

**Ildikó Fata 2009. *Das zweisprachige Translationswörterbuch für Fachsprachen in der wissenschaftlichen Theorie und Praxis. A kétnyelvű fordítói szakszótár a tudományos elméletben és gyakorlatban.* Budapest: Tinta. (Segédkönyvek a nyelvészet tanulmányozásához 93). 196 pages. ISBN 9789639902244. ISSN 1419-6603**

The book under review was originally a PhD dissertation, which was defended on the 16<sup>th</sup> of January 2008. This fact is not stated explicitly in the book itself, but it is apparent from e.g. Fata (2009b), which is a presentation – written in Hungarian – of the PhD dissertation. The dissertation presents the theoretical foundation for a particular dictionary: Ildikó Fata's *Magyar-német, német-magyar nyugdíjbiztosítási szakszótár* (2005), which is a Hungarian-German/German-Hungarian dictionary of pension insurance terminology. In the present review, only the dissertation will be treated, i.e. *Das zweisprachige Translationswörterbuch für Fachsprachen in der wissenschaftlichen Theorie und Praxis* (2009), although it is unavoidable that the dictionary occasionally will be referred to (for a more detailed treatment of selected parts of the dictionary, see Tarp 2007).

*Das zweisprachige Translationswörterbuch für Fachsprachen in der wissenschaftlichen Theorie und Praxis* (2009) makes a good impression on the reader from the very first glance, not least because of its beautiful cover. This impression not only stays, but is intensified when one has reached the end of the book. On the whole, one has to be very thorough indeed, if one intends to find something really significant to criticize in this fine piece of work. Its few suspect aspects mentioned below could only be identified with great effort.

The prose of the book impresses the reader with its precision, its strong scientific style and its steady expression, which at times appears a bit excessive. Bergenholtz's (2005b: 259-260) comment on Wiesmann (2004):

Die eigentliche Monographie ist allerdings nur zugänglich für die Leser, die problemlos Deutsch lesen können. Aber selbst den deutschen Lesern macht es die Verfasserin nicht leicht mit einem Stil und einer Satzlänge, der bzw. die jeden Volljuristen vor Neid erblassen lässt [...]

also pertains to this book, albeit only to a certain degree (mostly in chapters 2 and 4). A minor unfortunate, stylistic detail is the lack of consistency in the use of pronouns referring to the author herself (e.g. “Da wir uns [...] orientiert haben” (p. 12), “Weiterhin kann m.E. der idealtypischen Vorstellung...” (p. 12) (should actually be “u.E.”, in relation to the earlier “wir”), “Wie das unsere Analysen [...] zeigen werden...” (p. 13), “Eine Einfügung von mir...” (p. 30, footnote 14)). The author should have used the first person singular consistently, and possibly should have varied the sentence structure by changing the voice from active into passive.

Apart from the 150-page long main body of text (pp. 9-159), the book also comprises a bibliography (pp. 160-178), various appendices (pp. 179-191), a list of figures (pp. 192-194), and a summary in Hungarian (pp. 195-196). The source basis, which is apparent from the bibliography, is impressive in its size and variety of languages (the scientific and scholarly contributions referred to in the text are in German, Hungarian, English, Spanish, and Danish). The bibliography consists of approximately 300 sources, plus a pertinent survey conducted as part of the study (the questionnaire can be found in the section of appendices).

Chapter 1 (‘Einleitung’, pp. 9-15) is an introduction, in which the contents of the book are presented. Chapter 2 (‘Das Translationswörterbuch und die germanistische Metalexikographie’, pp. 16-50) contains a short introduction to modern metalexigraphy, but is mostly concerned with lexicographical typology with a particular focus on LSP lexicography. This chapter excels, among other things, by thoroughly defining various relevant terms, which to a large degree are the focal point of the dissertation (for example, it is made convincingly clear that *bilingual dictionaries* and *translation dictionaries* are not one and the same thing). Chapter 3 (‘Das Translationswörterbuch und die Wörterbuchbenutzungsforschung’, pp. 51-68) outlines previous user surveys, but for the most part (pp. 56-68) it deals with Fata's own survey, on which both the dissertation (i.e. the book

under review) and the dictionary (i.e. Fata 2005) is partially built upon. Unfortunately, the author refrains from a more detailed discussion of the results of the survey, on the grounds that such a discussion can be found in Fata (2006). That contribution (i.e. Fata 2006) is, however, written in Hungarian, and can therefore hardly be expected to be read by the majority of the international metalexicographical research community. Nevertheless, the results that are communicated to the reader in chapter 3 are highly interesting. For instance, one learns rather surprisingly that CD-ROM and online dictionaries are some of the least used lexicographical resources among Hungarian translators (pp. 60-61). At the same time, however, the author admits that the survey relies on 20 informants, all of whom are certified translators (“mit einem staatlich anerkannten Übersetzerabschluss”, p. 56), and therefore cannot be seen as representative for the whole population of Hungarian educated translators (“[d]iese Anzahl kann selbstverständlich keinen Anspruch auf Repräsentativität erheben”, p. 57). Another interesting and, in Fata’s own words, sad point (cf. “traurige[s] Ergebnis”, p. 63), is the fact that a total of 77 percent of the informants answered “no” to the question: “Bildete die Einführung in den Hilfsmittelgebrauch bzw. die Arbeit mit Wörterbüchern Teil Ihres Übersetzerstudiums?” (pp. 62-63). It is also interesting that the survey confirms the notion that prefaces and users’ guides are among the least frequently used and least appreciated components in lexicographical reference works. It is, however, surprising that the author considers this an “äußerst überraschende[s] Untersuchungsergebnis” (p. 64), since it is – among metalexicographers – a well-known phenomenon. Another thought-provoking result of the survey is that 75 percent of the informants chose not to answer the question about whether or not printed dictionaries have a future compared to electronic dictionaries (p. 64). Cf. furthermore:

Zwei Befragte haben die technischen Rahmenbedingungen hervorgehoben, an die die Internetbenutzung gebunden ist (z.B. internetfreier Arbeitsplatz, Stromausfall, keine Telefonleitung usw.). In diesen Fällen greift man unvermeidlich zu einem Printfachwörterbuch. Zwei Vpn [: Versuchspersonen] haben angegeben, Printfachwörterbücher hätten eine Zukunftschance, vorausgesetzt, sie werden ständig aktualisiert. In gedruckten Fachwörterbüchern sind zwar die Suchwege sehr langsam, dafür enthalten sie aber mehr Informationen als das Internet (oder elektronische Wörterbücher). Eine Vp [: Versuchsperson] hat das Internet als chaotisches, wenig überschaubares bzw. fachlich nicht kontrolliertes Gewächs bezeichnet, das die mit ihm verbundenen Hoffnungen nicht erfüllt hat. Drei Befragte haben hervorgehoben, als Geisteswissenschaftler eher traditionell veranlagt zu sein, sehr an Büchern in Papierformat zu hängen und sich vom Buchgeruch fasziniert zu fühlen. (pp. 64-65)

It is inappropriate that the author nowhere in chapter 3, or anywhere else in the book for that matter, discusses the problems concerning the quantitative analytical method (*in casu* the questionnaire), considering that she otherwise gladly presents *pro et contra* in many other connections (e.g. in chapters 2 and 4). The fact that it was not possible for Fata, who defended her PhD dissertation in January 2008, to take a stance towards Tarp (2009), is no excuse. The fact that Andersen/Bergenholtz (2001) represents a Danish contribution is no excuse either. Relevant subject material does exist in English and was published at the time when Fata was writing her dissertation – and could have been consulted. See for example Tarp (2009: 276) who, among other sources, refers to an English contribution from 1974:

It may be no exaggeration to say that the greater number of surveys conducted today is a waste of time and money. Many are simply bad surveys. Samples are biased; questions are poorly phrased; interviewers are not properly instructed and supervised; and results are misinterpreted. Such surveys are worse than none at all because the sponsor may be misled into a costly area. (Sheatsley 1974)

Altogether, however, it must be made clear that Fata’s survey is only a small part of the entire data collection gathered for the purpose of both the dissertation and the dictionary, and as such does not bring her overall conclusions into question.

Chapter 4 (‘Das Translationswörterbuch und das Korpus’, pp. 69-89) is about corpus-oriented lexicography in general (dealing with such issues as, e.g. the typology of corpora, the making of corpora, etc.) with focus on bilingual LSP lexicography, LSP texts and typology of LSP texts, as well as the theoretical foundation for the corpus on which Fata (2005) is based. Chapter 5 (‘Das

Translationswörterbuch und die Fachsprachenforschung’, pp. 90-118) offers a brief insight into modern LSP research, especially in Hungary and Germany, but apart from this it mostly deals with systematic classification of terminology and the problem of equivalence, the latter being the overall most thorough and interesting part of the chapter (pp. 106-118). If it has not yet occurred to the reader at this point of the book, then at least by the end of chapter 5 it should be abundantly clear that Fata’s Hungarian-German/German-Hungarian dictionary of pension insurance terminology (i.e. Fata 2005) is an extraordinarily ambitious piece of work – a modern, bilingual, two-way, bidirectional, poly-functional, corpus-based, LSP dictionary for translation purposes. Chapter 6 (‘Das zweisprachige Translationswörterbuch zur Rentenversicherung und seine Gesamtkonzeption’, pp. 119-154) deals with the collective concept of Fata (2005). Besides a short outline of contemporary dictionary research in Hungary, the author provides an elucidation of the dictionary’s intended user groups, its functions, headword selection, structures (mostly macro-, micro- and mediostructures) as well as its pedagogical dimensions. Chapter 7 contains the conclusion.

In accordance with Tarp (2002), Bergenholtz (2005a: 257-258) divides metalexical contributions into the following three categories: (1) linguistic contributions, (2) contemplative contributions, and (3) transformative contributions. In the first category he places all those contributions which are actually linguistic, but for one reason or another – perhaps due to misunderstandings, certain professional or local traditions, certain professional policies or convictions, etc. – take the appearance of (meta)lexicographical contributions. To the second category belong those contributions which offer an analysis of existing dictionaries, with focus on the needs of the given dictionary users, in order to make predictions for new dictionaries/dictionary concepts. A sub-category of this is the metalexical discussion based on an ongoing or completed dictionary project, on which the given (meta)lexicographer – that is, the author of the given contribution – is working or has worked. The third category consists of the kind of work in which theoretical analysis of, for instance, user situations, user qualifications and user needs, is applied as a basis for developing certain guidelines for the conception and preparation of new dictionaries. *Das zweisprachige Translationswörterbuch für Fachsprachen in der wissenschaftlichen Theorie und Praxis* (2009) is a prime example of a contribution belonging to the category of transformative metalexical lexicography and should be mandatory reading material for anyone working with bi-, mono- or polylingual lexicography, LGP or LSP lexicography.<sup>1</sup>

## Bibliography

- Andersen, Henning/Bergenholtz, Henning 2001: Brug af surveys til lingvistiske undersøgelser. Om Hansen, Erik Jørgen/ Andersen, Bjarne Hjorth, Et sociologisk værktøj. Introduktion til den kvantitative metode. København: Hans Reitzel 2000. In *Hermes* 27, 201-209.
- Bergenholtz, Henning 2005a: Marta Chromá: Legal Translation and the Dictionary. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer 2004. In *Hermes* 35, 255-258.
- Bergenholtz, Henning 2005b: Eva Wiesmann: Rechtsübersetzung und Hilfsmittel zur Translation. Wissenschaftliche Grundlagen und computergestützte Umsetzung eines lexikographischen Konzepts. Tübingen: Gunter Narr 2004. In *Hermes* 35, 259-266.
- Fata, Ildikó 2005: *Magyar-német, német-magyar nyugdíjbiztosítási szakszótár: Ungarisch-deutsches, deutsch-ungarisches Fachwörterbuch zur Rentenversicherung*. Szeged: Grimm.
- Fata, Ildikó 2006: Egy szakfordítók körében végzett felmérés eredményei és tanulságai. In Klaudy, Kinga/Dobos, Csilla (Eds.), *A világ nyelvei és a nyelvek világa. Soknyelvűség a gazdaságban, a tudományban és az oktatásban. A XV. Magyar Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Kongresszus előadásai. Miskolc, 2005. április 7.-9.* Pécs/Miskolc: MANYE/Miskolci Egyetem, vol. 2/1, 393-398.
- Fata, Ildikó 2009b: A kétnyelvű fordítói szakszótár a tudományos elméletben és gyakorlatban. In Fábian, Zsuzsanna (Ed.), *Szótárírás és szótárírók*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 211-218. (Lexikográfiai füzetek 4).

<sup>1</sup> I am very grateful to Thomas Brisson Jørgensen for translating this review from Danish.

- Sheatsley, Paul Baker 1974: Survey Design. In Ferber, Robert (Ed.), *Handbook of Marketing Research*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2-66.
- Tarp, Sven 2002: Translation Dictionaries and Bilingual Dictionaries – Two Different Concepts. In *Journal of Translation Studies* 7, 59-84.
- Tarp, Sven 2007: ¿Qué requisitos debe cumplir un diccionario de traducción del siglo 21? In Fuertes-Olivera, Pedro Antonio (Ed.), *Problemas lingüísticos en la traducción especializada*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, Secretariado de Publicaciones e Intercambio Editorial, 227-256.
- Tarp, Sven 2009: Reflections on Lexicographical User Research. In *Lexikos* 19, 275-296.
- Wiesmann, Eva 2004: *Rechtsübersetzung und Hilfsmittel zur Translation. Wissenschaftliche Grundlagen und computergestützte Umsetzung eines lexikographischen Konzepts*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr 2004.

*Loránd-Levente Pálfi*