

# New Approaches to Specialized English Lexicology and Lexicography



New Approaches to Specialized English  
Lexicology and Lexicography

Edited by

Isabel Balteiro

**CAMBRIDGE**  
**SCHOLARS**

---

P U B L I S H I N G

New Approaches to Specialized English Lexicology and Lexicography,  
Edited by Isabel Balteiro

This book first published 2011

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2011 by Isabel Balteiro and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-2577-8, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-2577-1

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations .....	vii
List of Tables .....	viii
Preface .....	ix

## **Part I: ESP and General English Lexicology and Lexicography**

Chapter One.....	3
The Role of Interdisciplinarity in Lexicography and Lexicology	
Raquel Martínez Motos	
Chapter Two .....	15
An Overview of the Evolution of English Lexicography in the Industries of Leisure and Tourism	
Marián Alesón	
Chapter Three .....	47
From Collocation to Meaning: Revising Corpus-based Techniques of Lexical Semantic Analysis	
Moisés Almela, Pascual Cantos, and Aquilino Sánchez	

## **Part II: Specialized Lexicology and Terminology**

Chapter Four .....	65
A Few Notes on the Vocabulary of Textiles and Fashion	
Isabel Balteiro	
Chapter Five .....	83
False Anglicisms in Legal and Business English as a Lingua Franca: A Process of Back-borrowing	
Miguel Ángel Campos-Pardillos	

Chapter Six .....	97
British and Spanish Consent Forms	
María José Peral	

### **Part III: Lexicology and Language Teaching**

Chapter Seven.....	113
The Case for Translation and ICTs in Teaching and Learning English for Law and Business	
Carmen Guerrero-Galán and Joaquín Pastor-Pina	
Chapter Eight.....	131
Teaching Terminology for the Tourism Industry: ICT Applications	
Manuel Palazón Speckens	

### **Part IV: Lexicology, Lexicography and Their Relation to Visual Arts**

Chapter Nine.....	153
Peculiarities in the Language of Superhero Comics: The Names of the Characters and their Translation into Spanish	
Anna Mehren	
Chapter Ten .....	175
Lexicology and Cinema: Remarks on the Translation of Proper Names	
José Ramón Calvo	
Chapter Eleven .....	189
Translating Linguistic Creativity: Dubbing and Subtitling of Slang in <i>A Clockwork Orange</i> into Spanish	
José Ramón Calvo Ferrer and Isabel Balteiro	
Contributors .....	207
Subject Index .....	211
Authors Index .....	217

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Figure 1-1: Semi-technical Terms
- Figure 1-2: General Vocabulary
- Figure 1-3: Polysemy
- Figure 3-1: Lexical constellations of *incidence*
- Figure 3-2: Lexical-conceptual constellations of *incidence*
- Figure 3-3: Expansion of the lexical-conceptual structure
- Figure 3-4: Conceptual constellations shared by the nodes of *incidence* and *cases*
- Figure 6-1: Common sense in British Consent Forms
- Figure 7-1: Self-correcting exercises
- Figure 7-2: Self-correcting exercises with a student's answers and key
- Figure 7-3: Multiple Activities
- Figure 7-4: Exercise Key
- Figure 7-5: Interactive Activity
- Figure 8-1: Producing a cloze with Hot Potatoes
- Figure 8-2: An example of a resulting cloze with Hot Potatoes
- Figure 8-3: The Quandary Interface
- Figure 8-4: Resulting maze with Quandary
- Figure 8-5: Layout of each unit
- Figure 10-1: Incidence of mechanisms of preservation and substitution
- Figure 10-2: Mechanisms of preservation
- Figure 10-3: Mechanisms of substitution

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1: Semantic Fields

Table 2-1: List of Dictionaries and Glossaries

Table 3-1: Classification of constellations according to the level of abstraction

Table 3-2: Frequency data used for constellation analysis of the node *incidence*

Table 3-3: Conditional probabilities used for constellational analysis of the node *incidence*

Table 3-4: First- and second-level sub-collocates of *incidence*

Table 3-5: Frequency and conditional probability data used for constellational analysis of the node *cases*

Table 6-1: Suggested Lay Terminology for Consent Forms

Table 6-2: Examples in Context

Table 6-3: Active Understanding in NHS Consent Forms

Table 8-1: Layout of each section in the virtual workbook



## PREFACE

The present book *New Approaches to Specialized English Lexicology and Lexicography* is the result of the work and joint efforts of the members of the LEXESP research group, which is actually the driving force of this study, as well as of other colleagues, who have kindly wanted to participate. This volume, therefore, focuses on the main interests of the group, namely, English Lexicology, Lexicography and on the Professional Englishes or English for Specific Purposes.

This work, as its title suggests, deals with what may be regarded as the new topics in English Lexicology and Lexicography and of Specialized or Professional Englishes from both theoretical and applied perspectives. In spite of this great and rich variety of approaches and topics that the book addresses, it still maintains a clear unity and a connecting thread, as all of them are related to English and ESP Lexicology and/or Lexicography. Furthermore, some of the chapters link these areas of theoretical and Applied Linguistics to other “less” scientific or “less” linguistic fields such as those of fashion, comics and even cinema, which may even be regarded as of a creative, recreational or enjoyable kind.

The structure of the book is as follows: chapters are grouped into four main parts: the first part “ESP and General English Lexicology and Lexicography” collects the three most general chapters (one to three), which function as some kind of introduction to the book, dealing with “The Role of Interdisciplinarity in Lexicography and Lexicology”, offering “An Overview of the Evolution of English Lexicography” in the specialized field of “Leisure and Tourism” or even relating Lexicology to Corpus Linguistics.

The second part, “Specialized Lexicology and Terminology”, comprises four chapters (four to seven) which focus on the language, especially vocabulary and/or terminology, of different fields or disciplines namely, the vocabulary of textiles and fashion, legal and business English terminology and anglicisms, and the language of medicine.

The third part, “Lexicology and Language Teaching”, brings these two fields, Lexicology and Language Teaching, closer to Professional Languages, Translation and New Technologies in two chapters (eight and nine): “The Case for Translation and ICTs in Teaching and Learning English for Law

and Business” and “Teaching Terminology for the Tourism Industry: ICT Applications”.

The fourth or last part, “Lexicology, Lexicography and their relation to Visual Arts”, is probably the most innovative of all parts. The three final chapters (ten to twelve) are centred in the translation of specific terms, mainly proper names and the vocabulary of slang in visual arts. Comics and films are the object of study in these particular cases. Their analyses give birth to the “Peculiarities in the Language of Superhero Comics: the Names of the Characters and their Translation into Spanish”, “Lexicology and Cinema: Remarks on the Translation of Proper Names” and “Translation of Slang Terms: Dubbing and Subtitling of Stanley Kubrick’s *A Clockwork Orange* into Spanish”.

In general, this volume attempts to synthesize and explore the study of English and ESP Lexicology and Lexicography and their relation to other linguistic and non-linguistic disciplines.

We hope this book will be of interest to researchers, teachers and students of English and English for Specific Purposes and also that readers will enjoy it as much as we have done either in writing our chapters or in preparing this edition.

—Isabel Balteiro  
Editor

# **PART I:**

## **ESP AND GENERAL ENGLISH LEXICOLOGY AND LEXICOGRAPHY**



## CHAPTER ONE

# THE ROLE OF INTERDISCIPLINARITY IN LEXICOGRAPHY AND LEXICOLOGY

RAQUEL MARTÍNEZ MOTOS

### Introduction

For the past two decades, both the bilingual *Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos* and the *Diccionario de Términos Económicos*, written by Professor Enrique Alcaraz Varó and Professor Brian Hughes, have become very popular research tools among professionals and students of Law, Economics and Translation and Interpreting from Spanish universities and abroad. In spite of the wide range of specialized bilingual dictionaries subsequently published, the above mentioned have become a referent for other specialized terminological tools.

This was the reason which led Professor Alfonso Domínguez Gil-Hurlé from the University of Salamanca and member of the Royal Academy of Pharmacy to propose Professor Alcaraz the making of a new bilingual English-Spanish dictionary of Pharmaceutical Sciences. After various years of intense work this new dictionary, which followed the same pattern used in the previous works already referred to, was finally published on May 2007 with the title *Terminological Dictionary of Pharmaceutical Sciences (Inglés-Español, Spanish-English)*. During this period two issues intricately related were discussed among the authors: on the one hand, the influence of the concept of interdisciplinarity on specialized language, in this case, on the language of Pharmaceutical Sciences and, on the other hand, the result from the application of this concept to the process of writing specialized bilingual dictionaries that satisfy the needs of a specific type of user.

These issues have some lexicographical implications that will be discussed throughout this contribution, which has been divided into four sections. The first provides a brief description of the concept of interdisciplinarity and its effect on Academic and Professional Languages.

The second explains the way in which it influences Lexicography. The third defines what semantic fields are, their blurred nature and their role in Lexicography. The fourth defines the concept of Lexicology and tackles the classification model of the lexical units of specialized areas with examples from the bilingual Dictionary of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

## **Interdisciplinarity and academic and professional languages**

The first decade of the third millennium can be labelled as the “society of knowledge”. According to Alcaraz (2007) one of the defining features of this society is “interdisciplinarity”, defined as “the interactive fertilization of methods and contents between two or more subjects, in order to produce enhanced and far-reaching results”. Simultaneously, it is widely accepted that nowadays society is also characterized by a tendency towards specialization. As a result, both interdisciplinarity and specialisation have a great influence on what has been named as “Academic and Professional Languages”. This term, coined by Alcaraz (2000) refers to the type of language used by specific knowledge communities or groups of professionals, such as chemists, lawyers, physicians, etc., that share similar values and institutions, and that use the same genres and terminology to communicate. We are aware of the lack of consensus among scholars regarding the boundaries of the concepts transmitted by other terms such as “Language for Specific Purposes” or “Specialized Language”. In order to avoid any controversy, the term “Academic and Professional Language” will be strictly used here to refer to any type of language used in specialised communication, in an academic or professional setting and characterized as having a restricted number of users. Regarding this Alcaraz (2005:5-19) argues that:

“The study of lexicological, lexicographical, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, stylistic, communicative, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, and other aspects of every academic and professional language is still to be done, and to do so we count on the theoretical reflections issued by linguists over the last century. In order to carry out this study in a credible and successful way interdisciplinarity must be advocated, which implies the active involvement of both linguists and specialists” [my translation]

As outlined above, two of the defining features of the society of knowledge are interdisciplinarity and specialization. As a consequence, this type of society promotes the exchange of concepts and methods between specialists in fields that have remained within imaginary

boundaries so far. Hence, the increasing need for tools that enable and facilitate this exchange. Among these, dictionaries stand out as the most important products designed to help their users to solve specific types of linguistic problems mainly arising from the specialized nature of the language and its surrounding social conditions.

The *Terminological Dictionary of Pharmaceutical Sciences (Inglés-Español, Spanish-English)*, by Alcaraz, Domínguez & Martínez (2007), intended to be one of these useful tools. The development of this project was possible thanks to the initiative and sponsorship of the José Casares Gil Foundation of the Spanish Royal Academy of Pharmacy as well as to the institutional, technical and human support of the Interdisciplinary Institute of Applied Modern Languages at the University of Alicante. Likewise, the working team was composed by experts with linguistic and pharmaceutical backgrounds from both institutions, that is, interdisciplinarity was present from the beginning all through its making process.

## **Interdisciplinarity and Lexicography**

In general terms, it is widely acknowledged that Lexicography is a science concerned with compiling, writing and editing dictionaries, as well as developing the principles that govern the process of dictionary making of the general lexicon of a language; while terminography is the discipline that deals with the production of terminological products made up of specialized lexical units or terms.

Nevertheless, from an operational point of view, the borderline between Lexicography and Terminography is considered to be fuzzy, as very often we can find terms or lexical units belonging to a specialized area in general language dictionaries or lexical units from the general lexicon in specialised dictionaries. The main reasons for this interaction are the dynamic nature of language and its subjection to extra-lexicographical social situations. Hence, the transformative approach to Lexicography developed by Bergenholtz & Tarp (1995), known as the *Functional Theory of Lexicography*, which presents Lexicography as an area of social practice and independent science concerned with analysing and building dictionaries that can satisfy the needs of a specific type of user with specific types of problems (Fuentes Olivera 2009:167-187).

“Every specialized dictionary is compiled with a certain user type in mind. From this follows that a profile of the intended users should be drawn up already at the dictionary design stage. At the same time it should be ascertained in which situations the user is intended to benefit from the

dictionary and consequently which types of information should be provided to fulfill the requirements arising in these situations.”

Accordingly, the usefulness of any lexicographical work is only justified by its capacity to cover its users' needs, which should be previously analysed at the dictionary design stage. As far as the specialized bilingual dictionary of Pharmaceutical Sciences is concerned, the authors were conscious that their work had to meet the needs of an interdisciplinary set of potential users. These were classified into four main groups: a) *experts* in the subject matter; b) *semi-experts* from other related fields such as biotechnology, biochemistry, biology, medicine or nursing; c) *learners* of Pharmacy or other related fields and; d) *mediators*, a group made up by translators and interpreters and other communication professionals such as journalists and scientific writers.

Once the would-be users of the dictionary had been established, their potential needs had to be analysed. Regarding experts, it was assumed that they all belong to the same knowledge community, have an adequate understanding of the subject matter (known as *cognitive competence*) but lack the necessary linguistic competence to understand or produce a specialized text in a language other than their mother tongue (even if it belongs to their domain), in our case English or Spanish. Consequently, these users mainly turn to dictionaries in search of linguistic information such as the equivalent for the term or its grammatical and pragmatic use.

As for semi-experts and learners of a specialized domain, in our case Pharmacy or any related field, it was established that their needs slightly differ from those of experts, since their cognitive competence is still more or less limited. Therefore, the conceptual information provided by a definition, the semantic field to which the term belongs or a synonym, can be of great help to their complete understanding of the concept transmitted by the term.

Lastly, it was assumed that mediators have an adequate linguistic competence in at least one foreign language but they lack the necessary cognitive competence. That is, their understanding of the concepts that make up the basic theories of the discipline are unknown to them. However, these assumed linguistic skills in more than one language do not guarantee an efficient transfer of specialized information, which requires the insertion and combination of linguistic entities in the text in accordance with the syntactic and pragmatic conventions of the type of academic and professional language they belong to. As a result, mediators may primarily consult a specialized bilingual dictionary in search of an equivalent and subsequently, for a better understanding of the conceptual information, they may look for a definition or the semantic field to which



the lexical unit belongs. Ultimately, the linguistic information regarding the relationship of the lexical unit with other concepts of the same discipline and its grammatical and pragmatic use can also be of great value for the mediator in the production of efficient texts.

Resulting from this analysis, the authors decided that the microstructure<sup>1</sup> of the dictionary should contain the following elements in order to meet the potential users' needs: (a) the *lemma* or term that is described; (b) the *grammatical category*; (c) the *semantic field*<sup>2</sup> or fields to which it belongs; (d) an *equivalent* of the term in English or Spanish; (e) a clear and concise *definition*; (f) an illustration as a way to contextualize the term and (f) other conceptually-related terms such as *synonyms* or *cross-references* from the same semantic field.

This type of lexicographical work had to be tackled from three different approaches: the understanding and organization of the basic concepts of Pharmaceutical Sciences; the use of language to transmit these concepts and the command of the lexicographical techniques required for the making of a specialized bilingual dictionary. Hence the above mentioned interdisciplinary background of the members of the working team makes sense.

## **Semantic fields and the blurred boundaries of Pharmaceutical Sciences**

At this point, a few aspects about the importance of semantic fields in specialized Lexicography should be highlighted. To begin with, the following question should be answered: what concepts should be assigned to the field of Pharmaceutical Sciences? In accordance with what has been stated in the previous section, Pharmaceutical Sciences are characterized by interdisciplinarity regardless of their highly specialized nature. Despite the difficulty to set clear borders and the overlapping with other disciplines, the establishment of these imaginary boundaries known as "semantic fields" is a key factor in the pre-design stage of any specialized bilingual dictionary. Generally, concepts are classified under subject-matter tags to facilitate the understanding of the specialized area and the relationships between its basic notions. Moreover, semantic fields can be

---

<sup>1</sup> This term refers to the information contained in each entry of the dictionary.

<sup>2</sup> A semantic field is formed by a group of lexical units clustered around a main word by means of sense relations. The most common sense relations are synonymy, antonymy, cause, effect, hyponymy, hyperonymy, implication, etc. (Lyons 1968).

extremely useful to associate lexical units with their most accurate equivalent in case of problematic polysemies.

Accordingly, the lexical units selected and included in the *Terminological Dictionary of Pharmaceutical Sciences (Inglés-Español, Spanish-English)* were classified under the following twenty-five semantic fields:

Semantic Fields	
(1) Pharmaceutical analysis	(14) Physioanatomy
(2) Health care	(15) Phytotherapy
(3) Bioethics	(16) General
(4) Biopharmacy	(17) History
(5) Biology	(18) Nutrition
(6) Biochemistry	(19) Pathology
(7) Biotechnology	(20) Healthcare item
(8) Law	(21)Pharmaceutical chemistry
(9) Cosmetics	(22) Public health
(10) Drug	(23) Safety
(11) Pharmacoeconomics	(24)Pharmaceutical technology
(12) Pharmacology	(25) Toxicology
(13) Pharmacotherapy	

**Table 1-1: Semantic Fields.**

Alcaraz (2005:5-19) points out that semantic fields are open, as their number may be increased, and contingent, as they are clustered around a main word by means of common sense relations, which may also vary. But this lack of a universal and undeviating nature does not imply a lack of stability, given the fact that they are set with the sole purpose of collaborating in the correct understanding of concepts.

## **Interdisciplinarity and Lexicology**

Lexicology can be defined as the discipline aimed at describing the functioning of the lexicon, as well as foreseeing the formation of new lexical units following the systematic and structural criteria of the language.

It is generally assumed that experts on scientific fields such as Pharmaceutical Sciences have no difficulties in understanding specific concepts in a language other than their mother tongue, and that consequently they do not use specialized dictionaries to look for conceptual information. The reason is that there is a general tendency to assume the monosemic and univocal nature of the terms belonging to

those domains, due to the fact that many of them are either borrowings from English or have a Latin or Greek origin and are subject to normalization according to international bodies' conventions.

Nevertheless, not every unit belonging to a specialized area can be labeled as being highly technical and univocal. The categorization model suggested by scholars such as Cabré (1993) and Alcaraz (2000) shows that this is not the case. According to this model, lexical units of any given specialized domain can be classified into three different categories: technical terms, semi-technical terms and general vocabulary frequently used in a specialized domain.

### ***Technical terms***

Also known as *terminology* or *subject specific terms*, they refer to those lexical units exclusively used by a given knowledge community in a specific domain, preferably in those technical and scientific areas defined as “hard”, such as (physics, chemistry, mathematics, engineering, etc.). These units are subject to a higher degree of normalization and are characterized by univocity and accuracy. As their usage is confined to a specific context, they usually can be found in specialized dictionaries or glossaries. A few examples from the field of Pharmacy are *antibiotic*, *antidiuretic*, *calamine*, *digoxine*, *ointment*, *sedative*, etc.

### ***Semi-technical terms***

This group is composed by terms that come from the general language but have acquired one or more different meanings when used within a specific area. Thus, their usage is not confined to a specific scientific or technical context as it is usually common to several fields. As a result, semi-technical terms are subject to polysemy, mainly due to the extension of meaning through processes of analogy. This is the case of the following terms in the field of Pharmacy:

**absorption**<sup>1</sup> (GRAL absorción; captación, retención; esta acepción general es sinónima parcial de *soaking up*, *swallowing up*, *taking in*, *drinking in*, etc. ◇ *The absorption of water by a sponge*; V. *cost absorption*), **absorption**<sup>2</sup> (FARMACOLOGÍA absorción; se refiere al paso o movimiento de un fármaco a la circulación sanguínea —*bloodstream*— a través de las barreras de absorción ◇ *Decongestants may affect the absorption of paracetamol*; V. *uptake*; *input*, *rate of input*, *disposition*; *dissolution*; *active absorption*, *facilitated absorption*, *passive absorption*, *pharmacokinetics*; *bioavailability*; *absorption rate*; *passive transport*; *active transport*, *area under the curve*; *effervescence*, *atomic absorption spectrometry*, *impaired absorption*), **absorption**<sup>3</sup> (FARMACOLOGÍA

reabsorción; alude a la eliminación de tejidos o depósitos ◇ *This medicine promotes the absorption of the new formed substances*; V. *absorbefacient, reabsorption*), **absorption**<sup>4</sup> (FARMACOECONOMÍA absorción, adquisición hegemónica de una empresa por otra; V. *amalgamation, integration, combination, merger; take-over*),

**discharge**<sup>1</sup> n/v: GRAL descarga; descargar; V. *unload, empty; charge*. [Exp: **discharge**<sup>2</sup> (FARMACOTERAPIA liberar ◇ *A spray discharges a fine jet of liquid from a pressurized container*; V. *release, deliver, eject*), **discharge**<sup>3</sup> (TECNO FARM descarga [de un aerosol]; en esta acepción es sinónimo de *delivery y de spray*), **discharge**<sup>4</sup> (GRAL flujo, secreción; segregar, secretar ◇ *His stomach discharged digestive juices normally*; V. *secretion; issue; ear discharge; sniffle; flow; secrete; astringent*), **discharge**<sup>5</sup> (GRAL emisión; emitir; expulsar ◇ *Phlegms are discharged through the mouth*—; V. *gas discharge*), **discharge**<sup>6</sup> (GRAL/FARMACOTERAPIA supuración; supurar ◇ *The purulent discharge from a wound*; V. *suppuration, pus discharge; discharging*), **discharge**<sup>7</sup> (GRAL/FARMACOTERAPIA derrame ◇ *A haemorrhage is an abundant discharge of blood from the blood vessels*), **discharge**<sup>8</sup> (GRAL/FARMACOTERAPIA excreción, excretar ◇ *Diuretics increase urine discharge*; V. *excrete, excretion*), **discharge**<sup>9</sup> (FISIO ANAT defecación; V. *stool, defecation*), **discharge**<sup>10</sup> (FISIO ANAT flujo vaginal, también llamado *vaginal discharge*; V. *menstrual flow*), **discharge**<sup>11</sup> (ASIST SANIT alta hospitalaria; V. *absolute discharge, patient discharge, discharge by transfer, discharge from hospital*),

### Figure 1-1: Semi-technical Terms

#### General vocabulary

This group is made up of the general vocabulary used in a specialized context without losing their original meaning. According to Alcaraz (2004:201-219) this type of lexical unit contributes to a better and more comprehensive understanding of the basic concepts of the specialized field. The following are examples of general vocabulary words commonly used in the field of Pharmaceutical Sciences:

**effect**<sup>1</sup> n: GRAL resultado, influencia, efecto, consecuencias, repercusión ◇ *The effect on pharmaceutical companies of computer-aided design*; V. *result*. [Exp: **effect**<sup>2</sup> (FARMACOTERAPIA efecto, resultado, consecuencias; los fármacos pueden producir efectos beneficiosos —*beneficial*—, nocivos —*harmful*—, terapéuticos —*therapeutic*—, agonistas —*agonist*—, antagonistas —*antagonist*—, —biológicos— *biologic*—, o tóxicos —*toxic*—; V. *outcome, acute effect; cause; action; result, consequence upshot, aftereffect, aftermath, sequel, issue, indices of effect, event, work*), **effect**<sup>3</sup> (GRAL producir, causar, efectuar, realizar, llevar a cabo, poner en ejecución ◇ *Specific genes effect specific bodily characters*; V. *produce*), **effect**<sup>4</sup>

(GRAL sentido, tenor; se emplea en expresiones como *to the effect that* —con el sentido de—, *to this effect* —a estos efectos, en este sentido—, etc.), **effect**<sup>5</sup> (FARMACOTERAPIA eficacia; sobre todo, en la expresión *indices of effect* —índices de eficacia— ◇ *Hospital pharmacists monitor the outcome of drug therapy —based upon indices of effect*; V. *effectiveness*), **effect**<sup>6</sup> (GRAL vigencia; se usa en expresiones como *be in effect* —regir, tener vigencia, estar vigente o en vigor—, *with effect from* —con efectos desde, vigente a partir de—, etc.).

**ingredient**<sup>1</sup> *n*: GRAL ingrediente. [Exp: **ingredient**<sup>2</sup> (TECNO FARM ingrediente, principio, componente; V. *active ingredient, principle, element, constituent*)].

**substance**<sup>1</sup> *n*: GRAL sustancia; V. *matter, material*. [Exp: **substance**<sup>2</sup> (TOXICOLOGÍA sustancia tóxica, droga ◇ *Substance abuse is more strongly disapproved than overeating or fast-driving*; V. *controlled drugs*)].

### Figure 1-2: General Vocabulary

Once the above classification has been established, it must also be pointed out that polysemy arises as a result of the growing interdisciplinarity, as it not only takes place at a semi-technical level within one knowledge area (by the addition of new senses to the traditional general meaning), but also between different specialized domains. The following examples may illustrate this point:

**capsule**,<sup>1</sup> **cap** *n*: FISIO ANAT cápsula; membrana en forma de saco cerrado —*a saclike membrane*—, que tapiza —*lining*— las superficies de varios órganos ◇ *The capsule of the kidney*. [Exp: **capsule**,<sup>2</sup> **cap** (TECNO FARM cápsula; forma farmacéutica sólida de administración oral que contiene una dosis de fármaco —*a dose of medicine*— y rellenos adecuados —*appropriate fillers*— encerrados en una vaina de gelatina blanda o dura —*soft or hard gelatine shell*—, normalmente dos mitades unidas a presión —*two halves pushed together*— ◇ *A capsule usually performs better than a tablet*; V. *coated capsule, delayed release capsule, extended release capsule, film-coated capsule, gelatin coated capsule, liquid-filled capsule, hard shell capsules, soft elastic capsules, implanted drug-releasing capsule; caplet; tablet; choke; encapsulate*),

**impaction**<sup>1</sup> (TECNO FARM impactación; es un método para reducir el tamaño de las partículas; V. *hammer mill*), **impaction**<sup>2</sup> (PATOL retención fecal; alude a una masa endurecida de heces —*a mass of hardened faeces*— alojada en el intestino —*lodged in the intestine*—, que impide la defecación —*impede defecation*—; V. *loose bowels, faecal softener, light stools*)

**pacemaker**<sup>1</sup> (PROD SANIT marcapasos; se trata de un dispositivo artificial —*artificial device*— que regula el ritmo cardiaco —*regulates the rhythm of the heart*— ◇ *A pacemaker is a medical device*; V. *heart pacemaker*), **pacemaker**<sup>2</sup> (BIOLOGÍA marcapasos; sistema u órgano que se comporta —*behaves*— como centro regulador —*regulating centre*— de funciones fisiológicas que se repiten —*recurring physiological functional*— de forma cíclica —*in a cyclical manner*—), **pacemaker**<sup>3</sup>, **pacesetter** (FARMACOECONOMÍA líder que marca la pauta ◇ *American pharmaceuticals have been the pacesetters of research in antiinflammatory drugs in the world*; V. *trendsetter*)

**Figure 1-3: Polysemy**

These examples show that, despite their assumed knowledge of specific conceptual information, expert users may have difficulties when it comes to choosing the most accurate equivalent of a polysemic technical term, even if it belongs to their knowledge area. Consequently, the microstructure of any specialized bilingual dictionary aiming to fulfill the needs of the potential users described in the previous section, should assign a semantic field to each of the meanings of a given term.

## Concluding remarks

As the above arguments show, nowadays society is marked by interdisciplinarity, which means that the boundaries between disciplines are blurred. Two consequences can be drawn for Lexicography: on the one hand, bilingual specialized dictionaries should be made by an interdisciplinary working team composed of lexicographers and specialists on the chosen topic. On the other hand, the potential users' needs should be carefully analysed at the pre-design stage in order to produce lexicographical tools that provide useful information and serve their purpose.

Although it is considered to be a highly scientific discipline, Pharmacy is not an exception, given the interdisciplinary nature of the semantic fields under which its lexical units can be classified and the taxonomy of the potential users of a bilingual specialized dictionary on this topic. What is more, polysemy is frequent among semi-technical terms, often between different knowledge areas. In all these cases, the subject-matter tag provided by semantic fields has proved to be a basic tool to help the user identify the most accurate equivalent in the target language.

## Bibliography

- Alcaraz, E. 2000. *El inglés profesional y académico*. Madrid: Alianza.
- . 2004. “Anisomorfismo y lexicografía técnica”. In *Las palabras del traductor*, coordinated by L. González and P. Hernández, 201-219. Bruselas: Esletra.
- . 2005: “El lenguaje de la farmacia. Lexicología y lexicografía”. In *Thistles. A Homage to Brian Hughes*, edited by J. Mateo and F. Yus, 5-18. Alicante: Universidad de Alicante.
- . 2007. “Consciousness in Life and Law”. Paper presented at *30th Congress for the International Academy of Law and Mental Health*. Padua, June 2007.
- Alcaraz, E. and B. Hughes. 2003. *Diccionario de términos jurídicos inglés-español, Spanish-English*. 7th ed. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Alcaraz, E. and B. Hughes. 2008. *Diccionario de términos económicos, financieros y comerciales inglés-español, Spanish-English*. 5th ed. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Alcaraz, E., A. Domínguez, and R. Martínez. 2007. *Diccionario Terminológico de Ciencias Farmacéuticas (Inglés-Español, Spanish-English)*. *Terminological Dictionary of Pharmaceutical Sciences (Inglés- Español, Spanish-English)*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Bergenholtz, H., and S. Tarp. 1995. *Manual of Specialised Lexicography: the Preparation of Specialised Dictionaries*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cabré, M. T. 1993. *La terminología*. Barcelona: Antàrtica/Empúries.
- Lyons, J. 1968. *Structural Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P. A. 2009. “Specialised Lexicography for Learners: Specific Proposals for the Construction of Pedagogically-oriented Printed Business Dictionaries”. *Hermes. Journal of Language and Communication Studies* 42: 167-188.





# CHAPTER TWO

## AN OVERVIEW OF THE EVOLUTION OF ENGLISH LEXICOGRAPHY IN THE INDUSTRIES OF LEISURE AND TOURISM

MARIÁN ALESÓN

### Introduction

The definition of ESP as a branch of scientific interest in the field of Applied Linguistics between the 1970's and the 1980's brought up a generalised enthusiasm in the description and analysis of many different types of specialized languages (Dudley-Evans & St John 1998:199-297, Hutchinson & Waters 1987:1-4, Kennedy & Bolitho 1984:6-10, or Swales 1990:2-4)<sup>1</sup>. Nevertheless, these languages were not defined by a mere linguistic interest. In fact, their definition was demanded by the *Discourse Communities* (Widdowson 1998:6-13) that employed those languages and, therefore, needed learning and linguistic tools that would render their professional communication effective. As J. Herbert states in his pioneering textbook on Technical English (1965:v) his work:

“[...] is intended for foreign engineers or students [...] who have already mastered the elements of English, and who now want to use their knowledge of the language to read books on their own subjects [...]”

As we can assume from the previous statements, one of the key features that characterizes specialized languages is its close relation to the needs of the Discourse Communities that use them. Indeed, most of the times they are defined on didactic grounds as the students of a particular field of knowledge need the language to become part of these communities. It is evident that students are non-initiates and, thus, require specific

---

<sup>1</sup> Robinson (1980:5) dates the first conference on ESP in 1969.

training on the language and communication conventions of their future professional environments:

“[...] the language learner, in order to be able to operate effectively as a participant in a discourse, needs to be able both to identify what type of discourse he or she is involved in, and to predict how it will typically be structured [...]” (Cook 1993<sup>4</sup>:49)

As a result, the study of a given ESP has always been preceded by a thorough analysis of the language use of a particular Discourse Community and of its communication needs. This work was and is still performed by lexicographers and discourse analysts who interview informants, visit professional settings and together with research on *realia*, finally, draw conclusions on the specific use of lexicon, syntax, structure, and genre. This approach was revealed as a completely new methodology both in the study of language and in the making of dictionaries (Alcaraz 2000:190-4, Hutchinson & Waters 1987:53-64, Flowerdew 2001:178-9, Robinson 1980:40, Widdowson 1979:251). Samuel Johnson, for instance, in his preface to the *English Dictionary* (1755) states the impossibility of performing such a task for a general dictionary in the 18<sup>th</sup> century:

“That many terms of art and manufacture are omitted, must be frankly acknowledged; but for this defect I may boldly allege that it was unavoidable: I could not visit caverns to learn the miner’s language, nor take a voyage to perfect my skill in the dialect of navigation.”

In former studies only the languages of Science and Technology were found to justify enough divergence from general language to be considered ESP. At that time linguistic specificity was focused primarily on lexicon variation which was realised through the classification of the specific vocabulary in mainly two fundamental blocks (Alcaraz 2000:42-3, Kennedy & Bolitho, 1984:57-58, Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998:80-83): *technical* and *semi-technical*. Technical or highly technical vocabulary is still defined as the lexicon belonging to a subject speciality, whereas semi-technical vocabulary consists of words and expressions that belong to the general-core vocabulary of a language but that are frequently employed on a given specialized field with an added specific sense (Alcaraz 2000:44, Kennedy & Bolitho 1984:57-8). Furthermore, specialized lexicon had to comply, as a result, with the ideas of *univocity* and *prescription*; that is to say, there is one word (or lexical unit) per concept and a discourse community that prescribes that relation as such.

As regards learning, the focal point was set on reading skills, as it was considered that future professionals in Science and Technology fields barely need other linguistic skills, inasmuch as they just required ESP to understand specialized books and manuals. These learners were described as “a new generation of language learners who knew specifically why they were learning a language” (Kachru 1985:221)<sup>2</sup>.

Some of these previous assertions have already been superseded by recent research and studies (Cabr  2001:389 and 2007:86-92). In particular, as regards learning, modern theories on acquisition see language from a holistic point of view and have established communication as the cornerstone in learning, thus overcoming the notion that only reading skills were the major focus of ESP learning. Similarly in linguistics, modern notions from *Pragmatics* (Alcaraz 2000), from *Functional Grammar* (Castello 2002), or from *Discourse Analysis* (Bhatia 1993, Bhatia & Gotti 2006, Swales 1990 and 2004) have been applied to the study of ESP and have greatly changed hackneyed assumptions.

Vocabulary, for instance, is not just regarded under the two-fold classification of technical and semi-technical language. On the contrary, there is a strong interest by researchers to analyse the non-specific vocabulary from the general-core language that is conventionally employed in specific professional or academic contexts at high frequently rates. In the particular case of Tourism, some researchers have pointed out the importance of the use of qualitative adverbs and adjectives in tourism texts (Alcaraz et al. 2006:xv, Castello 2002:2, Francesconi 2007:90-93, Manca 2007:120-7, Nigro 2006:54-55, or Calvi 2006:85). In addition, concepts such as *univocity* or *prescription* have been challenged as the analysis of meanings in context has revealed the possibility of *polysemy* and *ambiguity* (Alcaraz 2000:42, Cabr  2001:4, or Gotti 2008:46).

Concerning syntax, most of the research done highlights the notion of the existence of certain grammatical and syntactical traits that are more frequently used than others (Alcaraz 2000:30, Castello 2002:35-50, Nigro 2006:57-62), and reinforces the idea that it is very difficult to find syntactic structures whose use is essentially specific. Thus, ESP with regard to syntax abides by the same syntactic rules of general language, notwithstanding the fact that they establish a certain preference for some

---

<sup>2</sup> Kachru (1985:221) makes this statement about the learners of, what he calls, *New Englishes*, but if we also consider ESP as an example of language variation, this definition could be extended to ESP learners as well.

structures<sup>3</sup>. Furthermore, recent studies, from a Corpus Linguistic Analysis trend, have demonstrated that some syntactic structures are activated and determined by *lexical priming* (Hoey & O'Donnell 2008:295), that is to say, by the choice of the lexicon through collocation, colligation and semantic preferences. Consequently, lexicon is given again a preferred status in ESP studies (Cabr   2007:87).

From the perspective of Discourse Analysis, a key development in the study of ESP has been introduced by the Genre Theory (Bhatia 1993 and 2006, Swales 1990 and 2004). This approach conveys a framework of analysis that can provide linguistic evidence for the use of specific language in a specific setting and for specific goals. In fact, they retake the idea of *Discourse Community* and state that this community is really defined by the linguistic genres they share. Under this view, discourse communities are (Swales 1990:9).

“[...] sociorhetorical networks that are formed in order to work towards sets of common goals. One of the characteristics that established members of these discourse communities possess is familiarity with particular genres that are used in the communicative furtherance of those sets of goals.”

Summarizing, modern perspectives have gone back to the idea that context in professional and academic settings determine, in a way, the language we use. In addition, the driving force that demands the definition and description of ESP does not depend exclusively on learning outcomes, but also on the ideal of effective communication both in written and oral settings.

Particularly, in the case of the language of Tourism and Leisure Industries, the unclear definition of the professional context in which this language is employed has influenced the late definition of this language as ESP. On the one hand, the academic interest arose later, as was also the case with other non-technical or non-scientific languages. On the other, the status of tourism as a field of academic research is also recent and still there is “fuzziness” in its definitions and concepts (Burns & Holden 1995, Cooper et al. 2008:5). Nevertheless, there are sufficient linguistic, economic, pedagogical and historical reasons to justify its existence as a professional language clearly differing from Business English.

From an economic point of view, tourism is a major sector and in some geographical regions it is the primary income source. Following the

---

<sup>3</sup> In the case of the language of Tourism, for instance, it is worth mentioning the high frequent use of nominal phrases (Alcaraz 2000:31-2, Calvi 2006:61, or Nigro 2006:57-8).

UNWTO (2010), it is estimated that in 2009 “international tourism generated US \$ 852 billion (€ 611 billion) in export earnings.” In fact, due to the importance of tourism in global economies, it is essential, from a pedagogical perspective, to provide the work-force<sup>4</sup> with a first-class professional training. In this sense language is a key issue as tourism activities are essentially performed through communication between the tourist and the provider of the service<sup>5</sup>.

Furthermore, from a historical stand, tourism activities are as old as time. Although modern tourism just dates back to the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, after the Second World War, travellers have always existed and, thus, a necessity for bilingual glossaries and dictionaries. The first written accounts of what we could consider tourism in the ancient world could be traced back to the festivals of Olympia, Athens, Eleusis<sup>6</sup> or Eupidauros<sup>7</sup>. In some of them panhellenic events draw thousands of visitors (Dann 1996:69). In medieval times, for instance, pilgrimages, celebrations, or hangings attracted the interest of travellers and visitors. It is worth to mention that in some medieval history treatises, such as Nennius’ *Historia Brittonum* (2005:67) written in the 9<sup>th</sup> century, lists of worth visiting sites, called sites of wonder, are found together with a description of their attractiveness or somewhat “miraculous” features:

“IST ALIUD MIRABILE IN REGIONE CINLIPLUC. ES TIBI FONS NOMINE FINNAUN GUUR HELIC; NON FLUI RIVUS IN EO, NEQUE EX EO. VADUNT HOMINES PISCARI AD FONTEM, ALII VADUNT IN FONTEM AD PARTEM ORIENTIS ET DEDUCUNT PISCES EX EA PARTE.”<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Following UNWTO data on global employment from 2009: “Tourism’s contribution to employment tends to be slightly higher and is estimated in the order of 6-7% of the overall number of jobs (direct and indirect)” (UNWTO 2009).

<sup>5</sup> Indeed, for some experts in the sociology of tourism, this economic activity is considered essentially linguistic (see Dann (1997:249) in his seminal work *The Language of Tourism*).

<sup>6</sup> Ancient Eleusina (Greece), site of the celebration of the *Eleusian Mysteries* in honour of the goddess Demeter and her daughter Persephone (Schmitz 1875:452-454).

<sup>7</sup> Site of *Asclepeion*, one of the capital healing centres of Ancient Greece devoted to *Aesclepius*.

<sup>8</sup> “There is another Wonder in the region of Cinlipiuc. There is a well there called the fountain Guur Helic; no stream flows into it, nor flows out. Men go to the well to fish, some go to the well from the east, others from the north and from the east, and they match fish from each of these sides” (Translation from Nennius 2005:67).

Consistently, we can assume there has always been a need for certain specific terminology both from the part of the ancient and the modern tourist; a need that merely began with the specialized terms related to travel and transport to a wider demand ranging from accommodation and facilities terms, to more specific vocabulary related with many sub-categories such as health, art, tourism management, geography, law, marketing, sports, catering, climate, entertainment, insurance, etc.<sup>9</sup> As the analysis has shown, it is important to highlight that this set of terminology and vocabulary has not been stable through history. On the contrary, it has evolved at the same pace as the Tourism Industry, thus creating new communication needs among all the stakeholders involved in tourism interaction (namely, travellers, tourists, service providers, natives, governments, etc.).

This paper posits that tourism lexicon has evolved through time adapting to new developments and to the discourse community needs. Thanks to this evolution, specialized dictionaries and glossaries have also been adapted to these demands and, thus, modern works comply the evolution of both tourism and applied linguistics with the specific needs of the Discourse Community to which it is aimed.

## Methodology

For the present study a selection of dictionaries<sup>10</sup>, glossaries and phrase-books have been selected (see Table 2-1: List of Dictionaries and Glossaries). No dictionary published before 19<sup>th</sup> century has been analysed, with the exception of James Howell's *Tetraglotton* from 1660, as specialized lexicography did not really start to develop in its modern sense until the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when the development of manufacture and new industries demanded for an extended coverage of their fields that could not be met by general language dictionaries. James Howell's dictionary of 1660 could be considered a pioneering work<sup>11</sup>.

This corpus selection does not attempt to be exhaustive, but rather to offer a glimpse of the different features of each lexicographic work, together with a description of its relation with the discourse community

---

<sup>9</sup> See Alcaraz (2006<sup>2</sup>:xiii) for an exhaustive categorization of tourism fields of knowledge.

<sup>10</sup> All the dictionaries from the 17<sup>th</sup> to the 19<sup>th</sup> century are part of the records of the British Library, London.

<sup>11</sup> Father Esteban de Terreros finished in 1787 a pioneer multilingual dictionary that integrated terms from the Arts, Sciences, Commerce, and Manufacture.