

**SNELL-HORNBY, Mary and Esther PÔHL (Eds.) (1989):
Translation and Lexicography. Kirksville, Missouri, Division of
Language and Literature, Northeast Missouri State University,
238 p.**

Roda P. Roberts

Volume 36, Number 4, décembre 1991

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/003959ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/003959ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (print)

1492-1421 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Roberts, R. P. (1991). Review of [SNELL-HORNBY, Mary and Esther PÔHL (Eds.) (1989): *Translation and Lexicography*. Kirksville, Missouri, Division of Language and Literature, Northeast Missouri State University, 238 p.] *Meta*, 36(4), 677–678. <https://doi.org/10.7202/003959ar>

- SNELL-HORNBY, Mary and Esther PÖHL (Eds.) (1989): *Translation and Lexicography*. Kirksville, Missouri, Division of Language and Literature, Northeast Missouri State University, 238 p.

This work consists of a collection of papers read at the EURALEX Colloquium "Translation and Lexicography" held in Innsbruck in July 1987. This colloquium for specialists, organized by the European Lexicography Association (EURALEX) in cooperation with the Institute of Translating and Interpreting at the University of Innsbruck, was called to identify the special reference needs of professional and trainee translators, which existing dictionaries are criticized for not fulfilling. Out of the twenty-one papers presented during the colloquium, nineteen (12 in English, 7 in German) have been published in this work. They represent the point of view of practising translators and professors of translation. They are arranged in four sections according to topics: I. Language, the Dictionary and Translation; II. Dictionaries and Literary Translation; III. The Dictionary as a Tool in Translation; and IV. Specialized Translation and Lexicography. The fifth and final section of the book presents the concluding session of the Colloquium, during which translators were joined by lexicographers to sum up what each group could reasonably expect from the other.

A number of different themes are touched upon in this work. Among them are the main differences between dictionary-making and translating; an alternate way of analyzing the semantic substance of synonyms or stylistic variants; the lexicographic treatment of translation-specific items (i.e. items which are taken from translations and are "marked" from the point of view of distribution in relation to their habitual unmarked counterparts in the target language); the limitations of dictionaries for literary translation; the use of context and unilingual source language dictionaries in translation; and dictionary planning and publishing in the Soviet Union.

The articles range from highly theoretical (e.g. Paul di Virgilio's "The Dictionary's Role as Semantic Universe in the Genesis and Translation of the Literary Work") to very practical (e.g. Paul Kussmal's "Kontext und einsprachiges Wörterbuch in der Übersetzer Ausbildung"). Some deal with lexical items in general, others focus more particularly on specific types of lexical items (collocations and expressions, culture-bound terms, etc.). Some deal specifically with bilingual dictionaries, while others treat unilingual dictionaries as well. While most papers concentrate on dictionaries for human translation, one (Wolfram Wilss's) specifically treats dictionaries for machine translation.

The very different themes, dictionary types and lexical elements covered in the papers, along with the variety of approaches taken by the contributors, leaves the reader with the impression of a certain lack of unity in this work. However, despite this problem — which is typical of many conference proceedings — a certain number of points of agreement emerge from the nineteen papers. (1) Most existing bilingual dictionaries are inadequate for the needs of professional translators. (2) Dictionaries (both monolingual and unilingual) are particularly deficient in their treatment of certain types of lexical items such as free collocations and culture-bound elements. (3) Adequate examples are most important in dictionaries, with literary citations being particularly necessary for the literary translator. (4) To better respond to user needs, dictionaries will have to become more descriptive and include more conceptual and linguistic information in different forms (glosses, explanations, pictures, etc.).

More important perhaps are a certain number of observations made during the final discussion session of the Colloquium, presented in Section V of the collection. They can be summed up as follows. *Translators have some very high expectations of lexicographers. Yet both the "ideal dictionary" and the "ideal translation" are utopian. It is, in fact,*

dangerous to speak of the ideal dictionary. We should, instead, be talking about the ideal dictionary for a particular user. Taking into consideration the diversity of language combinations and types of translation, and the fact that some translators work into their dominant language while others work into their second language, there is a need for a number of different dictionaries for any given language pair. That is the message that comes out clearly in the conclusion.

Lexicographers, who are increasingly taking the user perspective into account, will certainly profit from reading this work, in which several contributors have stated precise dictionary needs for translation. However, translators must not forget that lexicographers are subject to the constraints of money and time — a fact largely ignored in the articles presented here. Perhaps another colloquium, this one presenting the lexicographer's problems to the translator, could help the two groups better understand each other and thus further bridge the gap between translation and lexicography.

RODA P. ROBERTS