Terminology and Text Linguistics

ÁGOTA FÓRIS
Károli Gáspár University, TERMIK
European Association for Terminology

1. INTRODUCTION

The basic function of language is to encode, store and transfer the knowledge accumulated by society. The structure of language and the complex processes of language use are approached in different ways by the various branches of linguistics.

Terminology and text linguistics study the aspects of language use from different perspectives and using different methods. Terminology research places the *term* into its focus and considers it as the basic unit. In text linguistics research it is the *text* that is studied. In both approaches the type of information the unit under study contains and how it does so are the important issues. Terms are part of the text. Term extractors, for example, rely on the role of terms in the text; they work using different methods, such as listing lexical units or their collocations based on their frequency of occurrence in the text, or take other features of the text into consideration while extracting terms.

In both fields several models have been developed to carry out studies and to articulate findings. These were published in detail many times (e.g.: Mel'cuk, Žolkovskij 1970; Dressler 1971; Halliday, Hasan 1976; Petőfi 1979; Beaugrande, Dressler 1981; Károly 2007; Sager 1990; Laurén, Picht 1993; Temmerman 2000; Budin 2001; Cabré 2003).

Recently, the study of Hungarian course books has gained special importance in Hungary, and several papers have been published on the pedagogic study of texts, most of which are quantitative studies. I joined this line of research with the so-called "qualitative terminology" studies, and looked for an aspect of text linguistics that could be linked to and

contrasted with terminology (the results were published in research reports and partly in Fóris 2006, 2010b). Another field I have researched is the scale-free networks of terminology and dictionaries (e.g.: Fóris 2007, 2008). Networks are present in texts at several levels. The structure of a text is the network that provides cohesion. The network between concepts establishes coherence, which appears as a configuration of knowledge formed by concepts. The networks present within the text are linked to external networks, such as the knowledge network of the author, the network of prior knowledge of the recipient, and their intertextual background.

Beaugrande and Dressler's *Introduction to Text Linguistics* provides the basis for comparing and contrasting certain aspects of text linguistics and terminology. This paper therefore aims to discuss issues that play a decisive role in encoding and decoding knowledge in a text.

2. TEXT LINGUISTICS AND TERMINOLOGY

The text is created using the verbal and written signs of a language. The text not only encodes information, but also ensures it is distributed through space and time. Depending on the nature of information, texts can have different structures and length. The text always exists in some physical from, appears in a confined space and time, but its cognitive network of relations is unlimited in both space and time. The text encodes information on concepts through terms; therefore the role of terms in a text has to be given specific focus when studying texts.

Texts can be studied from various viewpoints. A study focusing on a given aim can discover the general principles of the structure of texts, the links between a text and a natural language, the relation of the text structure to the encoded information, or the relation of the text to other components of the communication process. The studies conducted in texts linguistics have discovered a large number of findings on these topics (e.g.: Mel'cuk, Žolkovskij 1970; Dressler 1972; Beaugrande, Dressler 1981, 2002; Petőfi 1990).

Terminology and text linguistics study the issues of encoding and distributing knowledge from different starting points and approaches. Terminology studies place the *term* into focus, and it is considered to be the basic unit. These studies view the text created in the encoding process to be given, and determine the role of terms in handling information. Text linguistics studies focus on the *text* as the research subject. The text is

studied within the complex network of relations of handling information, and the features of internal and external effects are described. In this approach the term appears implicitly as the linguistic component that organises the cognitive content of information through the linguistic code. The two approaches to research have a common point: the study of knowledge storage and organization. Despite the different approaches and research methods, the findings can be incorporated into a common framework, they complement and strengthen each other.

During cognition, concepts are formed to map the elements of the world, and these concepts are structured into a system in the process of thinking to enable easy handling of the diversity in the world. The linguistic sign for a concept is the term, and the system formed through classification of terms is called terminology. Meaning is an inseparable part of the term, and it is described in terminology databases, dictionaries, and standards etc. as definitions.

Pierre Lévy's article on the responsibility of intellectuals drew the attention of researchers working in various fields to the importance of terminology issues. The Hungarian journal titled *Információs Társadalom (Information Society)* devoted a whole volume to this argument (2008/4). Lévy sees one obstacle to using the potential of collective intelligence in the great variety and fragmented nature of symbolic systems, one specific problem being the variety and incompatibility of classification systems in general and of terminology in particular (Lévy 2007: web, Lévy 2008: 9).

Terminology plays a significant role in both theoretical and empirical research, and the precise development and description of terminology is a basis for scientific classification and scientific theories. Knowledge is conveyed through language and technical texts not only convey knowledge but technical and terminological norms as well.

> "Moreover, texts are the most widespread vehicle of scientific exploration and discussion. The status of theories and models in most sciences is no better than the status of the accepted mode of discourse. The scientists themselves cannot belong to a scientific community until they have acquired its conventions of discourse and argumentations" (Beaugrande, Dressler 1981: 211–212).

It follows from the above that it is advisable to approach scientific texts both from the viewpoint of the text and the concept. The present paper focuses on the relation of texts and the terms they contain to convey information. This approach aims to study the role of terms in a text.

3. STANDARDS OF TEXTUALITY

Several types and forms of text can be distinguished; texts can be created for different purposes (a lyrical poem or a service manual), have different length (a multi-volume book or a telegram) etc., but there are certain common features that all created texts share. These characteristic features are known as standards of textuality. These principles refer to features that are present in linguistic structures, conceptual relations, aspects of communication and in the system of cognitive processes, and are reflected in texts.

In the text linguistics approach to the features of texts, terms are not treated explicitly, however they are always present implicitly in the deciphering of conceptual relations (the relations among concepts).

Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) consider a piece of writing to be a text if it is used in discourse and meets the seven standards of textuality. These are *cohesion*, *coherence*, *intentionality*, *acceptability*, *informativity*, *situationality* and *intertextuality*. Although these seven standards are widely known, in what follows I will discuss them in detail (by quoting) and elaborate on their terminological aspects.

> 1. "The first standard will be called COHESION and concerns the ways in which the components of the SURFACE TEXT, i.e. the actual words we hear or see, are *mutually connected within a sequence*. The surface components **depend** upon each other according to grammatical forms and conventions, such that cohesion rests upon GRAMMATICAL DEPENDENCIES" (Beaugrande, Dressler 1981: 3).

Cohesion is a **text**-centred notion, meaning that cohesion is present in the surface elements of the text (in its grammatical and lexical elements and characteristics) as they appear in the physical (verbal or written) form of the text. It can be studied with linguistic research methods. Halliday and Hasan understand cohesion as grammatical and lexical relations; they introduce and explain the concept of *lexical cohesion*, which indicates that the conceptual network of the text constitutes cohesion (Halliday, Hasan 1976: 238–239; Hasan 1984). Hasan differentiates between two types of lexical cohesion: general lexical cohesion and momentary relations. Such relations can and should be studied in both general language texts and texts written for specific purposes. The study of lexical–semantic relations is also important from the terminological point of view, as the designator of the term that refers to a concept usually appears in the text as some kind of lexical unit. The recipient will consider the text as a coherent

unit, if the terms found in it activate the same mental picture (concepts and conceptual relations) of his or her prior knowledge.

Therefore, terms significantly contribute to the cohesion of a text by conveying conceptual information. The linguistic component of the term makes it possible to insert the terms as essential elements of the linguistic code into text cohesion (Fóris 2010a).

> 2. "The second standard will be called COHERENCE and concerns the ways in which the components of the TEXTUAL WORD, i.e. the configuration of CONCEPTS and RELATIONS which *underlie* the surface text, are *mutually accessible* and *relevant*. A CONCEPT is definable as a configuration of knowledge (cognitive content) which can be recovered or activated with more or less unity and consistency in the mind <...>. RELATIONS are the LINKS between concepts which appear together in a textual world: each link would bear a designation of the concept it connects to. <...> Sometimes, though not always, the relations are not made EXPLICIT in the text, that is, they are not ACTIVATED directly by expressions of the surface" (Beaugrande, Dressler 1981: 4).

Coherence is a **text**-centred notion, also in the sense that it appears in the physical existence of the text, and it can be studied and established via linguistic tools. This latter characteristic makes this standard of textuality – along with cohesion – belong to the field of linguistics.

This feature refers to the cognitive content of the text, which appears in both space and time between wide limits. Cognitive content is delivered by concepts, and their comprehension is facilitated by the relations among them. Terms designating concepts carry the special and temporal links between elements of knowledge encoded in a text.

A significant purpose of scientific texts is the coherent presentation of the conceptual system of the cognitive content. Terms – as designators of concepts and at the same time the carriers of their meaning – play an important role in texts, their accurate and consistent use facilitates coherence.

> 3. "The third standard of textuality could then be called INTENTIONALITY, concerning the text **producer**'s attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text instrumental in fulfilling the producer's intentions, e.g. to distribute knowledge or to attain a GOAL specified in a PLAN" (Beaugrande, Dressler 1981: 7).

Intentionality is considered a **user**-centred notion in the sense that although this principle characterises the text, as it is delivered through a linguistic code, but its study and the reason for its existence lie outside the linguistic features of the text. The producer of a text establishes the

cohesion and coherence that serve the intention of the text. It follows that the purpose of a text determines how cohesion and coherence are manifested; for example the *target audience* and *aim* of a text are important factors: the scientific text can be written for experts having wide knowledge in the field, or students just familiarising themselves with the basics. Therefore, this standard of textuality is a key feature of a scientific text, as the intention of the producer of any such text (e.g.: an article, a course book, a standard) is to present specific content and amount of knowledge to the receiver.

The knowledge existing in the text producer's mind forms the basis for intentionality through the use of terms. The text producer selects the bits that fit his or her intention. Purposeful cohesion and coherence can be achieved through aptly selected terms and linguistic structures.

Intentionality stretches beyond the physical limitations of the text, and relies on the relations between the conceptual systems of the producer and the receiver. The producer shapes the conceptual content and linguistic structure of the text based on his or her own knowledge and the knowledge attributed to the receiver, and hence cohesion and coherence are established. Therefore, in order to produce a cohesive and coherent text we need to be familiar with (or at least suppose) the knowledge of the receiver and the terms such knowledge is encoded in.

> 4. "The fourth standard of textuality would be ACCEPTABILITY, concerning the text **receiver**'s attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text having some use or relevance for the receiver, e.g. to acquire knowledge or provide co-operation in a plan. Here also, we could view the maintenance of cohesion and coherence by the text receiver as a goal of its own, such that material would be supplied or disturbances **tolerated** as required. The operation of INFERENCING <...> strikingly illustrates how receivers support coherence by making their own contributions to the sense of the text" (Beaugrande, Dressler 1981: 7–8).

Acceptability is a **user**-centred notion, it assesses the text from the viewpoint of the receiver. Although it is a feature linked to the receiver, at the same time it rates the text as it appears in the relations between the text and the receiver. Whether cohesion and coherence of the text are established depends on the receivers, their knowledge, aims, and interests. The use of oversimplified structures, or those that are conceptually too complex when creating the surface text strongly influences its

usability for the receiver. A level of terms and relations between terms that is inappropriate for the receiver might fail to create coherence and thus restrict acceptability.

The acceptability of a text is determined by the relations of the prior knowledge of the receiver to the knowledge encoded in the text, and can be reached through a shared set of terms.

> 5. "The fifth standard of textuality is called INFORMATIVITY and concerns the extent to which the occurrences of the presented text are expected vs. unexpected or known vs. unknown/certain. <...> The processing of highly informative occurrences is more demanding than otherwise, but correspondingly more interesting as well. Caution must be exercised lest the receivers' processing become overloaded to the point of endangering communication" (Beaugrande, Dressler 1981: 8–9).

Informativity is also a **user**-centred notion, and also a feature that appears in the text and it can be evaluated from the viewpoint of the receiver. The same text could be approached in different ways depending on the receiver's prior knowledge. For example, knowledge encoded in the text of a course book must match the information processing capacity of the receiving students. If there is too much new information (be it conceptual or linguistic) in a text, the receivers could fail to process it, and if there is too little, they find it boring. Therefore, the prior knowledge, age etc. of the target audience are key factors of informativity.

Creating text which has optimal informativity is made possible by the coherent use of known terms, and by adjusting the information that carries new concepts and terms to the existing knowledge of the receiver.

> 6. "The sixth standard of textuality can be designated SITUATIONALITY and concerns the factors which make a text RELEVANT to a SITUATION of occurrence" (Beaugrande, Dressler 1981: 9).

Situationality is a **user**-centred notion, which is about the relation of the given text to the outside world in the situation of occurrence.

The attainment of situationality is significantly influenced by the relation of terms that occur in the text to terms customarily used in a given situation. For example, in a friendly chat the use of formal or poetic terms could be perceived as ironic or offensive. In a scientific paper the use of technical terms might make understanding the text more difficult, but at the same time facilitates communication in the workshop.

> 7. "The seventh standard of textuality is to be called INTERTEXTUALITY and concerns the factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts. <...> Intertextuality is, in a general fashion, responsible for the evolution of text types as classes of texts with typical patterns of characteristics" (Beaugrande, Dressler 1981: 10).

Intertextuality is a **user**-centred notion that characterises the relation of the text to other texts the receiver has previously processed. The receiver finds it easier to identify relations in texts that have similar standards of textuality; the application of similar frames, schemas, and plans (ibid. 90) makes text processing much easier. The existence of various types of text (a recipe, a scientific paper, a technical brochure, a novel, etc.) is the result of the efforts of text producers to create intertextual characteristics that reduce the processing efforts of the receiver.

Intertextuality is of key significance for texts of standards and course books. Education continuously builds the conceptual and terminological system, the role of interlinks between texts is crucial. For example, a concept of numbers is formed over several years. The processing of a text that contains a new term (e.g.: irrational numbers) relies on other texts (on natural numbers, integers, fractions) processed years before, and presupposes their knowledge. Such links are often not explicitly planted in the text, and the receiver retrieves the knowledge necessary for understanding the text while processing it. In the text of course books it is important to build appropriately intertextual texts that meet the requirements of coherence. Well-written course books of subjects taught in public education fulfil the requirement of intertextuality, both each individually and as a whole, by relying on previous course book texts both with regards to their structure and their content.

All of the seven standards of textuality discussed above are important to for the role played by texts in the communication process. Different texts can be evaluated using different approaches, and therefore different principles play a more important role in one case than in another. However, every standard has to be observed while composing a text, and all of them have to be considered when evaluating a text. The effect of each principle needs to be weighed depending on the given situation.

Quantitative research methods allow for the study of the surface text. Carefully planned studies on details of cohesion provide valuable data to be used in creating texts and evaluating them.

Qualitative research methods allow for the study of concepts, knowledge encoded in texts, and their relation in the text. In order to decide whether a text meets the requirements for encoding, storing and distributing concepts, we have to study its content, rather than just the surface structure. This includes the study of internal conceptual systems encoded in the text and of the external conceptual networks (i.e. the entire conceptual system of the domain) that are linked to them. These conceptual relations are manifested in terms, which are approached by text linguistics from the viewpoint of the standards of textuality and by terminology based on the features of the term. Both approaches emphasize the significance of conceptual aspects of evaluating texts.

4. MEANING AND SENSE

Being familiar with the basic concepts of text linguistics and terminology (e.g.: concept, meaning) it is necessary to go into details on the role of texts and terms in the complex process of communication.

In the study of the content of texts, *coherence* plays the key part. Coherence enables understanding the relations between terms, and facilitates the distribution of the cognitive content of the text. In order to study the cognitive content, we have to elaborate on the concept of *meaning*. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981: 84) differentiate between *meaning* and *sense* in the following way:

> "If MEANING is used to designate the *potential* of a language expression (or other sign) for representing and conveying knowledge (i.e. *virtual* meaning), then we can use SENSE to designate the knowledge that *actually* is conveyed by expressions occurring in a text. Many expressions have several virtual meanings, but under normal conditions, only one sense in a text. If the intended sense is not at once clear, NON-DETERMINANCY is present. A lasting non-determinancy could be called AMBIGUITY if it is presumably not intended, or POLYVALENCE if the text producer did in fact intend to convey multiple senses at the same time" (Beaugrande, Dressler 1981: 84).

In the text linguistics approach by Beaugrande and Dressler, the sense of a language expression is a specific realisation of an element of virtual meaning. For example, the term *father* could have one of the following meanings in a given text: ancestor that fathers a child, the strict educator of a child, the caring and loving guardian of a child. In any given text the term *father* occurs in one of the above senses.

The fact that the relation of meaning and sense is not clear is shown in cases when "foreign words" already rooted in the vocabulary of languages for specific purposes are replaced by "Hungarian words". In the receiving language, foreign words often have only one virtual meaning, therefore their sense in the text is unambiguous, while their target language equivalents often have several virtual meanings and therefore the receiver is not sure about the sense the expression is being used in. This is when the reader faces ambiguity. The same is true if a student tries to find the sense of a general language word as used in a text based on one of its virtual meanings. Comprehension based on the general language meaning of the word can only be unambiguous if its meaning is the same in the general language and in the LSP (all its meanings are the same). Ambiguity arises if the student does not select from the several virtual meanings the one that is needed to decipher the message of the text. This is why it is highly important to convey not only the knowledge of the subject at school but also the special language of the subject, and the norm system of that language. The translator's situation in the process of translation is quite similar: he or she has to find the actually suitable meaning from among the possible virtual meanings in the target language to match the sense of the source language.

It is worth noting that the differentiation of *meaning* and *sense* is done with various signs in the literature of semantics and pragmatics, for example: *lexical meaning* and *actual meaning*. The differentiation of the surface structure and the deep structure, or the linguistic and conceptual differences between cultures is also traceable to this dichotomy.

Terminology expresses the difference between virtual meaning and sense in the following way. The sense (actual meaning) of a term is made up of several components: the concept, the pragmatic situation, and the linguistic realisation together determine the sense (actual meaning) of a term (Fóris 2010a).

It is also necessary to elaborate on the sense of a text, once the sense of an expression is clarified. The text encodes knowledge using expressions (terms). The sense of an expression is the knowledge that occurs in a given context. The issue here is how this cumulative sense, which we can call the sense of a text, is activated through the use of expressions.

In Beaugrande and Dressler's understanding (1981: 84–85), the sense of the text is established through the continuity of knowledge activated

with the help of terms; namely, it is created through coherent configuration of terms and their relationship. A text can be coherent and still be incomprehensible to the receiver (for example, if he or she lacks the necessary background knowledge), and it can also happen so that the text is not coherent but the receiver can understand it because he or she can fill in the gaps in continuity. For example, if a course book on physics mixes up the perspectives of the macro and micro world, the distribution of information will not be coherent if the receiver is not familiar with the textual world of both (that is, has sufficient knowledge on both the macro world and the micro world).

When examining the features of text, text linguistics inevitably touches upon issues that terminology needs to answer when laying its theoretical foundations. One such issue is the definition of the **concept** as a cognitive unit.

> "A CONCEPT can be defined as a configuration of knowledge that can be recovered or activated with more or less consistency and unity. This definition is *operational*, based on the indisputable fact that language users, when employing or being confronted with a particular expression, tend to ACTIVATE roughly the same chunk of knowledge, i.e. place the chunk in ACTIVE STORAGE <...>. Variations among different language users do not seem to be substantial enough to occasion disturbances very often. It should follow from here that meaning of a concept is the sum of its possible uses (Schmidt 1978). Unfortunately, many concepts are so adaptable to differing environments that they remain quite FUZZY in regard to their components and boundaries. Therefore, defining concepts involves working with comparative PROBABILITIES <...>." (Beaugrande, Dressler 1981: 85)

The basic unit of terminology is the *concept*; its linguistic sign is the *term*. When these basic concepts were introduced, empirical findings (translation, contrastive linguistics etc.) revealed that the characteristic features of the concept and the term form a fuzzy set. The free choice of classification features or the differences between the world views of various cultures etc. lead to a different categorization of the same reality in the world. The features of a given concept are different not only in the various conceptual systems of different cultures, but also in different domains, and at times even among different groups of experts working in the same field. The fuzzy nature of the concept can be described from a terminological perspective: the actual meaning of the term can vary in

different communication situations (or, referring to the above, it activates different configurations of knowledge).

The relations between concepts "constitute the linkage which delimits the use of each concept" (ibid. 86). This definition of the concept does not contradict the terminological understanding, as it describes the same idea that terminology has on the relation of the linguistic sign of the term and the features of the concept.

"If concepts can indeed subsume different knowledge elements according to the conditions of activation, then concepts cannot be primitive, monolithic units. Instead, concepts must have their own components held together by a particular STRENGTH OF LINKAGE." (ibid. 86). The components of concepts can be different in the minds of different people having different background knowledge; take, for example, the conceptual components a physicist, a chemist and a literary man may have in their mind about the *atom*.

5. ACQUIRING AND ORGANIZING KNOWLEDGE

When discussing the issues of text encoding and decoding, we encounter questions of data storage in the brain and searching the stored elements. In order to be able to encode knowledge in a text, the text producer needs to find the necessary linguistic elements, and the rules of code formation. When decoding, the receiver has to peel off the knowledge elements from the linguistic signs. These processes that take place in the brain rely on the characteristic features that appear in the text through the standards of textuality. Different parts of the brain store linguistic signs and cognitive knowledge. The question here is how language code is formed to convey knowledge, and the other way round, in the process of decoding how cognitive knowledge is linked to the incoming linguistic signs.

In cognitive neuroscience, this mental process, in which knowledge is stored in different parts of the brain and is retrieved in utilisation is called *active memory* (Racsmány 2003, Gósy 2005: 27–71).

The findings of cognitive neuroscience indicate that knowledge organised in the brain has a network structure (Gósy 2005: 193–200), meaning that the network structure enables a quick access to stored knowledge and linguistic signs. Based on my studies in the field or terminology I presume that the mental processes that take place in the brain occur in a special, so called scale-free network structure, in much the same way as does the storage and retrieval of terms (Fóris 2007).

These networks do not evolve randomly, but instead are created in a purposeful way, and their special characteristics make for very fast and reliable operation. Such a network structure is suitable to model several details of the workings of language and communication processes. The internal and external links of a text also form a network that can be traced within a short time. The reference systems of printed dictionaries or the search engines of online dictionaries lead through a network of dictionaries (Fóris 2008). Conceptual/terminological networks appear well beyond the physical boundaries of a text in intertextuality, in linkages that form cohesion and coherence, and among the relations between the term set of the text producer, the text itself, and its receiver.

Knowledge and meanings are sensitive to context, they depend on it. The occurrence of knowledge and meanings is always done through some kind of network. The knowledge can be organised into a network in different ways; if this network is well-organized, the text is considered coherent. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981: 94) view coherence as a result of a network that contains concepts and relations: "Coherence will be envisioned as the outcome of combining concepts and relations into a NETWORK composed of KNOWLEDGE SPACES centred around main TOPICS."

In the network of concepts *nodes* have different functions. There are primary concepts and secondary concepts. The basis for classification is the extent to which the concept is suitable for the purposes of the governing hub that establishes mental continuity. A detailed discussion of this issue in the study of textual characteristics is highly important because terms that occur in a course book must be selected in a way that they activate the right concepts that ensure mental continuity.

Organizing concepts and relations into a network does not only result in a conceptual network, but also a grammatical network that plays a significant role in cohesion.

Decoding knowledge that has been encoded by the linguistic code system of a text is a complex psychological process. Information retrieval is not simply an operation of a code key to decipher the meaning of codes. Many of the standards of textuality focus on the relation between the receiver and the text. The decoding of a text is a psychological process, in just the same way as is text production, and the process follows the same global patterns. In the process of information retrieval inferring, supplementing, and being familiar with the conventions of text production have important roles.

The text can fulfil its purpose if decoding is completed. The success of decoding depends on the receivers being familiar with the signs and the code key, namely the accepted ways of expression. Knowledge transfer can only be effective if the receiver is able to understand the content of a text. This comprehension depends on whether the receiver has acquired the norms of the given text type, and to that end terminological norms are of critical importance.

CONCLUSION

Within the framework of text linguistics I focused on the relation of text structure and stored information. Out of the seven standards of textuality, coherence has the main role when studying scientific texts. Coherence of a text is understood at the network of relations between concepts, and in this the meaning of terms and their role in the text play an important role.

Terms have an important role in the standards of textuality. The information content of a text is encoded in the network formed by terms. Beaugrande and Dressler's text linguistic model describes the flow of information along the relation system in the textual network. Terms are present in the model as the carriers of configurations of knowledge (concepts). Terminology starts from the relation of the concept and the term, and builds a model for the communication process, which model also includes the various relations of the text.

REFERENCES

Beaugrande R. de, Dressler W. 1981: *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, London/New York: Longman.
Beaugrande R. de, Dressler W. 2002: *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. http://www.beaugrande.com/introduction_to_text_linguistics.htm (09.10.2011)
Budin G. 2001: A critical evaluation of the state-of-the-art of terminology theory. – *ITTF Journal* 12 (1–2), 7–23.
Cabré (Castellví) M. T. 2003: Theories of terminology. Their description, prescription and explanation. – *Terminology* 9 (2), 163–200.
Dressler W. 1972: *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
Fóris Á. 2006: A terminológiai szemlélet a tankönyvek minőségi megítélésében. [Terminological perspectives in the qualitative assessment of coursebooks.]. – *Iskolakultúra* XVI (5), 79–88.
Fóris Á. 2007: A skálafüggetlen hálók nyelvészeti vonatkozásai. [Linguistic approaches of scale-free networks.] – *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomány* VII (1–2), 105–124.
Fóris Á. 2008: Scale-free Networks in Dictionaries. In Bernal, E. – DeCesaris, J. (eds.) *Proceedings of the XIII EURALEX International Congress (Barcelona, 15–19 July 2008)*. Sèrie Activitats. 20. Barcelona: Institut Universitari de Lingüística Aplicada, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 1499–1504.
Fóris Á. 2010a: Change of paradigm in terminology: new models in KO. In: Gnoli C., Mazzocchi F. (eds.) *Paradigms and conceptual systems in knowledge organization*. Proceedings of the Eleventh International

ISKO Conference 23-26 February 2010, Rome, Italy. (Advances in Knowledge Organization Vol. 12.), Würzburg: ERGON VERLAG, 57–63.

Fóris Á. 2010b: Tankönyvvizsgálatok terminológiai és szövegnyelvészeti szempontból. [Course book analysis from terminological and text linguistic aspects.] – *Magyar Terminológia* 3 (2), 229–250.

Gósy M. 2005: *Pszicholingvisztika*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

Halliday M. A. K., Hasan R. 1976: *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hasan R. 1984: Coherence and cohesive harmony. In: Flood J. (ed.) *Understanding Reading Comprehension*, Delaware: International Reading Association, 181–219.

Károly K. 2007: *Szövegtan és fordítás*. [Text linguistics and translation.] Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Laurén C., Picht H. 1993: Vergleich der terminologischenSchulen. In: Laurén C., Picht H. (eds.). *Ausgewählte Texte zur Terminologie*, Vienna: TermNet, 493–539.

Lévy P. P. 2007: Nouvelle responsabilité des intellectuels. *Le Monde Diplomatique*. http://www.monde-diplomatique.fr/2007/08/LEVY/15006 (30.09.2011)

Lévy P. P. 2008: Az értelmiség új felelőssége a kommunikáció korában. – *Információs Társadalom* VIII (4), 8–11.

Mel'cuk I., Žolkovskij A. 1970: Towards a functioning meaning-text model of language. – *Linguistics* 57, 10–47.

Petőfi J. (ed.) 1979: *Text versus Sentence: Basic Questions in Text Linguistics*, Hamburg: Buske.

Petőfi S. J. 1990: *Szöveg, szövegtan, műelemzés*, Budapest: OPI.

Racsmány M. 2003: Az emlékezet kognitív neuropszichológiája. In: Pléh Cs., Kovács Gy., Gulyás B. *Kognitív idegtudomány*, Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

Sager J. C. 1990: *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schmidt S. 1978: Some problems of communicative text theories. In: Dressler W. (ed.) *Current trends in text linguistics*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 47–60.

Temmerman R. 2000: *Towards New Ways of Terminological Description. The Sociocognitive approach*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

TERMINOLOGIJA IR TEKSTO LINGVISTIKA

Nagrinėjant kalbos vartojimo klausimus, terminologijos ir teksto lingvistikos tyrimai remiasi skirtingais požiūriais ir metodais. Terminologijos tyrimuose pagrindinis dėmesys tenka *terminui*, kuris laikomas pagrindiniu vienetu, teksto lingvistikos tyrimuose – *tekstui*. Abiem atvejais domimasi, kokią informaciją ir kaip perteikia tiriamas vienetas. Straipsnyje, remiantis R. de Beaugrande ir W. Dressler knyga *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, atskleidžiamos terminologijos ir teksto lingvistikos sąsajos. Jas tiriant pagrindinis dėmesys kreipiamas į ryšį tarp teksto struktūros ir jame perteikiamos informacijos. Iš septynių teksto požymių ypatingas vaidmuo skiriamas koherencijai, kurią atskleidžia ryšių tarp sąvokų tinklas. Čia didelės svarbos įgauna terminų reikšmė ir jų vaidmuo tekste. Straipsnyje nagrinėjama, kaip tekste užkoduojamos ir iškoduojamos žinios. Trumpai paliesti klausimai, kaip žinios gaunamos, apdorojamos, saugomos ir perduodamos naudojant kalbą.

Ágota Fóris
Károli Gáspár University, TERMIK
Reviczky u. 4., 1088 Budapest, Hungary
E-mail aforis@t-online.hu