news, views **NETWORK no. 6**

and reviews in systemic linguistics and related areas

Editor: Robin P. Fawcett, Department of Behavioural and Communication Studies, The Polytechnic
          of Wales, Treforest, Nr Cardiff CF37 1DL, Great Britain. Tel: (work) 0443 405133 ext.
          2594, (home) 0222 842016.

Assistant Editors: Olu Adejare and Bisi Afolayan, University of Ife, Nigeria; Jim Benson and
          Bill Greaves, York University, Toronto, Canada; Margaret Berry, University of Nottingham,
          G.B.; Bill Downes, University of East Anglia, Norwich, G.B.; Peter Fries, Central Mich-
          igan University, Mount Pleasant, U.S.; Jim Martin, University of Sydney, Australia;
          Lewis Mukattash, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan; Erich Steiner, University of the
          Saarland, Saarbrücken, Fed. Rep. of Germany; David Young, UWIST, Cardiff, G.B.

EDITORIAL

April 1984

This issue is coming out several months after it was hoped; this is due to the simple fact that
Network has to get done when the Editor can find time to do it, and those things that he is paid a
salary explicitly to do have to come first. However it is a bumper issue, with over a quarter
as much again as the last - which itself was that much fuller than the one before. Readers may
be relieved to know that we do not intend to continue growing at this rate, though it is very
encouraging that there is so much news to report. And we are sure that there is more: please
send us details of any activities relating to systemic linguistics and related matters in your area.
Don't assume that someone else will do it! The next issue will be prepared in May, hopefully for
dispatch in June. Please send in any immediate-items of news, etc, right now.

In his address to the Ninth International Systemic Workshop at Toronto in 1982, Michael Halliday
suggested that, among the many uses to which systemic linguistics can be put, was linguistic theory.
In that one brief remark he brought tumbling down one of the major conceptual contructions within
which many of us work: the dichotomy between (1) theoretical linguistics and (2) the application
of that theory in a number of fields. Systemic linguists have always valued the interplay between
theory and application, and I for one would assert that my more 'theoretical' work has always
prospered most when I was working on some 'applied' task - whether analysing a literary text or the
syntactico-semantic structure of children, or considering the problems of mother tongue or second
language curriculum design, or putting a model of language in a computer. In one sense, it isthis last
activity that does most to undermine the simple notion of a theory and its application, because
for many linguists these days, including many in the neo-Chomskyan paradigm, the ultimate challenge
to a theory of language is its ability to be incorporated elegantly in a computer program.   Yet
this is nowadays also one of the most important applications of linguistics (see p. 19). But Halliday
in fact meant more than this; the implication is, perhaps, that those who see their job as that of
making theories should not be elevated above those who earn their living by using theories. Using
theories is in fact much harder, if only because the theories never work as well as they are
supposed to. (Of all the systemic grammars that I have looked at over the years, including all
those grammars and fragments of grammars that I myself have constructed, there is only ONE that
I know works in every detail, and with every combination of choices - the grammar for the English
Operators and Auxiliaries that I presented at the Silver Jubilee Meeting of the Linguistics
Association of Great Britain at Hull recently [handout available; paper not written up yet] which HAS
been implemented in a computer.) Thus, using theories always involves modifying the descriptions that
have been developed within their assumptions and so, often, modifying the theory itself. There are
therefore far more systemic 'theorists' about than we might think - and it is important that those who
try 'applying' systemic theory and then modify it a little should tell the rest of us what they have
been doing. It may be useful to someone else. Network would welcome contributions of this sort.

This issue of Network carries items of interest for a wide range of 'applications' of systemic ling-
uistics, as you will find. It also includes reports - one very thorough - of last year's workshop, and
an annotated bibliography of Peter Fries' work. (The third part of Michael Halliday's annotated biblio-
graphy will now appear in the next issue.) There is an important review of Martin & Rothery's Writing
project report, and the second paper from the Mann & Matthiessen computer text production project.

At the Nottingham workshop a committee was set up to plan our future activities, as follows: Chairperson: Robin Fawcett, members: Peter Fries, Jim Martin, Hilary Hillier (Dept. of English, University of Nottingham) and Ruth Riley (Dept. of Literature, Languages and Philosophy, Trent Polytechnic, Nottingham). Hilary Hillier has since agreed to be Treasurer, and Martin Davies, as Organiser of the next workshop (see below) has been co-opted for the current year. (The committee, it should be explained to those anxious about how their workshop fees are being used, consult by phone; no travel is involved.) There are a number of issues which the committee would like to consult 'members' (if the word is appropriate) about, and we hope we shall have a chance to do this at a full meeting at the next workshop. But if there is anything that concerns you or any suggestion that you would like to make, please write to one of the committee members listed above.

It may be useful to say now that the 1985 workshop, following the successful workshop at Toronto in 1982, will once again cross the Atlantic. IT will be at Ann Arbor, Michigan, and the Organiser will be Dick Bailey. We hope that it may be possible to obtain support from the British Council, the British Academy and other such institutions, as was so generously given in 1982, to supplement whatever can be got from our home institutions and our own inputs, and so to enable the good number of non-North Americans who attended in 1982 to do so again. And, looking further ahead still, we have been invited to Australia for 1987, when AILA (the International Association for Applied Linguistics) will be meeting there - which it is hoped will help with funding. (Australia is well worth a visit; see pages 23-4.) Why not plan to take your Summer holiday in the US in 1985 and in Australia in 1987?

Finally, we welcome Olu Adejare as an Assistant Editor. The next issue will carry a description of the work in systemic linguistics in the Department of English Language at the University of Ife, Nigeria - which is probably the biggest department in the world where the central theory is systemic linguistics!

Editor

```
NEWS  OF  FORTHCOMING  EVENTS
```

ELEVENTH INTERNATIONAL SYSTEMIC WORKSHOP

Following the successful tenth workshop, which is reported on fully elsewhere in Network, we are pleased to announce the first workshop to be held in Scotland - others having previously been held in England, Wales and Canada.

Date: 29 - 31 August 1983

Location: University of Stirling (well known as a particularly attractive conference venue).

Organiser: Martin Davies, English Studies, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, Scotland (tel. Stirling (0786) 3171).

Call for offers of papers and proposals for workshop sessions: while theoretical studies will be welcome, if there is pressure on time priority will be given to text studies.

Cost: £18.40 per day, plus £2.00 to cover the costs of a party on the first evening and £4.50 for a dinner on the second, and a small sum to cover administrative costs (extremely favourable rates).

Access: by coach: there are cheap fares from all major cities;

            by train: the famous 'Clansman' leaves London at 10.00 am and conveniently reaches Stirling, via Edinburgh, soon after 4.00 pm (the first session being planned for 5.00 pm); British Rail give substantial reductions on conference fares;

            by air: Stirling is easily accessible via Prestwick, Edinburgh or Glasgow.

All further offers and enquiries should go to Martin Davies, at the above address.

Announcing

THE ELEVENTH LACUS FORUM

Cornell University
Ithaca, New York
August 12-16, 1984

The Eleventh Annual LACUS Forum of the Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States will be held August 12-16, 1984, in Ithaca, New York, on the campus of Cornell University. Accommodations will be provided on campus at modest cost in the modern North Campus dormitories, or, if preferred, at several near-by motels.

Papers presented at the Forum will appear in the LACUS yearbook, *The Eleventh LACUS Forum*, which, like the previous yearbooks, will be published by Hornbeam Press, 6520 Courtwood Drive, Columbia, South Carolina, U.S.A. 29206. The LACUS professional membership fee of $20 per year ($25 Canadian) and student and emeritus membership fees of $12 ($15 Canadian) include a free copy of the current year's *Forum*.

For further information regarding the Eleventh LACUS Forum, and/or to join LACUS, please write to Valerie Becker Makkai, Secretary-Treasurer, LACUS, P.O.B. 101, Lake Bluff, Illinois, U.S.A. 60044.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Paid-up members of LACUS are entitled to submit an abstract for consideration for inclusion on the program of the Eleventh LACUS Forum. Membership dues may accompany abstracts submitted. Most papers accepted for presentation at the Forum will be published in the society yearbook. However, a paper listed in the Forum program which is not read by its author will not normally be published.

Abstracts of no more than one 8½ x 11 inch page in length should be submitted in an original plus twelve (12) copies to the LACUS address below. The original copy of the abstract should be camera-ready so that it can be photo-copied for inclusion in the meeting handbook. The abstract should be typed single-spaced, with at least 1½ inch margins on all sides. The author's name must not appear on any copy of the abstract. Instead, please submit, along with the abstract, a 3 x 5 card bearing the following information: 1) author's name, address, and affiliation; 2) title of the paper; 3) amount of time requested; 4) any audio-visual equipment needed. Papers are limited to no more than 20 minutes in length.

Abstracts should be as informative as possible so as to allow referees to get a reasonable idea of the substantive content of the paper. They should contain a clear statement of the point(s) to be made as well as a concise and representative accounting of the conclusions. Any reference to an article or book should identify it by title (not just author and year).

Deadline for receipt of abstracts is March 15, 1984. The program will be announced about May 1. Please send abstracts to:

LACUS, P.O.B. 101, Lake Bluff, Illinois U.S.A. 60044

```
┌─────────────────────────────┐
│    NEWS OF RECENT EVENTS     │
└─────────────────────────────┘
```

TENTH INTERNATIONAL SYSTEMIC WORKSHOP

UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM, 6 - 8 SEPTEMBER 1983

We give below three views of this highly successful workshop: one by a regular attender;
one by an established systemic linguist for whom, however, this was the first workshop; and
one by a new-comer.

PERSPECTIVE 1: THE REGULAR ATTENDER

The tenth international workshop, while smaller than last year's meeting at York University in
Toronto, nonetheless attracted about 45 participants from a number of countries, including a strong
North American contingent and linguists from Belgium, Egypt and Iraq.

Several of the major themes of the Ninth Workshop were further developed in papers this year.
These included computational linguistics: both work on the Nigel text generation program (Mann,
Matthiessen), and on statistical studies of texts, with respect to both lexis in relation to field of
discourse (Benson and Greaves) and to the grammar of the nominal group in Old English (Cummings).
Michael Gregory's paper on phasal analysis provided a detailed and convincing application of his model
of Communication Linguistics to the interpretation of a literary text. The opening address by Sandra
Thompson, on the position of purpose clauses in English discourse, contributed interesting insights to
the analysis of discourse structure, a major concern in more than one previous workshop. There were
several papers on grammatical topics (Aziz, Gotteri, Morley, Veltman) and one on the wider usefulness
of a systemic approach in educational research (Ogborn and Bliss).   Afaf Elmenoufy's paper on English
intonation stimulated an already vigorous demand for access to her findings in this area, and there
was general hope that her Ph.D. thesis will be published soon and become more widely available.

As in previous workshops, the friendly and informal atmosphere, and the opportunities to discuss
points with speakers outside the timetabled sessions, were among the attractions of the meeting. If
I have one criticism, it is that not enough time was allowed for more formal discussion at the end of
each paper, when all could hear it and have the chance to take part.   But I can appreciate the
difficulties of providing time for both kinds of debate within a full programme.

Much credit for another sucessful and enjoyable workshop must go to the organisers, Margaret
Berry and Chris Butler, and those who helped them.   It was good to revisit Nottingham University,
host to an earlier workshop in 1976, and a very congenial setting.

Eirian Davies

PERSPECTIVE 2: THE 'FIRST TIMER' ESTABLISHED SYSTEMICIST

Although I am one of the earliest systemicists, having worked with Halliday in London during the
sixties, this was the first time that I have attended a systemic workshop. It is surprising how one
can get cut off in this modern age in a country as near as Egypt!   I very much enjoyed seeing old
friends and colleagues, and just as much meeting the (for me) new systemicists, from the U.S., Canada,
Britain, Belgium, Germany and Iraq.

Ancaster Hall was a very good choice as a place for the workshop: easy and quick access between the conference room, the cafeteria and bar gave a friendly and homely atmosphere to the workshop, encouraging discussions among participants at all times, while the very attractive background of the university campus provided refreshing short walks after meals and at teatime.

The content of the workshop papers was interestingly varied, stimulating quite a lot of discussion. Particularly interesting was Prof. S. Thompson's (UCLA) paper 'The position of purpose clauses in English discourse', where she illustrated how an initial purpose clause, unlike a final one, extends its domain of reference beyond its main clause, thus functioning as a discourse organising device.

Also interesting was Prof. J. DuBois's (UCLA) paper 'Towards an ecology of grammar', in which he showed the necessity of looking at discourse to account adequately for the function of the article in Sacapultec. His conclusions about the necessity for different kinds of discourse analyses, one language-specific and another language-independent, and his representation of language in the 'conceptual' and 'material' worlds, were particularly interesting.

Mr N. Gotteri (Sheffield), in his paper 'When is a system network not a system network?', showed how using networks as a means of displaying a taxonomy of verb forms (not semantic features) can be very useful, not least as a teaching device. On the other hand, Mr J. Ogborn (Chelsea, London), in his paper 'The analysis of qualitative data for educational research' illustrated, very clearly and convincingly, the use of 'network structure' as a method of making sense of large bodies of qualitative data in educational research - a method which he claims will be of use to all social scientists.

Of special interest to me was Prof. M. Gregory's (York University, Toronto) 'A phasal analysis of a story: Hemingway's "The Sea Change"' which was highly complex but very illuminating about the role of linguistic analysis in looking at literature. I also found Prof. W. Mann's and Mr C. Matthiessen's (Southern California) presentations of the attempt to generate texts using systemic grammar quite fascinating.

In fact, one can say that there was no dull moment throughout the entire period of the workshop. I can only hope that I will be able to attend in the coming years systemic workshops that are as well organised, interesting and stimulating as this one.

Afaf Elmenoufy

PERSPECTIVE 3: THE NEWCOMER

The following contribution is much longer than the previous two, and adopts a rather more critical stance. It might, by analogy with the genre of the 'review article', be termed a 'report article'; the author not only describes and evaluates the papers but offers his own views in a number of cases. Readers' responses on particular points (including defences of their portions by the authors if they wish) would be welcome for the next Network.

I have been asked to record my impressions of this conference, and since my impressions relate mainly to the academic content of what was said, I should admit that they are those of an amateur. I write as a research student working on phonetic explanation in phonology, whose last contact with systemic linguistics took place on an undergraduate course over two years ago, and who attended the conference out of interest alone.

The late withdrawals of Drs. Lemke and Prakasam reduced the number of papers that we heard over the three days to thirteen. The withdrawals were unfortunate as I, for one, would have liked to have heard the latter's study in systemic phonology. With this talk missing, the workshop's interest in phonology was rendered negligible (consisting only of Afaf Elmenoufy's paper, which I regret to say was the one that I missed). Why should this be? Sampson (1980:235) enthuses that '..... prosodic phonology is in my judgement more nearly right than any other phonological theory.' If this is so, then it was a pity that phonology was so under-represented at the workshop. This point aside, however, the evidence of the papers presented was that systemic non-phonology is flourishing - more or less healthily - in a broad range of fields.

On the Tuesday evening Sandy Thompson spoke on 'The position of purpose clauses in English discourse'. 'Discourse' is a linguistic term that has gone through some rather dramatic changes of meaning since it was first invoked to mean something like 'spontaneously occurring speech'. Today it seems to have a rather wider range of referents; the data for this paper were drawn from literary, instructional, and academic writing. Initially the speaker pointed out that there were occasions on which moving a given subordinate clause of purpose (e.g. as in to construct a grenade, do such-and-such) from one position to another within a written sentence could produce bizarre text (contrary to the claims of some traditional grammars). Some of us, to whom 'discourse' still invokes 'spontaneously occurring speech', wondered whether this would hold for non-written data as well. To her credit, the speaker indicated that she wished to broaden the scope of her investigations in this precise direction. But I was wondering whether the traditional grammars were all that wrong anyway. Most of the examples of non-moveable sentence-final purpose clauses involved sentences of some length (?complexity) as in (1), which is part of Professor Thompson's example (7). Clearly the result of backing the underlined purpose clause, namely (2), is unacceptable (unacceptable, that is, with the same meaning as (1): it in fact means something different). But if (1) is rewritten as the less complex (3), the backing, giving (4), is by no means bizarre, although I will agree with those of my informants who feel it to be not stylistically as felicitous as (1).

(1) Speech samples were collected in two cities of about 75,000 inhabitants each. One city was in Southern California and the other in Southern Oregon. To find informants, I placed myself near schools or at parks and approached children asking them for help with a school project.

(2) *Speech samples were collected in two cities of about 75,000 inhabitants each. One city was in Southern California and the other in Southern Oregon. I placed myself near schools or at parks and approached children asking them for help with a school project to find informants.

(3) Speech samples were collected in two cities of about 75,000 inhabitants each. One city was in Southern California and the other in Southern Oregon. To find informants, I placed myself near schools or at parks. I approached children asking them for help with a school project.

(4) ?Speech samples were collected in two cities of about 75,000 inhabitants each. One city was in Southern California and the other in Southern Oregon. I placed myself near schools or at parks to find informants. I approached children asking them for help with a school project.

A further complication is the following. In (4) the mispositioning of the cohesive purpose clause seems to be compounded by the fact that the carrying sentence, and the immediately succeeding final sentence, have chosen different terms from the voice system. If the reflexive verb of the penultimate sentence of (4) is replaced by a non-reflexive one, as in (5), then the result seems even closer to acceptability:

(5) Speech samples were collected in two cities of about 75,000 inhabitants each. One city was in Southern California and the other in Southern Oregon. I waited near schools or at parks to find informants. I approached children asking them for help with a school project.

So I think there is rather more going on here than meets the eye, and certainly more than can be dealt with by the notion of an 'expectation chain', which the speaker put forward to account for her data. The expectation chain seemed to me both to be suspiciously hard to formalise (by what means we can recognise it when 'the enviroment creates a set of subject matter expectations'?), and - to the extent that it was useful (which is probably not very much, especially if there are indeed formal (syntactic) factors involved as well) - to be suspiciously close to common sense; did it belong in a section of the paper entitled 'Towards an explanation'?

The four papers presented on the Wednesday morning had in common the use of computers in linguistic work, but this was the only similarity among them; in fact they demonstrated well the variety of uses to which a computer can be put. The first and second papers were presented by Bill Mann and Christian Matthiessen respectively, and covered developments in the Nigel computational grammar. Nigel demonstrates what is to my mind by far the most interesting use of the computer; as a tool for synthesis. In this case, what is being generated is text. The synthesis is facilitated by Nigel's obtaining information from its 'enviroment', which in the early stages of the project meant simply the terminal operator. Nigel makes two types of enquiry of its enviroment; an 'ask' has a fixed set of possible responses, each of which corresponds to a choice from a system, while an 'identify' has an open-ended set of responses which are stored in a 'Function Association Table', which associates symbols representing entities in the enviroment with grammatical functions. The response of the terminal operator to identifies must have influenced the generation of the text, in the sense that one's response to an open-ended question is mediated by one's individual world view. It was therefore interesting to hear that more recently a computer-held enviroment has been developed. More detail about the form of this would have been fascinating, because if the enviroment is to be of any use to Nigel it must contain a considerable reserve of knowledge.

It was interesting to hear Bill Mann say in his paper on 'Inquiry Semantics' that Nigel recognises no true synonyms, as this accords well with the view of meaning developed by Firth and those who have followed him. It was also interesting to hear that systemic grammar has been more successful as a framework for tex-generation programs than other grammatical models. Since I guess that it would be straightforwrd to write a program to generate, transformational-style, pages upon pages of grammatical (but unacceptable) sentences, this is testimony to the systemicists' more viable approach to functionality and choice. Building a comparable notion of meaning into the transformational model would be by no means so straightforward. See Mann and Matthiessen (1983:2, 4).

Christian Matthiessen rather lost me in his discussion of 'Tense in the Nigel computational grammar'. When I was young, tense was something morpho-syntactic that was marked on verbs, and which English had two of. They could conveniently be called 'present' and 'past', as in execute and executed. Semantically, English had rather better facilities for time-reference, thanks largely to auxiliary verbs. Christian dealt with these latter facts, semantic to me, under the heading 'Grammar'. I therefore got lost when he moved onto the heading 'Semantics', although I have the feeling that this was more due to the fact that I was ill-equipped to understand what he was saying than to any shortcoming in the material.

Michael Cummings spoke on the 'Computational systemic description of the nominal group in Wulfstan's homilies'. In this case the computer is being used as a store for vast amounts of data, and as a time-saving aid in isolating common patterns among the nominal groups. To my mind the paper suffered from too many over-intimate details concerning the computing - old hat to those who had done similar work, and meaningless to those unacquainted with the computer - and not enough on the findings that mechanisation had facilitated. A similar criticism could be made of Bill Greave's paper on 'Investigating field of discourse using the CLOC package'. CLOC demonstrates a third use of the computer; a 'package' is a pre-written program, the workings of which are not accessible to the user, and which is activated into performing one or more of a finite and specified set of tasks by instructions from him. CLOC is a package that produces wordlists, concordances, indexes, etc., of

an input text, and it looks both easier to use and more versatile than the older COCOA, on which I
brought up. But the paper concentrated too heavily on 'selling' CLOC, and not heavily enough on us
him to investigate field of discourse; more of the latter option would probably have given those peop
who were not acquainted with this aspect of computing more idea of what it was all about.

As undergraduates one of our most heartfelt criticisms of systemic linguistics was that its
methodology was either insufficiently worked out or else completely lacking. The next two papers,
filling the first half of Wednesday afternoon, illustrated this point well. Nigel Gotteri asked 'When
is a system network not a system network?', to which his answer was: 'When it's simply a taxonomy'.
His suggestion that something that was not validly a system network could masquarade as one simply by
using the approved notational conventions appeared to horrify a couple of members of the audience.
The speaker's contention was illustrated with 'bogus' and 'genuine' networks of the fascinating
Bulgarian verb, but it was at around this time that the talk (and the floor) started raising more
questions than it was answering. For a start, consider the following: the speaker was not claiming
that bogus and genuine networks could be distinguished on purely _formal_ grounds, on the basis of some
difference in the schematic representations of the two networks under consideration. Their status as
'bogus' or 'genuine', or in other words their validity, must therefore depend on _functional_ criteria.
Now one cannot reasonably say 'A system network CANNOT function as a taxonomy', since it is self-
evidently as useful (or useless, depending on your point-of-view) a taxonomic device as the next man's.
So what we must construe the speaker as meaning when he said 'A system network is not a system network
when it's a taxonomy' is 'It is my opinion that taxonomy is not a valid goal for work in systemic.
linguistics.' Notice that this was quite radical; the vast majority of systemic linguists have seen
it as their business to produce _descriptions_ of language phenomena for many years. Nigel Gotteri, by
contrast, seemed to me to be issuing a plea for an _explanatory_ systemic linguistics, one in which a
system network accounts for a set of data instead of simply providing a description (taxonomy) of it.

If this issue was lurking clandestinely below the surface of the paper, the next one was simply
absent. It is the question of what systemic linguistics should provide its explanations in terms of.
Transformationalists attempt to account for language phenomena in terms of the innate structure of the
human mind; what, then, are the goals of systemic linguistic theory? Clearly, I think, there exists
in the field a tradition of relating a speaker's meaning choice to some notion of his social enviroment;
and if Nigel Gotteri was arguing that a system network is 'genuine' (i.e., has explanatory power) to
the extent that it accounts for speaker choice, then I believe that he is on to an issue of fundamental
importance for systemic metatheory. It was therefore regrettable that the speaker did not state
explicitly that this indeed was the line that he was taking.

While all this was not being said, the floor was looking for alternative accounts of the speaker's
contentions, in terms less likely to shake up the bedrock of systemic theory. Weren't the two networks
simply at different ranks, work-rank and (verbal) group-rank, it asked? Perhaps, but to my mind the
tactic fails in either case, because the question falls foul of the issue of the goals of linguistic
theory raised in the preceding paragraph. This time, though, it is not a question of what one's goals
are, but of whether one has them or not. Many systemicists, I fear, don't, and unless one has some
purpose in mind when saying 'This is a system network at X-rank and not at Y-rank', then one's assertion
is at best unjustifiable, and at worst uninterpretable. Now we have seen that there are (at least) two
potential reasons for positing a network; to provide a taxonomy of (to describe) a language, or to
explain it. I don't think that the members of the floor who asked whether the speaker's two networks
weren't at different ranks were explainers, because if they were, they were asking a question that, in
their terms, would be ill-formed. (An explainer would prefer to PREDICT what would happen IF a choice
occurred at X-rank or at Y-rank). So I think we must interpret them as describers, and if this is
correct, then I would say to them: given that (explicitly or otherwise) you are attempting to describe
the features of language, at present I don't understand how you can recognise what rank a network is
at, so please can we have an unambiguous statement of the criteria for placing a network at one rank
rather than another? Once we have this, then we may be able to answer the question they asked. (But
notice that, however it is answered, it is unlikely to refute the speaker's arguments, since he has
rejected description as a goal for systemic linguistics.)

The issues of speaker choice and of rank relate together rather interestingly. Consideration of such work as is currently available on speaker choice might make one think that the concept of rank (or at least; the members of the rank scale as currently formulated) is looking a little shaky; most speaker choice-modelling networks that I have seen have entry points at group rank or above. For a while one wonders whether anything is left among the lower ranks; but fortunately (for the ranks) it turns out that realisation statements require the existence of the smaller members. Perhaps it is only networks at, say, the rank of group and above, that are involved in delineating the speaker's semantic options; the onus on explanatory power would then be lifted off low-rank networks, which might then look rather 'taxonomic' in nature, especially if they were only responsible for some rather concrete aspects of realisation. But this issue really is a whole new ball game.

A final point about this paper, which may seem rather minor, but which to my mind epitomises the presentation; the 'genuine' network we were presented with employed only one type of opposition, that which Trubetskoy called 'privative'; an opposition of presence vs. absence of a feature. If this was being proposed as a universal characteristic of system networks (a proposal which I gather Dick Hudson once made), it too would presumably have some rather startling implications for systemic theory, but these too were not taken up; and so my overall impression of this paper was that it contained the germs of many important ideas, but mostly in latent form. I found it the most thought-provoking presentation of the workshop, and if my account of it makes it apear not fully thought through, this is the fault of the wealth of provocative ideas it contained, and not of Nigel Gotteri's excellent presentation of his current line of thought.

David Morley attempted to improve on extant versions of the transitivity network in his unhelpfuly entitled paper, 'Transitivity'. I know very little at all about transitivity, which left me free to ponder some wider issues. In a field in which I am more at home, phonological feature systems can be, and have been, multiplied ad nauseam. Once in a while somebody attempts to show that his feature system is better than N's (or C or H's!) by demonstrating that it can account for a given set of data more satisfactorily. Very creditable. So what (to draw out the methodological moral of this tale) was the point of producing a new account of the transitivity network? The answer to this is that there is no point at all, unless some attempt is made to compare, in a principled fashion, the various accounts. Did anybody hear, or has anybody read, Margaret Berry's 'They're all out of step except out Johnny' (Berry 1980)? Because, if so, they would be aware of at least one technique for approaching this business, one based on Sir Karl Popper's falsificationist methodology and its application to research programmes by Imre Lakatos. (Popper's work is usefully summarised in Magee (1973), which contains references to the original material; for Lakatos' work see, for example, Lakatos (1970).) According to Berry, what are needed are suitably presented (i.e. explicit) differing rival hypotheses designed to account for the same set of data. Hypotheses can be verified to the extent that they account for the data set, to the extent that they can be generalised to account for further data, and to the extent that they are independently motivated. They can be falsified to the extent that counter-examples to their claims can be presented. But if one's hypotheses are either inexplicit, or are not really in rivalry with one another (i.e., new hypotheses have no excess factual content over old hypotheses; one of three types of theoretical adhocness identified by Lakatos), or if they atempt to account for different sets of data, then they are simply incomparable with one another, and cannot be evaluated in any meaningful sense. And one will never be able to say: "Hypotheses A is better in the relevant sense than Hypothese B because ...." So Dr Morley's transitivity network may have been a world-shatterer. But no attempt was made to demonstrate this, and until one is, all the transitivity systems a man could ever devise are just going to be so much waste paper (incidentally, some of the comments from the floor suggested that it wasn't a world-shatterer, and Dr. Morley himself admitted that there was still work to be done on it, i.e., that it was currently inexplicit).

After all this we were definitely in need of a cup of tea, although once we had had one the rest of Wednesday never really provided as much to think about as the earlier papers. Yowell Aziz attempted in 'Verbal-clause vs. nominal clause: thematic organisation in Arabic' to decide under what circumstances Arabic clauses were verb-initial, and under what circumstances noun phrase-initial, but as no wider theoretical perspective appeared to inform the work, I found it rather uninteresting. Robert Veltman's 'Comparison and Code' was accompanied by a great handout, (fairly) well laid out and packed with interesting data, but once again my undergraduate's equipment wasn't upmarket enough for me really to grasp what was being said. One point, though, raised by Margaret Berry: entailment is a relationship between two propositions such that 'one cannot both assert the first and deny the second' (Crystal 1980:131). Thus the truth of The farmer killed the duckling entails the truth of The farmer killed the animal. The relationship is a logical one, mediated perhaps by the notion of hyponymy. Our ability to derive This room is not crowded from This room is less crowded than the Gobi Desert (Veltman's example (14)) is something different (Griceian conversational implication, I think), and, as far as I am concerned, Tom is even shorter than Kim tells us nothing about the truth or otherwise of Tom is very short (example (15)).

After dinner Afaf Elmenoufy spoke on 'Intonation and meaning in spontaneous discourse', which I regret I have to say I was not present for, meaning that I missed out on the only chance I had of hearing some systemic phonology. The day was concluded by Michael Gregory's 'A phasal analysis of a story: Hemingway's "The Sea Change"'. Again I cannot say very much due to my complete ignorance of Professor Gregory's theoretical standpoint. As a piece of stylistic analysis the paper helped inform my enjoyment of 'The Sea Change'; it would have been interesting also to have seen the predictive ability of the theory in action.

On, then, to Thursday morning, when we heard just two papers. The first was an excellent presentation by Jack du Bois entitled 'Towards an ecology of grammar'. Using a compelling set of hard-and-fast data, Professor du Bois examined first the nature of articles in Sacapultec, and then 'The discouse basis of ergativity'. The presentation of graphs showing the frequencies of occurrence of the phenomena in question added to the credibility of the paper in general, and in particular of the explanation of the use of ergativity in Sacapultec. In Sacapultec, it appears, the object of transitive clauses and the subject of intransitive ones have a very strong tendency to carry new information, a function only infrequently undertaken by the subject of transitive clauses. This new information must clearly be overtly present in a Sacapultec clause. Now Sacapultec is very loath to tolerate more than one overt noun phrase per clause; so it should be no surprise to find that the most commonly occurring overt types are transitive objects and intransitive subjects. Placing these two together in an ergative case marks them as comparable both from the point of view of their tendency to carry new information, and also from that of their tendency to occur overtly in a clause; it is, in a sense that Professor Du Bois unfortunately did not elaborate, the most 'economical' use of case-endings available. And it should also be no surprise to find that this ergative case is completely non-deleteable in Sacapultec noun phrases, whereas noun phrases in the absolutive case, containing transitive subjects and bearing old information, are deleteable under certain circumstances. Contrast this with the situation in English, where new information tends to occur as the subject of both transitive and intransitive clauses, thereby favouring a nominative/accusative case system (or at least the remnants of one in our pronouns), and you may have something along the lines of an explanation for ergative case patterns. Not content with this, however, Professor Du Bois then proposed that the two investigations he was reporting had different implications and motivations from a methodological perspective. His proposal was challenging; language-specific grammatical statements (about articles in Sacapultec, etc.), whose goal is the 'semantic-grammatical description of a language', are part of a study that seeks a psychological reality; yet they are only descriptive devices (compare the Chomskyan position). Language-independent metagrammatical statements (about the basis of ergativity, etc.), whose goal is 'understanding why languages are as they are', are, conversely, explanatory devices; they are part of a study that seeks an ecological reality, an account of 'language as [an] adaptive entity within [the] enviroment of discourse (and other) demands'. This last point showed most clearly that Professor Du Bois' position was systemic in its orientation - language is a changing social entity, rather than a psychological reality - and it was refreshing to hear someone say explicitly that Sacapultecs were unaware that their language tried to avoid two overt noun phrases in a clause. In general this paper was well presented, very well exemplified,

and above all, compelling listening.

The last paper of all was by John Ogborn, on the uses of systemic networks outside linguistics. Mr Ogborn is one of those subtle people who begin their paper by disclaiming any knowledge of linguistics. When it subsequently turns out that their linguistics is rather good, the audience is then dazzled with admiration, so much so that they usually pay no further attention to what is being said. This whole procedure turned out to be quite unnecessary, and the insight into the non-linguistic usefulness of systems suggests that they are an analytic tool of considerable power.

So did I gain any overall impression from this meeting of minds? This is a hard one to answer. The theme of the conference was rumoured to be the contribution that systemic linguistics can make to the analysis of spoken and written texts, but on an average sort of estimate not many more than three speakers could have been said to have had this theme in mind; the subject matter of the papers was in fact quite varied. So perhaps I should simply remake a point I made earlier: systemic-style investigations are clearly proceeding in a number of fields, and should some of these turn out to be more profitable than others (as surely will be the case), the effect of this (and a beneficial one it is too) will be more clearly to highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of the technique involved.

One more quibble before I go: terminology. When a transformationalist speaks of grammar you know exactly what he means; either 'syntax' or 'syntax, semantics and phonology', and the context usually disambiguates the two. When a systemicist says grammar, he can mean any one of a number of things: 'syntax', 'syntax plus lexis', 'syntax, plus or minus lexis, and semantics', and Heaven only knows what else. 'Text' and 'discourse' are used even more widely (see Stubbs 1983:9-10), and with such minute differences of meaning that the contextual disambiguation mentioned in the 'grammar' case above cannot apply. So please, systemicists, sort out your terminology; if you want to say something different from what your neighbour's saying, then either define your terms fully before you start, or else use different words altogether. Things will be much plainer.

And one further thing, and then I really am going: hello, Alison and Lesley.

Tim Lane
Department of Linguistics
University of Nottingham

References

Berry, Margaret (1980), 'They're all out of step except our Johnny: a discussion of motivation (or the lack of it) in systemic linguistics', mimeo: University of Nottingham.

Crystal, David (1980), A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics, London: Andre Deutsch.

Lakatos, Imre (1970), 'Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes', in Lakatos, Imre & Musgrave, Alan (eds), Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge, London: Cambridge University Press.

Magee, Bryan (1973), Popper, Glasgow: Fontana.

Mann, W.C., and Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (1983), 'Nigel: a systemic grammar for text generation', Information Sciences Institute, University of Southern California.

Sampson, Geoffrey (1980), <u>Schools of Linguistics,</u> London: Hutchinson.

Stubbs, Michael (1983), <u>Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language,</u> Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

TENTH LACUS FORUM

The tenth annual forum of the Linguistics Association of Canada and the United States took place 7-11 August 1983 at Laval University, Quebec, under the presidency of M.A.K. Halliday. There were a good number of papers by scholars working in the systemic tradition, among them being the following:

M.P. Jordon (Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario): 'Co-Hyponymic Lexical Cohesion in English Texts!.

Michael Gregory (Glendon College, York University): 'Propositional and Predicational Analysis in Discourse Description'.

William C. Mann (USC/Information Sciences Institute): 'An Overview of the Nigel Text Generation Grammar'.

Christian Matthiessen (USC/Information Sciences Institute): 'How to Choose English Tense'.

James E. Copeland (Rice University): 'Ideational and Textual Functions: Complementarities in Systemic and Stratificational Linguistics'('making connections with', rather than 'working in'), systemic linguistics).

Karen Malcolm (York University): 'Phases in the Initiation of Spontaneous Phatic Interchange Between Adult Interlocuters'

And there was in addition Michael Halliday's Presidential Address.

There were also papers by stratificational linguists. As Sydney Lamb, the principle architect of stratificational grammar likes to say, stratificational and systemic grammar are like two dialects of the same language. Papers by our stratificational cousins included, besides the bridging paper by Jim Copeland mentioned above;

W.J. Sullivan (University of Florida): 'Stratificational Theory and the Fallacy of "Literal" Translations'

Sydney M. Lamb (Rice University): 'The Structure of Linguistic Information: A Proposed New Synthesis'

Ilah Fleming (University of Texas at Arlington and Summer Institute of Linguistics): 'How AND WHY'

Tagmemic linguists can alsofairly be regarded as cousins to systemic linguists, and they too were represented - by the theory's chief architect, Kenneth L. Pike. Tagmemic papers included at least the following:

Alan F. Rister (Rice University): 'Towards a More Formal Definition of Pike's Tagmeme'

Kenneth L. Pike (Summer Institute of Linguistics): 'Toward the Linguistic Analysis of Revisions of One's Own Poems'

I say 'at least', because the above list was compiled from a copy of the programme, not from being present, and there will undoubtedly have been papers by contributors whose names are not known by me to be associated with a given theory that nonetheless drew insightfully on those theories. But it would be misleading to see LACUS forums (fora if you wish) as tied into these three theories: the

overwhelming feeling is one of openness to contributions that are set in any theory or none.   LACUS provides an enviroment where those who want to explore alternatives to the somewhat hegemonic Chomskyan and neo-Chomskyan paradigm can do so easily, and expect an interested and encouraging reaction, and many of the most interesting papers came into this category.

In conclusion, here are the names of some other well-known contributors to the 1983 Forum, to tempt you to join LACUS and so obtain the annual volume of papers (or to order it for your library): Paul Garvin, Victor Yngve, Earl M. Herrick, Edward L. Blansitt Jr., Saul Levin, Fred C.C. Peng, and Robert A. Hall Jr.

For more information write to LACUS, P.O.B. 101, Lake Bluff, Illinois, U.S.A. 60044.

LEXETER '83 AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF EURALEX

The Conference

LEXeter '83, the international conference on all aspects of lexicography, was held at the University of Exeter on September 9-12, 1983.   It was sponsored jointly by the British Association for Applied Linguistics, the Dictionary Society of North America, and the Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing, and was organised by Dr. Reinhard Hartmann.

LEXeter '83 was an event of significance in the history of lexicography for both its size and its scope.   272 participants from 39 countries were offered a programme of 6 plenary papers and a choice of 46 section papers, reporting on lexicographic work affecting 19 languages: Arabic, Chinese, Danish, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, German, Modern Greek, Hebrew, Hungarian, Italian, Norwegian, Polish, Russian, Spanish, Swahili, Trinidad Creole, and Yiddish.

Papers were presented about most of the major types of dictionaries: historical dictionaries, general-purpose monolingual dictionaries, language learners' monolingual dictionaries, bilingual dictionaries, and technical dictionaries.   In addition, special attention was devoted to the fields of terminology and computer-aided lexicography.   The topics of papers ranged from the treatment of pronunciation to the treatment of prepositions, from lexicographic data-bases to the limited defining vocabulary of learners' dictionaries, from culture-specific items in bilingual dictionaries to the terminology of spectral analysis.   (Copies of the Third & Final Circular with the full abstracts of papers and the conference programme are still available at £1.50; the publication of LEXeter '83 Proceedings in 3 volumes is planned.)

LEXeter '83 was also noteworthy for bringing together academic specialists, lexicographers working for commercial publishers, and representatives of the publishers themselves.   Two themes that recurred throughout the conference were the importance of making sure that dictionaries meet the needs of their users, and the necessity of providing appropriate training, research opportunities, and professional status for lexicographers.

The formation of the European Association for Lexicography

It was concerns such as these, together with a growing realisation of the problems common to lexicographers and terminologists working in different fields and even in different languages, that led the participants in the conference to feel that the time had come to form a professional body. At the close of the conference, therefore, the European Association for Lexicography was founded, for the purpose of promoting 'scholarly and professional activities related to dictionary-making, including the training of lexicographers'.

This was the result of developments in a number of fields concerned with the production and use of dictionaries.   Several different aspects of lexicography have recently received the attention of applied linguists, computer specialists, terminologists and others, but none has had the benefit of

the unified perspective which the new association hopes to offer. EURALEX plans a range of publications
and meetings in furtherance of its declared aims. Contracts and cooperation with other bodies (such as
the Dictionary Society of North America) will be sought, and fresh channels of communication will be
explored.

An international Executive Board has started work. Composed of Gabriele Stein (Hamburg) as Chairman,
Noel Osselton (Leiden) as Vice-Chairman, Reinhard Hartmann (Exeter) as Secretary, Frank Knowles (Aston/
Birmingham) as Treasurer and 5 other members (Sue Atkins, Collins Publishers; Tony Cowie, Leeds; Robert
Ilson, London; Tamas Magay, Budapest; Antonia Zampolli, Pisa) it represents some of the most important
topics and regional interest in lexicography in Europe.

There are 4 categories of membership: Active Membership for those engaged in lexicographical and
terminological work, Student Membership for those in training, Associate Membership for other interested
individuals or institutions, and Honorary Membership in recognition of outstanding achievement. As
founders of EURALEX, all LEXeter '83 participants are automatically considered Active Members, free of
charge until the start of the next Association year (April 1984). Others who would like to apply for
membership may do so by sending details as set out below, together with any comments or requests for
more information, to Dr. R.R.K. Hartmann, University of Exeter, EX4 4QH, Devon, England. (Copies of
the EURALEX draft Constitution are available on request.)

Details needed:

Name (block capitals), category of Membership, Affiliation (Institution), Postal address. And please
add your comments/suggestions/requests.

NEWS OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The contribution of systemic linguistics to LITERARY SYLISTICS continues.

In 1981 there was Leech and Short's Style in fiction: a linguistic introduction to English fictional
prose (Longman). This book takes a partly Hallidayan, partly Quirk-et-alian approach, and it was briefly
reviewed in Network No 4, pp 7-8. Now we have two further works of interest:

Prakasam, V., 1982. Functional stylistics: theory and practice. Patiala (India); Indian Institute
of language studies. pp. 75. £2.50; $5.00. Distributors: Harnam Publications, 4378/4-B, Ansari Road,
New Delhi, India, and Madaan Book House, Chowk Purani Kotwali, Patiala, India.

Stylistics, as the linguistic study of literature, is mainly concerned with the aesthetic purpose of
every linguistic device, the way it serves a totality. Its near synonym is literary semantics. It has
to specify the shaping principles peculiar to poetic arts. In this small book, Prakasam postulates
prominence, unity and rhythm as the three shaping principles. Of these concepts, prominence attracts the
chief attention and Prakasam argues that, in order to capture the prominence of a literary piece, we have
to look at language in general and literary language in particular from the functional point of view.
Hence, Functional Stylistics, in the rich, Functional view of the Hallidayan systemic grammar.

Cummings, M., and Simmons, R., 1983, The language of literature. Oxford: Pergamon Press. Paperback
£7.50.

This work which takes an explicitly systemic approach to literary analysis, will be reviewed in
Network in the near future.

Finally, in the stylistics area, Network readers may like to know of the publication of:

O'Toole, L> Michael, 1982, Structure, <u>Style and interpretation in the Russian short story</u>. Yale
University Press. Hardback £12.50. Michael ('Paddy' still to his many friends from his years at the
University of Essex) is now Professor of Human Communication at Murdoch University, Perth, W. Australia,
and this book draws on and integrates many approaches. Although Michael O'Toole has in the past drawn
insightfully upon systemic linguistics, he does so to remarkably little extent in the present volume.
However another is promised in due course, in which a more completely semiotic – and so perhaps systemic? –
approach will be taken.

The present work has attracted a warm review in the <u>Times Higher Education Supplement</u> of 5.11.82,
by John Elsworth. Here is a brief extract:

'Professor O'Toole brings together an impressive familiarity with the theoretical literature about literary
criticism and a scrupulous attention to the details of the specific text. He refuses to have a single
methodological label attached to him, and makes light of the tendency he perceives in current critical
discussion to regard each burgeoning school of thought as somehow superseding and displacing all that it
succeeds. To that extent he is confessedly eclectic, but is it an eclecticism born of a deeply considered
process of selection, and the purpose of the book is not to grind any theoretical axes, but to demonstrate
by example that the method works....... In its lucidity, its erudition and its judicious blend of
analytical regour with intuition, this book will be of lasting interest to all concerned with the questions
it examines.'

MODALITY is one of those 'non-experiential' areas of meaning to which particular importance is
attached in the plurifunctional approach of systemic linguistics. A recent book which presents a
unifying approach to this area is:

Perkins, M.R. 1983, <u>Modal expressions in English</u>. London: Frances Pinter (Open Linguistics Series)
and Norwood, N.J.: Ablex: pp xi + 186.   Hardback £12.50; $18.50.

While the book is theoretical as well as descriptive, Perkins adopts a 'modal-neutral' position, and
practitioners of ANY theory would do well to consider its implications. Systemic linguists, however, will
be pleased to find that the author uses a system-network notation to describe 'Some options for the
expression of modality in English' on p. 103. This is for descriptive insight, however, rather as at
various points in Quirk et al's <u>Grammar of contemporary English</u> (Longman 1972), rather than as part of
an explicit grammar. But a close examination of some of the networks found in the systemic literature
suggests that the line between the two is not as clear as it might be, and perhaps should be. (cp. Nigel
Gotteri's paper to the 1983 Workshop, e.g. as discussed on p. 8.)

From the publisher's catalogue:

Modality is an important area of semantics. Most studies, however, concentrate almost exclusively on the modal verbs while this work, which is both theoretical and descriptive, is the first to cover the entire range of modal expressions in English.

The text is organized so that the more general issues are dealt with first, followed by a more detailed analysis of the semantics of modal expressions. This is then supplemented by an assessment of how such an analysis is relevant to pragmatic and developmental perspectives on the expression of modality.

Contents: INTRODUCTION. THE SCOPE OF MODALITY. The Concept of Modality. Utterance Functions and their Relationship to Modality. Modality and Linguistics. Some Terminological Issues. MODAL AUXILIARY VERBS. Core-Meaning Approaches to the Modals. The Primary Modals. The Secondary Modals. QUASI-AUXILIARY MODAL EXPRESSIONS. Have (Got) To. Need To. Had Better. Quasi-modal Auxiliaries Compared with Modal Auxiliaries. ADJECTIVAL, PARTICIPIAL AND NOMINAL MODAL EXPRESSIONS. To, That and Be. Is To. Expressions Incorporating only Be . . . . To. Expressions Incor-

porating Non-verbally-derived Adjectives. Expressions Incorporating Verbally-derived Adjectives and Participles. Modal Nominal Expressions. MODAL ADVERBS. MODAL LEXICAL VERBS. SYNOPSIS OF MODAL EXPRESSIONS. FURTHER WAYS OF EXPRESSING MODALITY IN ENGLISH. Tense. If-Clauses. Questions. MODAL EXPRESSIONS AND POLITENESS. MODAL EXPRESSIONS IN CHILD LANGUAGE. Modal Expressions up to the Age of 5. Modal Expressions from 5 to 12. Towards a Theory of the Development of Modal Expressions. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS. Bibliography. Indexes.

TAGMEMIC LINGUISTICS has many affinities with systemic linguistics, and there are, moreover, signs
of increasingly mutual understanding between the two theories (as there are between stratificational and
systemic linguistics). Readers of <u>Network</u> may therefore be interested in:

Pike, Kenneth L., and Pike, Evelyn G., <u>Text and tagmeme</u>.   London: Frances Pinter (Open Linguistics
Series) and Norwood, N.J.: Ablex. pp ix + 129, including 28 figures.   Hardback £11.50; $18.50.

Tagmemic theory and practice treats language in terms of three hierarchies: grammar, reference and phonology.   It treats each of these hierarchies

at various levels of structure, and it does so in relation to a frame of reference integrated with a theory of behavior. No other theory of linguistics has covered such a broad theoretical perspective, or been applied to so wide a field of materials for analysis.

The volume is divided into three parts. The first part, an analysis of a particular text, shows how grammar and reference are handled at the various hierarchical levels. The second part analyzes a poem, where phonology in relation to levels of hierarchy can most appropriately be seen. The third part is a treatment of a difficult and important problem advancing the theory itself — specifically, it shows how irregularity on a low level of structure may reflect regularity at a higher level of structure — and by doing so resolve one of the long-lasting puzzles in the development of tagmemics.

This volume represents the most recent research and development of tagmemic theory in relation to phonological, grammatical, and referential hierarchies, while at the same time giving extensive application of these materials to narrative text.

Contents: TOWARD THE SYSTEMATIC EXE-GESIS OF A TEXT — THE DETAILED ANAL-YSIS OF ITS GRAMMATICAL AND REFER-ENTIAL TAGMEMES. Toward the Understanding of a Stream of Speech. The Tagmemic Model. The Grammatical Structure of the Bathtub Navy (BN). The Referential Structure of BN. The Battle of Dunkirk. The Greater Lexicon. Summary. PHON-OLOGICAL HIERARCHY IN A FOUR-CELL TAGMEMIC REPRESENTATION FROM POEM TO PHONEME CLASS. Purpose, Data, and Ap-proach. The Poem Divided into Paragraph Complex and Final Tentative Pause Group. The Paragraph Complex Divided into Paragraphs. Margin and Nucleus of the Emic Clause of Phonological Par-agraphs. Characteristics of Constituents of Poetic Subparagraphs. Constituents of the Phonological Sentence. Constituents of the Phonological Clause. Rhythm Groups and their Constituents. Syllable Structure. Classes and Sequences of Vowels. Classes and Sequences of Consonants. Some Re-maining Problems. THE TETRAHEDRON AS A MODEL FOR THE FOUR-CELL TAGMEME IN ITS MULTIPLE RELATIONS. Problems in Labeling the Rows and Columns of the Four-Cell Tagmeme Matrix. A Problem in Overlapping Rows and Columns. From Matrix to Tetrahedron with Each Face "Opposite" to a Point. Opposite Edges on the Tetrahedron. Features of the Four-Cell Tagmeme Matrix Relabelled. The Significance of the Tetrahedron Model for the Tagmeme. A Post-script on the Limits of Formalism. DISPLAYS AND FIGURES.

(Taken from the Ablex catalogue).

. appear in:

Petofi, S.S., and Sozer, E. (Eds.) 1983. Micro· and macro connectivity of texts. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

The papers are: 'Conjunction: the logic of English text', by J.R. Martin, and 'On the status of theme in English: arguments from discourse' by Peter H. Fries.

NEWS OF FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

Several important systemic publications are expected out in the fairly near future.   The first should be the two volumes of Systemic perspective on discourse, published by Ablex (Norwood, N.J.), followed shortly by the two volumes of The semiotics of culture and language, published by Frances Pinter in the Open Linguistics Series (London), and then by Michael Halliday's long-awaited Short introduction to functional grammar, published by Edward Arnold (London). (In mid-February M.A.K.H. was still awaiting page proofs - personal communication.)

The semiotics of culture and language contains the following papers by systemic linguists:

M.A.K. Halliday: 'Language as code and language as behaviour: a systemic-functional interpretation of the nature and ontogenesis of dialogue'.

1.1 Code and behaviour, 1.2 Context, prediction and choice, 1.3 A model of dialogue, 1.4 Some examples of dialogue between parent and child, 1.5 The origins of dialogue, 1.6 Conclusion, Bibliography.

Jeffrey Ellis: 'Some speculations on language contact in a wider setting'.
4.1 Introduction, 4.2 General language-culture contact, 4.3 Bilingualism, 4.4 Becker-type Sprachbünde, 4.5 Balkan-type Sprachbünde, 4.6 Pidgins and creoles, 4.7 Conclusion, Bibliography.

Ruqaiya Hasan: 'Ways of saying: ways of meaning'.
5.1 Culure and semiotic style, 5.2 Implicit and explicit styles, 5.3 Endophoric and exophoric interpretation, 5.4 Degrees of implicitness, 5.5 English semantic style, Bibliography.

Robin P. Fawcett: 'System networks, codes, and knowledge of the universe: a cognitive systemic approach to the relationship between language and culture'.
11.1 Aim, 11.2 System networks as a means of modelling language and the other codes, 11.3 The place of culture in knowledge of the universe, 11.4 System networks and the process of communication, 11.5 Conclusion, Bibliography.

The two volumes also contain important papers by Sydney M. Lamb, John Regan, Yoshihiko Ikegami, W.C. Watt, L.M. O'Toole, Donald Preziosi and Ashok R. Kelkar.

We give below full descriptions of the other two works from the publishers' catalogues.

SYSTEMIC PERSPECTIVES ON DISCOURSE
Volume One: Selected Theoretical Papers from the Ninth International Systemic Workshop and Volume Two: Selected Applied Papers from the Ninth International Systemic Workshop
edited by **William S. Greaves and James D. Benson, both, York University**

Over the last decade, the principle forum for the development of systemic theory has been a series of workshops. The Ninth International Systemic Workshop is important in bringing the leading practitioners of systemic linguistics together with the leaders of other major schools. The theoretical and applied developments in systemic linguistics represented in these two companion volumes make an important contribution to the understanding of discourse.

Contents for Volume One: The Roots of Systemic Theory, *M.A.K. Halliday*. Meaning, Context and Text: Fifty Years After Malinowski, *Ruqaiya Hasan*. A Demonstration of the Nigel Text Generation Computer Program, *William C. Mann and Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen*. An Introduction to the Nigel Text Generation Grammar, *William C. Mann*. The Systemic Framework in Text Generation: Nigel, *Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen*. Towards "Communication" Linguistics: A Framework, *Michael Gregory*. Explanation in English and Korafe, *Cynthia J.M. Farr, Ivan Lowe and Carl Whitehead*. How to Recognize Systems, *Joseph E. Grimes*. Working with Transitivity: System Networks in Semantic-Grammatical Descriptions, *Erich Steiner*. Comparison and Intensification: An Ideal but Problematic Domain for Systemic-Functional Theory, *Robert Veltman*. Discourse Systems and Structures and their Place within an Overall Systemic Model. *Christopher S. Butler*. On Types of Meaningfulness in Discourse, *Eirian C. Davies*. Process and Text: Two Aspects of Human Semiosis, *J.R. Martin*. Ideology, Intertextuality, and the Notion of Registers, *J.L. Lemke*. How Does a Story

Mean What it Does? A Partial Answer, *Peter H. Fries*. Non-Thematic Re-entry, *M.P. Jordan*. "Rest" and "Open Transition" in a Systemic Phonology of English, *J.C. Catford*. A Systemic Phonology of Isthmus Zapotec Prosodies, *Carol C. Mock*. On the Signalling of Complete Thoughts, *James Monaghan*.

March, 1984 ISBN:0-89391-193-3 in preparation

Contents for Volume Two: Negotiation and Meaning: Revisiting the "Context of Situation", *R.W. Bailey*. Text Structure and Graphic Design: The Visible Design, *Stephen A. Bernhardt*. Judicial Systemics: Function and Structure in Statutory Interpretation, *Fred Bowers*. Prolegomena to a Comparative Study of Revolutionary and Traditional Texts in Guatemala, *B.N. Colby*. A Systemic Network for Analyzing Writing Quality, *Barbara Couture*. A PROLOG Parser-Generator for Systemic Analysis of Old English Nominal Groups. *Michael Cummings and Al Regina*. What do Surface Markers Mean? Towards a Triangulation of Social, Cognitive, and Linguistic Factors, *Jonathan Fine*. Integrative Work: An Exploration in What Makes Reading Comprehension Test Questions Easy or Difficult to Read, *Linda Gerot*. Ideational, Interpersonal, and Textual Macrofunctions Applied to Lexicometric Work on French Business Correspondence, *A.A. Lyne*. Communication Linguistics: A Sample Analysis, *Karen Malcolm*. The Semantic Field of Homicide, *Yon Maley*. The Cohesive Harmony and Cohesive Density of Children's Oral and Written Stories, *Christine C. Pappas*. A Comparison of the Production of Surgical Reports by Native and Nonnative Speaking Surgeons, *Catherine Pettinari*. Complexity of Reality in Lawrence Durrell's *The Alexandria Quartet*, *Linda S. Rashidi*.What Surface-Structure Passing Can Tell Us about Style, *Donald Ross, Jr*. Functional Types of Scientific Prose, *E.L. Smith, Jr*. Discourse Structure: Social Class Differences in Answers to Questions, *Geoffrey J. Turner*. Some Applications of Systemic Grammar to TEFL, or Whatever Became of Register Analysis, *David J. Young*.

March, 1984 ISBN:0-89391-202-6 in preparation

A Short Introduction to Functional Grammar `New`

M. A. K. Halliday Professor of Linguistics, University of Sydney

This is the first concise introduction to a major theory of grammar. The design of the book draws extensively on Professor Halliday's experience of teaching an introductory course in applied linguistics and grammatical theory to undergraduate students; and the book will therefore also be of considerable interest and usefulness to those concerned with the applications of the principles of grammatical theory to the study of language development and mother-tongue teaching.
Contents: I, The Clause Introductory: constituency. Subject, actor theme. Clause as a message. Clause as interaction. Clause as representation. *II, Above, Below and Beyond the Clause* Below the clause: groups and phrases. Above the clause: the clause complex. Alongside the clause: intonation and rhythm. Above the clause: cohesion and discourse. Beyond the clause: metaphorical modes of expression. Appendix: analysis of a text. Index.
Readership: lecturers and students in departments of linguistics, applied linguistics and education.

Probable publication September 1982
160 pages approx
boards *now October 1984!*
ISBN 0 7131 6364 X
paper *approx price*
ISBN 0 7131 6365 8 *£9.95*

And from the Frances Pinter catalogue:

SEMIOTICS OF CULTURE AND LANGUAGE

Edited by *Robin P. Fawcett*, Polytechnic of Wales, *M. A. K. Halliday*, University of Sydney, *S. M. Lamb*, Rice University, Houston, and *A. Makkai*, University of Chicago

This collection of original papers presents a series of explorations of the relationship between language and culture which together provide a number of new perspectives on semiotics, as traditionally defined. The contributors' disciplinary bases are principally in linguistics, but they have been concerned to break down the barriers between linguistics and neighbouring disciplines.

Halliday, M.A.K., and Fawcett, Robin P. (Eds.) New developments in systemic linguistics, London: Batsford. We are still awaiting papers from a couple of crucial contributors, but these are promised for Easter (1984, that is).

PUBLICATION OPPORTUNITIES

SYSTEMIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO LITERARY STYLISTICS   The intention is to publish in the Frances Pinter OPEN LINGUISTICS series a book of papers that will both contribute to, and exemplify the value of, the insights that systemic theory brings to the problem of understanding literary texts. If you would be interested in offering a contribution to such a volume, either new or, in some cases, published elsewhere, you should write in the first instance to the Series Editor, Dr. Robin P. Fawcett, at Network's editorial address. Final arrangements for editing this volume have not yet been made as we go to press, but this arrangement should enable you to be in contact with the book's Editor(s) at the earliest possible opportunity.

See also TORONTO REPORT in the 'News of readers' activities' section for another possibility.

PAPERS AVAILABLE IN MIMEO/OFFPRINT FORM

PAPER BY DAVID BUTT

1982: '"Semantic drift" in verbal art'.

This paper was given to the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia (Perth 1982) and a section has subsequently been published in the Australian Review of Applied Linguistics. The paper argues that the methodology that stylistics needs to develop involves pouring the 'new wine' of contemporary linguistics (in the shape of systemic linguistics) into the 'old bottles' of European structuralism (Mukarovsky). Butt suggests that the foregrounding found in the poems of Wallace Stevens 'can appear like a semantic "drift" in which congruent meanings are displayed across grammatical systems with very different formal realisations', and this concept is exemplified by a detailed analysis of the foregrounded options in the experiential, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions.

PAPERS BY FRANCES CHRISTIE

1982: 'Development of writing programs: putting an interest in language back in schooling'.
1983: 'Learning how to write: a process of learning how to mean'.

The two papers draw on Halliday, Hasan, Martin, and Martin and Rothery and others to look at childrens' written compositions. While they are not heavy with linguistic terminology, they include relatively detailed discussions of written texts produced by children.

PAPER BY JIM COPELAND

1983: 'Texture and cohesion: some complementarities in systemic and cognitive linguistics'.   ('Cognitive means 'cognitive-stratificational', as the paper's first paragraph points out.)

In particular the paper offers a cognitive perspective (which does not presuppose a stratificational-relational model of language) on the notion of 'given' , and this yields a set of reasons for an entity being treated as 'given' that makes an interesting contrast with the types of phoric reference (ana-, cata-, exo- and homo-phoric reference) recognised in, e.g. Halliday and Hasan's Cohesion in English (1976). (In systemic theory phoricity and givenness are of course distinct, though related, phenomena, one being realised in the, third person pronouns, etc., and one in intonation.)

PAPERS BY ROBIN P. FAWCETT

1983a: 'Language as a resource'.

This was given as a keynote address to the 1983 annual congress of the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia, La Trobe University, Melbourne, and will appear in the Australian Review of Applied Linguistics (May 1984).

The paper presents two apparently separate ideas, each concerned with language as a resource, and then shows their interconnectedness. The first is a 'danger alert' about the possible effect (1) on our patterns of social interaction and (2) ultimately, perhaps, on our very thought patterns, if an inadequate model of language is adopted for use at the Man-Machine Interface - i.e. where humans and artificial intelligences communicate with each other.   The paper identifies three possible dangers that could result if a neo-Chomskyan approach were to be adopted, and reasons are given why a systemic framework is to be preferred.   Secondly, an applicable model of the functions, or PURPOSES, for which language is used is outlined, and several examples are given of its application.   The model is proposed as an adult equivalent of Halliday's 'Relevant models' proposals for young children, and it is presented in system network form.   It includes a number of features that make it more complex than the simple taxonomies of functions such as those proposed by Jacobson and others. Its most noteworthy feature, perhaps, is that is provides for the fact that many texts have both an ostensible and an ulterior purpose, both of which need due recognition.   Finally, the paper suggests that any adequate model of language at the Man-Machine Interface must incorporate some such model as this.

1983b: 'Language as a semiological system: a re-interpretation of Saussure'.

A shortened version of this monograph-length paper (66 pp) was given as the Invited Lecture at the 1982 Forum of the Linguistics Association of Canada and the United States.   The paper, which the author regards as a major theoretical statement, draws on five Saussurean dichotomies to define the necessary characteristics of any semiotic system, following Saussure's dictum that 'if we are to discover the true nature of language we must learn what it has in common with all other semiological systems.'   The centrality of the two mutually defining levels of semantics and form is established, and the overall shape of language is re-defined in these terms.   Finally, a distinction is drawn between an 'exhaustive grammar' and a 'minimal procedural grammar', and the importance for the computing paradigm of working with minimal procedural grammars is emphasised.   (In the course of the argument, it is shown that system networks - or indeed stratificational networks - can easily and naturally solve a problem discussed by Chomsky in Aspects.) The paper appears in Morreall, J. (Ed.) 1983, The ninth LACUS Forum 1982, Columbia: Hornbeam Press.

Photocopies/offprints are available from the author. Address as for Network. Please send 50p for each; £1 or equivalent for both.

PAPER BY ERICH STEINER

'The concept of context and the theory of action'.

It is the overall aim of this paper to contribute towards a clarification of the key terms mentioned in the title by considering them in the context of a critical analysis of texts, i.e. an analysis which

is explicitly aimed at bringing out ideologies (systems of beliefs and systems of meanings) realised
linguistic texts. The paper consists of three main sections:

In the first section, it is asked whether and how 'Critical Linguistics' can be seen as a useful
tool of analysis. From these considerations follows the need for describing the interconnections between
language and its use systematically.

In the second section, we look at the link between language and the cultural/political system in
which it is used, as well as at the more general components of the Pragmatics of language. This field
has usually been approached with the concepts of context/situation and/or activity/action. It is
argued that due to developments in several fields of knowledge, we are now able to begin to establish
a framework of analysis which is internally consistent, and the explanatory power of which goes beyond
everyday knowledge in at least some respects. The following fields are taken into consideration:
Rhetoric, Philosophy of Action, Political Economy, Sociology, Cognitive Psychology, Cognitive Science,
Artificial Intelligence, Theories of goal directed action, and Linguistics.

Finally, it is asked how the emerging consensus view can insightfully be used in Critical Linguistics.

The third section suggests a method of analysis. After a discussion of its general characteristics,
an analysis of a piece of text is given.

Available from Dr. Erich Steiner, Anglistick, Universitat des Saarlandes, D66 Saarbrucken 11, West
Germany, and from L.A.U.T (Linguistic Agency University of Tried), c/o Dr Hartmut Weber, Postfach 3825,
Universitat Trier, D-5500 Trier, Federal Republic of germany.

RECENTLY COMPLETED THESES

This is a new section in Network. We would like to invite both supervisors and students writing
theses or dissertations that fall within the areas of interest in Network to make it their own
responsibility to send us a summary and details of how to obtain it.

LINDA GEROT: 'A question of answers in reading comprehension'.

The question - what makes a written text easy or difficult to comprehend? - is a complex one.
Traditionally, difficulty has been considered to be a property of texts alone. I have refuted this
view. The basis postulate tested in the thesis is that difficulty is a product of the interaction of
three factors: the reader, the text and the questions used to test comprehension.

For the analysis of this interaction, the systemic-functional model of language was employed, and four
questions in particular were addressed: (i) What kinds of questions are asked in reading comprehension
tests?; (ii) What are these questions testing?; (iii) Are the questions graded in difficulty?; (iv)
What makes a question easy or difficult?

A system for the classification of reading comprehension test questions was formulated by reference to
the ways in which the information needed to reconstruct the correct answer was encoded in the language
of the test passage. Thus, answers to questions (i) and (ii) above were provided. Empirical research
revealed that test questions were graded in difficulty, and that the difficulty of a question depended
upon: (i) the degree of integration required to reconstruct an answer; (ii) the polarity of answers in
tasks involving yes/no questions; (iii) the alternative answers offered in multiple-choice tests.

Finally, the implications of these findings for the assessment of reading comprehension and readability
are discussed.

The thesis is on file at: Macquarie University Library, Macquarie University, North Ryde 2113,
New South Wales, Australia.   The Macquarie library will send a micro-film copy of the work through

inter-library loan upon request with the requesting library bearing the cost, which is $15.00 Australian. Author's address for correspondence: Dunmore Lang College, P.O. Box 150, North Ryde, NSW 2113, Australia.

In the next Network we hope to include a summary of Linda Rashidi's thesis on Durrell's 'Alexandrian Quartet'.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────┐
│   NEWS OF READERS' ACTIVITIES        │
└─────────────────────────────────────┘
```

BARRY CALDER, a lecturer in linguistics at Doncaster Metropolitan Institute of Higher Education and a regular attender of systemic workshops, suffered a very serious motorcycle accident in 1982, as regular readers of Network will recall.   He now writes, most hearteningly, of his growing ability to cope with everyday life from a wheelchair (12.12.83):

'Since leaving hospital so suddenly in mid-September, I have moved with Anne from Nottingham Street to a bungalow here in Cranworth Road just around the corner. It was impossible for me to live at 148 Nottingham Street, Sheffield any more because of its layout; here I can get around but the place is very very small and half our gear is in store.   We intend to stay here in the interim while we sort things out before looking for somewhere larger.

For the last month I have been slowly returning to a full-time job at Doncaster.   At the moment I am doing about a 30 hour week working over there three days out of five. Next term I go up to four days, with no doubt a concomitant increase in hours.   So I am adjusting gradually to life in the outside world,but it looks like taking a while before I am fully operative again.

Meanwhile, no thanks to the present government, it's back to the lobby to outlaw discrimination against disabled people ....

Address: 1, Cranworth Road, Sheffield S3 9DT (tel. 0742-755544).

We look forward to having Barry back with us at the systemic workshops.

JEFFREY ELLIS, who has been a strong supporter of systemic linguistics since the earliest days, has recently retired from his post as Reader in Linguistics at the University of Aston in Birmingham. He can be reached at the following address: 3 Warrinder Park Terrace, Edinburgh 9.

LINDA GEROT is currently in the process of writing several articles based on her M.A. thesis (summarised in the 'Recently completed theses' section), which she completed under Ruqaiya Hasan at Macquarie University.   This thesis will interest all those concerned with applications of linguistics in education.

Address: Dunmore Lang College, P.O. Box 150, North Ryde, NSW 2113, Australia.

LINDA RASHIDI, who gave an interesting paper on the application of systemic linguistics to the stylistic analysis of Lawrence Durrell's Alexandria Quartet at the Ninth International Systemic Workshop in Toronto in 1982, has completed her M.A..   Enquiries to her c/o Professor Peter Fries, Department of English Language and Literature, Central Michegan University, Mount Pleasant, Michegan 48859, U.S.A.

MICHAEL HALLIDAY spent six weeks in Beijing, China, in September and October 1983, giving lectu
and advising on the setting up of courses for teaching English as a second language.

MARY ANN EILER, whose review of Martin and Rothery's Writing project reports No's 1 and 2 appears
elsewhere in Network, writes (August 1983):

'I will be studying technical writing in the fall (through the American Management Association), hopefully
also teaching a course in tech writing and of course writing for the AMA. My first book for them is now
completed - it was a challenge for me, for I worked with computer for the first time. I will be doing
more technical writing at AMA in structured documentation for computer programs, etc.......

Have a good end of summer and a fantastic SYSTEMIC WORKSHOP. I will be with all of you in spirit.'

Address: 2914 N. Mason, Chicago, Il. 60634, U.S.A.

CHRISTIAN MATTHIESSEN, whose article 'What's in Nigel: 1' appears in the 'Article' section, writes,
in a letter partly to the Editor in a personal capacity, but perhaps of general interest (March 1983):

'We were very happy to get your invited LACUS paper; many thanks. There is a lot in it to think about
for me. I like "procedural felicity conditions". I had myself been using the paler term "choice
condition" and had arrived at the same view of its relation to truth conditions. I suspect that if we
come to truth condition from the notion of felicity condition we'll get a more realistic notion of truth
condition. For one thing, I suspect that truth conditions tend to be too eager to exclude states of
affairs. In a more comprehensive model than a truth conditional framework that has a strong
representation of communication and allows for more types of inference than just deduction, the conditions
can probably be less restrictive.

I wonder if you have any comments on connections between Systemic Linguistics and Dik's Functional
Grammar? I get the impression that Dik was in London sometime in the late 60s. His use of functions
and his functional components certainly seem to indicate that he was influenced a great deal by systemic
functionalism, but I haven't seen any remarks about this in his writings.

I have been very busy trying to complete a draft of an account of how to choose tense in English. The
tense grammar is Michael's and I have worked out tense choosers for the systems. The intention is both
to explore tense semantics and to have an example of how choosers and inquiries work. You may not like
it, if you don't agree with the tense grammar ....'

Can anyone comment on the historical relationship between Dik's 'Functional Grammar' and Systemic
Grammar? Chris and Bill Mann also write (December 1983):

'The discussion in What's in Nigel: 1 deals with issues of coverage of the clause in Nigel. We have
limited the scope to the clause to keep the discussion manageable. The intention is to send you a
sequel later on; hence '1' in the title. A review of systemic work on English - a consumer's guide,
as it were - would be fascinating and very useful, but What's in Nigel in no ways attempts to do that.
If it elicits materials or helpful references from readers of Network, we will of course be delighted.

This autumn has seen continued work on Nigel and a new report by Sandy Thompson and Bill on Rhetorical
Propositions. Christian has given two systemic talks at UCLA, one on systemic grammar in text
generation, and one on Cohesion to people in the department of English where Cohesion in English is
used as a text book. Bill has toured the East Coast, giving talks on Nigel and text generation.

Recently, Bill Woods* spent some time with us to familiarise himself with Nigel and our work on text
organisation.'

*Bill Woods is the creator of one of the best-known programs in AI: the LUNAR program for asking and

answering questions about rock samples from the Moon. — Editor.

MICHAEL O'TOOLE writes (December 1983):

'I hope to let you have some information for Network in due course.   I am currently building our Part I
as Language and Literature courses around the Cummings and Simmons book, which will involve a series of
lectures on how their approach relates to the literary theories we teach here.'

Address: Professor L.M. O'Toole, School of Human Communication, Murdoch University, Perth, West Australia,
6150, Australia.

BRAJ KACHRU writes (July 1983):

'It is an excellent idea to include in Network bibliographical references and notes on research in
progress.   Perhaps the following items will interest you.

Kachru, Braj B. 1981. 'Socially realistic linguistic: the Firthian tradition'. In Sociolinguistic Theory,
special issue of International Journal of the Sociology of Language. No. 31. pp. 65-89.

Kachru, Braj B. 1982. The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures.   Urbana, IL: University of Illinois
Press. xvi, 358. Paperback edition in 1983 by Pergamon Press, London.   Includes 20 specially ·
commissioned studies on English across cultures and issues related to English as an international and
intranational language. Several studies use theoretical concepts from J.R. Firth and M.A.K. Halliday.

Kachru, Braj B. 1983. The Indianisation of English: The English Language in India.   New Delhi, New
York, London: Oxford University Press. xvi, 280. This book is dedicated to the memory of J.R. Firth
(1890-1960). The eight studies included in the volume are based on the theoretical framework of J.R.
Firth, and the earlier approach of M.A.K. Halliday.

And I have currently six Ph.D students (at various stages of completion of their dissertations) working
on topics mainly related to varieties of English.   One student, Margie Berns, is working on 'Functional
approaches to language teaching'.   This is essentially based on the recent approaches to Systemic
Grammar.'

Address: Professor Braj B. Kachru, Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,
4088 Foreign Languages Building, Urbana, Illinois 61801, U.S.A.

ROBIN FAWCETT spent a demanding but rewarding six weeks in Australia, with a flying one-day visit
to Singapore on the way home, 10 July to 22 September 1983.   The visit was at the invitation of Michael
Halliday, Ruqaiya Hasan, Michael O'Toole, Dick Walker and the Applied Linguistics Association of
Australia at whose annual Congress Robin Fawcett gave a keynote address on 'Language as a resource'.
(See 'Papers available in mimeo form' section.)

All in all he gave 29 talks or seminars (i.e. an average of almost one a day), and enjoyed meeting,
among others, the following with active interests in systemic linguistics:

1) At Murdoch University, Perth: Michael O'Toole, Bob Hodge, Paul Thibault, Greg Sims. The visit
   included a talk on a new discourse model to the Perth Linguistics Circle at the University of
   Western Australia.

2) At Deakin University, Geelong (Language and Education Workshop): Fran Christie (Workshop Organiser);
   co-leaders with Robin Fawcett: Michael Halliday, Gunther Kress and Dick Walker - and the many well-
   informed educationalists attending it.

   After this, Robin Fawcett spent an enjoyable and useful weekend with Michael Halliday, talking and

bush-walking.

3) At La Trobe University, Melbourne, for the Annual Congress of the Applied Linguistics Association Australia. This was a superbly organised occasion, and it is interesting to note that although Australia's population is only 15 million, there were more attenders than at the meetings of the British Association of Applied Linguistics, which serves a population of 56 million!

4) At Brisbane College of Advanced Education, Brisbane: Dick Walker, and discussions on the value of systemic linguistics in educational work. Robin Fawcett also visited Rodney Huddleston (who made a considerable contribution to systemic linguistics in the late 1960's) at the University of Queensland, and enjoyed getting to know Brendan Bartlett and others better.

5) University of Sydney: Michael Halliday was in China during Robin Fawcett's visit, but he saw a lot of Jim Martin and postgraduates in the department, Gunther Plum, Cate Poynton and Eija Ventola (from Finland). He was glad also to be able to see more of Gunther Kress, who has recently moved to be Dean of the Faculty of Human Communication at the New South Wales Institute of Technology in Sydney.

6.) At Macquarie University (also in Sydney): Ruqaiya Hasan, who is senior lecturer in linguistics. Robin Fawcett had fruitful conversations with her and her colleague David Butt (see papers available in mimeo form).

During this period in Sydney RF gave several talks, including one to Sydney Linguistics Circle on a systemic computer model of language, and talks to groups of English as a Second Language teachers and advisers. He also paid flying (literally) visits up the coast to the University of Newcastle and inland to Canberra, giving two talks in each. And between all this he visited - and climbed! - Ayer's Rock (or Uluru, to give it its Aboriginal name) and fitted in four days among the incredibly beautiful fishes and coral gardens of Heron Island, on the Great Barrier Reef. Were Malinowski's coral gardens and their magic like this? Perhaps not, but this was magic too.

Finally, on the way home, RF called at the National University of Singapore, at the invitation of David Birch, where he found, to his great pleasure, Professor Shivendra Verma was visiting for a year's sabbatical. Again, a computer-implementible (i.e. generative/explicit) systemic semantic mini-grammar was presented.

In summary: it was a wonderful visit. There is lots of extremely stimulating work going on in Australia, and no visiting linguist could fail to gain greatly from a visit to this intellectually stimulating and, in its many distinctive ways, incredibly beautiful country.

TORONTO REPORT

JIM BENSON, MIKE CUMMINGS and BILL GREAVES are negotiating with John Benjamins for the publication of a volume of current essays on Systemic Linguistics. The aim is to show the full range of activities within the discipline, and to reach a relatively wide audience.

MIKE CUMMINGS is pushing ahead with his work on the Old English nominal group. Se the article elsewhere in this issue.

BILL GREAVES and JIM BENSON have been joined by Barron Brainerd, Professor of Mathematics and Linguistics at the University of Toronto, in the project to use the CLOC package developed by Alan Reed at Birmingham University. They are currently working on field of discourse in literary texts. CLOC is now mounted on the Glendon VAX, and the York University Computer Centre is prepared to cooperate with prospective users in North America. For information, write to Bill or Jim, c/o ALRWG, Glendon College, 2275 Bayview Avenue, Toronto, M4N 3M6, Canada.

The next issue of <u>Network</u> will include a valuable description of the activities of the Department of English Language at the University of Ife, Ile Ife, Nigeria, indicating the role of Systemic Grammar in the activities, by Oluwole Adejare.   Other departments are invited to send in similar descriptions; it is always of interest to those using systemic linguistics to learn the part it plays in the courses of others.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The third part of Michael Halliday's 'Annotated bibliography of publications relating to systemic theory', which covers the period 1973-1977, will appear in <u>Network</u> no. 7, and future issues will also include bibliographies of Ruqaiya Hasan, Shivendra Verma and others.

In this issue we present a selected annotated bibliography by a leading American systemic linguist, Peter H. Fries. (For those readers who are wondering, it may be useful to state (and so to get out of the way) the fact that Peter Fries is the son of C.C. Fries, author of that immensely influential work <u>The structure of English</u> (1952).   But Peter Fries is very much a linguist in his own right, as those who have heard his contributions to conferences or read his papers will testify. And, as you will see from the fuller bibliography that follows the selected annutated one, he is a linguist who has earlier had the enriching experience of working with tagmemic linguistics.

A: PETER H. FRIES: A SELECTED ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1) 'English Predictions of Comparison', in <u>The Third LACUS Forum</u>, 1976, Edited by Robert DiPietro and
   Edward Blansitt, pp 545-556. Columbia: Hornbeam Press. (1977) Reprinted: <u>Studia Anglica
   Posnaniensia</u>, 9.95-103. (1977)

   It is human nature to compare things. This comparison may take the form of comparisons with an
   unexpressed norm, (<u>This boat is long</u>. or <u>This boat is very long</u>.) It may take the form of a
   comparison with particular objects (<u>This boat is longer than that one (is)</u>.)   It may be a comparison
   with particular tasks (<u>This piece of wood is long enough to fit.</u>) or it may be a comparison within
   a particular group (<u>This boat is the longest of all</u>.) Systemic grammar offers a way to treat the
   different meanings of comparison in a unified way, and gives an explanatory description of the
   various structures used to express these meanings.

2) 'Language and the Expression of Meaning: a Linguist looks at Literature' <u>English in Australia</u>
   48. 29-38 (June 1979)

   The language of a text signals its meaning through various linguistic devices such as choice of
   vocabulary, choice of grammatical constructions, choice of thematic content and signals of cohesion.
   However, though the linguistic signals are in the language, it would be wrong to imply that a text
   can be interpreted simply by examining solely the language on the page. Readers are forced to make
   inferences at every level of interpretation.   Similarly, every text, once it is formed, contains
   an infinite number of patterns, of which only a limited number signal meanings. As a result readers
   (and linguists) must approach a text with some prior prejudices as to what is likely to be significant,
   and then process the text in terms of those prejudices, maintaining them or modifying them where
   appropriate.

3) 'On Negation in Comparative Constructions' <u>Festschrift for Jacob Ornstein</u>, Edward L. Blansitt, Jr.
   and Richard V. Teschner, Editors, Newbury House, Rowley (1980)

The English construction which expresses comparisons of inequality, e.g. John is taller than Bill, been analysed as having a deep structure which contains a negative element (e.g. Bazell (1967), (1969), Seuren (1969 and 1973) and Mittwoch (1974)). However the arguments advanced to support an analysis apply equally well to two other structures for which no such analysis may be advanced (the comparative of equality, e.g. John is as tall as Bill, and amount relative clauses, e.g. What money there is in the drawer should be taken to a bank) and to at least one construction for which the analysis must be more complext (before-clauses, e.g. He left before you did. On the other hand, there is clear textual evidence that comparatives of inequality but not these other constructions are necessarily associated with negation. This association with negation rises directly from the notion of inequality which this structure expresses and not from its syntactic properties.

4) 'Lanaguage and Interactive Behaviour: The Language of Bridge' in Notes on Linguistics No. 2. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Dallas.

For many years K.L. Pike has said that language is a form of behaviour, and he has given a number of examples demonstrating interactions between verbal and non-verbal behaviour. While useful, these examples are not totally satisfying, because they do not show the mechanisms by which language relates to non-verbal goals. The use of language in the game of bridge demonstrates this mechanism in a limited example. Specifically, the meanings expressed through language are the means of realising non-verbal goals which are determined by the rules of bridge. The game of bridge is analogous to a culture in that both determine the sorts of goals people wish to attain. Language and other forms of overt behaviour can then be seen as means of realising these cultural goals.

5) 'On the Status of Theme in English: Arguments from Discourse' in Forum Linguisticum, and in Petofi, S.S., and Sozer, E. (Eds.) 1983: Micro- and macro-connectivity of texts. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag. ·

The theme of a clause or sentence is the point of departure of that clause or sentence as message. In English the theme is realised as the initial constituent of the clause or sentence. The information that is contained within the themes of the various sentences of a passage correlates with the method of development of the passage, and, if the passage is outlinable, the outline structures of the passage. The meaning of theme and its realisation in English explains the general correlation of given information with the initial position in the sentence.

6) 'On Repetition and Interpretation' in Ruth Brend and Robert Longacre, Editors, Linguistics in the Humanities, Summer Institute of Linguistics, Dallas. (In press).

It is well know that when sentences are taken out of context they often change meaning. That is to say, the relation between a sentence and its context provides some of the meaning of the sentence. One technique we can use to discover how this phenomena takes place is to examine the role of repetition in the text. In particular, discovering the patterns of lexico-semantic interactions in a text allow us to discover how these patterns affect the interpretation of the individual messages of which the text is composed.

7) 'How does a story mean what it does: a partial answer' in W. Greaves and J. Benson (Eds.) Systemic Perspectives on Discourse: Volume 1: Selected Theoretical Papers from the Ninth International Systemic Workshop. Ablex Newark, N.J. (In press).

If we ask the question 'how does a story mean what it does?' certain elements of the answer are immediately obvious. For example we need an account of what happens. This, for example, has been attempted with a propositional analysis of the story. But clearly, stories are not merely linear sequences of events, they are structured. To be a story a text must have some sort of beginning, middle and end. Yet these terms are not sufficient for they do not tell us what distinguishes beginnings from middles and ends. Further it does not tell us how various beginnings are to be distinguished from one another, etc. A further problem lies in relating this macro-structure to the propositional analysis. Finally one must consider comparisons between episodes. If a story

contains several episodes, what happens in the later episodes will be interpreted by comparing it with earlier episodes. This paper will attempt to analyse a children's story from a micro-level and a macro-level, it will relate the two analyses and use these relations to show how the various episodes may be compared with one another and interpreted in the light of that comparison.

B. PETER H. FRIES: BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dissertation: The Uses of the Infinitive in the Object of the Verb in English (1964)

1.) 'A Paraphrastic Determination of Sentence Structure' with Richard Kittredge, University of Pennsylvania Transformations and Discourse Analysis Project Paper, Number 60. 1-23 (1965)

2.) 'History of the Language' With Jon Erickson, Eugene Kintgen and Bruce Stark, (Chapter) in Backgrounds in Language. Developed by the Upper Midwest Regional Education Lab and distributed by the National Council of Teachers in English (1967).

(tag) 3.) 'On Double Function in Tagmemics', Anthropological Linguistics, Volume 12, 122-135, (1970).

(tag) 4.) 'On Repeatability and Reduplication', TESL Reporter, Volume 3, No. 4, 1-2 (1970).

(tag) 5.) 'On Pernicious Recursion', Working Papers in Linguistics, Madison Linguistics Circle, Volume 1, No 1, 1-21 (1970) Reprinted in Studia Anglica Posnaniensia, 4, 35-50, (1972)

(tag) 6.) Review of Introduction to Tagmemic Analysis by Walter Cook in Language Sciences, 17, 45-50, (1971).

(tag) 7.) Tagmeme Sequences in the English Noun Phrase, Santa Ana: Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields, 36. (1970).

(tag) 8.) 'Tagmemics' in Language: Introductory Readings, Edited by Clark, Virginia, Rosa, Alfred and Eschholz, Paul, 194-208, New York: St. Martins Press. (1972) Reprinted: Notes on Linguistics, No 12, 3-13, (October, 1979)

(tag) 9.) 'Problems in the Tagmemic Description of the English Noun Phrase' Preceedings of the 11th International Congress of Linguists, Bologna, Italy, 1972, Edited by Luigi Heilman, Volume 1, 221-229. Bologna: Societa Editrice il Mulino Bologna. (1974)

(tag) 10.) 'English Noun Phrase Construction' TESL Reporter, Volume 6, No 1, 8-9, (Fall, 1972)

(tag) 11.) 'Some Fundamental Insights of Tagmemics Revisited', In Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honour of Archibal A. Hill, Edited by Edgar C. Press. (1977). Reprinted in Advances in Tagmemics, Edited by Ruth Brend, 23-34. Amsterdam: North Holland (1974)

12.) Reviews of:

Cooper, Peter S.A. Correct your English: Dialogues and Difficulties Second Edition. Munchen: Hueber, 1971, 1-115. paper

Hoffmann, Hans G. and Friedgold Schmidt. English Grammar Exercises: A systemic course for advanced students. Munchen: Hueber, 1971, 3-152. paper

Meldau, Rudolf and John Leyton. The Little England Book. Fifth Edition. Munchen: Hueber, 1971. 1-72. paper

Meldau, Rudolf and Ronald J. Taylor. Deutsche Ubersetzungsbeispiele zur Englishchen Sprachlehre. Eighth Edition. Munchen: Hueber, 1969, 1-46. paper.

Raith, Joseph and Herbery Marchl. Beispielsatze zur Englishchen Grammatik.   Third
Munchen: Hueber, 1969, 1-46 paper

Spiegelberg, Walter. Moderne Englische Nacherzahlungen.   Fourth Edition. Munchen: Hu
1979, 1-72. paper

in Modern Language Journal, Volume 58. 82-83. (1974)

13.) 'The Structure of Texts: A Preliminary Report' with Julie Fair, Michigan State University
Working Papers in Language and Linguistics 2. 109-122 (April 1976). Reprinted in The
Internal Journal, Volume 1, No 1, 1-8 Department of English, Central Michigan University,
(September 1974) and Studia Anglica Posnaniensia, Volume X, 95-104. (1978)

(tag) 14.) 'On Surface and Underlying Structure in Tagmemic Theory with Special Reference to Phrase,
Clause and Sentence', Tagmemics: Theoretical Discussion, Edited by Ruth Brend and K.L. Pik
Volume 2. 1-49. The Hague: Mouton, (1976)

(sys) 15.) 'English Predictions of Comparison', in The Third LACUS Forum, 1976, Edited by Robert
DiPietro and Edward Blansitt, pp 545-556. Columbia: Hornbeam Press. (1977) Reprinted:
Studia Anglica Posnaniensia, 9.95-103. (1977)

(sys) 16.) "Lexical Systems and the Meaning of Words', The Language of Poems, Volume 6, No 1 and 2,
3-5. (March 1977)

(sys) 17.) "Language and the Expression of Meaning: A Linguist Looks at Literature' English in
Australia 48. 29-38 (June 1979)

(tag) 18.) Review of Grammatical Analysis by Pike and Pike. Language, 907-911, (December 1979)

(sys) 19.) 'On Negation in Comparative Constructions' Festschrift for Jacob Ornstein, Edward L.
Blansitt, Jr. and Richard V. Teschner, Editors, Newbury House, Rowley (1980)

(tag) 20.) "On Surface and Underlying Structure in Tagmemics" Kivung Volume II, No. 2, June, 1978
(appeared 1981)

(sys) 21.) 'Lanaguage and Interactive Behaviour: The Language of Bridge' in Notes on Linguistics No.
2. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Dallas

(sys) 22.) 'On the Status of Theme in English: Arguments from Discourse' in Forum Linguisticum, and
in Petofi, S.S., and Sozer, E. (Eds.) 1983. Micro- and macro-connectivity of texts.
Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

(sys) 23.) 'On Repetition and Interpretation' in Ruth Brend and Robert Longacre, Editors, Linguistic
in the Humanities, Summer Institute of Linguistics, Dallas (In press)

24.) 'C.C. Fries' Signals Grammar and the Goals of Linguistics' in J. Morreall (Ed.) The
Ninth LACUS Forum 1982, Columbia: Hornbeam Press 1983.

(sys) 25.) 'How does a story mean what it does: a partial answer' in W. Greaves and J. Benson (Eds.)
Systemic Perspectives on Discourse: Selected Theoretical Papers from the 9th Internationa
Systemic Workshop: Ablex Newark, N.J. (In press)

REVIEWS

Network currently holds review copies of the following, and invites readers who would like to review them to apply to do so.

Gregory, M., and Carroll, S., 1978, Language and context. London: RKP
Halliday, M.A.K., and Martin, J.R., 1981, Readings in systemic linguistics 1956-1974. London: Batsford.
Perkins, M.R., 1983, Modal expressions in English. London: Frances Pinter and Newark N.J.: Ablex.
Pike, K.L., and Pike, E.G., 1983, Text and tagmeme. London: Frances Pinter and Newark N.J.: Ablex.

If you would like to propose a book that you would like to review, let us know; we can normally obtain a review copy for you.

We expect to be publishing the following reviews in future issues of Network:

Mountford, J.: Review of Kress, Gunther, 1982, Learning to write. London: RKP.
Birch, D.: Review of Fawcett, Robin P., 1980, Cognitive linguistics and social interaction: towards an integrated model of a systemic functional grammar and the other components of a communicating mind. Heidelberg: Julius Groos and Exeter University.

.........and a number of others.

NOTE TO AUTHORS: It would greatly help us if you would ask your publisher to send a review copy to Network. Please note that this is not accomplished by sending a complimentary copy to Robin Fawcett, as some authors of systemic books are kind enough to do, since Network reviewers need their own copies! Network will review ALL systemic works that we are sent, and we will do our best to review works that draw in part on systemic theory or adopt an approach compatible with systemic theory, e.g. work in the broader Firthian tradition or in tagmemic, stratificational or functional grammar.

Review of Martin, J.R., and Rothery, Joan, Writing Project Report 1980 and Writing Project Report 1981, Nos. 1 and 2 in Working Papers in Linguistics. Sydney: University of Sydney.

INTRODUCTION

English education has historically been somewhat myopic. Research in composition, though often elaborate, has seldom focused on the student writer attempting to mean in various contexts, evaluated for product, and subject to a hidden curriculum. In Writing Project 1 and 2, Martin and Rothery reverse this trend by including the writer and graphically illustrating the features of registers. In the roles of 'a teacher interested in linguistics' and 'a linguist interested in education', they also reverse an academic tradition that, in its distance from the real classroom, often compounded rather than facilitated the teacher's task.

The authors' objectives consist of two phases: (1) to analyse student writing from late primary through secondary school, and (2) to look at implications such analyses have for the teaching of writing so that, over the long term, research might 'quantify in a probabilistic way .... the relation between genre and words and structures.' Volume 1 contains a narrative of vicarious experience written by a boy in Year 6 of Primary School and an expository essay of literary criticism on the Canterbury Tales, by a girl in Year 11 of Secondary School. Rothery examines the former for experiential meanings in clauses, the schematic structure of a story, cohesive relations, and thematic choices. Martin analyses the expository essay for lexical cohesion, schematic structure, conjunction and theme. The purpose in both cases is to reflect 'demands narrative and exposition place on students.'

Rothery observes of writing instruction that 'although students are encouraged to undertake a range of written genres, little is known about the course of writing development.' She tells us that when asked what constitutes good writing, teachers typically reply 'Good ideas and good expression,' thus reacting to

the FIELD of a text and implying that deficiencies could be remedied in phrase-sentence structural appr
that 'were usually isolated from a text of any kind.' As teacher and linguist, I, too, have encountere
teacher observations that demonstrated little sensitivity to the complexities of register and would invar
find myself countering laments that 'Susie can't write' with 'Write what? a sentence? a paragraph? an essa
a poem? etc.

The 'fault' in such scenarios, at least in American education, is/was not that of the teacher alone
but equally that of textbooks endorsed by prominent academicians who, as Rothery observes of teachers,
'needed to draw on some explicit language knowledge' but did not. Conspicuously absent from language
research of the '60s and '70s that gave rise to 'The child develops language through using language,' as
Rothery argues, was an appreciation for register-specific tasks. Architects of the curriculum and
textbook writers seldom asked crucial questions like 'How far is the text from the activity it describes?' and
'How far removed are speaker and listener?', thus neglecting the variables of TENOR and MODE.

With FIELD, TENOR, and MODE Rothery's analysis relates register to lexico-grammar and text to the
lingusitic system - unlike too many studies still prevalent at least in the U.S. where, for example, cohesion
markers are often counted apart from any context or the larger linguistic system. Instead, Rothery rightly
contends that 'a systemic description is a paradigmatic one' that allows for 'comparing texts within the
same genre and for comparing texts from different genres.' It is just such a model that is so sorely needed
in the 'heuristics' of text production.

ANALYSIS

Narrative of Vicarious Experience

Although vicarious narrative - The Spaceship Story - demonstrates a range of process types, Rothery
points out that in the narratives of less able writers, material process clauses were more prevalent. She
speculates that 'choice of Process types ..... may be important in considering development in this type of
narrative writing.' In my own research, the proportion of material clauses in expository texts about
literature and the integration and placement of these clauses in the schematic structure (1) distinguished
successful from non-successful texts, and (2) clarified developmental stages in register production.[1]

Schematic structure, Rothery argues, requires consideration of EXPERIENTIAL HARMONY (the consistent
relationship between the characters' participant roles and processes in which they are involved) and
SEQUENTIAL HARMONY (the choice of sequences of processes to the end point of the structure). She notes
that the spaceship text includes a rapid succession of events without development. That 'this type of
progression may be typical of a certain stage of writing development' is substantiated by my own students'
ability (as late as the college level) to produce successful expository statements but their inability,
often, to sustain the logic of an extended exposition.

Rothery demonstrates that REFERENCE cohesion makes demands on the writer that face-to-face oral
interaction does not. The following sentence written by a secondary level student indeed involves the
kind of implicature that is often viewed as a mistake: // Firstly we will look at the League of Nations.
The Covenant was signed in April, 1919 ..... // The student is quite right in arguing as she does that
'The teacher will know what I am writing about' for so arguing demonstrates a keen sense of the
interpersonal role relationship with her audience. The question actually is not just one of audience
but also one of permitted degrees of indirect reference and the given-new contract for various registers.

In her treatment of CONJUNCTION, Rothery focuses on External relations (between propositions about
the world) and Internal relations (rhetorical connections in discourse). Because of the dominance of
External conjunctions in the spaceship story 'this would seem to be a distinguishing feature of narrative.'
The occurrence of only two Internal relations, however, motivates her to speculate that 'these kinds
of relations' may be 'used more frequently in narratives of older, more mature writers' and that if such
indeed is so, 'then an important similarity would be established between narrative and expository writing.'
One might also add that establishing potential relationships in genres is a necessary step in planning
a phased curriculum.

In her discussion of THEME, Rothery analyses teacher comments that urge students to vary sentence beginnings. She concludes that 'such remarks are focused at the level of the individual sentence or clause' and 'do not take account of the development of the text overall.' Although this may be so, teacher comments deserve further exploration. Research needs to test whether teachers may indeed be responding intuitively to the features of genre. If a teacher urges a student to avoid beginning each sentence with 'the character did this or that' or to break the monotony of a strict temporal sequence, he may be suggesting the interplay of options that exists in successful, mature realisations of a given register variety.

Rothery analyses LEXICAL cohesion from the perspective of Field. There is a 'space invasion' string, a 'crash' string, and 'injury and recovery' string, etc. and the 'earth and sky' string, which runs through the entire text, 'realises the setting of the narrative.' The proportions and lexical composition of strings also have important implications for the development of expository texts where Field is that of narrative.[2]

Rothery presents the PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS of her research as follows: (1) register is central in planning for language development; (2) language development should be systematically related to the child's language use; (3) report and narrative of personal experience are common to speech and writing; (4) writing excludes the interactive production of text in the child's oral language development; (5) a child's experiential distance from the event complicates the development of writing; and (6) the schematic structures of exposition and vicarious narrative should be introduced in the classroom in appropriate ways.

She encourages teachers to allow children to re-tell their stories in pairs or groups so that guidelines of 'where the child is at' in story-telling can be provided. Her observation that 'ideally teachers should be able to 'tune in' in this way while listening to children in all kinds of language situations echoes my own experiences with adolescents who engaged in a synoptic re-telling of the literary text as a preliminary to developing their expository texts. Allusions to character, events in the plot or aspects of the central idea became dominant in reference and lexical chains that 'configured' the secondary text.

Finally, Rothery urges teachers (1) to plan the writing situation and (2) to contrast situations for 'the kinds of texts they will lead to' or 'the particular feature of a text they wish to influence.' She concludes by arguing that it is essential for planning that teachers evaluate texts for a writer's strengths and weaknesses within and across genres. One might add that such an evaluation is crucial in phasing curriculum for students at various ability levels.

Exposition: Literary Criticism

Before analysing the essay question response on Chaucer's description of the Prioress, Martin observes that for many teachers 'no recognition is given to the fact that language exists and is used to shape meanings in texts that succeed in communication' and that 'many writing teachers ..... view the expression of "feeling", not approximation to a genre appropriate to a particular context, as the crucial factor in student writing.'

Such statements invite rebuttals that might include (a) an exoneration of the journal as a mitigator of writing anxiety and (b) the argument that early demand for genre specifications may stifle the free expression of ideas and result in artificial and even garbled syntax. The question is 'At what point should genre features be introduced and demanded?' A 'premature' adherance to genre might result in expository 'shells' where cohesive markers delineate the 5-paragraph format void of style or substance, as was often the case with my ESL students. Many English-speaking students procrusteanly adhere to rhetorical form, complaining that 'it is hard for me to say what I really want to the way the book wants me to.'

Martin's analysis of LEXICAL COHESION reveals a clustering by paragraph as seen in paragraph 1's concern with the nun's appearance, paragraph 2's with her singing, etc. while strings of literary criticism tend to run throughout until the conclusion where all the text's strings meet. Although Martin does not comment further, the question of a proportionate balance between various Fields displayed in the strings - literary criticism, what Chaucer does, the nun's appearance - might serve as a diagnostic tool to monitor register development. For example, the string 'what Chaucer does' (use, create , describe) represents a Tenor role that is slowly cultivated and with my own students did not appear proportionately integrated

with other Fields in the early phases of register development.

Martin's treatment of schematic structure underscores the intricacy of literary analysis. He analyses the introduction of six arguments by noting that the argument that refers to the nun is not connected to a literary device, and that the argument that refers to the language of poetry does not consider what aspect the rhythm is mocking. He concludes that the arguments lack 'the balanced exemplication needed to support the thesis.'

In his discussion of the interaction of lexical cohesion and schematic structure, he views the 'richness of language' as taught in secondary school as 'trivialised into a list of literary devices which are simply the generic icing on an intriguingly more sophisticated cake.' The interaction of the meta-language of literary criticism with cogent observations about the literature is a difficult synthesis for even gifted adolescents. It is no surprise that Martin's student refers in her conclusion to character traits without mentioning the language of poetry. To her credit, it is remarkable that she does so infrequently. It is a bit too harsh, it seems, to contend that literary devices are presented as nothing more than a generic icing.

For CONJUNCTION, he observes that although 'conjunction can be fairly forwardly analysed in a "good" essay' .... in 'poor writing the links are often so opaque as to be uninterpretable' and that lexical cohesion is more easily analysed in a poor essay than a good one. Lexical cohesion is more complex in its associations in good writing. In my own research, lexical items often entailed multiple resolutions where cohesive force and distance variables complicated the analysis.

Although in his treatment of THEME Martin argues that cautions against the passive reflect 'complete ignorance of the function of this text-forming resource,' good teachers have always recognised its rhetorical purpose, as have textbooks that encourage its use 'when an actor is unknown or unimportant' or when the expression that would be the object ..... needs emphasis or needs to be in the subject slot to improve continuity.'[3]

Martin observes that nearly half of the topical themes in the essay refer to Chaucer and that this may reflect the student's familiarity with narrative where persons function as a method of story development. He encourages a more 'appropriate alternative', namely literary criticism. Lexical items like plot, theme, character, etc., however, one might add, form an inordinately large corpus of lexical ties in early stages of many students' essays, particularly those of less able writers for whom the meta-linguistic set becomes a crutch in lexical bonding and can make for monotonous and unsuccessful texts. Martin's pedagogical implications follow: (1) literary criticism is probably the most sophisticated type of exposition; (2) genres entail dramatic differences in discourse structure; (3) students recognise genre as needed in their texts and teachers demand an approximation to genre whether or not they provide models; (4) 'learning through language' argues for 'a certain convergence between thematic narrative and exposition while ignoring the differences'.

Children are expected to master literary criticism before less demanding expository genres are internalised, according to Martin. It might also be added that since literary criticism involves a previous text, critical reading is an added and key variable in successful text production and furthers the argument for a developmental typology of written genres. Finally, if teachers need to know discourse structure, as Martin contends, so, too, do linguists and English educators at all academic levels need to get out of the 'closet' and observe children writing and even on occasion teach them, if they are to appreciate the full array of cognitive, environmental and behavioural variables that impact on the production of texts.

Martin's comments that 'it was teachers, not linguists, who expelled traditional grammar as valueless' requires some tempering, at least for the U.S. Veteran teachers here still decry the 'New English' forced on them by publishers, linguists and 'would-be-linguists' in English education. Contrary to the contention that 'linguistics was not brought in to fill the vacuum created by removing traditional prescriptive grammar,' it was precisely the 'linguistic revolution', via Paul Roberts, Jacobs and Rosenbaum, Harcourt Brace, and others in all camps (structural, tagmemic, etc.) that ousted the traditionalists, to the enduring distrust of any brand of linguistics among many classroom teachers.

Ontogenesis of Genres

In Writing Project 2 Martin and Rothery focus on an ontogenesis of genres and observe that (1) 'write is an intransitive verb in education,' (2) genre has been 'trivialised' in public education, and (3) teachers expect students to master genres but do so in evaluations rather than in instruction. The authors establish a typology of written texts from Infants school to late Secondary school that includes recounts, narrative, thematic narratives, report writing, exposition, and literary criticism. Their data indicates that (1) narrative strands are the most popular genres in infants and primary school, and (2) a hidden curriculum exists as early as the primary school.

They note that not only does speech and writing differ in medium but significantly in personal tenor in infants school in the avoidance of self-expression in the latter, thus underscoring 'one of the great ironies of the Brittonites' emphasis on self-expression in writing.' Further, among the 'morass of contradictions' that prevails is the fact that 'genres as different as Observation/Comment, Recount, and Report are all referenced .... by the same apparent generic term: story.'

The authors sound a more disputable note, however, in contending that 'social class determines a child's success in learning to write or not.' My own experience as a teacher for almost two decades in one of Chicago's most prestigous suburbs with children of the affluent and professional upper middle class challenges that conclusion. Even academically talented children in a homogeneous and privileged social enviroment (linguistic and other) do not demonstrate the same levels of writing proficiency across genres.

The authors then present their findings for each genre analysed:

A. Characteristics of Observation/Comment include: (1) a dominance of mental and relational clauses;(2) no clear beginning, middle, end;(3) a strong 'attitudinal' flavour in lexical strings;(4) exophoric reference to the writer (largely thematic); and (5) a conspicuous absence of conjunction.

Such data, if extended and quantified, would, as Martin and Rother argue, linguistically define expressive writing, and, it seems to me, also dispel the contention that such writing underlies all other genres.

B. Recount includes: (1) nearly 50 percent material clauses;(2) dominance of behavioural processes with a focus on events in the re-orientation;(3) absence of attitudinal strings; (4) exophoric reference to the writer and his class (thematic); and (5) successive temporal conjunctives.

C. Report includes: (1) absence of attitudinal strings but a specialised taxonomic vocabulary organisation - 'nocturnal animal, moused ear bats' etc.; (2) dominance of endophoric reference;(3) decentered theme - events and things not the writer; and (4) of 6 clauses, 3 relational, 2 behavioural, 1 material.

Martin and Rothery explain that 'when cognitive psychologists refer to Reports as "abstract" and involving "generalisation" they are in fact describing in very informal terms the experiential clause structure of this genre.'

D. Narrative includes: (1) majority of material clauses;(2) schematic structure of Orientation, Complication, Resolution, and Coda based on an unusual sequence of events;(3) endophoric reference to topic, demonstrating context independency;(4) dominance of lexical collocation versus taxonomy;(5) exclusion of writer in dominant theme; and (6) dominance of temporal conjunctions.

Martin and Rothery observe that 'the relation between words and structures is .... a question of tendencies, not of rules.' They are sensitive to the Herculean effort involved in thus establishing a descriptive methodology of genres and call their own work 'guidelines for further research rather than categorical facts.' They also decry any suggestions that teachers present as lessons the linguistic analyses of the project.

SUMMARY

Martin and Rothery conclude by commenting on the limitation inherent in Donald Grave's writing process approach[4] and argue instead for examining texts in relation to (1) the system of language from which they

derive, and (2) the social context or register of the writing. They should be applauded for the rich
beginning the Writing Project represents towards eliminating the hidden curriculum and establishing a
linguistically explicit ontogenesis of genres. One can only hope that this effort and others like it w
not fall on deaf ears among policy makers and holders of the purse in administration circles. The author
do much to re-instate the good name of linguistics and re-open a dialogue between Departments of Linguistic
English, and Education towards a mutual respect among professionals engaged in teaching young people how
to write. Their work should be required reading in the councils of English teachers everywhere.

Mary Ann Eiler
2014 N. Mason
Chicago, Illinois. 60634

NOTES

1) All references in the review to my own research are based on phases of my data collection for the
following: Eiler, Mary Ann, 'Meaning and Choice in Writing about Literature' in <u>Developmental Issues
in Discourse</u> edited by Jonathan Fine and Roy O. Freedle, Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1983. (<u>a
condensed version of the full dissertation</u>)

2) In early stages of writing about literature, college students often use the typology of the literary
text as cohesion markers in the expository text. In my own research cohort, one student complained
that the omniscient organisation of <u>All Quiet on the Western Front</u>, unlike the chronological sequences
of a previously read novel, was 'making it hard' to know what to choose for his essay.

3) Robert M. Gorrell and Mabel M. Brown. 'The Passive.' Chapter 22 in <u>Writing and Language 1.</u> 'Domains in
Language and Composition'. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., New York, 1972.

4) The authors also discuss a controvery in New South Wales involving approaches to writing instruction that
is not included in this review.

ARTICLES

We reprint with thanks the following, which is page 1 of an article (which becomes increasingly technical on the following pages) from York University, Toronto's. Computing News 15.5.

PROLOG parses Old English

Cecil O. Humphrey

SIBB SY ON EORTHAN

No, it is not the newest computer language. On the contrary, it's a very common Christmas maxim (Peace on Earth) in Old English. At York the marriage of tenth- and twentieth-century languages is being meticulously arranged by Glendon English Professor Michael Cummings. For three years Cummings has been using computer technology in his work on the analysis of Old English syntax. The Glendon linguist explains that his work dwells on the language as it was written at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh centuries, specifically the historical dialect known as Late West Saxon. He points out that the epic poem Beowulf, the most prominent literary monument in Old English still extant, was probably written down at about this time.

The object of this research is to produce a book describing the syntax of the Old English nominal group (noun phrase). Cummings explains that the nominal group is easily identified as a string of words which could be the subject of a sentence or the object of a verb. In Old English, the construction of the nominal group differs from that in modern English. For example, modern English uses the definite article ("the") to convey a certain meaning, while in Old English, the definite article does not exist as such. The demonstrative ("that", "those") employed in modern English does not exist as such in Old English either. Rather, there is a single item which has some of the characteristics of the modern definite article, and some of the characteristics of the modern demonstrative.

Cummings intends to produce an analysis of every nominal group found in a designated part of the Old English literary corpus. He selected a single book of homilies (sermons) written by a man named Wulfstan who was Archbishop of York prior to 1023. "Wulfstan's strange and seemingly awkward writing style guaranteed a wealth of peculiar nominal groups." The idea was to analyze and produce a structural tree diagram for each nominal group. The branching two-dimensional diagram provides a means of representing the bracketing of more inclusive or less inclusive units in syntactical sequences. "After coping with a certain number of tree diagram analyses, I realized that the use of a computer would facilitate handling all the detail in the great number of diagrams involved. I set out to find an adequate means of putting them into computer notation and getting them into a computer file."

Cummings uses a high level language called PROLOG (PROgramming in LOGic) which was originally designed to allow people interested in formalism to do logical problems and to find logical solutions in a convenient notation on the computer. It also works well for the tree diagram structure because the tree structure is one of the basic concepts of the language itself. PROLOG is an algorithmic language insofar as it deals with a notational symbolism which represents large logical concepts. "I have found in writing various programs in PROLOG that I very seldom have to develop an algorithm before I write the program. I am able to write the program directly out of the logical concept which I am trying to express."

Professor Michael Cummings

PROLOG provides a rapid and economical means of creating logical formalisms interactively. One of the devices which PROLOG uses is called a formula. This structure consists of a function symbol (a string of characters) followed by a set of parentheses in which you can place other strings of characters. These strings are separated by commas and are called arguments. The formula is used to express a logical relationship among arguments. This relationship is named by the function symbol. For example, in the formula: modifies(X,Y), the relationship between X and Y is called "modifies".

Following are two lines in PROLOG formula notation from the data file for Wulfstan homily number 2. Each line represents one tree diagram. The actual tree diagrams as printed out by the computer appear below them.

```
ng(2-28-1+[],a:[e:adj/nom/[1,e,o,f,a,n],h:noun/nom/[m,e,n]]).
```

WHAT'S IN NIGEL: 1

Christian Matthiessen,
USC/Information Sciences Institute

Nigel is the systemic grammar of English being developed by Michael Halliday, Bill Mann, and myself for the task of text generation. As such, this research belongs to a tradition in systemic linguistics, a tradition started by Davey's important work on text generation in the early 70s (see [Davey 79] and [Fawcett 80]). In the previous issue of Network, Bill Mann discussed the history of systemic linguistics and computation. His paper was the first in a series of discussions related to the work on Nigel.

Aspects of the work that we think are of interest include the design of a systemic semantics for text generation, thoughts on the systemic formalism in the light of Nigel, the specification of highly explicit realization statements, and Nigel's coverage. Here I will deal with the clause grammar part of the last topic. To a large extent, the grammar of Nigel is a formal representation of much of what is discussed in Michael Halliday's forthcoming A Short Introduction to Functional Grammar.

1 Systems and choosers

In Nigel, every grammatical system has a chooser associated with it. The job of the chooser is to make a purposeful choice in a given communicative context. It s task is thus a semantic one. We can view the chooser of a particular system as a procedure that presents questions[1] to the communicative context, Nigel's environment, and chooses a feature in the system according to the responses. These responses reflect distinctions that obtain in the context. The responses that together constitute the condition for choosing a grammatical feature can be called its choice condition or its procedural felicity condition, which is Robin Fawcett's term for a similar notion (cf. [Fawcett 83]).

As a brief example, consider the MOOD TYPE system with the terms indicative vs. imperative. Its chooser asks whether a command is intended. If the response based on an examination of the speech act to be performed is "yes, a command", the chooser chooses the feature imperative. The speech act (speech function) category command is thus the choice condition for the feature imperative.

The development of Nigel is a development of both the system stratum and the chooser stratum; in this discussion of what Nigel covers I will be concerned with both.

---

[1] We have adopted inquiry as the technical term for these questions; for a longer discussion of the semantics represented by inquiries, see [Mann 83].

2 Functional regions of the clause

To start with, let me follow good systemic tradition and present you with a map of Nigel; see Figure 1. This map is a partial function-rank matrix; only clause rank is represented; the verbal group regions are included together with clause regions proper in the clause network -- see section 2.2 below.

	Ideational	Interpersonal	Textual
clause proper	TRANSITIVITY: NON-RELATIONAL, TRANSITIVITY: RELATIONAL, CIRCUMSTANTIATION	MOOD, DEPENDENCY, POLARITY, ATTITUDE, TAGGING	THEMATIZATION, CULMINATION, VOICE, CONJUNCTION
verbal group	TENSE	MODALITY	

Figure 1:   Function-rank matrix for Nigel: Clause rank

This table may be compared with similar tables in e.g. [Halliday 76], p. 190 and [Fawcett 80].

2.1 The notion of functional region

Functional regions have really always been recognized in systemic grammar; we find regions like TRANSITIVITY and MOOD. The only thing I should point out is that we can view the meta-functions as defining three broad functional domains. Within these functional domains, we find functionally coherent and unified functional subdomains or regions like TRANSITIVITY, MOOD, ATTITUDE, and VOICE. In other words, it is useful to operate with (at least) two steps in delicacy here: (meta-)functional domains and subdomains (regions).[2]   Some of the differences among systemic linguists as to the number and nature of meta-functions can be resolved, I think and hope, by reference to these two degrees of delicacy -- broadest and least delicate distinction, yielding, say, three domains, ideational, interpersonal, and textual, and more delicately identified subdomains where we find e.g. ATTITUDE. Thus the differences between e.g. Halliday and Fawcett are ultimately differences in delicacy. Or, at least, that is what the work on Nigel's semantics suggests to me.

Whatever the case is, the functional regions have been quite helpful in the work on Nigel, since they indicate where functional unity can be expected and where systemic interdependencies are tight.

---

[2]Nigel is a one-network grammar (cf. [Matthiessen 83a]; both functional domains and subdomains are used to identify collections of systems in this one network, but they are not represented by independent networks or in any other way given a formal status in the grammar.

2.2 Clause and verbal group

In Nigel the clause part of the grammatical network falls into two parts, the verbal group part (tense and modality) and the clause network proper. Or, to put it another way, the part of the grammar Halliday identifies with the verbal group has been incorporated into the clause in Nigel. In a way, that is a temporary solution to a representational and notational problem: the FINITE element is an element in the functional structure of the verbal group, but we also need to make reference to it in the structure of the clause. (This came to be known as the finite problem.) The easiest immediate solution was simply to merge clause and verbal group, thereby eliminating any problems of structural interaction. This works without problems as long as their is a one-to-one relation between clause and verbal group. However, when the analysis suggests that there is more than one verbal group, e.g. because there is a hypotactic verbal group complex, new problems arise. Constructions where this issue arises have not been included in Nigel yet.

3 The ideational domain

The choosers for TRANSITIVITY and CIRCUMSTANTIATION tend to derive the information upon which they base their choices from the process of the event/situation being represented in the clause. This is one indication of the functional unity of this domain.

TRANSITIVITY Four process types are recognized: material, mental, verbal, and relational processes (mental and verbal thus not being grouped together). Originally, this distinction was cross-cut by a distinction in agency, middle vs. effective. The independence of these two distinctions represents a high degree of generalization, which is difficult to capture semantically, i.e. in the chooser that has to make a choice between middle and effective. As a result, the tendency is for separate agency-like distinctions for each process-type. At present, we have one "agency" system for relational processes -- it offers the choice between the ascriptive type and the equative type -- and one agency system for the non-relational process types.

The consideration of the semantic questions that have to be invoked in choosers to control the grammatical systems has favoured the differentiation of more than one type of agency (as already mentioned) and more than one type of range. Essentially, we now have one range system for each (non-relational) process type. However, at the same time, these different types of range (material range, verbal range etc.) are unified for purposes of realization.

One question that has emerged is whether verbal processes come in both a middle and an effective type. For example, is the difference between *say* and *tell* (with obligatory ADDRESSEE) one of agency?

The question has not been resolved. In general, there seems to be a need for more systemic accounts of transitivity beyond the first degree of delicacy (i.e. beyond material vs. mental vs. verbal vs. relational), not so much in order to handle lexical selection, but rather in order to fit in various special patterns. For instance, how does the type exemplified by *put* (with normally three inherent participants) relate to the overall transitivity picture?

CIRCUMSTANTIATION. There are about seven different types of circumstance, each available to any clause regardless of the type of process selected within transitivity. This is so partly because we have not found a general systemic account (or any account) of what the interdependencies between process type and different circumstance types are. (Dik's account, discussed in [Dik 78], does not seem exceptionless and would in any case have to be reconciled with the process types typically recognized in systemic work on English.) But, perhaps more importantly, there is a tendency in the work on Nigel not to make the grammar very restrictive. Often it seems that restrictions that at first sight look grammatical can be attributed to a higher "stratum" (cf. Robin Fawcett's work). Thus there are few "selection restrictions" of a semantic nature in the grammar of Nigel.

One issue that arises in this area has to do with the realization of the various circumstance types (CAUSE, MANNER, ACCOMPANIMENT, etc.): What does a general algorithm for elegantly distinguishing between adverbial group realization and prepositional phrase realization look like? At present, one or the other is selected on the basis of the subtype of circumstance, but this seems too rigid.

Another issue has to do with ordering. At present, there is just one unmarked sequence for non-thematic circumstances. What would a systemic account for the control of alternative natural sequences look like?

TENSE The grammar of tense in Nigel follows Halliday's account of tense. Tense is treated as serial, with secondary present instead of progressive aspect and secondary past instead of perfect phase (aspect). Experimentally, alternative accounts were tried, but it proved to be difficult to specify the semantic questions to be asked of the environment to control the selections. For instance, the aspectual notion of completion was problematic in this respect.

What is new in the tense account in Nigel is the fully explicit semantic account for the control of the grammar. An ISI report of this account is in preparation; a smaller part of it is discussed in [Matthiessen ar] and an example of the tense choosers in action is presented in [Matthiessen 83b].

4 The interpersonal domain

The choosers in this domain tend to derive the information they need from the speech function of the clause as interaction. The interpersonal region of MODALITY is barely covered in Nigel. In this case, the reason is not any lack of good systemic accounts! Rather, the formal task of representing modal knowledge in knowledge representation notation is quite problematic, so in the near future Nigel will not be requested to express any intricate modalities.

MOOD Nigel's grammar of mood follows established systemic lines; however, exclamatory clauses are not covered (see e.g. [Huddleston 65]).

Choosers select mood by checking for speech functional categories like statement, question, and command (semantic categories Halliday has indicated underlie the grammar of mood in English).

Speech functional metaphors (so-called indirect speech acts) are not covered by the mood choosers. The reasons are theoretical rather than practical. In general, choosers base their decisions on congruent, non-metaphorical, cases and the decision to use a metaphor is one level removed from the level at which the choosers do their reasoning. To try to handle metaphor in the choosers themselves would lead to complexity at the wrong level.

The nature of the participants in a process is constrained by transitivity selections. For instance, a participant, say PHENOMENON, may be constrained to be a fact realized as a *that*-clause. At the same time, there are mood restrictions deriving from the determination of mood (subject) person and number to handle for example agreement and cases of implicit subject. Somehow it must be ensured that a constituent, say PHENOMENON/SUBJECT (i.e., PHENOMENON conflated with SUBJECT), is not simultaneously constrained to be a fact (a transitivity selection) and to represent the speaker (a mood selection).

We have experimented with two approaches to this problem of potential conflict. One is to let the two be completely independent and thus allow conflicting preselections in the grammar and the other is to make the mood selections dependent on transitivity selections in such a way that it is only possible to choose to have say a speaker subject if that does not conflict with transitivity selections. The former approach shifts the burden of consistency from the grammar proper to its semantics and the environment.

DEPENDENCY This is a somewhat heterogeneous region which will be subdivided. Centrally, it deals with the mood or lack of mood of dependent clauses. Like the MOOD regions of independent

clauses It is independent of and parallel to TRANSITIVITY. Part of the MOOD region can of course be shared by independent and dependent clauses, as in [Hudson 71]. However, this account is not used in Nigel, partly because the structural realizations are different and partly because the semantic choice conditions for independent declarative etc. and dependent "declarative" etc. are really different. Still, there is an issue as to what the mood/dependency area of the grammar for both independent and dependent clauses should look like. There is the account in [Hudson 71] already mentioned. Winograd uses a different interpretation in his "Outline of English" in [Winograd 83] (appendix B), with the systems Clause: Finite/Non-Finite, Finite: Declarative/Interrogative/Bound/Relative, Non-Finite: Imperative/Present-participle/For-To, without a systemic representation of the distinction between "independent" and "dependent". This area has not been given as much attention by systemic linguists as mood in independent clauses, particularly in terms of a functionally motivated account.

POLARITY In this region, there are two systems for the choice between positive and negative polarity, one for finite clauses (where the polarity is typically marked in the FINITE element) and one for non-finite clauses. (What [Fawcett 80] calls near negative and transferred negative are not in Nigel's scope at present.)

From a semantic point of view, i.e., from a chooser point of view, there is further differentiation. The chooser for the system of finite polarity is sensitive to speech function distinctions. There is one "branch" for polarity (yes/no) interrogatives and another for the other mood types, since the reasons for choosing between the grammatical features positive and negative are different in these two contexts (cf. for example sections 7.57 & 7.58 in [Quirk 72]). This is an example of a situation where meta-functional interconnectedness shows up in the choosers (and so in the semantics) even though it may not be immediately clear from an examination of grammatical interconnectedness. However, it is difficult to make precise arguments of this nature unless one has an explicit notation (like choosers) for semantic organization.

Potential issues in the POLARITY region include questions about the scope of negation. Do we want to control scope in a systemic model and if so, how? -- Questions of scope have been important in logical semantics, but where do they fit in in a functional semantics? Related to questions of this kind is of course the issue about what has been described as an alternation between e.g. some and any.

ATTITUDE There is one system for ATTITUDE, enterable in declarative clauses. It allows for expression of the speaker's emotional/evaluative/epistemic etc. attitude towards his or her statement. ATTITUDE is thus related to MOOD both in the grammar and in the semantics. At present, Nigel does not include the grammar for other interpersonal comments, like specification of sincerity.

TAGGING There are tagging systems for both declarative clauses and imperative clauses, with different chooser questions depending on the difference in mood.

5 The textual domain

At this stage, the Nigel grammar has not been developed for a system with a phonological level; the output is written English. Consequently, there are no information units alongside clauses and no INFORMATION region. However, there is a region called CULMINATION, which is functionally related.

THEME PREDICATION and THEME NOMINALIZATION are not represented in Nigel at the present time. This is partly because there is a potential notational problem for these two regions, if we want to treat theme predication vs. lack of theme predication and theme nominalization vs. lack of theme nominalization as systemic alternations. I don't know of a published systemic account of these regions with fully explicit and formalized realizations. Such an account would be very helpful.

THEMATIZATION We have looked at a number of alternative ways of handling thematic systems in Nigel and the factors that come into play deserve more attention than I can give them here. The current account in Nigel specifies thematization systems for the various circumstantial types, for complements, for attitudinal and conjunctive adjuncts, etc. (but not for the process itself). These systems are all independent of one another. As a result, it is possible to get very long multiple themes in theory. In practice, when the grammar is used purposefully, however, text organization and planning will restrict the number of themes per clause (typically to one). The theme choosers ask questions intended to be sensitive to the type of considerations the important work by Peter Fries on theme selection and text organization has revealed (see [Fries 83]).

CULMINATION This region of the grammar contains a number of systems that allow alternative relative sequences for a number of functions, e.g. MEDIUM (or affected to use an alternative name) or BENEFICIARY. The functional basis for the purposeful control of these systems seems clear enough for spoken English at an informal level. They allow us to manipulate which of, say two, elements should be the unmarked information focus (conflate with the function NEW). However, this obviously has to be qualified for written English. Furthermore, we need an explicit operational account of the notions behind the functions of Halliday's information unit which he calls GIVEN and NEW.

CONJUNCTION Sources for the CONJUNCTION region[3] in Nigel are Halliday & Hasan's *Cohesion*

---

[3] The term *conjunction* is here used to represent the same region as in Halliday & Hasan's *Cohesion in English*, i.e., textual cohesive conjunction rather than the logical region of coordination.

in English and subsequent work by Jim Martin (see e.g. [Martin 83]). There has been some revision, though. In particular, some new general distinctions (i.e., distinctions of low delicacy) have been introduced.

For Jim Martin, CONJUNCTION belongs to the discourse stratum, just as e.g. SPEECH ACT. The treatment in Nigel is slightly different: what is explicitly marked by conjunction is dealt with in the CONJUNCTION region in the grammar and in the semantics, i.e., in the choosers that control the grammatical selections. The conjunctive relations that "underlie" conjunctions and may indeed be implicit are outside the scope of Nigel. They belong to the part of the text generation system that deals with text organization. As such, they are part of a general theory of the rhetorical organization of text.

VOICE There are different voice systems for ranged, middle clauses, non-benefactive effective clauses, and benefactive effective clauses. Choosers for this region have been difficult to design. Broadly speaking, there seem to be three kinds of considerations to take into account, one for each meta-function. (i) Ideational considerations have to do with whether the clause should be agentive or not, i.e., whether the ideational transitivity function AGENT should be mentioned or not. (ii) Interpersonal considerations have to do with the nature of SUBJECT as an interpersonal function, which is clear in at least imperative clauses: whoever is responsible for carrying out the command should be subject. (iii) Textual considerations have to do with reasoning about conceptual closeness to the topic of the current paragraph. Work by Sandy Thompson on the choice of the passive in natural discourse (see [Thompson ar]) has been very helpful and an explicit version of her account has been incorporated.

References

[Davey 79] Davey, A., *Discourse Production*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 1979.

[Dik 78] Dik, Simon C., *North Holland Linguistic Series*. Volume 37: *Functional Grammar*, North Holland, Amsterdam/New York, 1978.

[Fawcett 80] Fawcett, R. P., *Exeter Linguistic Studies*. Volume 3: *Cognitive Linguistics and Social Interaction*, Julius Groos Verlag Heidelberg and Exeter University, 1980.

[Fawcett 83] Fawcett, R., "Language as a Semiological System: A Re-Interpretation of Saussure," in Morreall,J. (ed.), *Ninth LACUS Forum*, Hornbeam Press, 1983.

[Fries 83] Fries, Peter H., "On the Status of Theme in English: Arguments from Discourse," *Forum Linguisticum*, 1983 *

[Halliday 76] Halliday, M. A. K., *System and Function in Language*, Oxford University Press, London, 1976.

[Huddleston 65] Huddleston, R., "Rank and depth," *Language* 41, 1965, 574-86.

[Hudson 71] Hudson, R. A., *North-Holland Linguistic Series*. Volume 4: *English Complex Sentences*, North-Holland, London and Amsterdam, 1971.

[Mann 83] Mann, William C., "Inquiry Semantics: A Functional Semantics of Natural Language Grammar," in *Proceedings of the First Annual Conference*, Association for Computational Linguistics, European Chapter, September 1983.

[Martin 83] Martin, J. R., "Conjunction: The logic of English text," *Forum Linguisticum*, 1983 *

[Matthiessen 83a] Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., "The systemic framework in text generation: Nigel," in *Nigel: A Systemic Grammar for Text Generation*, USC/Information Sciences Institute, RR-83-105, February 1983. This paper will also appear in a forthcoming volume of the *Advances in Discourse Processes Series*, R. Freedle (ed.): *Systemic Perspectives on Discourse: Selected Theoretical Papers from the 9th International Systemic Workshop* to be published by Ablex.

[Matthiessen 83b] Matthiessen, C., "How to Make Syntactic Choices in Text Generation," in Makkai (ed.), *LACUS*, , 1983.

[Matthiessen ar] Matthiessen, C., "Choosing Primary Tense in English," *Studies in Language*, to appear.

[Quirk 72] Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartik, *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, Longman, London, 1972.

[Thompson ar] Thompson, S.A., "The Passive in English: A Discourse Perspective," in Channon, R. & Shockey, L. (eds.), *A Festschrift for Ilse Lehiste*, , to appear.

[Winograd 83] Winograd, *Language as a Cognitive Process -- Volume 1: Syntax*, Addison-Wesley, 1983.

---

* and in Petöfi, J.S. and Sözer, E. (eds) 1983 <u>Micro and Macro connectivity of texts</u>. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.