1. Introduction

This Special Issue entitled *Dynamicity and Contrast in Systemic Functional Linguistics* provides research into two areas of linguistics, dynamicity and contrast, which are often approached as separate topics but which, within Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), can be regarded as complementary perspectives on the phenomenon of language change. *Dynamicity*, or language dynamics, refers to the mechanisms by which language evolves across different spatiotemporal scales, while language *contrast* refers to the observable differences between languages in their static state, as the temporary (and, in many ways, illusory) products of these dynamic processes. Therefore, while we notionally divide this Special Issue of *Lingua* into two topics, our more general aim is to show their inherent interconnectedness, with the term *dynamicity* indexing a process-based account of language change and the term *contrast* indexing a more product-based, or synoptic, account.

Halliday, writing in the 1980s, considered that there had been a tendency to focus on product-based and contrastive accounts of language change, and that this could be attributed, at least in part, to the historical tendency of theoretical and descriptive linguistics to focus solely on the written mode of language. As a result, grammar had been conceived of traditionally as "a theory of written language" (Halliday 1989: 97), with the workings of spoken language largely being overlooked. For Halliday, however, speaking and writing embody complementary world views, or "different kinds of knowing" (Halliday 1989: 97). As Halliday explains,

> The spoken language presents a DYNAMIC view. It defines its universe primarily as process, encoding it not as a structure but as constructing - or demolishing. In the spoken language, phenomena do not exist; they **happen**. They are seen as coming into being, changing, moving in and out of focus, and as interacting in a continuous onward flow. (Halliday 1989: 97; emphasis original)

However, the written language behaves in a different way:

> The written language presents a SYNOPTIC view. It defines its universe as product rather than as process. Whether we are talking about a triangle, the layout of a house, or the organisation of a society, the written language

> encodes it as a structure or, alternatively, as a chaos - but either way, as a **thing** that **exists**. (Halliday 1989: 97; emphasis original)

Clearly, the differences Halliday outlines here are not absolute, as both written and spoken modes are versatile and flexible, while new media further blur the distinctions between the two modes; however, they do capture a more abstract distinction between descriptions of text as interaction (which is most conspicuous in the spoken mode) and text as an instance of the grammatical system (which, superficially at least, is more conspicuous in the written mode). For SFL, however, the relationship between instance and system is more complex than simply the relationship between potential and choice, or catalogue and item, in that the theory strives to account for the perturbing effect of novel utterances on the system and the cyclical relationship between the existing "structure" and the continuous processes of "constructing - or demolishing" - that structure.

For SFL, language is a *semiotic system*, a system that creates meaning, and which has an endless *meaning potential* for creating new meanings (Halliday 1978: 60). As Lemke points out, it is a *dynamic open system* (Lemke 1984, qtd. in Halliday 1993: 110), with the property of being metastable: dynamic open systems persist "only through constant change; and this change takes place through interactive exchanges with their environment" (Halliday 1993: 110). In this way, "language includes both the potential to mean and the act of meaning which brings that potential to life [so that] a general linguistic theory encompasses both" (Halliday 1989: 60). Hence, theoretical problems such as dynamicity must be accounted for in order to expand the explanatory potential of the theory. Within SFL, this entails interconnecting three dynamic or generative forces within language as a social semiotic: the logogenetic, the ontogenetic and the phylogenetic. The following section looks at these forces and their interconnections.

2. Logogenesis, ontogenesis, phylogenesis

Logogenesis refers to the creation of texts as coherent semantic units through the gradual unfolding of smaller units of language. This is accounted for in various ways within SFL. Possibly the best-known feature of SFL in this regard is the analysis of Theme and Rheme as the organisational elements of a clause and the development of these across texts. This work was derived from the pioneering work of the Prague School and colleagues into 'Communicative Dynamism' and the Functional Sentence

Perspective (e.g. Mathesius 1911; Jakobson and Halle 1956; Firbas 1971, 1992; Daneš 1974), although there are significant differences between the approaches (Bartlett and O'Grady 2019). Further work on logogenesis in the SFL tradition includes Halliday and Hasan (1976) on cohesion across texts as semantic units; Cloran (2010) on Rhetorical Units as chunks of language demonstrating spatiotemporal unity beyond the clause but below the text; Zhao (2010) on the temporal dynamics of hypertexts; and Martin's work over several decades into the discourse semantics of texts (particularly Martin 1992).

Ontogenesis refers to the development of language in the individual child and their growing behavioural competence as members of social groups as they acquire form and function simultaneously, according to the demands and practices of the social situations to which they are exposed. From this perspective the language system is a behavioural potential, a reservoir, with individuals commanding their own repertoire of contextually-appropriate behaviours. Individual case studies of ontogenetic development from an SFL perspective are developed by Halliday (1975) and Painter (1999).

Phylogenesis refers to the development of the language system itself. As stated above, this is a process of continuous feedback, perturbation and recalibration between instances of language in use and the language system as a 'social fact', imagined differently across different social groups, as codes and dialects, and according to different contexts of use, as registers. Phylogenesis is thus linked to both logogenesis and ontogenesis. Logogenesis is the construction of novel syntagms, and these create new associations that become paradigmatic options in future use; while ontogenesis is the product of each individual's unique exposure to logogenesis across myriad contexts and hence to their personal and shifting imagining of the shared underlying system – which is transmitted in turn to other individuals, all with their own life histories and exposures to language in context. This creative learning breeds specialised languages to fit new functional niches, such as the rise of specifically scientific styles of writing from the 17th century (Banks this issue; Halliday 1993) and the vast array of genres we recognise and distinguish in our daily lives in the current day (Martin and Rose 2008). In more extreme cases, depending on social, political and geographical factors, the gulf between language use in context becomes so great and so durable that we recognise different languages - imaginaries at a greater scale than dialects, codes, registers or genres.

The relationship between logogenesis, phylogenesis and ontogenesis is dialectical, involving pressures and tensions between each element in this triadic representation of language as social semiotic. However, the complexity of the features involved in this dynamic thrust raises a number of questions that still remain elusive. Some of these questions are related to the dynamicity of language, not only in terms of the gradual process of change that these tensions provoke, but also in terms of the expansion of the system as a whole that they enable. Other relevant questions refer to the appropriateness (or lack of it) of the existing SFL framework in accounting for linguistic diversity. The description of languages other than English within the SFL tradition has sometimes been criticised for being Anglocentric, imposing analytical categories from English on other languages (e.g. De Beaugrande 1994: 12), or for failing to take seriously mainstream typological criteria for theoretical adequacy (McGregor in press). Considering all these aspects, this Special Issue addresses the following questions in particular:

- In terms of the dynamics between logogenesis and phylogenesis, what are the reciprocal pressures between logogenetic processes of production, the system as a whole and the contexts in which texts are produced?
- In terms of the dynamic genetic potential of language, how do we account for the expansion of the meaning potential of systems rather than just processes of change and divergence?
- In terms of the explanatory potential of SFL as a general theory of language appliable to the description of any language, to what extent are the fundamental categories of SFL adequate for the description of languages other than English and, hence, for the comparison of different languages?

The different papers in the current volume explore these different dynamics and the connections between them in different ways, each adding a piece to the overall jigsaw. For a further integrated discussion of these ideas from an SFL perspective, see the collection of papers in the special issue of *English Text Construction* (Arús-Hita and Clarke 2016). And for perspectives on dynamism from other schools of linguistics, see Wmffre (2013), Langacker (2001), Cann, Kempson and Marten (2005) and Kempson, Meyer-Viol and Gabbay (2001) and also the following website: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/dynamic-semantics/.

3. Modelling the dynamics of language

This Special Issue of *Lingua* presents four contributions on dynamicity which attempt to shed new light on current theoretical problems in language dynamics, specifically related to its modelling within SFL general theory of language. The topics covered address the logogenetic dynamics of conversational exchanges (Margaret Berry, Gerard O'Grady) and the dynamic modelling of context-system-choice relations needed to account for these (Michael O'Donnell), along with an exploratory account of phylogenesis from an evolutionary perspective (Tom Bartlett).

In accordance with Gregory's view that "a theory of knowledge relevant to linguistics as essentially a social science is a dialectical materialist one" (2002: 18), Bartlett embraces materialism in order to explain the dynamicity of language as an ever-expanding meaning potential and the relationship between logogenesis, ontogenesis and phylogenesis as the three different timeframes involved in the process of semiotic generation and expansion (Matthiessen, Teruya and Lam 2010: 196-8). To that end, Bartlett draws on systems theory, evolutionary biolinguistics and cultural evolution to describe semiotic activity as a phenomenon which is both social and embodied. Starting from the assumption that language systems and the human species coevolve, each accommodating to the other over time (Whitehead 1978 [1929]), Bartlett follows Lemke (1984; 2015) in exploring semiosis in terms of associations between phenomena. In this view, elements of our experience of the world (perceptions, actions, happenings, phenomena, places, processes, etc.) become associated with other, regularly cooccurring elements, such that, over time, these elements function as signs for each other. These elements are said to be in a redundancy relationship (i.e. the occurrence of one element predicts the likely occurrence of the other more than by mere chance). But there is also a higher-level metaredundancy relation, which means that the association between elements itself depends upon the different contexts in which the individual elements occur. The ability to recognise and respond to similar contrasts differently depending on the context in which they are experienced is seen as a key evolutionary advantage (Lemke 2015: 599). We thus have two layers, or strata, of meaning, with lower-order meanings combining to make higher-order meanings in context. This stratal organisation introduces tensions into the system, with overlaps and slippages in meaning allowing existing semiotic elements to recombine as novel elements at a higher level of abstraction, while evolved human tendencies towards restricted risk-

taking allow for a workable dynamic balance between normativity and novelty. Thus, Bartlett offers an interpretation of how the meaning potential expands within the overall language system, presenting it as "an ever-shifting lingua-cultural system being acted out through an unstable alliance of cultural domains and situation types", and concluding that each of those is realised "by a shifting articulation of features across several strata held together in dynamic tension through the expectancy relationships of redundancy and metaredundancy and our evolved predilection for imitation over innovation, or normal over marked behaviour".

The contributions from Margaret Berry[1] and Gerard O'Grady both consider the pressures exerted by various contextual features on logogenetic processes of production and reception and the dynamic modelling of spoken interaction. Both Berry and O'Grady explore this question through extending Birmingham School Exchange Structure, which models interaction according to a rank scale which includes "the move and the exchange, where an exchange is set up as [at least] a three-part structure, consisting (potentially) of three moves: Initiation ^ (Response) ^ (Feedback)" (Martin 1992: 46-7). This model was introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) on the basis of classroom interaction, a focus which has been developed fruitfully by Berry (e.g. 1981; 1987; 2016a) and other SFL linguists (e.g. Martin 1985; O'Donnell 1990; Ventola 1987; Muntigl 2009). The model has also been applied to the description of exchange structure in other genres, including conversational interaction. In this Special Issue, Berry addresses the question of how inequalities in the status relations of speakers in conversational exchanges relate to observable logogenetic differences in terms of the exchange structures produced. In order to do this, she looks into conversational exchanges by speakers with the social roles of Convenor and Ethnic Community Officer (from Australian Youth Justice Conferencing), Teacher (from Classroom Discourse), and Counsellor (from

[1] A contributor to this volume and a pioneer of SFL, Margaret Berry, sadly passed away in November 2020, as we were finalising this Special Issue, and her paper in this volume is one of the last of the many significant contributions she made to Systemic Functional Linguistics over a long and rich career. She will be best remembered for her innovative and inspiring work on the dynamics of exchange structure and so we are very proud to be able to include her latest thoughts on this topic in the current volume. She will be missed, but her influence will remain.

Relationship Counselling). In doing so, she revises her own model of exchange structure, drawing on work developed by researchers such as Zappavigna and Martin (2018) and Muntigl (2009). She thus incorporates into her modelling of status differences the option that speakers may be playing down or reinforcing status differences. In this way, Berry combines dynamic models of exchange structure with contextual variables of role and status and the conventionalised expectations they bring, thereby relating logogenetic and phylogenetic features within a unified account of turn-taking as a social phenomenon.

In his paper, O'Grady considers the adequacy of the existing SFL approach to modelling exchange structure in terms of the competing pressures arising from contextual variables. Drawing on the analysis of spoken texts, O'Grady advocates the incorporation of intonation into the model in order to account for assumptions of shared knowledge between the different speakers and the affiliative relations between them. He compares the exchange structures in two texts which are contrastive in terms of the features of the speakers involved (undergraduate students vs political rivals), as well as the nature of the conversation held (cooperative dialogue vs competitive talk). Unlike Berry's paper, the texts analysed here are produced by speakers with a similar status relationship. O'Grady's analysis reveals how the incorporation of prosody within the metafunctional coding of the texts contributes to finer-grained modelling by showing that certain moves predict and/or constrain the following moves throughout the conversation. In addition, the analysis shows in detail how knowledge is negotiated among speakers and how they position their interlocutors with respect to their higher or lower level of access to knowledge while simultaneously negotiating the level of affiliation between them. O'Grady's paper, therefore, seeks to describe the mechanisms that have been developed within the language system (phylogenesis) to cater for the on-line negotiation of shared knowledge and assumptions (logogenesis). This sets up issues that are explored further in O'Donnell's paper from the perspective of modelling context as an endlessly changing and emergent phenomenon.

Michael O'Donnell's contribution also seeks to refine the SFL modelling of logogenetic processes and the relationship between the unfolding text and the context in which this is produced, while also bearing significant similarities to Bartlett's paper in terms of the potential for logogenetic change to feed back into the system. Rather than taking the context of situation as a static object, O'Donnell

explores the potential for modelling it as a dynamic object, altered with each successive utterance. In this way O'Donnell seeks to build the dynamic potential of logogenesis into the phylogenetic description of the system itself. In O'Donnell's account, the context of situation, rather than being determined according to features external to the text, is interpreted as a social context which is continuously negotiated by the participants in the course of their interaction. In this way, while the first words of their interaction establish a particular context as relevant, subsequent utterances may either continue the already opened context, or shift to a new one, so that "our words tell the world which context of situation we are operating within". In this way, contextual features motivate certain linguistic expressions, while the logogenetic shifting of the text feeds back into and redefines the context of situation, which then motivates a different set of linguistic expressions. And so on, ad infinitum. As O'Donnell points out, in spite of the previous work on the nature of context and the text-context relationship (particularly Hasan 1981; Ventola 1984; Martin 1985; O'Donnell 1990; Ghadessy 1999; Bartlett 2013; and Berry 2016b), the context of situation is still often interpreted as static or constant throughout the interaction or the unfolding of text. O'Donnell maintains that a purely dynamic approach to the text-context relationship is more fruitful for text study and suggests two crucial aspects for a dynamic model of context. Firstly, he considers context as a subjective construction, in that the conception of the actual situation in a communicative interaction is not uniform across participants, but based on their individual perceptions of what is going on. In addition, O'Donnell envisages the context of situation as a semiotic construct, realized through the verbal and non-verbal acts we choose to produce and perform. In this way, each act would involve a choice either to continue the currently open context or to branch out to a different one. In adopting this dynamic perspective to context, O'Donnell demonstrates that logogenesis is not a feature of texts alone, but also of the contexts to which texts respond and of the unique configuration of ontogenetic histories that each new context brings together. Each new response then serves to recalibrate the context and to open up the system to non-generic behaviours with their potential for uptake as phylogenetic change.

4. The dynamics of language: cross-linguistic perspectives

In addition to the contributions which address the dynamics of the language system from a social perspective, this Special Issue also explores the potential of the SFL

framework for the comparison and contrast of different linguistic systems. The motivation for this is that the explanatory potential of SFL as a general theory of language can also be expanded by and benefit from studying different languages contrastively. Contrastive linguistics, i.e. the comparative description of pairs or groups of languages, has for a long time been a prolific area of research, stretching from the 1940s and 50s, when Charles Fries (e.g. 1945) and Robert Lado (e.g. 1957) used the contrastive study of languages to predict areas of difficulty in learning a foreign language, until the present day, when contrasts are often found of a more typological, or descriptive, nature. Such is the case with contrastive studies within the framework of SFL.

When describing languages from an SFL perspective, either in isolation or contrastively, it is important to take into account the distinction between theory and application: "theoretical assumptions are very general and all the categories of particular languages belong to the dominion of description" (Caffarel et al. 2004a: 11). When comparing languages, or language systems, we use theoretical assumptions to guide our contrastive typological description. SFL has been used as a theoretical tool for such descriptions (see selected references, below). These descriptions often follow the method known as 'transfer comparison', by which we "adopt the description of one language to that of another" (Caffarel et al. 2004a: 15), while recognizing that the functions of grammatical categories will not be isomorphic between languages. Such methodology has been successfully applied to a large number of typological descriptions, such as those in Caffarel et al. (2004b) and several of the descriptive works referred to below.

Another distinctive aspect of the contrastive research in this Special Issue is the SFL adoption of a trinocular perspective (Halliday 1996; Matthiessen 2007): from above (i.e. from a semantic point of view: what meaning does a given category construe?), from below (i.e. from the point of view of delicate lexicogrammar and phonology: how is it realised?) and from roundabout (from the point of view of the lexicogrammar at the same level as the category itself: what other categories/functions does it interact with?). The reason for adopting this trinocular approach to the description of language phenomena is explained by Halliday:

> The grammar looks at objects and events from all three angles of orientation. It takes account of their function: phenomena which have like value for human existence and survival will tend to be categorized as alike. It takes account of

> their form: phenomena which resemble each other to human perceptions will tend to be categorized as alike. And it takes account of how things relate to one another: phenomena are not categorized in isolation but in sets, syndromes and domains (Halliday 1996: 16).

It is easy to picture how this tripartite approach may benefit contrastive typological work, where we are trying to find out crosslinguistic similarities and contrasts at different levels. The trinocular perspective allows us to see: a) whether two languages have similar functions in a given context; b) the degree of similarity of the formal make-up of those functions; and c) the similarities and differences in terms of the relation of those categories to the other elements in their systems (as well as the actual composition of those systems).

Because English was the first language to be extensively described in SFL (see below), typological descriptions of individual languages in this framework often imply, more or less explicitly, an identification of commonalities and dissimilarities with the categories and functions of English, though also referring to other languages already described, totally or partially, from the SFL perspective. One clear example of this practice is Caffarel et al. (2004b), which includes the description of eight languages from seven different language families. Although the descriptions are individual, the contrastive spirit of the book can be appreciated in the final chapter, which is devoted to descriptive motifs and generalizations (more about this below). Caffarel et al.'s volume also offers a general overview of the place of SFL-based typological descriptions in the context of overall language typology (2004a: 54-58; see also Kashyap 2019).

As previously stated, English is undoubtedly the most widely described language from an SFL perspective. The most significant work in this area is Michael Halliday's *Introduction to Functional Grammar* (Halliday 1985, 1994, and Matthiessen 2004, 2014; henceforth *IFG*). While the description of English in this volume provides an extensive illustration of the theory, it has a focus on structure, rather than on system. For a more systems-based approach, the most comprehensive description of English to date is Matthiessen (1995), which covers the whole lexicogrammatical spectrum in detail. A more recent, although less detailed, description of English lexicogrammar – focusing, like *IFG*, on structure rather than on system – is found in Banks (2019). The other languages described in Caffarel et al. (2004b) are French (Caffarel 2004, see also Caffarel 2006; Banks 2017), German (Steiner and Teich 2004), Japanese

(Teruya 2004, see also Teruya 2007), Tagalog (Martin 2004), Chinese (Halliday and McDonald 2004), Vietnamese (Thai 2004), Telugu (Prakasam 2004) and Pitjantjatjara (Rose 2004). Other monographic language descriptions within the SFL framework are Lavid et al. (2010) for Spanish, Li (2007) for Mandarin Chinese, Tam (2004) for Cantonese Chinese, Bardi (2008) for Arabic, Park (2013) for Korean, Akerejola (2005) for Oko, Mwinlaaru (2017) for Dagaare and Kashyap (forthcoming) for Bajiika. For a full account of studies in systemic functional language description and typology, see Mwinlaaru and Xuan (2016).

In addition to the description of whole languages, there is a wealth of studies on specific areas of the lexicogrammar of languages from around the world. A number of such descriptions can be found in Martin et al. (2020), including the verbal group in Khorchin Mongolian (Zhang 2020), Mood in classical Tibetan (Wang 2020) and Theme in Brazilian Portuguese (Figueredo 2020). Considering the literature on Theme alone, descriptions have been provided by Steiner and Ramm (1995) for German, Fang et al. (1995) for Chinese, Caffarel (2000) for French, Andersen (2004) for Danish, Kim (2007) for Korean, Susanto (2008) for Ludruk, Moyano (2016) and Arús-Hita (2010) for Spanish, Thomson (2013) for Japanese, and Bartlett and O'Grady (2019) for Scottish Gaelic.

As stated above, much of the descriptive work in SFL uses transfer comparison. This facilitates the task at hand, because "the type of approach where no assumptions are made based on other languages and where the description of the lexicogrammatical system is built up from observations of discursive instances takes a considerable amount of time" (Caffarel et al. 2004a: 15). It also makes it easier to identify commonalities and differences between languages. There is a caveat, however: transfer comparison should not mean the blunt application of the descriptive categories used for the description of one language to the description of another language; rather, textual evidence should be the main criterion in identifying variations in the semiotic functions of superficially similar categories across languages. Transfer comparison is, therefore, simply to be taken as offering a possible heuristic model for description, which can then be ratified, modified, or discarded and substituted on the basis of more detailed analysis. Each typological description serves to provide a more comprehensive picture of the lexicogrammatical resources used by languages, which in turn helps to establish descriptive generalizations. Matthiessen (2004) explains how some categories appear to be

363 regular across languages while other categories are more specific to particular
364 languages: “For example, while all languages appear to have a Predicator in the
365 interpersonal structure of the clause, other interpersonal functions such as Subject,
366 Finite, Mood and Negotiator are much more variable across languages” (2004: 538).

367 SFL thus avoids the assumption of linguistic universals applicable to all languages,
368 as is very clearly stated by Mwinlaaru and Xuan (2016: 15):

369 > SFL theory … does not claim universality for grammatical elements such as
370 > Subject, Actor or Theme (and even systems such as ASPECT, TENSE and
371 > MODALITY) nor does it claim universality in the order of elements in the clause
372 > or any linguistic unit, for that matter, as part of the theory of language).

373 The four contributions to the second part of this Special Issue present a variety of
374 approaches to contrastive analysis within a functional perspective, each of which
375 puts descriptive models to the test in terms of the questions raised at the beginning
376 of this introduction. Arús-Hita challenges the explanatory potential of SFL,
377 suggesting some adjustments to the theory which may facilitate multilingual
378 descriptions, while the papers by Banks, Heilmann et al. and Sellami-Baklouti look
379 at the pressures on the logogenetic processes of production that arise from the
380 context, from the existing system as a whole, or from both.

381 **5. Contrast and translation: Putting the theory to the test**

382 Jorge Arús-Hita approaches the contrastive typology of English and Spanish from a
383 theoretical perspective, considering the enactment of communicative exchanges as
384 they are realized structurally in each language and the theoretical consequences of
385 the contrastive differences revealed. As he reminds us, although modelling the
386 description of one language by resorting to the description of another has been
387 common practice, particularly with models based on English language, typological
388 work on other languages, such as Spanish, has revealed areas of difference where
389 “mere transfer comparison does not work”. He identifies the structural resources
390 employed in each language for the interpersonal enactment of communicative
391 exchanges as one of those areas where Spanish does not behave like English. With
392 this in mind, Arús-Hita ‘pushes’ the theory in order to provide a model more readily
393 adaptable to the description of interpersonal enactment in both languages. The
394 author argues for a relocation of SPCA (Subject, Predicator, Complement, Adjunct)
395 structure from the interpersonal to the logical metafunction, suggesting that such a

396 move would not only provide the structural resources to create clause complexes but
397 also simple clauses, in the form of syntax.

398 The three remaining contributions focus on the description of the written mode of
399 language from the perspective of translation, where SFL has been largely adopted
400 by a variety of scholars working with different pairs of languages. In this case, the
401 languages compared to English are Spanish, French, German and Arabic, but readers
402 can find SFL-based contrastive work on translation involving other languages as well.
403 Some examples are Manfredi (2011) and Taylor (1990) for Italian and Vasconcellos
404 (2009) for Brazilian Portuguese. This Special Issue offers a variety of approaches to
405 contrastive studies within SFL by presenting: a 'translation-as-product' study which
406 compares English and French original texts and their translations within the specific
407 historical context of the early days of the dissemination of scientific findings (David
408 Banks); a contrastive 'translation-as-process' empirical study which analyses
409 translators' strategies in English-to-German translation and their thematic choices
410 (Arndt Heilmann, Tatiana Serbina, Jonas Freiwald and Stella Neumann); and a
411 contrastive corpus-based study of parallel texts comparing the construction of
412 causation in English and Arabic (Akila Sellami-Baklouti).

413 David Banks discusses contrast with reference to the translation of the academic
414 article in the late 18th century. That period is extremely important for science, as
415 "[i]n the earlier part of the seventeenth century the virtual disappearance of Latin as
416 a means of international communication created major difficulties for the growing
417 body of scientists in Europe" (Salmon 1966: 371). Together with the activities of
418 religious reformers in Germany, Poland, Scandinavia, the Low Countries and Britain,
419 who were trying to modernize medieval learning and put an end to sectarian disputes,
420 this initiated a quest for a universal language which could "unite all Christians in the
421 love of God, all cause for religious dispute being removed through the abolition of
422 verbal ambiguity" (Salmon 1966: 372). While linguistic discussion was dominated by
423 the features that such universal language should have, the first academic periodical
424 publication, the *Journal des Sçavans*, was being published (Paris, January 1665),
425 followed closely by the *Philosophical Transactions* (London, March 1665). Close
426 contact between both publications resulted in some texts appearing in both journals,
427 with English texts published in French in the *Journal des Sçavans* and French texts
428 published in English in the *Philosophical Transactions*. Banks analyses the
429 translation strategies employed in both cases through a comparison of source and

translated texts. This contrastive analysis shows two main distinct strategies, which Banks relates to differences between their respective types of readership. This paper thus addresses the first of the three questions posed above, regarding the way in which contextual pressures influence the logogenetic process of production at the time of translation.

The same issue is tackled by Arndt Heilmann, Tatiana Serbina, Jonas Freiwald and Stella Neumann, yet from the opposite direction. They look at pressures affecting the logogenetic process in translation not from the context, but from the choices available in the lexicogrammar. The authors analyse the translation of typical inanimate Subject Themes in the popular scientific register from English to German and hypothesize, from a typological perspective, which cases are likely to be more prone to translation variation. The underlying hypothesis was that English sentences containing a combination of inanimate Subjects and agentive verbs would pose a translation problem that could potentially be reflected in translation shifts and in an increased cognitive effort by the translator. An empirical test was designed and carried out in order to test this hypothesis and, by triangulating the keystroke logging and eye-tracking data of professional translators, the researchers were able to conclude that the feature +/- animacy of the Subject does not have a significant effect on the strategies employed. They suggest that this could be related to the high salience of this type of structure when translating from English to German, meaning that translators are able to substitute one structural option for another without extra cognitive effort.

Akila Sellami-Baklouti's paper, in turn, considers pressures coming from both the context and the system as a whole to account for contrasts in the system of causation as it is realized in comparable registers of English and Arabic. Her study focuses on the complementary analyses of transitivity and ergativity in parallel corpora of website Terms of Service (TOS), in order to show the respective probabilities in the semantic and lexicogrammatical systems of the two languages within the domain of causation. Apart from expected typological differences in realization between the two languages, the study shows that causation may also be activated by contextual factors with a cross-linguistic impact. The results of the analyses reveal that lexical, morphological and analytic resources show a variation in frequency among sub-corpora, which leads Sellami-Baklouti to introduce changes to the analytical model of the causation system in Arabic, which was originally based on the system for English as presented in Halliday and Matthiessen (2014). In this way, the register-

based study presented by Sellami-Baklouti provides a refined model of causation in Arabic, thus exemplifying the potential of contrastive studies in the modelling of language description.

6. Conclusion

Taken together, the papers in this Special Issue address dynamicity and contrast, in both written and spoken language, from a range of perspectives within the theoretical framework of SFL. These often rely on a rather complex descriptive apparatus, with the result that readers not familiar with SFL may have the feeling that the descriptive apparatus is overly intricate. The rejoinder to this is that complex phenomena require complex explanations or, in the words of Halliday (2009: 61), "language is complicated, and there is no point in pretending that it is simple". However, as Berry (this issue) reminds us, a model of something is not 'the real thing', because models can only capture some of the characteristics of what is being modelled, leaving out others. It is therefore of paramount importance to be clear about what is prioritized in each case. In this respect, the contributions that readers will find in this issue do not to try to offer oversimplified interpretations of the phenomena addressed, but rather to present their progress in the pursuit of more efficient models for the description of languages, through the consideration of features that often challenge current models and through attested analyses of authentic language. To this end, this Special Issue offers readers up-to-date research on long-standing questions in linguistics from the specific perspective of Systemic Functional Linguistics as a general theory of language, mankind's most powerful social semiotic system.

References

Akerejola, E., 2005. A Text-based Lexicogrammatical Description of Oko: A Systemic Functional Approach, PhD Dissertation, Macquarie University.

Andersen, T. H., 2004. The system of THEME in the Danish clause. In: Banks, D. (Ed.), Text and Texture: Systemic Functional Viewpoints on the Nature and Structure of Texts. L'Harmattan, Paris. pp. 191-213.

Arús-Hita, J., 2010. On Theme in English and Spanish: a comparative study. In: Swain, E. (Ed.), Thresholds and Potentialities of Systemic Functional Linguistics:

497 Multilingual, Multimodal and Other Specialised Discourses. EUT, Trieste, pp.
498 23-48.

499 Arús-Hita, J., Clarke, B., (Eds.). 2016. The dynamicity of communication below,
500 around and above the clause. Special issue of English Text Construction 9 (1).
501 https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.9.1

502 Banks, D., 2017. A Systemic Functional Grammar of French. Routledge, London.

503 Banks, D., 2019. A Systemic Functional Grammar of English. Routledge, London.

504 Bardi, M. A., 2008. A Systemic Functional Description of the Grammar of Arabic, PhD
505 Dissertation, Macquarie University.

506 Bartlett, T. 2013. "I'll manage the context": context, environment and the potential
507 for institutional change. In: Fontaine, L., et al. (Eds.), Systemic Functional
508 Linguistics: Exploring Choice. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.
509 346–64.

510 Bartlett, T., O'Grady, G., 2019. Language characterology and textual dynamics: A
511 crosslinguistic exploration in English and Scottish Gaelic. Acta Linguistica
512 Hafniensia 51 (2), 124-159.

513 Beaugrande, R. De. 1994. Cognition, communication, translation, instruction: The
514 geopolitics of discourse. In: De Beaugrande, R., Shunnaq, A. and Heliel, M. H.
515 (Eds.), Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East.
516 John Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 1-22.

517 Berry, M., 1981. Systemic Linguistics and Discourse Analysis: A Multi-Layered
518 Approach to Exchange Structure. In: Coulthard M, Montgomery, M. (Eds.),
519 Studies in Discourse Analysis. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, pp. 120–
520 145.

521 Berry, M., 1987. Is teacher an unanalysed concept? In: Halliday, M.A.K., Fawcett, R.
522 (Eds.), New Developments in Systemic Linguistics, Volume 1: Theory and
523 Description. Frances Pinter, London, pp. 41–63.

524 Berry, M., 2016a. Dynamism in exchange structure. English Text Construction 9 (1),
525 33-55. https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.9.1.03ber

526 Berry, M., 2016b. On describing contexts of situation. In: Bowcher, W. L., Liang, J. Y.
527 (Eds.), Society in Language, Language in Society: Essays in Honour of Ruqaiya
528 Hasan. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 184-205.

529 Caffarel, A., 2000. Interpreting French theme as a bi-layered structure: discourse
530 implications. Language in Performance 22, 247-272.

531 Caffarel, A., 2004. Metafunctional profile of the grammar of French. In: Caffarel, A.,
532 Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (Eds.), Language Typology: A Functional
533 Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 77-138.

534 Caffarel, A., 2006. A Systemic Functional Grammar of French: From Grammar to
535 Discourse. Continuum, London.

536 Caffarel, A., Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., 2004a. Introduction: Systemic
537 functional typology. In: Caffarel, A., Martin, J. R. and Matthiessen, C. M. I. M.
538 (Eds.), Language Typology: A Functional Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam,
539 pp. 1-76.

540 Caffarel, A., Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., 2004b. Language Typology: A
541 Functional Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam.

542 Cann, R., Kempson, R., Marten, L., 2005. The dynamics of language. Elsevier, Oxford.

543 Cloran, C. 2010. Rhetorical unit analysis and Bakhtin's chronotope. Functions of
544 Language 17 (1): 9-70. https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.17.1.02clo

545 Daneš, F., 1974. Functional Sentence Perspective and the Organisation of the Text.
546 In: Daneš, F. (Ed.), Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective, Mouton, The
547 Hague, pp. 106-128.

548 Fang, Y., McDonald, E., Cheng, M., 1995. Subject and Theme in Chinese: A systemic
549 functional account. In: Hasan, R., Fries, P. (Eds.), Subject and Theme: A
550 Discourse Functional Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 235-273.

551 Firbas, J., 1971. On the concept of Communicative Dynamism in the theory of
552 Functional Sentence Perspective. Sbornik prací filosofické fakulti brnenské
553 univerzity 19 (71), 135-144.

554 Fries, C., 1945. Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language. University of
555 Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI.

Figueredo, G., 2020. Axial argumentation and cryptogrammar in textual grammar: THEME in Brazilian Portuguese. In: Martin, J.R., Doran Y., Figueredo, G. (Eds.), Systemic Functional Language Description: Making Meaning Matter. Routledge, London, pp. 129-161.

Ghadessy, M. 1999. Text and Context in Functional Linguistics. Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Gregory, M. 2002. Relations and Functions within and around Language: The Systemic Functional Tradition. In: Fries, P. H., et al. (Eds.), Relations and Functions within and around language. Continuum, London, pp. 13-31.

Halliday, M. A. K., 1978. Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning. Edward Arnold, London.

Halliday, M. A. K., 1985. An introduction to functional grammar. Edward Arnold, London.

Halliday, M. A. K., 1989. Spoken and written language. Oxford University Press, Oxford. Second edition.

Halliday, M. A. K., 1993. Language and the order of nature. In: Halliday, M. A. K., Martin, J. R. (Eds.), Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power. The Falmer Press, London, pp. 106-123.

Halliday, M. A. K., 1996. On grammar and grammatics. In: Hasan, R., Cloran, C., Butt, D. G. (Eds.), Functional Descriptions: Theory in Practice. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 1-38. Reprinted in Halliday, M. A. K., 2002. Volume 1 in the Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday: On Grammar. Continuum, London, pp. 384-417.

Halliday, M. A. K., 2009. Methods – techniques – problems. In: Halliday, M. A. K., Webster, J. (Eds.), Continuum Companion to Systemic Functional Linguistics. Continuum, London, pp. 59-86.

Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R., 1976. Cohesion in English. Routledge, London and New York.

Halliday, M. A. K., McDonald, E., 2004. Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Chinese. In: Caffarel, A., Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (Eds.), Language Typology: A Functional Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 305-396.

588 Halliday, M. A. K., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., 2004. An Introduction to Functional
589 Grammar. Third edition. Arnold, London.

590 Halliday, M. A. K., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. 2014. Halliday's introduction to functional
591 grammar. Fourth edition. Routledge, Abingdon, New York.

592 Hasan, R. 1981. What's going on: A Dynamic View of Context. In: Copeland, J. E.,
593 Davis, P. W. (Eds.), The Seventh LACUS Forum 1980. Columbia, S.C.:
594 Hornbeam Press, pp. 106-121.

595 Jakobson, R., Halle, M., 1956. Fundamentals of Language. Mouton, The Hague.

596 Kashyap, A. K., 2019. Language typology. In: Thomson, G., et al., D. (Eds.), The
597 Cambridge Handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics. Cambridge
598 University Press, Cambridge, pp. 766-791.

599 Kashyap, A. K., Forthcoming. A Functional Grammar of Bajiika: A Systemic Functional
600 Perspective. Brill, Leiden.

601 Kempson, R., Meyer-Viol, W., Gabbay, D., 2001. Dynamic Syntax. Blackwell, Oxford.

602 Kim, M., 2007. A Discourse Based Study on Theme in Korean and Textual Meaning
603 in Translation. PhD Dissertation, Macquarie University.

604 Lado, R., 1957. Linguistics across Cultures. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor,
605 MI.

606 Langacker, R. 2001. Dynamicity in Grammar. Axiomathes 12: 7-33.
607 https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012701031022

608 Lavid, J., Arús-Hita, J., Zamorano, J. R., 2010. Systemic Functional Description of
609 Spanish. A Contrastive Study with English. Continuum, London.

610 Lemke, J., 1984. Semiotics and Education. Monographs, Working Papers and
611 Prepublications 2. Toronto Semiotic Circle, Toronto.

612 Lemke, J., 2015. Feeling and meaning: A unitary bio-semiotic account. In: Trifonas,
613 P. (Ed.), International Handbook of Semiotics. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 589-
614 616.

615 Li, E. S., 2007. A Systemic Functional Grammar of Chinese. Continuum, London.

616 Manfredi, M. 2011. Systemic Functional Linguistics as a tool for translation teaching:
617 towards a meaningful practice. Rivista internazionale di tecnica della

618 traduzione = International Journal of Translation 13, 49-62.
619 http://hdl.handle.net/10077/9176

620 Martin, J. R. 1985. Process and text: Two aspects of human semiosis. In: Benson, J.
621 D., Greaves, W. S. (Eds.), Systemic Perspectives on Discourse, vol. 1. Ablex,
622 Norwood, Ablex, NJ, pp. 248-274.

623 Martin, J. R., 1992. English Text: System and Structure. Benjamins, Amsterdam.

624 Martin, J. R., 2004. Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Tagalog. In: Caffarel, A.,
625 Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (Eds.), Language Typology: A Functional
626 Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 255-304.

627 Martin, J. R., Doran, Y., Figueredo, G., 2020. Systemic Functional Language
628 Description: Making Meaning Matter. Routledge, London.

629 Martin, J.R., Rose, D. 2008. Genre Relations: Mapping Culture. Equinox, London and
630 Oakville, CT.

631 Mathesius, V., 1911. O potenciálnosti jevů jazykových [On the potentiality of the
632 phenomena of language]. Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk, 1911-12,
633 třída filozoficko-historicko-jazykozpytná, č. 2, únor 1911: 1-24. English
634 translation in: Vachek, J. (Ed.), A Prague School Reader in Linguistics, Indiana
635 University Press, Bloomington, pp. 1-32.

636 Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., 1995. Lexicogrammatical Cartography: English Systems.
637 International Language Sciences Publishers, Tokyo.

638 Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., 2004. Descriptive motives and generalizations. In: Caffarel,
639 A., Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (Eds.), Language Typology: A
640 Functional Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 537-673.

641 Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., 2007. The ‘architecture’ of language according to systemic
642 functional theory: Developments since the 1970s. In: Hasan, R., Matthiessen,
643 C. M. I. M., Webster, J. J. (Eds.), Continuing Discourse on Language: A
644 Functional Perspective, Vol. II. Equinox, London, pp. 505-562.

645 Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., Teruya, K., Lam, M., 2010. Key Terms in Systemic Functional
646 Linguistics. Continuum, London.

647 McGregor, W. B., in press. Neo-Firthian Approaches to Linguistic Typology. Equinox,
648 London.

649 Moyano, E., 2016. Theme in English and Spanish: different means of realization for
650 the same textual function. English Text Construction 9 (1), 190-219.
651 https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.9.1.10moy

652 Muntigl, P., 2009. Knowledge moves in conversational exchanges: Revisiting the
653 concept of primary vs. secondary knowers. Functions of Language 16, 225-
654 263. https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.16.2.03mun

655 Mwinlaaru, I. N., 2017. A Systemic Functional Description of the Grammar of
656 Dagaare, PhD Dissertation, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

657 Mwinlaaru, I. N., Xuan, W. W., 2016. A survey of studies in systemic functional
658 description and typology. Functional Linguistics 3 (8), 1-41.
659 https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-016-0030-4 (accessed 15 October 2020)

660 O'Donnell, M. 1990. A dynamic model of exchange. Word 41: 293-327.
661 https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1990.11435825

662 Painter, C. 1991 Learning through Language in Early Childhood. Continuum, London.

663 Park, K., 2013. The Experiential Grammar of Korean: A Systemic Functional
664 Perspective, PhD Dissertation, Macquarie University.

665 Prakasam, V., 2004. Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Telugu. In: Caffarel, A.,
666 Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (Eds.), Language Typology: A Functional
667 Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 433-478.

668 Rose, D., 2004. Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Pitjantjatjara. In: Caffarel,
669 A., Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (Eds.), Language Typology: A
670 Functional Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 479-537.

671 Salmon, V. 1966. Language-planning in Seventeenth-Century England: Its Context
672 and Aims. In: Bazell, C. E., et al. (Eds.), In Memory of J. R. Firth. Longman,
673 London, pp. 370-397.

674 Sinclair, J. McH., Coulthard, R. M., 1975. Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The
675 English Used by Teachers and Pupils. Oxford University Press, London.

676 Steiner, E., Ramm, W., 1995. On Theme as a grammatical notion for German.
677 Functions of Language 2 (1), 57-93. https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.2.1.04ste

678 Steiner, E., Teich, E., 2004. Metafunctional profile of the grammar of German. In:
679 Caffarel, A., Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (Eds.), Language Typology:
680 A Functional Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 139-184.

Susanto, S., 2008. Thematic structure and theme variation in the language of Javanese 'Ludruk'. In: Wu, C., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., Herke, M. (Eds.), Proceedings of ISFC 35: Voices Around the World. Sydney, 35th Organizing Committee, pp. 219-224.

Tam, H. R., 2004. A Systemic Functional Interpretation of Cantonese Clause Grammar, PhD Dissertation, University of Sydney.

Taylor, C. 1990. Aspects of language and translation: Contrastive approaches for Italian/English translators. Campanotto Editore, Udine.

Teruya, K., 2004. Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Japanese. In: Caffarel, A., Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (Eds.), Language Typology: A Functional Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 185-254.

Teruya, K., 2007. A Systemic Functional Grammar of Japanese. Continuum, London.

Thai, M. D., 2004. Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Vietnamese. In: Caffarel, A., Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (Eds.), Language Typology: A Functional Perspective. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 397-432.

Thomson, E. A., 2013. The system of THEME in Japanese. In: Thomson, E. A., Armour, W. S. (Eds.), Systemic Functional Perspectives of Japanese: Descriptions and Applications. Equinox, London, pp. 101-136.

Vasconcellos, M. L., 2009. Systemic functional translation studies (SFTS): The theory travelling in Brazilian environments. D.E.L.T.A. 25, 585-607. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-44502009000300003

Ventola, E., 1984. The Dynamics of Genre. Nottingham Linguistics Circular 13, 103-123.

Ventola, E., 1987. The Structure of Social Interaction: A Systemic Approach to the Semiotics of Service Encounters. Frances Pinter, London.

Wang, P. 2020. Axial argumentation and cryptogrammar in interpersonal grammar: A case study of Classical Tibetan MOOD. In: Martin, J. R., Doran, Y., Figueredo, G. (Eds.), Systemic Functional Language Description: Making Meaning Matter. Routledge, London, pp. 73-101.

Whitehead, A. N., 1978 (1929). Process and Reality. The Free Press, New York.

Wmffre, I. 2013. Dynamic Linguistics: Labov, Martinet, Jakobson and Other Precursors of the Dynamic Approach to Language Description. Peter Lang, Bern.

Zappavigna, M. and Martin, J. R. (2018) Discourse and Diversionary Justice: An Analysis of Youth Justice Conferencing. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zhang, D., 2020. Axial argumentation below the clause: The verbal group in Khorchin Mongolian. In: Martin, J. R., Doran, Y., Figueredo, G. (Eds.), Systemic Functional Language Description: Making Meaning Matter. Routledge, London, pp. 35-72.

Zhao, S. 2010. Intersemiotic relations as logogenetic patterns: Towards the restoration of the Time dimension in hypertext. In: Bednarek, M. and Martin, J. R. (Eds.), New Discourse on Language: Functional Perspectives on Multimodality, Identity, and Affiliation. Continuum, London and New York.