EDITORIAL

This issue has something old and something new, something borrowed and something blue. Our old materials consist of information about recent International Systemic Workshops/Congresses (ISC:16, Helsinki; ISC:15, E. Lansing; ISW:14, Sydney; and ISW:13, Canterbury). Among the featured new materials are the reports on the computational projects now going on around the world. We also have three reports on resources available to Systemic linguists: the Systemic Archives, the list of Electronic Mail addresses of Systemic linguists, and the Select Bibliography of Systemic Linguistics. We also have reviews by Tom Brown, Martin Davies, and James Martin. And of course we've borrowed a number of book notices and other information.

Speaking of blue, NETWORK has run out of money with the publishing of this second double issue. We have attached a form for you to renew your subscription. If the number 1990 appears on your mailing label then please read the attached sheet at the end of this issue carefully. If you wish to postpone your payment until Stirling (and pay in sterling) please feel free to do so.

The Editors need your help to make things work smoothly. Please take some time today and send news to NETWORK NEWS, your articles to the Systemic Archives (c/o Martin Davies), any change of address to Nan Fries (Box 310, Mt. Pleasant, MI, 48804), any references of your work to Christian Matthiessen for the Systemic Bibliography (Linguistics Department, University of Sydney, NSW, 2006, Australia) and your electronic address to GL250012@YUVENUS.BITNET. If you take the initiative, the network of systemicists as a whole will benefit. Thank you for your cooperation.

The editors would like to thank Glendon Research Typing Services, Paule Anne B. Cotter and her team: Marie-Anne Lee-Kui-Chun and Jeannette Wong-Tung, for helping ensure that publication deadlines were met for volumes 11/12 and 13/14 of Network.

The Editors

NEXT DEADLINE SEPTEMBER 1, 1990 renew please
MEETINGS

FUTURE MEETINGS:

9th World Congress of Applied Linguistics -- ALA: 15-21 April, 1990, Thessaloniki, Greece. Invited speakers: M.A.K. Halliday. All correspondence: Prof. Stathis Efstratiadis, "ALLA 1990 Thessaloniki-Kalambaka" ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY, Π.Ο. Box 92, GR-540 06, Thessaloniki, GREECE. USE AIR MAIL ONLY.

ISBS 90, 12th International Institute for Semiotic and Structural Studies, June 1-29, 1990, University of Toronto. Contacts: Paul Perron, NH 224, Victoria College, University of Toronto, 73 Queens' Park Cr. Toronto, Canada M5S 1X7. (See Announcement in this issue. Bernstein and Greimas on faculty.)

11th ICAME (English Language Research on Computerized Corpora) meeting will be held in Berlin, June 10-13, 1990. Contact: Gerhard Leitner, Institut für English Philologie, Freie Universität Berlin, Guttlerstr. 2-4, D-1000 Berlin, 33.

TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) Summer Institute, June 23-August 2 (Two sessions). Contact: Sue Gass, English Language Institute, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, 48824, USA. (Fries teaching discourse analysis).

The Fourth International Conference on Functional Grammar, 25-29 June. (See Notice in NETWORK 11/12.)

Seventeenth International Systemic Congress, 3-7 July, 1990, Stirling, Scotland. Contact: Martin Davies, English Studies, The University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, Scotland, Great Britain. [NOTE: BE DETAILED]

International Pragmatics Conference, 9-13 July, 1990, Barcelona, Spain. (See notice in NETWORK 11/12)

LACUS (Linguistics Association of Canada and the United States), August 7-11, 1990, California State University at Fullerton. Contact: V. B. Makrai, LACUS, P.O. Box 191, Lake Bluff, Illinois, 60044 USA. (Systemic papers welcome.)


P.A.L.A. Conference in Amsterdam, September 12-14. Contact: Ron Carter, Department of English Studies, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, England. (Speakers: Widdowson, Leech and Enkvist)


Please notify the editors of NETWORK of any meetings which may be of interest to our readers. Thank you.

SYSTEMIC MEETINGS

17th International Systemic Congress:
Stirling, Scotland
July 3-7, 1990
Contact: Martin Davies

Followed by:
2nd Nottingham International Systemic Theory Workshop
July 9-11, 1990 (see notice)

18th International Systemic Congress:
Tokyo, Japan
July 29-August 2, 1991
Contact: Michael Halliday

19th International Systemic Congress:
Sydney, Australia
July 3-7, 1992
Contact: Rupiya Hansen

NEXT INTERNATIONAL SYSTEMIC CONGRESS NEWS
Stirling, Scotland
July 3-7, 1992
Contact: Martin Davies

Plans for ISC17 are coming along. Over 75 abstracts are in and over 150 people have asked for the Second Circular. Martin will still accept late abstracts, but things are getting a bit full. If you plan to go to Stirling, Scotland, contact Martin Davies immediately. Because of the large response to ISC17 Martin will start on July 3rd and not July 4th. Check Second Circular for details. If you have not told Martin that you are planning to come to Stirling it is URGENT that you do so.

LATE NEWS: The Congress will start at Noon July 3rd. The Congress will end at 5pm July 7th.
MEETINGS

ISISSS 90

Three Colloquia will take place during the Institute

DEIXIS
June 8–10

VICO AND ANGLO-AMERICAN SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY
June 15–17

THE SOCIO-SEMIOtCS OF OBJECTS: THE ROLE OF ARTIFACTS IN SOCIAL SYMBOLIC PROCESSES
June 22–24

SEVERAL WORKSHOPS WILL MEET TWICE A WEEK IN THE EVENINGS
and a workshop on Facial Measurement will take place June 1–3
(Facial Action Coding System—FACS; Ekman & Friesen)

All courses, workshops and colloquia will take place at Victoria College, a federated college of the University of Toronto, located in downtown Toronto, in the immediate vicinity of the Ontario Provincial Parliament, the Royal Ontario Museum, Queen's Park, Bloor Street and Yorkville Village.

All courses will be open to Visiting Scholars and Auditors. There will be a global participation fee of $400. Students taking courses for certification (maximum of two courses) will pay an additional fee of Can. $75 per course. Visiting Scholars and Auditors registering before March 31, 1990 will pay a reduced fee of Can. $350.

Limited financial assistance for students may be available.

On-campus accommodation will be available on a first-come, first-served basis. Rates are Can. $190 per week for a single, and $158 per week (per person) for a double. (Breakfast and tax included).

For more information about accommodation at Victoria College please contact:

Mr. G. Racca
Director of Residence
Victoria College
73 Queen's Park Cr.
Toronto, Canada
M5S 1B7

telephone: (416) 585-4522

Toronto Semiotic Circle
ISISSS 90

Twelfth International Institute for Semiotic and Structural Studies
University of Toronto (Victoria College)
June 1–29, 1990

Under the aegis of the School of Graduate Studies of the University of Toronto, the Toronto Semiotic Circle will offer a programme of advanced courses in various branches of semiotics at Victoria College in the University of Toronto during the month of June. The 1990 institute’s emphasis will be on visual semiotics, the semiotics of education, drama, film, discourse analysis and the semiotics of the emotions. The courses listed below will include twenty-four hours of lectures and seminars.

PROGRAM

Bernstein, Basil (Division of Education, University of London)
The Social Construction of Pedagogic Discourse

Derrida, Michel (University of Toronto)
The Psycho-semiotics of Problem Solving: Cognitive and Pedagogical Aspects

Douglas, Mary (London) 
Chains and Computers: The Securing of Public Knowledge

Eco, Umberto (University of Bologna) 
Reading Deconstruction: Language, Audience and Politics

Fairclough, Nigel (University of London) 
Symbolic Power: Politics, Discourse, Ideology

Henderson, Craig (University of Toronto) 
The Critical Theory of Kenneth Burke

Hutchins, Linda (University of Toronto) 
The Discursive Politics of Space

Jelinek, A.J. (Faculte des Sciences de l'Education, Universite de Paris) 
Semiotics of School Education

LABORATORY SCHEDULE

June 1–29, 1990

*Subject to final approval (Some lectures may be added)

Please send further information concerning ISISSS 90

IAME (Please Print) 

ADDRESS: 

TELEPHONE (Including Area Code) 

Mail: ISISSS 90

Ontario lst. 

Victoria College, Toronto. Canada 

M5S 1A7
When Peter Pries invited me to review the 16th ISG sessions on writing, I readily agreed, welcoming the opportunity to review the most recent work in systemic linguistics on written English. At the time, I had not anticipated that my far the majority of sessions at the Helsinki conference would address written English either centrally or tangentially—as, in fact, they did. Not only was it not possible for me to attend all the "writing" sessions at the Congress, but also it was quite difficult to characterize them as they contributed to systemic theory and research in writing. But this, in fact, is what I shall attempt to do here, as well as to demonstrate, in the process, that applications of systemic theory to writing are validating the enormous potential of this theory to explain language as it relates to social context.

The "writing" sessions in the main characterized written language through classifying the grammatical functions of sample texts. These sessions highlighted the power of systemic theory to discriminate choice. In a recent essay, Westrake and Plus clair, and insightfully so, that "it is the notion of choice, paradigmatic relations of 'either/or', which is the organizing concept of the systemic-functional model of grammar" (7). This simple assumption has important consequences for the development of systemic theory using computer technology; clearly, the either/or structure is highly compatible with the binary arrangement of data in computer memory. It also has significant implications for description and definition of language structure, in that descriptive models inevitably adopt the binary either/or structure at all levels from phoneme through word, to sentence, to extended discourse—a structure preeminently suitable for distinguishing grammatically new information from old, meta-discourse from content, writing from speech, and in turn, one written genre from another.

The descriptive offerings at the 16th ISG can be classified as they contribute to research on writing as follows: distinguishing oral and written discourse, tracing writing language acquisition, describing diachronic/historical development of written prose, distinguishing artistic and non-artist or written language, accounting for cohesion and coherence in writing, characterizing the structure and function of the written sentence, and identifying and describing written genres. I shall discuss papers at the Congress as they reflect these scholarly interests in the field of composition research.

Comparisons of oral/written discourse have had wide currency in research on composition, with many studies supporting or discovering pedagogical practices which link speaking and writing skills (e.g., Jemelius’s talk-write strategy). Early studies which classified the linguistic features of oral and written discourse often became inappropriate associated with efforts to distinguish basic and advanced writing skill (e.g., Lamsford, Kroll). And—e nvironment—early studies of student writing tended to associate advanced thinking with writing and sub-standard reasoning with orality, as seen in pedagogical applications of the work of David Olson and Walter Ong, confusion about the motivation for research on the oral/written distinction may in fact account for the fact that we see relatively little research in composition on the topic now. At the 16th ISG, two sessions dealt with the topic of oral/written differences directly, Karen McNalla in "Dialogue and Discourse," compared "real" conversation with prose dialogue in fiction in an effort to identify conventions which affect the function of "discourse" in both modes. And Annes Tost in "Marked Word Order in Discourse: A Text-Based Study in English" compared the meaning and function of "marked" and "unmarked" word order sequences in a 15,000-word corpus of both written and oral texts. Both studies are situated well within the province of linguistic expertise; each classifies features pragmatically, avoiding speculation about the social and cognitive values of the oral mode versus the written.

At the 16th ISG, two papers addressed the topic of written language acquisition: Janet Gilbert’s "A Close-up Look at the Acquisition of Two Patterns that Predominate in Written English" and Ann-Marie Linderberg’s "Rhetorical Patterns in Written English,". The former paper examined the use and structure of the relative clause in student and professional writing, the latter examined rhetorical patterns in written of students in their 10th year of schooling to the first-year at the university. Developmental studies of written English continue to thrive in composition research, with many such studies attempting to link theories of cognitive development proposed by Piaget, Bruner, and others to the acquisition and use of certain syntactic patterns in written English. Here too is an area where prescriptive applications of linguistic research have had deleterious effects on written language instruction. Fueled by research in developmental English, schooled in the progressive taxonomy of discourse types developed by James Moffett, instructors have virtually doomed students in writing classes to begin every semester writing "narratives" in the belief that the narrative is the essential stepping stone to the higher-order discourse patterns of exposition and argument.

Pedagogical research which applies systemic theory to writing instruction has demonstrated quite convincingly that young children are as capable of producing exposition as narrative, and are only limited to the latter by unsympathetic teachers (see, for instance, Christie; Martin and Notter). I believe that the more complete descriptions we can obtain of the writing behaviors of children at different ages, the more accurately we can ascertain the relationship between cognitive and written language skills. At the same time, I believe researchers need to question the appropriateness of adopting a cognitive developmental model to explain the difficulties of less-skilled adult writers. At any rate, much more work is needed here, and I would welcome more research incorporating systemic grammatical theory.
Three sessions at the Congress presented diachronic/historical studies of written English. In "Markers in Discourse: Comparative Analysis of Old English and Contemporary English Texts," Marianne Borghensterna examined, as her abstract states, aspect as a linguistic category which plays a central role in organization of narrative discourse. She predicts that a comparison of the textual realizations of this category across time may lead to a diachronic description of the aspect system. Martin Davies in "Thence from 'heorouf' to Shakespeare" traced the development of these systems through a historical comparison of literary and non-literary texts. And Brita Harvik in "On Discourse Markers and Narrative Strategies in the History of English" compared foregrounding strategies as they defy story-telling in Old and Middle English narratives with more modern "literate" strategies which favor backgrounding techniques. (The reader will note that I do not regard Harvik's presentation as a study of oral/written differences; the surviving Old-Middle English corpus is composed of written texts with oral origins; this discredits their use, I believe, as accurate commutations (e.g., research promises to explain surviving illustrations of the time the technical these studies traced the development of linguistic connectedness among sentences which are quite distant from each other; these connections promote the reader's continuous interpretation of similar meanings. In "Information Management, Context, and Sentence Structure," Kim Brown Lowenjanz examined professional writing in the fields of counseling (psychology), biology, and history to determine patterns of thematicization and information which function to manage information in written discourse. Both Brand in "Text-Cohesion in Modern Poetry" demonstrated how roles of cohesion, as defined by Halliday and Hasan, are violated in the modern poetry of Joyce and Durrell. In "Scientific Texts: Cohesion and Coherence," Gerald Parson tested hypotheses that link coherence to the ratio between central to peripheral tokens which form lexical chains in a text. His study of scientific texts produced by non-native and native writers revealed that the percentage of central tokens alone appears to contribute to the reader's sense of textual coherence.

The authors of these diverse papers on cohesion and coherence all acknowledge the interdependency of these related qualities in effective written discourse. In early studies of student writing, cohesion was mistakenly equated with coherence, a misconception Witten and Fahey addressed a decade ago in their essay "Cohesion, Coherence, and Writing Quality." Here they distinguished for composition researchers "cohesion," a textual function, from "coherence," a socio-semantic function, through referring to the functional linguistic theory of Michael Halliday and the textual component of that theory as detailed in Halliday and Hasan's Cohesion in English. Field studies which examine readers' perceptions of coherence as they correlate with degrees of lexical cohesion will continue to advance the potential of systemic theory to explain how texts mean.

Several Congress presentations reported on the grammatical functions of the written sentence in English. In "TP and Initial Inflation Classes as Structural Markers in Written English," Imre Bekkay examined the function of introductory adversative inaffixes as they signal structural relations or function to incorporate metalinguistic comment, as she notes in her abstract. Jean Bower in "Teaching Written Variations on (a) Theme" analyzed the rhetorical effectiveness of presenting "given" information in the "theme" position in a sentence, particularly as this fronted information provides continuity among larger segments of discourse. She also noted the difficulties of teaching inexperienced writers to recognize "given" and...
"new" information when constructing sentences. In "The Use of Systemic Linguistics to Describe Summarising Strategies at University Level," Helen Drury identified differences in summarizing strategies of non-native and native speakers, focusing in particular on the feature "grammatical metaphor." Peter Fries in "Patterns of Information in Initial Position in English" posited a correlation between method of development in a text and linguistic choices in the theme position, and a correlation between message in the discourse ("point" of the discourse) and linguistic choices in the rheme position.

While focussing on the English sentence, many of the studies listed above examined the function and placement of organizational devices which structure the flow of information among several sentences in written prose. This topic has been of increasing interest to researchers and teachers of composition and technical English who are concerned with the effects of sentence structure on readability (see essays on this topic by Hoff and Selzer). Systemic theory contributes to readability research through providing a consistent framework within which discourse organizational markers can be identified grammatically in their role of information management.

Perhaps the most elaborate research on written language to incorporate the systemic model is in that in the category of "genre description." Four papers addressed the problem of describing written genres at the 16th ICG. In her plenary address "Thematic Options and Success in Writing," Margaret Barry reported research on student writing of travel brochures, identifying grammatical devices which contribute to the successful articulation of the "brochure" genre. In a two-part presentation entitled "A Mixed Genre: From Case Report to Case Story," Gillian Francis and Anneliese Kramer-Dahl articulated in detail the syntactic and lexical similarities and dissimilarities between a psychologist's clinical case report of a patient's progress in therapy and a case story, which also narrates a psychiatrist's interaction with a patient, but purports to intrigue and entertain the reader with the human drama of the therapeutic setting. These researchers demonstrated the explanatory potential of systemic theory through using the grammar to identify linguistic features which correlate with the factual or quasi-fictional stance of the writing examined. This methodology shows potential to articulate and complement rhetorical theory on the difference between professional and popularized science writing (see, for example, Fuh-Kotick) and more general work on the heteroglossic functions of written discourse (for example, Lemke). In "Some Stylistic Aspects of Technical English," Lila Machauf and Judith Rosenhouse explored the boundaries between technical and non-technical English through examining the use of metaphor and idioms in both varieties. (Although these researchers chose to identify discourse simply by field, I believe one can say that this work appropriately contributes to the more specific area of genre study.) In "Thematic Progression Patterns and the Structure of Discourse in Professional and Popularized Medical Texts," co-authors Kevin Ngzi Ngou and Thomas Bloor compared variations in the thematic organization of information in abstracts, research articles, and journalist reported versions of the same medical project. Hence, they reported on differences in textual presentation when field is held constant but tenor and textual organization vary.

In my view, the most provocative and interesting paper on genre description was Jim Martin's "Life as a Noun: Arresting the Universe in Science and Humanities." In this plenary address, Martin characterized how texts which present message in the humanities and sciences (in the "point" of the discourse) and linguistic choices in the rheme position.

While focusing on the English sentence, many of the studies listed above examined the function and placement of organizational devices which structure the flow of information among several sentences in written prose. This topic has been of increasing interest to researchers and teachers of composition and technical English who are concerned with the effects of sentence structure on readability (see essays on this topic by Hoff and Selzer). Systemic theory contributes to readability research through providing a consistent framework within which discourse organizational markers can be identified grammatically in their role of information management.

Perhaps the most elaborate research on written language to incorporate the systemic model is in that in the category of "genre description." Four papers addressed the problem of describing written genres at the 16th ICG. In her plenary address "Thematic Options and Success in Writing," Margaret Barry reported research on student writing of travel brochures, identifying grammatical devices which contribute to the successful articulation of the "brochure" genre. In a two-part presentation entitled "A Mixed Genre: From Case Report to Case Story," Gillian Francis and Anneliese Kramer-Dahl articulated in detail the syntactic and lexical similarities and dissimilarities between a psychologist's clinical case report of a patient's progress in therapy and a case story, which also narrates a psychiatrist's interaction with a patient, but purports to intrigue and entertain the reader with the human drama of the therapeutic setting. These researchers demonstrated the explanatory potential of systemic theory through using the grammar to identify linguistic features which correlate with the factual or quasi-fictional stance of the writing examined. This methodology shows potential to articulate and complement rhetorical theory on the difference between professional and popularized science writing (see, for example, Fuh-Kotick) and more general work on the heteroglossic functions of written discourse (for example, Lemke). In "Some Stylistic Aspects of Technical English," Lila Machauf and Judith Rosenhouse explored the boundaries between technical and non-technical English through examining the use of metaphor and idioms in both varieties. (Although these researchers chose to identify discourse simply by field, I believe one can say that this work appropriately contributes to the more specific area of genre study.) In "Thematic Progression Patterns and the Structure of Discourse in Professional and Popularized Medical Texts," co-authors Kevin Ngzi Ngou and Thomas Bloor compared variations in the thematic organization of information in abstracts, research articles, and journalist reported versions of the same medical project. Hence, they reported on differences in textual presentation when field is held constant but tenor and textual organization vary.

In my view, the most provocative and interesting paper on genre description was Jim Martin's "Life as a Noun: Arresting the Universe in Science and Humanities." In this plenary address, Martin characterized how texts which present message in the humanities and sciences (in the "point" of the discourse) and linguistic choices in the rheme position.
of functional linguistic theory to be "directional" for improving the behavior of unpracticed writers. I also asked my listeners to consider the consequences of interpreting all language as social semantic for the vitality of "individual" expression. Or the consequences of investigating general constraints for overcoming language as an agent of chance. I raise these issues not to discourage applications of systemic grammar to the writing classroom, but rather to endorse applications that remain open, limited, and respectful of human capacity not only to use language in conventional ways, but also to chart new possibilities for language to work. Overall, I found the work on written English at the 1985 ICS to be comprehensive, motivated, and central to these concerns and these of composition research in general. This fine work illustrates the potential of systemic theory to re-vitalize the field of textual analysis through deftly articulating written texts as socio-linguistic phenomena.


The workshop on these in systemic linguistics was not part of the original schedule for ISCo-16. The idea developed during the week of the Congress, in response to the unusually large number of papers on the subject and the interest they elicited. We were happy to welcome Professor Backe, whose work has inspired and informed everyone writing and researching in this field.

Peter Fries began by asking the participants about their interest in the subject and the problems they had encountered in following it up. We had thought of this as the preliminary stage of the workshop, after which we intended to look at thematic selection and progression in specific texts. In the event, the problems gained momentum and occupied all our time. We began to record them on transparencies as they emerged. The list below is the result of an attempt to group, under more general headings, these problems that seemed to be related. These offer, tentatively, a number of heuristic questions as to our future research directions.

These in discourse: problems and directions

1. The unit of investigation and its boundaries

We need to decide what is the nature and size of the unit of analysis, and whether this should vary according to the emphasis of one's study. The first question is clearly whether there is to be understood as the first grammatical element of the clause, or in terms of degrees of communicative dynamism. Also, should we look at the clause of the whole clause complex, or the independent containable clause complex? (Peter Fries' 'united') or both main and subordinate clauses, or even of the nominal group? Do different patterns emerge according to which alternative we select, and what are the implications of these?

Secondly, we need to define the boundaries of these more clearly. It seemed that most of us use Halliday's definition and take these to be first element. Differences remain, however. Some see it as including everything that precedes the verb of the main clause, or everything up to and including the grammatical subject, while others consider it to be only the first grammatical element of the clause. There is also some question as to whether conjunctions like and subject and should be seen as part of (lexical) theme. Moreover, the first grammatical element may well be a subordinate clause, which has its own theme-these structure, so different levels of analysis may be necessary. In any case, it is important to clarify what one is exploring, and why, in the interests of comparability and reproducibility.

2. Terminology and the status of definitions; the meaning of these

Having decided what unit we are exploring, we need to reconsider its nature. What do we mean by 'business', by 'point of departure for the message' and 'peg to hang one's message upon'? These are not of course definitions - it is impossible to define without conceptualising, and the point about lexical meaning is that it is not representative. Instead we have either to demarcate our terminology ('peg' in particular) or look for the best metaphors to encode the perceived functions of these and to provide a heuristic for investigation. One useful way to conceptualise this is to consider it as a dynamic operation, highlighting and moving elements around within the ideational space in order to create the local context of the clause (Christian Matthiessen).

Then we need to consider the meaning of thematic choice and distribution, both in the immediate context of the clause and in longer stretches of text. Can themes become a unified concept - can we identify, for example, a single, consistent thematic function? We should collect a large body of examples and categorise these in order to discover regularities. Some of the possibilities raised were:

(i) Certain themes have specific local functions, as do initial purpose clauses and other 'abbreviated' clauses, negations and negative inversions, etc.

(ii) Regularities occur within text-segments: when any feature is systematically thematised, this is meaningful. A particular type of thematic progression may characterise a text segment. There may also be a perceivable relationship between thematisation and participant-building (the signalling of major participants, etc.)

(iii) Similarly, there will be relationships between these and discourse structure. In the text as a whole, various TPs and their sequence may characterise a generic structure. It was agreed that perhaps the pattern of thematic progression used to be reformulated. Related these-peg patterns should also be explored, for example, patterns of Reiteration and Replacement. TPs must be systematically related to genre.

3. Theme-like structures in larger discourse units

We should also develop the notion that clauses (or clause-complexes) function thematically with respect to larger units such as smaller elements realise the themes of clauses. This analogy has been developed from Fries' formulation by Jim Martin, who uses the terms Hyper-Theme and Macro-Theme to refer to these predicting the thematic progression paragraph-like text segments and longer stretches of text.

4. These themes: given-new etc.

It is also necessary to consider the concepts most closely connected with themes: theme, given-new, old-new, known-unknown, topic-comment etc. All of these need to be clearly conceptualised in order to reach consensus about what we are investigating.

In particular, we should look at the differences between the uses of the beginnings and endings of clauses to encode given and new information.
When and why is new information supplied in these, and what is the
significance of the last clauseal element (or referent)? When and why does new
information sometimes coincide with these? How do new messages accumulate
as a test progresses? Here we need to look at such concepts as Hypo-Nan
and Macro-New (Martin), secondary new, tertiary new etc.

5. Types of these and other related concepts
We should investigate all the types of these that have been formulated,
reconceptualising them if necessary, as well as loosely related concepts such
as cohesion and coherence:

- ideational, interpersonal and textual themes (how do textual themes relate to
  overall textual meaning?);
- marked and unmarked themes (What does markedness mean? Why are
  marked themes used?);
- dynamic and static themes (with reference, particularly, to Margaret Berry's
  ISC-15 paper);
- displaced themes;
- predicated (cleft) and 'equative' (pseudo-cleft) themes;
- grammatical metaphor in these, especially transformations such as general
  nouns, metalinguistic and 'bureaucracy' theme, text-reference and other types
  of anaphora;
- coherence; cohesive harmony; chain interaction; the distribution of tokens
  over the clause.

6. Cognition
The cognitive function in the serial processing of language means that the
ordering of elements is crucial. The question is whether the writer/speaker's
conception of how to orient the reader/hearer necessarily mirrors the
processing of the message (Rachel Whitaker). Is schematisation what writers
do, or what readers need, or both?

1. Types of signal
On the subject of signalling, referred to earlier, we discussed:

i) whether the boundaries of text segments are often signalled by marked
  themes, as suggested by Peter Fries. The question also arises as to the role
  of these in enabling recognition of text segments.

ii) the signalling of both local and global boundaries by pitch-changes and
  other intonational features.

Also on intonation, to what extent does it define the boundaries of given
and new information? It was suggested that we should investigate the location
and nature of the low units as related to the Information Unit. Is the
information unit typically intonation, grammatical, semantic, etc.?

8. These in languages other than English
Several people mentioned the difficulties they have had in deciding on how to
deal with these in other languages, especially those with word-ordering
principles more fixed than those of English. It may not be possible to
identify these with the first element of the clause, and so one has to consider
alternative realisations (e.g. based on CO).

9. Pedagogical uses of the concepts of thematic progression, method
   of development etc.
Are these ideas directly relevant to the teaching of reading and writing? Can
we go so far as to make them part of the metalinguage we use in teaching
such skills? There was also some discussion about possible differences
between native and non-native speakers in terms of the overt signalling or
encoding of logical relations.

10. Dialogue
Throughout a text, given and new can be seen as realisations of covert
dialogic property; this has applications to readability and memorability (Jean
Vesna).

I apologize to anyone who made comments and suggestions not included here,
also as for possible misrepresentations of various contributions. My notes
on the discussion were very brief, and some of them refused to be
reconstructed.

Information on the running of NETWORK: In the future please send all
material for publication to James D. Benson, English Department,
Glendon College, York University, 2275 Bayview Avenue, Toronto, M4N
394, Ontario, Canada. Please send all reviews and archive material
to Martin Davies, English Studies, The University of Stirling, Stirling,
FK9 4LA, Scotland, Great Britain. Please send all problems about
subscriptions and mailing to Peter K. Fries, Box 319, Ml Pleasant
Field, USA, 60544. The price of NETWORK is $5.00 per year. If you have
not subscribed and wish to, please send the money in US currency to Nan Fries, Managing Editor,
NETWORK, Box 319, Ml Pleasant, MI, USA, 48844. The deadline for the
next issue is September 1, 1990.

Book Authors, would you please tell your publishers to send brochures
announcing your books to James D. Benson, English Department,
Glendon College, York University, 2275 Bayview Avenue, Toronto, M4N
394, Ontario, Canada. Would you also ask your publishers to send
review copies of your books to Martin Davies, English Studies, The
University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, Scotland, Great Britain. We
would like to review and announce works which are of interest to our
readers.
Minutes of the Business Meeting

I. Introductions were made by the Chair, Robin Fawcett. Robin also thanked the Congress Chair, Elja Vestola (and her Programme Committee and staff), for the wonderful job they had done on the Helsinki Congress.

II. The Nominating Committee presented their report and the Chair then took nominations from the floor. The written ballot will be mailed out in the first circular of the Stirling Congress.

III. The Constitution Committee presented a draft of a constitution for the International Systemic Congress Committee. Revisions were suggested from the floor. The written ballot on whether to accept or reject the revised constitution will be included in the first circular of the Stirling Congress.

IV. Future International Systemic Congresses (approved)
   a) Stirling (Martin Davies, Chair) July 4-7, 1990
   b) Tokyo (Michael Halliday, Chair) July 29-Aug, 2, 1991
   c) Sydney (Quayala Hasan, Chair) no dates available

V. Invitations for future congresses: The International Systemic Congress Committee has received both formal and informal invitations from the following sites:
   a) Ghent:
   b) Madrid: Bregazzl
   c) Singapore: Francis
   d) Boston: Regan
   e) Chicago: Pappas
   f) British Columbia: Nolan
   g) Nigeria: Makale
   h) Glasgow: Scott and McPhail (see minutes from ISC13)

VI. Hilary Hillier, Treasurer, presented a financial report. At present there are small funds in the U.K., U.S. and Australia for emergencies (e.g. first circular expenses).

VII. Ann Fries, Membership Secretary, gave a membership report. Please notify her of any change of address on an unlined card to enable her to keep the persons chairing the Congress. There are approximately 700 names in the computer list at present.

VIII. The new editors of NTVSSE, James Benson and Peter Fries, were introduced.
Minutes of the ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

1516 INTERNATIONAL SYSTEMIC CONGRESS

Ragan felt that more 'bridging' toward ESL was desirable, and proposed exploring more explicitly defined tasks. (Fries observed that this was difficult to organize.)

Closure in her group covered approaches other than systemic.

In general discussion, Fries posed several questions: did the 'bridging' idea work? was there a problem about some workshops being too small and others too large? Greaves and Vatt said that small numbers were an advantage rather than a disadvantage. Davies said that he welcomed diversity. Fries said she didn't like to be forced to attend particular workshops, and that on this occasion everyone had chosen her first choice. Vatt suggested keeping the 'workshop' and 'tutorial' functions separate. Rashidi recounted his three workshop experiences, all of which were different and all of which were positive: one was 'presentational'; one was with subgroups catering to different levels of expertise; and one was a 'real' workshop, with no preset agenda, a speaker who knew a great deal, a test, a theoretical problem, and time to deal with it.

Other observations: 1. abstracts are extremely important; 2. the crisper barrier, while not conducive to deep academic discussion, provided a good setting for forthcoming subsequent communication among delegates; 3. more reaching out beyond the boundaries of systemic linguistics is required.

4. Bill Vattela, the organizer of ISG16 announced that the Congress would be held June 13-16 in Riiassar, Helsinki, Finland. Invited speakers are Halliday, Susan (both have accepted), Sven, Pirrau, and Hovist. One day might be devoted to them. In addition, one day to stylistic issues, one day to applied issues, and one workshop on tutorials. Abstracts will be required by November or early December of 1988.

The Finmark Summer Schools of Linguistics, organized by Fawcett, will be held just prior to the ISG, from June 5-9, 1989 at the University of Stavanger (Prof. Karl Sivertsen, Dept. of English). Halliday and Sven will be featured, and the format will include bridging, applied and introductory workshops.

Rush Brand announced LACUS 88 to be held in East Lansing, and Michael Jordan announced that LACUS 89 would be held at Queens University in Kingston, Ontario in the middle of August.

Rush Brand reviewed the locations of previous systemic workshops: 76-81 (E.C.), 72 (Toronto), 81 (Sydney), 80 (East Lansing), 87 (Michigan), 85 (Ann Arbor), 84 (U.K.; Cardiff), 87 (Sydney), 85 (East Lansing), 87 (Michigan), 83 (Sydney), 82 (U.K.; Cardiff), 88 (U.K.; Stirling), 85 (Ann Arbor). On behalf of the ISC Committee, he proposed 80 (U.K.), 81 (Australia), and 82 (Australia). At this point Fred Pung offered to organize a Congress in Tokyo.
Poulton were asked to summarize the Australian scene. Review copies should be sent to Martin Davies for Network, and to Ruth Brand for consideration by Vord. Authors were asked to send publishers brochures to Robin Fawcett.

8. Publications.

1. A list of ISI reports is available from:
   Dr. William C. Mann
   University of Southern California
   Information Sciences Institute
   4676 Admiralty Way
   Suite 1101
   Marina del Rey
   California 90291

2. Systemic Functional Approaches to Discourse (12th ISV), edited by Benson and Greaves, and published by Ablex, is now out.

3. Linguistics in a Systemic Perspective (original papers), edited by Benson, Comings and Greaves, and published by Benjamin, is now out.

4. A bibliography of Halliday’s recent publications prepared by Christian Matthiessen is available at cost.

5. Jay Lampke’s Talking Science: Language, learning and value, is forthcoming from Ablex.


9. Pragmatics, Discourse, and Text (Canterbury ISP), edited by Stanier and Yalcin, and published by Pieter, is also in press.

10. Functions of Style, edited by Birch and O’Toole, and also published by Pieter, has appeared.


13. Ruth Brand welcomed the submission of articles to Vord.

14. Fred Peng welcomed the submission of articles to Language Sciences.

15. The two volume festschrift for MAH, edited by Steels and Threadgold, and published by Benjamin, has appeared.


9. Jim Benson urged those with small potential at their universities to develop it.

10. The result of the ballot distributed to all members was 28-8, which the ISC Committee took as a mandate to proceed with becoming a more formal organization.

11. The meeting charged the ISC Committee to construct a draft constitution by the next AGM in Belfast.


**********************************************************

Looking Ahead to ISC:17 SCOTLAND

Amphod

BLAIR CASTLE

Near Stirling
Attending a systemic conference has always been a very special event for me as each of the two times I have gone I travelled from a university where there was little, if any, work going on from a systemic perspective. The workshop in Sydney last year was exciting indeed for it had that interest in most papers and workshops on practical classroom applications for teaching writing relevant to my field of English as a second language. I looked forward to similar stimulation at the Congress in February this year. And stimulating it was, but not as practical as it might have been for me.

Because travel connections kept me from the plenary address on day 1, but the references over the next few days to Chris Bailer's call for more research to provide evidence of the validity of systemic theory gave me some ideas of what had gone on. I happily arrived into Bernard Hudson's afternoon workshop on 'Language, situation, corpora and context'. The content of this and of his subsequent paper proved to be relevant and necessary: a theoretical model and classroom activity and discourse. The focus was on immigrant children in British Columbia undertaking language socialisation through content-based language practice. And having a systemics role in this it made an obvious avenue regarding practical descriptions of methodology for classroom practitioners.

Day 2 began with my own presentation on a systemic analysis of contextualised task-based written language activity and implications for classroom methodology. I found only variations on linguistics. A workshop that afternoon analyzed professional and student-written compositions. Later presentations revealed new frontiers in BP grammar, exciting research, social values lurking in science texts, undoubtedly expect systems, and a fascinatingly complex and simple picture of the complexity of language articles.

Perhaps I should not have expected something different. It is just that I have this feeling that systemic needs to market itself more broadly and thereby more successfully for the rest of the world. This Congress, to a greater extent than the workshop in Sydney, was a more comprehensive, but we still need to do more. Perhaps we still need to do more in this area, but we have a remarkably interesting group of teachers and researchers and we need to have the opportunity to share our perspective with others, including those who teach other subjects in the humanities and social sciences, such as language education, writing, literature, psychology, and education. Shouldn't this happen at our own Congress! I have presented a systemic orientation often enough at conferences of large groups of non-systemic language teachers such as TESOL, ACTE, and language teaching associations in non-English speaking countries, to realise how others through ignorance perceive systemics as some inapplicable fringe element of linguistics. Yet systemics is the most marketable of linguistic models to those who have yet to consider the importance of language in their own field and how much it can offer as a heuristic bridging discipline.
Highlights of the Annual Business Meeting of the 14th International Systemic Workshop held at the University of Sydney, August 28, 1987.

Minutes recorded by Nan Fries

Michael Gregory summed up the feeling of the participants with the statement that the Sydney Workshop was the fullest, richest workshop ever. Jim Martin encouraged participants to make suggestions for future meetings, and some of the suggestions were:

CONTINUE THE VARIED FORMAT introduced in Sydney with some enhancements:

- hold a week-long meeting and continue the change of venue format rotating to Europe, N. America and Australia; find ways to encourage more dialogue (to encourage dialogue we could try using a modification of the dialogue session in which members of a panel would state their positions on an issue, and then the audience could break into small groups for discussion); keep providing situations where 'Jrs' (novices) and 'Srs' (experts) can rub shoulders; take Wednesday afternoon off for 'chatting time'; and start 'buzz groups'.

CONTINUE THE WORKSHOP/SEMINAR SESSIONS started in Sydney with some slight changes. Some of the recommendations included:

- orient some workshops toward novices and some toward experts (with self-evaluation of audience); have more workshops (The workshops and seminars at Sydney constituted about 40 per cent of the program) present papers first, then do the workshops; divide the seminars/workshops into 'questions' vs. 'issues' sessions; separate workshops into 'reports' vs 'theoretical' strands; for text-analysis workshops, distribute texts to workshop participants ahead of time; give participants more information on the nature of each seminar/workshop beforehand, so that they have some basis for selecting the ones they wish to attend (perhaps a short description of each workshop should be sent out with the second circular; some noted that the workshops with more general titles filled first and those with more specific titles filled later); try having 'introduction' type workshops (mini-courses?) on the first day for new comers (especially next year); make special efforts to actively recruit workshop leaders.

CONTINUE TO HAVE PAPERS because some participants can't get funded unless they give papers. Some recommendations on paper-giving included:

- be sure to include papers oriented to a mixed audience; allow for longer papers (perhaps 1 1/2 hour slots with a 45 minute paper followed by discussion); discourage the reading of papers (with the comment that persons reading papers tend to use too much 'grammatical metaphor'); encourage more elaborate handouts because this allows people to reconstruct what was said and encourages 'spoken' papers rather than 'read' papers.

CONTINUE THE PANELS/DIALOGIC SESSIONS (even though they didn't accomplish what the Sydney organizers had originally planned)

After the discussion of the Sydney Workshop, the meeting moved on to the business agenda. The current International Systemic Workshop Organizing
The first item discussed was the Fifteenth International Systemic Congress. [Note name change which will be explained later in the minutes.] Three meeting places were suggested for 1988: England, the University of Illinois, and Michigan State University. A straw vote was taken by participants who were considering attending the meeting. Michigan State University was chosen because LACUS (The Linguistics Association of Canada and the U.S.) was meeting at MSU August 16-20. The 15th International Systemic Congress will meet at Michigan State University in East Lansing, Michigan, the week of August 8. Ruth Brend is in charge of local arrangements and Peter Fries is in charge of the program.

Plans for the Sixteenth International Systemic Congress were discussed next... Niija Ventola invited the participants to meet in Helsinki in 1989. She noted that Halliday and Hasan will be teaching an introductory course in a summer school of linguistics June 1-7 and the workshop could follow the course and be held June 12-17. The participants supported these plans with an overwhelmingly favorable vote. The site of the 1990 meeting will probably be in England.

A list of journals that might accept articles from Systemic Linguists was discussed. Those mentioned included: Australian Journal of Linguistics, David Bradley, La Trobe University; Word (Ruth Brend, Michigan State University); English in Australia, AILA Review; Linguistics and Style, Linguistics and Education, Language and Education and Occasional Papers in Systemic Linguistics (Margaret Berry, University of Nottingham).

Book news: Oxford University Press may distribute the Dahlia Series. There are now two festschrifts (five volumes) for Michael Halliday. One festschrift of the volumes, Language Topics: Essays in Honour of Michael Halliday (edited by Steele and Thorne) is being published by John Benjamins and a second festschrift of three volumes (Vol I edited by Martin and Hasan, Vol Ii edited by Berry, Butler and Fries, and Vol III edited by Fries and Greaves) will be published by Ablex. Selected papers from the 1986 Canterbury International Systemic Workshop will be published in a book (edited by Steiner and Veltman) called Text and Discourse Structure. The papers from the 1985 Ann Arbor International Systemic Workshop will be published as Systemic Functional Approaches to Discourse (edited by Benson and Greaves and published by Ablex).

The proofs will arrive soon. A book of essays edited by Benson, Greaves and Cummings called Linguistics in a Systemic Perspective will come out in 1988 with John Benjamins.

The International Systemic Workshop Organising Committee was re-elected for two years. Nan Pries agreed to put a mailing list on a computer (please send any new addresses and corrections of old addresses to Pries, Box 210, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan, 48804, USA). Robin Fries was elected editor of Network for two years. He may step aside when his term is up. There was a discussion of whether we should have a refereed journal. The decision was postponed. The name of our workshop was changed to the International Systemic Committee. The participants at the workshop agreed that 'the International Systemic Congress' should be used as our group name on official correspondence. The Congress Committee will order stationery with this letterhead. It was suggested that a ballot be sent to all persons on the current mailing list to see if we should become more organized (perhaps become an association/or a dues-paying
The International Systemic Congress Committee is working on the wording of the ballot. There is definite growth in the number of people interested in Systemics. Over 150 attended the Sydney workshop. It is hoped that a more structured organization will improve communication. There was discussion of the need for a constitution, a long-range planning committee, and dues. The meeting adjourned after discussion of these issues.
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You can't miss STIRLING CASTLE

Tel: Stirling (0786) 50000

Stirling Castle dominates the town. A Sunbelt tourist attraction. Stirling Castle is near the heart of Stirling, the county town of Stirlingshire, midway between Edinburgh and Glasgow. It is situated on the banks of the River Forth and has been an important strategic point since the 11th century. Stirling Castle was the scene of many key battles, including the Battle of Stirling Bridge in 1297 and the Battle of Bannockburn in 1314. It was once the seat of the Scottish monarchs and is now a major tourist attraction.

STIRLING’S 'TOP OF THE TOWN'

Centred on Broad Street, Stirling.

Tel: Tourist Board, Stirling (0786) 75019

Stirling’s 'Top of the Town' is a walk around the historic town centre of Stirling, Scotland, which features a variety of attractions and activities. The route starts at Stirling Castle and leads through the historic town centre, where visitors can explore the medieval streets, shops, and churches. The walk ends at the historic Stirling Bridge, offering stunning views of the river and the surrounding countryside.

Airthrey Castle

Airthrey Castle was built in 1791. It is currently used by various clubs and societies including the University choir and the student dramatic society. Radio Airthrey is also based there.

For information on Top of the Town events and activities contact the Loch Lomond & Trossachs Tourist Board on 01084 773730.
While attending the International Systemic Workshop in Sydney I was sufficiently enough to start giving my impressions at the conference. I soon found myself committed in making these impressions more public.

To do this I should also make my background more public. For about fifteen years I have been researching various aspects of aboriginal languages. I gained a Ph.D. by describing a morphologically rather complex language of northern Australia and through teaching and research maintain an active interest in the whole Australian language family (numbering over 200 distinct languages at the time of first European settlement). Nota generale I am interested in language description and typology, the ethnography of speaking and literary semantics. So much for background and interests, what about my theoretical position?

My theoretical position, such as it is, is a product of my particular interests. With regard to Australian (Aboriginal) languages I have become a consumer of linguistic theories because descriptions of Australian languages have been cast in terms of a whole range of theories. To maintain access to this literature one must have at least nodding familiarity with numerous approaches (whether you like them or not). The same can be said for typology where volumes of studies fill from Relational Grammar to Cb to LMG and so on. Of course I have my own preferences and these are very definitely towards the functionalist end of the spectrum. However I need a theory which is still usable even when I don't have an article let alone the language under study. One such theory is the hole and Reference Grammar developed by Foley & Van Valin (1985) which is functionally oriented but explicitly addresses analytic problems using data from a very wide range of languages.

2. Theory vs. Practice

In the opening address Michael Halliday stressed the need to focus on the lexicogrammar and to extend systemic theory to the study of languages other than English. I found both of these views highly congenial but was disappointed with the response to them as revealed in the conference itself. Almost all the presentations over three quite full days centered the 'centre' the lexicogrammar and flow to the 'periphery' discourse, register, ideology. Just a few offerings dealt with languages other than English. As a renovator I had to wonder about this gap between theory and practice. As a participant - observer I began to realize the gap was in some areas like a chasm.

The most yawn of these proved to be the evening 'dialogic sessions'. Among the strengths of systemic theory is its emphasis on register and ideology and thereby one would assume heightened awareness thereof. However, to a large extent, the dialogic sessions turned out to be a rev of 'heavies' on a stage talking to each other and to a few publicly credentialed gurus in the audience. The rest of the audience barely made a peep. Such situations are of course not uncommon in academic discourses but this was a 'workshop' for people who are perhaps more devoted than most to seeing that there is equality of access to a discourse.

Question time (at any session) bothered me as well. A well-formed question appears to follow a pattern something like this:

I'd first like to say, Max, how much I enjoyed your talk in which you related A and B to C. I particularly appreciated your interpretation of A and the way in which you related B and C to the whole of linguistics....(question follows a fair bit later).

be the question serves to display the credentials of the questioner. In part the very fact that the person is asking a question at all suggests a privileged position. The easy familiarity with the questioner (Max) indicates a well established personal network. The lead-up is the (actual) question which the (real) question actually arrived it was (frequently pitched at such a high level of generality that it was hard to see how the questioner could do justice to it.

By contrast an ill-formed question has the form:

What does 'equal' mean? (of the handout) I mean the trouble with this question is that it suggests the person asking doesn't already know the answer and might not even have a very clear idea of what the theory is all about. It's also a bit about and there's an indication that the questioner even knows who he's asking to.

Of course these question-types are idealised (even caricatures some might say). A healthy academic discourse should allow questions of various types and access to these different types should, in systemic especially, be open to all comers. However academic discourses tend to differ according to the type of questions usually put and the rights of access to the available questioning.

3. Academic discourses

Academic discourses can be grouped as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic Linguistics</th>
<th>Non-systemic Linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To reveal the implicit agent I have grouped them this way as a reflection of my own participation in the four specified subject areas. I was trained in the practice non-systemic linguistics, I work with systemic linguistics through friends, colleagues and superiors, and I have attended seminars in anthropology and philosophy fairly regularly over the years. Group A allows quite general questions with a run-up (can already described) but restricts access to questioning. Group B prefers rather specific questions and has a fairly emerging attitude regarding who can ask them. Group B is also relatively disputative. Debate is sometimes acerbic but can also be a face of playfulness as well as believers have a place in the academic discourse of Group B. For Group B is a serious business: any signs of levity should be nipped in the bud. Let me give one example from a run-up to a well-formed question: not an exact quote but reasonably close:

"You've set forth a lot of very interesting ideas here, Jay. That was a lot of fun. (pause) I don't mean that it wasn't serious but, that is... these things should be fun although we can learn as well..." question follows.

"I'd like to say, Max, how much I enjoyed your talk in which you related A and B to C. I particularly appreciated your interpretation of A and the way in which you related B and C to the whole of linguistics....(question follows a fair bit later).

be the question serves to display the credentials of the questioner. In part the very fact that the person is asking a question at all suggests a privileged position. The easy familiarity with the questioner (Max) indicates a well established personal network. The lead-up is the (actual) question which the (real) question actually arrived it was (frequently pitched at such a high level of generality that it was hard to see how the questioner could do justice to it.

By contrast an ill-formed question has the form:

What does 'equal' mean? (of the handout) I mean the trouble with this question is that it suggests the person asking doesn't already know the answer and might not even have a very clear idea of what the theory is all about. It's also a bit about and there's an indication that the questioner even knows who he's asking to.

Of course these question-types are idealised (even caricatures some might say). A healthy academic discourse should allow questions of various types and access to these different types should, in systemic especially, be open to all comers. However academic discourses tend to differ according to the type of questions usually put and the rights of access to the available questioning.

3. Academic discourses

Academic discourses can be grouped as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic Linguistics</th>
<th>Non-systemic Linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To reveal the implicit agent I have grouped them this way as a reflection of my own participation in the four specified subject areas. I was trained in the practice non-systemic linguistics, I work with systemic linguistics through friends, colleagues and superiors, and I have attended seminars in anthropology and philosophy fairly regularly over the years. Group A allows quite general questions with a run-up (can already described) but restricts access to questioning. Group B prefers rather specific questions and has a fairly emerging attitude regarding who can ask them. Group B is also relatively disputative. Debate is sometimes acerbic but can also be a face of playfulness as well as believers have a place in the academic discourse of Group B. For Group B is a serious business: any signs of levity should be nipped in the bud. Let me give one example from a run-up to a well-formed question: not an exact quote but reasonably close:

"You've set forth a lot of very interesting ideas here, Jay. That was a lot of fun. (pause) I don't mean that it wasn't serious but, that is... these things should be fun although we can learn as well..." question follows.

Question time (at any session) bothered me as well. A well-formed question appears to follow a pattern something like this:

I'd first like to say, Max, how much I enjoyed your talk in which you related A and B to C. I particularly appreciated your interpretation of A and the way in which you related B and C to the whole of linguistics....(question follows a fair bit later).

be the question serves to display the credentials of the questioner. In part the very fact that the person is asking a question at all suggests a privileged position. The easy familiarity with the questioner (Max) indicates a well established personal network. The lead-up is the (actual) question which the (real) question actually arrived it was (frequently pitched at such a high level of generality that it was hard to see how the questioner could do justice to it.

By contrast an ill-formed question has the form:

What does 'equal' mean? (of the handout) I mean the trouble with this question is that it suggests the person asking doesn't already know the answer and might not even have a very clear idea of what the theory is all about. It's also a bit about and there's an indication that the questioner even knows who he's asking to.

Of course these question-types are idealised (even caricatures some might say). A healthy academic discourse should allow questions of various types and access to these different types should, in systemic especially, be open to all comers. However academic discourses tend to differ according to the type of questions usually put and the rights of access to the available questioning.

3. Academic discourses

Academic discourses can be grouped as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic Linguistics</th>
<th>Non-systemic Linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To reveal the implicit agent I have grouped them this way as a reflection of my own participation in the four specified subject areas. I was trained in the practice non-systemic linguistics, I work with systemic linguistics through friends, colleagues and superiors, and I have attended seminars in anthropology and philosophy fairly regularly over the years. Group A allows quite general questions with a run-up (can already described) but restricts access to questioning. Group B prefers rather specific questions and has a fairly emerging attitude regarding who can ask them. Group B is also relatively disputative. Debate is sometimes acerbic but can also be a face of playfulness as well as believers have a place in the academic discourse of Group B. For Group B is a serious business: any signs of levity should be nipped in the bud. Let me give one example from a run-up to a well-formed question: not an exact quote but reasonably close:

"You've set forth a lot of very interesting ideas here, Jay. That was a lot of fun. (pause) I don't mean that it wasn't serious but, that is... these things should be fun although we can learn as well..." question follows.
For Group B there seems to be a reluctance to turn the subject matter and its methods back on to one's own experience. Within anthropology many practitioners feel that peculiar or trivial to anthropologists what is going on around them. For instance, I have found among anthropologists little enthusiasm for a study of sensitive politics by the distinguished political anthropologist, F.G. Bailey (1977). Among systemicians I have likewise encountered a reluctance to apply their tools to their own immediate experience. Then I cited applying some of the concepts of growth proposed by Jay Lemke (in his planetary address) to systemic and other theorists people in whose circle I was not really a participant, but I got a very serious reaction. It seemed to me completely appropriate to start applying some (theor
tical and methodological) tools to our 'historic' own society. In another occasion (prior to the conference) I asked some systemic theorists if they had considered the schematic structures of societal disorganisation. Since some of the people I was talking to were directly involved in the process of producing such texts it seemed to me an especially legitimate application of one part of systemic theory. Again the idea was treated with amused tolerance rather than being seriously entertained. In a Group B discussion I would have someone to engage with in a Group A discussion I had just committed a faux pas. However, if you are aware that there are different discourse styles then you should be able to adapt. In the domain of anthropology I find myself doing a question-cut off in the approved fashion almost without thinking about it. But if there are two cultures (and no doubt a lot more) it is important that linguists of all people should be bi-cultural and bicultural otherwise both sides also out.

4. Religion

Not long into ISY I began to characterize what was going on around me in terms of religious metaphors. Some are believers and others are non-believers. I saw the mixing plenty obvious as among whom members of the clergy spoke to a congregation. One priestremarked the congregation that there are not many of us and it can be lonely out there. This is gathering when we are among like-minded people and we can not walk out of church. In systemics are heterosexual. That does not make not. Certainly a doubt. From attempts at Group B discussion I was clearly not sitting enough, decisively irrelevant, at times even meaningless. On top of this before and after ISY I have been hosting parties and seeing myself as a host. At first I regarded religious analogies with some levity but as time went on I began to realize that the situation was a good deal more serious than that. Lots of people at the conference had really got religion. This is fine when it is religious but not when it is one particular approach to the study of language.

In most religious following the theologians and religious leaders have a rather broad view of the world; it is among the most of believers that a certain consciousness is to be found. So too in Systemics it is the high priests that are adaptable but the bulk of the congregation seems committed to an unchanging orthodoxy. A belief action that these is one, indivisible truth, that other people think doesn't really matter: it's as against them.

5. De and Then.

It's partly in the nature of a specialist conference that the in-group should be foregrounded. The trouble for us with some of the participants is that the out-group wasn't even somewhere in the background. At coffee one day I remarked that in the department at the University of Sydney there were students who had not even heard the name of prominent non-systemic theorist. Turning to my subject I went on: "One could be sitting around a table like this and no-one would even recognize the names: IS, GPS and LSP? There was a long, strained silence. Which had_fac-pas again.

OK, so perhaps some systemicians don't know much about non-systemic approaches but what they do know is that they're so good. Absolutely I want to know any - slipping (appropriately) within or out of the system. So I'm told (i.e., no non-systemically) I am only interested in make-up, decontextualized sentences. I point out that this is not so but people occasionally know. I'm told "they don't do anything that's applied". I know my cover by polishing to all these NTS with I've been dealing with me do as linguistics in Aboriginal Australia, China and New Guinea. "Well, they're exceptional!" So all six of them are exceptional! I could go on. It was a long battle.

From my outsider's perspective I can see one point of resistance between this "us" and "them" which has been unhealthy for all. Transformational generative grammar has been accused of being a closed shop in terms of access to crucial information (Hey 1975). Linguistics would write papers which would be lost on a people who were only available to the inner circle. Untransformationally systemics seems to be open from the same disease: it's just that the systemics seems to be the inner circle of the earth. Not even when I look at one of the world centres of systemics I find that access for the outsider is only available in someone's filling cabinet. Baldwin's unpublished The Meaning of Modern English is a good case in point but there are many other recent papers which I'm sure are not widely known outside the "charmed circle".

6. What's In It for me.

As a non-aligned functionalist I find plenty in systemics that is quite congenial especially when I'm looking at English. Such by Welinger (in appear) and Earle (e.g. 1975) has convinced me that systemics can be profitably applied to languages other than English. But there are limitations. One of the great strengths of systemics is the level of detail it can provide in internal analysis. But this is also a major drawback when one has basically got under the surface of a language. It is as though an anthropologist could never either a brush or a hammers to in dig. Then the site has been exposed the one gross an instrument and my actual doctor who is under investigation. If the start of the dig the brush is well studied in soil. Rather than the fine brush for the fine cut of a functionalist these are suitable tools for a little known language.

As a pragmatic materialist I find systemics immensely frustrating. Systemics are particularistic when it comes to proposing analytic categories and their possible interrelations; non-systemics tend to be fairly imprecise. Systemics are problematic in a fact.

As an ethnographer speaking of the systemics' interest in context some tersely. While it has prompted I believe a theory of context needs to be much more constrained that it is in present. Certainly in systemic discussions the use of the word "context" is apt to set my teeth on edge because it is too often used out as an explanation but instead of one. Neither me nor an object falls towards the centre of the earth depends on context as such, but
temperature at which water boils. But it is very little help to me unless I have a clear idea of what the context is and how it affects the phenomenon under consideration.

In short there's plenty in it for me. I just wish it was all a lot more explicit e.g. analytic categories and tests for their application; the literature; people debating with each other. There will be more in it for me when it is more readily applicable to languages other than English. Really this is just another plea for greater explicitness and I should point out that there is some recognition of this need from within the ranks of systemicists, Favcett (1980) being a good example.

7. Advice?

In conclusion I must say I enjoyed the conference and believe that systemic theory has much to offer. However there is an awful lot of groundwork to be done and none of this was pointed out at the workshop Favcett encouraged people to produce system networks with full sets of realisation statements while Hailiday emphasized the importance of the lexicogrammar. I would enjoin systemicists to debate (explicitly) differing approaches within systemics and linkages with theories outside. Blind faith is extremely unhealthy and the lack of engagement with most practising linguists is unrewarding for everyone. Advice is cheap but I would like you to be

more disputatious
more centripetal and
less autoaphaloscopic

and then we would be more at one.

Michael Daleh
Dept. of Linguistics
University of Sydney
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Notes

1. My thanks to Bill McGregor and Jim Martin for comments on an earlier draft.
2. Centripetal (literally 'seeking the centre') refers to my agreement with Hailiday that there is a tremendous need to focus on the lexicogrammar.
3. Autoaphaloscopic = inspecting one's own navel.
BOOK REVIEWS


Reviewed by James R. Martin

Schools of linguistics is a valuable survey of 20th century linguistic theory. Beginning with a discussion of 19th century historical linguistics, Sampson goes on to discuss the following "schools": Saussure, the Descriptivists (including American structural linguistics from Bloom to Harris), the Prague School, Noam Chomsky and Generative Linguistics, Functional Grammar (embracing Halliday and Sociolinguistics) and the Language School (covering Fischer, Hall, and systemic approaches). In addition Sampson includes a chapter on the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis which does not as one might at first have expected deal with American anthropological linguistics as a school. No survey of this kind could fail to be stimulating, but Sampson has produced a very readable and at times provocative book as well. It updates and treats at a more advanced level much of the material presented in Diens (1967) while avoiding the often obscure and needlessly technical account in Davis (1972). As such Schools of Linguistics should prove a useful addition to reading lists at the advanced undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

Linguists familiar with Sampson's linguistic views will not be surprised to find schools presented very much from a 'generalist' as opposed to a 'particularist' (to use Sampson's 1976:1 terms) perspective. That is, if we divide linguists into those with a philosophical/psychological world view (the phoneme to neuron or phoneme to reality group) and those with a conventional approach, if we consider as an example a book on phoneme to social reality group, then Sampson falls rather extremely into the former category. At the beginning of his The First of Linguists (1984) Sampson thanks Consult for "creating the subject" (p 29) on which he has written (v) and as far as Sampson is concerned the "Chomskian" (politically perhaps the more polemical) orientation is inevitable. Given this orientation it is somewhat ironic that one of two lasting impressions of School of Linguistics have to do with a very critical (I should perhaps say "Criticalists") stance adopted with respect to Chomskian orientation and the very friendly stance adopted with respect to the Prague School, whose ethnomethodological analysis is well known. Unfortunately this friendly stance does little to mitigate and function almost as an apology for the anti-ethnographic bias which leads Sampson to gloss over social and functional interpretations of language in several chapters.

In this review I will concentrate on contrasting Sampson's generalist stance, being rather less in sympathy with his approach to Chomskyan linguistics to argue against it. I will comment in detail only on the chapter dealing with the London School, leaving it to members of other schools to address exhaustively any injustices done to them.

In Chapter 1, 'Predates the nineteenth century,' Sampson reviews those developments in 19th century historical linguistics which set the stage for Sampson's synchronic revolution. The account is less chronological than that of Robinson (1979) and ignores the work of von Humboldt which had little impact in this period. Sampson focuses in particular on three areas: the development of the concept of sound laws out of work on formal correspondences within the historical-comparative paradigm; the conception among workers in the field of their research as science; and the search for a theory of language change, particularly along the lines of a Darwinian model. With the ascendancy of the neo-grammarians movement sound laws were conceived as optional rules.
governed processes, and historical linguistics as the science which studied them. But the neo-grammarians' insistence on language change originating in the individual and their focus on the data of language change led to an often caustic rejection of Theorizing about language change in general. It is Sampson’s thesis that it was this lack of a satisfactory theory of language change which made the 20th century ripe for Saussure.

In Chapter 2, ‘Saussure: language as social fact’, Sampson discusses naturally enough the legacy of Saussurian dualisms - synchronic and diachronic, systemic and paradigmatic, and langue and parole. For Sampson the key issue appears to be to what extent language can be characterized as a social as opposed to an individual fact. Saussure's concept of langue as an aspect of collective consciousness in Durkheim's sense stands of course in sharp contrast to a philosophical/psychological view of competence as something in people's heads and is thus something of a challenge to Sampson's generalist orientation.

Unfortunately Sampson’s focus on this issue is at the expense of an adequate discussion of Saussure’s concept of the sign, whose arbitrariness was for Saussure the underpinning of those dualisms noted above. Culler (1976), in a far more satisfying treatment, notes that for Saussure it was the arbitrariness of the sign which ensured that the neo-grammarians’ sound laws operate blindly. And it is this arbitrariness which leads Saussure to treat language as a form not substance; and if as form, then as a set of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, interlocking and constituting a single stratum de langue. Sampson’s slight treatment of the sign would be harmless enough if Saussure’s own formulation of the concept could be simply taken for granted in 20th century linguistics. But there is every reason to believe that it cannot. For Saussure both significant and signifié were arbitrary - the sign orders both a conceptual and an acoustic morass. Modern linguistics has always been comfortable with the idea of an arbitrary signifiant, but the idea of an equally arbitrary signifié has never been widely accepted. Indeed, Sampson seems not really to appreciate Saussure’s position on the arbitrariness of the signifié, attributing to Putnam a long argument having to do with just this fact. Almost incredibly, in the middle of this argument, Sampson points out that ‘part of the concept of “beech” is “not elm” and vice versa’ (552; my italics) without even mentioning Saussure’s discussion of value, content, and signification. All this has the effect of completely undercutting Saussure’s interpretation of language as a semiotic system, and for Saussure’s contribution to structuralism outside linguistics readers will have to look elsewhere.

In Chapter 3, ‘The Descriptivists’, Sampson turns to Bloomfieldian linguistics. Boas is introduced as the father of American structuralism, and his version of linguistic relativity (looking at language as history and its own terms) is briefly reviewed. Sampson then turns to the question of Bloomfieldians’ attitude to behaviourism and discovery procedures. Sampson, like Culler, criticizes the Bloomfieldians at length for failing to develop a theory of language because of a. the attention given to discovery procedures, and b. their exaggerated stance with respect to linguistics - namely that languages vary without limit and unpredictably (a position which is in fact attributed by Jones, 1957/96 to Russian linguists; I know of no references to any American linguist actually arguing for this position). In this Sampson accepts and further refines the straw Bloomfieldian man set up by Chomskyans to promote their revolution.

I would like to make two criticisms of Sampson’s interpretation. First, it is important as Gleason (1975) points out to distinguish between behaviorism and theory, where behaviorism refers to a set of analytical techniques and theory to an interpretation of the results of these. How Bloomfieldians avoided the term ‘theory’; but it would be wrong to characterize their interest in discovery procedures as a simple interest in heuristics. As Gleason suggests, the Bloomfieldians’ term for heuristics was ‘short cuts’, and for them theory was in fact the discussion of discovery procedures. To my mind though, their concern with lingual and logical about work is a concern with discovery procedures. Indeed Chomsky’s (1957) abandonment of the search for their formalization was not at all a shift from an interest in heuristics to one in theory, but a shift in which he thought linguistic theory should be about. In fact, Chomsky admits openly that the goals he sets for linguistic theory are weaker than those pursued by the Bloomfieldians (for Chomsky theory chooses between descriptions, it does not generate them). I see no reason why the corpus cannot be interpreted as a rich and exciting theoretical interest, one that might eventually explain why children learn a language, why people ‘parrot’ a sentence in conversation (no matter how often a generativist claims neutrality in his use of the term ‘generative’), his productive bias is clear). Sampson’s dismissal of Bloomfieldians as atheoretical is surely misguided.

Second, and more seriously, Chapter 3 has nothing whatsoever to say about anthropological linguistics after Boas. Sapir’s name does not even appear, and there is no reference to the contributions made by him and his students to American structuralism. What seems to be going on here is that Sapir and his followers have been discredited in modern linguistics because of their ethno-geographic concerns (in this Chomskyans simply follow in the neo-Bloomfieldians’ footsteps; note the insulatingly patronizing note by Jones after Sampson’s work which has never been widely accepted). Indeed, Sampson seems never to appreciate Sapir’s position on the arbitrariness of the signifié, attributing to Putman a long argument having to do with just this fact. Almost incredibly, in the middle of this argument, Sampson points out that ‘part of the concept of “beech” is “not elm” and vice versa’ (552; my italics) without even mentioning Saussure’s discussion of value, content, and signification. All this has the effect of completely undercutting Saussure’s interpretation of language as a semiotic system, and for Saussure’s contribution to structuralism outside linguistics readers will have to look elsewhere.

In Chapter 3, ‘The Descriptivists’, Sampson turns to Bloomfieldian linguistics. Boas is introduced as the father of American structuralism, and his version of linguistic relativity (looking at language as history and its own terms) is briefly reviewed. Sampson then turns to the question of Bloomfieldians’ attitude to behaviourism and discovery procedures. Sampson, like Culler, criticizes the Bloomfieldians at length for failing to develop a theory of language because of a. the attention given to discovery procedures, and b. their exaggerated stance with respect to linguistics - namely that languages vary without limit and unpredictably (a position which is in fact attributed by Jones, 1957/96 to Russian linguists; I know of no references to any American linguist actually arguing for this position). In this Sampson accepts and further refines the straw Bloomfieldian man set up by Chomskyans to promote their revolution.

I would like to make two criticisms of Sampson’s interpretation. First, it is important as Gleason (1975) points out to distinguish between behaviorism and theory, where behaviorism refers to a set of analytical techniques and theory to an interpretation of the results of these. How Bloomfieldians avoided the term ‘theory’; but it would be wrong to characterize their interest in discovery procedures as a simple interest in heuristics. As Gleason suggests, the Bloomfieldians’ term for heuristics was ‘short cuts’, and for them theory was in fact the discussion of discovery procedures. To my mind though, their concern with lingual and logical about work is a concern with discovery procedures. Indeed Chomsky’s (1957) abandonment of the search for their formalization was not at all a shift from an interest in heuristics to one in theory, but a shift in which he thought linguistic theory should be about. In fact, Chomsky admits openly that the goals he sets for linguistic theory are weaker than those pursued by the Bloomfieldians (for Chomsky theory chooses between descriptions, it does not generate them). I see no reason why the corpus cannot be interpreted as a rich and exciting theoretical interest, one that might eventually explain why children learn a language, why people ‘parrot’ a sentence in conversation (no matter how often a generativist claims neutrality in his use of the term ‘generative’), his productive bias is clear). Sampson’s dismissal of Bloomfieldians as atheoretical is surely misguided.

Second, and more seriously, Chapter 3 has nothing whatsoever to say about anthropological linguistics after Boas. Sapir’s name does not even appear, and there is no reference to the contributions made by him and his students to American structuralism. What seems to be going on here is that Sapir and his followers have been discredited in modern linguistics because of their ethno-geographic concerns (in this Chomskyans simply follow in the neo-Bloomfieldians’ footsteps; note the insulatingly patronizing note by Jones after Sampson’s work which has never been widely accepted). Indeed, Sampson seems never to appreciate Sapir’s position on the arbitrariness of the signifié, attributing to Putman a long argument having to do with just this fact. Almost incredibly, in the middle of this argument, Sampson points out that ‘part of the concept of “beech” is “not elm” and vice versa’ (552; my italics) without even mentioning Saussure’s discussion of value, content, and signification. All this has the effect of completely undercutting Saussure’s interpretation of language as a semiotic system, and for Saussure’s contribution to structuralism outside linguistics readers will have to look elsewhere.

In Chapter 3, ‘The Descriptivists’, Sampson turns to Bloomfieldian linguistics. Boas is introduced as the father of American structuralism, and his version of linguistic relativity (looking at language as history and its own terms) is briefly reviewed. Sampson then turns to the question of Bloomfieldians’ attitude to behaviourism and discovery procedures. Sampson, like Culler, criticizes the Bloomfieldians at length for failing to develop a theory of language because of a. the attention given to discovery procedures, and b. their exaggerated stance with respect to linguistics - namely that languages vary without limit and unpredictably (a position which is in fact attributed by Jones, 1957/96 to Russian linguists; I know of no references to any American linguist actually arguing for this position). In this Sampson accepts and further refines the straw Bloomfieldian man set up by Chomskyans to promote their revolution.
Imagine, philosophical issues aside, the shape of Chomsky's grammar had it derived from tautomic rather than mainstream non-eliminative descriptions. I will return to Sapir's treatment of this (or rather the lack of a treatment) of continuity in American linguistics in considering Chapter 5.

In Chapter 4, 'The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis', Sapir enunciates the interrelatedness of language, thought, and reality. The relation between language and thought has been a particularly vexing one for modern linguistics. Several prominent 20th century linguists, whether basing their argument on the abstractions of the Sapir-Whorf or on the ideas of Buhler or Rhetorical, hold that linguistic relations exist in the mind. Thus, as in the case of Saussure, a Sapir-Whorfian is one who rejects this idea. The claim that language determines or is thought and conditioned or is our perception of reality is not the only way of adjusting functional/Bourgeois perspectives: 'it is possible to make John as these rather than those in his mind.' "(cg. Sapir)

Third there was the function of the concept: Sapir mentions Bühler's classification of speech functions, and then refers to the Prague School's concern with styles and registers. Sapir notes that a concern with stylistics is outside the scope of his book, but some discussion of the concept of foregrounding as developed by Boursu and others would have been useful since it is a concept which enables explicit linguistic manifestations of verbal art, which connection distinguishes the linguistic approach to literature from that of other disciplines. After a discussion of his own use, Sapir ends in Chapter 5, a rather curious note, discussing labor's work on language and social context. There is something distinctly close to his particular allocation of linguistics to society, but it is not so clear explained by the fact that in spite of having discussed sociolinguistics as an individual and outside 'core' linguistics as defined from the generalist perspective (SO) Sapir cannot avoid incorporating some conceptions in his book the irrefutable methodological and descriptive contributions of the variables.

In Chapter 5, 'Functional Linguistics: the Prague School', it is perhaps the most satisfying in the book. It provides a clear and sympathetic account of the school's functional orientation to language. For the Prague School, a functional orientation to language manifested itself in three ways: first, all there was a concern with paradigmatic relations - the function of a linguistic unit within the system. This characterized both Trubetzkoy's work on phonology and H. J. Martin's functional interpretation of language change. Second, there is the question of the function of linguistic items in a text. The school's work on functional sentence perspective is crucial here. Sapir notes H. J. Martin's introduction of the concept of Thema and Xena which formulated this functional perspective in their work on syntax. Nathanson, in his use of the terms, is unfortunately responsible for the confusion of Thema and Theme with given and how much later work and it would have been helpful if Sapir had cleared up this problem with reference to Nathanson instead of mentioning it on page 105, writing that passive is not the only way of adjusting functional sentences perspectives: 'it is possible to make John as these rather than those in his mind.' (cg. Sapir)

Third there was the function of the concept: Sapir mentions Bühler's classification of speech functions, and then refers to the Prague School's concern with styles and registers. Sapir notes that a concern with stylistics is outside the scope of his book, but some discussion of the concept of foregrounding as developed by Boursu and others would have been useful since it is a concept which enables explicit linguistic manifestations of verbal art, which connection distinguishes the linguistic approach to literature from that of other disciplines. After a discussion of his own use, Sapir ends in Chapter 5, a rather curious note, discussing labor's work on language and social context. There is something distinctly close to his particular allocation of linguistics to society, but it is not so clear explained by the fact that in spite of having discussed sociolinguistics as an individual and outside 'core' linguistics as defined from the generalist perspective (SO) Sapir cannot avoid incorporating some conceptions in his book the irrefutable methodological and descriptive contributions of the variables.

In Chapter 6, 'Sapir's gestalt and generative grammar', Sapir turns to the work of Stump, with respect to SO grammar (Generative Phonology is considered in Chapter 8). Sapir briefly introduces readers to Chomsky's formalization of a non-grammatical conception of sound laws and how work, on Sapir's description of gestalt and generative, on Sapir's notion of Gestalt. A word on Sapir's use of the term 'gestalt'. On Chomsky's idealized speaker, on the split of gestalt linguistics should be analyzing, and an on. As such work of labor and his colleagues usually provides the clearest possible vindication of an descriptive/ethnographic perspective in linguistic theory. That Sapir locates his discussion of the work of labor, the author, and colleagues to four pages in this chapter is one of the more seriuos failings of the book (the other being Sapir's treatment of E. E. Wieder which will be discussed below).

Sapir himself seems uncomfortable with the philosophical/psychological interpretation of sociolinguistics as the study of the correlation between language and society rather than the actual determination and explanation of one by the other. Hopefully variation theory will receive recognition with the chapter 11 deserves in future editions of the book.
universals can be seen in this light as a legitimation of certain Bloomfieldian heuristics (e.g., short cuts having to do with tendencies in language and the use of intuition in analysis; cf. Gleason, 1975). But in Saapson's view the advancement of intuitions and periods to the status of theory is premature and has been lethal. He argues for a return to the empiricist methodology of the Bloomfieldian period and a rearticulation within linguistics to the description of languages on their own terms so that a viable theory of universals can eventually be constructed. It is hard not to be sympathetic with this position.

One of the refreshing aspects of this chapter in the attention Saapson gives to socio-political aspects of the competition between the different schools. Such is the force of personality in academia, and the importance of being in the right place at the right time, that real progress is made only over the centuries (or even millennia as in the case of Chomsky's palaeoics and the eclipsing stance adopted by his and his followers to those even linguists whom they used to regard as ignorant of the latest research). But people do changes in the interest either of scholarly or productive debate. Although he does not criticize the Chumsky school's concern with generativity (especially in Chapter 8) Saapson himself does little to bring out the continuity between Chomsky and neo-Bloomfieldian linguistics. Differences between schools have been emphasized at the expense of historical relationships. Chomsky's concerns could only be the (almost rebellious) child of neo-Bloomfieldian. To take just two examples, Chomsky's argument for the necessity of a transformational grammar on his implicit assumption that the only kind of syntactic analysis which can be formalized in a generative system. The same can be said of Chomsky's palaeoics. Similarly the Bloomfieldians' preoccupation with the problem of just how phoneme could be described as consisting of a number of the ideas given by generative phonology to a phonological hierarchy, syllable structure, and prosody in general.

Saapson puts it; and in the long run I think Saapson will be more embraced by this page and a half than by any other portion of School of Linguistics. A review is no place to do justice to Saapson's ideas. Readers interested in his work will find in Halliday's systemic/functional grammar a far more Bloomfieldian theory than that articulated by Saapson, incorporating Saapson's formulation of system manifested in process, with system interpreted paradigmmatically and process syntagmatically, and language treated as the expression plane of higher order semantics. Unfortunately Saapson does not understand the point of either linguist well enough to note the connections. Readers interested in Saapson's development of Saapson's thinking are best referred to the Pioneers of Saapson's reinterpretation of Saapson especially as systems with a limited number of bases and research paradigms relations in a crucial contribution. As well, his formulation of the concept of double articulation (for which Kaphnis is known) is in a clear theoretical interpretation of Saapson's discussion of the sign - Saapson providing a clear theoretical interpretation of sequencing in language at a time when Bloomfieldian morphophonemics was utilized semantically with the relations between morphemes and their meaning. This work is fundamental in any understanding of the relationship between language and cultural systems. Saapson's contribution to this end could well be recognized as the position he has taken. In the meantime one can only apologize on behalf of the contemporary linguistic ideology which underlies Saapson's reaction.

The cost of the chapter is more than reasonable. Saapson notes not clearly the advantages and disadvantages of stratificational linguistics as he sees them. On one side he notes: 1. the relative simplicity of relational network notation in terms of the number of symbols used; 2. the practicality of measuring the overall simplicity of a grammar using this notation (simplification in one part of a 70 grammar generally leads to a complication in another); 3. the recognition of stress with distinct inventory and a horizon permitting a clear statement of the differences between phonological, morphological, grammatical, and semantical patterns; 4. the neutrality of relational network notation with respect to speaking or listening (as works in Artificial Intelligence have discovered one main problem with 70 grammars is that you cannot run them backwards); 5. Saapson's (1969) projection of the ungrammaticality of centre embedding (which can be blocked only in an ad hoc way in 70 grammar and must therefore be ignored as a performance feature). Saapson has no major reservations about relational network grammar. The first has to do with his feeling that it cannot be used to generate structures such as relative clauses involving what he terms structure dependency. I do not think that Saapson's doubts are at last well founded here. Saapson's major reservations about relational network grammar are in his better position to do this than many 70 grammatists in that its semantics includes information about the identity of participants in a given text, providing the necessary conditioning information for the rule. Saapson's second reservation has to do with the fact that relational network notation can be used to describe semantic systems other than language and thus runs the danger of not showing how language differs from other human activities. Saapson is surely being inconsistent here. In the
proceeding chapter he criticized the incorporation of universals into TG notation on the grounds that it was premature and foreclosed potentially significant observations. Any notation system which can be used only to describe language runs a similar danger in showing language to be more different from other semantic codes than it actually is. For an illuminating discussion of language in relation to other sign systems see Rieman (1961, section 3).

Two final comments before turning to Chapter 8. First: Sampson could have made more of the contrasts between stratificational and Bloomfieldian linguistics. It does seem that stratificational grammar constitutes a coherent and mutually consistent alternative linguistics in contrast to the Tree-Process formalization of TG grammar (Rochele’s 1954) third model, that of hard-and-fast in a logically formulated generatively in systemic linguistics although Sampson does not note this in Chapter 3. But Rochele’s crystal 1962 paper which outlines the stratificational solution to the problem of Bloomfieldian morphophonemics is not mentioned. More discussion of continuity of this and other kinds would have been helpful especially since the design of the chapter makes it seem as if stratificational grammar derives principally from Halleian work in fact it is a fundamentally part Bloomfieldian theory. Second: Sampson regretfully makes no reference at all to the chapter on the work of the Hartford stratificationalists on discourse. Unlike Saish whose focus has been principally on phonology and morphology, Geeslin and his students approached the question of stratification from the point of view of the relation between discourse and grammar (see Geeslin, 1968; Geeslin, 1976). Their work on the discourse structure of texts in various non-Indo-European languages led to a stratified model of language in which the tone was the basic semantic unit, represented in a notation including information about participants identification and conjunction. Sampson presumably views stratificational as outside linguistics proper and as ignoring their work on triple articulation here. Such a position is tenable even for a phonologist, given a language like Thai whose narrative texts are described by Geeslin (1968) as consisting of a single clause complex with percentage morphemes realizing reference and conjunction between such clauses. On the other, morphological work could have been given to how stratificational linguists argue for the necessity of strata. Linguists seem generally to agree that languages consist of sounds, words, and perhaps meanings as well. But they do not agree on where the boundary between strata falls. Indeed, Chomskyan linguistics has by virtue of the power of its mutual rules completely obscured the boundary between syntax and semantics (it would not be too far fetched to argue that in its twilight years generative semantics obliterated the boundary between language and the world; cf. November, 1960, chapters 7 and 8).

In Chapter 8, ‘Generative Phonology,’ Sampson discusses the Chomskyan approach to phonology. Sampson’s feeling is that other than the personalities involved, all that generative phonology has in common with TG Grammar is an interest in universals. While it is quite true as Sampson points out that one thing generative phonology does not do is generate all and only the well formed sequences of phonemes in a language (their Bloomfieldian preoccupation with the relation between morphemes and phonemes distracts them from this), I would have thought that the main thing that TG Grammar and Generative Phonology share is a generative formalism involving unrestricted rewrite rules with the power to reorder, delete, and to generally mutate in any way a string of symbols. Much more of their other flaws from the power of these rules than Sampson seems willing to admit.

Sampson begins with a brief introduction to the concept of distinctive features, deriving from Jakobson, and introduced to generative phonology by Halle. I have always found puzzling the argument that once distinctive features are introduced, the phoneme is no more than a handy abbreviation for use in transcription. Halle’s distinction of system and process is an illuminating description of language in relation to other sign systems see Rieman (1961). Sampson expresses two reservations about process analysis. First there is the problem of abstraction. Sampson sees a danger in setting up processes which
realization is not a ‘natural’ class, which danger is enhanced by Firthian practice of being rather implicit about the phonetic realization of some of their premises. In this respect generative analysis is more Jakobsonian than Bloomfieldian phonemics. Interested in phonology as an abstract formal system rather than as a principle for reducing languages to writing. However both Firth’s ‘revelation of connection’ and Halliday’s principle of ‘appropriateness’ were designed as constraints on abstraction, which constrains lexicography of all schools have been very close to formalize. Sampson’s second reservation has to do with Firth’s claim that it is part of the meaning of an American to sound like one. This makes sense or no sense depending on how one defines meaning and for Firth the purpose of linguistics was to make statements of meaning, which describe the way in which people use language to live. Defined in this way, labor’s work on the social significance of phonological variation would seem to vindicate Firth.

Sampson’s treatment of Firth’s description of meaning as function in context is more problematic. Not only does Sampson fail to give an accurate presentation of Firth’s views, but he presents them in terms which make it highly unlikely that anyone will be able to argue against. The first of these involves Sampson’s tacit acceptance of a number of dualisms (e.g., meaning vs. reference) that Firth explicitly rejected: word and idea, language and thought, expression and content (note Sampson’s distinction ‘between what one says and what one means’). In other words Sampson accepts the idea that sentences and the like have meanings for Firth sense meant but they do not have content. The second involves Sampson’s implicit acceptance of the basic meaning of a sentence as a truth-functional relation between that sentence and some possible world (note his reference to the ‘propositional meaning’ that a logician would see in a sentence). Thus it follows that even though Firth’s dualism is meaningful because one cannot imagine a world in which it would be true; for Firth one essential part of a linguistic analysis of meaning involves a description of the implication of utterances a sentences cannot be meaningful. In Halliday’s terms, meaning can only be discussed with reference to context (or text). In Halliday’s context: meaning as such is not meaningful. Firth’s approach to meaning is certainly ‘higher’ as Sampson puts it if one accepts the duality of content and expression and if one is in analysis meaning referentially as the relation between this content and some world. But seen in its own terms Firth’s approach is perfectly coherent.

Even setting aside these deeper issues for a moment, Sampson’s description of Firth’s approach to meaning is a complete misrepresentation. Firth makes it absolutely clear on several occasions that the central purpose of his theory was to break meaning up into a series of component functions. These component functions include: context of situation, collocation, syntagm (including collocation), and phonology. In spite of this Sampson (226) describes Firth’s approach as an approach which let Firth ‘to negativ the meaning of a word with the range of verbal context in which is uttered’ (Sampson’s italics but it would have been nice if he had used it). And context of situation is taken at implying that meaning is to be interpreted an acceptability or appropriateness (176, my italics). Firth’s intent Epiphany of light through a specific metaphor is obviously lost on Sampson. Readers interested in a more sensitive introduction to Firth’s treatment of semantics are referred to Kangham (1979). The best example of a Firthian approach to collocation, which Sampson does not discuss, is Allen (1956). Mitchell (1979) illustrates Firth’s contextual approach applied to a buying and selling situation type.

Having dismissed Firth’s approach to meaning Sampson skips over the work of non-Firthian linguists on style and category grammar, collocation, and register and goes on to focus on systemic linguistics. Sampson looks only at systemic grammar (ignoring the work of systemicists on phonology (especially intonation), discourse, register, code, language development, stylistics, and applied linguistics (including both mother tongue and second language teaching) most of which is presumably defined by Sampson as outside core linguistics. This would perhaps be forgivable were it not for the fact that in the Firthian view of many systemicists languages, even grammar itself, cannot be properly described without taking these functions into account (Sampson makes an attempt to discuss the functional orientation of the school which has extended much of the thinking of the Prague School). For something of the true descriptive/ethnographic flavour of systemic research see Halliday (1975), Halliday and Hasan (1976), Halliday (1978) and Halliday and Martin (1961).

Sampson’s presentation of the paradigmatic orientation of a systemic grammar from which its name derives is fairly clear. Very little attention is given to the question of how systems are realised—how languages is manifested as text in Halliday’s terms. Halliday has been notoriously linguist about this it is true, but Baskin (1971) provides a clear exposition of how systems generate grammatical structures. This lack of attention to realization (in both Halliday’s work and Sampson’s account) makes the theory seem more exotic and inaccessible than necessary. Most linguists find it difficult even to think of language in terms of system rather than structures—more than one systematic has to their chagrin found linguists reacting to their networks as tree diagrams at a funny angle. Sampson’s lack of attention to Halliday’s functional analysis of English clauses and groups also has the disadvantage of failing to publicly embrace linguists like Bloch Bähr whose Functional Grammar (1978) acknowledges none of the work in systemic linguistics which he has presumably redefined for himself.

Sampson’s criticism of systemic grammar raised a number of interesting points, many of which are highly debatable. One would be that latent core linguistics which have been held equally in Britain since 1974. Sampson first raised the question about whether core linguistics (in its present form) is normally proposed for latent grammar (in his dialectal terms, whether skeleton and system are isomorphic). This problem as an straight-forward empirical question having to do with whether or not system networks and realisation rules have enough generative power to simply state everything there is to say in closed systems outside phonology. As much it is a rather global issue, not one which can be settled on a basis of one or two examples such as those Sampson proposes. Still less progress can be made if accepting the dualism of content and expression one accepts one’s definition of context. In such a way that the distinction between finite and non-finite clauses in English is said to have no particular meaning (one wonders how many hundreds of years it will be before Firth’s rejection of these dualisms and Saussure and Halliday’s discussion of the arbitrariness of the sign have an impact on linguistics). Halliday and Fawcett (1975) will include a number of papers referring to the issue of stratification.

Sampson then goes on to criticize the concepts of rank and delivery as used by Halliday in particular. I was surprised by Sampson’s outright rejection of the concept of rank given his interest in constituency as the basic defining property of human language (1975, 1978, 1980). Any grammar incorporating a concept of rank makes stronger claims about constituency in language than an it based one and would thus seem more appealing to a generalist. By feeling is that Sampson’s problem here has to do with a proscription with systematic
patterns in discussing constituency. The concept of rank embodies an empirical claim about the way in which systems cluster paradigmatically in terms of their dependence on or independence of each other. How many ranks a language has, and the number of ranks at which a given unit enters into systematic oppositions, is a descriptive question. For example, Chinese, like other including languages, has a single rank, the syllable. A phonological syllable in a language does not distinguish syllable and foot. The strongest universal claim that can be made is that all languages have two ranks on each system. Turning to the question of the number of ranks at which a given unit must be described, the problem of total accountability as it is pondered in systemic linguistics, once again this is a purely descriptive question. An innovation like hyphen clearly must be described at clause, group, and word ranks if the semantically significant oppositions it realizes are to be described; a combination such as language on the other hand can be generated directly from clause to complex system. It does not enter into oppositions at other ranks. Again languages differ in the number of ranks a comparable unit is relevant to. In English, for example, an argument can be advanced for the recognition of such realities while in metalinguistic agglutinating languages like Tagalog, clause and word systems are adequate to generate the comparable unit. I have every confidence that when linguists who have based their description of syntax on IC analysis turn their attention to the paradigmatics of grammar, if ever they do, they will boldly pronounce the concept of rank as a powerful new constraint on PS grammars. (We can be equally confident that no reference will be made to tagalog or systemic linguistics, such is the state of scholarship in our times, as Sampson quite rightly suggests.)

Halliday's concept of delinquency is less easy to defend, especially in the extreme potential formulation whereby he characterizes a grammar as an infinite system generating finite texts. But on a weaker reading, Halliday provides a valuable challenge to the traditional brick and mortar view of grammar and texts in western linguistics. This view depends on a strong symmetrical orientation and view syntax as the glue which binds words together to sentences. It is this view which underlies both transformational (generate the structures, then add in the words) and lexicalist (start with the words and add on the structures) approaches to grammatical description. The alternative systemic one is that lexis is most delicate gramer - that the difference between words and structures is one of general vs. specific semantically significant opposition. Interrogated paradigmatically this means that an system networks process from left to right in delinquency their features come increasingly to be realized through lexical items rather than structural configurations. Raman's paper in the Halliday and Forrester (1987) collection exemplifies this principle. It is worth noting in passing that such a formulation does not exhaust the lexis-grammatical description of lexis for Halliday, who creates first's concept of realization, thus treating the acceptability of a strong cup of tea and the unacceptable of a powerful cup (cf. Sampson, 1987). Is this a lexi-grammatical fact. Note as well that in this view the concept of open and closed class items is replaced by that of those entering into collocational patterns in text and those lacking this mutual expectancy.

Sampson's major reservation about systemic linguistics has to do with the role that intuition appears to play in systemic analysis (198). I find the objection an odd one in that it confuses heuristics and theory. No linguistic theory that I know of has succeeded in incorporating the whole of heuristics into theory - this is, succeeded in formulating a set of discovery procedures which will generate grammars out of data (Chomsky has not helped us towards this goal by flatly denying that this is possible). All linguists make use of intuition in constructing their analysis. The crucial question is meant to be not whether intuition is used but whether intuitions count as data. In TG grammar they do. In systemic linguistics they do not. Systematic, like Firthians before them, have more than any other school (except perhaps some recently labor and his colleagues) realized that it is versatile in their social context which constitutes the data for which they must account. Firth's concept of 'routine of connection', the neo-Firthians' 'expostion', and systematic's 'realisation' are all explicitly oriented to ensuring that Firthian descriptions account for language in use. If systematicists have at times also to make explicit the expression of their descriptions it is because their goals are so much broader than those of other schools. If they have been reluctant to use simplicity as a criterion for deciding between descriptions it is because they are not interested in providing descriptions of small arbitrary pieces of language - there is no point in ranking all grammatical simplicity above simplification in the short term may lead to complexity overall. Of course these tendencies have been led PK in an age when it is better to be explicit and trivial than implicit and comprehensible. But hopefully in the long term the political price will have been worthwhile.

Before concluding I would like to make two political comments. The first is rather fanciful, but will serve I hope to underline the possibility that the systemic approach is subject to an inherent philosophical/psychological bias from the start. Namely that systemic linguistics was written, imagine that in a couple of generations the descriptive/interpretive tradition of linguistics altogether will fall to corrupt political discipline. (This will be necessary if linguists are to survive in their present numbers. One wonders how long the Tobacco, B FOOT, and Powers of our world will fund a discipline whose leaders publicly assert that linguistics is useless. Sampson himself regards applied linguistics as a group of charlatans (11) who have duped governments into wasting tax-payers' money by supporting them.) Imagine the contents of a book about 20th century linguistics written in that period:

Chapter 1: Systemic language as social fact
  1. Noon, language as social fact
  3. Noon, the Prague school: functional linguistics
  4. Noon, language in relation to a unified theory of human behavior
  5. Noon, the study of language in social context
  6. Halliday, language as a social semiotic
  7. Noon, sociolinguistics: social and language contexts
  8. Noon, linguistics: contexts of language and culture
  9. Noon, Artificial intelligence: teaching computers to talk
  11. Noon, Stylistics: foregrounding and correcting semantics

Blessed? Perhaps. But not so much as Schools of linguistics. In the introduction to his book Language Sapir, pointing out, and commenting on generalités as opposed to particular facts, suggests that a principle for the conduct of intellectual affairs that a 200 flyaway scholars, 300 schools of thought contend (1975/11). Such is the force of ideology in linguistics that the works compounding our ethnographer's imaginary history either win or die at Sampson's hand.

My second comment is unfortunately not fanciful and has to do with two examples of what I consider the essential political irresponsibility of philosophico/psychological linguistics. In 1979 Sampson published a book,
Liberty and Language, in which the basis of his interpretation of linguistic semantics is argued for a form of ultra-Thatcherian liberalism which he refers to as libertarian thin-lining so be advocated among other things the abolition of public education at all levels, primary, secondary, and tertiary; an end to corporal punishment of children, and the deregulation of all trade unions; and so on. A year later Chomsky allowed a piece of his writing on civil liberties to be published on the internet by an online discussion group, values which claim that Hitler's racial holocaust never in fact took place. It strikes me as a sad comment on philosophical-psychological linguistics that a. it is compatible with political views as different as those of Sapir and Chomsky; and b. it poisonously encourages the publication of the document noted above. Chomsky adamantly refuses to apologize (1981) for succumbing to the pressures of this group.

It should be obvious from the above that School of Linguistics is an extremely stimulating book to say the least. Despite of its scope it is not an easy book to review; but it must have been all the more difficult to write and so is to be congratulated to Sampson for a well written and perfectly fair assessment of our discipline. I don’t think that many linguists will like the book.

Sampson’s approach is far different. (I should perhaps say ‘far different’ for all that. Generalists are likely to be dismayed by the irrelevance of Sampson’s discussion of Chomskyan linguistics. Particularists are likely to feel that far too little attention has been paid to the problem of language and social class. Somewhere I read somewhere that one will be bored and that we will all have learned something from the book about why we think the things we do (without ever at times knowing that we think them).
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The blurb claims that this is "the only work of its kind, containing over 400 entries, an easy-to-use alphabetical arrangement, drawn from a range of related disciplines, likely to be of value to any student or teacher of English." I would say the claims are justified. Written, Dr. Wales says, "as much for their own benefit as anyone else," it is bound to be useful for anyone who is becoming, as she says she was, "increasingly overwhelmed by the proliferation of terms that has characteristically accompanied the development of stylistics and other disciplines relevant to textual analysis since the 1960s and is becoming increasingly frustrated by the semantic problems in the terminology that have resulted." The main problem with the book as it stands, though, is the price: it is currently £4.48 in hardback in the U.K., and most of us will probably want to wait for the paperback edition, praised for some time in 1990, but we will undoubtedly get it then, and - if the price is right for them - specify it for students.

The entries are, as claimed, informative, clear (by and large), and well informed. In a book which draws on a careful bibliography of what must be more than 400 texts, one could not expect the articles to maintain exactly the same balance between fullness and economy as one might personally prefer, so that we may have to accept that on a major entry such as that on "register" there is no room for mention of the distinction made first, I think, by Michael Gregory and subsequently by the Marxist between "heart," "functional form" and "personal form." Since these are all distinguished from each other in the entry on "Tones" though we might desire at the absence of the crucial distinction between the definition of the regular as a semantic matter and its recognition in specific texts; LEXICO-GRAMMATICAL, the lack of which distinction relates some work in the 1970s and can still cause problems.

(Data might offer a slight variation on the mental source for the term "regular" itself, since the same is probably drawn metaphorically from the notion of vowel and instrumental registers, in the particular pitch ranges which a voice or an instrument can encompass. In practice the use of the term in such work in stylistics is much closer, whether consciously or not, to its use (and the use of its cognate, "registration") by organists, not to describe the one-dimensional quality of pitch but to describe the particular combination of steps required for a passage of music, in the acoustic coloring to be used: dissonance, flute, or whatever - alone or in combination or contrast. This multi-dimensional concept matches much more closely the semantic coloring of a text, derived from its particular contextual configuration, which is at the heart of the idea of register, I think it was T. B. W. Rand who used the term first, in *Linguistics, Sociolinguistic and Philosophy* (London: Longman, 1974), pp. 20 ff., which doesn't appear in the bibliography but I have no idea whether he thought in these terms or not. I offer the suggestion not as an account of the origin of the term but as a gloss on it.)

On the other hand, if you can quibble over a particular entry, you can't help being grateful that you are so obtrusive that you are fonder with all the exceptions she draws upon for the work she has done in bringing together information and insights from the one that is too fast familiar. The comprehensive bibliography already mentioned has been strenuously used, and there are specific references to it on most pages. One or always finds gain in a bibliography, but to incorporate the use considerably be described as comprehensive. The most recent lists in it (I've spotted was dated 1988!) In addition, cross-references to other entries in the main text are indicated by the use of italic small capitals and bold face, in the usual way, nothing when the omissions aid a term one wants a good deal of time very nicely lacking up all the comments - which is one of the chief pleasures of using a dictionary. Since this review is being transmitted to the editors by Electronic Mail, and as terminal and not have the facilities to indicate these variations in type-face very clearly, I cannot render a typical entry absolutely faithfully, the editors will do their best to reproduce the
but it is worthwhile giving the flavour of one or two which are likely to be of interest to readers of NETWORK, their strengths and weaknesses being plainly apparent.

de-autonomization, also de-familiarization.

Terms used by the RUSSIAN FORMALISTS and PRAGUE SCHOOL linguists in their discussion of LITERARY, especially PROSE, and non-literary, language, and in particular, of the AUTOMATIZING tendencies of everyday communication and its consequent over-familiarity.

(i) Poetry by contrast de-autonomizes; it ACTUALIZES or FOREGROUNDS (e.g. avatars) consistently and makes the reader aware of the linguistic medium, by what the Formalists called devices, e.g. METAPHOR, unusual patterns of SYNTAX, or REPETITION (see Trakhtenbrot 1962).

(ii) Literary language not only highlights or foregrounds, but also ALIENATES or STRANGLES instrumentally. Readers must look afar at what has become familiarized (see Shklovsky 1917). So Blacher’s “Elfeg” in his IMAGERY and RHETORICAL QUESTIONS forces on the reader a radical and dynamic re-conceptualization of the animal. And Joyce’s poetry generally, in language and subject, makes us feel the essence of things (compare an apt illustration of Shklovsky’s own description of the function of literature, namely that it should reveal the “Vanishing” of a theme).

However, as these same critics acknowledge, what is novel or strange can itself become automated, familiar, literary language through the age reveals successive tendencies to conventionalization.

One can acknowledge that there are grounds for leaving out a cross-reference to what would have to be a fairly lengthy amount of “history” (there is in fact no entry for its full extent at all) while we do in a sense “learn” what the term “de-autonomization” and “de-familiarization” mean from this, without more detailed exemplification like the terms do seem to reach rather shallowly at this stand — I would like to know how we tell the difference between an automated and an un-automatized utterance, or between an actualized and an un-actualized one, for example — though to give the definitions more substance in this way would have required a very different book — in fact, books.

Here is the next example, currently of particular interest to systematists.

theme; thematicization, etc.

In LITERARY CRITICISM theme is the ‘point’ of a literary work, its central idea, which we infer from our INTERPRETATION of the PLOT, IMAGERY and SYNOPTISM, etc.

(i) In LINGUISTICS theme is one of a pair of terms (see also RUSSIAN) particularly developed by the post-war PRAGUE SCHOOL as part of their general interest in the INFORMATIONAL value of SYNTAXES. (See also COMPARATIVE SYNTAX, FUNCTIONAL SYNTAX, PERSPECTIVE CPPS, etc. See further Forbes 1973: 53)

In effect, these in EU coincide more with rhyme in that this carries most semantic importance, most commonly coinciding with the FOCUS and with NEW INFORMATION, i.e. what is said about a term or concept. The theme, in contrast, carries least significance in context, commonly coincides with OLDER INFORMATION, and is also usually found in initial position, generally coinciding with the grammatical SUBJECT of the utterance, i.e. the topic or ‘starting point’ theme thematic subjects. Linking theme and rhyme are transitional elements usually the VERB PHRASE, e.g. “Time” (Shakes “not to be trifled with”) (Shakespeare Sonnet 42). Although these commonly occur initially, it need not always in a connected discourse, but it will always be the element with the lowest communicative value.

Outside the Prague School, however, the terms theme and rhyme have been taken over in a more schematic way, as in the SYNTACTIC-FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR of Halliday (1967), under the general heading of thematic structure (and what is elsewhere called topicalization). Here the theme is any initial element, whether CONJUNCTION, ADVERBIAL or SENTENCE, and not only the subject but also the COMPLEMENT, if placed initially. Themes as ‘point of departure’ might seem plausible in some cases, e.g. for denotations of place as in “in the window” (theme) + a “particular” (rhetoric) where the most important part of the message focusses on ‘a window’. In other cases, however, the variation of normal WORD ORDER is such that PRONOMINOLOGY or INVERSION for EMPHASIS or prominence, and so to produce what other linguists (e.g. Sinclair, 1976; Quirk et al. 1973) would call a marked theme, or what others would call confusingly thematicization or topicalization, e.g. even cites the rain. It is hard to justify “down” as topic and “rain” as the moment here, rather the reverse.

In Quirk et al. (1980) these is opposed not to rhyme but to FOCUS, normally EMP-FOCUS, the ‘point of completion’, carrying usually the most informational interest or value, and that the element coinciding with the normal NUCLEUS of the INFORMATION in speech. With this opinion between point of initiation and point of completion, these cases in some ways to have the ‘lowest’ communicative value, as for the Prague School, but is actually an element of some prominence.

All in all, the thematicization of utterance or thematic meaning (Leach 1976), the distribution of elements according to the degree of prominence, is an important part of PARAGRAPHS and TEXT structuring and processing in the written medium; significant also for the understanding of theme in EU, see further Lyons 1977, vol. 2, 123.

(2) In ORM-ORAL-LINGUISTIC THEORY, the study of oral verse composition, a theme is a component element of narration and description, a sort of set-piece. It is larger than a FORMULA which occurs within the verse line, which helps the oral poet to compose his songs without readily. Examples would be the arising of the hero, or a sea-voyage such as survive in the Old English poem Beowulf. It is also known as a type-scene. See further Lord 1962; Fry 1942.

Here, in the last paragraph of the second definition, one would like to see a sharper definition of “most semantic importance”, distinguishing it from “communicative importance” or “value” or “dynamism”, a clearer understanding of what is meant by “least significance”, how these in this scheme of things is identifiable (English if it is not identifiable by “initial position”, a discussion of how the difference between a “transitional element” and “theme” can be recognized, how we know whether there is a transitional element at all in a given clause (7 sentence, 7 utterance), and — if theme is “what is said about topic”, and topic generally coincided with the grammatical subject of the utterance (topic) — what are the difference between topic and subject and theme?

In the next paragraph, where various approaches to the topic are discussed, it is not made clear that Halliday — as well as Sinclair and Quirk et al. — would recognize adverbial and complements in initial position as “Marked Themes”. It is not denied, but it is left open, with the possibility of misunderstanding in contrast, through the word “other”. Moreover, “in Down the rain”, it is surely not difficult to identify “Down” as these if these is not topic, though one can understand the difficulty if the two functions are conflated in the entry at this point is not talking about these but topic, as is underlined by the final sentence in the paragraph.

In all, this is — and would probably only claim to be — an introduction to the topic for beginners (and perhaps many of the other entries would claim to be no more), but even so, there is initially here which one would particularly wish to be absent in an account for beginners, and also one would wish to have seen some mention of the role of Theme in Method of Development.
A short introductory chapter introduces the student to the notion that at all levels language is "rule-governed," and that, unlike some other systems, it has also the power to refer to things outside itself in a characteristic way. In illustrating this very aptly by a table showing how children develop a range of expressions for "animals," such a development is only achieved in a social context by interaction. It follows that language is constantly adapting itself to the circumstances it is used in, and that as long as it does, it forms a constraint, or a set of constraints on our behaviour. This will mould the reader's attention on the ensuing sections of the book.

NATIONALISM AND SOCIETY.


As one of a series of books on Communication Studies, this provides an introduction to language studies related to the topic of nationalism directed to the needs of "the new student." In a short review I shall look mainly at the range of topics Montgomery offers, and the sort of provocation they make for the student who uses this book.

A short introductory chapter introduces the student to the notion that at all levels language is "rule-governed," and that, unlike some other systems, it has also the power to refer to things outside itself in a characteristic way. In illustrating this very aptly by a table showing how children develop a range of expressions for "animals," such a development is only achieved in a social context by interaction. It follows that language is constantly adapting itself to the circumstances it is used in, and that as long as it does, it forms a constraint, or a set of constraints on our behaviour. This will mould the reader's attention on the ensuing sections of the book.

Thus the first of these considers the development of language in childhood, while the latter sections deal with the particularisation of "languages" in different social situations, and the consequences for the individual in society. The approach throughout is broadly that associated with Halliday, an one might expect, though the illustrative material derives from a wide variety of sources, as the bibliography attests. The final sections look at the nature of discourse and at the opposing theories of linguistic representation. Each section ends with a list of background sources and further reading, followed by suggestions for appropriate work, including classroom involving the student in collecting material and adapting it to analyse.

Part One begins with a discussion of the earliest stages of language acquisition the "proto-language" of Halliday's analysis, and the beginnings of syntax as exemplified in two-word utterances. The role of dialogue in this phase and beyond in illustrated quite thoroughly with attention to both interpersonal and ideational aspects. The picture of language functioning in a social context and moving towards the increasing use of forms encountered in such contexts is clearly established. The book cannot of course explore the role of phonological features such as facilitation, for instance, take account of, because in practice the time and effort required to teach the "new student" with the skill to exploit these would be too great.

We now turn to a consideration of the different sorts of social group the language of which we may learn the nation, the region, a social class grouping — not to mention the groups which, in one sense or another do not belong to any of these. Here the emphasis lies on the social presupposition of accent, the work of Labov and Trudgill among other things the ambivalent attitude towards the assertive form of those who do not habitually speak it. The whole section on accent and dialect simultaneously explores the network of resources that underline what is not considered in this text that such things as the current concerns in Scotland for a recognition of "Scots" the language lost dialect that since the late nineteenth century has had no written form but exists in accent has given Scots the appeal of a native identity, preserved in a literature never more strongly than today. This is an indicator reaction. Even considering the Gaelic speakers of the western isles of Scotland, we have in Scotland no such sense of a language dominated by our English language as exists as that of the West Indies whose native tongue, whose native social status, and whose past status as language from the Caribbean are those of people new thought to be speakers of English. The history of the development from a variety of English of African origins by way of Pilgrim to Greco is well illustrated here, and its social consequences. More isolated still
are the languages of the socially unacceptable: the junkies, the criminals, the prostitutes - the Anti-languages.

Returning to normality we have to consider the different choices of language we have to make in different situations; what we refer to as register, with its three aspects of tenor, mode and style. While the author deals lucidly with the effects of the linguistic differences between speech and writing, I feel that more might have been said in two respects. First, the visual representation of language which in writing allows the manipulation of text for practical purposes, as Jack Goody points out in THE


dOHESTICATION OF THE SAVAGE MIND, which has been taken up by the computer; and second, it is the writing system that has created for us our folk-linguistic (and to some extent our linguistic as well) picture of the sounds of our language, and to some extent its grammar. The implications of this for folk linguistics are considerable. The influence of the written forms may be felt, too, to have some bearing on the next topic discussed, the work on codes and role systems due to Bernstein. The treatment here is lucid and the controversy about disadvantage is met with a pronouncement that speakers may in fact handle codes more flexibly than either party to the controversy may be prepared to allow. This whole part is brought to a suitable conclusion with a final summary.

Part Three deals with the nature of dialogue and its possible range of social uses, while Part Four looks at the issues raised by Whorf, proposing a compromise formula to reconcile the universalist and relativist positions, and then looks at the hidden ideological features that lurk in linguistic forms.

The text, then, offers a comprehensive introduction to its proclaimed topic. I wish all introductory texts in linguistics could deal as fully and clearly with their subject as this does. I would even consider it as a general introduction to the study of language, particularly for B.Ed students.

Tom Brown
Edinburgh
January 1990
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OVERVIEW

The Penman Project at USC/ISI has been conducting research in computational natural language processing since 1978. The project is presently organized around three principal theoretical efforts: - Natural language generation (single-sentence generation) - Text structure development (paragraph-length text planning) - Natural language understanding (single-sentence parsing)

USC/ISI is a non-profit organization of about 200 people conducting research into various aspects of Computer Science. The Penman project is part of the Intelligent Systems Division, whose members are investigating a number of questions in the general area of Artificial Intelligence (AI).

NATURAL LANGUAGE GENERATION (PENMAN)

Penman is a natural language sentence generation program developed at USC/ISI. It provides computational technology for generating English sentences and paragraphs, starting with input specifications of a non-linguistic kind. The culmination of a continuous research effort since 1978, Penman embodies one of the most comprehensive computational generators of English sentences in the world.

The research goals underlying Penman are threefold: to provide a framework in which to conduct investigations into the nature of language, to provide a useful and theoretically motivated computational resource for other research and anti-development groups and the computational community at large, and eventually to provide a text generation system that can be used routinely by computer system developers. Penman is being used by computer scientists (as the output medium of their programs, among others projects in human-computer communication, expert system explanation, and interface design) and by linguists (as a reference and research tool).

Penman consists of a number of components. Nigel, an English grammar based on Syntactic Functional Linguistics, is the heart of the system, containing over 600 systems. Guided by its input and default settings, Penman traverses the Nigel network, selecting a feature at each system until it has assembled enough features to fully specify a sentence. After a process of realization, Penman then generates the English sentence. Nigel is described in, among others, [Matthiessen 84, Hynn and Matthiessen 83]. In order to use or extend Nigel, the user need simply load it on a computer and can then interact via the window interface (which is tailored to support research on grammar construction and control) to control selections within systems and study the resulting output feature collections and realizations.

Besides Nigel, Penman also contains a number of information resources, such as a lexicon of closed-class words and a very general taxonomic model of the world. This taxonomy, called the Upper Model, is based on the distinctions made...
in English -- for example, close objects are treated differently in English than actions. Actions and objects are called in different classes in the model. As is represented in a generalization hierarchy with property inheritance. In the Penman, a user only define a lexicon of domain-specific words and also provide a model of domain-specific entities to be linked to the Upper Model. For these tasks Penman provides programs that allow a person with relatively little training to create lexical items and link domain concepts to the Upper Model. The structure and use of Penman is described in detail in the Penman Manuals (Penman 88).

The Penman sentence generator is written in Common Lisp and currently operates on TI Explorer and Symbolic Lisp machines as well as on Apple Macintosh-I computers. It is available free of charge from ISI for study and instructional purposes. It has been distributed to about 20 sites worldwide, and has been used for graduate level instructional purposes at various universities, as well as forming part of various Ph.D. thesis efforts. On the Mac, the full system occupies about 2.5 Megabytes and generates a two-clause sentence in about 10 seconds; on a TI Explorer, it generates the same sentence in about 2 seconds.

TEXT STRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT (TEXT PLANNING)
Over the last seven years, members of the project have been investigating the planning and generation of coherent multi-paragraphed paragraphs. Recognizing the need to plan the coherent order and linkage of clauses, a theory of the interrelationships inherent in text structure called Hierarchical Structure Theory (HST) (Nann 84, Nann & Thompson 85, Nann 86, Nann & Thompson 86, Martinez & Thompson 88) was developed after extensive analysis of hundreds of texts of various genres. The analysis concluded that English text is coherent by virtue of hierarchical relations which bind between clauses and blocks of clauses, and identified about 25 basic relations for English. These relations, such as sequence, purpose, and elaboration are often identified by key words or phrases (such as "then", "in order to", and "e.g.", respectively). In order to plan multi-paragraphed paragraphs by computer, one requires both a sound theory of text organization and an algorithm that can make efficient use of it. The theory is provided by HST, the algorithm by an adaptation of the top-down hierarchical expansion planning system NHK (see Sacerdoti 75). This text structure planner plans coherent paragraphs which achieve communicative goals of affecting the hearer's knowledge in some way. It operates after some application program (such as an expert system) and before Penman. From the application program, the planner accepts one or more communicative goals along with a set of terms that represent the material to be generated. Using reformulations of HST relations as goals, it assembles the input entities into a tree that embodies the paragraph structure, in which metatextuals are HST relations and terminal nodes contain the input material. It then traverses the tree, submitting the input entities to Penman to be formulated as clauses. The planning process is described in [Nann 84a, 84b, 86]. Earlier work, with plans based purely on HST relations, has also been performed at ISI see [Noree & Searles 88a, 87, Noree & Paris 89].

NATURAL LANGUAGE UNDERSTANDING (PARSING)
A prototype parser has been developed to use the Vipal grammar, enabling its bidirectional use for both language generation and understanding. Using an automatically derived representation of the grammar in the notation of Functional Difflusion Grammar (Kay 85), the parser extended a widely used annotation-based parsing system (PROSPECT [Shieber 84]) to accommodate a fuller range of grammatical descriptions, including descriptions containing disjunctive and conditional information (see [Kasper 88a, 88b]).

Recently, approaches have been made in the theory of representation languages which make possible a new integrated treatment of syntax and semantics. Until recently (i.e., the logical operator HST), we could not handle in the KL-ONE knowledge representation language family. This meant that grammars (as well as the intermediate structures built by parsers) could not be represented in these languages, because parsers necessarily deal with multiple options due to the structural and semantic ambiguities inherent in languages (since the KL-ONE family of languages provide none of the best and most well defined representation languages available, this inability was a serious problem). On the other hand, semantic knowledge is usually represented in these languages. The inability to represent both syntactic and semantic knowledge in the same system has precluded the development of parsers using a single inferring technique such as classification to perform their work in a homogeneous and unified manner. Thus the lack of a general framework for computing with disjunctive knowledge structures has been a hindrance to the development of parsing technology.

Recently, the ability to perform inference over disjunctions was added to Log, a newly developed example of the KL-ONE-like languages at ISI. This capability will allow the representation of syntactic and semantic knowledge in the same representation system. This will enable a parser to access semantic and syntactic information assoon as it is relevant in a straightforward and direct fashion using a single general mechanism, the classifiers, as the central inferring operation. The potential benefits of an integrated parsing approach are manifold.

PEENMAN PERSONNEL AND PUBLICATIONS
The Penman group currently consists of Dr. John Bhatia, Dr. Richard Berry (project leader), Dr. Robert Kasper, and Dr. William Nann (on partial retirement), Dr. Michael Halliday, and Dr. Rick D'Oonnell (a graduate student visitor from the Linguistics Department, University of Sydney). Closest associated with the project at ISI are Dr. William Searles, Dr. Cecile Paris, and Dr. Vigil Arena.

A number of people have worked on or with the project in the past; the list includes Christian Matthiesen, Michael Halliday, Susan Goggin, Sandra Thompson, Brian Tholohan, Johannes Heine, Peter Frame, Cecila Ford, Lynn Poulton, Robert Albanis, and Thomas Callway.

In addition, for many years the Penman group has benefited from the work of visiting researchers. Computer scientists, linguists, and others from all over the world have come, to work with us on generation problems. Our work has been significantly extended and refined by our interactions with these researchers.

The group embodies a combination of Computer Science and Linguistics. In recent years the proportion has been about 70% Computer Science and 30% Linguistics. We maintain active interaction with linguists who serve as consultants, primarily in the areas of discourse, grammar, lexical knowledge and speech processing. We also maintain contact with academic departments at several universities in the U.S. and abroad, and regularly employ graduate students from ISI, USC, the University of Sydney, and other institutions.

One of the main achievements of the project has been the successful publication record. The following is a summary of the publications since 1984. - Conf. and Workshop presentations: 45 - Book Chapters: 20 - Journal Articles: 5 - Books: 1

COLLABORATIONS
Recently, in order to promote increased development of various computational aspects of Systemic Linguistics, the project entered into a multifacational collaboration in which various partners would have different focuses of research. While using Penman as a common centre. All work will be shared among all the partners and periodic updates will ensure that everyone is using the same basic mechanisms in their investigations. This collaboration, a group in the Linguistics Department at the University of Sydney, Australia - the RMIT project at Melbourne, Australia - the University of Melbourne project at Melbourne, Australia - the University of Arkansas project at Arkansas, USA. Roughly speaking, ISI will act as a liaison house for the computational implementation and distribution of Penman and the parser, and support various aspects of research. ISI will support research on generation and parsing as well. The Linguistics Department group in Sydney will pursue...
fundamental work on linguistic theory and grammatical development. In more detail, the cooperation will be as follows:

THE PENMAN PROJECT AT ISI: The project at ISI will perform three kinds of work. First, it will continue research on text planning and parsing, with the intent of adding to the functionality of the Penn sentence generator. Second, it will continue the short-term grammatical enhancements that continually appear when new requests are made by users. Third, it will continue distributing and supporting Penn to the international computational linguistics community, adding the latest knowledge representation and presentational technology and incorporating new theoretical developments into the grammar and models as they are developed by the other partners. Contacts there are: Dr. Edward Boy, Dr. Robert Kapser, Dr. John Hajek Information Sciences Institute of USC, 4745 Adelphi Way, Marina del Rey, CA 90292-6945 U.S.A. Tel: (USA)-315-282-1511 Fax: (USA)-315-282-411 Email (on the ASNet): harvey@isi.edu, kasper@isi.edu, hajek@isi.edu

THE KOMET PROJECT AT IFI: The project at IFI will initially concentrate on three areas: the development of a German grammar centered on Migel; the refinement and extension of the Upper Model, and the development of parsing software in the KOMET framework. This work is also foreseen for the future. Periodically the Upper Model and the work will be sent to ISI to be included in a version of Penn. Contacts there are: Dr. Erich Stein, Dr. John Hajek Information Sciences Institute of IFI Mathematics and Computer Science, Hessenstrasse 15 6000 Bonn Federal Republic of Germany Tel: (V.Germa~)-6151-875-826 Fax: (V.Germany)-6151-875-818 Email (on KOMET): steiner@ipip.darmstadt.gm.de

THE GROUP AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY: The group at the Uniyersity of Sydney will continue the refinement and extension of the grammar of English and the development of new areas of grammar and supra-grammatical control. The group will act as the clearing house for specialized segments of grammar developed by systemic linguists throughout the world, and will periodically feed all the grammar parts and provide a new version of Migel to be placed into Penn and distributed. ISI and IFI will serve as training ground for graduate students pursuing a Ph.D. in Systemic Functional Linguistics from the University. Contacts at the University are: Dr. Christian Hatzhehassen, Dr. Nick O'Donnell Department of Linguistics, University of Sydney Sydney 2006 Australia Tel: Australia-61-2-492-4247 Email (on UUNET): sammlar@psy.csiro.au

OTHER INTERESTS

In addition to the above collaborations and research, members of the Pennman project in some cases in collaboration with other researchers, have proposed or plan to pursue work on the following questions: - Register-Controlled Generation of Variations: The definition and use of register in order to determine the selection and organisation of material, constituent head, and lexical unit; in order to tailor the generated text to the level of sophistication of the reader. Dr. John Hajek with Dr. Christa Paris from ISI. See [Bateson & Paris 89a, 89b]. - Text Planning and Parsing: The use of focus/foreground in order to help control the text planning process. Dr. Edward Boy with Prof. Kathy McKoy from the University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA. See [Boy & McKoy 89]. - Machine Translation: The use of Pennman and the parser in a multi-project, multi-modular language translation program, in which the Upper Model plays the role of a generalised Transfer Structure/Intelligencer. The whole Pennman project with the KOMET project, the IAI in Saarbruecken, West Germany, Prof. Herbert Riesenhuber, CDI, Prof. Tord Falase, SRI, Dr. Bally Weiss, NMR, and Prof. Ralph Cohn, N.Y.U. - Construction of a Linguistic Programming System: The construction of a general computational framework in which different grammatical modules, parsers and generators can be written, combined, extended, and compiled. This project also to continue knowledge representation and inference methods, to create a linguistic programming system that can be used by the linguists in the development of new grammars, rules, and operations. The proposed system should generalise and improve upon the capabilities developed in earlier unification-based frameworks, such as PATR-II and Functional Unification Grammar. Dr. Robert Kapser with Prof. Carl Pollard, CMU, Pittsburgh, PA, USA. The addition into the grammar of features to control the realization of international connotations in order to achieve desired communicative effects. John Hajek with Prof. Pau Oshika from the Portland State University, Portland, OR, USA. - Construction of large bilingual lexicon: Dr. Ken Doi from AT&T Bell Laboratories will spend a year at ISI and build a large (over 100,000 word) English-French lexicon using the Canadian Parliamentary Record.

CONCLUSION

The Pennman project is always in search of new opportunities for growth and new collaborations. The group has banded a number of short-term visitors and Pol~ight scholars, and attempts to foster an open, friendly, and positive research environment. For further information, please contact the author.
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...off the plane, in international, heading towards luggage. Someone holds cardboard signifier bearing my name. Once, from 111, Daily-driven to my motel, but on the way, we drop in on the ISI offices, to meet Bob and Cecile. Dinner is arranged. I am taken to the motel, time for a shower, and to the restaurant, somewhere in the endless suburbs of L.A.

So begins my first days in the employ of Information Sciences Institute, working as part of Persoon. Persoon is a large scale text generation project using Halliday’s systemic functional grammar. The grammar is called HGS.

During the years of NIGEL’s development, Christian Matthiessen was the resident grammarian. He’s in Sydney now, getting a computational project started down under, in the sydronic capital. John Brame now holds that role, but he’s in Dartmouth at present, working on a German text generation project with Erich Stelzer’s group, also using systemic grammar. While he’s away, I guess Nigel’s in my hands.

Nigel is grown up now, as the grammarian’s task isn’t as important as it was. I correct his grammar when it’s poor. I’m teaching him to my uncoordinate complexes properly at present. You could say that I’m an ESL teacher for a computer.

Well, as I say, most of the work in the grammar is done, the main effort in the project is being applied in other directions. Producing coherent whole texts is important, as ‘text planning’ and ‘Rhetorical Structure Theory’ (RST) are key issues. Producing text appropriate for varying contexts is also important, so register theory is an issue.

The idealistic component of the semantics is central to our work. This is where we represent the meanings which Nigel expresses. In Artificial Intelligence (AI) they call this “knowledge representation”. We use the same knowledge representation system for this purpose. Persoon takes idealistic structures in some notation and generates text to express them.

You might want an example of how Persoon actually operates. Well, imagine a satellite sitting up there, constantly bearing down the latest weather info. This information can be converted into a database of facts (in Leac notation). Looks may then be used to deduce new information from these facts (‘high pressure system implies “rain tomorrow”’). The text planner then decides in what order it wants to express the information, and how the information is to be logically related (e.g. “rain tomorrow BECAUSE there is a high pressure system building”). Nigel then generates text for each fact.

Parsing is becoming important too – for machine translation. Syntax is in a good position in the translation stakes, having existing projects in English and German, and soon to be in Japanese. Translation might take place as follows: we parse in one language into some (language-neutral) representation (say, Loon), and then generate from Loon to the other language. We’ve done a lot of work on the generation side, as now we need to get the parsing side together. Bob Kasper’s working on this.

The team here at present is relatively small. Ed Dwyer, as project manager, Bob Kasper, working on parsing and knowledge representation, Richard Whitney programmer, Cecile Paris on register and John Brame (when he gets back). Passers-through are common... people (like me) drop in for 6 months or so, add their bit to the project, and go off again. It’s a good way for a systematist like me to get trained in the computational side of things.

I’m discovering that the most important word here is “funding” – it determines how many people are working on the project, and what sort of machines we can have to work on. EDL means to spend all his time chasing the elusive dollars, and being dragged away from what we academically really consider important.

III is a good environment for research. I can get in when I like (mostly a good time) and come and go as I please. I sometimes get distracted by the great views out over the marine, or out to the mountains, but if the snow is up, you can’t see very far anyway. There’s plenty of people willing to ram about language related issues, and more talks from drop-in than I have time for, giving exposure to a wide range of language-related topics. I’m gaining hands on experience in all aspects of the Persoon system, and can test out my own linguistic theories by incorporating them into the system.

Anyway, I must get back to Nigel’s lessons.

For more news on computational linguistics

Lock in network were upper Matthiessen and Poult on.
CONVERSAL is a major research project that applies and develops Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in a very large, fully working computer program. It is planned to last 5 years, with about 6 researchers working on it at any one time. We are about halfway through the first 3 years (including the possibility of taking on another one). The project in the first place was to develop, with full support from the University of Wales College of Cardiff, one of the very few computerized systemic grammars. It finally works; you know this by now because of the 'inquiries' in the 'choosers' in the SPG model that can be found at length here. The conversational model (CONVERSAL) is based in fact based in the School of English Studies, Journalism and Philosophy, part of which is the Applied English Language Studies. (The Computational Linguistics Unit is a Department of Artificial Intelligence (AI).)

The Conversational model (CONVERSAL) is a Department of Artificial Intelligence (AI). This is because language is part of any attempt to use computers to model how people think and communicate. If you believe, as I do, that the use of language is the communication to other members of one's species and its use to communicate with oneself (i.e. to think) about those many things that are most naturally mediated through the code of language) are essentially the same, and if you therefore believe in (what I call) the semiotic systems (codes) by which we communicate provide us with our apparatus for thinking, then your model of how the human mind 'thinks' and 'plans' will depend crucially on the linguistic categories that are built into the code by which the human organism communicates with its fellow(s). The CONVERSAL project has therefore begun with language, but it is going on to relate language to other resources of the human mind, including sociallinguistic resources of various types. By the end of Phase 2 I may be able to deal, in a principled way, with the question:

"What does Fred Jones think?"

As it happens, Fred Jones lives at 11 Boswell Crescent, Canton, Cardiff. If Ivy (the project) believes that her interlocutor knows that Canton is a part of Cardiff, she replies (cooperatively):

"We live at 11 Boswell Crescent, Canton."

Notice the way in which this reply avoids excessive redundancy, not only by the use of "that" (which is not easy to provide for in a fully principled way) but also because we Cardifffians know that "Canton" is part of Cardiff. To get this right in a principled way involves many aspects of what is termed problem-solving, and this is because each involves the various aspects of socialcognition with which SFG naturally interrelates. In other words, even in Phase 3 I have attended to the relations of the "core" model of language itself outward and upward to discover and to other "higher" components, these being in turn modeled in terms related to the SFG model of language. In Phase 2 we shall develop these other components rather further, but always around the systemic language of itself.

In any case, any adequate systematic grammar needs higher components. This is because the labels that we use in system networks mean very little on their own; the only way to think of them is as short forms for the "felicity conditions" which must be satisfied if that option is to be chosen (roughly the 'implicature') in the 'choosers' in the Nigel grammar at all. These felicity conditions or impicature must be "up" or "not" to something about something, we claim, which is itself shaped, in large measure, by the options available in the language. (In some models, such as the Halliday, (1980), the suggestion is that all choices in the Nigel grammar are 'picked' in a higher network; this is the strongest form of Halliday's hypotheses about higher systemic systems, and it is good that the idea should be pushed to see how far it will go. We in CONVERSAL make no assumption that system networks, essential though they are for understanding the 'meaning' or 'status' of any semantic system, are necessarily appropriate for representing all higher components - and we do in fact use other ways of structuring these components.)

From the viewpoint of one of our sponsors, CONVERSAL is not regarded as centrally a project in either linguistics or AI; it is in electronic engineering. So we linguists in the team have had to learn to see linguistics, which we first knew and loved as an "arts" subject, as a "technology" or one of
the technologies that contribute to the development to superior AI models, and on no better ways of using the knowledge and intelligence in computer programs. This also simplifies the old task of "languages" divide never did make much sense. Luckily, our sponsors also recognize that we are not simply "applying" what is "known" in linguistics to this new area of application. They recognize that the process of "application" is potentially highly innovative, and that we often need to do fundamental research in linguistics as part of achieving our goals. So there is no conflict between these alternative views of what we are doing.

Predecessors of COMNURAL

Most current work on generation, world-wide, uses a "functionalism" theory of language, and many use ideas derived from [1].

The first successful generator was Weaver's PROVERBS (Weaver 1978). But the well-known recent generators is undoubtedly Ronn and Mathieson's NICKEL (e.g. Ronn and Mathieson 1983, Mathieson 1987 and 1988), developed at the Information Sciences Institute (ISI) of the University of S. California. But there have also been the following: Rastien's adaptation of NICKEL for Japanese developed at Sony, and to be described in a book, written jointly with Christian Mathieson, about the English and Japanese versions of NICKEL, hopefully to be published in late 1990, Patan's socio-grammatically driven generator (1988), and Bough and Isard's PRED and DBS2 system (Bough and Isard 1987, Bough 1987). Sellier (1987) points out that any recent work has also been influenced by systeemic notions, and he cites McDonald's NICKLE (1990, 1993), McDonald's TEXT (1982, 1985) and Kay's grammar-writing tool Functionalist Declarative Grammar (Kay 1979, 1983). There is also the work by Erieh Steiner and his colleagues, first in the German part of the EUROPA Project at Saarbrucken (e.g. Steiner et al 1989) and now, in a very recently started project on generation in German, at Kaiserslautern. Finally, in the last few years a new body of work has begun to develop that is concerned with syntactic grammar as a formalism (Pattan & Ritchie 1987, Pattan 1989, and Kellius 1988). Pavett (1989a) suggests reasons why SG lends itself naturally to language generation.

Some background facts about the structure of the COMNURAL project

The long-term goal of the project is to contribute to the development of systems that will enable computationally naive people to interact naturally ("convivially") with the Intelligent Knowledge Based Systems (IKBSs) that we should expect a decade ahead. Because of the broad scope of the project, there is considerable potential for spin-off projects and applications (see further below).

The COMNURAL consortium consisted in Phase 1 of the University of Wales College of Cardiff, the University of Leeds, IBBR Malvern, ICL and Longman. Each has a representative on the Project Management Committee, and each has a share, in proportion to the input, of any royalties that may eventually be earned by the consortium. The provisions of the Collaboration Agreement for Phase 1 (1987-89) will continue in Phase 2 (1990-93), though we expect there to be some changes in the consortium members. At the time of writing we are just finalising arrangements for Phase 2, and this expert will and with a look at what we hope to achieve in the period 1990-92.

The project has three sub-teams, each of whom works closely with the others. In Phase 1 these worked on: (1) language generation (at Cardiff: Robin Pavett (Project Director), Gordon Tucker and Joan Wright, assisted part-time by Paul Trench and David Young), (2) language parsing and understanding (at Leeds: Eric Atwell (the Leeds Team Leader), Olve Souter and Timmy O'Donnoghue) and (3) beliefs, reasoning and planning (at Cardiff: John Wright and his colleagues). Thus, while the project has a firm linguistic base in the Natural Language Processing (NLP) unitfield of AI, it encompasses many other central aspects. Indeed, it could in due course be extended to other areas of AI, such as vision and hearing, and it could be adapted to new ways of representing mental processes such as parallel processing (which should suit the 'simultaneity' of system networks and neural networks. Given sufficient funding, we may begin the exploration of some of these during Phase 2.

The achievements of Phase 1 of COMNURAL

What was achieved in Phase 1? There are three main achievements. The central component of the overall system is the generator, built at Cardiff. This is called GENESIS (because it GENerates 'convivially'). The Leeds contributions were to build (1) a derived parser, called the RAP (for Realistic Assingnment Parser, which develops earlier work at Leeds), and (2) the interpreter (called REVOLUTION, because it revamps the 'world'). Each of these is a major development in its field. But because both build directly on the relevant aspects of GENESIS, we can characterise the coverage of the COMNURAL system as a whole in terms of the size of GENESIS.

There are a few facts to give you a perspective on our work in Phase 1. McDonald, Vaughan and Parantee 1987-179 (in Koepen, G. (ed.) Natural Language Generation (1987), referring to the Pomona project at the University of S. California, say "Nigel. Person's grammar... is the largest syntactic grammar and possibly the largest machine grammar of any kind... Although we developed GENESIS completely independently, starting from scratch with new networks and handling realisation in a rather different way, GENESIS already has more systems than Nigel (which has not grown in the interim because the team have been working on other components of Pomona). One major theoretical difference between the two is that the networks in GENESIS are more explicitly oriented to semantics than in Nigel. We assume the assumption that the system networks in the lexicogrammar are the semantics. In some areas the effect of this is that we have more systems than they do for an equivalent set of realisations. It is difficult to compare grammars, but if we take the metric that Bill Mann used to use to tell other AI people how large Nigel is, we can say that GENESIS has around 600 semantic systems realised in grammar (syntax and morphology, and also intonation and punctuation (see below), while Nigel has about 400 (semantic)-grammatical systems. But GENESIS additionally does something that the builders of Nigel would have liked to do, but from which they were prevented by the requirement of a sponsor that they link their generation system to a parser produced on more conventional lines: GENESIS integrates system networks for vocabulary with the networks realised grammatically. Gordon Tucker has particular responsibility for this area, and, through him, we are now implementing what Halliday termed the grammarian's dream of lots of most delicate grammar" (instead of having a separate lexicon, as in Nigel and all other grammars that we know of).

So, at the end of Phase 1, GENESIS has altogether 1,100 systems, of which 600 are realised in syntax, morphology, intonation or punctuation. In addition there are some 1,400 realisation rules, involving about 4,000 operations. Another notable feature of GENESIS is that it generates output that is either written or spoken (i.e. marked for sonically motivated intonation), as required. It needs a speech synthesiser to turn this into a phonetic output, we have recently heard that IBBR Malvern have invited a research proposal from University College London to work with us on this, so we hope that this will happen.)

Every grammar has its areas of strength and gaps in its coverage. GENESIS at this point still has many gaps: filling these is one of the main tasks of Phase 2. Areas of grammar covered so far include the following (using the most general terminology possible, which may not always coincide with that of, say, Halliday 1985):

1. Complex structures realised in any of 8 different auxiliary verbal elements, realised chionically in mood, modality, tense, aspect and voice, (incl. being), as well as the usual forms that are standard in all treatments, "used to", "willing in its habitual sense, "be going to", "be about to"; and
2. Groups with provision for multiple modifiers, these types of determiner selection, as in, e.g., "five of the biggest of those apples", (i.e. (a) selection by quantification, including weak "one" and "all", (b) selection by superlativisation, and (c) selection by three types of delimiting, realised in "the", demonstratives and possessives), and qualifications...
full range of pronouns and proper names (with their own quite complex internal grammar): complex positive constructions, e.g. "the new doctor's ear's don't"; comparative and superlative adjective and adverb constructions (but not with embedded clauses yet); propositional groups: many types of verb complementation (including some "metaposition"), handled as embedded clauses, are dealt with by situations that "fill" the phenomenon: the relationship of adjectives to adverbs of manner; irregular verbs, nouns, adjectives, and adverbs, handled in a single network; realizations of information structure in both punctuation and intonation; order and question words (including multiple wh-questions); five types of potentially core-occurring "time" adjectives (including two types of frequency and repetition); adverbs of place and manner; marked thematicization of all participant roles (Complements) and all types of meaning introduced so far that are realized in adjectives; a nearly complete range of transitivity types (defined in terms of configurations of participant roles, including covert roles); three types of "passive" constructions: special grammars of fate, addresses and human proper names; adjectives expressing logical relationships ("because", "in", ...), and such adverbs. Apart from the greater syntactic complexity of the network described above, GENESIS covers a number of areas which, so far as we are aware, are not yet in NGP. These include: (1) some register options in NGP and TENOS, and their effects on realizations in both texts and syntax (e.g. "Who were you listening to?" vs. "To whom were you listening? in the sense of 'right' vs. the use of probabilities). (2) The use of probabilities in generation (on which a paper will shortly be published in the Journal Machine Translation; (3) different co-ordination rules for not just two but any number of co-ordinated nominal and other clauses of groups; and, as mentioned above, (4) the first stages of providing semantically motivated intonation in a speech synthesizer output, and (5) a system network approach to lexta. Integrating grammar and lexta (as well, of course, an intonation/punctuation) in a single "levelling" (of meaning potential), (at least NGP covers some areas that we don't, but we are, perhaps naturally, less aware of these.)

GENESIS is still growing, so that in Phase 2 we estimate that it will have less than two times the number of systems realized in this way. This should enable it to handle somewhat more complex phenomena, and its potential for advancing our understanding of language, of course, in that a syntactic construction is committed to handling the phenomena covered in transformational grammar by an ordinary "sentence" rules without first generating one structure and then turning it into another. We have already found good ways of handling many of the patterns in syntax that have been observed in the lexta, and can see the way to tackle many of the remaining ones. But there remain several problems that are likely to be less tractable in a syntactic framework - as well as plenty that are tricky for all grammars.

As for the vocabulary in GENESIS, it should grow in Phase 2 to at least 3-4,000 word-senses (or possibly more if an ambitious planned procedure is successful).

GENESIS already covers many aspects of intonation and punctuation, and the intonation in particular will be extended and refined in Phase 2. In this area we have no precedents to build on, and it is hard to predict how it will be to solve all the many problems of this fascinating area of the computational generation of language.

In all this work, a vital element has been the grammar writing tool for working syntactic functions developed to our specifications by Joan Wright. It is in a continual process of development, and it has been interesting to see the way in which it has influenced the details of syntactic grammar formally and at the same time simplified where we were adding to it (e.g., in our re-setting of probabilities in networks). It is called DEPHEL (because it defines relationships between entities in the grammar).

COMPARAD, which started 7 years after Pensa, has been able to draw on Pensa for general inspiration and for source of help in organizing such a project, given limited resources to use simple language of Bill Sange and the other members of the ITAI team for the way in which their experience with us in the planning the COMPARAD project. Above all, because of the fact that the researchers at ITAI were clearly being successful in their attempts at building a large syntactic system, we have been led to believe that we could do it too. We needed this inspiration, because our approach yielded significant results within the first two years - which, if it turned out, we were able to provide (intention, but and a lot of work). The achievement at ITAI were an immense encouragement, even though we did not
alternative approaches. There is a serious difficulty in finding time for this sort of work, when there is a continuing pressure from one's sponsors to produce bigger and better versions of one's systems. We hope to hold in more time for this in future - perhaps beginning at the 17th International Systemic Congress at Stirling this coming Summer. But what does emerge clearly is that the existence of these two very large systemic functional generations - independently developed as they are - demonstrates the pre-existence of SFG as an appropriate model for the computational generation of language.

Possible applications of COMMON L.

There are many possible spin-off applications. First, any system with both an understanding of a generation component could assist in machine translation, of whatever sort, so that we may think we can make a significant contribution is what is known as "test to speech". This is the process of mechanically turning written text into spoken language. This must include semantically motivated innovation, which is something that has been handled inadequately so far in work on text to speech, but with GENRE it already does good progress in attending to this in a principled way. Other possible spin-off applications include interactive tools for language learning (potentially achievable as an application because of the possibility of using quite limited domains), the development of services of that complexity (e.g. for readers for English as a Foreign language), and possible applications in the games industry. At the appropriate points we may seek industrial interest in these (and no doubt other) possible applications.

Prospect

This project is still young (barely 18 months old, in terms of actual research, as opposed to setting it up initially), and it is only now beginning to find some interest, so that as the project has been published, and are therefore in the public domain (Fawcett 1986 and Tucker 1989), and others are in various stages of appearing. But most of the reports are still confidential to the partners, and a major task of Phase 2 will be to derive current and future reports - and indeed from the software - the publications and presentations which are now closed, in order to make COMMON L better known to the relevant research communities, both academic and industrial.

I do not know the date when this issue of Network will reach you. At the time of writing (the end of January 1990) the position is that we expect shortly to be advertising for two researchers. These will be to work on the 'higher components' of the model, i.e. on Ivy's belief and inferring system, on the way in which this and the inferences performed on those beliefs will be represented, and on how Izy plans and understands discourse (drawing on Fawcett at al. 1988). These are therefore primary posts for people with an understanding of current issues in AI, one is likely to be a reasonably senior post, and one for someone recently out of a relevant MSc course. It may be that someone with a linguistics background but some programming experience would be suitable for the junior post. Secondly, there is the possibility of a more centrally linguistics posts, later in the year. But for the junior post, you would be expected to contribute to the project in some significant way, to be determined by yourself.

Very little work has been done so far on comparing and evaluating the
TEXT GENERATION IN DARMSTADT

ECOMET is the name of this project, which will initially be devoted to German text-generation. We are planning to extend it to other languages in the near future. The German generator will start with the PENMAN approach, applied to German. It will incorporate my Systemically based contributions to MT (cf. Steiner et al. 1988, Ballman et al. ed. 1989/ Steiner 1989), so that, while it will be kept compatible with PENMAN and the PENMAN system, it will represent an alternative version of Systemic Grammar which differs from PENMAN mainly in that

- it uses none of its central ideas in the area of transitivity to a Fauconnier-type variant of Systemic Grammar
- it incorporates insights from modern theories in Computational Linguistics, such as LFG, GPSG, and also GB.

While the sentence generator will be the core of the system initially, it will soon shift its focus to the areas of text-planning, a general interface to domain-knowledge, and knowledge representation beyond purely linguistic knowledge. ECOMET currently has four full-time staff, with an increase to be expected very soon. It benefits immensely from the support of the ISI PENMAN group, especially John Ballman, Ben Kasper, Cecile Paris, and Dr. Noy. A long term contract of co-operation between the CDU and ISI has been signed. The CDU is the "Gesellschaft fuer Mathematik und Datenverarbeitung", a German Federal Research Institute which contains the "German Research Centre for Computer Science", (over 150 scientific staff altogether). Similarly, (say extensive contracts, involve co-operation with SRI Stanford (Charniak), Philips Research Laboratories (South), Universidade Catolica do Rio de Janeiro (de Souza). Co-operation in the future is also foreseen with CONNALS in Cardiff.

ECOMET has a sister project in the USA under the name of KENTX, which develops a parallel system for parsing, and which has just begun to investigate, with much appreciated hands from Ben Kasper, the possibilities of parsing with Systemic Grammar.
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GD/IPSi
P.O. Box 122
D-6000 Darmstadt
West Germany

E-mail address: steiner@ipip.darmstadt.gmd.dfg.de

COMPUTATIONAL SYNTACTIC WORK AT OHIO STATE

By TERRY PATTON Dept. of Computer and Information Science, Ohio State University 2026 Neil Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43210 U.S.A.

At Ohio State, the computational work involving systematic grammar is aided both at exploring fundamental language-processing issues and at practical language processing. Our interest in systematic grammar stems from some remarkable computational properties of its descriptive apparatus. We will first discuss the central idea behind our research—that the relationship between the semantic and grammatical strata described by Halliday can provide the basis for efficient linguistic inference. Two research projects based on this idea will then be outlined: a real-time language generation system, and a preliminary system that uses the same grammar for both generation and understanding. The discussion of these projects will be followed by some brief concluding remarks.

The Computational Idea

Our primary computational-linguistic interest is in the matter of efficiency. There are two reasons behind this. First, we are interested in recognizing the computational difficulty of knowledge representation, with the fact that people process language very rapidly. Second, we are interested in building practical interfaces that would allow natural-language interaction between people and computers—and people will simply not tolerate long pauses.

One aspect of systematic grammar that provides significant computational advantages is stratification. The relationship between the semantic and grammatical strata provides an inducing mechanism of considerable computational power. For simplicity, we use the model where semantic choices result in the projection of specific grammatical features. In any case, stratification provides a means of specifying an explicit relation between the situation and the grammar. This description of inter-relational facilitation establishes a kind of coarse-grained inference analogous to that found in the most efficient artificial intelligence systems.

The computational advantages of coarse-grained inference can be seen in medical diagnosis—a favorite artificial intelligence task, a doctor performing a routine diagnosis does not go through detailed, fine-grained reasoning about physiological processes, chemical interactions and so on. Instead the diagnosis is done using coarse-grained knowledge of the form: If the patient has symptoms A, B and C, then the most likely cause is disease D. The doctor has accumulated a large body of such knowledge through years of experience and study, and this allows routine diagnoses to be made quickly in one large step rather than in many smaller steps. The incorporation of coarse-grained knowledge into computer systems was the key to the enormous success of the so-called "expert systems." Systemic grammar describes coarse-grained relationships between situations and grammar—that is, registers—through the mapping between the semantic and grammatical strata. This mapping allows grammatical features to be inferred from the field, tense and mode in one step, rather than going through the long chains of fine-grained reasoning that often appear in the grammatical literature.

Generating Language as Part of People Do
completely determines the clause, processing time is less than a second on a relatively slow computer, and too small to measure when running on one of our faster machines. We use C++, an "object-oriented" programming language (these are suited to representing classification hierarchies), to encode the system networks at such strata. We take advantage of the ability of C++ to perform all the inheritance in the classification hierarchy before the program is run. For a systemic grammar, this means that a feature inherits all the realization rules of its entry conditions, their entry conditions and so on. Thus, preelaeting the most delicate features allows required grammatical realization rules to be found without traversing the network. Our system exploits the combination of register knowledge and object-oriented representation to drastically reduce the work that needs to be done between the time the program receives the semantic input and the time the clause is generated. The point is that almost all the necessary work is done when the grammer is initially loaded, and this work does not have to be repeated when it is generating clause. The register knowledge predetermines decisions about which grammatical features are required given the field, tense and mood; and the automatic inheritance is used to avoid traversing the grammar. If enough detailed register knowledge is made available to the system, structural realization of semantic input can be computed very quickly.

Bidirectional Processing of a Systemic Grammar

Another project we are pursuing is the development of a computer system that uses the same systemic grammar for both efficient language generation and efficient computational realization. Although the systemic grammar is not an end in itself, it is the ideal goal for computational linguists. Our approach is to exploit register knowledge for both tasks. This coarse-grained knowledge allows us to efficiently dictate grammatical features for generation, and to efficiently produce expectations that can guide the understanding process as described below.

Field, tense and mood determine semantic choices which then preselect a set of expected grammatical features. The realization rules of these features are then simply compared to the text being understood. Taking into consideration which expectations were set and which were not, and including features that have no viable alternatives (according to the realization rules and the logical constraints of the network), a new set of preselections is then produced. This is repeated until a complete match is achieved. The successful set of semantic and grammatical features constitutes the interpretation. We have been encouraged by a successful preliminary implementation of this method.

Conclusion

We have chosen systemic grammar as our object of study not only because of its advantages for linguistic description, but also because of its significant computational properties. By taking advantage of the relationship between the semantic and grammatical strata, we can produce clauses literally instantaneously even for large grammars. Preliminary results suggest that we may also be able to exploit the same relationship to build an efficient bidirectional language-processing system. We plan to continue exploring the role of coarse-grained linguistic knowledge in natural-language processing—using systemic grammar both as a vehicle and as a source of inspiration.


PROGRESS REPORT: SYSPRO

by Michael Cummings

SYSPRO (since 1986, 1988 N. Cummings) is a program for the computer simulation of systemic network models. Various systemic colleagues of mine have been a patient audience to demonstrations and demonstrations of SYSPRO at the 12th (Canterbury) and 14th (Sidney) Systemic Congresses (and workshops for hands-on use of SYSPRO were mounted at the 15th (Michigan State) and 16th (Belfast) Systemic Congresses, and another is scheduled for the Stirling Congress in July 1990.

SYSPRO is a reasonably portable software in its present version. Although originally written in PROLOG code for a VAR/PRIS environment, I have distributed it at workshops in a binary form designed to run on IBM PC/XT/AT of computers. In this form, the software loads much faster and runs somewhat faster than in PROLOG code. This version, however, still requires the use of a commercial PROLOG interpreter, which is available only from Logicos International, Toronto, at a cost of at least $100 U.S. It would obviously be desirable to provide an independently executable compiled binary file for SYSPRO which could be run without a PROLOG interpreter.

Other improvements in the present SYSPRO facility which our experience in workshops has suggested include a simplification of the user environment. A certain amount of PROLOG notation is retained in the syntax of operational commands and statements, which has made the software less user-friendly than it could be.

My work on the program since the last workshop has included both these objectives. I am now experimenting with a commercially available PROLOG development system which can produce compiled and independently executable code. In principle, a program in such a format can run up to 80 times faster than in its original interpreted PROLOG code. In practice, a compiled version of the SYSPRO systemic network graphic output module runs about four times faster than its interpreted counterpart. Part of the discrepancy between expectation and result relates to an inherent drawback in the new PROLOG development system: paradoxically its creators left it short of built-in logic predicates in favour of built-in predicates for windowing and other fancy graphic output modes. As a result, I have had to write my own routines to define predicates which are already built into more standard dialects of PROLOG. Execution of the user defined predicates is slower than if they were built-in, and this is critical in the case of the sorting function. However, the four-fold gain in speed which the net result makes the graphic output just that much more satisfying to use. I have also seen an improvement in the handling of memory resources, which is crucial for the graphic output of large systemic networks.

Improvements in the user environment are more easily achieved. In both the current and the experimental versions of SYSPRO, the syntax of user operations is defined in an environment module of simple proportions. Reverting this module to suit the human context revealed in workshops in
not a large problem. In future releases, however, the entire program will have to be recompiled with the new environment module, irrespective of changes to any other modules.

For the sake of general information about SYSPRO and its intended use, I have prepared a copy for submission to the HUMANITIES COMPUTING YEARBOOK. This information is as follows:

SYSPRO is a program written in PROLOG [© 1985 Logicware International, Inc.] to facilitate the notation of systemic linguistics. It is designed to operate either in the PDES (Purdue Development Support System) environment of PROLOG or as a stand-alone binary program in conjunction with the PROLOG interpreter. It is available for IBM-PC/XT/AT and compatibles, including VAX/VMS.

Systemic linguistics is a school of the linguistic sciences which centers on the paradigmatic aspect of language and on a multistratal approach to language. The paradigmatic aspect of language is formalized in logical alternatives dependent on some condition, i.e., a 'system' of choices among various language features in the context of some logically prior feature or structural condition. A series of logically dependent systems constitutes a 'system network', a species of semantic graph which, in its indefinite extensibility, becomes a model for Saussurean language taken as a whole. In common with other approaches to language, systemic linguistics postulates that language is a semiotic, with encoding and reencoding on several strata, from the level of the socio-cognitive down through the phonological. Within each stratum, the paradigmatic aspect of language is susceptible to the network model. A logical engine with a finite variety of states. Each of the states implies an output which may be interpreted structurally in each linguistic stratum. Each state of the network in higher strata may preclude states of the networks in lower strata, mediated by the structural outputs of relatively higher networks.

As a simulation of systemic network models of language, SYSPRO permits the user to enter system networks into memory, store the recorded networks on disk, recall them from disk, display the networks as graphics in the standard systemic notation, and, most important, derive from the networks linguistic expressions which represent each of the various logical states which the networks imply. These 'selection expressions' have long been part of the systemic description of language. SYSPRO was designed to facilitate linguistic description in network form, but it also serves to check the logical validity of proposed system networks and to catalogue the logical outputs of such networks.

Each of SYSPRO's functions has a characteristic prompt-response mode of operation. The structure of input sequences is based on ordinary PROLOG notation. There are five basic functions:

1. The editorial function. In order to permit SYSPRO to derive selection expressions, the user must first enter the system network into memory. To accomplish this, the user invokes the dialogue facility of the program, by typing the command <bar:><enter> or the command <bra:><enter> -- the first for entering a single system, the second for entering parallel ('simultaneous') or 'bracelike' systems. The program responds dialogically by prompting for the nature of the entry condition(s), i.e., whether simple or complex, and if complex, whether disjunctive or conjunctive. The program continues by prompting for the label which represent systemic choices, and in the case of simultaneous systems, by prompting for further systems. When the dialogue is finished, the system or 'brace' of simultaneous systems is automatically asserted into main memory in the form of rules. The network is thus understood by the program as a rule structure. The user may display the recorded rules for inspection with the command <showrules>. The rules may be edited, filed to disk or erased during the session. The disk file of rules may be edited during the session by invoking the host environment, or after the session. A disk file of rules may be restored to main memory during a session.

2. Deriving selection expressions. SYSPRO outputs all selection expressions implied by the rules which constitute the (logically) first network in main memory. The initiating command is <express>. Selection expressions are derived by a depth-first graph-search and written on the screen in standard systemic notation, between brackets and with internal bracketing and slants to represent simultaneous dependencies. Each expression is numbered serially. The order in which particular expressions appear is sensitive to the order of the rules in main memory. By using the command <expr(s)(X)> where X is the entry condition to some system within the network, the user may limit the derivation to just that subnetwork which begins with the named entry condition. The output of selection expressions may be routed to a disk file instead of to the screen.

3. Displaying the network as a graphic. Because the user may want to avoid drawing the network diagram himself, or because he may want to check the network as a schematic at some stage during the entry dialogue, the command <show> causes all the network implied by rules stored in main memory to be displayed on the screen. This command uses a depth-first graph-search and displays the screen to the user. The command <show(X)>, where X is the entry condition to some system within the network, displays just that subnetwork which begins with the named entry condition. The graphic output may be routed to a disk file instead of to the screen.

4. Deriving preselected expressions. The user may wish to limit selection expressions output to just those which each include a particular feature or a set of features from the network. At the command <select[1],...,J> SYSPRO outputs those and only those selection expressions which each include the features itemized in the list [1,1,.....]. The number or order of features in the list is immaterial. If no selection expression for the stored network includes all the features in the list, an error message appears.

5. Testing networks for logical consistency. At the command <test> SYSPRO searches the stored network for one kind of
1. Author/vendor.

Michael Cussings
English Department
Cedron College
York University
2275 Bayview Avenue
Toronto, Canada M8N 3G6

2. Cost. SYSPRO is distributed free of charge but users are
asked to pay a flat fee to defray cost of distribution media,
package, and technical information supplied. The fee is $15.00
Canadian, or $12.50 U.S., payable in Canadian or U.S. dollars
only.

N.B. SYSPRO runs only in conjunction with a commercially
available PROLOG interpreter which can only be obtained from
Logware International, Inc., Toronto. The current cost of the
least expensive software package including the interpreter is
about $100.00 U.S. (See next system and requirements, below).

3. Cost system and requirements. SYSPRO can be supplied as
PROLOG code to run on the PROLOG environment on VAX/VMS
systems and IBM PC/XT/AT systems and compatibles. It can more
conveniently be supplied as a binary file to run in conjunction
with the PROLOG interpreter on IBM PC/XT/AT systems and
compatibles. The PROLOG interpreter is available as part of any
one of several software packages for micros distributed by

Logware International
2050 Dundas Street East
Suite #204
Mississauga, Ontario
Canada L4L 1Z2

The least expensive of these packages is the PROLOG Primer, which
is currently listed at about $100.00 U.S. plus postage.

Instructions for accessing the PROLOG interpreter in the Primer
package are included with the SySpro package. Logware products
are available only by direct orders to Logware International, Inc.

SYSPRO can be supplied in either 5 3/4 or 3 1/2 inch diskette
format. It can be run from the supply diskette or copied onto
hard disk. It requires a minimum of 640 K RAM running under PC-
DOS or MS-DOS version 2.0 or higher.

4. Copy protection and restrictions. There is no restriction on
copying SYSPRO in either the PROLOG code or the binary file.
Information about copy protection and restrictions on PROLOG
products is available from Logware International, Inc.

5. Support and updates. Advice from the author/vendor is freely
available, and updated versions will be made available at cost
time-to-time.

6. Demonstrations. A SYSPRO computer lab workshop has been a
feature of the last two annual meetings of the International
Symposium on Logic Programming and Applications, held in
Bergen, Norway (1989), and in Helsinki, Finland (1990). A third
is scheduled for the 1990 IJCAI-90, Stirling, Scotland. Subsequent
meetings of the Symposium are scheduled for Paris (1991) and
Sydney, Australia (1992). For 1990 information, write

17-ISC 1990
Battist Diani
Department of English Studies
Stirling University
Stirling, Scotland
UK

7. Bibliography. A bibliography of published and pending
articles on SYSPRO, its architecture and applications, is included
with the package.

As a postscript, I should add that I have been using the software in my
current research on the syntax of the nominal group in Old English, which I
hope to be able to present before very much longer in a monograph form.
The logical structure of the nominal group, and the system network for the
logical function which generates this structure have been problems holding
me up for a long time. I have gone back to my keyboard countless times to
revise the logic network and to take off yet another set of selection
expressions as a control. My current version of this network generates 205
selection expressions before recursion, and I fancy that I would never have
had this far in thinking it all through without machine assistance. If any
of my colleagues who have received a copy of SYSPRO and have mounted it on
their own machines have had any joy of it, I would be grateful to hear
their stories.
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Certain papers are available from the Systemic Archive at Stirling, c/o Martin Davies, English Studies, The University of Stirling, Stirling FK9 4LA, Scotland. UK. Lists of papers available are published regularly in the systemic newsletter Network (see under 1 below).

1. General

JAMES BESSENE AND WILLIAM O'REAVER (EDS.) 1985. SYSTEMIC PERSPECTIVES ON DISCOURSE. Volume 1. HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS.

JAMES BESSENE AND WILLIAM O'REAVER (EDS.) 1988. SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL APPROACHES TO DISCOURSE. Selected Papers from the Fifteenth International Systemic Workshop. HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS.
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JAMES BESSENE, PETER FRIESE, WILLIAM O'REAVER AND CHRISTIAN MATTHIJSEN (EDS.) 1989. SYSTEMIC STRUCTURE AND DISCOURSE. Selected Papers from the Sixteenth International Systemic Workshop. AMSTERDAM: BENJAMIN.

MARGARET BARRY. 1975/6. INTRODUCTION TO SYSTEMIC LINGUISTICS 1 & 2. LONDON: BATESFORD. REPRINT EDITION IN PREPARATION.

MARGARET BARRY (ED.). 1984. NOTTINGHAM LINGUISTIC CIRCULAR: SPECIAL ISSUE ON SYSTEMIC LINGUISTICS.

CHRISTOPHER S. BUTLER. 1985. SYSTEMIC LINGUISTICS: THEORY AND APPLICATIONS. LONDON: BATESFORD.

RUBEN F. FOWDELL. 1985. COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION. CENTER: UNIVERSITY OF OESTERREICH, WELTRAUM I.

RUBEN F. FOWDELL & DAVID YANG (EDS.). 1988. NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN SYSTEMIC LINGUISTICS. Volume 1: LONDON: FRANK CRONER.

MA.K. HOLLIDAY. 1973. EXPLORATIONS IN THE FUNCTIONALITY OF LANGUAGE. LONDON: EDWARD ARNOLD.


ALEX DE ALE & AARON STANMAN (EDS.). 1990. FERNS IN SYSTEMIC LINGUISTICS. A GUIDE TO HALLIDAY. LONDON: BATESFORD.

JAMES PONCEMON. 1979. THE NON-FIRTHIAN TRADITION AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO GENERAL LINGUISTICS. TILBORG: WISSER.

ERICH STEINER. 1985. DIE STELLENUNG DER BRITISCHEN KONTEXTUALISMS. HEIDELBERG: NORD.

ERICH STEINER. 1994. SYSTEMIC LINGUISTICS: TOWARDS A MODEL OF GOAL-DIRECTED ACTION AS A STRUCTURING PRINCIPLE FOR THE CONTENT OF SITUATION. SYSTEMLINGUISTICS. HAMBURG: DEUTSCHE UNIVERSITÄT DES SÜDENS. TO BE PUBLISHED BY HELDER PETER, HAMBURG.

ERICH STEINER & R. VETTER (EDS.). 1988. PRAGMATICS, DISCOURSE AND TEXT: EXPLORATIONS IN
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Robin P. Fawcett. 1988. What makes a 'good' system network 'good'? In Benson & Groves (eds).
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Occasional Papers

Occasional Papers in Systemic Linguistics, Volumes 1, 2, 3 (to appear); and 4 (in preparation). To place order, send payment (£ 6.50 outside the U.K.) to Hilary Holliday, Department of English Studies, University of Nottingham, NG7 2RD, U.K.

H. Grammar & semantics


Thesis


Articles


Christopher S. Butler. 1987. Communicative function and semantics in Halliday & Fewlett (eds; see I above).

Christopher S. Butler. 1988. Politeness and the semantics of modality/directives in English. In Bowers, Cummings & Green (eds; see I above).


Elliot Davies. 1990. On different possibilities in the syntax of English. In Bowers, Cummings & Green (eds; see I above).

Elliot Davies. 1990. English questions. In Steiner & Yellin (eds; see I above).


Numbers 1-2

Peter H. Fries 1982. On Repetition and Interpretation. Forum Linguisticum 7 (1) 50-64.


Peter H. Fries 1988. Towards a discussion of the flow of information in text. MS.


James R. Martin 1983. Consequences of the logic of English text. In James S. Preece &escort Soccer...


T. Language education

Books


Articles


M.A.X. Holliday. 1979. Some reflections on language education in multilingual societies, as seen from the standpoint of linguistics. Singapore: Regional Language Centre (RELCO Occasional Papers).

M.A.X. Holliday. 1979. Differences between spoken and written language: some implications for literacy in pleased page et al. (eds), Communication Through Reading. Adelaide: Australian Reading Association.


Conference reports


VI. Language development (child language)

Study


Rugman, Helen. For reasons five to nine children's language from home to school.


VIII. Language, Sociality, Ideology

Books


Cedric Peach. 1985. Language and Gender: making the difference. Deakin University Press (Social-Cultural Aspects of Language and Education).

Articles


Ragga Hassan. 1985. ‘Moving, comfort and facts: fifty years after Malinowski.’ In Benson & Gresens (eds), see above. 3.


VIII. Verbal art (stylistics) 3.

Sokka 3.


Pope 3.


Articles 3.


David O. Bult. 1985. Wallace Stevens and willful nonsense. Southern Review, 10, No. 73. 3.


David O. Bult. 1988. ‘Attention to meaning and the aribital fabric of a poem.’ In Fawcett & Young (eds), see above. 3.


Michael J. Gregory. 1978. ‘Wordsworth’s “To His Coy Mistress”: the poem as a linguistic and social event.’ Poetics 7. 3.


EX. Semiotics

Book


Articles


Terry Stroop. 1988. What did Milton say about devil's and why don't the critics believe him? In Dennis, Cunningham, and Greaves (eds.) (see above).


X. Artificial Intelligence and computational linguistics

Books


Theses

Linguistics.
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Addresses for Getting the News Out

To get works included in the MLA Bibliography
1. The bulk of the items on this list were generously given by Peter Friis in the autumn of 1984. However, another very useful collection came in, in October 1987, from Bill Mann and Chris Mathiesen, representing their work at the ISS; and they sent a further supply this summer, while various other items have come in from time to time. Further accessions would make the archive more useful, and would be very welcome; and I would be very grateful to have any doubtful attributions, dates or other inaccuracies corrected.

2. The descriptor categories available are as follows:

1. Semantics
2. Lexicography: syntax
3. Morphology
4. Lexicography: lexis
5. Phonology
6. English
7. Other languages
8. Systemic
9. Realizations
10. Functional components
11. General theory
12. Comparison with other general theories
13. Applied linguistics (language in education)
14. Other applications of linguistics
15. Text and discourse
16. Child language and language development

3. I do not undertake to categorize papers, and the bulk of the items on this list have never been categorized, so the list is not as useful as it could be. But if intending contributors classify their own, they will make the list much more useful. If desired, the principal category may be underlined, as for example Tony Sage's are.

4. Reminder. In the past, the question of copyright of items deposited in the archive has been raised, some authors saying that their editors or publishers should be contacted if their articles are to be published elsewhere, which raises the question whether depositing an item in the archive may - in some countries, at least - constitute publication. It may do but whether or no it does, since I cannot possibly write to all editors and publishers on the matter, I can only accept items on the understanding that authors have obtained any necessary permissions before depositing their work. The copyright in all cases remains with the owners. No liability is accepted by me or by my department or by Stirling University for any unmitting misappropriation of copyright.

5. The cost of duplicating is worked out according to the number of sheets a paper requires. The costs of postage are worked out according to whether the recipient is in the U.K., Europe or elsewhere, these categories deriving from the different scales of the U.K. postage rates. Duplicating costs have risen, so new rates (including both copying and postage charges) are given in the boxes below. Cheques should be made out to 'The University of Stirling', in Sterling, please, so that the amounts are received net of conversion charges. Pre-payment is essential; no money, no copies.

Please cite the List Number, as given before each item.

Send all Archive material to:

Martin Davies, English Studies, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, Scotland, Great Britain
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Cost to U.K.</th>
<th>Cost to Europe</th>
<th>Cost elsewhere:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>£1.50</td>
<td>£1.50</td>
<td>£1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>£1.50</td>
<td>£1.50</td>
<td>£1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>£1.50</td>
<td>£1.50</td>
<td>£1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Systemists are to be found in the following U.K. Postal Zones; rates for others will be quoted on request:

### A
- Egypt
- Israel
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  - Paper's title number of sheets;
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.21</td>
<td>C. Davies</td>
<td>&quot;Literal force and contextual significance of English Interrogatives&quot; (4th IPRA Conference, Antwerp, August 1987, (20.9.87)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
(3.3) Martin Davies


(3.4) Peter H Fries

Bibliography, 6/86, typescript [12]; n.p.; (October, 1986).

(3.5) —


(3.6) —


(3.7) —


(3.8) —


(3.9) —

"Language and Interactive Behavior; the Language of Bridge" [22]; From Notes in Linguistics 25: 17-23, (January 1985); (October, 1986).

(3.10) —

"Language and the Expression of Meaning" [31]; English in Australia, Vol. 48, June 1979, 29 — 38; (October, 1986).

(3.11) —

"Language Features, Textual Coherence and Reading", paper delivered at The Second University of Texas at Arlington Conference on Linguistics and The Humanities: The Text as Convergence of Concerns, March 15, 1983; submitted to Word; (October, 1986).

(3.12) —

"Lexical Patterns in a Text and Interpretation" [31]; Festschrift for Robert Lado, Kurt R Janowsky (ed), Benjamins 1985; (October, 1986).

(3.13) —


(3.14) —


(3.15) —

"On Repetition and Interpretation" [51]; Forum Linguisticae, VII, 1, August 1982; (October, 1986).

(3.16) —

"On the Status of Theme in English" [24]; in *Macro and Macro Connessity of Texts*, János S. Patthi and Emil Sieber (eds.), Helmut Buske Verlag (Hamburg), 1983; (October, 1986).

(3.17) —


(3.18) —


(3.19) —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Japanese Sequences in the English Noun Phrase</td>
<td>Publication of the Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, October 170 (October, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>&quot;Japanese&quot;, Ch. 8 of Language: Introductory Readings</td>
<td>Clark, Enochloz and Ross (eds.), St. Martin’s Press, 1972 (October, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>G Fulton</td>
<td>&quot;Perceptions of Time and Change in To Autum: A Stylistic Analysis&quot;</td>
<td>(October, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>Michael Gregory</td>
<td>&quot;Clause and sentence as distinct units in the morphosyntactic analysis of English and their relation to semantical propositions and predicators&quot;</td>
<td>(October, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>English Patterns: Perspectives for a Description of English, Preliminary version for use by the Glendon College English Department, 1972 (October, 1986)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Notes on Communication Linguistics, Semology Predicational Structures*</td>
<td>Glendon College, York University, Toronto (October, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>Michael Gregory &amp; Karen McInnis</td>
<td>&quot;Generic Situation and Discourse Phases: An Approach to the Analysis of Children’s Talk&quot;</td>
<td>(October, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>&quot;How children learn language&quot;</td>
<td>(October, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>&quot;How Is A Text Like A Clause?&quot;</td>
<td>(October, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13.513 | Ruqaiya Hasan
| 13.523 | ——
"The Ontogenesis of Ideology: an interpretation of Mother-Child Talk" (13) n.d. (see note on cover: "Received 5/24/85"); Macquarie University, Australia; (October, 1986). |
| 13.533 | ——
| 13.543 | ——
"Situation and the Definition of Conversation", Paper presented for discussion at the Multi-Disciplinary Workshop on Analysis of Naturally occurring conversation The NAP (November 17-20, 1982) ("The provisional title of this paper had appeared as 'The Interaction between conversation (language) and situation.") (22); (October, 1986). |
| 13.553 | ——
"Situation and the Definition of Genre" - "This is a revised version of the paper presented for discussion at the Multi-Disciplinary Workshop on the Analysis of a Naturally Occurring Conversation The NAP (November 17-20, 1982). "To appear in Perspectives on Discourse: Multi-Disciplinary Study of a Naturally Occurring Conversation tentative title" edited by Allen E. Grinev, Allen Horwood, NL." (44); (October, 1986). |
| 13.563 | ——
"Socialization of Cross-Cultural Education" (101) (101, 8, 1974); (October, 1986). |
| 13.573 | ——
| 13.583 | ——
"The Structure of the Nursery Tales" An Essay in Text Typology" (23); "slightly revised version of talk delivered in Geneva at the 6th International Conference of S.L.I., 6 - 10 May, 1981" (October, 1986). |
| 13.593 | ——
"The Verb 'Be' in Urdu" (63); from Verhaar (ed.) The verb 'be' and its synonyms 5, 1 - 63. (1973); (October, 1986). |
| 13.603 | ——
"Ways of Saying: Ways of Meaning" (20); revised version of a talk presented at the Burg Brunstein Symposium No. 66, August 8 - 17, 1975; copy dated 1982; (October, 1986). |
| 13.613 | Ruqaiya Hasan
"What is Coherence?" (43); n.p., n.d. (1990) pencilled on front; (October, 1986). |
| 13.623 | ——
"What Kind of Resource is Language?", Keynote address delivered at the 15th A.L.A.A. Congress, La Trobe University, Melbourne, August 1983 (130); (October, 1986). |
| 13.633 | ——
"Workshop on Casual Conversation" (33); preliminary version of "Casual Conversation" by M A Halliday and G Plam. (Chapter One of Discourse on Discourse Workshop Reports from "The Macquarie Workshop on Discourse Analysis, February 21 - 25, 1982", Introduced and edited by R. Hasan) published by the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia, Occasional Papers Number 7, 1985; (October, 1986). |
| 13.643 | R Kasper


"Conjunction and Conversational Structure" (draft) (43) Sydney, 1979; October, 1986.

"Conjunction: the logic of English text - draft" (73) Sydney, 1983; October, 1986.


"Hypotaxis and Embeddings: logical and experiential perspectives on subordination" (45) Handout at Systemic Workshop 1985, University of Michigan; October, 1986.

"Intervening in the process of writing development" (111) Sydney, n.d.; October, 1986.
| (3.02) | - | "Lexical cohesion, field and genre parcelling experience and discourse goals" (draft, 1984) (25); Sydney, "to be published in Proceedings of Second Rice Symposium in Linguistics and Semiotics Text Semantics and Discourse Semantics" October, 1986. |
| (3.03) | - | "Reference and Conjunction in children's narrative" (23); Sydney, "to be published in Rupiya Nasan (ed.): Five in Wino children's language from home to school" October, 1986. |
| (3.04) | - | "What is good writing? - the school's v.ew" (27); "to be published in Rupiya Nasan (ed.): Five in Wino children's language from home to school" October, 1986. |
| (3.05) | C Matthiessen | "Notes on the Organization of the Environment of a Text Generation Grammar" (27); reprinted from Natural Language Generation: Recent Advances in Artificial Intelligence, Psychology and Linguistics, April 1987; (15th October, 1987). |
| (3.06) | - | "Representational Issues in Systemic Functional Grammar" (28); reprinted from the Proceedings of the 12th International Systemic Workshop in Ann Arbor, MI, May 21 - 24, 1986; (15th October, 1987). |
| (3.07) | - | "Semantics for a Systemic Grammar" (29); reprinted from Syntactic Perspectives on Discourse, R. Cawney, J. Benson & H. Graves (eds), Benjamins, 1987; (15th October, 1987). |
| (3.08) | C Matthiessen | "The Structure of Discourse and 'Subordination'" (30); reprinted from Clause Combining in Discourse and Grammar, John Hucks and Sandra Thompson (eds), Benjamins, 1987; (15th October, 1987). |
| (3.10) | USC/ISI | "Publication record, 25 January 1985" (32); Marina del Rey, CA, 1986; (October, 1986). |

---
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List 4: Published in NETWORK 11 - 12.
List 5: Published in NETWORK 11 - 12.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Semantics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lexicogrammar: syntax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lexicogrammar: morphology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lexicogrammar: lexis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Phonology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. System networks</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Applied linguistics</td>
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<td>14. Other applications of</td>
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<td>16. Child language and</td>
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<td>17. Other languages linguistics</td>
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<td>18. System networks linguistics</td>
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<td>19. Language in education</td>
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<td>20. Other applications of</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Text and discourse</td>
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</table>

I do not undertake to categorize papers, and the bulk of the items on this list have never been categorized, so the list is not as useful as it could be. But if intending contributors classify their own, they will make the list much more useful. If desired, the principal category may be underlined.
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<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Details</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Archive Lists 1-5: [6]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Abstracts for 14th International Systemic Workshop, Sydney, Australia, August 24 - 28, 1987 [18]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Abstracts for 15th International Systemic Congress, East Lansing, Michigan, USA, July 1988 [18]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Helen Drury & Carolyn Webb
Using Text Strategies to Improve Student Writing
(HERDSA in press) [4]; Paper given at ISIC-16, Helsinki, June, 1989

Robin Fawcett
COMMUNAL: A Brief Overview [4]; Cardiff, March 1989

Jonathan Fine
The Dynamic Construction and Misconstruction of Social Reality [11]; papers presented to ISIC-16, Helsinki, Finland, June, 1989

Ruqaiya Hasan

Ruqaiya Hasan
Meaning in Sociolinguistic Theory [30]; paper presented at the First Hong Kong Conference on Language and Society, University of Hong Kong, 23 - 25 April, 1988

Ruqaiya Hasan & Carmel Cloran
A Sociolinguistic Interpretation of Everyday Talk Between Mothers and Children [12]; to appear in H A K Halliday, J Gibbons & H Nicholas (eds.): "Learning, Keeping and Using Language: Selected Papers from the 8th World Congress of Applied Linguistics"

Betty J Haslett
A Pragmatic Perspective on Reading: Integrating Text, Reader and Context [17];

Penman Project Documentation:

(No author)
The Nigel Manual (DRAFT), December 14th, 1988 (74);

(No author)
The Penman Reference Manual (DRAFT), December 19th, 1988 [14];

(No author)
The Penman User Guide (DRAFT), December 21st, 1988, [26]

C Matthiessen
What's in Nigel: Lexicogrammatical Cartography, 1988 [50]; (this appears to be a short synopsis of the next four items - MD)

C Matthiessen
What's in Nigel: Lexicogrammatical Cartography, Volume 1: General Introduction; Clauses and Complex Clauses, June, 1988, [104];

C Matthiessen
What's in Nigel: Lexicogrammatical Cartography, Volume 2: Introduction to Simple Clauses; Experiential Clause Grammar, June, 1988 [206];

C Matthiessen
What's In Nigel: Lexicogrammatical Cartography, Volume 3: Interpersonal Clause Grammar, June 1988 [120];

C Matthiessen
What's in Nigel: Lexicogrammatical Cartography, Volume 4: Textual Clause Grammar, June 1988 [102];
Introducing Systemic Functional Linguistics Forum
Journal of African Chapter of International Systemic Congress.

Systemic Functional Linguistics Forum (SFLF), the Journal of the International Systemic Congress (ISC) Africa Chapter, is published twice a year in March and September.

SFLF aims to provide an outlet for scholars, researchers, and educators who share the concerns of Systemic Functional Linguistics. It contains articles and reviews on topics in Functional Linguistics. Contributions are invited from scholars on all branches of the subject. From time to time, special issues are devoted to particular topics, such as Genre Analysis, Child Language or Phonetics and Phonology. Manuscripts should be typed with double-spacing on 8½ x 11 sheets and should be submitted in triplicate. Maximum length 20 pages.

Contributions to SFLF and correspondence about contributions should be addressed to:

Dr. Paul Atadile,
Department of English Language,
Obafemi Awolowo University,
Ife-Ife, Nigeria.

EU:
Board of Editors, SFLF,
Department of English,
Obafemi Awolowo University,
Ife-Ife, Nigeria.

Subscription:
Individuals: Nigeria: $10.00 or $12.00 (plus postage) per volume
Overseas: $20.00 or $24.00 (plus postage) per volume
Institutional: Nigeria: $15.00 or $17.00 (plus postage) per volume
Overseas: $30.00 or $36.00 (plus postage) or $35.00 or $41.00 (plus postage) per volume.

Dr. Paul Atadile, C.A.T., E.L.-E.
K.A.F.O.N.
Dr. Kevin Nwogu, P.R.T., Yola
For the Local Chapter

Ms. Maiden Issues of SFLF is due in Spring 1990. It focuses on Discourse and Genre analysis.

ISSUES IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Issues in Applied Linguistics (IAL) is a new refereed scholarly journal published by the graduate students of the UCLA Department of TESL & Applied Linguistics. The Editors encourage submissions of previously unpublished articles on topics of concern to the field of TESL and Applied Linguistics from students, faculty and independent researchers.

Issues in Applied Linguistics invites submissions in the following categories:
1. Full-length articles: Manuscripts should usually be no longer than 20 double-spaced pages (excluding tables, references, etc.). Submit three copies and a 200-word abstract of the article to the Editor.

2. Reviews: Reviews of scholarly works, tests, tests, instructional materials including non-print materials, comparative reviews, and review articles. Reviews should be no longer than five double-spaced pages. Submit two copies to the Editor.

3. Book notices, squibs, work in progress: Short book reviews, short discussions of research, and short reports of work in progress in any area relevant to our field. Book notices should be brief and no longer than two double-spaced pages. Squibs and work in progress should be no longer than five double-spaced pages. Submit two copies to the Editor.

NOTE: All submissions to IAL should follow the publication guidelines of the American Psychological Association and should not be under consideration for publication elsewhere. Manuscripts will not be returned to authors. The Editor reserves the right to make editorial changes for clarity.

Authors should include a cover letter with a full mailing address and home or office telephone number (and electronic mail address, if available). All submissions must be accompanied by a biographical statement of no more than 50 words.

Deadline for receipt of submissions:
For Volume I, Number 1: February 15, 1990.
Manuscripts received after this date will be considered for publication in a subsequent issue.

Send all manuscripts and correspondence to:

Assistant John Kustner, Editor, at the address above or via BITNET: BIV 0078@UCLA
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NEW BOOKS

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY
Amsterdam • P.O. Box 105 • 1000 AE AMSTERDAM
Tel. (+31) 20 48 00 200 • Fax (+31) 20 67 75 00
San Diego • 1931 Fourth Avenue • San Diego, CA 92103-4156
Tel. (858) 430 2920 • Fax (858) 430 2921

Distributions and agents
• John Benjamins North America Inc., c/o Birkhäuser, 180 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, USA
• John Benjamins Canada Inc., 70 Eglinton Avenue East, Suite 700, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4P 2P1
• John Benjamins Benelux, Debruyne & Janssens Publishers, Drostdystraat 2, 2517 AH The Hague, the Netherlands

Publication date: May 1990

Appended linguistics

Learning, Keeping and Using Language
Selected papers from the 8th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Sydney, August 16-21, 1987.
M.A.K. HALLIDAY, JOHN GIBBONS AND HOWARD NICHOLAS (eds)
The book brings together 59 papers of the 8th World Congress of Applied Linguistics in 1987. The contributions are grouped in 9 main sections: theoretical linguistics, applied linguistics, and using language. Each section is preceded by an introduction by one of the Editors.
Co-editors: M. A. K. Halliday, John Gibbons, Howard Nicholas
ISBN 1-55619-017-4 $26 US
Publication date: January 1990

Language, Literature and Critical Practice
DAVID ROBICH
Conceptions, published cultural, political and social critiques have had a crucial impact on the way in which we approach and understand texts. In Language, Literature and Critical Practice, David Robich argues that understanding texts is an important prerequisite to creating political and social critiques. This book covers texts in which, in the past, political and social critiques have been either ignored or treated as trivial.

Relating topics

Language Theory
Essays in honour of Michael Halliday
Rutger Huyghe and Teun Terauds (eds)
ISBN 90 272 3820 4 • 1986 • Paperback
Price to be announced

Routledge Linguistics 1990

PUBLISHING COMPANY

Routledge Linguistics 1990

LEGAL SCHOLL/ LAW SCHOOL 10 East 16th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036

On the plane of theory, description and discourse practice, this series will do much to support and stimulate work at the Mitchell Centre, University of Melbourne

Routledge Perspectives on Language

NARRATIVE
A Critical Linguistic Introduction
MICHAEL J. TOONAN

Keywords: a wide range of narrative types—written and spoken, literary and non-literary—and when these are observed in the language users' immediate experience. The book begins with an account of different narrative forms. The nature, temporal, conceptual, and social consequences of various patterns are then examined from a linguistic point of view. Examples are drawn from narrative texts, literature, and literary theory. The book is addressed to scholars, students, and teachers.

Learning How to Mean
Explanations in the Development of Language
M.A.K. HALLIDAY

Learning How to Mean is an introduction to the basis of language acquisition and development. It is addressed to a wide range of readers, from those taking a first course in linguistic theory to those who are already familiar with Halliday and colleagues' theories of grammar and communication.
Statistics in Linguistics
C. S. Butler
A good introduction to basic concepts for
beginning and applied linguistics students.
(Langford Books)
(1964)
230 x 152 mm 234 pages
$13.95
$8.95

Computers in Linguistics
C. S. Butler
Locomotives: the way towards a
language identity.
(1966)
229 x 152 mm 229 pages
$19.95

INTRODUCTION

Introduction
A book by Blackwell, Inc., Three
Cambridge Center
Cambridge, MA, 02142

5 Discourse Stylistics
An Introduction
RONALD CARTER
and WALTER HANSH

There are a number of copies still available of P. Tench's PhD thesis, of the
above title, that University of British Columbia Press has duplicated for circulation
to interested people: pp 1-152. Cost, incl. postage, 12.50; cheque payable to
UWC, P.O. Box 94, Cardiff CF1 3XE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA PRESS
4841 Memorial Road, Vancouver BC V6T 1W5

New Linguistic Aspects of Legislative Expression
G阴道AIS KENNEDY

In this book, Kenneth Kennedy analyses
the official language of the United States Congress, and
the way in which the text is constructed.

The writing of the United States Congress is
an important aspect of the legislative process. The
language used in the House and Senate is designed to
reflect the interests and values of the people who
vote. The laws that are passed by Congress are
based on the principles of democracy, and are
meant to be fair and just.

CONCLUSION

There are a number of copies still available of P. Tench's PhD thesis, of the
above title, that University of British Columbia Press has duplicated for circulation
to interested people: pp 1-152. Cost, incl. postage, 12.50; cheque payable to
UWC, P.O. Box 94, Cardiff CF1 3XE.

THE ROLES OF INTONATION IN ENGLISH DISCOURSE

It is maintained that intonation performs six separate roles in
English discourse. There is a static role which principally
involves Halliday's notion of 'central intonality', subject to four
main structural conditions: the clause must be single, simple,
straightforward and short, categories which are examined and
described in detail.

Secondly, there is an informational role, which involves intonality
(distribution of information), tonality (cases of information) and
tone (status of information) falls for major information, rises for
minor information, and falls (for thematic marking) and.
A third role is in textual organisation of spoken discourse, via
intonation units and groups, and phonological paragraphs; the pitch
level of the onset syllable, the depth of fall and length of pause are the relevant features.

The fourth role discussed is connected to communicative functions:
falls and rises in independent units of intonation realizing the
premise or addition of information, authoritative or open exchange,
and various kinds of social interaction.

A fifth role is the expression of attitude; it is maintained that it is
not principally rises and falls that manifest this function but
the degree and type of fall, rise and fall-rises, and the type of
pitch movement in weak and pre-weak.

Finally, the sixth role is stylistic; intonation is a principal
means of coordinating and distinguishing between language events
and moods.

A tentative integration of the six functions into a single,
comprehensive, model is attempted in the conclusion. The work
rests on detailed analysis of recorded recordings of genuine
discourse and the results of detailed analysis of the major authors in current
intonational studies, via Pike, James, O'Conner & Arnold, Halliday, Crystal, Thistle, Brazil, Brown, Carton, and others.

SUMMARY

The Roles of Intonation in English Discourse
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The following publications are now available from the University of Strathclyde:


Contents of Volume 1:

1. What is a system network not a system network? (Nigel Gosteli).
2. Information and meaning in spontaneous discourse (Ali El-Venby).
3. Register analysis: The language of air traffic control (Kosin O. Ekanade).
4. Negotiating new contexts in conversation (Carmel Cloran).
5. Alternative approaches to casual conversation in linguistic description (Kasra Walton).

Contents of Volume 2:

1. Sentence initial elements in English and their discourse function (Ivan Lowe).
2. Court discourse as genre: some problems and issues (Sandra Harris).

Contents of Volume 3:

1. They're all out of step except our Johnny: A discussion of motivation for the lack of it in Systemic Linguistics (Margaret Barry).
2. Interpersonal meanings in judicial discourse (Tom Bailey).
3. 'He's my friend' or 'It's my friend': A systemic account (Ann-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen).
4. Sentence types in English discourse: A formal approach (Kieran Devine).
5. Information structure in English conversation: The given-new distinction revisited (Rodolfo Galykens).

B. Monographs in Systemic Linguistics

Number 1: A Comparative Study of the Writing of Scientific Texts Focusing on Coherence and Cohesion

Gerald Parsons

This research report written by the Editor of the series, uses Hasan's chain interaction method to investigate the comparative coherence of sixteen texts. The results show that a significant correlation exists between perceptions of coherence and the percentage of central tokens, thus lending support to Hasan's concept of cohesive harmony.

The study develops Hasan's taxonomy of central tokens by showing that it is possible to modify the concept of cohesive harmony by focusing upon long chains of interaction. This results statistically in a distinct improvement in the explanation of the informants' perceptions of the coherence of the texts.

A method of calculating the relative strength of some of the factors contributing to the cohesion and coherence of the texts shows that at least 34% of the variation of the coherence of the texts is caused by the variation in cohesion. A detailed step by step account of the analysis of one of the texts is given along with sufficient detail of the remaining fifteen to enable the reader to follow the method through.

Number 2: Discourse Variation in Medical Texts (Forthcoming)

Kevin Nwogu

This is a study undertaken as an exercise in Comparative Discourse Analysis. Working within Genre Analysis the work examines the variation in the organisation of the three parallel genres of written medical texts - the Abstract accompanying a medical research paper, the Research Article itself and the equivalent Journalistic Reported Version.

Further details will be supplied later.

C. Reprints in Systemic Linguistics

Number 1: An Introduction to Systemic Linguistics

Volume 1: Structures and Systems

Margaret Seggy

This is a reprint of Volume 1 of the popular introductory account of Systemic Linguistics, first published in 1975 and is in response to many requests for the book. Volume 1 deals with Structures and Systems and is characterised by succinct and lucid writing.

The two opening chapters lay the foundations for the rest of the book and are especially helpful in clarifying the characteristic features of systemic linguistics.

Chapter 3 focuses upon language levels and the next chapter deals with syntagmatic and paradigmatic chains and choice. The rest of the book concentrates upon grammar and in particular discusses the concepts of structure, unit, rank, system, and delicacy.
O.P.S.L. is a relatively informal journal which aims (1) to provide quick circulation for important papers in systemic linguistics but unlikely to appear in these other journals for some considerable time; (2) to provide an outlet for working papers reporting on the early stages of research programmes and designed to elicit comments from colleagues in the field; (3) to encourage new writers in systemic linguistics who may wish initially to try writing for such a journal before revising their work for publication elsewhere. It is also hoped occasionally to publish papers from writers who, though not working within a systemic framework, nevertheless share the concerns of systemic linguists.

Monographs in Systemic Linguistics

This is a new departure for the group. The aim is to focus attention entirely upon one particular study. The rationale is that in so doing an opportunity will be provided to give the reader an in-depth insight into the development of the author's ideas, not always possible in shorter publications.

It will be particularly useful in providing an opportunity for the author to give a detailed account of an analytical model which may be problematic. In so doing, it is hoped that constructive criticism may be developed which will lead to progress in solving some of the problems involved.

Reprints in Systemic Linguistics

This again is a new departure. The aim is to reprint volumes for which there still appears to be a demand, but for which the original editions are no longer available. We are grateful to T. Batsford Ltd. for permission to use the original setting in the reprint version of our first volume in this series.

Contributions to O.P.S.L. and correspondence about contributions should be addressed to:

Dirk Noë, School of Translation and Interpreting (RIVT)
University of Antwerp
B-2000 Antwerp, Belgium

Contributions to the Monograph series and correspondence about contributions should be addressed to:

Dr. Gerald Parsons
Dept. of English Studies
University of Nottingham
Nottingham NG7 2RD U.K.

Orders for any of the publications should be sent on the proforma below to:

Mrs. Hilary Hillier
Dept of English Studies
University of Nottingham
Nottingham NG7 2RD U.K.

ORDER FORM FOR PUBLICATIONS FROM THE NOTTINGHAM ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS PUBLICATIONS GROUP (N.E.L.L.)

Please send me: 

copies of O.P.S.L. Vol. 1. I enclose £

copies of O.P.S.L. Vol. 2. I enclose £

copies of O.P.S.L. Vol. 3. I enclose £

copies of Monographs in Systemic Linguistics No. 1. I enclose £

copies of Reprints in Systemic Linguistics No. 1. I enclose £

Total: £

Prices per copy

O.P.S.L (each volume)  - £6.00 (£6.50 overseas)
Monographs in Systemic Linguistics No. 1 - £8.00 (£8.50 overseas)
Reprints in Systemic Linguistics No. 1 - £8.00 (£8.50 overseas)

Prices include postage and packing.

Payments should be made by (1) a personal cheque drawn on a British bank, (2) a Eurocheque, or (3) a postal money order, all payable in Sterling. All other cheques or money orders are acceptable if an equivalent of £5 is added to cover bank charges. Cheques or money orders should be made payable to "Univ. of Nottingham/OPSL".

My name is

My address is

..........................................

..........................................

..........................................

..........................................

..........................................

(Please check that your name and address are legible)

Please send this form to: Hilary Hillier, Dept. of English Studies, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, U.K.
Announcing a new publication:

**LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE - THEORY AND PRACTICE**

*Essays in Honour of Walter Graweg from his Colleagues and Friends*

Edited by: Christopher S. Butler, Richard A. Cardwell and Joanna Channell

Contents:

- Researching politeness in a second language (CHRISTOPHER BUTLER AND JOANNA CHANNELL)
- Bilingual dictionary reference skills - some research priorities (R. R. K. HARTMANN)
- On ivory towers and the market place: everyday and specialist knowledge in applied linguistics (MICHAEL STUBBS)
- Communicative effectiveness: a unifying concept for language teaching across the curriculum (J. L. M. TRIM)
- The significance of poetry (H. G. WIDDOWSON)
- Thematic options and success in writing (MARGARET BERRY)
- Symbolist solipsism: musing on mirrors and myths (RICHARD A. CARDWELL)
- Bakhtin's metalinguistics (MALCOLM V. JONES)
- Le vide papier que la blancheur defend (BERNARD MOGUURK)
- Rhetoric, language and thought (WALTER NASH)

Nottingham Linguistic Circular Special Issue in association with University of Nottingham Monographs in the Humanities

ISBN: 0 900572 69 8  
Price: £6.50 (paperback)

Available by mail order from:
The Secretary, Department of Linguistics, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD Tel: 0602-484848 Ext 2511 (order form is overleaf)
Following the success of last year's workshop on Theme, we are pleased to announce that a 2nd Systemic Workshop will be held in Nottingham this summer. The topic this time will be RHEA. The workshop is timed to follow on from the 17th International Systemic Conference at Stirling University (4-7 July 1990).

Date of Workshop: 9-11 July 1990 (registration 10.00 on 9th).

Conference Address: Dr. Gerald Parsons, Dept. of English Studies, The University, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, U.K.

Further Information: This will be sent to those who return the slip below by April 2nd.

Papers: Please indicate on the slip if you would be willing to present a paper. While the main topic is Rhea, papers on related matters will be considered.

Please return this slip by April 2nd, 1990 to Dr. Gerald Parsons, Dept. of English Studies, The University, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, U.K.

NAME: ____________________________
ADDRESS: _________________________
(PLEASE WRITE CLEARLY)

Please tick as appropriate:

[ ] I hope to attend the 2nd Nottingham International Workshop and would like further information.
[ ] I am willing to present a paper on

[ ] RHEA
[ ] Related topic (please specify below)

---

Results of the election

BALLOT FOR THE CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEMIC CONGRESS COMMITTEE

I am in favour of adopting the enclosed proposed constitution for the International Systemic Congress Committee.

I am NOT in favour of adopting the enclosed proposed constitution for the International Systemic Congress Committee.

INTERNATIONAL SYSTEMIC CONGRESS COMMITTEE BALLOT

The following people were nominated for the positions on the International Systemic Congress Committee. Please vote for one for each position. Circle the name of the person you wish to vote for.

Chair: Martin Davies, Elia Venzo
Membership Secretary: Jan Pfeil
Treasurer: Hilary Miller

AREA REPRESENTATIVES

The following positions represent different areas of the world. Please vote for one candidate from the area in which you are located. Circle the name of the person you wish to vote for.

Africa: Femi Adeilo
Australia: Francine O'Shaughnessy, Christian Matthiessen
Britain: Martin Davies
Canada: Michael Coulombe, Bernard Mohan
China: Li Wenliang
Continental Europe: Erich Steiner, Elia Venzo, Chair
USA: Barbara Couture, Peter Regan
Other Countries: Jonathan Fine (Israel), Gill Francis (Singapore), Amy Tsou

Please return the ballot to Nan Fries, Membership Secretary, Box 310, Mount Pleasant, MI 48804, USA, by November 1, 1989.
NETWORK NEWS

CHRISTINE PAPPAS has moved from the University of Kentucky to the University of Illinois at Chicago. She presented a paper, "Exploring the reading aloud curriculum genre: a sociolinguistic perspective," at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference in December 1989 in Austin, Texas, and is planning to deliver "Youth children's discourse strategies in using the story and information book genre: an analysis of co-referentiality and co-classification" at the 9th World Congress of Applied Linguistics in April 1990 in Thessaloniki, Greece. Christine's current research activity is represented by the following items:


Pappas, C.C. The onsets of the registers of written language young children's sense of the story and information book genres. Grant from the National Council of Teachers of English Research Foundation.

Address: University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Education, Box 4348, N/C 317, Chicago, IL 60606. Phone: 1-312-996-5767. 8-312-620-4712

MARCIE BERN has moved and is now Assistant Professor of English in Linguistics and director of the English as a Second Language Program at Purdue University (Indiana, USA). She is currently looking at the role of English in West Germany. She writes: "One study is on English in the German legal register; another, large-scale long term project is a study of the impact of English language broadcast news on the acquisition of English by German youth. This study is being conducted in collaboration with Nallo Skirmer, a colleague at Purdue in Communications". Marcie will also be found at the ASLA Conference in Greece. Recent and forthcoming publications include:


Address: Department of English, Navot Hall, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907 (USA). Phone (317) 494-7769.

JOHANNA DE STEFANO delivered papers on cohesion to the International Reading Association annual convention (May, 1989) and the American Educational Research Association meeting (March, 1989). She is currently studying the implications of the spread of English via global telecommunications technology, as well as using cohesion analysis to investigate 'register clash', and the oral and written language of ethnic minority groups. Recent publications include:


'Friendly or unfriendly ten?' a comparison of oral dialogue of economically disadvantaged children and the written dialogues of 'club' literacy materials'. (In press). Johnston, J.D. and Borman, K.H. (Eds.), Effective school programs for economically disadvantaged students: school based strategies for diverse student populations. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. (to be completed FY91)

Address: 257 Arts Hall, Ohio State University, 1945 N. High St., Columbus, OH 43210 U.S.A.

SUSANNA SHORE is hard at work on her doctoral dissertation, 'Multiple structures in the Finnish clause (a systemic-functional description of the Finnish clause). Recent publications include:


Address: Department of Finnish, University of Helsinki, Pahkalamanni 33, 00100 Helsinki, Finland.

Sydney native MARCE BROWN, who is currently employed in the private sector, has been thinking about a master thesis. "I'm looking at developing the systemic concept of genre in a cognitive, epistemological direction. There are some well developed theories in AI about the structure of knowledge we have on how to do things. I want to look at genre as knowledge about how to do things linguistically, taking some ideas from AI knowledge representation".


Address: Department of English, Navot Hall, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907 (USA). Phone (317) 494-7769.
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Sydney native MARCE BROWN, who is currently employed in the private sector, has been thinking about a master thesis. "I'm looking at developing the systemic concept of genre in a cognitive, epistemological direction. There are some well developed theories in AI about the structure of knowledge we have on how to do things. I want to look at genre as knowledge about how to do things linguistically, taking some ideas from AI knowledge representation".


Address: Department of English, Navot Hall, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907 (USA). Phone (317) 494-7769.
DENISE MURRAY will also be found at the AILA Congress in Greece, as well as at TESOL in San Francisco. When not travelling Denise will be working on several projects, including 'Course development and evaluation of CAL in the writing classroom' and 'Language and society in the computer age, a volume in the Language series Language and Social Life, edited by C. Catlin. Recent and forthcoming publications include the following:

Constitution for action: the computer terminal as medium of communication.

Forthcoming John Benjamins, Holland.

Collaborative writing as a literacy event. In Collaborative Language Learning and Teaching, D. Ruman (ed.), CUP.


Address: 7054 Calleterra Drive, San Jose, CA 95120, USA.

MICHAEL JORDA'S recent and forthcoming publications are as follows:


Some inter-paragraph connections in formal prose. Technical Writing, 1, 2, 1989.


The reader over your shoulder: a linguistic introduction. Technical Writing, 1, 2, 1989.


An integrated three-pronged approach to discourse analysis. In V. Mann and S. Thompson, eds., Discourse Description, Benjamins.


Recent and forthcoming publications by JOSEPH KESS include the following:


Address: Department of Linguistics, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3Z1.

FRANCES ORISTII, formerly of Deakin University, has taken up the Foundation Chair of Education at the Northern Territory University in Darwin.

Address: Faculty of Education, Northern Territory University, P.O. Box 40146, Canberra, N.T. 0201, Australia.

RAY GERPIALAMA is among those making her way to AILA in mid-April. On her way there she will be spending time in Nottingham and on the way back in Toronto at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Address: The University of Wollongong, Faculty of Education, P.O. Box 1144, Wollongong, NSW 2500, Australia.

SILL McGREGOR'S travel plans are very interesting indeed but he has stretched the editor's palaeographical skills to the limit. He is working on (1) semantic grammar: development of a new theory of grammar (2) an investigation of the grammar of Ryukyuan, a dying language (3) eastland Western Australia (4) the construction of race and race relations in English discourse in Australia (4) the organisation of discourse in Goonyandal.

BONAYA BASHI and MICHAEL HALLIDAY are also going to Thailand for the 19th World Congress of Applied Linguistics in April. After returning to Australia, they plan to attend the 17th ICA at Stirling in early July. From there Buxis plans to go to Barcelona for the 1990 International Pragmatic Conference (9 - 13 July) and then to Tokyo for the Language Sciences Summer Institute (23 - 31 July) and the 1990 Conference of the Language Sciences Association of Japan (28 and 29 July) at the International Shibril University.

Michael expects to go to China for the Seminar on Systemic Linguistics at Peking University but the seminar was held, with over 60 attending and nearly 20 papers coming papers; and it was clearly felt to have been a great success. The next such seminar will be held at Boston University in the (northern) summer of 1991. Michael also drew attention to the timings for Tokyo 1991: Language Sciences Summer Institute (22 - 26 July); Language Sciences Association of Japan, Conference (27 - 28 July); 19th International Systemic Congress (29 July - 2 August).

Recent and in press publications by MICHAEL HALLIDAY include:

'So you say "pass" ... thank you three months.' In Allen D. Grimshaw (Ed.). What's going on here: complementary studies of professional talk. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, in press.


'Some lexicogrammatical features of the Zero Population Growth text.' In Sandra Thompson and William Nunn (Eds.). Discourse analysis: diverse analyses of a fund-raising text. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, in press.

'Some basic concepts of educational linguistics.' In Werner Stolhy (Ed.). Languages in education in a bilingual or multilingual setting. Hong Kong Institute of Language Education, 4.1-4.859.


Address: 2 Laing Avenue, Killara, N.S.W. 2071 Australia.

Recent and in press publications of KESSAHA BASHI include:


After the successful completion of Phase 1 of the COMMUNAL Project (a full account of which appears elsewhere in this volume) ROBIN FAVCETT has accepted a permanent post at the University of Wales College of Cardiff (UWCC), as the Director of the Computational Linguistics Unit.

Address: The Computational Linguistics Unit, Aberconway Building, University of Wales College of Cardiff, Cardiff CF1 3YB, UK.

GORDON TUCKER, who worked with Robin Fawcett on Phase 1 of COMMUNAL, will be at UWCC for Phase 2. He will continue with having the major responsibility for the implementation of the concept of 'texts as most delicate grammar'. Address: as for Robin Fawcett.

PAUL TRENCH, who contributed to the model of information in the COMMUNAL Project, is now a part of the School of English Studies, Journalism and Philosophy at UWCC.

Address: ASLS, SESJP, University of Wales College of Cardiff, Cardiff CF1 3yb.

DAVID DUNG, of UVCC, is seeking a sabbatical year, as for Paul Trench.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES

For possible posts on the COMMUNAL Project at Cardiff, see the last section of Robin Fawcett's of COMMUNAL in section on computational linguistics.

NETWORK NEWS

Bill Rand Lelchman Marin have joined the Summer Institute of Linguistics and are preparing to return from ISC and move to Harvard in August to work on Computer Assisted Design Adaptation and discourse analysis.

Address: 681/683, 667A Adamantly Way, Marina del Rey, CA, 90292-6403. ISI will forward mail for the Marin's.

Louise Ravello is currently planning to finish her dissertation next summer. The good news from Louise is that she will be going home to Australia for Christmas and attending the Systemic meeting there. Also, she has wheels (and hence great liberty).

Address: English Language Research, University of Birmingham, Fergusson, B1 2TT, Great Britain.

Betty Samrai is now in Michigan studying for a Ph.D. Betty will be at the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan from September - May and then will return to Singapore for four months before returning to Michigan for the fall term.

Address: English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109.

Michael O'Toole ran a Language Education Conference in December, 1989, in Paris which was described as "an interesting mix of systems and semantics". The Editors of NETWORK would like to have more information on this conference, and all other conferences which deal with semantics.

Address: School of Human Communication, Murdoch University, Murdoch, Western Australia, 6150, Australia.

Boul Bernstein will be in Toronto in June and in Australia in October.


Geoff Steevens can be reached at 360 Bliss Drive, Urbana, Illinois, 61801, USA through the winter 801 (we don't have a bad winter). And then she can be reached at 81 Person Court, Cambridge, England. CENTER.

Peter Fries was named a Lendolradzke Professor at the University of Victoria. That meant that he went to beautiful Victoria BC for a week and gave a series of five lectures on discourse. During his visits he met Gordon and Kathy Fawcett. He also met Robin Thomson and his partner, and he met Bette Fries. Robin and Peter returned from Italy. Peter has also returned to India. Peter is currently teaching at the University of Toronto, the Technical University of Berlin, the University of Warsaw, the University of Munich, the University of Edinburgh. Peter and his wife, Betty, have just returned from India. Peter has also been at the University of the Saarland, the University of Munich, the University of Edinburgh, the University of London, and TESOL Liaison Committee NCTE - National Council of Teachers of English, TESOL. Peter is currently teaching at the University of Bremen, the Technical University of Berlin, the University of Warsaw, the University of Munich, and TESOL Liaison Committee NCTE. Peter is currently teaching at the University of Bremen, the Technical University of Berlin, the University of Warsaw, the University of Munich, and TESOL Liaison Committee NCTE. Peter is currently teaching at the University of Bremen, the Technical University of Berlin, the University of Warsaw, the University of Munich, and TESOL Liaison Committee NCTE.

Here are some recent publications:

"C. C. Fries' View of Language and Linguistics", in Peter H. Fries and Nancy M. Fries (Eds.), Towards an Understanding of Language: C. C. Fries in Perspective, 63 – 64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

"Slot in Referential Hierarchy, in Relation to Charles C. Fries' Views of Language", in Peter H. Fries and Nancy M. Fries (Eds.), Towards an Understanding of Language: C. C. Fries in Perspective, 103 – 117. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.


ADDRESS: Box 318, Mt. Pleasant, MI. 48858.

Caroll Martin writes about an article by Sharon Crowley entitled "linguistics and Composition Instruction" where the author says "linguistics favors an extremely narrow, noncontextual notion of what it means to be a user of language". (pp.149-150). Carol's intent is to illustrate a linguistic systemic analysis of texts at CCC in March in a paper called "The Flow of Description in Fact and Fiction" where she will be discussing Theme/Rheme.

ADDRESS: 2012 Bay Street, Texas City, TX 77590.

Lynn Poulton writes that "I have been spending most of my time readjusting to being a student again – getting used to actually taking classes, etc. So far things have been a lot of fun here. Linguistics Department, Rice University, Houston, Texas. Class are interesting, and I've had a chance to do stuff like look at languages other than English (something I never seemed to find the time to do when working on a computational news from Lymo). I do have a Mac-compatible version of the legal grammar with me, but haven't quite gotten it running properly. In addition, I'm trying to find the time to continue work on the Textual metafunction in generation, and will hopefully (if I ever get it written) be giving a paper on the differing textual considerations for generating monologue and dialogue (i.e., part of an interaction with a user) in a text generation system, at the Natural Language Generation Workshop at ACL this year."
In brief, for Network News

Christian Matthiessen
Department of Linguistics
Sydney University, Australia

E-mail: phil@sydnet.net
Ph. (2) 692 4227 (ext)

Recent and upcoming publications:


-- jointly:


Research topics include:


-- jointly:


Current research projects include:

As part of the development of the Passive form generation system, I wrote a 'map' of the systems of the Np+P grammatical category, (and to that it can serve as a supplement to Michael Halliday's "Introduction to Functional Grammar" - now called "Lexico-grammatical cartography: English systems". This has an ongoing project, with recursive draft versions. Associated with the work on English systems is work on English in its typological context to a systemic perspective.

As we start to develop a more complete linguistic toolkit in Sydney using the AUI framework, we are focusing on two areas of research application, multi-linguage generation and speech generation, although both of them will be opportunistic to extend the work on the various levels of the text generator as well.

(1) Multilingual generation. Beginning in 1989, we will develop a version of the passive form system capable of producing (verbatim) text in Chinese, English, and Japanese. Part of the task is to create systemic generation grammars with semantic interference for Chinese and Japanese, drawing on the work at Kyoto University on Japanese by John Bevers and students and on the work on the basis for Chinese grammar and text in Chinese by the department of linguistics at Sydney University under Michael Halliday's supervision. But it will also be necessary, of course, to develop different higher-level systems in the environment to support global and local text organisation. The system will rely on one common database of knowledge text, which is necessary, of course, to ensure that the texts produced have the same source and present the same information (where the notion of sentences has yet to be specified). One interesting question, which multi-linguage generation shares with the interpretation of biographies, is to what extent the common feature base can be extended as one integrated system or has to be modelled at separate but coordinated systems, no doubt, it will sit somewhere between these two views. It is clear, then, that the lack of multilingual
I see the multilingual generation work as a common tool in developing and testing systemic functional grammars of various languages. Chinese and Japanese are part of the funded research, but I would like to see other languages such as Tagalog and Indonesian being acted upon. Naturally, I will be most grateful for papers and written references to systemic functional work on Chinese and Japanese, as well as other languages. This research is also to be seen in the context of the development of a systemic generation program of Grammar in Derrida's work.

(1) Speech generation. The work on extensive text generation and speech synthesis is more exploratory since it has not yet been funded. A group at the department of Electronic Engineering at Sydney University, including Clive Swanwick and Julian Proctor, are working on various aspects of speech processing. The possibility is being explored to interface their work on speech generation with text generation using the Pentium system. Like the one hand, this is an opportunity to share the interface between the two generators and the speech synthesizer. The languages part of the phonological analysis and its interaction with learning earlier, of course, already been worked out by McIntyre, but research is needed on the interface to the synthesizer. On the other hand, research on speech generation spans the possibility of expanding these areas of modeling in a generation system that are expressed in speech but not directly in writing since their modes of expression (intension in particular) are not represented in writing. These areas are primarily interrelated and to be part of the future, there would be an opportunity to extend the interface and test texts of a text generator, both of which have been neglected relative to the automatic text in past research.

There is that considerable research intended in research on speech generation, but there are also numerous practical applications, for instance in the context of various telephony services.

Personal notes:

In and around Sydney:

Sydney is a lively and active, groups meet regularly in the area of semantics and educational linguistics, both with systemic-descriptive. A Sydney-based linguistic group in the beginning to meet. Every month the Sydney Linguistics Circle (SLC) meets to listen for a while, speakers since last September have included Bill Foley, Robert de Swaan Floor, Vancouver, Martin Witten, and Christian Matthias. The two main Sydney groups in this metropolis, Bill Foley and Sydney University, have given their latest developments. Unrelated to this is Sydney, with speakers by Bill Martin, D. Shaw, and others.

Rupali Hanson (a semantic variation) and Christian Matthias (an semantic interface) gave papers at ASLA and Jenny Hawkins at MA in Melbourne, September 1989.

Jim Martin, while on sabbatical, has been continuing his research on Jago's idea in a working on the interpersonal metafunction and organization in dialogue. He has left a life of being (though far more on a work), superimposing this truly monzial analysis of 'English Talk' as well as a number of papers this year, including 'Life as an Action'.

Rupali Hanson and Michael Holloway visited Japan in August 1989, giving a paper of lectures at Tokyo's University and looking at possible venues for the 1990 CLS meeting in Tokyo. 1991.

A joint session with the ASLA and ASLA meeting in September, 1990.

Christian Matthias and John Connolly went to a conference on language and text led by Prof. in Stanford and Prof. in N.C. with P. I. working with the organizers, to bring Chinese and Western scholars together for the first time at Xian, PRC, March 89. There were very interesting systemic functional papers at Chinese, and by Prof. Shuanghe Hu (A Semantic-Functional Approach to Word Order in Chinese) and one by Prof. Feng Yang (A Contraive Study of Theme and Rheme Structure in English and Chinese). Other scholars and students also showed a good deal of interest in systemic-functional work, including computational applications. Christians and John gave a paper on the interaction needed to support changes in the text, the interaction needed to support changes in the text, and paper by Michael Holloway comparing systemic Chinese and English was read. The spontaneous hospitality shown by the Chinese scholars and students made the conference a very pleasant experience.

Christian will take a trip to two other systemic generation projects using Panass, first to Los Angeles in December to visit Marilyn and the Panass project, then to Boston in January to visit Eric Guenter's German large generation project. Later in the year, Christian plans go to Europe again for conferences, including ICS in Stockholm.

Lynn Preston, from Sydney University, has been awarded a post-doctoral fellowship at the University of Leeds, where she is in her first term. She is pursuing her systematic computational research interests on the same tale. In the Panass project at ICS (UCLA), it is a wonderful opportunity to continue the exchange between staff and students.

Mark O'Connell was in developing systemic computational linguistics at the Department of Linguistics, Sydney University, (research on systemic parsing and grammar, dynamic models of exchange, etc.) is well into the Panass project at UCLA for six months (starting late November, 1965). He's planning to go to Starling for ICS.

Klaus Henrich, Department of Linguistics, Sydney University, in an systemic research on journalistic English, studying the semantic movement in news articles.

Two systemic B.A. Honours those have been completed this year in the Department of Linguistics, Sydney University, one by Gundy Thorpe, the writer of radio advertising a linguistics perspective, and one by Tim Harkey, 'Expressing the Inarticulate: a study of the discourse of new religious movements' in Sydney.

Two systemic B.A. Honours those have been completed this year in the Department of Linguistics, Sydney University, one by Gundy Thorpe, the writer of radio advertising a linguistics perspective, and one by Tim Harkey, 'Expressing the Inarticulate: a study of the discourse of new religious movements' in Sydney.

USC/IS

It's now in charge of the Panass project at IS/ USC/IS, while taking up a position in March 1990 with the ASLA, John Berman, Eric Guenter, and Christine Matthias are linking together text generation research using systemic and Panass at USC/IS, at IS/IC (Barcelona), and at Sydney University.

Santa Barbara

Sandy Thompson, Jack Dulius and colleagues and students from USC and the University of California at Santa Barbara (Barbara Fox and Susan Conklin) continue to do researches that are highly complex and of obvious systemic research in the general framework of what is often called 'West-coast functionalism'. Sandy Thompson has co-authored a number of papers exploring the reflection in grammar of 'information flow' in discourse (or 'tells' and 'questions'). This is highly complex and of obvious systemic research in the general framework of what is often called 'West-coast functionalism'. Sandy Thompson has co-authored a number of papers exploring the reflection in grammar of 'information flow' in discourse (or 'tells' and 'questions'), and the significant differences between relative clauses in national grammar serving as Subject, Object, etc. These all give support to Plato's hypothesis of the 'blinded phenomena within the clouds from Thessaloniki to Rome and in all the unsectarian lands' from Erwin to New Jack.
If you put it in systemic/Hjelmslevian terms, something that has always been of great interest to systemic linguists.
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SYSTEMIC LINGUISTS LOOSE A GOOD FRIEND

PETER STREVENS
Applying linguistics to language teaching

The unexpected death at the age 67, in Tokyo, of Peter Strevens has deprived British language teaching of a wide-ranging theorist and scholar. Co-author of the pioneering Linguistics for Language Teaching, published in 1964, Strevens was a major figure in many innovations in applied linguistics and English language teaching throughout the world.

After graduating from University College, London, he started his career in India before moving to Edinburgh to help develop the first applied linguistics course in the English speaking world. As a Professor of English at the University of Leeds from 1961 to 1967, Strevens was followed by the first ever Chair in applied linguistics at the University of Leeds, which he held from 1966 to 1974. After establishing a strong research programme with graduates who linked with those from Edinburgh in dominant applied linguistic development in Britain.

At the same time, he was active in establishing the new discipline on a wider basis, as Secretary of the British Association for Applied Linguistics from 1966 to 1970 and as a founder member and second chairman of the British Association for Applied Linguistics from 1972 to 1975. His later work, as Director of the NELT Educational Trust in Cambridge, took him more specifically into English teaching. He published books on phonetics, language teaching practice, and language teacher education, and also collaborated on the development of “SeaSpeak”, the international language of the sea. The sea, indeed, was one of his life-long loves, and his internationalism was the product of a constant awareness of Britain as a trading and maritime nation.

His extensive work for the British Council and other official bodies, and his constant travelling, played a major role in ensuring that the market-led spread of the English language in the last 40 years was accompanied by systematic analysis and support for everyone concerned with it. Much of this depended on the goodwill he was able to win from ex-students, colleagues and friends who had benefited from his generosity. From contacts made on their behalf and other similar kindnesses.

The combination of scholarship, entrepreneurial zeal, administrative competence and generosity that Strevens brought to an important part of Britain’s cultural diplomacy is rare.

He leaves a widow and two sons.
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