DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 889 FL 025 393

AUTHOR Parkinson, Brian
TITLE Translator, Traitor, Source of Data: Classifying Translations of "Foreign Phrases" as an Awareness-Raising Exercise.
PUB DATE 1998-05-00
NOTE 15p.; For complete volume, see FL 025 387.
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (080) -- Reports - Research (143)
JOURNAL CIT Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics; n9 p73-85 1998
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Class Activities; Classification; Classroom Techniques; *Discourse Analysis; *Language Patterns; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; Second Language Instruction; *Second Languages; *Translation

ABSTRACT

A system for classifying (coding) translations of sentence-length or similar material is presented and illustrated with codings of entries in the "Dictionary of Foreign Phrases and Classical Quotations." Problems in coding are discussed, relating especially to intertextuality, intention, and ownership. The system is intended for pedagogic use, and the place of such classifying activities within advanced second language courses involving translation is considered. Using this approach, students are encouraged to adopt a relatively non-judgmental, descriptive attitude toward particular translations, but also to question the general ideology of a book such as the one analyzed here and to explore implications for their own learning. (Contains 26 references.) (Author/MSE)

Translator, Traitor, Source of Date: Classifying Translations of "Foreign Phrases" as an Awareness-Raising Exercise

BRIAN PARKINSON

2

TRANSLATOR, TRAITOR, SOURCE OF DATA: CLASSIFYING TRANSLATIONS OF 'FOREIGN PHRASES' AS AN AWARENESS-RAISING EXERCISE

Brian Parkinson (IALS)

Abstract

A system for classifying (coding) translations of sentence-length or similar material is presented, and exemplified with codings of entries in the Dictionary of Foreign Phrases and Classical Quotations *(Jones, 1925). Problems in coding are discussed: they relate especially to intertextuality, intention and ownership. The system is intended for pedagogic use (after further trialling), and the place of such classifying activities within advanced foreign-language courses involving translation is considered. The recommended approach is, in some respects, analogous to Widdowson's approach to teaching literature. Students are encouraged to adopt a relatively non-judgemental, descriptive attitude to particular translations, but also to question the general ideology of a book such as Jones, and to explore implications for their own learning.*

1. Introduction

This article is a sequel to Parkinson 1995a (though it can be read independently), and pursues in a small way the agenda outlined there of finding analytical activities which can help learners in advanced foreign-language courses involving translation. In both cases the emphasis is on language awareness, a necessary prelude to satisfactory performance, rather than on performance itself. Whilst the earlier article focused on texts of 'normal' length (say one page upwards) and on general features such as purpose, formality and register, the present one looks at the translation of short, typically one-sentence, proverbs and sayings and similar 'free-standing' (see 2.2) material, and offers a category system for coding such material. The system is illustrated with sample codings of entries from the *Dictionary of Foreign Phrases and Classical Quotations* (Jones, 1925).

Sections 2 to 6 describe in turn the dictionary, the coding system, some problems of coding, the results of (very limited) trialling, and some pedagogical issues.

Before all this, a comment on the academic literature in translation. There is a great deal, but rather little that seems directly relevant to or is found practically helpful by the advanced students I teach and meet - some trainee translators, some general students who use translation for language improvement or need it to pass examinations. Such students consistently praise Duff (1981), Baker (1992), the early work of Newmark (e.g. Newmark 1982, 1988), and sometimes recent material for particular pairs of languages, e.g. Agorni & Polezzi 1996, Roberts 1996, Gutknecht & Rölle 1996, or the seminal Vinay & Darbelnet 1958. Such works are typically most helpful for those beginning serious translation, typically at upper intermediate level, but at higher levels there seems to be nothing comparable: a critique of Bassnett 1991, Gentzler 1993 and Venuti 1992, and the wider tradition(s) they represent, is offered in Parkinson 1995b.

EDINBURGH WORKING PAPERS IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS, number 9 (1998) ISSN 0959-2253

2. The book chosen for analysis

2.1 Description

According to its title page, the *Dictionary of Foreign Phrases and Classical Quotations* is "edited with notes by Hugh Percy Jones, B.A." - no other writers or helpers are mentioned - and published in 1925. It seems, however, to be an unacknowledged reissue of an earlier work: the whole tone and layout seem Victorian, there is a "present German emperor", the "present century" is the nineteenth, and *fin de siècle* is translated (p. 232) as "extremely modern, up to date". A "Publisher's Note" (p.v.) mentions a "predecessor", called *Deacon's Dictionary of Foreign Phrases*, and tells us that the present work costs "about double" but "contains nearly ten times as much information".

A few extracts from the introduction will give an idea of intended audience and purpose:

> The writings of the Press constantly contain allusions and references which presuppose some knowledge of foreign languages and literature on the part of both the writer and reader. The same may be said of our public speakers. Although it has ceased to be a habit in the House of Commons for honourable members to denounce one another in a phrase borrowed from Lucan or Virgil, (.....) still a happy phrase from the treasury of the classics is often found to be no mean ally in enforcing an argument.
>
> Nowadays we are all citizens of Cosmopolis, and we do not hesitate to import a phrase, even if clothed in a strange dress, should it serve our purpose better than the more familiar words of our mother tongue. (.....) For example, how common is the use of such Latin phrases as: *Deus ex machinâ; Quantum mutatus ab illo; Nolo episcopari;* (.....) (s)uch French phrases as *Bon chien chasse de race; Vogue la galère* (.....).
>
> At the same time, while these and numerous other phrases are in common use, it must not be forgotten that a large number of the reading public - indeed, an ever-increasing multitude - are often in doubt as to the meaning of the commonest phrases of this kind. A great majority have never had the opportunity of cultivating any language other than their own, while, in the present day, technical education has very properly diverted the attention of many from the study of languages to what is of more immediate practical utility. Such people, when confronted by a quotation from a foreign language, may be tempted to exclaim with Berchoux, *Qui nous délivrera des Grecs et des Romains?* A confession of ignorance is always unpleasant, and it is for the convenience of those troubled ones that this book is primarily designed.
>
> (pp. x-xi)

The book, then, is not aimed at academics, but at the anxious self-improver.

It contains about 14,000 entries, mostly of one line but some of eight or more, from Latin (127 pages), (Classical) Greek (56), French (166), German (41), Italian (71), Spanish (52) and Portuguese (13). Pages xii to xix introduce each language separately, all in very positive terms but with a hint of racial stereotyping, e.g.:

> Whether the Moorish strain in his blood is responsible for the Spaniard's love of sententious sayings we need not inquire.
>
> (p. xix)

The introduction to Greek is perhaps the most revealing:

> I fear that some people, on seeing that more than fifty pages of this book are devoted to Greek quotations, will be inclined to exclaim: *Que diable allait-il faire dans cette galère?* Greek has, unfortunately, ceased to be popular as a subject for study. "What is the use of Greek?" - a question often put to long-suffering pedagogues by their charges - is now more often heard from the lips of those whose age ought to have given them more wisdom. But, as in the past:
>
> > "Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit, et artes
> > Intulit agresti Latio"
>
> so we may be permitted to hope that Greek literature is only receiving a temporary rebuff (.....)
>
> It is true that we seldom hear Greek quoted nowadays; but this is a fault that may be remedied. I am told that, within recent years, an alderman has been heard to adorn his speech with excerpts in the language of Sophocles. Why should not this wholesome infection spread to our Lord Mayors?
>
> (p. xiv)

Jones, then, was writing for a world where the social importance of (a certain kind of) foreign-language knowledge seemed firmly entrenched, but where the gaps between socially expected knowledge and actual knowledge were becoming hard to ignore.

2.2 Reasons for choice

The choice of this text type, a book of 'phrases and quotations', has a clear rationale. Such 'phrases' (in fact usually sentences not phrases in syntactic terms) can be viewed as free-standing, as having meaning of their own as mini-texts, independent of particular texts in which they might be embedded. Their translations can therefore, in principle, be evaluated independently, without having to take account of multiple features of cohesion and coherence as one would with a translation of a sentence from a novel, newspaper article or other longer text. An analogy might be made with evaluating answers to a series of short, independent algebra questions, as opposed to the single steps in a ten-page proof. Pedagogically, this ought to provide the many 'fresh starts' seen as important for valid language testing (e.g. Hughes 1987: 36-43), and arguably therefore for teaching too.

Of course, no text is entirely free-standing, and in some ways 'phrases and quotations' even have more links with the linguistic 'outside world' than a typical sentence from a novel - see Section 4. In my view, though, this does not invalidate the above rationale, and 'phrases and quotations' have something distinctive to offer, though only as a not too frequent alternative to more typical textual material.

Within the chosen text type, the choice of such an old book is a little more arbitrary, and I may decide upon a more modern one for later pedagogic use - see Section 6. Nevertheless, the book chosen does have certain advantages:

(i) It is almost entirely free of the technical terms which occupy so much of every remotely comparable modern work. There are none from science, economics, international affairs, etc., only a few from law. This is entirely to the good, as it leaves far more room for students to give their own opinions: if told that *Pauschalberichtigung für Forderungen* means 'flat-rate provision for trade receivables', most of us feel we must just accept it.

(ii) A textbook from the heyday of foreign-language quotation in English may have a certain extra authenticity; modern equivalents may be seen as marginal text-types.

(iii) The ideological slant of certain entries (see Section 3, Categories 11 and 13) may be, if not totally obvious and indisputable, at least more so than in contemporary texts. This should help students inexperienced in ideological 'deconstruction'.

(iv) Such deconstruction might profitably be extended to the book as a whole, helping students to question, and consider alternatives to, the overall approach to language and language learning which a book such as Jones represents - see Section 6.

3. The coding system

This section presents, with examples, 13 of the 15 categories in the current (first) draft of the coding system. I have removed two categories which seem very infrequent, renumbered others, and slightly simplified some definitions. For the sake of clarity (but perhaps unfairly, see Section 4), I have omitted in the examples some alternatives and notes given by Jones.

Category 1: "Straight Translation"

This is not necessarily 'word for word', but as near to this as (easily) permitted by the grammar and lexis of the two languages. Examples:

Les rois ont les mains longues.	Kings have long arms. (p. 289)
Wer oft schiesst, trifft endlich.	Who shoots often, hits at last. (p. 387)
Nullum imperium tutum, nisi benevolentiâ munitum.	No government is safe unless fortified by good will. (p. 82)

Category 2: "Small Changes"

There are one or more changes, not obviously necessary, such as singular for plural, abstract noun for related personal noun, use of loose synonym, change of syntax, omission of detail. These are not so large as to prevent translation of 'general meaning', nor do they fall into Categories 11 or 13 below. Example:

Les pots fêlés sont ceux qui durent le plus.	The cracked pot lasts longest. (p. 289)

(More literal translation: 'Cracked pots are the ones that last longest'.)

Category 3: "Large Changes - Unsystematic"

Though placed third to facilitate initial understanding of the system, this is logically the final category, a miscellaneous 'dustbin', where the coder places any translations with changes too great to be included in Categories 1 or 2, but not adequately accounted for by any of the processes mentioned in Categories 4 to 13. Example:

Was vernünftig ist, das ist wirklich;
und was wirklich ist, das ist vernünftig.
Hegel

Whatever is, is right. *Pope*

(p. 384)

(More literal translation: "Whatever is rational/reasonable is real and whatever is real is rational/reasonable.")

Category 4: "Verse to Verse"

Verse in the foreign language is rendered as verse in English, retaining the general sense but with substantial changes probably dictated by rhyme and/or metre. Example:

De la Fortune on vante les appas;
Méfions-nous de la traîtresse;
Non-seulement la dame n'y voit pas,
Mais elle aveugle encor tous ceux
qu'elle caresse. *Albéric Deville*

Some say that Fortune's ways are kind;
Still she's a traitress; shun her wiles!
Not only is the goddess blind,
But blinds the men on whom she smiles.

(p. 219)

(More literal translation: "People praise the charms of Fortune; let us mistrust the traitress; not only is the lady blind, she also blinds all those she caresses.").

Category 5: "Misunderstanding"

The translator seems to have misunderstood the original text, or perhaps there has been some clerical mistake later in the editing process. Example:

Den Himmel überlassen wir
Den Engeln und den Spatzen. *Heine*

We leave Heaven to the angels and the spirits.

(p. 357)

(Correct translation: "..... to the angels and the sparrows".).

Category 6: "Proverb to Proverb"

The translation is significantly different from the original at the word level, but a recognised proverb of (arguably) similar general meaning has been substituted. (This is normally in English, but sometimes in Latin or Greek.) Example:

Viele Händ' machen bald ein End.

Many hands make labour light.
(p. 383)

(More literal translation: "Many hands soon make an end".).

Note: If the coder feels that the chosen proverb is *not* equivalent, another category, probably 3, 12 or 13, should be chosen.

Category 7: "Specialised Use"

The translation offered is clearly not the literal or normal meaning of the original words in the original language, but may well be an accurate reflection of how they are (or were) normally used in the English-speaking world. Example:

Proxime accessit.	Honourable mention. (p. 96)

(More literal translation: "He/she came next.").

Category 8: "Short Translation"

The translation is shorter than the original; what is included is (fairly) literal, but a significant part of the overall meaning is omitted. Example:

Der Horcher an der Wand hört seine eigne Schand.	The listener never hears any good of himself. (p. 358)

(More literal translation: "The listener at the wall (eavesdropper) ...".).

Category 9: "Essential Explanation"

The translation is longer than the original, but the added elements are clearly necessary as an explanation of what would otherwise be obscure. Example:

Ex pede Herculem.	Judge of the whole from a part, as you can guess the size of Hercules from seeing only his foot. (p. 40)

(More literal translation: "Hercules from foot.").

Category 10: "Long Translation (Non-ideological)"

The translation is longer than the original. The additional material is or includes an interpretation or explanation, but this does not fit Category 9, nor does it in any obvious way suggest the influence of particular moral, political or social opinions or assumptions of the translator. Example:

Was du liebst, das lebst du. *Fichte*	A man forms his life according to the standard of what he considers gives happiness. (p. 384)

(More literally: "What you love, you live.").

Category 11: "Long Translation (Ideological)"

As Category 10, except that the additions/changes do reveal or suggest a filtering through, or the intrusion of, particular moral, political or social assumptions of the translator. Example:

Fides ante intellectum.	The pupil must accept without questioning his master's instructions. (p. 44)

(More literal translation: "Faith before intellect/understanding".).

Category 12: "Semantic Change with Identifiable Pattern (Non-ideological)"

This category and the next differ from the other eleven in that they are used to describe a pattern of changes observable over several (at least four) translations in the same corpus. These are changes, not fitting any of Categories 4 to 11, which entail the deletion, addition, or change of elements from a particular semantic field. Within this type, Categories 12 and 13 are distinguished in exactly the same way as Categories 10 and 11.

An example of apparently non-ideological changes of this type is the frequent removal of the 'animal' element from French proverbs translated into English:

(a) A bon chat, bon rat.	Well matched; set a thief to catch a thief. (p. 184)
(b) A rude âne rude ânier.	Like cures like. (p. 191)
(c) Faire d'une mouche un éléphant.	To make a mountain of a molehill. (p. 230)

(More literal translations: (a) "To a good cat, a good rat"; (b) For a stubborn donkey, a stubborn driver"; (c) "To make an elephant of a fly".

Category 13: "Semantic Change with Identifiable Pattern (Ideological)"

For definition see Category 12. By far the largest and clearest sub-division of Category 13 is male-generic translation of gender-neutral originals. The (easily avoidable) use of generic 'he' occurs hundreds of times, and the German *der Mensch* ('human being') and *man* ('one') are both frequently and predictably translated as 'man' (*der Mann* in German).

Some readers will feel that this says nothing about the translator's personal views, only about the linguistic norms of the time. Perhaps the following example will be more persuasive.

A dix-huit ans, on adore tout de suite; à vingt ans, on aime; a trente, on désire; à quarante, on réfléchit. *Paul de Kock*	At eighteen we learn to adore a woman in a moment; at twenty we love her; we yearn for her at thirty; but at forty we consider whether she is worth the trouble. (p. 186)

(More literal translation: "At 18, one adores at once; at 20, one loves; at 30, one desires; at 40, one thinks about it.").

Jones's version seems to me sexist in four ways. Not only is a statement potentially applicable to men and women assumed to apply only to men, not only are our readers assumed to be (or 'interpellated' as - see Althusser 1971) men, not only is the woman apparently without choice, but the

decision is presented as a balancing of (probably economic) advantages which demeans both sexes. Perhaps Paul de Kock meant all this, but should the translator so assume?

Contrary to expectation, very few non-gender-related examples have been found for Category 13: no obvious racism, Grundyism, etc., no hostility to any political and social group. All that has emerged so far, very marginal at that, is a tendency to delete religious elements, e.g.:

Il est juste que le prêtre vive de l'autel.	The labourer is worthy of his hire. (p. 239)

(More literal translation: "It is just (fair) that the priest should live by the altar.").

4. Some problems and issues in using the coding system

Any coding system, except the very simplest, encounters problems of interpretation and justification: attempts to establish inter-coder reliability for categories nearly always lead to disappointment, and reliability is only a necessary, not a sufficient, condition for validity. Potential ambiguities, procedural problems and questionable assumptions will occur to any careful reader of Section 3. In the present section, I will not attempt to deal with all such problems, but only to touch upon three issues which may be of some theoretical interest - intertextuality, intention and ownership - and two practical choices affecting the ground rules of coding.

Intertextuality is a broad term covering everything from direct quotation of another text, through parody, rebuttal, etc., to faint and elusive echoes of old texts which may just slightly affect our response to new ones. It is everywhere in language: like the butterfly's wing in chaos theory, everything potentially affects everything else. In the area of 'famous quotations', though, it is particularly salient: few of these are wholly original, many belong to a family of variants, not just across languages but also within the same language. Newton (for example) did indeed say something about seeing further by standing on the shoulders of giants, but this was not, and not even offered as, original, having earlier versions in at least five languages over two millenia.

Jones often seems unsure how to cope with such networks. He has a few favourite English phrases such as 'set a thief to catch a thief' and 'coals to Newcastle', used several times per language for very different originals. He makes some (to me) doubtful links, e.g.:

Si cadere necesse est, occurrendum discrimini. *Tacitus*	(If we must fall, let us boldly face the danger.) "How can a man die better than facing fearful odds?" (p. 110)

but he misses or leaves unspoken some much clearer links, e.g. between these two entries:

La donna è mobile.	Woman is a fickle thing. (p. 431)
Varium et mutabile semper femina. *Virgil*	Woman is ever fickle and changeable. (p. 122)

Nonetheless, Jones clearly has considerable knowledge of intertextual links which I lack, and which may make some of my codings 'unfair' or simply wrong. *A fortiori*, students with very limited literary knowledge may in particular cases of intertextuality be as helpless as those who do not understand *Pauschalberichtigung für Forderungen* (see Section 2).

Issues of intention, and whether it matters, are now a commonplace of literary criticism and theory. What did an author mean when he/she wrote certain lines, can we to some extent ignore intention (see Wimsatt & Beardsley 1954), can readers (or 'interpretive communities', see Fish 1980) create their own meaning? Space permits only one example from this complex area, lines from Boileau which Jones quotes, translates and comments upon in a footnote, as follows:

Quotation:	Après l'Agésilas, Hélas! Après l'Attila, Holà! *Boileau*
Translation:	After Agesilas, Alas! After Attila, Great Heavens!
Comment (extract):	This was Boileau's epigram on the production of *Agésilas* and *Attila*, the two tragedies written by Corneille in his declining years, in which the tragedian showed a marked falling off in dramatic power. It is said that Corneille naively supposed Boileau wished to praise and not to condemn these plays (.....)

Rather unusually for this book, we are given access to two 'meanings'. More characteristically, it is implied that one is (laughably) wrong. My own reading of (almost) original sources (e.g. Boileau-Despréaux 1808, 1966) suggests a third interpretation: that the first two lines were originally published alone; that they were intended by Boileau and taken by Corneille as critical; that the version here, published much later, was an attempt to placate. All this of course may affect the translation of '*holà*'! For present purposes, it does not matter who is right, only that in such cases it may be difficult or impossible to find out.

The ownership issue is addressed by Jones himself:

> (T)here are an enormous number of short quotations which are, so to speak, shreds from the fabric of a well-known passage of a Latin author. These passages are so familiar to those who are themselves well versed in the literature of the Romans that a word or two quoted from them becomes a finger-post to the entire passage. But I fear that to the average man the information that *virginibus puerisque* is a quotation from Horace, or that *cacoëthes scribendi* are words of Juvenal, would not materially add to his respect for the genius of these writers. (.....)
>
> Sometimes, too, the popular sense given to brief excerpts from the Latin is different from the meaning of the original. For example, *Noli me tangere*, which is the Vulgate version of the risen Christ's "Touch me not!" addressed to the Magdalene, is now commonly used to indicate a threatening attitude. Again, Horace's *Vestigia nulla retrorsum* and Virgil's *O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint* are often applied in a way not meant by the poets.
>
> (pp. xii-xiii)

There is probably a case for (at some level) accepting 'wrong' quotations and translations, just as we (at some level) accept the German *der Talkmaster* for 'talk-show host', or the Japanese *Madamu Kiraa* ('madam killer') for a man who courts older women (examples from Foley & Hall, 1993:40).

Applying this to practical coding, I have used Category 1 or 2 where the translation seems an (almost) accurate reflection of established 'misuse'.

I end this section by reporting and briefly discussing two practical decisions on 'ground-rules'. First, I excluded from coding entries of two kinds:

(a) All entries consisting of a single word.

(b) Entries consisting only of a noun phrase (e.g. *table d'hôte*) or only of an adverbial phrase (e.g. *tant pis*), **unless** they were presented as or recognisable as a quotation from literature or from a real or apocryphal historical speech, e.g.:

> Das Ewig-Weibliche. The eternal feminine.
> *Goethe*
>
> (p.355)

This is attributed to Goethe and recognisable to literate Germans as a quotation from *Faust*.

Second, where Jones offers more than one translation, I based my coding on **the first translation which was not in brackets**.

Both these decisions reflected my ideas of how a modern, monolingual reader might use the book - preferring a normal dictionary for single-word items, and assuming that the first translation not in brackets was offered as 'best'. All such decisions, though, have an element of arbitrariness, and introduce a bias. In this case, the main effect is to reduce the dominance of Category 1, especially as Jones often puts literal translations in brackets. This may be 'unfair' on Jones, but for pedagogic purposes (see Section 6) it has the virtue of promoting more varied coding, and probably more discussion.

5. Trialling of system and reliability study

I used the system to code a pseudo-random sample of 600 entries, 200 each from the French, German and Latin sections of Jones. I asked a friend to double-code a 30% sub-sample (180 entries), and thus obtained preliminary inter-coder reliability measures for the system. The results of both procedures are given below. The approach was exploratory and not rigorously controlled, and the coders doubtless untypical, so no great claims can be made for these results, but they may provide inspiration for readers to attempt their own analysis.

Table 1: Results of Brian Parkinson's Codings (per cent)

Category / Language	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
French	49.5	22.5	2	0	0.5	5.5	1.5	5.5	0	0.5	2.5	3.5	6.5
German	50.5	20	1	3.5	0.5	15	0	0	0.5	2.5	0	0.5	6
Latin	41	24.5	1	0.5	0	17.5	1	0.5	1	3	3	1.5	5.5
Average	47	22.3	1.3	1.3	0.3	12.5	0.8	2	0.5	2	1.8	1.8	6

Table 2: Intercoder Reliability Resnlts (per cent)

Notes:
1. Reliability percentage = (agreed codings ÷ total codings) x 100.
2. Disagreements are counted under category chosen by first coder (BP).
3. Separate entries are given only for cells where first coder made at least three entries; columns with no such cells are omitted.
4. 'Overall' figures give equal weight to each relevant coding; 'average' figures give equal weight to each relevant cell; 'overall average' figure meets both criteria.

Category / Language	1	2	6	8	11	12	13	Other	Overall
French	82	63	84	100	50	100	81	43	75
German	89	80	86	X	X	X	100	33	81
Latin	65	27	92	X	40	X	33	47	68
Average	79	57	87	X	45	X	71	41	75

Agreement was higher than expected, though of course this does not validate the whole system: a notorious and unavoidable problem of ICR trials is that they do not provide enough data for rarer catgories, where agreement is often lowest.

6. Pedagogical implications

This system is intended for use (after refinement) with students, but has not yet been so used, so much of the present section will be programmatic and speculative. I hope in a future article to provide data on actual use, and invite readers to try the system themselves and contribute to this.

I begin, though, with a warning. Many students in classes labelled 'advanced', with or without a translation component, have problems much more fundamental and urgent than anything relating to matters discussed in this article: they have yet to master (parts of) basic grammar, or the mechanics of writing, or basic distinctions of formality and register. Until such weaknesses have been, if not eliminated, at least greatly reduced, analysis or criticism of published translations is likely to be vacuous and counter-productive.

My second point is that evaluation does not mean, at least not mainly, classification as 'good' or 'bad', 'right' or 'wrong'. It is a matter of describing and classifying: some of the descriptions will contain value judgements, but these should be secondary and usually tentative. This applies to almost any kind of evaluation - see Parkinson et al. 1982 for an example from a totally different field - but even more so here, as only an extremely small percentage of Jones's translations are outright mistakes - see Section 3, Category 5. The words 'source of data' in the title of this article, besides providing a (non-Scottish!) rhyme, show how I think books such as Jones should be used. They are not primarily models to be followed, nor Aunt Sallys (Uncle Percys?) to be derided and bettered. Instead, they are linguistic data to be understood. The (more or less!) non-judgemental approach which modern linguists have applied to pidgins and creoles, dialects and sociolects, child language, interlanguage, parent talk, foreigner talk, teacher talk, forms such as *der Talkmaster* (see Section 4), and most recently and tentatively (e.g. Cameron 1995) to the naïve prescriptivism of non-linguists, can be extended to translation as a social activity and product. A student may conclude that Jones (for example) produced this or that translation around 1890, with this or that logic in his framework, and this or that relevance or required modification in the student's own.

Thirdly, the fact that the system, even after refinement, is likely to be less than totally reliable, does not invalidate it for pedagogical use. If subjectivity is too great, the system will indeed be useless, but a margin of Heisenbergian 'Unschärfe' (persistently mistranslated as 'uncertainty'!) may be acceptable, even beneficial, as it encourages students to discuss the merits of rival codings. An analogy may be made with Widdowson's influential approach to literary criticism (Widdowson 1992; see Gilroy & Parkinson 1996:217-8 for summary and discussion), which encourages 'precision of reference in support of a particular interpretation, but emphatically not precision of interpretation itself' (p. xii). What advanced foreign-language-through-or-for-translation teaching needs, and the present article aspires (in a very small measure) to further, is what advanced foreign-language-through-or-for-literature has obtained from the work of Widdowson and his followers: a move towards systematicity, and away from vague obeisance to (e.g. Leavisite) models forever unattainable by many, but a move which stops short of spurious objectivity and prescriptive channelling, and leaves room for individual response and learner-centred teaching.

Finally, I would imagine that, after working with a book such as Jones for any extended period, both students and teachers would want to question the whole *raison d'être* of such a book, and to explore related issues of language in society and language learning. Why are such books now less popular? Is it because we are less well educated and so ignorant that we will not even attempt to understand and use such material? Or are we *better* educated, able to formulate our own ideas, and thus no longer in need of the wise sayings of dead white males? As for foreign language learning, should we base this on large chunks of language learned as wholes, or synthesise everything from smaller units, or make some compromise? Do we have a real choice in this, or does the 'compromise' happen anyway (see e.g. Weinert 1995 and her references)? If we can or must use chunks, should they include material of the kind found in Jones?

Rather than answer these questions, I will hide behind Goethe, as Victorianised by Jones:

> Was du ererbt von deinen Vätern hast,
> Erwirb es, um es zu besitzen.
>
> What thou hast inherited from thy fathers, be sure thou earn it, so that it may become thine own.
>
> (p. 384)

I am not sure that Goethe would like 'be sure thou earn it'. What about 'acquire', as *Spracherwerb* is after all 'language acquisition'?

References

Agorni, M. and L. Polezzi (1996). *Annotated Texts for Translation: English-Italian, Italian-English*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and Philosophy, and other Essays*. London: New Left Books.

Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words*. Routledge: London.

Bassnett, S. (1991) *Translation Studies*. (Revised Edition). London: Routledge.

Boileau-Despréaux, N. (1808). *Oeuvres Poétiques*. Paris: Buisson.

Boileau-Despréaux, N. (1966). *Oeuvres Complètes*. Paris: Gallimard.

Cameron, D. (1995). *Verbal Hygiene*. London: Routledge.

Duff, A. (1981). *The Third Language. Recurrent Problems of Translation into English*. Oxford, Pergamon.

Fish, S. 1980. *Is There a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Foley, M. & D. Hall *Distinction: English for Advanced Learners*. London: Nelson.

Gentzler, E. (1993). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.

Gilroy, M. & B. Parkinson (1996). 'State of the art article: teaching literature in a foreign language'. *Language Teaching*. 29,4: 213-225.

Gutknecht, R. and L. Rölle (1996). *Translating by Factors*. Albany: Suny Press.

Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.

Jones, H. P. (ed.). (1925). *Dictionary of Foreign Phrases and Classical Quotations*. Edinburgh: John Grant.

Newmark, P. (1982). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Parkinson, B. (1995a). 'Research to inform advanced EFL courses involving translation: an immodest proposal'. *EWPAL 6*: 78-82.

Parkinson, B. (1995b). 'Book reviews'. *SATEFL Newsletter*. 14, 1:14 & 16.

Parkinson, B., D. Mcintyre, R. Mitchell & A. Nutt. (1982). *An Independent Evaluation of 'Tour de France'*. Stirling: Department of Education, University of Stirling.

Roberts, P. (1996). *Annotated Texts for Translation: Spanish-English*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Venuti, L. (ed.) (1992). *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London: Routledge.

Vinay, J. & J. Darbelnet (1958). *Stylistique Comparée du Français et de l'Anglais*. Paris.

Weinert, R. (1995). 'The role of formulaic language in second language acquisition: a review'. *Applied Linguistics*. 16, 2, 180-205.

Widdowson, H. G. (1992). *Practical Stylistics: An Approach to Poetry*. Oxford: OUP.

Wimsatt, W. K. & M. Beardsley. (1954). 'The intentional fallacy'. In Wimsatt, W. K. *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*. Lexington, USA: University of Kentucky Press.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").