

1

What this handbook does and does not cover

Are the footnotes for you? And are the endnotes for you?

This book is intended for two types of reader, and it makes use of two types of supplementary notes: footnotes (notes at the bottom of a page) and endnotes (notes at the end of each chapter). The first group of users of the handbook will typically have relatively little background in linguistics, e.g. students on some types of senior undergraduate or MA or MSc course - and if you are in this group you will probably be using the book as an advanced-level textbook for one or both of these two purposes: (1) to enable you to understand how the grammar of English works, and (2) to equip you to analyze some sentence or longer text that interests you. (For 'text' see below.) The second group of readers will already have a solid background in linguistics, and they may be interested in the theoretical or descriptive questions which are raised by the framework presented in the main text but which are not addressed there. These issues include differences between the way in which the theory of language used here analyzes sentences and the way that other theories do. It is also here that most references to other works are given. So:

the FOOTNOTES, which are shown by '1, 2, 3' etc, are for BOTH types of reader, and the ENDNOTES, which are shown by 'a, b, c' etc, are for the second type.

1 The purposes of this handbook

Those who do not work in the field of linguistics probably assume that all those who do work in this field have the ability, as a matter of course, to analyze systematically any chunk of language that occurs in a real-life situation - i.e. any 'text'. Yet the fact is that very many of those who today earn their livelihood by teaching and researching in linguistics spend relatively little time on analyzing natural texts, focussing instead on more abstract theoretical goals. Indeed, they would probably have to admit that they would find it difficult to provide a complete analysis of the syntactic (or grammatical) structure of all the sentences of a naturally occurring text of any length. And even fewer would be able to provide an analysis at each of the levels of both form (syntax) and meaning (semantics).¹ Why should this be so?

1. Let's take a bit of the first sentence of this section as an example. Most linguistics theories would analyze *any chunk of language that occurs in a real-life situation* as a unit that has the word *chunk* as its 'head'. But from a functional perspective it is more insightful to bring out the similarities between this example and *some language that occurs in a real-life situation*. To do this we analyze *language* as the head of the unit (as we will see in Chapter 7), and then address the question of how best to model the similarities and differences between *any chunk (of)* and *some*.

WHAT THIS HANDBOOK DOES AND DOES NOT COVER

The first part of the answer is that it really is a very difficult task to analyze naturally occurring texts - at least in many places of most texts. But the second part of the answer is that some of today's dominant theories of language - especially those inspired by the ideas of Chomsky - simply do not think that it is a major goal of a theory of language to equip a user of that theory to describe to analyze real-life texts. For me - and for a steadily increasing number of linguists - this certainly is one of the major goals of linguistics.² Indeed, the reason why I have written this *Handbook* and the accompanying *Functional Semantics Handbook* is to empower anyone who wishes to be able to analyze language from a functional viewpoint to do so - and to do this at the levels of both **form** and **meaning**.

This reason for calling this book a 'handbook' is that it is a book that it is intended to be useful to have 'to hand' when you are analyzing language.³ In fact, it serves three different functions.

- 1 It is a 'fast track' but comprehensive coursebook that will TEACH YOU THE SKILL OF ANALYZING English sentences. It works quickly from simple beginnings to encompass something close to the full complexity of English syntax.
- 2 It is a DESCRIPTION OF THE GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE (OR SYNTAX) OF ENGLISH. In other words it is, in traditional terms, a 'grammar'. It is written from the viewpoint of the theory of language known as Systemic Functional Linguistics, and it therefore takes a FUNCTIONAL approach to syntax. This means that for each word or larger unit it asks both 'What function does it serve in the unit above?' and 'What function does it serve in expressing the meaning of the sentence - and so the 'meaning' of the Performer (the speaker or writer)?'
- 3 It is also a reference work that is designed to be EASY TO CONSULT when you are working on analyzing texts at the intermediate and advanced levels. The 'advanced level' includes research in any field that involves the analysis of texts. With its detailed index and a comprehensive trouble-shooting section that is cross-referenced with the main text, this handbook is a work that you will continue to find useful long after you have acquired the basic skills of analyzing sentences. Even the most experienced analyst needs to check occasionally on what alternative analyses are possible, and this handbook is designed to help in precisely these situations.

And most grammars would probably have a problem with analyzing the little item *i.e.*, and in deciding the relationship between *i.e.* a 'text' and what precedes it. See Chapter 20 for the solution to this second problem.

2. For me, linguistic theory, the description of particular languages, and the use of the descriptions in analyzing real-life texts in various fields of application all go hand in hand.
3. It is therefore a 'handbook' in the sense that it is 'a book that gives you advice and instructions about a particular subject, tool or machine' (Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary, 1995). This is a different sense from the one in which it is being increasingly used in which a collection of carefully chosen papers or specially written chapters introduces the reader to the central ideas of a field of study.

It is pleasing to be able to record that, in his recent comprehensive survey of functional descriptions of language (2002a & b), Butler comments (2002b:471) that ‘Systemic Functional Grammar has achieved a much wider coverage of English than other approaches, this being especially true of the Cardiff Grammar.’ It is the present handbook and its sister volume *The Functional Semantics Handbook* that the broad coverage of the Cardiff Grammar’s approach to modelling English finds its fullest expression.

2 The scope of this handbook

2.1 Overview

I have said that this book is about how to analyze the **syntax** of **sentences** in English texts. This is a hugely ambitious goal, so we should be clear from the start about the two ways in which its scope is nonetheless limited.

The first limitation derives from the term ‘syntax’ and the second from the term ‘sentence’. But the limitation to syntax (rather than including semantics) is not such a serious restriction as it would be in most other theories of language, because at every point the *Handbook* related the syntax out to the meanings and functions that the syntax is there to express. So this is a type of syntax that reflects directly the meanings that it expresses. And because these meanings include the contribution of ‘sentence syntax’ to signalling the relations of the sentence to the rest of the discourse of which it is a part, the analysis transcends the limitations that are found in traditional ‘sentence grammars’ (where the task is seen as accounting for the internal structure of sentences). The purpose of this section is give you a picture - quite literally - of where the syntax of sentences fits into the overall picture of language and its use.

2.2 The meanings of ‘sentence’ and ‘text’

We will begin with the term **sentence**. But since it cannot be defined without using the term ‘text’, we will need to bring this into the picture too.⁴

This term ‘sentence’ is used in different ways by different linguists. In this book it is normally used as a short form for **text-sentence**, so that a sentence could be defined as ‘a stretch of text that has the internal structure of a sentence’. This definition is of course circular, in that it depends on an understanding of what ‘the internal structure of a sentence’ may be - and it is the task of this whole book to explore just what this is.⁵

4. I will not discuss the interesting question of what ‘English’ is. For a good discussion of the problem of ‘English and varieties of English’, see Chapter 1 of Quirk *et al* (1985), and for a discussion of the same topic from the viewpoint of corpus linguistics see Sections 1.3 and 1.4 of Biber *et al* (1999).

5. Definitions of technical terms are inevitably circular, in the sense that they are bound to make use of other words which are themselves technical terms within the theory. Nonetheless they are still useful as a ‘short form’ reminder of the place of the term in the overall picture of language (or ‘model’; see Section 2 of Chapter 2), and we will find them useful at various points in this book.

WHAT THIS HANDBOOK DOES AND DOES NOT COVER

However, it will do surprisingly little harm if we allow ourselves to start from the admittedly rather superficial test for a sentence that many of us first learnt at school. This is the definition: ‘A sentence is a stretch of language that begins with a capital letter and ends with a full stop.’ As it stands, of course, this definition only works if the text is a WRITTEN text. However, surprising as it may seem, this simple definition can be used as an aid to determining the sentence boundaries in SPOKEN texts. You simply write the text down and trust your judgement about where to put the sentence boundaries. (Much more principled criteria that you can use to guide such decisions will be given in Chapter 21.) But it doesn’t matter much, in fact, if two analysts of a given text disagree over where to place the sentence boundaries - and as the book progresses the reason why sentence boundaries are relatively unimportant will become increasingly clear.^a

The sense in which the word **syntax** is used in this book will similarly become clearer as the book progresses - starting with the next section and Chapter 2.

2.3 Analyzing texts at different levels

We can study texts at a number of different levels. For some purposes it is necessary to involve what we will call the ‘higher’ levels of analysis, and for some it isn’t. Figure 1 provides a highly simplified picture of the major components of a communicating mind - and of some of the ‘levels’ of language and of the ‘beliefs’ and ‘purposes’ that it expresses. At one time or another linguists have attempted to analyze texts at all of the ‘levels’ shown there. I will now comment briefly on each, so that we can see where the level of analysis that is provided in this book belongs - and also its central role as the basis of virtually every ‘higher’ type of analysis.^b

A second characteristic of definitions is that in many cases - including the present one - the fact that they have to be short if they are to be useful means that they often express a generalization to which there are exceptions (so that they may be said to be ‘99% reliable’, ‘99.9% reliable’, etc.).

WHAT THIS HANDBOOK DOES AND DOES NOT COVER




Figure 1: Some components and outputs in the generation of texts, and some corresponding levels at which texts may be analyzed

Look first at the lower two boxes. The string of numbered sigmas (Σ s) represents a string of **sentences** in a **text** (Σ being 'S' in the Greek alphabet). As this part of the diagram shows, sentences coincide roughly - but not completely - with the **acts** that are the lowest units of the **discourse structure**. Acts combine to form **moves**, and these in turn combine as the elements of an **exchange structure** (such as a question and its answer) or a **rhetorical structure** (such as a descriptive paragraph). And these 'chunks' of texts in their turn function as the components of even higher and larger units of discourse, and ultimately as the elements of a **genre structure**, such as a conversation or a short story.

But which of these units does the concept of a 'text' correspond to? Ideally, the beginning and end of a text that is to be the subject of analysis would correspond to the beginning and end of a complete genre structure. But in practice this hardly ever happens; linguists usually find themselves analyzing much shorter texts that have been picked out of the middle of complete units of discourse. The usual reason is simply that there isn't time to analyze a complete genre structure in full detail - unless it is very short, e.g. some types of advertisement and some labels.

There are two main types of discourse. The first is interactive discourse, where two or more people co-operate - and sometimes conflict - with each other in producing the text. The most typical type is a face-to-face dialogue, in which the participants take turns in contributing to the discourse (e.g. a conversation with a friend or an interview for a job). But in the second type of discourse the addressee is typically absent, as in a newspaper item or a novel, and an example of this type is therefore usually a monologue. Typically - but not necessarily - **spoken** texts

WHAT THIS HANDBOOK DOES AND DOES NOT COVER

occur in **interactive** discourse and typically - but not necessarily - **written** texts occur in **monologue**. But we often find mixtures of the two, e.g. when, in the course of a casual conversation with a friend, we give them an account of some recent mishap. And the converse occurs when the writer of a novel reproduces a supposed piece of dialogue between two characters, surrounded by quotation marks and expressions such as *she said*, and so on.

We need linguistic descriptions of what is termed **exchange structure** to analyze the interactive type of discourse, and descriptions of what is termed **rhetorical structure** to analyze texts that are monologues - whether spoken or written. In the *Functional Semantics Handbook* (Fawcett forthcoming a) you will find outline descriptions of these two types of analysis, as well as an introduction to the concept of genre structure. It also tells you where you can read more about these ways to analyze the higher structures of discourse.^c

Here we have been looking at discourse as something that consists of an increasingly large and increasingly abstract set of 'units' - the largest of which is the entire structure of a genre, such as a short story or a service encounter in a shop. But ultimately the units of text at this high level of abstraction must be represented in terms that include units of about the length of a clause - and also clauses that combine to function as sentences. And such representations clearly have to show far more than just the type of 'discourse act' that the unit performs. The 'purpose' of any such utterance (which is in fact a type of discourse 'act') and the 'propositional content' of the utterance both need to be represented in some kind of 'logical form', and the type used here is one that has been specially developed to enable it to represent the various types of meaning that are found in the semantics of a Systemic Functional Grammar. This representation language is therefore called **systemic functional logical form**, and its role is shown in Figure 1 by the series of boxes labelled 'LF1', 'LF2', etc.^d

Look now at the large box at the top of the diagram. Here, the three dominant words are 'BELIEF SYSTEM', 'FEELINGS' and 'PLANNING'. The belief system contains the **beliefs** of the person (or for some texts the persons) who are producing the text, and we will call him/her/them the **Performer (P)**. Notice that these beliefs include P's beliefs about the person or persons who P is communicating with, i.e. the **Addressee (A)** - and so beliefs about A's beliefs, feelings and plans. These beliefs - whether they are P's beliefs or P's beliefs about A's beliefs - include a great deal of **cultural** (i.e. socially shared) 'knowledge', and this in turn includes the **ideological** assumptions and the **myths** of the social groups to which P and A belong. The full analysis of a text that relates it to the level of the belief system is therefore often able to show how certain influential social groups maintain their hold on power through their use of language, how they persuade others to accept their view of the world, and how other groups are thereby systematically disempowered - and also how members of such groups sometimes disempower themselves through their use of language. Scholars such as Bernstein, Chilton, Fairclough, Kress, Martin and many others are interested in discovering the **ideologies** that underlie texts ('Critical Discourse Analysis'). And **feelings** - which are typically feelings about some situation or some thing or some class of situations or things - manifest themselves in attitudes, which in effect function as a

type of belief. Finally, notice that among the beliefs in the top box are beliefs about the **context of situation** in which the text occurs. Different types of situation naturally have their associated genre structures. And the type of linguistic analysis known as **register analysis** relates the text to each of the major aspects of the situation in which it occurs. Interestingly, the humour in a lot of the funniest comedy - including many of the 'Monty Python' TV sketches - depends on the mismatch between the text and an aspect of the context of situation in which it occurs.^e

2.4 The essential role of sentence analysis

We come now to a concept that is both blindingly obvious and yet that is also often ignored by those who seek to understand texts. It is that all of the fascinating insights described in the last section are ultimately expressed in words, and so through SENTENCES - i.e. the string of Σ s in Figure 1. In other words, it is in the nitty-gritty details of the analysis of text-sentences that we discover and recognize all of the different types of 'meaning' that we have just been considering (if we allow ourselves to stretch the meaning of the word 'meaning' that far, which we will not do again). So anyone who is analyzing a text in terms of its ideology, its register or its discourse structure must inevitably ALSO describe the text - even if they only do so in whatever terms they happen to have at their command. And this is all too often done in terms of those bits of traditional grammar that the analyst happens to know, rather than through a complete description of this level of language. It is through the internal structures and meanings of the text-sentences that we give expression to all the higher 'meanings'.

But is it good enough to describe the words and structures of the sentences in terms of 'those bits of traditional grammar that the analyst knows'? The fact is that it is not. The analysis of any higher structure will be immeasurably strengthened if the sentences are analyzed both SYSTEMATICALLY and FUNCTIONALLY. The great strength of making a SYSTEMATIC analysis that uses a well-defined, well-tested and publicly available framework is that other people who read your work can always satisfy themselves that they would have made the same analysis - and they are consequently very much more likely to accept your interpretation of the text. This is because your description of the text is much less open to the accusation that it is subjective than it would be if you merely picked out a few examples from the text which appeared to illustrate the case that you are making at that point.^f

But there is another reason for making a full and systematic analysis of a text - and it is if anything even more important. It is that when you analyze texts systematically and functionally you often discover significant facts about the text that you had not suspected were there, at the time when you first heard or read it. This discovery of the unexpected is one of the most exciting aspects of analyzing texts.

Finally, the reason why an analysis should be not only systematic but also FUNCTIONAL is that a functional analysis is, by its very nature, more likely than a purely 'formal' analysis to help you to understand WHY a text is as it is. Chapter 2 will make it clear why this is so.

2.5 Where this handbook comes in

So how much of the great complexity of producing a text that is summarized in Figure 1 does this *Handbook* cover? The answer - which may at first seem disappointing - is 'Only the lowest level of the representations in the right hand column'. In other words, most of this handbook is about the lower of the two layers of structure in each of the boxes labelled 'Σ' in Figure 1. It will therefore equip you with the skill to analyze texts in terms of the first stage of a **systemic functional** model of language. The 'core component' of a systemic functional model of language is the **lexicogrammar** (or 'grammar' for short), and as we will see in Chapter 2 it has the two levels of form and meaning. This *Handbook* equips you to analyze the **forms** of language, focussing on the **functional syntax** of sentences, while the *Functional Semantics Handbook* equips you to build on this to analyze the many simultaneous strands of **meaning** that are found in sentences.

The scope of this book and its sister volume is therefore limited to analyzing only the **forms** and **meanings** of sentences - if 'limited' and 'only' are the right words for what is still in fact a very ambitious goal indeed. What these two handbooks do NOT do is to equip you with the further sets of skills that are necessary to analyze the levels of Figure 1 that lie above the text-sentences.

What this book gives you is the necessary FOUNDATION in functional syntax that will enable you to go on to undertake all of the higher types of analysis. In other words, we can only be confident of the reliability and validity of any analyses of texts that we undertake in terms of the HIGHER level categories - such as semantics (in the *Functional Semantics Handbook*), discourse structure, register and ideology - WHEN THEY ARE BASED ON SOUND AND REPLICABLE SENTENCE-ANALYSIS SKILLS.

However, even when we describe sentences only at the level of their syntax, it can be both rewarding and highly insightful if it is done in a functional framework. The fact that the framework presented here is functional at every level means that a great deal of the 'higher' meanings of the text can be interpreted directly from the analysis - and that what cannot be interpreted directly can often be inferred indirectly. If you base your text analysis on a functional model of language - and especially when you move up from the functional syntax of the present handbook to the 'multi-strand semantic analysis' of the *Functional Semantics Handbook* - you will find that a significant part of the work of explanation associated with the 'higher levels' shown in Figure 1 has already been done.⁶

6. The field of 'critical linguistics' is concerned with the analysis of texts in terms of their ideological implications. In 1992 Norman Fairclough, a leading figure in this field, made a survey of contributions to the well-known journal *Discourse and Society*, and he offered the following criticism (which is probably just as valid today as it was in 1992): 'A general observation on the linguistic analysis in the *D&S* papers is that it is often conceived in rather narrow terms as analysis of vocabulary and perhaps metaphor, with an occasional grammatical example' (Fairclough 1992:214). The point of his paper is to persuade other scholars working in this field that 'detailed textual analysis will always strengthen discourse analysis' (p. 194). And later (p. 210) he makes a specific recommendation as to which type of grammar is needed when he states 'that issues of social identification in texts cannot be fully addressed without a multifunctional view of language such as Halliday's' - i.e. a systemic functional grammar, such as the one described in this handbook.

3 Seven special features of this handbook

There are many books that describe the grammar of English, and quite a few that take an explicitly 'functional' approach to the task. This book is different from all others that have been published so far in combining in one book the following seven features.

1. **Learning through doing** From Chapter 3 on, the goal of this handbook is to explain the structure of English. Often the quickest and clearest way to do this is to explain the new concepts as clearly as possible, and then to help you to fix them in your mind by getting you to analyze examples that illustrate the new point. But you will also find that fairly often I introduce a new concept by getting you, the reader, to engage in the process of GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS. In other words, we will follow the principle of **'learning about grammar through doing grammar'**, wherever it is possible to do this without adding too much to the time taken. Since the task of language is (to oversimplify somewhat) to turn meanings into forms and forms into meanings, a language is essentially a PROCEDURE (rather than some sort of 'object'). So when you are analyzing a text you are simply doing CONSCIOUSLY what we all normally do UNCONSCIOUSLY for much of each day - whenever we read anything or hear someone talking. And the natural way to learn the procedure of text analysis is to learn it through doing it. So, in working through the examples for analysis in this handbook, you are in a way repeating - though at a conscious level - the unconscious process of learning to analyze incoming spoken text that you underwent as a very young child.

2. This handbook contains an unusually high proportion of diagrams of sentence structure. Normally diagrams are used quite sparingly in books about language - probably because it was expensive to reproduce them when using traditional methods of printing books, and because they take up a lot of space. But now, with electronic printing, this problem is easily solved. It is rightly said that A GOOD DIAGRAM IS WORTH A THOUSAND WORDS. Indeed, I have often found that a description in words of a grammatical structure leaves me unsure about what the writer thinks the structure really is.⁸ So it is a guiding principle of this handbook that diagrams are treated as an essential complement to language itself in explaining the structure of language. Here **the explanation of a structure will only be considered complete when the analysis has been set out in diagram form** - or, of course, when its structure can be inferred directly from a nearby diagram. So reading this handbook will not only give you plenty of practice in your DIAGRAM-DRAWING skills - in 'learning through doing' - but also in your DIAGRAM-READING skills. To those studying the structure of language, these two skills are as important as the skills of reading and writing.

3. The framework for describing texts that is presented here has been **developed in conjunction with a very large computer model of language** - one which is possibly the largest and most detailed machine grammar in the world. It has therefore been rigorously tested in the framework that is increasingly being

WHAT THIS HANDBOOK DOES AND DOES NOT COVER

recognized as the most demanding test of all for a model of language: a computer implementation for natural language generation.^h

4. The computer model was itself **developed on the basis of a very large project in text analysis**, out of which has come one of the very few corpuses of text that have been analyzed in terms of their functional syntax.ⁱ And that framework for describing the structure of English has continued to be developed and expanded in the decade and a half since then, through the analysis of very large further quantities of text by myself, my colleagues and our students.

5. In part because of this large amount of text analysis, the framework for analysis provided here is a **relatively complete description of English**. Indeed, it gives clear guidance on many aspects of the structure of English that are left out in other descriptions.^j

6. In view of this broad coverage, it is a surprising fact that the core concepts of **the description of English syntax can be summarized in a few pages**. Specifically, Appendix A is a summary of the essence of Chapters 3 to 21 in JUST THREE PAGES. This illustrates the combination of coverage and economy that characterises this model of English syntax. (However, the summaries for the multi-strand semantic analysis given in the *Functional Semantics Handbook* take up rather more space.)

7. Because the book's main aim is to equip you with analytical skills, it specifies, as clearly as possible, the FRAMEWORKS OF CONCEPTS and the PROCEDURES that are recommended when making each type of analysis. The result is that this *Handbook* gives you a regularly developing set of *Guidelines* in the early chapters and in Chapter 21. And at every point it gives you **tests**, with clearer **criteria** than are found in many other grammars of English, to help you decide between alternative analyses.

Taken together, the seven features listed here means that this handbook is not only a handbook to help students and researchers in the task of analyzing texts but also one of the fullest accounts of English syntax yet published.

4 A note on the sources of the examples

I have said that this handbook has arisen out of work on analyzing REAL TEXTS that occur in REAL SITUATIONS. One side-effect of this is that many of the examples used are based on naturally-occurring texts.^k

Note the words 'based on'. There is an increasing number of authors of books such as this who make it a rule to use only naturally occurring examples. But this praiseworthy practice brings with it three problems for a book such as the present one. The first is that most natural examples turn out to involve more than one item of grammatical interest. And when you are learning about something as complex as language, it is helpful to be able to think about ONE NEW CONCEPT AT A TIME. Clearly, then, it will be more helpful to the reader if an example illustrates just the one grammatical concept that is being examined at that point, rather than also illustrating

WHAT THIS HANDBOOK DOES AND DOES NOT COVER

some other interesting concept that happens to occur in the example - because the second concept may well divert the reader's attention away from the point that the example is intended to illustrate.^l

The second problem is that, when you are trying to illustrate the difference between two examples, it helps if they are the same - except for the part that illustrates the distinction.^m

And the third problem is that most natural examples are far longer than they need to be to illustrate the point that is being made. The usual reason is that they contain long expressions for referring to people and things when a shorter one would do equally well - and would save space. In a book in which we are not simply noting examples but also analyzing their syntax, this is a major factor. Specifically, problems arise when the analysis of a sentence does not fit on one line. (There are techniques for handling examples that require more space, of course, and these will be introduced at the appropriate point.)

Many of the examples that we will study are therefore simplified adaptations of real texts. Others are simply invented - often in order to illustrate a significant point of difference between it and a preceding example. But in the vast majority the purpose of the example is to illustrate a structure of a common type, so that its authenticity is not an issue. And in such cases I have not hesitated to use an invented example, if I thought that this would make it easier for the reader to understand the point that it illustrates. Given the ultimate origin of most examples in real-life texts, I do not think that the careful use of invented text-sentences makes the arguments being presented any less valid as examples of the structures of natural language.⁷

In writing this book, the type of change to a naturally occurring example that I have most frequently found myself having to make has been to replace long expressions that refer to people such as *that guy you were talking to last week* by short names, such as *Ike* and *Ivy*. In the course of reading this handbook you will learn quite a lot about the imaginary world of this couple and their acquaintances - and also about Paula and Adam.⁸

7. To defend the use of adapted and even invented examples in this way is in no way to deny the fact that our picture of the types and frequencies of the structures that occur in English has been powerfully influenced for the better by the advent of corpus linguistics in the second half of the twentieth century.

8. Ike and Ivy appear to have two principle acquaintances, the unlovely and occasionally somewhat brutish Fred and the sophisticated Fiona. But occasionally other characters appear on the scene, including the mysterious Ivan and a delightful child of indeterminate sex called Alex. Ike and Ivy first entered my life many years ago, when I first began writing about language in the 1970s, and I needed two short names for examples.

I am occasionally asked about the origins of the names *Ike* and *Ivy*. I am really not sure where *Ike* came from. I think it must have come from the President of the United States, General 'Ike' Eisenhower (whose supporters at election time used to wear badges proclaiming *I like Ike*). As an example of a short clause it is hard to beat. The only other Ike that I have ever heard of is Ike Turner, the former husband of the singer Tina Turner. As for *Ivy*, I did once know someone with that name, but I don't associate her with the Ivy you will meet here.

Whatever the origin of the names, you will discover a number of facts - or rather beliefs - about them in the course of working through this *Handbook*. I myself find that I still know remarkably little about them. In particular I leave it to you to form your own view of the precise

5 The use of technical terms

This handbook, like any technical handbook, makes use of a set of TECHNICAL TERMS to enable it to do its job. I have followed the policy of introducing these slowly, in their natural contexts, and letting their meanings emerge through use. However, if you want an explanation of the technical terms in relation to each other in a short space, look at Chapter 2 for the technical terms of systemic functional grammar as a whole, and Chapter 25 for the theory of syntax used here - and so its technical terms.

6 How the handbook is organized

This book is the first of a pair of handbooks. It covers the structure of language at the level of form (its **syntax**), using a strongly **functional** approach. The second book covers the various **semantic functions** that a language serves - that is, it shows how to analyze language at the level of meaning. To do this it uses the **systemic** part of a **Systemic Functional Grammar**.

Within each volume there are a number of major parts - some quite short and some, such as Part B of this volume, hundreds of pages long. And within each part the material is broken down into chapters - and again, some are long and some are short. The rest of this section gives you a summary of what is in each PART of the two books.

6.1 The contents of the *Functional Syntax Handbook*

Part A gives you an overview of the handbook (the present chapter) and of what a language is and how language works (Chapter 2). Since language is as it is because it exists to turn meanings into forms - and back again, of course - we use a modern theory of language that places the concept of 'choice between meanings' at the heart of the explanation. This type of theory emphasizes the **functions** that are served by the **forms** of language, and Chapter 2 explains why I have chosen to use one particular theory: **Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)**.

Part B of the book is by far the longest. In it you will discover - partly through your own work in analyzing sentences - the basic principles of the way that the **syntax** of English is organized. There are INTRODUCTORY EXPLANATIONS of the new concepts, whenever this is needed to equip you for the next stage. There are also regular SUMMARIES of the ideas that have been introduced, and regular sets of GUIDELINES that summarize the procedure for analysis as it has been learnt so far. There are several sections which show you, systematically, how to analyze aspects of grammar for which there is no adequate treatment in current standard grammars.

nature of the relationship between Ike and Ivy.

Paula and Adam are more recent discoveries; Paula is always the Performer (P) and Adam is always the Addressee (A).

The analysis of intonation and punctuation are both covered briefly but, for our present purposes, adequately. Most books on grammar ignore **intonation** and hardly any cover **punctuation**, and yet both carry important aspects of meaning. (There is a little basic information about intonation in English in Section 7 of Chapter 4 and a rather fuller picture in Chapter 19 - which also suggests a simple way of representing it in the analysis of a text, and tells you where to go to get a fuller picture.) Part B concludes with a chapter that consists solely of guidelines for analyzing sentences, and this summarises all of the basic concepts that have been covered in the handbook so far. The proportion of ‘learning through doing’ is at its highest in the early chapters of this part of the handbook.

Part C deals with what we will call the **special constructions**. These are a small set of structural devices that exploit the basic concepts of syntax that have been established in the previous chapters. They are brought into use when we apply certain important principles that guide the way in which we function as Performers who produce text-sentences for Addressees - and often we can only see their function clearly when we view them in their role as contributions to the larger units of discourse. Part C introduces first these principles and then the constructions themselves.

As a re-enforcement of the DESCRIPTION of English syntax provided in Parts B and C, **Part D** briefly summarises the THEORY of syntax that underlies the procedures for analyzing sentences described in this handbook. Because the emphasis in this book is firmly the description of English syntax and the skills that are necessary to analyze it, these two chapters have been kept quite short, with only a limited discussion of differences between this theory of syntax and others. (For a full discussion of the major alternative theories of syntax within Systemic Functional Linguistics and for a full description of the theory used in this *Handbook*, see Fawcett 2000a.)

Part E is the ‘trouble-shooting’ section of the *Handbook*. It consists largely of a list of words that often present problems to the analyst because they can be analyzed in more than one way. For each of these, advice is given to help you to decide what the solution to the problem is. By using this section of the book in conjunction with the concepts and skills learnt earlier in the book, you should be equipped to tackle virtually any text in spoken or written English.

The type of syntax analysis used in this book displays the syntax of the text-sentence in such a way as to bring out the **functions** that each word and each unit serves in the overall structure. But these structures exist to convey **meanings**, and it is in the second book, the *Functional Semantics Handbook*, that we will see how this happens, as we diagram the ‘strands of meaning’ of different types that run simultaneously through the syntactic units of language.

6.2 The contents of the *Functional Semantics Handbook*

Part A introduces the approach to analyzing the **meanings** of a text-sentence that is used here. This type of ‘functional semantics’ is in fact a **multi-functional semantics**, and its great advantage is that it enables you to analyze the many different types of meaning that are found in any text IN A SINGLE DIAGRAM. In systemic functional grammar, the meanings of a text are represented as features, and

the *Functional Semantics Handbook* gives simplified versions of all of the main system networks that are designed to be suitable for use in analyzing texts. It is these that provide the semantic features that are used in the multi-strand analysis of meaning.

Part B shows you how to analyze the **experiential** meanings of sentences in texts. Major chapters show you how to analyze the **participant** and **circumstantial roles** that are found in every clause (these having been left at a relatively simple stage in Part B of the present *Handbook*). It provides (1) a set of tests for recognizing the different **Participant Roles** that occur in clauses, (2) the fullest description yet of the **Adjuncts** that express meanings realized in the clause (including **Circumstantial Roles**), with tests for each, including the many types of ‘time’ meaning.

Part C covers **interpersonal** meaning. This includes the semantics of MOOD and POLARITY. It is this part that corresponds most closely to the types of ‘act’ found in an analysis of the exchange structure.

Part D covers the two strands **evaluative** meaning. These are the Performer’s assessment of the **validity** of what he or she is saying, and also the expression of his or her feelings about it, i.e. the **affective** strand.

Part E deals with the types of meaning that are introduced when the Performer structures the text, i.e. **textual** meanings. These include **thematic** and **informational** meaning, as well as the structuring of texts in terms of the **logical relations** between the events (or ‘propositions’) that its clauses refer to. The last of these is the main reflection in the grammar of the categories found in rhetorical structure.

Part F covers several types of meaning that take the explanation outside the current sentence. One type is the **inferential** meanings of words such as *even*, and another is the **discourse organizational** meanings of Adjuncts, clauses and even whole sentences. We also include here aspects of the **ancillary grammar** that enable the Performer to adjust what is being said in various ways, often in mid-sentence.

Part G covers the semantic analysis of groups - and these turn out to be just as interesting as clauses.

Part H brings all of these strands of meaning together into a single, integrated, multi-strand semantic analysis, and shows some of the advantages of analyzing texts in this way.

Finally, **Part I** discusses the analysis of sentences in relation to other levels of analyzing texts such as those shown in Figure 1, and tells you where to find further guidelines to help with those analysis tasks.

7 Some practical advice on how to read this handbook

7.1 What to miss out and when

Read the advice in the box at the start of Chapter 2, and decide whether you should begin there, or go straight to Chapter 3, in Part B. Then work steadily through the rest of Part B, using Chapter 21 as a summary. You will find that a

topic is often treated twice - first at the basic level and then at a more advanced level. If you are going to equip yourself to analyze any type of text at all - which we will refer to as 'unrestricted natural texts' - you need to acquire the concepts and analysis skills that are developed in the more advanced chapters of Part B as well as the 'basic' ones. You also need to cover Part C. Part B is the foundation for all of the other parts of the handbook that follow - and also for the *Functional Semantics Handbook*.

7.2 Reading with pencil, paper and eraser - and postits

My last two points are both very practical ones. When you are reading this book you will regularly find examples that you are invited to analyze - because, as I explained in Section 3, the easiest way to learn about language is 'learning through doing'. So you need to have a PENCIL, some PAPER and an ERASER at hand when reading this book (and usually when consulting it too). A pencil is better than a pen because you are bound to need to change your first analysis at times - which is why you need the eraser too. (I myself always use a cheap propelling 'clutch' pencil, which has the great advantage that it doesn't need sharpening all the time....)

As you work your way through the book, you will find every now and then important bits that you will often need to turn back to, in order to consult them. One of the finest inventions of modern times is the pads of tiny sticky (but removable) sheets of paper called 'postits'. One good use for them is to mark the pages that become your vital reference points in this handbook (or indeed in any other book that you are reading). For example, you might well want to place one by the useful summary of types of TRANSITIVITY in Figure 16 in Section 7.7 of Chapter 3.

Finally, as we approach the end this chapter - let me remind you of what I said at the start about the use of the FOOTNOTES (at the bottom of occasional pages) and ENDNOTES (at the end of each chapter).

The FOOTNOTES, which are shown by '1, 2, 3' etc, are for ALL readers, and the ENDNOTES, which are shown by 'a, b, c' etc, are for readers with advanced experience of linguistics.

8 A warning and a promise

Let me end this chapter with a warning and a promise. Even though the coverage of this handbook is extremely wide, it is impossible to anticipate every problem in text analysis that you might ever encounter. No grammar of English (or of any other language) is as complete as that. Nonetheless I feel confident that this handbook will give you a framework of CONCEPTS and a set of GUIDELINES (including many specific TESTS) that will enable you to make an intelligent and systematic attempt at analyzing every part of any naturally occurring text in English. The framework described here has worked effectively for many researchers and for many generations of students, and it will work effectively for you.

Endnotes

These endnotes provide ‘follow-up’ comments and references for readers with prior knowledge and experience of linguistics. They include occasional brief comparisons with other approaches - including the ‘traditional’ approach to grammar and, within systemic functional grammar, comparisons with the proposals of Halliday and others.

a. In other words, in this framework a ‘sentence’ is not an abstract unit of syntax, as in formal theories of language but - typically - a minimal operational element of discourse. I say ‘typically’, because advertisers quite often play with the use of full stops to make their texts more arresting - and also because there are some types of texts (e.g. a book title such as *David Copperfield* or a label on a tin in a kitchen saying *Sugar*) that are simply nominal groups (though it can always be argued that they are one-clause sentences with *This is* ellipted; see Chapter 20 for ellipsis). Here, as we will see later in the book, a sentence is not regarded as a syntactic **unit**, but as an **element**. It is not an element of syntax, however, but an element that functions at the interface between the ‘sentence grammar’ (whose structure this book describes) and the structure of the ‘discourse grammar’. See Fawcett (2000:177) for the role of the element ‘sentence’ in a generative systemic functional grammar. As will by now be becoming clear, the major unit of organization in the present model of syntax - as in many others - is the clause. In this book, therefore, you will not find the strong emphasis that many formal linguists would place on the difference between a ‘sentence’ in the sense of a ‘well-formed string of words and morphemes that is generated in a generative grammar’ and a sentence that occurs in a natural text. In a systemic functional approach the nearest equivalent relationship is that between the ‘potential’ and the ‘instantial’. These concepts will be presented in Chapter 2.

The term ‘sentence’ is therefore used here in a way that is different from its use in formal grammars. But it is also used differently from the way in which Halliday uses the term in many places - e.g. in his theoretical discussion of grammatical units at the start of *IFG* (p. 23). There he lists the sentence as the highest unit on his ‘rank scale’ - with the lower ones being clause, group, word and morpheme. While he then adds that ‘later on we shall reconsider the significance of the term ‘sentence’ in this hierarchy’ (p. 23) he still lets the term ‘sentence’ stand as the highest of the units in the ‘rank scale’ - just as it was in Halliday (1961). This is surprising, because in practice - i.e. in his descriptions of clause relations in his Chapter 7 of *IFG* - he in effect replaces the concept of the ‘sentence’ as a unit by that of the ‘clause-complex’ - suggesting that the term ‘sentence’ may be used for written ‘clause complexes’ but not for spoken ones. Even for Halliday, then, the sentence is not a unit in the sense that the other units on his ‘rank scale’ are, because such ‘unit complexes’ occur, in the Sydney Grammar, above every one of the units listed above. In other words, if the ‘sentence’ is to be a unit on the rank scale, each of the ‘unit complexes’ associated with each of the lower units on the rank scale would need to be treated as one too. Here we will NOT treat each type of ‘unit complex’ as another type of unit, but as two or more **co-ordinated units** - and we will therefore allow for nothing ‘above the clause’ that is more complex than two or more co-ordinated clauses functioning as a sentence. (For clause co-ordination, see Chapter 11 - and, for a complete summary of the present framework for syntax, see Chapter 24.) For a much fuller critique of the concept of the ‘rank scale’ and the role of ‘parataxis’ and ‘hypotaxis’ within it, see pp. 317-33 of Appendix C of Fawcett (2000).

b. The focus in this diagram is on illustrating, in very broad terms, the various possible ‘levels’ at which representations of a text can be made. But the diagram is incomplete in at least the following two ways. The first is the fact that the diagram shows only **outputs** from the operation of the model of how texts are produced, and not the **components** of the model, whose work produces those outputs. We will consider this distinction in relation to form and meaning in Chapter 2. But a second lack is the fact that there is no indication in the diagram of the important set of components that ‘consult’ the various aspects of the belief system, and which then decide which features in the system networks will be chosen to appear in the representation at the level of meaning. We will return to this topic in the *Functional Semantics Handbook*.

c. The terms ‘exchange structure’ and ‘rhetorical theory structure’ indicate the two bodies of work

WHAT THIS HANDBOOK DOES AND DOES NOT COVER

on understanding 'structure above the sentence' that I consider to provide the most promising sources of adequate descriptive frameworks. As for the work done under the banner of 'conversational analysis', I find it full of interesting details, but too unwilling to commit to explicit models of the goals, plans and actions of people as they use language socio-cognitively to provide the main framework for a description.

d. The full COMMUNAL model of text generation in fact has both a **basic logical form** and an **enriched logical form**. After they have consulted various aspects of the **belief system**, certain algorithms (based on the concept of the **decision tree**) are applied to the basic logical form and it is developed into an **enriched logical form**. You may like to consider here a simple example of a basic logical form (adapted from Fawcett (1993a), which represents what will become a linguistic output with the form of *Fred destroyed the book*. The basic systemic functional logical form of this utterance is: 'event (e100), process (e100 = destroy), agent (e_100 = o_79), affected (e_100 = o_202), time_position (e_100 = t_60), t_60 = past.' This says that there is a 'destroying' event that is named 'event no. 100'), the 'agent' of which is object no. 79 and the 'affected' of which is object no. 202. (A later algorithm will determine how these are to be realized, given the Performer's assessment of the state of the Addressee's beliefs. Finally, the LF states that the event happened at a 'time position' which is unspecified other than that it occurred before 'now'. (The full specification of the event's time position is in this case recoverable from the Time Position Adjunct in a previous clause.)

e. The term 'register' in the right hand column of Figure 1 is placed in brackets because, while the mental construction of the **context of situation** that determines variations in register is found in the **belief system**, the expression of these factors is in fact at lower levels. It is certainly arguable that aspects of 'register', in a broad sense of the term, are expressed in choices in discourse structure, while most studies of the effect of register choices rightly show that the effect of register variation is seen in the lexicogrammar itself. Indeed, in the COMMUNAL model the systems for REGISTER are themselves located as early systems in the lexicogrammar, the choices being predetermined by earlier, higher decisions (Fawcett, Tucker & Lin 1993).

f. Sadly, I have to say that some of those working in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis seem to be particularly likely to leave themselves open to the charge that they are 'cherry-picking' - i.e. choosing only the aspects of the text that illustrate their point. Indeed, Fairclough himself has upbraided his CDA colleagues on this matter. Interestingly, he suggests that SFL provides the best framework for analyzing texts at the lexicographical level (Fairclough 1992).

g. For example, I have found this to be a problem at many points in Quirk et al's *Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (1985), even though they do provide occasional diagram representations of structure. In general terms, however, that work is an invaluable resource.

h. The computer model of language that is referred to here was - and continues to be - developed as part of an integrated text production and text understanding system. This major project is named the COMMUNAL Project. The project began in 1987, and it has received substantial support from The Speech Research Unit at DRA Malvern as part of Assignment No. ASO4BP44, on Spoken Language Understanding and Dialogue (SLUD), from the Research Council of International Computers Ltd, from Longman, and from Cardiff University.

COMMUNAL stands for COnvivial Man-Machine Understanding through NATural Language, and it is a long-term project in building a system for communication with computers that draws on systemic functional linguistics (SFL) in general and systemic functional grammar (SFG) in particular. The major architect of this theory is Michael Halliday, and all of those working on the project acknowledge his great influence on how we approach the challenge of trying to model language. SFL concepts are supplemented by concepts from other frameworks and by new concepts when these are found useful.

At the heart of the COMMUNAL project lies the GENESYS sentence generator, which has this name because it GENERates SYStemically, i.e. using a SFG. See Fawcett 1988a for an account of the founding assumptions of the project. For the fullest account yet published of how a SFG works (i.e. when functioning as the sentence generator in a computer model of natural language generation) see Fawcett, Tucker and Lin (1993). Other relevant works include Fawcett 1980, 1987, 1990, 1994a and b and 1996, and Tucker 1992, 1996a and b, and in press a and b. As I pointed out in the Preface, GENESYS has been described by Butler (1993:4503) as 'the

WHAT THIS HANDBOOK DOES AND DOES NOT COVER

largest computer-based systemic grammar in the world'.

The grammar used in GENESYS - and also for related work in textual description - is sometimes referred to as the 'Cardiff Grammar', and this handbook and its sister volume *The Handbook of Functional Semantics* provides the fullest published description of the Cardiff Grammar of English.

i. The syntactically analyzed corpus (Fawcett, Perkins and McBride 1987) is available through the International Computer Archive of Modern English (ICAME), Bergen, Norway, but anyone intending to use it is advised to also consult the leading specialist on it, Dr Clive Souter, School of Computer Studies, University of Leeds. The transcripts have been published in four volumes, as Fawcett and Perkins (1980a-d).

j. Butler, in his recent comprehensive survey of functional descriptions of language (2002a & b), comments (2002b:471) that 'Systemic Functional Grammar ... has achieved a much wider coverage of English than other approaches, this being especially true of the Cardiff Grammar.' For example, this book provides (in Chapter 14) detailed guidance in recognizing and testing for compound nouns, while Halliday's *Introduction to Functional Grammar* (1994) leaves them out, as Halliday himself points out (p. 185) - even though they are very frequent in natural texts, and the problem of distinguishing them from certain types of modifier is one on which most text analysts would welcome guidance. And there are several types of TRANSITIVITY that are covered systematically here, but which are omitted or marginalized in *IFG*. Two important classes are the three-role processes of the *put/send* and the *make/elect* types, which are here treated as relational processes (see Section 7 of Chapter 3). Even the very full coverage of English grammar provided in Quirk, Greenbaum Leech and Svartvik's superb *Comprehensive Grammar of English* (1985) leaves out many frequently occurring aspects of (a) tempering in the quality group, and (b) the internal structure of the unit that is here called the quantity group. Another example is the lack of a systematic treatment anywhere else (so far as I know) of the wide range of Auxiliary Extensions introduced in Chapter 14. Finally, other accounts largely or wholly omit the 'special units' such as those for the human proper name, the address, the date and clock time. In these and many other ways this grammar offers a broader coverage than most if not all others. Nonetheless there will be many phenomena that it does not describe as fully as you might wish - some that are treated as inferable from other phenomena and, no doubt, a few that have simply been overlooked.

k. Some grammars and dictionaries, such as those associated with the COBUILD Project, make it a rule to use only examples from naturally-occurring texts. This is a healthy corrective to the long-established practice of making up examples, but it is not necessary to make it an absolute principle. And it can adversely affect the flow of the exposition in a book such as this - which is why higher priority is given here to other considerations.

l. This is a continuous problem for those writers who take a strong line with themselves (and others) on the issue of whether examples in books such as this should be 'real life' examples. This is because it is an extremely time-consuming task to locate in a corpus a complete set of examples to fill out the paradigm of contrasts that are required. It is also true that the use of corpus examples may cause problems for the readers of such books, because of the work that has to be done in order to discover the point of contrast with a previous example. I remain nonetheless full of admiration for scholars such as Butler (2003 a & b) who do accept this discipline.

But the main value of corpora, it seems to me, is as a source of data for discovering the syntactic patterns of language. This is because collocation is merely the 'poor relation' of Firth's other concept of **colligation** - which is the relationship between items and units in a text in terms of their syntactic relationships. So while examples used in books such as this to illustrate a point should be ones that have been attested in a naturally occurring corpus (or ones that might be, if one looked long enough), it is helpful to the reader to simplify them - often by merely shortening them.

As an aside, I might add that, in my view, many linguists have been misled by the relative ease with which it has been found possible to use corpora to investigate Firth's notion of **collocation** (where the 'closeness' of one word to another is measured by the number of intervening words) into believing that corpus studies are yielding the sort of data that linguists need. We need better tools for using corpora than we have so far - including, as a first stage, parsers that can parse them in functional terms, and query systems that can ask intelligent

WHAT THIS HANDBOOK DOES AND DOES NOT COVER

questions about them in such terms. See Day (in preparation) for a first attempt to meet this need.

m. This is essentially the equivalent at the level of form of the ‘minimal pairs’ approach to the establishment of a phoneme in segmental phonology, where the difference between, for example, /rap/ and /lap/ in English demonstrates that there is both a /l/ phoneme and a /r/ phoneme in English.