

PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH ZOONYMS IN BILINGUAL SCHOOL DICTIONARIES (PORTUGUESE-ENGLISH) AND THE ISSUE OF EQUIVALENCES

Rosana BUDNY*

- **ABSTRACT:** The phraseological units with zoonyms (PUz) are culturally integrated metaphorical expressions, which denote peculiar aspects of our communication and give a special color to the language speakers' talk. Therefore, dictionaries may be expected to render PUz to the target language, with closest meaning to the source language, regarding the informality aspect. It is expected to learn how PUz equivalences are treated in bilingual school dictionaries in Portuguese-English direction. Theoretical principles that support the investigation are the ones from the Bilingual Metalexigraphy represented by Casares (1950); Zgusta (1971, 1984); Bejóint (1981, 1994, 2000); Hartmann (2007); Welker (2004) on the interface they make with the Phraseology of Zuluaga (1980); Ortiz Alvarez (2000); Corpas Pastor (1996); Xatara (1998). The aim of this paper is to demonstrate equivalences and conceptualizations of Phraseology toward the goal of trying to understand what one may expect from translations given to PUz by the researched dictionaries. It is based on the chapter 5 of Budny's (2015) doctoral dissertation demonstrating the small incidence of phraseologisms (around 37%) on these reference materials and PUz translation divergences, which do not always receive a satisfactory translation if one focuses on their cultural emblematic aspect.
- **KEYWORDS:** Phraseological units. Zoonyms. Dictionaries. Equivalence.

Introduction

If someone asks you which animal names you remember, it is probable that some domestic and known animal names will come up to your mind, such as cat, dog, horse, and donkey. However, if it is the case one brings back his childhood memories one will go further and much probably will come up with some animal names like monkey, giraffe, elephant, lion, resulting from circus goings, or, still, rattlesnake, wolf, animal names present in storytelling told by a very close relative.

* Federal University of Grande Dourados (UFGS), College of Communication, Arts and Letters. Dourados – MS – Brazil. Adjunct professor. rosanabudny@ufgd.edu.br.

The sensations evoked by these animal images are usually found in the popular imaginary, become materialized in the speech of certain people, and as a result, many popular phraseologisms arise in everyday tongue, fruit of a very relaxed talking environment. Expressions of the kind “*virar bicho*” (blow your top), “*conversa pra boi dormir*” (a cock and bull story), “*ser um burro de carga*” (be a drudge), “*viver como cão e gato*” (live like cat and dog), “*fome de leão*” (a black hunger), “*dizer cobras e lagartos*” (to call somebody every name in the book), are present in everyday dialogues. They are easily understood as they are heard since childhood, but can become “*um bicho de sete cabeças*” (a mountain out of a molehill) for the unwarned foreigner or for the translator who renders a vernacular text into English, or, yet, for the learner of the Portuguese language who intends to understand and absorb our idioms, full of animal names.

These are reasons enough to justify, for themselves, a very meticulous job to describe and, in the sequence, try to search for a translation and include those phraseologisms in bilingual school dictionaries. That is the task of this researcher, who aims at verifying the presence or absence of phraseological units with zoonyms (PUz)¹, also called zoometaphors on these reference materials.

The chosen dictionaries for the research (all referenced under the reference session) are the ones easily found at local bookstores, being popular for their low price among students and parents. They are *Oxford Escolar* (2012), *Longman Escolar* (2009), *Michaelis Escolar* (2010), *Collins Prático* (2012), *Mini-Webster's* (HOUAISS, 2011), *Landmark* (2006), and *Larousse Avançado* (2009). This last one deviates from the other dictionary categories for it sustains a more advanced level in the foreign language. This researcher considers it a positive characteristic, once it favors the setting of a differentiating parameter in the analyzed material.

This dictionary investigation searches the treatment given to the PUz in terms of the presented equivalence, considering the complexity of conceptualizing the term equivalence. Moreover, it tries to find out which equivalences are attributed to them on these reference materials, in the direction Portuguese – English. To analyze the various aspects that are involved in that discussion about equivalence concepts, assumptions are taken of Bilingual Lexicography and Metalexigraphy with works by authors such as Casares (1950), Zgusta (1971, 1984), Zuluaga (1980), Bejoint (1994, 2000), Biderman (2001), Hartmann (2007), Martinez de Souza (1995), Welker (2004).

The methodology of the present research is:

- (i) To find a phraseological unit with zoonyms (PUz) in the dictionaries;
- (ii) To compare the correspondence it receives (or not) in the seven bilingual dictionaries;
- (iii) To verify if the given translations are the same on those reference materials;
- (iv) To check out if equivalences have the same register (formal x informal record).

It is known that PUz are considered metaphorical expressions that integrate the culture of a people and their peculiar communication aspects, adding to them special

¹ This article develops part of the doctoral research carried out and defended by this researcher (BUDNY, 2015).

color and intimacy. For that reason, one expects dictionaries may render the PUz to the target language, observing the maximum proximity with the source language, as far as informality is concerned, according to Fonseca and Cano (2011, p. 2, our translation), the dictionaries:

[...] witness a civilization, reflect the knowledge and linguistic and cultural heritage of a people in a history-determined moment. That cultural heritage is transferred to new generations through the language. [...] also, they register the social norm from this time, with their values, their interdictions, their use marks [...].²

The PUz represented by metaphorical expressions respond to the necessity of communication of a group in specific moment and space and result from “a process of creation in which there is the junction of some elements for a global meaning” (ORTIZ ALVAREZ, 2000, p. 269). That creative act seems to be inspired by metaphors for the constitution of many of those units. Concerning the formation of metaphors, it is worth mentioning authors like Ullmann (1964) who claims that the metaphor is composed by, basically, two terms: the element from whom one speaks and the idea whose element is compared to, in a way that, the more different these two terms, the more expressive the metaphor will be. Castro (1978, p. 118, our translation), by his turn, observes that the metaphor is an “[...] unpaid and constant resource of creation and recreation within language, since immemorial times. It is one instrument to know and to nominate. Its function is favored by linguistic taboos, by euphemisms, and by other resources”. It is also a constant source of feedback on figurative meanings. Thus, the relevance of those linguistic expressions makes them worth studying, translating, and, in the sequence, compiling in the dictionary.

The user of those reference materials, generally language learners, translators, professors and researchers need to find in the correspondences presented on them, adequacy, uniformity and level of register compatible with the proper informality of these phraseological units, mainly, if the dictionary aims at coding as its major function.

Based on the cited authors, it is argued that the issue of equivalence is target of divergences in Translation Studies. This can be observed by Hartmann (2007, p. 15, our translation) who corroborates the opinion of Snell-Hornby (1987) about equivalence and affirms that the bilingual dictionary maker shall not trust “[...] in the illusion of equivalence among lexemes, but in the perception that the partial covering and the non-equivalence are a reality of the interlingual comparison”. The author does not believe in one unique notion of equivalence. For him, as well as for Snell-Hornby, the equivalence should be subdivided in degrees of equivalence. These categories would

² Original fragment: “[...] testemunham uma civilização, refletem o conhecimento e o saber linguístico e cultural de um povo num determinado momento da história. Essa herança cultural é transmitida às novas gerações pela língua. [...] também, registram a norma social desta época, com seus valores, suas interdições, as suas marcas de uso [...]” (FONSECA; CANO, 2011, p. 2).

correspond, on the one hand, to the ‘total equivalence’ (in one of the extremes) and on the other hand, to none possibility of equivalence (that is, ‘any correspondence’). Based on these points of view one may realize the complexity of understandings regarding one definition for the term equivalence.

In order to get distance from the two extremes foreseen by Snell-Hornby (1987) and by Hartmann (2007), one may base on the pragmatism of Zgusta (1984), who argues the bilingual dictionary has, throughout history, presented the equivalence with two different properties: 1. Translatability (or insertion) and 2. Explanatory paraphrase. Although Zgusta evidences the common use of those properties in the dictionaries, he affirms bilingual dictionaries should not offer explanatory paraphrases or definitions; instead, they should offer truly lexical items from the target language that, once inserted in the context, would produce a stable translation, without deviation. Yet, another aspect we may add concerning the PUz in our investigation is that, frequently, they are not inserted in the informal contexts of those expressions.

Although lexicographers try to contextualize the PUz by means of quotations (quotes), they cannot always pursue that targeting for all the PUz cases. The progress of discussions around one concept scientifically accepted for the equivalence is slow and the results still limited. One may notice the lack of a consistent methodology for the application of a theory and of a practice may converge for the lexicographer day by day and several times turns his job intuitive and experimental.

After analyzing studies in the field, this researcher understands the equivalence for phraseological units with zoonyms as approximated values of meanings in different cultural contexts, but intermediated by similar events. The equivalence seen this way may provide satisfactory translations for many phraseologisms in bilingual school dictionaries.

It is known that bilingual dictionaries are important to the job of lexicographers and to comparative studies (HARTMANN, 2007). Although one considers it is common to find words undressed from their contexts in bilingual dictionaries, far from their collocation environments, one can affirm the given correspondences present some kind of relevance for the consulting of the user or the translator.

The difficulty one generally notices in the search for equivalences in bilingual materials is to find a static correspondence for the lexical correspondence. Regarding to translations of idioms or metaphorical expressions, and markedly the zoonymic units, one may observe a “touch” of “artificial” and “unreal” as Hartmann (2007, p.15) argues. One may find, sometimes, (‘several’ times) a formal equivalence for an informal phraseological unit.

A recurrent aspect is that some presented equivalences are not unanimous in dictionaries, and that points to the fact that the necessity of production of users is not being fulfilled. After a meticulous study³ on those occurrences under the light of

³ The mentioned research is part of the doctoral dissertation “Phraseological Units with zoonyms in monolingual and bilingual dictionaries (Portuguese-English) and in manuals from PNLD”, defended in 2015, in Lexicography and

Metalexigraphy and Phraseology theories, this researcher tries to provide a real example analysis, a type of ‘X-ray’ of the phraseological units with zoonyms in the researched dictionaries.

Learning Metalexigraphy to understand the dictionary

For Welker (2004, p. 11, our translation) Metalexigraphy is “[...] the study of problems related to the making of dictionaries, dictionary critics, research on lexicography history, research of the use of dictionaries and dictionary typology”. Another concept that can be mentioned is the one from Krieger (2006, p. 143, our translation) who affirms that Metalexigraphy is “the discipline that studies critical analysis of dictionaries, and investigates problems in its elaboration”.

On the Metalexigraphy practiced at present, one may observe the abundance of categorizations and thoughts related to the presentation of bilingual school dictionaries. As for metalexigraphical aspects one argues about the dictionary delinquency, that is, the practice of reprinting dictionaries without mentioning previous editors or, still, the practice of the marketing team to overvalue the entry numbers of a work, increasing the stock of lexical items in the cover to favor the dictionary trading.

Bergenholtz and Tarp (1995) explain that the quality of a lexicographical work includes meticulous selection of lemma oriented by very judicious objectives. It should be made clear for the user in the introduction or in the user guide. The user who dedicates to these studies is the language student, the translator, or the researcher who makes uses of the dictionary with, usually, clear and didactic objectives. In that sense, there is a Metalexigraphy interested in school issues, which is commonly called Pedagogical Lexicography (PL).

In the definition given by Hernandez (1998, p.50, our translation), Pedagogical Lexicography receives also the name of Didactic Lexicography. The author compares the two terms and considers that such Lexicography “refers to works of the ones who have not achieved yet the linguistic competence in their mother tongue or in the second language”. It may be understood, based on the argument that the pedagogical lexicography is unequivocally related to the making of dictionaries for learners or for the language learning. As for the use of dictionaries as didactic materials to help language learning, it is common to argue about which one is better, monolingual or bilingual. This researcher states it is possible to find good results in studies by means of using that reference material.

In the scope of dictionaries which are considered pedagogical or didactic, as Hernández suggests, one may register a contrastive bilingual dictionary being elaborated by Durão, Ruano, and Werner (2009), named DIFAPE which is directed to Brazilian

Foreign Language Teaching area, in the Program of Translation Studies Post-Graduate in the Federal University of Santa Catarina.

Portuguese mother tongue speakers in process of learning Spanish (peninsular variant) as foreign language.

Durão, Ruano, and Werner (2009, p.193-194, our translation) state bilingual dictionaries are more appropriate for foreign language learning and explain:

Among counter arguments to the bilingual dictionary as a didactic tool, there are arguments that highlight the semantic differences between languages, the impossibility to delimit lexical meanings of a language by means of the equivalent indication and the danger of interference. Many linguists assume the idea that the value of each element of a language defines itself by the place it occupies in the interior of the system of that language, as for its relations with other elements of it. From that concept on, one concludes that the meaning of a lexical item in a language can be explained only by means of other elements from the same language, and it is not possible to be thoroughly clarified by translation equivalents.⁴

The above discussion arises controversy among several scholars and the authors' reflections on the theme corroborates the importance of this issue. Therefore, the goal of designing didactic materials fit to language learners, once their needs are different from the monolingual dictionary users.

Learning Phraseology to understand phraseological units with zonyms

Phraseology is an area of studies whose object of reflection are phraseologisms or phraseological units. It studies phraseological phenomena and holds sociocultural aspects that are always present in one specific community. Studying those items is a way of learning how to understand “the situations which motivate their use” (ORTÍZ ÁLVAREZ, 2012, p. 12, our translation).

Zuluaga (1980) contributed enormously to the understanding of characterizing aspects of the phraseologisms. He argues that Phraseology designates “both the set of phraseological phenomena as the science which studies them” (ZULUAGA, 1980, p. 226, our translation). One employs here the term in the two mentioned meanings.

⁴ Original fragment: “Entre os argumentos contrários ao dicionário bilíngue como dicionário didático existem aqueles que destacam as diferenças semânticas entre as línguas, a impossibilidade de delimitar os significados léxicos de uma língua por meio da indicação de equivalentes em outra língua e o perigo da interferência. Muitos linguistas assumem a ideia de que o valor de cada elemento de uma língua se define pelo lugar que ocupa no interior do sistema desta língua, assim como por suas relações com outros elementos da mesma, portanto o valor de uma língua não pode ser idêntico ao valor de um elemento de outra língua. Partindo desse conceito, chega-se facilmente à conclusão de que o significado da unidade léxica de uma língua pode ser explicado unicamente mediante outros elementos da mesma língua, não podendo ser esclarecido satisfatoriamente mediante equivalentes por tradução.” (DURÃO, RUANO, WERNER, 2009, p.193-194).

In Brazil, phraseological studies in the direction Portuguese-English, in the scope of bilingual Lexicography area are backwards if compared to other pair of languages (TAGNIN, 1989; ORTIZ ÁLVAREZ, 2000). Not only this fact, but also the lack of phraseological materials in bilingual language dictionaries (mainly the ones that assist the function of production/codification) come to corroborate the interest of this researcher for the studies of phraseological units.

Welker (2004) claims that the first studies of Phraseology arose in Russian territory, in the decade of 40's from the XX century, with Vinogradov and Isasenko⁵. Out of Russian territory, Phraseology establishes as science around the years 70's and 80's in the same century. The great precursor of phraseological studies was Bally (1961) (ORTÍZ ÁLVAREZ, 2000; WELKER, 2004), who created the conceptual framework for the studies of phraseological phenomena. From him, the first monograph about the topic according Welker (2004) seems to be the one from Makkai (1972) whose doctoral dissertation points out the idioms (idiomatic expressions). Other studies by Welker on phraseologisms is Rothkegel's (1973), which investigates an automatic or computational analysis of the phraseological units. The German scholar Burger (1973) intensified the phraseological research and published papers on idioms. Another very relevant contribution is Zuluaga's (1980) who made an outline on phraseological research which went from 1880 (Paul) to 1973 (Burger). Nowadays, the studies involving phraseological phenomena are in full expansion and the interest for delimiting and learning the phraseological units is visible.

The chart below shows some definitions on Phraseology proposed by researchers who are bringing great development to that area of studying.

Chart 1 – Some Phraseology definitions

AUTHOR/YEAR	PHRASEOLOGY
SAUSSURE (1916) ⁶	<i>Groupings are constituted by syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations of units belonged to the language and provided by tradition.</i>
BALLY ([1909]1961)	<i>On Phraseology the assimilation of language facts occurs mainly, by associations and groupings, which may be transitory, but can also have a usual character by repetition, and form indissoluble units.</i>
VINOGRÁDOV (1938)	<i>The narrow relation between phraseology (idiomatic) and lexicology is conditioned not only by structural closeness of word and idiom concepts, but also by constant movement from the word to idioms and idioms to words.</i>

⁵ One can find in Ortiz Álvarez (2000) bibliography several notions from phraseological studies that are fruit of many Russian researchers' works.

⁶ Bally and Sechehaye (two of his pupils) compiled notes from the courses ministered by Saussure and edited the General Course of Linguistics, a seminal book for linguistics science.

AUTHOR/YEAR	PHRASEOLOGY
REY (1986)	<i>System of expressive particularities linked to social conditions in which language is actualized [...] two aspects of same reality: expression and locution generally employed as two synonyms.</i>
FIALA (1988)	<i>Phraseology, a set of complex forms that belong to several syntactic categories figurative or not, but it is constituted by recurring combinations, more or less stabilized, of lexical and grammatical forms, fixings built in restricted contexts.</i>
TRISTÁ (1988)	<i>Phraseologisms are word combinations that, due to its constant use, lose their independence and acquire a global meaning.</i>

Source: Budny (2015, p.67, our bold).

On the presented definitions, one may verify the occurring of words such as *groupings, associations, closeness, idiomatisms, expression, locution, combinations*, among others, that point out meaningful traces present in the Phraseology. Particular combinations characterize these linguistic phenomena. Definitions help in the study of phraseologisms whose compositions are object of investigation in the area and often, theoretical discordances. One aspect that holds some divergence is the one related to the category choices (idioms, collocations) that should (or not) be included in Phraseology.

For the purpose of this study, this researcher agrees with the classifications for phraseological units proposed by the following authors: Hausmann (1984 apud WELKER, 2004), Xatara (1998), Burger (1998). These researchers include in lexical combinations, in addition to idioms, collocations, proverbs, maxims, aphorisms, clichés, as well as poems and periods in phraseological units.

In current phraseological studies, the expression “phraseological unit” – the study object of Phraseology – is gaining supporters among researchers of the area. According to Corpas Pastor (1996), in order to recognize phraseological units is necessary to observe the following characteristics:

- a) Expressions formed by several words (PUz are formed by, in the minimum, two graphical words);
- b) Institutionalized expressions crystallized with time, learned and utilized by language speakers;
- c) Stable expressions in several degrees;
- d) Expressions which characterize themselves for presenting syntactic or semantic particularities (they cannot be used in passive voice, in the first case and the keyword of the phraseological unit resists to changes, in the second);
- e) Expressions that characterize themselves by the possibility of variation in some of their integrating elements; they contain already lexicalized variants in the language, or occasional modifications in context. As, for example, the phraseological unit “*estar com minhocas na cabeça /me deixar/ me deixa com minhocas na cabeça / (não) por minhocas na (minha) cabeça* ((not) have rocks in one’s (my, your) head). One peculiarity

of some phraseological units (excepting proverbs) is that they do not constitute complete statement and, generally, function as elements of the sentence.

Phraseological units can be classified according to Welker (2004, p. 164-166) and some provided examples as: (1) idiomatic, which can be illustrated by the PUz “*estar em palpos de aranha*” (to have (hold) a wolf by the ears) or “*estar com minhocas na cabeça*” (have rocks in (one’s) your head); (2) non-idiomatic, as, for example, “*como sardinha em lata*” (packed like sardines); (3) the ones with diverse degrees of idiomaticity; (4) the ones partially idiomatic (or semi-idiomatic), in which one component keeps its literal meaning, as for example, “*agarrado como carrapato*” (hanger-on).

In the studies of phraseologisms, Ortiz Álvarez (2000), Welker (2004), among other researchers, have tried not only to explain the limits of idiomaticity, but also to establish criteria of fixedness. However, “there are not precise limits between idiomatic and non-idiomatic phraseologisms” (WELKER, 2004, p. 165-166, our translation) and phraseologists agree that the criteria of fixedness is random. The criteria of delimitation and classification of PUz are heterogeneous, but for the purpose of this investigation one may cite Ortiz Álvarez (2000, p. 90, our translation) who states that “[...] PUz are indivisible phrases semantically and composed by two or more words and that depending on their grammatical structure and function can constitute or comprise sentences”. Concerning the studies of phraseological units with zoonyms, the same characteristics pointed out by Welker and Ortiz Alvarez can be observed. It is possible to find PUz, which is pointed in the sequence, that are delimited only by two lexemes, as for example, “*dar zebra*” (the dark horse has won), “*galinha morta*” (to be dead easy). Other PUz are formed by more than two lexemes, as in “*puxar a brasa pra sua sardinha*” (to feather one’s nest), “*estar com a pulga atrás da orelha*” (to have a flea in one’s ear). Some variations were also found in the analysis of PUz components, which can be affirmed, with Welker (2004), their criteria of fixedness is casual and requires more reflections. As one may notice, there are many aspects to be investigated when it comes to expose PUz nature.

What it is possible to expect in the medium term is the enlargement of reference materials that contemplates phraseologisms and the search for other translations that may respond for cultural aspects of the PUz nature. Dictionaries usually have potential to help the student to learn new expressions and to elaborate texts in the English language. They can explain aspects of using an idiom with certain deepness. In more detailed dictionaries it can be found clear definitions and examples on how to use words in the scope of their contexts of use (HUMBLÉ, 2006; BEJÓINT, 1981)⁷, find information on the register of the PUz (informal, jocose, vulgar), which offers more security for those who need to utilize popular expressions. Many lexicography researchers (KRIEGER, 2006; WELKER, 2004, 2008; HARTMANN, 2007; DURAN, 2008) defend the validity of the dictionary as a support tool to the teaching of foreign languages.

⁷ As Béjoint used to affirm more than twenty years ago: “In general, the best dictionary for production is the one which brings more detailed information on syntax and collocation [...]” (BÉJOINT, 1981, p.210, our translation). Syntax as well as collocation suppose the knowledge of the behavior of the words that collocates with the unknown word.

The nature and variety of equivalences for phraseological units with zoonyms

The studies carried out by Budny (2015) on phraseological units with zoonyms demonstrated that some phraseologisms receive diversified equivalences in bilingual school dictionaries. Such fact may constitute an obstacle for these dictionary users, mainly if they are in classroom context, developing production activities where all of them are working in the same source-text, at the same time. In that environment, how would one explain such diversity of equivalences, and if one is talking about a commercial translation to be delivered to the client by the translator, how to justify the several “possible” versions? Naturally, on the one hand, one may illustrate the ambiguity of equivalences when one finds different versions for the same meaning unit and that constitutes a situation of hesitation for the user of the dictionary. On the other hand, the translations (when one finds them) not always seem to correspond to the stylistic and informal effect one expects of them.

It may also be suggested as an example the following PUZ, “*ser um asno*”, which means “a person who makes everything wrong and irritates others because of that”. It is translated in its figurative or popular meaning in the four researched dictionaries, as silly ass; stupid; fool; ass; ignorant. In the case one translated the following interjection: “*Seu asno!*” it would be necessary to choose which translations would fit better. Then, one would have the following possibilities: “You silly ass!”, “You stupid!”, “You fool!”, “You ass!” and “You ignorant!” that somehow could translate the interjection, but if one considers the idiom making part of a colloquial, informal context, much probably “You ignorant!” or “You stupid!” would not fit as the best option for the expression. There is the necessity to keep the stylistic aspect of informality. One may also emphasize the co(text) should help in the correspondence that better fits the interjection translation.

Another example that can be mentioned is related to the PUZ “*Ser uma baleia*”, that means, in figurative, pejorative and popular meaning, a very obese individual, a very fat one. From the researched dictionaries, four of them presented the following equivalences for the PUZ, “To look like a beached whale”, “To be very overweight”, “To be enormous” and “a fat person”. A person who wants to employ a pejorative colloquialism “*Fulana está uma baleia!*” probably would not like to see his/her talking translated as “So and so is very overweight!”, or still, “So and so is a fat person!”, “So and so is enormous!”. Even though those translations at any given time may be legitimate, they may not be appropriate when the intention is to find the colorfulness of the idiomatic and cultural emphasis of the phraseologism. Fortunately, for that PUZ one may easily find an idiomatic and cultural correspondence that is, for example, “So and so looks like a beached whale!” which privileges a translation with stylistic and idiomatic traces.

As for the PUZ “*vai dar bode*”, which holds a familiar, colloquial meaning and has the idea of “you are going to have trouble”, it brings the inconvenience of presenting the formal translation “there’ll be trouble” for the idiom which one learns to be colloquial,

informal, and expects to receive one equivalence with the same informality. The PUz receives the correspondence “be hell to pay” from Larousse which seems to satisfy the colloquial and informal nature of the phraseologism.

There is another example, that is, the expression *olhos de águia*, which suggests that the person who owns them gets to see opportunities that others do not see. According to the monolingual dictionary UNESP, the expression has the meaning of “perceptive”, “acute”. In the search for that PUz in one dictionary of idioms in Portuguese⁸, this researcher found the following definition: a very acute look, very penetrating, which perceives and sees all. Michaelis presents the equivalence “piercing eyes”. A research at *Google* has been proceeded for one reference given in English, and the following citation has been found “She looked at me with ‘piercing eyes’ and I was suddenly frightened that she knew what I had done.”⁹. However, it was possible to verify the PUz can be similarly translated by *eagle eyes*, according to the on-line Cambridge dictionary and it means, “To perceive everything, even small details” and followed by the citation where the equivalence is in the adjectival category of English “My eagle-eyed mother noticed that some cakes had gone missing”¹⁰.

One can point out many cases of PUz, which have been translated by formal correspondents and should not be applied in contexts of informality and expressiveness of the phraseologisms. From there comes the necessity for more studies in the area of zoonymic phraseologisms for better translation representation in dictionaries.

PUz are scarce in bilingual dictionaries. Similarly, there is not much theoretical reference on the theme. One of the challenges to face is the scarcity of phraseological studies in the direction Portuguese- English. What one can abundantly find in the area are reference materials and dictionaries in the direction English-Portuguese, which are the most described and translated in the current lexicography (HARTMANN, 2007).

As far as production is concerned, it is relevant the dictionary presents marks related to the existing linguistic community variants. They may correspond “[...] to the variation in the space (regionalism), to the variation in time (archaism), to variation in society (cultism/vulgarism) and to the thematic variation (language of specialty)”, according to Fonseca and Cano (2011, p.2, our translation); yet, such marks are rarely contemplated by editors and lexicographers in those materials.

Conclusion

This paper presented not only relevant aspects on the studies of phraseological units with zoonyms in bilingual school dictionaries, but also attempted to contribute for the lexicographical studies in Brazil. These studies aimed at strengthening their

⁸ Available in: <<http://www.dicionariodeexpressoes.com.br/busca.do?expressao=Olhos%20de%20E1guia>>. Access on: 18 Apr. 2014.

⁹ Available in: <<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/piercing>> Access on: 12 Jul. 2017.

¹⁰ Available in: <<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/eagle-eye>>. Access on: 12 Jul. 2017.

use and gathering theoretical knowledge on the theme, demonstrating the comparison of equivalences, with distinct traces and register of occurrences in bilingual school dictionaries. Common sense says that the occurrence of phraseological units with zoonyms is vast, and it constitutes one cause to deserve deeper studies and categorizations that may contribute for the advance of Pedagogical Lexicography in Brazil. Some years ago, the search for meanings of a word having as base an obstinate analysis was speculated, handily conducted in many written text pages. Currently, one cannot affirm the ways have changed radically, but present technological tools¹¹ encourage ways for the search of cultural information¹² to help better phraseological units with zoonyms translations.

BUDNY, R. As unidades fraseológicas com zoônimos nos dicionários bilingues escolares (português-inglês) e a questão das equivalências. *Alfa*, São Paulo, v.61, n.2, p.495-509, 2017.

- *RESUMO: As unidades fraseológicas com zoônimos (UFz) são expressões metafóricas integrantes da cultura e expressam aspectos peculiares da comunicação, com um colorido especial próprio à conversa dos falantes de uma língua. Por esta razão, espera-se que os dicionários possam verter as UFz para a língua alvo, com a maior proximidade possível com a língua-fonte, no que se refere à informalidade. Procura-se conhecer o como se dá o tratamento das UFz com relação às equivalências que lhe são atribuídas em dicionários bilingues escolares, na direção português-inglês. Tomam-se por base pressupostos da Lexicografia e da Metalexicografia bilingues com autores como Casares (1950); Zgusta (1971, 1984); Bejôint (1981, 1994, 2000); Hartmann (2007); Welker (2004) na interface que fazem com a Fraseologia com Zuluaga (1980); Ortiz Alvarez (2000); Corpas Pastor (1996); Xatara (1998). O artigo objetiva dar a conhecer algumas conceituações dadas à equivalência e à Fraseologia na tentativa de entender o que se pode esperar das traduções oferecidas para as UFz nos dicionários pesquisados. Trata-se de um recorte da tese de Budny (2015) que demonstra a pouca incidência desses fraseologismos (cerca de 37%) nesses materiais e a divergência de traduções para eles, traduções nem sempre satisfatórias para o aspecto cultural emblemático das UFz.*
- *PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Unidades fraseológicas. Zoônimos. Dicionários. Equivalência.*

¹¹ Corpus linguistics, for example, has contributed much to the study and analysis of languages in general or specialized, its tools have brought to the light of the curious look of researchers interesting aspects of linguistic phenomena in their natural occurrence.

¹² We understand by “cultural translations” those used in cultural studies that serve to demonstrate the process of linguistic transformation in the translation of a given language A into language B.

REFERENCES

- BALLY, C. **Traité de stylistique française**. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1961. Obra original de 1909.
- BÉJOINT, H. **Modern lexicography**: an Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- BÉJOINT, H. **Tradition and innovation in modern English dictionaries**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- BÉJOINT, H. The foreign student's use of monolingual English dictionaries. **Applied Linguistics**, Oxford, v.2, n.3, p.207-222, 1981.
- BERGENHOLTZ, H.E.; TARP, S. **Manual of specialized lexicography**. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1995.
- BIDERMAN, M. T. C. Os dicionários na contemporaneidade: arquitetura, métodos e técnicas. In: OLIVEIRA, A. M. P. P. de O.; ISQUERDO, A. N. (Org.). **As ciências do léxico**: lexicologia, lexicografia, terminologia. 2. ed. Campo Grande: Ed. da UFMS, 2001. p.131-144.
- BUDNY, R. **Unidades fraseológicas com zoônimos em dicionários monolíngues e bilíngues (Português- Inglês) e em livros didáticos do PNLD**. 2015. 250p. Tese (Doutorado em Estudos da Tradução) – Centro de Comunicação e Expressão, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2015.
- BURGER, H. **Phraseologie**: eine einföhrung AM beispiel dês Deutschen. Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1998.
- BURGER, H. **Deutsche idiomatik**. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1973.
- CASARES, J. **Introducción a la lexicografía moderna**. Madrid: CSIC, 1969. Original de 1950.
- CASTRO, W. **Metáforas machadianas**: estruturas e funções. Rio de Janeiro: Ao Livro Técnico, 1978.
- CORPAS PASTOR, G. **Manual de fraseología española**. Madrid: Gredos, 1996.
- DURÃO, A. B. A. B.; RUANO, M. A. S.; WERNER, R. Equivalentes léxicos e informação semântica contrastiva no dicionário contrastivo Português-Espanhol. In: DURÃO, A. B. A. B. (Org.). **Por uma lexicografia bilíngue contrastiva**. Londrina: Ed. da UEL, 2009. p.193-207.
- DURAN, M. S. **Parâmetros para a elaboração de dicionários bilíngues de apoio à codificação escrita em línguas estrangeiras**. 2008. 187p. Tese (Doutorado em Estudos Linguísticos) – Instituto de Biociências, Letras e Ciências Exatas, Universidade Estadual Paulista, São José do Rio Preto, 2008.

FONSECA, H. D. C.; CANO, W. M. Expressões metafóricas construídas a partir de zoônimos e registradas em dicionários de língua geral. **Horizonte Científico**, Uberlândia, v. 5, n. 2, 2011. Available in: <<http://www.seer.ufu.br/index.php/horizontecientifico/article/view/4436>>. Access on: 10 jul. 2017.

HARTMANN, R. R. K. **Interlingual lexicography**. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2007.

HERNÁNDEZ, H. La lexicografía didáctica del español: aspectos históricos y críticos. In: FUENTES MORAN, M. T.; WERNER, R. (Ed.). **Lexicografía iberorománicas: problemas, propuestas y proyectos**. Frankfurt: Vervuert, 1998. p. 49-79.

HUMBLÉ, P. Melhor do que muitos pensam: quatro dicionários bilíngues Português- Inglês de uso escolar. **Cadernos de Tradução**, Florianópolis, v. 2, n. 18, p. 253-273, 2006. Available in: <<https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/traducao/article/view/6951>>. Access on: 10 jul. 2017.

KRIEGER, M.G. Políticas públicas e dicionários para escola: o programa nacional do livro didático e seu impacto sobre a lexicografia didática. **Cadernos de Tradução**, Florianópolis, v. 18, p. 235-252, 2006. Available in: <<https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/traducao/article/view/6950>>. Access on: 10 jul. 2017.

MAKKAI, A. **Idiom structure in English**. Hague: Mouton, 1972. (Janua Linguarum, series maior, 48).

MARTINEZ DE SOUZA, J. **Diccionario de lexicografía práctica**. Barcelona: Bibliograf, 1995.

ORTÍZ ÁLVAREZ, M. L. **Tendências atuais na pesquisa descritiva e aplicada em fraseologia e paremiologia**. Campinas: Pontes, 2012.

ORTÍZ ÁLVAREZ, M. L. **Expressões idiomáticas do português do Brasil e do espanhol de Cuba: estudo contrastivo e implicações para o ensino de português como língua estrangeira**. 2000. 334p. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística Aplicada) – Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2000.

ROTHKEGEL, A. **Feste syntagmen**. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1973.

SNELL-HORNBY, M. Towards a learner's bilingual dictionary. In: COWIE, A. (Ed.). **The dictionary and the language learner**. Papers from the Euralex Seminar at the University of Leeds. Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1987. p. 159-170.

TAGNIN, S. O. **Expressões idiomáticas e convencionais**. São Paulo: Ática, 1989.

ULLMANN, S. **Semântica: uma introdução à ciência do significado**. 3. ed. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1964.

WELKER, H. A. **Panorama geral da lexicografia pedagógica**. Brasília: Thesaurus, 2008.

WELKER, H. A. **Dicionários**: uma pequena introdução à Lexicografia. Brasília, DF: Thesaurus, 2004.

XATARA, C. M. O campo minado das expressões idiomáticas. **Alfa: Revista de Linguística**, São Paulo, v.42, n. esp., p.147-159, 1998.

ZGUSTA, L. Translational equivalence in the bilingual dictionary. In: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LEXICOGRAPHY AT EXETER, Tübingen, 1984. **Proceedings...** Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1984. p. 147-154.

ZGUSTA, L. **Manual of lexicography**. Paris: Mouton, 1971.

ZULUAGA, A. **Introducción al estudio de las unidades fijas**. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1980.

DICIONÁRIOS BILÍNGUES OBJETOS DA PESQUISA

COLLINS. **Dicionário prático Inglês-Português/Português-Inglês**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Disal, 2012.

HOUAISS, A. **Webster's minidicionário, Inglês-Português/Português-Inglês**. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2011.

LANDMARK. **Dictionary English-Portuguese/Portuguese-English**. São Paulo: Richmond Publishing: Moderna, 2006.

LAROUSSE. **Dicionário prático para o aprendizado da língua inglesa: avançado**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Larousse do Brasil, 2009.

LONGMAN. **Dicionário escolar Inglês-Português/Português-Inglês para estudantes brasileiros**. 2. ed. Inglaterra: Longman, 2009.

MICHAELIS. **Dicionário escolar Inglês-Português/Português-Inglês**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Melhoramentos, 2010.

OXFORD. **Dicionário escolar para estudantes brasileiros de inglês, Português-inglês/Inglês-português**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Received in June 2016

Approved in March 2017

