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1. Theme and Objective of the Thesis

In my doctoral thesis I investigated the informational structure, i.e. the role of functional sentence perspective (FSP) in 20th century English literary texts (novels and short stories) and in their Hungarian translation. My research had two levels. Firstly, I observed the changes in the informational structure at the sentence level, and furthermore, related to these changes, I examined those modifications that appeared at the text level, in the structure of the text.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. The concept of FSP

According to the functional approach of the Prague School of Linguistics, founded in 1926, “every linguistic element may perform different functions in different context and situations” (Adam 2009:10). The founder of the FSP theory was Vilém Mathesius (1975), who wanted to set up a formal system for dividing the sentence into parts according to their information-load. He had several followers later on, among them Daneš (1957), Halliday (1985), and Firbas (1957), but it was Jan Firbas who developed this universal system the furthest, and he was the one who first called it functional sentence perspective (FSP).

In the FSP, **functional** refers to the functional linguistic and theoretical approach. It operates primarily at the sentence level, but through sentence level analysis we can get to a higher text level (see later by dynamic semantic chains) and to under sentence (e.g. clause and NP) level analysis as well (Firbas 1999 and Svoboda 1984). It is perspectival, because **perspective** expresses here the inner dynamism of a sentence unit, namely its directedness towards the most **rhematic** element in the sentence. The perspective that starts from the thematic subject and ends in other rhematic elements is called the **Qualification Scale**, and the perspective pointing to the rhematic subject is called the **Presentation Scale**. The two can be present in the same sentence at the same time; which we refer to as **Combined Scales**.

2.1.1. The Communicative Dynamism and the Communicative Units

A central element of Firbas’ FSP theory is the concept of Communicative Dynamism (CD), which means that the sentence element, which has the lowest communicative value, is the **theme**, whereas the element with the highest communicative value is the **rheme**. “The
communicative dynamism is the relative extent to which a linguistic element contributes towards the further development of the communication” (Firbas 1992: 8).

The communicative dynamism of a sentence element is defined by the interplay of four factors, which, according to their importance, are the following: context, linearity (word order), semantic structure (dynamic semantics), and intonation. In the case of a written text intonation is not defined, we can only deduce it. In my analysis I did not take it into consideration.

The hierarchy of the FSP factors can be influenced by the type of the language, e.g. by word order rules (English, German), or by fixed focus position (Hungarian), or by the fact, that the word order follows the growing CD content of the sentence elements (Czech). Svoboda (2005) summarizes the result of the interplay of the factors that manifest itself in the division of the sentence into two or three units according to Firbas (1992) as follows:

1. table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMATIC</th>
<th>NON-THEMATIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THEMATIC</td>
<td>TRANSITIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Proper – ThPr</td>
<td>Transition – Tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diatheme – DTh</td>
<td>Transition Proper – TrPr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.2. Linearity (word order)

Linear modification or the linearity principle is a factor that modifies word order in the FSP. Mathesius (1975) calls it objective word order, Firbas (1992) refers to it as ordo naturalis, when the elements of a sentence show growing CD, i.e. the word order mirrors a ‘from theme to rheme’ sequence. The theme (ThPr and DTh) has the lowest degree of CD and the rheme (Rh and RhPr) the highest, in between are the so called transitional elements, which is usually the verb (Tr and TrPr) that binds the theme to the rheme.

The Hungarian syntax, mainly the approach of É. Kiss (2003) that is based on the views of Brassai (1860, 1885/2011), differs in several points to the sentence description of Firbas (1992) that is based on Mathesius’ (1975) view. This Hungarian syntax describes the relationship between the elements of a sentence on the basis of semantic-logical rules. Since
these rules are restraining and contribute to word order, they need to be taken into consideration, but other definitions of the generative description of É. Kiss cannot be easily shared: 1. Fixing the topic or theme at the beginning of the sentence cannot be absolute. 2. Dividing the sentence into topic and predicate does not fit my analytical purpose, as I prefer the tripartite division of Firbas (see table 1.). 3. After the verb there can be thematic elements if their CD is lower. 4. I analysed text sentences instead of created sentence examples. 5. I took into consideration the semantic-logical rules especially to do with the focus, because focus has to do with the elements Rh and RhPr, the strongest elements in CD.

2.1.3. The context

In FSP, the concept of context is limited, Firbas calls it *immediately relevant context* and it is “only a fraction of the complex phenomenon of context” (Firbas 1992: 22).

According to this, the retrievability of information in the immediately relevant context is also limited. Followers of Firbas (Svoboda 1981; Hajičová & Vrbová 1981) came to the conclusion that it means a very short text passage, about 7 *operational fields*, i.e. 7 sentences or clauses. When Firbas talks about *retrievability span*, he means this short text passage. If something is out of the retrievability span, its new appearance counts as new information, and it is no longer thematic.

2.1.4. Semantic Structure (Presentation, Qualification and Combined Scales)

In his theory Firbas distinguishes between two scales, the Presentation Scale (PrSc) and the Qualification Scale (QSc). The main difference between the two is that in the QSc the perspective shows away from the subject and in the PrSc the perspective shows to the subject. In both cases the verb has a central role as a transitional element. In the case of QSc sentences, the subject has a low CD and the verb points to other elements in the sentence (object, adverb) or to itself if there are no further elements with higher CD. In the case of PrSc sentences the verb presents the subject, with the parallel of Firbas (Adam 2009): the PrSc “ushers” the person or thing to the stage.

Adam (2013) investigated the PrSc sentences and distinguished four subgroups that play an important role when we compare English and Hungarian PrSc sentences. The four subgroups in English are: 1. *existential there* + *be* construction; 2. rhematic subject in front of

The two main scales can merge, and then we talk about Combined Scales (CSc). This can usually be broken down to two separate sentences or statements in a given order. The essence of CSc is that the subject in it carries the dynamic semantic role of a Phenomenon (Ph) that is presented by the verb, and it is the Bearer of Quality (BofQ) at the same time, whereas Quality refers to the high CD information carried by elements other than the subject in the sentence (cf. Firbas 1992: 67).

### 2.2. The FSP in Translation Studies

There are two approaches in Translation Studies that used the theory of FSP in their investigations. One is based on Daneš’s (1974) theme-structure model – this was applied e.g. by Lautamatti (1987) and Gerzymisch Arbogast (1994) in their comparison of source language text (SLT) and target language text (TLT); the other built on the theory of Firbas (1957 and 1992) which analysed SLT and TLT sentences according to their informational and grammatical structures – see e.g. Klaudy (1987, 2004) and Rogers (2006).

### 3. The aim of the research

The information structure of a sentence can be analysed in several different ways (cf. Lutz 1981). In my analysis I choose Firbas’ (1992) analytical method, because it does not view information structure as an individual phenomenon but as interplay between *context, linearity* and *dynamic semantics* (Adam 2009). Therefore its applicability is universal.

According to Firbas (1992), the aim of FSP is to expand the CD of the elements of a sentence. In order to gain relative comparable values, we must analyse both the SL and the TLTs with the tools of FSP.

Furthermore, comparing the CD values and patterns of the information structures of SLT and TLT sentences, I aimed to categorize the changes, analysing 10 different texts with their translations. The reader can follow my analysis in tables 28 and 29, where both the SLT and TLT sentence analyses are summarized. When there were changes in the information structure I also explained them separately.

Elaborating the FSP does not remain at the sentence level. It is especially interesting for the Translation Studies to investigate how the changes in FSP influence text structure in the
translation. With the help of such analysis we can see the representation technique of both the author and the translator and compare them.

The overall goal of my investigation was to make the first steps towards a systematic, FSP based, comparative study of expressive texts and their translations. Such a systematic study would enhance the role of Translation Studies between Literary Studies and Linguistics, but it would also give useful insight for those translators and translation students, who approach translation from its technical side.

4. Research questions and hypothesis

During my investigation I started from the presumption that translators keep the information structure during translation. This is also suggested by the specialized literature dealing with translation: Firbas (1992), Baker (1992), and Reiß (1976).

During the research related to the sentence perspectives of the SLT and TLT, such as to the activity of the translator, I set out to answer the following questions, and related to these questions I formulated the following hypotheses.

1. Question and hypothesis related to the preservation of FSP

- research question: Is the assumption verifiable that the translator preserves the FSP in translation? Do they keep the same elements in the “foreground”, i.e. in rhematic position, or in the “background”, i.e. in thematic position like the author, or do they change it? In other words: is there a shift in perspective?

- hypothesis: Translators of expressive texts preserve the FSP of the SLT, because beyond transmitting the information they also want to make the way of information processing, which is part of the style, accessible to the reader.

2. Question and hypothesis related to the consequences of shift in the FSP

- research question: If the translator does not preserve the information structure, what is the reason behind it? What kind of consequences does it have on the meaning, or the word order?

- hypothesis: The translator can be necessitated by the syntactic structure of the SL, e.g. by the passive, that does not exist in the TL (in this case in Hungarian) to change the information structure of the TLT.
3. Question and hypothesis related to the preservation of FSP
   - research question: If a translator preserves the perspective, how do they do it?
   - hypothesis: If the translator wants to preserve the information structure against the differences between the language structures, they will insert thematic or rhematic elements into the sentence, in order to achieve harmony and relative balance in the CD.

4. Question and hypothesis related to the connectedness of the SL semantics and the TL syntax.
   - research question: Is there a constant syntactic structure in Hungarian that can be related to the English SL perspectives (Qualification, Presentation, and Combined Scales) defined by dynamic semantics?
   - hypothesis: If in the SL the CD is defined mainly by the semantics, e.g. in the case of a presentation scale with a preverbal rhematic subject, the translator will reproduce this with a clear syntactic structure, e.g. with a focus expressing exhaustive identification.
   - In case of a Combined Scale, when the English sentence “perspectives” to the subject and to the elements after the verb at the same time, the translator will create two sentence units with two verbs in the translation. One of the verbs will ensure the CD of the rhematic subject, the other the CD of the remaining rhematic elements of the SL sentence.

5. Question and hypothesis related to the positioning of the most rhematic element (RhPr) in the Hungarian TL sentence unit.
   - research question: Where do translators position the rhematic elements inside the Hungarian sentences? How does this relate to the focus position of the Hungarian verb?
   - hypothesis: In the first instance the rhematic element or elements of the Qualification Scale will appear in the rhematic field I (the left side of the verb), i.e. into the focus position of the Hungarian verb, and in the second instance it will get into the rhematic field II (the right side of the Hungarian verb).
The verity or falsity of the hypothesis will be assessed while interpreting the results in chapter 6. The research questions will be answered separately in chapter 7.

5. The corpus of the research

I carried out my research on paragraphs selected at random from eight random selected 20th century English novels and two English short stories and their Hungarian translations. Common feature of the texts were that each of them were descriptive and belonged to the expressive text-types (Reiß 1976). I investigated 182 SL sentence units and 204 parallel TL sentence units.

I used the concept of sentence unit according to the definition of László Deme (1971), i.e. I distinguished the sentence from the sentence unit. A sentence can be constituted of more than one sentence units. The sentence unit can be a coordinated or a subordinated clause. As for its characteristics the sentence unit consists of at least one predicative unit, or it can be completed to become one. The predicative unit contains a subject, a predicate and an object. Although a one sentence unit contains only one of these, there can be more than one adverbial. There can be more than one subject, object or predicate only if they are accumulated. Attributes and verbal phrases do not count as sentence parts, they are only structural parts.

Translators usually preserve sentence boarders, but the number of sentence units changes. Beyond investigating the changes in the number of sentence units, I also observe how the changes from sentence to sentence unit or from sentence unit to sentence influence the information structure. In the following table I have summarized the key data of the texts in my corpus:
2. table

Texts used in the analysis and the number of sentence units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>author</th>
<th>English title</th>
<th>first published</th>
<th>nr. of s.u.*</th>
<th>translator</th>
<th>Hungarian title</th>
<th>first published</th>
<th>nr. of s.u.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Golding, William</td>
<td>Lord of the Flies</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tibor Dery</td>
<td>Legyek Ura</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amis, Kingsley</td>
<td>Lucky Jim</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>János Komlós</td>
<td>Szerencsés Flótás</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rushdie, Salman</td>
<td>Midnight’s Children</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mihály Falvay</td>
<td>Az éjfél gyermekéi</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mansfield, Katherine</td>
<td>At the bay</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Klára Szőllősy</td>
<td>Az őbölben</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Waugh Evelyn</td>
<td>Decline and Fall</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tamás Kéri</td>
<td>Jámbor pálya</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hardy Thomas</td>
<td>To Please His Wife</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Miklós Vajda</td>
<td>Az asszonyért</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Forster, E. M.</td>
<td>A Passage to India</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Arpád Göncz</td>
<td>Ut Indiába</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Conrad, Joseph</td>
<td>Heart of Darkness</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pál Vámosi</td>
<td>A sötétség mélyén</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Orwell, George</td>
<td>Animal Farm</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>László Szijgyártó</td>
<td>Allatfarm</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Greene, Graham</td>
<td>The heart of the matter</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tamás Ungváry</td>
<td>A kezdet és a vég</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the total number of sentence units</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the total number of sentence units</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*nr. of s.u. = number of sentence units

6. Research method

In my research I used a comparative analytic method in which the following steps were made:

I. The SLTs and TLTs were divided into sentences and sentence units.

II. The sentence units were submitted to a complex analysis:

1. The grammatical and information structure of the sentence units were investigated, i.e. on the one hand the sentence units were divided into parts of sentences, on the other hand their CD was elaborated on the basis of their context, linearity and dynamic semantics.

2. The types of Scale for each sentence unit was identified.
3. On the basis of the CD of the elements the cadence of the sentence units were defined.
4. These three analytic areas were summarized in tables by each text.

III. The analysis was compared according to the areas of the complex analysis.

1. With the help of Rogers’s (2006) taxonomy, the grammatical and the information structure of the SL sentence units were compared with the grammatical and information structure of the TL sentence units, and the results were recorded. Further, it was noted whether both, none, or only one of the structures had changed.
2. The changes were typed, and depending on which structure had changed separately or in concordance with the other, was named accordingly.

IV. The dynamic semantic chains were broken down on the basis of the sentence unit analysis.

1. Breaking down the sentence units and comparing their grammatical and information structure made further text-level analysis possible. On the basis of Firbas (1995 and 1999) the thematic, transitional, and rhematic elements of the sentence units in the different texts were linked and compared both in the SLTs and in the TLTs.
2. The thematic, transitional and rhematic elements were counted.

V. Finally the dynamic semantic chains were contrasted.

1. The dynamic semantic chains were compared; the results were matched with the changes that emerged in the grammatical and in the information structure.
2. The number of thematic, transitional and rhematic elements were counted and compared, and they were correlated with the changes in the grammatical and information structure.
3. Connections were detected between the representational technique and the grammatical and information structure of the texts.
7. **The results of the research**

7.1. **Summarized results of the changes in the information and grammatical structure**

As table 2 shows, 182 SL and 204 TL sentence units were investigated. With the exception of text 1, 2 and 3, the number of sentence units in the TLTs grew. These changes were summarized, and therefore contain processes of the other direction as well, e.g. less frequently sentence units of the source language texts became adverbial phrases or attributive constructions in the target language text, or the translator simply omitted a sentence unit. The results of the comparisons related to the grammatical and the information structures are as follows:

1. From the source and target language a total of 182 sentence units were investigated. Neither the information nor the grammatical structure changed in 101 cases. This means that the translators kept both structures in 55% of the cases.

2. The grammatical structure changed in only 42 sentence units, but this was not accompanied by any changes in the CD. This was 22% of the total number of analysed sentence units. Consequently in 78% of the cases, the perspective was not changed so that it would point to another rhematic sentence element which was different from the one in the SLT. The information structure alone changed in only 3 cases. Both grammatical and information structures were changed in 36 sentence units. This was approximately 20% of the total number of sentence units analysed.

3. The fact that in 80% of the 182 analysed SLT and TLT sentence units, the translators preserved the FSP proves the first hypothesis, i.e. that translators strive to carry over the FSP of the SL sentence unit to the TL sentence unit, and practically preserve the information structure.

4. The number of sentence units increased by 13% in the TLTs. If we compare this number with the 23% of changes in the grammatical structure, and with the 20% of the joint structural changes, then we can tell that the conversion from verbal phrases to sentence units are only for ¼ of the grammatical changes responsible. For ¾ of the grammatical changes, other grammatical restrains or translational decisions were responsible.
7.1.1. Changes in the grammatical structure

Table 28 of my dissertation summarizes 42 changes in the grammatical structure. Three subgroups were established.

1. I call *sentence unit like changes* those conversions, in which the verbal phrase becomes a sentence unit, or the sentence unit turns into a verbal phrase, or a part of a sentence becomes a sentence unit, or the sentence unit becomes part of a sentence. 19 of the 42 changes in the grammatical structure belong here. Other grouping factors were on the target language side. In 5 cases the sentence unit like change was accompanied by *rheme dissolutions*. In 4 cases the rheme proper (RhPr) element got into the rhematic field I and in 7 cases into the rhematic field II on the target language side.

2. The second biggest subgroup in the grammatical structural changes was *the conversion of passive structures*. In the corpus, there were 13 such examples. This group was interesting because the grammatical change was not accompanied by changes in the informational structure. My second hypothesis was that when translating a passive structure from the source language text, translators would be required to change the information structure, since there are no equivalent grammatical structures in the Hungarian target language. There were such changes in the information structure (see next chapter), but I did not expect the extent to which the translators managed to carry over the FSP of the source language passive sentence units to the target language sentence units without changing the information structure.

On the target language side, I found that in 3 cases the translators substituted the passive structure with *middle voice* verbs, in 5 occasions with active verbs and with insertions of other elements, in one case by making the agent of the sentence unit become a rhematic subject and in another case by substituting Presentation Scale type II by Presentation Scale type III *adverb + SV inverse* structure.

3. In 5 cases the grammatical structure was changed because of *lexical restrictions*, but in these cases the translators put the most rhematic elements into the rhematic field I (focus) position.

There were some examples that could not be classified.
7.1.2. Joint alteration of grammatical and information structures

Table 29 of my dissertation summarizes the joint alterations of grammatical and information structures. There were 35 cases where the CD of the most rhematic (RhPr) elements of the source language sentence units were changed, they either lost some meaning or dynamics, or, on the contrary, they gained extra content or dynamics.

Four bigger groups were established that had more than three elements and five smaller ones that contained one element each. Since these elements do not seem to be isolated phenomena, further analysis could develop these sets too.

1. In the first bigger group the change in CD was caused by grammatical shifts e.g. from NP level to main sentence level, or from main sentence level to clause level.

2. In the second and third groups the starting point of the changes were again the passive structures, but in 6 cases the translators could not compensate for them, and this led to changes in the CD, because either new elements had to be inserted, or the perspective pointed to another element in the translation.

3. In the third group, the alterations were caused by extra elements that entered either the rhematic field I, i.e. the focus position of the verb, or the rhematic field II. In the translation this caused shifts in the perspectives.

4. Finally the fourth group contained 4 elements and it got the name shifts in CD, because the linearity of some elements changed in these sentence units, e.g. a rhematic (RhPr) element got into the sentence starting position and became a theme (DTh), or the other way round, a thematic element got into sentence final position and became a rheme.

The other smaller groups contain only one element each, and the change of their CDs are connected to the changes of their rheme proper elements: omission, changes in point of view, topicalization of the rheme proper element, changes of focus, enumeration.

7.2. Alterations of the Qualification, Presentation, and Combined Scales

Starting from the source language texts, I analysed 181 scales that had a counterpart on the TL side, one was unpaired. 156 of them were Qualification, 20 Presentation, and 5 Combined Scales. 17 of the 20 Presentation Scales remained Presentation Scales, 149 of 156 Qualification Scale sentence units remained Qualification Scales in the translations. Though preserving the scales does not automatically guarantee equal information structures, translators tend to keep the type of scales as well.
7.2.1. Alterations of the Qualification Scale

Most of the 156 Qualification Scales remained Qualification Scales, but in 7 cases they were converted into Presentation Scales. In 3 other cases the Qualification Scale sentence units were divided into Presentation and Qualification Scales. In other words in these 10 cases the translators rhematized either the subject of the SL sentence units or converted other rhematic sentence elements of the SL sentence units into rhematic subjects in the TL.

From these cases it is interesting to mention sentence unit 1/V.10 and 6/IV.8 of table 28 of the dissertation. In the passive English sentences the agents of the actions are rhematic, this is ensured by the by + agent structure at the end of the sentence. In the Hungarian translations these agents got into preverbal focus positions, they became rhematic subjects, and the exact type of focus is that of exhaustive identification. These examples belong to the Qualification Scale → Presentation Scale type of changes.

7.2.2. Alterations of the Presentation Scales

The essence of the Presentation Scale is the rhematic subject, be it in the SL a semantically marked type II, a syntactically marked there is/are type I, or again a syntactically marked adverb + SV inverse type III.

As mentioned before there were 17 Presentation Scales in the corpus that were Presentation Scales on both sides. 9 of them in the SL belonged to type II, 4 to type III and 4 to type I. The translators used only two structures in the TL, but they were syntactically marked: subject + verb + VM (verb modifier) and adverb + SV inverse, which is the same as type III.

7 Presentation Scales from the 9 type II sentence units were translated by subject + verb + VM structures and 2 by adverb + SV inverse structures in the TL. From the 4 type III Presentation Scales 2 were reproduced by subject + verb + VM structures and 2 by adverb + SV inverse structures. Finally the 4 type I Presentation Scales were translated by 2 subject + verb + VM and 2 adverb + SV inverse structures. (See dissertation table 30 and 31).

As one can see, on the one hand the Presentation Scales are reproduced in Hungarian by two different syntactic structures and as such the Presentation Scale form is evident. On the other hand it is interesting to note that there is transit between the different Presentation Scale structures in translation.
My third hypothesis was that the semantically marked English Presentation Scale sentence units would be reproduced in Hungarian with a concrete rhematic preverbal subject followed by a verb modifier. This has been partially verified, but it is important to see that the other Presentation Scale structure is also active in Hungarian, and as said before there is a transition between them.

7.2.3. Alterations of the Combined Scales

Regarding my fourth hypothesis there was only one occasion when the SL Combined Scale sentence unit was divided into Presentation and Qualification Scale sentence units. In two other cases they became Presentation Scales (1/IV. 9 and 2/III. 6 in table 28) and in another case it was turned into a Qualification Scale (2/IV. 9–10). Further analysis could produce more examples of Combined Scale sentence units that would help to find regularities in their conversion.

7.3. Alteration of the cadence of the sentence units

The cadence of the sentence units are in close connection with the position of the RhPr elements. The analysed English sentence units show raising tendency in CD towards the end of the sentence. If we take the position of the RhPr elements in the English sentence units, from a total of 182 sentence units, the RhPr elements were positioned after the verb in 167 cases.

The cadence of the Hungarian sentence units shows a more varied picture. The proportion of left and right rhematicization is 107:87, which is approximately a 5:4 proportion. In this proportion, the Hungarian verb uses the possibility of positioning the RhPr element on the left side of the verb in the focus position. This seems to verify my fifth hypothesis, according to which, in the Hungarian sentence units the position of the RhPr elements is primarily in the rhematic field I, i.e. in the focus position of the verb. But it is also important to see the high number of sentence units where the RhPr elements are found in the rhematic field II, in the post verbal position.
7.4. Conclusion about the analysis of the dynamic semantic scales

7.4.1. Changes in the number of dynamic elements

The numerical changes of thematic, transitional and rhematic elements in the dynamic semantic scales show the dynamic shift between the SLT and the TLT at the text level. Table 3 summarizes the number of thematic, transitional and rhematic elements of the 10 analysed text pairs. An increase is indicated by bold numbers, a decrease by italics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text</th>
<th>SL text</th>
<th>TL text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nr. of ThPr and DTh elements</td>
<td>Nr. of Tr elements (verbs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 → 1a</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 → 2a</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 → 3a</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 → 4a</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 → 5a</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 → 6a</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 → 7a</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 → 8a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 → 9a</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 → 10a</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The small change in the number of RhPr elements indicates that the translators preserve the information structure. The number of the rhematic elements grows only in four cases, but with not more than two elements. In three cases it decreases but with no more than two
elements. An extreme case is text 8, the first paragraph of the *Heart of Darkness* by Joseph Conrad, where the number of rhematic elements decreased by 6 elements. The analysis of text 8 showed that several elements were thematised, and there were several insertions which contributed to these shifts. The decrease of the rhematic elements goes with an increase of the thematic elements, which also shows the type of process as well.

The consequence of rhematisation is an increase in the number of thematic elements. There are three elements more in the thematic layer of texts 8 and 10, and five elements more in texts 6 and 7. This increase in the translation is interesting if we consider that thematic pronouns are usually only implicitly present in the Hungarian sentence units. A constant or slightly decreasing number of elements in the thematic layer of the translation would not be surprising. Independent of this, the number of elements in the thematic layers of text 3 and 9 decrease, but in these text pairs the number of transitional elements also increase, because new sentence units were created in these texts. In these two cases it goes together with a decrease in the number of the rhematic elements.

In text 4 (Mansfield–Szöllősy *At the bay* text pair) the number of thematic elements dropped by ten. Looking at table 13 of the dissertation, it turns out that the reason for this is the lack of pronouns in the TLT. The diminishing number of transitional and the rising number of rhematic elements show that some verbs were carried over into the rhematic layer. The situation is similar in text 5, the rhematised transitional elements increase the number of the rhematic elements. In text 5 though, the number of thematic elements remains constant.

The text which stands out the most is text 7, *Passage to India* by Forster, which was translated by Göncz. Compared to the SLT in the translation both the number of thematic and rhematic elements increase, but the number of transitional elements decrease. This is because the translator added new elements, not only in the thematic, but also in the rhematic layer; there were verbs that were rhematised. Table 29 shows that Rh → Th and Th → Rh shifts frequently go with a subject → predicate shift, or with *rheme-dissolution*.

Table 3 connects the results made at the end of text analysis related to the dynamic semantic scales with table 27 and 29 that summarize the changes in the grammatical structures and in the informational structures. The reasons and explanations for the numeric changes in the different dynamic layers of the texts can be found there.

On the basis of the analysed material it is hard to find tendencies. It is difficult to say that during the translation of expressive texts from English to Hungarian the number of thematic elements increase, or that the number of rhematic elements diminish. The
investigations of these short paragraphs suggest that this is text and translator dependent. For a more universal picture about the numeric changes of thematic and rhematic elements in similar translations further investigation is necessary.

7.4.2. Dynamic semantic chains and the technique of representation

In my dissertation I not only elaborated on the CD of sentence units, but I also linked the thematic, transitional and rhematic elements of each text, then I compared these chains with their translation. I also observed how the changes in them affected the cohesion of the texts. In the chains of thematic elements there are background and back-referential elements or even agents of different actions; the chain of the rhematic elements on the other hand fix the most important information for which the individual statements were created: appearing persons, objects or the result, or the aim of the action. These rhematic chains provide a logical sequence according to their content, which can be interpreted on the basis of the specific plot or in an abstract way, and it can be parallel with the plot of the novel or its content. Depending on the intention of the author, the rhematic chains of the opening paragraphs of the novels showed a different pattern than their translations. The comparison of the thematic and rhematic chains of SLT and TLT are already worthy of note. For instance, it is interesting to see whether those same elements that were highlighted in the translation also proved to be the most important ones in the original text. When the information structure of the sentence units in both the source and target language were identical, the two rhematic chains were also identical, and the same chain of logical or abstract elements could be found in the target language as well.

The dynamic semantic chains prove that the perspectives of the given sentences, their information structure and their theme proper elements, that were the goal of the utterance, play an important role in the representation of the scene. If the chain is preserved in the translation, the representation of the scene will be identical or at least very similar to the one of the SLT. Comparing the dynamic semantic chains proved the second part of my first hypothesis, where the translators intend to preserve how the information is transmitted, because this is part of the style, and they want to make this accessible for the readers of the TL.

The analysis of the dynamic semantic chains is a very useful method, if we want to get nearer to the inner realm of the text. The elaboration of the dynamic semantic chains carries
us nearer to the representation-technique of the author on the one hand, while also helping us to compare it with the translation on the other hand. The distinction of the Presentation Scales is also very useful, since the appearance of a character/object before a background is a very important element of the style and can contribute to the development of the plot or the message of the work.

8. Answers on the research questions

In chapter 6, five research questions were put forward which I am going to answer following a summary of the results.

The first question asked whether translators preserved the information structure, or whether there were shifts in perspectives?

In the corpus that I investigated, there were expressive English literary texts and their translations. According to my results the translators preserved the information structure in 80% of the cases and changed them in 20%. In the cases of changes there were shifts rather than a complete change in the perspective, i.e. RhPr elements lost their CD, or became partly thematic and partly rhematic through dissolution of the RhPr. Changes in the information structure are represented in table 29 of the dissertation.

The second question referred to the means by which the translator ensures the preservation of the perspectives.

When the translator does not change either the grammatical or the information structure, the preservation of the perspective is presumably automatic. Changing the word order does not mean changing the perspective, a RhPr element from the end of an English sentence unit keeps its CD in the translation in a preverbal focus position, although the word order has changed. In order to preserve the CD the translator has to apply certain grammatical transformations. The means of preserving the information structure are summarized in table 28 of the dissertation.

The third question referred to the consequences that emerge if the information structure changes or there is a shift in the perspective.

On the basis of the investigated corpus and of the analysis made on the dynamic semantic chains (see 6.4), we can say that a shift in the perspective can have several consequences. The consequences manifest themselves in the way and technique of the literary representation.

The fourth question asked about the perspectives and their syntactic relations, i.e. whether the Qualification and Presentation Scales in the English SLT can be matched with syntactic
structures in the Hungarian TLT. This question grew out of previous observations, according to which the semantically coded rhematic subject was realized syntactically in Hungarian.

In connection with the Qualification Scales, further investigations are necessary to find regularities that can explain and decide the position of certain elements inside the sentence units. In this small corpus the results were too diversified. In connection with the Presentation Scales though, the answers are clear and evident. The English Presentation Scales are realised with two concrete syntactic structures in the Hungarian sentence units.

The fifth question asked where translators position the most important information, the RhPr elements.

According to my observations, in the Hungarian sentence units, the RhPr elements occupy a 5:4 proportion in the rhematic field I, and the rhematic field II, i.e. they find a place either before or after the verb. If we ask about the rhematic elements in general, they are around the verb. The result of rheme-dissolution is that the rhematic elements appear in front of and after the transitional elements. This is always influenced by the focus. Where a verb prefix closes the rhematic field I, the rhematic elements gather after the verb. Sometimes this is achieved with the help of focus anticipators. Examples for this phenomenon can be found in table 28. Some focus anticipators neutralize the rhematic field I (e.g. 5 → 5a / XII. 17), others point ahead to the rhematic field II (e.g. 4 → 4a / V. 10–11; 10 → 10a / VI. 10). The situation is different if the verb modifier is a pronoun, in these cases the verb modifier becomes rhematic in the rhematic field I. Such examples were shown in table 28: 10 → 10a / VII. 12; 2 → 2a / III. 8 and 8 → 8a / IV. 8 in table 29.

9. The theoretical and practical use of the dissertation

As far as I know, this is the first time that Jan Firbas’ analytic method has been fully applied in investigating the information structure of English to Hungarian translations. Firbas’ method has several followers, not only in the Czech Republic, but also in other parts of the world (cf. Hladky, J. ed. 2003). With this dissertation I hope to have carried out the first steps necessary to join international research in this field.

This study could be valuable for Hungarian Translation Studies, because since Klaudy’s publications (1987 and 2004), there have been a limited amount of studies published on this topic. Still, despite all the detailed results we haven’t covered everything about the information and grammatical structure in this field. There is still scope for new insight into translation technique and about regularities in text organization.
My research (in chapter 6.7.4.6), has shown that the perspective of the TLT not only shows whether a translator preserved the information structure or not, but it also shows their perception. Text 7, for example, had two translators and the two translators perceived an ambiguous perspective, which Firbas calls a case of potentiality in two different ways. We can conclude their perception from their translations. This and similar observations point out a new way to research those texts, that have more than one translator. With the help of FSP we can study the perception of the translators.

In my research I analysed literary texts and their translations. At sentence level, there were new insights about how translators transformed sentence units of expressive texts in order to achieve the same effect of the SLT by reproducing the same information structure. Recognizing, describing and reproducing these structures can help translation students to be more conscious about their decision making, when reproducing information structure.

Analysing sentence perspectives in their sequence, and establishing dynamic semantic chains is still a new method that has not been exhausted yet. In my dissertation I connected it to representation-technique, but further analysis could open new territories into text level investigations, that as an interdisciplinary field could be investigated further by literary science, by aesthetics and text-linguistics.

Analysing the dynamic semantic chains on a greater corpus could bring new results in the case of translations where the TL is Hungarian, and here it would be worthy to focus on Hungarian translations from different languages. Is there a difference when translating from different languages into Hungarian? Have texts translated from different languages into Hungarian a special character, that manifests itself in relation between grammatical structure and information structure, or do translators translate from every language in the same way? Can we conclude on the SL from their translations? If yes, how does this manifest itself in connection with the information structure?

Another promising area for FSP analysis would be those texts that have been translated from Hungarian into other languages. It was Elekfi (1986), who first investigated this field, but he analysed only very short, 2-3 element sentences and there is a great need to analyse longer parts and longer texts. It is also a fact that several theoretical questions need to be clarified.

I would like to continue my research in three areas: in analysing student translations, interpreting the works of professional translators, and investigating the information structure of other types of texts.
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