1 Luke A. Rudge – Bristol Centre for Linguistics, University of the West of England 2 3 Situating Simultaneity: An initial schematisation of the Lexicogrammatical Rank Scale 4 of British Sign Language 5 6 **Abstract** 7 8 A central tenet of systemic functional theory is the rank scale: an ordered representation of the 9 part-whole relationships of units within semiotic systems. Linguists have schematised the rank 10 scales for the lexicogrammars of English, French, Spanish and Chinese, to name a few. 11 However, such schematisation has yet to occur for languages in the visual-spatial modality 12 (i.e., sign languages). 13 14 This paper contributes to current literature by establishing a working schematisation of the 15 lexicogrammatical rank scale of British Sign Language (BSL). By taking a glottocentric 16 perspective and with reference to systemic functional theory and BSL data, this work 17 demonstrates that it is possible to create an organised rank scale for a language operating the 18 visual-spatial modality as long as the productive simultaneity found within is accounted for 19 sufficiently. This is enacted through a more detailed elaboration of the morpheme rank, so that 20 higher ranks may be represented accurately. 21 22 This study provides the foundations for similar rank scales of semiotic systems operating in 23 the visual-spatial modality to be schematised, while also suggesting areas for further empirical 24 investigation in both systemic functionalism and sign linguistics. 25 26 **Keywords** 27 28 British Sign Language; Lexicogrammar; Morpheme; Rank Scale, Simultaneity; Systemic 29 Functional Linguistics; Visual-Spatial Modality

#### 30 1 - Introduction 31 32 In their review of systemic functional descriptions of languages, Mwinlaaru and Xuan (2016) 33 highlight a growing body of literature covering numerous semiotic systems. This body of 34 knowledge is helping to confirm and challenge theoretical assumptions in systemic 35 functionalism, while assisting scholars in working towards a typologically-sound model of 36 describing and analysing languages (Christie, 2004; Halliday, 2009). However, a pattern 37 arises from Mwinlaaru and Xuan (2016), and across other systemic functional descriptions of 38 language (e.g., Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014), that may hinder such a goal: the majority of 39 this work is based on spoken and/or written languages. 40 41 Until recently, sign languages – semiotic systems found around the world that operate in the 42 visual-spatial modality – have had little recognition in systemic functional literature, with the 43 exception of Johnston's (1996) preliminary investigations into the metafunctional diversity of 44 Australian Sign Language (Auslan). As such, a vast area of research is yet to be explored 45 concerning the application of systemic functional theory to languages operating in the visual-46 spatial modality. It is only recently that empirical work into this area has commenced with 47 British Sign Language (BSL; see Rudge, 2018) and in other sign languages (e.g., Flemish 48 Sign Language; Wille et al., 2018). 49 50 Before systemic functional descriptions of sign languages may be expanded to the level of 51 detail seen in those of spoken languages (see, inter alia, Matthiessen, 1995; Caffarel, 2006; 52 Li, 2007; Teruya, 2007; Lavid, Arús and Zamorano-Mansilla, 2010; Halliday and 53 Matthiessen, 2014), it is necessary to understand and establish the 'fundamentals' of 54 languages in the visual-spatial modality when viewed through a systemic functional lens. One 55 such fundamental aspect concerns the abstracted representation and organisation of the 56 componential nature of the lexicogrammar, otherwise known as the lexicogrammatical rank 57 scale. As suggested above, this has been explored in considerable detail for languages such as 58 English (e.g., Matthiessen, 1995; Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014) but this has yet to be 59 investigated in a sign language such as BSL. 60 61 This paper presents a preliminary exploration into BSL from a systemic functional 62 perspective, with the goal of offering a coherent schematisation of its lexicogrammatical rank 63 scale that may be adapted and employed in later studies. Firstly, the notion of the rank scale

is explored in terms of its diachronic development and its use in systemic functionalism, including its application to various languages and at different strata (e.g. lexicogrammatical, discourse semantic, etc.). Secondly, a brief overview of the nature of linguistic production in BSL is presented, focusing predominantly on the differences between fully and partly-lexical signs (Hodge and Johnston, 2014) and commentary on expressive simultaneity and how this affects meaning making. Finally, the BSL lexicogrammatical rank scale is developed in several stages, demonstrating similarities and differences to that which has been schematised for spoken languages. This is performed in as glottocentric a manner as possible (i.e., using data from within the language rather than attempting description via comparison between languages or 'transfer comparison;' see Caffarel, Martin and Matthiessen, 2004; Quiroz, 2018). In particular, the visual-spatial nature of the language results in adaptation of a 'typical' lexicogrammatical rank scale at morpheme rank: a three-way split into manual, nonmanual, and spatio-kinetic components is required in order for higher ranks to be fully and accurately represented in BSL. This paper provides significant impact in the domain of systemic functional linguistics, with a potential for application beyond this theoretical domain. Firstly, it argues that a lexicogrammatical rank scale for a sign language can be reliably schematised, providing opportunities not only for BSL to be explored in greater detail from systemic functional perspectives, but also for other semiotic systems within the visual-spatial modality. Secondly, systemic functionalism has been demonstrated as flexible in its application both within linguistics (as noted above) and beyond (e.g., Kress and van Leeuwen, 2006; Sidoni, Wildfeuer and O'Halloran, 2016). This flexibility is further supported here: a central component of systemic functional theory may be applied to a language in an understudied modality without compromising the integrity of the theory itself, instead expanding and challenging current understanding. Finally, this work provides pathways for exploration concerning the understanding and representation of simultaneous embodied expression (see Martin and Zappavigna, 2019). For instance, BSL is capable of communicating both in a sequential and a simultaneous manner, to the extent that multiple experiential processes can be produced in concatenation and/or at the same time. Indeed, it is possible and common for spoken language users to employ co-speech gesture alongside their speech (see the notion of the 'semiotic repertoire' presented by Kusters et al., 2017) in which two separate modalities (the oral-aural and the visual-spatial) realise related yet distinct meanings, but this has been studied neither in detail from systemic functional perspectives, nor when the simultaneity is

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

restricted to one modality. This paper therefore opens up this avenue, among others, for future research.

It should be borne in mind that this application of a theoretical framework to the structure a sign language is one of many that could be performed. For instance, other work in the domain of the structure and function of signed languages includes perspectives at the 'opposite end' of the formal-functional spectrum, such as Sandler and Lillo-Martin (2006) who employ a predominantly generative approach in their investigation of sign language syntax and clausal structures. Other perspectives are ontologically and epistemologically closer to systemic functionalism. Lepic and Occhino's (2018) use of Construction Grammar approaches on American Sign Language (ASL), for example, note that "phrasal patterns themselves are typically associated with semantic or pragmatic functions that cannot be attributed to the identity and arrangement of their internal constituents alone" (p.142). Further approaches rework existing positions on sign language structure into more holistic perspectives. These may draw on divisions seen between sign language and gesture, and instead analyse and describe sign languages using a broader notion such as the 'semiotic repertoire' (e.g., Ferrara and Hodge, 2018; Kusters at al., 2017).

The work presented here, similarly to the works noted above, adds a novel interpretation of sign language description and analysis that explores the systemic functional theoretical tenet of rank so that later work concerning functional aspects of sign language may build upon it. It is intended to be a complementary addition to the many alternative linguistic perspectives available, rather than appearing superior or subordinate in manner.

#### 122 123 The development of rank and of the rank scale 124 125 Human languages are multidimensional in their nature. When they are viewed from systemic 126 functional perspectives, there are a variety of ways in which they may be abstracted. This 127 includes, for instance, the stratification of the linguistic system (i.e., the 'levels' of language 128 ranging from the phonetic to the discourse semantic), clines of delicacy from general (i.e., 129 system) to specific (i.e., instance), and the notion of rank as an organising principle of 130 linguistic form and function (Berry, 2017). This latter dimension of systemic functional 131 theory forms the focus of this paper and will be expanded on in this section. 132 133 'Rank' as a concept in systemic functionalism traces back to Halliday's (1961) foundational 134 work discussing the "fundamental categories of that part of General Linguistic theory which 135 is concerned with how language works at the level of grammar" (p.242). Halliday suggests 136 various organising principles, one of which stipulates that "the units of grammar form a hierarchy that is a taxonomy" (p.251): a ranking of grammatical units. As systemic 137 138 functionalism developed into its first major iteration (see Taverniers, 2011), Halliday (1961) 139 described the lexicogrammar of English as having five units of expression that could be 140 placed into a hierarchical scale: sentence - clause - group/phrase - word - morpheme. 141 142 Three fundamentals about this scale are noted. Firstly, the relationship between each rank is 143 compositional: a sentence is composed of one or more clauses, a clause is composed of one 144 or more groups and/or phrases (e.g. nominal groups, prepositional phrases, etc.), and so on. Secondly, this scale echoes the notion that language is "a patterned activity" (Halliday, 1961, 145 146 p.250) and that each rank represents the point of departure for choices in meaning-making. 147 While this is not immediately visible on a rank scale itself, it is possible to cross-reference 148 ranks with the specific functions that language has developed to serve in a function-rank 149 matrix (see Table 1 of Halliday, 1973, p.141)<sup>1</sup>. For instance, the ideational system of 150 TRANSITIVITY (i.e., how processes, participants, circumstances, and the relationship 151 between these three are realised) is situated at clause rank, while the interpersonal system of 152 ATTITUDE is at group rank, and the textual system of COLLOCATION is at the word rank. 153 Finally, Halliday (1961) notes the potential for 'rank shift,' or how units at a one rank may 154 operate in the guise of a unit at a rank below. For instance, the lamp in the corner

121

2 - Rank in Systemic Functional Linguistics

155 demonstrates how a prepositional phrase (in the corner) qualifies a nominal group (the lamp) thereby operating "as if it was a word" (Matthiessen, Teruya and Lam, 2010, p.170). 156 157 158 Since Halliday (1961), systemic functional theory has developed and has been applied in 159 multiple contexts (see, e.g., Martin, 2016; Sidoni, Wildfeuer and O'Halloran, 2016; 160 Taverniers, 2011). Nonetheless, 'rank' has remained a constant throughout (although not 161 without criticism; see, e.g., Matthews, 1966, and McGregor, 1991). In more recent literature, 162 its specificity and application has extended substantially. In the fourth iteration of their 163 introduction to functional grammar, Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) detail a fine-tuned 164 lexicogrammatical rank scale of English demonstrating these developments. In contemporary 165 theory, the clause is at the highest rank of the scale, with 'sentence' no longer forming a part 166 of this scale (cf. Peng, 2017, who extends the lexicogrammatical rank scale beyond the clause 167 and into the proposed ranks of 'clause complex,' 'paragraph' and 'text'). Additionally, the 168 compositional nature of the scale is explained via the notion of "exhaustiveness" (p.21): 169 elements in one rank are made up of a whole number of elements in the immediate rank below.<sup>2</sup> The concept of rank shift remains, as does the idea that "units of different rank 170 171 construe patterns of different kinds" (p.22), and extensions of this organising principle 172 beyond the lexicogrammar are present. For instance, Halliday and Matthiessen provide the 173 rank scale operating at the phonological stratum (tone group – foot – syllable – phoneme). 174 Rose (2007, p.187) similarly identifies a discourse semantic rank scale (genre – stage – phase - message). In short, rank scales present "the stretches of language of different sizes that 175 176 carry patterns (structures) and choices (systems)" (Berry, 2017, p.49). 177 178 Returning the focus on lexicogrammatical concerns, an example of the lexicogrammatical 179 rank scale for English is presented in [Insert Table 1: 180 [Insert Table 1 here: "An example of the lexicogrammatical rank scale of English."] 181 182 183 The rank scale in [Insert Table 1 demonstrates 'exhaustiveness' in the relationship between 184 ranks, and may be interpreted as follows: The books had contained several errors is a clause simplex (i.e., it is one 'unit' of a clause rather than a combination of clauses or clause 185 186 complex) whose composition is discernible at lower ranks. At the group/phrase rank, two 187 nominal groups construe the experiential participants of the clause (i.e., the 'things' and/or

phenomena) and surround a verbal group which construes the experiential process (i.e., the relationship) between these nominal groups. The groups are composed of individual words (when understood in the traditional sense; see, e.g., Coates, 1999, on problems surrounding 'word') which are in turn composed of morphemes that, in this instance, include free bases (i.e. 'book,' 'contain' and 'error'), bound roots (i.e. 'ha-'), and bound suffixes (i.e. '-s,' '-d' and '-ed').

### Lexicogrammatical rank scales across languages

As rank functions as one of the core dimensions of systemic functionalism, the description and analysis of a language though a systemic functional lens should at some point include the schematisation of a lexicogrammatical rank scale. Systemic functional descriptions of languages other than English (summarised in works such as Caffarel, Martin and Matthiessen, 2004, and Mwinlaaru and Xuan, 2016) indicate that this schematisation has occurred, although this is not to say that every lexicogrammatical rank scale is identical in its formation. Various languages do follow the same structural pattern with regards to the forms of the English lexicogrammatical rank scale: French (Caffarel, 2006) and Spanish (Lavid, Arús and Zamorano-Mansilla, 2010) employ the compositional hierarchy of clause – group/phrase – word – morpheme. However, Matthiessen (1995) identifies that "certain languages have essentially no word structure so do not maintain a distinction between the word and morpheme ranks" (p.79). This is visible in the Chinese lexicogrammatical rank scale (Li, 2007) which does not employ the morpheme rank (i.e. the scale contains three ranks: clause – group/phrase – word).

Just as the number of ranks may vary between languages, so too may the systems and functions associated with each rank. In other words, "the division of grammatical labour" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p.9) is not the same cross-linguistically. Certain typological patterns appear, such as the clause acting as the most 'stable' rank across languages in terms of function (i.e. clause simplexes are generally association with the systems of TRANSITIVITY, MOOD and THEME; see Caffarel, Martin and Matthiessen, 2004), but lower ranks are subject to far greater variation. For instance, Quiroz (2008) notes that the MOOD system of English operates at clause rank, whereas Spanish calls both on the clause rank *and* on other ranks due to the rich inflectional morphology within the language. Demonstrating by way of a comparative example, English may alter the declarative *You* 

speak clearly to the imperative Speak clearly by the omission of the interpersonal Subject at 223 clause level. Spanish, conversely, can realise a similar distinction in MOOD through strategies including the use of different verbal (morphemic) suffixes: Habláis claramente ('You speak clearly,' declarative) and *Hablad claramente* ('Speak clearly,' imperative). When compared with other languages, the strong focus on the ranks of clause and group/phrase in English systemic functional descriptions is clear. In fact, there appears to be very little attention paid to the morphemic rank in English in any systemic functional 230 literature, to the extent that many foundational works in this area overtly include statements such as "morphology [...] will not be discussed" (Matthiessen, 1995, p.76), or that while the 232 word and morphemic rank are indeed lexicogrammatical components, "their systems are, in a 233 sense, subservient to the higher-ranking systems" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p.86). 234 Some recent exceptions exist, such as Peng (2016) who shifts the focus onto the morphemic rank noting both the syntagmatic potential of the morpheme in forming higher ranks and how 236 the overarching level of text can influence a morpheme's "probabilistic distribution" (p.45). To briefly summarise, the dimension of rank has remained a core component in systemic functionalism since its inception in the early 1960s. Although rank scales may be formulated for the various strata of a language, the rank scale in the lexicogrammatical stratum is crucial to describing a language in terms of how its expression links to its realisation of meaning, 242 thereby allowing for the compositional analysis of the forms and functions with regards to the 243 grammatical labour performed at each rank. Furthermore, while similarities in the 244 organisation of lexicogrammatical rank scales appear cross-linguistically, notable variances 245 also exist between languages; one size does not necessarily fit all.

222

224

225

226

227

228

229

231

235

237

238

239

240

246	3 – British Sign Language: expression and simultaneity
247	
248	Most systemic functional descriptive work focuses on spoken and written languages. In an
249	effort to broaden the literature in this field, and to challenge and extend this theoretical
250	domain, it is necessary to consider how a language that operates in the visual-spatial modality
251	- British Sign Language (BSL) - may be described in terms of its lexicogrammatical rank
252	scale. Prior to exploring this in further detail, however, a brief summary of BSL and how
253	meaning is expressed is necessary to contextualise the propositions offered in later sections.
254	
255	British Sign Language (BSL) is one of over 140 documented sign languages in use
256	worldwide (Eberhard, Simons and Fennig, 2019). It is used predominantly in the UK, though
257	the number of BSL users around the world remains indeterminate (see Chapter 2 of Rudge,
258	2018, for further discussion on the difficulties encountered when attempting to calculate this
259	figure). In 2003, it was recognised as an official minority language by the British
260	government, yet the benefits of and advances since this recognition are often disputed (see,
261	e.g. De Meulder, 2015a, 2015b).
262	
263	Communication in BSL is performed via embodied articulation which is primarily manual
264	(i.e., via the hands). However, the hands are only part of the full communicative picture:
265	other articulators including parts of the face and the use of the space in front of the signer are
266	key to understanding the full semiotic potential of BSL (and of other sign languages; see
267	Baker et al, 2016). These two broad productive areas will be referred to in this paper as 'non-
268	manual' and 'spatio-kinetic,' respectively.
269	
270	An in-depth description of the productive potential of BSL is not provided here. However,
271	this section covers information relevant for the discussions provided later, namely: the
272	production of different sign types (fully and partly-lexical, based on Hodge and Johnston,
273	2014); and the use of embodied articulators to produce meaning both in concatenative and
274	simultaneous manners.
275	
276	Fully- and partly-lexical signs
277	
278	Fully-lexical signs form the primary lexicon of a sign language, otherwise referred to as the
279	established or core lexicon (Sutton-Spence and Woll, 1999). These signs are 'listable' in the

280 sense that they may be found in a dictionary (e.g. Brien, 1992; Fenlon et al., 2014) and they may range in their form in terms of iconicity and arbitrariness (e.g. TREE as highly iconic, and 281 BIRTHDAY as highly arbitrary; see Figure 1). Similarly to spoken languages, a change in one 282 283 phonological parameter can result in a change in meaning, such as that observed between 284 BIRTHDAY and COUNCIL (see Figure 2). 285 286 [Insert Figure 1 here: "TREE (left) and BIRTHDAY (right) in BSL."] 287 [Insert Figure 2 here: "The minimal pair BIRTHDAY and COUNCIL in BSL."] 288 289 290 Non-manual components may accompany fully-lexical signs to modify the meaning being 291 realised. For instance, mouth gestures may co-occur with manual signs. Johnston, van Roekel 292 and Schembri (2015) note that mouth gestures may be prosodic in nature (see Dachkovsky, 293 Healy and Sandler, 2013), that they may be "devoid of semantic content but match classes of 294 manual movement such as opening, closing and twisting" (Johnston, van Roekel and 295 Schembri, 2015, p.4; see also Woll, 2001), or that they may add further experiential meaning 296 (e.g., adverbial/adjectival, or circumstantial). Using this latter categorisation of mouth 297 gestures noted above, an example of this may be seen in the production of KNOW without a 298 mouth gesture and KNOW accompanied by puffed-out cheeks: the former suggests the act of 299 knowing and the latter suggests wider or more extensive knowledge (e.g., to know well). 300 Further changes in other non-manual articulators such as eye aperture may also occur 301 depending on the degree of the circumstantial information being presented (see, e.g., Chapter 302 15 of Sandler and Lillo-Martin, 2006). 303 304 Thus, in order for the meaning (and, consequently, the function) of fully lexical signs in BSL 305 to be understood, the manual, non-manual and spatio-kinetic parameters must be interpreted 306 simultaneously. This simultaneity also occurs in partly-lexical signs: signs that use 307 conventionalised parameters (including those noted above) to realise meanings and functions 308 (Sutton-Spence and Woll, 1999) but whose form cannot be classed as fully lexical. Hodge 309 and Johnston (2014) identify two primary classifications of partly-lexical signs in Auslan 310 (Australian Sign Language), although a similar categorical distinction can be argued for BSL: 311 points and depicting constructions. Points (e.g., a handshape with only the index finger 312 selected) in sign languages are viewed as being a part of the lexicogrammar (Fenlon et al., 313 2019; cf. co-speech gestural pointing; Kendon, 2004) that can be used to communicate

314 participant reference, location identification, discourse regulation, and so on. In each case, the 315 point must exist in some area of the signing space - the space in front of and around the 316 signer - regardless of whether the intended referent is physically present or not. 317 Consequently, meaning is produced through a combination of manual elements (i.e., the 318 shape of the point) and spatio-kinetic elements (i.e. the location in signing space that 319 specifies the meaning). 320 321 Partly-lexical signs that realise actions and those involved in the action are known as 322 depicting constructions (or classifier constructions; see Emmorey, 2003). These may be split 323 further into conventional or embellished depicting constructions (Lu and Goldin-Meadow, 324 2018), but for the purposes of this paper this level of distinction is not required. What is 325 important to note is that these constructions rely heavily on the simultaneous combination of 326 manual, non-manual and spatio-kinetic elements (cf. fully lexical signs that have a stronger, 327 albeit not sole, reliance on manual elements). Furthermore, Lu and Goldin-Meadow (2018) 328 note that "signers may show a strong preference for depictive devices over lexical items [...] 329 simply because depictions can often provide more depth and accuracy in portraying a referent 330 than lexical signs" (p.14). As such, it is possible use depicting constructions that encode a 331 wealth of meaning and often require lengthy glosses in English. For example, a BSL user 332 signing about an acquaintance who visited historic ruins used a depicting construction to 333 express how the acquaintance found walking up a tall spiral staircase to be gradually 334 exhausting to. This depiction was expressed as follows: the signer's dominant hand 335 represented a pair of legs; an upwards, circular motion of the dominant hand (palm facing 336 downwards) represented the movement up a spiral staircase; and a gradual reduction in the 337 pace of upwards movement represented decreasing speed over time, accompanied with a 338 progressively exasperated look on the signer's face to reinforce the increasing difficulty of the task (see Figure 3).<sup>4</sup> 339 340 341 [Insert Figure 3 here: "An example of a depicting construction in BSL."] 342 343 Concatenation and simultaneity in BSL 344

The above sub-section suggested that the combinatorial and simultaneous nature of BSL

production: manual, non-manual and spatio-kinetic elements may be called on at various

points during a signed utterance to realise meaning. However, instances of simultaneity are

345

346

348 nonetheless articulated over a period of time with signs being produced one after another 349 (i.e., following a logogenetic progression; see Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). A brief 350 example of this concatenation can be observed when allocating referents to the signing space. 351 This usually follows a two-step sequence: the 'what' or the 'who' (i.e., the experiential 352 participant) is produced first, followed by a point in the signing space to place this entity in a 353 location for later reference (with the inverted order being viewed as infelicitous in certain 354 instances; see Neidle and Nash, 2012). A similar two-step pattern is observed in Lu and 355 Goldin-Meadow's (2018) data: prior to depicting constructions, signers tend to name an 356 object (i.e., using a lexical sign) prior to providing description on the object, whether via 357 further lexical signs or partly-lexical depicting constructions. 358 359 As logogenesis is found within BSL production, this suggests that there are orders in which 360 the signs of BSL are produced, and it is thus worthwhile to briefly address this area of study. 361 Space does not permit a full exposition of this complex and much-debated area, but some key 362 points may be overviewed as follows. 363 364 Studies attempting to schematise the constituent order of sign languages span decades and 365 theoretical perspectives (see, inter alia, Deuchar, 1983; Engberg-Pedersen, 1993; 366 Hoffmeister, 1978; Meier, Cormier and Quinto-Pozos, 2002; Neidle et al., 2000; Padden, 367 1988; Sandler and Lillo-Martin, 2006). Helpfully, Napoli and Sutton-Spence's (2014) review 368 of the constituent orders of 42 sign languages results in the suggestion that "SOV and SVO 369 should be the prevalent orders found in all declarative sentences" (p.12). From this, possible 370 generalisations can be drawn. For example, in combination with the abovementioned findings 371 by Lu and Goldin-Meadow (2018) and Pfau and Bos' (2016) identification that "no sign 372 language has been described with a basic VSO order" (p.126), it may be suggested that verbal 373 signs are produced after the occurrence of at least one nominal sign (i.e. the participant(s) 374 is/are realised prior to the process) in a typically declarative construction. However, 375 investigations are on-going and have yet to reach an agreed consensus in the sign linguistics 376 subdomain (see, e.g., current discussions on order in Finnish Sign Language; see Jantunen, 377 2017. In addition, researchers such as Lutalo-Kiingi (2014) suggest that "attempts to discover 378 one basic, underlying sign order in sign languages [...] may be inappropriate "(p.120), and 379 instead call for an analytical approach that "[permits] patterns of greater complexity, such as 380 variable sign order according to discourse context or other factors" (ibid.).

The systemic functional perspective similarly stands opposed to finding constituent orders based on form itself, prioritising the paradigmatic over the syntagmatic (but still keeping syntagmatic affairs in mind; see Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). As such, while the present work does acknowledge the patterned sequencing of signs that occurs in BSL, it does not intend to wade into the discussions of constituent order mentioned above. Strings of signs will be presented in the following sections which may be analysed further or indeed contested from different theoretical perspectives. Nonetheless, the primary focus from this point forward remains on the hierarchical composition of the lexicogrammar of BSL that is produced in various sequences over time (i.e., drawing together systemic functionalism and BSL to propose a working lexicogrammatical rank scale).

## 4 – Schematising the lexicogrammatical rank scale of BSL

This section presents a progressive development of the schematisation of the BSL lexicogrammatical rank scale. It begins by considering rank scales in previous systemic functional descriptions of languages, and then problematises their form when considering languages in the visual-spatial modality (based on the literature discussed above). Using examples extracted from recorded BSL interactions, the lexicogrammatical rank scale of BSL is developed with particular attention paid to productive simultaneity. Finally, a comparison of two similar BSL productions is offered to suggest how, from a systemic functional perspective, BSL may express more than one part of a clause at a time and how such instances might be represented via this rank scale.

Three provisos regarding the present study need to be established. Firstly, the BSL examples used here demonstrate only a small sample of the productive potential of BSL. This work is not intended to be a comprehensive review of BSL, both due to space limitations and the novelty of investigation into sign languages from systemic functional perspectives. However, these examples have been chosen to show the opportunities and challenges of schematising a lexicogrammatical rank scale for a language in the visual-spatial modality. Secondly, each example has been verified as a permissible and sensical production by native and fluent BSL users. However, for ease of comparison and to reduce variation, the examples are deliberately homogeneous in their function: interpersonally, each example is declarative; and textually, each example is unmarked. Finally, this work does not attempt to create a function-rank matrix similar to what has been produced in systemic functional descriptions of other languages. Further data must be analysed before this can be achieved, but this paper acts both as a base to an eventual function-rank matrix and as a guide for future research when working on systemic functional descriptions of languages in the visual-spatial modality.

### Accounting for manual, non-manual and spatial components

Typologically, lexicogrammatical rank scales incorporate the ranks of clause, group/phrase, word, and morpheme (see [Insert Table *I* above and Matthiessen, Teruya and Lam, 2010; cf. Chinese wherein the morphemic rank is viewed as redundant; see Li, 2007). If BSL were analysed solely as a sequence of forms (i.e., without taking productive simultaneity into account), a similar rank scale of clause, group, word and morpheme may be produced.<sup>5</sup>

426 [Insert Table 2 exemplifies this possible rank scale via a simple clause that may translate as I 427 *know him/her/it* (see Figure 4 for the production of this clause in BSL):<sup>67</sup> 428 429 [Insert Table 2 here: "A rudimentary lexicogrammatical rank scale for BSL."] 430 431 [Insert Figure 4 here: "I know him/her/it in BSL."] 432 433 At first glance, Figure 4 appears to fulfil the compositional requirement of a rank scale: 434 exhaustiveness is present as each rank is made up of one or more items from the rank 435 immediately below. There also appears to be repetition at the word and morpheme ranks, 436 which may lead to questions of whether the morpheme rank is superfluous. However, the 437 productive capabilities of BSL noted in previous sections indicates that multiple articulators 438 are called on to produce elements at word rank. Sandler and Lillo-Martin (2006) identify that 439 "It is clear that sign linguists must pay careful attention to non-manuals in order to fully 440 understand sentence structure" (p.473), thereby reinforcing the stance that simply repeating 441 what is seen at word rank in morpheme rank is not exhaustive due to the productive 442 simultaneity enacted by manual, non-manual and spatio-kinetic elements. Consequently, the 443 form of the rank scale in [Insert Table 2 requires adaptation. One way of doing so would be 444 to 'split' the morpheme rank into three: manual (what is produced on the hands), non-manual 445 (what is produced on the face, torso, etc.), and spatio-kinetic (what is produced in the signing 446 space with regards to location and movement). Importantly, this split is not intended to show 447 a hierarchy within morpheme rank (e.g., manual is not composed of non-manual), rather it 448 'zooms in' on the components that combine to form the rank above. This enhanced 449 lexicogrammatical rank scale is presented in [Insert Table 3: 450 451 [Insert Table 3 here: "A lexicogrammatical rank scale of BSL showing an expanded 452 Morpheme rank."] 453 The morpheme rank can now more accurately represent the composition of each signs. The 454 hands produce a meaningful value, although in the case of PT:PRO3SG the meaning of the sign 455 can only be fully understood when considering the spatial component that is simultaneously 456 realised.

457

458 The importance of this split becomes more apparent when considering instances of BSL that 459 call on further productive simultaneity. The following example in [Insert Table 4 (with the 460 production of this example shown in Figure 5) demonstrates such an instance, translating to 461 *He/She asks me incessantly* (where '++' indicates the repetition of a sign): 462 463

[Insert Table 4 here: "The extended lexicogrammatical rank scale for BSL demonstrating further morphemic complexity."]

465

464

[Insert Figure 5 here: "He/She asks me incessantly in BSL"]

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

466

[Insert Table 4 demonstrates how this 'zoomed in' morpheme rank permit greater clarity regarding what is produced by the signer. As in [Insert Table 3, an equivalent pointing sign (PT:PRO3SG) is used. However, ASK++ requires further explanation. The manual form of the sign (all fingers extended except for the thumb and index finger touching at their tips) is produced by both hands rather than just the dominant hand, providing both the core meaning of the sign (i.e., the action of asking) and the idea that this action occurs frequently or extensively. The non-manual features include a puffing of the cheeks while maintaining gaze at the third-person referent in the signing space. The cheek puff emphasises the notion of frequency or degree, while the maintained gaze identifies that the previously-mentioned referent is one that is involved in the action – in this case, as the one asking. Finally, the spatio-kinetic elements provide information with regards to participant roles and, again, the nature of the process. Both hands begin this sign from the location designated by PT:PRO3SG, and end by moving through the space towards the signer themselves. Unlike KNOW in [Insert Table 3, ASK is an indicating verb (see Cormier, Fenlon and Schembri, 2015) which employs movement between two or more points, thereby encoding or 'indicating' the participants involved in the process. In this case, the movement between the referent ('3') and the signer ('1') denotes who asks the question and who is being asked. Furthermore, the sign is repeated numerous times and at a slightly faster rate of production than the signer's usual pace, realising the persistent nature of the action.

487 488

489

490

Collectively, these components within the morpheme rank combine to represent what is realised at higher ranks, and modifications to any of these morphemic values would alter the meanings produced. For example, without the check puff during the manual production of

491 ASK++ in Figure 5, the manner of the action could alter from 'incessant' to 'habitual,' and if the movement altered to '1  $\rightarrow$  3' then the participants would switch in role: the signer would 492 493 be asking, rather than being asked. 494 495 Accounting for greater complexity 496 497 More complex productions in BSL may be represented in the proposed adaptation of the 498 lexicogrammatical rank scale, such as when depicting constructions are used. In [Insert Table 499 5 (Figure 6) which may be glossed as *The policeman follows the thief*, a depicting 500 construction is used to realise the interaction between the two participants: 501 502 [Insert Table 5 here: "Representing a depicting construction in the lexicogrammatical rank 503 scale."] 504 505 [Insert Figure 6 here: "The policeman follows the thief in BSL."] 506 507 Similar to previous examples and in line with observations regarding sign order noted above 508 (see, e.g., Napoli and Sutton-Spence, 2014), signs realising the participants and their 509 locations in the signing space are produced prior to realising the process: POLICEMAN-FOLLOW-THIEF.<sup>8</sup> In this case, as two human participants are involved in one action that 510 511 includes movement through space, this is realised by each hand representing an allocated 512 participant, identified in [Insert Table 5 as CL ('classifier'). Identifying the participants and 513 their locations in signing space (i.e., 'x' and 'y') prior to signing the process FOLLOW 514 (expressed by the movement of one classifier handshape tracking the other) enables observers 515 to understand which hand is associated with which referent. Consequently, the individual 516 morphemic components of this production are critical in this sequence of signs: without the 517 prior allocation of the participants in the signing space, it is not possible to identify who is 518 following who; without accounting for non-manual features, the process may range in 519 meaning from SNEAK to FOLLOW to CHASE, to name a few interpretations; and without the 520 movement in the signing space, FOLLOW cannot be realised (i.e., a static production of both 521 classifier handshapes would suggest that both participants are stood still). 522

Proposing and problematising the simultaneous realisation of similar functional elements

523

The previous examples demonstrate that it is possible to account for the many simultaneous productive elements in BSL by splitting the morpheme rank. On top of this, BSL permits a further level of productive complexity facilitated by the use of independent articulators, particularly the signer's hands. For instance, in some cases it is possible to use each hand to express more than one experiential process at the same time. An example is provided in [Insert Table 6 below (Figure 7) which may be glossed as *The policeman watches the thief* while the thief passes by:<sup>9</sup> [Insert Table 6 here: "Simultaneous clauses in BSL."] [Insert Figure 7 here: "The policeman watches the thief while the thief passes by in BSL"] The production of the above is explained as follows. Firstly, the signer signs THIEF as a participant and then allocates THIEF to a position in the signing space ('y') using a pointing sign. Then, the signer introduces POLICE as a second participant, but does not allocate a space; the signer instead embodies this participant (i.e., the signer assumes the role of POLICE, a technique referred to as role shift or constructed action; see Sutton-Spence and Woll, 1999). With all participants established, the processes are signed: the right hand adopts a handshape and movement to represent THIEF moving in front of the signer (THIEF-PASSES-POLICE), while the left hand and non-manual features express LOOK to track the position of THIEF as it moves across the signing space (POLICE-WATCH-THIEF). The simultaneity in the realisation thus represents the simultaneity of the reported actions. In short, the signer wished to recount two related actions that were experienced simultaneously, and the visual-spatial modality permits the simultaneous expression of these actions. In [Insert Table 6, shaded and unshaded cells are used to associate the productive components concerned with the two processes. Note that the non-manual morphemic value cannot have two different associations as the face, torso, etc. is classed as one indivisible entity. However, it is useful to discuss alternative interpretations for this closing example. As noted in Section 2, a feature of lexicogrammar from systemic functional perspectives is rankshift,

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

wherein units at a higher rank 'shift' downwards to operate as units of a lower rank (see Matthiessen, Teruya and Lam, 2010). In the case of Table 6 and Figure 7, it may be argued that either of the two processes shifts into group rank as a nominal group (i.e., "The policeman watches the passing thief" or "The thief passes the watching policeman"). While not refuting this interpretation in its entirety or the presence of rankshift per se, caution is nonetheless advised when considering the glottocentricity of this description (i.e., how much the description relies on the data from the semiotic system in question or how much it uses elements from other languages as a basis for description; see Butler, 2003). To reiterate, BSL permits the co-occurrence of independent, meaning-bearing articulations. Among such articulations, it is possible that two experiential processes may be produced at the same time. Languages employing the spoken modality, however, are not able to orally articulate two processes simultaneously (i.e., saying "watch" and "follow" at the same time) as production is restricted and phonation occurs as a single stream: sounds must be expressed one after another. As such, a language in the visual-spatial modality has the opportunity to express co-occurring actions by expressing these actions simultaneously, rather than needing to call on other semiotic resources (e.g., hypotaxis or parataxis between clauses via the

We may further muddy the waters of this interpretation, too. Firstly, while attempting to remain as glottocentric as possible, it must by borne in mind that there is a strong influence from spoken languages on signed languages (see, *inter alia*, Brentari, 2010; McKee, 2017; and Sutton-Spence, 1999). A truly glottocentric description may therefore be impeded by this influence. However, this issue may also be argued for across spoken languages given language contact and change: very few languages, regardless of modality, are free of cross-linguistic influence. As such, perhaps 'visuocentric' may be better suited in this context rather than 'glottocentric' (see Rudge, 2018). Secondly, it may (and, from the perspective of the author, should) be argued that semiosis in typically spoken communications also implicates the visual-spatial modality to varying extents via the use of co-speech gesture and embodied paralanguage (i.e., viewing such communication through the lens of the broader semiotic repertoire; see Kusters at al., 2017). Simultaneity in expression may thus occur through different productive modalities, such as a verbal production of "the police were

logical metafunction; see Butt and Webster, 2017). Indeed, given this simultaneous potential,

one such resource that may not needed to such an extent may be the rankshift required to

relate a process to a participant within a nominal group.

watching" as a manual gesture representing a thief passes in front of the speaker. However, as most systemic functional descriptions of languages have focused predominantly on typically 'linguistic' features, the similarity of the above argument for the description of simultaneous expression in spoken languages remains largely underexplored (cf. Martin and Zappavigna, 2019). It is hoped, though, that observations such as these provoke further study in this area.

## **5 - Conclusions and further study**

The theoretical models and abstractions developed in systemic functionalism allow for thorough understandings, descriptions and analyses of semiotic systems. This paper has presented one such core abstraction - the lexicogrammatical rank scale - alongside its novel application to BSL. This work proposed that the lexicogrammatical rank scale can indeed be used to represent the various meaning-baring units found in a language expressed in the visual-spatial modality, but the fact that this modality permits different degrees of simultaneity in the realisation of meaning (when compared with, e.g., spoken language in one modality that can call on co-speech gesture in another modality; see Martin and Zappavigna, 2019) requires recognition in order to create accurate descriptions using systemic functional frameworks.

This is not to say, however, that the current paper offers a watertight proposal when it comes to working with systemic functionalism and sign languages. While the work is novel and testable in terms of the explanation, adaption and argumentation for a lexicogrammatical rank scale of BSL, it is nonetheless restricted in certain ways. For instance, the data employed to get to this point is deliberately limited to unmarked declaratives. While it is certainly feasible to apply further linguistic data to the proposed rank scale, work completed by Rudge (forthcoming) demonstrates that clauses realising different selections in the interpersonal system of MOOD (e.g., polar interrogative) call on additional non-manual and/or spatiokinetic elements (i.e., changes in eyebrow position). Based on discussions raising form this paper alone, it would be assumed that these elements would be located at the morpheme rank. However, Rudge argues that these latter features act at the phonological stratum due to their prosodic nature and suprasegmentally. As such, categorising 'that which is lexicogrammatical' and appearing in the rank scale against 'that which is phonological' and does not appear in the scale is tricky: certain articulators can be attributed to either category, and a broader analysis of the rest of the sign, or even the entire utterance, must be performed to gain a more accurate insight into this split (see Mapson, 2014).

Other types of 'split' may also be addressed in future research that extends this work. Two on-going discussions include the point at which elements of a sign language can be categorised into being conventionalised (i.e., encoding) or non-conventional (i.e., showing), and at a broader level, the division point between what forms part of a sign language and

what is gestural (see, *inter alia*, Goldin-Meadow and Brentari, 2017; Kendon 2004; McNeill, 2015). Addressing these splits has been avoided in this paper, instead choosing to present how features that would likely occur in typical BSL may be schematised in a rank scale regardless of whether they are viewed as more or less conventional, depictive, indexical, gestural, mimetic, or so on. This was not done to shun what are extremely valid questions and areas of study. Rather, this paper intended to provide a starting point from a systemic functional perspective that assumes all non-somatic expression (Martin and Zappavigna, 2019) within the visual-spatial modality as part of a broader semiotic repertoire (Kusters et al., 2017). The author nonetheless encourages and welcomes studies that challenge and advance the proposed rank scales while taking the abovementioned oppositions into account.

The systemic functional approach seeks to understand human language as a social semiotic, and while it has developed in many ways since Halliday's initial works into what was then scale-and-category grammar (Halliday, 1961) it has very much focused on semiotic systems in spoken and/or written modalities. This work presents one of the necessary first steps towards advancing systemic functional theory in its goal of creating an accurate framework for semiotic systems irrespective of their modality of expression. Aside from what is noted above, it is hoped that more detailed investigations into the lexicogrammatical rank scale of BSL - or, indeed, of other sign languages – identify aspects such as which ranks act as 'points of departure' for which systems (i.e. the creation of a function-rank matrix). The availability of independent articulators while signing presents various levels of productive complexity within a single modality, such as the ability to produce two separate experiential processes. This leads to questions concerning how this may be accounted for in the logical metafunction (i.e., clause complexing and possible simultaneous groups and/or clauses). These questions and others have already started to be addressed in Rudge (2018), and many more investigations await, both in BSL and beyond.

# 6 - Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Ellie Dennington Gray and Victoria Punch for their assistance in discussing and visualising the BSL examples provided in this paper. The author also wishes to thank the anonymous reviewer for their responses to an earlier version of this paper.

### 662 Author's Address

663

- 664 University of the West of England
- 665 Frenchay Campus
- 666 Coldharbour Lane
- 667 Bristol
- 668 BS16 1QY
- 669 UK

670

671 Endnotes

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The function-rank matrix for English can be found in Appendix 4 of Matthiessen (1995, pp.797-810).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) also use the term "exhaustiveness" later in their work, in the sense of "everything in the wording has some function at every rank" (p.84). This latter reading is not intended here.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Following conventions in sign linguistics, small caps are used to represent sign glosses.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Importantly, as this kind of construction is partly-lexical, there is a strong reliance on context and co-text. The same depicting construction could, for example, represent a seated parachutist caught in an updraft, had the context have supported such an interpretation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> A few notes regarding terminology are necessary at this point. 'Clause' is used here to remain consistent with other systemic functional work. However, as noted by Hodge (2013) and Hodge and Johnston (2014), the author acknowledges that the use of 'clause' for a signed language is problematic. 'Group' is used without 'phrase' as the concept of a phrase in systemic functional terms has yet to be identified securely (see Rudge, forthcoming, for further discussion on this point). Finally, 'Word,' similar to 'clause,' is used in its systemic functional sense: a rank in the grammar of a language (see Matthiessen, Teruya and Lam, 2010). The author does not wish to suggest that sign languages comprise of words as the term is understood in the spoken and written modalities. Rather, this choice has been made to allow for consistency in systemic functional terms.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> In this example, 'I' is not overtly signed as the first-person Senser of this mental process is implicit. Signing PT:PRO1SG PT:PRO3SG KNOW would also be felicitous.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> 'PT:\_\_\_\_' indicates a pointing sign. In instances where points identify pronominal referents, the convention of "PT:PRO(person)(plurality)" is used, hence "PT:PRO1SG" indicates 'first-person singular.'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> A more accurate gloss, following conventions provided by Cormier et al. (2017), would be: 'DSEW(1-VERT)-MOVE:HUMAN (move-following-LH: policeman following thief)' (with a similar gloss for the other hand). However, for ease of interpretation and to maintain a level of simplicity in the rank scales, the author has chosen to use a more contextualised gloss, especially as the use of Figures assists with interpretation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> This may also be translated as "The police watch the thief who is passing by," to use a hypotactic construction, or "The police watch the passing thief" in an attempt to reduce the structure to one main clause in English. This latter was identified by an anonymous reviewer, leading to the discussion in the remainder of the section.

# References Baker, Anne, Beppie van den Bogaerde, Roland Pfau & Trude Schermer (eds.). 2016. The Linguistics of Sign Languages: An introduction. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Berry, Margaret. 2017. Stratum, delicacy, realisation and rank. In Tom Bartlett & Gerard O'Grady (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics*. 42–55. London: Routledge. Doi: 10.4324/9781315413891.ch4 Brentari, Diane. 2010. Introduction. In Diane Brentari (ed.) Sign Languages. 1-16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Brien, David (ed.). 1992. Dictionary of British Sign Language/English. London: Faber & Faber. Butler, Christopher S. 2003. Structure and Function (Part I). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Butt, David G. & Jonathan J. Webster. 2017. The logical metafunction in systemic functional linguistics. In Tom Bartlett and Gerard O'Grady (eds.) The Routledge Handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics. 96-114. London: Routledge. Caffarel, Alice. 2006. A Systemic Functional Grammar of French: From Grammar to Discourse. London: Continuum. Caffarel, Alice, James R. Martin & Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen (eds.). 2004. Language typology: A functional perspective. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Christie, Frances. 2004. Systemic functional linguistics and a theory of language in education. Ilha Do Desterro: A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies 46. 13–40. Coates, Richard. 1999. Word structure. London: Routledge.

- 706 Cormier, Kearsy, Jordan Fenlon, Sannah Gulamani & Sandra Smith. 2017. BSL Corpus
- annotation conventions (Version 3.0). London: Deafness Cognition and Language (DCAL)
- 708 Research Centre, UCL.

709

- 710 Cormier, Kearsy, Jordan Fenlon & Adam Schembri. 2015. Indicating verbs in British Sign
- 711 Language favour motivated use of space. *Open Linguistics* 1. 684–707. Doi: 10.1515/opli-
- 712 2015-0025

713

- 714 Dachkovsky, Svetlana, Christina Healy & Wendy Sandler. 2013. Visual intonation in two
- 715 sign languages. *Phonology* 30(2). 211–252. Doi: 10.1017/S0952675713000122

716

- 717 De Meulder, Maartje. 2015a. A Barking Dog That Never Bites? The British Sign Language
- 718 (Scotland) Bill. Sign Language Studies 15(4). 446-472. Doi: 10.1353/sls.2015.0016

719

- 720 De Meulder, Maartje. 2015b. The Legal Recognition of Sign Languages. Sign Language
- 721 Studies 15(4). 498-506. Doi:10.1353/sls.2015.0018

722

- 723 Deuchar, Margaret. 1983. Is BSL an SOV language? In J. Kyle and Bencie Woll (eds.)
- 724 Language in Sign: An International Perspective on Sign Language. 59-76. London: Croom
- 725 Helm.

726

- 727 Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons & Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2019. *Ethnologue*:
- 728 Languages of the World, Twenty-second edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International.

729

- 730 Emmorey, Karen (ed.). 2003. Perspectives on Classifier Constructions in Sign Languages.
- Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

732

- 733 Engberg-Pedersen, Elisabeth. 1993. Space in Danish sign language: The semantics and
- 734 morphosyntax of the use of space in a visual language. Hamburg, Germany: Signum.

735

- Fenlon, Jordan, Kensy Cooperrider, Jon Keane, Diane Brentari & Susan Goldin-Meadow.
- 737 2019. Comparing sign language and gesture: Insights from pointing. Glossa: A Journal of
- 738 *General Linguistics 4*(1). 1–26. Doi: 10.5334/gjgl.499

- 740 Fenlon, Jordan, Kearsy Cormier, Ramas Rentelis, Adam Schembri, Kate Rowley, Robert
- 741 Adam & Bencie Woll. 2014. BSL SignBank: A lexical database of British Sign Language (1st
- 742 Edition). London: Deafness, Cognition and Language Research Centre, University College
- 743 London.

744

- 745 Ferrara, Lindsay & Gabrielle Hodge. 2018. Language as Description, Indication and
- 746 Depiction. Frontiers in Psychology 9 (716). 1-15. Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00716

747

- Goldin-Meadow, Susan & Diane Brentari. 2017. Gesture, sign and language: The coming of
- age of sign language and gesture studies HHS Public Access Author manuscript. *Behavioural*
- 750 and Brain Sciences 40(46). 1–43. Doi: 10.1017/S0140525X15001247

751

- Halliday, Michael. A. K. 1961. Categories of the theory of grammar. Word 17(3). 241–292.
- 753 Doi: 10.1080/00437956.1961.11659756

754

- Halliday, Michael. A. K. 1973. Explorations in the Functions of Language. London: Edward
- 756 Arnold.

757

- Halliday, Michael A. K. 2009. Preface to Continuum Companion to Systemic Functional
- 759 Linguistics. In Michael A. K. Halliday and Jonathan J. Webster (eds.) *Continuum Companion*
- 760 to Systemic Functional Linguistics. vii-viii. London: Continuum.

761

- Halliday, Michael A. K. & Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen. 2014. Halliday's Introduction to
- 763 Functional Grammar (4<sup>th</sup> edn.). London: Routledge.

764

- Hodge, Gabrielle. 2013. Patterns from a signed language corpus: Clause-like units in Auslan
- 766 (Australian sign language). PhD Thesis. Sydney: Macquarie University.

767

- Hodge, Gabrielle & Trevor Johnston. 2014. Points, depictions, gestures and enactment: Partly
- 769 lexical and non-lexical sign as core elements of single clause-like units in Auslan (Australian
- 770 Sign Language). *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 34(2). 262–291. Doi:
- 771 10.1080/07268602.2014.887408

772

Hoffmeister, Robert. 1978. The development of demonstrative pronouns, locatives, and

774 personal pronouns in the acquisition of American Sign Language by deaf children 775 of deaf parents. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota. 776 777 Jantunen, Tommi. 2017. Fixed and NOT free: Revisiting the order of the main clausal 778 constituents in Finnish Sign Language from a corpus perspective. SKY Journal of 779 Linguistics 30. 137-149. 780 781 Johnston, Trevor. 1996. Function and medium in the forms of linguistic expression found in a 782 sign language. In W. H. Edmondson & R. B. Wilbur (eds.) International Review of Sign 783 Linguistics (Vol. 1). 57-94. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 784 785 Johnston, Trevor, Jane van Roekel & Adam Schembri. 2015. On the Conventionalization of 786 Mouth Actions in Australian Sign Language. Language and Speech 59(1). 3–44. Doi: 787 10.1177/0023830915569334 788 789 Kendon, Adam. 2004. Gesture: Visible Action as Utterance. Cambridge: Cambridge 790 University Press. 791 792 Kress, Gunter & Theo van Leeuwen. 2006. Reading images: The grammar of visual design 793 (2nd ed.). Oxford: Routledge. 794 795 Kusters, Annalies, Massimiliano Spotti, Ruth Swanwick & Elina Tapio. 2017. Beyond 796 languages, beyond modalities: transforming the study of semiotic repertoires. *International* 797 Journal of Multilingualism 14(3). 219–232. Doi: 10.1080/14790718.2017.1321651 798 799 Lavid, Julia, Jorge Arús & Juan Rafael Zamorano-Mansilla. 2010. Systemic Functional 800 Grammar of Spanish: A Contrastive Study with English (Vol. II). London: Continuum. 801 802 Lepic, Ryan & Corrine Occhino. 2018. A Construction Morphology Approach to Sign 803 Language Analysis. In Geert Booij (ed.) The Construction of Words: Advances in 804 Construction Morphology. 141-172. Switzerland: Springer. 805 806 Li, Eden Sum-Hung. 2007. A Systemic Functional Grammar of Chinese. London:

807

Continuum.

Lu, Jenny C. & Susan Goldin-Meadow. 2018 Creating Images With the Stroke of a Hand: Depiction of Size and Shape in Sign Language. Frontiers in Psychology 9 (1276). 1-15. Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01276 Lutalo-Kiingi, Sam. 2014. A descriptive grammar of morphosyntactic constructions in Ugandan Sign Language (UgSL). PhD thesis. Preston: University of Central Lancashire. Mapson, Rachel. 2014. Polite appearances: How non-manual features convey politeness in British Sign Language. Journal of Politeness Research 10(2). 157–184. Doi: 10.1515/pr-2014-0008 Martin, James R. (2016). Meaning matters: a short history of systemic functional linguistics. Word 62(1). 35–58. Doi: 10.1080/00437956.2016.1141939 Martin, James R. & Michele Zappavigna. (2019). Embodied meaning: a systemic functional perspective on paralanguage. Functional Linguistics 6(1). 1-33. Doi: 10.1186/s40554-018-0065-9 Matthews, P. H. (1966). The concept of rank in 'neo-Firthian' grammar. Journal of Linguistics 2(1). 101-109. Matthiessen, Christian. M. I. M. 1995. Lexicogrammatical Cartography: English Systems. Tokyo: International Language Sciences. Matthiessen, Christian M. I. M., Kazuhiro Teruya & Marvin Lam. 2010. Key terms in Systemic Functional Linguistics. London: Continuum. McGregor, William. 1991. The concept of rank in systemic linguistics. In Eija Ventola (ed.) Functional and systemic linguistics: Approaches and uses. 121-138. Berlin: Mouton. McKee, Rachel. 2017. Assessing the Vitality of New Zealand Sign Language. Sign Language Studies 17(3). 322-362.

842 McNeill, David. 2015. Why We Gesture: The Surprising Role of Hand Movements in 843 Communication. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 844 845 Meier, Richard P., Kearsy Cormier & David Quinto-Pozos. (eds.). 2002. Modality and 846 structure in signed and spoken languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 847 848 Mwinlaaru, Isaac N. & Winfred Wenhui Xuan. 2016. A survey of studies in systemic 849 functional language description and typology. Functional Linguistics 3(8). 1-41. Doi: 850 10.1186/s40554-016-0030-4 851 852 Napoli, Donna Jo & Rachel Sutton-Spence. 2014. Order of the major constituents in sign 853 languages: Implications for all language. Frontiers in Psychology 5. 1–18. Doi: 854 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00376 855 Neidle, Carol, Judy Kegl, Dawn MacLaughlin, Benjamin Bahan & Robert G.Lee. 856 857 2000. The Syntax of American Sign Language: Functional Categories and Hierarchical 858 Structure. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 859 860 Neidle, Carol & Joan Nash. 2012. The noun phrase. In Roland Pfau, Markus Steinbach & 861 Bencie Woll (eds.) Sign Language: An International Handbook. 265-291. Berlin: De Gruyter 862 Mouton. 863 864 Peng, Xuanwei. 2016. English Morphemic Constituents Working for Discourse Wording: 865 Extending Rank Scale from "Clause (Complex)" up to "Text (Type)." International Journal 866 of English Linguistics 6(3). 38-60. Doi: 10.5539/ijel.v6n3p38 867 868 Peng, Xuanwei. 2017. '(Text as) wording' as wording in text size: stretching 869 lexicogrammatical rank hierarchy from clause to text. Word 63(2). 136-172, Doi: 870 10.1080/00437956.2017.1309030 871 872 Rose, David. 2007. Reading genre: A new wave of analysis. Linguistics and the Human 873 Sciences 2(2). 185-204. Doi: 10.1558/lhs.v2i2.185

875 Rudge, Luke A. 2018. Analysing British sign language through the lens of systemic 876 functional linguistics. PhD thesis. Bristol: University of the West of England. 877 878 Rudge, Luke A. Forthcoming. Interpersonal grammar of British Sign Language. In James R. 879 Martin, Beatriz Quiroz and Giacomo Figueredo (eds.) Interpersonal Grammar. Cambridge: 880 Cambridge University Press. 881 882 Padden, Carol. 1988. Interaction of morphology and syntax in American Sign Language. 883 London: Routledge. 884 885 Pfau, Roland & Heleen Bos. 2016. Syntax: simple sentences. In Anne Baker, Beppie van den 886 Bogaerde, Roland Pfau & Trude Schermer (eds.) The Linguistics of Sign Languages: An 887 introduction. 117-148. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 888 889 Quiroz, Beatriz. 2008. Towards a systemic profile of the Spanish MOOD. Linguistics and the 890 Human Sciences 4(1). 31-65. Doi:10.1558/lhs.v4i1.31 891 892 Quiroz, Beatriz. 2018. Negotiating interpersonal meanings: Reasoning about MOOD. 893 *Functions of Language* 25(1). 135-163. 894 895 Sandler, Wendy & Diane Lillo-Martin. 2006. Sign Language and Linguistic Universals. 896 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 897 898 Sidoni, Maria G., Janina Wildfeuer & Kay O'Halloran (eds.). 2016. Mapping Multimodal 899 Performance Studies. London: Routledge. 900 901 Sutton-Spence, Rachel. 1999. The influence of English on British Sign Language. 902 International Journal of Bilingualism 3(4). 363-394. Doi: 10.1177/13670069990030040401 903

Sutton-Spence, Rachel & Bencie Woll. 1999. The Linguistics of British Sign Language: An

Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

904

905

907 Taverniers, Miriam. 2011. The syntax-semantics interface in systemic functional grammar: 908 Halliday's interpretation of the Hjelmslevian model of stratification. Journal of Pragmatics 909 43(4). 1100–1126. Doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.09.003 910 911 Teruya, Kazuhiro. 2007. A Systemic Functional Grammar of Japanese. London: Continuum. 912 913 Wille, Beatrijs, Kimberley Mouvet, Myriam Vermeerbergen and Mieke Van Herreweghe. 914 2018. Flemish sign language development: a case study on deaf mother - deaf child 915 interactions. Functions of Language 25(2). 289-322. Doi: 10.1075/fol.15010.wil 916 917 Woll, Bencie. 2001. The sign that dares to speak its name: Echo phonology in British Sign 918 Language (BSL). In Penny Boyes Bräm & Rachel Sutton-Spence (eds.) The hands are the 919 head of the mouth: The mouth as articulator in sign languages. 87–98. Hamburg: Signum 920 Press.