Volume Four

功能语言学
年度评论

Annual Review
of Functional Linguistics

主 编 黄国文
常晨光

Volume Four

功能语言学年度评论

Annual Review of Functional Linguistics

主　编　黄国文

常晨光

功能语言学年度评论
第 4 卷　2012 年

Annual Review of Functional Linguistics (Volume 4, 2012)

Contents

i

Editors' Introduction: "Broadening the Path" in the Chinese Context

Huang Guowen, Chang Chenguang & Lü Dairong

Sun Yat-sen University, China

1. Introduction

This is the 4th volume of *Annual Review of Functional Linguistics* edited by scholars (HUANG Guowen & CHANG Chenguang) at Sun Yat-sen University (SYSU), where the 40th International Systemic Functional Congress (ISFC40) is to be held in July, 2013. The theme of this congress is "Broadening the Path: Complementarities in Language and Linguistics", and as is stated in the Call for Papers, the idea behind this theme is to suggest that we who work within the general framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) should give greater emphasis to the value of the complementarities in current work within SFL, and this implies that, while we continue to focus on our specialized areas of interest, we should also take an active interest in the full range of current research within SFL, and work towards integrating developments in these diversified fields in a more unified model of language. We should on the one hand recognize the evolutionary (rather than revolutionary) nature of SFL (e.g., from a theory of grammar to a theory of language, which is now a general linguistics theory) and on the other hand foster its appliability (e.g., from a theory that is designed to identify problems for itself to a theory that identifies and tackles "problems that arise from outside itself", which is a problem-oriented theory, see Halliday 2009: 61). Therefore, the aim of ISFC40 is to encourage developments and complementarities of "link paths" that will connect the various different research interests within the broad, open pathway of SFL.

Along with the theme of ISFC40, the journal of *Annual Review of Functional Linguistics* also encourages creative, open and friendly dialogues and interactions among scholars working in different regional and academically diverse communities of SFL. In the previous volume (i.e. vol. 3), we included two papers: one by J.R. Martin (2011) and another by R.P. Fawcett (2011). These papers set out similarities and differences between each author's perspective on grammar with the grammar of SFL as proposed by M.A.K. Halliday. As such, Martin's "Sydney Grammar (SG)" and Fawcett's "Cardiff

Grammar (CG)" may be regarded as different "registers" (or dialects?) of SFL in that they both theorize and interpret language within the broad framework of SFL theory. As was stated in the editors' (Huang et al 2011) introduction to the volume, these two invaluable papers together offer the reader a rare opportunity to view two important perspectives on different "registers" of the SFL model of language and the kind of dialogue that is currently going on among scholars within the SFL community.

2. Papers in this volume

There are four papers in the present volume. The first paper is entitled "Exploring patterns of conjunction in different registers: A challenge from SFL for corpus linguists", by Geoff Thompson. The author argues that "an SFL approach suggests strongly that it may be time for corpus linguistics to accept that at present it is both liberated and limited by its methodology", which echoes Halliday's (2008: 75) assertion: "Corpus linguists have asked us to work towards 'corpus-based grammars'; in order to be able to do this we have to ask them, in turn, to work towards a grammar-based corpus."

The second paper is Part 2 of the paper entitled "Problems and solutions in identifying Processes and Participant Roles in discourse analysis" by Robin P. Fawcett, with its focus on how to handle metaphor, idiom and other problems. The first part of the paper was published in volume 3 (Fawcett 2011). The relationship between the two parts is clearly explained by the author in the present part. The focus of Fawcett's paper is on identifying Processes and Participant Roles in discourse analysis in general and on "different problems that arise in the analysis of TRANSITIVITY" and the "problems that need to be handled within a framework that is able to model how we use both fresh metaphors and long-established idioms in a synchronic model of language and its use" in particular. The underlying aim is to demonstrate "a cognitive-interactive model of communication through language" within the general framework of SFL. The author argues that the Cardiff Grammar is simpler than the Sydney Grammar in that the former "accommodates the 'ergative' and the 'transitive' perspectives WITHIN A SINGLE DESCRIPTIVE FRAMEWORK, so relieving the text analyst of the task of deciding which framework to use in which cases".

The third paper "A typological perspective on relations between genres in popular science" by YU Hui and CHEN Chunhong discusses various genres identified in Stephen Hawking's *A Brief History of Time*, a landmark volume in science writing. The study shows that "popular science discourse tends to display two distinctive systems of genres: a system of informing genres describing and explicating entities and processes in science, and a system of sharing genres narrating and presenting varied experiences and viewpoints". It is argued that the "two systems are intertwined in popular science and may well account for the distinguished feature of popular science: educating as

knowledge-based science textbooks while at the same time entertaining as sympathy-evoking story books". The underlying observation is that "a discourse is often a complex of different genres".

The fourth paper "A functional exploration of the *It*-Evaluative Construction" is by WANG Yong. Working within the framework of functional-syntactic analysis, the author proposes the notion of the *It*-Evaluative Construction (IEC) as a Theme packaging device, which is similar to the Evaluative Enhanced Theme construction within the Cardiff Grammar model (e.g., Huang 2003). The paper examines the relationship between IEC (e.g., "It was true that she would not enter a shop in her own country") and its non-special variant ("That she would not enter a shop in her own country was true.") and argues that the former, rather than its non-special counterpart, is the unmarked variant.

The four papers in this volume can be interpreted from the perspective of "Broadening the Path" in that they either discuss issues which are of interest to more than one "school" of linguistics (Thompson's paper is concerned with SFL and corpus linguistics and Wang Yong's with different grammatical approaches to the construction under investigation) or suggest alternative approaches to the phenomena of language use, as what Fawcett and Yu & Chen have demonstrated in their papers.

3. Chinese SFL activities

During the years of 2011 and 2012 a number of important SFL activities took place in China, both at the national level and the local level.

In 2011, the 12th National Conference on Functional Linguistics (10-12, Nov.) and the 11th Systemics Week (6-10, Nov.) were held in Nanjing, Jiangsu Province and hosted by the PLA University of International Relations and Nanjing Normal University. There were over 200 participants from over 100 universities presenting papers at the conference and there were 16 plenary speeches delivered during the Systemics Week. James R. Martin (The University of Sydney) and Jonathan Webster (City University of Hong Kong) were among the international scholars who gave plenary speeches in both events. The main difference between the two activities is that at the conference the participants present papers while at the Systemics Week the participants attend lectures and talks given by senior scholars.

In 2012, from 15-18 June the 13th National Conference on Discourse Analysis was hosted by the University of Inner Mongolia, and like the 12th National Conference on Functional Linguistics there were over 200 participants attending the conference. Later in the year, the 12th Systemics Week (7-11, Nov.) was hosted by the University of National Defense in Changsha, Hunan, during which 18 plenary speeches were delivered by senior scholars. Jonathan Webster (City University of Hong Kong) and

3

Wendy Bowcher (Sun Yat-sen University) were among the professors who taught at the Systemics Week.

Apart from the national conferences and two Systemics Weeks, the past few years also witnessed the happening of three special SFL meetings, which were the strategic planning meetings for the China Association of Functional Linguistics (CAFL), designed to discuss "political" or "business" issues concerning the promotion/teaching and the development of SFL in China rather than academic issues. The participants of these meetings were key members of the CAFL. The meetings were hosted by the University of Science and Technology Beijing (2009), Beijing Normal University (2010) and the PLA University of International Relations (2011) respectively.

Since 2006, SFL scholars at Sun Yat-sen University (SYSU) and the University of Science and Technology Beijing (USTB) have been working on symposia on "Functional Linguistics and Discourse Analysis", and during 2012, four symposia were held in the two universities.

(1) March 29-30, USTB. Theme: Studies in Functional Syntax, with Robin P. Fawcett (Cardiff University) and Geoff Thompson (University of Liverpool) and some Chinese SFL scholars as main speakers.

(2) May 25-27, SYSU, Zhuhai Campus. Theme: Discourse Analysis and Corpus Linguistics, with special focus on the translation of Confucius's *Analects*. Speakers were from two special research groups: one from SYSU (headed by HUANG Guowen) and the other from South China Normal University (headed by HE Anping).

(3) Oct. 9-12, SYSU, Guangzhou Campus & Zhuhai Campus. Theme: Strategic Planning for Functional Linguistics Studies. There were nine main speakers at this symposium: CHANG Chenguang (SYSU), DING Jianxin (SYSU), HE Wei (USTB), HUANG Guowen (SYSU), WANG Yong (Central China Normal University), Jonathan Webster (City University of Hong Kong), XIN Zhiying (Xiamen University), YANG Bingjun (South West University), and YU Hui (Beijing Normal University).

(4) Nov. 20-21, SYSU, Guangzhou Campus. Theme: System, Corpus and Translation. The main speakers were: CHANG Chenguang (SYSU), HE Anping (South China Normal University), HU Kaibao (Shanghai Jiaotong University), HUANG Guowen (SYSU), Susan Hunston (University of Birmingham), PENG Xuanwei (Beijing Normal University), and Jonathan Webster (City University of Hong Kong).

Apart from the SFL activities summarized above, there have been many local activities in universities throughout China. All this shows that SFL is very popular in China, and this has been the case for the past 20 years or so.

If we look at the SFL activities described above, we can see that the idea of "Broadening the Path in the Chinese Context" applies because although the events are identified as SFL-oriented some of the speakers are in fact not SFL scholars. The

participation of these scholars highlights the importance of complementarities in the study of language and linguistics in China.

4. Concluding remarks

Despite the fact that there are many SFL activities going on in China every year, there are, as observed by Huang (2011), a number of problems for devoted SFL scholars to seriously consider if the fruitful situation is to be maintained in the Chinese context. A review of the publications in China will show that in recent years more and more people are becoming interested in the "cognitive approach" to language (i.e., cognitive grammar, cognitive linguistics), which suggests that SFL has to remain as attractive and relevant or it may be threatened by other theories and approaches in terms of keeping its researchers. Furthermore, there is a large group of people in China who are not able or ready to get involved with any of the schools of and approaches to linguistics, and this may suggest that more SFL courses and activities must be conducted.

As Huang (2011) argues, there are quite a number of challenges of developing SFL in China. Two questions pointing to these challenges are: (1) When can a comprehensive SFL description of the Chinese language become a reality? (2) To what extent can Chinese SFL scholars produce writings of a truly creative nature? These are not simple questions which can be easily answered. Questions of this kind are relevant to Chinese SFL scholars and to international SFL scholars as well. China is a huge market, and what we have to do is to ensure that good quality products are being exchanged.

References

Fawcett, R.P. 2011. Problems and solutions in identifying Processes and Participant Roles in discourse analysis, Part 1: Introduction to a systematic procedure for identifying Processes and Participant Roles. *Annual Review of Functional Linguistics*. Vol. 3. Beijing: Higher Education Press. 34-87.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2008. *Complementarities in Language*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2009. Methods – techniques – problems. In M.A.K. Halliday and J.J. Webster (eds.), *Continuum Companion to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Continuum. 59-86.

Huang, G.W. 2003. *Enhanced Theme in English: Its Structures and Functions*. Taiyuan: Shanxi Educational Press.

Huang, G.W. 2011. Challenges of developing SFL in China. *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies*, 12: 15-23.

5

Huang, G.W., C.G. Chang & D.R. Lü. 2011. Systemic Functional Linguistics studies in China (2010). *Annual Review of Functional Linguistics*. Vol. 3. Beijing: Higher Education Press. 1-7.

Martin, J.R. 2011. Metalinguistic divergence: Centrifugal dimensionality in SFL. *Annual Review of Functional Linguistics*. Vol. 3. Beijing: Higher Education Press. 8-32.

Exploring Patterns of Conjunction in Different Registers: A Challenge from SFL for Corpus Linguists

Geoff Thompson
University of Liverpool, UK

1. Introduction

The principled reliance on corpora of attested language use as the basis for investigating the nature of language and text has clearly brought about a radical re-alignment of linguistic enquiry over the past forty or so years. Chomsky's famous, and repeated, dismissals of the goals and method of corpus linguistics as "mere data arranging" (Chomsky 1964: 36) or simply the accumulation of "huge masses of unanalysed data" (Andor 2004: 97) have long since been shown to be misguided and trivial (to use one of his own favourite terms of dismissal). The ever-widening range of phenomena that have been brought within the scope of corpus linguistics and the fundamental insights gained into how language functions attest to the vigour and value of the field. However, there are certainly areas in which further advances can be made; and in this article I wish to address to an issue that is increasingly recognised as becoming urgent if corpus linguistics is to continue setting the research agenda. This is the issue of how far automatic recognition of fundamental features of discourse can be pushed, particularly in the direction of functional realizations.

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) has, from its origins, been based on the study of attested language use, and thus has a natural affinity with corpus linguistics — although the connections have not always been straightforward (see e.g. the contributions in Thompson & Hunston 2006, and the succinct overview in Butler 2004). In recent years, the view of language as probabilistic has become central to our understanding of how the language system functions. Even at the most general level, it has been demonstrated that many choices are not equipropable (Halliday & James 1993/2006); and in the SFL approach different registers can be distinguished by the probabilities that certain configurations of choices from different systems will or will not occur. It is only through corpus-based studies that probabilities can be investigated: frequency of occurrence in text is taken as a reflection of probability in the system. The corpus is therefore central to at least one major line SFL enquiry. However, this immediately raises the problem of how the kinds of functional patterns which are the

main concern of SFL can be identified and quantified in large amounts of text.

Although there has been a good deal of discussion over how large a corpus needs to be in order to gain valid and useful results (e.g. Biber 1990, Sinclair 1992, Kennedy 1996, Ghadessy et al. 2001), the basic assumption is that, while the purpose of the corpus has a very strong influence, larger is better. On the other hand, at present practical restrictions limit, often severely, the amount of text that can be analysed if the linguistic feature in focus is not susceptible to automatic recognition of strings, meaning that the majority, if not all, of the analysis must be carried out manually. Matthiessen (2006: 109) discusses this difference in terms of moving up the stratal hierarchy, from graphology to lexico-grammar to semantics: "the automation of the analysis becomes increasingly difficult as we ascend the stratal organisation towards semantics". Given that, in SFL, the account of grammar is pushed as far as possible in the direction of the semantics (Halliday 1994: xix), there is a clear tension between the desirability of automation of analysis and the orientation towards meaning.

The linguistic phenomenon in which I am interested raises this issue with particular sharpness. This is conjunction: essentially the ways in which two clauses may be connected, whether or not there is an explicit signal of the connection, and whether or not the two clauses form a single complex or separate sentences. Conjunction lies in the area where the lexico-grammatical and semantic strata meet; and it therefore represents what, to borrow Vygotsky's term, might be called the "zone of proximal development" for corpus linguistics — one of the key areas which, I would argue, corpus linguistics should now aim to colonise. It should be clear that this topic must be approached from the perspective of discourse analysis — that is, patterns of use of conjunction across texts (not just the meanings of individual [groups of] lexemes). I aim to explore conjunction as a whole phenomenon rather than just the lexical items which serve a conjunctive function (the study therefore contrasts with traditional corpus studies, such as Trebits 2009, which typically focus narrowly on pre-established identifiable strings).

There are two complementary stages in working with corpora in this way, both of which are broadly in the area of phraseology. The first involves recognition of the particular categories being explored. In principle, this is done by setting up criteria that are as explicit as possible for identifying especially distinctions between different manifestations of the phenomenon — in this case different types of conjunctive relations. One way of establishing the criteria is by trawling through a corpus to find as many uncontroversial examples as possible and then looking for patterns in the contexts in which these instances occur. The recognition criteria do of course include the presence of explicit conjunctive signals, but, as will be shown below, these are very rarely sufficient by themselves. The criteria can then be used to decide on the categorisation of unclear or potentially ambiguous cases. This lays the ground for the second stage:

automation of identification. Again in principle, if the criteria are sufficiently explicit and precise, it should be possible to train a computer to use them in order to search mechanically and differentiate between categories in text, to a reasonable (and, through learning, to an increasingly high) degree of accuracy. It is worth noting that, on the whole, for most mainstream corpus linguistic studies the first of these stages is relatively or wholly unproblematic: it is surface features that are the focus, and the criteria essentially involve specifying a string, with or without possible variations. Automatic searching for the string(s) is then typically straightforward (although there has been valuable work on overcoming certain problems such as identifying discontinuous strings — e.g. Greaves 2009). It is only after that stage that interpretation by the researcher comes in — delayed human intervention, in Sinclair's (2001) term. In the kind of study that I aim to carry out, on the other hand, human intervention is at present still necessary not just in interpreting patterns of use once all relevant instances have been identified, but in the prior, and fundamental, task of deciding precisely what counts as a relevant instance, and what any instance is an instance of. Any move towards automation of these stages is therefore to be welcomed, but appears to be far from straightforward.

The following discussion of practical problems that I face in analysing conjunction in a corpus is intended to serve as an illustration of the kinds of issues which arise in attempting to make automatic identification of particular sets of functional choices in text more effective, and to explore some of the potential lines of enquiry that seem to be worth following up in extending the scope of corpus linguistics into this "zone of proximal development".

2. The focus of enquiry

In exploring the phenomenon of conjunction, I start from the assumption (cf. Hoey & Winter 1986) that in the normal case every clause stands in relation to at least one other clause nearby — most often (though not always) adjacent to it. In fact, this means that many clauses — particularly independent clauses — enter into two relations: one with a preceding clause and one with a subsequent clause, as in Table 1.[1]

Table 1   Chaining of clause relations

(a) Although she was excited at the prospect of her novel being ↓situation
    put on the stage,

(b) she felt some trepidation at the thought of seeing it.   ↑**cancellation/situation**↓

(c) When, however, in the following month the play transferred ↓location: time
    to the Phoenix Theatre,

(d) she agreed to attend a matinee.   —

                                                                    cancellation↑   9

Here the highlighted clause, (b), serves both to cancel the situation expressed in clause (a) and expresses the situation which is cancelled in clause (d).[2] Three points are worth making in relation to this example. First, the example illustrates cases both where the two clauses are adjacent (a, b) and where there is an intervening clause (b, d).[3] Second, the analysis is "flat" rather than hierarchical: unlike in, for instance, a Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST) approach (Mann & Thompson 1988), I do not set out to explore how groups of clauses form relations at a higher level with other groups of clauses until all relations within a text are exhaustively described (although in principle I would accept the RST assumption that, with monologic texts where a hierarchical analysis is possible, the same categories of relations will apply all the way up). Thirdly, the example shows that (at this stage of the research) no distinction is made between relations between clauses in the same clause complex/sentence and those between sentences: analysis shows that the same categories of relations hold for both these cases (although there are certainly differences in the frequencies with which some of the relations are associated with inter-sentence or inter-clause contexts).

The model of conjunction that I am using is based on Systemic Functional Grammar, drawing in particular on the insight that language serves three major functions, or "metafunctions": experiential, interpersonal and textual (see e.g. Halliday 1994). The experiential metafunction relates to language used to talk about states of affairs (in the physical or mental world) — this is equivalent to the "content" domain in some other approaches (e.g. Sweetser 1990). The interpersonal metafunction realises meanings related to the interaction between speaker and hearer, and to the expression of speakers' attitudes towards the world and the content of their own messages. The textual metafunction enables meanings to be expressed in such a way that the messages fit in appropriately with the co-text and the context of utterance. The specific categories of conjunctive relations are not of primary concern here, so I will only provide a very brief outline as background; for a detailed account see Thompson (forthcoming). Relations are seen as construing meanings in each of the three metafunctional domains; and I follow Halliday in differentiating between expansion and projection, since this distinction is borne out by the ways that the two kinds of relations interact in text. Projection is broadly equivalent to what is traditionally called reported or quoted speech or thought, while expansion includes all other relations. The main categories of expansion used in my approach are drawn from Martin (1992): addition, comparison, time and consequence. This gives the basic model shown in Table 2 (in the examples, ranking clause boundaries are marked //, embedded clauses are marked [[ ]]).

Table 2   A tri-functional model of conjunction

	experiential	interpersonal	textual
expansion	connects figures in a complex representation and/or sequence	connects moves in an unfolding interaction	connects steps in an unfolding argument
	e.g. condition: *it's all right // as long as you don't move*	e.g. speech act/motive: *Apologies for my ignorance, // cos I am not really good in Excel formulas.*	e.g. sequencing: *"How do I get started?" First of all, it depends on a variety of factors.*
projection	projects a meta-representation through a representation of speech or thought	frames a "packaged" proposition in terms of attitude or speech act	frames a "packaged" proposition in terms of textual function
	e.g. report: *He said // that she's coming soon.*	e.g. modalised claim: *I believe // it's the longest running parade, isn't it?*	e.g. causal projection: *The reason being is [[that we like people who are like us]].*

My main aim in the study is to explore detailed aspects of Halliday's (1994: 338) insight that "different registers vary both in their overall use of conjunction and in their orientation towards that of an internal or external kind". "External" conjunction in Halliday's approach corresponds to experiential conjunction in the model shown in Table 2, while "internal" conjunction covers both interpersonal and textual conjunction. In order to carry out the investigation, I perform a manual analysis of patterns of conjunction in six smallish corpora, representing different registers: romantic fiction, academic research articles, business annual reports, political speeches, personal blogs and casual conversation. I use UAM CorpusTool (http://www.wagsoft.com/CorpusTool/) for the analysis, in order to keep a record of my decisions. This also allows me to call up all examples of any category of conjunction and/or conjunctive signals.

In the rest of this article, I will examine a sample of areas of conjunction which, on the basis of the processes of analysis that I went through in dealing with my corpus, seem to pose different degrees of difficulty for automatic identification.

3. Signals and indicators in analysing conjunction

3.1 A more straightforward case

To start with an area which appears to be less problematic, the distinction between expansion and projection is generally very clear to the human analyst, and in principle it should not pose too many problems for automatic identification. Assuming a POS-tagged and parsed corpus, the determination of cases in which a relation involves projection rather than expansion can draw on a combination of structural criteria