Pedagogical Interpretation for the Development of the Phraseological Component of the Spanish-Speaking Learner of the Russian Language

Enrique Federico Quero-Gervilla*[a], Ana María Díaz-Ferrero[a] and Rafael Porlán-Moreno[b]

[a]University of Granada
Granada, Spain
[b]University of Córdoba
Córdoba, Spain

Abstract. The presence of set phrases (SP, also known as phrase units) in an interpreting process causes specific difficulties that turn its processing in interpretation different from other language elements. However, development of the linguistic-phraseological competence of future interpreters has hardly been the focus of researchers, particularly in the Russian-Spanish language combination. In the present paper we analyse the difficulties that interpreting the PUs of a discourse entail as well as the importance of counting on a solid linguistic-phraseological competence for successful interpreting to take place. Based on the approach of pedagogical interpreting, we present a didactic proposal taken from a Russian language manual for future translators and interpreters that we are developing at the University of Granada. The aim of this proposal is to help students develop their linguistic-phraseological competence through a systematisation of interpreting strategies, both in terms of reception and production.

Keywords: pedagogical interpreting, Russian language teaching, phraseology, interpreting strategies, Russian, Spanish.

Research area: theory and history of culture, art (cultural studies).

* Corresponding author E-mail address: efquero@ugr.es

Формирование лингвофразеологической компетенции будущих устных переводчиков в комбинации языков «испанский – русский»

Э.Ф. Керо-Хервилья[а], А.М. Диас-Ферреро[а], Р. Порлан-Морено[б]
[а]*Университет Гранады*
Испания, Гранада
[б]*Университет Кордобы*
Испания, Кордоба

Аннотация. Наличие в процессе устного перевода фразеологических единиц (далее ФЕ) вызывает специфические трудности, которые отличают их обработку в устном переводе от других языковых элементов.

Фразеологические единицы, в отличие от других языковых элементов, в процессе устного перевода вызывают определенные проблемы. Однако вопросы развития лингвофразеологической компетенции будущих устных переводчиков практически не были в центре внимания исследователей, особенно в русско-испанской языковой комбинации. В данной статье мы анализируем трудности, с которыми сталкивается устный переводчик при понимании ФЕ в дискурсе. Мы исходим из того, что устный перевод не может считаться успешным без сформированных профессиональных навыков употребления ФЕ. Основываясь на теории преподавания устного перевода, мы разработали дидактическую модель, представленную в пособии по русскому языку для специалистов в области устного и письменного перевода, созданном коллективом автором в Гранадском университете. Цель данного пособия – помочь студентам развить лингвофразеологическую компетенцию через систематизацию стратегий устного перевода, как в плане понимания этих ФЕ, так и в плане их перевода с русского на испанский.

Ключевые слова: преподавание устного перевода, методика преподавания русского языка, фразеология, стратегии устного перевода, русский, испанский.

Научная специальность: 5.10.1 – теория и история культуры, искусства.

Introduction

Most studies on interpreting and its teaching have focused on the interpreting process, the theory of sense, the effort model, stress management in interpreting, the description of interpreting strategies or even on the final result of this process and the evaluation of the quality of the final product (Donato, 2003; Gile, 2009; Jimenez-Ivars, A. and Pinazo, D. 2001; 2013; Kalina, 2002; Li, 2015; Pradas Macías 2004, among others), taking for granted that the interpreter must possess a high level of linguistic competence suitable for interpreting, "even though this turns out to be rather utopian" (Cerezo, 2020: 43). In this sense, Gile (2017) in an article on tradition and innovation in interpreting studies states that:

IT's focus was on the interpreter's intellectual processing of speech. Language issues were considered non-relevant as long as interpreters mastered fully their working languages, which was a prerequisite. Linguistic research was therefore dismissed from research into interpreting (Gile, 2017: 1425).

The truth is that there are not very many studies available taking care of the process of the acquisition of linguistic competence by interpreters, despite the fact that in interpreting courses the problems experienced by students often stem from a lack of knowledge of languages. This problem is even more accentuated when it comes to the interpreting of sequences of discourse which contain set phrases (hereinafter referred to as SPs) or phraseological units, the proper interpretation of which is directly related to the possession of the adequate lexical-phraseological knowledge. Moreover, we can affirm that the ability to confer naturalness to the use of language by inserting appropriate expressions at the right moment is one of the main elements of the concept of fluency (or proficiency). In other words, adequate linguistic competence – and within this, lexical-phraseological competence – together with good interpretative competence enables the message to be understood and re-expressed correctly. The absence of this knowledge leads to an erroneous transmission of the message, or to a lack of precision and fluency in the elaboration of the discourse in the target language.

As Schmidhofer (2022) confirms, what has been published so far on language teaching applied to interpreter training has focused mainly on the teaching of the English and German languages and, to a much lesser extent, on other languages such as Italian or Russian. Moreover, the works analysed in the latter language are mainly oriented towards translator training, and rarely towards interpreter training (Gavrilenko, 2006; Stalmach Pajestka, 2008; Esakova, Koltsova, Litvinova, 2011; Alikina, Shevtsova 2011).

As far as the teaching of Russian language phraseology is concerned, a great progress has been made in the last decades in terms of the offer of didactic proposals, but they are mostly aimed at teaching foreign languages in general (Velichko 1996, 2012; Adonina, Lazarev, Nikitina, Smirnova, Fisenko, Chernova 2017; Krjuchkova 2016) or aimed at SP translation (Timofeeva, 2007; Arakelyan, 2018); but work involving a specific analysis of the development of the phraseological component of the future interpreter's linguistic competence is scarce. Therefore, within the Russian-Spanish language combination, it is important to increase the availability of research studies related to the acquisition and development of the interpreter's linguistic competence, as well as of didactic proposals for the development of the phraseological component of the aforementioned competence in order to successfully deal with interpreting.

1. Language teaching in interpreter training and the development of linguistic-phraseological competence

The methodology for teaching foreign languages has evolved considerably throughout history, mainly since the mid-20th century. It was then that the Grammar-Translation method, which was based on the teaching of grammar followed by the translation of sentences or short texts, gave way to other methods such as *the Audio-Lingual Method*, focused on the understanding and repetition of dialogues, and the subsequent analysis of other linguistic aspects such as syntax, or the notional-functional model, which places greater emphasis on communicative functions. It is within this framework of the communicative approach that language teaching for specific purposes emerged in the 1960s, that is to say, oriented towards the learner's own needs and objectives. In this way, different researchers have shown the need to design language teaching methods that may be applied to the specific needs of Translation and Interpreting learners. Berenguer considers that in a foreign language class for translators "the study of contextual factors –both pragmatic and semiotic– that condition the text should occupy a preferential place" (Berenguer, 1999: 136). Such contextual factors would be the communicative intention, the

speaker, the text's function, the implicatures or the role of the receiver. Schmidhofer also considers that the objectives of language teaching-learning for translators "should be defined primarily in terms of the competences needed to be able to cope with the subsequent subjects of Translation and the demands of the labour market" (Schmidhofer, 2013: 98–99). Along the same lines, Cerezo makes it clear that the teaching of foreign languages for future translators and interpreters is a discipline whose methodology must be located within the specific needs of Translation and Interpreting studies and "disassociated from the teaching of foreign languages for general purposes" (Cerezo, 2019: 251). According to this author, the study of language "is not considered an end in itself, but a means to achieve another end, in this case, the development of translating competence" (Cerezo, 2019: 245), or interpreting competence as in the work in question. Among the specific initiatives in language teaching, pedagogical translation for language teaching in the training of future translators and interpreters has emerged: Lavault-Olléon, 1985; Hurtado Albir, 1988; García-Medall, 2001; Martín Santana, 2004; Barceló Martínez, 2021. The aim of pedagogical translation in foreign language teaching is the acquisition or improvement of language skills, but its use has given rise to much controversy. A number of authors (Zabalbeascoa, 1990; García-Medall, 2001) have collected the main arguments for and against the inclusion of pedagogical translation as a tool for L2 teaching and learning. However, this situation has changed in recent years and, as Barceló Martínez states in the foreword to his French language teaching manual based on pedagogical translation, "the use of pedagogical translation for teaching future translators and interpreters has a high degree of acceptance among language teachers for translators and interpreters, since, in combination with other types of activities and tasks, it is a tool of proven effectiveness" (Barceló Martínez, 2021: XVIII).

Regarding the relevance of the knowledge of phraseology, Ferro Ruibal pointed out decades ago that "*o dominio da fraseoloxía é*

o máis alto nivel de dominio de calquera lingua"[1] (Ferro Ruibal, 1996: 104). Knowledge of a certain number of SPs (collocations, discourse formulas, idiomatic expressions, proverbial phrases, proverbs, stereotyped comparisons, phraseological schemes, aphorisms…) by future interpreters gives them greater confidence in the handling of interpreting tasks, reduces the stress and added effort involved in interpreting and favours the elaboration of the message in the target language. Moreover, it makes their expression more natural and their interpreting more fluent, making a pragmatic use of the foreign language similar to that of a native speaker in cases of reverse interpreting.

The way in which this competence in the foreign language is acquired is different from the process happening during the development of a mother tongue. A native speaker of a language is exposed to the use of SPs all throughout their life within the context of their language community and is allowed to perceive them in different contexts. That enables them to assimilate the meaning and situations of use of SPs in an intuitive and automatic manner. For a foreign language learner, however, years may pass without any exposure to even two different situations in which the same sentence or SP is formulated, making it difficult to identify the meaning and pragmatic aspects associated with its use. In an paper on the knowledge of set phrases or phraseological units by Translation and Interpreting students, Martín Martín concludes that the lack of knowledge of this type of units is high in both English and Spanish. Given that this part of language knowledge is essential for future translators and interpreters, "it seems necessary to consider its theoretical and practical teaching as a fundamental activity in university education, especially in TeI studies" (Martín Martín, 2008: 195). Similarly, Serrano Lucas states in a different paper on the teaching of phraseology to future translators that "a translation student should develop in parallel their phraseological competence in their two working languages and their translation competence, and acquire techniques that enable them to identify and understand SPs

---

[1] The mastery of phraseology is the highest level of mastery of any language.

in context" (Serrano Lucas, 2010: 200). In the case of interpreting, it is clear that the greater the number of exposures to and repetitions of a lexical unit, the more solid and effective its assimilation and automation will be. So it would be highly beneficial to carry out lexical exercises during the development of interpreting skills in order to establish equivalences that help to consolidate linguistic-phraseological competence and, consequently, to overcome the interpretation problems that may arise when confronted with a discourse. In this sense, the concept of *memory priming* is useful for working with SPs. This concept comes from the field of psychology and establishes that stimulating the memory with a specific piece of information predisposes the person to the subsequent identification of that same information, either directly or through the establishment of secondary relationships (Porlán, 2017).

In order for the student to develop the phraseological component more efficiently, we propose a methodology in which the teaching of the lexical-phraseological component occupies a prominent place in the programming of language teaching for interpreters, placing the focal point not only on the word but also on the analysis, comprehension and automation of SPs or lexical segments in order to enable a rapid lexical activation and the development of fluency.

2. The problem of facing phraseological units in interpretation

The occurrence of SPs in a speech which is to be interpreted causes specific difficulties which differentiate their processing from that of other elements of language. Beyond their semantic contents, many phraseological units are a faithful reflection of the characteristic conventions proper of a given society and, by extension, of the vision of the world of the group of speakers who use them have. The interpreter must identify the SPs in the discourse at the moment of listening, understand their meaning in the context in which they are used, look for a possible idiomatic correspondence in the target language (TL) and insert them into the discourse. Carrying out these four steps often becomes a complicated matter due to the ur-

gency of the process and the difficulty of selecting a contextually appropriate SP in the TL in a short space of time. According to Stephanie Díaz-Galaz and Constanza López Portuguez (2016), this type of unit is a frequent cause of difficulties in simultaneous interpreting as it requires to invest a greater effort of understanding and rephrasing. Along these lines, Tolosa Igualada (2018) highlights the relevance of those elements related to the speaker's *modus dicendi*, i.e. the way the message is enunciated and the use of quotations, phraseological units, proverbs and sayings, all within the framework of the exogenous difficulties of simultaneous interpreting. According to this author, such exogenous difficulties "occur with elements that, regardless of the interpreter's level of competence, regardless of their technical and psychological know-how, are objectively difficult" (Tolosa Igualada, 2018: 383) and could therefore be a problem even for the most experienced interpreters.

The complexity of interpreting a discourse with phraseological units depends mainly on three factors: the type of SP; the way in which the speaker uses the SP in the discourse; the mode of interpretation (consecutive, simultaneous, etc.); and the circumstances in which the interpretation takes place. Generally speaking, specialised phraseological units tend to pose more difficulties, as it is also the case of those which are unique to a certain culture and have no correspondence in the TL either because they reflect a specific cultural reference or because of their non-transparent metaphorical meaning. Examples of the latter in Russian would be *Пришла беда, отворяй ворота//lit. Misfortune has come, open the gates* (i.e. one misfortune brings another misfortune or misfortunes never come alone) or *Умный в гору не пойдёт, умный гору обойдёт//lit. The intelligent person does not climb the mountain but goes around it* (i.e. he should not get into unnecessary trouble). The difficulty also increases when SPs are not used in their customary form but modified, truncated, incomplete or deautomatised (Zuluaga 1975: 2001), i.e. altered by the speaker to better adapt them to their communicative intention in the discourse; that would be the case of the following

headline where the saying *Не все то золото, что блестит*//Not all that glitters is gold appears deautomatised: *Не все зололото, что спасает: куда инвестировать, если неспококойно на рынках*[2]//It's not all gold that saves you: where to invest when the market is unstable. On the other hand, interpreting SPs becomes more complicated when the interpreter has less time to process and reformulate the information, as it is usually the case in simultaneous interpreting, or maybe when the conditions are not ideal for them to focus on the creative process that the utterance of set phrases often involves. However, the interpreter will assess in each case whether or not it is appropriate to transmit the SP or to omit it and paraphrase or summarise the idea itself. Regardless of the complexity of the SP and the modality of interpreting or the circumstances in which it takes place, there is no doubt that in order to do a correct interpretation of a speech, it is first of all necessary to have a high level of linguistic competence as well as good interpreting skills to be able to choose the interpreting strategy that best suits each situation. Thus, when a SP occurs in a discourse, the interpreter activates their lexical knowledge to find a possible phraseological solution that allows them to convey the message and, in those cases in which they cannot find a phraseological equivalent, they will resort to the interpreting strategy that allows them to find the most appropriate solution. According to Gile's (1995) effort model in conference interpreting theory, the interpreting process needs to be underpinned by a certain amount of mental energy which is limited. Then, if the energy available is not sufficient, the interpreter's performance is negatively affected. In short, resolving difficulties prior to processing a speech frees up effort distribution capacity and helps the interpreter to apply their energy to the elaboration of their speech. Therefore, interpreter training should make use of all resources possible to, in a preliminary step, limit as much as possible the possibility of confusions, doubts and/or surprises that interrupt cognitive processing, slow down interpreting and influence the quality of the final

message produced in the TL. Consequently, in interpreter training it is very useful to clear up elements of difficulty such as SPs beforehand. If the interpreter counts on a sufficiently large repository of established relations between expressions that they have been able to automate, their performance will be better. In other words, a sound study of phraseology will make the interpreter able to generate automatisms which result in an instant verbal reaction to specific textual stimuli. In Russo's words:

> L'interprete deve interiorizzare delle equivalenze tra espressioni o collocazioni lessicali e strutture sintattiche peculiariari della LP e della LA, per poter destinare risorse a parti del discorso non prevedibili o concettualmente complesse (Russo, 1998: 109).

In this way, the problems posed by phraseology can be solved with little mental effort. In an article on the interpretation of phraseologisms from Chinese into Italian, Moratto (2010) concludes that the command of set phrases not only provides support for interpreting, but also lends naturalness to the discourse:

> The results indicate that mastering Chinese idioms not only is a major asset for interpreters, but also a way to please the audience and meet with the audience's expectations (Moratto, 2010).

We therefore consider that language teaching for future interpreters should include linguistic-phraseological exercises that generate automatisms in the student, and consider as well as the practice of interpreting tasks that allow the development of the necessary skills for successful interpreting.

3. Methodology: pedagogical interpreting in the teaching Russian for future interpreters

As we have explained above, there are numerous authors who have noted the need to use translation for the linguistic training of future translators and interpreters but, as Capel Moreno states, "interpreting as an instrument in foreign language teaching has been much less explored than translation for the same purpose"

---

[2] https://quote.rbc.ru/news/article/5e01e5ca9a7947dce2d-f5bd5

(Capel Moreno, 2007: 183). The first studies on pedagogical interpreting came to light in the 1980s. In this sense, Pollock (1984), who can be considered the introducer of this term, deems pedagogical interpreting to be very useful for language teaching, since it simulates a real interpreting situation because it integrates four essential elements of oral/aural skills: comprehension, phonology/fluency, lexicon, and grammar. The improvement of comprehension and fluency produces skills, and the reinforcement of lexicon and grammar produces knowledge. A year later, in the volume edited by Tomas and Towel (1985), there is an interesting compilation of proposals for the implementation of interpreting in the foreign language classroom. Thus, our methodological proposal for teaching the Russian language is based on pedagogical interpreting, which consists of working on all the components associated with language teaching (lexis, syntax, pragmatics, spelling, pronunciation, etc.) simultaneously with specific interpreting exercises (sight translation, consecutive interpreting, summary interpreting, etc.). We work with specially selected texts, the length of which varies according to the language level of the students and the linguistic objective to be achieved.

If we analyse the favourable arguments put forward by different studies on pedagogical translation (Hurtado Albir, 1988; Zabalbeascoa, 1990; García-Medall, 2001; Barceló Martínez, 2021) and apply them to pedagogical interpreting, we can highlight the following reasons in favour of its use as a means of developing linguistic competence in the context of the training of future translators and interpreters:

• It speeds up the process of foreign language acquisition, mainly comprehension and oral expression, since most of the activities are carried out orally.

• It makes it possible to become aware of the lexical, structural and pragmatic differences and similarities between the source language and the target language and, consequently, to avoid possible interferences in the interpreting process.

• It broadens the lexical and thematic competence of the learner as interpreting takes place in a wide variety of subject areas.

• It develops the ability to select and synthesise key information from a discourse due to the need to seek the overall meaning of the message rather than word-for-word correspondence.

• It familiarises the student with the interpreting process and the strategies involved.

The difference between pedagogical interpreting exercises and professional interpreting exercises lies in the fact that the aim of the latter is to develop purely interpreting skills, while the former seek to develop and consolidate linguistic skills that serve as a support for subsequent interpreting activity. As Porlán states, the use of pedagogical interpreting exercises in the classroom can serve different purposes:

> reinforce oral language practice, listening comprehension, the tangible apprehension of the meaning of the message, the immediate putting into practice of learned grammatical content and, at intermediate and advanced levels of learning, it can facilitate the sharing of different versions of the same message in both directions (between L1 and L2 and vice versa). (Porlán 2020: 56–57).

At the University of Granada we are working on the development of a B 2 level Russian language teaching manual for Spanish speakers aimed at future translators and interpreters. For its elaboration we follow a language teaching approach based on the practice of pedagogical translation and interpreting in which the student acquires linguistic knowledge, and at the same time becomes aware of the strategies of translation and interpreting.

4. Methodological proposal for the development of the linguistic-phraseological competence of translation and interpreting students

In this article we focus our attention exclusively on the exercises included in the aforementioned manual which are aimed at developing the linguistic-phraseological component. These are tasks that familiarise the student with the different interpreting strategies, and follow a process that includes prior preparation (lexical, structural and interpretative), the per-

formance of the pedagogical interpreting exercises and a subsequent analysis of the learning process, accompanied by proposals for improvement:

4.1. Lexical and structural preparation

Before carrying out specific pedagogical interpretation exercises, the student must become familiar with the vocabulary (commerce, environment, health, food, education…); the structures and speech elements associated with the textual genre (discourse markers: computers, connectors, reformulators; argumentative markers…) with which they are going to work, both in Russian and in Spanish. To this end, exercises are carried out to develop the student's linguistic competence – including the lexical-phraseological component – in the two working languages. This first part of lexical and structural familiarisation is carried out following a semantic and discursive categorisation so that the student can establish lexical associations or semantic networks that facilitate their assimilation and generate automatisms when interpreting. According to Higueras (2004) "words are stored in the lexicon not as in a dictionary, but forming networks, with relationships of different types, which are expanded over time, thanks to exposure to *input*" (Higueras, 2004: 13). Therefore, following the criteria proposed in studies on lexical teaching and learning (Baralo, 2007; Higueras, 2009), exercises to learn or activate the lexicon should include activities related to the form of lexical units, their meaning (real or figurative) and the most frequent syntagmatic combinations, as well as the syntactic structures in which they appear, the register and their intentional value, and possible variations.

For example, for the interpretation of a discourse in the field of education, as it can be the case of a speech related to the world of university (inauguration of a course, graduation, etc.), lexical and structural preparation consists of providing a general vocabulary sheet associated with this subject area as well as vocabulary which is specific to the discourse to be interpreted. Thus, first of all, vocabulary related to university education is studied, such as lexical units on the training and assessment process such as ЕГЭ//selectividad/EVAU, *проходной*

балл//nota de corte, вступительные экзамены//exámenes de acceso, *учебный план*//plan de estudios, *контрольная работа*//control, *итоговый экзамен*//examen final, *устный экзамен*//prueba oral, *письменный экзамен*//prueba escrita, *дипломная работа*//trabajo fin de grado, *получить диплом*//obtener un diploma; or the type of subjects such as *предмет по выбору*//asignatura optativa and *обязательный предмет*//asignatura obligatoria; the different phases of study: *бакалавриат*//grado, *магистратура*//máster, *докторантура*//doctorado; the physical academic space such as *конференц-зал*//sala de conferencias, *читальный зал*//sala de lectura or *кабинет преподавателя*//despacho del profesor; or the cycles of the education system such as: *начальная школа*//educación primaria, *средняя школа*//educación secundaria, *высшее образование*//educación superior; other collocations and locutions such as: *выучить наизусть*//aprender de memoria, and *(кого) на кончике языка*//tener en la punta de la lengua, *потерять мысль*//quedarse en blanco, and proverbial phrases such as *на ошибках учатся*//de los errores se aprende or *учиться никогда не поздно* (lit. it is never too late to learn), and *век живи – век учись* (lit. live a century, study a century) whose English equivalent is "Knowledge takes no place".

The structure of a speech in general is also analysed, as well as the discursive formulas specific to it: forms of address such as *глубокоуважаемый ректор*//excelentísimo/a rector/a magnífico/a, *глубокоуважаемый декан*//ilustrísimo decano, *дамы и господа*//señoras y señores; speech ordering elements such as *сначала*//en primer lugar, *для начала я хочу сказать, что*//quiero comenzar diciendo que; *дальше*//a continuación quiero decir, en segundo lugar; *в заключение хотелось бы сказать о…*//no quiero terminar sin mencionar; set expressions of politeness of thanks such as *я хочу сказать «спасибо» (я хочу поблагодрить)*//quiero dar las gracias, agradezco profundamente or other routine formulas such as *для меня большая честь*//es para mí un gran honor.

This is followed by exercises to fix this vocabulary, such as:

• Complete definitions with the lexical units defined. Examples:

1. *Дипломная работа* – это письменное научное исследование, подготовленное студентом для завершения обучения в университете.

2. Тот, кто поступает в высшее учебное заведение, – *абитуриент*.

3. Человек, который оканчивает университет, – *выпускник*.

• Text reading exercises where the student is got to fill in the blanks with one of the proposed variants (declining or conjugating the different verbs and nouns to adapt them to the context). Example:

Выбор научного руководителя

Сложно ли писать (***a. диплом;*** *b. ведомость; с. работа*) самому? многое зависит от выбора не только темы работы, но и (*a. профессор; b. преподаватель;* ***с. научный руководитель***), поэтому они тщательно присматриваются к (*a. доцент;* ***b. преподаватель;*** *с. профессор*) в университете.

Почему так (*a. нужно;* ***b. важно;*** *с. обязательно***)** выбрать хорошего (*a. друг; b. Преподаватель;* ***с. руководителя***)? от этого будет зависеть, сколько раз вы будете отправлены на (*a. заработок; b. переработка;* ***с. доработка***). Одни преподаватели могут с первого раза подробно описать все (***a. недочеты и недоработки;*** *b. недостатки и ошибки; с. глупости***), чтобы студент не (*a. выиграть;* ***b. терять;*** *с. прои*грать) напрасно время и (*a. ничего не делать; b. работать как следует;* ***с. работать по существу***).

Подробнее: https://zaochnik.ru/blog/kak-napisat-diplomnuyu-rabotu-s-nulya-trebovaniya-rekomendacii-oformlenie-obrazec/

• Reading a text in Russian in which some words have been removed so that the learner, with the help of the linguistic and extra-linguistic context, completes the missing parts. This exercise is particularly useful when applied to the completion of routine formulae, collocations, locutions or other types of set phrases such as sayings.

(Добро пожаловать) на факультет филологии и журналистики!

Факультет филологии и журналистики – это (*современный*) факультет, объединяющий в себе (*классическое*) и современное образование. Мы рады предложить вам множество (*направлений*) подготовки бакалавриата, (*магистратуры*) и докторантуры. Мы готовим специалистов в области филологии: направления подготовки – филология профиль зарубежная филология, (*профиль*) прикладная филология, лингвистика, перевод и переводоведение, журналистика. (*Направления подготовки*), которые есть на нашем (*факультете*), дают возможность реализовать нашим студентам себя в направлениях магистерской программы «Русский язык и литература» в контексте национальной культуры, русский язык в аспекте современных научных парадигм, (*письменный и устный*) перевод, иностранные языки в теоретическом и прикладном аспектах. ((166) Добро пожаловать на факультет филологии и журналистики ТГУ – YouTube)

• Match words from two different columns in order to form collocations or other types of SPs:

Column A	Column B
Учебный	годы
У меня на кончике	диплом
Предмет	план
Получить	языка
Выучить	по выбору
Студенческие	наизусть

4.2. Pedagogical interpretation exercises

In this section, pedagogical interpreting exercises aimed at developing linguistic-phraseological competence and familiarising the learner with different interpreting strategies are included. The first step would be to describe (or review) the interpreting strategies applied to the exercise to be practised. There are different studies that have dealt with the concept of interpreting strategies from different perspectives (Kohn & Kalina, 1996; Bartłomiejczyk, 2006, Gile, 2009; Ricardi, 2005; Kalina, 1994, 2000; Li, 2015). We understand strategies as the actions performed by the interpreter during the interpreting process in order to facilitate a

proper understanding of the message and its elaboration in the TL. Based on this concept of strategy, in this paper we propose a classification of interpreting strategies as they are applied to phraseological units:

tions with a specific communicative function, such as the opening or closing formulas of a speech (*для начала*//para empezar, *в первую очередь*//en primer lugar, *и на этом все*//eso es todo, *спасибо за внимание*//gracias por su

Interpretation strategies		
Reception strategies	Anticipation: prediction of SP before they are formulated in speech.	
	Information selection: distinguishing the core content of a sequence or discourse containing SP.	
	Segmentation of information: division of the message received into understandable parts.	
	Reconstruction of information with the help of context: deduction of the message with complementary information.	
Production strategies	Coined or institutionalised reproduction: transmission of the message with a SP coined in the TL.	
	Coined or institutionalised reproduction with an explanation: transmission of the message with a coined SP and explanation of its meaning.	
	Paraphrasing: reformulation of the content of the message with omission of the SP. In many cases a synthesis or generalisation of the content of the original discourse is carried out.	
	Borrowing: word-for-word reformulation in the TL of the SP of the original language.	
	Creative reformulation or improvisation: reproduction of the meaning of the original message through the creation of a structure that can be perceived as an existing SP.	

Table prepared by the authors

As Kalina states "the strategies interpreters use most frequently must become, to a certain degree, automatic so as to leave cognitive capacity for complex operations that occur less frequently" (Kalina, 2000: 22). These strategies become particularly relevant when related to Gile's effort model, as they are intended to help reduce the interpreter's cognitive processing load and optimise the energy and resources available for effective interpreting. They are a series of tools that allow the interpreter to anticipate or predict the message to be conveyed by the speaker with the help of contextual knowledge or information, reduce the effort invested in the generation of oral production to save time in the analysis of the next unit of information delivered by the speaker, expand the information delivered by the speaker to improve the possible understanding by the recipients of the message, correct an utterance already delivered that is perceived as erroneous, or apply strategies of creative reformulation or omission in cases of difficult translation or null correspondence.

For example, many routine formulas are used in specific communicative situa-

atención) so that the interpreter, through the strategy of anticipation, can foresee the words or discursive formulae that are going to be uttered. On the other hand, the use of phraseological or paremiological presenters (*как гласит поговорка*//como dice el refrán, *как говорится*//como se suele decir) announcing the use of a SP is frequent. In order to put the anticipation strategy into practice, exercises are carried out in which the teacher reads the beginning of some sentences of a speech and the learner has to guess how they continue.

Regarding the practice of the paraphrasing and reformulation strategy, consecutive interpretation exercises are carried out over short speeches with carefully selected SPs: they present a metaphorical or non-evident meaning which requires reformulation or explanation for their correct understanding by the listener. In these cases the learner puts into practice a tendency in the use of SPs in discourse, i.e. SPs often establish semantic-discursive links with other lexical and phraseological sequences in the linguistic or extra-linguistic context, and are followed or preceded by synonymous SPs, glosses or paraphrases aimed at clarifying the

meaning of the set phrase (Olza and Losada, 2011; Gwiazdowska, 2020). Also, many SPs carry within themselves cultural elements that convey the worldview of the community of speakers who use them; thus, this type of explanatory glosses establish connections between cultural and linguistic elements. For example: In the following news item published in the newspaper "gazeta.ru" the aphorism "*Гора родила мышь*" (lit. The mountain gave birth to a mouse) is used, the Spanish equivalent of which is "El parto de los montes" (The birth of the mountains). In this case, the interpreter may choose to use a paraphrase and explain the meaning of the aphorism or include other synonymous phraseological units such as "mucho ruido y pocas nueces".

"Гора родила мышь": Путин о докладе по "российскому делу"

Президент США Дональд Трамп рассказал, что российский лидер Владимир Путин думает о докладе спецпрокурора Роберта Мюллера передает РИА "Новости".

"Мы обсуждали это (доклад Мюллера). Он сказал что-то вроде *"гора родила мышь".* Он знал это, потому что он знал, что не было никакого сговора, что бы там ни говорили", – сказал Трамп.

В то же время президент сказал, что не обсуждал с Путиным "невмешательство России" в выборы в США в 2020 году. ("Гора родила мышь": Путин о докладе по "российскому делу" – Газета.Ru | Новости (gazeta.ru))

Summarised consecutive interpreting exercises consist on a synthesis of the contents in Spanish of a speech originally generated in Russian. With the aim in mind of developing phraseological competence, this exercise is combined with an activity which involves the choosing of a phraseological unit by the learner in order to convey the general idea/sense of the discourse. Because of their iconic and referential character, SPs can act as tokens of the condensed message elaborated *in extenso*, i.e. the speaker often concludes his exposition or highlights his arguments with the formulation of an idiomatic expression or a parable. With this exercise, the student not only becomes fa-

miliar with SPs but also puts into practice strategies of information selection and a synthesis of the main ideas.

The division of attention, mental agility and the automation of SPs correspondences is trained with the help of sight translation tasks, i.e. the oral reformulation in Spanish of a text originally written in Russian or vice versa. The learner first performs a diagonal reading to extract the key information from the text and then translates it. This exercise involves a process of mental reworking which helps create a certain distance from the original text and the achievement of a natural oral production in the TL.

4.3. *Analysis of the learning process*

This last part analyses the difficulties encountered in carrying out these exercises, the strategies used and the extent to which they have been useful. The aim is for the learner to reflect on and monitor the needs they experience in order to improve their linguistic competence. As Marta Arumí-Ribas points out:

> The integration of metacognitive tools and strategies in training is a pedagogical approach that allows a greater focus on the process, and invites more autonomous and learner-centred learning. At the same time, it empowers students to take responsibility for their own learning. Students should not only know the general objectives, but also the specific competences and skills that they must master at each moment (Arumí-Ribas, 2009:158).

For example, the student can write a short report to analyse the phraseological units or the interpreting strategies used. They may also answer a questionnaire which will serve to reflect on the tasks performed, the difficulties encountered during the execution of the pedagogical interpreting exercise and the needs for improvement with regards the development of a linguistic-phraseological and interpretative competence. This questionnaire includes questions on problems related to the understanding of the original discourse and the production of the student's discourse version in Spanish (problems caused by lack of lexical, grammat-

ical and subject knowledge, lack of concentration, lack of fluency, etc.); interpreting strategies used to solve the problems (anticipation, selection of information, segmentation of information, paraphrasing, synthesis, omission, improvisation, etc.) and skills to be developed to avoid the repetition of these problems in the future.

5. Conclusions

The interpretation of set phrases is often a difficult challenge due to the limited reaction time available for the interpreter, so they must have a good command and phrasing knowledge of the source language and count on pre-established automatisms with regards the use of the target language in order to successfully convey the message.

In this paper we use as our main base the hypothesis that a thorough knowledge of the working languages also implies knowing a good number of phraseological units. In other words, an adequate linguistic-phraseological competence allows the student to correctly understand the original discourse and later re-express it in the target language. To this end, language teaching for interpreters must follow a specific methodology, which should be different from that used in language teaching for general purposes. With this aim in mind, we have carried out a didactic proposal for the development of the aforementioned competence based on pedagogical interpreting and a selection of interpreting strategies for both the reception and the production of the message.

The systematisation of interpreting strategies combined with an increase in the lexical-phraseological flow of the learner favours lexical activation in an interpreting process and allows a balance in the distribution of efforts so that the interpreter applies their energy to the elaboration of the discourse.

References

Adonina L. V., Lazarev S. V., Nikitina V. V., Smirnova S. V., Fisenko O. S., Chernova N. V. Sovremennaja vysshaja shkola: innovacionnyj aspekt [The importance of phraseology in the methodology of teaching Russian as a foreign language]. In: *Sovremennaja vysshaja shkola: Innovacionnyj aspekt* [*Modern Higher School: The Innovative Aspect*], 2017, 2 (36), 26–38.

Alikina E. V., & Shvecova Ju. O. Obuchenie budushhih perevodchikov metodike predvaritel'noj podgotovki k situacii ustnogo posledovatel'nogo perevoda [Teaching future interpreters how to pre-prepare for consecutive interpreting situations]. In: *Sibirskij pedagogicheskij zhurnal* [*Siberian Pedagogical Journal*], 2011, 12, 93–100.

Arakelyan E. The lack of bilingual resources for translating phraseological units from Russian into Spanish [La falta de medios bilingües a la hora de traducir las unidades fraseológicas del ruso al español]. In: *Nuevas tendencias en traducción: Fraseología, Interpretación, TAV y sus didácticas,* coordinated by P. Valero Cuadra, A. Cuadrado Rey P. Carrión González. Berlin, Peter Lang, 2018, 89–111.

Arumí Ribas M. New challenges in interpreter training – integrating the metacognitive component in the classroom [Nuevos retos en la formación de intérpretes la integración del componente metacognitivo en el aula]. In: *TRANS: revista de traductología*, 2009, 13, 149–162.

Baralo M. Word acquisition: semantic and lexical networks [Adquisición de palabras: redes semánticas y léxicas]. In: *Actas del Foro de español internacional: Aprender y enseñar léxico*. Munich, 15–16 de junio de 2007, 384–399.

Barceló Martínez M. T. et al. *Pedagogical translation in translator-interpreter training (French-Spanish)* [*La traducción pedagógica en la formación del traductor-intérprete (francés-español)*]. Granada, Editorial Comares, 2021. 226 p.

Bartłomiejczyk M. Strategies of simultaneous interpreting and directionality. In: *Interpreting,* 2006, 8 (2), 149–174.

Berenguer L. How to prepare for translation in the foreign language classroom [Cómo preparar la traducción en la clase de lenguas extranjeras]. In: *Quaderns: Revista de traducció*, 1999, 4, 135–150.

Capel Moreno A. I. *The design of translation and interpreting tasks: a tool in the teaching-learning of English as a foreign language at baccalaureate level* [*El diseño de tareas de traducción e interpretación:*

un instrumento en la enseñanza-aprendizaje del inglés como una lengua extranjera en bachillerato]. Ph D. Thesis. Almería, Editorial Universidad de Almería, 2007. 534 p.

Cerezo Herrero E. Foreign languages for translatological purposes: in search of an own identity [Lenguas extranjeras con fines traductológicos: en busca de una identidad propia]. In: *Quaderns. Revista de Traducció,* 2019, 26, 239–254.

Cerezo Herrero E. Foreign language didactics in Translation and Interpreting studies: what does the research tell us? [La didáctica de lenguas extranjeras en los estudios de Traducción e Interpretación: ¿qué nos dice la investigación?]. In: *Hermēneus. Revista de Traducción e Interpretación*, 2020, 22, 41–73.

Díaz-Galaz S., López Portuguez C. Omission in simultaneous interpreting: unintentional mistake or communicative strategy? [La omisión en interpretación simultánea: ¿fallo involuntario o estrategia comunicativa?]. In: *Onomázein,* 2016, 33, 427–455.

Donato V. Strategies Adopted by Student Interpreters in SI: A comparison Between the english-italian and the german-italian language-pairs. In: *The Interpreters' Newsletter,* 2003, 12, 101–134.

Esakova M. N., Kol'cova Ju. N., Litvinova G. M. Osobennosti prepodavanija russkogo jazyka v russkojazychnoj i inostrannoj auditorijah: problemy podgotovki perevodchikov) [Peculiarities of Russian language teaching in the Russian-speaking audience (problems of translator training)]. In: *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Serija 22. Teorija perevoda,* [*Moscow University Translation Studies Bulletin. Series 22],* 2011, 112–125.

Ferro Ruibal Xesús Everybody talks like who they are. Reflections on the phraseology. [*Cadaquén fala como quen é. Reflexións verbo da fraseoloxía en xebre*]. A Coruña, Real Academia Galega, 1996.

García-Medall J. Translation in language teaching [La traducción en la enseñanza de lenguas]. In: *Hermēneus. Revista de Traducción e Interpretación*, 2001, 3, 113–140.

Gavrilenko N. N. *Ponjat', chtoby perevesti: perevod v sfere professional'noj kommunikacii. Kniga 2* [*Understand to translate: translation in professional communication. Book 2*] Moscow, Nauchno-tehnicheskoe obshhestvo im. akademika S. I. Vavilova, 2010. 206 p.

Gile D. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1995. 283 p.

Gile D. Basic Concepts and Models. In: *Interpreter and Translator Training (Revised edition).* Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2009. 283 p.

Gile D. Traditions and innovation in Interpreting Studies: a personal analysis for 2016. In: *Domínios de Lingu@gem*, 2017, 11 (5), 1424–1439.

Gwiazdowska A. The role of co(n)text in the interpretation of phraseological units. In: *Linguistica Silesiana,* 2020, 41, 85–103.

Higueras García M. Basic keys to lexical teaching [Claves básicas para la enseñanza del léxico]. In: *Carabela*, 2004, 56, 5–25.

Higueras M. Learning and teaching vocabulary [Aprender y enseñar léxico]. In: *Marco ELE*, 2009, 9, 111–126.

Hurtado Albir A. Towards a communicative approach to translation. [Hacia un enfoque comunicativo de la traducción]. In: *Actas II Jornadas Internacionales de Didáctica del Español como Lengua Extranjera*, eds. L. Mique, N. Sans. Madrid, Dirección General de Cooperación cultural, 1988, 53–81.

Jimenez-Ivars A., Pinazo D. I failed because I got very nervous. Anxiety and performance in interpreter trainees: An empirical study. In: *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 2001, 11, 105–118.

Jimenez-Ivars A., Pinazo D. Mindfulness training for interpreting students. In: *Lebende Sprachen*, 2013, 58 (2), 341–365.

Kalina S. Analyzing Interpreters' Performance: Methods and Problems. In: *Teaching Translation and Interpreting* 2, eds. C. Dollerup, A. Lindegaard. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1994, 59–67.

Kalina S. Interpreting Competences as a Basis and a Goal for Teaching. In: *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 2000, 10, 3–32.

Kalina S. Quality in interpreting and its prerequisites. A framework for a comprehensive view. In: *Interpreting in the 21st Century*, eds. G. Garzone, M. Viezzi. Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2002, 121–130.

Kohn K., Kalina S. The Strategic Dimension of Interpreting. In: *Meta*, 1996, 41 (1), 118–138.

Krjuchkova L. S. Obuchenie inostrannyh uchashhihsja russkoj frazeologii [Teaching Russian phraseology to foreign students]. In: *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki [Philological Sciences. Issues of theory and practice]*, 2016, 7–3 (61), 198–202.

Lavault-Olléon É. *Fonctions de la traduction en didactique des langues: apprendre une langue en apprenant à traduire*. Paris, Didier Érudition, 1985. 115 p.

Li X. Putting interpreting strategies in their place: Justifications for teaching strategies in interpreter training. In: *Babel*, 2015, 61 (2), 170–192.

Martín Martín J. M. The degree of knowledge of phraseological units in Translation and Interpreting students [El grado de conocimiento de las unidades fraseológicas en estudiantes de Traducción e Interpretación]. In: *Paremia*, 2008, 17, 189–199.

Martín Santana M. C. The importance of Language C (second language) in the Faculty of Translation and Interpreting: a goal-oriented concept of language learning [La importancia de la lengua C en la Facultad de Traducción e Interpretación: un concepto de aprendizaje de la lengua con un fin específico]. In: *Traducción, lenguas, literaturas: sociedad del conocimiento, enfoques desde y hacia la cultura*, ed. S. Bravo Utrera. Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad, 2004, 141–152.

Moratto R. Chinese to Italian Interpreting of Chengyu. In: *InTRAlinea*, 2010, 12.

Olza I., Losada M. C. Co(n)textual supports in the discursive use of phraseological units [Apoyos co(n)textuales en el empleo discursivo de las unidades fraseológicas]. In: *Revista Signos,* 2011, 44 (76), 132–144.

Pradas Macías E. M. *Fluency and its pauses: a conference interpreting approach*. [*La fluidez y sus pausas: enfoque desde la interpretación de conferencias*]. Granada, Comares, 2004. 288 p.

Pollock R. Towards a pedagogic theory of interpreting: learning to interpret or interpreting to learn? In: *Bradford Occasional Papers,* 1984, 5, 92–112.

Porlán Moreno R. *Elaboration of specific teaching units for the training of conference interpreters by integrating multimedia material from the professional reality* [Elaboración *de unidades didácticas específicas para la formación de intérpretes de conferencias mediante la integración de material multimedia procedente de la realidad profesional*]. Ph D. Thesis. Granada, University of Granada, 2017. 374 p.

Porlán Moreno R. Integration of pedagogical interpreting in the language classroom: action-research, competences and didactic activities in the spoken language. In: *Revista Limite*, 2020, 14, 55–75.

Ricardi A. On the Evolution of Interpreting Strategies. In: *Meta,* 2005, 50 (2), 753–767.

Russo M. Effects of morphosyntactic dissimilarities in simultaneous interpretation from Spanish into Italian [Effetti delle dissimmetrie morfosintattiche nell'interpretazione simultanea dallo spagnolo in italiano]. In: *Lo spagnolo d'oggi: forme della comunicazione*, Atti del XVII Convegno (Milano 24–25–26 ottobre 1996), ed. Associazione Ispanisti Italiani. Roma, Bulzoni, 1998, 107–117.

Schmidhofer A. The specificity of foreign language teaching-learning in Translation Studies [La especificidad de la enseñanza-aprendizaje de la lengua extranjera en los Estudios de Traducción]. In: *Alfinge*, 2013, 25, 95–114.

Schmidhofer A. Translation and Interpreting-Oriented Language Learning and Teaching (TILLT): Where Do We Stand. In: *Sendebar*, 2022, 33, 264–283.

Serrano Lucas L. C. Methodology for teaching phraseology in translation: the phraseology card as the final task [Metodología para la enseñanza de la fraseología en traducción: la ficha fraseológica como tarea final]. In: *Paremia*, 2010, 19, 197–206.

Stalmach Pajestka J. Foreign language teaching for translation and interpreting: the case of Language C (second language) (Russian) [La enseñanza de la lengua extranjera orientada a la traducción e interpretación: el caso de la Lengua C (Ruso)]. In: *La formación de traductores e intérpretes. Aproximación interdisciplinar*, ed. I. Pascua Febles. Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Publication Service of the ULPGC, 2008, 95–107.

Thomas N., Towel R. *Interpreting as a Language Teaching Technique.* London, Centre for information on Language Teaching and Research, 1985. 128 p.

Timofeeva Timofeev L. On the translation of phraseology – a pragmatic approach [Sobre la traducción de la fraseología, un enfoque pragmático]. In: *Interlingüística*, 2007, 17, 1029–1038.

Tolosa Igualada M. From "pedagogy by example" to "pedagogy based on critical observation" in conference interpreter training [De la "pedagogía del ejemplo" a la "pedagogía basada en la observación crítica" en la formación de intérpretes de conferencia]. In: *Nuevas tendencias en traducción: fraseología, interpretación, TAV y sus didácticas,* eds. P. Valero Cuadra, A. Cuadrado Rey, P. Carrión González, P. Berlín, Peter Lang, 2018, 377–401.

Velichko A. V. *Sintaksicheskaja frazeologija dlja russkih i inostrancev* [*Syntactic phraseology for Russians and foreigners*]. Moscow, Filologicheskij fakul'tet MGU, 1996. 94 p.

Velichko A. V. Predlozheniia frazeologizirovannoi structury v russkom iazyke: strukturno-grammaticheskaia I semanticheskaia kharakteristika [Phraseological structure sentences in Russian: structural-grammatical and semantic characteristics]. In: *Moscow State University Bulletin [Series 9. Philology],* 2012, 4, 7–23.

Zabalbeascoa Terrán P. Applications of translation in foreign language teaching [Aplicaciones de la traducción a la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras]. In: *Sintagma*, 1990, 2, 75–86.

Zuluaga Ospina A. Phraseological fixation [La fijación fraseológica]. In: *Thesaurus*, 1975, 30 (2), 225–248.