

NÓRA CSONTOS

MEANS OF SHARING KNOWLEDGE IN TECHNICAL TEXTS: A POSSIBLE INTERPRETATION OF THE TECHNICAL TEXT TYPES¹

In: Fóris, Ágota; Bölcskei, Andrea (szerk.): *Linguistic Research in teh Fields of Content Development and Documentation*, Budapest, KRE–L’Harmattan, 2023, pp. 269–292.

Abstract

The aim of the paper is to create a possible typology for technical texts in a socio-cognitive framework, focusing on the concept of technical text. By using the findings of cognitive linguistics and the pragmatic perspective, the study tries to point out the benefits of a typology of technical texts embedded in this theoretical framework. As the basis of a text typology is necessarily determined by the nature of the text, the concept of technical text needs to be examined from the perspective of institutionalized and empirical knowledge components. By highlighting the means of sharing knowledge, the study provides a proposal for interpreting the possible types of technical texts and identifying directions for further research.

Keywords: socio-cognitive linguistics, schema, text type, technical text, technical text type

INTRODUCTION

A specialized text typology created in a socio-cognitive² framework considers text type³ as knowledge that is generalized and inferred from the formal presentation of texts. In connection with the composition of this knowledge, this framework emphasizes that the text type can be

¹ The paper was supported by the research program “The Hungarian Language and Professional Culture: Hungarian Linguistic Research in the Fields of Content Development and Technical Documentation” at the Faculty of Humanities of the Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary. The Hungarian version of the paper contained figures, which were removed from the English translation for lack of space. The bibliographical data of the first, Hungarian publication: Csontos, Nóra: A tudás megosztásának módja a szakszövegekben. A szakszövegtípus egy lehetséges értelmezése, in Fóris, Ágota – Bölcskei, Andrea (szerk.): *Tartalomfejlesztés és dokumentáció: nyelvészeti kutatások*, 2021, 93–122.

² On the concept, cf. Croft, William: Towards a social cognitive linguistics, in Evans, Vyvyan – Poursel, Stephanie (eds.): *New directions in cognitive linguistics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2009, 395–420; on the theoretical development of the text typology based on concept cf. Kuna, Ágnes – Simon, Gábor: Műfaj, szövegtípus, szövegfajta, Nézőpontok, kategóriák, modellek a szövegnyelvészeti kutatásban, *Magyar Nyelv*, 113., 2017/3, 257–275; Tátrai, Szilárd: Esti Kornél és a beégés: megjegyzések a műfajiság pragmatikai vonatkozásaihoz, *ibid.*, 290–301; on research conducted in this frame cf. for example Kuna, Ágnes: Az orvosi recept mint szövegtípus a 16–17. században, 1. rész, *Magyar Nyelv*, 112., 2016/4, 385–400; Kuna, Ágnes: *Nyelv, meggyőzés, gyógyítás, A meggyőzés nyelvi mintázatai a 16–17. századi orvosi receptekben*, Budapest, Tinta, 2019; Hámori, Ágnes: Diskurzusműfaj, séma és forgatókönyv, A „vice” műfaj sémájának jellemzői és kiépülésének dinamikája a társas interakciókban, *Magyar Nyelv*, 113., 2017/3, 311–329; Ballagó, Júlia: Az internetes receptportálok műfajisága a kontextualizációs utasításként értelmezett paratextusok nézőpontjából, in Laczkó, Krisztina – Tátrai, Szilárd (szerk.): *Kontextualizáció és metapragmatikai tudatosság*, DiAGram Könyvek I., Budapest, ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, 2019, 315–334.

³ For a summary of text typology analyses see: Csontos, Nóra: Technical texts from the perspective of text typology. Text typology analysis of instruction manuals, in Fóris, Ágota – Bölcskei, Andrea (eds.): *Linguistic Research in the Field of Content Development and Documentation*, Budapest, KRE – L’Harmattan, 148–154.

considered as a category⁴ of the complex linguistic images of cognitive patterns used for the realization of certain interactive purposes, originating from the interaction of certain characteristics and created along the lines of text samples. This typology emphasizes that beyond the formal and structural characteristics that define text types, the contexts and speech situations understood in a broader sense factor in, and the internally ongoing transmission and creation of meaning also are key.⁵ Text types adhere to the speech situations and embody the prototypical representations of some communicative functions, or they change as the communicative components change. Resulting from their story of origin and the speech situations understood in a broader sense, these categories cannot be considered complete or describable along the lines of necessary and sufficient features, but instead they form an open category enabling the texts and the text types to have contact along the lines of similar or identical components or characteristics.

In the framework of categorization⁶ based text typology realized under a socio-cognitive framework, social and cultural factors also have their part aside from individual knowledge and operations. It connects the typical text types and their creation with the components of the knowledge based on the conventionalized, encyclopedic knowledge and on the everyday experience of the speakers and language users. It considers the text types as knowledge or experience that originate, on the one hand, from the empirically-based, everyday knowledge about texts, and on the other hand, from the knowledge of specialized texts conventionalized

⁴ On cognitive linguistics, which forms the basis of the social-cognitive text typology see Langacker, Roland W.: *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Volume I, Theoretical prerequisites*, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1987; Langacker, Roland W.: *Grammar and conceptualization*, Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 1999; Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor: *Kognitív szemantika*, Nyitra, Konstantin Filozófus Egyetem, Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kara, 2010; Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor: *Bevezetés a kognitív nyelvészetbe*, Budapest, Osiris, 2013; Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor: Bevezetés, in Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor (szerk.): *Nyelvtan*, Budapest, Osiris, 23–71; Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor: Jelentéstan, in Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor (szerk.): *Nyelvtan*, Budapest, Osiris, 2017, 207–466; Langacker, Ronald W.: *Cognitive grammar, A basic introduction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008; on the pragmatics approach see: Tátrai, Szilárd: *Bevezetés a pragmatikába, Funkcionális kognitív megközelítés*, Budapest, Tinta, 2011; Tátrai, Szilárd: Pragmatika, in Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor (szerk.): *Nyelvtan*, Budapest, Osiris, 897–1058; Verschueren, Jef: Pragmatic perspective, in Verschueren, Jef – Östman, Jan-Ola – Blommaert, Jan (eds.): *Handbook of pragmatics*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1995, 1–19; Verschueren, Jef: *Understanding pragmatics*, London, New York, Sydney, Auckland, Arnold, 1999.

⁵ Cf. Tátrai, Szilárd: A kontextus fogalmáról, *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 128., 2004/4, 479–494.

⁶ Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor: *Kognitív szemantika*, 24; cf. also Tolcsvai Nagy: *Bevezetés a kognitív nyelvészetbe*, 114–129; Tolcsvai Nagy: *Jelentéstan*, 215–222, on non-scientific cognition see e.g. Rosch, Eleanor, Human Categorization, in Warren, N. (ed.): *Studies in Cross-Cultural Psychology. Vol. I.*, London, Academic Press, 1977, 1–49; Eysenck, Michael W.–Keane, Mark T.: *Cognitive Psychology: A Student's Handbook* 8th Edition, Psychology Press 2020; Geerarts, Dirk: *Diachronic Prototype Semantics: A Contribution to Historical Lexicology*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1997, 10–22.

and acquired during social activities considering the culture and socialization⁷ of the language users' community.

This approach, in accordance with cognitive linguistics and pragmatics as a point of view, considers the text type and the genres as a cognitive schema, in particular a script-like schema on the basis of which we carry out social activities.⁸ Since the text type is typically connected to the transfer of knowledge and characteristic actions, the complex schemata (knowledge framework and script)⁹ are equally important. The script contains and organizes knowledge connected to the activities of social life, together with components that are temporal and connected to the order of activities and roles.¹⁰

Text types are created and operated by a cognitive need as well as communicative and social relationships.¹¹ Text types emerging along the lines of categorization offer a framework for language use. This framework, as a consequence of experience-based categorization, is known, can be experienced by the speakers, or can be learned. Consequently, a text or the constructions functioning within it can become acceptable or even conventional, becoming the pattern for both identification and creation. Therefore, the text type does not have real meaning, but it is a pattern: the construction, or the mode Cf. of construction becoming typical to the speech situation¹² makes the formation or the creation of the meaning possible throughout the interaction. Thus the text type based on categorization can simultaneously become the baseline of linguistic activity throughout text creation and point out the interactional and socio-cultural conventions; furthermore, it provides a framework for encyclopaedical and experience-based knowledge to form and be formed, and it gives a schema to the linguistic realization and

⁷ Cf. Tátrai: *Pragmatika*, 905; cf. also Tomasello, Michael: *Gondolkodás és kultúra*, Budapest, Osiris, 2002, 103–143.

⁸ Cf. Schank, Roger C. – Abelson, Robert P.: *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding*. Hillsdale (NJ.), Erlbaum, 1977.

⁹ Cf. van Dijk, Teun A: Kontextus és megismerés. Tudáskeretek és beszédaktus-megértés, in Penavin, Olga – Thomka, Beáta (eds.): *Tanulmányok 15*, Újvidék, 1982, 63–81; de Beaugrande, Robert – Dressler, Wolfgang: *Bevezetés a szövegnyelvészetbe*, Budapest, Corvina, 2000, 127–128; Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor: *A magyar nyelv szövegtana*, Budapest, Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 2001, 73–78; Tátrai: A kontextus fogalmáról, 481–482; Tolcsvai Nagy: Jelentés, 226–227.

¹⁰ On the script-based research see: Hámori: Diskurzusműfaj, séma és foratókönyv, 311–329; Kuna, Ágnes: *A 16–17. századi magyar nyelvű orvosi recept szövegtipológiai és pragmatikai vizsgálat funkcionális kognitív keretben*, Doctoral dissertation, Budapest, ELTE BTK, 2011; Kuna, Ágnes.: *Nyelv, meggyőzés, gyógyítás, A meggyőzés nyelvi mintázatai a 16–17. századi orvosi receptekben*, Budapest, Tinta, 2019.

¹¹ Heinemann, Wolfgang: Textsorte – Textmuster – Texttyp, in Brinker, Klaus – Antos, Gerd – Heinemann, Wolfgang – Sager, Syen Frederik (Hrsg.): *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*, HSK. 16.1., Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 520; Kocsány, Piroska: *Szöveg, szövegtípus, jelentés: a mondás mint szövegtípus*, Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 151., Akadémiai, Budapest, 2002, 54–56.

¹² On the process of construction see: Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor: Bevezetés, in Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor (szerk.): *Nyelvtan*, Budapest, Osiris, 42–50; cf. also Langacker, R. W.: *Foundations*, 118–120.

recognition that enables the generation and transfer of meaning originating from and along the lines of the schema.

When describing text types in this framework, the schematizing patterns by the utilization of which the mental activity of text creation and reception are represented, and by which texts can be created and interpreted throughout the socio-cognitive activity, are coming to the forefront. It is also important to emphasize the existence of the traditionally recognizable structures consisting of typical linguistic features, because these structures as linguistic constructions are the result of construction carried out by the utilization of the schemata¹³. But in connection with these, how and why these schemata are introduced to the language interaction needs to be studied, too: is it only the experience-based knowledge at work, or does the conventionalized way of construction, developing on the experience based knowledge, also define the linguistic construction, the structure, the formation and the components of the text?

DEFINING THE CONCEPT OF SPECIALIZED TEXT

To analyze the specialized text types, it is necessary to clarify the concept of specialized text; using this as a baseline poses an interesting question: does specialized text mean only one text type? The core problem in connection with the concept of the specialized texts is how, and especially on what basis, can the typical components indicating a specialized text be identified. To what extent can the already existing definitions be used throughout the identification of these components? Is the deductive or inductive description of the conceptual construction of the specialized texts meaningful? And consequently, what is the relationship between the existing definition(s) that can be identified as “scientific”, and the concept of specialized text localized in the mind?

The “holistic” framework for cognitive linguistics and the concept of text¹⁴ as interpreted in this framework necessarily answers the aforementioned questions and guides the basic method and guidelines for research. Under this theoretic framework the concept of specialized text has two basic components:

- Experience-based knowledge: this connects the text instances and text types with the receivers of the texts. While understanding and interpreting the text, the receiver is able

¹³ Cf. Kárpáti, Eszter – Kleiber, Judit: A mentális állapot változásának szerepe egy diskurzus szerveződésében. *Iskolakultúra*, 28., 2018/5–6, 28–39. <https://doi.org/10.14232/ISKKULT.2018.5-6.28> (Accessed: September 14, 2020)

¹⁴ See Tolcsvai Nagy: *A magyar nyelv szövegtana*, 13–14, 38–54, 62–64.

to identify typical characteristics and attributes of the texts. Through the act of schematization and abstracting¹⁵ the receiver stores these in their mind, thus generating the specialized text types and the concept of specialized text;

- Institutionalized knowledge: knowledge based on scientific experience and knowledge conventions, which are acquired by the language user mainly throughout education, such as written discourse especially in connection with the strongly conventionalized text. This kind of knowledge describes the specialized text based on criteria.

Institutionalized knowledge has one more component that largely defines the language users' concept of specialized text. The creation of specialized texts takes place along the lines of institutionalized knowledge: documentation, standards and legal regulations can regulate the content and form of texts. The style guides of scientific texts and the marketing of commercial products can also be rated here.

This paper considers it necessary to analyze the concept of specialized text according to these two components of knowledge before it outlines the interpretation of specialized text as a text type. It uses the findings of two studies of different purposes as the basis for the characterization of specialized text schema and the creation of its entity as a text type. The first analyzes the components of institutionalized knowledge connected to the specialized text, using the definitions of specialized text with a short sidetrack about the importance of the legal regulations and standards defining the creation of these texts; the second examines the components of the everyday, experience-based knowledge by asking language users about their knowledge.

The baseline idea of the study assessing experience-based knowledge was that though a full and detailed definition of the concept of specialized text cannot be expected from respondents, prototypical characteristics (i.e. the most easily recalled and activated features) can be expected, and these will include components of institutionalized knowledge and the knowledge emerging as the result of processing the text samples. Therefore the responses can point out which text samples or characteristics can become defining at the creation of a text type schema, how these characteristics connect as components of specialized text, what categories and subcategories will experience result in, and what will be their basis. The frequency of knowledge items in the responses can point out how language users categorize specialized texts, on what basis, what are the defining and frequent elements among these, and what are less essential and more peripheral elements.

¹⁵ Cf. Tolcsvai Nagy: Bevezetés, 33, 34–35; see also Langacker, Ronald W.: *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, 116–137.

Components of institutionalized knowledge

Definitions

Before analyzing institutionalized knowledge, first it is necessary to overview the descriptive definitions of the concept of specialized text. The scientific descriptive definitions of the concept of specialized text consider the specialized text to function as the written product of specialized discourse. However, after analyzing the definitions of specialized text it can be seen that these definitions focus mainly on the formal characteristics of texts, providing a formal description of specialized texts. From the pragmatical components, provided the definition applies to these, mostly the role of the creator and receiver of the text is emphasized, and their intention to understand and to be understood, which characterizes the interaction between them.¹⁶

Based on the shared components of the analyzed definitions¹⁷, specialized texts have the following properties:

- it is the written language product of specialized discourse;
- it is characterized by accurate, brief and clear development of the topic;
- it can be linked to a certain subject, field or profession;
- it is characterized by the dominant use of terms (strong presence of terminology);
- the topic is delimited;
- the structure and form of the text is strongly conventionalized, and the emphasis of the syntactic structures (compound sentences) is a typical linguistic feature;
- symbols, graphs and diagrams may be embedded in the text.

Considering additional details about the selection of linguistic tools, both the COTSOES (2002) and Cabré (1999) emphasized that specialized texts are primarily characterized by

¹⁶ See e.g. Cabré, Maria Teresa: *Terminology. Theory, methods and applications*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999; Kurtán, Zsuzsa: *Szakmai nyelvhasználat*, Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest, 2003.

¹⁷ The research used the following works for the analysis: Fóris, Ágota: A magyar terminológia helyzete és fejlesztésének feladatai napjainkban, *Magyar Tudomány*, 2006/6, 737–745, Fóris, Ágota: A szótári információk és a szaknyelvi normák viszonya, *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 130, 2006/1, 49–59; Felber, Helmut: *Terminology Manual*, Paris, UNESCO, Infoterm, 1984; Banczerowski, Janusz: A szaknyelvek és a szaknyelvi szövegek egyes sajátosságai, *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 128, 2004/4, 446–452; Pearson, Jennifer: *Terms in Context*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1998; Pátrovics, Péter: A medicina nyelve, *Magyar Orvosi Nyelv*, 2004/1, 11–24; Kurtán: *Szakmai nyelvhasználat*; Wright, Sue Ellen – Budin, Gerhard: *Handbook of Terminology Management*, Vol. 1–2. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1997; Arntz, Reiner – Picht, Heribert: *Einführung in die Übersetzungsbezogene Terminologiearbeit*, Hildesheim, Georg Olms Verlag, 1982; COTSOES: *Recommendations for Terminology Work*, MediaCenter of the Confederation, Bern, 2002.

nominalization.¹⁸ Arntz and Picht's (1982) study revealed that the ratio of the nouns in specialized texts compared to other text types is 44% to 28%, and other categories of word classification (e.g. using pronouns which create coreference in non-specialized texts) has a smaller role in these texts.¹⁹ According to Cabré (1999), subordinations are less frequent than in other texts because of the more compact structures used.

Among the lexical particularities emerges the use of professional terms. Wright and Budin (1997) argued that the most important and most particular characteristic of the specialized language is the use of terminology.²⁰ Bańczerowski (2004) emphasizes the strong presence of foreign and loan words and the use of classical language vocabulary.²¹

Pragmatic components include the issue of the linguistic possibilities of marking the receiver. The preferred use of the present indicative and depending on the language, the use of the 3rd person singular or the 1st person plural form, or the general "you" in order to form sentences with a general, were proposed by Arntz and Picht (1982) as the manifestation of impersonality.²²

Institutionalized knowledge components defining text creation

When defining the concept of specialized texts, it is a determining factor that their creation is regulated by documents (style guides, standards, laws, etc.). Viewing the genre of specialized texts as a whole, these factors influence their forming to some extent, and thereby having an effect on the aforementioned definitions and our experience-based knowledge on these texts. This strongly institutionalized component of institutionalized knowledge can impact the knowledge and expectations of both the creator and the receiver about specialized texts.

The documents of institutionalized knowledge can be considered metadiscourses that define the forming of the text to different degrees. They can be regulations (a law or a standard), or recommendations and expectations (e.g. the guidelines for academic papers). This paper will only mention these texts and not go into detail:

- *Institutionalized knowledge as a regulation:* texts and visual or online content that regulate and help using a product or a service are called documentation.²³ In the

¹⁸ COTSOES, Cabré.: Terminology, 1999.

¹⁹ Arntz – Picht: Einführung, 1982.

²⁰ Wright – Budin: Handbook, 1997.

²¹ Banczerowski: A szaknyelvek, 2004.

²² Arntz – Picht: Einführung, 1982.

²³ Cf. Fóris, Ágota – Faludi, Andrea: Relations of documentation and document management with terminology and translation, in Fóris., Ágota – Bölcskei Andrea (eds.): *Linguistic Research in the Field of Content Development*

documentation process, institutionalized knowledge is represented as laws and standards. The structure, content and presentation of the documentation are specified by English language standards introduced in Hungary, but not yet accessible in the Hungarian language. A few examples include the following: the MSZ EN 62023:2001 *Műszaki tájékoztató és dokumentáció felépítése* (IEC 62023:2011 *Structuring of technical information and documentation*); MSZ EN 82079-1: 2013 *Használati utasítások készítése. Tagolás, tartalom, megjelenítés. 1. rész: Általános elvek és részletes követelmények* (IEC/IEEE 82079-1:2012 *Preparation of instructions for use. Structuring, content and presentation. Part 1: General principles and detailed requirements*); MSZ EN ISO 11442:2006 *Termékek műszaki dokumentációja. Dokumentumkezelés szabványok.* (ISO 11442:2006 *Technical product documentation. Document management*). The content, form and structure of documentation are also regulated by several paragraphs in Act no. 88 of 2012 on market surveillance. The preparation of the documentation, the owner's manual and its structural regulations are also included in the conditions of using the CE sign of the European Union, based on the 93/68 of 22 July 1993 directive of the European Commission. Furthermore, the Hungarian consumer protection regulations (Act no. 155 of 1997) contain more information regarding the content and type of these specialized texts.

- *Institutionalized knowledge as a system of expectations:* The documents connected to the specialized texts of sciences, which define the form of the text of academic papers, are slightly different from those presented above. These are style guides and guidelines on content and form. From a theoretic point of view these can be considered as documents as well because they contain important aspects of the creation of specialized texts. But compared to laws or standards, they exhibit lower levels of institutionalization and they are rather a system of expectations. The audience they target defines how detailed they should be. The documents can contain the expectations regarding both the content and the form of the specialized texts.
- *Institutionalized knowledge as a mode of action:* In connection with the creation of specialized texts, the aspect of reception is also worth mentioning. The goal of having an impact on the receiver with the text as a tool of persuasion can also determine the

and Documentation, Budapest, KRE – L'Harmattan, 2021, 27–30; Fóris, Ágota – Faludi, Andrea: Technical writing and documentation as intralingual technical translation, *ibid.* 38–40; B. Papp, Eszter: Professional documentation in the 21st century, in Fóris, Ágota – Bölcskei, Andrea (eds.): *Linguistic Research in the Field of Content Development and Documentation*, Budapest, KRE – L'Harmattan, 2021, 60–61.

creation of the specialized text. This function can work throughout the specialized text, or can become more sophisticated in only a part of it. For example, with regard to commercial products, marketing²⁴ deals with the possibilities of persuasion, but it also becomes a determining factor of the process of creating the specialized texts.²⁵

The concept of specialized text in experience-based knowledge

A questionnaire survey to assess experience-based knowledge of specialized texts was conducted. Following the general questions on sex, age, completed level of education and profession, additional questions addressed the concept of specialized text as well as the possible types of specialized texts and their characteristics. The survey contained only open questions, and it did not include multiple choice or similar types of questions that would present to any extent the concept, type or the text type of specialized texts. The aim was to elicit the knowledge stored in respondents' minds on specialized texts they were familiarized with. The questions were the following:

1. Please describe what a specialized text is.
2. List some specialized texts.
3. What do you think the characteristics of a specialized text are? Write at least 5 characteristics.
4. What groups could you specify if you were asked to group specialized texts?
5. What is the purpose of specialized texts?
6. Where can you encounter specialized texts during your everyday life?

The hypotheses were the following:

- both types of knowledge components appear in the concept of the specialized text;
- specialized texts do not form a homogeneous category;
- the clusters are formed based on the KNOWLEDGE²⁶ observable in the text and the way it is shared, the script working in the texts, and the linguistic constructions that drive them;

²⁴ See for example Antalovits, Miklós – Süle, Margit (szerk.): *Termékmenedzsment*, Budapest, Typotex, 2012; Rekettye, Gábor – Töröcsik, Mária – Hetesi, Erzsébet: *Bevezetés a marketingbe*, Budapest, Akadémiai, 2016.

²⁵ Cf. Czinkóczi, Ágnes – Fehér, Ildikó: How is technical content created? in Fóris, Ágota – Bölcskei, Andrea (eds.): *Linguistic Research in the Field of Content Development and Documentation*, Budapest, KRE – L'Harmattan, 2021, 126–129.

²⁶ Here KNOWLEDGE refers to well-structured information made explicit in a text. In the rest of the paper, *knowledge* in this sense will be typeset in small capitals. Small capitals are also used for the main components of specialized texts and specialized text types.

- the respondents categorize the texts through the act of schematization and abstraction, and when they describe the specialized text type they focus on the characteristics of the categories;
- there will be a discrepancy in the concept of the specialized text between laypeople and experts;
- the responses will reveal the schemata and patterns that create linguistic structures and thus create specialized texts and their types.

Results

The questionnaire was shared on Facebook and filled in by 200 persons. 70% of the respondents were men and 30% were women. Respondents were from all age brackets, distributed fairly evenly: 8% were under 18 years of age, 9% were between 18 and 25, 17% were between 26 and 35, 23% were between 36 and 45, almost a quarter (24%) were between 46 and 55, and 19% were over 55 years of age.

The respondents' level of education was an important demographic because of the conceptual components involved, as the components of the institutionalized knowledge are acquired throughout one's education. Only 1% only completed their elementary education, over a quarter (26%) completed their secondary education, almost half (49%) had a university degree, and another quarter (24%) were university students at the time of completing the questionnaire. This shows that the majority of respondents had come across the definition of specialized text several times during their studies.

To define both the complexity of the knowledge about specialized texts and the level of the institutionalized knowledge in participants, the research filtered the respondents' professions and also asked if they wrote specialized texts in their jobs. Based on the answers, a differentiation could be made between laypeople and non-laypeople categories. Respondents who – by their own judgement – did not write specialized texts and whose professions were confirming this were considered as laypeople. The non-laypeople respondents worked with the creation of specialized texts (including translation) because of their professions. The difference between the two groups became significant only in two occasions, which will be analyzed in detail below.

The non-laypeople category (67%) makes sense when compared to the laypeople category (33%): while defining the concept of specialized text the non-laypeople respondents presumably used either experienced and institutionalized knowledge or a certain component of

it because of their professions, so they were expected to possess a more pronounced definition of the concept of the specialized text. The knowledge of the laypeople users, on the other hand, was based on everyday experience. They might have had some institutionalized knowledge too, but it was obtained and applied mainly from the use of these texts.

When observing the central questions of the questionnaire and defining specialized texts (i.e. question 1 - *Please describe what a specialized text is*), the difference between the two groups of respondents became apparent: there was a noticeable difference between the answers of laypeople and the non-laypeople. The components introduced in the previous section of the paper appeared several times in the definitions provided by respondents. According to 15%, the typical characteristic of the specialized texts is the use of terms. They only defined the specialized texts with this characteristic. 11% gave a more complex definition: besides the use of terms, they emphasized the characteristic structure of the text and the phraseology. 21% defined the specialized texts specifically linked to a profession. In their answers the use of terms was also mentioned. There were two groups of respondents (with 5% and 7%) that mentioned other components of meaning not listed earlier or not discussed in the previous section besides the use of terms and the link to a profession. It is also worth mentioning that almost half of the respondents did not mention any component of “official definitions”, but described the specialized texts from functional point of view, which was grouped as “other”.

The answers in the “other” category defined the specialized text along a component of meaning different from those mentioned in the previous section. Some sample answers from this category follow:

- reflects information related to a subject field or a profession;
- a text created for the purpose of the certain field;
- a text that says or writes how to operate, or how to do something in a way that it is done well;
- the transfer of information is the main objective, and it contains terms;
- a text that solves a certain problem;
- detailed explanations or instructions;
- description of tasks;
- a text that explains what something is good for, how to do something, what is there to know, and transfers knowledge that wasn't known;
- a narrative written on a topic of a certain discipline.

As these examples show, these definitions sometimes mention the use of terms or the link to the profession, but centrally they contain the function, the purpose of the text and the modality of speech.

This question is worth examining on the basis of the defined respondent groups because this was one of the questions in which relevant differences arose.

Answers with “only terms” (15%) and “link to a subject field and other” (7%) were only given by layperson respondents. At the same time layperson’s definitions contained more “other” category answers (22%). This is because when they look at a text, they decide if it is a specialized text by examining the more central components (the terms and the title that can refer to the subject itself), or the specialized text becomes more characteristic in certain situations (that can lead to linking it to a subject field). The category “other” reflects a comprehension of the texts. In this case the function of the text is at the center of attention and the specific speech situation – i.e. the text’s topic, connections and purpose.

Most answers of non-laypeople also fell into the “other” category (19%). It is also possible that they can schematize the operational features of text during the creation of the text, and they also refer to the contextual components when creating the text (who and what is the target, what speech act is realized in it, etc.). The other factors coming up in their responses can be explained by the fact that while creating a text, institutionalized knowledge (laws, standards, systems of expectations, etc.) is activated. Therefore, they use these components because of the conscious text creation and the style characteristic of the specialized texts, and in this context the components of the concept of specialized text are necessarily defined.

How the everyday experience defines the knowledge about certain texts and text types is well represented in the answers given to the 2nd question (*List some specialized texts*). The most different text samples were listed here. The texts listed as specialized text were ones people encounter in their everyday lives. Here there was no relevant difference between laypeople and non-laypeople respondents. The mentioning of the texts carry a relevance in the definitions of specialized texts, as these are the typical text samples with which the respondents were able to illustrate the (sub)category of specialized text. The answers revealed that specialized texts do not form a homogeneous category: several texts are similar in the working of some of their components, though they are different from others in these components. At the same time these samples draw our attention to the fact that the respondents do not recall the known and conventionalized definition when they define a specialized text; instead, they primarily remember an instance of specialized texts they got to know and which became part of their everyday life. This claim is based on the fact that the most frequent examples of a

specialized text are the *instructions for use* (30%), the *scientific text* (24%), and the *cooking recipe* (12%); this latter category shows a lot of similarity with the instructions for use with operational and language construction. Based on the responses these texts can be considered prototypic elements of the specialized text category as per their definitions, while those mentioned only at 1% frequency (e.g. tax office document, official requests) are considered peripheral examples.

The 3rd question was *What do you think the characteristics of a specialized text are? Write at least 5 characteristics.* Among the characteristics listed here, several elements return that already appeared in the above definitions. Most respondents mentioned that the specialized text is “complex”, “contains complicated sentences” and “only experts understand it”. At the same time, on the basis of the responses it is clear that respondents consider operational and structural parts of the text equally important. Meanwhile the answers also draw attention to the fact that the use of terms is a decisive factor when people decide whether a text falls into the specialized text category. Probably on the level of structure this is the component to which they can connect specialized texts, and this is what shows to them that the transfer of KNOWLEDGE is professionally adequate.

The 4th question (*What groups could you specify if you were asked to group specialized texts?*) inquired about the possible dimensions, along which the examples defined as specialized texts can be organized into categories by the characteristics discovered and presented. 40% of the respondents defined the specialized texts along the content and form, and they always continued to subdivide the content. In 32% the aspect was different professions (e.g. *engineering, medical, legal*), while in 18% the categories of *humanities* and *sciences* were mentioned. Within the dimension of form, *written vs spoken* categories appeared in all cases. 5% of the respondents added a subject, namely focusing the text²⁷ to the form and the content. The largest number of the respondents (52%) categorized the specialized texts by highlighting the receivers, along the dimension of “who it is targeted at”. In terms of this factor they created the following categories: *scientific – for experts – not for experts*, and *not for laymen – for everyday users and laymen*. The *scientific – not scientific* opposition came up only in one case, and 12% of the respondents marked another category between *scientific – for experts*: the *pseudoscientific*. Apart from these dimensions and the categories based on them, the list of different genres appeared in 2% of the responses, and in 1% the answer was “I don’t know”.

²⁷ Though the subject is obviously part of the content, it is important to emphasize here that the respondents who mentioned that the specialized texts can be grouped according to their subject also gave answers that belonged to other groups of content as described above.

The 5th question (*What is the purpose of specialized texts?*) inquired about the function and purpose of the specialized text. The respondents primarily gave the following responses as the purpose of the specialized text: *informs, knowledge transfer, information transfer, source of information, provides help, can learn something from it, summarizes the knowledges, a field can be acquainted with from it, explains, helps, and provides information necessary to reach a specific aim*. The abstracted collective component of these responses is sharing KNOWLEDGE²⁸, and sharing KNOWLEDGE with a PURPOSE. The DIRECTION, the MODE and the QUALITY of sharing KNOWLEDGE is changing across these responses. Other responses also mentioned the motive of sharing KNOWLEDGE, but another component is more pronounced. One answer category was *systematization*, which refers to the STRUCTURING OF KNOWLEDGE. Another category was DESCRIPTION, and the category *analysis* involved the detailed ELABORATION. For the category *professional communication*, it was the INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP.

The 6th question (*Where can you encounter specialized texts during your everyday life?*) aimed to complete answers for question 2, and the most common answer was “just about everywhere”. The respondents listed numerous situations and circumstances from their everyday experiences: *a lot of places: from the doctor’s office, in the directions for use of the online school administration platform and the list of ingredients of products to the labels on clothes; the assembly and installation of household machines, the policies of workplaces, the leaflets of medicines, the instructions for medical devices, the travelling conditions on vehicles, but also the descriptions of different conditions in every field of life; schedule, recipe, medical record and referral, technical descriptions of machines; in journals, on websites, in the library, in the university; elevator, lawyer, Media Markt, inside a building, IKEA, in the boxes of over the counter or prescription medicines*. In the examples above there is one component again that becomes emphasized: the respondents mainly define the concept of specialized texts in the contexts of texts perceived and processed in everyday life; therefore, in the knowledge of specialized texts, everyday genres²⁹ also play a major role.

Conclusion

²⁸ In cognitive linguistics concepts are marked in small capitals.

²⁹ Cf. Bahtyin, Mihail: A beszéd műfajai, in Bahtyin, Mihail.: *A beszéd és a valóság. Filozófiai és beszédelméleti írások*, Budapest, Gondolat, 1986, 357–419.

In the scientific definition of the specialized text the formal characteristics are primarily identified together with the emphasis of terms; however, the language users' concept of specialized texts is more dominantly comprised of the purpose of the text, the role of the receivers, the fact that these texts transfer KNOWLEDGE, or the method of KNOWLEDGE transfer. The responses also draw attention to the fact that besides people's experiences originating from scientific works, the experiences understood and interpreted from texts during their everyday life also contributes heavily to their construction of the concept of specialized text. People can classify if something is a specialized text or not along these lines. From the responses it is also obvious that the basis of identification is that people compare the texts to each other, and they do this along the shared properties of the texts.

The responses reveal that the specialized texts do not form a homogeneous category, and people usually group them into categories along different dimensions. Categories are formed when one acquires experience-based knowledge, and some properties become the focus of attention. The categories are associated on the basis of shared properties. The prototypical specialized text-types are *instructions for use* and *scientific texts*, which were mentioned most frequently. The forming and operation of the categories can be realized in several dimensions, and the audience the text targets becomes a defining factor: experts, non-experts/laypeople, non-laypeople. Therefore, in this case the categorization of texts is guided by KNOWLEDGE, or the way of KNOWLEDGE sharing in the different interactions.

This study adequately demonstrates the complexity of specialized texts. This complexity is defined by two types of the knowledge components (*institutionalized* and *experience-based*), and also the heterogeneity of the concept of specialized texts. The multiplicity, variety and frequency of the factors in the responses confirm that cognitive categorization involves openness and flexibility of the categories, and that the categorization is based on relationships, differences and similarities, and the existence of prototypical and less prototypical characteristics. In several cases the respondents did not name isolated characteristics, so the components were not activated in an isolated way. All this demonstrates that there is a connection between the knowledge components, and some characteristics can come into focus depending on the actual circumstances.

The research drew attention to the fact that the specialized texts do not stand alone: the language users use their gathered and solidified knowledge (also during the processing of the text) to identify the texts and to create the concept of the text. This it is not so much the

knowledge of specialized text but the knowledge of specialized text-type³⁰, which can serve as a model both to identify and create text samples.

SPECIALIZED TEXT AND SPECIALIZED TEXT-TYPE

On the basis of the research the prototypical specialized text can be summarized with the following characteristics: the sharing of KNOWLEDGE, an entity-related subject field, with a specific purpose in a written, formal speech situation based on the typical path as the method of understanding related to a receiver and the receiver's background knowledge. It is basically characterized by its elaboration, and its creation is guided by different levels of institutionalized conventions. Making the knowledge accessible can become defining, and the method of construction also defines linguistic forms and results in a special structural construction. Specialized texts include the text types of science as well as so-called everyday speech genres.

The common components of specialized texts include the KNOWLEDGE and the sharing of this KNOWLEDGE. *Sharing* means this is not about a simple *handing over* from the creator of the text, but dialogue between the creator of the text and the recipient also occurs. The recipient creates the understanding of the text, actively participates in creating the text, and simultaneously creates the opportunity for sharing KNOWLEDGE.³¹

In the sharing of KNOWLEDGE a key element is the OBJECT that the knowledge is targeted at and the GOAL that gives the reason for the sharing of the KNOWLEDGE. In the situational context, KNOWLEDGE is shared in the interaction of the text creator and the receiver. Typically, the creator of the text possesses the KNOWLEDGE, and in the shared attention scene created between them the receiver pays attention to the OBJECT and the KNOWLEDGE related to it. The schema includes all the typical components that can come into play when creating, but also when receiving each text. In the situational context the texts can construct these characteristics in different ways, and from the OBJECT and KNOWLEDGE related to it certain components can be developed and brought into focus to serve a certain goal in the intersubjective relationship between the creator and the receiver of the text. The OBJECT and the KNOWLEDGE related to it can become accessible in different ways in the texts.

³⁰ Cf. Kocsány, Piroska: Szövegnyelvészet vagy szövegek nyelvészete, *Filológiai Közöny* 35., 1989/1, 26–43.

³¹ Cf. Gadamer, Hans-Georg: *Igazság és módszer*, Budapest, Gondolat, 1984, 211, 276; Kulcsár Szabó, Ernő: Megértés – történet – létesülés, in Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor: *Megértés és megértetés, Magyarázat a bölcsészettudományokban*, Budapest, Gondolat, 2017, 14–18. See the section titled *A tudomány szakszövegei*.

KNOWLEDGE can be shared through several paths and in different ways, which become characteristic of the speech situation. The specialized texts do not form a homogeneous category and they cannot be considered as one text type. Nodes are formed based on what is elaborated, how and to what extent this occurs based on the components of the schema, and how it becomes accessible throughout the intersubjective relationship between the text creator and the receiver. In short, this is about KNOWLEDGE sharing in a broader sense and the possible WAYS of constructing meaning.

The text type constructs the relationship between the KNOWLEDGE and the OBJECT linked to the interactions, and it displays the representation of knowledge in relation to something and the arrangement of the knowledge at the same time. Purposeful construction throughout the interactions makes the OBJECT and related KNOWLEDGE accessible, highlighting some components while others remain in the background. In the KNOWLEDGE–OBJECT relationship, it puts KNOWLEDGE of a SUBJECT FIELD in the active attention zone, but in the interaction of the creator and the receiver of the text only that part is elaborated on and shared about the *object* which is crucial for the specific goal. The same way, it is not the full schema of the *object* that is elaborated, but only the part that is needed for the subject field KNOWLEDGE sharing throughout the interaction in order to fulfill its purpose.

The SPECIALIZED TEXT can be considered a subcategory functioning as a discourse domain³², which provides components to the possible construction process. The texts form nodes based on the methods of construction and includes the defining components of construction coming into play during the construction process and their accessibility. The methods of construction form categories by becoming characteristics of the speech category.³³ As it becomes characteristic to a situational context, a category can be interpreted as a script: it contains all the construction-defining components and the KNOWLEDGE related to them, as well as the process of how they are utilized.

The knowledge components are elaborated on from the subcategory and made accessible during the construction of meaning. The central component of the category is the prototypical way of construction that makes an OBJECT about the subject field KNOWLEDGE

³² Cf. Taavitsainen, Irma – Jucker, Andreas H.: Trends and developments in historical pragmatics, in Jucker, Andreas H. – Taavitsainen, Irma (eds.): *Historical pragmatics*, Handbooks of pragmatics 8., Berlin–New York, De Gruyter Mouton, 2010, 3–30; about the role of the discourse domain in the creation of text types see also Kuna: *Az orvosi recept mint szövegípus a 16–17. században*, 388–389.

³³ Cf. Kárpáti, Eszter – Kleiber, Judit: But let your 'Yes' be 'Yes', and your 'No', 'No'. Meaning construction in medical encounters, *Linguistics Beyond and Within* 2019/5, 46–60. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338920738_But_let_your_'Yes'_be_'Yes'_and_your_'No'_%27No%27_%27No%27_Meaning_construction_in_medical_encounters (Accessed: September 14, 2020)

accessible in the interaction for a certain PURPOSE. The texts are placed in the same category as long as the accessibility of KNOWLEDGE happens with similar components and in similar ways. Meanwhile, texts can also belong to a different category based on their components or the similarities observed in their method of construction. The categories form a network. The categories do not have fixed boundaries: the process of the construction can at the same time become defining in one category and open the boundaries of other categories; the organization of the components and the accessibility of the KNOWLEDGE happen in similar ways, but the quality of the components and the KNOWLEDGE are different. New texts are classified by comparing them to the typical components of the category and the way their relationship is expressed. If a text does not fit in any category, a new category can be created.

The category is defined by sharing of KNOWLEDGE and its METHOD as they become characteristic of the situational context. More than one component can become characteristic of a situational context, thus creating subcategories within the categories. Throughout the construction different components of the specialized text schema can come into focus. Construction is also language construction, and language construction also becomes characteristic of the text types and text structures. Their use is defined by which one of the shared knowledge components typically becomes the focus of attention during interaction in the KNOWLEDGE – OBJECT relationship, which contributes to the elaboration of the central KNOWLEDGE. They also show the organization of components to background or focus, and thus the accessibility path to KNOWLEDGE (e.g. structuring: dividing into chapters and subchapters).

The method of construction as the basis of the specialized text-types is typically conventionalized, and this conventionalization varies to an extent: some parts of the process of constructing certain texts are regulated by institutionalized knowledge (laws, standards), while others are governed by systems of expectations or effects. In the first case there is a limited possibility to modify the way of KNOWLEDGE sharing during the construction; therefore, the category can be described more distinctly, as the elements of the category are not very different from each other. But in cases where the construction process defining the category works as an expectation or a mechanism of effect, the category is organized around a center and the periphery contains various subcategories. In this case the characterization of the text type can be carried out by the description of the prototypical examples.

Comparing this possible interpretation to the traditional understanding of the specialized text, it can be said that the DOMAIN becomes the characteristic feature of categories. This way of interpretation also resolves the rigid opposition of *specialized text* and *non-specialized (general) text*: construction can make accessible the components of knowledge that can create

intermediate categories between specialized text and non-specialized text. It is worth mentioning here that pseudoscientific texts show a similar way of construction, and they are characteristic of certain specialized text types, giving the feeling of being scientific. A kind of (fictive) KNOWLEDGE sharing happens on the level of construction, but the KNOWLEDGE that forms the basis of the texts is not linked to the specific subject field or to any domain.

Lastly, in the relation of *specialized texts* and *non-specialized texts*, the knowledge of the specialized text types is worth mentioning. As the responses given to the questions about the concept of the specialized texts showed, in the case of the specialized text types this knowledge is largely defined by the texts which the language users see in their everyday lives, and also by the ones they only encountered as receivers, not creators. Knowledge of text types can differ among language users. At the same time even the layperson experience is sufficient for the language user to have some kind of script about how specialized texts are constructed based on the prototypic components of the ways of construction. But comparing to other types of texts, in this case users cannot fill the “empty places” by activating the script because they do not have the knowledge about the subject field that the text would share with them.

Possibilities for analyzing the specialized text types

A possible path to the classification, identification and characterization of specialized texts and text types is through analyzing the relation of OBJECT and KNOWLEDGE and the method of the construction process that enables sharing KNOWLEDGE.

The characteristics that define the specialized text types can be linked to the operational and the structural part of the text. At the same time it is worth emphasizing again that in this framework function and form as well as operation and structure are not separated: the level of structure, the wording and the form of the text are always motivated by and connected to the content, as well as to what the text wants to make apparent and accessible. The wording, the form and the use of terms are connected to the content that the text expresses in the discourse.

The fundamental questions of specialized text typology research and the components that create a text type and can become characteristic of the texts, are summarized as follows:

- Directing attention: What is the attention drawn to? Is the OBJECT or the KNOWLEDGE at the center of attention? What is the level of elaboration and what is it linked to? How does the KNOWLEDGE transfer take place?

- The central speech act (its realization, the linguistic tools of expression) and other components the text contains: which knowledge components appear and how do they become definitive?
- With what kind of speech modality does the text make KNOWLEDGE (of the subject field) accessible?
- From whose point of view (including the possible intertextuality) does KNOWLEDGE sharing takes place? How is it displayed, and what is it connected to?
- The possibilities of subjectification subjectivation: Did the creator of the text use the means of subjectification and metapragmatic reflections? Can they use them throughout the KNOWLEDGE sharing process? How and to what extent do they reflect on the knowledge sharing of their own and of others? To what extent do they make KNOWLEDGE the subject of reflection?
- The participant roles in the characteristic interaction of the situational context: To what extent and how are the speaker and the receiver marked? Do the speaker and text creator refer to themselves? If yes, how and what in connection to?
- For the receiver: To whom is the text addressed? How does the construction of KNOWLEDGE happen when expecting laypeople instead of experts? How does the construction of KNOWLEDGE happen with expert, non-laypeople receivers? What differences are there between each category and the method of construction?
- How scientific are the texts? What are the characteristics of scientific, popular science and pseudoscientific texts?
- The level of conventionalization of the text type: Is the institutionalized knowledge activated? If so, how does it define the construction?
- How is construction that carries out the KNOWLEDGE sharing modified in the new mediums? In online contexts, how is the process of construction modified when changing from formal situational contexts into more informal situational contexts?
- Wording: How are central speech act and other speech acts constructed? What are typical linguistic constructions? How are terms used? To what extent is there elaboration?
- What is the structure of the text? Is it segmented into chapters and subchapters?

- Title: Does the text have a title or anything that functions as a title? What does it target, represent and highlight from the components found in the text? How does it contribute to KNOWLEDGE sharing and creation of the text type?
- Is KNOWLEDGE shared only by linguistic means or also by non-linguistic components? What is the function of the visual contents embedded in the text in the process of sharing KNOWLEDGE?

SUMMARY

This study offers a theoretical approach of specialized text-typology within a socio-cognitive framework providing a possible interpretation of the specialized text type. To explore this theoretical framework, first it analyzed the concept of the specialized text and its components. It found that during the creation of specialized text and specialized text types several components of knowledge come into play. The appearance of institutionalized knowledge can be interpreted firstly as a requirement, secondly as a system of expectations, and thirdly as an effect mechanism. The empirical research about the experience-based knowledge analyzed specialized texts and their organization into nodes. This study illustrated that specialized texts do not make up one text type. KNOWLEDGE and the sharing of it in situational contexts form the basis of how nodes are organized. This paper proposed an interpretive framework for the methods of KNOWLEDGE construction, and explored possible ways of using this framework for different types of analysis.

SZAKIRODALOM

- ANTALOVITS Miklós – SÜLE Margit (szerk.): *Termékmenedzsment*, Budapest, Typotex, 2012.
- ARNTZ, Reiner – PICHT, Heribert: *Einführung in die Übersetzungsbezogene Terminologearbeit*, Hildesheim, Georg Olms Verlag, 1982.
- B. PAPP Eszter: Professional Documentation in the 21st Century, in Fóris Ágota – Bölcskei Andrea (eds.): *Linguistic Research in the Field of Content Development and Documentation*, Budapest, KRE – L'Harmattan, 2021, 41–58.
- BAHTYIN, Mihail: A beszéd műfajai, in Bahtyin, Mihail: *A beszéd és a valóság. Filozófiai és beszédelméleti írások*, Budapest, Gondolat, 1986, 357–419.
- BALLAGÓ Júlia: Az internetes receptportálok műfajisága a kontextualizációs utasításként értelmezett paratextusok nézőpontjából, in Laczkó Krisztina – Tátrai Szilárd (szerk.):

Kontextualizáció és metapragmatikai tudatosság, DiAGram Könyvek I., Budapest, ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, 2019, 315–334.

BAŃCZEROWSKI, Janusz: A szaknyelvek és a szaknyelvi szövegek egyes sajátosságai, *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 128., 2004/4, 446–452.

CABRÉ, Maria Teresa: *Terminology. Theory, methods and applications*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1999.

COTSOES: *Recommendations for Terminology Work*, Bern, MediaCenter of the Confederation, 2002.

CROFT, William: Towards a social cognitive linguistics, in Evans, Vyvyan – Poursel, Stephanie (eds.): *New directions in cognitive linguistics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2009, 395–420.

CZINKÓCZKI Ágnes – FEHÉR Ildikó: How is Technical Content Created? The Lifecycle of Technical Documentation, in Fóris Ágota – Bölcskei Andrea (eds.): *Linguistic Research in the Field of Content Development and Documentation*, Budapest, KRE – L'Harmattan, 2021, 119–138.

CSONTOS, Nóra: A tudás megosztásának módja a szakszövegekben. A szakszövegtípus egy lehetséges értelmezése, in Fóris, Ágota – Bölcskei, Andrea (szerk.): *Tartalomfejlesztés és dokumentáció: nyelvészeti kutatások*, 2021, 93–122.

DE BEAUGRANDE, Robert – DRESSLER, Wolfgang: *Bevezetés a szövegnyelvészetbe*, Budapest, Corvina, 2000.

EYSENCK, Michael W. – KEANE, Mark T.: *Cognitive Psychology: A Student's Handbook* 8th Edition, Psychology Press 2020.

FELBER, Helmut: *Terminology Manual*, Párizs, UNESCO, Infoterm, 1984.

FÓRIS Ágota – FALUDI Andrea: Relations of documentation and document management with terminology and translation, in Fóris Ágota – Bölcskei Andrea (eds.): *Linguistic Research in the Field of Content Development and Documentation*, Budapest, KRE – L'Harmattan, 2021, 17–36.

FÓRIS Ágota – FALUDI Andrea: Technical Writing and Documentation as Intralingual Technical Translation, in Fóris Ágota – Bölcskei Andrea (eds.): *Linguistic Research in the Field of Content Development and Documentation*, Budapest, KRE – L'Harmattan, 2021, 38–40.

FÓRIS Ágota: A magyar terminológia helyzete és fejlesztésének feladatai napjainkban, *Magyar Tudomány*, 2006/6, 737–745.

FÓRIS Ágota: A szótári információk és a szaknyelvi normák viszonya, *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 130., 2006/1, 49–59.

GADAMER, Hans-Georg: *Igazság és módszer*, Budapest, Gondolat, 1984.

- GEERARTS, Dirk: *Diachoric Prototype Semantics: A Contribution to Historical Lexicology*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1997.
- HÁMORI Ágnes: Diskurzusműfaj, séma és forgatókönyv. A „vice” műfaj sémájának jellemzői és kiépülésének dinamikája a társas interakciókban, *Magyar Nyelv*, 113., 2017/3, 311–329.
- HEINEMANN, Wolfgang: Textsorte – Textmuster – Texttyp, in Brinker, Klaus – Antos, Gerd – Heinemann, Wolfgang – Sager, Syen Frederik (Hrsg.): *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*, HSK. 16.1., Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2000, 507–523.
- KÁRPÁTI Eszter – KLEIBER Judit: A mentális állapot változásának szerepe egy diskurzus szerveződésében, *Iskolakultúra*, 28., 2018/5–6, 28–39.
<https://doi.org/10.14232/ISKKULT.2018.5-6.28>
- KÁRPÁTI, Eszter – KLEIBER, Judit: But let your 'Yes' be 'Yes', and your 'No', 'No'. Meaning construction in medical encounters, *Linguistics Beyond and Within* 2019/5, 46–60.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338920738_But_let_your_%27Yes%27_be_%27Yes%27_and_your_%27No%27_%27No%27_Meaning_construction_in_medical_encounters
- KOCSÁNY Piroska: *Szöveg, szövegtípus, jelentés: a mondás mint szövegtípus*, Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 151, Budapest, Akadémiai, 2002.
- KOCSÁNY Piroska: Szövegnyelvészet vagy szövegek nyelvészete, *Filológiai Közöny*, 35., 1989/1, 26–43.
- KULCSÁR Szabó Ernő: Megértés – történés – létesülés, in Tolcsvai Nagy Gábor (szerk.): *Megértés és megértetés, Magyarázat a bölcsészettudományokban*, Budapest, Gondolat, 2017, 13–37.
- KUNA Ágnes – SIMON Gábor: Műfaj, szövegtípus, szövegfajta, Nézőpontok, kategóriák, modellek a szövegnyelvészeti kutatásban, *Magyar Nyelv*, 113., 2017/3, 257–275.
- KUNA Ágnes: *A 16–17. századi magyar nyelvű orvosi recept szövegtipológiai és pragmatikai vizsgálata funkcionális kognitív keretben*, Doktori disszertáció, Budapest, ELTE BTK, 2011.
- KUNA Ágnes: Az orvosi recept mint szövegtípus a 16–17. században, 1. rész, *Magyar Nyelv*, 112., 2016/4, 385–400.
- KUNA Ágnes: *Nyelv, meggyőzés, gyógyítás. A meggyőzés nyelvi mintázatai a 16–17. századi orvosi receptekben*, Budapest, Tinta, 2019.
- KURTÁN Zsuzsa: *Szakmai nyelvhasználat*, Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest, 2003.
- LANGACKER, Ronald W.: *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Volume I, Theoretical prerequisites*, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1987.
- LANGACKER, Ronald W.: *Grammar and conceptualization*, Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 1999.

- LANGACKER, Ronald W.: *Cognitive grammar, A basic introduction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- PÁTROVICS Péter: A medicina nyelve, *Magyar Orvosi Nyelv*, 2004/1, 11–24.
- PEARSON, Jennifer: *Terms in Context*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1998.
- REKETTYE Gábor – TÖRŐCSIK Mária – HETESI Erzsébet: *Bevezetés a marketingbe*, Budapest, Akadémiai, 2016.
- ROSCH, Eleanor: Human Categorization, in Warren, N. (ed.): *Studies in Cross-Cultural Psychology. Vol. I.*, London, Academic Press, 1977, 1–49.
- SCHANK, Roger C. – ABELSON, Robert P.: *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding*, Hillsdale (NJ.), Erlbaum, 1977.
- TAAVITSAINEN, Irma – JUCKER, Andreas H.: Trends and developments in historical pragmatics, in Jucker, Andreas H. – Taavitsainen, Irma (eds.): *Historical pragmatics*, Handbooks of pragmatics 8., Berlin–New York, De Gruyter Mouton, 2010, 3–30.
- TÁTRAI Szilárd: A kontextus fogalmáról, *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 128., 2004/4, 479–494.
- TÁTRAI Szilárd: *Bevezetés a pragmatikába, Funkcionális kognitív megközelítés*, Budapest, Tinta, 2011.
- TÁTRAI Szilárd: Esti Kornél és a beégés: megjegyzések a műfajiség pragmatikai vonatkozásaihoz, *Magyar Nyelv*, 113., 2017/3, 290–301.
- TÁTRAI Szilárd: Pragmatika, in Tolcsvai Nagy Gábor (szerk.): *Nyelvtan*, Budapest, Osiris, 2017, 897–1058.
- TOLCSVAI NAGY Gábor: *A magyar nyelv szövegtana*, Budapest, Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 2001.
- TOLCSVAI NAGY Gábor: *Kognitív szemantika*, Nyitra, Konstantin Filozófus Egyetem, Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kara, 2010.
- TOLCSVAI NAGY Gábor: *Bevezetés a kognitív nyelvészetbe*, Budapest, Osiris, 2013.
- TOLCSVAI Nagy Gábor: A nyelv emberi lényege, A magyarázat látóköralkotó változatai a nyelv tudományban, in Tolcsvai Nagy Gábor (szerk.): *Megértés és megértetés, A magyarázat a bölcsészettudományokban*, Budapest, Gondolat, 2017, 38–62.
- TOLCSVAI NAGY Gábor: Bevezetés, in Tolcsvai Nagy Gábor (szerk.): *Nyelvtan*, Budapest, Osiris, 2017, 23–71.
- TOLCSVAI NAGY Gábor: Jelentéstan, in Tolcsvai Nagy Gábor (szerk.): *Nyelvtan*, Budapest, Osiris, 2017, 207–466.
- TOMASELLO, Michael: *Gondolkodás és kultúra*, Budapest, Osiris, 2002.
- VAN DIJK, Teun A: Kontextus és megismerés. Tudáskeretek és beszédaktus-megértés, in Penavin Olga – Thomka Beáta (szerk.): *Tanulmányok 15*, Újvidék, 1982, 63–81.

- VERSCHUEREN, Jef: Pragmatic perspective, in Verschueren, Jef – Östman, Jan-Ola – Blommaert, Jan (eds.): *Handbook of pragmatics*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1995, 1–19.
- VERSCHUEREN, Jef: *Understanding pragmatics*, London, New York, Sydney, Auckland, Arnold, 1999.
- WRIGHT, Sue Ellen – BUDIN, Gerhard: *Handbook of Terminology Management*, Vol. 1–2. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1997.