memorizing stuff, which is bad for learning anyway. Each pupil can answer using his own words to describe a particular thing.'; (c) 'It was really interesting. The Portuguese language classes helped a lot. And there was a big difference between these classes and the ones we got before. I realised that these classes help to give a general idea of the subjects we learn about.'

The class teacher's assessment was similarly positive. She felt her pupils had learnt more and shown a greater interest. Moreover, there were no problems with discipline.

Summary

This paper has reported on an investigation of ways of developing an emancipatory discourse in Portuguese language teaching in Brazil. As the project progressed, pupils gradually became subjects of the teaching and learning process, entitled to speak their minds and take decisions. The teacher progressively allowed the pupils to speak for themselves and accordingly reduced the extent of her own oral contribution. At the end of the school year, the class performed better than a comparable class used as a control group.

We must, as ever, be cautious about generalising from the case of one class in one school. Nevertheless, the results provide a very positive basis for further projects in other schools.

Note

1. A version of this paper was presented at the Third International Conference on Language Awareness, Trinity College Dublin, July 1996.

References

Althusser, L. (1971) Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In L. Althusser (ed.) *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: New Left Books.
Apple, M.W. (1990) *Ideology and Curriculum*. London: Routledge.
Bourdieu, P. (1982) *Ce que Parler Veut Dire*. Paris: Fayard.
Clark, R., Fairclough, N., Ivanic, R. and Martin-Jones, M. (1991) Critical language awareness: Towards critical alternatives. *Language and Education* 5, 41–54.
Fairclough, N. (ed.) (1992a) *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman.
Fairclough, N. (1992b) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selection from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
Janks, H. and Ivanič, R. (1992) Critical language awareness and emancipatory discourse. In N. Fairclough (ed.) *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman.
Orlandi, E. (1988) As *formas do silêncio* (The forms of silence). Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.
Thiollent, M. (1985) *Methodologia em Pesquisa-Açao* (Methodology in action-research). Sao Paulo: Cortez.

Translation Competence and Language Awareness[1]

Pamela Faber
Faculty of Translation and Interpretation, University of Granada, Spain

One of the most difficult things translators have to learn is how to extract conceptual meanings from source texts, so that they base their translations on reformulations of those meanings, rather than on the words or structures that codify them. This article describes an exercise in lexical analysis, involving verbs of sound in English and Spanish. Its aim is to enable students to discover underlying patterns of meaning which are representative of lexical-conceptual structure. Through this type of activity, students explore the relation between language and thought, while also increasing their dictionary skills and awareness.

Introduction

Language Awareness has been defined as 'a person's sensitivity to and conscious awareness of the nature of language and its role in human life' (Donmall, 1985: 7). Such awareness is obviously a major asset for any foreign language (FL) learner, but for translation students, it is a vital necessity. Arguably, consciousness of underlying patterns of meaning in language (in its generic sense) stands in direct relation to the relative ease with which students acquire translation skills.

Translation can be seen as a cognitive process involving a considerable amount of problem-solving and decision-making (Wilss, 1994). This process, when considered in its microcontextual or narrower sense, is that which leads strictly from source text analysis to the production of the target language text. In a wider or macrocontextual sense, the strategies translators use and the decisions they make are oriented to the totality of the target text and thus influenced by a great variety of factors, of which the most important is the intended purpose of the target text in the target culture (Reiss & Vermeer, 1984; Nord, 1991). Nevertheless, behind the translation process, whether macro- or microcontextual, lies the problem of the genuine reconstruction of utterance meanings (Neubert, 1991: 19).

One does not have to be explicitly aware of this to translate successfully. Evidently, people can translate in different phases without being conscious that they are dividing the text into translation-oriented units, searching for functional equivalence, or organising the resulting text in a theme/rheme configuration similar to the original. In fact, it is often the case that translators are blissfully unaware that any of the above even exist as concepts related to the process of translating.

Translation competence

The concept of *Translation Competence* (TC) can be understood in terms of knowledge necessary to translate well (Hatim & Mason, 1990: 32f; Bybee, 1996: 91f). However, in the past, it has often been referred to as though it were a celestial

gift that certain people are miraculously endowed with, and which converts the translator into some sort of latter-day textual alchemist with the magical power to transform a source language text into a target language text (Toury, 1980; Seleskovitch & Lederer, 1984). But if we accept such an explanation of the ability to arrive at interlinguistic textual correspondence, then no rational analysis is possible.

On the other hand, TC defined as 'the knowledge need to translate well' is itself too general. It is more productive to divide knowledge into different subtypes. Bell (1991: 36) defines TC in terms of five types of knowledge: target language knowledge, text-type knowledge, source language knowledge, real-world knowledge, and contrastive knowledge. A similar set of components is proposed by Nord (1991: 146). TC means having these different types of knowledge at one's disposal, and being able to use them to solve problems and make appropriate decisions.

All these types of knowledge are undoubtedly important, but this article focuses on contrastive knowledge (which corresponds to a subtype of 'transfer competence, in Nord's list referred to above) because the process of learning how to translate can be considerably enhanced by making students conscious of the degree to which languages coincide and differ. This type of language awareness for translators has much in common with the new type of contrastive analysis advocated by James & Garrett (1991b: 6):

> This [language awareness aimed at foreign language learners] suggests scope for a new type of Contrastive Analysis (CA), not CA of the classical sort done by linguists and then made over to textbook writers, but CA done by pupils as FL learners themselves, to gain linguistic awareness of the contrasts and similarities holding between the structures of the MT [mother tongue] and the FL.

This variety of CA, then, does not mean a detailed contrastive study, but rather activities which develop an awareness in students of patterns of meaning common to many languages. Translation is much more than this, of course, and accordingly, the exercise described here is not a translation method, but rather a consciousness-raising activity for student translators.

Translation students differ from FL learners in that the former should already possess a native-like command of at least two languages when they begin their studies. However, it is well-known that bilinguals are not necessarily competent translators. Knowledge of two languages is only part of the knowledge that is necessary for translating well. An important perception for translators to acquire, either consciously or intuitively, is that language structure (both paradigmatic and syntagmatic) is a representation of conceptual structure.

Dictionaries and Interlinguistic Correspondence

Exercises in lexical analysis enable translation students to discern the patterns underlying meaning. Their value lies in the fact that one of the most difficult things translators have to learn is how to extract conceptual meaning from a source text, and to base their translation on a reformulation of that meaning, not on the words or structures that codify it. The aim of such exercises is for students

to discover the connection between language and thought. At the same time, this reinforces the intuition (which they as reasonably proficient speakers of at least two languages have already acquired) that language is a partial codification of how different language communities have interpreted reality. In certain basic areas of meaning, languages will coincide with their primary vocabulary, while in other areas there will be important differences.

When looking at meaning, the obvious place to go is the dictionary, an extremely important source for translators in general. Paradoxically, the words most likely to be looked up tend to be not so much unfamiliar items as those that are well-known, on account of the multi-faceted nature of meaning. It is important that students of translation have both dictionary skills and awareness. Translators need to use a range of different dictionaries since there is no single dictionary that contains all the information necessary about word meaning and/or possible interlinguistic correspondences. Indeed, Nida (1996: 85) states that many dictionaries are inadequate and based on quite wrong concepts about the nature of meaning, and that bilingual dictionaries are often even less satisfactory because they usually provide only a list of glosses and have no definitions.

Nevertheless, when they start off, students naively regard dictionaries (both monolingual and bilingual) with exaggerated veneration, and consider the definitions and interlinguistic correspondences in them to be invariably reliable. This is evident in their readiness to accept even deficient examples of lexico-graphic practice as sacred scripture. An example of this can be seen in the exercise below in which first-year undergraduates in the Translation Faculty of the University of Granada were given the following question:

> Does the lexical entry below offer sufficient information? In your opinion, why are there so many correspondences given for *bawl*?
>
> **bawl** *v. intr.* gritar, chillar, vocear, rugir. vociferar, desgañitarse[2]

Answers to this question included assertions such as the following:

(a) *Bawl* has many 'definitions' in Spanish, and almost any of them will do.
(b) Exact translation is seldom possible.
(c) Language varies according to specific socio-cultural contexts.
(d) Certain words are more difficult to translate than others.
(e) By looking at the text, the translator will automatically know which correspondence is the best one.
(f) *Bawl* has so many correspondences in Spanish because Spanish is a richer language than English with a greater variety of possible nuances, and a translator must inevitably accept this.

This exercise was given as part of an Applied Linguistics course, designed to familiarise students with basic linguistic concepts useful in translation. The class was composed of 44 students (age range 18–27), the majority of whom were native Spanish speakers with good communicative skills and acceptable fluency in English, having passed the university entrance exam, as well as a second language-specific exam given at the Faculty. About 20% possessed native-like

fluency because they had either lived abroad and/or one of their parents was English-speaking.

Even though none of the students had any background in lexicography or semantics, one might have expected a greater awareness of the differences in meaning in the Spanish equivalents offered for *bawl*. However, the students seemed to feel that the authority of the dictionary was greater than their own as language users. Moreover, not one noticed the most obvious problem with the above entry: namely, that among the six possible correspondences given (itself an excessive number even for bilingual dictionaries of this type), there is no mention of *berrear*, which is arguably the 'best all-purpose' equivalent. Nor did anyone remark upon the fact that *bawl* could have different meanings, depending on whether the agent is a drill sergeant (*shouting*), a baby (*crying*), or a tone-deaf singer (*singing*). Although in answer (c), sociocultural contexts were mentioned, nobody showed any clear expectation that the dictionary might offer an explanation of the meaning differences between the various correspondences on the basis of different contexts. This result is indicative of the fact that until then, students had not reflected either on the importance of dictionaries, or on the different types of information a useful dictionary for translators might contain.

Given the incomplete and occasionally inaccurate information offered in certain bilingual dictionaries, a useful technique to increase dictionary skills and awareness is for students to learn how to establish interlinguistic correspondences by using the information found in monolingual dictionaries. An activity which opens many students' eyes to the relationship between language and the mind is the use of dictionary information to map out an area of the lexicon in two languages, or to construct parallel representations of part of a semantic field.

Mapping Out Semantic Space[3]

Although in one respect beginner translation students hold dictionaries in great awe, in quite another, they do not give them the importance they deserve. Standard dictionaries contain the body of knowledge gathered by lexicographic tradition and their definitions have the status of referential authority for users of the language in question. Moreover, it invariably comes as a revelation to students that anything so mundane as a dictionary definition is in one sense a translation of perceptions of reality, and thus encodes how the dictionary makers perceive and categorise the world. In fact, each dictionary definition can be considered an example of a micro-knowledge representation, because definitional structure is iconic with how subjects and events are categorised on the basis of sensory data.

> **bawl** to sing badly in a very loud voice

> **warble** to sing pleasantly in a high-pitched voice with trills (like a bird).

For example, in the preceding definitions, we can see, that both *bawl* and *warble* are ways of *singing*. The fact that they share the same nuclear term or classifier (*sing*) locates them in a subdimension of the lexical field of verbs of SOUND. In both cases, the adverbial modification of *sing* in their respective definitions, encodes features which differentiate them from each other, as well as from the

Figure 1 Meaning components for *bawl* and *warble*

Meaning component	bawl	warble
Classifier (indicating field membership)	SING (to make a musical sound)	SING (to make a musical sound)
Manner1	loudly	pleasantly
Instrument	voice	voice
Manner2	badly	high-pitched, with trills like a bird
Pragmatic information (world knowledge)	(negatively evaluated by the perceiver)	

other verbs with the same nuclear meaning. Their definitions can thus be divided into the components in Figure 1.

Other lexemes which fall in the same semantic field are *sing, hum, croon, yodel, chant, carol* and *troll*. A semantic field is defined here as 'the set of all lexical units that share an explicitly distinguished non-trivial semantic component' (Mel'cuk, 1988: 170). From this definition, it naturally follows that a semantic field can be conceived as a hierarchy of lexemes all of which share the same nuclear meaning. The classifier marks the semantic territory covered by a specific field and thus becomes the factor which determines field membership. This is also in consonance with Mel'cuk's *Decomposition Principle* which stipulates that the definition of a lexical unit must contain only terms that are semantically simpler than itself (Mel'cuk, 1988: 170). Wierzbicka (1992: 11) writes:

> Explicating involves reducing semantically complex words to semantically simple words, and hence the words used in an explication are not selected at random: there is a hierarchy among words, and a correct definition will reflect this hierarchy.

Lexemes specify the nuclear meaning of the field they belong to in different ways. These minimal differences in content are the basis upon which the lexemes are interrelated and structured into meaningful configurations in the same area of semantic space.

By using a variety of dictionaries as texts that embody our shared knowledge about words, students are asked to contrast and compare the definitions given for verbs within the same general area of meaning. In this way, they extract the meaning components of each lexeme through definitional analysis, identify the type of component, and learn how to construct their own definitions on the basis of this mini-investigation into meaning. For this type of analysis, three or more dictionaries[4] are used in order to obtain a consensus of the meaning components for each term.

A thesaurus can be used as the source for the initial group of verbs. However, as the meaning relationships among these lexemes are specified, the members of the lexical set which finally appear in the hierarchy may vary somewhat.

To justify the inclusion of a verb in the meaning area in question, each term is

lexically decomposed so that its definition consists of a nuclear word (or a previously defined non-nuclear one), and one or more features which differentiate it from the preceding members of the hierarchy. For example in the lexical dimension, *to make a musical sound*, the nuclear word, *sing*, is the superordinate in terms of which all the other words are defined. The adverbial modification within the definitions encode features (*semes*) which differentiate the lexemes from each other within each meaning area. Lexemes are distinguished from each other by one *seme* or minimal distinctive feature. The various kinds of features of semantic differentiation show us the divisions and distinctions that each language makes in the semantic continuum (Faber, 1994; Faber & Mairal, 1994; 1997).

For example, in the case of bawl, definitional analysis would be carried out by using information from the following dictionaries:

bawl　　to shout in a loud, rough voice; to cry noisily (*Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture*).

bawl　　to shout or cry loudly (*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*).

bawl　　If you bawl, you shout or sing something very loudly and rather harshly. If a child is bawling, it is crying loudly (*Collins Cobuild*).

bawl　　to shout or sing in a very loud voice; to cry loudly (*Cambridge International Dictionary of English*).

bawl　　to cry or sob loudly; wail; to cry out loudly and vehemently; shout (*American Heritage*).

Once it is ascertained, that *bawl* is in reality not one lexeme, but three, the students would then proceed to insert sense components (derived from the preceding dictionary definitions) as shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2 Activity Sheet 1

	bawl1	*bawl2*	*bawl3*
Classifier	shout	sing	cry
Manner1	loudly	loudly	very loudly
Instrument	voice	voice	voice
Manner2	harshly	badly	unpleasantly
Pragmatic information	(indicative of speaker authority and/or strong emotion)	(negatively evaluated by the perceiver)	of children

The components in Figure 2 allow them to construct new definitions, something like the following:

bawl1　　to shout loudly and harshly
bawl2　　to sing badly in a very loud voice.
bawl3　　to cry very loudly in an unpleasant way (of children).

The meaning components used are natural language phrases found in

definitions, and thus differ from componential analysis (Nida, 1975). In componential analysis, the meaning of a word is the sum of the binary features it possesses, such as +/-human, +/-male, +/-concrete, etc. When componential analysis was most popular in the 1950s, linguists hoped that it would enable them to arrive at the set of universal semantic features. However, it soon became clear that this type of analysis is only applicable to a small sector of vocabulary (e.g. kinship), and that word meaning is much too complex to be expressed purely in terms of binary oppositions. Varieties of componential analysis have been proposed by various authors both as an aid to translation (Newmark, 1981; 1988) and vocabulary learning (Rudzka *et al.*, 1981, 1985). However, in translation, its use has always been somewhat limited because the translator must inevitably give priority to correspondence at higher levels of the text, and words must be considered in context.

Nevertheless, the elaboration of lexical hierarchies is a valuable exercise because it more generally helps students acquire dictionary skills and awareness, and more specifically shows them how the polysemy of lexemes such as *bawl* can be resolved. The next step after elaborating the definitions for each verb in the

Figure 3 Activity Sheet 2

Within each of the following meaning dimensions, arrange the verbs listed in lexical hierarchies in terms of their definitional structure.

VERBS OF SOUND
sound to make a particular noise.

SOUNDS PRODUCED BY HUMANS
To make a sound by speaking

To make a loud sound by speaking
bawl1, roar, shout, shriek, bark, holler, whoop, scream, bellow, howl1, yell, vociferate, screech, cry out

To make a sound expressing unhappiness
cry1, cry2, moan, whine, groan, whimper, bawl2, yowl, sob, weep, wail, blubber, howl2

To produce musical sounds
sing, bawl3, hum, troll, croon, yodel, warble, chant, carol

lexical set is to specify their relationship with other lexemes. Figure 3 shows the activity sheet given to students for this task.

When completed, the hierarchies would be similar to the ones in Figure 4. As can be observed, within verbs of SOUND, *bawl* would appear in three different subdimensions, depending on the type of agent producing the sound.

The completed version of Activity Sheet 2 shows that *bawl* falls in three different areas of meaning, and as such, is related to three different sets of

Figure 4: Activity Sheet 2 (completed version)

```
VERBS OF SOUND
sound to make a particular noise.

SOUNDS PRODUCED BY HUMANS
To make a sound by speaking
To make a loud sound by speaking

shout to speak loudly
    yell to shout loudly (because of excitement, anger, pain).
    whoop to shout loudly (because of excitement, happiness).
    cry to shout (because of excitement, surprise, fear).
        scream to cry out loudly in a high-pitched tone (because of great excitement, anger, pain,
        fear).
            shriek to scream very sharply and loudly.
                screech to shriek disagreeably and continuously.

bawl(1) to shout loudly and harshly.
    roar to shout loudly and continuously in a very deep voice.
    bellow to shout in a loud deep voice.

To make a sound expressing unhappiness
whine to make a long, high-pitched sound (because of unhappiness).
whimper to make short, high-pitched sounds (because of unhappiness).
moan to make a long, low-pitched sound (because of pain, grief, suffering).
    groan to make a long, low-pitched, rather loud moan (because of pain, worry, disapproval).
cry 1 to make a loud sound (because of unhappiness, fear, pain).
    wail to make long, loud, high-pitched cries (because of sorrow, pain).
    howl to make a long, loud cry (because of pain, fear, unhappiness).
    yowl to howl loudly.
cry2 to make a sound when you produce tears expressing strong emotions .
    weep to cry very softly.
    sob to cry I, breathing in short breaths.
    blubber to cry very in an unpleasant, childish way.

bawl(2) to cry very loudly in an unpleasant way.

To produce musical sounds
sing to produce musical sounds with/without words.
    hum to sing with closed lips, without pronouncing words.
    croon to sing in sweet, low voice.
    warble to sing pleasantly in a high-pitched voice with trills (like a bird).
    yodel to sing, changing quickly and continuously from a normal voice to a very high one (as
    in Switzerland).
    chant to sing a religious prayer/song.
    carol to sing happily (esp. Christmas songs).
    troll to sing loudly to celebrate something (old-fashioned).

bawl(3) to sing badly in a very loud voice.
```

lexemes. These hierarchies of meaning constitute the basic structural pattern of each area of semantic space. Such an analysis helps students learn to be discriminating dictionary users. It also helps them learn how to establish interlinguistic correspondences within the context of an entire lexical field. In order to do this, Spanish verbs are examined in the same way as the English ones.

An example of the definitional analysis of *berrear* (the Spanish equivalent of *bawl*) can be seen in Figure 5. Figure 6 is an example of the comparison of the definitional components of *bawl3/berrear3*.

Figure 5 Activity Sheet 3 (completed)

| berrear | Dar berridos los becerros u otros animales. 2. Llorar o gritar desaforadamente un niño. 3. fig. Gritar o cantar desentonadamente las personas (*Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*). |

| berrear | Dar berridos los becerros u otros animales. fig. Gritar o cantardesentonadamente. (*Diccionario ideolgico de la lengua española*). |

| berrear | (1) Emitir su voz propia un becerro u otro animal que la tenga semejante.
(2) (desp.) Emitir gritos estridentes; por ejemplo, una criatura cuando llora.
Se aplica hiperbólicamente a la acción de cantar con estridencia y desafinación. (*María Moliner*). |

	berrear1	*berrear2*	*berrear3*
Classifier	gritar	cantar	llorar
Manner1	sonido fuerte	haciendo mucho ruido	sonido fuerte
Instrument	la voz	la voz	la voz
Manner2	sonido desagradable	desafinadamente	sonido desagradable
Pragmatic information	despreciativo	despreciativo	infantil

berrear1	gritar con estridencia (sonido fuerte y desagradable) (despreciativo).
berrear2	cantar mal (desafinadamente), haciendo mucho ruido.
berrear3	llorar un niño con estridencia.

Figure 6 Activity Sheet 4 (completed)

	bawl3 (sing)	*berrear3 (cantar)*
Classifer	sing	cantar
Manner1	loudly	haciendo mucho ruido
Instrument	voice	la voz
Manner2	badly	desafinadamente
Pragmatic information	(negatively evaluated by the perceiver)	despreciativo

The parallel representation in English and Spanish of the subdimension of *to make a musical sound*, with approximate correspondences within the two sets of verbs, would be similar to those in Figure 7.

Figure 7 Contrastive lexical hierarchy for verbs of singing in English and Spanish

To produce musical sounds		Emitir sonidos musicales	
sing	to produce musical sounds with/without words	**cantar**	emitir sonidos musicales, formando palabras o no (to emit musical sounds with/without words)]
to sing on key		**entonar**	cantar, ajustándose al tono (to sing on key)
hum	to sing with closed lips, without pronouncing words	**tararear**	cantar sin pronunciar las palabras, con voz dulce (to sing in a sweet voice, without pronouncing words)
croon	to sing in sweet, low voice	**canturrear**	cantar con poca voz y descuidadamente (to sing softly without thinking what one is doing)
warble	to sing pleasantly in a high-pitched voice with trills (like a bird)	**gorjear**	cantar con un sonido semejante a los pájaros (to sing like a bird) .
yodel	to sing, changing quickly and continuously from a normal voice to a very high one (as in Switzerland)	*cantar a la manera tirolesa*	
to sing in a monotone		**salmodiar**	cantar algo con cadencia monótona (to sing in a monotone)
chant	to sing a religious prayer/song, *to sing psalms*	**salmear**	cantar salmos (to sing psalms)
carol	to sing happily (esp. Christmas songs)	*cantar villancicos*	
troll	to sing loudly to celebrate something (old-fashioned)	*cantar muy alto para celebrar algo*	
bawl	to sing badly in a very loud voice	**berrear**	cantar mal, haciendo mucho ruido (to sing noisily and off-key)

When students compare the subdimension in Figure 7 (*to make a musical sound*) with that of Figure 8 (*to make a loud sound by speaking*), they find that although lexemes such as *bawl* belong to more than one meaning area, these meanings are interconnected and must necessarily be taken into account in the search for correspondence. In this case, all the meanings of *bawl* coincide in the component of *loudness*. Nevertheless, it is evident that the lexicographer who elaborated the initial bilingual dictionary entry only chose to define *bawl* as a kind of *shouting*.

Students thus acquire a graphic representation of how different languages divide up the same semantic space, and see distinctions made in one language that are not made in another. This coincides with the following list of insights which can usefully be gained through Language Awareness activities:

Figure 8 Contrastive lexical hierarchy for verbs of shouting in English and Spanish

VERBS OF SOUND		VERBOS DE SONIDO	
sound	to make a particular noise	sonar	producir un sonido (to produce a sound)
SOUNDS PRODUCED BY HUMANS		SONIDOS PRODUCIDOS POR SERES HUMANOS	
To make a sound by speaking		Producir un sonido articulado	
To make a loud sound by speaking		Producir un sonido alto y articulado	
shout	to speak loudly	gritar	hablar muy alto (para hacerse oír o por enfado) [to speak very loudly (in order to be heard or because of anger)
yell	to shout loudly (because of excitement, anger, pain)	vocear	gritar (lit.) [to shout (literary)]
whoop	to shout loudly (because of excitement, happiness)		
cry	to shout (because of excitement, surprise, fear)	chillar	gritar de manera aguda y estridente (to shout in a sharp, high-pitched tone)
scream	to cry out loudly in a high-pitched tone (because of great excitement, anger, pain, fear)		
shriek	to scream very sharply and loudly		
screech	to shriek disagreeably and continuously		
bawl1	to shout loudly and harshly	berrear1	gritar con estridencia (despreciativo) [to shout very loudly and disagreeably (derogatory)]
		vociferar	gritar muy fuerte y de manera descompuesta (to shout very loudly and with strong emotion
roar	to shout loudly and continuously in a very deep voice	rugir	gritar muy fuerte usu. varias veces como por dolor o ira (to shout very loudly and continuously because of pain or anger)
bellow	to shout in a loud deep voice	bramar	rugir de forma violentísima (to roar in a very violent way)
		mugir	bramar (fig.) [to bellow (figurative)]

Languages are different in many ways, e.g.

- there is no word-for-word equivalence,
- like-sounding words may not mean the same,
- some languages have several words for only one word in another,
- some languages do not have a word that others have (Donmall, 1991: 120).

Conclusions

Even students with a good command of two languages often begin translation studies with an erroneous concept of the translation process and what it involves. This is partly due to naive ideas about meaning and language. One of the most important tasks for the teacher is to foster awareness in students of how language

works through a wide variety of activities which ultimately lead them to understand translation better.

The exercise in lexical analysis described here builds on knowledge the students already have (the use of dictionaries, knowledge of the L1 and L2) and helps them see how basic correspondences at the level of word can be derived. It also encourages students to place words in terms of their paradigmatic relations with other words in the same meaning area. This is valuable because even students with a high level of proficiency in the FL often do not have an overview of the semantic distinctions made in comparable lexical domains.

The effectiveness of these activities can be judged from the reports of the students themselves: that they later found insights from the activities to be beneficial for pre-translation text analysis, as well as for the subject of Terminology where they also had to derive conceptual relationships between terms in specialised domains. It also made them more wary about blindly accepting so-called translation correspondences in bilingual dictionaries, but even more important, it gave them more realistic expectations of what dictionaries can offer translators.

Notes

1. This research was carried out within the framework of the project *Desarrollo de una lógica léxica para la traducción asistida por ordenador a partir de una base de datos léxica inglés-español-francés-alemán multifuncional y reutilisable* funded by the DGCIYT (PB 94-0437). The author wishes to thank Peter Garrett as well as the two anonymous referees for their suggestions and helpful comments regarding this article.
2. Entry taken from *Amador English-Spanish Dictionary*.
3. The lexicological model used to structure the lexical field of SOUND is the Functional-Lexematic model elaborated by Martín Mingorance (1990, 1995), which integrates Coseriu's Theory of Lexematics (Coseriu, 1977) and Simon Dik's Functional Grammar (Dik, 1978, 1989).
4. The English dictionaries used were *Collins Cobuild, Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary, Cambridge International Dictionary, American Heritage* and *The Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture*. Spanish dictionaries were *María Moliner: diccionario del uso del español, Diccionario Ideológico de la Lengua Española* and *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*.

References

Aitchison, J. (1987) *Words in the Mind: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bell, R. (1991) *Translation and Translating*. London: Longman.

Bybee, A. (1996) *Teaching Translation from Spanish to English*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Coseriu, E. (1977) *Principios de Semántica Estructural*. Madrid: Gredos.

Dik, S.C. (1978) *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam: North Holland.

Dik, S.C. (1989) *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Donmall, B.G. (1985) *Language Awareness: NCLE Reports and Papers*, 6. London: CILT.

Donmall, B.G. (1991) Old problems and new solutions: LA work in GCSE foreign language classrooms. In C. James and P. Garrett (eds) *Language Awareness in the Classroom*. London: Longman.

Faber, P. (1994) The semantic architecture of the lexicon. *Lexicographica. Series Maior* 57, 37–51.

Faber, P. and Mairal, R. (1994) Methodological underpinnings for the construction of a

functional lexicological model. *Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies* 15, 193–217.

Faber, P. and Mairal, R. (1997) The paradigmatic and syntagmatic structure of the lexical field of EXISTENCE in the elaboration of a semantic macronet. *Studies in Language* 21, 119–54.

Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.

James, C. and Garrett, P. (1991b) The scope of language awareness. In C. James and P. Garret (eds) *Language Awareness in the Classroom* (pp. 3–23). London: Longman.

Martín Mingorance, L. (1990) Functional grammar and lexematics. In J. Tomaszczyk and B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds) *Meaning and Lexicography* (pp. 227–53). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Martín Mingorance, L. (1995) Lexical logic and structural semantics: Methodological underpinnings in the structuring of a lexical database for natural language processing. In Ulrich Hoinkes (ed.) (1995) *Panorama der Lexikalischen Semantik* (pp. 47–59) Tübingin: Narr.

Mel'cuk, I. (1988) Semantic description or lexical units in an explanatory combinatorial dictionary: Basic principles and heuristic criteria. *International Journal of Lexicography* 1, 165–88.

Neubert, A. (1991) Models of translation. In S. Tirkonnen-Condit (ed.) *Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Studies* (pp. 17–26). Tübingen: Narr.

Newmark, P. (1981) *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.

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

Nida, E.A. (1975) *The Componential Analysis of Meaning*. The Hague: Mouton.

Nida, E.A. (1996) *The Sociolinguistics of Interlingual Communication*. Brussels: Hazard.

Nord, C. (1991) *Text Analysis in Translation*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V.

Reiss, K. and Vermeer, H.J. (1984) *Grundlagen einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Rudzka, B., Channell, J., Putseys, Y. and Ostyn, P. (1981) *The Words You Need*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Rudzka, B., Channell, J., Putseys, Y. and Ostyn, P. (1985) *More Words You Need*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Seleskovitch, D. and Lederer, M. (1984) *Interpréter pour traduire*. Paris: Dider.

Toury, G. (1980) *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Wierzbicka, A. (1992) In search of tradition: The semantic ideas of Leibniz. *Lexicographica* 8, 10–25.

Wilss, W. (1994) A framework for decision-making in translation. *Target* 6, 131–50.