

## ***Abstract***

Two volumes of *Officina Textologica* have dealt with the examination of co-referentiality so far: Volume 2 (*Co-referential elements — co-referential relations. Analysis of Hungarian Texts*) and Volume 4 (*Co-referential elements — co-referential relations. Analysis of Hungarian Texts vol. 2: Discussion*).

The aims of the second volume were declared by János S. Petőfi, editor of the serial *Officina Textologica*, in the foreword of the volume: “(1) to show how reference is made, in different text types, to the elements (e.g. persons, objects, events, etc.) of a specific part of the world (‘world entity’), which is presumably represented in a selected text, according to the sender (author, speaker, etc.) and / or the receiver (reader, listener, etc.) of the text; in other words, what sort of words and / or suffixes can be used as referential units to the ‘world entities’? (2) to show what kind of linguistic, textological, or general knowledge (about the world, etc.) is needed for revealing the co-reference relations between co-referential words or phrases referring to the same ‘world entity’; (3) to search for the most effective way of representing and illustrating co-referential elements and co-reference relations.” (10-11) The authors of the volume, following an analysis by János S. Petőfi as a pattern, examined different text types which therefore could be compared.

Volume 4, as a discussion of Volume 2, dealt with more general issues about co-referentiality by authors with different theoretical backgrounds.

The present volume deals with the question of co-referentiality using a contrastive approach: its aim is to compare the co-referential characteristics of Hungarian and foreign language texts, chiefly the French, English and German translations of the selected Hungarian texts. The authors’ selection of texts also makes the comparison possible in different text types.

In their essay *Co-referential issues in contrastive view*, SÁNDOR KISS and FRANCISKA SKUTTA concentrate, after making a distinction between lexical and grammatical co-referentiality, concentrate on one specific type of lexical co-referentiality: pronouns and those elements which make some kind of pronoun-like reference. Summarising and generalising the experience of their contrastive study, the authors give a notable remark as follows: “Co-referentiality, being a universal tool for organising texts, has created similar categories in the two languages which, at the same time, imply a parallelism in the systems of pronouns. Further research is required to explore the relationship between co-

referentiality and qualification as well as the exact semantic relationship of pronouns and nominal determinants in the two languages.”

In her essay, ANDREA CSÚRY compares the co-referential relationships in Hungarian and French dialogues. The author selects an apparently heterogeneous corpus for her analysis which consists of a passage from a present-day Hungarian play and a transcribed everyday French dialogue. Describing co-referentiality in the deliberately heterogeneous corpus, she sets out to illuminate the similarities and differences between the two text types. The author’s results are remarkable: she gives a clear and logical explanation of the slight differences between the more or less similar dialogues, as well as the reasons for them.

In his research, ISTVÁN CSÚRY also uses a corpus of dialogues. He analyses the complex text constituents of Hungarian and French dialogues. His research has been motivated by the fact that in Hungarian text research only very few publications deal with everyday dialogues. As the author puts it, the descriptions of such texts are “on the one hand partial (because it is a great and hard job, practically and theoretically, to assess all characteristics of dialogues), on the other hand hypothetical and intuitive (because, for lack of data as to quantity, variability and processing quality, scholars usually generalise, partly or exclusively, their subjective views coming from their own practice and experience of speaking).” With his research, the author intends to abate this insufficiency: on the basis of the experiences obtained from his study on a selected legislative dialogue, he wants to extend our overall knowledge of “the features of written texts conventionally studied by text linguists”. The author uses the concept *dialogue* in its widest sense because he considers both prepared statements and the written answers to interpellations as dialogues.

In his essay *Hidden correspondences (co-referential relationships) in the conceptual structures of English modal verbs*, PÉTER PELYVÁS analyses an apparently systemic linguistic problem which is also related to the context. The “hidden correspondences” are such factors, i.e. roles and actors, which take their part in the construction of the context and, at the same time, remain hidden in terms of the explicit formation of sentences. As the author says, “their presence in conceptual structure can be clearly justified on the basis of the characteristics of the grammar of the different senses of the modal auxiliaries”.

KÁROLY I. BODA and JUDIT BODÁNE PORKOLÁB compare the co-referentiality of a poem by T.S. Eliot and its two Hungarian translations. On the basis of the semantic model developed by Melčuk and Zholkovsky and using the so-called index-representation of co-reference analysis, the authors present a formal metalanguage text representation which is capable of describing the theme-rheme structure of texts, and therefore preserve the meaning structure of texts and their translations. In the interpretation process the authors set out from

the meanings of the words of the original poem (e.g. from monolingual dictionaries) and then try to obtain the communication units to be represented by means of lexical functions.

EDIT DOBI demonstrates the means of co-referentiality on the micro-, meso- and macro-level in Hungarian and German texts. The author systematises the means of co-referentiality according to their scope in order to make a distinction between language-specific phenomena (which characterise particular languages irrespective of their textological functions) and the phenomena that (also) participate in the construction of the context. The author explains her intention as follows: “Language-specific grammatical phenomena, although sometimes they might be difficult to separate from textological ones owing to their frequent contribution to co-referentiality, should be explained in the framework of system grammar rather than in that of textology.” The corpus of the examination consisted of one technical and one literary text, both in Hungarian and in German. With the help of this corpus, the author was also able to use a contrastive approach to co-referentiality in terms of its relationship to different styles.

The essays in this volume both summarise the findings of contrastive research and discuss some issues and problems which require further polyglot research.