DIK, SIMON C., *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 2. Complex and Derived Constructions.* Ed. Kees Hengeveld. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 1997. xx + 477 pp. ISBN: 3-11-015405-6.

This second part of *The Theory of Functional Grammar (TFG2)* sees the light more than two years after the death of its author, Simon C. Dik, at the age of 55. The publication of Dik's posthumous grammar is made possible with the assistance of Kees Hengeveld, Dik's disciple and successor at the Vrije Universiteit van Amsterdam. The text as it is published intends to reflect Simon Dik's views as closely as possible; with the exception of chapters 16 to 18, the draft versions of all the chapters in this volume were discussed with the author. It is a sequel to part 1 of *The Theory of Functional Grammar (TFG1),* published by Dik in 1989 and revised in 1997, to which it makes constant reference and whose content is presupposed. This second part completes Simon Dik's view of a model of description of a natural language, by dealing with the functional grammar of complex and derived constructions. It is designed to be used "for advanced study of FG by those who already have a reasonable knowledge of the basic framework of the theory" (*TFG1*: Preface).

FG is a grammar which is basically centred on the sentence or, in Dik's terms, *predication.* The predication, however, is not viewed in isolation but in context. In general terms, FG attempts to describe a natural language as an instrument which can only be understood correctly as functioning in a wider, pragmatic setting. This is reflected in the consideration of pragmatics as "the all-encompassing framework within which semantics and syntax must be studied" (*TFG1*:7). In particular, both *TFG1* and *TFG2* aim to describe and explain the linguistic expressions of natural languages of any type in a way that is typologically, pragmatically and psychologically adequate.

This approach may be compared with other functional-typological grammars such as those of Givón (cf. Givón 1984 and 1990) in that it attempts to arrive at a universally valid characterisation of linguistic phenomena, while recognising the effect of external factors which determine the nature of the common properties of languages, and resorting to genetic factors only when all other attempts at explaining the linguistic facts have failed. As a result of this typological interest, the grammars are enriched with examples from a wide scope of languages, ranging from Western (mainly English and Dutch) to other less common Australian or African languages.

In spite of being a functionally-oriented grammar, FG exhibits a higher degree of formalisation than most other functional approaches to language. This is in part due to the use of logic (for which Dik uses the term "Functional Logic") which enables the derivation of new pieces of knowledge from the knowledge the model already possesses. As a result of this, FG analyses of sentence structure often resemble the notational conventions used in formally-based analyses and, in particular, those of Chomskyan Transformational-Generative grammar. There exist points of convergence in the treatment of language structure in both grammatical frameworks, and transformational-generative explanations of specific linguistic

Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense, 6, 241-249. Madrid, 1998.

phenomena are often introduced to illustrate the line of argumentation, although they are ultimately rejected in favour of other arguments more compatible with the spirit of FG. Nonetheless, Dik's standpoint is absolutely functional and, as Siewierska (1991:1) states, he "places FG firmly within the functional paradigm of linguistic theory which he repeatedly champions and unequivocally opposes to the formal paradigm as represented by mainstream American linguists".

Almost equal in importance to the grammars themselves (mainly, Dik 1978, 1989 and the present text of 1997 [1]) are the various written contributions of other FG linguists [2], which provide applications of FG ideas to different languages or more detailed accounts of specific topics. Many of these volumes came to light as compilations of selected papers of the FG conferences which have been being held in Europe every two years since 1986 (Antwerpen). These volumes help those interested in FG to keep track of the development of ideas and the more recent interests within this theoretical model (cf. e.g. Bolkestein et al. 1981, Hoekstra et al., eds. 1981, Bolkestein et al., eds. 1985a and 1985b, van der Auwera & Goossens, eds. 1987, Nuyts & de Schutter, eds. 1987, Hannay & Vester, eds. 1990, Connolly et al., eds. 1996).

The present book consists of eighteen chapters, dealing with thirteen main topics involving complex and derived constructions. While *TFG1* mainly concentrated on the structure of main clauses, *TFG2* discusses the most important linguistic phenomena outside the boundaries of the clause proper. *TFG2* can be further structured in blocks by grouping together those chapters which concentrate on related issues, as will be seen in the more detailed discussion of the contents of the volume which follows.

It would have been useful to have an introductory section at the beginning of the book with an overview of the different phenomena discussed in the text and an explanation of how the author envisaged the connection between *TFG1* and the present volume. Instead, the author starts with the discussion in the first chapter of one of these phenomena, predicate formation. In this chapter, Dik gives a survey of the most important types of predicate formation rules as found across languages, by means of which new predicates can be derived from given predicates in a particular language. In FG each clause is described in terms of an abstract underlying clause structure (a *predicate frame*) which is mapped on to the actual linguistic expression by a system of expression rules. The construction of such a predicate frame first of all requires a *predicate,* which designates properties or relations and which is to be applied to an appropriate number of *terms,* which designate entities (cf. the Preview on FG in Dik 1989:45ff). An example of such a predicate formation rule is the Agent Noun formation in English by means of which from any action verb such as *work* we can derive the corresponding Agent Noun *worker.* In this chapter, Dik presents a modified approach to predicate formation in which he not only describes the processes involved, but also gives an explanatory treatment of how these processes can be functionally understood.

Chapters 2 to 7 and 9 may be grouped together since they are concerned with the description in FG terms of linguistic operations such as subordination, embedding and coordination which extend beyond the simple clause in various ways.

Chapters 2, 3 and 4 focus on verbal restrictors. *Restrictors* were introduced in *TFG1* to designate elements which restrict or narrow down the set of potential

referents of the term within which they are embedded (*TFG1*:116ff, *TFG2*:27). Of all the types of restrictors that may qualify a term, Dik concentrates on restrictors which are construed around verbal predicates or verbal restrictors (VRs). A typical example of a VR is a relative clause modifying a noun *(the man who is working in the garden)*. The term *verbal restrictor* is rightly used by Dik in a wider sense than the subclass *relative clause* to include restrictors whose verb may not be explicit (*The school* in the centre of town *is not very good*) but which can indeed be regarded as alternative formal expressions of a similar semantic configuration (*The school* which is in the centre of town *is nót very good*). Whereas chapter 2 discusses some fundamental properties of VRs, chapter 3 gives a survey of the typological variation across languages and of the ways these various types can be interpreted in terms of FG. After this detailed account of VRs, chapter 4 concentrates on the explanatory level, by raising a number of questions pertaining to the ways in which the variety and the recurrent properties of VRs could be explained. This procedure of addressing a number of questions, by way of hypotheses, and then discussing some possible answers to them from a functional grammar perspective is followed by Dik throughout the whole book. This is a useful methodological tool which simplifies the task of the reader in following the line of argumentation and endows the discussions with theoretical rigour.

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 present the FG view of embedded constructions. In chapter 5, Dik develops a semantic typology of embedded constructions taking into account the different types of matrix predicate (or superordinate clause, cf. Downing & Locke 1992) and the semantic constraints which these matrix predicates may impose on their embedded complements. The different types of embedded constructions outlined by Dik according to the type of complex term they refer to are: *embedded predications,* which make reference to a state of affair (*John witnessed* the changing of the guards), *embedded propositions* in which reference is made to a possible fact (*John knew* that Mary had failed to show up) and *embedded clauses,* referring to a speech act (*John considered* why Peter had failed to show up) [3]. The term *embedded construction* is also used by Dik to refer to adverbial clauses which function as satellites *(John will only take the job if nobody else is interested).* Other functionally-oriented grammars, while not rejecting the constituency analysis for these adverbial clauses, present an alternative analysis which views these adverbial clauses as *dependent,* rather than embedded, and which is considered preferable for discourse (cf. Downing & Locke 1992). In this analysis, adverbial subordinate clauses are distinguished from nominal and adjectival clauses which are indeed embedded and function as arguments of the superordinate clause.

The treatment of embedded constructions continues in chapter 6 with a discussion of functional and formal properties of these constructions. Within the functional parameters, Dik concentrates on different types of functions which the embedded construction may have: semantic functions (such as Agent, Goal or Zero), perspectival functions (or syntactic functions, Subj and Obj) and pragmatic functions (mainly Topic and Focus). In FG, the predication in general receives the assignation of three levels of functions: semantic, syntactic (or perspectival) and pragmatic functions. This differentiation of the three levels of linguistic analysis is present in most functionally-oriented grammars, starting with Daneš, one of the first linguists who postulates this three-level approach to language (cf. Daneš 1966). In

the discussion of the formal properties of embedded constructions, the position of the construction is one of the features discussed which, as Dik describes, is affected by principles such as that of categorial complexity (or LIPOC, cf. *TFG2*:127, *TFG1*:ch.16) and the iconicity principle.

Chapter 7 completes the treatment of embedded constructions by concentrating on the different types of these constructions which can be found within and across languages. Dik provides a taxonomy which is intended to have cross-linguistic validity and in which the first parameter used to classify these constructions is the presence of a finite or non-finite verb.

Chapter 9 concentrates on coordination, by mainly looking at the different types of coordinative relationships distinguished and how they can be treated in FG. In Dik's characterisation of coordination importance is given to the fact that the members of the coordination should be *functionally equivalent.* In many approaches to this phenomenon the requirement has been that the members should be *categorially* equivalent (i.e. should be constituents belonging to the same category), but Dik proves that, even if this criterion is met, the result may still be an ungrammatical sentence containing coordinated terms. His explanation is that coordinated members should have the same functions, not only syntactic, but also semantic and even pragmatic (for a more detailed account, see *TFG2*:192ff). Dik also rejects the traditional treatment of coordinate constructions as reductions of coordinated full clause structures (cf. e.g. Quirk et al. 1972:ch. 9). Instead, he proposes a "Direct Approach" to coordination, more compatible with the spirit of FG, which postulates "a coordination of sub-clausal constituents in terms of rules which directly multiply such constituents locally, in the position in which they occur in the clause structure" (*TFG2*:195).

Other issues concerning non-basic clausal structures such as negative polarity and interrogative clauses are described in chapters 8 and 12, respectively. A related chapter is chapter 11 with a detailed account of the illocutionary layer. In chapter 8 Dik considers negation (which he views as an operator [4] rather than a satellite) from various angles including what precisely is denied or negated, the pragmatic and semantic values of negation and the different strategies which may manifest it in formal expression. Following Lyons (1977), the author makes a distinction between *predicational negation* and *propositional negation* on semantic and pragmatic grounds. The former reflects an objective statement of the non-occurrence of some state of affair *(John is not rich)*; the latter indicates a subjective denial of some pre-established proposition (*John is NOT rich* —as the addressee seems to imply). The first form of negation involves a case of New or Completive Focus, the second a case of Counter-Presuppositional Focus (cf. *TFG1*:13.4).

Chapter 12 describes how different types of interrogative clauses can be treated in FG, including the various responses which may be given to questions. A large portion of the chapter concentrates on Q-word questions which, for Dik, display the most interesting properties, especially in their interrelations with verbal restrictors (cf. chapters 2-4), on the one hand, and Cleft constructions (cf. chapters 13-14), on the other. With respect to this second type of relationship, Dik's statement that Q-word questions are a particular type of Focus construction is highly questionable. Focus constructions are defined in *TFG1*:278 as "constructions which intrinsically define a specific constituent as having the Focus function"; the typical construction

included in this group is the Cleft construction. It is true that there exist Q-word questions which take the form of a Cleft construction *(What was it that Peter found in the garden?)* but this cannot be considered the basic pattern, at least in the more common Western languages. Also worrying is the constant use of unnatural examples for which a clear context of occurrence is difficult to find [5]. Much more successful is the discussion of the various types of responses and the distinction between answers and responses.

Questions are sentence types with interrogative illocutionary force as their basic illocution, but other derived illocutions (such as Exclamation, Request or Rhetorical Question) can be also found in interrogatives by conversion of the interrogative illocutionary operator. Chapter 11 centres around these basic and derived illocutions of the different sentence types. The chapter outlines the work of scholars such as Austin and Searle in what is a useful review of Speech Act Theory.

Chapters 13 and 14 can be grouped together in terms of their similar concern, the use of Focus constructions, special complex constructions which specifically have the function of bringing some Focus constituent into prominence. Focus constructions are typically represented by Cleft constructions. These include not only "prototypical" Cleft and Pseudocleft sentences, but also identifying constructions with "classificatory" head nouns such as *person, thing,* etc. in one of the arguments of the construction *(The thing I found is John's watch).* This is in agreement with the treatment given to both identifying and Cleft constructions and their inclusion in the same group as Focus constructions in other related works (cf. Moreno Cabrera 1987, Martínez Caro 1995:ch.5). Similarly, Dik rightly distinguishes between prototypical Clefts such as (1) and constructions such as (2):

(1) a. *It was JOHN with whom I went to New York.*
b. *It was JOHN that I went to New York with.*
(2) *It was WITH JOHN that I went to New York.*

by positing a different analysis for each of them. The embedded clause in (2) is not a relative construction as in the prototypical clefts, but a general subordinate *that*-clause. In semantic terms, constructions of type (1) and (2) have also different types of predications: whereas (1) contains identifying constructions, (2) is a property-assigning one.

In chapter 14, Dik discusses three more specific phenomena concerning Focus constructions. I would like to draw the reader's attention to one of these issues, the process of "demarking" of Focus constructions, which can serve to illustrate the use of diachronic features in Dik's functional explanations. By the "demarking" of Focus constructions, the author understands certain grammatical phenomena in (mutually unrelated) languages through which "an originally marked Focus construction is increasingly used in conditions in which no special focusing is called for, and finally ends up as the pragmatically neutral, unmarked clause type of the language involved" (*TFG2*:325). This is a process typically associated with languages with P1VSO order [6] (such as Spanish) in which the demarking of the Focus construction may end up in a variation in the ordering of constituents as the only trace of its earlier existence as a marked Focus construction. Furthermore, Dik wishes to include the previous demarking process in a more general principle which states that any pragmatically

marked construction may undergo markedness shift, finally leading to a pragmatically unmarked, neutral construction type. This may again be applied to Spanish, in which constructions which were formerly pragmatically marked (and which are currently so in other languages such as English) have become grammaticalised (neutral) constructions in some contexts. Left and right dislocations provide an instance of such demarking in Spanish [7].

The following two chapters discuss two further theoretical issues. Chapter 15 describes and explains certain discrepancies between underlying clause structure and surface expression including the construction of Raising. Chapter 16 presents the basic notions relevant to a theory of *accessibility*, understood as the capacity of a term to be the target of some grammatical operation, by dealing with the various types of constraints explaining the inapplicability of a particular operation to a particular term.

Finally, a further set of chapters reflects the increasing interest in FG in matters pertaining to the discourse and the pragmatics of verbal interaction, as can be seen by the publication of two recent volumes on FG (Connolly et al., eds. 1996 and Bolkestein & Hannay, eds. forthcoming). While chapter 18 presents a preliminary version of a functional grammar of discourse, chapters 17 and 10 give an account of two further issues with implications for the organisation of the discourse, extra-clausal constituents and anaphoric relations, respectively.

Particularly interesting is the discussion of extra-clausal constituents (ECCs) in Chapter 17. This completes the study of intra-clausal constituents and pragmatic functions provided in *TFG1*:ch.13 and reflects FG's concern with spoken discourse. Moreover, the discussion is most welcome in grammatical theory, which has so far devoted much less attention to this type of constituent than to clausal-internal elements. Dik's account of ECCs centres on their typology, in terms of position and, more importantly, function. By and large, ECCs fulfill a wide range of functions, from the interactional and attitudinal to those of discourse organisation. Related to the latter, Dik distinguishes three main pragmatic functions: Boundary marking, Orientation and Tail. The wider pragmatic function of Orientation reformulates Dik's function of Theme (cf. *TFG1*:13.1). This is a kind of pragmatic superfunction which includes others such as Theme, Condition and Setting. Dik wishes to make a clear distinction between Theme (a function outside the clause) and Topic (one of the two pragmatic functions within the clause, the other one being Focus). However, if Theme (and, more generally, Orientation) is closely associated with the notion of topicality, then we could ask what difference there is between intra-clausal Topic and extra-clausal Theme (ie. why have two labels referring to similar, if not the same, concept), especially when Dik himself uses the term "integrated Theme" for Topic (cf. *TFG2*:398). The discussion is otherwise detailed, well illustrated with examples and illuminating.

The last chapter is meant as a first step towards a grammatical model that takes into account levels of linguistic organisation higher than the clause. As Dik himself is cautious enough to state, this is indeed just the bare outlines of what a theory of discourse should look like. The discussion is centred on three main lines: the decisions that S must take in building up a discourse, the overall organisation of a discourse and the notion of discourse coherence. The second of these topics considers discourse as having a hierarchical, layered structure. Each of the layers is

represented by different types of units, which are viewed as subdivisions of a *discourse event,* both from the interactional point of view and from the point of view of the content. In relation to the concept of coherence, the author considers what factors contribute to both local and global discourse coherence. Among these, Dik mentions notions such as *frame* and *script, iconicity,* the use of *connectors,* and the importance of the pragmatic functions *Topic* and *Focus* for coherence.

Despite the introductory character of the chapter, Dik does indeed touch upon those main features of discourse which should be taken into account in a discourse grammatical model. It would be desirable that, in view of its own standards of adequacy and of the recent interests in linguistic theory, FG should progressively develop into such a model.

On the whole, the book is a successful attempt to provide the reader with both a descriptive *and* explanatory grammar of complex and derived constructions from a functional perspective.

Among the drawbacks found, one could mention the use of isolated, invented, and often unnatural examples, which seem inappropriate in a grammar whose aim is to describe a natural language as functioning in a wider, pragmatic setting. In general, it would have been helpful, for a greater comprehension, to have included more examples illustrating the theoretical discussions; this is especially obvious in chapter 18.

A certain degree of superficiality has been also observed in the account of some phenomena in particular languages, as a consequence of the wish to account for as many languages as possible, in an attempt to arrive at universal explanations. Finally, some issues which were not discussed in depth in *TGF1* are left unmentioned here. Particularly striking in this respect is the poor treatment given in FG to prosodic features.

Despite these disadvantages, *TFG2* is an *essential* text for advanced students of FG and in general for any scholar interested in functional-oriented (or even other more formal) models of language. It has been a long-awaited and much-needed book which successfully completes the treatment of FG given in *TFG1,* by providing a description of a natural language that is typological, pragmatically and psychologically adequate. Like the first part, it will assuredly be the standard current reference book on FG for many years to come.

NOTES

[1] Siewierska (1991) is an excellent critical account of FG and highly recommendable for any scholar in linguistics wishing to learn the working of the model.

[2] Such as the *Working Papers in Functional Grammar,* available from IFOTT, Institute for Functional Research in Language and Language Use, University of Amsterdam.

[3] These are Dik's examples. For a detailed account of the higher layers of underlying clause structure (Predication, Proposition and Clause), see *TFG1:* ch. 12.

[4] The term *operator* is used in FG to refer to modifications and modulations of linguistic expressions effected by grammatical means (Siewierska 1991:20).

[5] This is particularly obvious in the discussions of echo-questions (Q-pattern strategy) and multiple Q-word questions.

[6] P1 in FG is a clause-initial special position for constituents with the pragmatic function of Topic or Focus or other special constituents such as subordinators, relative pronouns, etc.

[7] The following examples in Spanish may serve as illustration of one of these processes (left dislocation or, in Dik's terms, Theme+Clause construction):

a. La ropa ya la he lavado.
b. El coche lo vendí la semana pasada.
c. A mi hermano le encanta el fútbol.

REFERENCES

van der Auwera, Johan and Louis Goossens (eds.) (1987). *Ins and Outs of the Predication.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Bolkestein, A. Machtelt, Henk A. Combé, Simon C. Dik, Casper de Groot, Jadranka Gvozdanovic and Co Vet (1981). *Predication and Expression in Functional Grammar.* London: Academic Press.

Bolkestein, A. Machtelt, Casper de Groot and J. Lachlan Mackenzie (eds.) (1985a). *Syntax and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Bolkestein, A. Machtelt, Casper de Groot and J. Lachlan Mackenzie (eds.) (1985b). *Predicates and Terms in Functional Grammar.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Bolkestein, Machtelt, and Mike Hannay (eds.) (forthcoming). *Functional Grammar and Verbal Interaction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Connolly, John H., Roel M. Vismans, Christopher S. Butler and Richard A. Gatward (eds.) (1996). *Discourse and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Daneš, Frantisek (1966). A three-level approach to syntax. *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* 1, 225-240.

Dik, Simon C. (1978). *Functional Grammar.* Amsterdam: North-Holland (3rd printing 1981, Dordrecht: Foris).

Dik, Simon C. (1989). *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1. The Structure of the Clause.* Dordrecht: Foris. (2nd rev. ed., 1997, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter).

Downing, Angela and Philip Locke (1992). *A University Course in English Grammar.* Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.

Givón, Talmy (1984) and (1990). *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction.* 2 vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hannay, Mike and Elsevine Vester (eds.) (1990). *Working with FG; Descriptive and Computational Applications.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Hoekstra, Teun, Harry van der Hulst and Michael Moortgat (eds.) (1981). *Perspectives on Functional Grammar.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Lyons, John (1977). *Semantics.* 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martínez Caro, Elena (1995). *Funciones Pragmáticas, Orden de Constituyentes y Acentuación en Inglés y en Español. Estudio de Corpus.* Tesis Doctoral. Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Moreno Cabrera, Juan Carlos (1987). *Fundamentos de Sintaxis General.* Madrid: Síntesis.

Nuyts, Jan and Georges de Schutter (eds.) (1987). *Getting One's Words into Line. On Word Order and Functional Grammar.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* London: Longman.
Siewierska, Anna (1991). *Functional Grammar.* London: Routledge.

Elena Martínez Caro
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Departamento de Filología Inglesa
Facultad de Filología
28040 Madrid (SPAIN)
E-mail: fling09 @ sis.ucm.es