



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/94920/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Vismans, R. (2015) J. Lachlan Mackenzie & Hella Olbertz (eds.) Casebook in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Functions of Language*, 22 (2). pp. 264-269. ISSN: 1569-9765

<https://doi.org/10.1075/foL.22.2.04vis>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

**J. Lachlan Mackenzie & Hella Olbertz (eds.)** *Casebook in Functional Discourse Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins 2013, ix + 313 pp. (ISBN 978 90 272 0604 6 (Hb)/ 978 90 272 158 7 (Eb))

**Reviewed by Roel Vismans (University of Sheffield)**

In the Introduction to this volume its editors describe their *Casebook in Functional Discourse Grammar* as “a representative and reliable sample of current work in a relatively new framework”. At the same time it is “a tribute to the intellectual father of FDG”, Kees Hengeveld (p. 1). The intended reader of the *Casebook* remains implied, but it is clearly not for the totally uninitiated because any reader will at times want to refer to Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008), the model’s comprehensive description on which much of the *Casebook* builds and which is therefore a central reference point. The *Casebook* consists of ten chapters covering a variety of issues and drawing on a wide range of (typologically and genetically) different languages. The first three chapters discuss the (application of the) model to a large number of languages and are thus clearly typological in nature, whereas the focus in the seven remaining chapters is on one or two individual languages. Below, I will briefly outline and comment on each chapter before giving an overall appreciation of the book.

The Introduction presents a potted history of Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG) and its predecessor, Functional Grammar (FG), a school of functional linguistics founded in Amsterdam by Hengeveld’s mentor, Simon C. Dik, in the 1970s. The extension of FG into FDG took place in the early years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. As the editors point out (p. 4), “a principle that is fundamental to FDG, is that of layering”. This principle was already present in FG, but FDG has embraced it further and in every chapter this *Casebook* illustrates again and again how important layering is to FDG’s explanations for linguistic phenomena and its answers to linguistic problems. It is unfortunate, therefore, that the Introduction’s figure outlining the “overall architecture of FDG theory of verbal interaction” (Figure 1, p. 3) does not clarify the layering terminology as fully as a more elaborate figure in Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 13; Figure 2. “General layout of FDG”). Briefly, FDG’s architecture consists of four Components: the Conceptual, Contextual, Grammatical and Output Components. Most of the book is concerned with the Grammatical Component where four Levels are distinguished: Interpersonal, Representational, Morphosyntactic and Phonological. Finally, each Level is in turn layered and all layering is based on scope relations.

Layering in chapter 1, A new approach to clausal constituent order (appropriately by Kees Hengeveld himself), is primarily concerned with the Morphosyntactic Level. Hengeveld’s proposal is based on the use of ordering templates with four absolute positions and the principle that configurational ordering (based on relationships like predicate-argument relations) follows hierarchical ordering. Hierarchical ordering is based on scope and this is why the Interpersonal and Representational Levels also play an important role in constituent order in the clause. Hengeveld’s approach results in “84 logically possible constituent order patterns” which are based on “14 logically possible underlying orders” rather than the six patterns distinguished by traditional Greenbergian typology. The chapter concludes with an illustration of this approach to three V-medial and six V-initial languages according to the traditional classification, that are all different in the FDG treatment.

In chapter 2 Marize Mattos Dall’Aglío Hatthner studies the interaction between tense and two types of evidentiality (Event Perception and Deduction) in a sample of 34 native languages from Brazil. It builds on earlier work by the author and Hengeveld<sup>1</sup> on evidentiality in FDG, in which they discern four different types of evidentiality operating at the Interpersonal and Representational Levels. Event Perception and Deduction both operate at the Representational Level where tense is located in the Episode (absolute tense) and State-of-Affairs (relative tense) layers. Dall’Aglío Hatthner argues that in interaction between the two categories the evidential’s semantics controls tense distinctions.

The third and final typological chapter, by J. Lachlan Mackenzie, proposes two different spatial adposition classes: grammatical and lexical, where *adposition* is a catch-all phrase for pre- and postpositions, and indeed circumpositions. Mackenzie suggests that grammatical adpositions express one of a (limited) set of semantic functions (such as Locative, Allative and Ablative), whereas lexical adpositions draw on the lexicon for further refinement of the “description of the three-dimensional environment” (p. 90). These two different aspects of the Representational Level (one a semantic

---

<sup>1</sup> Four types of evidentiality in the native languages of Brazil; at the time of writing this review the article had been accepted for publication by *Linguistics*; preview at

[http://home.hum.uva.nl/oz/hengeveld/publications/fc\\_hengeveld&hattner.pdf](http://home.hum.uva.nl/oz/hengeveld/publications/fc_hengeveld&hattner.pdf).

operator, the other a lexeme) are then expressed at the Morphosyntactic Level in a variety of ways, one of which is adpositions, with the grammatical adposition having the lexical one in its scope. This is probably best exemplified by the difference in English between *to* and *into*, where *to* expresses the Allative function and *in* is a lexical expression for containment. The head of the phrase *to the car park*, then, is *car park*, whereas *in the car park* is the head of the phrase *into the car park*. Mackenzie shows that in the languages he has studied such lexical expressions can not only be adpositions, but also (adverbial) modifiers, leading to a distinction between Lexical Head Constructions and Lexical Modifier Constructions.

In chapter 4 Inge Genee applies FDG to the complex verbal morphology of Blackfoot and demonstrates the importance of the distinction between lexemes and words in FDG. Blackfoot verb roots are simplex lexemes and ‘finals’ are derivational affixes. A combination of root plus final is a stem. Stems can undergo further derivation by means of an additional final. Two types of finals are distinguished: concrete ones are lexical and provide addition meaning, whereas abstract finals are grammatical expressions of animacy and transitivity. So in FDG terminology concrete finals create new lexemes, abstract finals create new words. This seems not unlike Mackenzie’s distinction between different types of adposition, one of which is the expression of a semantic function and the other derives from the lexicon. Genee proceeds to give a detailed account of how FDG represents the introduction of these two different classes of finals, in the process clearly illustrating the interrelations between the various FDG Levels.

Unlike all other chapters in the book, which are concerned with FDG’s Grammatical Component, John Connolly in chapter 5 theorises the Conceptual Component. More particularly, he tries to formalise Conceptual Level Representations that act as input into the Grammatical Component’s Formulator where the representations of the Interpersonal and Representational Levels are constructed. Much of the component’s work is done by what Connolly calls the Conceptualiser. He demonstrates how Conceptualiser and Formulator interact by elaborating the generation of possessive and passive constructions in English and Welsh. Although the Conceptual Level Representation is the same, different representations are generated at the Representational Level because of the two languages’ different grammatical systems.

Chapter 6 by Freek Van de Velde studies external possessor and other Indirect Object constructions in Dutch. The English sentence ‘The soap slipped out of his fingers’ can be rendered into Dutch in two ways. One is equivalent of the English construction (*De zeep glipte uit zijn vingers*), but the other uses an indirect object (or dative) external possessor: *De zeep glipte hem uit de vingers* (‘The soap slipped him out of the fingers’). There is in fact a network of related constructions in Dutch and Van de Velde teases out the different ways these can be represented in FDG in order to explain the differences between them. For this he invokes the division between the Interpersonal and Representational Levels. This is one of the more technical chapters of the *Casebook*, with over 100 examples (many from the internet and, in the case of English, the British National Corpus; BNC) and detailed representations illustrating the workings of the model.

The different levels of representation are again invoked by Sterre Leufkens in chapter 7. Her chapter is about time reference in indirect speech in English, although it also draws on data from other languages through other authors’ work. She first critiques seminal work on this issue by Comrie (1986) and Declerck (1988), especially around tense copying, and the use of absolute, relative and absolute-relative tense. In her analysis a Reportative operator crucially triggers tense copying at the Interpersonal Level in order to indicate that the speaker is not committed to the truth of the statement, whereas the operator remains idle when the speaker’s commitment is not in doubt and the present tense is then used. This chapter is illustrated by some excellent contextualised examples from two corpora (BNC and the International Corpus of English).

The same is true for chapter 8 by Evelien Keizer, who also uses BNC and the Corpus of Contemporary American English, and is the only author who explicitly refers to her qualitative methodology (p. 215) which requires that examples are provided with a wider context in order to give full explanations. In doing this, Keizer presents a thorough study of English *The X is(is)* construction, where *X* is often the noun *thing*, although other head nouns are possible too. The chapter suggests that there is no significant difference between versions with *thing* and other nouns, nor between the version with one occurrence of *is* and the one with two occurrences. Keizer then presents an analysis of the construction that covers all four levels of analysis in FDG’s Grammatical Component (she is in fact one of only two authors to do so), drawing on Construction Grammar for much of the discussion.

The chapter introduces semi-fixed templates at the Morphosyntactic and Phonological Levels as an innovation, in recognition of the existence of semi-fixed expressions like *the thing is*.

Daniel García Velasco in chapter 9 provides a thoroughly plausible pragmatic explanation for raising, especially Subject-to-Subject Raising and Subject-to-Object Raising, mainly in Spanish. He argues that raising has “a textual function, as it operates on active referents and thus creates discourse cohesion and thematic continuity” (p. 272). This leads him to suggest a (for FDG) new pragmatic dimension: *givenness*, which relates “to the pragmatic structuring of discourse and to a dynamic temporal dimension, as opposed to the static form-oriented nature of aboutness” (i.e. Topic, Focus, contrast; p. 269). Like Keizer, García Velasco also takes context into account in his discussion and draws on all four levels of analysis.

In the final chapter of the book Hella Olbertz and Sandra Gasparini Bastos introduce a subjective/objective distinction in deontic modality. Their analysis is also corpus-based (using the Alcalá corpus) and they derive their evidence from the interaction between tense and modality (cf. chapter 2 on the interaction between tense and evidentiality). The introduction of the distinction between subjective and objective deontic modality leads to a revised model of tense and modality in FDG with refinements of the State-of-Affairs layer in the Representational Level.

In 1994 I wrote a PhD within the framework of FG as it had then most recently been outlined in Dik (1989). My last publication within the FG tradition appeared ten years later, but by then a change in career had led to a refocusing of my research. Although I have remained vaguely aware of developments within the framework, I lost touch with FG and its successor FDG, except for a brief return as external examiner in another university. The invitation to review the *Casebook in Functional Discourse Grammar* therefore afforded a welcome opportunity to (re)acquaint myself with the framework. The *Casebook* itself has been a good vehicle for this re-acquaintance, as I have become more and more familiar with new terminology and concepts as reading progressed. However, the most informative chapter from the point of view of learning to understand the FDG model, was that by John Connolly. This is not only because of its (for this book unique) focus on the Conceptual Component, but also because of the clarity and simplicity of its explanation of the model in his introduction. His emphasis on the fact that “our proposals should lend themselves to computerization” (p. 128) also highlights that FDG aims to be “an explicit and highly formalized mode of functional linguistic description” (p. 152).

This of course echoes Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 26) who position FDG “halfway between radically functional and radically formal approaches to grammatical analysis.” In this context it is noticeable that a number of the *Casebook*'s authors engage with other models critically but without becoming polemical, for example where Mackenzie reviews various treatments of adpositions or Keizer discusses Construction Grammar. This halfway stance, a juxtaposition of functional and formal, also explains why every chapter in this book contains a section where the issues under discussion are expressed in FDG formalisation, some of them in great detail. For novices this may be hard to grasp at first, but it is essential to the model.<sup>2</sup> These formalisations require careful proofreading and editing and the fact that the *Casebook* contains a very small number of only minor errors, is testament to the high professional standard of the editors' work.

From an outsider point of view, two observations raise questions about the current state of FDG research. First, assuming that the *Casebook* is representative, as the editors claim, it is noteworthy that 90% of the contributions are concerned with the theory's Grammatical Component. Only Connolly's chapter discusses another component of the FDG theory of verbal interaction. Secondly, whilst the *Casebook* is richly illustrated with examples from a large number of languages, the data sources of the material also vary: examples are invented, derive from the existing linguistic literature or come from linguistic corpora (including the internet). This probably partly reflects the authors' research methods: a qualitative (discourse) analytical approach, for instance, requires contextualised data and examples for which corpora are the most appropriate source. However, I am wondering whether an increasing use of such larger chunks of text with context (as applied by for example Leufkens, Keizer and García Velasco) may lead to research beyond the Grammatical

---

<sup>2</sup> One wonders whether the FDG community has ever considered using colours to distinguish various levels and layers. In digital publishing this is easier. I did not have access to the *Casebook*'s e-Book version, so I could not check. The electronic version of Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008) does not use colours.

Component and further into the Conceptual and Contextual components. I will be watching with great interest.

Comrie, Bernard. 1986. Tense in indirect speech. *Folia Linguistica* 20 (3-4): 265-196.

Declerck, Renaat. 1988. Sequence of tenses in English. *Folia Linguistica* 20 (3-4): 513-544.

Dik, Simon C. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hengeveld, Kees & Mackenzie, J. Lachlan. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A Typologically-Based Theory of Language Structure*. Oxford: OUP.