Volume Six

第 6 卷

功能语言学
年度评论

Annual Review
of Functional Linguistics

主　编　黄国文

常晨光

Volume Six

第 **6** 卷

功能语言学
年度评论

Annual Review
of Functional Linguistics

主　编　黄国文
常晨光

高等教育出版社·北京

功能语言学年度评论
第6卷　2016年

Annual Review of Functional Linguistics (Volume 6, 2016)

Contents

Editors' Introduction:
Systemic Functional Linguistics
Studies in China during 2014–2016

Huang Guowen & Chang Chenguang
South China Agricultural University, China; Sun Yat-sen University, China

1. Introduction

Many things related to Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) studies in China happened in the past two years, which are worth mentioning in this introduction, but due to the focus and space only a few more important ones will be reported. This introduction will start with a brief summary of the main points of the six papers in this collection. This will be followed by the description and reporting of some events in the past two years. It is hoped that the brief descriptions of SFL activities here will keep our colleagues in other parts of the world informed of the SFL progress in China.

2. Papers in this volume

There are six papers in this volume. The first one, by Jonathan Webster, entitled "Three Histories: Halliday as Learner, Teacher, Grammarian", is an account of Halliday's career as learner, teacher and grammarian. The paper is based on a keynote speech that Webster gave at the Fourteenth Symposium on Functional Linguistics and Discourse Analysis, which was held at Sun Yat-sen University on May 13, 2015 in celebration of Professor M. A. K. Halliday's seventieth year of teaching and researching Chinese. The events and ideas presented in the paper are authentic in different senses, one of which is that the stories are told as far as possible in Halliday's own words as taken from interviews which have been conducted with him by different people over the years (see Martin 2013), as well as his writings contained for the most part in his eleven-volume collected works (see Webster 2002-2007, 2013).

The second paper entitled "Exploring the Attitudinal Variations in Academic and Popular Scientific Texts", by Chen Yumin & Tang Yifan, draws upon the appraisal systems of attitude and graduation, and attempts to examine the attitudinal variations in the academic scientific texts and popular scientific texts for the general public and young readers by comparing different attitudinal resources and the ways of encoding attitudinal meaning. Three scientific texts on the same topic of black hole are chosen as data to be

analyzed. It is found that attitudinal variations in the academic and popular scientific texts of different levels serve to accommodate the needs of different target audiences.

More than 30 years ago, Halliday (e.g., 1985) aroused SFL scholars' interest in studying grammatical metaphor, and much has been written since on the study of scientific discourse, especially papers on grammatical metaphor in English. The third paper in this volume is by Xin Zhiying & Yang Chuanzhi, who explore "Elemental Metaphor in Ancient Chinese Medical Discourse". The paper examines ancient Chinese medical discourse, exemplified by *Neijing Suwen*, which represents the essence of traditional Chinese medicine. The study not only shows the appliability of Halliday's ideas of grammatical metaphor to the analysis of ancient Chinese scientific discourse, but also suggests that analyses from the perspective of grammatical metaphor can provide some insights into the flexible use of ancient words in ancient Chinese, as flexible words are also the meaning junctions in grammatical metaphor.

More than three decades ago, Hasan (1984) proposed the Model of Cohesive Harmony Analysis for text analysis and this model has been applied to the study of discourse since. The fourth paper entitled "Cohesive Harmony Analysis: Measuring the Coherence of a Text", by Tian Jianqiu, reviews the origin, the basic concepts and analytical procedure in Hasan's model, and then describes its applications and finally suggests possible ways of its development. The author argues that Hasan's model "could be considered integrating the cohesive analysis of the interpersonal meaning relations" and that "there could be the calibration of cohesive harmony with the analysis of logical relations between clauses".

The fifth paper "Implicit Evaluation: An Interface between Systemic Functional Linguistics and Corpus Linguistics", by Deng Fei & He Anping, looks at important definitions, mechanisms of realization and empirical studies of implicit evaluation from both the perspective of Systemic Functional Linguistics and that of Corpus Linguistics. By taking a phraseological approach of Corpus Linguistics to explore language resources of implicit evaluation in discourse, the paper indicates the complementarities of Functional Linguistics and Corpus Linguistics in the studies of implicit evaluation.

The final paper entitled "Literacy Studies in America from a Systemic-Functional Perspective", by Sun Yinghui, reviews studies of the development of students' literacy conducted by American scholars who work within the theoretical model of SFL. It is reported that those scholars applied SFL to their studies by simplifying the original ideas and focusing on the analysis of the language features of text. The author argues that these studies have not only brought new and effective solutions towards the literacy problems, but proved the great application potential of SFL in the field of education and teaching.

3. Events during 2014-2016

There are a number of SFL activities in China every year, the most well-known ones are the Chinese National Conference on Functional Linguistics, the Chinese National Conference on Discourse Analysis, and the Systemics Week.

The 14th Chinese National Conference on Discourse Analysis was held in Xi'an, hosted by Chang' an University in September 2014, and the 15th was held in Ningbo in October, 2016, hosted by Ningbo University.

The 14th Chinese National Conference on Functional Linguistics was held in April 2015 in Beijing, hosted by Beijing Normal University, and the 15th conference will be hosted by Guizhou Normal University in Guiyang in 2017.

The 14th Systemics Week was held in Chongqing and it was hosted by Southwest University in November 2014, which was followed by the 15th Systemics Week hosted by Shandong University in Jinan in December 2015 and the 16th Systemics Week hosted by Chengdu University of Technology in Chengdu in November 2016.

During the 14th Chinese National Conference on Functional Linguistics held in Beijing, Beijing Normal University officially launched The Halliday-Hasan International Fund for the Study of Language and Other Systems of Meaning, the goal of which is to promote research in language and other semiotic systems, with emphasis on the further development and application of Systemic Functional Linguistics.

Since 2006, Sun Yat-sen University (Convenors: Huang Guowen and Chang Chenguang) and University of Science and Technology Beijing (Convenors: He Wei and Zhang Jingyuan) have hosted sixteen symposia on Functional Linguistics and Discourse Analysis. The fourteenth was held at Sun Yat-sen University on May 13, 2015 in celebration of Professor M.A.K. Halliday's seventieth year of teaching and researching Chinese, with the symposium theme of "Language Teaching and Language Learning". Professor Halliday was invited as a special guest at the symposium. The fifteenth was a two-day event, also held at Sun Yat-sen University, co-organized with the City University of Hong Kong, on September 8–9, 2015 to honor the lasting contribution of Professor Ruqaiya Hasan to the study of language, meaning, and society, with the symposium theme of "Ways of Meaning".

Speaking from an international SFL perspective, the year of 2015 was a bad year for SFL, when the SFL community lost some of the brightest stars, including Ruqaiya Hasan (June 24, 2015) and Geoff Thompson (November 3, 2015). These great scholars were frequent academic visitors to China before they passed away. Their contributions to the development of SFL will be dearly remembered and they will live in our hearts forever.

4. Concluding remarks

In talking about the important enterprises of the China Association of Functional Linguistics over the past two decades, Professor M.A.K. Halliday (2016: 5) emphasizes the importance of publishing the present *Annual Review of Functional Linguistics*, saying that "This is an extremely valuable resource enabling non-sinophones to keep up with what is going on in the field in China". We sincerely hope that more and more people will join us in our endeavor in the process of teaching and researching SFL in the Chinese context, by offering help of different kinds, including contributing to this *Annual Review of Functional Linguistics*.

References

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2016. The contribution of systemic functional theory to linguistics in China. In Webster, J.J. and Peng, X.W. (eds), *Applying Systemic Functional Linguistics: The State of the Art in China Today*. London: Bloomsbury. 3-13.

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

Hasan, R. 1985. The texture of a text. In M.A.K. Halliday and R. Hasan (eds), *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. Australia: Deakin University Press. 70-96.

Martin, J.R. (ed.). 2013. *Interviews with M.A.K. Halliday: Language Turned Back on Himself*. London: Bloomsbury.

Webster, J.J. (ed.) 2002-2007. *The Collected Works of M.A.K. Halliday*, Vols.1-10. London: Continuum.

Webster, J.J. (ed.) 2013. *Halliday in the 21st Century*. London: Bloomsbury.

Three Histories: Halliday as Learner, Teacher, Grammarian

Jonathan Webster

City University of Hong Kong, China

The account here of the three histories of M.A.K. Halliday as learner, teacher and grammarian is told as far as possible in Halliday's own words as taken from interviews which have been conducted with him over the years (see Martin 2013), as well as his writings contained for the most part in his eleven-volume collected works.

1. Halliday, the learner

Professor M.A.K. Halliday (MAKH) began studying Chinese just after his 17th birthday. As he explains in his paper entitled "Notes on Teaching Chinese to Foreign Learners", it was an 18-month long intensive course taught in the Chinese Department at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

The course was taught by a team of British and Chinese language teachers, using Y.R. Chao's *Gwoyeu Romatzyh* (Guóyǔ luómǎzì, literally "National Language Romanization") rather than Chinese characters to teach reading and writing. Because GR incorporates the tones into the spelling, dictation became a useful teaching technique. As Halliday explains, "Characters were not introduced until very late in the first year of the course, which meant that when we did start to study them we learnt them rather quickly, and without too much difficulty, because by that time we were already well acquainted with the language and had reached some measure of fluency" (2012: 5).

One of MAKH's strategies for learning to write Chinese characters involved standing in front of a blackboard, using a piece of chalk to draw "with the full extension and movement of the arm, preferably at the same time singing a tune to match the rhythm of the strokes" (2012: 5).

The initiative for conducting this intensive course came from Professor J.R. Firth, who pointed out at the beginning of the war that Britain was obviously going to be involved in the war in Asia and it was high time that they trained some service people in Asian languages.

After eighteen months' language training, MAKH entered military service, doing half a year's army training in Britain, followed by a year of serving overseas in India.

5

During the year in India, he was with the Chinese Intelligence Unit in Calcutta, doing counterintelligence work. Besides interviewing those who came out of Japanese-occupied China about the situation there, finding out about the fighting at the front — who was fighting who, and how it was going — they would also read and censor the mail going in and out of China.

After that year and a half, he along with three others from the first batch who had learned Chinese — including John Chinnery, who went on to become Head of the Chinese Department at Edinburgh, Cyril Birch who later taught at Berkeley, and Harry Simon who ended up at Melbourne as Head of the Department of Chinese — were pulled back to London from their respective postings, to teach Chinese to new recruits.

2. Halliday, the teacher

It was 1945, and everyone figured there were still years of war ahead against the Japanese, so the number of those being trained in Chinese and Japanese for the three services was increased. This, of course, meant that they needed more teachers of Chinese. So MAKH spent his last two years in the army teaching Chinese. To this day, he remembers the first Chinese class he ever had to teach, on 13 May 1945, during which he gave dictation to a group of very high-powered air force officers.

He was not given any training in how to teach Chinese, so MAKH followed the same way as he had been taught Chinese, but with the exception that he tried to teach the students some grammar. As a learner, MAKH often had been puzzled by the grammar of Chinese, and wanted explanations to questions like "how does one actually know what can (or cannot) be said?" This struggle to engage with the grammar of Chinese became all the more pressing when he began teaching Chinese, and was put in the position of having to explain things to his students. He began with very straightforward questions about the grammar, because he found that there were so many things about Chinese grammar which just simply hadn't been described at all, and fell outside the scope of both traditional and then current grammars of Chinese.

MAKH (2012: 5) writes,

> I was very aware that we had been given very little instruction in Chinese grammar, and were largely left to work it out for ourselves. There were so many things in the language that needed to be explained, and the only way to explain them was to locate them within the workings of the grammar. Adult learners need explanations. But they need to be genuine explanations, in terms of the language itself, its underlying patterns and principles, not the fake explanations so often offered in terms of stereotypic features of the culture, derived from stories of Chineseness told by foreigners or by the Chinese themselves.

One such myth is that Chinese lacks clear-cut syntactic categories — "that it is more 'fluid' or 'flexible' than other languages". While acknowledging that morphemes are not distributed into classes, nevertheless, argues MAKH, "words are [distributed into classes], including words consisting of just one morpheme, and these classes are reasonably clear-cut — as much as grammatical categories ever are (they are inherently indeterminate, or 'fuzzy', in any language)" (2012: 8). No language, insists MAKH, is more indeterminate than another.

What MAKH discovered through teaching Chinese for over ten years is that not all learners learn the same way. Instead, he observed how learners tend to vary along what he identifies as four parameters of learning (2012: 6-7):

(1) By ear or by eye — some learn more by listening (and speaking), others learn more by reading (and writing).

(2) By performance or by reflection — some learn by doing, others by thinking.

(3) By content or by expression — some focus more on the meaning, others on the sound (or the sight).

(4) By principle or by example — some work from the top down, deriving instances from generalizations, others work from the bottom up, finding out patterns for themselves.

How does MAHK characterize himself as a language learner?

"I am an extreme ear-learner", he writes, "I cannot learn a language, especially its vocabulary, from reading it, only by listening and speaking. On performance versus reflection I am somewhere about the middle. On content versus expression, as a learner I tend rather towards the expression end — which is perhaps why I became a grammarian, to redress the imbalance! As regards learning by principle or by example, here I find I am always 'shunting', moving alternatively in one direction or the other" (2012: 7).

Based on his own experience learning and teaching Chinese, MAKH suggests three factors which he believes can help foreign learners of Chinese learn more successfully:

(1) Adult or adolescent beginners would be better taught initially by speakers of their own language "who have learnt the language from the outside as they are doing themselves" (2012: 6). Native speakers can better contribute to the learning process once the essentials of the learning task have been mastered, and when learners "can recognize and take advantage of the native speakers' superior knowledge".

(2) Chinese characters are better introduced later rather than sooner — "the

longer you postpone facing the students with characters, the more easily and more quickly they will learn them" (2012: 6).

(3) Provide accurate training in phonetics — "if foreigners get the tones right, as part of the overall sound pattern, they can get away with quite a lot of 'un-Chinese' effects in their meanings and in their grammar and vocabulary" (2012: 6).

When MAKH came out of the army in 1947, he decided he wanted to go on studying Chinese. He did not yet have a degree, so he thought he would pursue his degree from the University of London externally in China. Walter Simon, who had taught MAKH Chinese during that initial intensive course, happened to know the President of Peking University, Hu Shi; so he wrote to him to ask if he would take MAKH on as a student and help him find some way of earning a living, perhaps by teaching English in a high school.

When MAKH arrived in China, and turned up at Peking University, Hu Shi said, "Good. You start teaching next week in our English Department". So in 1947, at the beginning of classes, he enrolled as a student at Peking University in the Chinese Department, and began teaching English in the English Department. MAKH had never taught any English before; but they were desperate for speakers of English. English had been totally banned under the Japanese occupation and most of their students were beginners. Not knowing what he wanted to do afterwards, except that he needed to prepare himself for the examinations for the London degree, he took classes in the Chinese Department in everything he could find — literature, classical Chinese and such.

After one year at Peking University, in June 1948, MAKH flew down to Nanjing, where the British Council had made the necessary arrangements for him to take the University of London examination, which was exactly the same examination as the internal exam. The examination was on Modern Chinese: a combination of language and literature, including the history of Chinese literature from 500 BC to the present day — all in one paper! As MAKH recalls, there was one question that you knew you were going to get, which was "Write about the author of your choice". MAKH had in fact been to see author and playwright Cao Yu, who was living and working in Shanghai at the time, and had even spent a whole day with him; so he was, of course, ideally prepared for that question!

After completing his London degree, at that point in his life, he had no intention of going on to do postgraduate study, so he took a job in China working for the Chinese Industrial Cooperatives, which required him to travel to a remote part of northwest China, where there were these village cooperatives that had served as a kind of industrial base in the unoccupied areas during the Second World War. MAKH worked for the

cooperative for about six months; until, in some small village up in Gansu, a letter arrived which had been chasing him for about three months, saying he'd been given a scholarship from England for postgraduate study.

The letter read "proceed back to Beijing immediately" (or words to that effect!). The conditions were that MAKH could spend two more years studying in China before returning to England to do a higher degree. That meant he would have to get back to Beijing, which would not be easy, however, since he was miles away from any city, with fighting still going on. After managing to get a bus to Lanzhou, where there was an airport, he was able to catch a plane going by some roundabout route to Beijing. He arrived in Beijing just a few days before the airport closed. Any later and he would never have been able to get back in.

Geoff Williams, in his chapter on "Halliday as an International Educator", appearing in the recently published *Bloomsbury Companion to M.A.K. Halliday*, recalls what MAKH said in an address before an international congress at the University of Sydney in 1987 as he retired from the Chair of Linguistics there: "[MAKH] spoke of the dilemma he had faced in the years immediately after the Second World War: whether he should continue working politically in rural areas of China, or to attempt to develop ways of thinking about, and working with, language that might in time be helpful to people engaged in key social practices such as education" (2015: 334). MAKH chose the latter.

Williams describes Halliday's contribution to language education as having been "both an enduring and an extraordinary one." He continues, "Few educators, and I suggest no other linguist, could reasonably claim to have given education such a broad and genuinely appliable body of theoretical and descriptive resources for practicing and researching meaning-making in education". A comment Halliday himself made about Bernstein's work seems equally apposite to his own: "His ideas are, of course, not simple, because the things that he was trying to explain are not simple, and he didn't distort them by pretending that they were (Halliday [1988] 2007: 82)" (Williams 2015: 346).

3. Halliday, the grammarian

It was toward the end of November when MAKH re-enrolled at Peking University. Professor Luo Changpei, who MAKH had met during his first year at Peking University when he attended one of Luo's courses on the history of Chinese, took MAKH on and started training him in historical linguistics and Sino-Tibetan studies. After about six months or so, however, it became clear to Luo that MAKH really wanted to work on Chinese dialects, so Luo told him, "Well then you need to go and do some work

in synchronic studies; next year you should go and study with my friend Wang Li." MAKH credits Wang Li, who was Dean of the Faculty of Arts at Lingnan University in Guangdong with teaching him the tradition of Chinese linguistics.

It was May, 1949, and getting to Guangdong was complicated by the very heavy fighting then going on in central China. So MAKH traveled by boat from Tianjin to Korea, then down to Hong Kong; and from there back in late August into Guangdong, which would be liberated just a few weeks after his arrival there.

Wang Li was doing a survey of the widely differing varieties of Cantonese of the Pearl River Delta. But because there was so much chaos all around, Wang Li and his students could not do their survey work in the surrounding villages. Instead, they surveyed university students who were natives of these small towns and villages, and who spoke their own local dialects in addition to standard Cantonese. When it came to the analysis, MAKH did the tones — Wang Li said he was the best among his research students at hearing and identifying tones! MAKH also developed a grammar questionnaire which he used to get the students to give him their versions of the Cantonese sentences in their own local dialects. MAKH was fascinated by the differences between Mandarin and Cantonese grammar, and also by how these local dialects differed in their grammar from Cantonese.

The terms of his scholarship required MAHK to return to England to complete his PhD. MAKH anticipated that he not only would be working on the material from his dialect work with Wang Li but also would be working under Firth while teaching Chinese in the Chinese department at S.O.A.S. But, England in 1950, was at the height of McCarthyism. When he attended an interview for the job at S.O.A.S. he was asked only one question: whether he was a member of the Communist Party. He answered, "No," because he wasn't. But he also refused to undertake that he would not become a member of the Communist Party in the future. In the end, he didn't get the job.

MAKH ended up in the Chinese department at Cambridge, where there was no Modern Chinese at all, only classical. Not only would he not be working with Firth, but also he could not pursue his Chinese dialect studies as part of his PhD research. There was simply no one at Cambridge qualified to supervise him on modern Chinese dialects. But then neither did he consider himself suited to working with classical Chinese. Being someone who learns primarily by ear, he had always felt quite put off by the idea of "engaging with dead languages." As a compromise, his supervisor at Cambridge, Gustav Haloun, then Professor of Chinese, suggested that MAKH work instead on the Chinese translation of the 14th century *Secret History of the Mongols*《元朝秘史》. This traditional Mongolian biography of Genghis Khan had been translated into Chinese to serve as a textbook for Chinese civil servants who had to learn the official language of the civil service, Mongolian. The fact that it was not supposed to be a work of literature,

but rather intended to be more like a language manual, made it an interesting case study into an earlier stage of modern Mandarin.

MAKH negotiated with Haloun to be allowed to go up to London to study with Firth, who had agreed to take him on for informal supervision. But then Haloun died, quite suddenly, at the end of that year; so MAKH went to ask if Firth would be willing to become his supervisor, officially, if it could be arranged. Firth agreed, and MAKH, although still a student at Cambridge, was allowed to transfer to the supervision of Firth, traveling regularly to S.O.A.S.

Being supervised by Firth was "a wonderful experience", recalls MAKH. Though Firth could be "very tough", intellectually, even occasionally "bullying", still "if you said to him, 'Hang on, I don't think I agree with you', he would say 'Oh yes, you might be right.'"

In 1954, MAKH was appointed as Assistant Lecturer in Chinese at Cambridge, with a teaching load of between 12 to 14 hours a week — twice the number of hours then stipulated by the university as a maximum, which left him little time for writing, let alone trips to London. So when he finally submitted his thesis — at four o'clock on the last day of the final extension, 31st December, 1954 — the grammatical framework had diverged somewhat from what was clearly recognizable as Firth's teaching. Whereas Firth defined the system by its environment in largely syntagmatic terms, it seemed to MAKH that the environment is instead better thought of as paradigmatic. Nevertheless, Firth still acknowledged the thesis as having been produced under his guidance, and supported its publication; he also agreed to let MAKH dedicate it to him.

It would be another six years, however, before MAKH would complete what would be the first journal article in Systemic-Functional Linguistics — a lengthy article, called "Categories of the theory of grammar". Hoping to show it to Firth before submitting it, he took the article with him to a conference arranged by the British Council on English language teaching, where Firth was to be the opening speaker. The date was 14th December and everyone had taken their seats in the conference room, waiting for Firth to appear, when the convener came in and reported that Firth had died, suddenly, during the night. Dedicated to Firth, the article appeared in WORD.

4. Halliday, as learner, teacher and grammarian

For MAKH — as learner, teacher and grammarian — language is meaning potential — "It is a range of possible meanings; together with the means whereby these meanings are realized, or expressed" (Halliday 1975: 8). Learning language is learning how to mean, and learning how to mean means learning the grammar. Describing the role grammar plays in meaning-making, MAKH writes,