

Educational Linguistic Studies

# 教育语言学研究

主 编 赖良涛

2020年



上海交通大学出版社  
SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

Educational Linguistic Studies

# 教育语言学研究

(2020年)

主 编 赖良涛

副主编 严 明 江 妍



上海交通大学出版社  
SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

## 内容提要

本书分为名家访谈、功能语言学和教育话语研究、语言认知与教育研究、语言社会生态与教育研究以及司法话语与教育研究五个部分,共收录原创论文 18 篇,主要从功能、社会、认知神经、法律等各流派语言学视角探讨学校、家庭与社会中的语言教育教学、知识建构、儿童语言发展和普法教育等问题。本书适合高等院校从语言角度研究教育教学的研究者以及外语、汉语、民族语言教师、普法教育者和其他教育研究者与实践者使用。

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

教育语言学研究. 2020 年 / 赖良涛主编. —上海:  
上海交通大学出版社, 2020  
ISBN 978 - 7 - 313 - 23825 - 2

I. ①教… II. ①赖… III. ①教育学—语言学—文集  
IV. ①H0 - 05

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2020)第 181699 号

## 教育语言学研究(2020 年)

JIAOYU YUYANXUE YANJIU (2020 NIAN)

主 编: 赖良涛

出版发行: 上海交通大学出版社

邮政编码: 200030

印 制: 江苏凤凰数码印务有限公司

开 本: 889 mm × 1194 mm 1/16

字 数: 349 千字

版 次: 2020 年 11 月第 1 版

书 号: ISBN 978 - 7 - 313 - 23825 - 2

定 价: 62.00 元

地 址: 上海市番禺路 951 号

电 话: 021 - 64071208

经 销: 全国新华书店

印 张: 12.5

印 次: 2020 年 11 月第 1 次印刷

版权所有 侵权必究

告读者: 如发现本书有印装质量问题请与印刷厂质量科联系

联系电话: 025 - 83657309

# 《教育语言学研究》编委会

## 顾问

胡壮麟 北京大学

陆俭明 北京大学

李宇明 北京语言大学

## 编委会主任

俞理明 上海交通大学

## 编委会副主任

王文斌 北京外国语大学

张春柏 华东师范大学

张 辉 南京师范大学

## 主编

赖良涛 上海交通大学

## 副主编

严 明 上海应用技术大学

江 妍 上海交通大学

## 主办单位

中国英汉语比较研究会教育语言学专业委员会

上海交通大学外国语学院

## 专家委员

Bernard Spolsky 巴伊兰大学

Christian Matthiessen 香港理工大学

J. R. Martin 悉尼大学

Karl Maton 悉尼大学

Nancy Hornberger 宾夕法尼亚大学

常晨光 中山大学

常 辉 上海交通大学

范 琳 北京外国语大学

方志辉 佛罗里达大学

高雪松 新南威尔士大学

高一虹 北京大学

顾曰国 中国社会科学院

黄国文 华南农业大学

李战子 国防科技大学

刘承宇 西南大学

马博森 浙江大学

梅德明 上海外国语大学

苗兴伟 北京师范大学

彭宣维 广东外语外贸大学

沈 骑 同济大学

苏新春 厦门大学

王初明 广东外语外贸大学

王小潞 浙江大学

王振华 上海交通大学

文 旭 西南大学

杨信彰 厦门大学

杨 忠 东北师范大学

于 晖 北京师范大学

张德禄 同济大学

郑咏滢 复旦大学

朱永生 复旦大学

邹为诚 华东师范大学

# 目 录

## 名家访谈

系统功能语言学教学之反思：麦蒂森访谈录(第一部分)

..... 克里斯蒂安·麦蒂森 王 博 马园艺 1

## 功能语言学与教育话语研究

横向话语在小学低年级数学课堂中的“支架”功能 ..... 陈 静 梁晓琳 14

SSCI 期刊论文的认知语义密度 ..... 赖良涛 王任华 31

SFL 与 LCT 框架下的累积式知识建构

——以军校基础阶段英语阅读课为例 ..... 戴祯琼 40

英汉小句复合体形合与意合取向对比 ..... 明建平 54

## 语言认知与教育研究

新无意识心智理论对外语教育理念变革的启示 ..... 周 频 高 雅 67

偏性理论与英语词汇意义网络表征 ..... 李俊敏 80

认知—语用视角下事实类抽象名词概述回指的结构特征和语篇功能 ..... 吴丹苹 马博森 89

存在构式动词的英汉认知语义准入条件研究 ..... 朱 雷 汪 薇 97

## 语言社会生态与教育研究

语言教育规划与政策研究之语言生态范式 ..... 王 瑾 陈凡凡 105

西方国家基础教育的外语教育政策对我国的启示 ..... 王 斐 115

云南中缅边境地区少数民族语言生态与多语教育 ..... 李 强 123

“一带一路”倡议背景下云南少数民族的多语教育与人才培养模式 ..... 杨诚英 128

民族院校多语教学生态失衡现状与对策研究

——以云南民族大学大学英语教学为例 ..... 李方华 134

## 司法话语与教育研究

知者结构与价值分析：法律文化价值观在宪法中的话语建构 ..... 张冉冉 140

## 2 教育语言学研究(2020年)

介入模式视角下普法话语态度取向初探 .....	陶 君 李庭芳	151
检察官客观义务在公诉检察文书中的背离和完善 ——以起诉书为例 .....	崔玉珍	164
公安微博新文体教育功能的语篇构式语法实现 .....	郑 洁	172
法律咨询实务中的会话叙事 .....	谢妮妮 宋成方 高瑞霞	179

### 征稿启事

《教育语言学研究》征稿启事 .....		187
《教育语言学研究》稿件格式 .....		188

## 系统功能语言学教学之反思： 麦蒂森访谈录(第一部分)

克里斯蒂安·麦蒂森<sup>①</sup> 王博<sup>②</sup> 马园艺<sup>③</sup>

香港理工大学 中山大学 广东科学技术职业学院

本次访谈旨在分享克里斯蒂安·麦蒂森(Christian Matthiessen)教授在系统功能语言学教学方面的一些体会。采访时间为2017年12月29日,地点位于麦蒂森在香港理工大学英文系的办公室。以系统功能语言学教学为主题的访谈共分两部分,本篇论文为其中的第一部分。本文主要围绕七个要点展开:① 低龄学习者是否适合学习系统功能语言学;② 麦蒂森多年来讲授过的系统功能语言学课程;③ 关于指导不同程度的学生学习系统功能语言学的一些体会;④ 如何导入本科生的系统功能语言学课程;⑤ 适合初学者学习系统功能语言学的书目有哪些;⑥ 如何在课堂上讲授元功能理论;⑦ 如何指导学生练习划分小句。

麦蒂森自20世纪80年代末便开始从事系统功能语言学教学工作。虽然他的授课对象并不包括中小學生,但他肯定了低龄学习者中开展系统功能语言学教学的意义,并介绍了杰夫·威廉姆斯(Geoff Williams)与露丝·弗伦奇(Ruth French)的研究。麦蒂森认为,中小學生在学习系统功能语言学的理论术语时既不会有太大困难,也不会对此表示反感。教师面临的挑战则主要来自教师培训、授课材料、教育制度、工作环境及考试制度等方面。

麦蒂森自1988年起分别于悉尼大学、麦考瑞大学及香港理工大学任教,讲授过多门与系统功能语言学相关的课程,包括“语法、意义及语篇”“语篇、语义及语境”“语域变体”等,涉及语言类型学、语言学、翻译研究等多个领域。同时,他还在世界各地讲授过多门短期密集课程。他认为,多数学员在学习系统功能语言学时格外注重理论在教学或翻译研究中的应用价值,学员对理论的掌握也与其对理论应用的兴趣密切相关。

谈及在大学中对不同程度的学生讲授系统功能语言学的体会,麦蒂森强调了对本科生开展语言学教学的重要性,并建议在本科一年级让学生从语言的表达层面(expression plane)接触语言、了解语言,从语音练习入手,而不应过早讲授句法规则、语音规则等语言学理论。硕士、博士的教学都应建立在学生掌握语音知识的基础上。同时,麦蒂森还介绍了澳洲和香港在研究生培养计划上的差异。

麦蒂森认为,如何导入本科生的系统功能语言学课程要视学生情况而定。如果学生并没有学习传统语法的背景,授课时就不需要过度强调传统语法与功能语法的差异(Coffin等,2009)。麦蒂森再次

① 克里斯蒂安·麦蒂森(Christian Matthiessen)(1956—),男,讲座教授。主要研究方向为系统功能语言学。通信地址:香港九龙红磡香港理工大学英文系,邮编:999077。电子邮箱:christian.matthiessen@polyu.edu.hk

② 王博(1984—),男,博士,副研究员。主要研究方向为系统功能语言学。通信地址:广东珠海唐家中山大学国际翻译学院,邮编:519082。电子邮箱:wangbo55@mail.sysu.edu.cn

③ 马园艺(1979—),女,博士,讲师。主要研究方向为系统功能语言学。通信地址:广东珠海金湾区广东科学技术职业学院国际合作学院,邮编:519090。电子邮箱:yuanyi.ma@connect.polyu.hk

强调了从语音视角切入课程的意义,并建议教授学生从语音层面了解系统及选择的意义,进而使学生对人类语言的语音潜势(sounding potential)有所掌握。同时,麦蒂森将从系统角度与结构角度描述语音进行比较,指出了系统功能语言学在研究语音上的优势。

谈及适合初学者入门的书目,麦蒂森推荐了杰夫·汤普森(Geoff Thompson)的《功能语法入门》(*Introducing Functional Grammar*)(2014)以及戴维·帕特(David Butt)等人撰写的《功能语法的应用》(*Using Functional Grammar*)(1995)。麦蒂森理想中的入门读物包括以下特点:①采取自下而上的视角介绍语言,从人类身体器官发出的语音切入;②兼顾自上而下的视角,从语义角度介绍语言,并借此从人类身体的感官切入;③使用多种语言对语言学进行介绍,不局限于英语或汉语。

在讲授元功能理论时,麦蒂森支持将元功能同语言的个体发生(ontogenesis)相联系。这样做一方面可以将复杂的理论解释清楚,另一方面可以使学生回忆自己学习语言的过程,增加课程的趣味性。林文杰(Marvin Lam)也曾经在香港理工大学尝试过这一方法。同时,麦蒂森建议在课堂上使用图片、视频、录音等多种资源,并希望在编著教材时可以配备网络资源或录音。麦蒂森还在授课时鼓励学生创建自己的文本资料库,以督促学生在生活中观察语言、重视语言。

最后,麦蒂森就如何指导学生划分小句提出了自己的见解。他主张按语域区分文本,从食谱等程序性文本(procedural text)入手。这类文本不仅包含较少的语法隐喻,其语义和词汇语法之间的关系也更一致。麦蒂森还介绍了他和韩礼德(Halliday)曾经计划撰写的专著《英语语篇导论》(*An Introduction to English Discourse*),提出了从语域的视角对个人在成长过程中接触的文本进行介绍的构想。

## **Some Reflections on Teaching Systemic Functional Linguistics: An Interview with Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen (Part I)**

Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen<sup>①</sup>, Bo Wang<sup>②</sup> and Yuanyi Ma<sup>③</sup>  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University; Sun Yat-sen University;  
Guangdong Polytechnic of Science and Technology

Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen is Chair Professor of the Department of English, the Faculty of Humanities, at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU), where he is a member of the PolySystemic Research Group. He has degrees in linguistics from Lund University (BA) where he studied Arabic and philosophy, and from University of California, Los Angeles (MA, PhD), and has previously held positions at Sydney University and Macquarie University. He has co-authored various books with Michael Halliday, such as *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* and *Construing Experience through Meaning: A Language-Based Approach to Cognition*.

Bo Wang and Yuanyi Ma are active members of the PolySystemic Research Group, an SFL (systemic functional linguistics) working group with both an international and regional focus in the Pearl River Delta, China and Southeast Asia. They received their doctoral degrees from The Hong Kong Polytechnic

University, and their research interests include systemic functional linguistics (SFL), translation studies, discourse analysis and language typology. They are co-authors of *Systemic Functional Translation Studies: Theoretical Insights and New Directions* (Equinox, in press), *Lao She's Teahouse and Its Two English Translations: Exploring Chinese Drama Translation with Systemic Functional Linguistics* (Routledge, 2020), *Systemic Functional Insights on Language and Linguistics* (Springer, forthcoming), and *Translating Tagore's Stray Birds into Chinese: Applying Systemic Functional Linguistics to Chinese Poetry Translation* (Routledge, 2021). They are also co-editors of *Theorizing and Applying Systemic Functional Linguistics: Developments by Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen*. Bo Wang is Associate Research Fellow at School of International Studies, Sun Yat-sen University. Yuanyi Ma is Lecturer at Guangdong Polytechnic of Science and Technology.

Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen is a leading scholar in the SFL field and a long-time collaborator with M. A. K. Halliday. In this interview with him, which took place on December 29, 2017 in his office at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, he comments on his experiences of teaching SFL. He talks about the young learners of SFL, reflects on the courses on SFL he previously taught, discusses the strategies for teaching students at different levels, gives suggestions on beginning a course for undergraduate students, and recommends some books for beginners. This interview transcript also includes Matthiessen's insights on teaching metafunctions and clause chunking.

## 1 Teaching SFL to Young Learners

**Bo Wang:** The three of us all have some experiences of teaching SFL. The students we have taught are all university students. How about you, Christian? Can children learn SFL?

**Christian Matthiessen:** Nobody would be foolish enough to let me teach secondary school students or primary school students. But if there is one opportunity, it would be interesting. Of course, there are various explorations of teaching SFL to young students, either embedded in teaching and writing, or specifically in teaching about the grammar. A number of people have done researches on this, including Geoff Williams (e. g. 1995, 1998, 2005) and a primary school teacher named Ruth French (2013). The general sense is that these studies are very successful and young learners love learning about language. This is well-known by now. But as far as the young learners are concerned, they have no problem with terminology, and they love it. They have to grow and cope with terminology, talking about dinosaurs or the minions or whatever it might be. They also have terminology in other subjects. So, why not in proto-linguistics?

The challenges would come when teachers are not trained to do this. They are asked to do it, but they do not have the materials, the training and so on. So, it is very important to bring all these together. In some contexts, the lesson is that you have to adopt a trinocular approach if you want to make changes in the school system (for trinocular approach see e. g. Halliday, 1978, 1996). Coming in from above, there are the ministry of education and the school authority (like the Education Bureau here in Hong Kong). But you also have to come in from below, i. e. from the frontline teachers and even the students. Also, from roundabout, there is the environment of the particular school they work in. Unless all these are in some sense coordinated and synchronized, chances are that the attempt would fail. So, if you come in only from above, but you do not have the support from the people who actually have to

engage with teaching, then it is probably doomed to fail. For the teachers, no matter how enthusiastic, insightful and informed they are, they cannot overturn the curriculum or the examination system. They can see that the examination system introduces inertia and an unfortunate orientation in the whole educational process, but the system is very difficult to be replaced.

I have not taught primary or secondary school students, but I have taught teachers who teach them. After talking to the teachers, I have had this experience. For instance, while I was in India over a number of years ago, I taught an intensive course for English teachers for over a week or two. They got very excited and enthusiastic about what we can do with SFL and with teaching about language as a way of empowering students. But ultimately, they said they had to train their students to pass the exams, which unfortunately pointed them at a very different direction.

## 2 Matthiessen's Courses on SFL

**Bo Wang:** Your experience of teaching SFL must have started in the 1980s when you were at Sydney University.

**Christian Matthiessen:** Yes, the first sustained effort was in 1988.

**Bo Wang:** What courses have you taught so far?

**Christian Matthiessen:** In a sense, the course that I started teaching and inherited at Macquarie University was “Grammar, Meaning and Discourse”. But there were also courses that were concerned with grammar, engaging grammar as a meaning-making resource, including “Discourse, Semantics and Context” and “Register Variation”.

Then, I have also taught in other contexts, like the courses on language typology and on translator training through text analysis. There were courses that were more theoretically-oriented, like a course I introduced at Macquarie that looked at language through paradigmatic organizations, i. e. through systems. There was one course here at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University on registerial cartography that I had introduced. Then there had also been courses on trends for applied language sciences where there was just one small component of SFL and courses on linguistic theories for research students.

There were similar intensive courses. Like the ones in India that I have mentioned, I had been asked to teach intensive courses in different places around the world, like Australia, China, Japan and a few places in Latin America. But of course, one of the main themes of the courses was to help people coming from education or from translation (cf. Matthiessen, Wang & Ma, 2017a, 2017b). It is interesting to see that the aspects of the overall theoretical potential to focus on will certainly depend on the interest of the students. In a sense, it is rarer to be in a context where linguistics is without an immediate link to some areas of application like education or translation.

## 3 Teaching SFL to Students of Different Levels

**Bo Wang:** In a previous interview on educational linguistics (Matthiessen, Wang & Ma, 2019a), you have talked about the differences between the courses taught to undergraduate students and those

to MA students. Are there more observations on those courses?

**Christian Matthiessen:** Yes, we have had a whole range of courses. Talking about the undergraduate students, one important observation is the insights we owed to Michael Halliday. He said that you have to think carefully about how you start up linguistics with undergraduate students (see also Matthiessen, Wang & Ma, 2019b). There is a fashion of starting the first-year lectures on linguistics by teaching students about linguistics, which means teaching them to write some kind of syntactic rules, such as phrase-structure rules, transformational rules and similar rules in phonology (e. g. Chomsky, 1957; Chomsky & Halle, 1968). But Halliday's take on it is absolutely right: in the first year, you teach them about language, which means that you help them develop a sense of language that is a kind of reflection of language — an engagement with language that we do not normally explore, because it is part of us and a background to us. But it is that ability to begin to reflect on language and engage with language that is a very important way in. And that includes just being able to attend to rhythmic patterns, intonation patterns and what I called “phonetic yoga”. In the first year, it can be very informative for students to begin to explore their articulatory potential, which often means breaking out of the mother tongue, beginning to learn to use other parts of the potential than those that are phonologized and semioticized in the mother tongue. That is very important, and it is a way of getting into the sense of language as potential — language as choice. In a way, that is easier to be introduced at the expression level (the expression plane of language) (e. g. Halliday, 1992a, 1997), because it is in some sense finite. As members of the human family, we all in principle share the articulatory and auditory potential. So, there is no reason why we should not engage with the “phonetic yoga” and learn to articulate sounds that are “foreign” to us from whatever language it comes from.

When people get to the master's and doctoral levels, you assume that they have had this background. But that is not necessarily the case, because they can get into these programs coming from some other discipline. That can be an interesting challenge. With master students in Hong Kong, because in principle you only have one year, the program is so packed, so it is difficult to have this kind of transition. But you can articulate the possible learning path for students (whether he is in an undergraduate program, an MA program or a doctoral program). Again we should note that with a one-year MA program, there is not much we can do in the path. But I think that is important. You simply have a sort of study path; you build on the earlier experiences, earlier insights and so on; and then you can go further. It can be a semantic path or whatever, but there is some tension between that and the completely unconstrained elective courses.

When I arrived at Sydney University, they had the best MA program I ever came across, because they had three steps of teaching SFL. This was not actually a one-semester system, but a tri-semester system. One dose was a prelim, where they warmed up and learned up chunking a text into different units and doing some analysis. Then following that, they had a course on functional grammar, and then courses on text in context, register variation and so on. That was very very good and effective, but it was built on the condition that you could have this kind of sequence. And then you got to the point, because people could really master the theoretical

descriptive analytical resources. But you would have to adjust that to the local conditions. Otherwise it would be difficult.

For undergraduate students, it depends. In Australia, I think it is still very good. You can get a bachelor's degree either in three years (for an ordinary bachelor's degree) or four years. There is an honors program, and the fourth year is much more research-oriented. That is where you could introduce the research methods and the more theoretical aspects of SFL. At the end of that year, the students have to produce an honors thesis, which is more substantial than a capstone thesis we have at PolyU now. The honors thesis is a more substantial work, and is a great springboard into postgraduate research studies. If you take through an honors year, then you do get something that is more theory-oriented. People could engage, and we did get some very interesting works.

For an MA program, it has to be more applied, but probably more towards tooling people up to do analysis of discourse in context. People come from different backgrounds, but obviously one of their major backgrounds is an educational one. If you move them into doctoral work, then there is a wider range. You assume that people are much more prepared to engage with theoretical foundations, comparisons of theories and so on, so there is a kind of natural progression here. That is like what one starts to do in an honors year, but at a higher level. Of course, the research component of that is quite significant. It would be interesting to consider what it would mean to design a whole undergraduate, a whole MA, or a whole doctoral program based on SFL, but as far as I know, nobody has been able to do this. At all the places, I have seen that SFL exists alongside other kinds of teaching. I am not saying that the program should be SFL only, but I really mean a program with SFL as the one guiding principle in design. That would be very exciting, but maybe it is pie in the sky.

As I have talked to people on translator training, the incident that seems to happen is: you build the program not only around some notion of progression through registers in terms of the challenge (difficulty) in translating, but also in terms of what aspects of the linguistic resources in the mother tongue and in the target language get exercised along the way. My sense is that in translator training, it tends to be more of a "dog's dinner" in terms of the selection of texts. Texts may be selected because they are more easily available, instead of thinking through what it would mean to step by step building up the translator's multilingual meaning potential by exposing them to an increasing range of registers and also some kind of progression in challenge and difficulty. That is not about teaching SFL, but about having a program informed by insights from SFL.

You could have imagined the same thing for bachelor in professional communication at PolyU. It is not based on SFL, but you could have imagined an SFL version, which is actually systematically based on the kind of insights into language in different institutional contexts from SFL. That is another possibility. SFL could be a target itself, but it could also be something that underpins the curriculum thinking and selection and so on.

#### **4 Beginning a Course on SFL for Undergraduate Students**

**Bo Wang:** Talking about teaching a course on SFL for undergraduate students who know nothing

about SFL before, what shall we begin with in that course?

**Christian Matthiessen:** Very interesting question.

**Bo Wang:** I attended Marvin Lam's class before, and he started with the relationship between traditional grammar and functional grammar, and also the ontogenesis of how a child acquires his mother tongue.

**Christian Matthiessen:** This depends very much on the local circumstance of the course. I have been in a context where some proportion of the students already had a background of traditional grammar. For them, that would make sense. But some proportion of the students had not had that kind of background, then that would not be a very good start.

Personally, I would rather forget traditional grammar and initiate through language, through language awareness and so on. But it really depends on where the students come from. There is a useful book by a team from Open University in the UK that takes a step through traditional grammar, which is referred to as formal grammar in the book (Coffin, Donohue & North, 2009). They have built up their book from traditional grammar into functional grammar.

On the one hand, I prefer to do it through language; and on the other hand, it tends to give people the sense that there is traditional grammar, and then separately there is functional grammar. I have tried to show to people that that is not the case. It is all functional grammar, which has simply swallowed traditional grammar. This is true of many disciplines. In physics, when relativity theory was introduced, Newtonian physics was not thrown out, but was swallowed up and was adapted and relativized. I think it is the same. I would rather say: "I'm teaching you this, but it's all part of functional grammar. Forget traditional grammar." Of course there are word classes and so on, but I am not teaching you traditional grammar, I am teaching you part of an overall unified and holistic conception of language. There are always pros and cons, but we do tend to get this misunderstanding when people say: "Ah, I need traditional grammar, and I need functional grammar". I would say: "No, you don't need traditional grammar, what you need is what's been taken up and adapted from the tradition." As in any discipline, you do not throw away your foundations. I have been trying to disabuse people of that notion. But it depends on the conditions, so you should always localize your approach.

If you are thinking about introducing the SFL theory and description (e. g. Halliday, 1985a; Matthiessen, 1995; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014), it would probably make sense to move in from the outer strata of language. It is easier for people to engage with text as flow of meaning in context on the one hand, and on the other hand with the flow of sounds at the other strata end. The value of doing that is: with the flow of sounds, you can generate some principles of language in an easier and more accessible way. It is easier to isolate systems — to try them out (i. e. what I called "phonetic yoga"). The principle of choice is good to be worked out in phonetics and into phonology to give people phonetically a sense of the sounding potential as the sounding potential of the human body, and phonologically as the sounding potential of a particular language — the way that the language has semiotized the human body (cf. Halliday & Greaves, 2008; Matthiessen, in press).

You can take advantage of the fact that phonological systems are much smaller than semantic systems or lexicogrammatical systems. Within a more manageable realm, you can explore these issues. Also, “phonetic yoga” includes learning to discriminate distinctions that are not phonologized in one’s mother tongue — a particular language. It is becoming more attentive, more sensitized, awareness raising and consciousness raising about language. So, if I had the opportunity, I would go about it like that.

**Bo Wang:** Since we are approaching lexicogrammar from below, i.e. from phonetics and phonology, can we tell our students about stratification?

**Christian Matthiessen:** I think ideally yes, but again it depends on what kind of students they are and how much of the curriculum is devoted to this aspect of it. But other things being equal, this would be the ideal case. It is a complete tragedy that people do not get phonetics and phonology in this way. For phonology, what they tend to get is solving jigsaw puzzle. Both at Sydney University and at Macquarie University, by the time I taught the third-year students, who were potential honors students that took our “functional” strand, I noticed that they were so uninterested in phonology and did not want to have anything to do with it. That is because of all these jigsaw puzzle models. If you think of phonology as the semioticized resources of the human body for a human language, it becomes of much more fun and much more interesting. I was trying to demonstrate this in Argentina, because some students asked me to do that. If you take the systemic approach to phonology, you can shortcut a number of things that preoccupy people from the 1940s and the 1950s into generative phonology (e.g. Jakobson, 1949; Jakobson, Fant & Halle, 1952), which is so much structure-based, because you can locate aspects of the principle and the description of phonology in the system, instead of packing everything into the structure (e.g. Halliday, 1985b, 1992b; Tench, 1990). That is a huge advantage, and it is also descriptive. But fairly little has been done on that.

## 5 Recommending Some Books for Beginners

**Bo Wang:** Are there any books that you would recommend beginners to read?

**Christian Matthiessen:** This is a challenge. Halliday (1985a) originally wanted to call his *Introduction to Functional Grammar (IFG)* “a short introduction”. But it was over 300 pages. Then the publisher said: “How could it be short when it was over 300 pages?” Halliday saw that point, otherwise the book would be called *SIFG*. But as the years have passed, the area was populated with other books, like Geoff Thompson’s (1996, 2004, 2014) *Introducing Functional Grammar*. That meant *IFG* could have actually be expanded a bit and become more advanced.

Then you had other introductions that were more explicitly oriented towards educational concerns, like the book *Using Functional Grammar* (Butt *et al.*, 1995) coauthored by David Butt and his colleagues at Macquarie University at the time. But as far as the first introduction of *Using Functional Grammar* is concerned, there is no book that I would wholeheartedly recommend. When we were working on text analysis and translator training, we used this book, which was great in many respects, but it was really for teachers or for people into education. I felt that we need something else. That is why I started the project of

producing something for translators. I have written part of the introduction to translation studies through text analysis using SFL (I originally conceived it as a multi-authored project) and also a multilingual version of *IFG*.

What I would expect of an introduction is somewhat along the lines that I have suggested: using the way we as speakers engage with language, moving in from below — the interface to the human body, i.e. phonetics into phonology, and also from above through semantics in context — the interface to another aspect of the human body, i.e. the sensor remoter system and so on. Then you can relate that to the social conception of social groups and communities. But I would also be very keen if we are talking about linguistics from the start but to have more than one language. Here of course, you will face the challenge of the selection of languages. In some sense, you might want a number of introductions to have a number of languages. But the choice of languages is depending on where it is taught. If you look at the introductions that are designed to do so, they usually introduce SFL through English. There are some introductions with Chinese and some with Spanish, but they do not have this kind of multilingual orientation that I myself feel much more important.

For those reasons, if I were to recommend a book, I have to say it is yet to be written. I am not criticizing any of the existing books, I am just saying they do not represent what I would think needs to be done in an introduction. Obviously when you write a book like this, you have to be selective, and you only have so much space and so on. But there are a number of very exciting things that could be done, in particular if you have some kind of a web companion, so that you can have audio recordings and include some devices to sensitize people to meaning-making and other semiotic systems.

## 6 Teaching the Metafunctional Modes of Meaning

**Bo Wang:** When we teach a course on SFL, we will need to introduce the different metafunctional modes of meaning to our students. Then how should the metafunctions be taught?<sup>①</sup>

**Christian Matthiessen:** Teaching the metafunctions, which implicate language together with other systems, is important. It reminds me of an important point you just made about moving in ontogenetically in Marvin Lam's lectures. I have also tried that on various occasions and got positive experience. This is very valuable for various reasons. One is that it manages the complexity of the things. People would not really respond to this. It is not that you can remember your life as a protolanguager, i.e. as a protolanguage speaker, because our memories do not tend to go that far back in time. But our memories start with something when we are already into the mother tongue (see e.g. Painter, 1984, 1999; Derewianka, 1995 for studies that explore children learning how to mean from the SFL perspective). Nowadays, when there is so much video recording around, maybe it would be different. Even at a young age, kids would see earlier versions of themselves as they grow up. But I do think people will

---

<sup>①</sup> See [https://v.youku.com/v\\_show/id\\_XMjUwNTEwODU2OA](https://v.youku.com/v_show/id_XMjUwNTEwODU2OA) or <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YyvH9DzbrqY> for Christian Matthiessen's mini-lecture on metafunction.

find it very interesting. That is good, as people have to get attention and enthusiasm. It is also a way of managing the complexity of post-infants in language gradually. You can also introduce questions about some field work techniques observing language and so on.

But with our resources now, it is easier to give illustrations that are, for example, video, spoken, and interactional. That is now much easier than it used to be. They are difficult to be put in a book. You can put snapshots, but you will need a web companion. In the old days, there would be a CD that comes with the book. That is easier to give people a sense of practicing a range of speech sounds through “phonetic yoga”, like what Ladefoged (1975) did in the CD that came with his book *A Course in Phonetics*. But obviously, you can also do this for the written mode with easier illustrations. Certainly it will be very costly to put a lot of reproductions into a book if they are colored, but you can do this on the web. You can also provide your students with some tools or at least point at the tools, so that they can become more active explorers at an earlier stage. That goes with the whole point nowadays of fitting your language lab on a laptop computer or on an even smaller device. We need to think creatively about this.

I would start on the one hand trying to get my students to build their own text archives from day one, and on the other hand to separately keep a discourse diary that is related to the archives. It is all about raising awareness of the role of language in daily life. These are helpful ways too.

## 7 Teaching Clause Chunking

**Bo Wang:** Before the students learn the different metafunctions, they may also need to learn about how to chunk clause complexes into clauses/clause simplexes.

**Christian Matthiessen:** Yes, I agree. This is why the prelim at Sydney University was so good when I first arrived. They would do this kind of work in the prelim. Then, about the time they came to the *IFG*-based course, they were already familiar with clause chunking.

**Bo Wang:** Yes. It took me quite a long time to know how to chunk clauses after auditing several rounds of courses at PolyU. What would be helpful for students to learn that?

**Christian Matthiessen:** In principle, the same applies to chunking phonologically, chunking semantically and chunking rhetorical-semantically. That is absolutely important. It can be helped by informing the selection of texts registerially. You can start with texts that are fairly straightforward to chunk. That has to do with the grammar itself, which is congruent rather than metaphorical. It also has to do with the register. Procedural texts are probably easier to chunk, because they are not likely to have a great deal of grammatical metaphor, both in terms of ideational and interpersonal metaphor (see e. g. Halliday, 1984, 1993; Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999/2006). That is because you have to be able to map the texts onto some pause of action. There is a sense of congruence between the semantics and the lexicogrammar, but also some sense of congruence between the semantics and the kind of activity that you have been instructed and performing. So, I would work on procedural texts before I start with, for example, academic discourse and legal discourse. It is always helpful to look for pedagogical strategies that are based on language itself, in this case, register variation and the range from