Teaching English-Spanish Contrastive Analysis through Translation[1]

Rosa Rabadán
Belén Labrador
Noelia Ramón
University of León, Spain.

Abstract:

For the past few years, the Department of Modern Languages at the University of León (Spain) has been offering a course on English-Spanish Contrastive Linguistics focusing on explicit instruction in L1-L2 differences. The directionality is from English into Spanish, since our students are native speakers of Spanish enrolled in an English degree. This has proved to be helpful in raising learners' awareness of the one-to-many relationships between meaning and form across language boundaries and also in improving their translation performance.

The course makes use of a corpus-based methodology to develop a number of tasks oriented towards highlighting the grammatical areas that are particularly problematic from an English-Spanish perspective and may cause difficulties in the improvement of the translation skills of our students. After a short theoretical introduction to the field of Contrastive Linguistics, a top-down functional approach is employed to deal with textual contrasts and contrasts at various lexico-grammatical levels.

The main purposes of this 'contrast-through-translation' course are to offer students the opportunity a) to explore the semantic and pragmatic cross-linguistic relationships between English and Spanish at different levels of analysis, and b) to improve both their understanding of the source language (English) and their accuracy in the production of the target language (Spanish).

Keywords: contrastive, English-Spanish, teaching, translation, corpus-based methodology.

1. Introduction: translation and contrastive analysis in language training

Corpus-based work has brought the benefits of empirical research to a number of cross-linguistic activities including advanced language learning and translation. These benefits are mainly concerned with the direct access to real language, both original and translated; the possibility of processing a large volume of descriptive data and the relative ease of accessibility to these data.

This paper sets out to present a course on corpus-based English-Spanish Contrastive Linguistics for Spanish students enrolled in an English degree. It is a compulsory third year course focusing on explicit instruction in L1-L2 differences. The contents and objectives of this course will be described here with the help of illustrative examples.

Why teach contrastive analysis through translation? The course outlined in this paper highlights the use of translation practice as a tool to grasp the functional semantic and pragmatic differences in a cross-linguistic study between two or more languages and uses corpora of two different types: bilingual comparable corpora and translation corpora.

The main aims of this 'contrast-through-translation' course are to offer students the opportunity a) to raise their awareness of interlingual differences and the problems they pose (Clark and Ivanic 1995: 168-185) b) to explore the semantic and pragmatic cross-linguistic relationships between English and Spanish at different levels of analysis, and c) to improve both their understanding of the source language (English) and their accuracy in the production of the target language (Spanish).

The main features of the approach to language analysis to be employed in the subsequent contrastive study are outlined in the preliminary chapters.[2] The text is taken as the basic linguistic unit, and language is described from the perspective of meaning in context. The method followed in contrasting two languages is explained and the concept of *tertium comparationis* is presented and discussed in detail. This concept is understood as the measure against which cross-linguistic similarity or difference is considered (Krzeszowski 1990). Throughout the course a set of semantic-pragmatic cross-linguistic labels fulfils this role: e.g. 'progressive meaning', which does not necessarily involve a specific form in Spanish, although it does in English (A staggering twenty-two

---

[2] As a background to the actual translation-based contrastive analysis between English and Spanish, the students are also provided with an introduction to the field of Contrastive Linguistics by commenting upon the relationships of CA with linguistics, psychology, FLT and translation. Some of the topics approached include a) language universals and linguistic relativism, b) bilingualism, diglossia, code-switching, pidgins and creoles, c) communicative competence, d) Transfer Theory and the concept of interlanguage, e) Error Analysis. Special care is devoted to distinguish between CA and other disciplines related to languages in contact or involving two or more languages.

percent of all the children in the U.S. **are living** in poverty/ *Un asombroso 22 % de los niños de EE UU **viven en la pobreza*)[3].

In the final part of the preliminaries, the students are given a brief introduction to corpus linguistics from the perspective of CA (Contrastive Analysis). Large monolingual reference corpora are presented, both in English (Cobuild, BNC) and in Spanish (CREA), as well as comparable and parallel corpora in the two working languages. The parallel corpus of choice is P-ACTRES, which is an open corpus being compiled at the University of León (see section 3.2). Students work in class with the online versions of the Cobuild, BNC, the CREA and P-ACTRES. They are shown how to use the various search possibilities of each of the corpora by means of directed tasks.

A top-down design has been employed to cover most linguistic levels, from macrolinguistics (contrastive rhetoric) to microlinguistic analysis (morphosyntax, phraseology and lexis). Contrastive work is preceded by a functional description of the linguistic possibilities in the two languages for the category/semantic area being examined (Bondarko 1991) and it focuses on areas that are known to be problem triggers in cross-linguistic transfer at all the three levels: rhetorical, grammatical and lexical. In the case of macrolinguistics, authentic textual materials are used to identify and compare textual conventions in English and Spanish. As for microlinguistics, specific materials have been designed making use of authentic language samples extracted from Cobuild's Bank of English, CREA, and from the English-Spanish parallel corpus P-ACTRES. These exercises consist of concordance lines or microtexts specifically selected from one of our three corpora. The aim is to expose students to these texts where they have to identify a) the meanings conveyed by certain grammatical structures, or b) the various formal resources employed to realise a particular meaning in English. Next, students are asked to discuss the translational solutions available in Spanish for the actualisation of those particular meanings, and finally they are required to render those microtexts into acceptable idiomatic Spanish.

2. Methodology

The methodology developed over the years is based on the use of a fairly standard procedure, the selection of an appropriate *tertium comparationis* and the use of an analytical 'tool kit' that includes comparable and parallel corpora as sources of empirical data.

The procedure comprises three stages: description, juxtaposition and contrast (Krzeszowski 1990). The first describes the linguistic phenomenon being analysed in each of the languages independently, the second yields the map of possible cross-linguistic equivalences as well as the interlinguistic 'gaps'[4], and the third supplies the differences between the one-to-many choices, both formally similar and dissimilar in the TL. In the first and second phases we use comparable corpora, and parallel corpus data are also used in the final contrast phase. Both types of data - comparable and parallel - can be used profitably in different ways provided the same *tertium comparationis* is used throughout the analysis independently of the status of the data.

This is one of the key issues in any contrastive study, as it has to do with what is to be compared. Do we pick up formal correspondents and work from there? Do we rather start from semantic equivalence and compare formally dissimilar items? Or do we go for chunks of language that do the same job in the same context? Although different possibilities have been discussed, among others by Catford (1965) and Krzeszowski (1984), the most widely accepted *tertium comparationis* for CA is *translation equivalence* (Halliday et al. 1964; Chesterman 1998*)*. It is generally accepted that translation is always present either implicitly or explicitly in cross-linguistic contrastive analysis, as a means or as an end. Independently of whether we favour an inclusive definition or a partial one of 'language that is doing the same job in the same context' across languages, *translation equivalence* seems to be our best option for CA (James 1980*)*.

In our corpus-based approach this means that we need to find cross-linguistic labels at the rhetorical, grammatical and lexical levels that will comply with the requirement of 'doing the same job' in English and in Spanish texts. Our choices have been cross-linguistic labels which stand for what is shared in terms of global meaning: the textual function, the semantic, pragmatic or lexical meaning (see applications in section 5). These are applied at the descriptive stage to comparable materials in both languages separately and also to parallel corpus data so as to obtain the 'translation options' Spanish offers for one given problem area in English.

The 'tool kit' in our procedure includes, as mentioned before, comparable and parallel corpora. Comparable corpora are "original texts in two or more languages which share certain features (typically, texts are from the same genre or subject domain)" (Salkie1997:305) whereas parallel corpora are said to be composed of both original texts and their translations; they are even called "the Rosetta stone of modern corpus linguistics" (McEnery and Oakes 2006: 211). Baker (1995: 234) uses the term 'comparable' to define corpora which are composed of original and translated texts in the same language. On the other hand, the term 'parallel' has been used instead of 'comparable' – "parallel texts, i.e. authentic material in the two languages, selecting texts that are

---

[3] All bilingual examples come from P-ACTRES.
[4] Throughout this paper 'interlinguistic gaps' refers to blank spaces in the semantic/ pragmatic contrastive grid that result from juxtaposing the resources available in each language for encoding a certain function.

maximally equivalent on as many levels as possible" (Louhivaara 1998: 145-157). Nowadays the terminology most widely accepted is 'comparable' to refer to original texts in two different languages - in order to avoid ambiguity, Zanettin (1998: 616-629) calls them "bilingual comparable corpora"- and 'parallel' for 'translation corpora'.

The relevance of our chosen corpora for our applied purposes and their contribution as well as the advantages of using them are discussed in the following section.

3. The tools

Corpora provide us with the authentic materials needed to offer students both data to support regularities in the use of language and also to examine particular translation possibilities for a given utterance in the source language, that is, corpora have the advantage of being "able to cater both for the linguist's love of generalities and for the translator's love of the instance"(Malmkjaer 1998: 534-541).

. That is the reason why corpora are used as the main tool in our applied study. By working on corpus-based exercises of a variety of types, students can become aware of the differences, learn to solve concrete translation problems and get a grasp on the general tendencies that characterize the use of English as compared with the use of Spanish, a kind of 'contrast-through-translation' course.

3.1. Monolingual corpora as "sources" for comparable corpora

Large monolingual reference corpora can be used both on their own and in combination with others, as 'source corpora' for the building of bilingual comparable corpora (Zanettin 1998). The monolingual reference corpora of our choice are Cobuild's Bank of English and CREA.[5] Their role is to supply microtextual concondance lines in English and in Spanish, respectively.

CREA is the Reference Corpus of Contemporary Spanish built by the Spanish Royal Academy. As of May 2006 it comprises 160 million words from texts written in American Spanish and in European Spanish (approximately 50% each). It includes materials from a variety of registers: books, press, miscellanea and transcriptions of oral recordings. The chronological span goes from 1975 up to the present and the interface offers an interactive feature that allows users to define the period and the size of the corpus to be used to their own convenience. Table 1 below shows the composition of the part of CREA that we use for our purposes – contemporary Spanish as used in Spain for the period 1990-2005. Access to the corpus is free.

CREA (Spain) (1990-2005)	Number of words
Books	25,943,651
Press	28,049,721
Miscellanea	2,454,697
Oral	2,530,072
TOTAL	58,978,141

Table 1. Composition of the part of CREA selected.

Concordances from CREA allow us to illustrate the real use of Spanish when we are dealing with some English-Spanish contrastive topics in class, such as particular areas of non-equivalence. In Task 4, for instance, there is a preliminary stage where concordance lines from CREA are used to exemplify the use of the Spanish imperfect.

The Bank of English, launched in 1991 by Collins and the University of Birmingham, is a corpus of modern English language that contains 524 million words from different sources. The online version -Cobuild Direct- offers nearly 58 million words. Throughout this paper Bank of English corpus means the restricted online version. It includes written texts come from newspapers, magazines, fiction and non-fiction books, brochures, reports, and websites. Spoken material comes from television and radio broadcasts, meetings, interviews, discussions, and conversations. A subscription is needed for access to the only part of the corpus that is available online. Table 2 shows the composition of this part, which we use to collect data for our teaching applications.

Bank of English	Number of words
Books	10,980,698
Press	27,076,057
Miscellanea	4,349,064

---

[5] http://www.rae.es/. Students are also exposed to other English language corpora such as the BNC as an illustrative example of what a monolingual corpus in English looks like, but this particular corpus is not used for the extraction of concordances. For Spanish the choice is CREA.

Oral	15,011,670
TOTAL	**57,417,489**

Table 2. Composition of the part of The Bank of English accessible online.

Tasks 4 to 10 are based on microtexts which consist of concordance lines from The Bank of English specifically selected on the basis of the difficulties that some of the words or expressions they contain cause in their translations into Spanish. There are two basic perspectives to approach this type of microtextual task - the functional approach (Tasks 6, 7, 8, 10) and the formal approach (Tasks 4, 5, 9).

Although there is a general agreement on the terminology, comparability still remains a controversial issue; not all authors agree upon the requirements two separate monolingual corpora need to fulfill in order to be considered comparable. It is true that CREA and The Bank of English have not been compiled as a comparable corpus *ad hoc*: they are completely independent of each other. For our purpose we define comparable corpora as "a collection of texts composed independently in the respective languages and put together on the basis of similarity of content, domain and communicative function"(Zanettin 1998: 617) CREA and The Bank of English are compatible in terms of quantity and quality as can be seen in tables 1 and 2; both the total number of words and the genres included are quite similar. They are both large monitor corpora composed of a wide variety of textual types, genres, subjects, registers and media representative of their respective languages.

The advantages of comparable corpora with respect to parallel corpora are, first of all, that they are much easier to obtain. It also makes sense to rely upon utterances produced by native speakers when describing linguistic uses in a contrastive way, hence the use of a corpus that contains original texts in two languages without any of the translation effects, whether induced by the source text – the so-called "translationese" features of translated texts (Baker 1996) or caused by universal translation strategies. This does not mean that translated texts are less entitled to belong to the target language; it is simply that they are considered different from original texts. Curiously enough, translated texts have been even proved to contain more target language phrases, structures, and so on particularly characteristic of the target language than original texts, what has been called "the Eliza Doolittle phenomenon" (Malmkjaer 1998: 535).[6] On the other hand, the main drawback of comparable corpora is the fact that it is difficult and time-consuming to identify equivalence relations between elements in the two languages, something which poses no problems when using parallel corpora, where the textual chunks have been aligned on the basis of translation equivalence.

The use of comparable corpora is not shown in any particular task in this course but underlies many of them. Data gathered from contrastive 'comparable-corpus-based research' was used to empirically identify problematic areas and therefore select appropriate concordance lines for tasks 4-10. For instance, sentence 1 in task 7 has been specifically chosen because it contains a quantifier intensified by a premodifier: 'a great many' and a previous English-Spanish contrastive study based on the comparable corpus CREA-Bank of English (Labrador 2005) showed the frequent use of this premodifier in English as opposed to Spanish, which tends to use suffixes or other lexemes to express the intensification of quantity in general.

3.2. P-ACTRES: The English-Spanish Parallel Corpus

Even though some authors have highlighted the importance of using comparable corpora for contrastive analysis (Ramón 2002; Granger et al. 2003; McEnery & Xiao 2006), our applied study has shown that this is not enough and that useful insights may also be gathered from a parallel corpus in various ways. A parallel corpus includes original texts in one language and the corresponding translation in one or more other languages. The ACTRES (Spanish acronym of "English-Spanish Contrastive Analysis and Translation") research group has been involved in the compilation of an English-Spanish parallel corpus for several years now. For the time being, this parallel corpus is unidirectional, i.e. it is made up of original texts in English with the corresponding translations into Spanish, and is known as P-ACTRES (Parallel ACTRES). It includes written material from a variety of different registers (fiction, non-fiction, press & miscellanea) published originally both in English and in Spanish in the year 2000 or later, thus representing the contemporary stage of the language. All the materials have been published, and although it is assumed that there has been a previous editing and revision process, a simple informal test is run on each candidate textual pair to guarantee the 'threshold quality level' of the translations.[7] The P-ACTRES corpus is still under construction and aims at reaching a size of several million words. The version currently available has been aligned at sentence level using a modified version of the Translation Corpus Aligner developed for the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (Hofland and Johansson 1998), and can be searched with the Corpus Workbench Browser (CWB). The English half of the corpus is also tagged for part-of-speech, which enables us to carry out more refined searches[8]. At present, P-ACTRES contains

---

[6]On the frequency of use of typical features of the target language in a target language text, see also Tirkkonen-Condit, "Unique Items--- Over- or Under-represented in Translated Language?" .

[7] See Mauranen, "Will 'Translationese' Ruin a Contrastive Study?" on the dangers of *translationese* for a contrastive study.

[8] We are grateful to Knut Hofland for his co-operation in the setting up of the P–ACTRES parallel corpus.

over one million three hundred thousand words distributed between the two languages and across registers as follows:[9]

MATERIALS	ENGLISH	SPANISH	Number of words
Books	482,201	509,910	992,111
Newspapers	85,441	94,912	180,353
Magazines	61,721	69,218	130,939
Miscellanea	40,178	49,026	89,204
TOTAL	669,541	723,066	**1,392,607**

Table 3: Contents of the English-Spanish Parallel Corpus P-ACTRES

The P-ACTRES corpus is being set up with several aims in mind, including both research and teaching purposes in the field of contrastive analysis and translation between English and Spanish. Practical applications derived from the research include teaching materials (FLT and translator training), lexicographic resources and other tools for use in the translation process or in translation quality assessment (TQA).

The use of parallel corpora in teaching translation-oriented language contrasts and in translator training has been investigated by a number of authors (Ebeling 1998; Bowker et al, 1998; Botley et al. 2000; Véronis 2000; Zanettin 2000; Zanettin 2001). Translation corpora have been found useful primarily for studying the translation process and product. The main advantage of a translation corpus is the fact that it is an extensive and accurate repertoire of strategies deployed by previous translators, provided the quality of the translations can be guaranteed. A parallel corpus supplies lists of translation equivalents for potentially problematic linguistic items in the source language (SL) that have already been dealt with and transferred into the target language (TL) by professional translators. The high number of authentic translation solutions offered is an excellent source of information for translators and translator trainees, since parallel corpora contain information that is often not included in bilingual dictionaries. In other words, parallel corpora provide information that is not available elsewhere. An additional advantage of this type of database is that a parallel corpus constitutes a translation memory *per se* and can therefore be fed into specific computer-aided translation software (TRADOS, Déjà Vu, etc.) that. Finally, most existing parallel corpora are specialized corpora, i.e. they are relatively small and contain texts belonging to a very specific subject matter.[10] In these cases, parallel corpora are particularly useful, since they improve the terminological and phraseological accuracy of the text in the TL (Williams 1996). We argue in this paper that general-language parallel corpora can also be considered helpful tools in teaching language contrast through the analysis of professional translations.

The P-ACTRES corpus has a number of advantages and is currently being used in different ways to build applications for the teaching of English-Spanish contrastive analysis:

1. parallel concordances for polysemous lexical items in English and their corresponding translations into Spanish can easily be extracted and edited, so that students can identify the different translational options taken and set up lists of resources available in the TL. They can further evaluate this list and complete it if they consider that there are additional possibilities that have not been exploited, or correct it if they identify translation errors; (see Task 2);
2. fill-in-the-gap exercises may be constructed on the basis of P-ACTRES by leaving blanks in the SL and providing the corresponding translations. Students would then be asked to fill in the gap with one or more English words that could have led to those particular translations. In table 4, the degree adverb *fully* has been omitted.

The transition to a ____ oxic world appears to have been protracted. (EKAH1E.s524)	La transición hacia un mundo plenamente óxico parece haber sido larga. (EKAH1S.s501)
As discussed more ____ in chapter 11, oceans rich in oxygen from top to bottom may not have developed until the Proterozoic Eon was almost over. (EKAH1E.s525)	Como se discute con mayor detalle en el capítulo 11, hasta casi el final del eón Proterozoico no debieron de haberse desarrollado océanos ricos en oxígeno desde la superficie hasta el fondo. (EKAH1S.s502)
Scientists didn't ____ appreciate either the genealogical relationships we know from the Tree of Life or the time relationships among	Los científicos de la época no podían apreciar plenamente las relaciones genealógicas del árbol de la vida que hoy conocemos, ni tampoco las relaciones

---

[9] The figures may vary according to the date each application has been built and to adjustments of the contents to make P-ACTRES as 'back-comparable' as possible to CREA. The reason for these adjustments is to facilitate the comparison of translated and non-translated Spanish using the same corpora used for the cross-linguistic contrast.

[10] On the representativeness of small corpora and their uses, see Ghadessy et al., *Small Corpus Studies and ELT. Theory and Practice*

ancient rocks. (EKAH1E.s576)	temporales entre rocas antiguas. (EKAH1S.s552)
There was a great column which was ____ three times the reach of a man's arm in thickness... (EPJ1E.s144)	Había una gran columna cuyo grosor era tres veces la longitud del brazo de un hombre... (EPJ1S.s136)
On the croup of the horse and on the head and round about there were ____ ten nests of herons, who nested there every year. (EPJ1E.s148)	En la grupa del caballo y en la cabeza y alrededor de ella había un total de diez nidos de garzas, que anidaban allí todo el año. (EPJ1S.s140)

<div align="center">Table 4. Degree adverb fully and its translations into Spanish.</div>

3. work-in-progress based on P-ACTRES has provided the research group with examples of translationese, i.e. unidiomatic translations due to the influence of the SL. Students are given these examples and are asked to provide an assessment of the translation and a justification of their judgement. In example (1) below we can see one of these instances, where the most idiomatic translational option in Spanish would have been the lexical verb in the past tense and imperfect aspect, but where the influence of the source text can be seen in the superfluous use of the verb *'poder'*.

But he couldn't remember what came next. (HP1.470)
No podía recordar cómo seguía. (HP1T.475)

To conclude this section, we agree with McEnery and Xiao (2006) in considering that parallel corpora cannot be the sole source of data for teaching contrastive analysis, but should be complemented with the use of comparable corpora. Our work has shown that using a combination of both comparable and parallel corpora and exploiting them for different contrastive and translation purposes is the best procedure to profit from the advantages of both.

4. Teaching applications

The various translation-based applications that have been designed, tested and used so far fall within four categories and address different students' needs:

a) low-quality translations from English into Spanish to be rewritten by students. The aim is to develop the students' awareness of cross-linguistic differences and the problems this causes.

TASK 1: The following text has been taken from the Spanish edition of **Newsweek.** Read for instances of interlanguage, give reasons why those choices are not acceptable in Spanish, and try to point out the English constructions/lexical items they are likely to derive from. Finally, try to rewrite the text in idiomatic Spanish.

LOS INVISIBLES REFUGIADOS **[Los (afectados) invisibles]**[11]
Desde que viví un desastre, adquirí una nueva comprensión de las dificultades de los desposeídos.
[Tras verme envuelta en un incendio, comprendo mejor los problemas de los afectados]

POR JOAN R. CALLAHAN

Mientras me apresuraba hacia la línea rápida, sintiendo una carga más pesada de la que pudiesen sugerir los 12 artículos que llevaba, una anciana se las arregló para expresar simultáneamente su alarma, confusión y simpatía. "Quiere pasar primero, querida?", me dijo. Le eché una mirada a mi carrito de compras; probablemente ella asumía que yo vivía en él. Mi ropa estaba sucia y sudorosa, mi nariz había sangrado no hacía mucho y mis brazos estaban cruelmente amoratados. Sólo Dios sabe qué tipo de expresión tenía mi rostro. Para ella, el único misterio que quedaba era el por qué yo necesitaba cosas tales como yogur, ropa interior y Oil of Olay.

[Cuando me acercaba, abatida, a la caja rápida (con 12 artículos), una anciana, confundida y alarmada por mi aspecto, me dijo con amabilidad: "Pase, pase". Miré el carrito. Seguro que la señora pensaba que era una "sin techo". Tenía la ropa sucia y sudada, los brazos llenos de cardenales y me había sangrado la nariz hacía poco.

---

[11] Translations given between square brackets are our own and have not been published; otherwise they have been extracted from P-ACTRES.

Prefiero no pensar en la cara que tendría. Para la anciana, no tenía mayor sentido que yo comprara yogur, ropa interior y crema hidratante]

b) parallel texts of original English materials and their corresponding translations into Spanish to identify differences in the use of lexical, phraseological and terminological units. The aim is to add up to the students' resource pool so as to help improve understanding of the SL and production in the TL.

TASK 2: "Support verb constructions" are used in both languages but not always in the same cases. There are several possibilities: a) the same resource and the same verb are used in the two languages, e.g. 'do the shopping' - *hacer la compra*, b) the same resource is used but a different verb is chosen, e.g. 'take pictures', *hacer fotos*, c) different resources are used, e.g. 'click' (fully semantic verb) – *hacer clic* (support verb construction). Comment on the translation solutions adopted in the following examples for the lexical item 'kick'.

"Oh, let's **kick** her, just this once, "Ron whispered in Harry's ear, but Harry shook his head. (FRJK3E.s257)	- Oh, vamos a darle una patada, sólo una vez - murmuró Ron en el oído de Harry, que negó con la cabeza. (FRJK3S.s263)
I lie and **kick** my legs until the boots fly from my heels. (FWS1E.s451)	Me tumbo y pataleo hasta que las botas vuelan de mis talones. (FWS1S.s439)
We can indeed feel the force exerted on a ball when we strike it with a bat or **kick** it with our foot. (EAP1E.s74)	De hecho, podemos sentir la fuerza aplicada a una pelota cuando la golpeamos con un bate o le damos un puntapié. (EAP1S.s84)
We should **kick** the whole evil pack of them out of our country! " (FFK2E.s160)	¡Deberíamos echar a patadas de nuestro país a toda esa jauría! (FFK2S.s156)

Table 5. Lexical item 'kick' and its translations into Spanish.

c) comparable texts to identify differences in rhetorical and textual conventions in English and Spanish (death notices, recipes, abstracts, ads, job offers, CVs., etc.). The aim is to develop the students' awareness of differences in rhetorical structure in texts serving the same function.

TASK 3: a) Starting from text A, identify text type, text structure and text function. Do the same with text B. b) Following the procedure used in class, identify text patterns, syntactic patterns and culture-bound areas for each text. Establish typical rhetoric differences for this text form between English and Spanish texts. c) Put forward tentative guidelines for translation English-Spanish and translate text A using your newly acquired contrastive knowledge.

Text A:

SPICED BEEF

SERVES 6

1.8 kg (4lb) salted rolled silverside
1 medium onion, skinned and sliced
4 medium carrots, sliced
1 small turnip, peeled and sliced
8 cloves
100 g (4 oz) dark soft brown sugar
2.5 ml (1/2 tsp) ground cinnamon
juice of 1 lemon

1.　　If necessary, soak the meat in cold water for several hours or overnight, then rinse. Tie up the meat to form a neat joint and put in a large saucepan or flameproof casserole with the vegetables.
2.　　Cover with water and bring slowly to the boil. Skim the surface, cover and simmer for 3-4 hours, until tender. Leave to cool completely in the liquid for 3-4 hours.
3.　　Drain the meat well, then put into a roasting tin and stick the cloves into the fat. Mix together the remaining ingredients and spread over the meat.
4.　　Bake at 180ºC (350ºF) mark 4 for 45 minutes to 1 hour, until tender, basting from time to time. Serve hot or cold.
(*The Dairy Book of British Food*)

Text B:

MARMITAKO

Para 4 personas:

650 gramos de bonito.- 1 kilo de patatas.- ½ kilo de tomate.- 3 pimientos verdes.- 1 pimiento rojo. – 1 cebolla grande. – 3 dientes de ajo.- Un trozo de guindilla.- 12 cucharadas grandes de aceite. – 1 litro de agua.- Sal.

En una cazuela se fríe en el aceite la cebolla y los dientes de ajo bien picados. Cuando éstos empiecen a dorar se añaden los pimientos verdes y el rojo, y los tomates pelados, todo ello bien picado.
Cuando esté hecho este sofrito, se agregan las patatas troceadas y el agua, dejando que hierva con el puchero tapado.
Cuando veamos que las patatas están casi hechas y blandas, se añade el bonito, que antes habremos limpiado, quitado la piel y las espinas y cortado en trozos más bien pequeños.
Si por la cocción se ha evaporado mucha agua y ha quedado algo seco, se añade más agua templada.
Cuando esté cocido el bonito, que suele tardar aproximadamente unos 10 minutos, se sazona con sal y algo de guindilla roja u otro picante, en la cantidad que uno desee.
El caldo debe quedar un poquito espeso. Este plato debe ser caldoso.
Se sirve.
(J. D. de Echevarría, *Cocina vasca tradicional*)

d) English microtexts extracted from Cobuild's Bank of English or from the English subcorpus of P-ACTRES to be analysed from a contrastive perspective and subsequently translated into natural-sounding Spanish. Our sample applications will concentrate on this task type (see section 5 below). The aims are to raise the students' awareness of the differences, facilitate the acquisition of useful conceptual tools, develop well-grounded and effective work habits, boost resourcefulness and adaptiveness and improve ST understanding and TT production.

The concordance lines or microtexts are specifically selected from the English reference corpus to illustrate the different problem areas. Their length is determined by translational considerations. There are two basic perspectives when approaching this type of microtextual task: the functional and the formal approach.

In the **functional approach** students are given microtexts in which they have to identify and analyse the various formal resources that actualise a particular function, e.g. characterisation (a list of complex noun phrases is provided where students have to identify all elements that characterise the head noun). Then students are asked to discuss the translational solutions available in Spanish for the actualisation of that particular semantic and pragmatic function; and finally students should choose the most appropriate option in each case and render those microtexts into acceptable idiomatic Spanish.

Some forms in English present problems for our Spanish-speaking students due to their multifunctional nature, e.g. –ing forms. In order to increase their awareness of one-to-many correspondences between form and function, the **formal approach** is preferred and students are given exercises where they have to identify and analyse the meanings conveyed by one particular formal structure in different co-texts. Next, the translational solutions available in Spanish are discussed to decide upon the most appropriate translation in the microtexts given.

5. Sample Applications

5.1. Verbal Contrasts

English and Spanish differ considerably in their tense system, particularly in the way meaning functions are associated with different forms. The way modal meanings are expressed in both languages is also a contrastive issue (English modal verbs vs mood in Spanish). The main focus is on the following areas: the English Simple Past/Spanish *pretérito* and Spanish *imperfecto* contrast (Rabadán 2005a), the English Progressive forms/Spanish Simple and periphrastic forms contrast (Rabadán 2005b) and the de-centering of the English future and the options in Spanish (Rabadán, forthcoming). Our sample application focuses on the obligatory choice between *pretérito* and *imperfecto* when rendering a Simple Past into Spanish. The English form can convey **absolute, anaphoric, habit**, or **hypothetical** meanings. The Spanish preterite means exclusively **absolute past**, the rest of functions being covered by the imperfect. Besides, the Spanish imperfect is also capable to convey the **progressive**, as in (2)

1) Los guardas jurados llamaron a la policía municipal y ésta, ante el cariz que **tomaba** la noche, pidió ayuda a la Guardia Civil. [The security guards phoned the local police and, seeing how things were starting to look, these asked the Guardia Civil to come and help]

And **irrealis**, as in (3)

2) En un principio, el programa **iba a ser presentado** por cuatro mujeres -de ahí su título-(…) Finalmente, acudirán al magazine dos colaboradoras que irán variando semanalmente….. [Initially the show was to be conducted by four women – hence its name- (…) In the end, the magazine will be presented by two different females each week …]

which are typically expressed by other means in English.

TASK 4: The Simple Past in English may convey 'absolute/anaphoric past', 'habit', 'hypothetical', etc. In Spanish the *pretérito* generally conveys 'absolute past' while the *imperfecto* offers a wide range of semantic functions, the most salient being 'anaphoric past'. In the following microtexts (a) identify the meaning of the past forms; (b) decide upon a translational solution into Spanish, and (c) try to render your text into acceptable Spanish.

3) Every one of the millions of television viewers around the world who **saw** the video of them clubbing and kicking Rodney King knows that.
   Meaning: **[absolute past]** Translation solution: Spanish *pretérito*
   [Lo saben todos y cada uno de los millones de telespectadores que en todo el mundo **vieron** el vídeo en el que golpeaban y daban patadas a Rodney King.
4) People who knew him **saw** him as a friendly braggart, someone always having a joke, and a family man.
   Meaning: **[anaphoric past]** Translation solution: Spanish *imperfecto*
   [La gente que le conocía le **consideraba** un fanfarrón simpático, siempre dispuesto a una broma y dedicado a su familia].
5) Such letters always **meant** disciplinary trouble
   Cartas como aquella **significaban** problemas disciplinarios indefectiblemente.
   Meaning: **[habit]** Translation solution: Spanish *imperfecto*.

Spanish does not have a class of modal verbs, at least not in the same way English or German do. Modality can be expressed in different ways: periphrastic constructions, tenses both in the indicative and the subjunctive, adverbs, prepositions, etc., very much as in other languages, but with a radically different distribution. Class work focuses on discriminating meaning functions cross-linguistically and assigning typical translation solutions to each. This is done by means of semantic labels, which used as a *tertium comparationis*, help students interpret the microtext and provide a meaningful and correct translation into Spanish, as shown in task 6 below.

Besides, modality is an area in which the techniques of either using low-quality translations from English into Spanish to be rewritten by students (see task 1) or having them work with parallel texts of original English materials and their corresponding translations into Spanish have proven to be extremely beneficial as they successfully raise students' awareness of the differences, as in

6) 'Could be useful,' he said to Harry and Hermione as they went into dinner. '**Shall** we go?
   Podría ser útil-les dijo a Harry y Hermione cuando se dirigían a cenar-. ¿**Vamos**?

TASK 5: MUST is a carrier of various modal meanings. Frequent functions of must are 'obligation'; 'command' or 'logical deduction', another manifestation of necessity. Spanish offers a range of translation possibilities depending on meaning: *haber que*, *deber* or *tener que* when we are dealing with the meanings of 'obligation' and 'command', and *haber/deber de* when the meaning is 'logical deduction'. In the following microtexts (a) characterize the meaning of MUST; (b) decide upon a translational solution into Spanish and explain why, and (c) try to render your text into acceptable Spanish.

7) You **must** be John's wife
   Meaning: **[logical deduction]** Translation solution: *deber de + infinitive*.
   Debes de ser la esposa de John.
8) Official rules dictate that ministers **must** declare all gifts valued at more than £ 140. If they want to keep them they **must** fund the difference with their own money, while the rest are held for safekeeping.
   Meaning: **[obligation]** Translation solution: *haber de + infinitive; tener que + inf; deber + inf.*

[El reglamento establece que los ministros **han de** declarar todos los regalos de valor superior a £ 140. Si quieren quedárselos **tienen que** abonar la diferencia de su bolsillo, si no se guardan a buen recaudo]**.**

5.2. Actualization of Nouns

Some of the differences between English and Spanish that are explained in detail in class are: a) The structure of the NP (more premodification in English vs. more postmodification in Spanish, possible combination of predeterminers, determiners and postdeterminers in English, e.g. 'all eight of my' + noun), b) zero article in English with plural count nouns and non-count nouns that whenever they express universal reference, as opposed to the use of definite article in Spanish, e.g. 'dogs are nice pets' and c) more frequent use of possessive determiners, especially with parts of the body and clothes, in comparison with the combined use of object personal pronouns and definite articles in Spanish in those co-texts.

TASK 6: Identify resources that actualise nouns in the following utterances, comment on their function in the given context and think of a suitable Spanish version. Remember that sometimes typical determiners and pronouns have other functions apart from actualising.

9) She laughs shrilly, slapping her thigh. [Se ríe de forma estridente, dándo**se** palmadas en **el** muslo].
10) All eight of my great-grandparents lived in the city. [**Mis ocho** bisabuelos vivían en **la** ciudad].
11) A favourite of mine is a lemon sponge cake covered with lemon syrup. [**Uno de mis favoritos** es **el** bizcocho de limón cubierto con sirope de limón].

5.3. Quantification

Some of the differences between English and Spanish that are problem-triggers are: a) the premodification of indefinite quantifiers (especially of those expressing proportional quantification) which is very frequent in English and rare in Spanish that tends to use suffixes to intensify or attenuate quantities, b) the use of partitives and collectives, the choice of which depend on the noun they are followed by , and c) affixative quantification which exists in both languages, but in Spanish it is much more frequent and there is a wider range of affixes available.

TASK 7: Identify quantifying resources in the following microtexts and explain how they contribute to the overall meaning. Remember that sometimes quantifiers do not express quantification whereas some words that are not usually considered quantifiers can do so. Suggest suitable translations into Spanish.

12) It was applicable to a great many of us. [Se podia aplicar a **muchos** de nosotros]
13) A glaze of melted butter, a squeeze of lemon and a tiny pinch of nutmeg are more than enough. [**Una capa de** mantequilla derretida, **un chorrito de zumo de** limón y **una pizquita de** nuez moscada son **más** que **suficiente**]

5.4. Characterisation

Some of the differences between English and Spanish characterising adjectives and adverbs that are explained in detail in class are: (1) the different position in attributive function: in English, generally before the noun, in Spanish, generally after the noun, (2) the use of nouns as adjectives in English, whereas Spanish prefers prepositional phrases with *de* or relative clauses, (3) the common use of present and past participles in English that often correspond to adjectives, prepositional phrases or relative clauses in Spanish, (4) the frequent accumulation of adjectives in front of a noun in English, whereas in Spanish periphrastic resources and a greater variety of structures are more appropriate, and (5) the non-equivalence of –*ly* adverbs in English and –*mente* adverbs in Spanish based on pragmatic considerations, where other resources must be used instead, e.g. prepositional phrases or clauses. In order to raise the students'awareness of these differences between English and Spanish, assignments based on corpus-based contrastive materials, such as tasks 8 and 9 below are regularly given:

TASK 8: In the following NPs locate the head noun and all the individual characterising resources that modify it. Translate the examples into Spanish taking care not to accumulate too many similar resources in the same NP.

14) a pronounced, sweet and sour cherry flavour *[un sabor **a cereza intenso y agridulce***]
15) an unpasteurised organic cow's milk cheese *[un queso **de vaca orgánico sin pasteurizar***]
16) ten home-produced, low-budget films *[**diez películas de producción casera y bajo presupuesto***]

TASK 9: In the following examples, provide the translational options available in Spanish for the underlined adverbs.

17) a **wildly** inappropriate attempt at humour [un intento de ser gracioso del todo fuera de lugar]
18) used to hearing **spectacularly** oddball stories [acostumbrado a oír historias disparatadas]

5.5. Degree

Some of the differences between English and Spanish that create cross-linguistic problemsare: a) Spanish students find it difficult sometimes to recognise the function of degree whenever it is expressed by –*ly* adverbs or other resources, especially lexical items originally negative in nature, which intensify the quality or quantity of the head of the phrase: e.g. *terribly, awful, a hell of a lot*, etc., and b) another typical difficulty is to identify the function of degree in idiomatic expressions in English, e.g. *wide awake, fast asleep, bone idle*, etc., which can greatly affect the way the textual material is interpreted and/or transferred into Spanish.

TASK 10: Identify grading resources which typically have other meanings apart from degree and suggest suitable translations in Spanish for the given utterances.

19) Many men hit their partners when they are stone cold sober.[Muchos hombres maltratan a sus parejas cuando están **completamente** sobrios.]
20) Ten thousand homes were badly damaged by the storm. [La tormenta causó destrozos **muy importantes** en diez mil casas.]

6. Conclusions

Teaching CA through corpus-based translation applications has proven to have numerous advantages, which can be tentatively summarized as follows:

- It can be an effective awareness-raising tool as it highlights the expressive differences between both languages and the possible ways to bridge them.
- It seems to bring (linguistic) conceptual tools to the students' resource pool and to help them develop adaptive and effective work habits.
- There is the perception that it has an impact on the students' understanding and information processing of the source language (English), as it seems to make a difference in improving their skills in this area and ultimately in the quality of the target text.
- It seems to have a positive impact on the students' production in the target language, as accuracy and naturalness show improvement rates.

Informal tests carried out on end of term results for four years running show a marked difference between those students who had CA training previous to the translation options offered to them and those who had not. Improvement levels were checked by giving these two different groups of students a poor translation into Spanish and asking them to i) first identify mistakes, non-acceptable expressions and low idiomatic choices in Spanish, and ii) to provide an alternative text justifying the changes made (see Task 1 above used as an awareness raising tool). So far, we are able to report in the following areas: better understanding, more effective work routines and, above all, a general improvement in both their language analysis skills and their production in both languages. Work to produce more refined teaching tools is already underway.

7. References

Baker, Mona. "Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and Suggestions for Future Research". *Target* 7 (1995): 223-245.

———. "Corpus-based Translation Studies: The Challenges that Lie ahead". In *Terminology, LSP and Translation. Studies in Language Engineering in Honour of Juan C. Sager*, edited by Harold Sommers, 175-186. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1996.

Bondarko, Alexander. *Functional Grammar. A Field Approach*. Translated by I.S. Chulaki. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1991.

Botley, Simon P., Anthony M. McEnery and Andrew Wilson, eds. *Multilingual Corpora in Teaching and Research*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000.

Bowker, Lynne, Michael Cronin, Dorothy Kenny and Jennifer Pearson, eds. *Unity in Diversity? Current Trends in Translation Studies*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome, 1998.

Catford, J.C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,, 1965.

Chesterman, Andrew. *Contrastive Functional Analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1998.

Clark, Romy and Roz Ivanic. "Consciousness-raising about the Writing Process". In *Language Awareness in the Classroom*, edited by Carl James and Peter Garrett, 168-185. London/New York: Longman, 1995.

Ebeling, Jarle. "Contrastive Linguistics, Translation, and Parallel Corpora". *Meta* 43 (1998): 602-615.

Ghadessy, Moshen; Alex Henry and Robert L. Roseberry, eds. *Small Corpus Studies and ELT. Theory and Practice.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001.

Granger, Sylvianne, Jacques Lerot and Stephanie Petch-Tyson, eds. *Corpus-based Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003.

Halliday, M.A.K., Angus McIntosh, and Peter D. Strevens, *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*. London: Longmans, 1964.

Hatim, Basil. *Communication across Cultures. Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1997.

Hofland, Knut and Stig Johansson. "The Translation Corpus Aligner: A Program for Automatic Alignment of Parallel Texts". In *Corpora and Cross-linguistic Research: Theory, Method and Case Studies,* edited by Stig Johansson and Signe Oksefjell, 87-100. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998.

James, Carl. *Contrastive Analysis*. London: Longman, 1980.

Krzeszowski, Tomasz P. "Tertium comparationis". In *Contrastive Linguistics. Prospects and Problems*, edited by Jacek Fisiak, 301-312. Berlin/New York: Mouton, 1984.

———. *Contrasting Languages. The Scope of Contrastive Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton, 1990.

Labrador, Belén. *Estudio contrastivo de la cuantificación inglés-español*. León: Universidad de León, 2005.

Louhivaara, Sakari. "Aspects of Adverb Position in some Finish and English Texts". In *Compare or Contrast? Current Issues in Cross-Language Research*, edited by W.R Cooper, 145-157. Tampere: University of Tampere, 1998.

Malmkjaer, Kirsten. "Love Thy Neighbour: Will Parallel Corpora Endear Linguists to Translators?" *Meta,* 43 (1998): 534-541.

Mauranen, Anna.Will 'Translationese' Ruin a Contrastive Study? *Languages in Contrast* 2 (1999) :161–185.

McEnery, Anthony and Z. Xiao. "Parallel and Comparable Corpora: What are They Up To?" In *Incorporating Corpora: Translation and the Linguist,* edited by G. James and Gunilla Anderman. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/59/01/corpora_and_translation.pdf [25/05/2006], forthcoming.

McEnery, Tony and Michael Oakes.1996. "Sentence Alignment in the CRATER Project". In *Using Corpora for Language Research*. Studies in Honour of Geoffrey Leech, edited by Jenny Thomas and Mick Short, 211-231. London/New York: Longman.

Rabadán, Rosa. "The Applicability of Description: Empirical Research and Translation Tools". In *Contemporary Problematics of Translation Studies*. Edited by Carmen Toledano. Special issue of *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 51 (2005): 51-70.

———. "Proactive Description for Useful Applications: Researching Language Options for Better Translation Practice". *Meta* 50 (2005): Document RP15Rabadan.

———. "Translating the 'Predictive' and 'Hypothetical' Meanings English-Spanish". *Meta* (forthcoming).

Ramón, Noelia. "Contrastive linguistics and translation studies interconnected: the corpus-based approach". *Linguistica Antverpiensia*. New Series 1 (2002): 393-406.

Salkie, Raphael M. "Naturalness and Contrastive Linguistics". In *Proceedings of PALC '97*, edited by B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk & P.J.Melia, 297-312. Lodz: University of Lodz, 1997.

Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja. "Unique Items--- Over- or Under-represented in Translated Language?" In *Translation Universals. Do They Exist?* edited by Anna Mauranen & Pekka Kujamäki, 177-184. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2004.

Véronis, Jean, ed. *Parallel Text Processing. Alignment and Use of Translation Corpora*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2000.

Williams, Ian A. "A translator's reference needs: Dictionaries or parallel corpora?" *Target* 8 (1996): 277-299.

Zanettin, Federico. "Bilingual Comparable Corpora and the Training of Translators". *Meta* 43 (1998): 616-629.

———. Parallel Corpora in Translation Studies. In *Intercultural Faultlines*. *Research Models in Translation Studies I: Textual and Cognitive Aspects, e*dited by Maeve Olohan, 105-118. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome, 2000.

———. "Swimming in Words: Corpora, Translation, and Language Learning". In *Learning with Corpora*, edited by Guy Aston, 177-197. Bologna: CLUEB, 2001.