabic and English that are pragma-linguistically incongruent. Hence, it is unable to go beyond the sentence level because the division of the source language text into smaller meaning units does not ensure the transfer of the communicative meaning. It can be said that this mechanistic view of translation is similar to that of the behaviourist concept of language.

The Behaviourist Model

Behaviourism is an empirically based approach. Skinner (1957) claims that language is a habit, the learning of which is dependent on three elements: stimulus, response and reinforcement.



He (1957) emphasizes the importance of behaviourism specifically its procedures in a classroom setting. He describes six procedures of behaviour. (1) Specify the desired outcome that needs to be changed and how it will be evaluated. (2) Establish a favourable environment by removing unfavourable stimuli that might complicate learning. (3) Choose the proper reinforcers for desired behavioural manifestations. (4) Begin shaping desired behaviour by using immediate reinforcers for desired behaviour. (5) Once a pattern of desired behaviours has begun, slacken off the number of times reinforcers are given. (6) Evaluate results and reassess for future development. In fact, these approaches constitute, as far as translation and behaviourism are concerned, both the ST and the instructor's teaching of how to translate represents the stimulus component of the process. The response represents the translators' reaction to the ST and the instructors' teaching of how to translate represents the component of the process. Finally, reinforcement is a vital element in the training process because it increases the likelihood that the behaviour will or will not occur again, by positively reinforcing trainees' successful translation and negatively reinforcing their inadequate translation.

It can be claimed that a contrastive analysis of the source and target language would help instructors predict their students' potential areas of difficulty. Interference between the two languages is the main source of their errors; that is why a comparison between the SL and TL is needed. However, the contrastive analysis made claims that are both strong and weak: strong in the sense they overestimate, at times, the role of interference in cross-linguistic interaction and weak in the sense that they failed to predict other non-interference errors which have sometimes been an obstacle to the learning process. Let us consider again the reinforcement procedure, as it is a complex but essential one. If the TT is an adequate reflection of the ST, it means that the trainee has succeeded in following or adhering to the instructor's instruction. As a result, there will be a positive reinforcement to the trainee's production (TT) and obviously to his method of translation. However, what will happen if the trainee's reaction does not conform to the instructor's teaching methods? How can we judge a translation to be right or wrong if we consider the fact that an ST may have different but adequate translations? The behaviourist approach claims that translation is a habit formation brought about by reinforcement where errors should be eradicated. It would fail to account for the creativity of trainees who can find effective ways of translation other than the instructors' translation. This is because translation training is a process that necessarily involves trial and error. It is generally held that in a learning/training process, learners who play a reactive role by responding to the instructor's stimulus are often left with "little control over the content, pace, or style of learning. They are not encouraged to initiate interaction because this may lead to mistakes" (Richards 1986, p. 56). The instructor's role then becomes central and dominating. He (1986, p. 56) adds that "the instructor models the target language, controls the direction and pace of learning, monitors and corrects the learners' performance". As a result, learners/trainees avoid going into areas which they are not sure they can master and instructors consequently do not construct a complete picture of their students' progress.

The Communicative Model

The communicative model comes partly as a response to criticism faced by the linguistic model. The emphasis has moved to another fundamental dimension that was inadequately covered in the linguistic model which is the functional and communicative potential of the text. Proponents of the communicative approach (e.g. Newmark 1988) attempt to investigate the systems of meaning that lie behind the communicative uses of text. The approach accounts for



both the grammatical and notional implications of the text because it starts from a theory of language as communication where the translation is a means to deliver a communicative goal in another language. Therefore, “if the purpose of translation is to achieve a particular function for the target addressee, anything that obstructs the achievement of this purpose is a translation error” (Nord 1997, p. 74). The approach was primarily designed to train students to produce in the TL the natural equivalent to the message of the SL.

Newmark (1988) views the approach as an approximate translation where an SL cultural word is translated by a TL cultural word. The choice of features indigenous to the target language and culture is made in preference to features with their roots in the SL. The result, Hervey and Higgins (1992, p. 28) argue, is to “minimize forcing SL specific features in the TT, thereby to convert it into a natural TL text within a target cultural setting”. They (1992, p. 28) add that the translator is striving to reduce translation loss to minimize differences rather than to maximize sameness. The communicative model holds, therefore, the view that what is said in one language should be said with the same communicative effect in the other. Nida's and Taber's (1969) dynamic equivalence which calls for equivalent effect can be said to fall within this framework due to the fact that it assumes that translation consists in producing in the receptor language the most natural equivalent to the message of the SL. In the teaching activity, proponents of the cultural approach would attempt to acculturate their students in both languages so that cultural gaps are bridged as much as possible. Trainees would be made aware of the fact that translation is a message provided to a particular audience in a particular communicative situation. As a result, errors that may affect the intelligibility of the translated text would be sanctioned as serious within this framework. Here, there is the risk of overlooking the quality of translation in terms of faithfulness to the ST and altering the type and function that the text sets to fulfil.

The Emergence of Text Typology

While the linguistic model identifies translation with a transfer of structural sub-levels of text (e.g. word and sentence, etc.) and the communicative model defines it as a set of purposive communicative acts, the text-linguistic model goes beyond the two approaches by catering for other essential meaning aspects. It starts from context as a crucial element which determines the meaning of the text. Yet the text is considered the primary unit of study from which the reader or the translator can infer and refer to other contextual elements. One of the characteristics of text is its resemblance to or difference from other texts. However, we may wonder, as did Bell (1991, p. 202) “how is it given that each text is unique, that some texts are treated as the same?” The key concept for answering such a question, he (1991, p. 202) suggests “is that of a type-token relationship; each individual text is a token a realisation of some ideal type which underlies it”. The text typology draws upon text research conducted within both applied linguistics (Werlich 1976) and translation theory (Beaugrande 1978). This body of work has been the basis on which Hatim and Mason (1990) have developed a text-type model of the translation process which they termed rhetorical typology.

Based on the eclectic approach to translation which claims that choosing the appropriate method depends on the type of text being translated, more elaboration on text typology is needed. In translation, we can distinguish between two major levels: micro and macro, the two of which constitute the standards of the textuality of text. Micro-level refers to the organisation of the textual elements in the text, i.e. the way the surface components of the text relate together. It is mainly categorized into three types: syntactic, semantic, and stylistic. Macro-



level, however, refer to the extra-linguistic meaning of the surface components and the communicative functions they perform. We can distinguish, within this contextual aspect of the text, two subtypes. The first relates to situational adequacy which involves the three Hallidayan discourse parameters of the field, tenor and mode of the ST which should be fulfilled in the TT. The second involves the type of text being translated which results in the wrong choice of the appropriate translation model.

Rhetorical Typology

Historically speaking, during the medieval ages, the Arab scholar Al-Jahidh from Al-Basra in Iraq (in Aharoun, 1969: p. 75) predicted the emergence of the text typological model when he recommends that before any translation attempt “the translator should know the structure of the text, behaviours of the people and their ways of understanding each other”. In the twentieth century, Beaugrande and Dressler (1981, p. 186) define text-typology as “a set of heuristics for producing, predicting, and processing textual occurrences, and hence acts as a prominent determiner of efficiency, effectiveness, and appropriateness”. Both scholars put emphasis on the structure of the text, which indicates the rhetorical purpose of the text type, whether it is argumentative, expository or instructive. Also, Hatim and Mason (1990, p. 140) define text type as “a conceptual framework which enables us to classify texts in terms of communicative intentions serving an overall rhetorical purpose”. They (1990) propose a method for the classification of texts and maintain that any given text when meeting a number of standards of textuality would have a context, a structure, and a texture. Each of these domains is capable of yielding a set of hypotheses about the text. When these elements collaborate, they can construct a text that is able to reflect its overall rhetorical goal which is based on the notion text's predominant rhetorical purpose. Hatim (1990, p. 149) defines this notion as “a term stands for the means whereby a text is defined as a token of a type. The term subsumes the set of communicative, pragmatic and semiotic procedures which followed when relating a text to its context”. Based on the above-mentioned dominant contextual focus, three main text types can be distinguished: exposition, instruction, and argumentation.

Following Werlich (1976), Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), and Hatim and Mason (1990) propose a comprehensive model of translation grounded in the notion of rhetorical typology. They prefer to divide texts according to the rhetorical purposes that characterise every text. Within this model, three major text types, with other branching subtypes, can be listed. First, an expository text is used to analyse concepts with the aim of informing or narrating. Second, the argumentative text is used to evaluate objects, events or concepts with the aim of influencing future behaviour. Third, an instructive text is used to direct the receiver towards a certain course of action. Hatim and Munday (2004, p. 73) claim that “the text-oriented models of the translation process that have emerged in recent years have all sought to avoid the pitfalls of categorizing text in accordance with situational criteria such as subject matter. Instead, texts are now classified on the basis of a predominant contextual focus”. This division of the text into three types makes the translators confront the difficult issue which they called text hybridization. This means that texts that are essentially multi-functional are now seen as the norm rather than the exception.

This rhetorical typology, however, is context-sensitive and views texts in terms of their rhetorical purpose, i.e. exposition, argumentation, and instruction. We may claim that the translators are the first and most text-analyst who should determine the type and profile of the ST text. The translator will then need to consciously manipulate and combine the features of



the profile that are essential to make the translated text an instance of the text type in the TL and culture. However, Munday (2008, p. 75) concludes that “the translation method employed depends on far more than just text type. The translator’s own role and purpose, as well as sociocultural pressures, also affect the kind of translation strategy that is adopted” This is a clear indication of the non-binary nature of translation which requires ongoing interdisciplinary research.

Reiss (1989) also notes that text type is an important concept for translation quality assessment. She believes that one can be in a position to judge a translation “fairly”, only when one is able to establish some factors among which is the determination of the kind of text the original represents in terms of text type and text variety. Broadly speaking, text-typology aims at grouping texts into categories and types, and at identifying and describing linguistic and conceptual features that texts belonging to a particular group have in common. The definition of the term text-type varies somewhat between different linguists, but most follow Hatim and Mason’s (1990) in relating this concept to communicative intentions. In such an approach, texts are defined by features which could be described as external to the text itself. These include areas such as text purpose, text producer’s intentions, writer/reader relationships, and medium of communication. On the other hand, opponents of this model such as (Newmark 1988) may argue that texts are a blend, therefore, it is impossible to find a text with a single type. However, Hatim and Munday 2004, p. 74) argue that it is generally accepted that almost all texts are in a sense hybrid, “the predominance of a given rhetorical purpose in a given text is an important yardstick for assessing the text type identity”. Hatim (2007 p. 13) explains this by saying that “it is the degree of text evaluativeness that seem to be the single most important feature which distinguishes one type rom the other”. This means that we have to rely on the predominant txt type.

The Application of Eclecticism in Teaching Translation

The eclectic approach is adopted to translation whereby translation theory is determined according to the dominant type of text, i.e. the identification of a translation problem should precede the choice of the appropriate theory. Thus, before making a decision about the choice of a suitable translation method, we should follow the procedures borrowed from Popper (1959). In this view, an initial teaching problem (P1) is identified, and then a trial solution (TS) is introduced, followed by an error elimination process (EE) and resulting finally in a solution which may contain new though different problems (P2). In other words, to construct a theory according to the resulting situation. The decision to choose the suitable strategy to render the line from Shakespeare depends on the following. (1a) Either in terms of formal equivalence, if the reader is familiar with the SL culture or in (1b) in terms of dynamic equivalence, if the reader is not familiar with the SL culture.

1. Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?

(1. a) هل لي مقارنتك بيوم صيفي؟

(Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?)

1. b) هل لي مقارنتك بيوم ربيعي؟

(Shall I compare thee to a spring's day?)



In this respect, an error analysis of students' performance would provide a crucial feedback to the instructor, helping to identify P1 as a first step towards determination of the translation teaching model. However, the feedback from students' errors only exhibits inadequacies of the model being taught. In other words, we can identify P1 only in respect of a theory; the concept (problem) itself suggests a priori theoretical feedback. The students' errors are often measured in terms of what has been taught or what objectives are aimed at. We cannot assess students' errors without referring to the theoretical framework that is adopted or will be implemented as a teaching model. Thus, the construction of a theoretical framework P2 should precede and conclude the formula above. P1 remains the teaching variable which keeps changing according to different training situations thereby generating different theoretical perspectives. Therefore, we would imagine that the process is circular rather than linear. The basic hypothesis is that "different text types place different sets of demands on the translator, with certain types being obviously more demanding than the other" (Hatim, 1997, p. 13). This emphasises the claim that each text needs special treatment by the translator according to its rhetorical purpose.

Translation Teaching

The linguistic paradigm of translation teaching can be called into question. Our claim considers translation as a process in which trainees play an active role. We can also add that translation training is a process that involves not only the creation of meaning and response in the TL but also equally undergoes the influence of the translator in a communicative transaction. Many controversies in translation studies could be solved by a better understanding of how diverse viewpoints on translation relate to one another. Neubert and Shreve (1992, p. 32) argue that "each model represents a particular point of view, but there are also significant interdependencies. Eventually, without yielding their specific perspectives, each of these models could contribute to a more ambitious and more adequate integrated theory of translation". Every particular teaching situation would have its drawbacks and advantages and the task of the instructor is to retain those advantageous aspects. However, this eclectic view of translation theory may also add to the confusion of students about the appropriate model of translation. Accordingly, an error-analysis process is needed as feedback to track the students' areas of confusion and difficulty, redirect them, and then provide remedial teaching or re-assessment of the existing teaching models or pedagogy.

The likely logical explanation for the persistence of the problem can be related to the methodology of teaching. It seems, therefore, justified to recognise the failure of the teaching model to implement a functional-oriented method. The functionality of the method must not focus on each language separately. It should emphasise, in addition to the use of the language within its natural context, those functional aspects that are most relevant to translation between the two languages. In other words, the method should be based on a functional comparative approach in order to consolidate both the monolingual and bilingual skills of trainee translators. They are introduced to the main translation models without any serious critical involvement in them or encouragement to relate the theory to their translation practice. In each class, students are given a text type and asked to translate it without any theoretical account of the notion of text-typology. The confusion could be prevented if students are shown how each text type requires a certain rhetorical structure of the text. Nevertheless, the most common errors among trainee translators are those related to the nature and type of text despite the fact that the apparent focus of the course seems to be text-typological. The identification of the typology of the text provides a ready-textual frame for the TT and reduces the task of the translator to a process of information filling.



Translation Courses

Most translation courses have two main drawbacks: first, it makes a clear-cut distinction between the theory of translation (translation models) and translation practice. In the class, students compare their translations with that of the instructor as if this were the correct version without any retrospective feedback from translation theory. This can be traced back to the absence of a solid discipline of what Holmes (1988) calls applied translation studies which implement findings that can be of value in the pedagogical area of the teaching of translation and the training of translators. This defect may result in two negative pedagogical implications. First, students may think of translation theory as a kind of philosophical debate which has no direct impact on actual translation. They may also assume that for each text there is one and only one correct translation, that of the instructor, which runs contrary to the non-binary nature of translation. The second limitation of the course design is that it takes translation theory as a translation teaching method. The inappropriateness of this view follows from the fact that translation theory does not always coincide with the specific course objectives, the actual students' competence and the cross-linguistic and cultural framework of the two languages involved in the translation course. Translation theory predicts problems which usually end up dominating the teaching approach, at the expense of other potentially significant characteristics of the learning and translating situation.

A more satisfactory approach should combine translation theory with selected instructional situations based on empirical studies such as error analysis and contrastive linguistics. Relying on translation theory per se can also be too abstract or too specific in actual translation practice. For instance, Delisle (1980, p. 57) observes with regard to English-French translation that “translation theories do not make the task of teaching translation any easier because of their excessive abstractedness and their broadness in respect of particular genres of text”. In this respect, Bartrina (2005, p. 177) emphasises the role of translation theory by saying that “knowledge of theory can never be provided to students as an end per se, but as a starting point for the adoption of the methods required to ensure continuous learning”. He (2005) adds that the theory should give trainee translators an enthusiasm for learning, practising and thinking about translation in both a specific and an interdisciplinary manner.

The abstractedness and particularity of translation theory for a teaching situation can also be traced back to the fact that it is not empirically driven. That is, it does not stem from the needs and requirements of the relevant teaching situation. An insightful alternative for this situation is that advocated in this paper, where a pedagogical working hypothesis should consist of the interplay of translation theory and feedback from the translation products. A continuous assessment of students' performance is, therefore, necessary to implement and reshape the translation teaching to suit and incorporate students' needs and the course objectives. But there are other cases where a problem arises with the monolingual dictionary itself or when the bilingual dictionary does not provide an equivalent which is in harmony with the TT. Students must be encouraged in this context to perform an analysis of the text to eliminate the confusion and extract the required meaning of the word from its context and/or retrieve a relative context equivalent available from their knowledge of the TL. By the end of the first stage, students must have the required linguistic and bilingual competence for a translation, and the instructor should have the necessary feedback from the students to be able to take them to the next stage of translation skills.



CONCLUDING REMARKS

In conclusion, translation is both theory and practice; it is neither a practical nor a theoretical exercise, but rather a combination of the two, despite the fact that each has some useful insights. However, translation instructors usually choose a model of translation and judge their students' performance accordingly. They should make it clear to their students that every translation has its own aim and that they could choose the methods that best serve the intended aim of translation. It is undeniable fact that the process of analysis is not as simple, since models of translation differ in focus and therefore in assessment. Therefore, it is high time for the winds of change to blow considering a revision in translation teaching methods after many years of the dominance of the prescriptive approaches over translation teaching. Translation teaching should no longer be seen as a set of rules and instructions prescribed by translation instructors to the students as to what strategies will lead to an (in)correct translation. Bearing in mind the importance of decision-making in translation, instructors should try to teach their students the actual translation methods based on the type of text being translated and explain the perlocutionary consequences resulting from the adoption of such methods for the students, i.e. by employing the eclectic approach to allow their students to select voluntarily between different available options.

Finally, the basic teaching approach should be based on text typology due to the fact that different text types place different demands on the translator. In crude terms, each text needs special treatment by the translator. Accordingly, trainees need not be linguistic geniuses to be translators. The real need is for instructors to identify and make their students recognise where their skills are lacking when support is needed and what measures are to be taken. This can be achieved by being able to demystify text-type forms through the application of a broad view of the text typological model that incorporates insights from other models of translation.

REFERENCES

- Aharoun, A. (ed.). (1969). *Kita:b Alhayawān [The Book of Animals]*. Dar Al-kitab Al-Arabi.
- Bell, R. (1991) *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. Longman.
- Bartrina, F. (2005) Theory and Translator Training. In Tennent M (ed) *Training for the New Millennium*. Benjamins.
- Catford, J. (1965) *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). *New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind*. Cambridge University Press.
- Delisle, J. (1980) *L'Analyse du Discours comme Méthode de Traduction (Cahiers de traductologie, No. 2)*. University of Ottawa Press.
- Edward, A. (1963) Approach, Method and Technique. *ELT Journal* V. xvii, 2 pp 67.
- Gao, L. (2011) Eclecticism or Principled Eclecticism. *Creative Education*. 2(4) 363-369.
- Halliday, M. (1992). How Do You Mean? In M. Davies, & L. Ravelli (Eds.), *Advances in Systemic Linguistics: Recent Theory and Practice* (pp. 20-35). Pinter Publishers.
- Halliday, M. (1964) *The Linguistic Science and Language Teaching*. Longman.
- Hatim, B. and Munday, J. (2004) *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. Routledge.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*. Longman.
- Hervey, S. and Higgins, I. (1992) *Thinking Translation*. Routledge.



- Kumar, C. (2013) The Eclectic Method-Theory and its Application to the Learning of English. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, Volume 3, Issue 6, June 2013 1 ISSN 2250-3153 www.ijsrp.org
- Kussmaul, P. (1995) *Training the Translator*. Benjamins.
- Munday, J. (2008) *Introducing Translation Studies*. Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988a) *Approaches to Translation*. Prentice-Hall International.
- Neubert, A. and Shreve, M. (1992) *Translation as Text*. Kent State University Press.
- Nida, E. and Taber, C. (1969) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. E. J. Brill.
- Nord, C. (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. St. Jerome.
- Reiss, K. (1989) *Text-types, Translation Types and Translation Assessment*. (in A. Chesterman (ed.) pp. 105–15.
- Richards, J. C. (1986) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, B. (1957) *Verbal Behaviour*. Prentice-Hall International.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1983) Dimension and Perspective in Literary Translation, In Wilss, W. and Thome, G. (eds.), *Translation Theory and its Implementation in the Theory of Translation and Interpreting*. pp. 105-13, Gunter Narr.
- Wali, N. (2009) Eclecticism and Language learning. *Al- Fatih Journal*. No.39, pp 34-41.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1979). The Deep Structure of Discourse and the Use of Translation, In Brumfit, C. J. and Johnson, K. (eds.), *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. pp. 60-71, Oxford University Press.
- Werlich, E. (1976) *A Text Grammar of English*. Quelle and Meyer.