

Wax and Wane of Translation in Language Teaching

Marzieh Izadi

Translation Studies, University of Birjand

Email: Izadi6984@gmail.com

Received for publication: 19 January 2016.

Accepted for publication: 02 April 2016

Abstract

This article sets to embark on a journey into the history of language teaching with particular attention given to the ebb and flow of translation as one of the most controversial element in language teaching. The ideas and statements in this article are firmly anchored in the belief that movements in language teaching are mostly driven by the extrinsic factors such as commercialism and politicization rather than the intrinsic, academic ones. This article divides the course of the history of language teaching, based on the leading methodology practiced in each era, into three phases. The first phase is the time when grammar-translation method reigned over language schools under the Roman Empire, Renaissance and the beginning of the 19th century. The second phase is characterized by the dawn of the direct method and the dust of translation at the end of the 19th century. The third phase bears witness the first tentative steps towards reinstating the role of translation in language teaching. In the end, the study tries to put the reasons causing the shift of the pendulum in language teaching into perspective and discuss their pedagogical implications.

Keywords: History, Language Teaching, Reinstating, Translation

Introduction

The slippery nature of translation has made it possible for every major language teaching methodologies to assign their own self-interest definition to it unbeknownst of translation studies. This chaotic ambience overwhelming translation in language teaching has led this paper to set the forum for reassessing and reformulating a novel definition of it with the crutch of translation studies. In so doing, this article partitions the course of the history of language teaching into three major eras. In each one, the study tries to capture the ongoing debate for and against the use of translation. These three major trends are as follow, the grammar-translation method (GTM), the heyday of translation as the principal pedagogical tool for language learning. The direct method (DM) and the political, economic mafia against the use of translation. Finally, the third stage which is marked by the desperate attempts to relieve translation from the grip of GTM and giving it the façade of a lively-looking communicative activity.

Discussion

The Rise and Fall of Grammar-Translation Method

While undertaking an investigation into the history of grammar translation method, one should bear in mind that GTM did not start off as a distinctly named methodology however, it has earned its name due to its dual emphasis on *grammar* and *translation* by its detractors in the Reform Movement that were in desperate attempt to assign a name to the so-called traditional method (Howatt, 1984). The anonymity of this method, in the earliest stages of its development, talks of its orphaned status as we cannot ascribe its origins to any particular person in the course of history.

Amongst the scholars who has testified to the orphaned state of GTM is Rivers (1981) holding that "this method cannot be traced back to the tenets of any particular master teacher, but it clearly is rooted in the formal teaching of Latin and Greek which prevailed in Europe in the nineteenth century" (p. 28). Thus, in recounting the history of GTM, this article tries to identify those styles of language teaching methodologies comprising only of the consistent practice of grammar and translation as they have helped lay the foundation of GTM. In fact, the evolving process of GTM is classified by Benson (2000) as follows, its infancy stage under the Roman-Greek Empire, and its continued life in the Reformation-

Renaissance era and finally its recognition as a distinct methodology in the nineteenth century.

The Infancy Stage of Grammar-Translation Method under the Roman Empire

This stage is of significant importance in the formation of GTM, largely due to the fact that it was first in this stage that grammar and translation tied the knot and paved the asphalt for the formation of GTM as a distinct methodology. However, before focusing exclusively on this methodology and its pedagogical implications, this article tries to capture the historical background providing the fertile ground for the evolution of this method. During the second and third centuries B.C by falling Greece under the Roman Empire, the Latin felt the dire need to make use of translation as the vehicle for transferring knowledge and information from Greek culture, which was at that time at the zenith of intellectualism, to their own language and culture. As the result of such circumstances, a kind of bilingual Greek and Latin education emerged that had grammar and translation as its mainstay. The primary aim of that education was to make students commence their formal education with the sound system of Latin and Greek and then progressed from these grammatical studies to reading and translating Greek classics to Latin language (Robins, 1997). In fact, it was first during this period that grammar and translation as the main teaching and learning activities tied the knot, and cemented their relationship to be well extended over into the reformation-renaissance of the 15th and 16th centuries and with the advent of the 19th century to the modern language teaching.

The Reformation-Humanistic Movement

The second evolutionary stage of GTM is bound with the sweeping political reforms, such as the religious movement, the nationalistic-reformation movement and the advent of the new technology of printing press. Indeed, these rebellious movements savored tremendous triumph in successfully rendering the Latin language independent of the hegemonic control of Church, stretching the borders of knowledge into secular areas and more importantly, the narrowing down of the study of Latin and Greek to their literature. However, these revolutionary changes had little, if any, effect on the methodologies used in language teaching pedagogy of that time and that era is mostly recognized by its strict adherence to the principles of language teaching set in the previous era rather than by injecting novel approaches in order to amend the previously established language teaching methodologies. In a sense, the methodologies used in this era are mostly derivative although there was some smidgen of originality brought as the souvenir from the revolutionary movements of the time, but they were not so eye-catching as to bring about any kind of paradigm shift in language teaching methodologies. In this period, once again grammar and translation resurfaced and served as the fundamental cornerstones of language teaching methodology to the extent that the same definitions of grammar and translation offered by the linguists in the previous era survived more and less intact and were just carried over to this period. For instance, the definition of grammar held by Italian Niccolo Perotti, one of the leading grammarians of Renaissance time, bore considerable similarities with the one Quintilian had of Grammar during the Roman time. In fact, Perotti like Quintilian viewed grammar as propaedeutic to the appreciation of literature

(Benson, 2000). Of the novel features that were introduced in this era, some of the most important ones are as follow, the teaching of Latin grammar through vernacular translation which was till that time unprecedented also tweaking and refining the previous usage of translation, that is, contrary to the previous era that translation was carried out just from Greek to Latin in the new era, we have the arrival of the new concept "Double translation" which is duly associated with the methodology proposed by Roger Ascham in 1570:

The master first helps the child construe and parse a passage from Sturm's edition of Cicero's letters; the child then translates the passage into English on his own in a paper book; the master lays the textbook, Ciceronian "Original" alongside the child's effort and without chiding, gently shows him where Cicero would have used a different word or syntactical arrangement. (As cited in Benson, 2000, p. 241)

A more comprehensive picture of the general ambiance of language teaching in the Renaissance period is the one drawn by Benson (2000):

The pupil commences his three years of grammatical instruction with the usher or junior master. The first year is designated to the introduction of Latin Grammar, learning basic vocabulary, and held simple conversations; by year two he was translating Latin, speaking and writing in Latin and reading elementary material; in the third year he reviewed and improved on everything done earlier, did Biblical translations both ways, read Aesop's Fables, studied Comeniu's *Janua Linguarum* and read more widely from religious text. (p. 242)

As it can be construed, there is no deep cleavage between the traditional language teaching methodologies used in the second and third centuries with the one used in the sixteenth century. The language teaching methodologies used in these two eras have both grammar and translation as their principal pedagogical tools. But the point worth being noted here is that although it is easy to overlook the innovations driven by the Renaissance movement, like the use of vernacular translation in the early stages of learning Latin and the application of double translation amid the derivative styles of language teaching pedagogy of that time, these innovations spearheaded such movements that resulted in the identifying grammar-translation method as distinct, independent methodology.

Modern Language Teaching: Mutton Dressed up as a Lamb

The third stage of GTM entails the application of the same methodologies employed for teaching the traditional languages, Latin and Greek, but this time to the modern foreign languages. After a century-long struggle of the modern foreign languages to be assigned a degree of credence equal to that of the classical languages, they finally beat their path to the curriculum of European school in the eighteenth century and the study of them fell on the norm of language syllabus together with the classical languages. This flirtation of the classical together with the modern languages made the modern language teaching adopt the objectives and approaches of the traditional language teaching (Robins, 1997). However, as GTM has as its background the traditional language teaching of classics, it envisaged the same objectives for starting off the task of learning the modern languages, which are learning the new languages as a gateway to new civilizations and their literature, and as a mental training drill to develop the mind (Cook, 2003). And as the objectives set for language teaching in the nineteenth century remain intact plausibly, the same approaches, that is, the dual emphasis on grammar and translation, which were used in the previous era are also used in the new one to achieve the similar objectives.

Grammar

The study of grammar in this era as in the past was justified by a drive toward rule and regularity. To this end, students, at the outset of commencing the task of learning a new language, were encountered comprehensive, exhaustive description of the grammatical rules which they were required to master. However, as the knowledge of grammar per se is deemed inoperable for

undertaking the task of translation which is the hallmark of GTM, a long list of literary vocabularies with their translation equivalents, extracted from the same reading passages, is prescribed to the students for memorization. Following the explanation of the frozen, grammatical rules and the presentation of vocabularies, to ensure the comprehension of them, a set of the decontextualized, invented sentences, contained mainly of the words and constructions they have already encountered, are presented to the students and they are asked to apply their gained knowledge to their translation. This obsession with translation was because of the underlying belief that a successful language learner was the one who could translate the passages well (Cook, 2010). In fact, this practice of language learning that was immersion of students in the exhaustive explanation of grammatical rules and the long list of literary vocabularies was rooted in the belief that by learning a language through early exposure to the intricacies of grammatical rules, students would become ready to deal with the difficulties and uncertainties of real life besides the enormous amount of memorization of new words and grammatical rules would provide a good mental practice for the learners (Benson, 2000).

Translation

As stated above, one of the central pivots around which GTM revolved was the immersion of students from the early stages of learning into the difficult classical texts. As this early engagement with full passages in the target texts might sound daunting to the students who have not yet acquired enough linguistic ability in the early stages of language learning resorting to translation for understanding and appreciating the literary work was considered perfectly acceptable to the students pending the advanced levels when they have gained enough mastery over the vocabularies and constructions of the target language that they can appreciate the value and significance of the texts in the original language without resorting to translation (Munday, 2012). Also, it was the widely held belief that by virtue of translating from the native language to the target language the students would become acquainted with the nuances and delicacies of the target language which then help them to write accurately in the target language at the advanced levels (Benson, 2000). As it is evident here and as the one of the objectives of GTM has suggested, the use of translation as a pedagogical tool has played the pivotal role, especially in their early encountering to the target language, in acquainting the students with the literature of other civilizations. In sum, GTM can be judged successful in bringing the students into contact with great civilizations and literature of other cultures and in establishing itself as an effective mental tool in training the mind in logical thought. However, its use of invented, pre-fabricated sentences over authentic, connected ones, its obsession with reading and writing and the blind eye it turned at listening and speaking betray some of the weaknesses of its approach. In the end, the use of discounted, invented sentences as a distinctive feature of this method coupled with other criticisms rust through the main bastions of this method and indicate the need for the emergence of a new movement called the reform movement.

Bridging the Traditional-Modern Gap: The Reform Movement

As the standard maxim of the language teaching holds, the language teaching methodologies should constantly be modified to keep pace with the social changes, so in the post-World War II circumstances due to the rapid-paced changes in social life, language teaching also experienced huge changes that even today still holds good. Indeed, the social circumstances of those days were proved to be exceptionally effectual in breaking the mold of Grammar-Translation Method's tyranny and revolutionizing the practice of language teaching in a way that all the other succeeding methodologies in one way or another respond to it. Indeed, the serial of unprecedented changes that occurred in the emerging society after World War II left its print on language teaching methodology milieu. For instance, one of the foremost changes that occurred after the World War II was the valorization of migrancy to the United States and the post-world war immigrants' demand to learn their new homeland language in no time and for purely a functional, utilitarian purpose so that they

can survive and prosper in the new environment. This situation tacitly made grammar-translation method, which is mainly geared toward translation and literature, virtually paralyzed to quash the hunger of immigrant society. The occurrence of such circumstances gave rise to a trailblazing movement, called the reform movement, which tried to crack the bastions of the traditional method by inflating its inability to cope with the modern day society and introducing new perspectives into language teaching (Cook, 2010). The Reform Movement was pioneered by a German phonetician, Wilhelm Viëtor in 1882, with his key pamphlet 'Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren!' (Language-teaching must turn around) a landmark in language teaching (Howatt, 1984). Fortunately, the idea of the reform, first voiced by Viëtor, gleaned support from other scholars as well, the most prominent figures among them are "Passy in France, Jespersen in Denmark, Sweet in Britain and Klinghardt in Germany" (Cook, 2010, p.169). In particular, their approach to language teaching was from highly interdisciplinary perspective as they set the cornerstones of their approach, which are "the primacy of speech, the centrality of the connected texts and the absolute priority of an oral methodology in the classroom" (Cook, 2010, p.171), borrowing ideas from the two sciences of phonetics and psychology. In the mind of the reformists, most of them were among the prominent phoneticians of their time, the traditional language teaching suffered most from the neglect of speech so, in order for the reform to take place sustained attention should be invested on accurate pronunciation of the learners. This meticulous attention to the accurate pronunciation becomes barefaced in some of the commentaries made by scholars like Viëtor (1882) and Sweet (1899). In this vein, the argument of Viëtor (1882) seems too revolutionary "Reform, he insisted, must begin with the provision of accurate descriptions of speech based on the science of phonetics" he also cites a quote from Sweet (1899) that made exactly the same point " If our wretched system of studying modern languages is ever to be reformed, it must be on the basis of a preliminary training in general phonetics" (Howatt, 1984, p.172). Indeed, this obsession with phonetics was so firmly entrenched in the minds of the teachers that for many of them, modern language teaching became equal to the using phonetics (Howatt, 1984). The reformists then restore to the new science of psychology and its theory of associationism to militate against the use of invented, disconnected words and sentences of grammar-translation method. The theory of associationism maintains that our ability to think and learn can be explained by the connections we make between the different ideas in our mind (Oxford, 2008). Therefore, in the view of associationists, grammar-translation method by the use of disconnected and decontextualized word and sentences flouts the basic tenets of their schools of thought, they instead suggested that in order to facilitate the learning process these disconnected sentences should be replaced by the connected texts in which each word or sentence become cumulatively loaded with the contexts and co-texts in which it is encountered so that the learners would be able to understand the meaning of each word through its association with other elements of the text. The reformists also exploited the idea of associationism to condemn the use of translation as a tool for language learning. According to Sweet (1899), for example, using translation make the learners see the foreign language through the lenses of their mother tongue language, it further means that learning a language through the application of translation exercises would prompt the learner "to associate ideas from their own language with the new term, instead of the ideas that native speakers associate with it" (Sweet, 1899 as quoted in Pym 2013, p.12). Viëtor (1882) also rails against the use of translation by quoting that " The use of translation could lead to the formation of *cross associations* which then hinder the development of foreign language teaching (Viëtor,1882 in Howatt, 1984, p.173). Another implication of the theory of associationism and its use of connected text is the introduction of the inductive method of teaching grammar that is contrary to grammar-translation method in which the grammatical points first taught deductively then followed by a list of disconnected sentences especially constructed to illustrate particular points

of grammar, the reform movement called for a much closer bond between text and grammar " in which the language of the text provided the data for grammatical rules rather than being used to exemplify rules previously learnt out of context " (Viëtor, 1882 in Howatt, 1984, p.173). The most drastic deviation from grammar translation method was evident in the reformists' attaching great importance to the oral methods in the classroom which obliged both the teacher and the students to use the foreign language as the normal means of classroom communication. Although this use of the foreign language does not mean that they left no room for translation or the use of the modern tongue. In fact, restoring to the modern tongue for glossing new words and explaining new grammatical points was the normal feature of this method, it further means that although the use of translation has generally frowned upon, it is not banned outright (Howatt, 1984). In sum, the reform movement can be judged successful in bringing about sweeping reforms which marked the end of the century-long sterile emphasis on grammatical accuracy, and the neglect of spoken language fluency, however, the financially disinterested and pedagogic ideas of the reformists were soon bastardized by the burgeoning of the private language schools, the most prominent among those was Berlitz School, emerging out of commercial imperatives and bearing the slogan of death on translation. Indeed, this era started from the end of 19th century and lingered on to the 20th century can be duly named the "shameful history of language teaching" in which the academic, pedagogic default of language teaching methodology was to a large extent sidelined and it was the private language school and the publishing houses that became major trend-setting in language teaching arena.

Direct Method: The Occultation of Translation

The winds that the reform movement generated in the 19th blow to the direct method. The underlying cornerstone of the direct method is teaching a new language through the medium of its own without recourse to translation as an intermediary between the first language and the second one. In the view of direct methodologists, in order for the successful language learning to take place, the learner should retrace the footsteps of a child learning his first language which tacitly nullifies the use of mother tongue and translation as the source of interferences from the first language to the second language. To gain credence for their claim, they recourse to the linguistic dogma that each language is a system of internally consistent contrasts and relations; therefore, for the learners that already know another language, and are operating two distinct systems simultaneously, it is incumbent to take vigilance to keep the two systems as separate as possible and the best way to eliminate these interferences and errors is to learn the new language through its own medium (Philipson, 1992). Albeit the direct methodologists' endeavors to make their arguments, which they lobbied against the use of translation, seem pedagogically and academically justified, the whole plain mystery of direct method lies in the commercial, political imperialism of those countries whose languages are going to be taught by this method. This point will be further elaborated on when each tenet of the direct method is scrutinized individually. The key tenets of the direct method enshrined by Robert Philipson (1992) as follows: "the monolingual fallacy, the native speaker fallacy, the-earlier-the-better fallacy, the-more-the-better fallacy, the standard fallacy" (p. 185).

Tenet One: English is best taught monolingually

The orthodoxy of monolingualism bears all the hallmark of the direct method in a way that by imposing tighter sanctions against the use of translation and mother language in the classroom, it actually sets the direct method apart from all the other previous language teaching methodologies. The dogma underpinning this tenet is isolationism that is the learner makes a clean break with his or her mother tongue to the extent that the language being studied would become "his or her sole medium of communication in any given environment" (Gatenby, 1965 as cited in Philipson, 1992, p. 185). However, as much as the reasons giving props to monolingualism seem commonsensical,

teaching a new language oblivious of the other languages that the learners may know would lead to, in the terms of Sternagel (1984), their alienation and deprivation of their own cultural identity and more importantly acculturation rather than increased intercultural communicative competence (Sternagel, 1984 as cited in Philipson, 1992, p.185). Moreover, the insistence on using only one language, in this case, English, at the expense of the other ones makes the other vernaculars be differentiated with reference to English as *the other*, that is, English is *the one* and rest of the languages become known as *the other*. And this act of replacing other languages in favor of the one is, in fact, rightly in tune with linguistic and ideological disregard of dominated languages and cultures. In fact, the prominent leitmotif that runs through this tenet is the attempt to impose a single lens on the whole world. In sum, in spite of the frequent deference of monolingual tenet to pedagogical values and judgments, one of the points that helps unmask the true nature of this tenet is its receiving sustenance from economic impetus of the dominant cultures by providing the opportunity for the dominant countries to flood the global market with their monolingual textbooks, and creating jobs for them by positing their native speakers as ideal teachers and exporting them (Philipson, 1992).

Tenet Two: The ideal teacher is a native speaker

The architects of this tenet have put such a blind faith in the proficiency of the native speakers that they consider native speaker teachers, merely because the language is going to be taught is his or her mother tongue, as the *uncontested king*, in Chomskyan term, in language teaching. This tenet up until now still has been proven to be the sacred cow in language teaching arena and no one ever questions the underlying factors that give the native speaker the upper hand. Actually, the architects of this tenet posit the superiority of the native speaker teacher mainly because of his or her "greater facility in demonstrating fluent, idiomatically appropriate language, in appreciating the cultural connotations of the language, and in being the final arbiter of the accessibility of any given sample of language" (Philipson, 1992, p.197). However, by delving deeply into the attached virtues of the native speaker teacher, it can become quite clear that none of the mentioned virtues are intrinsic, inherent ones that make it impossible for a non-native teacher to get his or her hand on them. In fact, a non-native speaker teacher who has managed to push the insuperable boundaries of the target language can make a better model for the students to emulate due to the fact that they share the same language with the learners and have penetrating insights into the linguistic and cultural needs of the learners. Despite all of that, the erosion of the native speaker teachers' tyranny as the sole, ideal model for the non-native teachers and students to emulate has begun to take place in our new age of technological resources that provides an easy and open access to a wide range of native speaker models (Philipson, 1992).

Tenet Three: The earlier English is taught, the better the results

The confidence with which this tenet is pronounced is derived from the urge to tap young children capacity of informally learning a foreign language. This tenet tacitly gaining credence from Gatenby's (1965) delineation of three different physiological and intellectual maturational phases and his endorsement of an early start for foreign language learning. According to Gatenby (1965):

The age period from birth to 10+ is an ideal one for language learning, from 10+ to 16-17+ children were too old for natural process and too young for the intellectual one, an incentive was also lacking while from 17 onwards reduced aural, memory and imitative skills were counter-balanced by reasoning and determination. (Gatenby, 1965 as cited in Philipson, 1992, p. 200)

Whereas the notion of the earlier, the better may have a long academic pedigree, the obsession with the age per se is the Achilles heel of this tenet because as the great accumulation of evidence from many sources inescapably points out, age is not isolated from loads of other factors. Besides embarking on learning a new language before attaining full cognitive development in the

first language has been proven to have devastatingly perverse consequences such as mental confusion and absence of real understanding. In this tenet like the rest, there is likewise some economic and political impetus lurking in the background including more jobs for the teachers and entrenching the dependence on the dominant countries from early stages (Philipson, 1992).

Tenet Four: The more English is taught; the better the results

This tenet is actually the sequel to the previous one under the new disguise of the maximum exposure fallacy, the erroneous belief underpinning this tenet is that if the amount of exposure to the target language is to be maximized, one could hopefully expect better results to be yielded. Whilst the belief underpinning this tenet may seem commonsensical, increasing the amount of exposure to the new language may inevitably make the quality sacrificial lamb. The opponents of this tenet; therefore, suggest that instead of starting with learning a new language at lower stages which ultimately leads to the waste of good deal of time and money, and even worse the mental and cognitive frustration of children who experience the long-time exposure to the new language, it is highly advisable to reduce the length of time as much as possible and compensate for that commensurately by providing trained teacher, well-written material and cutting-edge methods of teaching. The economic and political consequences of this tenet are like the other tenets (Philipson, 1992).

Tenet Five: If other languages are used much, standard of English will drop

The architects of this tenet maintain that by using other languages in addition to English in the classroom, the standards of English will seriously be deteriorated. Indeed, this tenet has been proven to be highly effective in out casting of the role of translation and the usage of mother tongue in the classroom. Also, this tenet is firmly anchored in the belief that if more than one language is spoken in the classroom it would probably rob the students their opportunities to perform in a new language which would then result in their reduced competency in communication. This kind of relation that the other languages have in respect to only one language is, in fact, mirrors the position of other cultures in respect to Anglo-American one. Moreover, the definition of standard and the means of determining it are matters of great controversy and debates as there is little consensus on what standard used to be and is now. The architects of this tenet should take enough vigilance not to impose their own prescribed, subjective impressions (Philipson, 1992).

As it is evident here as much as that the direct method tries to don academic and pedagogic concerns, however, the discourse in which it introduces its main tenets unmask its underlying economic and political impetus of the dominant countries. Despite this propaganda campaign which the direct method ran against the use of other languages other than English and translation, A few voices are raised in defiance of translation in recent century that call for the rehabilitation of the role of translation in the mainstream of language teaching by making a plea for reassessing its role, and unlocking its true potential as language learning facilitator. In particular, they draw their attention to the pedagogical value of translation and the important role it can play against the linguistic imperialism of the dominant countries which in fact is a subtle form of colonization.

Translation: Staging Comeback to the Language Teaching Milieu

In the first decade of the 21st century, a movement has been taken shape that turned its back against the scathing lobbies of direct method against the use of translation and tried to make the pendulum swing back to revived interest in the use of translation by somber assessment of pedagogic and academic value of translation and the role it can play in defiance of linguistic imperialism. In terms of pedagogy, the founding fathers of this movement rail against the anti-translation dogmatism maintaining that translation takes place anyway even if we impose a tight sanction against its use that would be in theory. In practice, translation continues to live its legitimate life, albeit secretly and silently. For example, even in the most hardline monolingual

classrooms, restore to translation is made in the extremis, for checking the comprehension. Translation is so deftly interwoven in the language teaching practice that restore to it has become inevitable especially for the learners who already know another language and see the second language through their first language worldview. In fact, it has now become quite clear even to the most hardened direct method diehards that to explain a new word or a grammatical construction through the use of translation is much more efficient, especially in the realm of abstract concepts, than the direct method's alternatives, e.g. pantomiming, drawing, and using classroom realia (Cook,2010). In this vein, Widdowson (1978), points to the pedagogic value of translation as a facilitator in language learning:

What we are aiming to do is to make the learner conceive of the foreign language in the same way as he conceives of his own language and to use it in the same way as a communicative activity. This being so, it would seem reasonable to draw upon the learner's knowledge of how his own language is used to communicate. That is to say, it would seem reasonable to make use of translation. (Widdowson, 1978, p. 159)

The translation revivalists also point to the erroneous idea underlying the direct method, that for the successful language learning to take place, the learner should emulate the path taken by a young child, maintaining that academics who envisaged this path are all living in ivory tower because, in the actual situation, the tight schedule of adult language learners together with the inability of conventional schools to provide full immersion in the target language will defeat any attempt to follow this path, the situation is much worse for EFL learners who in fact are detached from the foreign language learning context (Yule,2010). To compensate for the difference between natural language learning and instructed language acquisition, Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) recommend the use of translation as an antidote for the lack of exposure maintaining that conventional schooling fails to indulge the learners in the new language in a way that is comparable to the native speaker child's indulgence in his first language. "A language cannot be learnt in conventional schooling through mere exposure to the EFL learning because there is simply never enough of it " (Butzkamm and Caldwell, 2009 as quoted in Cook, 2010, p. 51). Pursued further, in terms of the policy of language learning, translation revivalists link the suppressing of other languages in favor of only one language, English, with the denial of linguistic human right claiming that the promotion of only one language at the expense of others would lead to the linguistic, ideological and cultural disregard of dominated languages (Philipson, 1992). In encapsulation, one of the prominent points that provides the immediate urge for translation revivalists is the nullification of power relations of center-periphery and its replacements with such notions like cultural hybridity, fragmented nature of our today societies, valorization of migrancy, advancement in communication technologies and the advent of globalization which together calling for even more intercultural communication ties that can only be fulfilled by the interconnectedness nature of translation. In sum, what this movement, in particular, is trying to do is to relieve translation from the clutches of grammar-translation method by formulating a novel definition of it unbound from its GTM style whose obsession with academic formality and formal accuracy in writing makes it turn a blind eye to the actual needs of the learners and more importantly trying to make the translation wear the makeup of a lively-looking communicative activity despite its long-held stereotype of being pedagogically, cognitively and practically infertile.

Conclusion

It would be naïve and wacky to think that paradigm shifts in language teaching all happened in the purest academic form by a group of scholars trying to impose their academic insights on how to teach and learn the languages rather these shifts were more the results of economic, political

sleight of hands of dominant powers trying to preserve their exertion of power on language. In fact, this vacuum of any substantial pedagogic, linguistic arguments in the formation of major language teaching trends becomes evident when these methodologies elude any scientific grappling which then it raises the depressing possibility that they are fed more by economic, political impetus than by academic ones. For example, if the major language teaching methodology in each period were to be discussed, GTM, Direct Method ... it can become quite clear how much each methodology has got drunk on such extrinsic factors like, commercialism, and politics rather than keeping their academic sobriety. This point will be more illustrated by just a cursory glance at the main principles of grammar-translation method which then reveals how much this method being saturated by the expediencies set by the dominant power of the day or the case of direct method and it's being so much imbued with the political and economic concerns that it is being on the verge of vomiting them. As it is the case, a few movements have been taken shape in the 21st century calling for the somber, academic reassessment of each methodology unbound from any political, commercial impetus, investigating the highly suspicious forces behind the rejection of translation in the 20th and calling for a climate of reform in language teaching. If these emerging movements, as they are intended, managed to scrub language teaching arena off the century-long animosity toward translation, then we can become pretty confident that by using translation as an inalienable tool of language teaching and learning we are not only easing the learners into the daunting process of language learning but we are also bringing the possibility of learning a new language at the expense of losing our own identity below the minimum.

References

- Benson, M.J. (2000) *The secret life of grammar-translation*. Studies in the humanities and sciences Journal. 40 (1), 225-249
- Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Cook, G. (2003). *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Howatt, A.P.R. (1984). *A History of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Munday, J. (2012). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R, H, L. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Pym, A, Malmkjær, K, & Gutiérrez-Colón Plana, M.M (2013). *Translation and language learning: The role of translation in the teaching of languages in the European Union*. Belgium, LU: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Rivers, W.M. (1981). *Teaching foreign-Language Skills*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Robins, R.H. (1997). *A Short History of Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Sinfert, T, R. (2013). *Translation in Foreign Language Pedagogy: The Rise and Fall of the Grammar Translation Method*. PhD Thesis: University of Harvard at Cambridge.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1990). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University