WHAT CONSTITUTES "COMPLEMENT" IN SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR: ITS THEORETICAL PROBLEMS AND IMPLICATIONS

By:

Joko Kusmanto

Lecturer in State Polytechnic of Medan;

Doctoral Student of Linguistics Department;

Postgraduate Program, Sebelas Maret University

E-mail: jokokusmanto@gmail.com

Abstract

Despite the wide-range application of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) for various kinds of text analyses, SFG theory poses significant syntactic problems which have not been touched much. These syntactic problems are basically the result of its fundamental theoretical construct, i.e. the semantic perspective in approaching grammar. In fact, this theoretical construct seems to mix up the syntactic function and the semantic role analysis, two out three levels in syntactic analysis. It results in a serious inconsistency in labeling the syntactic unit of analysis in a clause and in defining many terms as well. This paper roughly explores both syntactic and semantic problems which appear in Mood system, particularly the label 'Complement'. This paper does not discuss each problem in detail and in a systematic way; rather it will only show us that there are still many works to do in the theory of SFG itself. Thus, there should be more scholars and advocates of this school of grammar focusing their investigations on the theoretical level of grammatical/syntactic issues.

Key Words : Systemic Functional Grammar, Mood analysis, Complement, Syntactic function, Semantic role

1. INTRODUCTION

Despite the wide-range application of Systemic Functional Grammar (henceforth SFG) for various kinds of text analyses, the theoretical stances promoted in SFG have not been much alluded to for a critical discussion. In Indonesia particularly, nowadays, we can find hundreds of text analyses conducted by students as well as language researchers by applying SFG at various levels of study. However, they have not yet contributed much theoretically to the theory of SFG. It is because most – not to say all – of those studies constitute only sorts of "copy and paste" models of text analyses (Kusmanto, 2011). They apply the model of text analysis theoretically constructed in SFG in every respect without critically (i) questioning the theoretical stances in SFG, (ii) analyzing its suitability to linguistic data which are different from English, and (iii) forwarding a theoretical feedbacks on the basis of their research findings. Even, there is almost none of the SFG advocates who focuses on investigating theoretically the theory of SFG. In fact, the theoretical study of SFG is also a significant and integral part of the study of SFG.

One of the theoretical constructs in SFG is Mood Analysis. This level of analysis constitutes the analysis of the grammar as interpersonal meaning (Eggins, 2004; Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004). The analysis basically deals with the speech roles that participants of an interaction take on in their exchange (Eggins, 2004:144 – 147). There are two basic speech functions that the participants of an interaction can take on. Those are speech functions which fall under the term (i) *demanding* and (ii) *giving*. The speech function *demanding* can be in the form of reciprocally demanding (i) information or (ii) goods and services. The speech function *giving* can also take the form of reciprocally giving (i) information or (ii) goods and services. Hence, there are four interpersonal exchanges altogether as can be presented in Table 1 (Eggins, 2004:146).

Table 1. Speech Functions and Commodities in Interaction

Speech Role	Commodity Exchanged	
	Information	Goods and Services
Giving	Statement	Offer
Demanding	Question	Command

The structure of the exchange at the level of Mood Analysis comprises MOOD and RESIDUE. It is still open to questioning whether or not the term Mood analysis indicates MOOD as the locus of the interpersonal meaning in the grammar or the locus of what sort of speech function is being exchanged in an interaction among the participants. In other words, it is MOOD that becomes the main facet technically used to evaluate the type of the speech function of an utterance? MOOD itself is theoretically composed of two constituents, i.e. Subject and Finite. In English, the presence of and the difference between Subject and Finite can be clearly evaluated in utterances as many authors of SFG have exemplified. The question is whether or not these two constituents of MOOD are universal across different languages. Does every language possess an element which can be classified as Subject and Finite such as English? There are still many more other questions that we can address to it which will end up with an assumption that this theoretical issue is still open to discussion. However, it is beyond the scope of the discussion which will be presented in this paper and further studies on it will be lengthy and take another different paper.

This paper is prepared to discuss one of the constituents in the RESIDUE. The term RESIDUE itself is introduced in Mood analysis to cover the parts of an utterance which are not identified as the constituents of MOOD. In other words, in English, RESIDUE will include all constituents which theoretically are assigned to lingual units in an utterance other than the Subject and the Finite. Basically, there are three constituents which theoreteically we can possibly find in RESIDUE on the basis of SFG. These three constituents are Predicator, Complement, and Adjunct. However, this paper will only focus its discussion on the theoretical issue of the Mood constituent named as "Complement" in SFG. The discussion is directed to read critically the syntactic and semantic problems of the Mood constituent as theorized by most of systemists.

2. BRIEF ACCOUNT OF COMPLEMENT IN ACCORDANCE TO SFG

Most authors of SFG books define Complement as the element or constituent in modal structure of the clause that has a potential of being Subject but it is not (Eggins, 2004; Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004; Matthiessen et.al. 2010). In other words, the definition says that Complement is a constituent of an utterance which is not in the position of the subject but it can

take place the current subject position in another construction. Eggins (2004: 157) clearly exemplify it by the process of making the clause into passive voice as in (1) as in Eggins (2004:157).

(1) a.

Henry James	Wrote		'The Bostonians'
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
MOOD		RESIDUE	

b.

'The Bostonians'	was	Written	By Henry James
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Adjunct
MOOD		RESIDUE	

Based on the definition previously given, the constituent '*The Bostonians*' in (1.a) is identified as Complement because the constituent '*The Bostonians*' can fill in the subject position of the passive construction respectively in (1.b).

Most authors of SFG books – if not all – also agree that a clause may have two Complements. Matthiessen et.al. (2010:75) say that "there can be up to two Complements in a clause". Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:123) also precisely say the same thing that "in *the duke gave my aunt that teapot* there are two Complements, *my aunt* and *that teapot*". This clause can be analyzed as in (2)

(2)

The duke	gave		my aunt	that teapot
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement	Complement
MOOD		RESIDUE		

We can understand clearly in (2) that either *my aunt* or *that teapot* can function as Subject as explained by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:123) in (3).

(3)   a. My aunt was given that teapot by the duke.

    b. That teapot was given my aunt by the duke.

However, it is not the whole story. Complement may also be in the different form as it can not be identified based on its capability of being Subject in a clause. In SFG a constituent like *contemporary* for instance in (4) is also classified as Complement (Eggins, 2004:158).

(4)

He	isn't	Contemporary
Subject	Finite	Complement:attr
MOOD		RESIDUE

Therefore, according to SFG, the use of term Complement is more comprehensive than what is understood by that term in traditional grammar (Bloor and Bloor, 2004:48). It covers both the Object and the nominal as well as adjectival Predicate in traditional grammar. It is of course very interesting. On the one hand, SFG give a new perspective on how a clause is grammatically analyzed which, according to SFG, is said to be on the basis of a semantic perspective (Eggins, 2004:144). But, on the other hand, this perspective raises questions on how the semantic content of a clause is related to and projected into a syntactic operation in a clause.

In order that we can identify which constituent in a clause is the Complement, we certainly have to be able to recognize the identities of the Complement. There must be an evaluation tool(s) which enable(s) us to identify with a great confidence that a certain constituent in a clause is the Complement. More or less it is concerned with the definition of the Complement itself. Such definition should be rigorous enough so that Complement can be well identified. It should also be consistent across the linguistic data; otherwise it is only like a personal preference. I will focus this part on examining the definitions of Complement which have been made by authors of SFG books.

3. THE PROBLEM OF COMPLEMENT AS A NON-ESSENTIAL PARTICIPANT

Eggins (2004:157) defines Complement as "a non-essential participant in the clause, a participant somehow affected by the main argument of the proposition". This definition seems sensible; in fact, it immediately leads to a great misunderstanding. What does Eggins really mean by the phrase 'non-essential' in her definition? How do we assess the characteristic of being 'non-essential' in the clause? If there is not any standard tool that everyone can use to identify the standard value of a constituent as a 'non-essential' constituent in a clause, most probably every different person will have different values based on which a constituent is said to be the 'non-essential' constituent in a clause.

Syntactically an element is said to be non-essential in a clause when it can be dropped off but the clause is still grammatically and semantically acceptable. This is a standard stance held by most linguists when analyzing a clause. The constituent *yesterday* in (5.a), for example, is a 'non-essential' element as it can be dropped of without affecting the grammatical and semantic acceptability of the clause as in (5.b).

(5)   a. Henry cooked a chicken yesterday.

         b. Henry cooked a chicken.

Again, this indicates that the status of the constituent *yesterday* in (5.a) is syntactically 'non-essential'. This constituent is of course 'essential' in terms of the time required by interlocutor to know the complete content of the information.

It will be different if the constituent *a chicken* in (5.a) which is dropped off from the clause as in (6).

(6)   *Henry cooked yesterday

It is clear that the constituent *a chicken* can not be dropped off from (5.a). When it is dropped off the clause soon becomes grammatically and semantically unacceptable. This indicates that the status of the constituent *yesterday* is different from that of the constituent *a chicken* in clause (5.a). Because the constituent *a chicken* can not be dropped off, the constituent *a chicken* can not syntactically be said as a 'non-essential' contituent in clause (5.a). Upon the basis of this reason,

I am convinced that this is not what Eggins means by "non-essential participant" for Complement. Therefore, her definition contains a serious flaw if it will be used as the standard tool both to identify a Complement in a clause and to interpret the meaning of the constituent.

It is clear that what Eggins means by 'non-essential participant' in her definition is not syntactic in nature. Syntactic operations as in (5) and (6) prove that her definition fails to work. Hence, what does she try to say by the 'non-essential participant' in her definition of Complement? It is true that Complement and Subject are not symmetry (DiSciullo, 2003). But, it does not mean that constituents which are identified as the Complements in (2) and (4) are syntactically 'non-essential participant'. Even, they are also not semantically 'non-essential participant' as the syntactic behavior of a constituent in a clause is the projection of the semantic content of the clause. Since they are syntactically 'essential constituents', they are also semantically 'essential'. When they are semantically not essential in a clause, they may syntactically be dropped off from the clause. This shows how syntax and semantics are closely related in nature.

Further, Eggins' definition of Complement is also intertwined with her definition of Adjunct as "clause elements which contribute some additional (but non-essential) information to the clause" (Eggins, 2004:158). She differentiates the term 'additional' from 'non-essential' without any clear-cut explanation what the differences between the term 'additional' and 'non-essential' are. I will say that when something is said to be additional, it is most probably non-essential. By definition, both Complement and Adjunct bear the same syntactic projection in a clause as only 'an additional or non-essential participant'. Once again, it does not seem to be what she means by the two definitions. They must fill a different syntactic function in a clause since she labels those constituents with different labels, i.e. Complement and Adjunct. Hence, when we examine deeply Eggins' definition of Complement and Adjunct, they are very perplexing. The problem of her definition appears to be the result of how she – and also most advocates of SFG – is mixed up in perceiving constituents in a clause in terms of their propositional function and in terms of their syntactic function at the same level. Even, it is also interwoven with the semantic content of a constituent as an informational content.

Complement is truly 'non-essential' when a clause as a proposition in general is being talked about. When we are talking about a proposition, we are merely concerned with the question of which part constitutes the Subject of a proposition and which part constitutes the Predicate of a proposition. Complement as part of the Predicate of a proposition might be thought of as non-essential element. It is because when we are talking about proposition, we are talking about the structure of thought which comprises (i) the Subject or what is being talked about and (ii) the Predicate or what is being related to the Subject (Edi Subroto, 2011). Complement is thought of as a non-essential constituent because it does not constitutes to be what is being talked about. However, when the elements of the Predicate are analyzed, Complement can not be said to be a non-essential constituent if its presence is obligatorily required in the Predicate. It is clear then that Eggins fails to differentiate the usage of the term Subject which, in fact, represents two different levels of analyses. One is the term Subject used as one of the constituents of a proposition and the other one is the term Subject used as one of constituents of a clause. The former will only have the Predicate as the other main constituent, while the latter will have Predicate, Complement, and Adjunct as the other main constituents. We can see that the term Subject is used in both the analysis of proposition (the informational function of a constituent in a proposition) and the analysis of clause (the syntactic function of a constituent in a clause). Hence, though they have the same term, they belong to a different level of analysis. In other words, Eggins is talking about Complement as a syntactic function as if she was being analyzing the constituents of a proposition. Her definition will be more problematic when, in fact, SFG allows Adjective to be a Complement such as *happy* in *She is happy*.

4. THE PROBLEM OF THE POSSIBILITY OF TWO COMPLEMENTS IN A CLAUSE

Though we have seen that the previous Eggins' definition of Complement is not syntactic in nature, authors of SFG books also propose an identification tool of Complement which works syntactically. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:122) define Complement as "an element within the Residue that has the potential of being Subject but is not; in other words, it is an element that has the potential for being given the interpersonally elevated status of modal responsibility — something that can be the nub of the argument". Eggins (2004:157) also applies this definition for Complement, i.e. "an element within the Residue that has the potential of being Subject but is

not". This definition obviously sounds a syntactic operation; Complement is identified on the basis of its syntactic behavior in a clause. We can identify and test it in a syntactic operation. Can the element being investigated function as Subject, in this case by making the clause into passive voice for instance? Based on this syntactic operation, we can identify whether or not the nominal group *the duke* and *that teapot* in sentence (7.a) are really Complements. The syntactic operation shows that the nominal group *the duke* and *that teapot* in (7.a) are Complements because they can function as Subject as we can notice it in (7.b) and (7.c).

(7)   a. The duke gave <u>my aunt</u> <u>that teapot</u>

The duke	Gave	my aunt	that teapot
Subject	Predicator	Complement	Complement

b. My aunt was given that teapot by the duke

My aunt	Was	Given	that teapot	by the duke
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement	Adjunct

c. That teapot was given my aunt by the duke

That teapot	Was	Given	my aunt	by the duke
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement	Adjunct

The syntactic operation in (7) seems to prove that both *my aunt* and *that teapot* are truly Complement. Accepting that both *my aunt* and *that teapot* are truly Complements means that both *my aunt* and *that teapot* have the same syntactic level in relation to the Predicator *gave*. It is still questionable as some grammarians will not accept (7.c) as a grammatical clause unless it becomes '*that teapot was given to my aunt by the duke*'. If this is correct, then the constituent *that teapot* in (7.a) cannot be the Subject as in (7.c). Yet, such operational definition of Complement is disqualified by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:123) when they say that "any

nominal group not functioning as Subject will be a Complement". Therefore, what they have said previously in their definition of Complement becomes meaningless. This kind of contradictory description on what Complement is will really make students and teachers as well perplexed.

Such problem appears because English does not have an overt marker which shows that the constituent *my aunt* and *that teapot* in (7.a) have a different level of syntactic relation to the Predicator *gave*. It is quite different from Indonesian where the clause (7.b) and (7.c) are from different clauses as the origin as in (8).

(8)   a. *Tono membelikan bibiku sebuah teko teh*. 'Tono bought my aunt a teapot'

Tono	*membelikan*	*Bibiku*	*sebuah teko the*
Subject	Predicator	Complement	Adjunct

b. *Tono membeli sebuah teko pot untuk bibiku*. 'Tono bought a teapot for my aunt'

Tono	*membeli*	*sebuah teko teh*	*untuk bibiku*
Subject	Predicator	Complement	Adjunct

Two kinds of affixes (me-N-kan) and (me-N-i) are attached to the Predicator *beli* 'buy' to mark the different syntactic relation that the noun phrases have in relation to the Predicator. It is only the constituent *bibiku* 'my aunt' in (8.a) which can be in the Subject position when the clause is made into passive clause. Therefore, Complement cannot be assigned to the constituent *sebuah teko teh* 'a teapot' in (8.a). This Indonesian example presumably provides a hint that both the constituent *my aunt* and *that teapot* cannot be Complement at the same time in the same clause. It is a universal phenomenon across languages that if a Predicator has more than one obligatory noun phrases in a clause, those noun phrases will have a different syntactic relation to the Predicator. Different languages overtly mark this kind of different syntactic relation between the noun phrases in a clause in different ways – be it a phonological marker, morphological marker or even just sequence marker. In short, every language has its own ways in marking the

different syntactic relation that noun phrases have in a clause in relation to the Predicator (Dixon, 1994).

5. THE PROBLEM OF INTERMINGLING SYNTACTIC FUNCTION AND SEMANTIC ROLE

If two or more noun phrases have different syntactic relations to the Predicator in a clause, two Complements cannot take place in a clause. Assigning two noun phrases in a clause with the same label indicates that those two noun phrases have the same syntactic relation. It is logically unacceptable since two different syntactic relations will not fill in the same slot which is semantically provided by the Predicator. Therefore, the possibility of two Complements in a clause – including in English – which has been theorized so far in SFG needs reconsidering thoroughly. This problem arises because SFG underestimate the detail semantic and syntactic analysis of constituents in the Mood analysis.

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:123) state that the term Complement "covers what are 'objects' as well as what are 'complements' in the traditional school grammar. But that distinction has no place in the interpersonal structure; it is imported from the experiential analysis, that of transitivity" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004:123). This raises some questions. Firstly, the distinction between Object and Complement is not really imported from the experience analysis if the term 'transitivity' in SFG, in fact, does refer to the analysis of semantic role. Object and Complement are differentiated in traditional school grammar because they show a different syntactic behavior in a clause. Obviously, this different syntactic behavior is the realization of their different semantic role in relation to the Predicator. We have to understand, then, that both syntactic function and semantic role relates to the term 'transitivity' as both deal with the relation between Argument(s) and Predicator in a clause. The difference lies in the level of the abstraction and in labeling the Arguments as explained previously. The term 'transitivity' in general is understood in terms of (i) whether the Predicator is transitive, intransitive, ditransitive or others if any and (ii) the number of essential, hence core, Arguments in relation to the Predicate. The analysis of syntactic function labels the Arguments with certain functions in a formal and abstract way as a syntactic relation to the logic of the Predicator. Meanwhile, the

analysis of semantic role labels the Arguments with certain roles in a less abstract way as a semantic relation to the semantic type of the Predicator.

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:57) say that Subject is grammatical Subject and ACTOR is logical Subject. This is confusing and debatable since both the term Subject and ACTOR deal with logical relation. The term Subject is related to the logic of syntactic function of the constituents in a clause, meanwhile the term ACTOR is related to the logic of semantic relation among the constituents in a clause. The logic in syntactic function is somewhat abstract logic, while the logic in semantic role is less abstract logic. The former reduces much the semantic type of the Predicate, while the latter takes much the semantic type of the Predicate into account. Therefore, Subject and ACTOR are different in terms of their level of analysis. When we examine Subject, we are talking about the syntactic function of a constituent in a clause. What formal room does a constituent fill in a clause in relation to the informational logic of the Predicator. Meanwhile, when we examine ACTOR, we are talking about what the semantic role of a constituent plays in a clause in relation to the Predicator.

In the other place, yet, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:112) state that "Subject .... like other grammatical functions... is semantic in nature". Here they clearly mention Subject as grammatical function. But, the term 'grammatical function' also refers to the label of the nominal group *the notice* in '*The notice tells you to quiet*' as SAYER (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004:253), which, as a matter of fact, is a semantic role. In other words, both labels applied in Mood system and labels applied in Transitivity system constitute the analysis of grammatical function. If that is the case, it is very clear that there is confusion in SFG in distinguishing which is syntactic function and which is semantic role.

Secondly, it is true that the distinction between Object and Complement has no place in the interpersonal structure. It seems that, because of this, SFG underestimates their differences. However, this statement raises an ironic question: why do we bother ourselves to describe the structure of Residue then. We have to bear in our mind that the distinction between Object and Complement (Direct Object and Indirect Object respectively in traditional grammar) does have to do with a different syntactic operation and, therefore, should be kept differentiated. If not, there will be an oversimplification in the syntactic function of Argument(s), confusion in the

syntactic analysis, and to some extent, it affects the teaching of English syntactic operation and other languages like English as well.

6. RECONSIDERING HOW INTERPERSONAL AND EXPERIENTIAL MEANING IS RELATED IN SFG

It was already mentioned previously that Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:123) say that the term Complement "covers what are 'objects' as well as what are 'complements' in the traditional school grammar. But that distinction has no place in the interpersonal structure; it is imported from the experiential analysis, that of transitivity". Their statement is partly correct. The terms Object and Complement or Direct Object and Indirect Object are imported from the experiential analysis or precisely from the semantic role analysis. Object or Direct Object is more or less the participant that the Predicator takes effect on directly, while Complement or Indirect Object is more or less the participant that the Predicator takes effect on indirectly. We can see clearly that the term Direct Object and Indirect Object bears very much the notion of the semantic roles that the participants play in the clause. However, it is a little bit strange if this distinction has no place in the interpersonal structure.

If the Mood analysis is thought of being merely concerned with the identification of speech functions, the distinction between Object and Complement of course has no significant consequence on the analysis. But, this will result in at least two problems. First, the analysis of the constituents is not really semantically based as the authors of SFG books have claimed. It is clear from the previous analysis that two Complements (Subject ^ Predicator ^ Complement ^ Complement) in a clause have a different semantic role. We can know that they have a different semantic role from their different syntactic behavior in the clause. It is obvious that syntactic behaviors of a constituent in a clause are much related and affected by its semantic role in the clause. Therefore, if SFG underestimates the distinction of the semantic role of the two noun phrases in a clause, particularly those pertaining to the ditransitive verbs, it is not correct to claim that all the analyses as well as the labeling systems in SFG are semantically based or really take the meaning into account.

Secondly, as having been previously stated, it is ridiculous that we bother ourselves to analyze the elements of RESIDUE in detail in which we have Predicator, Complement, and

Adjunct. It is more ridiculous when Adjunct is classified in detail by most authors of SFG books while the distinction of the semantic role that the two Complements have in a ditransitive clause is underestimated. If the distinction of the semantic role that the two Complements have in a ditransitive clause is claimed not to contribute to the identification of the speech function of an utterance, neither does any kind of Adjunct. In English, speech function seems to be mostly related to the analysis of Subject and Finite. Therefore, it will be enough if we only have Subject, Finite, and Predicator as the elements of Mood Analysis. But it is also not enough in English since we need to identify which constituent bears the Finite in the Predicator.

If it is claimed that the analysis in SFG is semantically based, the Mood analysis will be in an exemption. The identification of the constituents in Mood analysis is not built upon the basis of semantic analysis, even not upon the basis of rigorous syntactic operation either. Therefore, the Mood analysis and the Experiential analysis are not built in a real congruent alignment. The identification of Complement can not be the compass to identify the semantic role in the Experiential analysis. For instance, the constituent which has been identified as the Complement in Mood analysis will be directly the main hint for us to identify it as the Goal for Material Process or as the Phenomenon for Mental process in Experiential analysis. This problem shows that on the whole SFG still lacks the integrality of the analysis across the three levels of analysis in detail.

7. CONCLUSION

Though what has been presented in this paper is mostly explorative and rather unsystematic, it has shown that there are still a lot of jobs to do at the theoretical level of SFG. The theoretical issues discussed in the paper constitute only a small part of the whole story, a tip of iceberg. There would presumably be a lot more problems if careful and thorough investigation is carried out, especially across different languages. One of the striking problems in SFG is that it does not distinguish clearly the two levels of analysis, i.e. syntactic function and semantic role. The semantic perspective in approaching grammar proposed in SFG should not be understood as doing a syntactic analysis without applying a formal syntactic examination and as intertwining the analysis of syntactic function and that of semantic role.

The significance of investigating at the level of the theoretical construct of SFG is no doubt. It is the foundation upon the basis of which text analyses are carried out. There should be more and more advocates of this school of grammar focusing themselves on the investigation at the theoretical level of SFG. More investigations at the theoretical level of SFG should be presented in Systemic Functional meetings. This is a personal experience. Systemic Functional meetings are mostly flooded with text analyses which do not touch the theoretical substance of SFG. Even, some of them applied things which were not quite well suited to the text being analyzed. It usually happens when they apply SFG for Indonesian text. In fact, SFG – Eggins (2004) and Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) – is mostly based on English. Even, there should be a meeting discussing the theoretical aspects of SFG theory.

Last but not least, knowledge on general linguistics should be sufficiently introduced to students of linguistics prior to being introduced with a certain school of grammar, let us say SFG here; so that they are able to read the theory of SFG critically. This is important since there is a tendency when someone has already been an adherent to a certain school of grammar; s/he loses her/his critical ability to deconstruct the school of grammar s/he adheres to. Deconstruction here does not mean to break the theory down, but to be able to understand the basic and philosophical foundations on the basis of which the theory is built and their theoretical frameworks on the basis of which the operational analyses are performed. With a sufficient knowledge on general linguistics, text analyses conducted on the basis of SFG can have two simultaneous objectives. First, it is aimed at understanding the social, cultural, and ideological dimension in a text. Second, it is aimed at providing significant theoretical feedbacks to the theory of SFG.

REFERENCES

Aarts, Bas. 2001. *English Syntax and Argumentation*. 2nd Edition. New York: Palgrave

Bloor, Thomas and Meriel Brool. 2004. *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach*. 2nd Edition. London: Arnorld

DiSciullo, Anna Maria (ed.). 2003. *Asymmetry in Grammar: Volume 1, Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dixon, R.W.M. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Eggins, Suzanne. 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. 2nd Edition. New York: Continuum

Halliday, M.A.K and Mathiessen, C.M.I.M. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd Edition. London: Arnorld

Halliday, M.A.K and Mathiessen, C.M.I.M. 1999. *Construing Experience through Meaning: A Language-based Approach to Cognition*. London: Continuum

Kusmanto, Joko. 2011. "Refine-tuning imperfect grammatical analyses of SLF for more accurate interpretation: two explorative cases". In Francien Herlen Tomasowa and Syariful Muttaqin (eds.). *Systemic Functional Linguistics: Applied and Multiculturalism*. Malang: Aditya Media

Mathiessen, C.M.I.M; Kazuhiro Teruya, and Marvin Lam. 2010. *Key Terms in Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Continuum

Edi Subroto. 2011. *Pengantar Studi Semantik dan Pragmatik 1*. Solo: Cakrawala Media.