

# Unity in Diversity



Harm Pinkster, Inge Genee (eds)

*Papers presented to Simon C. Dik  
on his 50th birthday*



1990  
FORIS PUBLICATIONS  
Dordrecht - Holland/Providence RI - U.S.A.

***Published by:***

Foris Publications Holland  
P.O. Box 509  
3300 AM Dordrecht, the Netherlands

***Distributor for the U.S.A. and Canada:***

Foris Publications USA, Inc.  
P.O. Box 5904  
Providence RI 02903  
U.S.A.

***CIP-DATA***

**ISBN 90 6765 511 2**

**© 1990 Foris Publications - Dordrecht**

**No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the copyright owner.**

**Printed in the Netherlands by ICG Printing, Dordrecht.**

# Contents

Preface	vii
<i>Willem F.H. Adelaar</i> The role of quotations in Andean discourse	1
<i>A. Machtelt Bolkestein</i> Unreportable linguistic entities in Functional Grammar	13
<i>Teun A. van Dijk</i> Issues in Functional Discourse Analysis	27
<i>Jan P. van Eijk</i> Intransitivity, transitivity and control in Lillooet Salish	47
<i>Dorothea Franck</i> The life of language	65
<i>Casper de Groot</i> Auxiliary operator Inf and constructions with an infinitive in Hungarian	73
<i>Mike Hannay</i> A note on semantic functions and adpositional term predicates	93
<i>Henk Haverkate</i> Politeness and mitigation in Spanish: a morpho-pragmatic analysis	107
<i>Hanneke Houtkoop-Steenstra</i> Normative and analytical perspectives on interviewing techniques	133
<i>Simon van de Kerke and Pieter Muysken</i> Quechua <i>mu</i> and the perspective of the speaker	151
<i>Martha L. Komter</i> The discourse structure of job interviews	165

<i>Kitty M. van Leuven-Zwart</i> Translation studies: developments and perspectives in teaching and research	183
<i>Harm Pinkster</i> The development of cases and adpositions in Latin	195
<i>Ger P. Reesink</i> Adverbs in Papuan languages. Or: "Where have all the adverbs gone?"	211
<i>Henk van Riemsdijk</i> Functional prepositions	229
<i>Sie Ing Djiang</i> On the internal structure of the Noun Phrase in Bahasa Indonesia	243
<i>Norval Smith</i> Deverbal nominalization in Sranan: a search for regularities	265
<i>Co Vet</i> Aktionsart, aspect and duration adverbials	279
<i>Lourens J. de Vries</i> Some remarks on direct quotation in Kombai	291

# Preface

Simon Cornelis Dik was born in September 1940. He entered the University of Amsterdam at the age of eighteen, to study Classics and Linguistics. He was at once taken on as a research assistant by the then Professor of Linguistics, Anton Reichling. After his appointment as Professor of Linguistics in 1969, he created (together with his colleague Ben Tervoort) a truly multi-disciplinary department. He has been active in all sorts of administrative duties. Most importantly, he is the author of a large number of books and articles on a broad range of subjects, from morphology to conversational analysis, from Dutch to non-Indo-European languages, both descriptive and theoretical, diachronic and synchronic. Among these publications his work on Functional Grammar is a source of inspiration for an active group of "functional grammarians", both in the Netherlands and abroad.

The diversity of his scholarly interest is reflected in the range of Ph.D. dissertations he has supervised or co-supervised, 26 to date and several other dissertations underway.

On the occasion of his 50th birthday, which for Simon Dik is also the beginning of a part-time professorship (to have more time for his own research), eighteen of his promotae and promoti have united in writing a collection of papers for their promotor, with gratitude and respect. We had the privilege of coordinating and editing the work.

Harm Pinkster  
Inge Genee





# The role of quotations in Andean discourse

William F.H. Adelaar  
*Department of Comparative Linguistics*  
*State University, Leiden*

## 0. Introduction

The rendering of conversations in a narrative account normally involves the following ingredients: (1) an expression (most commonly a verb) referring to the act of communication and (2) an expression referring to the message communicated. The latter either takes the shape of a grammatically embedded object clause, which may be marked by the presence of a complementizing element, or it is reproduced in its original form, that is, as a *quotation*.

In a number of Western European languages, the two construction types coexist and the selection of either one can be a matter of style or the preference of the speaker. For instance, in Dutch we find competing options, such as the following:

- (1a) Hij zei tegen mij: "Ga weg!".  
'He said to me: "Go away!".'
- (1b) Hij zei dat ik weg moest gaan.  
'He told me that I should go away.'

(2a) Hij vroeg aan mij: "Slaap je?".  
 'He asked me: "Are you asleep?">'

(2b) Hij vroeg me of ik sliep.  
 'He asked me whether I was asleep.'

Several native languages of the Andean region also have constructions involving embedded object clauses and direct quotations, but the decision as to which type of construction must be used in each particular instance is not a matter of free choice. The present contribution is intended to summarize a number of relevant facts concerning the expression of message complements in the Andean languages Quechua and Araucanian. It also addresses the consequences of a grammatically conditioned division between quotation complements and clausal object complements.

### 1. Message complements in Quechua

In Quechua, the equivalent of the verb "to say", *ni-* (*ñi-* in some dialects), can be accompanied by a quotation but not by an embedded object clause that expresses the content of a message. At the same time, *ni-* is the only verb that can occur in direct syntactic contact with a section of quoted speech. Verbs other than *ni-* that refer to some kind of communication ("to tell", "to warn", "to ask", "to call", "to argue", etc.) must be used in a periphrastic construction involving a gerund-like form of the verb *ni-* preceded by a direct quotation, whenever the content of the message is to be overtly expressed. This gerund-like form, *nispa* (*ñispa*) closes any section of quoted speech and establishes a necessary link between such a section and verbs of communication other than *ni-*. Impressionistically, it acts as the vocal counterpart of a colon in English. The examples (3) and (4) illustrate the above. (For an explanation of the glosses see the note at the end of this article.)

(3) "uku wayqu-pi allpa-kuna-qa ancha sumaq-mi"ni-n-ku.  
 deep valley-in fields-PLUR-TOP very fine-ASS say-3s-PLURs  
 'They say: "Down in the valley the fields are excellent.'"

- (4) "kay-man chay makawisa-cta apa-mu-chun" ni-spa  
 this-ALL that Macauisa-ACC take-CIS-3sIMP say-GER

kacha-rka-n.  
 order-PAST-3s.

'They gave an order saying: "Let him bring Macauisa here!" '

OR: 'They gave the order that he should bring Macauisa to them.'

The verb *ni-* itself is frequently found in the same type of construction. In it, *ni-* occupies the place of the higher verb and is accompanied by its own gerund. This can be seen in the following example (5).

- (5) "liw allpa-kuna-m qam-kuna-paq ka-nqa"  
 all field-PLUR-ASSyou-PLUR-BEN be-3sFUT

ni-spa-s-iki kanan-qa ni-wa-chka-nchik.  
 say-GER-HRS-APP nowadays-TOP say-3s4o-DUR-3s4o.

'As you should know, they now reportedly say to us: "All the fields will be yours".'

OR: 'As you should know, they now reportedly say to us that all the fields will be ours.'

In contrast, several verbs referring to perception or knowledge ("to hear", "to see", "to know", "to remember") or reflection ("to speak about", "to discuss") take object clauses as their complements, as is illustrated in (6), (7) and (8).

- (6) señor-ni-nchis yacha-n-mi chay alma-kuna-q moroso  
 Lord-CONN-4p know-3s-ASS those deceased-PLUR-GEN slow payer

ka-sqa-n-ku-ta.  
 be-NOM-3ps-PLUR-ACC

'Our Lord knows that those deceased people have been slow payers.'

- (7) hina riku-y-ku sikwani uray-man chinka-ya-pu-q-ta.  
 then see-1s-PLUR Sicuani below-ALL disappear-DIR-NORET-NOM-ACC

'Then we saw (the airplane) disappear downward towards Sicuani.'

- (8) ña-m-ari                    wakin-ni-n                    kapitulu-pi                    as-lla-kta  
 already-ASS-APP   other-CONN-3p   chapter-LOC   a little-RESTR-ACC
- yuri-mu-ska-n-ta-pas                    rima-rka-nchik.  
 be born-CIS-NOM-3ps-ACC-INCL   speak-PAST-4s  
 'As you may remember, we have already spoken a little of the way he  
 came to be born in a previous chapter.'

In sentences (6), (7) and (8), the presence of nominalizers such as *-sqa* (*-ska* in the variety of Quechua represented in (8)) or *-q* marks the clauses referring to the fact known, the event perceived or the topic reflected upon as a potential complement.

The three constructions introduced in this section can be formally summarized as follows:

- (I) "QUOTATION" *ni-*
- (IIa) "QUOTATION" *nispa V-*
- (IIb) "QUOTATION" *nispa ni-*
- (III) OBJECT CLAUSE (NOM) *V-*

## 2. The meaning of "to say"

The outline given in section 1. suggests a division between a class of communication verbs consisting of *ni-* and a number of semantic equivalents of *ni-* (cases I and II) on one hand and a class of verbs of knowledge, perception and reflection on the other (case III). The reality, however, is more complex, and this has to do with the unusually extensive semantic domain covered by *ni-*. The verb *ni-* can refer to all kinds of mental activity in which no actual talking is involved. (The expression "inner speech" used by De Vries, this volume, is quite appropriate for referring to the content of such activities.) Among the semantic readings potentially assigned to *ni-* we find such interpretations as "to consider", "to want" and "to intend", along with cases of actual speaking ("to call", "to answer"). Variation in the choice of lexical material is not a stylistic requirement for speakers of Quechua, a fact which may explain in part the enormous frequency of *ni-* and other basic vocabulary (verbs in particular) in Quechua texts. In short, the meaning of *ni-* to a large extent extends beyond that of a verb of communication. And, as we have seen before, the verb *ni-* demands a message complement in directly quoted speech (with or without the intervention of *nispa*).

The above combination of facts compels speakers to use quotations in sentences which do not refer to actual speaking in order to render the content of a mental activity. The following examples illustrate such uses.

- (9) chay-si                    kiki-lla-n-tak                    uk wata    chika ñuñu-n-wan  
therefore-HRS    self-RESTR-3p-SEQ one year    about breast-3p-INSTR

kawsa-chi-rka-n            "pi-p            churi-n-ch            kay-ka"            ñi-spa.  
live-CAUS-PAST-3s who-GEN son-3P-CONJ this-TOP say-GER

'So she herself reportedly kept (the child) alive with her own breast for about one year while saying: "Whose son could this be?"'

OR: '...wondering whose son it could be.'

- (10) "ñuka-kta-pas            muna-wa-nka"            ñi-spa            amu-rka-n-ku.  
me-ACC-INCL    want-1o-3sFUT say-GER come-PAST-3s-PLUR  
'They came while saying: "She will love me as well."'

OR: 'They came with the expectation of also being loved by her.'

- (11) "mana-chu-s    ri-sak            ri-sak-chu-s"            ñi-k            ina-s  
not-INT-HRS go-1sFUT go-1sFUT-INT-HRS say-NOM like-HRS

ayni-kacha-rka-n.  
answer-HESIT-PAST-3s.

'He hesitated to give his answer as if he were saying: "Am I not supposed to go or am I supposed to go?"'

OR: 'He hesitated to give his answer as if he were in doubt whether he should go or not.'

In none of these examples does the verb *ni-* "to say" refer to actual speaking. The uses illustrated call for English translations such as "to wonder", "to expect", "to doubt." However, direct quotations are required as complements of *ni-* in exactly the form they would take if the referent of the subject of *ni-* were actually to pronounce his thoughts.

### 3. Nonsubject encoding and the verb "to say"

In Quechua verbs, the personal reference system obligatorily encodes not only subjects, but also human nonsubjects if these correspond to the speaker, the addressee or both. The semantic function (as defined by Dik 1980: 3) of an encoded nonsubject is not a priori established and depends on the meaning of the verb in question. With the verb *ni-* it may be an addressee (the person *to*

whom is spoken), a person *about* whom is spoken or even a person *in relation to* whom something is said. The encoding of nonsubjects is also normally respected in those cases where *ni-* does not refer to actual speaking. This usage further strengthens the impression of the subject being engaged in a conversation, even though nothing but thoughts or wishes is reproduced. The following examples illustrate this:

- (12) *ancha yaku-wan atipa-pti-y-ka "yaya-nchik-mi atipa-n"*  
 if water-INSTR win-SUB-1s-TOP Lord-4p-ASS win-3s

*ñi-spa-m ñi-wa-nki.*  
 say-GER-ASS say-1o-2s

‘If I should be victorious with water, you will say about me: "Our Lord is winning."’

OR: ‘If I should be victorious with water, you will consider me, your Lord, to be the winner.’

- (13) *"miku-y-ni-yki-cta usu-chi-sak" ñi-pti-yki-pas*  
 eat-NOM-CONN-2p-ACC be spoiled-CAUS-1sFUTsay-SUB-2s-INCL

*chay kapari-y-ni-yki-cta uyari-spa-m ancha utka-lla*  
 that screech-NOM-CONN-2p-ACC hear-GER-ASS very rapid-  
 RESTR

*karku-su-nki.*

*chase-3s2o-3s2o*

‘Whenever you will say (in relation to someone): "I shall spoil your food", he will hear your screeching and chase you away.’

OR: ‘If you intend to spoil somebody’s food, he will hear your screeching and chase you away.’

See (5) for another example of nonsubject encoding with the verb *ni-*.

#### 4. Quotations within quotations

A section of quoted speech acting as the message complement of *ni-* "to say" may itself contain an instance of *ni-* accompanied by a quotation. Quotations included within quotations are relatively frequent as a result of the necessity of expressing the respective messages by means of quoted speech. The resulting constructions may acquire a considerable complexity. For each instance of *ni-* the speaker must seek the perspective of the subject corresponding to it and fill in the required affixes of personal reference accordingly.

- (14) chay-si yaya-n-ta-ka "yaya, kay-pi-m uk  
so-HRS father-3p-ACC-TOP father this-LOC-ASS one

wakcha [yaya-yki-cta alli-ya-chi-sak] ñi-mu-wa-n"  
poor man father-2p-ACCgood-become-CAUS-1sFUT say-CIS-1o-3s

ñi-spa willa-rka-n.  
say-GER tell-PAST-3s

'So she reportedly told her father: "Father, a poor man here says to me:  
[I will cure your father]."'

OR: '..."Father, a poor man here says to me that he will cure you."

In (14), a girl reports a conversation for which she has to adopt the perspective of an unexpected visitor whose words she transmits literally. The choice of the right personal reference affixes to express this perspective is crucial for a correct interpretation. A further illustration is (15).

- (15) chay-si chay ñawpa-k churi-n-pa kusa-n-ka kay  
so-HRS that precede-NOM child-3p-GEN husband-3p-TOP this

simi-cta uyari-spa-s ancha piña-rka-n  
news-ACC hear-GER-HRS very become angry-PAST-3s

"ima-pak-mi [chay uk wakcha-wan tinki-chi-sak]  
what-BEN-ASS that one poor man-INSTR be united-CAUS-1sFUT

ñi-spa ñi-n ñuka chika kapak-pak  
say-GER say-3s me such rich man-GEN

kuñada-y-ta" ñi-spa.  
sister-in-law-1p-ACCsay-GER

'Then the husband of his eldest child reportedly became very angry when he heard the news, and said: "For what reason does he say: [I will marry her to that one poor fellow], she being my sister-in-law and I being such a rich man?"

OR: '..."Why does he intend to marry her to that one poor fellow, she being my sister-in-law and I being such a rich man?"

## 5. Hearsay evidentials

Quechua sentences normally contain an indication of the source from which the information transmitted was obtained. The affixes that serve this purpose operate at the sentence level and are commonly referred to as evidentials or validators. The set of evidentials includes an affix *-s/-si* that indicates hearsay and second-hand information (translated ‘reportedly’ in the examples given so far). The availability of a hearsay evidential offers an alternative for the outermost frame of communication reference and produces the effect of mitigating the complexity of sentences involving quotations within quotations. One must observe, however, that the use of a hearsay evidential does not provide any clue for identifying the person who supplied the information. Hearsay evidentials help the speaker disclaim responsibility for what he says (“I only heard it said, I did not see it myself”). If a speaker wants to make clear that a known person supplied information that he is transmitting, he will use *ni-* instead of the hearsay evidential.

A good illustration of the interaction between a hearsay evidential and the *ni-* + quotation construction is supplied by example sentence (5), repeated here for the sake of clarity as (16).

(16) "liw allpa-kuna-m qam-kuna-paq ka-nqa"  
all field-PLUR-ASSyou-PLUR-BEN be-3sFUT

ni-spa-s-iki            kanan-qa            ni-wa-chka-nchik.  
say-GER-HRS-APP nowadays-TOP say-3s4o-DUR-3s4o

‘As you should know, they now reportedly say to us that all the fields will be ours.’

It can be argued that, in (16), the hearsay evidential *-s-* in *ni-spa-s-iki* is in a certain sense equivalent to an additional *ni-spa ni-n-ku* (“saying, they say”) frame.

## 6. Switch-reference

The presentation of dialogues in Quechua texts depends to a large extent on a phenomenon commonly referred to as switch-reference in linguistic literature (see, for instance, Weber 1989: 298). Switch-reference implies that subordinate verbs are marked for having same or different subjects in relation to a hierarchically higher verb in the same sentence. Most Quechua dialects distinguish two affixes which have the function of subordinating verbs to other verbs. The suffix *-spa*, glossed ‘GER’ (gerund) in the example sentences, implies



subordination to a verb with the same subject; the suffix *-pti-*, glossed 'SUB' (subordinator), implies subordination to a verb with a different subject and is obligatorily accompanied by affixes of personal reference. In textual accounts of conversations there is a frequent alternation of the gerund and subordinator forms of *ni-* "to say", *ni-spa* and *ni-pti-*, which mark, respectively, the continuation of a speaker's contribution to the conversation or a transition to a contribution of his partner in the conversation. This is particularly important where there are two participants in the conversation that are both non-identical to the author or story-teller and his audience. In practice, it permits a distinction of two "third persons" and the use of lengthy fragments of text in which the subjects are not referred to lexically. Questions, exclamations and conjectures are quoted literally and are followed by *ni-*, which often replaces more specific verbs referring to asking, exclaiming or guessing. The concept of answering is expressed by the combination of "to say" and switch-reference. Many Quechua dialects lack a verb "to answer" and, if they do have one, its meaning is usually more specific than that of the English counterpart.

## 7. Quotations in Araucanian

Other Andean languages exhibit a subdivision of the class of verbs similar to that in Quechua, assigning a special status to the verb "to say" in relation to quoted speech. In Aymara the verb *sa-* "to say" and its derivative *sasa* "saying" play a role virtually identical to that of *ni-* and *nispa* in Quechua (Hardman, Vásquez, Yapita 1988: 314). This is most certainly an effect produced by the long period of intimate contact to which the two languages have been subjected, which has led to an amazing amount of typological similarity. More remarkable is the existence of a similar situation in an unrelated language such as Araucanian (also called Mapuche or Mapudungun), which has not undergone profound influences from either Quechua or Aymara. In this section, some of the relevant Araucanian facts are outlined and exemplified.

In Araucanian the verb for "to say" is *pi-* (or, alternatively, *feipi-* "that-say"). Its message complement obligatorily takes the shape of a quotation, which preferably precedes the verb *pi-*. As in Quechua, *pi-* is the only verb that behaves like this syntactically, although Smeets (1989: 473) mentions three other verbal expressions that may also occur with quotation complements. Other verbs take object complements that have a nominalized verb as their nucleus. There is no equivalent of Quechua *nispa*.

Like *ni-* in Quechua, Araucanian *pi-* covers a semantic domain that exceeds the limits of communication in the literal sense. Apart from referring to communication, it also refers to wishes and intentions, as in (17).

- (17) "fem-i mai", pi kiñe longko; "fei meu mai  
 be so-3s APP say-3s one chief that from APP

küpa-iñ, [kim-a-fi-iñ chem dëngu ñi mële-n]  
 come-1PLURs know-FUT-3o-1PLURs what matter 3p exist-  
 NOM

pi-ke-iñ APP", pi fei-chi longko.  
 say-HAB-1PLURs then say-3s that-ADJ chief

"So it is then," one of the chiefs said. "This is why we have come. We want to know what is going on", that chief said.'

In (17), *pi-ke-iñ* must be interpreted as "we want", but being a derivate of the verb *pi-* it is preceded by a direct quote (*kim-a-fi-iñ chem dëngu ñi mëlen* "we shall find out what is going on").

As in Quechua, Araucanian verbs contain personal reference affixes that obligatorily refer to subjects and nonsubjects. The system is more elaborate than in Quechua since it also identifies third person nonsubjects and formally distinguishes two types of pragmatic relationships between third person subjects and nonsubjects. Quotations within quotations in which all the personal reference affixes are selected according to the perspective of the corresponding subjects are frequent and may exhibit a considerable degree of complexity, as in the following example.

- (18) "[iñche deuma feyentu-fi-ñ, fei meu mai,  
 I already adhere-3o-1s that from APP

[[ [[feyentu-pe tuchi feyentu-no-lu, fei nie-le-nge-a-i  
 adhere-3sIMP which adhere-NEG-NOM that have-BEN-PASS-FUT-  
 3s

wesha dëngu]]] pi-n mële-rke-i]], pi-a-fi-mi],  
 bad thing say-NOM exist-HRS-3s say-FUT-3o-2s

pi-nge-n" pi-ke-i fei-chi werken.  
 say-PASS-1s say-HAB-3s that-ADJ messenger

'That messenger said: "I have been told as follows: [You will tell them the following: [[I have already adhered to the cause and so then there is the (reported) saying: [[[Let them adhere! For whoever does not adhere something terrible will be kept in store.]]] ]]'.'

A possible free translation of (18) would be:

‘The messenger said: "I was told to tell you (on behalf of my chief) that he has already adhered to the cause. And, therefore, there is said to be an agreement that you should adhere to it as well and that whoever does not will be severely punished.”’

## 8. Conclusion

It follows from the above that the verb "to say" has a different status in the languages treated from that in Western European languages. Whatever its exact meaning may be, it is characteristically linked up with the use of quoted speech and thought and can very well be regarded as the sole representative of a subclass of quotation verbs. Its use and existence constitute an areal feature, since the languages at issue and the relevant expressions themselves do not visibly have a common genetic origin. In one important respect, the Andean facts are parallel to those found in Papuan languages, such as Kombai and Western Dani, where direct quotations obligatorily accompany speech act verbs (see de Vries, this volume).

The necessity of preserving the form of quoted speech as it would be pronounced in a real dialogue situation and the intricate constructions consisting of quotations embedded in quotations place a heavy burden on the listener's memory and imagination. He has to keep track of the speaker's constantly changing perspective, which often moves outside the observable reality.

## NOTE

The examples (3), (5) and (16) are from Soto Ruiz's beginners' course in Ayacucho Quechua; (6) and (7) are from Cuzco Quechua and were taken from the autobiography of Gregorio Condori Mamani. The examples (4) and (8) through (15) are from the idolatry manuscript written for Francisco de Avila about 1608. It represents an extinct dialect closely akin to the former two. Wherever necessary, the orthography of the examples has been regularized in order to make their analysis more transparent. The Araucanian examples are from the memories of chief Pascual Coña, recorded in the 20s of the present century. The original orthography has been respected as much as possible.

The Quechua facts related in this article are valid for the conservative dialects of Central and Southern Peru, but not necessarily for all of the other dialects. The fragmentation into dialects does not allow us to generalize about the language as a whole. Strong influence from Spanish sometimes gives rise to a different usage, as is the case, for instance, of Condori Mamani's autobiography, where direct quotes may accompany verbs other than *ni-*. Even in Avila's idolatry

manuscript there are such cases (for instance, quotes accompanied by *nima-* "to speak" instead of *ni-*), but these can be considered erroneous or, at the least, very uncharacteristic. The time difference between the language of the idolatry manuscript and present-day Ayacucho Quechua is not particularly relevant, because the linguistic facts at issue have remained essentially unchanged.

In Ayacucho Quechua, and maybe in other dialects as well, (nominalized) object clauses can accompany the verb *ni-* whenever they do not express the content of a message; e.g., *llapa* (all) *ruwa-na-n-ta* (do-NOM-3ps-ACC) *ni-n* (say-3s) "she tells her everything she has to do" (Soto Ruiz 1987: 163).

Quotes are placed in quotation marks (inverted commas), unless they are embedded in other quotes. In that case, square brackets are used with the number of brackets rising from 1 to n as one advances from outer to inner frames.

Glosses used in the morpheme-for-morpheme translation of the examples have the following approximate meanings: ACC accusative case, ADJ adjectivizer, ALL allative case, APP appeal to knowledge of hearer, ASS assertion evidential, BEN benefactive case, CAUS causative, CIS cislocative, CONN phonologically conditioned connective element, CONJ conjecture evidential, DIR directional, DUR durative aspect, FUT future tense, GEN genitive case, GER gerund, HAB habitual, HESIT hesitation, HRS hearsay evidential, IMP imperative, INSTR instrumental case, INT interrogative, INCL inclusive, LOC locative case, NEG negation, NOM nominalizer, NORET no return, PASS passive, PAST past tense, PLUR plural, RESTR restrictive, SEQ sequential, SUB subordinator, TOP topic. The symbol V refers to verb. The symbols o, p, s refer to object (nonsubject), possessor and subject in combination with numbers identifying person (4 being first person inclusive); ps refers to possessor and subject simultaneously. The gloss HAB for the Araucanian affix *-ke-* does not seem to be appropriate in the case of the two example sentences (17) and (18). It is used here for lack of an alternative interpretation. In (18), the gloss BEN for *-le-* is tentative. The regular form of the affix at issue after a vowel is *-(le)l-* (Smeets 1989: 365).

## REFERENCES

- Condori Mamani, G. 1977. *Autobiografía*. Cusco: Centro de estudios rurales andinos "Bartolomé de Las Casas".
- Coña, P. 1984. *Testimonio de un cacique mapuche*. Santiago: Pehuén editores.
- Dik, S.C. 1980. *Studies in Functional Grammar*. London/New York: Academic Press.
- Hardman, M., J. Vásquez & J.D. Yapita 1988. *Aymara, compendio de estructura fonológica y gramatical*. La Paz: Instituto de lengua y cultura aymara.
- Smeets, I. 1989. *A Mapuche Grammar*. Dissertation University of Leiden.
- Soto Ruiz, C. 1987. *Rimaykullayki, Unterrichtsmaterialien zum Quechua Ayacuchoano*. Republished by R. Hartmann a.o., 2d ed. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Taylor, G. (text ed.) 1980. *Rites et traditions de Huarochiri: manuscrit quechua du début du 17e siècle*. Paris: Éditions L'Harmattan.
- Weber, D.J. 1989. *A Grammar of Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.

# Unreportable linguistic entities in Functional Grammar

A. Machtelt Bolkestein  
*Department of Latin*  
*University of Amsterdam*

## 0. Introduction

In Dik (1968: 166) it is pointed out that the maximum units to be described by a functionally oriented grammar are those linguistic entities which are in no way grammatically dependent on their preceding or following linguistic context. The size of such independent linguistic entities (ILE) may well exceed that of the sentence, as is clear from a consideration of sequences of two sentences where the second clause contains some connecting device, or exhibits pronominalization, or forms one intonation unit together with its preceding clause, and, for example, from question answer sequences, where the answer part may not be a full sentence at all. The question about what is the upper limit of such entities is not further explored in Dik (1968). Dik insists, however, that a description along the lines of a functional grammar will not restrict itself to the sentence, and in the layout of the linguistic structure as visualized (by a tree diagram) in Dik (1968: 170f) it is indeed the case that the syntactic category sentence is not the uppermost, initial category in the hierarchical structure, but a subcategory of the initial category ILE (cf. also 1968: 191f).

In this paper I will consider to what extent the expectations arising from the above claim have been fulfilled by the way in which the theory of Functional Grammar (FG) has developed since. Have studies within the FG framework

actually investigated entities larger than sentences? What further notions have been proposed in order to describe the phenomena observed? What modifications has the theoretical framework undergone? For this purpose I will first trace the history of the notion ILE throughout Dik (1978), (1980) and (1989). I will then discuss the merits of a recent FG proposal concerning the nature of the underlying structure attributed to utterances, in the light of its potential value for describing ILE's rather than sentences. Finally I will touch upon a few of the problems which will have to be solved within any theory which adheres to the functional point of view.

### **1. The ILE and its replacement: extra-clausal constituents**

In the outline of Functional Grammar presented in Dik (1978: 15f) the claim that 'FG is meant to cover any type of linguistic expression', and that 'it is thus not restricted to the internal structure of sentences' is repeated, with reference to the earlier work. In spite of the renewal of this claim, however, the book concentrates exclusively upon the structure and properties of predications, that is, of sentences, and even, mainly, upon that of simple non-complex sentences. The notion ILE, while figuring in the index, occurs only once, in the passage just quoted.

It might be concluded that FG is guilty of false pretenses in its insistence upon the importance of taking larger units than the sentence into account. However, this conclusion is not justified. One aspect to which both in Dik (1978: 127f) and in subsequent work within FG much attention is devoted, is that of the grammatical consequences of information structure, also known as Theme Rheme structure in other frameworks, as the distribution of given and new information, or as Topic Focus Articulation. In FG the latter labels are used, for two distinct 'pragmatic functions' assumed to be relevant, namely for the entity 'about' which the predication predicates something in the given setting (often old, shared information, but not necessarily), and the entity which presents the relatively most important or salient information (often new, but not necessarily) (1978: 130). Pragmatic functions are, in other words, defined as functions which specify the informational status of the constituents involved within the wider communicative setting in which they occur. This wider communicative setting can be specified as consisting of the intentions and the state of knowledge of the speaker and his beliefs concerning that of his speech partner at a particular point of the verbal interaction in a given situation. Thus, the pragmatic function of a constituent of a sentence is among other determined by its relation to other constituents in the wider context and the properties of the preceding (sometimes the following) discourse.

The observation that a special pragmatic status may have consequences for the grammatical realization of the predication has inspired a number of studies since the publication of Dik (1978), and has been shown to hold true for many

languages. Correlations have been shown to exist, for example, depending on the language, with word order rules, with intonational contour, with voice variation, with the selection of special construction types such as clefting or raising, and with special morphological marking. Such studies offer ample evidence that syntactic phenomena are not autonomous, and support the claim that the grammar should be formulated in such a way so as to be able to handle units larger than the sentence.

Apart from the pragmatic functions Topic and Focus, which are assigned to constituents of the predication, Dik (1978: 130f; 132f) also distinguishes a separate pragmatic function Theme, for elements which precede the predication but are not part of it: they are separated from what follows by intonation and/or pause, and may therefore be called extra-clausal. In thus differentiating two different types of 'left-dislocated' constituents, the FG approach differs from other frameworks (such as Systemic Grammar, cf. Halliday 1985) in which no principled distinction is made between intra-clausal Topic and extra-clausal Theme, or in which a one to one correlation between occupying the first position in the sentence and having a particular pragmatic status is taken for granted. The FG function Theme is not defined in terms of information structure, but in terms of relevance, namely as presenting a domain or universe of discourse with respect to which it is relevant to pronounce the following predication (Dik 1978: 138). The constituent involved need not necessarily be coreferential to any constituent within this predication (Dik 1978: 133f). The distinction between Topic and Theme is defended by Dik on the basis of several differences in behaviour which I will not go into here: suffice it to refer to a recent functionally oriented investigation of Theme constructions (Gelukens: 1988). This is a study in which it is convincingly shown on the basis of extensive attested material that in a language like English Theme constituents have a quite different function in discourse than Topics, and statistically quite frequently do not refer to shared or old information at all. Geluykens' conclusions concerning the discourse function of Themes are a refinement of, but quite compatible with the somewhat provisional definition in Dik (1978), and a confirmation of the validity of the distinction between Topic and Theme. The results of this study offer another illustration of the claim that taking discourse rather than isolated sentences into account may lead to insightful generalizations about what factors influence the use of certain syntactic constructions, and, consequently, an indirect argument in favour of the original 1968 claim.

Both in Dik (1980) and in Dik (1989) the pragmatic functions Topic and Focus figure prominently in the indices and in the actual number of pages devoted to these issues, the notion of Theme somewhat less so: in (1989) it occurs only a couple of times, mainly listed alongside other types of extra-clausal constituents (: 380). Extra-clausal constituents are mentioned a few times, more or less in passing (e.g.: 45; 264f): their treatment is explicitly postponed to forthcoming work. Still, a rough indication is given of a number of functions (again called pragmatic

functions) which they may serve. These are divided into three main functions: (i) the management of the interaction, (ii) commenting on the content of the clause proper, and (iii) the organization of the content of the expression in relation to the context in which it occurs.

Most attention, however, is paid to the clause-internal pragmatic functions Topic and Focus (1989: 265-287). The account of information structure is considerably expanded and refined, and has undergone a number of changes compared to earlier work, clearly inspired by the modifications proposed in the FG inspired investigations of specific languages and specific constructions which have appeared in the meantime (e.g. De Vries 1983; Hannay 1985). Thus topicality and focality are now viewed as not necessarily mutually exclusive; and a number of subtypes both of Topic and of Focus are distinguished on the basis of the fact that these subtypes receive different marking or exhibit different behaviour in some languages (see e.g. Dik 1989: 282f). Consequently, the relevance of these subtypes is language specific.<sup>1</sup>

As opposed to the relevance of notions belonging to the area of information structure, the notion of independent linguistic entity has completely disappeared both from the index and from the text. Does this imply that FG has lost interest in units larger than the sentence (with the exception of matters of information structure and 'participant tracking')? This implication is contradicted by a consideration of another recent development in the theory of FG, namely the way in which it views the underlying structure of utterances (rather than that of sentences in isolation).

## 2. The underlying structure of utterances: the interpersonal level

In contrast with earlier accounts of sentence structure in FG, in Hengeveld (1988; 1989; *fc.*) and Dik (1989: 247f; see also Reesink: *this vol.*), an analysis of clause structure is adopted in which various layers of structure are distinguished, which are ordered hierarchically with respect to each other. Each of these structural layers represents a different type of entity (in a formal representation, which I will not go into here, symbolized by different variables), which may roughly be described as: the sentence as an entity designating a state of affairs (the predicational level), the sentence as an entity expressing a the speaker's attitude with respect to a possible fact (the propositional level), and the sentence as an entity which is the product of a speech act, an utterance, in a certain communicative situation (the utterance or clause level).<sup>2</sup> In other words, different levels of structure are taken to correspond to the different functions of language recognized in other approaches (e.g. Halliday 1985): thus the so-called representational or ideational function of language in Halliday is associated with



the predicational level of structure, whereas the interpersonal function is associated with the propositional level of structure and with the speech act level.

As far as the hierarchical ordering of these structural layers is concerned, the highest all encompassing level, which has all other levels within its scope, is taken to be that of the speech act: the speech act level has the propositional level in its scope, and the latter contains the predicational level. Dik and Hengeveld differ mutually in what they conceive to be the highest level of the overall structure of the speech act/utterance: Hengeveld suggests that a fifth, textual, level may have to be distinguished, whereas in Dik the speech act level is the outer or upmost one. An implicit assumption of this approach is that as a rule it will be possible to assign specific linguistic phenomena to a specific level of structure according to the main function which they fulfil in utterances (although there need not be a clear one to one relation between elements of surface form and abstract elements on a particular level). This implicit assumption of 'locatability', so to speak, is the source of one of the problems to be touched upon below (2.2.).

The advantages of this view of sentence structure are demonstrated by several recent and forthcoming publications, among other proposing a typology of satellites and operators (Dik 1989: 57-60; 247f); Dik e.a. fc.), and a typology of sentential complements (Hengeveld: fc.; Bolkestein 1989; fc.). I will briefly go into both typologies, and some problems connected with them.

## 2.1. *Satellites*

Satellites are those lexically expressed constituents of sentences which are not required by the valency frame of the predicate. They may consist of single lexical items or be internally complex, for example have the internal structure of a subordinate clause.<sup>3</sup>

In Dik e.a. (fc.) it is argued that the hierarchically ordered layered structure may be used to account for differences in behaviour between at least four different types of satellites, which are attached to different layers of the layered structure. These four types of satellites are predicate satellites ( $\sigma_1$ ), predication satellites ( $\sigma_2$ ), proposition satellites ( $\sigma_3$ ) and illocutionary satellites ( $\sigma_4$ ), each attached to the corresponding structural layers respectively. Examples are the satellite constituents in (1 a-e) respectively.

- (1) a. John left on foot
- b. John left yesterday
- c. Apparently/fortunately, John has left
- d. Frankly/since you are interested, John has left
- e. Summarizing/as far as John is concerned, he left

As mentioned above, Hengeveld (fc.) suggests that the level 4 satellites subsumed under illocutionary satellites in Dik (1989: 259) and Dik e.a., which are described as having the function of commenting on the Reason, Condition or Purpose of the speech act, might have to be further differentiated into what are called style disjuncts in Quirk e.a., that is into illocutionary satellites ( $\sigma_4$ ) on the one hand, and a fifth type of satellites, clause satellites ( $\sigma_5$ ) on the other. The former have the function of specifying the manner of the speech act, such as *frankly*, *honestly*, *seriously*, and the like, and the latter have the function of specifying the felicity of the utterance in its discourse context, such as for example *in brief*, *summarizing*, *finally* (cf. (1)e). If we regard this description of the function of clause satellites as another way of saying that their function is to manage the interaction process, Theme constituents such as *as far as...is concerned* also qualify for  $\sigma_5$  status.

This difference in approach is connected with the different view which Dik and Hengeveld take of the status of illocution in the underlying structure as a whole: in the account of the former it is considered to be a speech act (utterance?) operator, which determines the type of speech act, event or product on the very highest layer; for Hengeveld basic illocution has the status of an abstract predicate frame designating the specific semantic and/or pragmatic relation between the speech participants and some content; in the latter view there is an empty position on the highest level of the underlying structure for utterance operators and satellites. For the present purpose I will not go into this problem further.

Without repeating the criteria which justify this distinction between these (at least) four types of satellites (which are partly already given in earlier literature on differences in behaviour between adjunct and disjunct adverbials), I want to point out that Dik e.a. stress the fact that the two 'lowest' level satellites are clause internal, whereas the higher types, from  $\sigma_3$  up are extra-clausal constituents. Their extra-clausal status is confirmed by phenomena like intonational contour, by the fact that Topic Focus distribution takes place within the predication proper and does not include such constituents; and by the fact that operators of the lower levels, such as tense, sentence negation and inferential modality, also have no scope over them: the other way round, such lower level operators fall within the scope of these higher satellites, as may be seen from (2):

- (2) a. Frankly, fortunately, John had not left  
 b. Since you ask, John might be ill

As observed above, basic sentence type distinctions such as the distinction between Declarative, Imperative and Interrogative sentences are in FG (see Dik 1989: 254f) described as basic illocutions (ILL). They are taken to have the status of either operators on the highest, speech act, level, or alternatively of abstract predicate frames (Hengeveld 1989; fc.). Illocutionary satellites fall outside the scope of the basic illocutionary force of sentences, as shown by (3):

## (3) Frankly, why did John leave?

The fact that such satellites are outside the basic illocution is problematic in view of the tacit assumption in FG that operators of a certain layer have satellites of that same layer within their scope. The fact that ILL does not have scope over illocutionary satellites such as *frankly* seems an argument in favour of attributing to ILL a status on a lower layer of the hierarchical structure than that accorded to it in Dik (1989: 254f). This is supported by a consideration of complement constructions, another area where the hierarchically ordered layered structure account seems to be a fruitful approach.

## 2.2. Reportable and unreportable speech acts

Both Hengeveld (1989a: 146; 156; fc.) and Dik (1989: 248f) argue that given the distinct structural layers and types of entities represented by them, sentential complements may also be subcategorized according to the type of entity they represent. Matrix predicates of different semantic subclasses govern different types of entities, and this has to be specified in their lexical entry, since it may have consequences for further properties of these complements. Thus verbs of direct perception such as *to watch* will govern either first order entities (concrete objects) or second order entities (events), verbs of emotion such as *to regret* may govern either events or third order entities (propositions), in the latter case carrying a meaning like 'to think regretfully that...'; whereas verbs of speech will govern either utterances (when governing direct speech) or propositions (when governing indirect speech).

In Bolkestein (1989; fc.) some of the implications of this claim are explored on the basis of investigation of complement clauses in classical Latin. It is concluded that a number of behavioural criteria support a differentiation among complement types along the lines of the layers which they represent. The clearest of these is the distribution of level 3 and level 4 satellites (see 2.1.) over the various complement types: such higher level satellites only occur in complements of verbs of speech and thought, but are absent from complements of verbs of emotion, of direct perception and of happening:

- (4) a. he said that, since she wanted to know, he had left ( $\sigma_4$ ).  
 b. he said that John was probably leaving ( $\sigma_3$ )
- (5) a. ?he regretted that, since she wanted to know, he had left  
 b. ?he watched John probably leave

In view of the possibility for indirect speech complements of verbs of speech to contain extra-clausal constituents presumably belonging to the highest level, it is

not correct to state that such complements represent proposition entities. In fact, complements of such matrix verbs may themselves be classified according to the basic illocution (Declarative, Imperative, Interrogative) which they carry: this classification is useful in view of the fact that in many languages, among which Latin, certain formal and behavioural properties correlate with these distinctions, such as (i) the choice of subordinating conjunction, (ii) the existence of semantic restrictions for Imperative complements as to the controllability of the state of affairs designated, and (iii) as to the presence of truth value and evaluative satellites (Bolkestein 1976; *fc.*; for the notion of controllability see Dik 1989: 96). This means that complements of verbs of speech should be analyzed as propositions plus an illocution rather than as bare propositions, and, given the compatibility with some types of extra-clausal elements pointed out above, even more than that. In certain cases it can be argued that not only basic illocution, but even non-basic or 'converted' illocution (for the notion of illocution conversion see Dik (1989: 257f)) is relevant for formal properties of the embedded clause: thus, in classical Latin, interrogative complements which have the illocutionary force of statements (so-called rhetorical questions) are realized by a different construction than real questions for information are: the verb of the former will be realized as infinitive, that of the second as a finite verb in the subjunctive mood, in spite of the fact that in direct speech they are formally not distinguished.

However, as observed by Coulmas (1986: 9), indirect speech complements cannot contain all material which may be present in direct speech utterances. For example, utterances with a fourth basic illocution, namely that of Exclamation (which in some, but not all languages forms a separate sentence type), cannot be reported by indirect speech complement at all:

- (6) a. What cheek she has!  
 b. \*He exclaimed that what cheek she had

Some other sequences of more than one clause which in view of their intonation form a linguistic entity larger than a single sentence cannot literally be reported in indirect form either. This is the case, for example, with warnings and threats (and also with contingent promises and predictions) of which the first clause has the verb in the imperative mood (but which cannot be described automatically as having the basic illocutionary force of an Imperative). The form in which such ILE's have to be reported has to be turned in that of an ordinary Declarative conditional construction:

- (7) a. drink that and I'll kill you  
 b. \*he threatened that she should drink that and he would kill her  
 c. he threatened that if she drank that, he would kill her

- (8) a. drink that and you'll die  
 b. ?he warned her that she should drink that and she would die  
 c. he warned her that if she drank that, she would die

Furthermore, in spite of the possibility to contain certain extra-clausal constituents such as those demonstrated in (3) and (4), the presence of various types of extra-clausal constituents such as those having the function of Initiator (*well, now*; see Dik (1989: 264f)) or other starters (like adversative *however, but then,*) or the sentence-final particle *though*), vocatives having the function of Address (*Ladies and Gentlemen*) and discourse markers such as *oh, alright, (ah) yes*, and Tags which have the function of modifying a Declarative illocution into Interrogative one (*isn't it*) leads to unwellformed results. Dutch examples are *nee, nou, eh* 'no, well, eh', *(ja) maar* '(yes) but', etc. Many other elements which parenthetically refer to either the speaker's or the hearer's attitude or state of knowledge (*look, you know, I mean, I see*, but also evaluative comments like in Dutch *fijn* 'great' or *jammer* 'a pity') are excluded as well. If such extra-clausal elements are present, the effect will be strange or change the degree of indirectness of the reported speech into the type of free or semi-indirect speech which would be better without the subordinating conjunction, cf. (9):

- (9) a. ?he said that well, he was hungry  
 b. ?he said that ladies and gentlemen, this was a festive occasion  
 c. ?he said that it was a festive occasion, wasn't it

This shows that there is a difference, perhaps in the degree of extra-clausality, between Theme constituents and speech act modifying satellites such as *since you....*, on the one hand, and on the other, certain other elements which seem to be more interaction oriented and more characteristic of dialogue than of monologue discourse. Within the hierarchical utterance structure such differences between extra-clausal elements could only be accounted for if further distinctions are made on the highest structural level.

Moreover, the extra-clausal status of some elements excluded from occurring in indirect discourse is doubtful, if certain criteria (e.g. the criterion of intonational contour) are maintained as decisive. A case in point is offered by Latin leading question particles (as opposed to the neutral clitic particle *-ne*) such as *num*, which indicates that the speaker himself expects or wishes to have the question answered in the negative, and the particle *nonne* which indicates the expectation or wish for a positive answer. In indirect speech questions governed by matrix verbs of asking such as *rogare* 'to ask', such particles do not occur with the same function. The same holds for the Dutch expressions *toch (zeker) niet* (a complex particle combination suggesting that a negative answer is plausible) and *toch (zeker) wel* (positive answer), which functionally resemble extra-clausal tags in English, but are

neither sentence initial nor extra-clausal from the intonational contour point of view:

- (10) a. *hij is toch (zeker) niet weggegaan?*  
 he aux complex Q-particle gone-away  
 'he hasn't left, has-he?'
- b. *?ze vroeg of hij toch (zeker) niet was weggegaan*  
 she asked whether he complex Q-particle aux gone-away  
 'she asked whether he hadn't left, had he'
- (11) a. *Nonne abiit?*  
 Q-particle leave:PF/3P  
 'he has left, hasn't he?'
- b. *?rogabat nonne abiisset*  
 ask:IMPF/3P Q-particle leave:PF/SUBJ/3P  
 'she asked whether he had left, hadn't he'

Such particles express the speaker's attitude with respect to the possible truth value of the proposition questioned. They could, therefore, conceivably be argued to function on the propositional level rather than on the speech act level, as opposed to particles and other expressions of which the function is more clearly that of managing the interaction, such as for example the Latin sentence initial particle *an* ('is the conclusion justified that...', 'does that mean that...'; in Dutch the particle *dan* 'then' may occur with a similar function in questions), which introduces questions which have the function of checking whether an unexpected potential implication of a preceding utterance in the discourse is indeed justified:

- (12) S1: *te dum vivebas noveram*  
 you while live:IMPF/2P know:PLPF/1P  
 'I knew you while you were alive'
- S2: *An me mortuum arbitraris?*  
 Q-particle me dead think:PR/2P  
 'do you believe I am dead, then?' (from a comedy by Plautus, *Truc.*164)

The particle *an* illustrated in the second clause in (12) could be argued to be more context oriented and more interaction oriented than *num* or *nonne* (see 11): the utterance introduced by it always has a close relation to some preceding utterance or act, usually (but not necessarily) performed by another speech participant. Like *num* and *nonne*, it also is excluded from being embedded with this same function

in Interrogative complements. In the case of *an*, this could perhaps be accounted for by its characteristic dialogic function. However, none of the question particles are extra-clausal, and the same holds for many other particles which typically have the function of explicating the relation between the clause which contains them and some preceding or following clause. It is often difficult to decide whether such elements (I call them particles, as an indiscriminate waste basket label) relate text units (e.g. paragraphs) or rather single clauses, and in the latter case whether they relate these clauses on the speech act level or on a lower, representational ('semantic' or 'logical'), level. However, it is still possible to show that some of them are relatively more interaction oriented than others, as has been argued in Kroon 1989 for the Latin pairs *enim* vs. *nam*, and *ergo* vs. *igitur*, usually called causal and consecutive particles respectively. Kroon shows convincingly that the members of these pairs are wrongly treated as more or less interchangeable in the handbooks. However, she also shows that this difference in interaction-orientedness is relative rather than absolute: one of the properties of such sentence connecting devices is that they function in more than one way at the same time, as is often observed in particle research.

Even if this were not the case, with respect to the description of such interaction managing particles within the layered structure account, we are confronted with the 'locatability' problem alluded to in 2.1: in view of their function we would perhaps want to situate them in the underlying structure ascribed to utterances on the outermost layer, which also hosts other, extra-clausal, discourse markers. At the same time, since they cannot be analyzed as extra-clausal themselves, the criteria for recognizing satellites belonging to these levels do not apply to them. The question remains both as to what status should be assigned to them, and whether, whatever they are, they should be treated as situated on any specific layer of structure.

Within FG there are as yet no explicit proposals as to how such elements should be described in agreement with the sentence model as a whole. Various options are conceivable: (i) as abstract predicates (on some level), (ii) as operators characterizing the clause which contains them as a specific type of entity (an option which neglects their basic relating function), or (iii) more or less parallel to the way subordinating conjunctions are treated, as the product of expression rules which have a number of primitive functional relations between clauses or entities of another nature (whether or not with the requirement that these entities should belong to the same layer of structure) as their input. The lack of attention for such relations within texts and the lack of explicitness of the theoretical framework with respect to these alternatives means that there are quite a number of barriers to take in order for the theoretical framework to account for entities larger than sentences.

### 3. Concluding remarks

Has FG actually looked at entities larger than sentences which could be called ILE's in the original 1968 sense? Yes and No. There are (at least) two ways in which sentences may exhibit linguistic properties which are sensitive to (and therefore not independent of) the surrounding discourse, that is, may have linguistic properties which are due to the fact that they are part of a larger whole: (i) by the fact that they exhibit a certain information structure which may have consequences for certain formal phenomena, and (ii) by the fact that they fulfil a certain function with respect to the main goals of the speaker and to their surrounding discourse. Concerning the first type of cohesion phenomena the discussion within FG is in full swing, and has already resulted in a further elaboration of Topic Focus articulation. With respect to the second type of cohesion, FG is still at the start, and may profit considerably from proposals within neighbouring disciplines such as text grammar, discourse analysis or rhetorical structure theory.

At the same time, in spite of many unsolved problems, the layered structure account of utterances recently developed in FG makes possible a consistent and formal treatment of the properties of intra- and extra-clausal constituents, and seems to be able to handle at least some properties of utterances which are connected to their discourse function. The recognition of the importance of the speech act level (which constitutes a third area in which linguistic properties of sentences may not be independent from factors outside their own domain) has already opened the way for further developing a description of phenomena connected with illocution (for attempts in that direction see e.g. Vet *fc.*; Risselada 1989). For FG to make come true its final aim, it is to be hoped that the trend will extend itself to the study of the functional relations between sentences within context.



## NOTES

1. In a recent WPF (Working Papers in Functional Grammar) Mackenzie & Keizer (1990) and Hannay (1990) discuss the potential (ir)relevance of the notion Topic for a description of word order in English.
2. I would speak of the product of a speech act rather than of the speech event or the speech act. In Hengeveld (1989; fc.) the highest level variable is said to represent the speech event rather than a product of speech activity. This seems to me unfortunate: the structure of the speech event is only relevant in as far as it is reflected in the structure of the utterance or stretch of text (sequence of utterances) produced. Dik (1989: 255f) describes the variable involved as a variable for the speech act, but also speaks of expressions, utterances and clauses (which are products rather than acts or events). Although I will continue to use the term 'speech act level' this should, to my opinion, be interpreted as 'the level of the speech product.'
3. Although it may not be unimportant, I will not go into the fact that there is no consensus within FG concerning the formal representation of satellites: whereas Hengeveld, following Vet fc., represents them as restrictors on predications (propositions etc.) in a way comparable to restrictors on term level, Dik represents them as fulfilling a Semantic Function within the predication (proposition etc.) as a whole.

## REFERENCES

- Bolkestein, A.M. 1976. The relation between form and meaning of Latin subordinate clauses governed by *verba dicendi*. *Mnemosyne* 29, 155-175; 268-300.
- Bolkestein, A.M. 1989. Latin sentential complements from a Functional Grammar perspective. *Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain* 15. 1-4, 41-52.
- Bolkestein, A.M. fc. Sentential complements in Functional Grammar. In: J. Nuyts, A.M. Bolkestein & C. Vet (eds.) *Layers and Levels of Representation in Language Theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, p. 71-100.
- Coulmas, F. 1986. Reported Speech: some general issues. In: F. Coulmas (ed.) 1986, *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton De Gruyter, p. 1-28.
- Dik, S.C. 1968. *Coordination*. Amsterdam: North-Holland
- Dik, S.C. 1978. *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam: North-Holland (3d printing 1981 Dordrecht: Foris).
- Dik, S.C. 1980. *Studies in Functional Grammar*. London/New York: Academic Press.
- Dik, S.C. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Dik, S.C., P.C. Hengeveld, E. Vester and C. Vet fc. The hierarchical structure of the clause and the typology of adverbial satellites. In: J. Nuyts, A.M. Bolkestein & C. Vet (eds.) fc. *Layers and Levels of Representation in Language Theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, p. 25-70.
- Geluykens, R. 1988. *Left-dislocation in English Discourse*. Ph.D. Diss. University of Antwerp.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An introduction to functional grammar*. Baltimore: E. Arnold.
- Hannay, M. 1990. Pragmatic function assignment and word order variation in a Functional Grammar of English. *Working Papers in Functional Grammar (WPF)* 38.