When I first studied linguistics, half a century ago, there was no discipline of “discourse analysis”. Linguists typically investigated phonology and morphology, or, less often, syntax. They might make use of texts – written texts – as sources for their examples; but a text was not an object of study in its own right. If a text happened to be the only source for finding out about a particular language, in the way that the Chinese version of the Secret History of the Mongols was for the earliest phases of modern Mandarin, it might be analysed in considerable detail as I did in my doctoral thesis (Halliday 1959); but even here the aim was to describe the system of the language, not to elucidate the text. J. R. Firth was unusual among linguists in regarding “typical texts . . . in . . . contexts of situation” as a proper domain for linguists to study (Firth 1968: 13). In general, analysing text was a literary preoccupation, and it figured as an activity within linguistics only where the two disciplines could merge, as in the work of certain scholars of the Prague school.

Any discursive tendencies that linguists might have shown were suppressed by Chomsky, with his insistence on treating language as a formal system and his consequent contempt for data. So when discourse analysis was taken up as an academic pursuit, it tended to be divorced from linguistic theory; and the myth was perpetuated that “linguists have no interest in discourse”. Those who studied discourse were not, for the most part, grammarians or phonologists; Conversational Analysis, for example, pays little attention either to grammar or to rhythm and

intonation. And undeniably, one can gain much insight into a text from many angles without analysing it in grammatical or phonological terms.

But many linguists do, in fact, engage with discourse; and the linguistic analysis of text is an essential component in its overall interpretation. After all, a text is made of language; it gets its meaning, and its value, from being an instance of some linguistic system. More specifically, a text is made of lexicogrammar: it comes to us in the form of wording. But the relation of discourse to lexicogrammar, and of discourse organization to lexicogrammatical organization, is highly complex. It involves three distinct vectors: part to whole, form to meaning, instance to system. Grammar creates structure up to the clause complex (the written sentence); texts tend to be more inclusive (e.g., a conversation, a speech, a book). Text is organized as semantic structure: what we call "a text" is really a unit of meaning. And, as noted above, a text is an instance, whose properties derive from a system, the total "meaning potential" that the lexicogrammar makes possible. All these vectors are implicated when we produce and understand a piece of discourse.

In this paper I want to consider just three aspects of this complex relation of discourse to lexicogrammar (which I shall usually refer to simply as "grammar" for short):

(1) How are grammatical units organized internally such that they form "parts" of a textual "whole"?

(2) How does the grammar set up semantic relations that create unity in a text?

(3) Do the logical-semantic relations that link grammatical units also figure in relating one phase of a text to another?

I have not tried to be comprehensive; my aim has been rather to illustrate the general principles, and to suggest how a grammarian may approach the analysis of discourse.

1 The "textual" organization of the clause

I myself became aware of this problem when investigating spoken language. I have always been particularly interested in spoken language, and also I had had to teach spoken language to foreign language students: first teaching Chinese to speakers of English, and later on teaching English to speakers of Chinese. In the course of this experience I had become aware that there were certain resources in the grammar, both in Chinese and in English, which were specifically "textual" in function:
that is, they were resources for organizing the discourse as continuous flow, maintaining coherence with whatever had gone before.

For example, I wanted to explain to English-speaking students of Chinese when to say xihao yifu 洗好衣服 and when to say ba yifu xihao 把衣服洗好; when to say wo xi yifu 我洗衣服 and when to say yifu shi wo xi-de 衣服是我洗的; xi yifu-de shi wo 洗衣服的是我, wo xi-de shi yifu 我洗的是衣服; and so on. Clearly these options had something to do with the flow of the discourse: the clause was being organized as a message, based on a distinction between what is being presented as news to the listener and what the listener is being presumed to know already — between the Given and the New. At any given point in a dialogue, there seemed to be some sort of balance, a kind of oscillation between these two poles; and the most “newsworthy” item was given some kind of prominence — either it was put last in the clause, or it was predicated (introduced by shi 是), or both. Y. R. Chao brought to our notice, in his Mandarin Primer (1948), the contrast between ta zhu zai Beiping 他住在北平 and ta zai Beiping zhu 他在北平住, explaining it as a difference in what the speaker wanted most importantly to convey.

From this point of view it became clear that the ba construction, which at first seemed quite mysterious, was a device for getting the verb to the end of the clause, so that it would carry prominence as new information. Otherwise, if there are two participants (nominal elements) in the clause, unless one uses ba the verb cannot come in final position. English has the same problem, but solves it by means of phrasal verbs. Compare they expelled the leader and they threw the leader out: when these are spoken naturally, in the former the leader is New, whereas in the latter threw . . . out is New (Halliday 1985, 1992). Clearly it is the speaker who decides what to treat as Given and what to treat as New; but he does this (unconsciously, of course) in the light of all that has been said before.

Wang Li 王力 (1946–47: 164) called the ba 把 construction chuzhishi 處置式, which he translated into English as “execution form”; and in my early writings on Chinese grammar I labelled it the “ergative voice”, on the grounds that it was “singling out the verbal element as new by opposition to all nominal elements” (Halliday 1956: (= 1976: 44); cf. 1959:56, 80 (and n.1)). The Swiss grammarian Henri Frei independently called the ba construction “ergative” (Frei 1956–57). I included both the ba 把 construction and all the other variants mentioned above (yifu shi wo xi-de 衣服是我洗的 and so on) in the Chinese system of “voice”. In doing so, I was treating “voice” as a system which organizes the flow of discourse. The problem with the category of voice as
described by classical European grammarians is that, because it always involved changes in the form of the verb (active/passive, as in Greek and Latin), it was seen as a verbal system; whereas in fact it is a system of the clause, and it may or may not be accompanied by changes in verbal morphology. In Chinese, obviously, the verb does not undergo any change; but there is still a fully grammaticized system of voice. What is common to all voice systems is that they are resources for assigning variable status in the discourse to participants, and other elements, within the clause. In other words, they allow the speaker to control the information flow.

Thus the passive, in English, enables the Actor to be presumed (e.g. *these clothes have been washed*); or, alternatively, to be placed in a position of prominence, at the end of the clause (*these clothes were washed by your mother*). The particular options in the Chinese system are not, of course, identical with those in English; but the semantic space construed by the two systems is the same. The one term in the Chinese system that most resembles a typical Indo-European passive is that with bei 被; so the bei 被 construction was at first the only one in Chinese that was recognized by most Western grammarians as being a category of voice. But the variation in both Chinese and European languages is governed by the same principle: that of arranging the elements of the clause in all possible ways in relation to the context of the discourse — the context as the speaker inherits it, and as he wants to shape it afresh in his turn.

Reordering the elements of the clause is not the only way of varying their status in the discourse flow. Both in Chinese and in English the positional prominence is complemented by phonological prominence (pitch movement and stress), and may in fact be overridden by it. This happens in Chinese with bei 被 or gei 給, as in zhe yifu gei ni muqin xihaole 這衣服給你母親洗好了, where phonological prominence is assigned to ni muqin 你母親, thus overriding the positional prominence of xihaole 洗好了. Note that there is no way in Chinese of getting the Actor in final position other than xi zhexie yifu-de shi ni muqin 洗這些衣服的是你母親; but this adds another semantic feature — the construction X-de shi Y X 的是 Y identifies Y exclusively as 'the one(s) who X', and the speaker may not want this particular nuance of meaning. Similarly in English we can say *your mother washed these clothes*, with phonological prominence on *your mother*. Both languages make use of this phonological device, in their own different ways, to get around the constraints imposed by the grammar on the order in which the elements occur. This does not mean that certain orderings are impossible — that seldom happens! What it means is that other orderings carry other meanings, and these may not correspond to what the speaker wants to say.
Among these other meanings are some that are also textual: other choices in the organization of the discourse, independent of the Given and the New. Thus, both in Chinese and in English there is choice in the order of elements not only in the final part of the clause but also at the beginning. Let us say, for example, that *your mother*/*ni muqin* is in a position of prominence, either at the end of the clause or following *shi*/*be*; and let us hold her constant in that position. We still have a choice with regard to what comes first: in Chinese, either *zhe yifu* or *xi* (zhe yifu shi ni muqin xi-de, xi zhe yifu-de shi ni muqin), in English either *these clothes* or *wash* (these clothes your mother washed/were washed by your mother, the one who washed these clothes was your mother). I had not explored this feature in my work on Chinese; but in analysing spoken English I found it essential to account for the speaker’s choice of what to put first in the clause. It was clearly a meaningful choice; and it seemed to belong to the same general domain, the organizing of the discourse flow. But whereas the prominence associated with clause-final position, and with predication by the verb *be*, directed the listener’s attention to what was newsworthy — new, or unexpected, in the discursive context, or at least constructed this way by the speaker — the significance of initial position was a prominence of a different kind. When I had looked at this in Chinese, trying to teach my students how to start off a Chinese clause, I had thought it was simply the ‘Given’ part of the Given + New configuration. But that did not seem to explain things very well; for one thing, the *shi...de...* constructions are reversible — one can have both *zhe sanjian yifu shi wo xi-de* 這三件衣服是我洗的 and *wo xi-de shi zhe sanjian yifu* 我洗的是這三件衣服. When I investigated a quantity of spoken texts in English, while investigating English intonation in 1958–63, I found that, in order to explain the choice of word order in English one had to postulate that there was another system at work: a system of Theme whereby the speaker selected some element in the clause as the point of departure for the message, realizing this selection by putting this element first. This accounted for the difference, in English, between *your mother* washed *these clothes* and *these clothes* were washed by *your mother*, in both, *your mother* is New, but in the first of the two she is also thematic, whereas in the second example *these clothes* is selected as the Theme. At the time, I was unaware of the work of the Prague school linguists in this area; I later found that they had explored it very fully in a number of languages, English being one.

I was not sure whether there was any comparable system of Theme in Chinese — or whether, even if there was, the function of Theme was
necessarily realized by first position in the clause. This problem was addressed by Fang Yan 方玲. When Fang Yan was in Sydney she analysed various texts in Chinese from this point of view, including some spoken xiangsheng 相聲 texts (of which I still have a copy!); and she found that Chinese does make use of initial position in the clause in a way that is quite similar to English. This is not very surprising, because Chinese and English are quite similar in the range of functions for which they use word order (that is, in the differences in meaning that are realized by different arrangements of the elements in the structure of the clause). So Fang Yan identified this initial element as Theme (Fang 1993, 1995); and she has also co-authored a paper with Edward McDonald and Cheng Musheng 程慕勝 (Fang et al. 1995), entitled “On theme in Chinese: from clause to discourse”. Let me draw attention particularly to the second half of that title.

In what way is the speaker's choice of Theme relevant to the unfolding of the discourse? We have seen that, in the case of Given + New, the listener-oriented prominence of the New has an important — if fairly local — discourse function. This becomes apparent, for example, in dialogue, where it provides a major resource for steering the topic of conversation. Given + New can be interpreted as a kind of question-and-answer framework: the New is giving the answer in response to a particular question. So zhexie yifu shi ni muqin xi-de 這些衣服是你母親洗的 implies the question shi shei xi-de ?; these clothes were washed by your mother implies the question “who washed these clothes?”. I am not suggesting that this is the answer that would have been given if such a question had actually been asked; if it had been, the answer would have been much more likely to be elliptical, e.g. Your mother. What the speaker is doing, in assigning the Given + New structure, is setting up the message as the answer to an unspoken question. The remainder, the Given part, is what is presumed to be “in the air” already; in this case, the listener is presumed to know that the discourse is about clothes and their getting washed. But the Theme + Rheme structure is very different in meaning. The Theme is a kind of prominence construed from the point of view of the speaker — it is the element the speaker chooses as the foundation on which to construct a message; and it would seem at first sight to have little significance beyond the particular clause in which it occurs. It is true that the Theme is, very often, selected by the speaker from within the Given part of the Given + New configuration; but in that case its discursive significance might be simply because it is Given, not because it is Theme. However, it is not always selected from within the portion that is Given; sometimes the Theme is...
also presented as New. So the question that arises is: has the clausal Theme got any function in the wider context of the discourse?

A number of years ago Peter Fries showed that, in written English, the choice of Theme in the clause played a very significant discursive role (Fries 1981). The elements chosen as clausal Theme throughout the course of a text were not, in fact, a random selection of items which varied clause by clause; rather, they displayed a considerable regularity of patterning. The particular kind of pattern formed by the progression of the Themes depended, as František Danes had predicted some time earlier (1974), on the register, or functional variety, of the text: narrative, for example, tended to display a different kind of thematic organization from that of expository discourse. In some registers, there would be a certain motif, or set of motifs, which would figure most of the time as clausal Theme; while other motifs, although equally common in the text, would only seldom be given thematic status. This suggested that the Theme in this technical grammatical sense, as an element in the structure of the clause, was related to "theme" in its meaning as the topic or concern of the text as a whole. To take a simple example, in a short biographical text, which is a life history of a particular individual such as one finds on the back cover of a book introducing the author, the majority of clause Themes are likely to be either the individual in question (by name, or referred to by a pronoun) or some expression of location in time.

In the more than 15 years since Fries' original paper there has been a great deal of further work on thematic systems in grammar, both in English and in various other languages. Fries himself showed that the patterning of the non-thematic portion of the clause, particularly in combination with the New (the "N-Rheme", as he labelled it), was also highly relevant to the progression of the discourse. In subsequent studies he has explored the relationship between the selection of Theme and the goals of different types of text; and he has demonstrated that the type of thematic patterning will vary, not only among different registers, but also at different stages in the unfolding of a single text, in ways that closely relate to its functional context (Fries 1992, 1994, 1995). Martin (1992), extended the grammatical notion of Theme to encompass larger units than the clause. Martin's "hyper-Theme" and "macro-Theme" relate to the structure of the paragraph and beyond; he proposes that, analogous to the Theme of a clause, there is a hyper-Theme of the paragraph and a macro-Theme of the text (1992: 437). This provides the essential bridge between the "micro" grammar of the clause and the "macro" semantics of the text. Matthiessen (1995a) showed how the continuity of clausal
Themes throughout a text was the primary resource for organizing the text's ideational content — for enabling the text to function in the construction of knowledge. And in the paper I referred to earlier Fang et al. have established in Chinese a principle of thematic organization linking the clause to the clause complex, and begun to explore how the Themes that appear in these grammatical environments maintain a systematic progression through the discourse.

Thus the grammatical systems that organize the flow of discourse at the “micro” level — the thematic (Theme + Rheme) system and the information (Given + New) system within the textual component of the grammar — do play a significant part in organizing the discourse as a whole. On the one hand, they are powerful resources for the creation of local meaning; on the other hand, they have at the same time a global significance for the semantic unfolding of the text. If we look at discourse “from below”, as it were (that is, from the perspective of the lexicogrammar), it appears as the product of the interaction between Theme + Rheme and Given + New. In this connection it is interesting to note what Kress and van Leeuwen say about “Given and New” in relation to semiotic systems other than language (Kress and van Leeuwen 1995:186—92). They find that the construction of Given + New is one of the fundamental parameters of the organization of visual images, and in this way is central to the production and comprehension of all forms of pictorial art.

2 The creation of semantic unity within a text

Whereas the thematic and information systems are realized through structural configurations in the grammar (Theme + Rheme, Given + New), there are other systems in the “textual” domain which are also realized by the grammar although not by structural means. These are the various systems of “cohesion”.

An account of such systems in English was given by Ruqaiya Hasan and myself in our book Cohesion in English (1976). These systems fall into four general categories: reference (tracking participants or other semantic elements), substitution/ellipsis (retrieving items of wording), conjunction (building up logical-semantic sequences) and lexical cohesion (by repetition, synonymy, hyponymy, etc.). Systems of cohesion in Chinese were first identified and described by Hu Zhuanglin 胡壯麟 (1981). The categories of cohesion in English and other languages have been widely discussed in educational and other contexts, and I shall not try to summarize them here. My aim is just to give a brief illustration
of their function in creating discourse. For the present purpose I shall confine myself to the systems of reference and conjunction.

All discourse depends on the ability of language to refer: to construe categories of human experience – things, events and so on – and to keep track of them as the discourse proceeds. Since things, or “entities” (people, animals, objects), are on the whole more stable than phenomena of other kinds, most types of discourse depend heavily on tracking certain particular entities through the text, making it clear that the same persons and objects are still around. Every language has resources for doing this; for example, in Chinese, pronouns such as ta, tamen, demonstratives zhe, na 這, 那, as well as items that are semantically more complex like geng 更 (geng da 更大 implies some earlier reference to the quality da 大; compare English comparatives such as bigger). Such features serve to create discourse, because the reference has to be resolved within the text.

The cohesive device of reference is clearly related to the structural device of Given + New, since it would seem that anything previously referred to in the text must be inherently “given”. But the two concepts are not identical. Something that has been referred to before may be foregrounded when it reappears on a different occasion, being presented as unexpected or contrastive; for example, zhe yifu bushi ta xi-de 這衣服不是他洗的, where the ta is coreferential with some earlier expression (e.g. ni muqin 你母親) but is New in this particular context. The fact that something has been mentioned before does not restrict its potential in the flow of the discourse: it can still be given prominence as the New.

There is an important difference between Chinese and English at this point. In English, in almost all environments where some person or other entity is presumed from the preceding text, it will be realized by the presence of a reference item; for example, Your mother has given me these clothes. She washed them. This is connected with the way English expresses the categories of transitivity and mood, which depends on the presence and location of such items in the clause; in this case, the position of she realizes declarative mood, and the presence of them realizes “effective” in transitivity (Halliday 1985/1994). Thus these two items cannot be ellipsed. (There is ellipsis in English; but it is a “copying” device, not a referential one.) In Chinese on the other hand coreference is typically established without being signalled by any pronoun; for example, Ni muqin gei wo zhejijian yifu. Xihao le 你母親給我這幾件衣服洗好了. (This may also be called “ellipsis”; but if so it is important to point out that it means something different – that in Chinese ellipsis
is a referential device, which in English it is not; cf. Fang et al. 1995.) In formal grammars this phenomenon in Chinese is often referred to as "pro-drop" (dropping the pronoun), but this is a disgracefully anglocentric term: it implies that something that is really present (or else ought to be present!) has been dropped, or got left out. But it is English, not Chinese, which is exceptional; there are relatively few languages in which the reference item is obligatory in the way that it is in English. A clause in Chinese like xihaole 洗好了, which displays this referential ellipsis, has exactly the same cohesive power in the discourse that English she's washed them has. (Of course, the reference in such a clause might be to the context of situation; but that is true of reference in general, not a special feature of any particular wordings in either English or Chinese.)

In addition to creating cohesion by tracking participants, referential expressions also serve to maintain continuity of Theme. (Again, this is so no matter whether the reference is signalled by pronouns or by ellipsis.) Both in Chinese and in English the REFERENCE system intersects with the THEME system to produce a powerful discursive effect: that of an entity being "chained" along the text both as a participant in a range of different processes and as the point of departure for a sequence of different messages. Because such an entity is semantically complex (it is both a participant in some process and a Theme), the effect of its persistence through the discourse is especially striking.

The other cohesive system I want to mention here is that of CONJUNCTION. The conjunction system sets up logical-semantic relations between one piece of text and another: relations of equivalence, addition, alternation, adversity, comparison and contrast, cause, time, condition and concession (Halliday and Hasan 1976: ch. 5; Halliday 1985/1994 ch. 9; Martin 1992: ch. 4). This system is unique in that it operates both structurally and cohesively. Structurally, it takes the form of a grammatical relationship between clauses in a clause complex: either with one clause dependent on the other ("hypotactic") or with the two clauses having equal, mutually independent status ("paratactic"). Thus for example in English:

hypotactic: I put my coat on because I was feeling cold
paratactic: I was feeling cold, so I put my coat on.

The paratactic type is less fully grammaticized; it is in a sense intermediate between the hypotactic and the purely cohesive:

cohesive: I was feeling cold. That's why I put my coat on.
The expression *that's why* is an expression of the logical-semantic relation of "cause"; but, while it creates cohesion, it does not set up any structural relationship in the grammar.

There is the same range of conjunctive resources in Chinese: hypotactic, paratactic, and cohesive. There is an interesting contrast between the two languages in the realization of the hypotactic: in English, the dependent clause must be marked by a conjunction, whereas the dominant clause may or may not be:

hypotactic: If you're feeling cold, (then) put your coat on.

In Chinese, it is the other way round: the dominant clause must be marked by a conjunction, the dependent clause may or may not be:

hypotactic: Wo (yinwei) juede leng jiu chuanshang dayi 我(因為)覺得冷就穿上大衣。
paratactic: Wo juede leng, suoyi chuanshang dayi 我覺得冷，所以穿上大衣。

A systemic study of the clause complex in Chinese was undertaken by Ouyang Xiaoqing (Ouyang 1986). As in English, the system of conjunction in Chinese also functions cohesively (cf. Hu 1981):

cohesive: Wo juede leng. Jieguo shi, wo chuanshang dayi 我覺得冷。結果是，我穿上大衣。

In fact, both in English and in Chinese there is some difference between the grammatical categories of conjunction in the clause complex and the categories that set up non-structural, cohesive relations. But they cover more or less the same logical-semantic space. The major distinction that is made within this space is that between expansion and projection: in expansion, one term in the relationship elaborates, extends or enhances the other term; in projection, one term is quoted or reported by the other. Let us focus on the relationship of expansion. Typical logical-semantic relations within this category in both languages are: (elaborating) 'that is', 'in other words', 'for example'; (extending) 'and', 'or', 'but'; (enhancing) 'when', 'because', 'if', 'although', 'then', 'so', 'yet'. (The examples given above were of the "enhancing" type.) Now, these types of expansion turn up all over the grammar; in Chinese, for example, we find that they define the three basic types of relational process: elaborating, with shi 是, as in ta shi jiaoshou 他 是 教授 ‘he is a/the teacher’; extending, with you 有, as in ta you qiche 他 有 汽車 ‘he has a car’; enhancing, with zai 在, as in ta zai ketang 他在課堂 ‘he is—at the classroom’. But the question that concerns us here is their significance
for the construction of discourse. We have seen that, in the form of cohesion, they establish semantic links between larger components, those that are beyond the reach of grammatical structure. But will we find logical-semantic relations of this kind defining – or at least contributing to – the structure of the text as a whole?

Let me clarify this question a little further. When we are considering the relation between grammar and discourse, we will certainly find that different texts are distinguished from each other, and one part of a text is distinguished from another part of the same text, by their selection of features in the grammar. This point has been brought out by Ren Shaozeng 任紹曾 (Ren 1992). Typically we find differences in the relative frequency of terms in grammatical systems: one text, or one part of a text, may show a preponderance of certain process types in transitivity, or certain selections in modality; and if this turns out to be a regular feature characterizing a whole class of texts, where those texts also have a common context of situation, then we recognize that grammar has a role in defining discourse types, or registers. Now, the logical-semantic relations that make up the conjunction system display regularities of this kind just as other grammatical systems do: we find certain kinds of conjunction favoured in certain texts or portions of texts. So, for example, expository texts tend to contain a large number of elaborating clause nexuses, whereby the speaker (or, more often, the writer) attempts to clarify some general proposition by repeating it in different words and giving examples. In this sense the conjunction systems contribute to the characteristic properties of a text by virtue of the way they are deployed.

But this is not the question I am asking here. The question is, rather, whether the conjunctive relations which link one clause with another, and in so doing form a clause complex, also serve to link one piece of discourse with another, and in so doing form them into a text. Is there any deployment of conjunction analogous to the way the system of reference constructs a narrative by the "chaining" of participants? If we come back for a moment to conjunction as a cohesive relation, joining two passages in a text which are not related in grammatical structure: Martin has argued that a cohesive relation of conjunction should be recognized on semantic criteria alone, even when there is no actual conjunction present – no marking of any kind (Martin 1992: ch.4). This does present certain problems; in particular, it then becomes necessary to explain the difference in meaning between the marked and the unmarked variants; for example, between I felt cold. So I put on my coat. and I felt cold. I put on my coat. But Martin’s point – which is a valid
one — is that in both cases the relationship is construed in the lexico-grammar; the difference is simply that in the second case it is not authenticated by a conjunction. Thus with *I felt cold. I put on my heavy coat.* the meaning ‘therefore’ is clearly present in the wording of the two successive clauses, even though the causal relation itself is not explicitly marked.

This principle is embodied in Rhetorical Structure Theory as developed by Mann *et al.* (1992). Rhetorical Structure Theory is used to chart the progression of the argument through a paragraph or longer segment of a written text. This starts, usually, with relations between single clauses; but these relations are then extended across larger and larger portions of text, so that the text appears as a hierarchy of semantic units. The relations that are set up between pairs of units, at any rank, do not depend on any specific form of marking. Where Rhetorical Structure Theory differs from the cohesive system of conjunction, however, is that the relational categories that it invokes — such things as evidence, motivation, background, solutionhood — are set up purely on semantic grounds, without being derived from systemic features of the grammar (but see Matthiessen forthcoming). This does not mean they are invalid; but it does mean that the criteria for assigning them are not explicit, and hence the analysis tends to be rather subjective. For the same reason they do not illustrate the point that I am raising here, which is: do the logical-semantic relationships that are explicitly construed in the grammar play any part in the larger construction of discourse? This will be the topic of the final section.

### 3 Logical-semantic relations in discourse structure

We interpret the structure of grammatical units as configurations of functions. For example, in English, a clause is a configuration of Actor + Process + Goal, and also of Theme + Rheme; a nominal group is a configuration of Deictic + Numerative + Epithet + Classifier + Thing, and so on. There is an important analogy, in this respect, between grammatical units and discourse-semantic units (texts), in that they are built up on similar principles. Hasan has shown that this same notion of a functional configuration can be applied to the structure of a text (Hasan 1978, 1984, 1994). Some notion of this kind had been implicit in the work of Vladimir Propp on the Russian folk tale. What Hasan proposed was the notion of a “generic structure potential”; and she demonstrated that a register could be defined by its generic structure potential, having
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some obligatory and some optional elements, some ordering that was fixed and some that was fluid, some possibility of iterative patterns – closely analogous to structure as found in grammar. Thus the structure of the nursery tale in English could be represented (in slightly simplified form) as:

\[
[(\text{Placement})\wedge\text{InitiatingEvent}]\text{SequentEvent}[\wedge(\text{Finale})\wedge(\text{Moral})]
\]

where the element enclosed in ( ) is optional, + indicates fixed order, °fluid order, and [ ] define the limits within which the ordering may vary; the symbol ^ indicates that the element in question may be iterated (Hasan 1984: 80). Hasan has presented the generic structure potential for various other registers, such as a retail shopping encounter and a dissertation defence. And just as in identifying grammatical structures we need to have the relevant semantic information, so also “for the construction of the [generic] structure potential, we need to have sufficient contextual information” (Hasan 1994: 167). In other words, we are always interpreting linguistic structure, whether grammatical structures or discourse structures, “from above” as well as “from below”.

Now, in grammar we find two different kinds of structure, with a basic typological distinction between them. One is the configurational type, like the clause consisting of Actor + Process + Goal, where each element has a different function with respect to the whole. The other is the iterative or “tactic” type, like the clause complex made up of an indefinitely long sequence of clauses with each nexus linked by a relation of expansion or projection. It seems that the same distinction may be found between two kinds of structure in discourse.

Consider the various structures associated with narrative, such as the English nursery tale that Hasan analysed. The simplest kind of narrative is that which Martin and Rothery (1981) refer to as a “recount”, which is a series of episodes linked by the meaning ‘and’. A recount is an iterative structure; we might refer to it as an “episode complex”, where the logical-semantic relation is, and remains throughout, one of the “extending: additive” kind of expansion. When children first make narratives, this is how they typically do it. The conventional narratives of adults have a more complex structure. This can be represented configurationally, as Hasan does for the nursery tale; compare Labov and Waletsky’s (1967) analysis of narratives of personal experience:

\[
(\text{Abstract})+[(\text{Orientation})+\text{Complication}]+[\text{Evaluation}°\text{Resolution}](+\text{Coda})
\]
(I have shown this using Hasan’s notation.) These are labelled as functionally distinct constituents. But notice that most of them occur in a fixed order (and see Martin 1992: 556–9 for a critical assessment of the concept of “evaluation”); and their meaning is dependent on the order in which they occur. Thus Resolution makes no sense unless there has first been a complication to resolve; and Complication must have been preceded by something that it is a complication of. And the Orientation must come first – or at least before the narrative action starts.

It might be helpful to analyse this as an iterative structure, one that is based on the same logical-semantic relations that make up the grammatical system of conjunction. As in the recount, each segment is an expansion of something that has gone before; but the sequence is no longer constructed out of simple extension by “and”. Instead, the narrative switches to the adversative kind of extension “but” – that is the Complication; and when it comes to the Resolution, this is no longer extending but enhancing. The Resolution embodies a concessive relation “although”: the meaning is “despite the complication, matters have been resolved”. I am not suggesting that it is wrong to label the components of a narrative as a configuration of functional elements; this is one way of looking at them – just as the components of a conditional clause nexus, the ‘if . . . then’ relation, have traditionally been labelled as “protasis + apodosis”. But we may gain further insight into it if we also interpret it in terms of the logical-semantic relations of conjunction. Whereas the configurational elements that we can recognize in narrative and other discourse genres seem to have no counterpart in grammatical structure, the analysis of a text as a sequence of phases linked by types of expansion suggests that even the “macro” organization of discourse is construed along lines laid down in the grammar (cf. Martin’s concept of macro-Theme, above).

Let me recapitulate a little. One of the resources out of which speakers construct connected discourse is the system of conjunction, which establishes semantic relations between portions of a text that are not (or may not be) related by grammatical structure. These semantic relations are construed by the lexicogrammar in the form of conjunctive expressions, whose own grammatical status may be quite varied: in Chinese, as in English, they may be adverbs or adverbial groups, “prepositional” phrases, or clauses. These items themselves enter into the grammatical structure; but they do not create structure – they create cohesion. Conjunctive relations cover essentially the same semantic space as the logical-semantic relations that are construed structurally within the
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clause complex: the three types of expansion (elaborating, extending, enhancing). Same examples from Chinese are:

- [elaborating] na jiushi shuo 那就是說, huan yiju hua shuo 换一句話說, zong er yan zhi 總而言之, piru 譬如
- [extending] hai you erqi or buguo 不過, buran-de hua 不然的話
- [enhancing] tongshi 同時, zheyang yilai 這樣以來, jieguo 結果, yuanlai 原來, wulun ruhe 無論如何

When we come to consider the relations which obtain between the elements of a discourse structure, in most types of discourse we will not find these explicitly marked. But they may still be linked by the same kinds of semantic relations. Thus, a new element might elaborate on what has gone before — repeating it, clarifying it or exemplifying it; it might extend what has gone before — adding something further, or stating some alternative, adverative or reservation; or it might enhance what has gone before — in terms of time, cause and effect, condition and consequence, comparison, concession and so on. In other words, the same logical-semantic relations that are construed in the grammar, both structurally and cohesively, by the conjunction system are also available for constructing discourse: not realized by specific lexicogrammatical markers, but nevertheless construed by the progressive unfolding of the text. They are present in the broader semantic patterns created by the wording.

Not all types of discourse would display patterns of this iterative kind. Narratives, or most of what we recognize as different types of narrative, probably do; and so also does conversation (cf. Hasan 1984, 1994; Hasan (ed.) 1985; Eggins 1990; Eggins and Slade 1997). But many types of discourse are essentially configurational in their structure, like guidebooks, manuals, or advertisements for jobs. Texts of this kind could often be reordered, or set out in different ways on a printed page, without disrupting the relationship among the parts. It is not the case that texts of a given register belong clearly to one kind or the other; rather, the analysis in terms of conjunctive relations will be more revealing with some varieties of text while having little or no relevance to certain others.

It is always difficult to illustrate points of text analysis within the limits of a short paper (for obvious reasons!). But I am appending here two short specimens of Chinese text which will perhaps bring out the difference between text that is organized more configurationally and text that is organized more by relations of expansion. Text (a), Bai She Zhuan
白蛇傳 (the Legend of White Snake), is a narrative, taken from a programme of a Peking opera performance. Text (b), Deng Wanxia 鄧宛霞 (Tang Yuen-ha) and Cai Zhengren 蔡正仁, is a biography of two of the leading performers, taken from the same source. By and large, my analysis would work also with the English translations; but it is the Chinese original that I am considering here.

Text (a), the narrative, has an Initiating Event, the encounter and subsequent marriage of Bai Suzhen and Xu Xian (lines 1–5). This is followed by three rounds of Complication + Resolution:

1. Fahai plots and brings about Xu Xian’s death (lines 5–8); Bai brings Xu Xian back to life (lines 8–9);
2. Fahai captures Xu Xian and refuses to release him (lines 9–12); Bai Suzhen enlists help and Xu Xian escapes (lines 12–16);
3. Xiaoqing is angry with Xu Xian and tries to kill him (lines 16–17); Bai restrains her and effects a reconciliation (lines 17–19).

There is no separate constituent of Evaluation; but there is a positive appraisal in the final clause nexus of the last Resolution (‘the three of them become reconciled and are once again united’, where hehao ru chu and tuanyuan 团圆 both carry the semantic feature ‘desirable’). We can identify the logical-semantic relations whereby this text is organized:

(a) between Initiating Event and Complication (1) extending: adversative
(b) between Complication and Resolution enhancing: concessive
(c) between one Complication and the next enhancing: temporal

Text (b), on the other hand, which is biographic, displays a more configurational type of structure. Let us consider just the first of the two biographies, that of Deng Wanxia (Tang Yuen-ha). This has three fairly distinct elements in its structure, which we might call Recognition, Qualification and Position. The Recognition consists of two parts, the awards and honours she has received (lines 1–2, and also lines 7–8), and the stars who have taught her and praised her work (lines 3–5). The Qualification gives details of the roles she has taken and her achievements in these roles (lines 6–7). The Position is an account of her present responsibilities (lines 9–11). These three elements are not logically related, and their function does not depend on the sequence in which they occur: they could appear in any order and the overall configuration would be unaffected. Much the same pattern recurs with the second biography below.
I am not suggesting that texts of every kind exclusively favour one or other of these two modes of structure. What we recognize as discourse will typically embody some features that can best be interpreted as configurations and some that can be explained as types of expansion — as envisaged in Hasan’s (1984) concept of “generic structure potential”. Much of the discourse that we encounter in the course of our lives is a mixture of patterns, some larger some smaller, some clearly visible on the surface and some more subtle and obscure. My concern is just to point out that the logical-semantic relations which are systemic in the lexico-grammar, and appear in a discursive form as relations of cohesion, also appear figure on a more “macro” scale in the generic organization of texts. Again, I do not want to press the analogy between grammatical structure and discourse-semantic structure too far. But I think that, in our experience, modelling semantic patterns in terms of the theoretical concepts developed in lexicogrammar, while it has its dangers, is on the whole more fruitful than sidelining the grammar and setting up semantic categories solely on the basis of some rather vague appeal to meaning. This has been, as I argued at the beginning, a problem with discourse studies in general: they have tended to be pursued without reference to the study of the other strata of language. What Hasan, Martin, Matthiesen, Fries and others have done is to draw attention to those aspects of the grammar which provide a point of entry to theorizing about discourse in explicit linguistic terms. There is a very good opportunity in Chinese linguistic studies for maintaining a close association between theory of grammar and theory of discourse, such that each contributes significantly to the other; and at the same time for exploring the differences, and the similarities, between discourse patterns in Chinese and in other languages.