J. R. Martin, Language and Linguistics

Y.J. Doran

Department of Linguistics

The University of Sydney

By any measure, J. R. Martin is a major figure in linguistics. A brief look at Martin's impact quickly shows this. If quantitative measures are anything to go by, at the time of writing, his Google scholar citation count is 45,235with an h-index of 83, which puts him 8th in the world in terms of citations for the tag 'Linguistics' and 3rd in the world for 'Literacy', with a number of those above him no longer active (or alive). This numerical impact is accompanied by the fifty-six and growing PhD students he has supervised (plus innumerable Masters and undergraduate honours students), his forty-odd authored and edited books (or more, depending on when you are reading this), his eight volumes of collected works, plus the twenty-odd books of school teaching materials he has co-produced, and the roughly 250 journal articles, book chapters, special issues, working papers and the like he has written. Couple this with the fact that research he has driven strongly underpins literacy curricula and pedagogy both in Australia and world-wide, and that this festschrift has appeared while he is in his prime with many years of major contributions to come, and the significance of Martin's work becomes clear.

The role of this chapter is to give some account of Martin's work and influence. An obvious way of coming at this is by overviewing the enormously broad and varied work he has engaged in thus far and the descriptive, theoretical and applied models and interventions

he has developed. This would highlight the range of Martin's work, from Systemic Functional theory and metatheory to description and application across language and semiosis, from educational linguistics to clinical and forensic linguistics, from critical discourse analysis to positive discourse analysis, language variation and development to identity and affiliation, from genre to register to discourse semantics to lexicogrammar to phonology, from language description and typology involving English, Tagalog, Korean and Spanish, to multimodality of images and body language and powerpoint and space, from the language of science to that of history and literature and music and administration and news and opinion and tragedy and hope and activism and schizophrenia, from classrooms to conversations, from written language to spoken language and a wealth of interdisciplinary ventures throughout. Such an overview would emphasize the diversity of objects of study and give a sense of the richness and detail for which Martin is renowned. But to give such an overview would give little sense as to why these objects occurred and what we can learn from them; it would tell us little about how these come together, or the unity in diversity of Martin's work. More practically, if this chapter were written ten years ago, a number of these objects would be missed; or by writing it today, I am surely missing the new focuses and developments of the years to come. To give an overview of the objects of Martin's work is to give a list. But it says little about how the list holds together, how it came to be or the principles upon which new things are added to it. Put simply, we learn little from such an overview that can help us reflect on our own work.[i]

Another point of departure is to emphasize not the breadth and diversity of Martin's work, but its stability. From this perspective we may say that Martin has firmly positioned his work within the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics. This gives a good insight into the unity of his work and a sense that he has developed the tradition pushed forward by his teacher Halliday and by Firth before him. But again, this would miss the enormous change that this field has had during his lifetime. For one, the name of this approach has continually

changed from its earliest days, from neo-Firthian linguistics, to scale and category grammar, to systemic grammar to systemic functional grammar, to systemic functional linguistics to social semiotics and systemic functional semiotics. This name change of course reflects the continuous change that has marked the field. For a student of current Systemic Functional Linguistics to read Gregory's scale and category grammar of English that Martin was trained on in his undergraduate years (Gregory 1966-72) would be like a modern English speaker reading Middle English; although there is some vague semblance for those who understand the relation, for other than historical reasons, it would be best to consider it a different linguistic approach.

But this constant change and diversity holds the key to understanding Martin's work. It has been said that Chomsky has consistently been the first post-Chomskyan (Gregory 1998). Such a description could also be applied to Martin (and to Halliday before him). This pithy remark holds the insight that the wavelength of academic change is often larger than can be noticed if one is engaging in detail with a field's development for only a few years (as, say, a PhD student would be), while short enough for the field to be a little unrecognizable if one is away from the coal-face for a while (as, say, for a post-PhD scholar forced to move away and focus on securing a job for a number of years rather than on keeping up with and developing their field). In this continual but at a glance unnoticeable change, it becomes easy to take the principles of one's field when one is trained as the principles forever more, and to then be frustrated and angered when the field seems to increasingly and irrevocably move away from its 'true' essence. It is in this sense that many look to the key books and the key knowers for answers – in the field of SFL/Social Semiotics these tend to be either Firth, Halliday, Hasan, Martin, Matthiessen, Kress, and/or van Leeuwen, depending on when and where you were trained – and to shun new developments as vulgar. If Martin is regularly the first post-Martinian just as Halliday was consistently the first post-Hallidayan then the question is what drives this change. What are the principles upon which Martin's work has

developed, and how can we understand its unity and diversity in a way that can enable a more sober understanding of the development of academic knowledge in general. It is these questions that this chapter will explore.

Linguistics and other things

In his 1992 *English Text*, Martin describes his linguistic upbringing as follows:

> I first became interested in discourse analysis in 1968. I was a first year student at the time, in Michael Gregory's English department at Glendon College in Toronto. Gregory began our course by introducing us to Hallidayan linguistics (grammar, register theory and stylistics) and hired Waldemar Gutwinski to join the department to teach "American" linguistics. It was Gutwinski who first introduced me to discourse structure, and I have been shunting between clause grammar and cohesion analysis ever since.
>
> Gutwinski was a student of Al Gleason's, and after finishing my BA at Glendon I enrolled in an MA at the University of Toronto to study discourse analysis with him. After my MA I went to Essex to begin a PhD with Michael Halliday, returning to Toronto for 18 months to work with Gleason before finishing my degree in Sydney in 1977… My debt to Al Gleason, and to Michael Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan will be more than obvious to readers of this book. Readers familiar with systemic grammar will perhaps forgive me if I refer to Gleason as my meta-Theme and Halliday and Hasan as my meta-New. (1992: xiii)

There are a number of things striking about this training in linguistics. The first is the unusual scope this training would have been at the time, especially in North America, bridging scale and category grammar, register, stylistics and cohesion (in undergraduate at Glendon), stratificational linguistics, fieldwork-based language description and discourse structure (with Gleason in both the MA and during the PhD), and the enormously expansive

socially, theoretically, descriptively and appliably-oriented focuses of Halliday and Hasan that developed through the '70s, which pushed much further than linguistics was generally assumed to cover at the time.

But there is another set of striking similarities between each of the people Martin notes in his training that he has carried through in his work. This is the openness in which linguistics, however it is defined, is conceptualized in relation to other things – other academic fields (e.g. sociology, literature, education), other arenas (e.g. non-research institutions such as schools, legal systems, family and healthcare contexts) and things typically considered 'other than language' (context, broader semiosis, society etc.). Although at times, especially in the early '60s, nods were made by a number of these teachers – especially Gregory (e.g. 1966-72) – to linguistics being the study of language for its own sake, each of these teachers all made regular reference to the need for linguistics to be useful for things outside of linguistics.

In the preface to the grammar of English that Martin was initially trained in, for example, Gregory (1966-72: 14) notes that:

> to make statements about language in its own terms is not, nor should it be, the sole purpose for any linguist's study. Unless his statements about language are useful, useful not only to other linguists, but also to other men, this has essentially been a trivial study. Inevitably the statements of the majority of linguists do have such value.

Similar sentiments, often arising from the problematics of various applied research goals, can be found in the work of Gleason (particularly in relation to translation, second language teaching and school education, e.g. 1965, 1968), Gutwinski (in relation to stylistics and literature, 1976), Hasan (across a range of areas associated with education, social transmission and verbal art e.g. 1985, 2009, 2011) and, of course, Halliday who famously emphasized his commitment that 'linguistics cannot be other than an ideologically committed

form of social action' (1985: 5).[ii] This type of linguistics is one that involves a dialectic between theory and practice, where the theory is both developed to be appliable to any problem that arises in the real world and in research, and flexible enough for problems to drive its expansion and development.

This concern for an appliable linguistics has run deep in Martin's work as well as those of his students and close colleagues (see Caldwell et al. in press). As he describes:

> I have tried to practice linguistics as a form of social action, a practice which Halliday (e.g. 1985) has suggested cannot be other than ideologically committed. This practice dissolves the linguistics vs applied linguistic opposition which has evolved in response to the hegemony of American formalism – whose idealizing reductivity comes nowhere near serving the need of language users and their aids around the world. In its stead, linguistics as social action engages theory with practice in a dialectic whereby theory informs practice which, in turn, rebounds on theory, recursively, as more effective ways of intervening in various processes of semogenesis are designed. (Martin 2000: 116)

As Martin's work has shown, practicing linguistics in this way is not a simple task. It implicates a wide range of principles and practices that at times can be in tension with each other. We will explore these here.

Linguistics and practice

The most obvious feature of an appliable linguistics is its use in solving problems outside linguistics. Importantly, this is not a one-way street; an appliable linguistics in Halliday's sense is one where outside problems in turn drive the development of linguistics (2008).[iii] As far as Martin's work is concerned, the area in which he has worked most deeply in this sense is his concern for designing and implementing literacy pedagogy. This pedagogy has become

known as 'Sydney school pedagogy' or 'genre pedagogy'. Twenty years ago Martin (2000: 116) described the ongoing development of pedagogical work in the 'Sydney school' as follows:

> The transdisciplinary literacy research to which I am referring evolved as an action research project in and around Sydney from 1979… involving at key stages the Linguistics Department at the University of Sydney and the Metropolitan East Region of the New South Wales Disadvantaged Schools program. Our goal, as educational linguists, was to intervene in the process of writing development in primary and secondary school across various depths of time. As far as logogenesis was concerned, we attempted to provide students with knowledge about language… that they could use in reading, writing and editing. As for ontogenesis, we worked with teachers on the design of curriculum (learner pathways) and pedagogy (classroom activity). Finally, with respect to phylogenesis, we were committed to a redistribution of literacy resources and critical language awareness… which we hoped would emancipate the meaning potential of the students we were working with, with a view to giving them ways of redesigning their world. To date, we have had some impact on the first two of these frames for intervention; only time will tell the extent to which the work been socially empowering for the non-mainstream students involved.

This description gives a sense of the multifaceted pedagogy that has been developed, concerned not only with what students write, but what they can know to help them write; not just what the curriculum should be, but how teachers can effectively teach this curriculum at every level of granularity, from the largest-scale lesson-sequences down to the small-scale exchanges that take place in the classroom; and not just an individualist perspective where each student can 'attain their potential' but an explicitly social and political one, concerned with the redistribution of cultural capital traditionally horded by the ruling classes in a way that enables students not just to succeed in their world, but to change it.

As far as the role of linguistics is concerned, this quote makes clear that Martin and colleagues' work in this area does not begin from the perspective of linguistics, per se. Rather, it begins with educational, social and political issues at stake, and in a sense, 'works back' to linguistics. It does not ask 'what can linguistics do to help education?', which is likely to lead to the help being limited to what linguistics can do at the time, but rather begins with questions of education and asks 'how can we develop a linguistics that can help solve this problem?'. This is a profoundly different question that puts the onus back on linguistics to develop itself in a way that can be useful; not just develop a linguistics on its own terms and then find a use for it once it has been developed.

In this chapter we will not go into detail into the various components of the Sydney School pedagogy that has developed (and is still developing), other than to indicate that coming at the issue from the perspective of education implicates a highly-multifaceted understanding of education as a social practice and a highly intricate design of pedagogy. Rose and Martin (2012) and Martin (1999a, 2012e) give extensive overviews of the program as it developed at various points. Here we shall simply exemplify the dialectic of theory and practice by giving a small overview of the role of genre in this pedagogy and how it fits within Martin's framework. This overview is necessarily simplified but should hopefully give a taste as to what it means to develop an appliable linguistics.

The first thing to say about the notion of genre in SFL is that, in contrast to the oft repeated story of its development, it did not arise purely from educational work. In Martin's conception, genre has its roots in, amongst other things, the interplay between Gregory's functional tenor in a four-variable understanding of register (Gregory 1967), in relation to Halliday's three-variable understanding of register (1978); Hasan's work on text structure (1979); Mitchell's Firthian account of the staging and options in service exchanges in Cyrenaica (1957); Labov and Waletsky's work on narrative (1967); Gleason and the Hartford Stratificationalists' concern for text schematic structure (1968); and a little later, Bakhtin's

speech genres (1986) and ongoing work of Kress (1985). More directly, however, seminal work driving the development of the SFL notion of genre came from a number of students working in a research group with Martin from 1980-85, which:

> included Plum, who worked on a variety of spoken genres elicited from dog breeders (Plum 1998), Ventola, who studied Finnish migrants' interactions with Australian staff in post office and travel agency service encounters (Ventola, 1987), Eggins, who examined dinner table conversations among her housemates and friends (Eggins & Slade, 1997), Rothery, who was interested in doctor/patient consultations as well as primary school writing (Rothery, 1996) and myself a would-be critical linguist, who was working on environmental and administrative discourse (Martin 2015: 34)

The roots of genre, then, came from a diverse range of influences and impetuses. But it is true that it has gained it most significant foothold in relation to work concerned with educational issues. A significant reason for this is that, as Martin, Rothery and others quickly realized, genre – in its recontextualized form for teachers and educationalists as a 'text type' described as a 'staged, goal-oriented social process' – was a relatively easy and unobtrusive starting point for teachers to understand and teach the texts that students need to write. This is in contrast to a starting point from grammar in an Australian context where grammar had been systematically removed from the curriculum for decades, and so could not be reliably assumed to be known by teachers (Rose and Martin 2012: 1-4).

As this 'way in' through genre was developing, the question naturally arose as to how to teach it in a way that ensured access for everyone – particularly those from marginalized backgrounds who were (are) consistently left aside by both 'traditional' and 'progressivist' pedagogies, such as students from working class, migrant or Indigenous backgrounds. An early and well-known response to this came in the form of the 'Teaching-Learning Cycle', a designed curriculum genre that aimed to make explicit the nature of the particular literacy

tasks students need to master and give them gradual and aided experience in succeeding in this task. Martin (1999a: 126-127) explains this pedagogy as follows:

> It comprises three main phases: Modelling, Joint Construction and Independent Construction. Modelling involves introducing students to an example of the text type in focus, discussing the function of the genre, and examining its structure, including relevant language features. Joint construction involves preparing for work on another example of the genre, which will be jointly constructed by the teacher and students (with the teacher developing a text on the board, on large sheets of paper or on the overhead projector in response to suggestions from students). Independent construction involves students preparing for another instantiation of the genre, which they will write on their own; it explicitly encourages creative exploration of the genre and its possibilities… teaching can begin at any point, depending on the needs of the students. For example, some teachers found the Joint Construction stage unnecessary for some students, whereas for others, this stage needed to be worked through more than once before students were ready to write on their own.

This curriculum genre has been elaborated significantly since the '80s, encompassing a much wider range of practices (including reading, writing and listening), year levels (from primary through to tertiary and education outside of schooling contexts), subjects across the disciplinary map and degrees of detail in teaching (from whole curriculum and assessment to highly detailed design of teacher-student interaction).

But the needs of the pedagogy did not just emphasize the design of teaching practices, it also involved questioning both what students need to write to succeed and what they actually do write. This required a significant descriptive effort in a way that 'handed back' a problem from education to linguistics. This descriptive effort has dramatically expanded the horizons of text linguistics, both in SFL and beyond. This is first by broadening the models and mapping of genres that occur across our social lives. But second, this is because, despite

its name, 'Sydney School genre pedagogy' and the descriptive and theoretical research programs it has driven by no means only involve genre. Genre is, in one sense, just a useful way in. The pedagogy more broadly aims to target all language and literacy issues needed for success in any area. In this sense, the expansion of studies of genre raised their own issues surrounding linguistic features of texts that were not yet understood. Factual genres often used in science, for example, highlighted key issues associated with ideational meaning in lexicogrammar, discourse semantics and field, amongst other things. Similarly work on various story genres helped spark various concerns about evaluative language, including distinguishing the different types of evaluation used in anecdotes, exemplums and observations. This helped develop the categories of affect, judgement and appreciation within the system of ATTITUDE, while a concern for understanding the reader positioning that occurs in various journalistic texts drove the development of the system of ENGAGEMENT, all contributing to the now highly influential model of APPRAISAL given in Martin and White (2005). These descriptions have in turn been recontextualized as pedagogical tools in a wide range of teacher-oriented resources and embedded into curricula around the world.

It is this back and forth between theory and application shown by Martin and colleagues' work that illustrates an appliable linguistics. A problem in the outside world drives an expansion in linguistic modelling which in turn is used to solve the problem in the outside world, which leads to further problems for linguistics to help solve and back and forth and so on. Of course this account is highly simplified. Such a program is not a simple case of clean transitions from education to linguistics and back; nor is it a case that the two fields are perfectly siphoned off from each other; the dynamics are such that they co-develop at various degrees of intensity, in relation to various other programs and issues both inside and outside of education or linguistics.[iv]

Linguistics for understanding language

To stop at this point and suggest that Martin's work has been entirely driven by external concerns would do injustice to it. The interplay between theory and practice has been a key driver through Martin's career, but throughout, it has been doubled with a concern for developing a linguistics for understanding the enormous and multifaceted nature of language and semiosis themselves (or, in a Hallidayan vein, the 'social semiotic').[v]

This is most obvious in Martin's long-term descriptive and typological programmes focusing on Tagalog and English, and more recently with Mira Kim and Gi-Hyun Shin on Korean and Beatriz Quiroz on Spanish. Beginning with Tagalog, Martin first encountered this language during his MA field-methods course run by Gleason at Toronto before enrolling in a six-week intensive Tagalog course in Hawaii associated with a Linguistic Society of America Institute during his PhD and eventually undertaking three field-work trips in Manilla once working in Sydney. More recently, he has worked with Prixie Cruz, a Tagalog speaker and linguist living in Manilla, as well as supervising a doctoral student working on Tagalog, Kent Ramos. From the perspective of general descriptive linguistics, as with much discussion about Tagalog, Martin has unpicked its well-known and extensively discussed case and alignment features from an SFL perspective (in terms of TRANSITIVITY, Martin 1996a). But importantly, Martin's work does not stop at these well-known features. He has also put forward detailed descriptions of the interpersonal systems of MOOD and MODALITY (1990), and POLARITY, TAGGING, VOCATION, COMMENT and ENGAGEMENT (2018), logical meanings across a range of grammatical environments (1995), the discourse semantic systems of CONJUNCTION and CONTINUITY (1981) and PARTICIPANT IDENTIFICATION (1983), and a brief discussion of textual meaning and THEME (2004a).

A crucial feature of Martin's work in this area is the use of descriptions to make broader arguments about language and linguistics. This is seen, for example, through his work on the Tagalog logical linker *na-/ng-*. This linker is a generally productive linker for

hypotaxis across ranks and systems throughout the grammar, shown by examples (1) and (2)
(both from Martin 1995) where it links elements in the nominal group and the clause complex
respectively (linker in bold; with the examples glossed for morpheme and word in (1) and
clause and complex in (2)).[vi] In these situations, they follow Halliday's (Halliday and
Matthiessen 2014) interpretation of hypotaxis fairly closely, showing an iterative structure
organized through dependency.

(1)	*iyo-**ng***	*marami-**ng***	*masama-**ng***	*bata*
	that-LK	many-LK	bad-LK	child
	δ	γ	β	α
	that	*many*	*bad*	*child*

‘those naughty children’

(2)	*Ewan niya ku**ng***	*natatakot dom so Raffy **na***	*makakita ng damdamin sa mata niya*
	α	β	γ
	She didn't know	*Raffy was also afraid*	*he'd be able to see the feeling in her eyes*

‘She didn't know if Raffy was also afraid he'd be able to see the feeling in her eyes’

In certain situations, however, Martin argues that these linkers are 'co-opted' for
interpersonal purposes where they appear to mark the scope across which various
interpersonal meanings are covered. In (3), for example, the linker marks off the attitudinal
meaning exclaiming her speed, positioned at the front of the clause, from the running which
is the target of the attitude.

(3)	*ang*	*bilis*	*niya-**ng***	*t<um>akbo*
	T	fast	3SG-LK	run<COMPL>

α β

'How fast she ran'

In an instance like this, the linker does not necessarily relate two similar units, as occurs in prototypical hypotactic structures, nor is it particularly iterative. In fact, it is relatively variable as to what units maybe come before or after the linker and typically only relates two elements. This poses a problem for descriptions that take constituency as its primary means of structure. Without relatively distinct units, it is difficult to parse the clause in a consistent manner; moreover a purely constituency representation would not be able to account for the scoping that occurs between the fronted interpersonal elements and their domain after the linker. Martin used this and other descriptions to argue for the importance of recognising both multiple tiers and distinct types of structure in grammatical description – in this case, the interaction between constituency, interdependency and scoping (or prosody). In conjunction with his work on Tagalog TRANSITIVITY and various areas of English, this contributed to Martin's reinterpretation of Halliday's particulate structures in terms of orbital and serial structures (1996c) and clearly resonates with his emphasis on prosodic structure in interpersonal domains such as APPRAISAL (Martin and White 2005).

In this sense, Martin's work on Tagalog has opened the way for him to make significant contributions to broader theoretical, metatheoretical and descriptive issues in linguistics. In addition to the need for a plurality of types of structure in description rather than just constituency, he has shown the need for cryptotypic description, rather than just phenotypic description (e.g. 1990, 1996a), the need for metafunctionally (2004a) and stratally diverse (1980, 1983) perspectives on description, rather than just ideational meaning within the grammar, the constant interplay between a structural (syntagmatic) perspective and a paradigmatic perspective (Martin and Cruz 2018), not just a focus on syntagms of classes,

and the need for recognising, accepting and celebrating metalinguistic diversity (in terms of approaches to linguistics), not just linguistic diversity (1996b).

In terms of typology proper – the comparison and categorising of languages, rather than just their description – Martin's work has evolved over the years from emphasising an interpretation of grammar from the perspective of discourse (1983) to a more generalized 'defeasible' typology (Martin and Quiroz 2020). In such a typology, all typological statements are necessarily tentative, being made with reference to the particular stratum, rank, metafunction, level of delicacy and axial perspective from which things are said to look 'the same' or 'different'. Throughout, Martin has emphasized a constant reflexivity about the ways of describing language, not just the descriptions or typologies themselves.

Although his descriptive work on Tagalog has developed from the earliest years of his career, more well-known is Martin's descriptive work on English. This work began during his PhD, focusing on children's story-telling (1977), and has continued to develop since. The key feature of this work is its broadening focus; Martin has continually worked with a view that expands what can be studied by linguistics. Given Martin's (and SFL's in general) concern for a linguistics that can help the world, this makes sense. When one's research is driven largely by a field's internal problems, these internal problems tend to bound what the research can find. In the case of linguistics, this tends to mean that if one's research is driven by trying to see what types of phonetic, phonological, morphological or syntactic patterns occur around the world, research in this area will inevitably tend to remain focused on phonetics, phonology, morphology or syntax. However if one's research is driven not by internal issues only but also by problems external to the field, this has the potential to significantly expand what the field focuses on. A linguistics that looks to a world outside linguistics is a linguistics that expands what it can be. Martin's work very definitely shows this trajectory.

Starting in the '70s, Martin interpreted Gleason's stratificational linguistic concern for discourse structure through a Systemic Functional lense. His PhD thesis used the systems of REFERENCE and CONJUNCTION to force the issue of stratification in SFL. In particular, he worked to establish space in the theory for the cohesive resources identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) to be interpreted as discourse systems and structures rather than as non-structural elements within the grammar. This was followed by a gradual expansion of discourse semantic systems, such as NEGOTIATION and SPEECH FUNCTION, APPRAISAL, the discourse structure of periodicity, and IDEATION (see Martin 1992, Martin and White 2005). As these systems developed, this broadening focus expanded into exploring patterns of register and genre, as well as issues surrounding identity, community, ideology, individuation, allocation and affiliation (Martin 2010), and, following the multimodal revolution heralded by Kress and van Leeuwen (1990), detailed descriptions of non-linguistic semiosis such as image-text relations in children's picture books (Painter, Martin and Unsworth 2013;), body language, gesture and paralanguage (Martin and Zappavigna 2019, Ngo et al. forthcoming), and highly technical infographics and other semiotic resources used in school science (Martin et al. 2020, Doran and Martin 2020; see Unsworth this volume).

Coupled with this expansion is Martin's insistence not to privilege one particular register, such as casual conversation, over any other (as reflected in the list of focuses given at the beginning of this chapter). A useable theory of language and semiosis in this conception must be able to account for the variability of use in both 'everyday' language and language across various institutional and academic arenas, as well as the variability in users of language (and not just in terms of surface-level dialect features). This was shown right from the very beginning of Martin's work, with his first book, written with Sherry Rochester, exploring the discourse of people with various forms of schizophrenia (focusing in particular on their means of participant tracking; Rochester and Martin 1979), while his PhD tracked the story-telling and discourse patterns of children at 6/7 years old, 8/9 years old and 10/11

years old (1977). This breadth of focus has continued to this day, exemplified through his recent work with Michele Zappavigna and Paul Dwyer in the legal setting, where they explored the language and paralanguage of people engaging with Youth Justice Conferencing – a form of restorative justice that aims to divert young people away from a long engagement with the court and prison system (Zappavigna and Martin 2018 and Volume 8 of his collected works, Martin 2012f). As with previous work, this research developed a rich picture of the language and body language that organise this institutional setting *and* the way people used this to perform a range of identities.

To intervene in the contexts of schooling or law or medicine or any other field requires an understanding of how these fields work and how people differentially engage with them; a linguistic theory that takes unconscious, everyday chat as the most 'pure' of language will struggle to do anything in this area.

Theory, description and instance

Through this expansion, Martin has extended Halliday's 'extravagant' approach by pushing for a model that can integrate an increasingly large range of semiosis (or, as he has put it in personal conversation, a model that can bring more of the etic into the emic). The effect of this integrative approach is that every area of language resonates out to all others, and parallels, similarities and complementarities can occur across all levels, metafunctions and objects of language and linguistics. An illustration of this is given by the opening paragraph of Martin and White's Preface in their (2005) *Language of Evaluation*, the key text for the influential description of English APPRAISAL. APPRAISAL is often used in isolation to the rest of SFL, but, as Martin and White emphasize, it arose from concerns about other features of language and so resonates strongly across SFL theory:

The impetus for this book grew out of work on narrative genres, principally undertaken by Gunther Plum and Joan Rothery at the University of Sydney through the 1980s. Their point was that interpersonal meaning was critical both to the point of these genres (as emphasised by Labov) and also to how we classified them. This encouraged us to extend the model of interpersonal meaning that we had available at the time (based largely on work by Cate Poynton on language and gender), especially in the direction of one that could handle affect alongside modality and mood. (2005: xi)

This brief overview makes clear that the work of APPRAISAL inherently impinges on the SFL descriptions of genre, as its systems map key variables that occur across different story genres (Martin and Rose 2008). It also indicates APPRAISAL's importance for understanding register, in terms of the variation in tenor shown through the model proposed by Poynton (1990), and grammar, shown through the nod to mood and modality and Poynton's work on vocation and naming (which, in turn, all impinge on intonational and rhythmic phonology). Although not developed by 2005, APPRAISAL is also key to the growing models of affiliation and individuation (see chapters collected in Bednarek and Martin 2010), which in turn resonates out to Hasan's work on semantic variation, class and gender (2009). When looked at from this perspective, it becomes clear that appraisal is situated not as an isolated system in itself but in relation to a wider context of linguistic and social variables. This is illustrated further by the next two paragraphs of the preface which overview the range of research projects, researchers, objects of study and external interventions that influenced the development of the system:

The appraisal framework we're presenting here was developed in response to this need as part of the Disadvantaged Schools Program's Write it Right literacy project, which looked intensively at writing in the workplace and secondary school (from about 1990 to 1995). Jim was academic adviser to this project, in which Joan Rothery focused on secondary school

English and Creative Arts (working closely with Mary Macken-Horarik and Maree Stenglin). Peter [White] joined the team, and drew on his background as a journalist to focus on media discourse (working closely with Rick Iedema and Susan Feez). Appraisal theory developed as we moved from one register to another, and shuttled among theory, description and applications to school-based literacy initiatives. Caroline Coffin focused on secondary school history in this project, and adapted appraisal analysis to this subject area. The main innovation in this period involved moving beyond affect to consider lexical resources for judging behaviour and appreciating the value of things, and the recognition of syndromes of appraisal associated with different voices in the media and discourses of history.

During the 1990s Jim was also supervising influential PhD work by Gillian Fuller, Mary Macken-Horarik and Henrike Körner. Fuller's heteroglossic perspective on evaluation in popular science, drawing on Bakhtin, was a major influence on the development of engagement as a resource for managing the play of voices in discourse. Körner specialised in legal discourse, and her work on graduation, especially the distinction between force and focus, was also foundational. Macken-Horarik's study of appraisal in secondary school narrative drew attention to the need for a more dynamic perspective on evaluation as it unfolded prosodically in discourse. More recently Sue Hood's application of appraisal theory to academic discourse led to further developments with respect to graduation, some of which we have incorporated here. (2005: xi-xii)

This preface gives a sense of the integrative scope of SFL theory and its concern with coherently 'importing' what it needs into the theory, rather than leaving difficult questions to other approaches. But to emphasize the integrative and expansive nature of SFL under Martin's influence is not to suggest that he has isolated himself from other approaches or fields. Throughout his entire career Martin has engaged deeply with other approaches and theories for insights that SFL and linguistics in general could not at the time see. Indeed this interaction has sewn some of the most 'creative tensions', to use Bernstein's words (1995:

398), that have pushed Martin to new thinking and expanded SFL. In addition to the major

synthesis of systemic functional and stratificational concerns from the earliest days of

Martin's work, the approaches Martin has engaged with have ranged from speech act theory

and interactional linguistics to case grammar, cognitive grammar and a wide range of

traditions that have explored Tagalog, to corpus linguistics and critical linguistics, approaches

derived from Bakhtin, Vygotsky, Labov and Hjelsmlev, and a range of progressivist

educational frameworks.

But the most long-standing and intense engagement has been the sociological

approach of code theory, progenating from the work of Bernstein and the long engagement

with this by Halliday and Hasan and most recently taking the form of Legitimation Code

Theory (LCT) (Maton 2014, see Maton and Doran 2017). Martin's deep interaction with

Bernstein's code theory and LCT have regularly offered a complementary perspective on

phenomena and has posed questions not readily available to linguistics at the time. Often this

has led to developments in Martin's model of linguistics itself in the form of 'responses' or

SFL interpretations of what code theory has seen.

A recent example of this is his development of 'mass' and 'presence' (Martin 2020,

Martin and Matruglio 2020). These concepts have been provoked by the LCT concepts of

'semantic density', described as the degree of complexity of meaning, and 'semantic gravity',

the degree of context-dependence of meaning (Maton 2014). As LCT increasingly engaged

with text analysis, it became clear that these analyses were generating insights that did not

have obvious corollaries in linguistics. In particular, Martin realized that there was a wide

range of linguistic features that tended to be implicated by shifts in semantic gravity and

semantic density that were not tied to any particular metafunction, rank or stratum. In terms

of the context-dependence of meaning implicated by semantic gravity, this had tended to be

considered to that point as an aspect of the register variable mode, associated with the degree

to which language is constitutive of or ancillary to what is going on (Halliday and Hasan

1985; Martin 1992). Under standard SFL modelling, then, context-dependence should primarily impact on features within the textual metafunction. However Martin and Matruglio (2020) showed that this was not the case, with context-dependence affecting features across all metafunctions. To account for this, they proposed the concept of 'presence' as the linguistic conception of context-dependence and detailed a range of variables and linguistic features associated with it (a similar process happened for mass in relation to field). Importantly for this chapter, this example illustrates how insights generated by another approach, used in close proximity to Martin's work in SFL, led to the development of concepts in SFL itself. But this is not the end of the story. A big question still remains about where mass and presence 'fit' in the theory. They do not fit within strata, ranks or metafunctions within the realization hierarchy but rather appear to organize the selection of features across the realization hierarchy. In this sense, they appear more associated with the dimension of instantiation. But at the time of writing, what this actually means for the theory and how it conceptualizes semiosis is not yet clear. This is worth noting, as it illustrates the flow-on effect that a development in one area can have on the rest of the theory; the insights developed by LCT have led to developments in SFL, which in turn are likely to drive serious exploration of the theoretical dimensions of instantiation and realization. An integrative and relational theory means that all its components resonate with all the others, and so changes in one lead to changes in all others.

To manage this ever growing theoretical and descriptive apparatus, the constant interplay between theory and practice, and the various creative tensions that arise through interaction with other approaches, Martin has regularly reflected on the nature of SFL theory itself . Such metatheoretical explorations, taking their lead from similar concerns by his teachers Halliday (2003), Hasan (2009) and Gleason (1965, 1973), have enabled a continually reflexive understanding of how approaches develop, and, perhaps more importantly, how approaches *should* develop if they are to achieve the broad goal of being

socially responsible. But as anyone who has read Martin's work will testify, he does not spend his time in purely abstract space; all concepts are continually put at risk through engagement with actual instances of language. It is a rare publication of Martin's that does not centre on a very close analysis of an instance of language or semiosis.

Community and Values

As we have seen, throughout his career, Martin has emphasized a socially responsible linguistics. In addition to the interventions noted above, his work has insisted on thinking through the implications of research. A key example of this is his call and development in the late '90s and early 2000s for a positive discourse analysis (see volume 6 of his collected works, Martin 2012d). This arose, in part, from a frustration that multiple decades of critical discourse analysis had had little effect on the world, seemingly partly due to the assumption that by exposing a discourses' underlying power structures, this would somehow change them. In response, and through his long engagement with interventionist programs, he emphasized that it is not enough to simply expose and critique. One must also model, design and intervene:

> I sometimes get the feeling that modernity has mesmerized critique, to the point where an obsession with hegemony rules virtually all critical inquiry; as a result, all we end up doing is exposing power and showing why the world is a terrible place. This is not only depressing but frustrating, since it doesn't tell us what we need to know about change for the better. There is more to challenging power than critiquing it; in addition we need to know how people commune in ways that rework its circulation (Gore 1993) – personally, locally, nationally and globally. I think it is time to get off the high moral ground and take a look at people we admire and how they get on with what they do. We can learn some things from them that we need to know if we are going to intervene effectively as discourse analysts in the sites that motivate us. (Martin 2002: 187)

It was in this sense that positive discourse analysis was born: an approach to discourse that did not simply criticize the bad, but looked for the good in the world in order to understand how it works and how it came about, and to use this as a model for the design of interventions to change the world. A significant focus in this regard has been Martin's work on discourses of reconciliation, in particular with respect to Indigenous Australia and South Africa (e.g. Martin 1999b, 2002, 2004b, Martin and Rose 2007).

Critical Discourse Analysis still dominates the broader field of discourse analysis – it is, of course, easier in academia to critique than to celebrate, to expose than to design, to write than to intervene. But this will change. And such an emphasis on Martin's part shows the seriousness with which he takes the social responsibility of theory.

This seriousness of responsibility plays out in other ways. No single person can change the world from the academy. To have any hope of a lasting influence requires a committed and thoughtful community who are constantly developing and adapting to the world around them, while also keeping an unwavering eye on social changes they want to make. Throughout his career Martin has enacted community, working with others to build infrastructure to support young scholars and keep discussion pushing forward. To be an SFL doctoral student in Sydney is to have constant support – a weekly doctoral seminar, a weekly SFL seminar, weekly masterclasses, ad hoc workshops and regular supervisions, annual national conferences combined with annual international conferences, and a constant interaction of junior and senior scholars across all possible objects of study. At an international level, Martin has regularly travelled and worked with scholars across the world, with a particular emphasis on the 'global south' such as Latin America and Asia (or more broadly, areas traditionally marginalized by Euro- and Americo-centric academia) and is regularly worrying about how to ensure knowledge is shared and community developed. Although intellectual achievement is the general focus of academic biography, it means

nothing without a community engaging, pushing and extending it. Martin understands this well and has practiced it throughout his career.

Envoi

Festschrifts can be double-edged swords. Some are there to celebrate a scholar. Others can be a capstone, concluding a career. This is most definitely the former (and only the former) – Martin is continually expanding the horizons of linguistics and will do so for a long time yet. The principles discussed in this chapter continue to drive and expand his work, and to be away from his office for even a few months is to miss much theoretical and descriptive development (by him, his students, those engaging with them and those in the broader SFL community). For this reason, this chapter is a summary, not a summation. We have taken only a moment here to rest, to steal a view of an intellectual career that is ongoing, to look back on the distance Martin and the field has come, and to look toward its future. In the spirit of positive discourse analysis, it is a celebration and an analysis, so we can use its object as a model to design and improve.

That is to say, keep pushing us all along, Jim.

References

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986) The problem of speech genres. In C. Emerson and M. Holquist (eds), V.W. McGee trans. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press. 60-102.

Bednarek, M. and Martin, J.R. (2010) (eds) *New Discourse on Language: Functional Perspectives on Multimodality, Identity and Affiliation*. London: Continuum.

Bernstein, B. (1995) A response. In A. Sadovnik (ed.) *Knowledge and Pedagogy: The Sociology of Basil Bernstein*. Norwood: Ablex. 385-424.

Caldwell, D., Knox, J. and Martin, J.R. (in press) (eds) *Appliable Linguistics and Social Semiotics: Developing Theory*. London: Bloomsbury.

Cope, B., Kalantzis, M., Kress, G., Martin, J.R. and Murphy, L. (1993) Bibliographical essay: Developing the theory and practice of genre-based literarcy. In B. Cope and M. Kalantzis (eds) *The Powers of Literacy: A Genre Approach to Teaching Writing*. Londonx: Falmer. 231-247.

Doran, Y. J. and Martin, J. R. (2020) Field relations: Understanding Scientific Explanations. In K. Maton, J. R. Martin and Y. J. Doran (eds) *Studying Science: Knowledge, Language, Pedagogy*. London: Routledge.

Eggins, S. and Slade, D. (1997) *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.Gleason, H.A. (1965) *Linguistics and English Grammar*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gleason, H.A. (1968) Contrastive analysis in discourse structure. In J.E. Alatis (ed.) *Contrastive Linguistics and Its Pedagogical Implications*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. 39-64.

Gleason, H. A. (1973) *The Architecture of Language and The Strategy of Description*. Unpublished Draft Manuscript.

Gore, J. (1993) *The Struggle for Pedagogies: Critical and Feminist Discourses as Regimes of Truth*. London: Routledge.

Gregory, M. (1966-72) English Patterns: Perspectives for a Description of English. In J. De Villiers and R, Stainton (2009) (eds) *Michael Gregory's Proposals for a Communication Linguistics: Volume II of Communication in Linguistics*. Toronto: Gref. 1-142.

Gregory, M. (1967) Aspects of varieties differentiation. *Journal of Linguistics*. 3:2. 177-198.

Gregory, M. (1998) Systemic Functional Linguistics and other schools: Prospectives and Retrospectives. In J. De Villiers and R. Stainton (2009) (eds) *Michael Gregory's Proposals for a Communication Linguistics : Volume II of Communication in Linguistics*. Toronto: Gref. 312-329.

Gutwinski, W. (1976) *Cohesion in Literary Texts*. The Hague: Mouton.Halliday, M.A.K. (1978) *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985) Systemic background. In J.D. Benson and W.S. Greaves (eds) *Systemic Perspectives on Discourse, Volume 1: Selected Theoretical Papers from the Ninth International Systemic Workshop*. New Jersey: Ablex. 1-15.

Halliday, M.A.K. (2003) *On Language and Linguistics: Volume 3 in the Collected Works of M.A.K. Halliday*. J.J. Webster (ed.). London: Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. (2008) Working with meaning: Towards an appliable linguistics. In J.J. Webster (ed.) *Meaning in Context: Implementing Intelligent Applications of Language Studies* London: Continuum. 7-23.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1985) *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2014) *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Hasan, R. (1979) On the notion of text. In J.S. Petöfi (ed.) *Text vs Sentence: Basic Questions of Textlinguistics*. Hamburg: Helmet Buske. 369-390.

Hasan, R. (1985) *Linguistics, Language and Verbal Art.* Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Hasan, R. (2009) *Semantic Variation: Meaning in Society and in Sociolinguistics. The Collected Works of Ruqaiya Hasan, Volume 2*. J.J. Webster and C. Cloran (eds). London: Equinox.

Hasan, R. (2011) *Language and Education: Learning and Teaching in Society. The Collected Works of Ruqaiya Hasan, Volume 3*. J.J. Webster and C. Cloran (eds). London: Equinox.

Kress, G. (1985) *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice*. Victoria: Deakin university Press.

Kress, G. and van Leeuwen, T. (1990) *Reading Images.* Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Labov, W. and Waletzky, J. (1967) Narrative analysis. In J. Helm (ed.) *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*. Seattle: University of Washington Press. 12-44.

Martin, J.R. (1977) *Learning how to tell: Semantic systems and structures in children's narrative*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Department of Languages and Linguistics, University of Essex.

Martin, J.R. (1981) Conjunction and continuity in Tagalog. In M.A.K. Halliday and J.R. Martin (eds) *Readings in Systemic Linguistics*. London: Batsford. 310-336.

Martin, J.R. (1983) Participant identification in English, Tagalog and Kâte. *Australian Journal of Linguistics.* 3:1. 45-74.

Martin, J.R. (1990) Interpersonal grammatization: Mood and modality in Tagalog. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. 21:1. 2-50.

Martin, J.R. (1992) *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Martin, J.R. (1995) Logical meaning, interdependency and the linking particle {*na/-ng*} in Tagalog. *Functions of Language*. 2:2. 189-228.

Martin, J.R. (1996a) Transitivity in Tagalog: A functional interpretation of case. In M. Berry, C. Butler, R. Fawcett and G. Huang (eds) *Meaning and Form: Systemic Functional Interpretations*. New Jersey: Ablex. 229-296.

Martin, J.R. (1996b) Metalinguistic diversity: The case from case. In. R. Hasan, C. Cloran and D. Butt (eds) *Functional Description: Theory in Practice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 325-374.

Martin, J.R. (1996c) Types of structure: Deconstructing notions of constituency in clause and text. In E.H. Houvy and D.R. Scott (eds) *Computational and Conversational Discourse.* Heidelberg: Springer. 39-66.

Martin, J.R. (1999a) Mentoring semogenesis: 'Genre-based' literacy pedagogy. In. F. Christie (ed.) *Pedagogy and the Shaping of Consciousness: Linguistic and Social Processes*. London: Continuum. 123-155.

Martin, J.R. (1999b) Grace: The logogenesis of freedom. *Discourse Studies*. 1:1. 29-56.

Martin, J.R. (2000) Design and practice: Enacting functional linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 20. 116-126.

Martin, J.R. (2002) Blessed are the peacemakers: Reconciliation and Evaluation. In C. Candlin *Research and Practice in Professional Discourse*. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press. 187-227.

Martin, J.R. (2004a) Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Tagalog. In A. Caffarel, J.R. Martin and C.M.I.M. Matthiessen (eds) *Language Typology: A Functional Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Martin, J.R. (2004b) Positive discourse analysis: Solidarity and change. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses.* 49. 179-200.

Martin, J.R. (2010) Semantic variation: Modelling realization, instantiation and individuation in social semiosis. In M. Bednarek and J.R. Martin (eds). 1-34.

Martin, J.R. (2015) One of three traditions: Genre, functional linguistics and the "Sydney School". In N. Artemeva and A. Freedman (eds) *Genre Studies Around the Globe: Beyond the Three Traditions*. Bloomington: Trafford.

Martin, J.R. (2020) Revisiting field: Specialized knowlehde in seoncdary scool science and humanties discourse. In J.R. Martin, K. Maton and Y.J. Doran (eds) *Accessing Academic Discourse: Systemic Functional Linguistics and Legitimation Code Theory*. London: Routledge. 114-148.

Martin, J.R. and Cruz, P. (2018) Interpersonal grammar of Tagalog: A Systemic Functional Linguistics perspective. *Functions of Language* 25:1. 54-96.

Martin, J.R. and Matruglio, E. (2020) Revisiting mode: Context in/dependency in Ancient History classroom discourse. In J.R. Martin, K. Maton and Y.J. Doran (eds) *Accessing Academic Discourse: Systemic Functional Linguistics and Legitimation Code Theory*. London: Routledge. 89-113.

Martin, J.R. and Quiroz, B. (2020) Functional language typology: A discourse semantic perspective. In J.R. Martin, Y.J. Doran and G. Figueredo (eds) *Systemic Functional Language Description: Making Meaning Matter*. London: Routledge. 189-237.

Martin, J.R. and Rose, D. (2007) *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. London: Continuum.

Martin, J.R. and Rose, D. (2008) *Genre Relations: Mapping Culture*. London: Equinox.

Martin, J. R., Unsworth, L. and Rose, D. (2020) Condensing meaning: Imagic aggregations in secondary school science. In G. Parodi (ed.) *Multimodality: From corpus to cognition*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Martin, J.R. and White, P.R.R. (2005) *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal Systems in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martin, J.R. and Zappavigna, M. (2019) Embodied meaning: A systemic functional perspective on paralanguage. *Functional Linguistics*. 6:1. 1-33.

Maton, K. (2014) *Knowledge and Knowers: Toward a Realist Sociology of Education*. London: Routledge.

Maton, K. and Doran, Y.J. (2017) Systemic Functional Linguistics and code theory. In T. Bartlett and G. O'Grady (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Routledge. 605-618.

Mitchell, T.F. (1957) Language of buying and selling in Cyrenaica: A situational statement. *Hespéris*. 26. 1-41.

Ngo, T., Hood, S., Martin, J.R., Painter, C., Smith, B., and Zappavigna, M. (forthcoming) *Modelling Paralanguage Using Systemic Functional Semiotics: Theory and Application*. London: Bloomsbury.

Painter, C., Martin, J. R. and Unsworth, L. (2013) *Reading Visual Narratives: Image Analysis in Children's Picture Books*. London: Equinox.

Poynton, C. (1990) *Address and the Semiotics of Social Relations: A Systemic-Functional Account of Address Forms and Practices in Australian English*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Department of Linguistics, The University of Sydney.

Plum, G. (1998) *Text and Contextual Conditioning in Spoken English: A Genre-Based Approach*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.

Rochester, S. and Martin, J.R. (1979) *Crazy Talk: A Study of the Discourse of Schizophrenic Speakers*. New York: Plenum.

Rose, D. and Martin, J.R. (2012) *Learning to Read, Reading to Learn: Genre, Knowledge and Pedagogy in the Sydney School*. London: Continuum.

Rothery, J. (1996) Making changes: Developing an educational linguistics. In R. Hasan and G. Williams (eds) *Literacy in Society*. London: Longman. 86-123.

Ventola, E.M. (1987) *The Structure of Social Interaction: A Systemic Approach to the Semiotics of Service Encounters*. London: Frances Pinter.

Zappavigna, M. and Martin, J. R. (2018) *Discourse and Diversionary Justice: An Analysis of Youth Justice Conferencing*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martin's Collected works (all authored by Martin, edited by Wang Zhenhua and published in Shanghai by Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press)

(2010a) *Systemic Functional Linguistics Theory*. Volume 1.

(2010b) *Discourse Semantics*. Volume 2.

(2012a) *Genre Studies*. Volume 3.

(2012b) *Register Studies*. Volume 4.

(2012c) *Text Analysis*. Volume 5.

(2012d) *CDA/PDA*. Volume 6.

(2012e) *Language in Education*. Volume 7.

(2012f) *Forensic Linguistics*. Volume 8.

---

[i] In lieu of a complete referencing of Martin's work, the reader is directed to the list of his collected works at the end of this chapter. At the time of writing, a full list of his publications could be found via his university staff page: https://sydney.edu.au/arts/about/our-people/academic-staff/james-martin.html

---

[ii] The *cannot* in this now aphorism is a beautiful ambiguity in modality, interpretable in Halliday's terms (Halliday and Matthiessen 2014) as either probability or obligation.

[iii] In this sense, we can make a crude distinction between 'applied linguistics', where an already established linguistics is applied to outside problems, and an appliable linguistics that aims to develop a linguistics to be applied and so bounces back and forth between theory, description and application.

[iv] This account is also highly simplified in awkwardly attributing the development of genre pedagogy almost entirely to Martin. It was very much a social enterprise encompassing an enormous range of people. This is made clear, for example, in the acknowledgements section of Rose and Martin (2012). See also Cope et al. (1993) who detail the development of this pedagogy through the late 70s and 80s.

[v] Here I am avoiding using the phrase 'linguistics for linguistics' sake' as it sits uncomfortably with me as suggesting what Martin has (in personal conversation) called a 'dilettante' linguistics – an interest in the linguistic world without a commitment to changing the world. This section should be read in the context of his commitment to an appliable linguistics that 'cannot be other than ideologically committed'.

[vi] These examples are glossed using the Systemic Functional glossing conventions developed by the Systemic Language Modelling Network, to which Martin himself contributed. https://systemiclanguagemodelling.com/glossing/