

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2022.29.1.23>**СРАВНЕНИЕ БРИТАНСКИХ СИСТЕМНОЙ И ИНТЕГРАЦИОННОЙ ТЕОРИЙ И ИХ ВОСПРИЯТИЕ В РОССИИ**

Научная статья

**Гаврилова Ю.В. \***

Национальный исследовательский университет МЭИ, Москва, Россия

\* Корреспондирующий автор (march1378[at]yandex.ru)

**Аннотация**

Настоящая статья посвящена сравнению двух теорий, которые появились в Великобритании в XX веке. Первая теория называется системно-функциональным подходом или системной грамматикой, ее автором был Майкл Халлидей. Другая теория, именуемая интеграционной лингвистикой или интеграционизмом, появилась на несколько десятков лет позже и была разработана Роем Харрисом. В то время как Майкл Халлидей был непосредственным учеником и последователем Джона Фёрса и принадлежал Лондонской школе, Рой Харрис работал самостоятельно и часто ставил под сомнение многие идеи более ранних направлений лингвистики и предлагал собственный подход к изучению лингвистических теорий. В конце статьи автор приводит несколько имён российских исследователей, которые изучали указанные теории и применяли их в своих разработках. Применяется метод сравнительного анализа. Автор приходит к выводу, что несмотря на то, что речь идет о совершенно разных научных теориях, возникших в разные десятилетия XX века, можно говорить об их определённом сходстве, так как они обладают характерной чертой, присущей британской лингвистической науке, где школы и направления являются по сути тесно взаимосвязанными.

**Ключевые слова:** интеграционный, системно-функциональный, подход, эмпирический метод, сравнительный метод, метафункция.

**BRITISH SYSTEMIC AND INTEGRATIONAL THEORIES COMPARED AND THEIR IDEAS PERCEIVED IN RUSSIA**

Research article

**Gavrilova Yu.V. \***

National Research University MPEI, Moscow, Russia

\* Corresponding author (march1378[at]yandex.ru)

**Abstract**

This article considers and compares two theories that were developed by British linguists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The first theory is called systemic-functional approach, or systemic grammar, its author was Michael Halliday. The other theory is integrational linguistics, or integrationism, it appeared some decades later and was offered by Roy Harris. While Michael Halliday was John Firth's immediate follower and belonged to the London School, Roy Harris worked independently, often questioned many ideas developed and introduced by previous linguists and set up his own approach to studying linguistic problems. At the end of the article the author gives some names of Russian linguists that dealt with the problems and applied the theories to their research. The method of comparative analysis is used. The author comes to the conclusion that despite being separate theoretical approaches that appeared in different time periods there is much in common as both of them form a characteristic feature of British linguistic approach where schools and ideas are interconnected and interdependent.

**Keywords:** integrational, systemic-functional, approach, empirical method, comparative method, metafunction.

**Introduction**

As we know, systemic-functional grammar and integrational linguistics appeared in different time periods, but both approaches were developed in Great Britain. They were later transformed into other versions and applied to different kinds of linguistic analysis carried out by scholars. This article will attempt to compare both approaches and will also deal with the perception of the ideas in our country.

**Theoretical background**

The present research is based mostly on a selection of basic papers written by two British scholars of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, M. Halliday and R. Harris. Both theories have been influential and are considered separate and different ones. So an attempt to compare them and to find similarities is taken in this article.

**Methods**

Methods of our analysis include studying papers of British scholars critically paying special attention to the examples provided in their works and to the whole tradition of British linguistics.

**Systemic-functional grammar**

Systemic-functional grammar can also be called systemic linguistics or systemic-functional linguistics is now one of the sections of applied linguistics, which studies language notions in the context of communication, or context of situation. The approach appeared due to Michael Halliday (1925-2018), John Firth's follower. Its appearance dates back to the 1970s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. At the beginning of its existence it included 2 components only: 1) paradigmatic or vertical dimension which

meant the priority of the author. Grammar structures of the utterance later were perceived as being the result of the author's choice; 2) orientation towards meaning and not form, which means that the aim is to describe how words and word combinations are used to express meaning. Some time later, in the book published in 1985, the principles of functional grammar were given as follows:

"1) Grammar is functional in the sense that it exists in order to explain how language is used. Every text is understood in the context of its use and these contexts have shaped the language system. Functional grammar is natural grammar as anything can be explained with its help.

2) Fundamental components of meaning in a language are functional components. All languages are based on two types of meaning – ideational or reflective and interpersonal or active. These components, or metafunctions, are the reflection of language system.

3) Every element in a language is interpreted with reference to its function in the general language system. From this point of view functional grammar unites all elements of a language as natural configurations of functions. Every part is interpreted as functional in relation to the system in general" [12; P.XIII].

Language form is as important as its function in a sentence. This idea explains the name of the theory, functional grammar. Systems in a language do not exist in isolation, but cooperate with each other. Relatively easy systems are then united into systemic groups and this reveals the diversity of the meaning which is transmitted in every utterance.

Halliday saw the text as a semantic notion, and not as a grammar only as semantics must be closely connected to grammar as meanings in language are usually reflected with the help of definitions or wordings that is grammar actually. And in order to identify the meaning of the text grammar is supposed to be functional and semantic at the same time, grammar categories are to interpreted as revealing semantic models.

Language is a system for reflecting meanings. Meanings are contained in grammar (or syntagmatic) units. M. Halliday identified three basic metafunctions in his theory. They are interpersonal, experiential, textual. Interpersonal metafunction unites the systems that exist in order to express social connections between the author of the utterance and the addressee. In the following list of sentences grammar helps to identify the differences in meaning:

*The flight is confirmed.* (statement)

*Is the flight confirmed?* (question)

*Confirm the flight.* (imperative)

*Would you confirm the flight?* (direction with a positive modal meaning)

*The flight must not be confirmed.* (direction with a negative modal meaning)

As it is seen from the examples above not all the interrogative sentences function as questions and so the choice of every particular grammar form will totally depend on the context. Experiential metafunction implies studying the language from the point of view of its use for describing events, states and creating the speaker's picture of the language. The third metafunction is textual and takes into consideration the part of grammar that reveals the way the meanings in a sentence are organized in connection to the ideas around them and form the part of a wider utterance context.

The grammar category of transitivity is devoted to the type of the process (or action) described and voice. Mood systems are oriented at interpersonal meaning. The choice of the topic shows the sentence division into theme and rheme.

The types of grammar meanings are given in the table below.

Table 1 – Meaning types

Type of meaning	Clause systems
experiential	transitivity
interpersonal	mood
textual	theme
logical	hypotaxis, parataxis

As Thompson put it, systemic-functional grammar is one of the most fully developed alternative to the concept that was basic during most part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and developed the problem of language description into separate spheres, such as syntax, semantics, social linguistics... Language is a means of communication among people and can be duly understood only if the condition of total consideration of all the language notions and at all the stages of research [12, P. 231].

Among other books by M. Halliday we should also mention "Learning How to Mean. Explorations in the Development of Language" [4] and "Lexis as a Linguistic Level" [5].

### **Integrational linguistics**

Integrational approach was developed and introduced by another British linguist, Roy Harris (1931-2015). Harris's career is connected to Oxford University, but during his academic career he gave many lectures abroad. He is also one of the founders of International Association for Integrational Study of Language and Communication, IAISLC that was set up in 1998 and now has members from more than 25 countries.

According to Harris, the division of linguistics into theoretical and applied was not correct and symbolized so-called 'intellectual malaise' in science. And as a result linguistics has stopped paying attention to the fact that language is primarily a means of communication among people.

Harris was sure that none of the issues of theoretical linguistics has to do with an average language speaker. But at the same time identification of the key problem gave the opportunity of studying language in order to shaping linguistics as a multidisciplinary subject and carrying out analysis of communication mechanisms.

The fundamental idea of Roy Harris was understanding that only by communication we shape language as it is, both for an individual and society. In this context language is understood as a cumulative product of communicative situations.

Roy Harris worked on his theory for 25 years and he saw his goal as defining an integrational approach to symbols and semiotic systems and thus to human communication in general. And this approach supposed reconsideration of the existing educational practice along with all the history of linguistic ideas. He also believed that integrationism is very important for understanding interpersonal relations and modern society with its communicative resources.

Harris defined three integrational parameters relating to identification of time continuum: biomechanical, macrosocial and circumstantial. Biomechanical parameter takes into account physical and mental abilities of communicating people, macrosocial takes into account customs and traditions existing in society or social group, and circumstantial parameter relates to the conditions of a particular communicative situation.

So from the point of view of a scholar communication is a creative process, because it is seen not as a closed process of transmitting some messages and signs among people automatically, but as creating the conditions which would help communicating people freely interpret received messages depending on contexts. And these contextual possibilities are infinite and do not have any rules or special codes. Language from this point of view is actually human ability to communicate, while integrating signs into speech or writing. And while traditionally signs were seen as written or pronounced integrational approach concentrates on a communicative function of a sign in the context of communication.

Integrational approach in linguistics pays great attention to context, as there no signs without context and contexts in their turn are created by participants of speech situations.

Among many books published by Roy Harris probably the most well-known are the following three. They are “The Language Makers” [7], “The Language Myth” [8] and “The Language Machine” [9]. The book “The Language Makers” [7] deals with reconsideration of some basic ideas of linguistics and philosophy, that was necessary due to society development. The book “The Language Myth” [8] the author writes about the perception and role of language and from the point of view of society. And the book “The Language Machine” [9] that concludes the trilogy Harris states that due to massive development of mass media in the 20<sup>th</sup> century our perception of language has inevitably changed as a mechanical view on intellect appeared. A later book by Harris was “Signs of Writing” and it deals with reconsideration of some key points of written speech and its perception by traditional linguistics through the framework of integrational approach. Written speech is studied in this book as a kind of communication which helps to identify connection between events and shows how mathematical, musical and other kinds of writing are subject to the same principles as oral communication.

### **Brief comparison of theories**

Both theories are known in Russia, but Systemic grammar is probably more famous among linguists. Although the theories were developed during different time periods and by two different scholars (both from Great Britain) they certainly have similar points. Both approaches concentrate on language as a means of communication and claim to look at utterances in connection to the contexts they exist. Language is seen as a system and grammar is used to express meaning of utterances. Context of situation as a term is not new, as it was introduced by B. Malinowski and then developed by J. Firth.

### **Perception of theories in Russia**

In Russia the theories described above have been used in many thesis papers and research of other kinds, such as, for example, by Bubnova [1], Golubeva [2], Lifen, Sharafutdinov [11]. We may say that both of the theories are applied and their ideas are employed in further research. More literature is available in English, than in Russian. Material about systemic grammar is generally more thoroughly studied, but this fact can be explained by a later appearance of integrational theory in time.

### **Concluding remarks**

Summing up the ideas expressed above we should say that although two theories claim to be different from each other they obviously have got similar points, such as looking at language as a complex phenomenon and paying attention to context of situation. In Russia both theories are known, developed and successfully applied in research.

### **Конфликт интересов**

Не указан.

### **Conflict of Interest**

None declared.

### **Список литературы / References**

1. Бубнова Н.А. Ключевые слова социального словаря как инструмент речевого воздействия и манипуляции сознанием в аналитической публицистике: автореф. Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. / Н.А. Бубнова – М., 2012. – 22 с.
2. Голубева С.Л. Трансформация культуры в системе интернет-коммуникаций: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. / С.Л. Голубева – СПб., 2016. – 242 с.
3. Halliday M.A.K. An Introduction to Functional Grammar / M.A.K. Halliday – London: Arnold, 1985. - 387 p.
4. Halliday M.A.K. Learning How to Mean. Explorations in the Development of Language / M.A.K. Halliday – New York: Elsevier, 1975. – 164 p.
5. Halliday M.A.K. Lexis as a Linguistic Level / M.A.K. Halliday, C.E. Bazell – London: Longmans, 1966. – P. 148-162.
6. Harris R. Integrationism [Electronic resource] / R. Harris – URL: [http://royharrisonline.com/integrational\\_linguistics.htm](http://royharrisonline.com/integrational_linguistics.htm). (accessed: 15.04.2022)
7. Harris R. The Language Makers. / R. Harris – Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1980. – 194 p.
8. Harris R. The Language Myth. / R. Harris – London: Duckworth, 1981. – 212 p.
9. Harris R. The Language Machine. / R. Harris – London: Duckworth, 1987. – 182 p.

10. Harris R. *Signs of Writing*. / R. Harris – London and New York: Routledge, 1995. – 185 p.
11. Lu L. Analysing the text of the Announcement of the President of Russia to Federal Government in 2016 from the Point of View of Systemic Linguistics. / Lifen Lu, D. Sharafutdinov // Moscow: Political Linguistics – №5 71. – P. 73-80
12. Thompson G. *Systemic-Functional Grammar* / G. Thompson // Key Ideas in Linguistics and Philosophy of Language – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009. – 267 p.

**Список литературы на английском / References in English**

1. Bubnova N.A. Kljuchevye slova social'nogo slovarja kak instrument rechevogo vozdejstvija i manipuljacii soznaniem v analiticheskoj publicistike [Keywords of the social dictionary as a tool of speech influence and manipulation of consciousness in analytical journalism]: extended abstract of Candidate's thesis. Philology / N. A. Bubnova – Moscow, 2012–22 p. [in Russian]
2. Golubeva S.L. Transformacija kul'tury v sisteme internet-kommunikacij [Transformation of culture in the system of Internet communications]: Candidate's thesis. Philology. / S. L. Golubeva. – St. Petersburg, 2016 – 242 p. [in Russian]
3. Halliday M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* / M.A.K. Halliday – London: Arnold, 1985. – 387 p.
4. Halliday M.A.K. *Learning How to Mean. Explorations in the Development of Language* / M.A.K. Halliday – New York: Elsevier, 1975. – 164 p.
5. Halliday M.A.K. Lexis as a Linguistic Level / M.A.K. Halliday, C.E. Bazell – London: Longmans, 1966. – P. 148-162.
6. Harris R. Integrationism [Electronic resource] / R. Harris – URL: [http://royharrisonline.com/integrational\\_linguistics.htm](http://royharrisonline.com/integrational_linguistics.htm). (accessed: 15.04.2022)
7. Harris R. *The Language Makers*. / R. Harris – Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1980. – 194 p.
8. Harris R. *The Language Myth*. / R. Harris – London: Duckworth, 1981. – 212 p.
9. Harris R. *The Language Machine*. / R. Harris – London: Duckworth, 1987. – 182 p.
10. Harris R. *Signs of Writing*. / R. Harris – London and New York: Routledge, 1995. – 185 p.
11. Lu L. Analysing the text of the Announcement of the President of Russia to Federal Government in 2016 from the Point of View of Systemic Linguistics. / Lifen Lu, D. Sharafutdinov // Moscow: Political Linguistics – №5 71. – P. 73-80
12. Thompson G. *Systemic-Functional Grammar* / G. Thompson // Key Ideas in Linguistics and Philosophy of Language – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009. – 267 p.