The interpersonal metafunction in French from a Systemic Functional perspective

David Banks

Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines – Victor Segalen, Université de Bretagne Occidentale, 20, rue Duquesne, CS 9383729238 Brest Cedex 3, France

Abstract

Systemic Functional Linguistics has frequently been criticized for being anglocentric. Although this question has begun to be addressed in recent years, a large imbalance still remains. In this context Caffarel's book *A Systemic Functional Grammar of French* (Continuum, 2006), following on from her 2004 article, is to be welcomed as the first book-length treatment of French in a Systemic Functional framework. The analyses she provides show that in many ways French functions in a manner similar to English, with one major exception, the interpersonal metafunction. According to Caffarel the interpersonal analysis of the French clause is in terms of a Negotiator and a Remainder, where the obligatory components of the Negotiator are the Finite, the Subject, and the Predicator. This contrasts with the usual SFL analysis of the English clause in terms of Mood and Residue. However, further consideration shows that the French clause is amenable to a Mood + Residue analysis, and at the same time English clauses can be analysed in terms of Negotiator + Remainder. It would seem that Caffarel's suggestion supplies an alternative way of looking at the interpersonal metafunction rather than a structure which distinguishes between English and French.
© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Comparative methodology; French; Interrogatives; Language typology; Mood; Negotiator; Systemic Functional Linguistics

1. Introduction

Systemic Functional Linguistics has often been criticized as being English-centred. As Christopher Butler has remarked:

> The overwhelming concentration of systemic linguistics on English, particularly during the years of its most crucial development, has ineluctably led to a model of discourse which has a heavy anglocentric bias, despite the more recent appearance of work on other languages.
>
> Butler (2003, p. 397)

That work on other languages has continued, and indeed accelerated in the intervening years. This includes work on the language in which I have a personal interest, French, and the work on French which is best

---

E-mail address: david.banks@univ-brest.fr

known and, so-far, the most comprehensive is that of Alice Caffarel, notably Caffarel, 2004 and Caffarel, 2006 (with a shorter account appearing in Teruya et al. (2007)). In most respects, Caffarel's description and analysis of French resembles, and might be thought of as being parallel to the model developed for English, with one significant exception, that is, her treatment of the Interpersonal metafunction. In this paper[1] I should like to consider Caffarel's hypothesis, and to discuss to what extent her hypothesis is justified.

The semantic component of the model proposed by Systemic Functional Linguistics posits three metafunctions. These are the Ideational metafunction which deals with the speaker's representation of the world, the Interpersonal metafunction which deals with the relationships established between the speaker and his addressees and between the speaker and his message, and the Textual metafunction which deals with the linear organization of the message (cf. e.g. Halliday, 2004; Thompson, 2004; Banks, 2005a). The question of the Interpersonal metafunction in French in a systemic framework was dealt with in Huddleston and Uren (1969). However, this was at a period, before the metafunctional framework had been fully developed, and the main thrust of the theory was then in terms of systems of choice in language production, then called system networks. It is therefore considerably different to the treatment presented by Caffarel.

2. The interpersonal metafunction in English

The model of the Interpersonal metafunction, as it has been developed for English, is related to choice of mood, and distinguishes between a Mood (or Mood element) and a Residue, the Mood being made up of the Subject and the Finite. This is usually illustrated by the difference between a declarative and a polar question (sometimes known as a yes/no question; Caffarel calls this a confirmation question, as opposed to an information question, i.e. a WH-question). Thus, in the following example, taken from Halliday (2004), the Mood in the declarative is made up of Subject followed by Finite (*The duke + has*), while the Mood in the polar question is made up of Finite followed by Subject (*Has + the duke*), the Residue being identical in both cases (*given that teapot away*).

The duke	has	given that teapot away
Subj.	Fin.	
Mood		Residue

Has	the duke	given that teapot away?
Fin.	Subj.	
Mood		Residue

From Halliday (2004, p. 115).

3. Caffarel's hypothesis

Caffarel suggests that in French the Interpersonal metafunction should be analysed in terms of a Negotiator (or Negotiatory element in Teruya et al. (2007)) and a Remainder, where the Negotiator is made up of the Subject, the Finite, and the Predicator. Caffarel does not define Negotiator as such, but claims that it carries

---

[1] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 20th European Systemic Functional Linguistics Conference and Workshop, Helsinki, June 2008.

the negotiation of the exchange forward, is crucial to the negotiation process and the realization of Mood options, and is the most salient part of the interpersonal structure. The following example is taken from Caffarel (2006).

As-	tu	donné	le livre à Paul ?
Fin.	Subj.	Pred.	
Negotiator			Remainder

From Caffarel (2006, 129).
[Have you given the book to Paul?]

Here the Negotiator in this polar question is made up of the Finite (*As*), the Subject (*tu*), and the Predicator (*donné*). What is left constitutes the Remainder (*le livre à Paul*). From a formal point of view, this means that for English the Predicator is not in the Mood, with Subject and Finite, whereas for French it is included with the Subject and Finite in the Negotiator.

Caffarel believes this to be an essential difference between English and French:

> From a language-specific perspective on structure, the modal structure of French is considerably different from that of English. These structural differences result from both the different means of enacting an exchange and the different means of realizing MOOD selection... the French Negotiator–Remainder structure is functionally analogous to the Mood–Residue structure of English. Just as for purposes of negotiating an exchange in English, it is Mood that is crucial, so for negotiating French exchanges it is the Negotiator that is the most crucial clausal component.

Caffarel (2006, pp. 163–4)

4. The polar interrogative in French

Since the polar interrogative is used for purposes of illustration, it would seem appropriate to look more closely at the polar interrogative in French. Most general grammars of French (e.g. Arrivé et al., 1986; Maingeneau, 1996; Riegel et al., 1998), as well as more specific studies (e.g. Renchon, 1967; Borillo, 1978; Gadet, 1989; Quillard, 2000; Hansen, 2001) give three basic ways for formulating a polar question.

Option 1 is that the polar question has the same word order as the declarative. Its function as an interrogative is indicated only by intonation in oral language, and by punctuation, that is, the presence of a question mark, in written language:

(1) Vous partez ?
   [You're leaving?]

Option 2 is that of inversion. This has two forms depending on whether the Subject is pronominal or not. Where the subject is a pronoun the inversion is simple, and the pronoun Subject follows the verb in simple forms, and the Finite in complex forms:

(2) Veut-il que tu reviennes ?
   [Does he want you to come back?]

Where the Subject is not pronominal, the inversion is complex: the nominal Subject precedes the verb, and a coreferential pronoun follows it:

(3) Jean, part-il ?
   [Is Jean leaving?]

Option 3 is the use of *est-ce que* to mark the clause as a question:

(4) Est-ce que tu viens ?
     [Are you coming?]

Est-ce que could be glossed as *is it* (*the case*) *that*, but is probably no longer felt as having this literal sense, and functions simply as a question marker. The above French examples are taken from Maingeneau, 1996 and Mauger, 1968.

It can be noted that Maingeneau (1996) claims that option 3 is the most common, but that it is itself (presumably from an etymological point of view) a case of inversion, with the pronoun *ce* following the verb *est*. However, it seems reasonable to say that synchronically this is felt by French speakers to be a single unit, and hence it is no longer felt to be a true inversion. Arrivé et al. call this structure a "fait idiosyncratique du français" [an idiosyncratic fact of French] (Arrivé et al., 1986, p. 350).

Perhaps more significantly from our point of view, option 1 is not given by some of the grammars, e.g. Mauger, 1968; Lévy, 2000. Arrivé et al. claim that it is of "usage oral, qui ne peut être écrit que comme transcription d'un dialogue" [oral use and can only be written as the transcription of dialogue]. This is probably too restrictive, but it does indicate something about the nature and function of this structure. On the other hand, those studies that deal with informal or specifically with oral French find this by far the most frequent form in these registers. Thus it formed 78% of the corpus used by Quillard (2000), which has a bias to less formal registers. In Hansen's (2001) oral corpus it constituted 82.59 %, and in Gadet's (1989) corpus of telephone conversations it made up 88%. This is significant because for Caffarel this option seems primary. She says:

> Intonation is the prototypical means for prosodic expression; and it is notable that this may be the only resource used to indicate the systemic MOOD contrasts in French ...
>
> Caffarel (2006, p. 123)

and a little later:

> ...the MOOD options have a prosodic mode of expression, which either solely employs the phonological means or a combination of both phonological and grammatical ones.
>
> Caffarel (2006, p. 124)

This begs the question of register. Are we talking about written language or spoken language? This never seems quite clear. Ostensibly Caffarel is dealing with both, that is, she is dealing with the language as a whole, but as a reader I frequently get the impression, without it being explicitly stated, that it is oral French that she has in mind.

5. French interrogative structures and register

In order to get some inkling of how French interrogative structures operate in different registers, a mini-corpus (Banks, 2005b) of examples was studied. The examples of polar questions that occurred in these documents were considered. The three documents in question were:

1. The issue of *Elle* for 23 July 2007. *Elle* is a fairly chatty up-market women's magazine.
2. A copy of *Sortie de Secours*, a cultural magazine produced by students in my university.
3. The issue of *Le Monde* for 19 February 2005. This is the well-known French quality daily.

Table 1 gives the raw numbers of the examples of the different structures of the polar question found in the sample.

Column 1: no inversion.
Column 2a: simple inversion.

Table 1
Numbers of polar question structures.

	1	2a	2b	3	Total
Elle	16	13	8	1	38
Sortie de Secours	5	9	8	–	22
Le Monde	3	15	27	–	45

Table 2
Percentages of polar question structures.

	1	2a	2b	2a + 2b	3
Elle (%)	42	34	21	55	3
Sortie de Secours (%)	23	41	36	77	–
Le Monde (%)	7	33	60	93	–

Column 2b: complex inversion.
Column 3: *Est-ce que* marker.

Table 2 gives percentages for ease of comparison. Since simple and complex inversion are not in competition, as it were, but depend simply on the word class of the Subject, a column has been added giving the sum for both types of inversion.

Although this sample is very small, especially for written discourse, it nevertheless suggests several things. First of all, it would seem that the *est-ce que* type (option 3) is virtually restricted to oral language. In fact, the single example which does occur is in quotes, as a transcription of direct speech. Secondly, the lower the register (the closer one approaches an oral style), the more option 1 is favoured; and inversely, the higher the register, the more option 2 is favoured. Indeed, *Elle*, which is the most "oral" of these sources has the highest percentage of option 1 (42%) and the lowest percentage of option 2 (55%), while *Le Monde*, distinctly high register journalism, has a very low percentage of option 1 (only 7%), and a correspondingly high percentage of option 2 (93%).

6. Caffarel's arguments

Among the evidence that Caffarel produces in favour of her hypothesis is the following exchange, reproduced from a 1945 novel by Simone de Beauvoir (Caffarel gives a longer sequence, but this section will be sufficient for our purposes):

(5)   Est-ce commencé ?
      C'est commencé ?
      C'est commencé.
      C'est commencé!

These four clauses are all analysed as being exclusively Negotiator with no Remainder. This leads Caffarel to say:

> ...negotiating the resolution of the exchange involves the replaying of the interpersonal functions of Subject, Finite and Predicator...these three functions are...crucial both to the negotiation process in French and to the realization of MOOD options.
>
> Caffarel (2006, p. 123)

However, these four clauses calque fairly easily into English, so there seems no reason why the same claim could not be made for English:

(5′)   Est-ce commencé ? Has it started?
      C'est commencé ? It's started?
      C'est commencé. It's started.
      C'est commencé! It's started!

The reason why Caffarel sees this range of options as being peculiarly French may be related to the fact that she seems to discount the option of an uninverted question in English. But, of course the uninverted form (e.g. *It's started?*) is perfectly possible in English, even if it is more marked than its French equivalent. According to Quirk et al. (1985), in English, this type of question invites the "hearer's verification". So although there are differences in distribution, all four types are possible in both languages. Moreover, in relation to the clause:

(6) Paul, tu le vois ?

where *Paul* is not a vocative, but is coreferential with the pronominal complement *le*, she claims:

> [This example] also shows that, unlike English, the Finite is not always discretely realized in an interrogative clause, but can be fused with the Predicator...

<div align="right">Caffarel (2006, p. 127)</div>

But while of the (at least) three possible translations of this clause:

(7) Paul, you see him?
(7′) Paul, can you see him?
(7″) Paul, do you see him?

Paul, you see him? is undoubtedly marked, it is certainly possible. So while this example may be more marked than its French analogue, it shows that a fused Finite (i.e. in the absence of an auxiliary, markers, such as tense, usually attached to the auxiliary, are attached to the Predicator; thus the Finite and Predicator are "fused") is perfectly possible in these cases in English. Moreover, if one changes the French verb form to *passé compose* (perfect):

(8) Paul, tu l'as vu ?

there are at least two English translations:

(9) Paul, you've seen him?
(9′) Paul, you saw him?

and one of these has a fused Finite, where a fused Finite is impossible in the French!

(9″) *Paul, tu le vis ?

   Another line of argument taken by Caffarel relates to the *est-ce que* construction. She calls *est-ce que* a Mood interrogator (M-int), and claims that it is not part of the Negotiator because the rising intonation is of itself sufficient to indicate the interrogative nature of the clause. Hence, of the clause:

(10) Est-ce que tu vois la lune ?

she says that:

> Although clearly part of the interpersonal organization of the clause it [*est-ce que*] falls outside the Negotiatory structure: certainly, M-int is associated with the presence of the option [polar interrogative]; however, it is by no means crucial to the realization of that option, since the rising tone is by itself sufficient for that purpose.

<div align="right">Caffarel (2006, p. 125)</div>

On the other hand, rising intonation is not obligatory in this clause; it can perfectly well occur with falling intonation, in which case the marker is necessary to indicate its interrogative status.

Probably Caffarel's best arguments are related to ellipsis. In her 2004 article she points out that moves (or turns in an exchange) that have no more than a Subject and a Finite are possible in English but not in French.

> Whilst English exchanges are typically carried forward by means of adjustment within the Mood element, i.e. the Subject + Finite, French exchanges revolve around the Negotiator, i.e. Subject + Finite + Predicator. Moves consisting of just Finite and Subject are not possible in French.
>
> <div align="right">Caffarel (2004, p. 97)</div>

This is perfectly true. The sequence

(11) Est-ce que vous l'avez vu ?
      *J'ai.

is impossible in French, whereas in English

(12) Have you seen him?
      I have.

is perfectly banal. Moreover, she points out that in the negative imperative the negation Adjunct is attached to the Predicator in French, but to the Finite in English.

> In an imperative clause…negative polarity is realized in the Predicator, as in *ne pleure pas*, while in English imperative Negative is realized in the Finite, as in *don't cry*.
>
> <div align="right">Caffarel (2004, p. 97)</div>

Again, this is true, although it might be pointed out that elsewhere Caffarel accepts verb forms of this type as being fused Finite and Predicator, so it is not clear why that could not be said here. If this is done, then the negative Adjunct is being attached to the Finite, albeit fused with the Predicator. The point is taken up again in the 2006 book:

> If ellipsis occurs, it is defined in relation to the Negotiator or to the Remainder. Thus with full ellipsis, both Negotiator and Remainder are ellipsed and the clause 'has' only textual functions, for example, a polarity marker and/or absolute and textual Themes. Partial ellipsis involves either the whole of the Negotiator or whole or part of the Remainder, as in these adjacency pairs: *Tu écoutes? – Oui* (are you listening? – Yes)…
>
> <div align="right">Caffarel (2006, p. 132)</div>

Thus, the French question

(13) Tu mécoutes ?

has two possible (positive) answers:

(14) Oui.
(14′) Oui, je t'écoute.

On the other hand, its English counterpart has three possible answers:

(15) Are you listening to me?

(16) Yes.
(16′) Yes, I am.
(16″) Yes, I am listening to you.

So, the point is true, but what this means is that the resources of English provide an additional option compared with French. I think one must ask whether this is sufficient to warrant claiming that the Interpersonal metafunctions of French and English are essentially different.

Hence it would seem that these arguments have something in their favour, but at the same time I do not find them totally convincing or conclusive.

7. French: Negotiator + Remainder

I shall now attempt to apply Caffarel's suggested analysis to a number of French interrogative clauses. These are all simple but authentic clauses, taken from my mini-corpus.

(17) Vous avez compris le message ?

Vous	avez	compris	le message ?
Subj.	Fin.	Pred.	
Negotiator			Remainder

You've understood the message?

This is option 1, with no inversion. The Negotiator, *Vous avez compris*, is made up of Subject + Finite + Predicator, which occur in that order; the Remainder is the rest of the clause, *le message*.

(18) Vous ressentez une pression ?

Vous	ressentez	une pression ?
Subj.	Fin./Pred.	
Negotiator		Remainder

You feel a pressure?

This is a second example of option 1, but here the Finite is fused with the Predicator. Hence the Negotiator is made up of the Subject + the fused Finite and Predicator, *Vous ressentez*, and the Remainder is *une pression*.

(19) Est-il aussi puissant que dieu ?

Est-	il	aussi puissant que dieu ?
Fin.	Subj.	
Negotiator		Remainder

Is he as powerful as God?

This is option 2 of the simple inversion type. The Negotiator is made up of the Finite (or perhaps fused Finite and Predicator since this is the copula verb (cf. Halliday, 2004)), and the Subject, in that order, *Est-il*, and the Remainder is *aussi puissant que dieu*.

(20)   Vos travaux ont-ils eu un echo ?

Vos travaux	ont-	ils	eu	un écho ?
Subj.	Fin.	Subj.	Pred.	
Negotiator				Remainder

Has your work had an echo?

This is a second example of option 2, but this time with the complex type of inversion. Here the Subject occurs twice, once in nominal form and once in pronominal form. The Negotiator is made up of the nominal Subject + Finite + pronominal Subject + Predicator, in that order, *Vos travaux ont-ils eu*; the Remainder then is *un écho*.

(21)   Est-ce qu'il va mourir ?

Est-ce qu'	il	va mourir ?
M-int	Subj.	Fin./Pred.
	Negotiator	

Is he going to die?

Finally we have an example of option 3 (the only example to occur in the sample). The Negotiator is made up of the Subject and what I shall call a fused Finite and Predicator even though it is a complex verb made up of a conjugated verb, *va*, and an infinitive, *mourir* (thus avoiding for the moment the question of whether the verb *aller* can constitute a Finite in French). Thus the Negotiator is *il va mourir*; this is preceded by the interrogative marker *est-ce que*, which as has been seen, Caffarel considers to be outside the negotiation structure. There is no Remainder in this clause.

Hence the application of Caffarel's hypothesis does not seem to pose any problems in itself.

8. French: Mood + Residue

I should now like to see what happens if we attempt, for the sake of argument, to analyse these same clauses on the Mood + Residue model, originally developed for English.

(17)   Vous avez compris le message ?

Vous	avez	compris le message ?
Subj.	Fin.	
Mood		Residue

The first example has a Mood made up of Subject + Finite, *Vous avez*, with *compris the message* constituting the Residue. This seems straightforward and poses no problems.

(18) Vous ressentez une pression ?

Vous	ressentez	une pression ?
Subj.	Fin./Pred.	
Mood	Residue	

In the second example where there is a fused Finite and Predicator, the Mood is made up of the Subject, *Vous* plus that part of the verb considered to be Finite, frequently interpreted as tense. The Residue is then that part of the verb which constitutes the Predicator and the rest of the clause, *une pression*. This might initially seem a little more complicated, but it is a complication that has never posed problems in its analogous use in the analysis of English clauses.

(19) Est-il aussi puissant que Dieu ?

Est-	il	aussi puissant que Dieu ?
Fin.	Subj.	
Mood	Residue	

The third example has a Mood made up of Finite (or fused Finite and Predicator) + Subject, *Est-il*, with *aussi puissant que dieu* constituting the Residue. There seems to be no problem here.

(20) Vos travaux ont-ils eu un echo ?

Vos travaux	ont-	ils	eu un écho ?
Subj.	Fin.	Subj.	
Mood			Residue

In the fourth example the mood is made up of the nominal Subject + Finite + the pronominal Subject, *Vos travaux ont-ils*, with *eu un écho* as Residue. Once again, there seems to be no problem here.

(21) Est-ce qu'il va mourir ?

Est-ce qu'	il	va mourir ?
Fin. (Mood marker)	Subj.	Fin/Pred
Mood		Residue

Finally we come to the option 3 type. Unlike Caffarel, I think that since the Mood marker *est-ce que* indicates the Mood, it must be part of the Mood (element). This will also include the Subject, *il*, and whatever part of the complex verb, *va mourir* we consider to be Finite. Although different, this seems to be no more complex than Caffarel's analysis.

9. English: Negotiator + Remainder

I should now like to see, again for the sake of argument, what happens if one attempts to apply Caffarel's negotiation analysis to English polar questions. In the following the first example is taken from Quirk et al. (1985); the others are authentic examples from the Guardian Weekly, 30 May–5 June 2008.

(22) You've got the explosive?

You	've	got	the explosive?
Subj.	Fin.	Pred.	
Negotiator			Remainder

In this example, which has the same structure as a French option 1 type, that is, it has the same word order as a declarative, with its interrogative function indicated by a question mark, the Subject + Finite + Predicator, *You've got*, is analysed as Negotiator, with the rest of the clause, *the explosive*, as Remainder. This type of analysis seems to work well for this type of example.

(23) Was he in Cambodia advising Pol Pot?

Was	he	in Cambodia advising Pol Pot?
Fin.	Subj.	
Negotiator		Remainder

This is an example with inversion, hence similar to type 2 of the simple inversion option. Since the verb here is the copula, it is usually marked as Finite, but can be considered to be Finite + Predicator. Thus the Finite + Subject, *Was he*, is analysed as Negotiator, while *in Cambodia advising Pol Pot* functions as Remainder. This works reasonably well too.

(24) Have I misled her?

Have	I	misled	her?
Fin.	Subj.	Pred.	
Negotiator			Remainder

Here we again have an inversion type (option 2) but with explicit Finite and Predicator, so that the Finite precedes, and the Predicator follows the Subject. The Finite + Subject + Predicator, *Have I misled*, is thus analysed as Negotiator, with *her* as Remainder. This seems to work perfectly well.

(25) Does he think the French government will approve?

Does	he	think	the French government will approve?
Fin.	Subj.	Pred.	
Negotiator			Remainder

This is an example where English uses the default Finite, *do*, but otherwise it functions just like the previous example. Thus the Finite + Subject + Predicator, *Does he think*, functions as Negotiator, and *the French government will approve* as Remainder. This seems to work perfectly well too.

I also found the following, fairly peculiar, example, which must be highly marked in English, but which has a structure that seems similar to the complex inversion type of French:

(26) …soap operas, is it really freedom of speech?

I would suggest the following analysis for this clause:

… soap operas,	is	it	really	freedom of speech?
Subj.	Fin.	Subj.	Fin. (modal adjunct)	
Negotiator				Remainder

In this suggested analysis, the Negotiator is made up of the nominal Subject + Finite (and fused Predicator) + pronominal Subject + a modal Adjunct which forms part of the Finite, *soap operas is it really*, with *freedom of speech* as Remainder. So even with this rather peculiar example, an analysis along these lines seems possible.[2]

10. Discussion

As we saw in the previous section the Negotiator–Remainder structure works for English, and the Mood–Residue structure works for French. So it is possible to analyse both English and French either in terms of Mood + Residue or in terms of Negotiator + Remainder.

The notion of negotiation has been around for some time, and is discussed at length in Martin, 1992, and more briefly in Matthiessen, 1995. Although this is no more than speculation on my part, it is not impossible that this notion is at the origin of Caffarel's hypothesis. However, it should be noted that in Martin (1992) and Matthiessen (1995), negotiation is discussed in terms which are restricted to conversation or dialogue.

If one looks more closely at the differences between English and French polar questions, they boil down to two basic points: first English has more ellipsis options than French, and secondly, English has a default operator. Thus, where English has an ellipsis option which eliminates the predicate, leaving only the Subject and Finite, this is an option which is not available in French. Secondly, the fact that English has a default operator means that inversion of simple verb forms only occurs with those verbs which do not operate with the default Finite, that is with *be* and *have*. Since French has no default Finite, inversion can occur with all verbs. However, it should be noticed that simple inversion does occur in both English and French, it is simply that the existence of the default operator means that the phenomenon is much more restricted in English than in French, so the difference is not an absolute one but one of degree. These differences seem relatively slight in terms of using them as a basis for positing a difference in function at the level of a major metafunction. I would suggest that the differences in the ways in which French and English function are to be found at a rather more delicate level.

It might be objected that the above demonstration treats the analyses in a purely structural fashion. However, since the analysis can be applied in this way, it is possible to interpret the analyses along the lines

---

[2] This example occurs in an article about the banning of the broadcasting of soap operas on Afghan television. The following is a rather longer quote, including the example, in order to give more co-text:

Three stations have complied with the ban but the largest, Tolo TV, has stubbornly defied it. Its manager, Saad Mohseni, accuses the minister of promoting "re-Talibanisation". "A lot of people think: 'Soap operas, is it really freedom of speech?' But this is deeper than that. A bunch of radicals are dictating how we should run the country – and this is just the start," he said.

appropriate to each of them. The Mood–Residue analysis approaches the question from the point of view of mood selection and the implications of this selection in terms of the interpersonal meaning of the clause; the Negotiator–Remainder analysis begins from a speech act perspective, treating the negotiation of meaning in terms what goods or services are being given or requested. This probably corresponds more closely to Martin's (1992) discussion of Negotiation, which he considers to be a function in discourse semantics, whereas Mood operates at the level of lexicogrammar.

It seems to me that Caffarel's hypothesis provides us with an interesting new analytical possibility. It opens up a new perspective on the Interpersonal metafunction. However, it is not quite what she says it is. It is not a basic difference between the ways in which English and French function since both languages can be analysed in terms of mood structure and of negotiation structure. What I think she has provided us with is an alternative way of looking at the Interpersonal metafunction.[3]

References

Arrivé, M., Gadet, F., Galmiche, M., 1986. La grammaire d'aujourd'hui. Guide alphabétique de linguistique française. Flammarion, Paris.

Banks, D., 2005a. Introduction à la linguistique systémique fonctionnelle de l'anglais. L'Harmattan, Paris.

Banks, D., 2005b. The case of Perrin and Thompson. An example of the use of a mini-corpus. English for Specific Purposes 24 (2), 201–211.

Borillo, A., 1978. Structure et valeur énonciative de l'interrogation totale en français. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Université de Provence.

Butler, C.S., 2003. Structure and Function. A Guide to Three Major Structural–Functional Theories. Part 2. From Clause to Discourse and Beyond. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Caffarel, A., 2004. In: Caffarel, A., Martin, J.R., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (Eds.), Language Typology, A Functional Perspective. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Caffarel, A., 2006. A Systemic Functional Grammar of French. Continuum, London.

Gadet, F., 1989. Le français ordinaire. Armand Colin, Paris.

Halliday, M.A.K., 2004. An Introduction to Functional Grammar, third ed. Arnold, London (revised Matthiessen, C.M.I.M.).

Hansen, M.-B.M., 2001. Syntax in interaction. Form and function of yes/no interrogatives in spoken standard French. Studies in Language 25 (3), 463–520.

Huddleston, R., Uren, O., 1969. Declarative, interrogative and imperative in French. Lingua 22, 1–26.

Lévy, M., 2000. Grammaire du français. Approche énonciative. Ophrys, Gap.

Maingeneau, D., 1996. Syntaxe du français. Hachette, Paris.

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

Matthiessen, C., 1995. Lexicogrammatical Cartography, English systems. International Language Sciences, Tokyo.

Mauger, G., 1968. Grammaire pratique du français d'aujourd'hui. Langue parlée, langue écrite. Hachette, Paris.

Quillard, V., 2000. Interroger en français parlé. Etudes syntaxique, pragmatique et sociolinguistique. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Université de Tours.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J., 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of English. Longman, London.

Renchon, H., 1967. Etudes de syntaxe descriptive. In: La syntaxe de l'interrogation, vol. 2. Palais des Académies, Bruxelles.

Riegel, M., Pellat, J.-C., Rioul, R., 1998. Grammaire méthodique du français. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.

Teruya, K., Akerejola, E., Andersen, T.H., Caffarel, A., Lavid, J., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M., Petersen, U.H., Patpong, P., Smedegaard, F., 2007. Typology of MOOD: a text-based and system-based functional view. In: Hasan, R., Matthiessen, C., Webster, J.J. (Eds.), Continuing Discourse on Language. A Functional Perspective, vol. 2. Equinox, London, pp. 859–920.

Thompson, G., 2004. Introducing Functional Grammar, second ed. Arnold, London.