第 **1** 辑　Forum on Systemic Functional Linguistics Studies
（Volume I）

系统功能语言学研究
群言集

主编　黄国文　常晨光　廖海青

Forum on Systemic Functional Linguistics Studies

（Volume I）

第 **1** 辑

XITONG GONGNENG YUYANXUE YANJIU QUNYANJI

系统功能语言学研究

群言集

主编 黄国文 常晨光 廖海青

目 录

i

从小句到语篇，从内因到外因

（代前言）

按照一般的惯例，论文集通常都有一个"前言"。我们编辑完这本《系统功能语言学研究群言集》（第一辑），也该写个前言，对有关问题作些说明和解释。从标题可以看出，我们这里用的是一个"代前言"。因此，首先，让我们说说标题"从小句到语篇，从内因到外因"的意思，这也算是一种解题的方式。

一、"从小句到语篇"

这里的"从小句到语篇"是语言学家关心的问题。"小句"（Clause）是语法单位，也是语法的最大单位。"语篇"（Text）是意义单位，是语言使用的单位。小句与语篇的关系，不是大小的关系，而是"体现"（Realization）的关系，即：语篇的意义由小句来体现。例如，我们要用英语表示"请求某人帮我们开门"这一意义时，我们可以通过小句来体现：（1）祈使句：Open the door, please.（2）疑问句：Can you open the door?（3）陈述句：I wonder if you can open the door.（4）感叹句：How nice it would be if someone could open the door! 从这些例子可以看出，如果我们从语法的角度看这四个句子，它们是不同类型的小句；而当我们从语言在交际场合中的使用角度看，这四个句子是对某一意义的体现。

传统的语言研究，重点在于句子本身，因为句子被认为是语法的最大单位；而系统功能语言学既研究小句，又研究小句在语篇中的功能和作用。传统的语法学家往往从"自下而上"（from below或bottom-up）的角度看待问题；系统功能语法学者则优先考虑"从上至下"（from above或top-down）的视角。若从"自下而上"的角度出发，我们所关心的是："句子是怎样表达意义的"或"句子表达什么意义"？而从"从上至下"的视角出发，我们所关心的则是："意义是怎样通过形式来体现的"？

因此，作为系统功能语言学研究者，我们既要采取"从上至下"的视角，也要采用"自下而上"的视角，二者相互补充、相互作用。这里讲的是语言研究的方法问题。

二、"从内因到外因"

"从内因到外因"是哲学家关心的问题。从哲学的角度看，事物的内部矛盾是内因，事物的外部矛盾是外因。关于内因与外因的关系，我们在"IASK爱问"（http://iask.sina.com.cn/b/1709551.html）中看到一个有趣易懂的解释，归纳如下：外因与内因，实际上是一对相辅相成的矛盾。只要存在内因，就会有外因，不是这样的外因，就是那样的外因。因此，外因的变化，直接影响内因的变化。现实世界，本身是客观存在。任何事物的存在，都不可能排除外因而独自存在。所以，内因总是在外因这样或那样的影响下，发生变化的。假设没有外因，内因一成不变，

事物就不发展了。这是不可能的、不存在的。事物永远是发展的，永远不会停留在静止的状态上！

虽然这里的解释和讨论是非专业的，但说得通俗易懂。事实上，内因与外因的关系，要比我们这里说的复杂得多。但无论如何，有一点是清楚的，那就是毛泽东在《矛盾论》中所说的："外因是变化的条件，内因是变化的根据，外因通过内因而起作用"。

我们认为，内因与外因的关系可以帮助我们审视我国系统功能语言学研究的情况，使我们明白自己可以做什么和不能做什么，同时了解我们所处的环境对我们的学习和研究所带来的影响。

三、关于《系统功能语言学研究群言集》

本文是《系统功能语言学研究群言集》（第一辑）的代前言，但为什么我们会把标题定为"从小句到语篇，从内因到外因"呢？这些概念本来是风马牛不相及的，为什么我们硬把它们拉扯在一起？首先，"群言集"就是把大家谈的东西集在一起。可以是你说你的、我讲我的，大家说的东西可以互不相干。但是，"群言集"前面的"系统功能语言学研究"又限制了"群言"的内容；你不能随便谈，而是要围绕着主题来谈。

一个人可以谈他的想法，就像一个小句可以表示一个命题意义。一个人的谈话与别人的谈话有关联、连贯和衔接，就像语篇中小句（句子）与小句（句子）之间的关系。一个人的话语就像一个语篇中体现某一信息单位的结构。我们说"从小句到语篇"，是想强调从"自下而上"到"从上至下"的研究方法。我们听一个人的谈话，是想从他个人的观点、研究、贡献看集体的观点、研究、贡献。系统功能语言学者首先考虑的是意义和语义，我们编辑《系统功能语言学研究群言集》系列的目的是要看作为一个整体的中国系统功能语言学研究的现状。

"从内因到外因"，说的是内部与外部的关系。一个人之所以可以专心致志研究系统功能语言学，一定有其个人原因和外部环境的作用。也就是说，一个人在做一件事的时候会受到环境的影响，因此就有了内因与外因的相互作用和相互影响。

我们编辑《系统功能语言学研究群言集》系列，邀请学者们围绕下面这些问题谈谈他们个人的经历和看法：我是怎样走上系统功能语言学研究这条路的？我的主要研究兴趣和研究重点是什么？对系统功能语言学研究我个人有什么感想、观点、建议？我认为还存在的问题是什么？对系统功能语言学研究我有何展望等等。通过不同个人的不同学术经历、不同学术视野，我们可以看到中国系统功能语言学研究者所走过的类似的或不同的学术道路。通过各位学者的学术经历和他们所受到的他人和环境的影响，我们可以看到他们是在什么环境下从事研究的，也可以看出他们为什么会走上系统功能语言学研究的道路。

从这里的讨论可以看出，无论是"从小句到语篇"，还是"从内因到外因"，它们都有字面意义和比喻意义。"从小句到语篇"，从字面意义上看，是从传统语

法走向功能语法（语言学），从关心语法（语言结构）问题到关心语篇（语言使用）问题；就其比喻意义来说，则是：一个人只是一个大集体中的一个分子，一个人的力量是非常渺小的，但他在这个集体中又是可以发挥作用的，一个个分子之间有着这样或那样的关系，他们之间有关联、连贯和衔接。而"从内因到外因"，其字面意义可笼统概括为事物的内部矛盾和它的外部矛盾的关系问题；其比喻意义却可拓展为一个学者的成长得益于自身的潜能、素质、努力和专注，也得益于他人及其所处环境的影响和帮助。

通过这本《系统功能语言学研究群言集》（第一辑），我们可以看到不同年龄、不同教育背景、不同生活经历的学者是怎样学习和研究系统功能语言学的；作为个体的他们是怎样在大集体中发挥作用，怎样与其他人在一起形成一股研究的力量、一支浩浩荡荡的学术队伍的。我们希望，年轻的学者可以从在学术上已经有所建树的学者所走过的学术道路上看到前进的方向和系统功能语言学的研究前景；中年的学者可以通过其他学者所提出的研究课题、难题找到自己研究的切入点和研究的重点；老年的学者可以看到同龄人和年轻人是怎样进行系统功能语言学学术探索的；而不了解系统功能语言学的学者则可以看看我国系统功能语言学的研究者是怎样成长的。无论如何，我们希望通过这本群言集来帮助、促进学者之间的沟通，这样大家就可以互相鼓励、互相帮助、共同进步。

黄国文 常晨光 廖海青
2010年1月14日

My First Encounters with Systemic Functional Linguistics

Wendy L. Bowcher   **Sun Yat-sen University**

My first degree, which was a combined BA (Hons) Diploma of Education, was completed at Macquarie University in Sydney, Australia. I majored in Linguistics and History. I liked both history and linguistics and found the social dimensions of these subject fields interesting and challenging. In history I studied mainly Russian history, British industrial history, and social policy. In linguistics, I took as many courses as I could in the areas of child language development, phonetics and phonology, and syntax and semantics. I found the courses on syntactic theory almost mathematical in their methods — and perhaps because mathematics was one of my better subjects when I was at high school, I did particularly well in those courses. Syntactic theory, of course, is the theory of language developed by Noam Chomsky. I learned many rules of transformation and enjoyed drawing the accompanying transformation trees.

In my fourth year I started to think that maybe I could go further and do a postgraduate degree. I didn't know much about the kinds of degrees that were available, or really what "postgraduate" research involved. My parents had never been to university themselves and did not know much about universities or higher degree programs, so they could give me very little advice about courses, or universities, or post-graduate degrees. In fact, I was the first person in my immediate family to go to university, and I was full of excitement and anticipation when I went to enroll. I was stepping into the educational unknown.

One day I heard about the BA honors program, so I mentioned to a friend that I thought I might go on to do a BA honors. I was hoping she could shed more light on this degree. Instead, she laughed and said, "You can't do that unless you have a high grade point average!"

I felt rather deflated by her words. I needed a high grade point average? I had not taken much notice of grade point averages during my years of university. I was so happy just to be a part of university life and to be learning new things

and meeting all kinds of people that grade point averages had not meant much to me.

So within the next day or so I went to speak with one of the administration staff. I asked, "Do I have a high enough grade point average to do a BA honors degree?"

"Well, let's take a look", she said. She then turned to me and asked, "Now which subject would you like to do an honors degree in?"

"Well," I replied, "whichever subject I have a high enough grade point average in."

"You could choose either history or linguistics as your grade point average in both of these subjects is high enough to go on to do an honors degree."

I was rather surprised by what she said. I had no idea that my grade point average was high enough in two subject fields to qualify for their respective honors degree programs.

On enquiring about the advantages of doing an honors degree, the administration officer explained that the honors degree was a one-year course that involved course work and a research project, and that it was a good background to doing more academic research. She also said that if I did well in the honors degree, I could be accepted into a PhD program without doing a Masters degree first. She then told me that I should first decide whether I wanted to do a history or a linguistics honors degree and that I should talk with some of the professors as I would need to be assigned a supervisor for the research project.

I was at a bit of a loss as to what to do. I enjoyed both history and linguistics, so I first went to see my history professor and told her that I could do either a linguistics or a history BA honors degree, and that I didn't really know which one to choose. She suggested that perhaps I could combine my research so that it would reflect my interests in both subjects. This seemed like a good idea, but it also seemed a bit unfocused and overwhelming to me, and at that time I really couldn't think of a project in which I could combine both.

I then went to talk with the linguistics professors. One of the professors asked me which subject field I felt I was better in. I had scored higher in some linguistics courses than in the history courses of the same level, but deep down I felt that linguistics really was my forte.

And so it was that I started the BA honors degree in linguistics in the following year. I very much enjoyed the courses, which covered field methods

5

in linguistics, phonology, sociolinguistics, and other subjects. The courses were much more challenging than the ordinary undergraduate courses, and my fellow students all seemed very motivated and highly intelligent.

Perhaps because I was more interested in the social aspects of language, I was most fortunate to have Dr. Ruqaiya Hasan assigned to be my supervisor for my research project. Dr. Hasan had been my teacher in the undergraduate course on child language. I had found that course very interesting and I had found Dr. Hasan to be extremely knowledgeable in the area.

It wasn't long after I started the BA honors course that I started the research project meetings with Dr. Hasan. To be honest, I felt a little intimidated by Ruqaiya Hasan. She seemed so incredibly knowledgeable and I wondered if I could ever do a project that was satisfactory to her. I knew she would be a tough supervisor, and indeed, she certainly was. But she also turned out to be a wonderful mentor. She really cared about whether I understood something or not and she was passionate about sociolinguistics and the relationship between language and society. I admit that sometimes what she talked about was very difficult for me to grasp, but I suppose this raised my respect for her, and gave me someone to look up to and a depth of knowledge to aspire to.

The sociolinguistics course in the BA honors program was also taught by Ruqaiya Hasan, and I believe I still have my notes from that course stored somewhere in my home in Australia. The course introduced me to the work of many famous sociolinguists, such as Labov, Gumperz, Hymes, Fishman, Ferguson, and Halliday. I found the course very interesting and stimulating as it focused on the social aspects of language and different theories for researching the relationship between language and society. During that course, and especially during my research project meetings, I was also introduced to the work of Basil Bernstein. My reading of Basil Bernstein's work on sociology and education played an important part in formulating my own research project.

As the BA honors course ran for only one year it was soon time to think seriously about my research project. I had had a strong background in syntactic theory so it seemed sensible to include that in my research project. But I was also interested in the social aspects of language, and I was particularly interested in child language development. There had been much research done on applying the syntactic approach to understanding child language acquisition. This approach explains language learning in terms of a child's acquisition of syntactic rules through which children learn to generate sentences. Within this tradition

there were several articles of research that had aroused my curiosity, but one that particularly stood out was by Fluck (1977) who had commented that there was a difference in the production of relative clauses by differing social class groups. Interestingly, although he made this statement, his study of the comprehension of relative clauses in children did not include social class as a variable.

Because I come from a rather large family, I had had some experience in observing children learn language. I have four sisters, so there are five of us altogether, and I am the second eldest. We were all born within a span of ten years and are thus very close in age. I've been told that I was a rather quiet child. My elder sister was quite talkative, but my youngest sisters were particularly talkative, and talkative from very early on. I remember my mother saying how quickly my two youngest sisters began to speak. She said, "The little ones learned to speak very early on because you elder girls had no patience with them. You were constantly saying, 'What are you saying? Say it properly!'" My mother felt that it was this pressure on my youngest sisters to communicate intelligibly that made them speak very clearly and very early on in life. I have no research to back up the validity of what my mother said, but it does make sense to me that if the environment is conducive to communication then communication will happen; and the environment for my youngest sisters most certainly motivated them to talk and to be understood from a very young age. It was the pressure of needing to communicate with their elder sisters that seemed to boost their early communicative skills.

When I was doing my honors degree and reading about children learning language by "acquiring syntactic structures," it just didn't seem to fit with what I had experienced with my youngest sisters. "Structure" did not seem to be at the forefront of what was going on with them. It was communication that seemed to be key. Nevertheless, there were many experiments investigating the acquisition of syntactic structures in children, suggesting the complex ones come much later in the acquisition process due to the number of transformations involved in processing them. One complex structure from the point of view of the syntactic approach is the relative clause. Relative clauses are said to pose problems in processing by virtue of their syntactic complexity in that the relative clause is a dependent clause embedded within another. To derive the surface structure of a sentence containing a relative clause requires quite a number of "transformations" according to syntactic theory.

There were many methods of investigating syntactic competence in

children including elicited imitation, spontaneous speech, and toy manipulation. In investigating children's comprehension of relative clauses, Fluck (1977, 1978) had used a toy manipulation technique. In this technique, the experimenter says a sentence structure and asks the child to perform the actions in the sentence with some toy animals. A sample sentence is: "The teddy who is following the rabbit is wearing the hat" (Fluck, 1977). Fluck found that sentences with "Subject" relatives and co-ordinated structures showed fewer errors in comprehension than sentences containing "Object" relatives; the latter structures being acquired later than the former.

This kind of linguistic experimentation was very different from what I was reading on child language development within the functional approach. In contrast to the syntactic approach which foregrounds the mental processes involved in acquiring language structures, the functional approach foregrounds "the social processes involved" (Halliday, 1978: 18). The underlying thesis of Michael Halliday's book, *Learning How to Mean*, is that we develop language according to what we need language for. In explicating his theory of language learning, Halliday "emphasizes both the functions in the structures of language as well as the functions of language as used within certain contexts of situation" (Bowcher, 1982: 5).

Complementary to Halliday's work on child language development is the work of Basil Bernstein (see for example 1971, 1973). Bernstein advocated that the study of language is intricately woven into the study of the social system. Through communication within certain contexts, children learn and are made aware of the orders of meaning relevant to their social situation. Bernstein's work at the time I was doing my BA honors was famous and controversial. It was controversial particularly in the US because many people had misunderstood his work on "elaborated" and "restricted" codes to mean that children from working class backgrounds had some kind of linguistic deficit because they use a "restricted code." They often equated "code" with dialect. This misinterpretation led to what was labeled the "deficit hypothesis." Sociolinguists such as Dittmar and Labov argued that the language used by working class children was not deficit, but was simply "different" with Labov propagating a "difference hypothesis." Even though the argument was essentially based on a misinterpretation in the first place, many pages were written condemning Bernstein's "theory." In fact, Bernstein was trying to explain ways of behaving that have, amongst other things, linguistic manifestations. Hasan explained the difference between

Bernstein's codes and registers and dialects, in her well-known article "Code, register and social dialect" (Hasan, 1973; for comment on and argument against the criticisms made of the notions of restricted and elaborated codes, see Bernstein, 1990, especially Chapter 3. See also "Postscript" in Bernstein, 1971, *Class, Codes and Control*, Vol. 1).

To clarify very briefly, the codes that Bernstein refers to are essentially socialization processes and regulative principles of communication (see Bernstein, 1971). In the regulative context, "positional families" favor a socialization process in which one's position determines the degree and type of authority one holds. In such families, parents do not expect to "discuss" with their children the whys and wherefores of the family authority relations. Children are expected to obey their parents because they are children. Person-oriented families on the other hand allow more individuated discussion to take place. Parents are likely to seek the opinion of their children in setting up rules of behavior.

I remember seeing these two forms of socialization manifest in both behavior and linguistic choices very clearly one day in Sydney. As I was walking through a shopping center I saw a young mother and child. The child ran off to a shop and touched some of the goods on display. The mother went over to the child, slapped him on the legs and said, "I told you not to touch anything! Now do as you're told!" There was no further discussion from the mother as she dragged him screaming and wailing alongside her on her way to do more shopping. Where individuals are socialized within a restricted code certain individuals, in this case the mother, do not need to explain their action, they simply expect to be obeyed because their position gives them that authority. As for the children, they are not encouraged to explain their action, or to verbalise the reasons for their actions. A swift hit or a sharp word is a faster means of effecting obedience than time spent on explanations by children who are not expected to have a say in the matter.

That afternoon I travelled back to another part of the city to see a friend. On the way I stopped by a small corner store to buy some things to take to her place. At the shop there was a young mother and her son. The little boy stood on tiptoes and tried to grab something off the counter. The mother took it out of his hand, put it back on the counter and apologized to the shop owner. She then bent down to the little boy and asked, "What did mummy say before we came here?" The little boy did not reply. The mother asked, "Do you remember

9

that I told you not to touch anything in the shop?" The little boy replied, "Yes." She then asked him, "Why did you touch that?" The little boy said, "I don't know." The mother then said, "Well, that is really not a very good explanation. I think we will talk about this when we get home." She then turned to the shop owner, finished purchasing her goods and walked out of the shop holding her son's hand. This was a clear example of socialization into an elaborated code. Behavior here is based on individuation of the interactants. Individuals who are socialized within this code are encouraged to verbalize their thoughts, feelings, and understandings of the world. In regulative contexts of the elaborated code the lines between who has the authority and who does not tend to be somewhat blurred, or at least implicit. Nevertheless, as Hasan has pointed out "in the majority of cases both groups get the children to act in the way that the MOTHERS desire" (Hasan, 1993: 99 emphasis in the original).

The syntactic experiments, Halliday's work on child language development, and Bernstein's work on restricted and elaborated codes were strong influences on the formation of my own research project. But there is something else that influenced my BA honors research. It may not seem relevant at first, but it consolidated my ideas concerning the way in which contexts can motivate one type of talk rather than another, even for speakers who appear not to be competent in a certain type of talk. I read an article about the use of accents and dialects. I cannot now remember who wrote the article, nor can I remember its details, but it related how young people of a lower socio-economic background who spoke with a non-standard accent and/or dialect were able to switch to using standard forms if they wanted to in order to be funny or for comic effect. I wondered, "If they can actually use the standard form, why don't they use this all the time? What compels them to keep using the non-standard form?" While there are no doubt many answers to this question, the main point for me was that they CAN use the standard forms, but choose not to. The context of creating "comic effect" was a motivation behind their using the standard dialect at certain times and not at others. Could I create an environment to motivate the production and comprehension of a specific structure of language?

My research idea started to take shape. I decided that I would conduct two experiments on the acquisition of relative clauses by children, as this was considered to be a complex syntactic form and more typically associated with elaborated code. I also decided to interpret as a challenge the comment made by Fluck that there is a difference between the use of relative clauses by children

from different social classes. I wanted to see if this difference really was there. For the first experiment I decided to follow the toy manipulation experiments used in the syntactic approach experiments in order to elicit a variety of relative clauses (production), and have the children manipulate toys in order to show their comprehension of relative clauses. However, I refined the previous toy manipulation experiments in a number of ways: I developed a clearer definition of types of relative clauses (Fluck had not distinguished between OS and AS relatives) and took into account the use of transitive and intransitive verbs. I also attempted to decrease the degree of artificiality of the task by minimizing the number of toys and actions used in the experiment (some previous experimenters had used an unnecessarily large number of toys and associated actions).

As for developing an experiment in which I could motivate the use of relative clauses, the first thing I needed to do was to understand the function of relative clauses (in this case restrictive relative clauses). For this, I referred to Halliday. Here is the quotation from my dissertation:

> According to Halliday (1981) the relative clause realizes through its structure a particular function. The relative clause is said to "define" or to "specify which members of the total class designated by the Head noun ... are being referred to" (Halliday, 1981: 224). The relative clause functions as "postmodifier in the nominal group" (Halliday, 1981: 226). Hence the relative clause is a subordinate or dependent clause within a nominal group. It provides more information to the nominal group in which it functions and is therefore, an elaborating device. Within a conversation, it can be used to distinguish one object or person from another. To create a context in which such a device is needed, there should be at least two objects or persons similar in most ways but distinguishable by one particular physical or active attribute" (Bowcher, 1982: 56). (NB Halliday 1981 was the pre-published version of the first edition of *Introduction to Functional Grammar* — when it was called *A Short Introduction to Functional Grammar*).

For the second experiment I decided to devise a situation in which a rolling screen showed the progression of a story, and at certain moments in the story the experimenter would ask a question to elicit a specific type of relative clause. Although the details of the design were very much my own, there were several previous experiments that had used picture cards or "meaningful situations" to elicit children's responses (e.g. Hawkins, 1969/1973; Karmiloff-Smith, 1979) and