

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
CREATIVE RESEARCH AND STUDIES**

www.ijcrs.org

ISSN-0249-4655

**A Cross-Theoretic Study of Systemic Functional Grammar in
English and Arabic****Prof. Dr. Fareed Hameed Al-Hindawi (Ph.D.)**

Dept. of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, Babylon University

Asst: Lecturer Hani Kamel Al-EbadiDept. of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, Thiqr University

Abstract

The theory of Systemic Functional Grammar represents a functional perspective of analyzing and describing language. In the Hallidayan tradition, it is believed that language forms are shaped by interactants' functional uses of these forms. However, it seems that this kind of grammar is not handled by Western scholars only. Eastern scholars, represented by Arabs, here, have also had their attempts to deal with it and form their theoretic version. This study sets itself the task of finding out how close or different the two views are. This involves investigating the emergence and development of this theory in both contexts. Accordingly, the roots of the two theories are traced and their characteristics are pointed out. Moreover, in relation to the functional views in question, the functional nature of the systems of the two languages is investigated. Then, a cross-theoretic contrast is conducted to find out the similarities and differences between the two theories and the two languages in relation to the issues in question. The findings of the contrastive analysis conducted vindicate the hypotheses introduced by this work.

Key Words: Systemic Functional Grammar, Ideational, Interpersonal, Textual, Constatives, Performatives

1. Introduction

Functional approaches influence describing language and relating its structural units to the social contexts of the speech event. Such approaches emphasize the functions that interactants intend to exchange. In Halliday's words (1994: xv) "language is a resource that is mainly shaped by the uses that interactants make of it; it therefore targets to explain the forms of language in terms of the meanings that they express, and to develop a grammar which is designed to make it possible to say sensible and useful things about any text, spoken or written". As far as grammar is concerned, considerable efforts have been spent to remodeling grammar in terms of function rather than structure. In this regard, Systemic Functional Grammar stands for the recent updated version of this functional theorizing. According to it, language works in systems of relations integrating with each other to produce functional grammatical structures at different meta-functions. It seems

that the Western version of this kind of theory is not the only one as Arab scholars have had their attempts to introduce such a kind of it long time before Halliday's (1970) theory. This prompts this work to conduct a cross-theoretic study between the two versions in order to investigate how close or different the two theories are, their characteristics in addition to the functional nature of the systems of the two languages. Hence, the study aims at finding out the similarities and differences between the two theories and the two languages in relation to the issues in question. The study hypothesizes that: (a) Systemic Functional Grammar has its roots in Arabic earlier than in English, (b) both theories exhibit similarities and differences, and (c) English and Arabic languages are more similar than different in their main systems at the different meta-functions. So as to fulfill the aims of the study and test its hypotheses, a cross-theoretic contrast is conducted.

2. Systemic Functional Grammar in English

2.1 Historical Background

Historically, functional grammar theory goes across three periods. Halliday introduced the first version of this theory in his dissertation in 1955 and gave it the title 'Grammatical Categories in Modern Chinese'. In this version, he presents a tenacious theoretical framework that tackles relations among linguistic units methodically (Nahla, 2001: 177). Then, functional grammar has come to be known as 'Grammar of Case and Category'. It was initiated in 1961 when Halliday published his paper 'Categories of the Theory of Grammar'. This version of the theory aims at simplifying the basics of the theory toward a general theory of language and how it works. Another supportive paper was published in 1964 and was titled 'The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching'. From 1964 to the end of the 1970s, a significant development of the theory was taking place which results in a more mature vision of the theory which became to be known as 'Systemic Functional Grammar' (ibid.) (henceforth SFG).

2.2 English Grammar as a System

Halliday sees grammar as a wide network of systems of relations among signs in which these systems are ordered hierarchically and simultaneously at the syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes. The syntagmatic axis take over relations of chain among signs whereas the paradigmatic one captures opposing relations (Eggins, 2004: 190). A prominent property of the system is the choice of an element among options at hand. The process of selecting an element in a system is not a haphazard matter. Rather, it relies on interaction and overlapping among various systems at several ranks. Mainly, it works on a point of origin, a network of systems functions within a rank of a particular unit, and an entry condition that is a particular system of relations in which certain choices contrast with each other in order to pick out only one of them as the best option in a certain context excluding the others (ibid., 2004: 190; Nahla, 2001: 194). For example, the personal pronoun system involves a network of relational systems covering person, number and gender which integrate together to pick out the final candidate. The delicacy of this system in English start with the entry condition 'person'. According to this entry, there are three options are at hand: first person, second person and third person pronouns. When one of these options is chosen, the other two are excluded. A further step of delicacy entails the choice among these options according to another entry condition 'number'. Accordingly, each option has two further ones: singular and plural. Again when one of the options is chosen, the other will be excluded. Finally, delicacy becomes more complex because choice must be made among options of third person pronoun since it has three options according to gender: masculine, feminine and neuter.

2.3 Ideational Metafunction in English

According to SFG, the ideational metafunction, as Halliday and Hasan (1985: 32) and Simpson (1993: 88) state, expresses ideas. Graber (2001: 14) points out that the ideational metafunction encompasses experiential meanings and logical meanings which are related to 'content' talking about the world as speakers recognize, suppose or imagine it. Experiential meanings covers two levels: clause and discourse while logical meanings systematize relations across clauses (Halliday, 1994: 102; Teich, 1999: 15).

2.3.1 Experiential Meaning

The system of transmitting experiential meaning is known as transitivity which consists of process, participants and circumstances. Six processes are realized including material, mental, relational, behavioural, verbal and existential which are realized by verbal groups (Halliday, 1994: 111; Reed 1997, 69; Eggins, 2004: 216; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014: 105).

2.3.1.1 Process Type

1. Material Processes

These are processes of expressing that an entity perform an action towards another one. Such type of processes is not limited to concrete ones, but also covers abstract events and happenings (Halliday, 1994: 111). For instance:

1. They did the transfusion. (Eggins, 2004: 219)

2. Mental Processes

This subsystem expresses meanings of thinking or feeling indicated by three kinds of verbs: cognition including verbs of thinking, knowing, understanding, affection covering verbs of liking, fearing and perception involving verbs of seeing, hearing, as in the following example (Halliday, 1994: 117):

2. I saw the operation taking place.

3. Behavioural Processes

Halliday (ibid.: 139) states that this subsystem articulates physiological and psychological behaviours such as 'breathing, coughing, dreaming'. The below example illustrates:

3. John sniffed the broth.

4. Verbal Processes

Clauses of 'saying' as well as their synonyms, symbolic interactions of meaning are known as verbal processes" (ibid.), as in:

4. He praised her to her family.

5. Relational Processes

Relational processes has two options: attributive and identifying which in turn are subclassified into three options covering intensive, circumstantial and possessive (ibid.: 203, 242, 246) as in:

5. Susan is a talkative girl. (intensive process)
6. The bomb is in her room. (circumstantial process)
7. This is hers. (possessive process)

6. Existential Processes

Existentials indicate that something exists or happens. It is indicated by 'there' or 'be' such as 'exist, arise or occur' as in the following example (Eggins, 2004: 238):

8. There was snow (existent) on the ground (circumstance: location).

2.3.1.2 Participant System

The participant system in English integrates with the process type in the transitivity system. The selection of a certain participant relies on the semantic properties of that participant in relation to the main verb involved the process. Accordingly, each process type requires specific participants. For example, material processes may have at least one of the four participants: 'Actor, Goal, Range and Beneficiary' (ibid., 2004: 216) as in example (1). Mental processes have two obligatory participants: 'Senser and Phenomenon' as in (2). The former is a conscious one while the latter is an inanimate one. Behavioural processes have two participants: 'Behavior' who is obligatory and 'Behaviour' expressing a restatement of the process as in (3). Verbal processes have four participants including 'Sayer, Receiver, Verbiage and Target' as in (4). Relational processes have two options

according to the subtype of the process. attributive processes have two participants: 'Carrier and Attributive' while identifying ones involve the participants 'Token and Value' (Halliday, 1994: 203, 242-6) as in (5,6,7). Finally, existentials require two participants: There which has an interpersonal role rather than a transitivity one and the second is 'Extent' (Eggins, 2004: 238) as in (8).

2.3.1.3 Circumstantial System

In addition to the participants, processes may also be associated with the system of circumstantials. This system is typically recognized by adverbials, prepositional and participial phrases. The system of circumstance includes seven terms: extent, accompaniment, location, matter, manner, role and cause. These options cannot perform other roles of participant system (Graber, 2001: 16).

2.3.2 Logical Meaning

Logical meaning is the second component of the ideational metafunction which refers to the logical structure of the clause complex; a series of clauses bound together by a diversity of logical relations. As a system, it involves two subsystems: the tactic and logico-semantic (Eggins, 2004: 254).

1. Tactic

The tactic system portrays the kind of interdependency connection between clauses correlated into a clause complex. Two subsystems form taxis: parataxis and hypotaxis. The former expresses relations of coordination and is expressed by coordinators such as 'and, or, so, yet, neither. . . nor, either...or' while the latter reflects subordinating relations between clauses. The common particles of this system include 'if, while, became, when', as in the below examples (ibid.: 255):

1. He saw the back of me and I saw a glimpse of a shadow. (parataxis)
2. I was shot in the back while walking home one dry moonless night in 1968. (hypotaxis)

2. Logico-Semantic System

The second system of the lexical meaning is the one that deals with the specific kind of meaning relationship between joined clauses. It offers two options: projection and expansion. In English, projection clauses indicate relations of quoting and reporting; locution or what is projected and an idea or what is thought. They are the options of this system. Other types of relations among clauses are expressed within logico-semantic system by means of the expansion system. Expansions consist of three main options: elaboration which is done by exposition, exemplification and clarification, extension which has two subsystems including addition and variation, and enhancement which refers to cases when one clause enhances the meaning of another by qualifying it by reference to time, space, manner, cause or condition (Eggins, 2004: 271, 279, 282).

2.4 Interpersonal Metafunction in English

Halliday (1978: 128) recognizes the second metafunction of language as interpersonal. Text is seen as an exchange that takes place between interactants (Bazzi, 2009: 83). According to SFG, mood and modality are the main components of the interpersonal metafunctions in English (Graber, 2001: 25). Halliday and Matthiessen (2014: 97) state that mood provides the resources for enacting speech functions (speech acts) through the grammar of the clause: statements (giving information), questions(demanding information), offers (giving goods-&-services), and commands (demanding goods-&-services). The different types of Mood structure will be illustrated below.

2.4.1 Propositions

The grammatical structure of exchanging information is known as Proposition. The system involves either giving or demanding information as discussed below. Sometimes, an additional subsystem is realized which expresses cases between these two extremes and this is known as modalization (Eggins, 2004: 283).

1. Giving Propositions

Propositions are mainly associated with declarative clause while demanding information is associated with questions and expressed by interrogative clauses. In terms of Mood system, clauses are classified into two main constituents: Mood and Residue. The mood element of the clause has the function of carrying the argument while the Residue is less essential to the arguability of the clause. The mood has two main constituents: Subject and Finite. The Subject realizes the thing by reference to which the proposition can be affirmed or denied. The second constituent is Finite which its function is to make the proposition definite, or to anchor the proposition in a way that we can argue about it. Grammatically, the Finite is identified as the verbal part of the tag (Halliday, 1994: 72; Eggins, 2004: 153). The following example clarifies:

3. George (Subject) was (Finite) reading Henry James, wasn't (Finite) he (Subject)?
(Halliday, 1994: 72)

2. Demanding Propositions

Propositions also has the role of demanding information. English offers two main options for questions: polar, WH-interrogatives and exclamatives as in the below example which is a polar question (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014: 160).

4. Is Simon (Mood) reading Henry James (Residue)?

3. Modalization

This system refers to scales of probability and usuality. Propositions do not always fall within positive or negative polarities, but there are two kinds of intermediate possibilities: probability and usuality (ibid., 2014: 177). Modality system can be classified according to the degree of certainty or usuality through three options: high, median or low. For example:

5. 'The Bostonians' might (Finite:modal) possibly (Adjunct:mood) have been written by Henry James.

2.4.2 Proposals

In addition to propositions, speakers also an option of exchanging goods and services or what is called proposals. Interpersonally, they are employed in interaction to affect other's behaviour. This system is classified into two subsystems: giving and demanding goods and services (Eggins, 2004:176).

1. Giving Proposals

Giving proposals represent offers when the clause is used to give goods and services. In English, this system lacks a distinctive structural configuration. Rather, it depends on the system of questions as in the next example (ibid.: 178). For instance:

6. Will I (Mood) lend you my copy of the Bostonians (Residue)?

2. Demanding Proposals

Demanding for goods and services (or commands) are typically realized by imperatives (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014: 165).

7. Don't you (Mood) take my copy of the Bostonians' (Residue).

3. Modulation

Modulation represents an additional subsystem of proposals. It is a scale of obligation and inclination in between (Eggins, 2004: 179). It may be expressed by a variety of options including modulated clauses expressed in (command) and declaratives that are modulated to have the meaning of commands expressing meanings of obligation, necessity. For instance in the below example, the meaning of obligation is expressed through the Predicator constituent (obliged to read) (ibid.):

8. You are obliged to read Henry James!

2.5 Textual Metafunction in English

It is the system of the enabling or text-forming functions. The textual meaning, while not adding new reality nor altering interpersonal dimensions of the clause, is concerned with the potential the clause offers for its constituents to be organized differently to achieve different purposes (Halliday, 1974:95,97; Bazzi, 2009: 87). In English, this system is realized through the system of Theme involving Theme and Rheme.

2.5.1 Theme System

The element of 'theme' refers to what the sentence is going to be about or familiar or given information (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 64). There are three options of theme in English: topical, interpersonal and textual themes (Halliday, 1994: 301).

1. Topical Theme

The topical theme is the initial element of the clause that has transitivity role. This system has only one option or possibility of occurrence in the clause which is the initial position. The rest of the clause is the rheme as in the below example (Eggins, 2004: 38-12):

9. In most infants (Topical Theme) there are frequent episodes of crying with no apparent cause (Rheme).

2. Interpersonal Theme

In English, the interpersonal theme is that initial element which plays an interpersonal role. This system has a variety of options covering modal adjuncts, vocative, polarity, existential 'there' and comment (Halliday, 1994: 45; Eggins, 2004: 302). The following example clarifies:

10. Do (Interpersonal Theme) you give blood (Rheme)?

3. Textual Theme

Sometimes clauses may not start with topical or interpersonal themes. In such cases, the initial element is a textual theme. This system performs an important cohesive work relating the clause to its context. In English, it is indicated by two types of adjuncts: continuity and conjunctive adjuncts (ibid.: 305). For example:

11. So (Textual Theme) they could actually do it through the umbilical artery or whatever (Rheme). (ibid.)

2.5.2 Duplicated Themes

English language has two options of thematization. They may use one or more than one type of theme before the obligatory topical theme as in the following example (ibid.):

12. Can(Interpersonal Theme) you (Topical Theme) get you some more (Rheme)?

2.5.3 Marked and Unmarked Theme

Theme system offers options of markedness in English. English realizes 'unmarked' themes which stand for 'most typical' and 'marked' ones which refer to atypical one (ibid.: 318). In English, an unmarked theme takes place when all things are equal while a marked theme occurs in case things appear unequally marked. The choice of any of these options is not governed by structural criteria (Bazzi, 2009: 89). One way of making marked theme is to repackage a constituent as a circumstantial element as in the below example (Eggins, 2004: 319):

13. As for Diana (Marked Theme), she has donated blood 50 times.

3. Systemic Functional Grammar in Arabic

3.1 Historical Background

Arab linguists have studied language in terms of a functional perspective since ancient times. 'التنظير الدلالي في ' علوم اللغة العربية هو تنظير وظيفي في العمق قائم على المبدأ الوظيفي الاساس؛ مبدا اسبقية الوظيفة على البنية وتبعية الثانية للأولى (the

semantic theorization is fundamentally functional because it is based on the superiority of function to structure and dependency of structure upon function) (Al-Zaidi, 2014: 361). Generally, their concerns in functionalism can be traced through two approaches: functional perspective in rhetorical studies and that in grammatical ones. Each has old and contemporary trends. Because our concern here is SFG, our treatment will be on the functional perspective of grammatical studies in both its traditional and contemporary statuses. The goal is to show the efforts of Arab linguists in interweaving the notion of functionality with the linguistic analysis.

With respect to the traditional approach, some Arab linguists utilize the functional perspective to the study of language. Sibeweh is one of the famous Arab grammarians who incorporates functionalism into grammar. For him, function is superior to structure in constructing and using language. Besides, Sibeweh states 'تبعية' البنية للوظيفة... الحركة الاعرابية عنصر من عناصر البنية قد تعكسها وظيفة تداولية (parsing diacritics represent an aspect of the structure which may be governed by the pragmatic function of the utterance) (Al-Zaidi, 2014: 289). Besides, Ibn Jeni (322-392 A.H.) talks about the communicative function of language; language is the humans' tool to express their feelings, attitudes and ideas (ibid. 50). Moreover, Al-Jurjani (471 A.H.) shows the precedence of function to structure in that understanding the use of language structures depends on recognizing their contexts and functions (Al-Jurjani, 2000: 127, 261).

On the basis of those functional views about language, contemporary Arab scholars develop their functional studies of grammar. For example, Hasaan (2006: 29,30) relates that 'لا يمكن تأدية المعاني الوظيفية لعناصر اللغة في غياب القرائن اللفظية والمعنوية والحالية متضافرة' (it is impossible to perform the functional meanings of language elements in the absence of semantic, phonological and contextual criteria. Hasaan (ibid.: 196) argues that structures are meaningless without association between structures and these types of relations. In addition, Al-Samara'ee (2000: 152,153) examines the use of structures via investigating the functions these structures perform. He also focuses on the functional differences that distinguish one structure from another.

3.2 Arabic Grammar as a System

Arabic grammar is functionally systemic in nature. It works according to a network of relations that exists among its elements. For example, as Faiadh (1995: 27-30); Omer et al. (1994: 39); Hassan (2005: 217) state, the choice of an option in the Arabic personal pronoun system includes a network of subsystems of relations such as gender, person and number. The delicacy of this system begins with personal pronoun system as a point of origin while the first entry condition is person system that has three options: first person covering (انا I , نحن we), second person (انت you, انتما you, انتم you, انتن you) and third person (هو he, هي she, هما they, هن they). The next step in delicacy is the analysis of number system which has three options including singular (انا I, انت you, انتي you, هو he, هي she), dual (انتما you, هما they) and plural (نحن we, انتم you, انتن you, هم they, هن they). The third step of the system in Arabic is the entry condition 'gender'. It in turn has one of two options: masculine including (انت you, هو he, انتم you, هم they), feminine including (انت you, هي she, انتن you, هن they) and neutral involving (انا I, نحن we, انتما you, هما they).

3.3 Ideational Metafunction in Arabic

Although Arab linguists do not differentiate in their theorization between components of ideational metafunction, but it seems that Arabic grammar obviously distinguishes between experiential المعنى التجريبي and logical المعنى المنطقي meanings. This distinction is clearly recognized through the functions of structural units in and across clauses.

3.3.1 Experiential Meaning

Arab grammarians give attention to the verbal group in the clause although they do not name the processes these verbs indicate. The system of verbs in Arabic have several options according to their semantic function in the clause (Al-Ghalaeni, 1994: 46;). This verbal system includes the following options:

3.3.1.1 Process Type

Arab grammarians classify transitivity system according to two main criteria. First is the structure of the clause where the number of participants is the determining factor. The second is the semantic or functional content of the verb. This system has the following details:

1. Intransitive Verbs

These verbs indicate actions that require the agent of the action only. Clauses of intransitive verbs do not take another argument (Al-Ghalaeni, 1994: 46):

22. Saeed went. ذهب سعيد.

2. Transitive Verbs

Arab grammarians refer to those verbs that require more than one object as transitive verbs. In Arabic, this system encompasses three options: mono-transitive, di-transitive and tri-transitive verbs (Al-ibid.).

Mono-transitive verbs require one object to complete the meaning of the clause (ibid.: 34):

23. Tariq conquers Spain. فتح طارق الأندلس.

The system of transitive verbs with two participants, in turn, offers two further options: those verbs which transitive per se and those which need a preposition to achieve transitivity (ibid.: 35).

Di-transitive verbal system offers two verbal subsystems. The first includes a certain set of verbs such as (سئل to ask, أعطى to give) (ibid.). The second subsystem consists of two additional options: verbs of heart (أفعال القلوب) and verbs of transforming (أفعال التحول).

3. Verbs of Heart (أفعال القلوب)

This system of verbs represents another variety of di-transitive verbs in Arabic. Arab grammarians refer to them as verbs of heart because they indicate mental processes rather than physical ones. This system of verbs contain (رأى to see, علم to know). Besides, verbs of this system are divided into two further options: verbs of certainty and verbs of uncertainty or probability (Al-Ghalaeni, 1994: 36; Barakat, 2007: 5).

3.1 Verbs of Certainty (أفعال اليقين)

Certainty verbs form a subsystem of verbs of heart. They indicate certainty of speakers about certain actions. They include (درى to be aware, علم to know) (ibid.: 37; Barakat, 2007: 7):

24. I have known that the road is bumpy. علمت الطريق وعرا.

3.2 Verbs of Uncertainty (أفعال الرجحان أو الظن)

The second system of heart verbs are those of uncertainty or probability. These express speakers' doubt and uncertainty about action. Such verbs are (ظن to think, خال to suppose) (ibid., 2007: 19; Omer et al., 1994: 393):

25. I thought that my friend an enemy. خلت صاحبي عدوا.

4. Verbs of Transforming (أفعال التحول)

Verbs of this system has the meaning of (صير has changed into). They stand for a subsystem of di-transitive verbs in Arabic. They convey the meaning of changing the state of a certain entity or thing to another. They include (ترك has left, رد has given) (Al-Ghalaeni, 1994: 44; Barakat, 2007: 29):

26. I have made the enemy a friend. صيرت العدو صديقاً.

5. Tri-transitive Verbs (أفعال متعدية لثلاث مفاعيل)

Arabic realizes another main system of verbs which indicate processes that cannot be complete with the absence of any of them. This system includes verbs such as (أعلم has acknowledged, أخبر has told) (Al-Ghalaeni, 1994: 45):

أريئت سعيداً الأمر واضحاً.

27. I have acknowledged Saeed that the issue is true.

6. Verbs of Exclamation (أفعال التعجب)

Arab grammarians recognize additional class of verbs that indicate exclamations. These verbs of which only two (أفعل and ما أفعل) are used to state the greatness of a certain thing (ibid., 1994: 65):

28. How nice they are! ما ألطفهم!

7. Verbs of Praise and Dispraise (أفعال المدح والذم)

The final subsystem of Arabic transitivity system is that of verbs of praise and dispraise. Arab grammarians classify them as an independent class of verbs. They are divided into two types: verbs of praise including (حيداً, نعم, حب, how excellent, lovely etc.) as in (29) and those of dispraise including (لا حيداً, ساء, بنس what a bad, etc.) as in (30). the former express praise about certain deeds while the latter convey the speaker's disapproval about particular things (Al-Ghalaeni, 1994: 74):

29. How excellent Kalid is! حيداً رجلاً خالد

30. What a bad man is Omer! بنس الرجل عمر

8. Verbs of Hoping (أفعال الرجاء)

These verbs refer to speakers' wishes and desires of achieving particular happenings. This process can be achieved by verbs such as (عسى, حرى hope, maybe, might, etc.) (Al-Samara'ee, 2000: 268):

31. I hope that Zaid will stand. عسى أن يقوم زيد.

9. Verbs of Approximate Happening (أفعال المقاربة)

This process type indicates that an action was about to occur, but it would not. Members of this process are (كاد, أو شك to be close to) (ibid.: 273; Omer et al., 1994: 362):

32. Zaid has come to drown. كاد زيد أن يغرق.

10. Verbs of Initiation (أفعال الشروع)

Arab scholars call this process as initiating because its verbs mark the initiation or the beginning of occurrence of actions. These verbs include (انشا, طفق to initiate) (Al-Samara'ee, 2000: 283):

33. Ali has started reading. شرع علي يقرأ.

3.3.1.2 Participant System

The second component of transitivity system in Arabic is the system of participants. Process types, here, are associated with participants so as to complete the meaning of the clause. Arab grammarians depend heavily on participants in their classification of process types. Their classification of participant system depends on two main criteria: number of participants that the verb of the clause requires and the semantic role of participants that concords with the meaning of the verb.

According to the number of participants in the clause, Arab grammarians classify participants into four types. The first type is that is related to clauses that require one participant when the verb is intransitive. This participant plays the grammatical function of 'Subject'. The second one is that which is associated with clauses that require two participants when the verb is mono-transitive. These participants are the subject and the object of the clause as in example (23 above). The third type is the one which is concerned with clauses that require three participants when the verb is di-transitive as in examples (24, 25, 26 above). One of the participants is the subject while the other two are objects of the clause as in example (27 above). the fourth one is related to clauses that require four participants when the verb is tri-transitive. In this case, one of them is the subject of the clause while the rest are objects of the clause (Barakat, 2007: 7; Omer et al., 1994: 337; Mohammad, 2010: 219).

According to the semantic feature of the participant, Arab grammarians classify this system into two options: animate participants and inanimate ones. For them, certain process types are performed by animate participants only, other types are done by inanimate ones only while other types may be performed by both types of participants (Mohammad, 2010: 219).

3.3.1.3 Circumstantial System

The third component of transitivity system in Arabic is the circumstantial system. Arab grammarians refer to this system as 'adverbs'. Many Arabic adverbials are recognized including adverbs of degree, manner, place, time, numerical, adverbial accusative of specification, cognate accusative, adverbial accusative of cause or reason and comparison. In Arabic, most circumstances are interfered by means of the system of participants in that those are used as objects and thus they receive other participant roles (Al-Samara'ee, 2000: 149-290; Barakat, 2007: 242-397).

3.3.2 Logical Meaning

The system of logical meanings in Arabic is classified into two main subsystems: coordination and subordination. Both are fundamentally expressed by a variety of particles. The first system is expressed by (ادوات الربط coordinating particles) including (واو العطف and, فاء السببية and so, etc.) as in (34 below) (Aziz, 1989: 210). The second system is indicated by (الحروف الناسخة subordinating particles) which express the dependency of one clause to another including. Such particles include (أَنَّ that, لكن but, etc.) as in (35 below) (Aziz, 1989: 222; Barakat, 2007: 172; Omer et al., 1994: 373):

34. **And** the two presidents arrived in the capital yesterday . . .

ووصل الرئيسان الى العاصمة امس.

35. We believe **that** agriculture is a world language.

نعتقد أن الزراعة لغة عالمية.

(Ryding, 2005: 409, 423)

3.4 Interpersonal Metafunction in Arabic

Leech (1983: 57 states that interpersonal meanings are the concern of pragmatics. Leech's view, has its origin in Arab rhetoric when Arab rhetoricians classify interpersonal metafunction into two subsystems: constative utterances (الاخبار) and performative utterances (الانشاءات) (Qaseem and Deeb, 2003: 296).

3.4.1 Constatives

Constative utterances system involves three options: (الخبر الابتدائي primary constative, الخبر اطلبى requestive constative and الخبر الإنكاري denial constative (Al-Maidani, 1996: 133,4).

1. Primary Constative

This system is used when the addressee has no doubt about the speaker's information about something (Al-Hashimi, 1999: 48):

36. Knowledge is useful.

العلم نافع.

2. Requestive Constative

This refers to utterances in which the addressee is suspicious about the truth of something whether right or wrong (ibid., 1999: 49):

37. Those hardworking students have succeeded.

انه قد نجح المجتهدون.

3. Denial Constative

Here, the addressee denies or believes the opposite to what has been said. The speaker requires emphasizing his speech by using one or more assertives to assert his constative (ibid., 1999: 49):

38. Surely your brother is coming.

ان اخاك لقادم.

3.4.2 Performative Utterances (الإنشاء)

The second system of interpersonal meanings in Arabic is referred to as Performative Utterances. A performative utterance is one which cannot be judged as true or false, but it refers to something that is requested to be done, fulfilled or about to be fulfilled. This system has two options of performative sentences: الإنشاء الطلبي requestive performative and الإنشاء غير الطلبي non-requestive performative (Qaseem and Deeb, 2003: 282).

1. Requestive Performative

This option stands for those utterances that require fulfillment of the action which is not available at the time of requirement (Al-Hashimi, 1999: 64). This system includes a number of utterances such as استفهام interrogative, نفي negation, امر imperative, نهى prohibitive, نداء vocation, تمنى hope, رجاء wish, تحذير warning and دعاء invocation (Hassan, 1994: 244; Qaseem and Deeb, 2003: 282). For example stands for an imperative: 39. Honor your father and mother. أكرم اباك وامك.

2. Non-requestive Performative

This system in Arabic refers to those utterances that do not require fulfillment of the action which is not available at the time of requirement (Al-Hashimi, 1999: 63). It embodies five options: obligation (الإلزام), oath (القسم), pain (التوجع), praise (المدح) and dispraise (الذم) (Al-Maidani, 1996: 224). The below example is a case of praise:

40. Ali's affinity is valuable. كرم علي نسبا.

3.5 Textual Metafunction in Arabic

Textual metafunction is best described by Arab grammarians in terms of 'fronting التقديم and deferring التأخير' system. The clause patterning is a result of selection or choice. The addresser intends to plan what he desires to convey and thus arranges it in his mind, then he attempts to select the appropriate pattern through fronting and deferring particular constituents in an attempt to transmit his aims in an effective way. Traditional Arab linguists deals with this system of information structure. for example, Sibeweihi tackle aspects of التنبيه 'drawing attention' and التأكيد 'emphasis'. On his part, Al-Jurjani proposes what he calls التقديم على نية التأخير 'fronting which is for the intention of deferring' and التقديم لا على نية التأخير 'fronting which is not for the intention of deferring' (Abdul-Muttalib, 1984: 250).

Generally, Arab grammarians deal with fronting and deferring from two perspectives: syntactic and semantic.

Syntactically, fronting and deferring take place in both nominal and verbal sentences. In nominal sentences, the canonical word order consists of subject-predicate in which the subject precedes the predicate. Variability may take place through this canonical order which involves fronting and deferring of the subject and predicate. Two choices are recognized: obligatory which is constrained by structural criteria or optional (Owens, 1984: 28; Khalil, 1999: 97) with verbal sentences, that the canonical order is a verb. Again, this order may vary in the sentence according to obligatory constraints or optional subject (Barakat, 2007: 55; Cantarino: 1975, 41; Mohammad, 2010: 221). For instance, the circumstantial (الحال) is fronted in the below example (Faiadh, 1995: 140):

41. The boy is in the room. في الحجر (fronted circumstance) الولد.

4. English Systemic Functional Grammar and Arabic Systemic Functional Grammar Contrasted

Generally speaking, it is observed that both languages work according to networks of relation systems at the three metafunctions. In addition, it appears that Arab grammarians precede their Western equivalents in their theorization of systemic functional grammar theory. At all metafunctions, it is observed that traditional Arab grammarians' and rhetoricians' classifications have systemic functional bases. Besides, it is observed that

Arabic theory, unlike English, is the contribution of both grammarians and rhetoricians. Moreover, Unlike English, Arabic theory makes cooperation between structural and functional criteria in its classifications and identifications of systems and options. This section shows similarities and differences between English and Arabic concerning their treatment of SFG.

4.1 Historical Background

Historically, efforts were spent for analyzing both languages functionally. More specifically, Arab linguists precede their Western equivalents in their attempts to utilize functionality to analyze language. Western linguists, precisely Halliday, present Systemic Functional Grammar as an independent theory of grammar whereas Arab grammarians have not presented an independent theory of systemic functional grammar although its basic premises are available in their literature and theorization.

4.2 Grammar as a System

Both languages seem systemic in nature. In other words, relations among language units work according to networks of systems; the choice of a unit is governed by interacting systems of relations. Sometimes in Arabic, unlike English, the choice of an option within a system is conditioned by structural constraints as with thematic markedness in Arabic.

4.3 Ideational metafunction

a. Main Systems

1. Western and Arabic theories identify two systems of Ideational metafunction: experiential and logical meanings.
2. Both theories recognize process type, participant system and circumstantial system.

b. Subsystems

3. Although English and Arabic identify systemic functional transitivity system, they differ in their classification of processes. Arabic appears more comprehensive than English since it covers a wide range of processes. Besides, it is more precise.
4. Participant system in Arabic plays more functional roles than that in English; it contributes mainly in the identification of process types.
5. Circumstantial system in Arabic appears more functional than its equivalent in English; some circumstances play the role of some members of participant system.
6. Unlike English, Arabic theory makes connection between structural and functional criteria in its classifications and identifications of systems and options. For example, logical meaning system and process type system. Accordingly, Arabic systems of relations appear more interrelated, interacted and integrated than English.

4.4 Interpersonal metafunction

a. Main Systems

7. As far as interpersonal metafunction is concerned, both languages show a systemic functional nature of their classifications of networks of relations.
8. In both languages, there is a clear integration between the clause type and the interpersonal function conveyed.

b. Subsystems

9. It appears that Arab rhetoricians precede their Western equivalents in their concern with identifying the interpersonal metafunction of language with a pragmatic perspective. Later on, this orientation have been observed by Western scholars like Leech (1983: 57) when he considers interpersonal function as the main concern of pragmatics.

10. Arab scholars are more explicit than Western scholars in offering various and detailed systems and options expressing several interpersonal functions of language.
11. Unlike Arab scholars, Halliday makes a clear reference to modality as system of the interpersonal metafunction. In this regard, Arabs make implicit reference to this system within constative utterances only, not with performatives, when they classify constatives into three types according to the degree of audience's doubt.
12. Western scholars analyze Mood system structurally in terms of Mood and Residue while in Arabic there is no reference made to such analysis.

4.5 Textual metafunction

a. Main Systems

13. Both languages use nearly similar, not exactly identical, systems of describing textual metafunction. In other words, in both theories, textual metafunction is described mainly by means of word order.
14. English and Arabic make use of marked and unmarked themes.
15. Arab scholar do not theorize about duplicated themes.

b. Subsystems

16. Arab scholars refer to textual metafunction through the phenomenon of 'fronting and deferring' while in English it is referred to as 'markedness'.
17. English version of the theory identifies three types of theme while Arabic lacks such theorization.
18. Arabic, unlike English, offers more choices to express marked themes than English. This prosperity is the result of exploiting both nominal as well as verbal sentences in Arabic.
19. In Arabic, unlike in English, in most cases, markedness is obligatory rather than optional because of syntactic constraints. On the contrary, English markedness appears optional rather than obligatory.

According to the contrast made above, the following tables make clear the similarities and the differences between Western and Eastern versions of SFG across the different contrasted levels in terms of their main and sub-systems:

Table 1: Similarities & Differences between Western & Eastern Versions of SFG and their Frequencies in Terms of Main Systems

	No.	Frequency
Similarities	6	85.71
Differences	1	14.28
Total	7	99.99



Figure 1: Similarities & Differences between Western & Eastern Versions of SFG in Terms of Main Systems

Table 2: Similarities & Differences between Western & Eastern Versions of SFG and their Frequencies in Terms of their Subsystems

	No.	Frequency
Similarities	1	08.33
Differences	11	91.66
Total	12	99.99

**Figure 2: Similarities & Differences between Western & Eastern Versions of SFG in Terms of their Subsystems**

Conclusions

On the basis of the contrast conducted above and in accordance with the aims and hypotheses of the study, the following conclusions can be introduced:

1. Historically, SFG has had its early roots in Arabic because it has appeared in the Arabic context centuries before its emergence in Western contexts. This validates hypothesis (a).
2. The two versions of the theory (Western and Arabic) exhibit various similarities and differences. This is in line with hypothesis (b).
3. The two versions appear more similar than different in relation to their main systems of functional analysis and this is evident in their exploitation of these systems. Hence, this verifies hypothesis (c).
4. The theory has passed through gradual development in both English and Arabic.
5. The two versions of the theories are more different than similar in their subsystems of functional analysis.
6. The structural behaviour of language units, in both languages, appears in integration, more precisely following, with the functional behaviour of these units (like the structure of the clause, the choice of linguistic units and the labeling of systems)
7. English and Arabic languages lend themselves to the systemic functional analysis.

References

- Abdul-Muttalib, M. 1984. *Al-Balaghatu wal-Uslubiyya*. Egypt: Egyptian General Board of Writers.
- Al-Ghalaeeeni, M. 1993. *Collection of Arabic Lessons..* Beirut: Modern Library Press.
- Al-Hashimi, A. 1999. *Essences of Rhetoric in Rhetoric, Clarity and Eloquence*. Cairo: Modern Library.
- Al-Jurjani, A. 2000. *Dala'il ulaejaz fi Alm Alma'ani*. (edited by Yaseen Al-Aiwbi) 1st ed. Beirut: Almaktaba Alassria.
- Al-Maidani, A. 1996. *Arabic Rhetoric: Basics, Sciences and Arts*. Damscas: Dar Al-Elm.
- Al-Mwtoukel, A. 1986. *Studies in the Functional Grammar of Arabic Language*. Morocco: Dar althaqafa.
- Al-Mwtoukel, A. 1995. *Issues of Arabic in Functional Linguistics: the Underlying Structure and Semantico-pragmatic Representation*. Morocco: Dar alaman.
- Al-Samara'ee, F. 2000. *Meanings of Grammar*. Vol. 2. Oman: Dar Al-Fakir for Publishing.
- Al-Tahir, Sh. 2006. *Functional Perspective in the Explanation of Ibn Ashur's Al-Tahreer and Al-Tanueer*. Unpublished Thesis.
- Al-Zaidi, B. 2014. *Systemic Grammar and Arabic Linguistic Lesson: a Study in Sentence Grammar*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: University of Hajlakhadher.
- Aziz, Y. 1989. *A Contrastive Grammar of English and Arabic*. Mosul: University of Mosul.
- Barakat, I. 2007. *Arabic Grammar*. Cairo: House of Publishing for Universities.
- Bazzi, S. 2009. *Arab News and Conflict: A Multidisciplinary Discourse Study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.
- Cantarino, V. 1975. *Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose*. Vols.1 and 2. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Egins, S. 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Continuum International Group.
- Faiadh, S. 1995. *Modern Grammar*. Cairo: Centre of Translation and Publication.
- Graber, Ph. 2001. *Context in Text: A Systemic Functional Analysis of the Parable of the Sower*. Unpublished Dissertation: Emory University.
- Halliday, M. 1978. *Discussing Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Halliday, M. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Halliday, K and Hasan, R. 1985. *Language, Text and Context*. Geelong, Vic, Deakin University Press.
- Halliday, M. and Matthiessen, M. 2014. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Hasaan, T. 1994. *Arabic Language: its Meaning and Structure*. Al-Dar Al-Baidha': Dar Al-Thaqafa Press.

- Hassan, A. 2005. *The Comprehensive Grammar*. Vol 1,2,3. Cairo: Modern Library.
- Ibn Ya'eesh (no date). *Sharh ul-Mufasssal*, Vol.1. Beirut: Alam ul-Kutub.
- Khalil, A. M. 1999. *A Contrastive Grammar of English and Arabic*. Jordan: Jordan Book Centre.
- Mohammad, A. (2010). *Al-Nahw Al-Wadhifi*. Jordan: Dar Almassira.
- Nahla, M. 2001. *Systemic Linguistics: an Introduction to Halliday's Linguistic Theory*. University of Alexandria.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longma.
- Omer, A., Zahran, M. And Abdulatif, M. 1994. *The Basic Grammar*. Kawait: Dar Al-Salassl.
- Owens, J. 1984. "Structure, Class and Dependency". In *Lingua*. 64: 25-60.
- Qassem, M. And Deeb, Mauheei, Aldeen. 2003. *Sciences of Rhetoric: Eloquence, Clarity and Meaning*. Lebanon: Modern Foundation for Book.
- Reed, J. 1997. 'A discourse analysis of Philippians: Method and rhetoric in the debate over literary integrity'. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series*, vol. 136. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Ryding, K. 2005. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Simpson, P. 1993. *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Teich, E. 1999. *Systemic Functional Grammar in Natural Language Generation*. New York: Cassell.