USING TRANSITIVITY SYSTEM IN THE TEXTS OF SHORT STORIES DERIVED RESEARCH

Karama Hassan Hussain, Asst. Prof. Dr. ManalJassim Muhammad
University of Baghdad
College of Education for Human Sciences/ IbnRushd
Department of English

ABSTRACT

Hallidayan Transitivity system divides clauses into three basic elements: process, participant, and circumstance. The interpretationof clauses relies on the meaning of the elements. Hence, the clause depends,almost,on the processin construing the participants of each type of processes, yet the circumstance is not engaged directly in the process in the analysis. The present study examines Transitivity system in two selected short stories that have different styles. The analysis reveals that Transitivity system can efficiently construe literary texts, in which some verbless clauses and circumstances that function as participants, for example, which are vague, can be construed perfectly.

Key words: *systemic functional theory, transitivity, process, short stories.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Transitivity system adopts clauses to construe their structure. The structure of clauses is divided into three basic elements: *process, participants,* and *circumstance.* The process is the element that controls the clause and helps to interpret the participants. Likewise, tense and meaning play a crucial role in the clauses interpretation. Some processes depend on tense, and also, in some cases, the meaning of participants can affect the type of processes (see Halliday and Matthiessen 2004 and 2014 chapter 5). Some problems can be faced during the analysis. One of these basic problems is the meaning. The meaning of processes determines their type. In some cases, the meaning of participants can change the category of the process, regardless the meaning of the process. This case is caused when the meaning of the participant is not appropriate to the process type category that does not contain this type of participant. Thus, the process must be attached to another category that accepts the meaning of the participant. Equally important, the role of tense is another main problem encountered through the interpretation. Each process type has its own tense, except some processes that can be moulded in all tenses. In case of forming a process in a tense that is not applicable to it, the problem that is faced is whether it is possible to change the interpretation of the process and attach it to another type or not. The study aims at identifying the types of processes, participants and circumstances, which are proposed by Halliday. It is hypothesized that tense and meaning of the context of clauses can change the analysis of processes effectively, andtransitivity system can construe verbless clauses and guesses their type of process.

279

2. TRANSITIVITY SYSTEM

Systemic functional linguistics is a theory initiated by Michael Halliday. Halliday divides his theory into three basic metafunctions: *ideational, interpersonal* and *textual* (Angermuller et al.,2014:263)*.* The primary grammatical network that is used in *ideational* metafunction is *transitivity*, the system of interpreting the human experiences (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:13). Unlike the traditional concept of transitivity that emphasizes the demand of a direct object, the concentration of Hallidayan transitivity is on the lexical meaning of verbs (Bandstra,2008:9). Accordingly, this system consists of six types of processes: *material, mental, relational, behavioural, verbal,* and *existential*. Each one carries its own meaning, role, and function. Clauses are classified according to these processes by revealing the actions or relations between participants (Eggins,2004:249). Transitivity system represents the convergence of semantics and grammar (Simon-Vandenbergen et al.,1997:250).

Simply, Halliday defines transitivity as a linguistic term expresses the interrelation of processes and participants, and occasionally stretches to circumstances (Webster,2002:179). In transitivity analysis, only three basic components are focused: *process* (verb), *participants* (subject and object), and *circumstances* (adverbs/ prepositional phrases). Other components like conjunctions, coordinators and subordinators, minor clauses, some idioms, vocatives and model adjuncts are neglected in the analysis (Thompson,2014:93,153). Simultaneously, participants are attached directly to the process, in contrast to circumstances, which their attachment is indirect (Halliday&Matthiessen, 2004:170).

3. TYPES OF PROCESSES

3.1 Material Processes

Halliday clarifies that outer experiences are embodied in material processes (Webster,2004:353). Defining them as processes of doing and happening, material processes interpret a quantity of change in the stream of events that indicate a physical energy. Various types of participants are used for constructing material clauses. *Actor* is the participant that enacts and performs the deed, the one that causes the change, in its two entities: animate and inanimate. Some processes expand to get another participant that is the goal of the actor. The second participant is *the goal*. This case is effective in doing processes:

e.g. The gardener *(actor)* replaced *(material)* the fruit rod *(goal)*   (Halliday&Matthiessen,2004:179-180)*.*

The grammatical function of the *actor* is subject, which is compulsory, and the *goal* is the object (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:225). Moreover, the participants may function as *beneficiary*, which enacts as either *client* or *recipient:*

e.g. John made a doll *for Mary (client)*

e.g. Tom gave the keys *to me (recipient)* (Teich,2003:69).

*Client*is mainly the entity that an action is done *for*, whereas *recipient* is the entity that receives an action which is given *to* (Perez,2007:80)*.*

Scope interprets the process or the range of the process occurrence without falling under the influence of the process like the *goal*:

e.g. The mountain climber climbed *Alps mountain(scope)* last winter (Matthiessen et al.,2010:188).

280

Scope rarely appears as a personal pronoun, or never accepts the modification of a possessive. Also it cannot attach process of doing, in contrast to the *goal* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:242).

In contrast, *attribute* participant is the type that describes a state, and cannot enact as a subject, as Thompson (121:2014) claims:

e.g. The fashion designer chose the colours *a touch of blue(attributive).*

Mentioning *attribute* as a marginal participant in material processes, this participant is, in fact, attached tightly to relational processes, but it serves in material clauses in very restricted cases (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:243). *Initiator*, likewise, is another participant that ''brings about the action performed by the actor''. This participant can join frequently the processes:*make, let, get, have, and compel* to show causative construction, as in:

e.g. Sam *(initiator)* made *(process: material)* his child *(actor)*shot *(process: material) the ball (goal)*(Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:579).

The present-in-present (progressive tense) is the formal tense beside the simple tense, used for expressing habits and facts (Halliday&Matthiessen, 2014:225). Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:187-189) state the processes of this type like *build, melt, trim, stretch, whiten, glitter, roar, pave, dress, send, jump, escape, etc*.

3.2 Mental Processes

Indicating sense, mental processes are those processes that embrace different processes related to the inner, mental and psychological status like *desideration* or *wanting*, *perception, feeling,* and *cognition.* Primarily, *senser* and *phenomenon* are the participants engaged to the mental processes:

e.g. She (*senser*) feels (process: *mental*) happy (*phenomenon*)

Senser is the participant that tests an experience (Perez,2007:73). Halliday and Matthiessen (2014:249-252) assume that the *senser* is a human-like that has consciousness, because of the need to sense, think, feel, perceive and want. It cannot be represented by *it* grammatically, only by *he* or *she* as pronouns. At the same time, in imaginary world of stories, some inanimate entities are treated as animate conscious entities that can be interpreted as a senser. Testing *phenomenon* deeply shows that it is the entity that is wanted, felt, perceived and thought.

Mainly, *senser* is an obligatory participant and inherent in nature, in contrast to *phenomenon* which is optional (Bosseaux,2007:47). The ability of projectionis one of the characteristics of mental processes. Here, the projected part in mental clause is called as an idea clause and functions as a phenomenon, and at the same time can be interpreted as another clause. This characteristic distinguishes it from other types of processes, as in:

e.g. She thinks *that Emma will help her in shopping* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2004:206).

Chiefly, the tense is another distinction, in which simple present is the formal tense (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:254). Verbs like *perceive, believe, occur to, desire, tempt, adore, attract, etc.* are mental processes (Halliday&Matthiessen,2004:210).

3.3 Relational Processes

This third major type is stamped as processes of having and being. In fact, this type blends the outer and inner experience in its interpretation, but not as doing or sensing, but as being. Thereupon, the basic

function is characterization and identification. The most frequent verbs that are used here are *be* and *have* in its simple present or past forms(Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:259-260).

It is important to mention that relational processes are divided into three essential types: *intensive, possessive,* and *circumstantial*. Each of these three types dresses two separate modes that indicate being: *attributive* and *identifying* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2004:215).

Attributive clauses, on the one hand, links participants that have the same group membership:

e.g.*a. Sally (carrier) is beautiful (attribute).*

b. Sally becomes beautiful,

Sally is attributed to be beautiful.

In *identification*, on the other hand, the participants reveal the identity of each other, for example:

e.g.*a. Diana (identified) was the princess of England (identifier).*

           b. The princess of England was Diana,

Diana is identified as a princess of England (Webster,2002:185). *Identifying clauses*, in fact, function as clauses that identify an entity, and marked as equal participants. *Identified* and *identifier* occupy the role of participants. They are distinguished from attributive clauses by their reversibility. *Value and token* is another category of interpretation combines identifying clauses. They are difficult somehow to be construed, because of their perplexity in distinction markedly (Thompson,2014:101-103). Mainly, *token* stands for the lower *'expression'*, and the higher *'content'* is attached to the *value* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:279).

Indeed, *attributive clauses* engage two participants, *carrier* and *attribute.Carrier* stands for the subject, which is compulsory, and the complement is highlighted as *attribute* (Lock,1996:126). The attribute is frequently introduced as a nominal group, in which it will be either an adjective, indefinite articles in some cases, or a common noun as a head. It is significant to notice that the attribute cannot be formed as a pronoun or a proper noun (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:268).

It is important to mention that some nominal clauses, which are verbless, are treated in transitivity interpretation by regarding them as relational clauses. Such constructions lack process, only two participants are present, as in:

   e.g. a. Linda's mother *(identified)* was *(process: relational)* British *(identifier)*, her father *(identified)* American *(identifier)*, her nationality *(identified)* Canadian *(identifier).*

        b. When you arrived, Jenny *(Carrier)* was *(process: relational)* asleep *(attribute)*, Emma *(carrier)* in a bad mood to meet you *(attribute/ circumstance: manner),* and Sam *(carrier)* with his friends *(attribute/ circumstance: accompaniment).*

In these clauses, the first clauses *Linda's mother is British* and *Jenny was asleep* are clauses with verbs, in which the process *was* is present. In the second and third clauses *her father…* and *her nationality…*in*(a)* and *Emma…* and *Sam…* in (*b),* the process is not available, but depending on their meaning as the participants are parallel and first participant describes the second one, they are interpreted as relational clauses of being type (Halliday&Matthiessen,2004:214-215).

By the same token, there is a third participant can be involved in attributive and identifying, which refers to *assignment*. This participant assigns the correlation of the attribution identity. It is called the *assigner* in identifying clauses, and *attributor* in attributing clauses:

e.g. He *(attributor)* made *(process: relational)* me *(carrier)* happy *(attribute).*

e.g. He *(assigner)* made *(process: relational)* her *(identified)* his wife *(identifier)* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2004:237).

Accordingly, circumstantial type draws the interrelation between two entities that is of *place, time, cause, manner, role, accompaniment, angle* and *matter.* Relating this type to attributive clauses, the circumstantial component refers to an *attribute*, which is being attributed to another entity. The circumstantial component as attribute is perceived either by a prepositional phrase or by an adverbial group. In another case, the circumstance functions as a process, formed as a verbal group, and the attribute is represented as a nominal group, as in:

e.g. a. The novel *(carrier)* was *(process: relational) about myths (attribute/ circumstance: matter)(the novel concerns (= about) myths).*

     b. The conference *(carrier)* may *last (process: relational) two days (attribute/ circumstance: time)* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:290-291).

Mentioning the concept of ownership in relational clauses, *possessive type* draws the interrelation of possession between two entities. Nominal group is the basic form of the attribute in possession. In contrast, when the process bears the meaning of possession, the *carrier* will be in the role of *possessor*, and the *attribute* will be the *possessed*, and vice versa. *Have* is the frequent verb in possession type beside the equal verbs in meaning. These forms are not reversible. At the same time, in identifying clauses the *token/identified* can embrace the meaning of possessed and the *value/identifier* holds the possessor. When the possession is perceived as process, using the verb *own* mostly, the passivity and reversibility is present, for example:

e.g. The night *(possessor)* has *(process: relational)* a magic sky *(possessed)* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:293-297).

Associated with participants, it is a must in relational processes to have two participants, functioning as subject and subject complement, especially in *being* processes. Having one participant violates the meaning (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:261). Verbs of this process include *be, remain, sound, suffice, act as, indicate, include, exemplify, ensure, pronounce, prove, etc.* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2004:238).

3.4 Behavioural Processes

This category of secondary processes is the chain that connects material and mental processes, in which it falls between them. It has properties of both material and mental processes, so it represents the inner and outer experience, in which thoughts and ideas are interpreted externally through physical actions as behaviour (Halliday&Matthiessen,1999:514). The inherent participant in such clauses is the *behaver* that is represented by a conscious entity, as in:

e.g. The king *(behaver)* frowns *(behavioural process).*

In some cases, another participant can be involved. This participant is labelled as *behaviour:*

e.g. The king *(behaver)* frowns *(behavioural process)* (Halliday&Matthiesen,2004:250-251).

Behaviour, in fact, provides additional information about the process itself (Bandstra, 2008:16). In some cases, specifically with the process *watch* that requires a second participant after it, as in:

e.g. she *(behaver)* is watching *(process: behavioural)* her child *(phenomenon).*

In this example, the tense indicates behaviouralprocess, but *her child* looks like a *phenomenon* of mental, so it will be interpreted as a *phenomenon* of behavioural process not mental. The logical unmarked tense here is the present-in-present as well as the simple present tense. Examples of

behavioural processes are:*watch, hiss, sleep, lie down, gossip, cry, sneeze, dance, etc.* (Halliday&Matthiessen, 2014:301-302).

3.5 Verbal Processes

Verbal processes are defined as processes that carry verbs of words or saying that are used to transmit a message (Thompson,2014:106). Verbal process is a mix of internal and external experiences, in which it interprets thoughts and ideas to come to light through words (Halliday&Matthiessen,1999:584). Basically, one indispensible participant engages the verbal process, which is the *sayer*. It is unnecessary to be a conscious entity. The role of *sayer* is to carry verbal process. Correspondingly, three other participants can gather the verbal clauses, which are *receiver, verbiage* and *target.* The entity that receives the saying act is called the *receiver. Verbiage*indicates ''what is said'', not as a reported or quoted speech, but as either the message of what the sayer says, or the ''name of the saying''. Beside that, *target* is another participant embraced by verbal clauses. It is a symbol of the entity that is regarded as a goal by the verbal process. It could be a human being, a thing, or an abstract entity:

   e.g. a. Jane *(sayer)* asked *(process: verbal)* her sister *(receiver)* to clean the rug *(material clause).*
       b. The man *(sayer)* accused *(process: verbal)*Frank *(target)* of the theft *(verbiage)* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:303,306-307).

It is significant to mention that verbal clauses are either *quoted* or *reported* (locution as Halliday calls). In this case, these forms are not called participant, and occur outside the verbal process range, by constructing complex clauses (Lavid et al.,2010:135). In quoting, the two clauses are paratactic, whereas in reporting, the two clauses are hypotactically related to each other by projection. The projecting clause is formed by the verbal clause, while the projected clause can be constructed by any other clauses. To report a speech, '*that'* is used to link the two clauses (Eggins,2004:235-236). As a rule, the frequent tense here is either present-in-present, present in past (perfect tense) or simple present (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:305). Verbal processes are introduced by verbs like *say, flatter, talk, notify, question, entreat, chide, promise, etc.* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2004:255).

3.6 Existential Processes

Existential processes refer to what exists and happens, and this shows that they are part of the external experience. Actually, this type is not so frequent to be used. In narrative texts, in particular, such clauses present the introductory part of the story, introducing the setting and time (Halliday&Matthiessen,2004:256-257). Acquiring some features of material and relational processes, existential processes form the grey circle that occurs between material and relational processes. (Fontaine,2013:78). The structure of existential clauses is unique, in which *there*cannot be considered as a participant or circumstance, and should be distinguished from the adjunct *there*. Thus, *there* will be out of transitivity interpretation. The verb *be* is the recurrent verb here. *Existent* is the only inherent participant that stands for what exist. It could be a person, an abstract, an object, a thing, an event, an action, or an institution

e.g.   There   were   *(process: existential)*   bright   stars   yester-night *(existent)*(Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:307-309).

Hence, experiential processes have two aspects related to the use of copular verbs. The first one is constructed by empty *there*plus a copular verb *be:*

e.g. There is *(process: existential)* a shooting star phenomenon *(existent)* tonight.

Equally, the second construction is moulded by the *existent* in role of subject, followed by a copular verb or an existential process, and occasionally (a) circumstance(s):

e.g. Jimmy *(existent)* sat *(process: existential)* on the ground *(circumstance: place)* for two hours waiting the manager *(circumstance: time).*

 Likewise, *there* becomes a prerequisite when there is no clear circumstance and there is only the *existent* participant (Bloor&Bloor, 2004:125-126).

Another category can be inserted in these clauses that is of *meteorological* processes indicating weather. Three interpretations are possible here according to the structure of the clause: material as in the *wind is blowing*, existential as in *there is a storm*, and finally relational as in *it is hot* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:309-310).The logical tense of these processes is like relational, the present simple (Simpson,2004:25). Many other verbs can be used that bear existence meaning and are considered as synonyms of *be* like *exist, occur, take place, ensue, stand, grow, flourish, etc.* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2004:258).

4. CIRCUMSTANTIAL SYSTEM

Circumstance, in all its kinds, is the third component that is attendant in some clauses and absent in some others according to specific requirements related to the meaning of the clause. Represented by adverbs and prepositional phrases, circumstances are those elements that combine freely any type of processes, and can fill any position in the clause (initial, middle, or final), maintaining the same importance of clause meaning (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:310-311).

Mainly, circumstances cannot perform as a subject. On the one hand, the circumstances that act as participants are attached to indirect participants not direct ones, in which indirect participants as nominal groups, which are involved within the prepositional phrase, as in:

e.g. He gave the keys *to his little brother (receiver)* (Halliday,1994:150).

Illustrating circumstance types, *extent circumstances* provide information about the duration of time, and are used as a tool of enhancing clauses. It asks about *''How long?''* or *''How often?''* like *for, etc.*

Location holds two types *place (spatial)* and *time (temporal),* whichare the most popular types. Adverbs and prepositional phrases can form this kind.

In *manner,* the process realization is construed. *''How?''* is the plausible question. It has four subtypes: *quality*, *means, comparison,* and *degree* (Halliday&Matthiessen,2014:313-320).

On the other hand, *cause circumstances* have many subtypes like *reason*, which is moulded by a prepositional phrases, *purpose*, and *behalf.* They are used for the purpose of enhancement and agnate with the clauses of the same kind (Matthiessen et al.,2010:68-171). *Contingency*interprets the component that the realization of the process depends on. Three kinds are embraced: *condition*, *default,*and *concession*(Fontaine,2013:80).

In addition, *accompaniment* circumstances, which serve to extend clauses, hold two types: *comitative* and *additive*.

In the elaboration of clauses, *role* is employed, and has two kinds: *guise* and *product*(Thompson,2014:116).

285

Likewise, in projection, *matter* and *angle* are used. *Matter* interrogates about ''What about?''. Itis frequently used with verbal and mental clauses and some particular behavioural clauses, rarely utilized with other types of processes. *Angle,* in contrast, shows ''From what point of view?'' (Thompson,2014:107-116).

It should be noted here that circumstances can be treated autonomously, without identifying them in the light of process types, as a result of the absence of rules that adhere circumstances to combine specific elements in the clause (participant or process). Nevertheless, only small groups submit to such rules, and at the same time there is no overt effect on either meaning or structure (Halliday&Matthiessen,2004:280).

5. DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY

5.1 Data Collection

Two short stories are selected to be analysed. These short stories are written by different authors and of variant styles, fiction for children and love story, which help show how transitivity system and its processes run in each type. Oscar Wilde's *''The Devoted Friend''* is an Irish fiction written for children, published in 1888. The dialogue is the way of introducing this story, which is regarded as a simple story with complex ideas (Bristow,2017:154). TheBritish story*''In the Modern Vein: an Unsympathetic Love Story''* of H. G. Wells displays a love relationship, which is published in 1894. Wells utilized complex sentences more than that in other styles in his love stories, despite, directness and ease are maintained in his style (Hardy,1991:251-259). Selective parts of these two stories are displayed to show how transitivity system construes literary texts.

5.2 Model of Analysis

Halliday divides transitivity into three basic elements, which are *process, participant,* and *circumstance*. *Processes* are the core element in the clause, and according to them, the type of *participants* will be determined. Consequently, Halliday classifies process types into six parts. Each type has its specific construction, as in the following tables.

5.2.1 Material Process
Table (5.1) The structure of Material Process

participant	*process*	*participant*	*participant*	*(circumstance)*
Actor +	*Material process* +	*Goal* (+)		*(circumstance)*
Actor +	*Material process* +	*Scope* (+)		=
Actor +	*Material process* +	*Recipient* (+)	*Goal*	=
Goal +	*Material process* +	*Actor*	*(receptive clause)*	
Initiator +	*Material process* +	*Actor* +	*Goal/ Scope* (+)	=
Actor +	*Material process* +	*Client* (+)		
Actor +	*Material process* +	*Goal* +	*Attribute* (+)	=
Scope +	*Material process* (+)			=

5.2.2 Mental Process

Table (5.2) The structure of Mental Process

Participant	*Process*	*Participant*	*(circumstance)*
Senser +	*Mental process +*	*Phenomenon (+)*	*(circumstance)*
Phenomenon +	*Mental process +*	*Senser (+)*	=
Senser +	*Mental process +*	*that clause of projection (+)*	=

5.2.3 Relational Process

Table (5.3) The structure of Relational Process

type	*Participant*	*Process*	*Participant*		*(circumstance)*
attributive	*Carrier +*	*Relational process +*	*Attribute (+)*		*(circumstance)*
Attributive/ circumstantial	*Carrier +*	*Relational process +*	*Attribute/ circumstance (+)*		
	attributor	*Relational process +*	*Carrier +*	*Attribute (+)*	*(circumstance)*
Identifying	*Identified +*	*Relational process +*	*Identifier (+)*		=
	Identifier +	*Relational process +*	*Identified (+)*		=
	Token +	*Relational process +*	*Value (+)*		=
	Value +	*Relational process +*	*Token (receptive) (+)*		=
	assigner	*Relational process +*	*Identified +*	*Identifier (+)*	=
possessive	*possessor*	*Relational process +*	*Possessed (+)*		=

5.2.4 Behavioural Process

Table (5.4) The structure of Behavioural Process

Participant	*Process*	*Participant*	*(circumstance)*
Behaver +	*Behavioural process(+)*		*(circumstance)*
Behaver +	*Behavioural process +*	*Behavioural (+)*	=
Behaver +	*Behavioural process +*	*Phenomenon (+)*	=

5.2.5 Verbal Process

Table (5.5) The structure of Verbal Process

Participant	*Process*	*participant*	*participant*	*(circumstance)*
Sayer +	*Verbal process +*	*that clause (reported speech) (+)*		*(circumstance)*
Sayer +	*Verbal process +*	*''quoted speech'' (+)*		=
Sayer +	*Verbal process +*	*Receiver (+)*		=

Sayer +	*Verbal process* +	*Receiver* +	*Verbiage* (+)	=
Sayer +	*Verbal process* +	*Verbiage* (+)		=
Sayer +	*Verbal process* +	*Target* (+)		=

5.2.6 Existential Process
Table (5.6) The structure of Existential Process

Participant	*Process*	*Participant*	*(circumstance)*
There +	*Existential process* +	*Existent* (+)	*(circumstance)*
Existent +	*Existential process* (+)	/	=

6. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Selected parts of the two short stories are introduced in this section by giving the page number of the original texts of the short stories' versions. These selected parts contain the analysis of the short stories texts' in the light of transitivity system.

6.1 ''The Devoted Friend'' by Oscar Wilde
Page 1
One morning *(circumstance: time)* the old Water-rat*(actor)* put *(process: material)* his head *(scope)* out of his hole *(circumstance: place)*. He *(possessor)* had *(process: relational)* [bright beady eyes and stiff grey whiskers] *(possessed)*, and his tail *(carrier)* was *(process: relational)* like a long bit of black india-rubber*(attribute)*.The little ducks *(actor)* were swimming *(process: material)* about in the pond *(circumstance: place)*, [lookingjust like a lot of yellow canaries] *(circumstance: comparison)*, and their mother (*actor)*, who *(carrier)* was *(process: relational)* pure white *(attribute)* with real red legs *(circumstance: accompaniment)*, was tryingto teach *(process: material)* them *(goal)* [how to stand on their heads in the water] *(circumstance: manner)*.
Page 2
'Is *(process: relational)* the story *(carrier)* about me *(attribute/ circumstance: matter)?*' asked *(process: relational)* the Water-rat*(sayer)*. If so, I *(behaver)* will listen *(process: behavioural)* to it *(circumstance: place)*, for *(circumstance: cause)* I *(carrier)* am *(process: relational)* extremely fond of fiction *(attribute)*.'

'Little Hans *(possessor)* had *(process: relational)* a great many friends *(possessed)*, but the most devoted friend of all *(identifier)* was *(process: relational)* big Hugh the Miller *(identified)*.Indeed, so devoted *(attribute)* was *(process: relational)* the rich Miller *(carrier)* to little Hans *(beneficiary)*, that he [Hans] *(actor)* would never go *(process: material)* by his garden *(circumstance: manner)* without *(circumstance: accompaniment)* leaning *(minor process: behavioural)* over the wall *(circumstance: place)* and plucking *(minor process: material)* [a large nosegay, or a handful of sweet herbs] *(goal)*, or filling *(minor process: material)* his pockets (goal) with plums and cherries *(circumstance: accompaniment)* if it *(token)* was *(process: relational)* the fruit season *(value)*.
 Page 3
'Sometimes *(circumstance: time)*, indeed, the neighbours *(attributor)* thought *(process: relational)* it *(carrier)* strange *(attribute)* that the rich Miller *(actor)* never gave *(process: material)* little Hans

288

(recipient) anything in return *(goal),* though *(circumstance: contingency)* he *(possessor)* had *(process: relational)* [a hundred sacks of flour stored away in his mill, and six milk cows, and a large stock of woolly sheep] *(possessed);* but Hans *(senser)* never troubled *(process: mental)* his head *(phenomenon)* about these things *(circumstance: matter)*, and nothing *(scope)* gave *(process: material)* him *(recipient)* greater pleasure *(goal)* than to listen *(minor process: behavioural)* to all the wonderful things *(circumstance: place)* the Miller *(sayer)* used to say *(process: verbal)* about the unselfishness of true friendship *(circumstance: matter).*

 ['"How well you talk!"] *(verbiage)* said *(process: verbal)* the Miller's Wife *(sayer),* pouring *(minor process: material)* herself *(actor)* out [a large glass of warm ale] *(goal);* "really I *(carrier)* feel *(process: relational)* quite drowsy *(attribute).* It *(token)* is *(process: relational)* just [like being in church] *(circumstance: comparison)."*

Page 4

['"Why, what a good heart you have!"] *(verbiage)* cried *(process: verbal)* his wife *(sayer);* "you *(behaver)* are always thinking *(process: behavioural)* of others*(circumstance: matter).* And mind *(process: mental)* you *(actor)* take *(process: material)* the big basket *(goal)* with you for the flowers *(circumstance: accompaniment)."*

'So the Miller *(initiator)* tied *(process: material)* the sails of the windmill together *(recipient)* with a strong iron chain *(actor),* and went down *(process: material)* the hill *(scope)* with the basket on his arm *(circumstance: accompaniment).*

Page 5

'"Hans, I *(carrier)* am *(process: relational)* surprised *(attribute)* at you *(circumstance)*," said *(process: verbal)* the Miller *(sayer);* "friendship *(senser)* never forgets *(process: mental).* That *(token)* is *(process: relational)* the wonderful thing *(value)* about it *(circumstance: matter),* but I *(carrier)* am *(process: relational)* afraid *(attribute)* you *(senser)*don't understand *(process: mental)* [the poetry of life] *(phenomenon).* [How lovely your primroses are looking,by-the-by] *(verbiage)*!"

    '"Hans*,"(verbiage)* said *(process: verbal)* the Miller *(sayer),* "I *(actor)* will give *(process: material)* you *(recipient)* my wheelbarrow *(goal).* It *(carrier)* is not *(process: relational)* in very good repair *(attribute/ circumstance: manner);* indeed, one side *(scope)* is gone *(process: material),* and there is *(process: existential)* [something wrong with the wheel-spokes] *(existent);* but in spite of that I *(actor)* will give *(process: material)* it *(goal)* to you *(recipient).* I *(senser)* know *(process: mental)* it *(carrier)* is *(process: relational)* very generous of me *(attribute),* and a great many people *(attributor)* would think *(process: relational)* me *(carrier)* extremely foolish *(attribute)* for parting with it *(circumstance: cause)*, but I *(identified)* am not *(process: relational)* like the rest of the world *(identifier).* I *(senser)* think *(process: mental)* that generosity *(identified)* is *(process: relational)* the essence of friendship *(identifier),* and, besides, I *(actor)*have got*(process: material)* a new wheelbarrow for myself *(scope).* Yes, you *(actor)* may set *(process: material)* your mind at ease *(scope),* I *(actor)* will give *(process: material)* you *(receiver)* my wheelbarrow *(goal)."*

Page 8

 'So little Hans *(actor)* worked away *(process: material)* for the Miller *(client),* and the Miller *(sayer)* said *(process: verbal)* all kinds of beautiful things *(verbiage)* about friendship *(circumstance: matter),* which Hans *(actor)* took down *(process: material)* in a note-book *(circumstance: place),* and used to

read over *(process: material)* at night *(circumstance: time),* for *(circumstance: cause)* he *(identified)* was *(process: relational)* a very good scholar *(identifier).*

6.2 H. G. Wells' ''In the Modern Vein: An Unsympathetic Love Story''
Page 1

Of course the cultivated reader *(senser)* has heard *(process: mental)* of Aubrey Vair *(circumstance: matter).* He *(actor)* has published *(process: material)* on three separate occasions *(circumstance: time),* volumes of delicate verses *(goal)* —, some indeed, border *(process: relational)* on indelicacy *(attribute/ circumstance: matter)* —, and [his column, "Of Things Literary" in the Climax] *(carrier),* is *(process: relational)* well known *(attribute).* His Byronic visage and an interview *(scope)* have appeared *(process: material)* in the Perfect Lady *(circumstance: place).* It *(token/ identified)* was *(process: relational)* Aubrey Vair *(value/ identifier),* I *(senser)* believe *(process: mental),* who *(sayer)* demonstrated *(process: verbal)* that the humour of Dickens *(carrier)* was *(process: relational)* worse than his sentiment *(attribute),* and who *(actor)* detected *(process: material)* "a subtle bourgeois flavour" *(scope)* in Shakespeare *(circumstance: place).*

Even Aubrey Vair *(actor)* did *(process: material)* this *(goal),* weeping *(minor process: behavioural)* the sonnets *(phenomenon)* overnight *(circumstance: time)* into his blotting-book *(circumstance: place),* and pretending to write *(minor process: material)* literary causerie *(goal)* when his wife *(actor)* came down *(process: material)* in her bath slippers *(circumstance: manner)* to see *(minor process: mental)* [what kept him up] *(phenomenon).* She *(senser)* did not understand *(process: mental)* him *(phenomenon),* of course. He *(actor)* did *(process: material)* this *(goal)* before *(circumstance: time)* the other woman *(actor)* appeared *(process: material),* so ingrained *(attribute)* is *(process: relational)* conjugal treachery *(carrier)* in the talented mind *(circumstance: place).* Indeed, he *(actor)* wrote *(process: material)* more sonnets *(goal)* before *(circumstance: time)* the other woman *(actor)* came *(process: material)* than after that event *(circumstance: time),* because *(circumstance: cause)* thereafter he *(actor)* spent *(process: material)* much of his leisure *(scope)* in cutting down the old productions *(circumstance: manner),* retrimming *(minor process: material)* them *(scope),* and generally *(circumstance: manner)* altering *(minor process:material)* this ready-made clothing of his passion *(scope)* to suit *(minor process: relational)* her particular height and complexion *(value).*

Page 2

So Aubrey Vair's romantic longings *(carrier)* blew *(process: relational)* loose *(attribute)* for a time *(circumstance: duration),* much as *(circumstance: role)* a seedling creeper *(scope)* might, planted *(process: material)* in the midst of a flower-bed *(circumstance: place).* But at last *(circumstance: time),* in the fulness of time *(circumstance: time),* the other woman *(actor)* came *(process: material)* to the embrace of Aubrey Vair's yearning heart-tendrils *(goal),* and his romantic episode *(scope)* proceeded *(process: material)* as *(circumstance: role)* is here *(circumstance: place)* faithfully *(circumstance: manner)* written down *(process: material).*

The other woman's name *(carrier/ identified)* was *(process: relational)* unpropitious *(attribute)*—, Miss Smith *(identifier)* —, but you *(senser)* would never have suspected *(process: mental)* it *(phenomenon)* from her face and costume *(circumstance: place).* Her parentage *(carrier)* was *(process: relational)* promising *(attribute),* she *(identified)* was *(process: relational)* an orphan *(identifier),* her mother *(identified)* was *(process: relational)* a Hindoo *(identifier),* and her father *(identified)* an Indian civil

servant *(identifier);* and Aubrey Vair *(identified)*— himself a happy mixture of Kelt and Teuton*(identifier),* as indeed *(circumstance: role),* all literary men *(carrier)* have to be *(process: relational)* nowadays *(circumstance: time)*— naturally believed in *(process: mental)* the literary consequences of a mixture of races *(phenomenon).*

Page 4

"We *(carrier)* are *(process: relational),"* continued *(process: material)* Aubrey Vair *(actor),* conscious of a favourable impression *(identifier)* —, "we *(carrier)* are *(process: relational)* like fireworks *(attribute/ circumstance: comparison),* mere dead *(attribute),* inert things *(actor)* until the appointed spark *(circumstance: time)* comes *(process: material);* and then *(circumstance: time)*— if it *(carrier)* is *(process: relational)* not damp *(attribute)*— the dormant soul *(scope)* blazes *(process: material)* forth *(circumstance: time)* in all its warmth and beauty *(circumstance: manner).* That *(identified)* is *(process: relational)* living *(identifier).*

He *(sayer)* talked *(process: verbal)* to her *(receiver)* a lot *(circumstance: manner)* [about love and destiny, and all that bric-a-brac of the minor poet] *(circumstance: matter).*And they *(sayer)* talked *(process: verbal)* together *(circumstance: manner)* about his genius *(circumstance: matter).* He *(actor)* elaborately *(circumstance: manner),* though discreetly *(circumstance: manner),* sought *(process: material)* her society *(goal),* and presented *(process: relational)* and read *(process: material)* to her *(recipient)* the milder of his unpublished sonnets *(scope).*

Page 5

[A little boy clambering in the hedge some way down the lane] *(senser)* saw *(process: mental)* this group *(phenomenon)* with surprise *(circumstance: manner/ means)*, and then *(circumstance: time)* with scorn and contempt *(circumstance: manner/ means).* Reckoning *(minor process: mental)* nothing of his destiny *(phenomenon),* he *(actor)* turned away feeling *(process: behavioural)* that he *(actor)* at least could never come *(process: material)* to the unspeakable unmanliness of hugging girls *(goal).* Unhappily for Reigate scandal *(circumstance: manner),* his shame for his sex *(carrier)* was *(process: relational)* altogether too deep for words *(attribute).*

6.2 Findings and Discussion of the Short Stories

6.2.1 Findings and Discussion of ''The Devoted Friend''
Table (6.1) Percentages of ''The Devoted Friend'' Story

	Type of process	Total frequencies of processes	Total percentages of process	Major process		Minor process	
				Frequency	percentages	Frequency	percentages
1	Material process	225	33,987%	191	28,85%	34	5,13%
2	Relational process	187	28,247%	183	27,64%	4	0,6%
3	Verbal process	120	18,126%	116	17,52%	4	0,6%
4	Mental	81	12,235%	74	11,17%	7	1,05%

	process						
5	Behavioural process	26	3,927%	18	2,71%	8	1,2%
6	Existential process	23	3,474%	23	3,47%	0	0%
	Total results	662	99,99%	605	91,36%	57	8,58%

The analysis of the story ''The Devoted Friend'' reveals that the dominant type of processes is material process (33,9%), as it is identified in (225) clauses, followed by relational process (28,2%), as it is used (187) times, and then verbal process (18,1%), which shows (120) times of use. Other types record less frequencies and percentages: mental process (12,2%, 81 times), behavioural process (3,9%, 26 times), and existential process (3,4%, 23). Material process indicates the physical activities done by the characters. Similarly, the relational process relates the entity to the external environment by expressing a state, identifying, or attributing an entity. And because the story is a story within a story, verbal process is utilized to narrate events. Mental process also employed to express the internal state of the characters.

It is found that there are different forms of different clauses are analysed. Some entities have circumstantial form, but their function is participant. The analysis of the data reveals that such forms join attributive relational clauses, in which the attribute can be formed as a circumstance, and interpreted as (attribute/ circumstance), for example:

a. It *(carrier)* is not *(process: relational)* in very good repair *(attribute/ circumstance: manner)*.

  b. 'Is*(process: relational)* the story *(carrier)* about me *(attribute/ circumstance: matter)?*'

Another type of processes is joined by such forms, which is material process. In this type, some of participants *(actor, goal, client, and recipient)*are shaped circumstantially, as in the following example:

  c. 'So the Miller *(initiator)* tied *(process: material)* the sails of the windmill together *(recipient)* with a strong iron chain *(actor)*.

In other cases, Halliday assumes that attributive relational clauses cannot be reversed, but in literary texts, it is possible to reverse such clauses, as in the following example:

   a. So devoted *(attribute)* was *(process: relational)* the rich Miller *(carrier)* to little Hans *(beneficiary)*.

Another point is noticed here, which is the influence of the meaning of the context on the interpretation of some processes that changes the category of the process, like:

   a. I *(carrier)* feel *(process: relational)* quite drowsy *(attribute)*.

The process *feel* is treated as relational, not mental, because the context of the clauses guide the meaning. Followed by an attribute is the point that directs the process to be relational rather than mental.

Not only the meaning or the context can change the type of the process, but the tense also:

   b. You *(behaver)* are always thinking *(process: behavioural)* of others *(circumstance: matter)*.

The process *think*is built in present-in-present tense *thinking*, which is impossible to form mental processes, so it is attached to behavioural processes that accept this tense.

Finally, Halliday presumes that senser participant cannot be an inanimate, abstract entity but in fictional type of stories. In this story, senser is occupied by an abstract entity, as in:

a. Friendship *(senser)* never forgets *(process: mental).*

6.2.2 Findings and Discussion of ''In the Modern Vein: An Unsympathetic Love Story''
Table (6.2) Percentages of ''In the Modern Vein'' story

	Type of process	Total frequencies of processes	Total percentages of process	Major process		Minor process	
				frequency	percentage	frequency	percentage
1.	Material process	177	35,47%	158	31,663%	19	3,807%
2.	Relational process	122	24,448%	120	24,048%	2	0,4%
3.	Mental process	76	15,23%	72	14,428%	4	0,801%
4.	Verbal process	75	15,03%	71	14,228%	4	0,801%
5.	Behavioural process	30	6,012%	20	4,008%	10	2,004%
6.	Existential process	19	3,807%	19	3,807%	0	0%
	Total results	499	99,99%	460	92,182%	39	7,813%

The analysis of the data under study shows the dominance of material process (35,4%) and are used (177) times. It refers to the physical effort performed by the characters. The second process is relational one (24,4%)., which is used (122) times.This type is utilized to describe states and give identifications to love and other things in life by the characters. Likewise, mental (15,2%, 76 times) and verbal processes (15%, 75 times) are almost near to each other. Mental process is utilized by the heroes to express their emotions and beliefs. Verbal process is used between the heroes to negotiate their relationship. Behavioural and existential processes are less repeated in comparison with the other types.

The analysis of the story uncovers another significant point, which is the circumstantial participant. Such a form appears with some types of processes, like: material, verbal, and relational processes. With material clauses, the circumstantial participants appears as a goal configured as a circumstance, like in:

a. He *(actor)* at least could never come *(process: material)* to the unspeakable unmanliness of hugging girls *(goal).*

The other participant of material clauses that can be created as circumstance is *recipient*, as in this example:

b. … and read *(process: material)* to her *(recipient)* the milder of his unpublished sonnets *(scope).*

In additional to material, *receiver* of verbal process can be preceded by a preposition to frame a circumstantial participant, as in:

c. He *(sayer)* talked *(process: verbal)* to her *(receiver)* a lot *(circumstance: manner)…*

In relational process, attributive type has the ability to construct attribute as a circumstance, for instance:

d. We *(carrier)* are *(process: relational)* like fireworks *(attribute/ circumstance: comparison).*

Phenomenon, on the other hand, is appended to behavioural clauses that, in some cases, the second participant cannot be construed as a behaviour, like:

a. …weeping *(minor process: behavioural)* the sonnets *(phenomenon)* overnight *(circumstance: time).*

Here, *the sonnet* cannot function as a behaviour, but a phenomenon because its meaning is not identical to the process to work as a behaviour.

Reversibility comes into sight obviously. Some attributive relational clauses reverse carrier/ attribute positions. Consider the following examples along with the reversed forms structures as no.1:

a. So ingrained *(attribute)* is *(process: relational)* conjugal treachery *(carrier)* in the talented mind *(circumstance: place).*

a1. Conjugal treachery is so ingrained in ….

Furthermore, the role of semantics in interpreting clauses can change the path, in which some processes can be attached to another type because of the meaning of the clause, such as:

a. So Aubrey Vair's romantic longings *(carrier)* blew *(process: relational)* loose *(attribute)* for a time *(circumstance: duration).*

*blew*is a material process in nature, but because of the meaning of the clause that it is followed by an attribute, it is changed to relational process.

Another important point the analysis uncovers in the story, which is the verbless clauses. Some clauses do not have processes that refer to rhetorical literary structures. Yet, they could be interpreted according to the use of participants and depending on the previous clause to guise their process. Consider the following verbless clauses along with their clauses of original structures, numbered as 1.:

a. Her mother *(identified)* was *(process: relational)* a Hindoo*(identifier),* and her father *(identified)* an Indian civil servant *(identifier);* and Aubrey Vair *(identified)—* himself a happy mixture of Kelt and Teuton*(identifier).*

a1. …her father *was* an Indian civil servant; and Aubrey Vair *was—* himself a happy mixture of Kelt and Teuton.

Relying on the first clause,*her mother was a Hindoo*, it is presupposed that *was* is the omitted process, and the clauses denote identification of relational process.

6.3 The Comparison of the Two Short Stories' Findings

The analyses of the data (the two short stories) exhibit the prominent types of processes of each story. The comparison below helps show how each style of the stories utilizes the type of processes. In the tables (6.3), (6.4), the arrangement of processes in each story is tabulated to discuss the findings through the following tables.

Table (6.3) The final percentages of ''The Devoted Friend'' story

	Type of process	Total percentages of process
1.	**Material process**	**33,987%**
2.	**Relational process**	**28,247%**
3.	**Verbal process**	**18,126%**
4.	**Mental process**	**12,235%**
5.	**Behavioural process**	**3,927%**
6.	**Existential process**	**3,474%**

Table (6.4) The finalpercentages of ''In the Modern Vein'' story

	Type of process	Total percentages of process
1.	**Material process**	**35,47%**
2.	**Relational process**	**24,448%**
3.	**Mental process**	**15,23%**
4.	**Verbal process**	**15,03%**
5.	**Behavioural process**	**6,012%**
6.	**Existential process**	**3,807%**

The two tables clarify the rates of processes of each story, and how, in each story, the processes work. Material process is the dominant type in the stories, in a reference to the high performance of the physical acts of the characters to build up the events of the stories. At the same time, the distinction between the rates of the material process in each story is clear, in which, in ''The Devoted Friend'' that is written for children and which employs the highest number of processes(662 processes), it is noted that it uses material process (33,9%, 225 times) in a mild way beside the other types of process. No wide disparity between material and relational (28,2%), but between verbal (18,1%) and mental (12,2%) with material and relational the difference is largely built. In contrast to ''In the Modern Vein'' which is a love story, that utilizes material (35,4%) as well as relational (24,44%) basically, the difference in rates are wider a little bit between the use of mental ((15,2%) and verbal (15%), which are equal to each other. It employs almost (499) process, (177) of them are material process.

7. CONCLUSION

It is concluded that:

1. Circumstance as participant:

   Eliciting the findings of the analysis,it is deduced that some circumstances of prepositional phrases forms can function as participants. The position of some participants, like *client, recipient, receiver, etc*. needs to be preceded by a preposition to mould a prepositional phrase. Thus, such constructions are circumstance-like in form, and participants in function. In this case, these circumstance-like forms are analysed as participants, regardless their forms.

2. Reversibility in attributive relational clauses:

   Halliday presupposes that reversibility in attributive relational clauses are impossible to be constructed, only in literary clauses and old languages and in limited use. Through the data analysis, it is found that such a form is designed in some clauses, but restrictively.

3. The effect of tense and meaning on the analysis of clauses:

   These two elements are important in construing clauses, in which any change in the tense can shift the process from a category to another. The meaning has the same influence of tense. It is

discovered that, in many clauses, the tense can convert the category of processes, and the meaning of some participants that are not identical to the process' category changes the category of process as well.

4. Verbless clauses and transitivity system:

Some clauses are verbless or nominal clauses that lack the presence of verbs. Transitivity system proves its ability to interpret clauses that contain verbs as well as verbless ones. As it was deduced from the analysis, most of the verbless clauses are of relational type. Transitivity system confirms its efficiency in interpreting such a type of clauses.

5. Phenomenon participant in behavioural clauses:

As it is postulated by Halliday that phenomenon participant can be employed in mental clause, in some restricted cases, phenomenon can be attached to behavioural clauses, when the participant cannot be interpreted as behavioural. The analysis of the data confirms that some behavioural processes required a second participant that cannot be construed as behaviour, but phenomenon.

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angermuller, J., Maingueneau, D. &Wodak, R. (2014).*The discourse studies reader, main currents in theory and analysis.*Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bandstra, B. (2008). *Genesis 1-11: a handbook on the Hebrew text*.Texas: Baylor University Press.

Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2004).*The functional analysis of English*. (2ⁿᵈed.). Britain: Arnold.

Bosseaux, C. (2007). *How does it feel? Point of view in translation, the case of Virginia Woolf into French*.Amsterdam/ New York: NY.

Bristow, J. (Ed.). (2017). *Oscar Wilde and the culture of childhood*.USA: Palgrave.

Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. (2ⁿᵈed.). London/ New York: Continuum.

Halliday, M. (1994).*An introduction to functional grammar*.Great Britain: Edward Arnold ltd.

Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (1999).*Construing experience through meaning*.London/ New York: Continuum.

. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Great Britain: Arnold group.

. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London/ New York: Routledge.

Hardy, S. (1991). H. G. *Wells and language*.London: Universirt of Leicester.Published master thesis by ProQuest LLC 2015.

Lavid, J., Arus, J., &Zamorano-Mansilla, J.R. (2010).*Systemic functional grammar of Spanish, a contrastive study with English*.London/ New York: Continuum.

Lock, G. (1996). *Functional English grammar, an introduction for second language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Matthiessen, C., Teruya, K., & Lam, M. (2010).*Key term in systemic functional linguistics*. London/ New York: Continuum group.

Perez, M. C. (2007). *Transitivity in translation: the interdependence of texture and context*.Bern: Peter Lang.

Simon-Vandenbergen, A., Davidse, K., & Noel, D. (1997).*Reconnecting language: morphology and syntax in functional perspectives*.Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics, a resource book for students*.London: Routledge.

Teich, E. (2003). *Cross-linguistic variation in system and text*.Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Webster, J. (Ed.). (2002).*On grammar*. The collecting works of M. Halliday. (Vol. 1).London/ New York: Continuum.

. (Ed.). (2004). *The language of science*. The collecting works of M. Halliday. (Vol. 5).London/ New York: Continuum.

Wells, H.G. (2007). In the modern vein: an unsympathetic love story. *The short stories of H. G. Wells*.Australia: Gutenberg.http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks06/html.

Wilde, O. (2003). The devoted friend.*The happy prince and other tales*.(Ed. 10th).Gutenberg ebook.http://www.gutenberg.org