Revelations on Grammar Teaching Based on an Analysis on Syntactic Structure of Transformational Generative Grammar and Metafunctions of Systemic Functional Grammar

Yibing Zhang
College of Foreign Studies, Jinan University, Guangzhou, PR China
Corresponding Author: Yibing Zhang, E-mail: blingbling@stu2021.jnu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT
English has become one of the compulsory subjects for students in China. As a foreign language, especially one whose grammatical structure is, in some sense, diverse from learners’ mother tongue, it requires teachers to research proper methods to present syntactic patterns for students’ sake. When teachers turn to linguistics, there are two well-known theories about syntax from different points of perspective. They are transformational-generative grammar, proposed by Chomsky, and systemic functional grammar by Halliday. Concerned that most beginners may be challenged to be exposed to a totally new language that embraces foreign cultures; hence, learners are supposed to start with what is called the most fundamental syntax—the five basic English sentence patterns. As for teachers, it is necessary to analyze those sentence patterns and come up with practical teaching methods so that they can help learner study more efficiently. In this sense, this essay is far too meaningful. This dissertation aims to reveal the potential relations between the two theories in analyzing the five sentences as part of the efforts to seek more appropriate ways of discussing English syntactic features. Also, hopefully, it may bring some enlightenment to teachers. The method this paper applied is comparative analysis. After the research, the two theories have their place in explaining different types of sentences.
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1. Introduction
A foreign language is required in the contemporary world from campus to work due to globalization. People are more willing to study a second language, which not only prompts social advancement but individual development. Indeed, language is what is known to us as the tool that brings people all over the world together. A new language represents a specific culture that is conducive to broadening learners’ horizons. China has seen that English learning is precious. However, English is pervasively diverse from Chinese. Taking its pronunciation as an example, some sounds are vacant in Chinese, such as /j/ //tr/ (代玉华, 2011). Diversity is the core that challenges both teachers and learners. Teachers are supposed to figure out where the diversity lies and which aspect of English learners are bewildered. The answer to the former is best to turn to linguistics and the latter, to do some surveys. This paper mainly discusses how to impart syntax more efficiently to learners by taking the five basic sentence patterns, for instance. The five basic sentence patterns are the most fundamental in syntactic structure. Furthermore, complex sentences and compound sentences are literally transformed from those. Back to linguistics, there are two extremely critical theories about English grammar; they are respectively Chomsky’s transformational-generative grammar and Halliday’s systemic functional grammar. In the research of the syntactic structures, the two great linguists gave their opinions(杜妮妮, 2015). This paper has adopted the comparative analysis between the two theories in order to find more appropriate ways to explain the five basic sentences. After the comparisons, it is found that different type of sentences deserves their own method to be illustrated. Finding
suitable ways to teach syntactic structure is easier for beginners to access unfamiliar language. Hence, this paper is far-reaching no matter for learners’ and teachers’ sake.

2. Literature Review
Searching in the CNKI, the author found 27 theses on the application of Transformational-generative grammar in English. 23 of them are about English teaching, basically in syntax. Deep structure, surface structure, and transformational rules of transformational-generative grammar are the main contents of the discussion of English teaching tactics. Many scholars use sentences to explain the ambiguity and relations between different sentences. They argue that transformational-generative grammar makes English learning in syntax interesting. However, in 宇文磊’s thesis(2011), she contends that though transformational-generative grammar is conducive to English teaching, it still attaches importance to the linguistic forms without taking the functions of language into consideration and English teaching in China has increased the trends towards the actual use of it in different situations. Yet, the author considers that transformational-generative grammar is still of great value in contemporary English teaching in China, for the grammar makes it clear for learners to understand sentence patterns in their initial stage of learning. As for the systemic-functional grammar, there are 155 theses on the CNKI. Most of them are based on the functions of English sentences in different situations and discourse analysis. When it comes to discourse analysis, the most distinguished one is Huang Guowen’s paper. He defines a text according to its stylistic features and length. In his view, discourse usually refers to a series of consecutive paragraphs or a whole kind of language composed of sentences, which can be either speeches or written articles (韩强,2017). A short sentence or two sentences can be a text, and a long sentence can be more than ten thousand words. Radford (2000) insists on the view of “textual meaning”. Therefore, he does not agree that a text is regarded as a combination of sentences but as a unit of meaning. Around the concept of “unit of meaning”, discourse is regarded as a linguistic example used by people to express meaning in the process of communication, which can be oral or written. However, many scholars do research on sentence structures based on the theory. They apply the metalinguistic functions to the sentence structures. In this way, the English teaching process can be better explained.

2.1 Transformational-generative Grammar
Transformational-generative grammar (TG grammar for short) is Chomsky’s famous linguistic theory. TG grammar has experienced five different stages, according to him. Each process has its own importance in research. After constant modification and simplification, it became a hit in the history of linguistics. Without exaggeration, at that time, the study of linguistics is dominated by him. The grammar all together is divided into three parts; they are syntax, phonetics, and semantics. The three aspects, respectively, are the research of the structure, the sound systems, and the meaning of a language (苏鹤,1994). The relations between the three elements are the same because their forms are illimitable, all generated by certain and limited rules, which could be understood as some principles. As for Chomsky, he thinks that those principles are stored in infants’ brains. In another way, they are inborn. As these rules or principles are connected to language, Chomsky believes that the competence of language is innate(胡壮麟,2015). Hence, he starts to study how children learn their mother tongue. It is common to discover that the language that children speak has some characteristics. First, their acquisition needs little instruction from their family, though their language is not as grammatical as an adult is initially. Even though his relatives might make efforts to constantly correct their speaking, it turns out to be in vain. Second, children can speak and understand sentences that they have never heard before, but their ability to create new sentences is infinite. The above two points consist of the logical problem in language acquisition. Thus, to explain the phenomenon, Chomsky figures out a good way-Language Acquisition Device (LAD for short). LAD is a kind of innate endowment stored in brains, including the knowledge of the nature of language (戴炜栋,2002). Since every child has a similar capability to learn his mother tongue, such knowledge is universal. Basically, those principles mentioned above are stored there. In this sense, TG grammar is highly related to human cognitive knowledge or the black areas that haven’t been explored by human brains. Therefore, the aim of generative linguistic theory is to explore how human brains work on learning a language.

2.1.1 Phrasal Structure Rule
The phrasal structure rule is served as a method to analyze the structures of sentences. Particularly, Chomsky doesn’t analyze sentences in accordance with words included in sentences but phrases there. That is to say, in his view, a sentence is composed of phrases rather than words. The relation between words and phrases is subtle, which is supposed to start with the word “category”. In syntax, category refers to the elements that serve the same functions in sentences in a broad sense. Different from their forms, the grammatical meaning is the same. Furthermore, in the narrow sense, it can also include properties of the units serving the same grammatical meaning. For instance, the category of nouns includes number, gender, case, and countability. As for word-level categories, they can be separated into two groups according to their content: major word category and minor word category. Phrases are syntactic units constructed on the base of a certain word category. It contains NP, VP, AP, and PP（谭焕新, 2015）. When it comes to the phrasal structure rule, since it is a kind of rule, there is some grammatical mechanism in the formation of phrases. First, the position of words in phrases is fixed. These positions are technically called respectively head, specifier, and complement. Second, the functions of these positions are closely connected to each other and to the whole phrase. The head is the heart of phrases, which decides the category of the phrase. Specifiers give precise meanings and limit the boundary of the
phrase. Complements provide information about entities and locations implied by the meaning of the head. Moreover, heads restrict the choices of the complement and include the information of the complement.

2.1.2 XP Rule
According to 戴炜栋(2002), the XP rule sums up the basic features of four phrases (NP, VP, AP, PP). In all four phrases, the specifier is attached to the right. These similarities can be summarized with the help of the template below, in which X stands for the head.

\[
XP 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Specifier} \\
\text{X} \\
\text{Complement}
\end{array} 
\]

With the hints of the template, the four phrases can also be illustrated as followings:

- **NP**: \((\text{Det.})(\text{Modifier}) \text{Noun} (\text{PP})\)
- **VP**: \((\text{Aux.})(\text{Qualifier}) \text{Verb} (\text{NP/PP/AP})\)
- **AP**: \((\text{Degree words}) \text{Adj.} (\text{PP})\)
- **PP**: \((\text{Degree words}) \text{Prep.} (\text{NP})\)

Simple sentences and coordinated sentences can be analyzed with four common phrases. On that condition, complicated sentences in English are overlooked as there are two sentences embodied. Apart from the four common phrases, a subordinate sentence can also act as the head. If CP represents a subordinate sentence, then the situation becomes as below:

\[
CP 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C} \\
\text{S}
\end{array} 
\]

C stands for Complementiser, and S represents Complement Sentence. A subordinate sentence is usually embodied in another sentence with an introducer. The introducer could be understood as Complementiser, and Complement Sentence can be comprehended as its literal meaning.

2.1.3 Coordination Rule
From the name of this rule, it is easy to imagine that this structure needs the help of conjunctions. Hence, sometimes structures formed by more than one element of the same type with a conjunction such as “and”, “but”, “or” are dubbed coordinated structures, and this phenomenon is coordination(苏鹏, 1994).

2.1.4 Sentence Rule
The basic structure of the sentence is necessary to be mentioned in the tree diagram below because there are some details worthy of attention.

\[
S 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{Infl} \\
\text{VP}
\end{array} 
\]

As it shows, a sentence can be divided into three parts: NP, VP, and Infl. NP and VP have been discussed before, but Infl has not. Infl basically refers to the sentence’s tense or an auxiliary. Take the sentence “A boy bought a candy,” for example; its structure is illustrated as follows:
2.2 Transformation
There are many different types of sentences in English, such as statements, imperatives, interrogatory sentences, exclamatory sentences, etc.; how these sentences formed confused a great number of learners. Transformation may be an answer to it. Language is produced by the combination of the knowledge of human brains and behaviors (贾芳, 2019). Grammatical research also follows the same principle. Transformation grammar learning is divided into two levels, the higher one and the lower one. The lower level is easy to understand, but the higher level needs to be transformed by a lower level. Among them, semantics belongs to the higher level, while pronunciation belongs to the lower level, that is, the surface structure. The development of TG grammar, though, is boring and fixed in theory; it is still conducive to analyzing English sentences from another perspective and then helps students to learn quickly and master the corresponding grammatical knowledge (尹虹霓, 2013). The surface structure is related to phonology; the deep structure involves semantic relation, and the deep structure can be understood through transformation. In natural language, there are many sentences with different surface structures, but they have the same deep structure that is related to semantics. In order to explain this phenomenon, Chomsky divides sentences into the deep structure and surface structure, that is, at first, some basic rules help a sentence to be analyzed as deep structure, and then the deep structure tends to generate the surface structure through another set of rules, which is called transformational rules (Robin, 2000). The phenomenon is called transformation. Next, several ways of transformation are introduced.

2.2.1 Auxiliary movement
Sentences beginning with auxiliary and Wh- are the two mostly witnessed sentences of interrogatory sentences. It is acknowledged that interrogatory sentences initiated with auxiliaries are transformed by statements. The process of transformation can be explained by auxiliary movement. As the subtitle hints, auxiliary movement refers to the movement of auxiliary words, such as be, have, do, may, can, shall, and should. The way of this process is that the auxiliaries move from their original positions to the beginning of the sentence, and the empty position is displaced by “e”. Take the sentence “Will the girl leave?” for example.
2.2.2 Do Insertion

Do insertion is capable of forming a general question that does not contain Infl. by adding a special auxiliary verb “do”. The way of doing this is to move the interrogative “do” to the “C” and replace the empty infl. with “e”. In the sentence “Do birds fly?” its structure is analyzed as below:

2.2.3 Wh-Movement

Wh-Movement circumvents the ways of questions with the beginning of “Wh-”, which involves “Do insertion” and “Wh-movement”. “Wh-movement” is to move a word beginning with Wh to the specifier position under CP. An example of “What does Susan do at the park?” helps to illustrate the phenomenon.

2.2.4 Deep Structure and Surface Structure

In the second period of the development of generative grammar, Chomsky proposed a linguistic model with semantics. The grammar of this time includes three parts: syntax, semantics, and phonetics. Enlighted by the theory of the “internal form of sentence” and “external sentence”, Chomsky put forward “deep structure” and “surface structure”. Deep structure is formed with the help of XP rules, and surface structure is the final form of the sentence after transformation. Each sentence has a deep structure and surface structure even though a sentence hasn’t experienced transformation. On that condition, its surface structure and deep
structure will be the same. In another way, the deep structure is an abstract syntactic structure, and it is the underlying base of the sentence determining the ways of interpretation of sentences. There is also one thing that needs to be mentioned. In terms of the relationship between pronunciation and semantics, Chomsky posits that the deep structure controls the semantic part of the sentence and the surface structure is in charge of the phonetic expression. The deep structure is reflected in the surface structure by transformation. This is a simple summary of the relationship between deep structure, surface structure, and semantic interpretation in *The Standard Theory*. Take the example from the last part, for instance.

As the two tree diagrams represent, the deep structure is diverse much from the surface structure.

### 2.3 Systemic-functional Grammar
Systemic-functional grammar is put forward by Halliday. It is more practical than transformational generative grammar by Chomsky because Halliday, influenced by his teachers, thinks that language is applied to use for some functions. Basically, systemic-functional grammar is composed of two parts: systemic grammar and functional grammar. Systemic grammar deems as a system of systems. People make their choices in systems (Halliday, 2000). Every system has an entry condition that is distinct. Since systemic
grammars is in relation to systems, its aim is to explain the internal relations in language as a system network. Functional grammar argues that language cannot be separated from social activities. Its aim is to reveal that language is a means of social interaction. Halliday (2000) believes that there are three metafunctions in functional grammar: ideational function, interpersonal function, and textual function. Hence, it is obvious that the object adopted by systemic-functional grammar is diverse from that of transformational-generative grammar. For Halliday, he takes the actual use of language as his target, while Chomsky's linguistic competence is his object. Systemic Grammar contains a functional component, and systemic grammar is the base of Functional Grammar. This paper mainly focuses on three metafunctions of functional grammar to analyze syntactic structures.

2.4 Ideational Function

The ideational function is composed of two sub-functions, namely, the experiential function and the logical function. The ideational function is used to convey information to communicate content that is unknown to the hearer. In the two sub-functions, the experiential function is mainly composed of the transitivity system and voice; though the logical function is not involved temporarily in this paper. As for Transitivity, it is the main component of the experience function. It is simply the grammar of the clause in its ideational aspect. Moreover, transitivity can be divided into six processes: material process, mental process, relational process, behavioral process, verbal process, and existential process. Material process refers to the process of doing something (Halliday, 2000). Take a sentence, for example; John kicked the ball. This sentence is a process of material for material process usually contains an action verb ("kicked"), an actor (John), and a goal (the ball). The mental process is the description of mental activities. For instance, I love it. In this sentence, "I" is a sensor, and "it" is the phenomenon. The relational process is characterized by its link verbs (胡壮麟, 2015). Nevertheless, it has two different categories: one is attributive, and the other is identifying. Attributive means that the position of entities in a sentence cannot be exchanged by their attributives. To have a better understanding, the sentence “Amy is beautiful” cannot be written as “Beautiful is Amy”. Hence, it belongs to the Attributive of the Relational Process (胡壮麟, 2015). But “The book is on the table” can be changed into “on the table is the book”; it identifies the Relational Process. Behavioral process refers to actions of human beings, such as laughing, jumping, etc. In “He laughs happily”, “he” is the doer of “laugh”. The verbal process is the process of speaking. In the sentence “She said to him, “The weather is quite nice today””, “She” is the sayer; “him” is the receiver, and the content that “she” told “him” is verbiage. The last type is an existential process. It explains the process of the existence of things. The classic example is that there is a bird on the tree. In that, there is one participant in this process-the Existent.

2.5 Interpersonal Function

The interpersonal function includes all uses of language to express social and personal relations. This includes the various ways the speaker enters a speech situation and performs a speech act. It constitutes mood and modality. Mood refers to the roles that people are playing, while modality is to decide whether a sentence is speculating or making judgements, which means the certainty of the sentence (Quirk, 1927). Mood consists of a subject and is finite. The former is the subject in a grammatical sense, and the latter can be understood as tense and modal verbs. Apart from subject and finite, the rest of a sentence is called a residue, which contains a predicator, complement, and adjunct. Complement, in some sense, can be comprehended as an object in grammar; adjunct as adverbial. On account of the structure of the interpersonal process mentioned before, next, the purposes of communication in the interpersonal process are to be imparted. People communicate to give or take things that can be divided into goods & services and information. Moreover, four tasks of the interpersonal process are discovered. The first is an offering that can be accepted or rejected. The second is a command in response to undertaking or refusal. The third is a statement involved in acknowledgment and contradiction (Yule, 2000). The fourth is a question that can be answered or disclaimed. The sentence “He will buy me a smartphone tomorrow” evidently shows the purpose of the offer because “I” can take it or refuse it.

2.6 Textual Function

The Textual function means that language has a set of systems to make discourses, no matter whether they are written or spoken, into a coherent and unified text which is totally different from a random list of sentences. Cohesion is the device that links the sentences to a text (黎黎, 2013). From the view of textual function, sentences are analyzed by theme and rheme. The two conceptions are similar to Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP for short) proposed by Prague school. The theme is the initial part of the sentence, and rheme is the rest of the sentence. In “Tomorrow he will give me an apple”, the theme is “Tomorrow”. Take another example, in “Me; he will give an apple the day after tomorrow”, the theme is “Me”.

After the introduction of the three metafunctions, a simple sentence can be analysed in three different ways. Putting them together, the structure of discourse is unveiled. That is the reason why systemic functional grammar is apt for discourse analysis. Above all, the outline of Systemic functional grammar is presented. However, the full picture of the grammar has not been explained (许雁, 2015). Yet, what has been mentioned above is sufficient for the paper to explain the structure of sentences.
3. Teaching Views of Chomsky and Halliday

3.1 Chomsky’s Teaching Views

Chomsky’s generative linguistic theory has exerted a great influence on foreign language teaching. This powerful theory holds that language is a system governed by rules and emphasizes the importance of language rules. Language learning lies in the cultivation of language ability. Language itself is mastered through the learning of grammar rules. Based on this influence, there is a teaching method that pays attention to the presentation of language rules and knowledge in foreign language teaching, focusing on the explanation of grammar and language knowledge. It is believed that students learn from one example to infer from others (Hu Zhauling, 2015). As long as they know the grammar, they can read a lot and master the language themselves. The traditional teaching of English grammar, to an extent, follows that. Moreover, the theory of transformational-generative grammar has contributed to the emergence of the cognitive teaching method, which is based on Chomsky’s transformational-generative grammar, Piaget’s cognitive psychology theory, and Ausubel’s meaningful learning theory. The core of Chomsky’s transformational-generative grammar is the rule system of language and the mechanism of children’s language acquisition. It holds that language is the innate ability of human beings. Human learning language is not a process of mere imitation and memory but a process of creative use; human beings can deduce, transform and generate infinite grammatical sentences with the help of finite rules (Hu Duni, 2015). This theory of “natural concept” and the creativity of language has become the linguistic basis of the cognitive method. In addition, some new foreign language teaching methods, syllabus, and textbooks are directly or indirectly influenced by Chomsky’s linguistic and grammatical views (Fang Xihan, 1990). The cognitive coding method proposed by Carrol is influenced by Chomsky’s rationalism research method, aiming at the current foreign language teaching theory, especially the dissatisfaction with listening and speaking. This teaching method is based on the belief that language learning is not a simple process of habit formation but a process of active mental activity. This method attaches great importance to the positive role of learners in using and learning a language, especially in learning grammar rules.

3.2 Halliday’s Teaching Views

Halliday’s theory of systemic functional linguistics has posted a great impact on foreign language teaching. First of all, it produced a communicative teaching method. Second, the register theory prompts the teaching method based on situational context and cultural context. The communicative teaching method comes from three theoretical sources: linguistic origin, Halliday’s meaning system, and functions of language, sociological origin, Heims’ communicative competence, philosophical origin, and Austin’s speech act (Zhu Yifeng, 2013). Among them, the concept of “communicative competence” was put forward by Heims in response to Chomsky’s “linguistic competence”. In his opinion, a person’s language ability to make grammatical sentences includes not only the language ability proposed by Chomsky but also the ability to use language properly. Therefore, for the first time, he put forward communicative competence, including “language ability” and “language use”. This statement coincides with the emphasis of Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics on “language” research and “speech” behavior research. As for the new curriculum, based on the theory of systemic functional linguistics and the communicative syllabus, a new syllabus is proposed, which is called the “meaning negotiation model” (Mao Chunhua, 2013). It can be seen that systemic functional grammar plays an increasingly important role in language teaching, but it still needs to establish a set of teaching method systems to promote the new development of language teaching.

4. Methodology

Several sentences with five basic sentence patterns namely Subject +Verb structure (S+V), Subject+Verb+Predicative structure (S+V+P), Subject+Verb+Object structure (S+V+O), Subject+Verb+Object1+Object2 structure (S+V+O1+O2) and Subject+Verb+Object+Complement structure (S+V+O+C) are elicited to be analyzed according to the two theories.

4.1 S+V

(1) The paper was handed in three days later.

(2) The man killed the king with a knife.
Subjects and verbs constitute the first type of sentence pattern. Simple as it seems, learners are easily confused by other elements, such as adverbs, and propositions, in the sentence so that the true structure is veiled. Systemic functional grammar explains it as a chart shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideational</th>
<th>The paper was handed in three days later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material process</td>
<td>Goal/ Affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/passive</td>
<td>Process: Material Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Residue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked Theme</td>
<td>Predicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The first sentence can be explained by transformational-generative grammar as follows:

```
S
  NP  VP
    Det. N  V  V
    VP    PP
      Prep. NP
          N  N  Adv
  S
```

The paper was handed in three days later

As it shows, both theories throw light on the correct understanding. But the second sentence is more interesting than the first one as the analysis of ambiguity is demanded. Here are two versions of understanding.

1. The man killed the king; the king took a knife.

```
S
  NP  Pst.  VP
    Det. N  V  NP
      past  N  Prep. NP
          Det. N
  S
```

The man killed the king with a knife
2. The man killed the king by using a knife.

For the second sentence, it is hard to tell the ambiguity by systemic-functional grammar alone because the three metafunctions of two different meanings are the same. The following chart explains the reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideational</th>
<th>The man killed the king with a knife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material process</td>
<td>Process: Material Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/passive</td>
<td>Goal/Affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Residue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked Theme</td>
<td>Predicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, English learners are supposed to study the slight discrepancy for the fear that they should not have a correct comprehension according to a different context. Hence, when it comes to sentences of ambiguity, transformational-generative grammar is more appropriate to be taken into consideration.

4.2 S+V+P

(1) The captain is on the sofa

(2) She is pretty.

The second type is laborious for learners to study, especially for Chinese learners, because there is no similar concept in their mind, so they are not able to assimilate such knowledge. Technically, verbs before predicatives are dubbed as link verbs. For the first sentence, according to transformational-generative grammar, its structure is drawn as below:
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According to systemic-functional grammar, its structure is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideational Relational process</th>
<th>The captain is on the sofa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Declarative</td>
<td>Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Predicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual Unmarked Theme</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the second sentence, in light of the two theories, its structures are illustrated as follows:

4.3 S+V+O

(1) John likes linguistics.

(2) What was Helen bringing to the party?
(3) Mr. Hu made a speech.

The third type is composed of a subject, verb, and object. For this kind of sentence pattern, link verbs are excluded from verbs, or it would overlap the second type of sentence. Structural analysis of the first sentence in two theories is explained as follows:

![Diagram of sentence structure]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideational Mental process</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>likes</th>
<th>linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Senser</td>
<td>Process: Mental: Reaction Phenomenon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Declarative</td>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Residue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual Unmarked Theme</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sentence “What was Helen bringing to the party?”, its structure is more explicit by using transformational-generative grammar in that the grammar demonstrates the process of the transformation of a simple sentence and the reason why such an interrogatory sentence is divided into such type of sentence pattern. Here are the deep structure and surface structure of the sentence.

![Diagram of sentence structure]
After analyzing the sentence, its original structure is shown—Helen was bringing what to the party. The word “what” acts as the object of the sentence, “Helen,” the subject, “was bringing” the predicate and “to the party” the adverb. Hence, it is reasonable to find out that the sentence belongs to the third sentence pattern. Also, for English learners, pictures always speak louder than words. By using tree diagrams, learners tend to have a better understanding of such sentence patterns. The last sentence of this type is illustrated below:

From the second and third types of sentence patterns, a question that since the second element of the two types is a verb, why the third one is totally different haunts most learners. Even many teachers feel desperate to put link verbs and other verbs across. Therefore, putting forward a good solution is necessary. Compared to the analysis of the two theories, systemic functional grammar helps a lot. The ideational function of the two sentence patterns is quite distinguished. Taking the two sentences, “She is pretty” and “John likes linguistics,” for instance, the first one is the description of the relational process, for it explains some relations, while the second one is the mental process, and the sensor is used to describe the subject.
4.4 S+V+O₁+O₂

The teacher gave him two books.

The fourth type of sentence pattern consists of two objects respectively, a direct object and an indirect object. The direct object is the straightforward thing related to the verb, while the indirect object is the target of the action. The following two charts are the structures of this sentence in different theories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideational</th>
<th>Action/Active</th>
<th>The teacher</th>
<th>gave</th>
<th>him</th>
<th>two</th>
<th>books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material process</td>
<td>Process: Material Action</td>
<td>Goal/ Affected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Residue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Predicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Rheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked Theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 S+V+O+C

John promised Harry to see the doctor.

The fifth type of sentence pattern constitutes subject, verb, object, and complement. Complements serve for the additional information of the subject or the object. Sometimes they are not distinguished immediately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideational</th>
<th>Action/Active</th>
<th>John promised</th>
<th>Harry</th>
<th>to see the doctor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material process</td>
<td>Process: Material Action</td>
<td>Goal/ Affected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Residue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Predicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Rheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked Theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Chinese learners, due to the different language systems, distinguishing the last two types of sentence patterns is confusing. The conception of objects is always mixed with object complement. However, as is seen below, both theories are capable of explaining the differences. Take transformational-generative grammar, for example; the reason why sentences are divided into the fourth and fifth types is that the sentence structure is distinct. In the sentence "The teacher gave him two books", "him," and "two books" are parallel as they belong to the same branch (verbal phrase). Nevertheless, in the sentence "John promised Harry to see the doctor", the relation of "Harry" and "to see the doctor" is hierarchical, for they don’t belong to the same branch immediately. From the two tree diagrams, differences are totally noticed. As for systemic functional grammar, ideational and personal functions aren’t the same.

5. Conclusion

English is a well-organized language, particularly its syntactic structure. Chinese learners who are aspired to study such a language may feel it confusing to distinguish Chinese from English grammar. However, syntactic study is necessary to access a full vision of English. After analyzing five basic sentence patterns in the two theories, the teaching and learning of English syntactic structure are not as hard as before. It is obvious to observe that there are options between the two classic theories to illustrate five sentence patterns, and this paper has already provided some good ones for teaching and learning syntax. The secret of the regulations of English sentence patterns is also unveiled, offering convincing evidence for readers. There do be some sentence patterns that are difficult to master(马选梅,2008). But if teachers and learners know appropriate ways to explain and understand them, syntactic learning would be of little effort, even fun. Furthermore, disparities and similarities between the two theories in a given sentence pattern also are clearly shown in this paper. To sum up, transformational-generative grammar is suitable for figuring out the ambiguity of sentences and how interrogatory sentences form. Systemic functional grammar is more applicable to distinguishing SVO from SVP. Two theories are both capable of illustrating disparities between SVO-O2 and SVOC. Hence, different type of sentence patterns deserves specific methods to be explained according to their characteristics. Likewise, in the face of problems during English syntactic teaching and learning, learners and teachers are supposed to refer to some linguistic theories. No matter which theory is considered, it will always offer a reference to the users. Certainly, since not all theories give the same answers to one question, separate thinking and analyzing in several conditions can end up in optimal solutions. However, the paper also has limitations. First, it mainly focuses on the feasibility of theoretical aspects of teaching and learning. Empirical data are needed to complement the results. Second, detailed teaching processes are omitted. Examples for reference may be helpful in teaching processes because it is also a challenge for teachers to simplify difficult points in grammar teaching. Third, the instances of each sentence pattern are limited. Whether the conclusion is suitable for every sentence calls into question. More sentences are required to be analyzed. For future research, it is better to combine practical and theoretical factors in discussions of teaching for statistical data are more convincing with respect to teaching practice.
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