

# TRANSLATION AND LEXICOGRAPHY: A NECESSARY DIALOGUE

Cesáreo Calvo Rigual

Cesareo.Calvo@uv.es  
Universitat de València – IULMA

Maria Vittoria Calvi

maria.calvi@unimi.it  
Università degli Studi di Milano

## Abstract

Firstly, the fields of Translation and Lexicography are compared and their similarities and differences are brought to the fore. Later, a review of the (slightly scarce) literature on the topic shows that most of the work has focused on how translators use dictionaries, how useful they are, and which kinds of dictionaries are preferred, among other similar issues. It is highlighted that lexicographers show little interest in the field of translation, at least as a source for dictionary building. A few potential avenues of research are defined, which could be beneficial for translators and lexicographers alike.

## Resumen

Se comparan en primer lugar los campos de la Traducción y de la Lexicografía, poniendo de relieve las coincidencias y diferencias de tipo general que hay entre ambas disciplinas. A continuación se hace un repaso de la bibliografía (no demasiado extensa) sobre el tema, destacando que la mayoría de los trabajos se han centrado en el uso de los diccionarios por parte de los traductores, su utilidad, qué tipo de diccionarios prefieren estos y otros aspectos relacionados. Se pone de relieve el escaso interés de los lexicógrafos por el campo de la traducción, al menos como posible fuente para la redacción de diccionarios. Se dejan abiertos varios caminos que podrían ser recorridos con provecho mutuo por traductores y lexicógrafos.

**Keywords:** Translation. Lexicography. Dictionary. Bilingual dictionary.

**Palabras clave:** Traducción. Lexicografía. Diccionario. Diccionario bilingüe.



The bilingual dictionary is the translator's single, first and most important aid, and a translator who does not consult one when in doubt is arrogant or ignorant or both.  
(Newmark 1998: 29)

## 1. Introduction. General issues

Translation and Lexicography<sup>1</sup> are two disciplines which certainly have much in common and which can be helpful for one another. However, this relationship is not –nor has been– as smooth as one would wish. Krista Varantola (1998: 180) describes this unsatisfactory reality as follows:

the most sophisticated dictionary users are also the most demanding, more suspicious and harder to please than linguistically less sophisticated users who often have reasonably straightforward problems to solve. Consequently, frustration will drive language professionals to denounce dictionaries as inadequate. The situation is polarised, because dictionary makers, equally frustrated, believe that their critics do not understand the effect that space constraints have on the amount and type of information that dictionaries can provide, and are moreover convinced that, as few users read the introductory matter, they have unrealistic expectations about the coverage of their dictionaries.

Similarly, Reinhard R. K. Hartmann (1989a: 18) states that:

I would appeal to you to increase your awareness of the channels of communication which are there but sometimes unused. Translators, translation theorists, dictionary makers and metalexicographers in German-speaking countries don't read the publications of their French colleagues and vice versa, English and American experts in these fields don't read either. Translators ignore lexicographers, monolingual lexicographers ignore the work of their bilingual colleagues, the people working in so-called general areas ignore those in so-called technical specialisms. We can only function efficiently in society if we keep our own houses in order.

---

1. Abbreviations will be used throughout this paper to avoid repetition of key terms: T = translation, Translation Studies; L = Lexicography; D (DD) = dictionary (dictionaries); BD (BBDD) = bilingual dictionary (bilingual dictionaries); MD (MMDD) = monolingual dictionary (monolingual dictionaries).

Other scholars (such as Roberts 1992: 49 or Rogers & Khurshid 1998: 193) consider that the relationship between translator and dictionary is a love-hate one. Marengo (1989: 119-120) notes that, when a translator needs to use a dictionary, there are idyllic situations between him/her and the DD (when the appropriate equivalent term is found, which the translator might have even been unaware of) and also “calma operosa” moments (when the D offers equivalents which are not wrong, but inappropriate for the context) and even turbulent times (when equivalents are clearly wrong or the word is not found).

In order to mitigate the effects of such an unsatisfactory situation, this article will explore the state of the art in this area, by examining those studies which have made connections between T and L, and by highlighting the advances made so far and potential future developments.

As stated above, T and L are two disciplines which have much in common, although they also have significant differences:

1. They are both relatively old human activities. Spoken translation has been practiced from time immemorial and the first written translations appeared soon after the earliest evidence of writing around 2000 BC (Van Hoof 1991: 7). Around that time, bilingual lists of words –predecessors of BBDD– were crafted in Mesopotamia (Marengo 1989: 8). In both cases, the goal was obvious: enabling understanding between peoples who spoke different and mutually unintelligible languages.
2. Despite these early advances, the first theoretical contributions would not appear until the second half of the 20th century. Although early reflections on T date further back, the first rigorous works would appear in the 1950s, and the first main full-fledged theories would be published in the 1960s and 1970s, most of which were still closely linked to Linguistics: Darbelnet and Vinay, Catford, Nida, etc. (Hurtaido 2001: 123 ff.). After these –and until today–, we have witnessed a large increase in theoretical approaches to T. L also had to wait until recently to have a full-fledged body of theory. Besides the early but isolated attempts by Russian scholar Lev S. Scerba in the early 1940s, only four more theories (according to Tarp 2008: 14 ff.) have been developed since: Franz J. Hausman’s and Herbert E. Wiegand’s in the 1970s, Hans-P. Kromann and others’ in the 1980s, and the functional theory by Henning Bergenholtz and others in the 1990s. There is indeed a significant difference on the number of theoretical approaches in both disciplines: T has a wide array of theories (stemming from different premises and perspectives), whereas L has a much more limited

number of them, maybe due to the fact that the need for a theoretical apparatus was less widely felt, despite practice taking priority over theory in both cases. Indeed, it is important to highlight that many of those who translate or compile DD professionally ignore or even deny the need for a theoretical framework or the usefulness of advances in theory.

3. T and L start their way towards developing a theoretical foundation for the discipline from their dependence to Linguistics, as subdisciplines within Applied Linguistics, until they reach their scientific maturity and claim their status as independent sciences or disciplines. That moment arrives almost simultaneously in both areas. It is considered that the first publication which acknowledges T in that sense is James S. Holmes's key work "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" (1972). In L, it was another conference presentation, in this case by H. E. Wiegand in 1977 ("On the structure and contents of a general theory of lexicography").
4. The degree to which these two disciplines have developed is very different. This can be evidenced by the following indicators:
  - Academic status: nowadays there are countless Translation schools and degrees of different levels in translation, interpreting or related areas, whereas they are almost non-existent in the field of L. There are a few exceptions, such as the centers for Lexicography in Augsburg, Aarhus or Exeter, and a few master's degrees or similar programs (to our understanding, there are no undergraduate degrees in L).
  - Journals: the first ones in the field of T (*Traduire, Babel, Meta*), which are still published, were launched in the mid-1950s. The two main journals in L are more recent: *Lexicographica* (1985) and *International Journal of Lexicography* (1987). The number of T journals is currently much higher than that of L journals.
  - Monographs, conferences: also larger numbers in T.
  - Associations: as an example, there are no fewer than 15 translator (and interpreter) associations in Spain. They all tend to have a professional orientation and only in a few cases they have incidental connections with academia. In contrast, there is only one association in the field of L, which encompasses lexicographers and, mostly, L scholars.
5. The concept of (translation) equivalence is essential in T and in bilingual or multilingual L, although there is an important difference:

whereas equivalence is basically context-dependent in T, context is left aside in L, i.e. the maximum number of contexts for a lexical unit are disregarded so that the equivalents suggested can be appropriate for the most common contexts in which that unit appears. Much has been written about this issue in both T and L – an example of which is Hartmann's treatment of this concept in both disciplines (1989a).

Despite these differences, it is obvious that these two areas share many issues and, in our opinion, are able to offer much to one another. In the next few paragraphs, we will explore whether there is an actual mutual interest through an analysis of the literature.

The main works in T and L tend to ignore these relationships,<sup>2</sup> although both foundational studies mentioned above (Holmes, Wiegand) define precisely the sub-areas in which research can be developed and the sister discipline appears in both cases. Holmes (cit. in Hurtado 2001: 138) makes a difference between pure translation studies and applied translation studies. The latter include three subfields: translator training, translation criticism and the need for translation aids, among which two types of publications are found: DD and grammar books. However, Holmes considers that this is a related field to T, not a core one. Wiegand (1987: 15) describes four areas where what he calls *metalexicography* can be applied: history of lexicography, general theory of lexicography, research on dictionary use, and criticism of dictionaries. In the third area there is a significant space devoted to DD use (not only by translators, of course), so the space that L reserves to T seems to be greater than the space that T reserves to DD.

Compiling a bibliography on the relationship between T and L requires tenacious searches which, however, provide relatively scant results. Therefore, it seems obvious to conclude that mutual interest between these disciplines has been very limited so far (as expressed by Varantola in the first quote in this article, and as other authors also state, e.g. Wotjak 1997). Hartmann

---

2. Only some of the main scholars in each field, who are well known by experts in both disciplines, will be mentioned, so that the final list of references is not overwhelming. As it has been mentioned already, all of them usually ignore the other field. In T, we would mention classical studies by J. C. Catford, Nida & Taber or Vázquez Ayora, and more recent ones by M. Baker, Hatim & Mason, C. Nord, etc. As will be explained later, there are a few exceptions: scholars who have shown interest in both fields, such as Hartmann and Snell-Hornby, or authors whose theories are strongly linked to their actual translatorial activity, such as P. Newmark or V. García Yebra. Among scholars in L are H. E. Wiegand, G. Haensch, R. Werner or F. J. Hausmann. It is meaningful to note that in their main works, whenever there is a final subject index, it rarely includes L (or DD) or T, respectively.

(2004) conducted the first (and to our knowledge, only) literature review focusing on studies in L and T which had considered interlingual issues. Firstly, he identifies studies published in the field of L (journals, conference proceedings, dissertations...), but obtains a small number of them. Then he moves on to find useful contributions to L in T publications, which provides even more scarce results.

Further evidence about the limited interest in bringing these disciplines together lies on the number of monographs devoted to this matter. There are in fact only five, from Snell-Hornby and Pöhl's isolated and pioneering one (1989) to the most recent ones by Sin-wai (2004), Bowker (2006) and San Vicente (2006). Atkins and Varantola's monograph on the use of DD (1998) could also be added to this list, even if it does not only deal with L and T, as foreign language learners are also brought into the equation. If these miscellaneous volumes are analyzed in detail, it becomes obvious that only a few of the contributions in them are of a general nature –either from a methodological or theoretical perspective–, whereas the remaining ones focus on specific aspects of a language or a language pair. They are usually compilations of chapters dealing with one of our two fields, e.g. Bowker (2006), where none of the studies brings T and L together.

When wondering about the causes of this apparent lack of interest, one could ask, just like Humblé does (2010: 331):

Serait-ce parce que la relation entre le traducteur et les dictionnaires est tellement évidente que la littérature en traductologie ne semble guère lui accorder de l'importance ?

It is indeed meaningful that most of the editors of these volumes and the chapter authors come from the field of L, and not from T. In fact, other bibliographic references point at a similar situation. This will be a constant issue throughout this article.

## 2. Translators and dictionaries

One of the most studied and discussed issues is how translators use DD. There is a common element to all these studies: these works focus on the needs of D users and not on DD's main features.

The interest for D use becomes evident early (Tarp 2009: 276), by North American linguist Fred W. Householder –who argues for this approach in a meeting on L held in 1960–, and much later by authors such as Hartmann, Wiegand or Atkins, among others. These lexicographers advocate for a change in the way DD are studied and compiled, so that emphasis is made on the product (the D) instead of on its users.

Therefore, before compiling a D, it would be necessary to identify who would be its potential users and their specific lexicographic needs. This is the only way in which we can be helpful to them. However, this goodwill often faces insurmountable obstacles, mainly publishing companies, which want reference materials to be useful to the largest number of end users possible, for practical reasons. If we think about traditional (printed) DD, we need to be realistic and admit that different DD cannot be compiled for each group of users, due to the large investment in human and economic resources needed for them. However, it is true that the application of IT to lexicographic compilation processes makes it possible to fulfill the wish of creating flexible tools adapted to their users that many lexicographers (and translation practitioners and scholars) have.

There are multiple types of D users and they use reference works in many different ways. Hartmann (1989a: 104, 106) offers two tables describing the components of both aspects (reference acts, user profiles), including translators (in the category of complex tasks in professional contexts). He does not make a difference, however, between professional translators and translation trainees, which is relevant, as it will be discussed below.

There is a large number of studies on D use, as shown by Welker's monograph (2006), which includes 220 research projects published between 1962 and 2006, although only a small fraction of them deals with what translators and T students do. Most of such research focuses precisely on T students (e.g., Bowker 1998; Corpas et al. 2001; Hatherall 1984; Mackintosh 1998; Sánchez 2004, 2005; Varantola 1998) and only little focuses on professional translators (e.g., Durán 2010, Tomaszczyk 1989). As Mackintosh (1998: 124) explains, this preference might be due to the fact that students are an easier population to study and that the potential benefit stemming from changes in DD would impact those who use them most, i.e. students themselves. We will not consider those studies which use T as a tool to gather information, but which use subjects unrelated to T itself, such as foreign language students or, in one particular case (Atkins & Varantola 1989), lexicographers attending an L conference.

Criticism to the methods used in these studies has been common. Tarp (2009) distinguishes seven categories (questionnaires, interviews, observation, protocols, experiments, tests, log files). He observes that they all share some flaws, such as non-random sampling of subjects, small samples –which make results not very statistically significant–, question phrasings that bias results (Hatherall, 1984, also criticizes this issue), and others. Furthermore, none of these studies tells us anything about extra-lexicographic situations



which lead to user needs, as they tend to focus on observing while translation is in process or on the analysis of results. The only method that Tarp (2009: 293) finds reliable, according to function theory in L, is the deductive method based on a complex set of premises, which he does not describe further.

Studies based on D use by T students offer interesting results, albeit very different from one another and difficult to compare, both due to the different methods applied and to the diversity of issues addressed. Some use the so-called TAP (think-aloud protocol) method (Mackintosh, Varantola), others use questionnaires about D use (Corpas et al., Sánchez), others analyze students' behavior while translating a text (Bowker)<sup>3</sup>—sometimes adding one or more questionnaires (Hatherall)—, and others study the errors they make (Meyer). Some focus on D use in general, others on the use of general BBDD (Meyer) and some others on specialized translation (Mackintosh, Bowker, Varantola). The number of respondents varies notably, from 4 subjects in Varantola's study, 15 in Mackintosh's and 14 in Bowker's, to larger figures in the studies by Corpas et al. (52) and by Sánchez (98). All cases show a predominant use of BBDD: between 91.8% and 83.7% for Sánchez, between 94.2% among first-year students and 73.3% among last year students for Corpas et al., or 59% in Varantola's study. There is an interesting point in the latter study: during the first look-up of a search, the rate reaches 87%, but when students (who are translating into their L2 in this case) look something up for the second time, they mainly tend to use MMDD (87%). Mackintosh's study provides an exception to that trend: her students, who are translating a specialized text to their first language, tended to use a hybrid dictionary (bilingualized) (57.9%).

These studies also share results that indicate that D use (especially BBDD) is very common throughout the first year of training, but it becomes less common (in favor of MMDD or other DD) as the student progresses. Searches in BBDD aim to find T equivalents, whereas searches in MMDD target definitions, although in some cases searches related to spelling difficulties are also relevant (Sánchez 2004). Varantola's difference between searches for equivalent terms (55% in BBDD) and those seeking reassurance of something known already (45% in BBDD and 30% in MMDD) is very interesting.

Durán (2010) regrets the lack of studies on D use by professional translators and their needs, in contrast to those focusing on T students. He uses online surveys as a method because it allows reaching a larger pool of

---

3. This approach is also applied in Starren and Thelen (1990), although their methodological description seems confusing and their results are unclear.

respondents. In fact, the number of responses is indeed high (402). Most respondents are translators (62%) or interpreters (14%) and the remaining ones belong to related categories. Most of them (56.4%) expressed a preference for online resources. As far as resource types are concerned, just like students but to a much lesser degree, they prefer BBDD (39.4%) to MMDD in L2 or L1 (24.1%); only 10.8% mentioned multilingual resources (usually considered of poorer quality), which becomes a wake-up call for terminographers. Probably the most relevant piece of information in the study has to do with the question about one's favorite resources ("Which type of terminological resources do you use more when translating?"), which provided surprising answers. Answers were, in order: bilingual specialized dictionary/glossary (18.9%), searches in search engines (Google) (16.1%), terminological databases (8.8%), monolingual specialized dictionary/glossary (8.6%), and Wikipedia (8.6%). Therefore, DD –as it is already known– are not the only resources used by professionals in their working environments, since new ones (such as Google or Wikipedia) have entered the market and are extensively used despite constant criticism against them given their low reliability standards. Another question had to do with the kind of information that a good terminological resource should offer. Answers were as expected, because among the most important kinds of information reported are clear and concrete definitions and equivalents, then derivatives and compounds, domain specification (an issue which was ignored by students), examples, phraseological information, a definition in both languages (if bilingual) and abbreviations and acronyms.

Besides Durán's study, Tomaszczyk's (1989) is also worth mentioning, as it covers an introspective approach to one's own experience in using DD as a professional translator. While translating a specialized handbook into English (L2), he registered all his information searches. The most significant results from this study are the following: 81.3% of searches (for 691 lexical units overall) were related to specialized terms, whereas the remaining ones had to do with general-language units; DD provided a satisfactory answer for 58% of searches for specialized terms and for 79.1% of searches of general vocabulary. From the total number of searches, 54% were triggered by lexical units which were little known or unknown to the translator and the remaining 46% were confirmations of what the translator already knew: as was mentioned before for Varantola's study, it is important to remember that translators (and advanced T students) very often use dictionaries to confirm what they already know and not so much what they do not know. As far as the type of information looked for, 67% were L2 equivalents in a general BD

and a general technical one; 18.4% were related to general terminology or to a specific field, in specialized DD; the remaining 12% were searches about general language issues in DD in L2. From Tomaszczyk's point of view, although MMDD in L2 are very helpful, BBDD are the main tool for this kind of translation assignment.

It seems thus obvious that there is still much to do if we want to define actual needs of translators (be them trainees, professionals or otherwise) when they require the help of DD in a clear and precise way. We would need studies incorporating other research methods (beside common ones such as surveys, observation while translating or analysis of results), which are based on larger datasets (respondent sample size and diversity of tests, etc.) and which are built on theoretical developments. The investment in terms of manpower and infrastructure would be high, but technical resources at hand nowadays could certainly decrease it. Advances have been made. However, the picture is still not clear and complete and fails to be applicable to designing lexicographic tools which meet the needs of translation professionals and trainees.

### 3. Lexicographic tools for translators

The only issue that scholars seem to agree upon is that translators need lexicographic tools to do their job effectively. However, besides such a general statement, disagreement abounds. Although most authors consider BBDD (be them general or specialized ones) as the main tool for translators (and so is stated by most informants in studies described above), a non-negligible number of them have discredited them, questioned their position as main tools and foregrounded other types of DD as more useful and effective. That feeling of mistrust towards BBDD, which are considered responsible for many comprehension and production mistakes, mainly concerns foreign language learning processes and is related to translation being rejected as a pedagogical tool. Nevertheless, scholars such as Corda and Marelló (1999) tend to qualify their statements in this regard by highlighting that, on the one hand, "forbidding" using BBDD does not prevent interferences from happening and, on the other hand, BBDD have advantages over MMDD in comparative tasks. These authors suggest, as a conclusion, that students should become used to resorting to the right type of D depending on the task at hand (comprehension, production or translation).

The needs that DD must meet when they are being used by translators are varied in nature and depend on different factors: whether translation is being done into L1 or L2, whether translation is general or specialized.

Several of the studies described above gathered information about the types of tools that both T practitioners and trainees use. Here is a summarized list of the different types of DD:

- Bilingual DD (general and specialized).
- Monolingual DD (general and specialized).
- Hybrid DD (bilingualized).
- Synonym DD.
- Encyclopedias.
- Other DD.

All these reference works can be published in printed copy or in electronic copy; in this latter case, they can be on CD-ROM (and thus used in one's own computer) or be accessible online.

Besides these, new resources can also be found online, although they not always are of a lexicographic nature, that is, they are not exactly dictionaries:

- Terminological databases.<sup>4</sup>
- Search engines (Google is undoubtedly the most popular one).
- Web crawlers, i.e. engines that perform simultaneous searches in several dictionaries.
- Wikipedia.
- Corpora (parallel or otherwise).
- Grammar books and comparative style manuals. (Wotjak 1997: 123)

Lastly, a few other paralexigraphic resources which translators work with daily are worth mentioning, such as word processor tools (spell checkers, built-in dictionaries, synonym dictionaries) or T software. Tarp (2007: 254) uses a neologism to label these tools: *leximatos*.

Given the myriad of resources, it could be asked if one can talk about a translation dictionary and if any of those works can be considered as such. When L was an emerging discipline, Zgusta (1971: 216; 1984: 147) argued that BBDD's primary purpose was to serve as translation dictionaries, in a

---

4. Concerning the difference between specialized lexicography and terminography, Bergholtz and Tarp (2010: 29) state: "We still see terminography as a synonym of specialised lexicography. Not all colleagues agree, nor the majority of lexicographers, who see lexicography as a part of linguistics, and most terminographers neither, who claim there are large but unclear differences in relation to specialised lexicography. In reality, it is a discussion about something else, about research funding, about influence and positions at universities, and about defending a position concerning two traditions in making tools to solve exactly the same types of problems."

like manner to Hartmann (1989b: 9). After them, both subtle and categorical doubts about their role as translation dictionaries have increased exponentially. They have been framed in two different ways: either BBDD have been considered of little use for translators (a position rejected by authors such as Newmark, whose eloquent quote opens this paper), or they have been compared with other types of reference works which are just as useful for translators. The concept of *translation dictionary* appears in some studies, but only Tarp (2007: 231) seems to have offered a definition for it:

Un diccionario de traducción es una herramienta cuya función es cubrir las necesidades de información que tengan los traductores en relación con el proceso de traducción.

Albeit apparently simple, this definition includes some interesting premises. For instance, it is important to note that no specific mention is made about a particular type of dictionary. In fact, the translation dictionary that this author seeks is a dictionary from which different sources of information can be accessed (Tarp 2007: 256).

It is agreed that no single type of D is enough to do a translator's job. Iamartino (2006: 106), for example, considers that there is not one single translation dictionary, given that there are many different types of translators and translations, and, therefore, many different potential types of translation dictionaries. However, experts are set aside from each other depending on their preferences on types of dictionaries. Furthermore, it is also widely acknowledged that any lexicographic work, regardless of its flaws, can become useful for a translator at a given moment and even be worth purchasing (Newmark 1998; Piotrowski 1994: 118). For instance, some DD which have been labeled as ineffective and dated can offer encyclopedic definitions which can be useful from a diachronic point of view.

As explained above, BBDD are preferred by almost all T trainees and also by translators, but some disagree. Mackintosh (1998) believes that the best tool (in her case, for specialized translation into L2) are bilingualized or hybrid DD. Fraser (1999) acknowledges using BBDD as a stepping stone for translators, to look for clues and suggestions, but considers them of little use and even dangerous in the hands of bad translators. Piotrowski (1995) also argues against BD use by translators (not by tourists or L2 learners); in his view, in order to become true translation dictionaries, BBDD should offer an almost unlimited number of equivalents, covering an infinite amount of contexts, which is impossible; and he then recommends using MMDD and synonym dictionaries to translate into L1. Roberts (1990) echoes criticism about DD by translators and talks about a feeling of "frustration" (that same

feeling is also reported in Varantola, 1998: 180). Roberts does not criticize BBDD openly (considering that it is almost impossible that a dictionary can meet the needs of every type of translator), but does criticize their use by many translators and almost every T student, who turn to them blindly in search for answers at any stage of the translation process.

Corpora are a resource often advocated for by several scholars. In an empirical study on a group of students (where some used corpora and others used other DD to translate a specialized text into L1), Bowker (1998) noticed that students who had used corpora had better results. She recommends therefore the use of corpora, even if she also admits that there are only few available.<sup>5</sup> In fact, resource availability (corpora, and also specialized BBDD, terminological databases, hybrid dictionaries or even good BBDD) depends on the language(s) involved. Hartmann (2004), the father of contrastive textology and the author of a well-known taxonomy of parallel corpora, advocates for their use in D compilation (as does Wotjak 1997: 115). Tomaszczyk (1989) also considers using quality bilingual corpora (third type in Hartmann's classification, i.e., corpora built from texts which are not translations from one another, but independent –albeit comparable– as they deal with the same topic) for translators to learn about fields of expertise they are not familiar with.

The countless opinions voiced on the use of lexicographic tools in T could be divided in two groups: those by experts who see the T process as a whole (or focus on specific tools) and those by experts who differentiate several stages within the T process and recommend different tools for each stage.

Among the former, Iamartino (2006) analyzes the validity of five Italian-English BBDD when translating different lexical categories, both predictable (technical terms, collocations, multi-word units, culturebound terms, etc.) and less than predictable (such as general vocabulary, which is often misjudged as unproblematic). Among his conclusions, he highlights that equivalents suggested by BBDD will be more or less appropriate depending on whether translation is into L1 or L2, and that current DD must improve greatly and add many coreferences, labels and usage notes, if they want to be useful for translators.

---

5. Zucchini (2011) reached similar conclusions in an experimental study on the use of different resources during specialized translation tasks: DD were useful when filling linguistic gaps, a specialized terminological glossary was considered as the most comprehensive resource, and the comparable corpus from which the glossary terms were extracted met many participants' information needs about language use and phraseology and facilitated better results.

Other authors identify different needs in different stages of the translation process and, thus, favor resorting to different tools in each one of them. Roberts (1990) suggests as follows:

- Analysis of the SL text: translators usually resort to BBDD for clarifications about the meaning of lexical units, but they are often disappointed given the lack of semantic explanations next to equivalents. BBDD are also often poor in terms of multi-word units or words belonging to a particular sociolinguistic variety (e.g. regional). MMDD would be more helpful at this stage.
- Transfer of the text into the TL: translators complain that they often fail to find the appropriate equivalent, which might only appear as part of an example sometimes. There is a need for clear separation of the different senses, usage notes, the inclusion of actants, etc.
- Revision of translation: general BBDD are commonly used at this stage, although they often fail to be helpful, for the same reasons as above.

Tarp (2007), who is concerned with specialized translation at all times, divides the translation process in three stages, plus two more (pre-translation stage and post-translation stage):

- Pre-translation stage: if the translator is unfamiliar with the topic, an introduction to the field of expertise at hand in both languages would be very convenient.
- Reception: needs can be met with a MD in the source language or a BD.
- Transfer: the translator would need to use a BD with vast information about equivalents and collocations. It would need to include three types of vocabulary: a) general vocabulary (with labels to identify different meanings next to equivalents); b) terms belonging to a specific field which do not change from one country to another (e.g. biology); c) terms which do change (e.g. law; in such cases, the translator would require additional information).
- Production: if problems have already come up in the previous stage, a BD is recommended. If there are new issues, a MD in the target language would be more appropriate.
- Post-translation stage or revision: it covers all the above situations, although the most useful tools would be a MD in L2 or a BD from L2, given the focus of this stage on the target language.

A relevant question is then asked: what is the solution to this complex set of needs? There might be two: the scattered one (checking different sources, dictionaries, etc.; which seems to be preferred) and the comprehensive one (a single D which would offer different lexicographic answers). Obviously, the author advocates for the latter.

A few further clarifications must be made concerning the use of DD. It is different to translate into one's mother tongue (L1) than into a foreign language (L2). In the second scenario, the translator needs much more information than in the first one; even more so if the D is to be used by a T student (Wotjak 1997: 114). In such cases, besides DD, quality corpora can become helpful (as argued by Bowker, Hartmann and Tomaszczyk). The needs of a specialized translator are different from those of someone translating more general texts.

In the current state of affairs in L, it is impossible not to differentiate between two types of DD according to their form: printed DD and electronic DD. Despite the great advances made in all fronts since the latter appeared, electronic L has not benefited as much from its potential yet, despite having been around for 20-30 years. The main reason for this is that it has remained very closely linked to printed DD (at least as far as most well-known products are concerned), where the field has its origins. In fact, it is widely criticized that electronic DD (be them on CD-ROM or available online) are often copies of printed versions, with very little extra information (besides audio pronunciation of headwords). It is true that they surpass printed versions in ease of search and browsing, but other potential features are not taken advantage of, such as unlimited space (to include more information, additional examples, graphs, photographs, links to corpora, etc.) or the freedom not to follow the strict macrostructure and microstructure organization of printed versions. DD designed to be available online seem to be overcoming these limitations and approaching the popular request for individualized or personalized dictionaries, that is, that DD can offer different answers depending on the user profile and the kind of information request that s/he places. This is the underlying premise of the DD developed lately by the Centre for Lexicography at Aarhus University and its partners.

Fuertes and Nielsen (2012) focus on three online terminological DD (*Certerm*, *DiCoInfo*, *EuroTermBank*) in order to check if they agree with the theses of the functional approach in Lexicography and, thus, if they are useful for specialized translation. Their main problem seems to be their poor flexibility and ability to adapt to the user, as they do not offer customization.



The situation of electronic L is far from perfect and there are still many different types of obstacles to be overcome. Regardless of how these DD should be in the future, current ones are constantly criticized. Pastor and Alcina (2010) analyze many of them and offer a detailed classification of their search techniques. As other authors, they state that users of these DD do not benefit from them as much as they could for two reasons: because they do not make access to information easier and because users do not really know how to access them. One could also mention Tarp's objections (2007: 254) here: a) it is often difficult for users to figure out what they need at a given moment and, thus, run a quick effective search; b) much of the information in prefabricated resources (such as printed DD) is completely irrelevant; and c) such prefabricated resources may not always have enough information to provide appropriate answers to complex searches. Forget (1999) also addresses this issue. However, in this timesensitive field, almost 15 years gone by and all the current developments in IT and (to a lesser extent) in IT-based L minimize the current relevance of her comprehensive study.

Some problems of contemporary DD are related to practical issues, such as publishing decisions. Publishing a D often involves the investment of large amounts of manpower and economic resources, which entails that these products are conceived to yield profits. This conflicts with the understandable wishes of many lexicographers (and also many translators), who seek to find DD in the market which, in the case of lexicographers, would agree with their theoretical and practical assumptions, and, in the case of translators, would meet their needs. It has often been requested (Marello 1989: 18; Wotjak 1997: 115) that four different versions of BBDD should be available, depending on the language combination (L1 and L2) and their purpose (coding and decoding). Specialized translators would want additional information next to equivalents when they need to translate into their foreign language, as well as contrastive information which highlights the differences between concepts behind the terms in each language involved. However, publishing houses tend not to grant these requests and they develop products that cannot meet the needs of all users to the same degree, despite being good quality resources. The widespread use of IT for D compilation should enable the production of works in the near future that adapt to their users as much as possible, instead of having users adapt to DD, as it happens nowadays.

Although criticism of the role of DD in T is common, to a greater or lesser extent, suggestions for alternatives or improvement are much less often heard. Three different types of proposals are made: a) those arguing for new types of lexicographic tools (such as the above mentioned Aarhus Centre);

b) those suggesting improvements in current tools; and c) those in favor of improving D search techniques by training T students properly.

We will focus on this last item, which should be the easiest one to implement, but it is not always so. Roberts (1992), one of the authors who criticize DD (especially BBDD) most widely, considers that the problem lies in the poor way in which students use DD, because, despite having better and more comprehensive products, users (students) do not know how to look for what they need and resort to them blindly and impulsively. Teaching how to use DD correctly is necessary and that, in her opinion, should be included in documentation courses commonly found in T degree curricula. Furthermore, it should be taught by an instructor who is familiar with T, because if a librarian who lacks that T knowledge teaches it, as it sometimes happens, the training would not be as fruitful. Roberts (1992: 53 ss.) believes that this training should have four learning goals: a) familiarization with different types of lexical items; b) familiarization with different types of dictionaries; c) familiarization with dictionary entry formats; and d) illustration of ways to combine text analysis, translation and dictionary consultation. These four goals are related to four main problems that students have when translating: a) knowing what to look up in a dictionary; b) knowing where to look for lexical information; c) knowing how to interpret lexical information provided; d) knowing when and how to consult dictionaries during the translation process. For this author, the latter is the most important issue, as it covers them all.

In the last decades, there have been proposals to develop new types of DD which are specifically designed for translators. However, these have rarely become a reality. For instance, Marelló (1989: 120-122) appeals for collaboration between lexicographers and (professional or student) translators, and suggests that a new D is developed from the experience and sensitivity of both groups.

Rogers and Ahmad (1998) made an accurate analysis and foresaw the development of an appropriate translation dictionary in the notsofar future:

We would like to argue that the translator's dictionary of the future will be a more dynamic concept than that of the specialised paper-based dictionary of today or its replication on computer systems, often misleadingly represented as machine-readable dictionaries, terminology databases or lexical resource databases. The new dictionary will allow translators not only to draw on electronically-stored data-bases of terms with smarter semantically-relevant navigational paths, it will also support them in creating their own data-bases or simply help them to solve their problems in an ad hoc way by reference to large electronic corpora of text, a source of context-sensitive reference for language use. An integrated interface allowing access to a range of sources, including the Internet, following in the increasingly familiar workbench

approach [...] would allow the user/translator to extend and complement standard sources.

As described above, one of the few proposals that have led to actual products is that of experts in the Centre for Lexicography in Aarhus, which have already developed a variety of new specialized DD emerging from different premises. In particular, they are based on the assumption that a specialized translator does not only need terms and their definitions, but also information about textual and pragmatic issues, and knowledge about the topic at hand, all of it in two languages, among others (cfr. e.g. Nielsen 2010).

A particular area, which nonetheless goes beyond the purposes of this paper, is related to the compilation of lexica, electronic dictionaries or dictionaries for machine translation. It is a welldeveloped field which, to date, has only provided limited unassuming results, especially if we compare them with the expectations held when the field began to emerge. As an illustration, the works by Guest and Mairal (2007), Jiménez (2001) and Lépinette (1990, 1994), among many others, should be mentioned.

#### 4. Lexicographers as translators, translators as lexicographers

Until now, we have discussed the relationship between T and L almost in one sense only: D use by translators. But is it possible to explore the opposite sense? Can T or translators be useful for L or lexicographers? And another question follows: can a single individual be a translator and a lexicographer? Alternatively put, is a (bilingual) lexicographer a translator?

Hartmann (2004: 11) is one of the few authors who hints at what T can do for L, although he does not elaborate on it:

Translation is relevant to lexicography in two ways: as supplier of translation equivalents to be included in the bilingual dictionary and as consumer of information made available by lexicographers to professional translators.

Hartmann (1994; 1989b: 17) is in favor of using certain types of parallel texts (types one and two in his famous classification, i.e., those which are translations of one another and those which are both translations of a third text in a third language) as a source for translation equivalents and collocations, which can be used by lexicographers in the compilation of BBDD. He strongly believes in that process, which can contribute to overcome some limitations of equivalents included in BBDD, as they are gathered taking more general contexts as a basis and thus ignoring less common ones, which the translator may nonetheless need

Regarding one of the questions asked above, Humblé (2010) reflects on the deep relationships between bilingual lexicographers and T, after noticing –as we have already done in this paper– how indifferent the T field has been towards L. For instance, he states –cautiously by acknowledging a potential negative reaction among translation scholars– that bilingual lexicographers are indeed translators, not only because they conduct translation tasks frequently, but also because compiling a BD is itself a great T undertaking, as it involves translating all the lexical wealth (or a large part of it) of a language to another language. He obviously acknowledges that the translations provided by a lexicographer are different from those by a translator, as we already know. However, he remarks that there is an item within the lexicographic entry where the lexicographer matches the translator: examples. In these cases, lexicographers and translators face similar situations with similar problems.

## 5. Conclusions

The call for papers for this issue suggested a few topics, some more developed than others. Many of them have been covered by the authors who submitted their proposals, such as: electronic tools and translation (Durán), DD and different types of translation (legal, technical, etc.) (Fuertes, Nielsen & Bergholtz; Corpas & Roldán; Gallego), specific DD for translators (Buendía & Faber; or Tarp's article about a translation dictionary). Some papers fall outside the initial boundaries envisaged for this issue, but are nonetheless extremely interesting (Sánchez Martín; Vaxelaire). Other issues have remained unaddressed, such as other DD (encyclopedic DD, synonym DD, etc.) in translation, DD in translator training, and use of parallel corpora (comparable or translation-based) for compiling BBDD. Authors' choices match, in general terms, the issues which are more common in the literature overview that we have presented, with some exceptions, such as that of training translation students to use DD –a common topic in the literature which has not been addressed in this issue.

Interest in the sister discipline is evidenced in a number of ways, both from qualitative and quantitative perspectives. Lexicographers have shown concern for meeting translators' needs in the best way possible. Translators have often regretted how inappropriate lexicographic resources are for their needs, but have failed to provide specific suggestions for improvement to lexicographers. A fluent dialogue between the two parties, undoubtedly doomed to understand each other, has been missing. In this sense, it is important to highlight that lexicographers have traditionally been more interested in doing so. Among studies that address both disciplines there is a lack of

bidirectionality. In fact, studies about the use of dictionaries in Translation are an overwhelming majority. Studies on the use of Translation or translations in Lexicography are notably scarce.

It is our hope that the articles in this issue can do their bit in this great collective task and contribute to opening up new avenues of research.

## References

- ATKINS, B. T. Sue (ed.) (1998) *Using dictionaries. Studies of dictionary use by language learners and translators*. Tübingen: Max Miemeyer.
- BOWKER, Lynne. (1998) "Using Specialized Monolingual Native-Language Corpora as a Translation Resource: A Pilot Study." *Meta* 43:4, pp. 631–651.
- BOWKER, Lynne (ed.). (2006) *Lexicography, terminology, and Translation: text-based studies in honour of Ingrid Meyer*. Ottawa: Université d'Ottawa.
- CORDA, Alessandra & Carla Marello. (1999) *Insegnare e imparare il lessico*. Torino: Paravia.
- CORPAS PASTOR, Gloria; Jorge Leiva Rojo & M<sup>a</sup> José Varela Salinas. (2001) "El papel del diccionario en la formación de traductores e intérpretes: análisis de necesidades y encuestas de uso." In: Ayal, M. (ed.) 2001. *Diccionarios y enseñanza*. Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alcalá, pp. 239-273.
- DURÁN MUÑOZ, Isabel. (2010) "Specialized lexicographical resources: a survey of translators' needs." In: Granger, Sylviane & Magali Paquot (eds.) 2010. *eLexicography in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: New Challenges, new applications. Proceedings of ELEX2009. Cahiers du Cental*, vol. 7. Lovaine-La-Neuve: Presses Universitaires de Louvain, pp. 55-66.
- FORGET, Nadine. (1999) *Les dictionnaires électroniques dans l'optique de la traduction*. Ottawa: Université d'Ottawa. Thèse de maîtrise. École de traduction et d'interprétation. Electronic version available at: <http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~e-tithese/nforg/frmain.htm>
- FRASER, Janet. (1999) "The translator and the word: the pros and cons of dictionaries in translation." In: Anderman, G. & M. Rogers. (eds.) 1999. *Word, text, translation. Liber amicorum for Peter Newmark*. Clevedon & Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, pp. 25-34.
- FUERTES-OLIVERA, Pedro A. & Sandro Nielsen. (2012) "Online dictionaries for assisting translators of LSP texts: The *Accounting Dictionaries*." *International Journal of Lexicography* 25:2, pp. 191-215.
- GUEST, Elizabeth & Ricardo Mairal Usón. (2007) "Building a computational lexicon for automatic translation: A preliminary discussion." In: Fuertes Olivera, Pedro A. et al. (eds.) 2007. *Problemas lingüísticos en la traducción especializada*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, pp. 197-226.

- HARTMANN, Reinhard Rudolf Karl. (1989a) "Sociology of the Dictionary User: Hypotheses and Empirical Studies." In: Hausmann, Franz J.; O. Reichmann; H. E. Wiegand & L. Zgusta (eds.) 1989. *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*. Berlin-Nueva York: de Gruyter, pp. 102-111.
- HARTMANN, Reinhard Rudolf Karl. (1989b) "Lexicography, translation and the so-called language barrier." In: Snell-Hornby, Mary & Esther Pöhl (eds.) 1989. *Translation and Lexicography. Papers read at the Euralex Colloquium held at Innsbruck 2-5 July 1987*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V. et al., pp. 9-20.
- HARTMANN, Reinhard Rudolf Karl. (1994) "The Use of Parallel Text Corpora in the Generation of Translation Equivalents for Bilingual Lexicography". In: Martin, W. et al. (eds.) 1994. *EURALEX 94 Proceedings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 291-297
- HARTMANN, Reinhard Rudolf Karl. (1999) "Thematic Report 2. Case Study: The Exeter University Survey of Dictionary Use." In: Hartmann, R. R. K. (ed.) 1999. *Dictionaries in Language Learning. Recommendations, National Reports and Thematic Reports from the TNP Sub-Project 9: Dictionaries*. Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin, pp. 36-52.
- HARTMANN, Reinhard Rudolf Karl. (2004) "Lexicography and translation." In: Sin-wai, Chan (ed.) 2004. *Translation and Bilingual Dictionaries*. Tübingen: Max Miemeyer, pp. 7-21.
- HATHERALL, Glyn. (1984) "Studying dictionary use: Some findings and proposals." In: Hartmann, R.R.K. (ed.) 1984. *LEXeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9-12 September 1983*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, pp. 183-189.
- HUMBLÉ, Philippe. (2010) "Dictionnaires et traductologie : le paradoxe d'une lointaine proximité." *Meta* 55:2, pp. 329-337.
- IAMARTINO, Giovanni. (2006) "Dal lessicografo al traduttore: un sogno che si realizza?" In: San Vicente, Félix (ed.) 2006. *Lessicografia bilingue e traduzione: metodi, strumenti, approcci attuali*. Monza: Polimetrica, pp. 101-132.
- JIMÉNEZ Ríos, Enrique. (2001) "O papel da lexicografía nas novas tecnoloxías aplicadas á tradución." *Viceversa* 6, pp. 37-58.
- LÉPINETTE, Brigitte. (1990) "Lexicographie bilingue et traduction." *Meta* 35:3, pp. 571-581.
- LÉPINETTE, Brigitte. (1994) "La lexicografía bilingüe no convencional. Propuesta para la construcción de una base de datos contrastivos destinada a la traducción automática." In: Charlo Brea, Luis (ed.) 1994. *Reflexiones sobre la Traducción: Actas del Primer Encuentro Interdisciplinar "Teoría y Práctica de la Traducción"*. Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz, pp. 345-354.
- MACKINTOSH, Kristen. (1998) "An Empirical Study of Dictionary Use in L2-L1 Translation." In: Atkins, B. T. Sue (ed.) 1998 *Using Dictionaries: Studies of*

- Dictionary Use by Language Learners and Translators*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 121-149.
- MARELLO, Carla. (1989) *Dizionari bilingui, con schede sui dizionari italiani per francese, inglese, spagnolo, tedesco*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
- MEYER, Ingrid. (1988) "The General Bilingual Dictionary as a Working Tool in *Thème*." *Meta* 33:3, pp. 368-376.
- NEWMARK, Peter. (1998) *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- NIELSEN, Sandro. (2010) "Specialized Translation Dictionaries for Learners." In: Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro A. (ed.) 2010. *Specialized Dictionaries for Learners*. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, pp. 69-82.
- PASTOR, Verónica & Amparo Alcina. (2010) "Search Techniques in Electronic Dictionaries: A Classification for Translators." *International Journal of Lexicography* 23:3, pp. 307-354.
- PIOTROWSKI, Tadeusz. (1994) *Problems in bilingual lexicography*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- ROBERTS, Roda P. (1990) "Translation and the Bilingual Dictionary." *Meta* 35:1, pp. 74-81.
- ROBERTS, Roda P. (1992) "Translation pedagogy: strategies for improving dictionary use." *Traduction, Terminologie et Rédaction* 5:1, pp. 49-76.
- ROGERS, Margaret & Khurshid Ahmad. (1998) "The Translator and the Dictionary: Beyond Words." In: Atkins, B. T. Sue (ed.). 1998. *Using Dictionaries: Studies of Dictionary Use by Language Learners and Translators*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 193-204.
- SALMON, Laura. (2003) *Teoria della traduzione. Storia, scienza, professione*. Milano: A. Vallardi.
- SAN VICENTE, Félix (ed.) (2006) *Lessicografia bilingue e traduzione: metodi, strumenti, approcci attuali*. Monza: Polimetrica
- SÁNCHEZ RAMOS, M. del Mar. (2004) "Estudio experimental sobre el uso del diccionario como herramienta para el traductor: hacia una descripción de necesidades." In: Ortega, E. (ed.) 2004. *Panorama actual de la investigación en Traducción e Interpretación*. Granada: Atrio, pp. 477-486.
- SÁNCHEZ RAMOS, M. del Mar. (2005) "Research on Dictionary Use by Trainee Translators." *Translator Journal* 9:2. Electronic version available at: <http://translationjournal.net/journal/32dictuse.htm>
- SIN-WAI, Chan (ed.) (2004) *Translation and Bilingual Dictionaries*. Tübingen: Max Miemeyer.
- SNELL-HORNBY, Mary & Esther Pöhl (eds.) (1989) *Translation and Lexicography. Papers read at the Euralex Colloquium held at Innsbruck 2-5 July 1987*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V. et al.
- STARREN, Peter & Marcel Thelen. (1990) "General dictionaries and students of translation: A report on the use of dictionaries in the translation process."

- In: Magay, T. & J. Zigàny (eds.) 1990. *BudaLEX '88 proceedings*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- TARP, Sven. (2004) "How can dictionaries assist translators?" In: Sin-wai, Chan (ed.) 2004. *Translation and Bilingual Dictionaries*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, pp. 23-38.
- TARP, Sven. (2007) "¿Qué requisitos debe cumplir un diccionario de traducción del siglo 21?" In: Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro A. (ed.) 2007. *Problemas lingüísticos en la traducción especializada*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, pp. 227-256.
- TARP, Sven. (2008) *Lexicography in the borderland between knowledge and non-knowledge*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- TARP, Sven. (2009) "Reflections on Lexicographic User Research." *Lexikos* 19, pp. 275-296.
- TOMASZCZYK, Jerzy. (1989) "L1-L2 Technical Translation and Dictionaries." In: Snell-Hornby, Mary & Esther Pöhl (eds.) 1989. *Translation and Lexicography. Papers read at the Euralex Colloquium held at Innsbruck 2-5 July 1987*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V. et al., pp. 177-186.
- VAN HOOFF, Henri. (1991) *Histoire de la traduction en Occident*. Paris-Louvaine-la-Neuve: Duculot.
- VARANTOLA, Krista. (2002) "Use and Usability of Dictionaries: Common Sense and Context Sensibility?" In: Corréard, Marie-Hélène (ed.) 2002. *Lexicography and Natural Language Processing. A Festschrift in Honour of B.T.S. Atkins*. Euralex, pp. 30-44.
- WELKER, Herbert Andreas. (2006) *O uso de dicionários: Panorama geral das pesquisas empíricas*. Brasília: Thesaurus.
- WERNER, Reinhold. (2002) "El problema de la equivalencia en los diccionarios bilingües especializados". In: Ahumada, Ignacio (ed.) 2002. *Diccionarios y lenguas de especialidad. V Seminario de L Hispánica. Jaén, 21 al 23 de noviembre de 2001*. Jaén: Universidad de Jaén, pp. 3-20.
- WIEGAND, Herbert E. (1984) "On the Structure and Contents of a General Theory of Lexicography." In: Hartmann, R. R. K. (ed.) 1984. *LEXeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9-12 September 1983*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, pp. 13-30.
- WOTJAK, Gerd. (1997) "Reflexiones acerca de un diccionario para traductores." In: Vega, Miguel Ángel & R. Martín-Gaitero (eds.) 1997. *La palabra vertida*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense, pp. 111-124.
- ZGUSTA, Ladislav. (1971) *Manual of Lexicography*. La Haya & París: Mouton.
- ZGUSTA, Ladislav. (1984) "Translational equivalence in the bilingual dictionary." In: Hartmann, R. R. K. (ed.) 1984. *LEXeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9--12 September 1983*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, pp. 147-154.



ZUCCHINI, Luisa. (2011) “Riflessioni terminologiche e lessicologiche sul glossario ‘Linguaturismo’ e la sua applicazione nella didattica della traduzione”. In: Liverani, E. & Canals, J. (eds.) 2011. *El discurso del turismo. Aspectos lingüísticos y variedades textuales*. Trento: Tangram, pp. 17-34.

## BIONOTES / NOTAS BIOGRÁFICAS

### Cesáreo Calvo Rigual

Cesáreo Calvo Rigual is Professor of Italian at the University of Valencia. He received his PhD in Languages and Literatures (1993) with a dissertation entitled *El lèxic de la traducció italiana del Tirant lo Blanch (1538)*. He has published numerous studies in the following areas: monolingual lexicography (Italian) and bilingual lexicography (Italian-Spanish and Italian-Catalan), Italian-Spanish contrastive linguistics, and history of the translation of Italian works into Spanish and Catalan. In this latter field, he has contributed to the creation and development of the project Proyecto Boscán (Catalogue of Spanish Translations of Italian Works, until 1939). He has translated works by Pietro Aretino and Giovanni della Casa into Spanish, as well as *La venexiana*, by an anonymous Venetian author of the 16th century. He coauthored, with Anna Giordano, the Herder Italian Dictionary (1995, 2005 and 2010).

Cesáreo Calvo Rigual es Catedrático de Filología Italiana en la Universitat de València. Doctor en Filología (1993) con una tesis doctoral sobre “El lèxic de la traducció italiana del Tirant lo Blanch (1538)”. Ha publicado numerosos estudios en los siguientes campos: lexicografía monolingüe (italiana) y bilingüe (italiano-español e italiano-valenciano), lingüística contrastiva italiano-español e historia de la traducción de obras italianas al español y al catalán. En este último campo ha contribuido a la creación y mantenimiento del Proyecto Boscán (Catálogo de las Traducciones Españolas de Obras Italianas, hasta 1939). Ha traducido al español obras de Pietro Aretino y de Giovanni della Casa además de *La veneciana* de anónimo veneciano del siglo XVI. Es autor, junto a Anna Giordano, del Diccionario italiano Herder (1995, 2005 y 2010).

### Maria Vittoria Calvi

Maria Vittoria Calvi is Professor of Spanish at the University of Milan. She has wide experience in research and higher education teaching. She is Vice-President of the Association of Spanish Scholars in Italy (for the period 2010-2014)

and a member of CERLIS (Centro di Ricerca sui Linguaggi Specialistici) at the University of Bergamo. She has authored a great number of studies on Spanish Linguistics, focusing mainly on contrastive linguistics between Spanish and Italian and teaching-learning of related languages. Among her most recent research interests, contact between Spanish and Italian in migration contexts should be highlighted. In the literary field, her research mainly addresses contemporary fiction and, especially, the works of Carmen Martín Gaité.

Maria Vittoria Calvi, catedrática de Lengua española de la Universidad de Milán, tiene una larga experiencia en la investigación y en la docencia universitaria; es vicepresidenta de la Asociación de Hispanistas Italianos (trienio 2010-14) y es miembro del CERLIS (Centro di Ricerca sui Linguaggi Specialistici) de la Universidad de Bérgamo. Es autora de numerosos estudios de lingüística española, con especial atención en la lingüística contrastiva de español e italiano y la enseñanza-aprendizaje de lenguas afines. Entre sus líneas de investigación más recientes, también cabe destacar el contacto entre español e italiano en contextos migratorios. En campo literario, sus trabajos se han centrado en la narrativa contemporánea y sobre todo en la obra de Carmen Martín Gaité.