

A phraseotranslatological-based approach to literary translation¹

M^a Isabel GONZÁLEZ-REY

Abstract:

The production process of a literary text allows us to combine the words in several possible ways, from 1) the common free combination (*to look at a picture*) to 4) the original free combination (*the road wound uphill*) passing through 2) the pre-set combination (*to get around an obstacle*) and 3) the unfrozen pre-set combination (*to *raffle an obstacle*, i.e. instead of *to avoid an obstacle*). This procedure is the result of adding the two principles of J. Sinclair (1991), the *Mutual Choice Principle* and the *Open Choice Principle*, and that of D. Siepmann (2008), the *Creativity Principle*. All of them contribute to build the idiomaticity of the literary text in a proportion that is variable and that converges to explain the differences in style from one text to another, from one genre to another, from one author to another.

However, when it comes to translating that literary text we have to face the challenge of translating its idiomaticity into a language with different linguistic and cultural codes to those of the language of origin. Therefore, in this study we propose a new phraseotranslatological approach that offers guidelines that allow us to reach the same degree of idiomaticity in the target text, applying the same procedure (principles and ways of combining the words) to the translated text, but in a proportion that can be different from the source text, and yet not lose its idiomaticity.

Keywords: Phraseology, Phraseological units, Phraseotranslatology, Idiomaticity, Literary translation

¹ This study is part of the RELEX project (*Red de Lexicografía*, code ED341D R2016/046), directed by Dolores Sánchez Palomino, of the University of A Coruña (Spain), and subsidized by the Xunta de Galicia.

1 Introduction

The components that must be translated from a source text (A) to a target text (B) are generally of a linguistic, sociolinguistic, sociocultural, semiotic and melodic nature. Among these components, phraseology has long been ignored or described as untranslatable.

Although the importance of phraseology in translation is no longer questioned and the alleged untranslatability of some of phraseological units (PUs) is not accepted, what is certain is that the translation of idioms continues to pose problems, especially with regard to the way in which it is done.

Phraseotranslatology, as a branch of applied phraseology focused on the problem of the translation of PUs, has received little attention so far from translation specialists, who, however, have started to show more interest in this matter. Therefore, in this paper we will analyse the relationship between phraseology and translation and propose a phraseotranslatological approach to literary translation. In the first part, we will study all the aspects that concern phraseotranslation, as a common approach to several branches of applied phraseology, and in particular to phraseotranslatology. In the second part, we will look at the components that intervene in the production process of a literary text in the language of origin and how these components are reinterpreted in the process of translation into the target text (TT). Based on this analysis, we will propose a phraseotranslatological method of literary translation, based on two key concepts: *phraseologization* and *idiomatization*^[1]. These two concepts will help us to deal with literary translation in two stages: (1) identifying PUs in the source text (ST) and translating them into the TT, and (2) linking PUs to context to obtain an idiomatic text as a whole.

2 Relationship between Phraseology and Translation

[1] We have already presented and defined these concepts in González-Rey (2015: 149).

The relationship between phraseology and translation was highlighted at the 1992 congress, held in Geneva, entitled *Terminology, Phraseology and Translation*. The relevance of this congress to the recognition of the importance of phraseology in the field of translation comes from the fact that it was the translators themselves who put value on it. The affirmation of De Bessé, in the introduction of the minutes of the aforementioned congress, is significant:

Toute traduction, comme toute interprétation, doit présenter le même degré d'authenticité et de spécialisation que l'énoncé de départ, que celui-ci relève de la langue générale ou des langues de spécialité. Le traducteur et l'interprète sont donc constamment à la recherche non seulement du mot juste ou du terme exact (la terminologie pertinente) mais aussi de l'expression, de la tournure la plus naturelle, la plus spontanée, la plus idiomatique (la phraséologie appropriée). (De Bessé, [1993](#): 9)

However, this relationship has not stopped oscillating between a certain lack of concern and a state of “obfuscation” on the part of translators. Thus, within that pole of disregard lies that conception which considers the translation of PUs as another element of translation practice, a marginal phenomenon⁹ within the scope of translation:

⁹ This consideration of “marginal” comes from the fact that for many the phraseologisms do not stop being words like all other words, and which only differ from these in that they are “long words containing gaps” (Ladmiral, [2018](#): 289).

Il convient de préciser que si la phraséologie est un chapitre marquant et souvent mis en avant en matière de traduction, elle n’y représente qu’un *phénomène marginal* qui retient surtout l’attention de ceux qui sont extérieurs au monde de la traduction. (Ladmiral, [2018](#): 288).

At the opposite pole, that of “phraseological obfuscation” are those who “obsess over phraseological detail” and run the risk of losing sight of “l’ensemble du texte à traduire où vient s’insérer le phraséologisme considéré qui y prend son sens” (Ladmiral, [2018](#): 290).

These two poles show the need to take into account not only the phraseology that is incorporated into a text of any kind, and which we will call “phraseological fabric”⁴, but also the whole text with all the idiomaticity that emerges through all the elements that go into making it up, and which we will call “textual environment”. One (the phraseological fabric) cannot go without the other (the textual environment), since the PUs would not make sense without the context, nor would the context mean anything without the presence of the PUs⁵. But, in addition to that, it must be kept in mind that the idiomaticity of a text is not limited to the phraseology within it. Its idiomaticity comes from the conjunction of all the elements that intervene in its composition, be they phraseological or not. As Ladmiral indicates, the important thing in translation is to be “à l’écoute du *sens*, et même de l’effet que produit un *texte-source* afin de le ‘rendre’ en mobilisant les ressources propres de la *langue-cible*” (Ladmiral, [2018](#): 291).

For this reason, we want to present a phraseotranslatology model which deals in a differentiated way with these two fundamental parts of textual production, the phraseological

⁴ For more detail on the notion of “phraseological fabric”, see González-Rey (in press).

⁵ The “phraseological fabric” would only have to be eliminated from the text to be able to verify the lack of meaning that would be left for the context.

fabric, on the one hand, and the idiomaticity of the textual environment, on the other, and whose translational process will be done in two stages: the *phraseologization* of the phraseological fabric and the *idiomatization* of the textual environment.

This model is framed in one of the branches of phraseology, which is applied to translation, phraseotranslatology, whose specific approach is the translation of phraseology or *phraseotranslation*^[6]. Although other branches use this approach in a very different way, such as contrastive phraseology, bi/multilingual phraseography and phraseodidactics, they all have a point in common with phraseotranslatology: the awareness that PUs constitute a central phenomenon in language, and that therefore, their translation deserves attention. We will see below how phraseotranslation both unites them and distinguishes them.

3 Phraseotranslation as a Scientific Approach

As the name suggests, *phraseotranslation* deals with the translation of phraseology. As a scientific approach, several applied fields of phraseological research are of interest: *contrastive phraseology*, *phraseography*, *phraseodidactics*, and *phraseotranslatology*.

^[6] Phraseotranslation is gradually filtering into scientific terminology. Thus we can see a first recognition of this kind of approach in the colloquium held at the University of Padua, on 4, 5 and 6 June 2018, called “Phrasèmes en discours”, with a session dedicated exclusively to phraseotranslation (see program:

<http://www.maldura.unipd.it/phrasemes-en->

[discours/fr/docs/PROGRAMME_Phras%C3%A8mes-en-discours_FR.pdf](http://www.maldura.unipd.it/phrasemes-en-discours/fr/docs/PROGRAMME_Phras%C3%A8mes-en-discours_FR.pdf)).

Both *contrastive phraseology*⁷ and *bi/multilingual phraseography*⁸ have been of interest for some time in the translation of PUs, long before being established as branches of applied phraseology. In effect, comparing and compiling the PUs of one language with another goes back to ancient times, but with respect to doing so systematically and according to the criteria of phraseological research, it only dates from the second half of the 20th century. Both are closely related, united not only by an interest in the translation of PUs, but also by their descriptive purposes.

On the other hand, *phraseodidactics* and *phraseotranslatology*, even though they have the same interest in *phraseotranslation*⁹ in common with the previous two, they differ from

⁷ As an applied branch, *contrastive phraseology* had its official recognition at the first Europhras congress, held in Strasbourg in 1988, and whose title is illustrative in itself (*Europhras 88: Phraséologie contrastive*). This congress came to highlight a trend that had already begun during the 1970s and 1980s. The relevance of this branch propelled the emergence of others, such as *bi/multilingual phraseography* and *phraseodidactics*.

⁸ The international congress on phraseography held in 1997 in Santiago de Compostela marked a milestone in the consolidation of this branch of applied phraseology.

⁹ Sulkoswka (2016) offers a different perspective of the concept of phraseotranslation. She proposes granting phraseotranslation the rank of discipline and placing it “à la croisée de la phraséologie, de la traduction, des études contrastives et de la phraséodidactique” (Sulkoswka, 2016: 43). This discipline would include phraseotranslatological methods and phraseodidactic guidelines for what she calls “la didactique du figement” for future translators. For our part, we consider the

them due to their didactic character. In effect, both deal with the pedagogical treatment of phraseotranslation: the first does it within the framework of foreign-language teaching, and the second within the framework of translation studies. But, although both pursue the teaching of the translation of phraseology, their goals are different, and so they develop different pedagogical models. *Phraseodidactics*^[10] is interested in the didactics of translation of PUs as a means to achieve a receptive and productive phraseological competence in a foreign language. *Phraseotranslatology* is concerned with the study of the theory and practice of phraseological translation with the aim of translating the idiomaticity of the language from a ST into a TT. To achieve this, their pedagogical models will differ in as much as their techniques and tools also differ.

The following diagram summarizes the links between *phraseotranslation* and the disciplines that are interested in this kind of approach.

Fig. 1: here

In our study we will focus on *phraseotranslatology* in particular, in order to present a pedagogical model that allows us to tackle the translation of phraseology in literary texts.

4 Phraseotranslatology as a Branch of Applied Phraseology

translation of phraseology, or phraseotranslation, a transversal approach that crosses the four branches already mentioned.

^[10] The aim of phraseodidactics is not to learn to translate phraseology from one language to another, but to learn to speak a foreign language idiomatically, using phraseology appropriately. Phraseotranslation is only one of the tools used to achieve that end.

We are proposing the name *phraseotranslatology*^[1] to designate the scientific field focused on the theoretical and practical study of the translation of PUs. As its name indicates, its specific object of study is the translation of phraseology and its main function is to provide future translators with ways to translate these fixed expressions into other languages, preserving their idiomatic character during the transfer process. Learning to translate the phraseology of a language is its end, and not its means.

Its field of application is the professional field of translation, technical or literary, in which there are certain prevailing constraints (time, space, budget, type of translator, type of translation, etc.). In this field, professional translators deal with the phraseology of the texts that they translate in different ways, explicitly or implicitly, methodically or not (as we have already seen, the relationship between phraseology and translation can range from indifference on the part of the translator to “obfuscation”). In any case, it is certainly the quarry from which to extract data and draw conclusions.

These data and conclusions are what *phraseotranslatology* takes advantage of in order to focus on the theoretical and practical study of the translation of PUs within the framework of the training of future translators. But not only this; it is additionally based on the contributions of *contrastive phraseology* and *bi/multilingual phraseography*, whose studies are also connected with the translation of PUs, although with different purposes. Somehow,

[1] We have already proposed this denomination to refer to the branch dedicated to the study of the translation of PUs in González-Rey (2004). In Ramos Nogueira (2017: 38), our proposal is included, although the author uses the terms *phraseotranslatology* and *phraseotranslation* synonymously. For our part, we insist on distinguishing, on the one hand, the branch (*phraseotranslatology*) and, on the other, its object of study (*phraseotranslation*). Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator

these studies have highlighted the complexity of these prefixed sequences and have shown how ingrained they are in the culture of the language. In effect, each language chooses how to transmit that culture with the linguistic resources available to it and these research fields try to identify those resources, analysing the convergent and divergent elements among the PUs of the different languages and highlighting the difficulties they pose in the translation process.

In the following diagram, we illustrate the relationships that these fields of study maintain with each other and in turn with phraseotranslatology:

Fig. 2: here

As is clear in this diagram, *phraseotranslatology* is nourished by *contrastive phraseology* and *bi/multilingual phraseography* to provide solutions to the problems of phraseotranslation. For this, it tries to develop pedagogical models that help to resolve these problems, like the model that we are going to present next. But first, it is necessary to clarify the concepts on which our proposal is based and to see how these are closely related to the branches that support *phraseotranslatology*.

5 Concepts for a Phraseotranslatological Model

The concepts presented below are divided into two categories: those that have to do with the denomination of the translation unit and those that have to do with the translation process.

5.1 The translation unit

With respect to the first conceptual category, there are three notions from which we will start: those of *correspondence*, *equivalence* and *concordance*. The problem posed by these notions is that their denomination is often used synonymously. Indeed, *phraseotranslation*, in its transversality, makes it clear that each discipline that deals with it, names the translation unit differently.

Thus, the first two terms are the most often used by the majority of translation specialists, and as alternatives to each other. However, Lederer (2002) recommends that they be distinguished. On the one hand, she considers *correspondence* as “des faits de langue; elles sont répertoriées dans les dictionnaires bilingues ou, pour les termes techniques, dans les lexiques ou glossaires spécialisés. Hors discours, tous les vocables pris isolément peuvent faire l’objet de correspondances, simples ou multiples”; and on the other hand there are the *equivalences*, which the author describes as “faits de discours”, that is to say, expressions that result from the reformulation of meaning according to the context.

If we adopt this distinction, and we wish to do so, we would leave the term *correspondence* for bi/multilingual phraseology and the term *equivalence* for contrastive phraseology. This distinction is based on the fact that the lemmatized form of the translated PUs offered by bi/multilingual phraseology is, in effect, a static translation, which is proposed as valid for any context. The example that the dictionary can give, if there is one, leads the user to believe that it is representative of any context, when it is only illustrative of a single context. Conversely, for contrastive phraseology, the use of the term *equivalence* is the most pertinent, since the comparative study of contextualized PUs between two or more languages revealed the existence of a more modular translation, based on different degrees of equivalences^[12], from total equivalence to zero equivalence, passing through partial equivalence, according to the following exemplification:

- a. Total equivalence: the form and meaning of the PU in the ST coincide with the form and meaning of the PU in the TT (e.g. *Lavarse las manos* -> to wash one’s hands; *París bien vale una misa* -> Paris is worth a mass)

^[12] For more information about these degrees of equivalence, see Corpas Pastor (2000).

- b. Partial equivalence: the meaning of both PUs is the same but the form is somewhat different (e.g. *llevarse como el perro y el gato* -> to fight like cat(s) and dog(s))
- c. Zero equivalence: the meaning of both PUs is the same but the form is totally different (e.g. *llevarse como el perro y el gato* -> to be at each other's throat)

The descriptive vocation of contrastive phraseology brought out this type of graduation by comparing the use of PUs in different languages but in similar contexts.

Another concept in translation that can be confused with the previous two is that of *concordance*. Some specialists often use the term as a synonym for the previous two terms^[13], but its definition according to the *Dictionnaire de linguistique et des sciences du langage* (1994: 108) leaves no doubt:

Une concordance est un index de mots présentés avec leur contexte. Une fois réalisée, l'indexation des mots d'un texte, d'un auteur, d'une époque fournit des renseignements sur les références des mots et éventuellement sur leur fréquence; on offre à l'utilisateur la possibilité d'étudier parallèlement les divers emplois du même vocable.^[14]

The first consideration that we must make of this definition is that the term is born from an intralinguistic perspective, referring to the different contexts in which a word or expression can appear within the same language. The second is that these contexts are indexed and offered simultaneously to those who are interested in them. This meaning, which was defined

^[13] See Zouogbo (2008).

^[14] Paris: Larousse, p. 108.

25 years ago, has changed to that of bilingual concordance, with the arrival of computer translation programs (*concordancers*) that allow comparisons of concordances between two languages and which make up *translation memories*. From this point of view, the concept occupies a well-defined place in translation, and therefore we wish to distinguish it from the previous two terms, especially from a pedagogical perspective since it serves to differentiate various ways of approaching phraseotranslation in phraseotranslatology.

This first conceptual category can be summarized in the following diagram:

Fig. 3: here

Ultimately, in phraseotranslation, as a transversal kind of approach to different disciplines, the translation unit can receive a particular name according to the branch that is dealing with it without it being synonymous with other names in other disciplines.

Phraseotranslatology, however, will take these denominations into account in a differentiated way due to their contribution to the translation process.

5.2 The translation process

The two concepts that we are going to use in the translation process are *phraseologization* and *idiomatization* of the TT with respect to the ST. This involves differentiating in the starting text, on the one hand, the phraseology used by the author, and on the other, the idiomaticity of the text as a whole.

If we accept, as phraseologists, that phraseology is a linguistic system organized in different types of units (that is, on the one hand, phraseological statements: *pragmatemes* and *proverbs*; and on the other, phraseological syntagmas: *locutions* and *collocations*^[5]), their presence in the ST must be subject to a separate translation process with respect to the rest of the text. The set of PUs that appear in the original text form its “phraseological fabric” and

^[5] For more detail on this typology, see González-Rey (2018).

their translation in the TT is what we call the *phraseologization* process^[16]. During this process, the translation of the PUs in the original text will highlight the different solutions that can be adopted to maintain the same phraseological load in the TT. Phraseologizing the TT represents, then, the first objective within the translation process.

On the other hand, translating the idiomaticity of a text is not achieved only by translating the phraseology that it contains. What makes a language idiomatic is the particular way in which it arranges all its linguistic resources to express reality. Therefore, the rest of the original text that forms the context in which the “phraseological fabric” is inserted must be taken into account in the translation process in order to determine not only the choice of equivalences but also the decisions to be taken in case of no equivalence^[17]. Idiomatizing the TT is not only translating the phraseology of the ST but also making the whole text “idiomatic” for the reader. Thus, we define idiomatization as the set of translation options that require a natural reformulation of the translated text. We call this second stage of the translation process *idiomatization*, and it constitutes the second objective of the process.

This is outlined in the following figure:

^[16] But not only the “phraseological fabric”; phraseologization also concerns any single word in the ST which can be translated by means of a PU in the TT.

^[17] Dobrovol'skiĭ introduces this concept when questioning the system of equivalences established above, especially the total equivalence. He states that “[...] most of the phraseologies that have traditionally been considered absolute equivalents are in reality very far from being so. Several explanations have been suggested for this phenomenon. First of all, the more progress is made in semantic analysis, the greater number of elements of the lexicon turn out to be specific to the language [...]” (Dobrovol'skiĭ, [2005](#): 360).

Fig. 4: here

Before presenting below our proposal for a phraseotranslatological model, we must make clear the idea that, just as the ST forms an idiomatic block in which there is no separation between “phraseological fabric” and co-text/context, the same should occur in the TT. Only in the translation process do we proceed to separate the two stages in order to face the challenge of maintaining the same language load in the two texts. With this in mind, the phraseologization stage consists of the process of translating the “phraseological fabric” or the “textual environment” used in the source text (A), by means of PUs. Meanwhile, the idiomatization stage consists of the process of translating the “phraseological fabric” and the “textual environment” used in the ST, by means of free combinations (*common, creative* and *related* ones, as we shall see further on).

6 Proposal for a Phraseotranslatological Model

Taking into account the three types of translation unit and the two stages of the translation process presented previously, we now offer a phraseotranslatological model, which we will apply later to literary translation.

The recommended steps within this model are as follows:

1. *Reading(s) of the text*

The translator should undertake numerous readings of the text, first of all in a holistic way, in search of the general sense of the subject, and then in an analytical way, in search of how the ideas are organized and their mode of expression.

2. *Phraseologization stage*

This stage consists of translating the “phraseological fabric” of the ST through direct translation techniques.

- (a) The translator should extract the “phraseological fabric” from the ST, based on:

1. the typology of its elements: statements (*pragmatemes* and *proverbs*); and syntagmas (*locutions* and *collocations*);
 2. the discursive functions that each type performs within the text: as *argumentators*, *connectors* or *modalizers*.
- (b) Next, the *correspondences* of each PU should be looked up. In this phase, the search for *correspondences* is done through “static” translation, that is, through dictionaries, both on paper and in electronic format, in order to gather as many translation units as possible for each PU.
- (c) Subsequently, these correspondences are transformed into equivalences, ordering them according to their degree of equivalence (total, partial or zero).
- (d) Finally, intralinguistic *concordances* are sought in which these PUs can appear in the language of origin, in order to verify their true use in the target language¹⁸.
- (e) Once the text has been translated and the translation of the “phraseological fabric” has been inserted into it, the translator starts attempting direct phraseologization, first verifying the concordance, that is to say if the context in which the PU exists corresponds to one of those which has been collected in the concordance search, and

¹⁸ The order in which this stage begins can vary, according to the confidence of the translator faced with the presence or not of a PU. If the translator is not sure that it is a PU, they should start by checking the intralinguistic *concordances*, find their *correspondences* and finish with *equivalences*.

immediately after trying to translate the original PU with some of the obtained equivalences.

- (f) In the case of no equivalence, the translator may choose to use literal translation or a loan^[19], in order to keep to the maximum not only the idiomatic load of the original text but also the same placement of the PUs in the TT.

3. *Idiomatization stage*

The idiomatization phase starts when the translator cannot find a way to translate a PU using any of the mechanisms mentioned in the phraseologization stage. Even so, an attempt should be made to resolve the translation of the “phraseological fabric” without betraying the idiomaticity of either of the two languages in play. For this, several resources can be used, such as the following^[20]:

- (a) *Compensation techniques*: Although the omission of a PU in the TT may turn out to apparently be the easiest solution to adopt, this requires using the most difficult indirect (or oblique)^[21] technique of all, namely compensation. In effect, the decision to omit the translation of a PU

^[19] Both translation techniques are usually accompanied by translator’s notes placed at the bottom of the page, explaining the semanticism of these PUs in the source language in order for them to fit in the TT. The choice of these techniques is only considered as a last resort, in case no kind of equivalence can be found and the PUs’ presence in the translated text is desired.

^[20] Other indirect techniques can be omission, paraphrase or reduction to a single word.

^[21] We are using here the standard division established by Vinay and Darbelnet ([1958](#)), between direct techniques and oblique techniques.

cannot be executed without the translator assessing its impact on the idiomaticity of the translated text and seeking to compensate for this omission in some way, with the insertion of some other word or stylistic resource somewhere in the sentence or paragraph that conveys not only the sense of the deleted PU but the intention with which the author used it.

- (b) *The relevance of the textual environment:* In this phase of idiomatization, the role played by the rest of the text, co-text and context is very important, and which we call “textual environment” in order to differentiate the “phraseological fabric” from the text in which it is inserted.
- (c) The relevance of this “textual environment” is that it conditions not only the choice of equivalences in the phraseologization stage (concordances), but also the choice of the solution to adopt in case of no equivalence in the idiomatization stage.
- (d) *The idiomatic link:* This is what unites the phraseological fabric and the textual environment. It is an almost invisible thread, since it does not materialize with any lexical or grammatical element, but rather through a particular syntax. Its value is both intratextual and intertextual since its job is to maintain the same idiomatic load not only throughout the text to prevent the reader from detecting internal defects, but also between both texts, text A and text B.

The result of applying these two concepts, *phraseologization*, on the one hand and *idiomatization*, on the other, is that, although the proportion of “phraseological fabric” in the

ST has been able to vary in the TT when compared to the original text, as well as its location within it^[22], the idiomatic load has not been lost in the translated text.

7 Application of the Phraseotranslatological Method to Literary Translation

The problem posed by literary translation was perfectly described by Efim Etkind in [1982](#):

Le terme de traduction n'est vraiment pas précis. Traduire veut dire rendre le contenu de l'énoncé en une autre langue. Or, cette définition pose un autre problème, celui du terme « le contenu »; est-il aussi clair qu'il semble l'être? Pour des textes scientifiques, aussi bien du domaine de la philosophie que de ceux de la biologie et même de l'histoire, c'est évident: le contenu n'est que la somme d'informations rationnelles. La forme de l'expression joue un certain rôle extérieur, mais on peut l'ignorer. Nous avons donc toute une gamme de textes à partir de celui où le rôle que joue la forme verbale pour le contenu général est quasi nul, jusqu'à celui où c'est la forme qui elle-même devient le contenu. (Etkind, [1982](#): XV)

Without stating so in this quote, the literary text is defined in this central idea: in literature, form becomes content. And if translating is transmitting the content, in literary translation it is important to transmit that content in a verbal and meaningful way. Within the limits of this definition, then, the choice of the right word, as De Bessé states in the previous quote above, takes on special relevance, as an element placed at the service of idiomaticity both in the process of literary production and in that of literary translation.

7.1 How an idiomatic text in literature is produced

^[22] A lexeme in text A may result in a PU in text B, and vice versa.

The production of a literary text results from the application of three fundamental principles that can be extracted from the proposals made by Sinclair (1991), Hausmann (1979, 1997) and Siepmann (2008)²³.

7.1.1 Sinclair's principles

Sinclair (1991) distinguishes between the idiom principle, which explains the large number of semi-fixed sequences present in the lexicon and that the user must store in his memory in bloc, and the open-choice principle according to which the lexicon is composed of isolated words that can be combined to infinity as long as the grammatical rules of the language are respected. Examples of this dichotomy can be found in the following table:

Fig. 5: here

In this proposal, Sinclair applies the co-occurrence criterion to differentiate the combinations formed according to the idiom principle from those formed according to the open-choice principle.

7.1.2 Hausmann's principles

On the other hand, Hausmann (1979, 1997) distinguishes two types of combinations: frozen and free. The first ones contain idiomatic expressions: *la chambre forte* [the safety deposit box], *casser la tête à qqn.* [to do someone's head in, *Br. Eng.*, to make someone's head spin, *Am. Eng.*], etc. In the second, the following subcategories are established:

1. Free combinations, also called "co-creations": *une maison agréable* [a nice house], *regarder un arbre* [to look at a tree], etc.
2. Stylistic combinations or "counter-creations", created by a writer in order to provoke a stylistic effect: *la nudité noueuse* [the knotty nakedness], *le jour*

²³ These principles have already been explained in González-Rey (2014: 240–241).

fissuré [the cracked day], *la route se rabougrit* [the road dwindles], etc.

Examples of this division are given in the following table:

Fig. 6: here

In this proposal, for the first time, a distinction appears within the principle of Sinclair's open-choice principle, highlighting the creative side of an author. Thus an author's linguistic knowledge is not only made up of common vocabulary, united by a correct syntax, or of frozen expressions, but they also have the capacity to transform the language.

7.1.3 Siepmann's principles

Siepmann (2008), on the other hand, seeks to achieve a compromise between the theories of Sinclair and Hausmann in relation to literary production, adding a third principle to Sinclair's two, the "principle of creativity". This would encompass both Hausmannian counter-creations, coming from the open-choice principle, and a new type of stylistic combinations that he proposes calling "related creations", inspired by frequent associations, coming from the mutual-choice principle. Siepmann gives us an example with the English expression "economically clad", used by Colin Dexter in his novel *The Wench is Dead* (2001), whose form alludes to the collocation "scantily clad", since "economically" is a partial synonym of "scantily". This type of analogous transfer appears in other constructions and would explain that an expression like "a two-hour drive" served as a model for the related creation of "a 27-hour meander by sledge".

Here is a summary of Siepmann's proposal, based on the frequency principle:

Fig. 7: here

If we compare this proposal with the previous ones, we observe that Siepmann's counter-creations are close to the Hausmannian group of free combinations, and therefore they arise from the open-choice principle, in the same way as co-creations, since neither of these two types of combinations is predictable. On the other hand, Siepmann's related

creations are close to the mutual-choice principle, because their creation is inspired by pre-existing associations with the intention of de-lexicalizing them.

The interest in this proposal lies in the incorporation of a new principle for literary production, the principle of creativity, which governs, on the one hand, the de-lexicalized expressions (linked up to now to the group of frozen combinations), and on the other, counter-creations (linked to the group of free combinations). In this way, the doubly creative part of a literary author becomes clear, producing innovative work which affects not only common language (free but current combinations), but also the most institutionalized phraseology.

In summary, literary language consists of: 1) combinations that follow the open-choice principle (free combinations or co-creation); 2) combinations that follow the mutual-choice principle (frozen combinations or idiom principle); and 3) in the middle, combinations that follow the principle of creativity, based on one of the other two types: the open-choice principle to build a singular and original combination (zero frequency) and the mutual-choice principle to de-automate pre-existing combinations.

7.2 How to translate an idiomatic text

To tackle literary translation, we propose the application of the phraseotranslatological model presented in this paper, taking into account the three principles set forth by Siepmann and using the two stages of the translation process, *phraseologization* and *idiomatization*.

7.2.1 The phraseologization stage

After the prescriptive, holistic and analytical readings, the translator should proceed to identify the “phraseological fabric” used in the ST. This fabric is the product of the mutual-choice principle and should be the first to be delimited by following the steps below:

- (a) To ensure that it is effectively and without doubt of predetermined and institutionalized sequences, the translator should look for possible

concordances in other contexts in the language of origin. This procedure will allow, on the one hand, their verification as stable combinations, and on the other hand, their differentiation from related creations produced by the author.

- (b) Once the “phraseological fabric” has been delimited, the translator will organize it according to the typology of its elements (*statements* and *phraseological syntagmas*) and the discursive functions (*arguments*, *connectors* and *modalizers*) that these perform in the production of the literary text.
- (c) *Correspondences* and *equivalences* should then be explored, organizing these by degrees.
- (d) With the support of the textual environment, the most appropriate equivalence can next be chosen.
- (e) In the case of no equivalence, the possibility of using other phraseologization techniques will be evaluated, by means of literal translation or loan.

7.2.2 The idiomatization stage

In the idiomatization stage, the translator will face the other combinations, derived from the *mutual-choice principle*, *open-choice principle* and *principle of creativity*.

- (a) Within the combinations formed according to the first principle, all the PUs that have no equivalence and which should be omitted in the TT, should be treated according to indirect techniques (compensation, omission, paraphrase or reduction to a single word) to safeguard the same idiomatic load between the two texts.
- (b) Within the combinations of the second principle, all text that has not been identified during the stage of phraseologization as a product of the mutual-choice principle, and which, therefore, can enter the category of free

combinations, is included. In this part of the text, which we call “textual environment”, those combinations that are current combinations (co-creations) will have to be detected.

- (c) After having all types of combinations delimited (within the frozen ones, the no equivalence combinations that were not resolved in the phraseologization stage and within the free ones, the co-creations), there remain to be defined within the creative combinations those which are, on the one hand, the de-lexicalized or related combinations and, on the other, those of counter-creation.
- (d) Within the principle of creativity, the translator will have to deal with related combinations and counter-creations by means of adapting to the culture of the target language so that the author’s unique creations achieve the same effect in the reader of the translated text as the one produced in a reader of the original text. The expertise of the translator is no longer based on a simple search for linguistic elements already available in the language, with the help of external supports or technicalities. In these cases, the idiomatization of related combinations and counter-creations will depend on the creative part that the translator possesses, in symbiosis with that of the author.
- (e) The translator will complete this process of idiomatization with the application of the intra- and inter-idiomatic link, passing the translated text onto the reader receptibility test, the only one that can decide if a translated text “smells” or not of translation.
- (f) After applying the *phraseologization* and *idiomatization* stages, the proportion in which the three principles have been used by the author of the ST for its composition may have varied during the translation process. Indeed, it is

possible that some PUs, co-creations or counter-creations in text A have not reached text B or are located differently. Even so, what matters is that the translated text is “idiomatic” as a whole for its potential reader, just as the original text is for its reader.

8 Conclusion

The relationship between phraseology and translation has been strengthened over these decades thanks to a number of works that have been developed from different branches of applied phraseology, namely *contrastive phraseology*, *bi/multilingual phraseography*, *phraseodidactics* and *phraseotranslatology*, giving rise to the emergence of a common kind of approach: the translation of phraseology or *phraseotranslation*.

Of all the branches of applied phraseology, phraseotranslatology is that which has phraseotranslation not only as a special kind of approach but also as a specific object of study, since its scientific field is focused exclusively on the study and practice of the translation of PUs. However, this fact is not an obstacle for the other disciplines that share this kind of approach to help solve the problems that the translation of phraseology tends to pose.

These problems impose, in fact, the need to conceive pedagogical models capable of dealing with the translation process of the phraseology of a ST into a TT. The model presented here is based on the application of two concepts, that of *phraseologization* and *idiomatization*, in order to make the target text (B) as idiomatic as the source text (A) for the reader. These two concepts are applied consecutively: in a first stage, extracting the “phraseological fabric” from text A and proceeding to organize its translation applying the concepts of *correspondence*, *equivalence* and *concordance*; and in a second stage, levelling the linguistic load throughout text B through inter- and intra-idiomatic links, creating a symbiosis between “phraseological fabric” and “textual environment”.

This model, applied to literary translation, respects the three principles that govern the productive process as stated by Siepman: *the mutual-choice principle, the open-choice principle* and *the principle of creativity*. These principles allow for the determination of the presence of frozen, free and creative combinations (derived both from frozen and from free combinations) in a literary text. The translation process of these three types of combinations, by means of *phraseologization* and *idiomatization*, shows that the number of PUs in text B, as well as their location with respect to text A, often differ. And this is so, because, although in the phraseologization stage, to translate the phraseology of a text is to pass from lexicographical correspondence (1st level of translation of the PUs) to phraseological equivalence (2nd level of translation of the PUs), in the idiomatization stage, to translate the idiomaticity of a text is going beyond the stage of phraseological equivalence and non-equivalence; it is to achieve with text B the total textual equivalence of text A, thus creating a new concordance (3rd level of translation) for each of the PUs of both texts.

References

- Corpas Pastor, G. (2000). Acerca de la (in)traducibilidad de la fraseología. In G. Corpas Pastor (Ed.), *Las lenguas de Europa, estudios de fraseología, fraseografía y traducción*. Granada: Comares, 483–522.
- De Bessé, B. (1993). Introduction: le Colloque de Genève, *Terminologie et Traduction* 2/3, 1992. Luxembourg: Office des publications officielles des Communautés européennes.
- Dobrovól'skiĭ, D. (2005). Sobre la equivalencia translingüística de los fraseologismos. In J. de D. Luque Durán & A. Pamies Bertrán (Eds.), *La creatividad en el lenguaje: colocaciones idiomáticas y fraseología*. Granada: Granada Lingüística (Método Ediciones), 359–380.

- Etkind, E. (1982). *Un art en crise, essai poétique de la traduction poétique*. Lausanne: L'Âge d'Homme.
- González-Rey, M^a I. (2004). A fraseodidáctica: un eido da fraseoloxía aplicada, *Cadernos de Fraseoloxía Galega* 6, 113–130.
- González-Rey, M^a I. (2014). Le «double» principe d'idiomaticité en traduction littéraire, *RFULL (Revista de Filología de la Universidad de La Laguna)* 32, 227–244.
- González-Rey, M^a I. (2015). Fraseologización e idiomatización en traducción literaria. In Manuel Sevilla Muñoz (Ed.), *Enfoques actuales para la traducción fraseológica y paremiológica*. Centro Virtual Cervantes: Biblioteca Fraseológica y Paremiológica, 143–160.
- González-Rey, M^a I. (2018). Comment acquérir un savoir grammatical en FLE par le biais de la phraséologie. In Z. Nikodinovski (Ed.), *Actes du colloque Le même, le semblable et le différent au sein de la langue, de la littérature et de la culture dans les pays francophones*. Skopje: Faculté de philologie « Blaže Koneski » Université « Sts Cyrille et Méthode », 42–63.
- González-Rey, M^a I. (in press). La place du tissu phraséologique dans l'élaboration des discours et sa didactisation. In D. Savatovsky & M. Albano (Ed.).
- Hausmann, F.-J. (1979). Un dictionnaire de collocations est-il possible?, *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature* 17, 187–195.
- Hausmann, F.-J. (1997). Tout est idiomatique dans les langues. In M. Martins-Baltar (Ed.), *La locution entre langue et usages*. Fontenay/St. Cloud: ENS Éditions, 277–290.
- Lederer, M. (2002). Correspondances et équivalences faits de langue et faits de discours en traduction. In F. Israël (Ed.), *Altérité, identité, équivalence*. Minard lettres Modernes, 17–34.

- Ladmiral, J.-R. (2018). Phraséologie et traductio. In O. Soutet, S. Mejri & I. Sfar (Eds.), *La phraséologie: théories et applications*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 287–300.
- Ramos Nogueira, L. C. (2017). *La traducción de la fraseología en la obra de Carlos Ruiz Zafón en el par lingüístico español-portugués*, unpublished doctoral thesis. Granada: Universidad de Granada. [<https://hera.ugr.es/tesisugr/26657144.pdf>, downloaded on 8.10.2018]
- Sinclair, J. M. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Siepmann, D. (2008). Idiomaticité et traduction: essai d’une systématisation. In P. Blumenthal & S. Mejri (Eds.), *Les séquences figées: entre langue et discours*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 175–195.
- Sulkowska, M. (2016). Phraséodidactique et phraséotraduction: quelques remarques sur les nouvelles disciplines de la phraséologie appliquée, *Yearbook of Phraseology* 7, 35–54.
- Vinay, J.-P. & Darbelnet, J. (1966 [1958]). *Stylistique comparée du français et de l’anglais*. Paris: Didier.
- Zouogbo, J. Ph. (2008). Traduire le proverbe: à la recherche de concordances parémiologiques en bété pour la constitution d’un corpus trilingue allemand/français/bété, *Meta* 53/2, 310–323.

Fig. 1: The transversality of phraseotranslation

Fig. 2: Complementary branches to Phraseotranslatology

Fig. 3: The translation units of phraseotranslation

Fig. 4: Stages of the translation process

Fig. 5: Sinclair’s principles

Mutual-choice principle (or <i>idiom principle</i>)	Open-choice principle

<i>To kick the bucket</i> [to die]	<i>To walk in the street/on the road/in the country,</i> ...
------------------------------------	---

Fig. 6: Hausmann's principles

Frozen combinations	Free combinations	
Idioms	Co-creations	Counter-creations
<i>la chambre forte</i> the safety deposit box <i>casser la tête à qqn</i> [to do someone's head in; to make someone's head spin]	<i>une maison agréable</i> [a nice house] <i>regarder un arbre</i> [to look at a tree]	<i>la nudité noueuse</i> [the knotty nakedness <i>le jour fissuré</i> [the cracked day] <i>la route se rabougrit</i> [the road dwindles]

Fig. 7: Siepmann's principles

Mutual-choice principle (or Idiom principle)/Frozen combinations	Creativity principle		Open-choice principle/Free combinations
<i>Collocation</i>	<i>Related creation</i>	<i>Counter-creations</i>	<i>Co-creation</i>
<i>scantly clad</i> (799 results on Google Books)	<i>economically clad</i> 24 results on Google Books)	<i>thirstily clad</i> (0 results on Google Books)	<i>beautifully clad</i> (350 results on Google Books)

