

Abstract

This volume of *Officina Textologica* is relating to the research project declared in the *first* volume of the periodical as a discussion of the *third* volume with a similar title and using the same editorial principles. Based on the articles issued in the 1999's volume, the aim of the current volume is to initiate a professional debate on the possible linear arrangement of the components of text sentences.

In the third volume there were some tasks set about the issue of linearity which were intended to be performed 'playfully' by teachers and students, testing their linguistic as well as textological competence. The problem in question was the selection of the most and least acceptable variants (that is, the most and least appropriate ones relating to the composition of text) from sentences consisting of words and clauses arranged differently in the same context, and sometimes using different arrangements of sentences as well. The consequences had been drawn in the summary of the volume as follows: the linear arrangement of the components of texts is situation- and context-dependent, that is, it depends on the immediate context before and after the sentence in question. The analyses verified the intimate relationship between the order of words, the functional segmentation of sentences, and the use of suprasegmental tools. At the same time several questions remained unanswered, still open for further discussion. Therefore this sixth volume of *Officina Textologica* is a natural continuation of the third volume examining its problems thoroughly under different aspects.

The first essay in this volume is a historical survey of the problem; three essays draw theoretical conclusions to be generalised, analysing the same text (A hiúz [The lynx], a short story by Áprily) as a base of their arguments and proofs, and two other essays use pure theoretic approach and therefore have only a loose connection with Áprily's text.

In his essay "*An outline of Hungarian linguistic studies about the functional relationship between sentence and word order*" Gábor Tolcsvai Nagy sets out from a mutual agreement between specialists about the fact that "the order of words is not simply a question of their linear arrangement" (11) because "the order of the components in a sentence is a kind of structural feature which has functional (semantic) role, and this feature has broader textological aspects" (11). Based on these statements the author adopts both syntactic and textological approach.

Following these considerations, the author outlines the interpretations of the structural and functional description of the word order, that is, the functional segmentation of sentences or functional sentence perspective, in the Hungarian linguistic studies in the XX century. He criticises several books for their complete or partial omission of that topic: the academic descriptive grammar edited by József Tompa (1961-62); the university textbooks edited by Endre Rácz (1968) and Borbála Keszler (2000); and the book on functional syntax written by László Hadrovics (1969).

The author gives an in-depth review on the ideas and concepts about the functional segmentation of sentences used by László Deme (1971), László Dezső and György Szépe (1967), László Elekfi (1964, 1986), and Katalin É. Kiss (1983, 1992, 1995, 1998). He summarises the results achieved by Hungarian linguists as follows: “The functional and cognitive theories elaborated in the last two decades have been producing only a marginal effect on the Hungarian linguistic studies although in these theories new theoretical and methodological tools have been developed for the description of the functional perspective of sentences” (17). As regards the functional and cognitive approaches the author cites the studies of Halliday (1985) and Givón (1983, 1984), and the works of Langacker (1987, etc), respectively.

The author has the opinion that Hungarian textological studies are based on two fundamental components: the principle of thematic progression by Daneš, and the model of the functional segmentation of Hungarian sentences by É. Kiss. Note that their advantages and disadvantages have been explored in detail in a former textological work by the author (2001: 244-246).

Referring to the essays of the third volume of *Officina Textologica*, the author establishes: “There is one fact in the conclusions which should be, by all means, emphasised: the functional perspective is discourse-dependent, and therefore the immediate context and situation of the discourse should be modelled in order that the description be realistic” (21). Thus, Gábor Tolcsvai Nagy considers the textological experiments of the third volume as the verification of the correctness of the functional and cognitive approaches.

The title of Edit Kádár’s essay “*(Bá)birkózás*” is a witty and thought-provoking pun which is the concatenation of two words with two possible meaning (*Bábirk-style wrestling* or *Wrestling with Bábirkó*). On the one hand, *Bábirkó* is a name occurring in the text analysed; on the other hand, *wrestling* refers to the struggle a scholar carries on with his material — perhaps, this pun also includes an approving or disapproving reflection on the essays and authors of the third volume (Piroska Kocsány, János S. Petőfi, Imre Wacha). The first part of the essay analyses the different approaches to the question of the deleted sentence-variants from the text by Áprily. The author declares that there is no use examining the text under lexico-grammatical aspect, that is, instead of analysing the text in itself, it is necessary to consider the communicative situation as well. Consequently, the starting point of the analysis should be the speaker or sender and his or her intention which then might be the basis on which the receiver assigns implicit meaning to the text.

The author argues that the task can be only completed in the framework of a hypothetical discourse action grammar because considering the communicative situation, as opposed to the linear context in its narrower sense, excessively broadens the range of interpretation in the analysis. Continuing this train of thought, and also using the results of classical and generative grammar, Edit Kádár gives a convincing textological analysis of the text sentence in question and clearly shows the differences between the effect of grammatical word order and that of module order restricted by grammatical and communicative rules. She makes her point of view unmistakably clear: “the description

of word order belongs to the grammar in its narrower sense, therefore it is a question we do not deal with here. We are only interested in the module order now, that is, the word order organised under communicative aspects.” (31) Consequently, as she says, “we do not deal here with 24 different sentences but 24 different variants of the same sentence each having different module order” (32).

In her analysis, the author recognises that the 24 variants in question have not the same “status” because one of them with a default word order can be highlighted. This default variant corresponds to the selection of a native Hungarian speaker having no special information about the context and the communicative situation (32). Edit Kádár summarises her considerations as follows: “The prosodic scheme (intonation and stress, in the first place), together with the linear arrangement of the components of the sentence, organise the structuring of the new, relevant and known information within the text sentence.” (37)

The second part of Edit Kádár’s essay discusses a type of structure called “relative statements” using a fairly new approach, but her considerations about “tekintethatározói dativus” [a kind of dative case in Hungarian grammar] and “infinitivuszi vonzat” [the government when an infinitive is required] go further from, and therefore have only a loose connection with, what has been expounded in the foregoing.

In the first part of the essay “*An analytical approach to the linearised structure of text*” János S. Petőfi discusses general theoretical questions about the different types of organisation of texts considered as complex signs. The author differentiates between two of such types: the first one can be placed along the hierarchical (vertical) vs. configurational (horizontal) dimension of the formal and semantic composition of text, and the second one expresses the denotative vs. predicative organisation within the net of (co-)references of text. The author clearly declares his point of view: “even in the case of a concrete vehiculum, the main question is the interpretative creation of the manifested forms of the organisation of the vehiculum” (51).

In the second part of his essay, János S. Petőfi gives a comprehensive and detailed analysis of the example text of the third volume of *Officina Textologica* (*A hiúz* [The lynx] by Áprily) demonstrating his considerations with several illustrative tree diagrams and tables.

The author defines the relational and linearised structure of text. On the one hand, he considers the relational structure of text as a thematic or grammatical structure which is constructed of the units of the whole text and their components. As a consequence, he differentiates between the micro-, medium-, and macro-level organisation of text components. On the other hand, the linearised structure of text is the linear organisation of the structure composed of the units of the whole text and their components. This structure is global when considering the segmentation of the whole text, and it is local when examining the organisation of the smaller units or components of the text.

In the summary of the essay the author highlights the basic questions of the research project described in the first volume of *Officina Textologica*.

The next essay “*A creative approach of the linearised structure of texts*” made by Zsuzsa Benkes contains creative exercises and text analyses intended for the students to

prepare a detailed analytical discussion. The author, giving a general picture of the different types of creative approaches to the examination of texts, seeks an answer to the question of “how we can extend, using creative exercises, the scope of examination of the linear arrangement to the whole text” (69). The thought-provoking exercises and analyses from carefully selected texts reveal the various approaches and aspects to text analysis. The essay convinces the readers that creative-productive and kaleidoscope-style exercises make students think and act productively and independently.

Gábor Alberti’s comprehensive and very demanding essay “*Management of distance relationships in a totally lexical grammar*” is relating to the theoretical issues of linear arrangement and therefore it is relatively independent from the central theme of this discussion volume. The author’s considerations are based on the common experience which suggests that the neighbourhood of the closely related words in a sentence can be established according to semantic, syntactic (that is, precedence and proximity) and morphologic (that is, related to the concepts of case suffix and concord features) information.

As a starting point, the author cites such sentences in which there are clauses, inserted into the sentence because of multiple subordination, which, in addition to the interweaving of sentences, increase the distance of the closely related elements. Gábor Alberti seeks the answer to the question of when sentence interweaving (that is, the sort of sentence construction in which the distance of the semantically related words can be increased beyond limits) can be considered as relatively well-formed in the theoretical framework of the so-called Generative / General Argument Structure Grammar (GASG). Detailed examinations and analyses in the essay serve as proofs for the fact that the sequence and proximity relationship of “distantly placed words” is based on “the lexical features of words” (90).

In the essay “*Comments on the concept of text*” Eszter Kárpáti approaches to the question of linear arrangement by analysing two different types of texts (multimedia and political) and generalising the results. According to her opinion, in case of dominantly verbal texts which contain verbal as well as non-verbal components, the interpretation of text depends on the linearisation of the reader during which the reader determines the order and relevance of non-verbal components. In case of multimedia-type texts the interpretation process seems different because the order of components cannot be changed by the observer. Instead of that, the observer can only separate the distinct components in the given context and explore their inner and overall structure. In the case of political texts, the author attributes great importance to linearisation because it helps the reader recognise the role of unambiguously used personal pronouns in the composition of text which reveal the different roles assigned to the characters.

Summarising the foregoing considerations, we might state that the different theoretical approaches and analyses of text in the essays of the current volume have specified and deepened our knowledge on linearity. It is evident, however, that — in spite of the many interesting ideas developed by the authors — the topic of linear arrangement is still open for further discussion.