

# Translating and Learning the Language of Tourism as LSP: Corpus-based Approaches

*Stefania Gandin*

doi: 10.7359/791-2016-gand

*Keywords:* corpus linguistics, language of tourism, LSP teaching and LSP translation.

## 1. CORPUS LINGUISTICS, TRANSLATION AND LSP TEACHING: A GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The application of corpus linguistics to descriptive and applied translation studies represents nowadays a consolidated – but still evolving – research trend. Before the nineties but also afterwards, the vast majority of stylistics and corpus linguistics studies excluded translations from the material to be analysed, since translated texts were merely considered as alternative versions of original texts written in other languages. To date, the application of corpus linguistics methodologies to the study of translation has mainly addressed the study of different textual genres translated into and from English, through research projects aimed at identifying practices and universal norms characterising the translation of general language (cf. Baker 1993, 1995, 1996 and 2000; Laviosa 1998, 2002; Tymoczko 1998; Olohan and Baker 2000; Zanettin 2000 and 2012; Johansson 2003; Mauranen and Kuyamaki 2004; Olohan 2004), the translation of LSPs<sup>1</sup> and even the stylistic features of individual translators (cf. Hermans 1996; Baker 2000; Kenny 2001; Bosseaux 2004). However, the amount and size

---

<sup>1</sup> Amongst the largest and most important translational corpus-based projects we can recall the CEXI, the COMPARA (which are parallel corpora dedicated mainly or exclusively to fictional texts) or the ENPC, the MLCC, the TEC, and the TRANSEARCH (parallel, monolingual or comparable translational corpora containing a larger variety of textual typologies, including fictional and LSP texts).

of corpora dedicated to the translation of LSPs are still rather limited, particularly when considering the didactic potential offered by corpus-based methodologies to the study and teaching of LSP as L2 and the relating translational methods. As defined by Gotti (1991, 2003) and other scholars (cf. Balboni 2000; Bowker and Pearson 2002; Calvi 2003; Scarpa 2007), an LSP represents a language used to discuss any type of specialist field of knowledge, ranging from professional activities to recreational hobbies. LSPs are characterised by highly specific lexical, syntactic, morphological, stylistic and pragmatic features that are used mostly (or almost exclusively) in specialist communicative situations, such as experts-to-experts interactions, experts-to-semi-experts interactions, or experts-to-non-experts interactions. LSP teaching requires different approaches with respect to general language teaching, particularly in contexts of L2 learners. The development of the four basic skills of language competence (i.e. reading, listening, speaking and writing) outlined in the Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR) needs to be achieved not only focusing on a proficient lexical acquisition, but also providing students with the ability to access, understand and employ the cultural concepts and sociolinguistic features shared by a specialist discourse community, thus including the intercultural, stylistics and pragmatic conventions characterising the discursive patterns of any LSP (Calvi 2003). Another important issue to be taken into account when teaching an LSP as a foreign language relates to the fact that students cannot be considered as real members of the specialist discourse community they plan to join, since they do not share the same status of the professionals already composing that community. Therefore, the choice of materials to be employed in class needs to be undertaken on the basis of their “pedagogical suitability” (Denti e Fodde 2012, 39) and linguistic databases represent valid didactic tools to reach this goal, since they can provide authentic materials for the analysis of real linguistic scenarios in terms of genres, registers, stylistic conventions, concurrently with accurate and contextualised terminological resources, thus supporting teachers in the development of intercultural mediation skills, which represent an essential requirement for anyone willing to learn how to communicate within a specific field of knowledge in a foreign language. As pointed out by Calvi (2003), intercultural mediation skills applied to the teaching and learning of LSP as a foreign language can successfully be achieved through translation. Lately, in fact, language teaching researches have started to re-evaluate translation as a didactic method, considering it as a fifth ability to be developed in L2 learning contexts, besides the four basic skills outlined in the CEFR. However, translation has long been

considered as a mistaken and highly suspect teaching method, particularly by the exponents of the natural/communicative methods of language learning and teaching: this perspective rests on the idea of languages as independent, separate systems, and the presupposition that only by being fully immersed in a particular language system without any L1 (translational) interference, will the student be able to learn, comprehend and master the structures of a foreign language. Nevertheless, translation is an unavoidable process in the teaching and learning of any foreign language and LSP, if only for the cerebral effort involved on the part of the student, who mediates through mental translations all the new linguistic and cultural information embedded in the process of learning a new language. Recent research approaches (cf. Calvi 2003; Scarpa 2007; Balboni 2010; Cook 2010; Randaccio 2012; Pym et al. 2013) have demonstrated that translation can actually be a useful and effective teaching method that allows students a better understanding and development of the intercultural, pragmatic and conceptual knowledge of any foreign language and any LSP. The recognition of the pedagogical value of translation is stated also in the CEFR that, indeed, repeatedly mentions translation as one of the main methods to be developed when teaching and learning a foreign language, with the aim of enabling students to fully become “plurilingual and intercultural, in the sense of being able to mediate between different languages and cultures” (Pym, Malmkjær, and Del Mar Gutiérrez-Colón Plana 2013, 28), as stated in the following passages:

*The language learner/user's communicative language competence is activated in the performance of the various language activities, involving reception, production, interaction or mediation (in particular interpreting or translating). (CEFR 2001, 14; my emphasis)*

*The learner does not simply acquire two distinct, unrelated ways of acting and communicating. The language learner becomes plurilingual and develops interculturality. The linguistic and cultural competences in respect of each language are modified by knowledge of the other and contribute to intercultural awareness, skills and know-how. They enable the individual to develop an enriched, more complex personality and an enhanced capacity for further language learning and greater openness to new cultural experiences. Learners are also enabled to mediate, through interpretation and translation, between speakers of the two languages concerned who cannot communicate directly. (CEFR 2001, 43; my emphasis)*

*[...] the main objective of teaching a foreign language (even though not made apparent) was refinement of knowledge and mastery of the native language (e.g. by resorting to translation, work on registers and the appropriateness of vocabulary in*

*translating into the native language, forms of comparative stylistics and semantics).*  
(CEFR 2001, 136; my emphasis)

The use of translation in the fostering of intercultural mediation skills is particularly relevant when teaching and learning tourism discourse as LSP. In particular, at higher levels of education, such as university language degree courses and translation studies curricula, the development of advanced and accurate linguistic skills in tourism discourse as L2 necessitates tools that can provide up-to-date and authentic linguistic data, and in this perspective corpus linguistics methods may represent a valid and fairly easily accessible didactic resource.

## 2. TEACHING THE LANGUAGE OF TOURISM AND ITS TRANSLATION: CORPUS-BASED DIDACTIC PROPOSALS

On the basis of these theoretical premises, the following sections will present some corpus-based didactic proposals aimed at intermediate and advanced learners of English tourism discourse as LSP (B2/C1 level) involving 3 specific didactic scenarios:

1. *teaching English tourism discourse*, its features and properties, by using authentic materials coming from monolingual specialised corpora with the aim of exploring the different aspects of the language of tourism in terms of its main linguistic, stylistic and pragmatic properties, such as specific verbal techniques, communicative functions, etc.;
2. *teaching how to translate English tourist texts*, by employing parallel or even monolingual translational corpora in order to identify the main translational features and/or the most/least successful translational strategies used in tourist texts, through comparative analyses of specific concordances and collocations and other corpus-based parameters (e.g. lexical density, type-token ratios, etc.);
3. *teaching corpus linguistics methodologies* and, in particular, *corpus linguistics applied to translation studies*, by using monolingual (including monolingual translational corpora) and parallel corpora of tourist texts, in order to make learners familiar with corpus linguistics methodologies, notions, design criteria, technical tools, resources and procedures for the interpretation of data.

To demonstrate the potential application of these activities, the study will focus on a selection of concordances and collocates of a specific key-lemma [i.e. *landscape(s)*] related to one of the most important semantic

areas of tourist discourse: the description of tourism settings. It will be outlined how this kind of corpus-based materials, if used as a pedagogical resource, allow language learners to observe in context and learn some of the main properties, most and least successful translational strategies and universals of translation characterising the language of tourism as LSP.

### 2.1. *Teaching English tourism discourse*

As previously mentioned, the language of tourism represents a multi-dimensional LSP with its own pragmatic, lexical and syntactic features, linked to and influenced by other specialist languages. In educational contexts in which the learning of English tourism discourse as LSP represents a primary teaching objective, monolingual specialised corpora may be utilised as a valid resource to explore the different aspects of the language of tourism in terms of its linguistic, stylistic and pragmatic properties. By exploiting the authentic data included in this type of corpora, a teacher can effectively explain and show in context the typical characteristics of the language of tourism, such as those outlined by Dann (1996) or Gotti (2006) in the models below (*Tabs. 1 and 2*).

By means of corpus linguistics software (such as Wordsmith or Ant-Conc etc.) a teacher – and even students themselves – could explore and collect a large amount of textual data to be presented and analysed in class as valid and authentic references for the acquisition of the typical linguistic structures that any (prospective) expert in tourism communication should be able to master. A teacher could focus, for instance, on the description of tourist landscape by retrieving the most relevant collocates and collocations of relating key lemmas [i.e. *landscape(s)*, *scenery(ies)* and so on]. In this way, students will be given the opportunity to analyse contextualised sentences in which the main properties of the language of tourism are at work, such as those outlined in the following examples taken from a monolingual corpus of promotional tourism texts written originally in English (namely the TourEC – *Tourism English Corpus*<sup>2</sup>) and the English

---

<sup>2</sup> TourEC is a monolingual corpus of tourist texts originally written in English. It was compiled between 2011 and 2012 as part of a multilingual research project carried out at the Department of Humanities and Social Studies of the University of Sassari (Italy), focusing on the concept of authentic communication in tourism. TourEC comprises 468,254 tokens and 36,498 types (type/token ratio: 7.79), with over 500 travel articles downloaded from the web, written in English by a variety of authors and dealing with a vast array of typical tourist topics and locations worldwide (Gandin 2013).

Table 1. – Dann’s model (adapted): properties and techniques of the language of tourism.

CONVERGENT PROPERTIES		DIVERGENT PROPERTIES	
Functions (Jacobsonian classification)		Lack of sender identification	
Structure: combination of text/image or textual functions in order for the product to be purchased + use of a binary language of opposites		Monologue	
Tense: binary opposition btw present and future		Euphoria: use of hyperbolic language	
Magic: misrepresenting time and nature through language and images		Tautology: stereotypes, pre-packaged expectations about the destination	
VERBAL TECHNIQUES		VISUAL TECHNIQUES	
comparison	humour	colour	visual cliché
key words and keying	linguaging	format	connotation procedures
testimony	ego-targeting		
VERBAL AND VISUAL TECHNIQUES COMBINED			
puzzles		ousting the competition	
temporal contrast		infraction of taboo	
collage		significant omission	

Table 2. – Gotti’s classification (adapted): features of the language of tourism as LSP.

LEXIS				
Monoreferentiality	Lexical conciseness	Standard terms used in the specialist context of tourism	Specialised terms borrowed from other LSPs	Empathic language
SYNTAX				
Expressive conciseness				
GENRES				
Tourist guides, brochures and leaflets	Tourist articles in specialised magazines / web sites	Tourist articles in non-specialised magazines / web sites	Itineraries, professional correspondence	Other

source texts<sup>3</sup> sub-section of a bidirectional parallel corpus (ParTourE/I-C – *Parallel Tourism Corpus ENG\_ITA\_ENG*)<sup>4</sup>. In particular, examples (1) and (2) below represent perfect instances of the use of emphatic language or euphoria<sup>5</sup> in tourist texts (see my emphasis in *italics*), combined with the property of keywords and keying<sup>6</sup> (through the presence of adjectives such as *natural*, *extreme*, *desert* – see my emphasis in *italics*).

- (1) There are other countries in the world that enjoy *divinely inspired natural landscapes*, but Costa Rica boasts a higher biodiversity than Europe and the United States combined. (TourEC)
- (2) Another *incredible desert landscape* spreads out before you in Joshua Tree National Park, named after the soaring yuccas that create a surreal forest in this *extreme landscape*. Walk to peaks for nonstop vistas, or try your hand at rock climbing. (ParTourE/I-C - ENG ST)

Example (3) could be presented as an interesting instance of creative monoreferentiality (Gotti 2006) through the morphological derivation of the term *landscape* in a new verbal form (i.e. *landscaped* – see also the OED definition<sup>7</sup>):

---

<sup>3</sup> From now onwards: ST.

<sup>4</sup> ParTourE/I-C is a bidirectional parallel corpus of original tourist web articles in English and Italian with their relating translations. The corpus was compiled between 2013 and 2014 as part of an on-going research project developed at the Department of Humanities and Social Studies of the University of Sassari (Italy) and dedicated to the study of the translational features of the language of tourism. ParTourE/I-C comprises 320,854 tokens (ENG-ITA subsection: 115,671 tokens / ITA-ENG subsection: 205,183 tokens). Its texts describe some of the most popular tourist attractions in Australia Canada, Italy, Great Britain and USA.

<sup>5</sup> The use of empathic language is defined by Gotti (2006, 26-29) as a distinctive feature in tourism discourse compared with other LSPs, characterised by a predominantly persuasive function that resorts to the use of nouns, adjectives, expressions capable of conveying an hyperbolic, positive image of the destinations/services described in tourist texts. This notion corresponds to the property of euphoria, that is the tendency of the language of tourism “to speak only in positive and glowing terms of the service and attractions it seeks to promote” (Dann 1996, 65) by means of superlatives, hyperbole and other linguistic devices able to emphasise the uniqueness of the attraction/place to be promoted.

<sup>6</sup> The property of keywords and keying is defined by Dann (1996, 174-175) as “a series of attributes of the destination [...] which correspond to the requirements of the potential tourist” through the use of “appropriate language able to give an aura of genuineness and authenticity to the destination promoted” (i.e. through the use of words such as *away*, *adventure*, *escape*, *dream*, *imagination*, *pleasure*, *unique*, *exotic*, *romantic*, *happy*, *authentic*, *genuine* and so on).

<sup>7</sup> “To landscape: 1. *trans.* To represent as a landscape; to picture, depict. / 2. To lay out (a garden, etc.) as a landscape; to conceal or embellish (a building, road, etc.) by

- (3) About 40 minutes outside of Dubai, the Bab Al Shams Desert Resort and Spa presents a panorama reminiscent of David Lean's *Lawrence of Arabia*. Its tiered pools, shady niches and traditional Arabic-style, low-rise buildings *landscaped* with palm trees, cascading fountains and wide, white umbrellas provide plentiful space to relax. (TourEC)

Finally, example (4) could be used to explain the use of standard terms in the specialist context of tourism through a process of metaphorisation (Gotti 2006 – see my emphasis in *italics*):

- (4) INSPIRE! Toronto International Book Fair reinvents the culture of reading over three and a half dynamic days this November, featuring the largest gathering of programmed authors in Canada. Through the diversity of the local and *international publishing landscapes*, the fair will appeal to all book lovers and readers. (ParTourE/I-C - ENG ST)

Such corpus-based examples could be easily employed by both language teachers and students in order to analyse the main properties of English tourism discourse, find valid linguistic references to learn the right collocational patterns, phraseology, terminology and stylistics features of English tourist texts and develop familiarity with corpus linguistics research tools and methodologies.

## 2.2. *Teaching how to translate English tourism discourse*

Similar corpus-based approaches can also be applied when teaching how to translate tourist texts, in order to outline the features of tourism discourse and relating translational strategies by means of authentic linguistic materials. As affirmed by Durán Muñoz (2011, 31) translators of tourist texts “must transfer information that may not exist in the target culture in a very attractive way, so as to attract tourists to the target destination”. In this way “translators become intercultural mediators” and “must keep the essence of the source text, its content, its function, its cultural references, and at the same time they must approach the translation to the target audience, by making the content comprehensive, promoting the destination and making it closer to them”. Parallel corpora can offer endless examples to explain in class the general norms and the most (and even least) effective strategies characterising the translation of tourism discourse. In classroom

---

making it part of a continuous and harmonious landscape” (OED online, *ad vocem* – last accessed: November 2014).



contexts aimed at learning how to translate the language of tourism and at creating professionals able to write target texts<sup>8</sup> with equivalent persuasive effects, even a short example like the one below could be exploited to explain the various translational strategies available, along with specific properties of the language of tourism (in this case: euphoria, key words and keying, languaging<sup>9</sup>, the use of the conative function and ego-targeting devices<sup>10</sup>, etc. – see my emphasis in italics).

(5) ST: Scotland travel guide

From *deserted glens* to Edinburgh's *stylish streets*, *discover Scotland*, a land of *startling variety*.

*Learn* everything about Scotland from its *historic natural landmarks* like Loch Ness and Neolithic Orkney to its *unique* blend of *traditional and modern culture*. *Start your journey now*. (ParTourE/I-C - ENG ST)

TT: Guida della Scozia

Dalle vallate deserte alle eleganti vie di Edimburgo: scoprite la Scozia, una terra di sorprendenti contrasti.

Scoprite tutto sulla Scozia: dai siti storici naturali come Loch Ness e le neolitiche Orcadi al suo mix unico di cultura moderna e tradizionale. Inizia il tuo viaggio! (ParTourE/I-C - ITA TT)

This example could be used to outline the presence of specific translational phenomena, explaining for instance direct and oblique translation methods according to Vinay and Dabernat's model (1958), or the concept of translation shift according to Catford's model (1965), focusing on the notions of:

- Literal translations, in the strict correspondence between ST and TT syntactic structures and terminologies.
- Borrowings (i.e. *Loch Ness*).
- Modulation, in the choice of terms such as *contrast* for *variety*, or *discover* for both *discover* and *learn*, which attain an equivalent and effective persuasive function in the TL, slightly changing however the point of view embedded in the ST.

---

<sup>8</sup> From now onwards: TT.

<sup>9</sup> Languaging is a very common linguistic strategy in tourist texts, which is defined by Dann (1996, 183-185) as "the use of real or fictitious foreign words" or "a manipulation of the vernacular" with the aim of providing local colour to the text.

<sup>10</sup> The technique of ego-targeting employs "lexical devices typical of a conversational style" (Dann 1996, 185-188), such as the use of first and second person (plural and singular) pronouns, possessive adjectives and pronouns, interjections through which readers of tourist texts can be directly addressed and be "linguistically transposed into the tourist experience to be sold".

- Adaptation, in the translation of the term *glens* into a generic *vallate* (*wide valleys*).
- Unit shift, referring to the different punctuation system used in the TT, which modifies the hierarchical clause order of the ST.
- Intra-system shifts, in the translation of the final imperative *Start your journey* into *Inizia il tuo viaggio*, which uses a second person singular rather than a second person plural as in the previous translations of the imperatives *Discover Scotland* → *Scoprite la Scozia* and *Learn everything about Scotland* → *Scoprite tutto sulla Scozia*.

Parallel corpora could also be used to demonstrate inadequate translational practices, unfortunately still to be found even in professional settings such as translated materials of official tourism boards. In example (6) below, for instance, rather than seeing the conscious application of borrowing strategies linked to the property of languaging, the sentence *Suoni Di Great Britain* represents the evident result of an automatic translation, which leaves unaltered the reference to Great Britain and mistakenly reports the preposition *of/di* in capital letters (grammatically incorrect in Italian).

- (6) ST: Sounds of Great Britain. See your perfect day in Britain come alive in our new video. (ParTourE/I-C - ENG ST)

TT: Suoni Di Great Britain. Organizzate la vostra giornata perfetta in Gran Bretagna prendendo spunto dal nostro nuovo video. (ParTourE/I-C - ITA TT)

### 2.3. *Teaching corpus linguistics methodologies and its applications to the study of translation universals*

At a more advanced level of linguistic competence, this type of corpus based didactic approach could also be drawn on to make learners familiar with corpus linguistics methodologies and procedures for the interpretation of data, by explaining in particular the concept of universals of translation and how these phenomena can potentially affect the properties of the language of tourism in translated texts. The application of corpus linguistics to the study of translation universals developed from the need to define with empirical data the blurred concept of translationese, a term used to indicate (often in pejorative sense) how “the language of translated texts may differ from that of other texts produced in the same language” (Zanettin 2012, 12). Research in the field of translation universals resulted in the determination of the following linguistic phenomena:

- explicitation, represented by all those devices used to “spell things out rather than leave them implicit in translation” (Baker 1996, 180),

including for instance “the use or overuse of explanatory vocabulary and conjunctions, or any supplementary information added to the text (e.g. the translator’s forewords at the beginning of a text), [...] the higher presence of the reporting that [...] and the addition of grammatical and/or lexical items in the specification of terms”;

- simplification, expressed through the use of simplified language resulting in a lower degree of lexical density and a narrower range of type-token ratios, or by means of shorter sentences, alteration of the punctuation from weaker to stronger marks, omission of redundant or repeated information and shortening of complex collocations;
- normalisation represented by “the tendency to exaggerate the features of the target language and to conform to its grammatical and collocational patterns” (ibid., 183), through the normalisation of grammatical structures, punctuation collocational patterns and lexical creativity in terms of suffixes and ST unique words;
- levelling out, which “concerns the tendency of translated texts to gravitate towards a centre of a continuum [...]” (ibid., 184), so that the text moves away from any extreme of oral or literate markedness involved both in the source and target language;
- unique items, which entails the investigation of unusual “TL specific lexical items” which are not common in the standard TL and may turn out to be even less frequent in translated texts (Zanettin 2012);
- untypical collocations, which, although possible in the TL, are rare or absent in standard TL texts (ibidem);
- interference, which refers to “features of the SL that get transferred in target texts during the process of translation” (ibid., 21).

To explain universals of translation through corpus-based didactic activities, it would be advisable to use two monolingual corpora of translated and non-translated texts, in order to compare relating data and thus identify the linguistic and stylistic differences characterising translated language with respect to texts originally written in a specific source language. For instance, through this comparative-corpus perspective, a teacher could focus again on the description of tourist landscapes by letting students retrieve the related concordances in both corpora in terms of adjectives, common nouns and verbs (excluding therefore functional words such as articles, prepositions, conjunctions, etc.) and normalise all data in order to compare the results. The following *Tables 3* and *4*<sup>11</sup> represent an example

---

<sup>11</sup> Key to acronyms: ADJ = adjectives; NN = common nouns; VB = verbs; PoS = Parts of speech; PoS (#) = Parts of speech frequency rate; NRM = normalized datum.

of this kind of activity: they report the results of the collocational patterns (adjectives, common nouns and verbs) for the lemma *landscape(s)* taken from two monolingual corpora of English translated and non-translated texts, namely the T-TourEC (*Translational Tourism English Corpus*)<sup>12</sup> and the TourEC (see previous note 9). These data have been generated by means of the Wordsmith 6.0 tools suite and normalised on a base of a desired corpus size of 500,000 tokens (Tour-EC normalisation ratio: 1.07; T-TourEC normalisation ratio: 1.38): they comprise the three most left and three most right collocates of the node word, with a minimum frequency rate of 2.

These data could be presented and explained to students at different levels of analysis. Firstly, just by considering the frequency of the lemma *landscape* in both corpora, learners will notice a much higher rate in translated tourist texts: this will lead a teacher to explain the notion of lexical variation showing how, in this case, the higher frequency of the lemma *landscape(s)* generates far more variants in translational tourism discourse with respect to tourist texts originally written in English: 70 collocates (NRM 96.6) against 27 (NRM 28.89), therefore more than doubling the amount of lexical words accompanying the collocational pattern of the term *landscape(s)*. These results could be further compared in terms of PoS frequency and interpreted as data that indicate the presence of different translation universals since the larger range of different collocates used in the lexical patterning of the term *landscape(s)* in T-TourEC can be explained in terms of explicitation phenomena, while the wide variety of adjectives in the T-TourEC is linked to the universal of normalisation due to the fact that the higher proportions of evaluative and non-evaluative adjectives outlines the strong tendency of translated texts to conform to and over-use some of the most typical stylistic properties of tourism discourse, such as:

---

<sup>12</sup> T-TourEC was created in 2013 and comprises 361,198 tokens and 23,144 types (type/token ratio: 6.41), with over 800 texts divided in a set of three source-languages related sub-corpora exclusively dedicated to travel texts translated into English from Italian, Norwegian and Japanese. These language combinations were chosen because of their distant and different linguistic origins, in order to avoid biased data deriving from the potential repetition of linguistic and translational patterns implied in source languages coming from the same or a similar language family. Texts were downloaded from the institutional web sites of the national Japanese, Italian and Norwegian tourist boards, and describe the typical tourist attractions of the countries taken into consideration, with specific sub-topics corresponding to those included in the TourEC, so as to avoid potential topical bias in the comparison of the two corpora.

Table 3. – *TourEC* - collocates of *landscape(s)*.

N.	<i>TourEC</i> - <i>landscape(s)</i> [TOTAL node word frequency: 92 (NRM → 98)]	PoS	PoS #	N.	<i>TourEC</i> - <i>landscape(s)</i> [TOTAL node word frequency: 92 (NRM → 98)]	PoS	PoS #
1	BIG	ADJ	2	15	HILLS	NN	3
2	CHANGING	ADJ	3	16	HISTORY	NN	2
3	CIRCULAR	ADJ	2	17	MIX	NN	2
4	CULTURAL	ADJ	3	18	MUSEUM	NN	3
5	DIFFERENT	ADJ	2	19	PEOPLE	NN	2
6	DRAMATIC	ADJ	4	20	VINEYARDS	NN	2
7	EPIC	ADJ	3	21	ARE	VB	2
8	GREEN	ADJ	2	22	IS	VB	4
9	HARSH	ADJ	2	23	MADE	VB	2
10	NEOLITHIC	ADJ	2	24	SEE	VB	3
11	REMARKABLE	ADJ	2	25	SEEMS	VB	2
12	SURREAL	ADJ	3	26	SET	VB	2
13	THEIR	ADJ	2	27	TAKE	VB	2
14	BEAUTY	NN	2				

Table 4. – *T-TourEC* - collocates of *landscape(s)*.

N.	<i>T-TourEC</i> - <i>landscape(s)</i> [TOTAL node word frequency: 177 NRM → 244]	PoS	PoS #	N.	<i>T-TourEC</i> - <i>landscape(s)</i> [TOTAL node word frequency: 177 NRM → 244]	PoS	PoS #
1	ALPINE	ADJ	4	36	CLIFFS	NN	2
2	ARCTIC	ADJ	2	37	DOLOMITES	NN	2
3	BEAUTIFUL	ADJ	9	38	EXPERIENCE	NN	2
4	BREATH TAKING	ADJ	2	39	FJORD	NN	11
5	CHANGING	ADJ	2	40	GARDEN	NN	4
6	CHARACTERISTIC	ADJ	2	41	GLACIER	NN	2
7	CHARMING	ADJ	3	42	HISTORY	NN	3
8	COASTAL	ADJ	6	43	HOTEL	NN	9
9	CULTURAL	ADJ	15	44	MOUNTAIN	NN	3

Continue ➞

<i>T-TourEC - landscape(s)</i> N. [TOTAL node word frequency: 177 NRM → 244] PoS PoS #				<i>T-TourEC - landscape(s)</i> N. [TOTAL node word frequency: 177 NRM → 244] PoS PoS #			
10	DRAMATIC	ADJ	3	45	MOUNTAINS	NN	4
11	FANTASTIC	ADJ	3	46	NATURE	NN	3
12	FASCINATING	ADJ	2	47	OPENNESS	NN	2
13	HISTORICAL	ADJ	2	48	PART	NN	2
14	IMPORTANT	ADJ	2	49	ROAD	NN	2
15	JAGGED	ADJ	2	50	SCENERY	NN	2
16	JAPANESE	ADJ	3	51	SEA	NN	2
17	LUCANIAN	ADJ	2	52	SNOW	NN	2
18	LUNAR	ADJ	3	53	STYLES	NN	2
19	MOUNTAINOUS	ADJ	2	54	WILDLIFE	NN	2
20	NATURAL	ADJ	5	55	WINTER	NN	4
21	NEWEST	ADJ	2	56	ARE	VB	4
22	NORTHERN	ADJ	2	57	CAN	VB	4
23	NORWEGIAN	ADJ	6	58	DOMINATED	VB	2
24	OPEN	ADJ	2	59	EXPERIENCE	VB	2
25	PICTURESQUE	ADJ	5	60	EXPLORE	VB	2
26	RICH	ADJ	4	61	FEATURES	VB	2
27	SPECTACULAR	ADJ	3	62	FIND	VB	3
28	SPLENDID	ADJ	2	63	HAS	VB	4
29	STEEP	ADJ	2	64	HAVE	VB	2
30	UNIQUE	ADJ	4	65	IS	VB	14
31	VARIED	ADJ	6	66	KEPT	VB	2
32	VOLCANIC	ADJ	2	67	MADE	VB	2
33	AREA	NN	3	68	OPENS	VB	3
34	AREAS	NN	2	69	SHAPED	VB	2
35	BUILDINGS	NN	2	70	WAS	VB	3

- Euphoria (see the following examples and all the superlatives and hyperbolic adjectives reported in *Table 4*).
  - (7) Sicily, too, is covered in natural reserves and *brehtaking landscapes*. (T-TourEC)
  - (8) Located on the Tyrrhenian coastline, Maratea is a jewel in the region's crown. The *landscape is dramatic*, with plunging cliffs leading to a network of beautiful sandy coves hidden amongst the rocks. (T-TourEC)
- Keywords and keying (see the following examples and words such as *culture/cultural*, *history/historical*, *nature/natural*, *unique*, *wildlife*, *explore*, etc. reported in *Table 4*).
  - (9) The Heathland Centre is an information and knowledge centre about the *cultural landscape*. Here, you can follow trails through the *historical landscape* that have existed along the coast for 5,000 years. (T-TourEC)
  - (10) The journey from Narvik to Stetind is a fantastic way to experience Ofoten and enjoy the *unique landscape* and peaceful surroundings. (T-TourEC)
- The concurrent attainment of the conative function, in order to attract the potential tourist's attention by means of persuasive language, such as positive evaluative adjectives, but also with peculiar verbal forms such as imperatives, the use of past participle in thematic position, etc.: see example (11).
  - (11) Take part in a trip and *experience spectacular landscape*, nature and birdlife, a fantastic bluish light, and the possibilities to watch the orcas in the Vestfjord. (T-TourEC)
- The achievement of the referential function, through the use of non-evaluative adjectives and also common nouns: see example (12).
  - (12) Sea kayaking trips provide a different view of the *Northern Norwegian coastal landscape*. (T-TourEC)

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

Corpus-based didactic approaches can represent a valid didactic tool able to offer endless resources in terms of teaching materials, creative teaching and (self-)learning methods. The corpus-based activities described in this chapter are aimed at demonstrating how the teaching of any LSP needs

to take into account multileveled and dynamic perspectives, able to develop the lexical, intercultural and technical skills that are required to achieve an appropriate linguistic competence in specialised communicative contexts. The results of this study confirm how translation should be considered a key aspect to be re-evaluated and included in the teaching of any LSP as foreign language, particularly for the language of tourism, and how parallel, monolingual and monolingual-translational corpora can be effectively employed in contexts of L2 learners of English at university level in order to:

- explore and learn the different linguistic, stylistic and pragmatic properties of the language of tourism by means of authentic linguistic materials;
- recognise and understand the most/least successful strategies characterising the translation of tourist texts;
- discover corpus linguistics methodologies, notions, design criteria, technical tools and procedures for the collection, analysis and interpretation of complex linguistic phenomena, particularly when applied to the study of translation universals.

Corpus linguistics and its application to the study of translation represent therefore precious didactic resources to consolidate and innovate the teaching and learning procedures of any LSP as foreign language, and their various didactic scenarios are worthy of further investigations in the future, in order to identify other new, dynamic and up-to-date language-teaching methods.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, Mona. 1993. "Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications". In *Text and Technology: In honour of John Sinclair*, edited by Mona Baker, Gill Francis, and Elena Tognini-Bonelli, 233-250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baker, Mona. 1995. "Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research". *Target* 7 (2): 223-243.
- Baker, Mona. 1996. "Corpus-based Translation Studies: The Challenges that Lie Ahead". In *Terminology, LSP and Translation*, edited by Harold Somers, 175-186. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baker, Mona. 2000. "Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator". *Target* 12 (2): 241-266.
- Balboni, Paolo. 2000. *Le microlingue scientifico-professionali: natura e insegnamento*. Torino: UTET.



- Balboni, Paolo. 2010. "La traduzione nell'insegnamento delle lingue: dall'ostracismo alla riscoperta". In *Tradurre in pratica. Riflessioni, esperienze, testimonianze*, a cura di Flora De Giovanni e Bruna Di Sabato, 179-200. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- Bosseaux, Charlotte. 2004. "Translating Point of View: A Corpus-based Study". *Language Matters* 35 (1): 259-274.
- Bowker, Lynne, and Jennifer Pearson. 2002. *Working with Specialized Languages: A Practical Guide to Using Corpora*. London: Routledge.
- Calvi, Maria Vittoria. 2003. "La traduzione nell'insegnamento della lingua e nello studio dei linguaggi specialistici". In *Tradurre dallo spagnolo. Giornata di Studio, Milano, 28 febbraio 2003*, 7-14. Milano: LED. [01/10/2014]. <http://www.ledonline.it/ledonline/index.html?e-seminars/tradurredallospagnolo.html>.
- Catford, John C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay on Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, Guy. 2010. *Translation in Language Teaching: An Argument for Reassessment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Council of Europe – CEFR. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. [01/10/2014]. [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/elp/elpreg/Source/key\\_reference/CEFR\\_EN.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/elp/elpreg/Source/key_reference/CEFR_EN.pdf).
- Dann, Graham. 1996. *The Language of Tourism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Wallingford: CAB International.
- Denti, Olga, e Luisanna Fodde. 2012. "Il discorso turistico: peculiarità linguistico-comunicative nella didattica dell'inglese specialistico". In *Prospettive linguistiche e traduttologiche negli studi sul turismo*, a cura di Mirella Agorni, 23-46. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Durán Muñoz, Isabel. 2011. "Tourist Translations as a Mediation Tool: Misunderstandings and Difficulties". *Cadernos de Tradução* 1 (27): 29-49.
- Gandin, Stefania. 2013. "Translating the Language of Tourism: A Corpus-based Study on the Translational Tourism English Corpus (T-TourEC)". *Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences* 95: 325-335.
- Gotti, Maurizio. 1991. *I Linguaggi Specialistici. Caratteristiche linguistiche e criteri pragmatici*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Gotti, Maurizio. 2003. *Specialized Discourse: Linguistic Features and Changing Conventions*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Gotti, Maurizio. 2006. "The Language of Tourism as Specialized Discourse". In *Translating Tourism: Linguistic/Cultural Representations*, edited by Oriana Palusci and Sabrina Francesconi, 15-34. Trento: Università di Trento, Dipartimento di Studi letterari, linguistici e filologici.
- Hermans, Theo. 1996. "The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative". *Target* 8 (1): 23-48.
- Johansson, Stig. 2003. "Reflections on Corpora and Their Uses in Cross-linguistic Research". In *Corpora in Translator Education*, edited by Federico Zanettin, Silvia Bernardini, and Dominic Stewart, 135-144. Manchester: St. Jerome.

- Kenny, Dorothy. 2001. *Lexis and Creativity in Translation: A Corpus-based Study*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Laviosa, Sara. 1998. "The English Comparable Corpus: A Resource and a Methodology". In *Unity in Diversity? Current Trends in Translation Studies*, edited by Lynn Bowker, Michael Cronin, Dorothy Kenny, and Jennifer Pearson, 101-112. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Laviosa, Sara. 2002. *Corpus-based Translation Studies: Theories, Findings, Applications*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Mauranen, Anna, and Kuyamaki Pekka, eds. 2004. *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Olohan, Maeve. 2004. *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies*. London - New York: Routledge.
- Olohan, Maeve, and Mona Baker. 2000. "Reporting That in Translated English: Evidence for Subconscious Processes of Explication?". *Across Languages and Cultures* 1: 141-172.
- Pym, Anthony, Kirsten Malmkjær, and María Del Mar Gutiérrez-Colón Plana. 2013. *Translation and Language Learning: The Role of Translation in the Teaching of Languages in the European Union: A Study*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Randaccio, Monica. 2012. "Translation and Language Teaching: Translation as a Useful Teaching Resource". In *Aspetti della didattica e dell'apprendimento delle lingue straniere*, vol. 2, a cura di Federica Gori e Christopher Taylor, 78-91. Trieste: EUT.
- Scarpa, Federica. 2007. "Lingue speciali e didattica della traduzione". In *Linguistica, linguaggi specialistici, didattica delle lingue. Studi in onore di Leo Schena*, a cura di Giuliana Garzone e Rita Salvi, 255-267. Roma: CISU.
- Tymoczko, Maria. 1998. "Computerized Corpora and the Future of Translation Studies". *Meta. Translator's Journal* 43: 652-659.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul, et Jean Darbelnet. 1958. *Stylistique comparée de l'anglais et du français*. Paris: Didier.
- Zanettin, Federico. 2000. "Parallel Corpora in Translation Studies: Issues in Corpus Design and Analysis". In *Intercultural Faultlines. Research Models in Translation Studies I: Textual and Cognitive Aspects*, edited by Maeve Olohan, 105-118. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Zanettin, Federico. 2012. *Translation-Driven Corpora – Corpus Resources for Descriptive and Applied Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.