

As we discussed at the beginning of this course, Systemic Functional Grammar is, primarily, a theory about meaning and how it is expressed in language; that is, the relationship between meaning and form. Meaning, in this context, can *mean* different things. In previous courses, you've probably discussed "meaning" as referring to propositional meaning; that is, the kernel or the semantic core of a sentence. On this understanding, the clauses "Close the window!," "Please close the window," and "You close the window" might be said to have the same propositional meaning. In terms of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), however, these three clauses have different meanings, and this is particularly because SFG takes meaning to be more than — but including — propositional content.

Indeed, in SFG, each clause¹ expresses three different strands of meaning: interpersonal, experiential, and textual, and these meanings are directly associated with the overall functions of language. Language, as a tool for communication, can be used to enact social roles and maintain social relations; to express and construe experience; and to organize such interpersonal and experiential meanings as part of discourse in context, i.e., text. These three major functions are referred to in SFG as the meta-functions of language².

The role of SFG as a theory, then, is to explore how speakers³ use the different resources available to them in language to express the meanings they wish to express. Two important notions are worth mentioning here in relation to choice and the different strands of meaning mentioned above. First, while SFG focuses on how speakers choose to "word" or phrase their meanings, choice here is mostly unconscious. Yes, when writing an article or speaking in front of an audience, we do choose our words carefully, but for the most part, how we phrase our meanings is an unconscious effort that is, of course, constrained by the context in which we use language. Second, while we do discuss the different strands of meaning expressed in each clause, it's important to note that these strands are not individuated in the structure of the clause itself. On the contrary, the three strands of meaning together make up each clause.

Chapter four in our textbook, *Introducing Functional Grammar*, deals primarily with the grammatical resources of the interpersonal meta-function. In other words, the resources the grammar affords to speakers such that they can express interpersonal meaning (i.e., enact social roles and establish and maintain relations through language). Primarily, then, we will deal with the system of MOOD, and we'll have a few things to say about modality, finiteness, and tense, among other aspects. But it is at the MOOD, the clause system that has to do with the expression of speech functions, that we will start.

¹ Major clauses, that is.

² There is, of course, a question to be asked about this particular organization of meta-functions. Why are they three and not, for example, four, five, or even two. The received wisdom in SFG literature is that these three categories allow the theory to categorize the vast array of meanings expressed through language while being limited enough not to overcomplicate the theory.

³ Here, speakers refer to any use of language, whether written or spoken.

❖ Clause as exchange; dialogue and interaction

From an interpersonal perspective, the clause is a move in an ongoing interaction or dialogue. That is, viewed interpersonally, the clause expresses one move in an exchange between interactants. The “elements” of this exchange are either information or goods and services, and the interactants in this exchange are either giving or demanding. That is, in an ongoing dialogue, you’re either giving or demanding, and that which you are giving or demanding is either information or goods and services.

These distinctions are the primary entry point, so to speak, into the interpersonal grammar of the clause because which positions speakers take and assign their interlocutors in the exchange, and which choices they make when doing so, is the core or kernel of how social roles are enacted and social relations are created or maintained.

An example should make this a bit clearer: suppose you were in the Faculty of Arts cafeteria and your friend was blocking the way towards the (admittedly delicious) fries. You, hungry after hearing your instructor rant for an hour about Halliday and functional grammar, want to ask your friend to move out of the way. Supposing that you and this person were very good friends, you might simply tell them “move!” or “out of the way!”. In this interaction, you demanded (demanding as a speech role) that your friend move (goods and services as commodity). At the same time, you’ve positioned your friend as the recipient of the command whose options are now either to accept or reject your command.

Now, picture the exact same scenario, but instead of your very good friend, you found a professor from the English Department blocking the way to the fries (and stealing a fry whenever the guy behind the counter looks away⁴). Most likely, you would ask the professor politely to move away: perhaps something along the lines of “Excuse me, Dr. X, could you please move to the side?”. Notice how your speech role as demanding and the commodity being exchange as goods and services haven’t changed; what did change, in fact, is the relationship between you and the person you’re having the exchange with. In the first instance, the person you’re interacting with is a friend of yours, so a direct command realized as an imperative clause would be acceptable between you, but in the second example, your relationship with the professor is more formal; more institutional, as it were. As such, even though your speech role and the commodity being exchanged are the same, the wording is different: it’s an indirect command; a politely worded request.

This is, indeed, why we start discussing interpersonal grammar by noting the speech roles, commodities, and the associated speech functions. How you word your meanings in an exchange, whether you are giving or demanding information or goods and services, is a function of your relationship with the person you’re interacting with (and how you want it to be) and the context in which this exchange took place.

The two speech roles cut across the two types of commodity to give us four different (primary) speech functions: statements, which are associated with giving information; questions, which are associated with demanding information; offers, which are associated with giving goods and services; and commands, which are associated with demanding goods and services. In the cafeteria examples above, both instances had you, the speaker, as expressing a command, you demanding goods and services, but the expression itself differed. In the first instance, with your friend, you used an imperative clause, while an interrogative clause was used with the professor; these two different clauses realized the same speech function. The basic types of

⁴ Academics are well known for stealing fries.

clause realizing speech functions are declarative clauses, interrogative clauses, and imperative clauses, and their usual associations are shown below in Table 1. The basic interpersonal system connecting the semantics of speech functions with linguistic expressions or realizations is known as the MOOD system.

Speech role	Commodity	Speech function	Realization
Giving	Information	Statement	Declarative clause
Demanding	Information	Question	Interrogative clause
Giving	Goods and services	Offer	(usually) Modulated interrogative clause
Demanding	Goods and services	Command	Imperative clause

Table 1: Speech roles, commodities, speech functions, and linguistic realizations in an exchange

So, as a summary of what we've discussed so far, we've explored the basic speech roles in an exchange, the commodities being exchanged, the speech functions or acts taken on by the interactants, and the usual linguistic realizations used to express these speech functions. Two points are important to note here before we delve into the interpersonal structure of the clause: First, as we've mentioned above, while speech functions are usually associated with certain realizations — statements associated with declarative clauses, for example — this is not always the case; in fact, these associations are regularly shattered by speakers to express interpersonal meanings, as we've discussed in the examples above. Second, there is an important terminological distinction between mood, Mood, and MOOD:

- mood: Clause type, as in declarative, interrogative, and imperative.
- Mood: The component consisting of the Subject and the Finite in the interpersonal structure of the clause. We will get to this shortly below.
- MOOD: The system of choices expressing speech functions.

❖ The interpersonal structure of the clause

We've discussed the semantics of speech functions, but our theory focuses not only on meaning, but also on how it is expressed, and this is where the difference between declarative, interrogative, and imperative clauses becomes clearer. Observe, for instance, the following three clauses:

- (1) He will study syntax.
- (2) Will he study syntax?
- (3) Study syntax!

Clause (1) is declarative, clause (2) is interrogative, and clause (3) is imperative. The difference between them, other than they realize different speech functions, is their interpersonal structure. Below is an analysis of the interpersonal structure of the three above clauses, with a discussion of the functions and their definitions a bit later on.

1.

He	will	study	syntax
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
Mood		Residue	

2.

Will	he	study	syntax?
Finite	Subject	Predicator	Complement
Mood		Residue	

3.

Study	syntax!
Predicator	Complement
Residue	

The difference between these three clauses relates particularly to two functions: the Subject and the Finite. Note, for example, how clause (1) has the Subject followed by the Finite, while clause (2), an interrogative, has the Finite followed by the Subject. Clause (3), an imperative, has neither a Subject nor a Finite. Because of their relation to the mood of the clause (that is, clause type), the Subject and the Finite are grouped together in a component called Mood. This component is called as such because it is directly related to the mood of the clause. That is, Mood (Subject and Finite) realizes mood (clause choice). The ordering of the Subject and the Finite, and whether they exist or not in the clause, realizes the type of the clause.

In other words:

- Declarative clauses are realized by the Subject followed by the Finite (S[^]F).
- Interrogative clauses are realized by the Finite followed by the Subject (F[^]S).
- Imperative clauses are realized by the lack of a Subject and a Finite (S[^]F).

These are, of course, patterns that can have exceptions. Imperative clauses can, for example, have explicit Subjects and an emphatic do as a Finite, as we will see shortly. For the most part, however, these patterns hold and they are considered the primary way of distinguishing different clause types.

❖ Subject

So, the Subject is part of the Mood component of the clause. But what does it mean when we label “He” in the clauses above as Subject?

In SFG, the Subject is an interpersonal function; that is, it is associated with that strand of meaning contributed by the interpersonal metafunction. To understand why, we have to introduce two terms: **propositions** and **proposals**. Simply put, propositions are exchanges of information, whether giving or demanding, while proposals are exchanges of goods and services, again whether giving or demanding. So, statements and questions are propositions, while offers and commands are proposals. Observe, for example, the following clauses. The first is an example of the realization of a proposition, while the second is a realization of a proposal.

- (4) He went to the debate.
- (5) You go to the debate!

Looked at from an interpersonal perspective, the Subject is that which is responsible for the validity of the proposition or the proposal. In other words, it is the Subject of (4), “He,” which is responsible for the validity of the proposition expressed by the clause; “He” is responsible for making this proposition true or false. Similarly, in (5), the explicit Subject “you” is responsible for the success of this command. As such, when can define the Subject as that element in which modal responsibility is vested — that element which is responsible for the validity of the proposition or proposal.

As for identifying the Subject, we can use the moodtag or tag question probe: simply add a tag question to the end of the clause, and this will include both the Subject and the Finite usually in a reversed order. Observe clause (4) with an added tag question:

- (4') He went to the debate, didn't he?

Here, the tag question has reproduced the Subject, “he,” and the Finite element, although its polarity is reversed: “didn't.”

Most usually, Subjects are realized by nominal groups, such as in clauses (4) and (5) above. The Subject can also be realized by, for example, a prepositional phrase, such as in (6), or an embedded clause, such as in (7).

- (6) In the morning is better.
- (7) That he studied helped him.

❖ Finite

We've mentioned the Finite function several times so far, but we didn't properly explain what it is or how it is realized. First, the Finite has three (related) functions: it expresses tense, modality, and polarity, and we'll get to each of these shortly. Second, the Finite is realized by a small group of verbs that express tense, such as the verb *to be* and its different inflections (is, was, are, were) as well as the perfect auxiliary *has*, and verbs that express modality — modal verbs — such as *will*, *would*, *shall*, *should*, etc.

In terms of tense, it is the Finite element in the clause that “carries” the tense of the verbal group. So, for example, in clause (8), the verbal group is marked for the present tense, which is carried by the Finite, while in (9), the verbal group is marked for the past tense, which is, again, carried by the Finite.

(8) He is swimming.

(9) He was swimming.

The interpersonal structure of the two above clauses is analyzed as follows. Note how the Mood component includes both the Subject and the Finite.

8.

He	is	swimming
Subject	Finite	Predicator
Mood	Residue	

9.

He	was	swimming
Subject	Finite	Predicator
Mood	Residue	

As regards modality, the Finite element expresses the modality of the verbal group; that is, the Finite element can express the speaker's assessment of the proposition or proposal in terms of possibility, frequency, obligation, or inclination. So, for example, in clause (10), the Finite element expresses the speaker's evaluation regarding probability, while in clause (11), the Finite element expresses the speaker's evaluation regarding obligation (on the part of the addressee).

10. He might take the job.

He	might	take	the job
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
Mood	Residue		

11.

He	should	take	the job
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
Mood	Residue		

Finally, in terms of polarity, the Finite element expresses polarity; that is, whether the clause is positive or negative. The default case, the unmarked case, is that clauses are positive. The negative polarity of a clause, however, is realized through the Finite, among other elements in the clause. In other words, a clause like (12) is positive in polarity, and this is because of its lack of a negative marker such as a (negative) Finite. If the polarity of the clause is reversed, then a negative marker, here a Finite element, is needed, as is shown in clause (13).

12.

Get	the job
Predicator	Complement
Residue	

13.

Don't	get	the job
Finite	Predicator	Complement
Mood	Residue	

One final note about the functions of the Finite is that, as presented above, they seem to be simultaneous; that is, the Finite element expresses at the same time tense, modality, and polarity. However, a more accurate description is that a Finite element realized by a modal verb expresses modality; tense in such cases is usually neutralized. That is to say, when the Finite is used to express modality by the speaker, it expresses just that, not modality *and* tense. Observe, for example, clause (14), which while expressing an action in the future, has a Finite element that some grammarians would argue is inflected for the past tense.

14.

He	might	go	to Harvard
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Adjunct
Mood	Residue		

The clause here expresses an event in the future despite the argument that it is inflected for, or carries, the past tense. The “futurity” of this clause is, indeed, expressed not by the Finite element, which expresses modality, but by the rest of the verbal group, to which we will turn shortly.

The rest of the interpersonal structure of the clause is taken up by the Residue. This component usually includes: A) the Predicator; B) Complement(s); C) Adjunct(s). We'll discuss each in turn.

❖ The Predicator

The part of the verbal group excluding the Finite. The Predicator, in essence, is the interpersonal function assigned to that part of the verbal group that carries semantic content. Whereas the Finite links the proposition or proposal expressed by the clause to a certain time or expresses positive or negative validity or degrees of modality, the Predicator expresses the event or process that the Subject is engaged in.

15.

He	has	finished	his homework
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
Mood		Residue	

16.

He	must	have been eating	brownies
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
Mood		Residue	

17.

Could	he	have eaten	brownies?
Finite	Subject	Predicator	Complement
Mood		Residue	

In certain cases, as in clauses with verbal groups set in the present simple or past simple, the functions of the Finite and the Predicator are conflated; that is, they are fused in one lexical item. In such cases, we label the verbal group as F/P (Finite-Predicator fused or conflated). As regards the Mood/Residue, a fused Finite-Predicator is split equally between the two components. Observe:

18.

He	studies	on weekends
Subject	F/P	Adjunct
Mood		Residue

19.

He	studied	yesterday
Subject	F/P	Adjunct
Mood	Residue	

Note that *copula be* and *have* when it appears in the sense of “possess” are analyzed as Finite only; in such cases, no Predicator function appears when analyzing the clause.

20.

He	was	happy
Subject	Finite	Complement (Attributive)
Mood	Residue	

21.

He	has	a horse
Subject	Finite	Complement
Mood	Residue	

In clause (21), the nominal group “a horse” is analyzed as a Complement even though it can’t serve as the Subject of a passive clause. This is because of the structure of the clause itself, not because of the nature of the Complement. Speaking of Complements, they are the second element that is placed within the Residue component, so let’s discuss them.

❖ Complements

Simply put, a Complement is a participant in the interpersonal structure of the clause that was affected by the argument of the clause (Eggins, 2004, p. 157). In other words, the group functioning as Complement is affected by the event, process, or action expressed in the clause. The term Complement covers what has been referred to as “Object” in more formal approaches to grammar, but “Object” implies an entity acted upon; the object of impact. Such relationships are explored in an altogether different component of the grammar: the experiential component explored through the system of TRANSITIVITY.

The term Complement, then, suggest a certain complementarity with Subjects; like Subjects, Complements are typically realized as nominal groups. In fact, as Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p. 123) argue, any nominal group not functioning as Subject is a Complement. In fact, we can define the Complement as that element which has the potential to be a Subject. One neat probe to test whether a group functions as a Complement, then, is to see if it can function as a Subject in a passive clause. If the test passes, then the group is a Complement. Observe (22) below:

22.

He	scraped	his finger
Subject	F/P	Complement
Mood	Residue	

As you can see, the nominal group “his finger” functions here as a Complement in the interpersonal structure of the clause. If we were to test whether this nominal group can function as the Subject, by passivizing the clause, the probe would pass, i.e., we would have a grammatical clause:

23.

His finger	was	scraped
Subject	F	P
Mood	Residue	

◆ Direct and indirect object Complements

On an intuitive level, Complements can be easily identified in such clauses as we have seen above. However, some clauses have a more “complicated” structure, especially when the verbal groups are constituted by verbs such as “give,” “send,” or “offer.” Such verbs, referred to as ditransitives, require or license two Complements. Observe:

24.

He	gave	money	to his friend
Subject	F/P	C	C
Mood	Residue		

25.

He	gave	his friend	money
Subject	F/P	C	C
Mood	Residue		

Note how, in (25), both Complements can function as Subjects when the clause is rendered in the passive voice: **His friend was given money** and **Money was given to his friend**. Note, too, that some analysts refer to Complements realized as prepositional phrases (such as “to his friend” above) as oblique Complements, and other analysts use the term oblique Complement to refer to indirect object Complements generally. For our purposes, however, we will simply refer to them as Complements.

Other grammarians argue that a prepositional phrase, such as “to his friend” in (24), should be analyzed as an Adjunct rather than a Complement. This is based on the argument that the prepositional phrase itself can’t function as Subject without losing the preposition. In other

words, the prepositional phrase “to his friend” can only become the Subject of a passive clause if it loses the preposition:

24'. His friend was given money.

His friend	was	given	money
Subject	F	P	C ^{DO}
Mood	Residue		

While true, this observation doesn't apply to other prepositional phrases functioning as Adjuncts. Note, for example, clause (26).

26.

I	trampled	on the bed
Subject	F/P	Adjunct
Mood	Residue	

Observe how, if we make the nominal group “the bed” within the prepositional phrase “on the bed” a Subject, the preposition is left within the clause, functioning as an Adjunct:

26'.

The bed	was	trampled	on
Subject	F	P	Adjunct
Mood	Residue		

This, indeed, suggests that certain prepositional phrases in the clause, like “to his friend” in “He gave money to his friend” function as Complements rather than Adjuncts. Moreover, if we are truly taking a functional perspective to the analysis of clauses, then a nominal group like “his friend” in (25) and a prepositional phrase like “to his friend” in (24) both refer to entities in the clause. Yes, the form is different and, as such, the meaning expressed is different, but this difference is not significant enough to require a different label to the function expressed by the prepositional phrase.

◆ Attributive Complements

Complements appearing after copular verbs (such as the various inflected forms of “be” along with verbs like “appear,” “become,” or “seem”) are called attributive Complements. They can be nominal groups, prepositional phrases, or even adverbial groups. Observe:

27.

He	is	smart
Subject	F	C (Attributive)
Mood	Residue	

28.

He	became	president
Subject	F/P	C (Attributive)
Mood	Residue	

Unlike other Complements, attributive Complements aren't potential Subjects. That is, they can't function as Subjects in a passive clause. For example, the attributive Complement in the original clause "He became president" can't function as Subject in a passive clause: *President was become him.

However, clauses with attributive Complements allow a reversal of positions between the Subject and the Complement. Observe:

29.

Finites	are	important
Subject	F	C (Attributive)
Mood	Residue	

30.

Important	are	Finites
C (Attributive)	F	Subject
Residue	Mood	

This is a simple reversal of positions for thematic reasons that will be further explored in later chapters. The clause in example (30) is set in the active voice; not the passive. In fact, we don't seem to have passive forms of the copular verb "be." Observe the ungrammaticality of the following example: *Important is been (by Finites).

❖ Adjuncts

In the interpersonal structure of the clause, some elements serve to add non-essential information such as time and place or the speaker's judgments over the argument expressed in the clause. Such elements are called Adjuncts, and, while important, they are non-essential to the expression of propositions or proposals. Adjuncts can be classified into circumstantial, conjunctive, and modal, correlating with the three meta-functions: experiential, textual, and interpersonal, respectively.

◆ Circumstantial Adjuncts

Circumstantial Adjuncts are those that add information about the unfolding of the process or the event expressed in the clause in terms of time, place, cause, accompaniment, and manner, among others. Observe:

31. Circumstantial Adjunct of time

I	called	him	at 9:00 a.m.
Subject	F/P	C	A ^{CIR}
Mood	Residue		

32. Circumstantial Adjunct of place

I	saw	him	on campus
Subject	F/P	C	A ^{CIR}
Mood	Residue		

33. Circumstantial Adjunct of cause

He	works	for fame
Subject	F/P	A ^{CIR}
Mood	Residue	

34. Circumstantial Adjunct of accompaniment

He	works	with his three brothers
Subject	F/P	A ^{CIR}
Mood	Residue	

35. Circumstantial Adjunct of manner

He	travels	by car
Subject	F/P	A ^{CIR}

Mood	Residue
------	---------

As you can note from the above examples, circumstantial Adjuncts are usually realized by prepositional phrases or adverbial groups, as in “I saw him at 9:00 a.m.” or “I saw him yesterday.” A differentiating feature of Adjuncts is that they can’t function as Subjects, unlike Complements.

◆ Conjunctive Adjuncts

Conjunctive Adjuncts serve to connect or link clauses to the preceding parts of the text; that is, they serve a textual function, hence their connection to the textual meta-function. Examples of conjunctive Adjuncts include: “however,” “moreover,” “nevertheless,” and “in other words,” among others. Observe:

36.

However,	he	followed	them
A ^{CON}	Subject	F/P	C
	Mood	Residue	

Since they are not part of the interpersonal structure of the clause, conjunctive Adjuncts are not analyzed as part of the Mood or Residue components. Note how, in clause (38) below for example, the conjunctive Adjunct comes between the Subject and the F/P, but is not included in the Mood component.

37.

Afterwards,	the party	ended	
A ^{CON}	Subject	F/P	
	Mood	Residue	

38.

He	then	saw	his friend
Subject	A ^{CON}	F/P	C
Mo...		..od	Residue

◆ Conjunctive Adjuncts or conjunctions?

You may notice that conjunctive Adjuncts serve a similar function to Conjunctions in that they link the different parts of text together. However, they differ in two important aspects.

First, conjunctive Adjuncts can link parts of the text together, while conjunctions link clauses in a clause complex. Observe the difference between (i) He went to the restaurant because he was hungry; and (ii) He was hungry. Therefore, he went to the restaurant. In (i), the conjunction

“because” links two clauses in a clause complex (one single sentence), while in (ii), the conjunctive Adjunct “therefore” links two sentences.

Second, conjunctive Adjuncts can be moved within the clause. Observe: i) Therefore, he went to the restaurant; and ii) He, therefore, went to the restaurant. Conjunctions, on the other hand, can't be moved within clauses: iii) *He went to the restaurant he because was hungry. Viewed from this perspective, conjunctions express logical, not textual, meaning; as such, they are not analyzed as part of the interpersonal structure of the clause. Observe:

39.

because	he	was	hungry
	Subject	F	C ^{INT}
	Mood		Residue

◆ Modal Adjuncts

Modal Adjuncts express the speaker's judgments over the proposition or proposal expressed by the clause as a whole or over aspects of the event expressed by the clause such as probability, usuality, obligation and inclination. These latter ones will be discussed more fully later on as we discuss Modality.

◆ Modal Adjuncts: probability and usuality

Some modal Adjuncts are used by speakers to express their judgments or commitment to the likelihood or probability of the information expressed in the clause, while other modal Adjuncts express the speaker's judgment over the frequency or usuality of the information expressed in the clause. Observe:

40. Modal Adjunct related to probability

He	probably	went	to the store
Subject	A ^{MOOD}	F/P	A ^{CIR}
Mood			Residue

41. Modal adjunct related to usuality

He	never	goes	to the store
Subject	A ^{MOOD}	F/P	A ^{CIR}
Mood			Residue

A few things to note about the above two examples:

First, note that the modal Adjuncts express **the speaker's** judgments over probability and usuality. That is, these Adjuncts express judgments from the speaker's perspective regarding the probability or usuality of the proposition expressed by the clause. In (41) above, the person referred to in the clause could actually go every day to the store, but from the speaker's

perspective, he never does; hence “never” here is analyzed as a modal Adjunct — more specifically, a mood Adjunct.

Second, note that the two Adjuncts above express meanings associated with the modality expressed by the Finite element in the clause. (40) could be rewritten as “He might have went to the store” and (41) can be rewritten as “He does not go to the store.” Since there is a close association in meaning between such Adjuncts and the Finites in the Mood of the clause, they are termed mood Adjuncts.

Third, since mood Adjuncts represent the speaker’s intrusion, through expressions of judgment, over the event or action expressed in the clause, then expressions such as “in my opinion,” “as far as I understand,” “to my mind,” and “according to my understanding,” among others, can also be analyzed as mood Adjuncts. There are various ways of expressing modality available to speakers, and the use of modal verbal operators realizing the Finite, such as “might,” or mood Adjuncts such as “possibly” or “regularly,” represent ways of expressing this modality along a cline from subjective realizations like “I think” to objective realizations such as “It is likely.” The grammar of modality is complex and interesting; we will have more to discuss on this topic later on in this set of notes.

Fourth, a neat way of identifying mood Adjuncts is that they can’t be the focus of theme predication; that is, they can’t appear as X in an “it was X that Y” construction. This structure is called a predicated theme structure, which we will discuss more in the coming chapters. What is important here is that mood Adjuncts can’t function as predicated themes. Observe the ungrammaticality of i) *It was never that he goes to the store; and ii) It was to the store that he never goes. While ii) appears stilted, it is definitely more acceptable than i).

◆ Modal Adjuncts: obligation and inclination

The other side of the modality spectrum is that of the speaker’s assessment regarding the obligation and inclination related to proposal. That is, the speaker’s assessment or evaluation of the degree to which the addressee of a command or an offer is obligated or inclined to carry it out or accept it. This part of modality is termed modulation, while the previous part, that related to probability and usuality assessments of propositions, is called modalization.

42.

He	willingly	got	the pen
Subject	A ^{MOOD}	F/P	C ^{DO}
Mood		Residue	

The grammar of modulation is a bit more difficult and complex than that of modalization for several reasons, but chief among them, at least as far as we’re concerned, is that it is expressed usually not by modal Adjuncts but by expansion of the Predicator, like “supposed to” in “He was *supposed to* cut the grass” or “willing to” in “He is *willing to* study.”

◆ Modal Adjuncts: Comment Adjuncts

The other subtype of modal Adjuncts comprises comment Adjuncts, which express the speaker's judgment regarding the entire clause, not the probability or frequency, from the speaker's perspective, of the action or event expressed in the clause. Examples of comment Adjuncts include: "naturally," "inevitably," "of course," "obviously," "clearly," "plainly," "surprisingly," and "doubtless," among others.

Since they express the speaker's judgment or evaluation, comment Adjuncts are analyzed as part of the Mood component of the clause. Observe:

43.

Surprisingly,	He	never	goes	to the store
A ^{COM}	Subject	A ^{MOOD}	F/P	A ^{CIR}
Mood			Residue	

44.

He,	unfortunately,	never	goes	to the store
Subject	A ^{COM}	A ^{MOOD}	F/P	A ^{CIR}
Mood			Residue	

❖ WH-interrogatives

Simply put, WH-interrogative clauses represent the speaker's demand for a missing piece of information. Thus, they share with Yes/No-interrogatives the fact that the speaker is demanding information, but in the case of Yes/No-interrogatives, the speaker is demanding to know the polarity value of the clause; the answer to such interrogatives is, then, either yes or no.

In WH-interrogatives, the WH-element specifies the information the speaker is requesting, whether in terms of circumstances or participants; as such, it is a distinct element in the interpersonal structure of the clause. Additionally, the WH-element also functions as that element it is specifying. So, the WH-element always has two functions: a WH- function and the function of the element it is specifying, and these can be a circumstantial Adjunct, a Subject, or a Complement, as shown below:

45.

What	did	he	study?
WH-/Complement	Finite	Subject	Predicator
Res...	Mood		...due

46.

Where	did	he	study?
WH-/A ^{CIR}	F	S	P
Res...	Mood		...due

47.

Who	studied		syntax?
WH-/Subject	F/P		C
Mood		Residue	

Note that in all WH-interrogative clauses, the structure of the Mood component is such that the Finite precedes the Subject (F[^]S), similar to that of Yes/No-interrogative clauses. The exception is when the WH-element conflates with the Subject; in this case, the ordering of the Mood components is (S[^]F).

◆ The Imperative

Imperative clauses have a rather unique interpersonal structure, appearing in its unmarked form without any Mood components. Observe:

48.

Study	grammar!
Predicator	C
Residue	

This can be understood by exploring the speech function typically expressed by imperatives: commands. In most typical situations, commands are addressed to the person with whom one is talking, the addressee. As such, the Subject need not be explicit, hence the deletion of the Subject in unmarked imperative clauses. In addition, commands are usually absolute, in the sense that the speaker doesn't modulate their expressions, and they are, by nature, set in the future. As such, the functions of the Finite, to link the proposal to a time and to express degrees of modality, aren't relevant; hence, again, the ellipsis of the Finite.

There are, however, certain cases where the Subject and the Finite do appear in imperative clauses, such as the following:

49. Negation

Don't	study	grammar
Finite	Predicator	C ^{DO}
Mood	Residue	

50. Negation + emphasis

Don't	you	study	grammar
Finite	Subject	Predicator	C ^{DO}
Mood	Residue		

51. Emphasis

Do	study	grammar
Finite	Predicator	C ^{DO}
Mood	Residue	

Examples such as (54) and (55) are emphatic; that is, “you” in (54) and “do” in (55) are added here for extra emphasis.

In its unmarked, typical form, the imperative clause takes as its addressee “you,” an elided Subject. However, some imperative clauses include both the speaker and the addressee in the speech act, such as “Let’s move!” In such cases, “let’s” is analyzed as the Subject in the interpersonal structure of the clause. Imperative clauses with “let’s” or “let us” are known as the “suggestive” form, while those with an ellipted or explicit “you” as the Subject are known as the “jussive” form.

52. Speaker + addressee

Let's	study	grammar
Subject	Predicator	C
Mood	Residue	

53. Finite + Speaker + addressee

Do	let us	study	grammar
Finite	Subject	Predicator	C
Mood	Residue		

❖ Modality

Modality is that semantic region between the polar extremes of “Yes, it is” and “No, it isn’t” and between “Do it” and “Don’t do it.” Put more simply, modality has to do with the speaker’s commitment to the validity of the proposition, in terms of probability/possibility and frequency/usuality, and to the validity of the proposal in terms of obligation or inclination/readiness.

In the paragraphs above, we’ve argued that one of the functions of the Finite is the expression of modality through its realization by modal verbs such as “may,” “might,” “can,” “could,” “would,” “will,” “should,” among others. We also argued that modality can also be expressed by modal Adjuncts such as “possibly,” “probably,” “always,” “never,” and “willingly” or “readily,” among others. We can now say that the Finite and modal Adjuncts (mood Adjuncts in particular) are two ways of expressing modality in the interpersonal structure of the clause.

54. He might study grammar.

He	might	study	grammar
Subject	Finite	Predicator	C
Mood	Residue		

55. He possibly will study grammar.

He	possibly	will	study	grammar
Finite	Subject	Finite	Predicator	C
Mood	Residue			

Note that, in clause (55), we’re treating the Finite “will” simply as marking the finiteness of the verbal group (marking the act as happening in the future) as opposed to expressing modality. This is done for simplicity’s sake.

There are, of course, other ways of expressing the speaker’s commitment towards the validity of the proposition or the proposal. Observe the following examples:

56. I think he will study grammar.

57. It is likely that he will study grammar.

In (56), we have an expression of the speaker’s assessment of the proposition in terms of probability or possibility as an entire clause, “I think,” while in (57), we have the speaker’s assessment expressed as an attributive Complement, “It is likely,” within an extrapositional construction “It is likely that he will study grammar.”

What we have in examples (56) and (57) are **explicit** expressions of modality, termed as such simply because the proposition and the expression of modality are presented in two different clauses (“that he will study grammar” is a subordinate clause). On the other hand, examples (54) and (55) above constitute examples of **implicit** expressions of modality, since the modal assessment and the proposition are part of the same clause.

In addition to the distinction between implicit/explicit expressions of modality, we also have another distinction between more subjective and more objective expressions of modality. That is, is the speaker taking responsibility for this assessment? Or, is this modal assessment being

presented as more “objective”? Example (56), above, is one in which the modal assessment is presented as subjective, since the speaker is clearly taking responsibility for it, while example (57) is more objective, since the expression of modality is presented as if it is a general modal assessment, not that of the speaker.

In terms of examples (54) and (55) above, the Finite is taken to be more on the subjective side of modal responsibility, so (54) is an example of a subjective implicit modal assessment. Modal Adjuncts, on the other hand, are taken to be more objective in terms of modal responsibility, so (55) would be an example of an objective implicit modal assessment.

The above examples were of modal assessment in terms of possibility or frequency. Let’s see how this applies to modal assessments in terms of obligation:

- 58. She must study grammar.
- 59. She is supposed to study grammar.
- 60. I want Sarah to study grammar.
- 61. It is essential that she studies grammar.

In (58), much like (54) above, the modal assessment of the speaker is expressed through the Finite element “must.” As such, this is an example of an implicit, subjective modal assessment.

In (59), the modal assessment is expressed through an expansion of the Predicator. That is, the Predicator is essentially a verbal group complex. Both (58) and (59) are examples of implicit modal assessment, but while (58) is subjective, (59) is objective. Here is the interpersonal structure of clause (59)

She	is	supposed to study	grammar
Subject	Finite	Predicator	C
Mood		Residue	

In examples (60) and (61), we have an explicit modal assessment. In (60), the modal assessment is expressed in the clause “I want”; hence, we have an explicit, subjective modal assessment. In (61), the modal assessment is expressed by an attributive Complement “essential” within the superordinate clause “It is essential” — which is followed by the subordinate clause expressing the proposal, “that she studies grammar.” As such, (61) is an example of explicit, objective modal assessment.