

## Non-Finiteness

‘Non-finiteness’ is a phenomenon that occurs in most natural languages, whereby a verb is not inflected by grammatical tense and does not possess the grammatical features of aspect, mood or voice. Various theories have been developed to explain their distribution and their role in clause structure, but many instances of non-finiteness remain unaccounted for. Taking a functional approach, this study proposes a ‘process-relation framework’ to explain the more complex, previously unaccounted for instances of non-finiteness in clause structure. It applies the framework comparatively to non-finiteness in English and Chinese, showing how it can be applied across typologically distinct languages. Drawing on corpus-based instances and observations, it introduces numerous thought-provoking cases, in which constructional (or combining) types and the predictability of non-finiteness co-occur. In terms of application, non-finiteness is decisive in categorizing language types, and it is critical in processing natural languages, text segmentation and annotation in particular.

BINGJUN YANG is Professor in Systemic Functional Linguistics at Shanghai Jiao Tong University. His publications include *Corpus-Based Investigations into Grammar, Media and Health Discourse* (Springer Nature, 2020), *Language Policy* (Routledge, 2017) and *Absolute Clauses in English from the Systemic Functional Perspective* (Springer, 2015).

# Non-Finiteness

## *A Process-Relation Perspective*

---

Bingjun Yang

*Shanghai Jiao Tong University*



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press & Assessment  
978-1-009-07369-1 — Non-Finiteness  
Bingjun Yang  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)

---



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom  
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA  
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia  
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India  
103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)  
Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781009073691](http://www.cambridge.org/9781009073691)  
DOI: 10.1017/9781009072502

© Bingjun Yang 2022

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

First published 2022  
First paperback edition 2025

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

ISBN 978-1-316-51341-5 Hardback  
ISBN 978-1-009-07369-1 Paperback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> viii
<i>List of Tables</i>	x
<i>Preface</i>	xiii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xvi
<i>Symbols and Abbreviations</i>	xviii
<i>Leipzig Glossing Abbreviations</i>	xx
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Why This Study?	1
1.2 The Finite/Non-finite Distinction	3
1.3 Purpose of the Study	6
1.4 Research Questions	7
1.5 Methodology	7
1.6 Organization of the Book	7
2 Non-finiteness in the Literature	9
2.1 Non-finiteness in the Early History of English Grammar Writing	9
2.2 Non-finiteness in Traditional Grammar: Morphology-Based	14
2.2.1 The Property of the Verb	15
2.2.2 The Categorization of Non-finite Clauses in English	16
2.2.3 Sentence-Building Power and the Status of Tense	18
2.2.4 Scale of Finiteness	20
2.3 Non-finiteness from the Typological Perspective	21
2.3.1 Category Space and the Continuum Hypothesis	21
2.3.2 Obligatoriness and Asymmetry	25
2.3.3 Root Infinitives in Children’s Early Language	27
2.4 Non-finiteness in Generative Grammar: Form-Based	29
2.4.1 PRO as Subject of Non-finite Clauses	30
2.4.2 Tense and the Finite/Non-finite Distinction	33
2.4.3 Non-isomorphic Relation between Content and Form	36
2.4.4 Gradient or Binary	37
2.5 Non-finiteness in Cognitive Grammar: Meaning-Based	38
2.5.1 Non-finiteness as Atemporal Construal	38
2.5.2 The View of Scalarity	40
2.5.3 Verbal and Finite versus Nominal and Non-finite	43
2.5.4 Conceptual Motivation	44
	 v

vi	Contents	
	2.5.5 Non-finite Clauses as Constructions	45
2.6	Non-finiteness in Systemic Functional Grammar: Meaning- and Form-Based	46
	2.6.1 General Discussions on Non-finite Clauses	46
	2.6.2 Criteria of Non-finite Clause Identification	49
	2.6.3 Function-Specified Systems of Non-finite Clauses	51
2.7	Viewpoints from Other Theories and the Semantic Types	55
	2.7.1 Semiotic Grammar	55
	2.7.2 Role and Reference Grammar	56
	2.7.3 Functional Discourse Grammar	57
	2.7.4 Other Approaches and the Semantic Types	60
2.8	Some Special Types to Be Noted	62
2.9	A Summary of the Relevant Research	64
3	Theoretical Foundations	68
	3.1 Prerequisite: Distinguishing Spoken and Written Language	68
	3.1.1 Differences between Spoken and Written Language	69
	3.1.2 Grammars for Speech and Writing	71
	3.2 Cryptotype and Cline	73
	3.3 Metafunctions as Universal Categories	75
	3.4 Process as the Basic Semantic Unit	79
	3.4.1 Types of Situation and Types of Process	79
	3.4.2 Major, Median and Minor Processes	83
	3.5 Clause as the Basic Syntactic Unit: Major, Median and Minor	84
	3.6 Ideational Grammatical Metaphor	87
	3.6.1 A Sketch of Ideational Grammatical Metaphor	87
	3.6.2 Nominalization	89
	3.6.3 Adjectivization	91
	3.6.4 Verbalization	92
	3.6.5 Adverbialization	94
	3.7 Embedding, Two Principles and Rankshifting	95
	3.8 Defining Non-finiteness in Terms of Function	99
4	Basic Process Relations as One Solution to the Controversy	102
	4.1 The Basic Construction and Its Functional Components	102
	4.2 The Para-relation of Processes	104
	4.3 The Hypo-relation of Processes	106
	4.4 The Participant Conflated	108
	4.5 Process as Primary Participant	111
	4.6 Process as Secondary Participant	114
	4.7 Process as Circumstance	117
	4.8 The Triple Participant	119
5	Non-finiteness as the Bridge for Process Compression	122
	5.1 Clause Combining	123
	5.1.1 Conjunctions in English and Chinese	123
	5.1.2 Reconsidering Coordination, Subordination and Embedding	125
	5.1.3 Non-finite Clauses as a Basic Category of Clause Combining	130
	5.2 Basic Clause Relations and Non-finiteness	134
	5.2.1 Paratactic Relations	135

Contents	vii
5.2.2 Circumstantial Relations	136
5.2.3 Participial Relations	138
5.3 The Metaphoric Syndrome and Non-finite Clauses as the Bridge	140
6 Revisiting the Controversial English Constructions with Non-finiteness	143
6.1 Controversial Constructions with Non-finiteness in English: A Sketch	144
6.2 Causatives and Non-causatives	144
6.3 COCA Distribution of Typical Verbs in (Non-)Causatives	146
6.4 Process Relations in Typical English Constructions with Non-finiteness	149
6.5 The Serial Verb Construction	151
6.6 The Existential Construction	154
6.7 The Absolute Construction	158
6.8 The Process Relation in Ambiguous Non-finite Constructions	159
7 Revisiting the Controversial Chinese Constructions with Non-finiteness	163
7.1 The Serial Verb Construction	164
7.2 The Pivotal Construction	169
7.3 Pivotal Construction or Grammatical Metaphor?	179
7.4 The Existential Construction	183
7.5 Other Controversial Non-finite Constructions Revisited	190
8 Conclusion	195
8.1 Overview of the Major Findings	195
8.2 Limitations and Further Study	197
<i>References</i>	199
<i>Index</i>	227

## Figures

---

1.1	Google Ngram for ‘finiteness’ and ‘nonfinite’	<i>page</i> 4
2.1	The finite and non-finite verbs in Kruisinga (1932 [1915])	12
2.2	Categories of non-finite clause in Quirk et al. (1985)	18
2.3	The continuum hypothesis (Wetzer 1996: 44)	22
2.4	Verbal system typology matrix (Lowe 2015: 322)	25
2.5	The scale of grammatical dependency (T. Payne 2011: 331)	40
2.6	Degrees of finiteness in English (Givón 2001: 26)	42
2.7	The scale of syntactic level (Lehmann 1988: 192)	42
2.8	Theme in non-finite dependent clauses (Halliday & Matthiessen 2014: 127)	48
2.9	System of non-finiteness in terms of Phenomenon: ideational (B. Yang 2003: 149)	53
2.10	System network of Mood in non-finite clauses: interpersonal (B. Yang 2003: 145)	53
2.11	System network of Theme in non-finite clauses: textual (B. Yang 2003: 146)	54
2.12	Logico-semantic system network of non-finite clauses (B. Yang 2003: 148)	54
2.13	Inter-clausal syntactic relations hierarchy (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 477)	57
2.14	The taxonomy of embedded constructions (Dik 1997: 143)	58
2.15	Predication and sentence (Hengeveld 1992: 27)	59
2.16	The distinction as a syntactic category of the clause (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 89)	61
2.17	The scale of backgrounding (Leech et al. 1982: 187)	61
3.1	Grammatical categories in Whorf (1945)	74
3.2	The metafunctional framing of the grammar (Halliday 2004c [1998]: 50)	78
3.3	Types of situation (Mourelatos 1978: 423)	80
3.4	Process types in English (Halliday & Matthiessen 2014: 216)	82
3.5	The metaphoric syndrome: nominalization	91
3.6	The metaphoric syndrome: adjectivization	92

List of Figures	ix
3.7 The metaphoric syndrome: verbalization	93
3.8 The metaphoric syndrome: adverbialization	94
4.1 Type I: the basic construction	103
4.2 Type II: the para-relation	104
4.3 Type III: the hypo-relation	106
4.4 Type IV: the participant conflated	108
4.5 Type V: process as primary participant	111
4.6 Type VI: process as secondary participant	115
4.7 Type VII: process as circumstance	117
4.8 Type VIII: the triple participant in a single process	119
5.1 The systems of clause complexing (Halliday & Matthiessen 2014: 438)	126
5.2 Parallelism of clause linkage continua (Lehmann 1988: 217)	129
5.3 The scale of verbalization in Chinese	141
6.1 Typical verbs used as VP <sub>1</sub> across genres in COCA	148



# Tables

1.1	An overview of major corpora used in the present study	<i>page</i> 8
2.1	Disputes on the finite/non-finite distinction in Mandarin Chinese	24
2.2	Main clausehood, tense and agreement in non-finiteness	27
2.3	Proportions of optional infinitives (OIs) by age (Wexler 2004: 244)	28
2.4	Empty categories	33
2.5	The morphosyntax of the finite versus non-finite prototypes (Givón 2001: 352)	43
2.6	Non-finite tenses in English (Bache 2008: 17)	47
2.7	Semantic types of infinitive and gerund in English	62
2.8	Logical roles of absolute clauses (Q. He & Yang 2015: 16)	64
3.1	Cline between finite and non-finite clauses: morphological perspective (B. Yang 2015: 7)	75
5.1	Basic types of clause complex (Halliday & Matthiessen 2014: 447)	127
5.2	Types of embedding (Halliday & Matthiessen 2014: 492)	128
5.3	Inflections in Sino-Tibetan languages	133
5.4	Qualifiers realized by rankshifted median process in three different genres of the BCC corpus	139
6.1	Typical verbs for the six processes in COCA and causation	146
6.2	Query results of NP <sub>1</sub> + VP <sub>1</sub> + NP <sub>2</sub> + VP <sub>2</sub> in COCA	147
6.3	Major verbs used in the NP <sub>1</sub> + VP <sub>1</sub> + NP <sub>2</sub> + VP <sub>2</sub> construction in COCA	147
6.4	Major verbs used in the NP <sub>1</sub> + VP <sub>1</sub> + NP <sub>2</sub> + VP <sub>2</sub> construction in COCA (per million)	148
6.5	The hypo-relation of processes with non-finiteness	149
6.6	Participant conflation in mono-transitives	150
6.7	Participant conflation in complex transitives	150
6.8	Participant conflation and covert participant in complex transitives	151
6.9	The triple participant in a process with non-finiteness	151

List of Tables	xi
6.10 Query results of the top five serial verbs in COCA	152
6.11 Process relation in paratactic SVC	153
6.12 Process in SVC of the hypo-relation	154
6.13 A combination of hypo-related SVC and conflated participants	154
6.14 Typical verbs used to realize existential constructions in COCA	156
6.15 Process relation in the event-type existential construction	157
6.16 Process relation in absolute construction with -ing clause	158
6.17 Process relation in absolute construction with -ed clause	159
6.18 Process relation in absolute construction with prepositional phrase	159
6.19 Process relation in multiple absolute clauses in a construction from COCA	159
6.20 Hypo-relation between major process and median process	160
6.21 Ambiguous hypo-relation between major and median processes	161
6.22 Process relation in <i>Flying planes can be dangerous</i>	161
6.23 Infinitive clause functioning as participant	162
6.24 Non-finite clause functioning as the participant in a minor process	162
7.1 A common Chinese expression with and without verb in the BCC corpus	163
7.2 Process relation in explicit SVC in Chinese	168
7.3 Process relation in implicit SVC in Chinese	168
7.4 Typical verbs used in pivotal construction in Chinese (Yóu 2002)	171
7.5 Typical verbs in pivotal constructions in Chinese	174
7.6 Process relation in pivotal construction of causative	175
7.7 Search query results for ‘派n做’ in the BCC corpus	175
7.8 Process relation in non-causative material processes	176
7.9 Process relation in non-causative verbal processes	177
7.10 Triple participant in a single process	177
7.11 Process relation in pivotal construction of the mental process	178
7.12 Existential constructions with definite 这(zhè/this) in the BCC corpus	184
7.13 Chinese existential construction as ideational grammatical metaphor	186
7.14 Existential process combined with median process	187
7.15 Existential process embedded as participant	188
7.16 Typical ideational grammatical metaphors in existential constructions in the BCC corpus	189

## Preface

---

With the help of Jianhui Xu, my English teacher in senior high school, I managed to write a letter in English to a potential pen pal in 1986. Fortunately, a girl named Julie Willson from Yorkshire wrote back to me and we became pen friends. While at college, I wrote to her asking if she could buy me a book on linguistics. She was generous and sent me the book entitled *Modern Linguistics: The Results of Chomsky's Revolution* by Neil Smith and Deirdre Wilson. That was my first impression of what linguistics looked like.

As a student of English at Southwest University, I was very much encouraged by many teachers, among whom are Fengying Zhang, who taught me comprehensive English, and Wenbiao Yang, who was a teacher of English at the senior high school from which I graduated and who was selected to be trained at the university under a programme by the British Council. During my undergraduate years, I was lucky to be taught and supervised by Professor Rijin Long, who earned a MA degree with Professor Michael Halliday at the University of Sydney in 1981, and Professor Jiarong Liu, who is a stylist and sociolinguist. I completed my MA thesis under the supervision of the systemicist Professor Zhi'an Chen. Professor Li Li, who earned his MEd in TESOL from the University of Manchester, taught me computer-assisted language learning in 1992, which elicited my passion for computers. These people helped me dive into the sea of linguistics.

At a national conference on functional linguistics in 1997, I became acquainted with the systemicist Guowen Huang, who was then a professor at Sun Yat-sen University. Professor Huang earned a PhD in applied linguistics from the University of Edinburgh and a second PhD in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) from Cardiff University, and that was impressive in many ways. In 1999, I became a doctoral student under the supervision of Professor Huang. At an international conference held in Guangzhou that year, I met many leading systemicists, including Michael Halliday, Ruqaiya Hasan, Robin Fawcett, Christian Matthiessen and Peter H. Fries. For the purpose of learning the way of scientific observation better, I started a post-doctoral journey on narrative time in 2004 with the psychologist Professor Xiting Huang. With the

help and guidance of these scholars, I learned to swim in SFL, which is a part of the linguistic sea.

After graduation with a PhD in June 2002, I received funding from the Freeman Foundation and went to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) for further research. Professor Halliday once worked there, and it was quite by luck that I met him again at the World Englishes Conference held at UIUC. We talked a little about the relationship between theory and practice at tea break. There I also met Professor Carolyn G. Hartnett, who agreed to comment on the draft of my first book. She then wrote a foreword for me upon the acceptance for publication of the book. At UIUC, I attended classes taught by Adele Goldberg and several other professors. The whole class hoped that Professor Goldberg would teach us Construction Grammar, but she said she had to follow the requirements of the course, entitled ‘Conceptual Semantics’. That year of visiting enriched my sense of a wider sea of linguistics.

In 2014 I transferred to Shanghai Jiao Tong University under the recommendation of Professor Feng Yang and with the support of Professor Jie Zhang, Professor Kaibao Hu and Professor Longgen Liu. Soon after the settlement, I was accepted by Miriam Locher and went to the University of Basel in Switzerland as a visiting professor. It was a privilege to be invited to attend all kinds of activities in the English department there during the whole academic year. I attended classes run by Professor Locher, and was very much enlightened by her and also by other linguists there, including Professor Heike Behrens, Dr Daria Dayter, Dr Catherine Diederich and Dr Thomas C. Messerli. During my stay, I was invited to deliver a lecture on interpersonal metaphors in online communication between doctors and patients. I also had an opportunity to have a long talk with Professor Wolfgang Teubert about topics of corpus linguistics in a pub in Basel. The year in Basel widened my vision further, and it seemed to me that I could swim better in the sea of linguistics.

My favourite sport is tennis, but doing research, as I have already hinted at, may be better compared to swimming. Without some teaching of the basics, you will never know how to swim; and without some advanced guidance, you will not be able to become a good swimmer. The sea of linguistics is so vast that it is impossible for me to swim across it. Yet, with the help of the people mentioned here, and many others, I think I am now able to swim towards a tiny destination: non-finiteness.

Tiny as it is, non-finiteness has been one of the most controversial topics in linguistics. It is a hard nut, which disturbs theoretical linguists, text annotators, typologists and many others. With numerous findings for this hard nut, there must have been some consensus on the ‘cracking’ of it, but quite unfortunately few people from distinctive perspectives may be ready to accept others’ views

on non-finiteness. This may not be akin to Plato's cave, where chained prisoners would not believe what a freed prisoner claimed to see outside of the cave. It is the real nature of academic pursuit. If we take the elephant as the truth, then scholars are indeed the blind men. It is not possible for any blind person to see the whole elephant, but it is still useful for a blind person to be able to tell others what the elephant is like in his/her perspective. What is important is that his/her way of investigating the part s/he feels or touches should be sound and convincing. What I present in this book is simply a perspective on the 'elephant' of non-finiteness, and I hope that my argument will be convincing. More importantly, I hope that the knowledge I add to the understanding of non-finiteness, if any, will be beneficial both in theory and in practice.

The year 2020 challenged human beings with COVID-19, and millions of people have suffered losses of their beloved ones, although numerous people in their professions rose to the challenges and helped others. At the time of this crisis, it is really tough for people to continue their work. Yet, in this period of time the commissioning editor at Cambridge University Press (CUP), Helen Barton, and the three anonymous reviewers helped me improve the book with their professional suggestions and insightful comments. Professor Akila Sellami Baklouti at the University of Sfax provided helpful and insightful comments at the stage of clearance reading. Isabel Collins and Joshua Penny from CUP helped a lot in preparing the documents. I am also grateful to Jayavel Radhakrishnan and Judy Napper for their professional work in copy-editing. Without their support and encouragement, this book would never have been completed in its present form. I am particularly grateful to Helen and the reviewers for their help.

Upon the publication of this book, I am thankful to my father, Canjin Yang, who loved me very much but who passed away in 2007. I am thankful to my mother, Zengyu Yang, and my siblings for their constant love. My family's warm support is always very much appreciated: my wife, Lijuan Wang, my elder son, Ziqing Yang, and my younger son, Zibai Yang. They are the indispensable meaning of life to me. It is with the help and love of the people mentioned here and many others that this book is possible. Sincere thanks go to them, and errors remain mine.

## Acknowledgements

---

This research was supported by the National Social Science Fund of China (Project No.: 15BYY016). I am grateful to the original publishers for permission to use the following figures and tables.

Figure 2.1 from *E. Kruisinga: A Chapter in the History of Linguistics in the Netherlands* (A. J. Van Essen, 1983), Springer.

Figure 2.3 from *The Typology of Adjectival Predication* (Harrie Wetzter, 1996), Mouton de Gruyter.

Figure 2.4 from *Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit: The Syntax and Semantics of Adjectival Verb Forms* (John Jeffrey Lowe, 2015), Oxford University Press.

Figure 2.5 from *Understanding English Grammar: A Linguistic Introduction* (Thomas E. Payne, 2011), Cambridge University Press.

Figure 2.6, Table 2.5 from *Syntax: An Introduction* (Talmy Givón, 2001), John Benjamins.

Figures 2.7, 5.2 from ‘Towards a Typology of Clause Linkage’ in *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse* (Christian Lehmann, edited by J. Haiman & S. A. Thompson, 1988: 181–225), John Benjamins.

Figures 2.8, 3.4, 5.1; Tables 5.1, 5.2 from *Halliday’s Introduction to Functional Grammar* (M. A. K. Halliday & Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen, 2014), Routledge.

Figures 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12 from *A Study of Non-Finite Clauses in English: A Systemic Functional Approach* (Bingjun Yang, 2003), Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Figure 2.13 from *Syntax: Structure, Meaning & Function* (Robert Jr. Van Valin & Randy LaPolla, 1997), Cambridge University Press.

Figure 2.14 from *The Theory of Functional Grammar: Complex and Derived Constructions* (Simon C. Dik, edited by K. Hengeveld, 1997), Mouton de Gruyter.

Figure 2.15 from *Non-verbal Predication: Theory, Typology, Diachrony* (Kees Hengeveld, 1992), Mouton de Gruyter.

Figure 2.16 from *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (Rodney Huddleston & Geoffrey K. Pullum, 2002), Cambridge University Press.

Figure 2.17 from *English Grammar for Today: A New Introduction* (Geoffrey Leech, Margaret Deuchar and Robert Hoogenraad, 1982), Macmillan.

Figure 3.2 from ‘Things and Relations: Regrammaticizing Experience as Technical Knowledge’ in *The Language of Science: The Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday*, vol. 5 (M. A. K. Halliday, edited by J. Webster, 2004: 49–101), Continuum.

Figure 3.3 from ‘Events, Processes, and States’ in *Linguistics and Philosophy* (Alexander P. D. Mourelatos, 1978, 2: 415–34), Springer.

Table 2.3 from ‘Lenneberg’s Dream: Learning, Normal Language Development and Specific Language Impairment’ in *Variation and Universals in Biolinguistics* (Ken Wexler, edited by L. Jenkins, 2004: 239–83), Elsevier.

Table 2.6 from *English Tense and Aspect in Halliday’s Systemic Functional Grammar* (Carl Bache, 2008), Equinox.

Table 2.8 from *Absolute Clauses in English from the Systemic Functional Perspective: A Corpus-Based Study* (Qingshun He & Bingjun Yang, 2015), Springer.

Table 3.1 from ‘On Finiteness in Chinese from the Perspective of Cryptotype and Cline’ in *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies* (Bingjun Yang, 2015, 22(8): 6–10), Shanghai Jiao Tong University.

## Symbols and Abbreviations

---

$\alpha$	dominant clause
$\beta$	dependent clause
	boundary symbol of a clause complex
	boundary symbol of a clause
^	followed by
+	extending
=	elaborating
×	enhancing
↘	realized by
AGR	agreement
ANC	action nominal construction
AUX	auxiliary
BCC	Beijing Language and Culture University Chinese Corpus
BNC	British National Corpus
CCL	Centre for Chinese Linguistics Corpus
CEC	Chinese existential construction
CG	Cognitive Grammar
COCA	Corpus of Contemporary American English
CP	complementizer phrase
DP	determiner phrase
EC	existential construction
EPP	Extended Projection Principle
FRP	Full Realization Principle
GG	Generative Grammar
GM	grammatical metaphor
IFG	<i>Introduction to Functional Grammar</i>
IGM	ideational grammatical metaphor
INFL	inflection
LFVP	Limit of Finite Verb Principle
LOB	Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus
MC	main clausehood
NOW	News on the Web corpus
NP	noun phrase
OI	optional infinitive
PRO	pronoun without phonological content
RRG	Role and Reference Grammar
SFG	Systemic Functional Grammar
SFL	Systemic Functional Linguistics
SG	Semiotic Grammar



Symbols and Abbreviations

xix

SQ	search query
SVC	serial verb construction
T	tense
TAM	tense–aspect–modality
TP	tense phrase
VMC	verb-mediated construction
VP	verb phrase

# Leipzig Glossing Abbreviations

---

ASP	aspect
CLF	classifier
COMP	complementizer
COMPL	completive aspect
CONJ	conjunction
EXCL	exclamative word
FUT	future tense indicator
JUSS	jussive mood
LNK	linking word
MOD	modal word
NEG	negation
PASS	passive voice indicator
PL	plural
POSS	possessive marker
PRS	present progressive tense indicator
PST	past tense indicator
Q	question particle/word