

# Narrative Theory and the Dimensions of Systemic Modelling.

Rosemary Huisman  
*University of Sydney*

## Abstract

In general, narrative has been understood to be about story-telling: the organisation of time and the projection of a world (diegesis), but this paper suggests both concepts should be plural. Using the systemic modelling of language as social semiotic I show that three worlds/diegeses can be inferred (physiological, psychological and social worlds). Using the theories of modern physics I show that six natural worlds, with their associated six temporalities, can be described, the last three worlds being comparable to those of systemic description. The paper discusses the analysis of systemic dimensions (structure, system, stratification, instantiation, metafunction) in different media, and concludes with introductory notes on the technical construction of interpersonal meaning for narrative in film.

## 1 Interdisciplinary studies of narrative

The study of narrative is relevant to many disciplinary purposes. Thus Martin Cortazzi, wanting to help teachers find useful techniques from various studies of narrative, describes the modelling of narrative (through theory and practice) in the disciplines of sociology and socio-linguistics, psychology, literary study and anthropology (Cortazzi:1993). Each discipline has created models according to its own purposes of analysis. This is an important point to remember when looking at the present modelling of narrative in systemics. At the very least, however, all studies of narrative assume it is a study of 'story' or the telling or interpreting of story.

Systemic theory has much to offer the literary, and wider, study of narrative, though one use of the term 'narrative' in systemics as the name of a specific genre or text type has limited this relevance. To quote the authors of one introductory textbook: 'when texts share the same general purpose in the culture, they will often share the same obligatory and optional structural elements and so they belong to the same genre or text type' (Butt, Fahey, Feez, Spinks, and Yallop, 2000:9). In this use, the term 'narrative' for a genre contrasts with terms like recount, procedure, explanation, exposition, each of which is used to label a text with a specific sequence of structural elements. This use of the word 'narrative' derives from the work of William Labov, and his analysis of spontaneous oral narratives spoken by black youths in Harlem, New York (1972:354-396). Cortazzi (1993:45-48) cites Labov's work as an example of the modelling of narrative in socio-linguistics. While it may be useful to teach primary school children a structural sequence of Orientation, Complication, Resolution, Coda, to help them write simple narratives, this is not an adequate conceptual apparatus for studying the complex narratives of literary or filmic discourse, and even effaces the potential application of systemic theory. My approach, in contrast, has been to explore the wider contribution which systemic modelling can make to narrative theory.

## 2 'Literary' narrative

The study of narrative has been a particularly important focus in literary studies. Literary study of vernacular languages, developing from about 1860 in the

universities out of the earlier study of the classical languages, has included in literature texts which are highly valued in the culture, rather than merely 'texts which are written' (as the name might suggest). The literary study of narrative includes texts which, though written down in manuscript, appear to have arisen out of an oral or primarily oral tradition. This includes, for example, the Classical Greek *Iliad*, the Old English *Beowulf*, the medieval romances in English and French. These early narratives are frequently in what we'd understand as 'poetry', with various patterns of versification, such as the poetic genre known as the epic. However, the development of the new language technology of the printing press, and the many social effects associated with its use, led to prose, rather than poetry, becoming the dominant discourse for literary narrative. Within the discourse of prose fiction, developing from the seventeenth to the twentieth century, the two dominant genres became those of the novel and the short story.

In the twentieth century, the growth of new technologies for language and image has led to new discursive realisations for narrative - film, radio, television, digital media. (I'm taking the word discourse more generally to talk about semiotics, meanings associated with different media, rather than limiting it to talk about semantics, meanings in language - appropriately *discurrere* in Latin meant 'to run in different ways'.) The new awareness of the mass audience for these technologies led to a new awareness of so-called popular culture, with its associated texts. Departments studying such texts may be called Media and Communications, or Cultural Studies or indeed still English. This leads to the question: to what extent (if at all) can the techniques for analysing the narrative of one discursive medium be extended to analysing the narratives of other media? A possible answer is suggested in the concluding section of this paper.

### **3 Narrative temporalities, narrative diegeses**

Two assumptions about narrative run through different disciplinary modelling: that narrative organises time, and that narrative projects a world, a diegesis.

The first assumption is the most universal. Thus, to William Labov, 'a minimal narrative is defined as one containing a single temporal juncture' (1972:361). To the philosopher Paul Ricoeur, 'Time becomes human time to the extent that it is organized after the manner of narrative; narrative in turn is meaningful to the extent that it portrays the features of temporal existence' (1984:3).

The second assumption, that narrative in telling a story projects a world, is particularly taken up in literary and film studies. This projected world is referred to as the diegesis. Events within that world, the world of the characters, are diegetic events. The literary scholar Gérard Genette (1980) developed an intimidating arsenal of structuralist terminology (subsequently much used in literary narrative studies) centred on the term diegesis - for example extradiegetic narrator, one outside the world of the novel.

The two interdisciplinary assumptions, that narrative organises time and that narrative projects a diegesis, are not however sufficient. In both these statements, the word 'time' and the word 'diegesis' are singular. From my work on narrative, I have drawn the conclusion that in each case, the words should be plural - that time is more accurately *temporalities*, and diegesis more accurately *diegeses*. The first conclusion, about time, I initially drew from the modelling of nature in contemporary physics. The second conclusion, about diegesis, I initially drew from the modelling of

language as social semiotic in systemic functional linguistics. These two conclusions, this paper argues, turn out to be complementary .

#### 4 The dimensions of systemic modelling

In the third edition of *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, Halliday and Matthiessen describe five dimensions, or forms of order, in language (2004:19-36). These are the dimensions of structure, system, stratification, instantiation and metafunction. The theoretical importance of these dimensions is foregrounded: this five dimensional model is pictured, geometrically drawn on the two dimensional page, as the front cover of the edition. The graphic is repeated in Figure 1.6 (2004:21) in the text, and the information is repeated in tabular form at Table 1(3) (2004:20). I reproduce that table below, here Table 1.

**Table 1:** The dimensions (forms of order) in language and their ordering principles

	<b>dimension</b>	<b>principle</b>	<b>orders</b>
1	structure (syntagmatic order)	rank	clause - group or phrase - word - morpheme (lexicogrammar)
2	system (paradigmatic order)	delicacy	grammar - lexis (lexicogrammar)
3	stratification	realisation	semantics - lexicogrammar - phonology - phonetics
4	instantiation	instantiation	potential - sub-potential or instance type - instance
5	metafunction	metafunction	ideational (logical - experiential) - interpersonal - textual

We can see that the systemic use of narrative to name a text type, as in the socio-linguistic modelling, places it on the dimension of instantiation - this is the cline or continuum running between the potential and instance that Halliday and Matthiessen illustrate by the now familiar example of climate and weather. Climate refers to the patterns of weather observed on different days. A text-type or genre refers to similar patterns observed in different texts.

However, the particular dimension which I find immediately relevant to the more general study of narration is number 5, that of metafunction. As indicated, there are three orders of metafunction: the interpersonal, the textual and the ideational, the ideational having two sub-orders, the experiential and the logical. It was the experiential metafunction which first struck me as having particular resonance with a consideration of narrative.

Consider the coloured figure on the front cover of the second edition of Halliday's *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (1994). The two-dimensional circle models our experience as it can be interpreted through the grammatical system of transitivity. The same diagram appears in black and white in the body of the text with the caption 'The grammar of experience: types of process in English' (2004:172; also 1994:108). Halliday and Matthiessen write (2004:172):

[the figure] represents process types as a semiotic space, with different regions representing different types. The regions have core areas and these represent prototypical members of the process types; but the regions are continuous, shading into one another, and these border areas represent the fact that the process types are fuzzy categories.

Notice the reference to ‘core areas’ and ‘prototypical members of the process types’ or major process types - these are the three process types of material, relational and mental processes. (A footnote comments that the minor process types appear to vary more across languages than the major types, 2004:171.) These are choices of experiential meaning in the clause, a structural unit of the lexicogrammar. Before we can relate this to the more general study of narrative, we have to move along the dimension of stratification, dimension number 3, for which the principle of relation is that of realisation.

The realisation relations of stratification (sometimes called the ‘levels of language’) are well-known: context encloses semantics, which encloses lexicogrammar, which encloses phonology and graphology, which encloses phonetics and graphetics (Halliday and Matthiessen, 1994:25). What is particularly pertinent here is the realisation relation between context and semantics. Halliday originally theorised that the clumping of semantic choices around three main metafunctions evolved from the three principal purposes humans had in using language: to talk about happenings, to interact and express attitudes, to speak coherently in the situation. These three functions of language led him to theorise three aspects of the context, each realised in one of the functions - the familiar Field, Tenor and Mode of the context of situation.

Returning to the circle diagram on the cover of the second edition, we note that, representing choices of experiential meaning in the clause, these choices of Transitivity realise the Field aspect of the context of situation. Now consider the dimension of instantiation: on the dimension of instantiation, the context of situation instantiates the context of culture - a Field is one instantiation of the possible Fields of social action in a culture, it is the world of social action in the culture. Accordingly, in the centre of the circle, the Transitivity diagram summarises the prototypical process choices of the culture as those of doing, being and sensing. And these experiential choices are described as realising three prototypical worlds of social action: a physical world of doing, a world of consciousness of sensing, and a world of abstract relations of being. You could gloss these three worlds further as a physical world, a psychological world and a social world, since it is in a particular social context that aspects of experience are brought into semiotic equivalence.

The most complex of semiotic means used by humans, the means of language, structures the experience of reality in this tri-part way - three worlds of doing, being and sensing. We are familiar with the systemic idea of the three metafunctions being realised in overlapping choices within the clause, despite our intuitive folk sense that the clause is a unity. Now we see that our intuitive sense that we humans live in the experience of one world is similarly misleading. Our language potential tells us that we live simultaneously in the possible experience of three overlapping worlds: a physical world, a psychological world, a social world. This is not to say that at times one world or another may not be more dominant in our experience. Both these statements: that we live simultaneously in three overlapping worlds, and that at times one world or another may be more dominant, prove to be illuminating insights when taken into the general study of narrative.

## **5 Systemic worlds, narrative diegeses**

This brings me back, at last, to the earlier statements: that one persistent assumption about narrative is that narrative projects a world, and that in literary and film studies this world is referred to as the diegesis of the novel or film. But from considering the

systemic model of language as social semiotic we can conclude that human semiosis construes three overlapping worlds, three diegeses: the external and material world of physical action and events; the internal and psychological world of individual consciousness; the social world which is construed through human interaction and convention, including social identities and attributes. This more complex understanding of narrative projection actually simplifies, I suggest, the analysis of narrative in different media, since one can focus separately on the realisation of each world. It also enables one more readily to compare narratives of different historical periods and from different social contexts. It has been one of my research findings, for example, that literary narratives in English from different historical periods typically differ in the dominance of one world or another.

## 6 Narrative worlds and their temporalities

I turn now to the other persistent assumption about narrative - that narrative is about time, probably the most universal assumption in studies of narrative in any discipline. Yet here language itself has misled us - because the word 'time' is a singular noun, we talk as if time is a singular thing. Some writers in the Humanities, such as the philosopher Elizabeth Grosz (2004:155-243, 205:93-130), using the early twentieth century work of French psychologist Henri Bergson, have taken up a dual understanding of time - time as a concept and time as our experience, which Bergson called 'duration' - and medieval talk of theology pondered a duality of human and divine experience (time and eternity), but it is in the discourse of modern physics that the most explicit talk of temporalities takes place. (The following gives a fairly perfunctory account, as I have elaborated on this material elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>)

The physicist J. T. Fraser, founder of the International Society for the Study of Time, has written (Fraser, 1999:26):

Nature comprises a number of integrative levels which form a hierarchically nested and evolutionarily open system along a scale of increasing complexity.

Processes characteristic of each of these levels function with different types of causation and must be described in different languages.

Each level determines a qualitatively different temporality, and each level adds new, unresolvable conflicts to those of the level or levels below it.

Fraser describes six integrative levels, or worlds, each with its associated type of causation and temporality. The following Table summarises these associations.<sup>2</sup>

**Table 2:** The 'natural' worlds described in physics

Integrative level	Causation	Temporality
1. world of electromagnetic radiation	Chaos	Atemporal
2. world of particle-waves	Statistical	Prototemporal
3. world of galaxies	Deterministic	Eotemporal
4. world of life	Short-term intentionality	Biotemporal
5. world of the human mind	Long-term intentionality	Nootemporal
6. world of society	Social intentionality	Socio-temporal

<sup>1</sup> For an account of my modelling of narrative temporalities, see 'Relating SFL to narrative theory - widening the scope of both' in E Swain (ed), *Thresholds and Potentialities of Systemic Functional Linguistics as a Descriptive Theory* (Trieste, forthcoming).

<sup>2</sup> This summary is made from Fraser's writing in *The Genesis and Evolution of Time* (1982:22 & 181) and *Time, Conflict, and Human Values* (1999:21-43).

From the point of view of human existence, all these worlds co-exist, but from the point of view of everyday human experience, only worlds 4, 5 and 6 exist.<sup>3</sup>

If there are (at the present stage of description in physics) six types of world, each with its associated type of temporality, and the characteristic of ‘narrative’ is that it organises ‘time’ and tells a ‘story,’ then we can talk of six types of story, each with its associated type of temporality.

**Table 3:** Temporalities and the Worlds of Stories

World of Story	Temporality
1. a world/ story of becoming	Atemporal
2. a world/ story of possibility	Prototemporal
3. a world / story of matter	Eotemporal
4. a world/ story of life	Biotemporal
5. a world / story of human individual life	Nootemporal
6. a world / story of human social life	Socio-temporal

The first world/story could be described as a world of ‘Heraclitean flux’, where ‘everything happens at once’. The second world/story is one where the instant cannot be uniquely identified; you may know, or at least think, that something happened, but you can’t make a confident identification. The third world/story has identity and sequence, but it is reversible - what you see depends on where you stand. The fourth world/story is the familiar one of organic life, the organism moving sequentially from past birth to future death, and satisfying its organic needs in its present (the temporality of chronological sequence). The fifth world/story is that of the mental life of the individual human; its principle of sequence is associative, so that its temporality accommodates memory, prediction and fantasy. Finally, the sixth world/story, that of human social life, is one in which social identities, attributes and socially symbolic relations generally are told. Its principle of sequence is equative, relating what is understood to be socially significant, and similar or dissimilar.

It is now clear that students of narrative who talk about ‘time’ as a singular concept have homed in only on the temporality of world 4, the world of chronological succession, where one physiological action necessarily follows another. Yet we humans live in all these worlds, though we can sensibly experience only the last three.

## 7 Systemic modelling and ‘natural’ worlds

It is at this point we see how complementary are the insights given by the modelling of nature in physics and the modelling of language as semiotic in systemic theory. The last three worlds, those of life, human individual life and human social life, correspond to the three overlapping worlds previously inferred from the systemic model.

---

<sup>3</sup> World 1 is that described by the Theory of Special Relativity, where particles with zero rest mass are always on the move at the speed of light. World 2 is that of Quantum Theory, where particles of non-zero mass travel at speeds less than that of light. World 3 is the world described by the General Theory of Relativity, also referred to as Space/Time Theory.

**Table 4:** Complementary modelling of physics and systemic theory:

1. a world/ story of becoming	not linguistically realised
2. a world/ story of possibility	“
3. a world / story of matter	“
4. a world/ story of life	the physical world (doing)
5. a world / story of human individual life	the world of consciousness (sensing)
6. a world / story of human social life	the world of abstract relations (being)

It is not surprising that the semiotic sphere of the Transitivity System only encompasses the last three worlds, since these are the worlds of human experience on this planet, the environment in which human needs emerged, and in which human language evolved. However, from the late nineteenth century, the new epistemologies of worlds beyond sensible human experience have influenced aesthetic experimentation. It has been part of my research to observe how particular worlds are realised at different historical times of literary narrative, from the dominance of the world of abstract relations (world 6) in the Old English narrative poem *Beowulf*, to the tightly coherent interweaving of the last three worlds in the (so-called) classic realist novels of the nineteenth century, as in George Eliot's *Middlemarch*, through the dominance of worlds 5 and 3 in the so-called modernist text, as in the novels of Virginia Woolf, to the postmodern novel's use of worlds 1 and 2, as in Thomas Pynchon's *The Crying of Lot 49*, where events and characters do not necessarily 'make sense,' since these worlds are not sensible, cannot be sensed in direct human experience, and have no transitivity choices in natural language by which they can be meant.<sup>4</sup> In physics, their meanings are realised directly only in the contrived language of mathematics.

In summary, bringing together the concepts of systemic linguistics and contemporary physics considerably enlarges our understanding of what narrative theory can talk about. It shows the flaw in narratology, the still dominant approach to analysing literary narrative, and by extension, film narrative: that it assumes the chronological sequence of biotemporal time as experienced in the physical world *is* the time and the world of the narrative, and constitutes the 'story'. This assumed story is then contrasted with the plot or discourse (variously called), that is the actual sequence of telling in the narrative, so that elaborate theoretical categories have to be devised to describe 'deviations' from the assumed time and world of the 'story'. Instead, whatever the semiotic medium, we can consider the various worlds realised in the narrative, and the different kinds of sequence appropriate for their different temporalities.

## 8 Conclusion: narrative and the dimensions of systemic modelling

Because of its particular relevance to diegesis in narrative, I've concentrated initially on Field as the instantiation of the culturally possible worlds of doing, being and sensing. However, all parameters of the context of situation are relevant to the re-evaluation of narrative concepts, Tenor as the instantiation of possible social relations, roles and attitudes, Mode as the instantiation of the potential for organizing coherent messages in a given medium. The latter is a particularly important concept for modern technologies of communication, where the technical possibilities for constructing a

<sup>4</sup>These remarks may also describe the interplay of recent philosophy, literary criticism and cultural studies; for example, the Deleuzian 'lines of flight' used to enable accounts of 'becoming' in postmodern literary and gender theory. See, for example, Grosz, 2005.

message are explicitly taught and manipulated. The general point here is that, whatever the semiotic medium, the systemic concepts of Field, Tenor and Mode, and their related concepts on the dimension of **instantiation**, can be put to use in the analysis of narrative in that particular medium. In addition at this stage of investigation I also assume, though with a certain degree of caution, that the dimension of **metafunction**, as the meaningful realisation of Field, Tenor and Mode, also applies to all semiotic media.

In contrast, the analysis of the other three dimensions of systemic modelling, of **structure**, **system** and **stratification**, must be specific to the semiotic medium. Although analogies may be helpful, simply importing concepts from linguistic study into these three dimensions is counter-productive. To illustrate these assertions, I add here an Appendix with some introductory notes contrasting the study of narrative in language and film, and suggest some systemic choices in filmic discourse.

## **Appendix: Narrative in Film and the Dimensions of Systemic Modelling**

### **A1 Constructing ‘reality’ in film**

Julian Murphet emphasizes an important difference between story-telling in language and film (Fulton, Huisman, Murphet & Dunn, 2005:75):

It is important to emphasize ... the radical distinction between film as a narrative medium, and any of the language-based forms of narrative. In a novel, a long poem, a fire-side story or a verbal drama, the fact that what is being presented to us comes in the forms of words makes it almost ‘natural’ that we should posit a human consciousness as an agency behind the narration.

In the verbal narrative, the first order Tenor of giving information is readily realised in the speech function of statement, specifically telling, associated with the speech role of narrator, or teller. The second order Tenor will then be associated with the interaction of the characters in the subject-matter (one of whom may also be the narrator).

However, with film, ‘it is the machine [the camera] that tells the story’ (Fulton *et al.*, 1975:75). This is not our everyday human way of telling a story. In consequence, Murphet explains (Fulton *et al.*, 2005:76):

We tend not to recognize a narrator in commercial cinema...much of the narrative power of the cinema depends upon the erasure of a subject position from the narrative. Narrative cinema strives to be overpowering in its diegetic realisation; it overwhelms us with ‘realistic’ visual information, kinetic energy, sound and the rapid pulses of frequent cutting.

To the viewer of the film there typically appears to be only a first order Tenor of giving information realised in the mechanical function of ‘showing’. ‘Showing’ is as if viewers were watching a game of football, as opposed to ‘telling’, having a conversation later in which the game of football is the subject-matter (Halliday, 1978:144). With ‘showing’, there is no speech role of ‘narrator’.

Of course film can introduce a narratorial presence in various ways - the most obvious is the voice-over, whether external or internal to the characters, but the Hollywood or ‘realistic’ film narrative need not. Yet this apparently directly apprehended reality is totally constructed. In terms of the five dimensions described by Halliday & Matthiessen, the first question about film must be about the dimension of structure. The second question is how that structure can be construed as coherently meaningful.

### **A2 The structure (syntagmatic order) of film**

The basic unit of structure is the shot. This is a unit at the expression level, the level of technical production. The shot is taken with a continuous placement of the camera. A shot is usually fairly short, but it can be extended; the picture *Russian Ark* is famous for being made entirely with one shot.

The Mode of film is its organisation into a coherent message; this is the purpose of the textual metafunction, or textual meaning. Such meaning is realised in the individual shot and in the sequence of shots; the filmic terms ‘mise-en-scène’ and ‘montage’ are traditional terms related to such organisation.

‘Mis-en-scène’ has been used loosely for everything constructed in the individual shot. The specifically textual meaning of ‘mis-en-scène’ refers to the framing of the individual shot, the choices which bring one aspect into more or less

prominence. It could be compared to the systems of Theme and Information in language.

'Montage' has been used for the construction, through editing, of the sequence of shots. It could be compared to the choices of cohesion in language.

At the expression level, differentiated by the principle of rank, the structural units of film, resulting from editing, may be compared to the (graphic) structural units of the novel.

rank:	novel/text	chapter	paragraph	sentence	word
rank:	film	act/episode	sequence	scene	shot

The scene, like the sequence, act and film itself, is an edited montage, cut by various conventions designed to encourage the viewer interpreting a coherent story. (For example, the scene is constructed of shots which maintain the same temporal and spatial locations.)

Unlike language, but like other semiotic means of realisation, in the stratification dimension of the medium film there is no lexicogrammatical level between the expression and the semiotic level. The links between units are links of meaning, rather than structure, so that the scene is not a 'shot complex' comparable to the way a sentence is (usually) a punctuated 'clause complex'.

### **A3 The organisation of units of structure as coherently meaningful**

The question about meaning now becomes: how can this film narrative, which is a technical construction from the shots taken by a machine, be constructed so that it appears to derive from human consciousness, as narratives realised in language naturally appear to do? As Murphet puts it:

this 'becoming machine' of our cinematic spectatorship is repressed and translated into a 'human' perspective by a host of conventions designed to comfort and flatter us... mainstream cinema developed means for encouraging our belief that what we see projected on the screen is a matter of human psychology, human desires and human sense perception. ... What specific technical devices have allowed film narratives to project their worlds through the imagined eyes and thoughts of their characters? (Fulton *et al.* 2005:86-7)

We see here the integration of experiential and textual meanings through interpersonal meaning: the coherence (textual meaning) of the worlds of the film (experiential meaning) may be promoted through the subjective positioning of the narrative (interpersonal meaning). The narratological word for this is 'focalisation'. In Murphet's words, 'focalisation is the anchoring of narrative discourse to a specific subject position in the story; the projection of a diegesis through the interested "point of view" of a given character' (Fulton *et al.*, 2005:89). Focalisation then is a system of choices of interpersonal meaning.

Considering the metafunction of interpersonal meaning, along the dimension of stratification, takes one further than focalisation. A battery of filmic technical choices (expression level) which are conventionally associated with choices of 'meanings' (semiotic level) can be understood as choices of interpersonal meaning in filmic discourse. The following table suggests possible system names for such choices, systems at the expression, not the non-existent lexicogrammatical, level (comparable to 'Key' in phonology, though Halliday describes all systems as lexicogrammatical, Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 142).

**Table 5:** Technical Codes of Film Construction and Interpersonal Meaning<sup>5</sup>

	<b>Expression/Technical level</b>	<b>Semiotic level</b>	<b>System name</b>
Camera angle	High (looking up) Eye-level Low (looking down)	Power, authority Equality Disempowerment	<b>Status</b> (social role)
Camera distance	Extreme Close-up Close-up Medium Shot Long shot	Emotion Intimacy Involvement Distance	<b>Focalisation</b> (Narrative Subjectivity)
Camera movement	Fixed position Pan (camera rotates on fixed point) Tracking (camera runs on track parallel to action) Tilt (following movement up and down) Crane (high shot moving quickly to or from subject) Handheld Zoom in Zoom out	Static Surroundings  Involvement, pace  Effect of movement (drama, humour) Entrance to or withdrawal from material diegesis Participation in diegesis Surveillance Relation of subject to context	<b>Spatial Tense</b>
Focus	Sharp focus Soft focus Selective focus	Objective reality Mood (subjective reality) Significance, privileging	<b>Modality</b>
Lighting	High key Low key  Back lighting Fill (closest to natural light)	High modality; positive mood Low modality; uncertainty; negative mood High value Objective reality	
Lens	Wide angle Normal Telephoto	Dramatic emphasis Diegetic normality Voyeurism	<b>Affect</b>
Composition	Symmetrical Asymmetrical	Calm Disrupted	
Colour	Warm Cold	Optimism, passion, agitation Pessimism, calmness, reason	

## References

- Butt, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., Spinks, S. and Yallop, C. (2000) *Using Functional Grammar, An Explorer's Guide*. Sydney: Macquarie University.
- Cortazzi, M. (1993, reprint 2000) *Narrative Analysis*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Fraser, J. T. (1982) *The Genesis and Evolution of Time*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

<sup>5</sup> Material in Table 5 is collated and edited from Fulton *et al.*, 2005: 116 & 169, with the addition here of suggested System names.

- Fraser, J. T. (1999) *Time, Conflict, and Human Values*. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Fulton, H., Huisman, R., Murphet, J. and Dunn, A (2005) *Narrative and Media*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.
- Genette, G. (1980) *Narrative Discourse, An Essay in Method*. Ithaca, N.Y.:Cornell University Press.
- Grosz, E. (2004) *The Nick of Time, Politics, Evolution and the Untimely*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Grosz, E (2005) *Time Travels, Feminism, Nature, Power*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., revised Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2004) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. London: Arnold.
- Labov, W. (1972) *Language in the Inner City: studies in the Black English vernacular*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press.
- Ricoeur P. (1984) *Time and Narrative*, volume I. Chicago: Chicago University Press.