CrossMark

Offender Theme Analyses in a Crime Narrative: An Applied Approach

Reshmi Dutta-Flanders[1] 🔗

Abstract There is a great deal of research on the structure of narrative and its mode, and on the narrative positioning and counter positioning of the actor in legal and social contexts. In offender narratives, personal experiences are embedded for observation and analysis of particular realities that contextualize a disposition of the perpetrator being 'an undergoer' rather than an 'effector' of actions. This is evaluated in the shift from a narrated action to a speaker utterance in prospection and also in anticipation of the criminal act. Using 'grammatical logic', it is also possible to demonstrate how the crucial event (the crime) is not a cause, but an effect of a personal theme that encapsulates pattern of circumstances when the narrative outcome in criminal narrative becomes the product of its discursive practices. This is the 'story of intentionality' (my term) in crime narratives, characteristically embedded within the 1st the story of crime, the 2nd is the story of investigation [14, 20]. Using techniques from functional grammar and critical stylistics for discourse analysis, I intend to show an effective approach for the search of offender theme that underlies an act of crime. These disciplines provide the analyst with the linguistic material to analyse intersentential cohesion in a chain of semantically linked sentences (in written or spoken discourse) that explore the ways in which things are 'made to look' in the structure and functions of the English language. As a case study, I am using an offender narrative from Tony Parker's book Life After Life: Interviews with Twelve Murderers (1990) showing an effective approach for the search of personal themes underlying the act of crime. Offender theme analyses are also valuable for evaluating the changing nature or development of offender characteristics pre or post crime.

✉ Reshmi Dutta-Flanders
R.Dutta-Flanders@kent.ac.uk; reshmidf@gmail.com;
http://www.kent.ac.uk/secl/ell/staff/dutta-flanders.html;
http://cbconsultant.education/committes

1   English Language and Linguistics, School of European Culture and Languages, University of
     Kent, Canterbury, Kent CT2 7NF, UK

∅ Springer

1 Introduction

The 'story of intentionality' (my term) or 'intent' is about motivation that stems from the outcome of one's personal experiences and circumstances. This outcome in Jonathan Culler [3] is in the way of establishing a hierarchy of events,

> '*in which the functioning of narratives* … [manipulates the narrative outcome]
> *by presenting events not as given but as the product of* [its] *discursive forces.*'

For instance, the story of Oedipus[1] is about discovering the *signification* (meaning) of the fateful events of him killing his father Laius and ending up marrying his mother Jacosta.

As in detective stories, the revelation of Oedipus being the murderer of his own father is the story, but the significance (importance) of this determinate event is in the revelation of a prophecy.[2] The 1st logic behind Oedipus killing his own father must converge with the 2nd logic, i.e. the meaning relating to the *coming about* of a prophecy in the first-place due to Laius' past deeds. It is not the act of killing that determines the meaning, but is the search for the *signification* that leads readers to converge the effect (the significance) of Laius' prior deed with the 'coming about' of the prophecy (a cause due to the effect of Laius' past deeds) by murdering his own father and consequently the narrative outcome—Oedipus' tragic stature; such is the narrative theme in the case of offender narrative.

Discursive[3] forces in offender narrative make it essential that, in the interweaving of events in the discourse, the *narrative focus counters* the criminal intent or desire which is to be investigated and revealed; the *intent* is to be treated as a *product* of the discursive force in which the crime as an outcome is an effect of theme [3]. By identifying the order and perspective in which the narrative events are represented, the analyst is able to interpret the *product* of its discursive forces in the requirement

---

[1] Evidence suggests that the chronological order of the plays based on the saga of Thebes is, Antigone was first (442 BC), next Oedipus the King (after 430 BC) and Oedipus at Colonus last (produced after Sophocles' death) [24].

[2] Sophocles' version is that the prophecy told by Apollo at Delhi was that any son of Laius and Jacosta, the king of Thebes, would kill its father. They sent their infant out to die on the mountain side, but the shepherd who was supposed to abandon the child took him to Polybus and Merope, king and queen of Corinth, who were childless and they adopted this child and named him Oedipus, the swell-foot. When Oedipus was a grown man, he was told by an old man that he was not the son of the royal house. When he went to Delphi to ask Apollo, Oedipus was told of the prophecy. Oedipus decided not to return to Corinth, instead of going home southeast, he went east and on his way quarrelled with an old man in a wagon and defended himself when attacked, killing the old man who was, his father Laius. Oedipus came down to Thebes, where the citizens were oppressed by monster Sphinx. The monster would leave them alone only when she got an answer to her riddle. Oedipus answered the riddle and as a reward got the throne of Thebes and the hand of Jacosta. When plague struck the city of Thebes, the Delphic oracle declared it would cease only when the murderer of Laius was found to be exiled and executed. On investigation, Oedipus discovered his true identity and recognized that the prophecy was fulfilled that was made to him at Delphi. Jacosta hanged herself, Oedipus put out his eyes with pins from her robe and left Thebes [24].

[3] **Discursive**—proceeding by reasoning or argument rather than intuition.

of Oedipus' tragic stature over his crime. The narrative effect emphasises the *causal force* of past experiences manifesting offender themes[4] (my term) in,

Offender scenarios, such as

Prior to a crime (e.g. a bully, undermining self, solitary disposition, suicidal, grudge)
Relating or corresponding to the crime (e.g. offender rationale)
Premeditated action (e.g. as solution to personal circumstances)

The coming about of crime, such as,

Diminished responsibility (e.g. callousness)
Being a victim rather than an offender (a narrative object)
Offending behaviour (the justification)

Following sentencing, the outcomes such as,

The distancing act (the acceptance period)
The dual person (retiring-into-a-shell vs. the trouble maker)
Coping mechanisms (e.g. temporarily homosexual)
The offender moral: conscientious, being fair and loyal
Self-identity, confidence

2 Framework

The analysis of offender theme is about the way a *contrary logic* resists the *logic of signification* in which events are conceived as prior to their discursive representation. For instance, a prior event has made Oedipus guilty, and when this is revealed he attains tragic disposition in accepting its meaning. However, a contrary logic *resists* this *logic* by arguing that being his father, Oedipus cannot kill him; therefore, more evidence is necessary for Oedipus to acquire his tragic status. The force of the narrative relies on a *contrary logic*[5] in which the event is not the cause but an *effect of theme*.

---

[4] The **offender theme** is what influences criminality. It is not the crime that defines the criminal, but it is the influences before and after the crime, or personal circumstance that thematises the crime, making crime, not the cause but an effect of a theme that links to an offender background that is changing or developing pre-and post-crime.

[5] **Contrary logic**—in which an event is not a cause but an effect of theme. To describe this logic is not to quibble over details but to investigate tragic power (Culler 175). In Freud, the logic of signification (logic 1) is one in which events are conceived as prior to their discursive representation—the priority of event over meaning. E.g., a prior event has made Oedipus guilty, and when this is revealed he attains tragic disposition in accepting the meaning imposed by the revealed event. However, there is a contrary logic (perspective/logic 2) which resists the logic of signification by arguing that being his father Oedipus cannot kill him (the contrary logic), therefore more evidence is necessary for Oedipus to acquire his tragic status, hence the force of the narrative relies on the contrary logic, in which event is not a cause but an effect of theme. The play (narrative) thus brings to light **a deed** which is so powerful that **it imposes its meaning irrespective of any intention of the actor**. These **two logics** cannot be bought together in harmonious synthesis: each works by the exclusion of the other; each depends upon a hierarchical relation between story and discourse which other inverts.
(my emphasis) (Culler 1981: 175).

2.1 Textual Function

The meaning of the effect of past experiences is best evaluated in the metafunction in clauses in a criminal discourse where meaning and function come together by starting with a clause as the message; where the different kinds of meaning are realized in different metafunctions [1]: experiential, interpersonal, textual and logical (Table 1). For this study, I am focusing on the textual function in the clause as a message, because a participant role (typically realised by nominal group) is not a random variation; in textual function participant role creates relevance to context [12] by assigning *prominence* in an utterance as in examples 10–17 below.

Participant functions in textual metafunction may be semantically an Agent (a structural function or embodying feature of Agency), a Beneficiary (for whom the process took place) or a Range (that specifies the scope of the process); these roles can be mixed when having some features of the participant and some features of Circumstance (typically realized by an adverbial group or prepositional phrase), entering into the clause *directly,* participant-like as the nominal group, or *indirectly* circumstantial-like in prepositional phrases. Circumstance (footnote 5), unlike a nominal group, can be indirectly agentive (footnote 8) causing an action, while Actor role is more direct and volitional.

My focus is on <u>participant function</u> entering into the clause indirectly circumstantial-like (C element) in clause-initial position. If a participant is in the place of <u>prominence</u> in the message, such as in examples 5–7 in Table 2 [Note: A (Actor/Initiator), C (Circumstance[6]), M (Medium[7]), P (Process), G (Goal[8]), (Ag) Agent[9]], it tends to take a preposition (see column, 'marked Theme'[10]), and is construed as an 'indirect' participant. Similarly, the *information* in the C element acquires a special status in the clause as a message reinforced by the presence of a preposition and also as a marked theme providing circumstantial information, answering questions like, 'who by' in 5, 'to whom' in 6, and 'in what condition' in which the process occurs in 7 [19].

Hence,

---

[6] **Circumstantial** (C) elements provide information about: manner/how, location/point in time, extent/duration/how long/how often, quality/expressed by adverbs, means/by what means/with what, cause/why, comparison/what … like, degree/how much, cause (includes reason/as a result/why, purpose/what for, and behalf/who for), angle/point of view). (Thompson 2014: 116).

[7] Participant **Medium** is not the doer nor the causer but a nodal participant critically involved in some way or other with the process. (Halliday 1994: 165).

[8] An entity is a **Goal** through the Medium of which the process comes into existence.

[9] **Agent** is the external Agency. In material process, e.g. I (A) stole (P) sweets (G), it is the Actor who is the **Initiator** of the process and has a Goal (Transitive), otherwise it is the **Instigator** of the Process (Intransitive) e.g. *I ran,* where the cause of running is outside the given clausal structure. In Mental process (think, suppose, mean), the Agent is a Senser role, e.g. *I* (Senser) *mean* (Process) *I was guilty* (Phenomenon) and the process in the clause is encoded in one direction, from phenomenon to consciousness and not the other way around.

[10] **Theme**—a clause is organized as a message by having special status assigned to its parts. One element is the Theme, this then combines with the other part the Rheme of the clause, so that the two parts together constitute a message. Theme is the part that gives the clause its character as a message known as Thematic structure. First position of the clause defines the function of Theme realized in the grammar of English as a nominal group, adverbial or prepositional phrase. (Halliday 1985: 37–38).

Table 1 Metafunction

Metafunction	Kind of meaning	Status of clause	Clause structure
Ideational: Experiential	Construing a model of experience	Clause as representation Emphasize the **cause-&-effect** aspect of processes by comparison with the **deed-&-extension** one	Segmental (based on constituency)
Interpersonal	Enacting social relationships	Clause as exchange	Prosodic
Textual	Creating relevance to context	Clause as message	Culminative
Ideational: Logical	Constructing logical relations	Clause as representation	Iterative

(Halliday 1994: 36, 167, 172)

Table 2 Textual prominence

	Point of view	Non-prominent	Marked theme	Late news
5	Actor (A) (her nephew) **Transitive**	Her nephew (A) sent (P) her (G) flowers	By her nephew (C/ accompaniment) she (M) was sent flowers (O)	She was sent flowers by her nephew
6	Beneficiary (his aunt) **Transitive**	He (A/Initiator) sent his aunt flowers	To his aunt (C/location) he sent flowers	He sent flowers to his aunt
7	Range (the high jump) **Transitive**	John wins the high jump every time	At the high jump (C/condition) John wins every time	John wins every time at the high jump
8	Actor (Mary) **Transitive**	Mary sailed the boat	The boat (M) sailed (P) M + P (Middle clause)	The boat (C) was sailed by Mary (M)

(Halliday 1994: 164, 168 with some alterations)

> **Prominence** in the message …[is] functioning either (i) as a marked Theme (and not Subject) or (ii) as 'late news' – that is, occurring after some other participant or circumstance, that already follows the Process. In other words, prominence comes from occurring either **earlier** or **later** than expected in the clause; and it is this that is being reinforced by the presence of the preposition. The preposition has [thus] become a signal of special status in the clauses as the message. (my emphasis) [12]

Prominence is also reinforced as a Middle clause (M + P) without the presence of a preposition. For instance, as late news, *The boat* (is a Goal in the transitive reading of example 8) is topicalized not as a Subject, but as an *entity* (an object undergoing the Process) with Medium role through which the process of *sailing* is actualized due to an external doer/Actor/Initiator *Mary* (Table 2: column non-prominent). Note that Mary is also an Agent/Instigator of Process, and can be outside the constellation of a Middle clause structure. Thereby, *The boat* in Medium role is not a subject, but

a Theme that is about sailing (possibly for the first time), actualised by *Mary* (an Agent) who is instigating the process of sailing. As *late news* Mary features Agency and is also an <u>engaged participant</u> who manipulates the process of sailing. Mary is a *structural* Agent in Middle clause structure.

Let's now compare example 8 with example 10, where offender Danny in *subject position* is the Actor providing the Process of *stealing*. The C element in 10, *sweets from shop* …. is 'late news' and is part of the predicate in the subject predicate constellation.

Norm:

10. (extract a: line 3) Offender Danny: *I* (Actor/Initiator) *used to steal* (P) *sweets*
    (G) *from shops* (C) *but I* (S) *mean* (Ph) *all kinds do that don't they?*
    A/Initiator + P + G + C ….

<div align="right">(Transitive point
of view)</div>

Deviation:
Conversely, in 11 and 12 ("Appendix", extract c: line 27 and 28), the pronoun '*I*' is an entity (a victim of committing a crime on impulse), and becomes prominent in Medium role who is not the same narrating-I in 10, but an entity in 11 and 12, and following the *grammatical logic* is <u>functioning</u> NOT as a subject but as a marked Theme (i.e. prominent) in the clause.
Marked Theme:

11.	(cl. 27) Offender Danny: *I ran out of the house because I was very very frightened*	
	M + P + C	**(Ergative point of view)**
12.	(cl. 28) Offender Danny: *I ran like buggery*	
	M + P	**(Ergative point of view)**
13.	*If you had listened to me*, *you* <u>*wouldn't*</u> *have made mistakes* (*but you didn't listen to me*)	
		[Counterfactual premise]
14.	*If you listen to me, you wouldn't make mistakes, but I don't* <u>*suppose*</u> *you will listen to me*	
		[Hypothetical premise]
15.	*John* (Ag/Instigator/causer) *opened* (P) *the door* (M)	15b. *The door* (M) *opened* (P).
(Manipulative causation)	(Ergative Point of view)	**[Schema a**: Instigator-Medium**]**
16.	*John* (Actor/Initiator) *threw* (P) *the ball* (Goal)	
(Analytical causation)	(Transitive point of view)	**[Schema b**: Actor-Goal**]**
17.	*Mary* (Instigator) *changed* (P) *John* (Medium), *but it took her a whole life time to bring it about* (C)	
		[Schema c: Actor-Affected**]** [6]

In the above examples, from a *transitive point of view*[11] the direct participants are, Actor → Goal and the extension is linear. On the other hand, from an *ergative point of view*[12] [12], there is another <u>participant function</u> (an Instigator) or circumstance with Medium role thematising (or topicalizing) causation. The <u>causation</u> is *manipulative*, such as in example 16, where (causer) *Mary* is the instigator of the process and *John* is the Medium through whom the change is actualized. While in example 15b, *The door* (M) *opened* (P), the instigator of the process, *John*, is external and outside the clausal constellation making the structure non-linear. Because causation (due to John in 15a) like circumstance adds a feature of agency and surrounds the *additional participant function* of an a Medium through whom the act of opening is actualized. Also, inanimate entity, *the door* in 16 is indirectly involved in the process. Similarly, in 11 and 12, the effect of fright due to the murder, is a circumstance that surrounds the additional participant function of Danny as an Agent, who is running for fear of being caught by the police, and is an entity, a victim of his action (the murder). Thus, the circumstance surrounding additional participant function of Danny is *indirectly* made prominent in the Medium role, formulated due to an external cause that initiated Danny to run from the crime scene.

The difference thus between transitive and ergative interpretation is to whether or not there can be an *analytic causative* with the process (*John* (Actor/<u>Initiator</u>) *threw* (P) *the ball* (Goal) [**Schema b**: Actor-Goal]). Otherwise *causation* is *manipulative* due to participant function such as an <u>Instigator</u> (*John* (Ag/Instigator/causer) *opened* (P) *the door* (M) [**Schema a**: Instigator-Medium], or as a <u>Medium</u> participant function, *I* (M) *ran* (P) *out of the house* (C) [**Schema c**: Actor-Affected] in *ergative point of view*. Note that M + P constellation is an intransitive clause. In offender narrative, the analyst's concern is of the *external cause* that is *backgrounded* such as in intransitive structures, which becomes foregrounded when considering the

---

[11] **Transitive point of view—Transitive** clause is a <u>linear interpretation</u>. The function in the clause is defined by extension in the way of a Goal and emphasizes the distinction between the <u>direct participants</u> Actor and Goal only.

E.g. *Mary* (Actor) *made Fred* (Goal) *roll the ball* (C). This structure is configurational and cannot be extended like the ergative structure below. It introduces the participant function of an **Actor/Initiator** to account for an executive role in a <u>linear</u> clausal structure. (Halliday 1994:172).

[12] **Ergative point of view**—the clause adds a **feature of agency**. The structure is <u>open-ended</u>, and a further round of agency can be added on. The clause consists of both a **Medium and Agent** e.g., 'a' does something 'x', and 'a' makes 'x' do something.

E.g. *John* (Agency) *got Mary* (Agency) *to make Fred* (M) *roll the ball*. (Halliday 1994: 172)

The ergative is a **nuclear interpretation** and the nucleus of P + M has an **inner ring** of additional participants as well as an **outer ring** of circumstances (*John got Mary to make Fred* …) surrounding it.

The <u>difference</u> between ergative and transitive interpretation is whether or not there can be an <u>analytic causative</u> with process, *make*, as in,

The police (Actor/In)	made (P)	the bomb (G)	explode (C/manner).	Transitive
(Agent)	+P	+M	+C (manner)	Ergative
The bomb (M) exploded (P)				Middle clause

Lion made the tourist chase. X.

additional participant functions for an intransitive Actor in a M + P clausal structure (like examples 11 and 12).

Unlike clause 10, the textual functions in clauses 11 and 12 are non-linear, where the intransitive Actor does not provide the action; these clauses have an **inner ring** of additional participants that consist of both Agent and Medium, and an **outer ring** of circumstances surrounding the additional Agency functions such as, Actor *John got Mary* (Medium + Agent) *to make Fred* (Medium) *roll* (Process) *the ball* (Goal)) (see footnote 10 and 11). In this clause, Mary surrounds the participant function of Fred in Medium role through whom the Process of 'rolling the ball' is actualized. Similarly, in clauses 11 and 12, an outer ring of circumstance caused by fright makes Danny run from the crime scene, therefore pronoun 'I' in cl. 11 and 12 is a post murder *experiencing self* of Danny, <u>different</u> from its *core self* in 10.

Like above, in the textual function and also in the orientation of a narrating-I (in *modal sense* in clauses) the *vantage points*[13] that ensue in the analysis of extracts a-c below, present the narrating-I as a counterfactual or a hypothetical participant with reference to its crime.

2.2 The Counterfactual and Hypothetical Premise

Notice the 'if then' expression underlined in Danny's statement,

43. *I am the sort of person who if he's in a situation, a job, a prison sentence or whatever it is, he likes to get on with it to the best of his ability and <u>not</u> have hassle or give it either.* (p. 11)
44. <u>*If*</u> *people take me like I am, I <u>won't</u> give anybody trouble, you <u>don't</u> give us no trouble and we <u>won't</u> give any to you.*

The analyst is compelled to ask, did Danny by his own admission in clauses 43 and 44, kill his grandfather after all, in Danny's words, 'for giving him hassle' when he did not fulfil his request? Was Danny in denial of his inability to control his temper and therefore used the word *accident* (extract a: cl. 9, 16) <u>repeatedly</u>, so as not to appear that it was a consequence of his alcohol addiction (extract a: cl. 25)? The stylistic feature of repetition is used more commonly in offender discourse.

Furthermore, when describing himself NOT as a hardened criminal (extract b: cl. 43–47), the *iterative* use of rhetorical questions[14] expresses his inability to realise his anger problem as the *aggressor trigger* behind the killing (as pointed out in the St Andrews correction centre in extract c: cl. 40–42). Use of rhetorical questions is a *persuasive* strategy for *self-manipulation* as in management discourse [15]. Additionally, in the modal senses: *could, should, would* (deontic sub-storyworld) and in *Senser participant* role in mental processes: *suppose, mean, think* (epistemic

---

[13] **Vantage point**—Normally narrators speak from a vantage point at a specific time and describe the goings on, as an **omniscient narrator** who knows everything, or as an **external narrator** who reports only what is invisible and uninvolved character present on the scene might reasonably notice, and sometimes as an involved **character** at the time it occurred. [16: 156].

[14] **Rhetorical question**—in management it is a type of *persuasive* discourse strategy, where there is *concealment* of managerial self-serving motives when presenting information.

sub-storyworld) underlined in extracts ("Appendix"), foreground Danny's focus with reference to crime, indexing readers contextually to, 'the coming about of crime'.

Hypothetical premise[15] in the modal sense along with counterfactual inferences such as negation and the conditional 'if', together constitute an <u>alternate</u> world in Danny's account, that enables one to find further evidence of an offender theme of 'diminished responsibility'[16] in the implied falsity. For instance, look at the nature and the form of indicators associated with counterfactuality similar to examples in marked themes, 13 and 14 above,

Implied falsity in conditional if, or *implied rejection* of the *conditional premise*,

18.   <u>*If*</u> *you had listened to me, you wouldn't have made mistakes* (but you <u>didn't listen</u> to me).

As opposed to a *hypothetical premise* in <u>futurity</u> underlined,

19.   *If you listen to me, you* <u>*wouldn't*</u> *make mistakes, but I don't* <u>suppose</u> *you will listen to me.*

[22]

If *Counterfactual inferences* are utterances that are contrary to the known fact, and therefore are not true assertions [6], then counterfactual is also an *alternate world* that is viewed with hindsight [4]. All counterfactual meaning is pragmatically implied. *Counterfactuality* is not equivalent to lying, but an *intention of* <u>*concealing*</u> *the contravened known facts* from the hearer [6]. (my emphasis)

On the other hand, in *hypothetical implicature a predicative meaning* is intensified over a counterfactual utterance. By undercutting the lexical sense of volition and intention in hypothetical modals such as, *could* and *shall*, when appearing alongside counterfactual inferences in *negation* and *conditionals*, these features linguistically formulate, in the <u>distinction</u> between a counterfactual and an alternate hypothetical world, a *binary pair of events* constructed such as a factual one and a hypothetical other (with the counterfactual inferences), as we shall see in the analysis of Danny's account in extracts a–c.

Let's take up the case of offender Danny Morgan from the book of true criminal narratives, *Life After Life: Interviews with Twelve Murderers* (1990) by investigative journalist, Tony Parker.

3 Analyses

Case: Lifer Danny Morgan (on parole) was 14 years old when he killed his grandfather for not giving him pocket money after his mother had refused. Evaluation of three extracts (a-c) at micro level adopted from Danny's account are provided in the "Appendix": Tables 3–5.

---

[15] In Dannenberg [5: 307] 'the issue of hypothetical is vital … in its dynamic and contrastive interaction with events [it is] … deemed to "really happen" in a narrative world." There is dichotomy of 'narrator utterance' and 'character statement' [17: 88] when character's experience in hypothetical meaning is incorporated within its diegesis space as a narrator.

[16] **Diminished responsibility**—a plea under which proof of an impairing abnormality of mind is submitted as demonstrating lack of premeditation and therefore criminal responsibility. (Collins English Dictionary) Accessed: https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/diminished-responsibility 19th September 2017, 12.35 pm.

3.1 The Findings: Extract a

Extract a is about contextualising the state of Danny 'NOT being a criminal, i.e. linguistically establishing the theme of 'diminished responsibility'. The subject positioning of a narrating-I (e.g. cl. 3, *I used to steal*, and cl. 9. *I'd say*) is intransitive in a transitive point of view, but agent-oriented in an ergative point of view. With an intransitive Actor (who is not an Initiator and underlines actions like *steal* and *say*); the function is more manipulative causative (Schema c: Actor-affected), and not analytic causative in a transitive structure (Schema b: Actor-Goal). This can be argued as; intransitive clauses are more state-oriented (Schema c) than dynamic (Schema b). Additionally, a dominant Actor/Initiator narrating-I in Senser role (*I mean* in cl. 37 and *I suppose* in cl. 22) is more about an 'experiencing self', where the 'me' of participant Danny is set in opposition to his initiative self (*I used to steal sweets*), countering the *effects* of feeding his drinking habit that caused him to kill his grandfather. He is demonstrating a 'lack of premeditation and therefore criminal responsibility' over premeditated murder according to the definition for 'diminished responsibility' from Collins dictionary (footnote 14).

In counterfactual inferences, Initiator Danny constitutes a *countering narrative* [2] where the narrating-I is functioning as a Senser and also simultaneously as an entity (a narrative object) with Medium role through whom the personal circumstance of Danny's drinking habit is accounted for in the discourse. This is a feature of *double dipping* (in criminology) for multipositionality to fulfil different objectives of the narrating-I. The simultaneous participant functions in Senser and Medium role in clauses, are due to Danny's surrounding personal circumstance (like stealing to feed his alcohol addiction). Such are the linguistic characteristics of offender Danny's *experiencing self* in the discourse, also found in my wider research on criminality in the narrating act of *double function*[17] of tense aspects that provide value to Danny's present state against his backgrounded contrast in tense aspects, e.g. in perfective aspects about being an addict in cl. 22, 23 in extract a. Also, in progressive aspect a necessary condition is provided in cl. 19 *lying* and in cl. 21 *striking* for causation, and like the present tense form '*do*' in 5a (extract b) justify/instigate/trigger the act of killing his grandfather. Using such narrating act [6], Danny accommodates multiple foci in the simultaneous discourse functions of an Agent and Medium roles of a narrating-I, or a Senser role for the cognitive transformation of Danny's criminal behaviour. Danny thus is a *narrative object* in his narrative account through whom the *topicalization* of his personal circumstance for the offender theme of 'diminished responsibility' becomes prominent.

In Criminology, the simultaneity of participant position in the discourse is termed as *double dipping*, where the problem of multipositionality (as Senser and

---

[17] **Double Function** is where the present is given value against the backgrounded contrast in past tense. A withheld circumstance is indexed in the tense shift for content gap in narrator discourse. Similarly, in simultaneous participant roles (e.g., Senser, Medium role for default Actor role in Danny Morgan narrative) there is **double disposition** of an experiencing self of the principal narrator Danny, embedded within its principle narrator disposition as a lifer/murderer. This is for **displacement of focus** as a Senser or an entity with Medium role rather than the **vantage points** of the same participant in a narrating disposition. (Dutta-Flanders 2014: 153).

intransitive Actor in Danny's narrative) is tackled to accommodate the multiplicity of connections between entities, which are grounded to different objectives that an individual need to fulfil [6]. In literary criticism, such *parallel narration* in the story of crime is described as,

> *A polygenetic approach, in which the literary evolution of a new type of writing takes place.* [18]

3.2 The Findings: Extract b

Extract b is about contextualising criminality: the state of Danny being a criminal. The narrating-I in this extract is countering in *aggressor triggers,* the fact that Danny, who *likes to get on with it to the best of his ability and not have hassle or give it either* (cl. 43 and 44), can also become violent. As an <u>undergoer</u>, Danny's experiencing self is here *in opposition* to the violence associated with his anger (as an <u>effector</u> *he*), and in counterfactual inferences the act of murder is emphasised more as a <u>*process*</u> *of criminal development and change* from what he was in clauses 3 and 4.

3.3 The Findings: Extract c

In extract c, Agentive Danny in clauses 27, 28 also 21 and 23, is an entity with Medium role; this is because a status (both in Agency and Medium participant function) is *instigated* due to the external cause *fright*, that made him run from the crime scene, even though he knew he will be found out (cl. 32). Danny as an entity with (an implied) Medium participant function is a *narrative object* through whom the actions of *being remanded* and then *plead*[ing] *guilty* come into existence. By implied falsity or rejection of his conditional premise, as in extract a, an intransitive Actor Danny is countering the 'killing' of his grandfather as being <u>the cause of the effects</u> of feeling hassled and becoming angry when he is unable to get money to feed his habit.

Also, in line with the structure for courtroom discourse, the above extracts are an *elaboration* and are about establishing the *point* of the 'coming about of the crime'.

> **Orientation**—is about circumstance (who, when, where, what)
> **Core narrative**—is about what happened with reference to what was said, seen or done
> ***Elaboration***—provides further details, clarification, explication of aspects of the core narrative
> ***Point***—establishes the significance of the narrative account, i.e., the guilt or innocence of the defendant and addressed directly to the jury [13].

4 Conclusion

In the analysis of the three extracts from Danny's account, there is alternate positioning [2] of himself in his narrative, where Danny attempts to portray himself not as a hardened criminal. A scenario for an offender theme of 'diminished responsibility' emerges in the linguistic analysis when the events are narrated as a *binary pair* of events in hypotheticality, but with counterfactual inferences in the conditional 'if' and in the negation of reality.

Consequently, the reader's overall assessment of Danny's account is negated or is a conditional reality. A theme of 'diminished responsibility' is also linguistically analysed, when in Senser role Danny's default disposition as an Actor/Initiator in the extracts formulate *low topicality* for Danny being a hardened criminal, enabling him in cognitive transformation (in a change of state), as an experiencing self, to counter his established facts and withdraw from the real world of crime. While remain ignorant or in denial of his *aggressor triggers* (like the anger problem or his impatience when being hassled), as pointed out at St Andrews correction centre. In this way Lifer Danny (who was released on parole) establishes for himself an additional discourse slot, an *inter diegesis space* (my term) [7] in his narrative account, for an *identity* that makes his *perpetrator role* distinct from himself as a person.

The process of countering his core self (like an effector-he in clauses like, 27, 28 and 43, 44 in each extract) to reiterate, is constituted in linguistic choices like,

- The *progressive aspects*[18] in cl. 19, 21 and 37,
- The *experiencing self* as an undergoer in Senser role for low topicality of Danny being a hardened criminal
- The entity in Medium role topicalize/thematise Danny as a narrative object in the discourse.

Besides the above linguistic choices, additional participant functions of an intransitive Actor constitute an overall **Actor-affected** *schema c* (as in example 17 above) in the account, when an *outer ring* of personal theme (such as impatience in cl. 35) surrounds an *inner ring* of additional participant functions (of Agent + Medium) of a subject position intransitive Actor in the clauses as the message.[19] Intransitive clauses are not linear with direct participants like Actor to Goal; the 'energy input' from an outer ring of personal circumstance add a feature of agency to the intransitive Actor in subject position. Such as in cl. 24, the external circumstance surrounding additional participant functions is about, *if grandfather gave him the money …. Danny probably wouldn't have* [murdered him], and in cl. 26, the circumstance relates to *Danny not being able to keep [his] … temper under control*. In this way, a feature of (external) agency is instigated by personal

---

[18] **Progressive aspect** form causation [7] as a necessary condition, which is an effect necessary to justify/instigate/trigger the killing. In Ziegler [23: 7], '*aspectual meanings conveyed by the speaker's decision*, [such as in progressive aspects], … *refer to the action as* [being] *completed or not*.

[19] As illustrated in Kristin Davidse, in transitive model there is 'energy input' only at the level of the Actor, while in ergative model there is 'energy input' at two levels: that of Instigator within the outer ring and that of Medium within the inner ring [21].

circumstance and added to an intransitive Actor role, the clause then consists of both Agent ('a' does something to 'x') and Medium ('a' makes 'x' do something) participant function in ergative point of view. In Danny's account, it is the personal circumstance (of being unable to feed his habit) that makes Danny impatient and angry; this anger then makes Danny lose his control and commit crime—a case of manipulative causation.[20] In this way, transformation of one's experience (or a change of state) is analysed in participants functions like,

- a Medium within an intransitive Actor role, through whom the experience of *having been remanded* and then *pleaded guilty* is actualized, such as in cl. 35 and 36 (extract c).
- an Agent (Instigator) in cl. 43 and 44 (extract b) in subject position who is not an Initiator, but an entity (a narrative object) through whom the Process of *losing his temper* in cl. 45 is actualized, instigated by factors like not having money to feed his habit.
- an Actor role in cl. 45, when Danny does not *give hassle* or *give trouble* if his wishes or demands are fulfilled.

In this way, a backgrounded circumstance of an Actor as a feature of Agency or Instigator becomes prominent for the purpose of criminality. Additionally, in modal sense: *could, should, would*, though negated, a *deontic*[21] *storyworld*[22] is constructed where effector Danny expresses his degree of obligation. The iterative use of rhetorical questions (cl. 3, 17) as a discourse feature is also functioning as *self-serving motives* when Danny attempts to reinforce the murder as an *accident* in cl. 9.

A counter phenomenon is filtered in this way through an *evolved logic* of textual functions in clauses, which is different from a 'designed logic of mathematics'. By following the principles in functional linguistics and in transformational grammar (Appendix: Analysis), a logically woven and formally expounded construction of knowledge is achieved. As a result, the analyst can evaluate the psychological, the grammatical and logical functions in clauses, not possible when evaluating idealised

---

[20] Where the causee is involved as a non-volitional entity [such as Intransitive Actor, Medium], and the causer [the energy input due to personal circumstance and trait] physically manipulate the cause in effecting the caused event. Note that the notion of manipulative causation is traditionally expressed in lexical causative form. In my view effects of circumstance is also the causer that is instigated by personal traits [21].

[21] Modal verbs can, should, must trigger a **deontic-modal world**. While, **boulomaic modality** expresses desire or wish triggered by verbs, *want, wish*. Verbs such as *know, suppose, believe* express **epistemic orientation**. These are 3 **sub worlds** of the **text world** within a discourse. Text world is created in the mind of each interlocutor who are in the same **discourse world** involving face-to-face discourse participants e.g. author, reader etc. in the actual world. The content of text world is inaccessible, it is only a character-accessible world unlike facts available for checking and verification in the discourse world [25].

[22] **Storyworld**—there is the *storytelling world* and the storyworld. For example, after having narrated an incident of being held at gunpoint, the speaker explains to other listeners her inability to remember the person who was holding the gun to her head, and says, 'If it ever happens to you …'. As continuation of *exit talk*, the speaker is making it clear her inability to remember what her assailant was wearing. But in the context of the story, in this *swing phrase* the speaker switches the talk back into the story in the pronoun you (the listeners) instead of the general you in the Storytelling world. My emphasis (Polanyi, in Tannen 165–6).

clause structures that cannot be interpreted as what they really are as in natural living language [9]. Also in the analysis of one's experiences when transformed into meaning in clauses, enables the analyst to foreground an outer ring of personal circumstance as effect that surrounds the crime. Such as, the effect of personal themes of impatience and anger in the case of Danny allows us to focus any change and development in offender characteristics in the context of crime and criminality.

Finally, in identifying the perspective by which the narrative events are represented in linguistic analysis, the analyst is able to interpret the narrative's discursive forces in operation for a narrative requirement. In this instance, the narrative requirement is about perpetrator intent—i.e. countering of Danny's personal traits and circumstance as being the real focus in his account over his crime. And this narrative purpose is achieved in the counterfactual and hypothetical inferences that emphasise the causal force of Danny's past deeds which in turn manifest an offender theme of diminished responsibility over a premeditated criminal intent. This offender theme is also related to Danny's true sense of responsibility towards his alcohol and anger problems, foregrounded in a deontic storyworld of obligation. Furthermore, the trait of 'feeding one's habit' is an effect in criminal context, if remaining unmanaged, can cause Danny to reoffend, making the event not a cause but an *effect of the theme* (of coming about of crime due to callousness or being a victim of one's personal trait). Manifested in linguistic behaviour the personal theme is found contextually concealed from the hearer as contravened known facts (Danny's personal traits) in a hypothetical implicature for a predicative meaning of murder being an accident and not a 'coming about of crime' as a consequence of his alcohol problem. The theme of diminished responsibility is also intensified in a stylistically constructed *binary pair of events* when effects causing the murder are a factual one, but presented as a hypothetical other along with counterfactual inferences in offender discourse. Such is the analysis of the offender theme in Danny's account.

Appendix

Case study: Lifer Danny Morgan's Narrative in *Life after life* by Tony Parker (1990: Chapter 1)

Extract a   Context: the state of NOT being a criminal

p. 6–10
1. *I'd never been in prison before in my life for anything, and I shall never go back to prison again because I'm not what could be called criminal sort of person. … **3.** I used to steal sweets from shops but I mean all kinds do that don't they? … **4.** it wasn't anything big if you know what I mean. **5**. Most kids do little things: some get caught and some don't, that's all it amounts to really.*

6. *it wasn't anything big if you know what I mean.* … **9.** *I 'd say myself what happened was mostly an accident really, in the sense I didn't mean to kill him.* …. **15.**—*Last time, talking about being sad. …. I think this is the right way to look at it.* **16.** *I am sorry he's dead because I liked him, but … like I said I look on it it was like an accident, something that could have happened to anyone.* — **17.** *Which do I mean could have happened to anyone, the killing or the being killed?* **18.** *Well both I suppose.* **19.** *I mean the scissors lying there on the table, they needn't have been.* **20.** *It could have been a spoon or something.* **21.** *Or them sticking into him where they did in his neck, it could just as well have been his shoulder or his chest or somewhere round here where it couldn't have done the same damage.* **22.** *Or I suppose if I hadn't drunk a whole can of beer a bit earlier.* **23.** *That was all it needed with me, I was fourteen and I had no head for it at all, one pint and I'd be under the Table.* **24.** *So if I'd had less to drink, or even if I'd had more to drink and been incapable, I probably wouldn't have done it either way would I?* **25.** *yes or if he'd given me the pocket money, you could say that's true as well.* **26.** *I wouldn't say I was quick tempered person – normally no, I mean that's one thing it did teach me at St Andrews, how to keep your temper under control.* … **37.** *I mean I was guilty wasn't I, there couldn't really be an argument about it.*

Extract b   Context: Criminality (the state of being a criminal)

p. 11
… **40.** *Well I didn't know, did I?* **41.** *I thought that was why they'd sent me there, to find out.* **42.** *But I couldn't tell them, and they couldn't tell me, so the question never got answered did it?* **43.** *Now … I am the sort of person who if he's in a situation, a job, a prison sentence or whatever it is, he likes to get on with it to the best of his ability and not have hassle or give it either.* …. **44**. *If people take me like I am, I won't give anybody trouble, I'll be polite and cheerful and well behaved from morning till night… at St Andrews … the staff … were always trying to quarrel with you or upset you: …. …*
p. 12
45. *I could never see what good it was, and I either used to lose my temper or just switch off.*

Extract C   Context: Not being in control

27. *I ran out of the house because I was very very frightened.* **28.** *I ran like buggery.* — **29.** *I ran into the woods [near my house].* **30.** *I wasn't really hiding or anything.* **31.** *I think I was mostly in what they call a state of shock is it?* **32.** *One of the things I've never worked out in my mind is why the police didn't come looking for me.* **33.** *They'd easily have found me.*
—
p. 9

34. *I was taken off to a remand centre, and kept in custody to await trial.* **35.** *I got very very impatient because they kept taking me to court and having me remanded again, and I wanted to get on with it and have it over.*
— **36.** *I pleaded guilty.* **37.** *I mean I was guilty wasn't I, there couldn't really be an argument about it.*
[At St Andrews treatment centre, it was encouraged everyone lose their tempers and shout and scream. Danny Morgan was repeatedly asked,]
p. 10
38. *Why did you kill your grandfather?* **39.** *Well yes they were always asking me that one.* **40.** *Well I didn't know, did I?* **41.** *I thought that was why they'd sent me there, to find out.* **42.** *But I couldn't tell them, and they couldn't tell me, so the question never got answered did it?*
p. 11
… **43.** *Now … I am the sort of person who if he's in a situation, a job, a prison sentence or whatever it is, he likes to get on with it to the best of his ability and not have hassle or give it either. …. **44.** If people take me like I am, I won't give anybody trouble, I'll be polite and cheerful and well behaved from morning till night… at St Andrews … the staff … were always trying to quarrel with you or upset you: …. …*
p. 12
45. *I could never see what good it was, and I either used to lose my temper or just switch off. …*
p. 13
47. *I liked the people who ran it, they were straight down the line people: you don't give us no trouble and we won't give any to you.*

Table 3: Extract a   Theme: Contextualising a state of NOT being a criminal

Note: M (Medium), P (Process), C (Circumstance), A (Actor), G (Goal), In (Initiator), Instigator

- Linguistic expressions *in italics* and in **bold** is to draw analyst's attention.
- Processes are underlined to distinguish participant (Actor, Medium) and C in clauses

Clauses	Discourse features: Factual, Counterfactual, Hypothetical elements Rhetorical questions Tense aspects	Participant	Vantage point: Experiencing self Binary event Sub worlds
1. I'd never been in prison before in my life for anything, and I shall never go back to prison again because I'm not what could be called criminal sort of person	**Factual premise:** *I 'd never been* **Hypotheticality**: futurity: *Shall never* *Could be called* **Counterfactual**: Negation	M + P + C, And A (Initiator) + P + C Because C + C **Participant**: Medium +	***Binary pair of events*** (A factual self + hypothetical other with counterfactual

Clauses	Discourse features: Factual, Counterfactual, Hypothetical elements Rhetorical questions Tense aspects	Participant	Vantage point: Experiencing self Binary event Sub worlds
		Actor (Intransitive)	inference in negation)
3. I used to steal sweets from shops but I mean all kinds do that don't they?	***Rhetorical question***	Actor (Initiator) +P + G But S + P + C ***Double dipping***: (multi foci) **Participant**: Actor (Transitive) + Senser (an experiencing self for low topicality of criminality)	***Experiencing self*** ***Epistemic*** sub world of self-belief
4. It wasn't anything big if you know what I mean	**Counterfactuality**: Conditional *if* Negation	**Participant**: Senser (Elaboration of cl. 3: C + S (you) +P (Know) negating the criminal self with counterfactual inferences)	***Experiencing self*** ***Epistemic sub world*** of self belief
9. *I 'd say myself what happened was mostly an* ***accident*** *really, in the sense I didn't mean to kill him*	**Counterfactuality**: Negation **Hypotheticality**: futurity *would*	A + P + C, C + S + P ***Double dipping:*** **Participants**: Actor (Intransitive) + Senser (low topicality to evaluate murder as accident)	A Hypothetical other with counterfactual inferences ***Binary*** *pair of events* ***Deontic*** *sub world* (would) of obligation
15.—*Last time, talking about being sad. …. I* <u>*think*</u> *this is the right way to look at it*	Present valued against the past	C + S + P + C **Participant**: Senser (for **low topicality** when evaluating murder)	***Experiencing self*** ***Epistemic-oriented*** world view of self-belief

Clauses	Discourse features: Factual, Counterfactual, Hypothetical elements Rhetorical questions Tense aspects	Participant	Vantage point: Experiencing self Binary event Sub worlds
17. *Which do I mean could have happened to anyone, the killing or the being killed?*	**Hypotheticality:** *could* (a probability) **Rhetorical question**	S + P	***Experiencing self*** ***Deontic*** sub world (could) for obligation
18. *Well both I suppose*		S + P **Participant**: Senser (for low topicality of social conditions to perceive the completed action of killing as a possibility in cl. 17)	***Experiencing self*** ***Epistemic sub world*** for self-belief
19. *I mean the scissors lying there on the table, they needn't have been*,	**Counterfactual:** negation (when factually the scissors were present!) ***Progressive aspect*** as factual possibility	S + P + C **Participant:** Senser	***Experiencing self*** ***Binary pair of events***
20. *It could have been a spoon or something*	**Hypotheticality:** in futurity, *could have been*	C	***Binary pair of events*** ***Deontic*** sub world (could) of obligation
21. *Or them sticking into him where they did in his neck, it could just as well have been his shoulder or his chest or somewhere round here where it couldn't have done the same damage*	**Hypotheticality:** in futurity, *could … well have been* **Counterfactuality:** Negation ***Progressive aspect*** for proposition to be a factual possibility and form ***causation*** [7] as a necessary condition, which is an **effect** necessary to justify/ instigate/trigger the killing	C	***Binary pair of events*** ***Deontic*** sub world of obligation

Clauses	Discourse features: Factual, Counterfactual, Hypothetical elements Rhetorical questions Tense aspects	Participant	Vantage point: Experiencing self Binary event Sub worlds
22. *Or I* <u>*suppose*</u> *if I* <u>*hadn't drunk*</u> *a whole can of beer a bit earlier*	**Counterfactual:** conditional if negation	S + P If M + P + C ***Double dipping:*** **Participant:** Senser + Medium (In Medium role, the theme of, 'feeding one's habit' becomes prominent - an External cause that triggered the killing)	***Binary pair of events*** ***Epistemic*** sub world for self-belief
23. *That was all it needed with me, I* <u>*was*</u> *fourteen and* <u>*I had*</u> *no head for it at all, one pint and I'd* <u>*be*</u> *under the table*	**Factual premise:** in ***Perfective aspect*** which denotes a completed action Admitting to the effects of alcoholism	C, A + P (Intransitive) And M + P + C, C + M + P + C ***Double dipping:*** **Participant:** Actor (Intransitive) + Medium ***Medium*** role topicalizes the effects of drinking	**Factual premise**
24. *So if I'd had less to drink, or even if I'd had more to drink and been incapable, I* <u>*probably*</u> <u>*wouldn't have done it*</u> *either way would I?*	**Counterfactuality:** conditional 'if' for countering his drink habit **Hypotheticality:** in futurity ***Rhetorical question***	If A + P (Intransitive) If A + P + C (Intransitive) A + P + C (intransitive) **Participant:** Actor (Intransitive) ***Additional functions:*** Both Agent + Medium The circumstance of being alcoholic surrounding the additional functions Similar effect in cl. 27 and 28 in extract c.	***Binary pair of events*** ***Deontic*** sub world (would) of obligation
25. *Yes or if he'd* <u>*given*</u> *me the pocket money, you* <u>*could say*</u> *that's true as well*	**Counterfactual:** conditional **Hypotheticality:** futurity *could*	If A + P + O^{di} (me) + O^{In} (money) **Participant:** Actor (Transitive) (he-grandpa)	***Binary pair of event*** ***Deontic*** sub world of obligation

Clauses	Discourse features: Factual, Counterfactual, Hypothetical elements Rhetorical questions Tense aspects	Participant	Vantage point: Experiencing self Binary event Sub worlds
26. *I wouldn't say I was quick tempered person—normally no, I mean that's one thing it did teach me at St Andrews, how to keep your temper under control*	**Counterfactuality:** In negation, countering his quick temper as a ***trigger factor*** for committing crime	A + P + C, (Intransitive) S + P + C ***Double dipping:*** **Participant:** Actor (Intransitive) + Senser	***Binary pair of event*** ***Deontic*** sub world (would) of obligation
37. *I mean I was guilty wasn't I, there couldn't really be an argument about it*	**Counterfactuality:** Negation ***Rhetorical question***	S + P M + P + C ***Double dipping:*** **Participant:** Senser + Medium	***Experiencing self***, countering his guilt ***Deontic*** sub world (could) of obligation

Table 4: Extract b **Theme: Contextualising Criminality** (the state of being a criminal)

Clauses	Counterfactual or hypothetical elements	Textual function (orientation)	Vantage point
… **43**. *Now … I am the sort of person who if he's in a situation, a job, a prison sentence or whatever it is, he likes to get on with it to the best of his ability and not have hassle or give it either*	**Counterfactuality:** conditional if Negation Countering in negation the ***aggressor trigger:*** if hassled, Danny can flip (an ***effector*** Danny)	C + C + S + P + C **Participant:** Senser (***undergoer***) + ***Effector-he*** (an ***undergoer*** when countering the actions of an ***effector- he*** in conditional element and in negation	***Experiencing self***
44. *If people take me like I am, I won't give anybody trouble, I'll be polite and cheerful and well behaved from morning till night… at St Andrews … the staff … were always trying to quarrel with you or upset you: …. …*	**Counterfactuality:** Negation **Hypotheticality:** futurity will	C + A + P + C, A + P + C … + C **Participant:** Actor (Intransitive)	***Binary pair of events*** ***Deontic*** sub world (will) of obligation

Clauses	Counterfactual or hypothetical elements	Textual function (orientation)	Vantage point
45. *I could never see what good it was, and I either used to lose my temper or just switch off.* (cl. 23)	**Counterfactuality:** negation	A + P + C, and A + P + C **Participant:** Actor (Intransitive)	***Binary pair of events*** ***Deontic*** sub world (could) of obligation

Table 5: Extract c   Theme: Contextualising theme of 'not being in control'

Clauses	Counterfactual or hypothetical elements	Textual function (orientation)	Vantage point
27. *I ran out of the house because I was very very frightened*	**Factual premise**	M + P + C (An *entity* Medium through whom the act of running is actualized due to killing being the external cause to instigate running **+** ***Intransitive Actor*** with, **Additional participant functions:** Both Agent + Medium	***Participant functions:*** ***Agency + Medium***
28. *I ran like buggery*	External cause of freight instigating the running, also in cl. 24 and 27	M + P + C + Intransitive Actor with, **Additional Participant functions:** Both Agent + Medium	***Participant functions:*** ***Agency + Medium***
34. *I was taken off to a remand centre, and kept in custody to await trial*	Notice passivity—*was taken off* NOT active: They took me to a ….	M + P + C. And P + C Entity with Medium role	***A narrative object*** (Actor not in control of its situation)

Clauses	Counterfactual or hypothetical elements	Textual function (orientation)	Vantage point
35. *I got very very impatient because they kept **taking** me to court and **having** me remanded again, and I wanted to get on with it and have it over*	***progressive tense*** (See also cl. 21 and 23)	M + P + C Because A + P + O^{di} + C And P + M + C, and A (In) + P + C ***Double dipping:*** **Participant**: Medium + Actor (Initiator) (Murder being the ***external cause*** surrounding Medium participant function and agent function of the narrating-I)	***Participant functions:*** ***Agency + Medium***
36. *I pleaded guilty*		M + P + C **Additional Participant functions**: Both Agency + Medium (Murder committed as external cause surrounding participant functions)	***Participant functions:*** ***Agency + Medium***
47. *I liked the people who ran it, they were straight down the line people: you don't give us no trouble and we won't give any to you*	Repeated '… *you don't give us no trouble and we won't give any to you.*' In cl. clause 44	S + P, Ag/Instigator + P + C: C ***Double dipping*** **Participant**: Senser + Agent (Instigator)	***Experiencing self***

References

1. Bloor, T., and M. Bloor. 2013. *The Functional Analysis of English*, 3rd ed, 13. Oxon: Routledge.
2. Bamberg, Michael, and Molly Andrews. 2004. *Considering Counter-Narratives: Narrating, Resisting, Making Sense*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamin.
3. Culler, Jonathan. 1981. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*, 169–187. London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
4. Dannenberg, Hilary P. 2008. *Coincidence and Counterfactuality: Plotting Time and Space in Narrative Fiction*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
5. Dannenberg, Hilary P. 2014. Gerald Prince and the Fascination of What Doesn't Happen. *Narrative*, 22:3 (October 2014). Copyright 2014 by Ohio State University.

6. Dutta-Flanders, Reshmi. 2014 'Concealment and Revelation: an interdisciplinary approach to reader suspense', *Style* 48 (2) summer, pp. 219–242 and pp. 257–259. Available at: https://www.questia.com/library/p1129/style/i3785709/vol-48-no-2-summer Accessed 23 Oct 2015.

7. Dutta-Flanders, Reshmi. 2017. *The Language of Suspense in Crime Fiction: A Linguistic Stylistic Approach*. Palgrave Macmillan.

8. Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1973. *Linguistic Stylistics*, 11–26. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

9. Feng, Zongxin. 2014. 'The logical nature of Systemic-Functional Grammar and ''grammatical logic''. *Journal of World Languages* 1:3 232–241. Accessed 17 December 2014 @ 03.04. Routledge.

10. Halliday, M.A.K. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 3rd ed. London: Hodder Arnold. **(Revised by C. M. I. M. Matthiessen)**.

11. Halliday, M.A.K. 2014. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th ed. London: Routledge. **(Revised by C. M. I. M. Matthiessen)**.

12. Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold.

13. Harris, Sandra. 2005. Telling Stories and Giving Evidence: The Hybridisation of Narrative and Non-narrative Modes of Discourse in Sexual Assault Trial. In *The Sociolinguistics of Narrative*, ed. Joana Thornborrow and Jennifer Coates. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

14. Howard, Richard, and Jonathan Culler. 1977. *Tzvetan Todorov: The Poetics of Prose*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

15. Merkl-Davies, D.M., and N.M. Brennan. 2007. Discretionary Disclosure Strategies in Corporate Narratives: Incremental Information or Impression Management? *Journal of Accounting Literature* 26:116–196.

16. Polanyi, Livia. 1982. Literary Complexity in Everyday Storytelling. In *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*, vol. IX, ed. Deborah Tannen, 155–169. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

17. Ricoeur, Paul. 1985. *Time and Narrative: Vol 2. Translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer*, pp. 88–99. USA: The University of Chicago.

18. Sussex, L. 2010. *Women Writers and Detectives in Nineteenth-Century Crime Fiction: The Mothers of the Mystery Genre*. England: Palgrave Macmillan.

19. Thompson, Geoff. 1996. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. Arnold: Great Britain.

20. Todorov, T. 1987. *The Poetics of Prose. Translated by Richard Howard and Jonathan Culler*, pp. 43–52. Reprint. USA: Cornell University Press, 1977.

21. Ziegeler, Debra. 2012). The grammaticalization of modality. In *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, eds. Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog. Available at: www.oxfordhandbooks.com. Accessed 26th February 2015.

22. Ziegeler, Debra. 2000. *Hypothetical Modality: Grammaticalisation in an L2 dialect*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

23. Ziegeler, Debra. 2006. *Interfaces with English Aspect: Diachronic and Empirical Studies*, 7. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

24. Fagles, Robert. 1982. *Sophocles: The Three Theban Plays Antigone, Oedipus the King, Oedipus at Colonus*, 1st ed, 10, 14. Great Britain: Penguin Books, Allen Lane.

25. Gavins, Joanna. 2007. *Text World Theory: an introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Press.