

Olbertz, Hella, K. Hengeveld & J. Sánchez García, Eds. *The Structure of the Lexicon in Functional Grammar*. Studies in Language Companion Series, 43. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1998, pp. XII + 312.

Carmen Portero Muñoz
Universidad de Almería

This volume compiles a number of papers dealing with the lexicon which were presented at the VIIth International Conference on Functional Grammar held at the University of Córdoba from 23 to 27 September 1996.

If for a long time the lexicon has been banished from the linguists' minds, regarded as a depository of idiosyncrasies, the mounting role of this component in linguistic theory nowadays is beyond question. Functional Grammar (FG) is in tune with other current models of linguistic analysis where the lexicon is a central component, although in FG it has not been much investigated in comparison with other areas of linguistic research. It is not as a central object of concern but in the sense that lexical items constitute the «basic building blocks» around which the underlying structure of the clause is gradually built that this «central» role of the lexicon in FG must be understood.

In the FG's approach, all lexical items of a language are analysed as predicates; these and the terms are included in the lexicon, which is just one of the two components of the Fund, also consisting of a set of predicate and term formation rules. A fundamental notion is the *predicate frame*, a structure which provides the «blueprint» of the predication to be generated around the predicate by specifying its form and word class, as well as the number and semantic type of the arguments the predicate is allowed to take. While the information about how predicates must be used is stored in the form of a predicate frame, each lexical entry is also provided with a *Meaning Definition*, which represents the meaning of the word. By means of *Stepwise Lexical Decomposition*, each predicate is defined in terms of more basic ones. Based on presupposition and assertion, this principle of semantic decomposition helps to establish inter-lexical relationships.

The Structure of the Lexicon in Functional Grammar is one of the latest steps that have been put forward regarding the lexicon by a number of researchers using the FG framework and might well be seen as an effort to confer this component the centrality it deserves.

Part I contains a collection of papers working within the Functional-Lexematic Model (FLM), an integrated model which makes use of Coseriu's (1977) *Lexematics*, Dik's (1978) *Stepwise Lexical Decomposition* and some marginal contributions from *Cognitive Linguistics*.

Faber & Mairal provide an introductory presentation of the model and its theoretical background. Onomasiologically oriented, the FLM lexicon is a network of lexemes with both a micro- and a macro-structure, and in this sense, it is conceived as a grammar capable of accounting for the speaker's lexical competence. Through the establishment of semantic classes and the recourse to meaning postulates, the model aims at the enrichment of the lexicon component in FG and the simplification of the expression rule component.

Regarding the semantics-syntax interaction, Faber & Mairal are in accord with current theories based on the lexicon, though they are maybe too optimistic in believing that the mapping between the lexical representation of a predicate and its syntactic expression is *fully* predictable, and that the meaning of a word *systematically* interacts with its grammatical properties. If the syntactic expression can be reliably predicted from semantic properties in some cases, it should not be ignored that there are still properties which are specific to individual lexical items or to small groups of items.

This introduction is followed by three applications of the model to German, Spanish and English verbs, checking the ability of the model to account for as many languages as possible, i.e. its typological adequacy.

Calañas Contínente focusses on the semantic domain of existence in German. As a way of granting a privileged position to lexemes having a larger range of use, he widens the scope of the concept of hyponymy, by understanding it not only as a semantic relationship but also in terms of usage.

Felices Lago deals with the semantic field of feeling/emotion in Spanish. Acknowledging the need of verifying the theoretical assumptions of the FLM, he is aware of the deficiency of the model in that the data lack the necessary reality for the results to be fully reliable.

Fernández Sánchez uses the FLM as a theoretical framework to explain the cognitive processes intervening in our understanding and categorization of the outside world. The assumption that abstract notions are structured in terms of more concrete kinds of experience is confirmed by means of an etymological study of the lexemes included in the lexical field of possession. Surprisingly enough, no attention is paid to syntax in a model which consists of an integration of an essentially paradigmatic model of lexical analysis into a lexicon-based *grammatical* model which provides a highly-structured development of the syntagmatic aspect of lexical units, i.e. where syntagmatic behaviour as well as lexical structure need consideration.

Lastly, in agreement with FLM's hypothesis that there is an isomorphic relationship between word meaning and its grammatical properties, Rozina tries to prove the possibility of prediction of the «functioning» of predicates at higher levels of linguistic organization on the basis of their meaning definitions by means of Russian verbs of possession.

In general, while FLM provides detailed descriptions of the paradigmatic relationships among sets of different lexemes within a lexical field, it does not yet appear to have paid due attention to complex semantic networks, having focussed on the «core» lexicon so far, for understandable reasons if one bears in mind the enormous dimensions of its goal. In this sense, I must endorse Calañas' statement that the potential of the model for offering an appropriate rendition of the lexicon of the languages under analysis cannot be overemphasized.

The subject of the second part is predicate formation, i.e. the derivation of predicates and terms from basic lexical items on the basis of productive rules. All of these papers give a new treatment to problems already dealt with within FG.

Baron and Herslund provide a new account of support verb constructions, which they relabel as Verbo-Nominal Predicates (VNPs), constructions consisting of a verb without a very specific meaning of their own, which combines with a noun constituting the lexical core of the combination, the role of the verb being reduced to express the verbal categories of tense and mood. According to them, the creation of VNPs can be formulated as a predicate formation rule which moves the border of a verb to include its effected object, where the lexical weight is located. Besides, VNPs serve as input of a predicate formation rule rendering complex noun phrases, thus opposing Mackenzie's (1985) account of the structure of complex noun phrases as resulting from the addition of satellites to a valence-reduced noun derived from a verb. In their view, awkward though it may seem, complex noun phrases are derived, instead, from VNP-constructions, from which they inherit their syntactic capability of occurring with different complements.

Underlying this modified proposal is a radical departure from the FG's basic assumption that subject and object are syntactic notions not appearing in predicate frames. Baron & Herslund take up the valence framework expounded e.g. in Herslund & Sorensen (1994) and assume that the valence of a verb consists of two parts, an argument structure with semantic functions (SF) such as Agent and Goal and a grammatical structure with grammatical relations (GR) such as subject and object, grammatical relations being thus part of the valence frame.

Baron and Herslund explicitly regard their proposal as an extension of FG's notion of predicate formation, by allowing the input to a rule of predicate formation to be not only a basic or derived predicate, but also a syntactic combination. The possibility to have analytic items in either the input or the output of productive rules of this type is already established by FG, though (cf. Dik 1997: 1).

François questions the possibility to apply predicate formation rules to some verbal constructions in French, more specifically to describe the relationship between transitive and «pseudo-reflexive» (or unaccusative middle voice) constructions in the field of affectivity. His basic concern is

nothing else than a central issue when dealing with predicate formation: the degree of productivity and the input restrictions. Partial productivity is permitted by concluding that it is unavoidable to resort to lexically restricted predicate formation «rules».

Tweehuysen provides a reinterpretation of analytic causative constructions. By observing causative constructions in Swedish, he confronts Dik's hypothesis for the analysis of such constructions in Dutch with his own. While the former regards causative constructions as the result of a predicate formation rule, so that the causative *laten* is an auxiliary introduced by an expression rule into the surface structure, he draws the conclusion that Dik's claim does not hold true for Swedish, a bisentential approach being more appropriate. For him, *laten* is a predicate in its own right, which is added to the basic predicate. He then goes on to conclude that Dutch causatives should also be treated as bisentential constructions.

This paper illustrates the syntax-lexicon confrontation in that a phenomenon previously accounted for within the lexicon component, or rather, within predicate formation, is now explained syntactically. Tweehuysen is nevertheless aware of the intimate connection between the lexicon and syntax, which he reveals by considering raising as an intermediate stage to real valency extension resulting in some cases of lexicalization.

Part 3 is mostly devoted to collocations, not exclusively though.

Butler's article highlights the need to supplement FG's mechanisms for representing information belonging to the speaker's communicative competence. Relationships among lexical entries should be accounted for by a different formalism since although *some* of the differences between senses for lexical items can be handled in terms of the current model of the predicate frame, it is difficult to see how *all* the relationships holding between lexemes could be expressed in terms of differences in semantic functions and meaning postulates.

His proposal for the enrichment of the FG's lexicon concerns the inclusion of different types of information within the predicate frame, not only collocations: sense relationships, the association of the various grammatical forms of a verb with senses, colligations, i.e. the co-occurrence of lexical items with particular grammatical items or classes (vs. other specific lexical items), language dialectal or diatypic varieties, and syntactic information, the inclusion of which whenever a property cannot be predicted from the semantics of a lexeme remains an open question. Butler concludes hinting at the possibility that a «functional procedural» approach (Nuyts 1992) to language, in which the selection of values for pragmatic and varietal variables is made at a prelinguistic stage, might be required.

Corde focuses on the relationship between paradigmatic relations (i.e. various senses of words) and syntagmatic behaviour (i.e. collocations) and its significance from a lexicographic point of view. She begins her exposition by questioning whether it is possible for FG to provide a framework explaining the syntagmatic behaviour of words, which suggests she mistakenly limits syntagmatic relations to collocations, since FG does, indeed, account for syntagmatic relations in the sense that predicates are not given in isolation but as predicate frames providing information about how the lexeme must be used. It is collocations that current FG is still unable to account for, but they only represent one phenomenon of the syntagmatic realm. Since analysis of collocational patterns can be used to develop criteria for distinguishing between lexemes, she suggests connecting the distinction between collocations and idioms with the concept of selection restriction.

Besides *Stepwise Lexical Decomposition*, Corde revises Vossen's (1995) «anchored relational model», for which generic words individuate some self-evident concept and which, in her view, also fails to pay due attention to the syntagmatic level. Both writers coincide in emphasizing the need to make use of larger amounts of data stored in corpora to test theoretical hypotheses about the preferred lexical, syntactic, pragmatic and discoursal environments of words.

Underneath Butler & Corde's proposals can be seen a criticism on FG's assumed standards of pragmatic and psychological adequacy due to the failure of the model to account for collocations, undoubtedly relevant in the organization of the mental lexicon and in the process of language acquisition (cf. García Velasco & Martín Miguel, in this volume) and, more generally, for other types of information belonging to the speaker's communicative competence.

Part 4 concerns transitive verbs and their relation to the typology of SoAs.

Guerrero's paper is a cross-linguistic investigation on the «prototypicality» of transitive constructions in English, Spanish and German. Starting from the conception of transitivity as a prototype category and the assumption that the notion transitive is far more syntactic than semantic in English than in German or Spanish, where it is more restricted semantically, she provides a detailed illustration of the phenomenon.

Guerrero makes use of the FG typology of SoA's with the aim of establishing which of the parameters that define the semantic prototype can account for the structural variation across the three languages. She provides a reformulation of the semantic prototype, drawing the conclusion that the absence of *Control* and the presence of the feature *Change*, when it affects the first argument of the predication, seem to be relevant factors triggering off the use of syntactic structures more compatible with the semantics of the construction (intransitive, reflexive or attributive constructions) in the two latter languages. To my mind, studies such as this are most desirable since they corroborate the typological adequacy of the theory, while helping to make progress within the model.

Closely connected to the former is Podolski's paper, dealing with causativity, a notion within the scope of transitivity (for a treatment of causative constructions departing from the standard FG «derivational» account, cf. Tweehuysen, in this volume).

Podolski's comparative study of classes of causative verbs in Estonian, Russian and English leads her to the conclusion that morphological derivation is far less common in English, in which non-derivational conversive syntagmatic, analytic and suppletive types are met instead.

But for these cross-linguistic remarks on the types of derivation in causative constructions, confirming the typological adequacy of the model, Podolski limits herself to present a brief overview and discussion of a few debatable issues in former research concerning causatives (not much of the FG model's own investigation on the subject), such as the relationship between causation and transitivity, and some semantic and pragmatic considerations. She regards as causatives such transitive verbs expressing an action which brings about a change in the object and she estimates that prototypical transitives are also typical causatives.

Part 5 deals with various aspects of the relationship between the lexicon and the underlying structure of the clause.

García Velasco & Martín Miguel's paper deserves congratulations on undertaking what is usually missing when working within a specific theoretical framework: looking beyond that model, establishing links and pointing out differences between FG and other models of the lexicon.

They primarily refer to two functional theories of language that contrast sharply on the role they assign to the lexical component: FG and Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), the former representing a bottom-up orientation in which contentive lexemes provide the input for the linguistic generation process, the latter being top down in that the choice of features at higher levels has influential consequences on the choice of lexical items. In their view, the fact that in SFG a lexical item is a progressive fusion of the features all through the system traversal, and FG's statement that the definiens of meaning definitions is not directly accessible to the operation of syntactic rules are responsible for none of these two models having explicitly worked out a formal system of interaction between the levels of lexical definition and grammatical structure.

They go on to provide an overview of what other approaches have to say on the relation between meaning and form, although they merely concentrate on the gist of their proposals. While not much attention is paid to lexical decomposition and the way lexical knowledge should be represented, García & Martín point out how authors gradually try to derive aspects of the grammatical properties of a predicate from its meaning in a way as principled as possible. In this respect, they concentrate on Jackendoff (1990), the Lexicon Working Project (Hale & Keyser, 1986 and Levin & Rapaport, 1988) and Van Valin's Role and Reference Grammar (1993).

Finally, they indicate recent developments and implications within both FG and SFG. The claim of the opaqueness of the lexical information for the generation process in FG is modified by two re-

cent proposals which highlight the possibility of deriving different features of the predicate frame from its Meaning Definition. Worth mentioning in this respect are Bakker's (1994) conclusion that selection restrictions and meaning definitions codetermine each other to a large extent (regarding the verb *count*) and Rasmussen's (1994) system of Meaning Definitions. In SFG, grammar's influence on lexis may be regarded as a natural consequence of the theory's holistic conception of language. Nevertheless, lexis is granted autonomy at some level of extreme delicacy, when two or more words may be distinguished by purely lexical information.

Samuelsdorff discusses the relation of pronouns, adpositions and adverbs to the lexicon. For him, these three «word classes» exhibit a duality in that they may be classified as within the lexicon or as grammatical items. He sees a contradiction in the FG's account, but his own account is nothing short of confusing. He does not reach a conclusion as to the status of deictic pronouns which, unlike anaphoric pronouns, he claims might be recognised as lexical items. As for adpositions, having declared that they are a closed class «as a result of their being grammatical items», he proceeds to state that this traditional class contains a continuum of morphemes from lexicon to grammar, with cases such as *of* at the grammatical end of the continuum and words like *outside* at the lexical end. He speaks of «adjectives» and «adverbs», grammatical morphemes which together with lexical adverbs make up the traditional class of adverbs, which, in his opinion, should be replaced by a class of modifiers subdivided into different subclasses including the adjective.

Weigand and Hoppenbrouwers propose the introduction of a «Dynamic Lexicon», an alternative model which they deem a «more functional» or «truly functional» view of language in which linguistic actions and linguistic instruments, meaning and forms, are clearly distinguished and where an utterance is an action that gets significance in the social domain of human interaction.

They contend that the confusion between content and expression is a fundamental problem in the FG model resulting in a number of shortcomings, which they intend to solve. The lack of descriptive adequacy displayed by FG in that the complete supply of words in a language (i.e. predicates and function words) is not accounted for, can be mended with a modified model in which the Lexicon is a module covering the basic lexicon, the predicate formation rules and the formative expression rules.

Summing up, this volume contains a number of papers ranging from modest proposals to modify some aspects of the FG model, suggestions to reinterpret old phenomena in a new light, to proposals of radical renewal of the model as far as the lexicon is concerned. Butler's claim for the enrichment of the FG Lexicon, Baron & Herslund's treatment of verb-support constructions as input to a rule of predicate formation, and Weigand & Hoppenbrouwers' «Dynamic Lexicon» illustrate different degrees of dissatisfaction with the FG's approach to the Lexicon.

Time and again, FG is reproached for lack of compliance with the standards of adequacy which constitute the basis of the model. Butler's suggestion that more information concerning what the speaker knows about his/her language should be included within the predicate frame must be regarded as a complaint for FG's failure to achieve pragmatic adequacy. In this connection, particular emphasis is also made on the relevance of collocational information for the sake of psychological adequacy by a number of authors (cf. Butler, Corda, García Velasco & Martín Miguel). Yet FG could also raise its voice against the lack of loyalty to some of its fundamentals underlying what claims to be a modest proposal of change. Thus, the grammatical relations subject and object are assigned a different status by Baron and Herslund, now considered as basic notions defining the valence frame of verbs; Samuelsdorff dismantles one basic FG's assumption about term structures by suggesting that all pronouns should be generated by expression rules, thus denying the possibility for them to appear as basic terms in the lexicon; Tweehuysen regards passivization, a matter of syntactic functions assignment in the standard FG, as the result of predicate formation.

Though dealing with five different aspects of the role of the lexicon in FG, the old concern of the syntax-semantics interface underlies most of the papers under different disguises. The relevance granted to meaning postulates in the linguistic generation process or the possibility of predicting some syntactic phenomena from lexico-semantic structure, explicitly denied by the standard FG model of the lexicon (however, cf. Bakker & Rasmussen's recent proposals), is brought to the fore in more than one paper, with suggestions varying in degree of optimism and struggle.

The consideration of some elements as within syntax or as part of the lexicon component crops up on more than one occasion. FG's view of some causative constructions as the input of a predicate formation rule is substituted for a bisentential approach (cf. Tweehuysen); pronouns, adpositions and adverbs are considered mixed categories that belong to both the grammar, i.e. the expression rules, and the lexicon.

Besides *Stepwise-Lexical Decomposition*, different functional models of the lexicon are considered either in passing (cf. Corda's allusion to Vossen's *anchored relational model*, or Butler's reference to Nuyts' *Functional Procedural Grammar*) or more thoroughly (cf. García Velasco & Martín Miguel's revision of *Systemic Functional Grammar* or some offspring of *Generative Grammar*). However, there is still a sense of scattering and a deeper interpretation of the different accounts is needed in order to consolidate FG's theory of the Lexicon.

Overall, impressionistic though it may be, this volume is highly valuable as a preliminary endeavour to gather different contributions specifically dealing with a neglected component in the FG framework. As such, the book can provide important information not only for those linguists working within Dik's model, but also for those scholars interested in the role of the lexicon in contemporary grammatical analysis.

WORKS CITED

- Bakker, Dik 1994: *Formal and Computational Aspects of Functional Grammar and Language Typology*. Amsterdam: IFOTT.
- Coseriu, Eugenio 1977: *Principios de semántica estructural*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Dik, Simon C. 1978: *Stepwise Lexical Decomposition*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.
- Dik, Simon C. 1997: *The Structure of Functional Grammar. Part 2 (Complex and Derived Constructions)*. Ed. by K. Hengeveld. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hale, Kenneth and Samuel J. Keyser 1986: Some Transitivity Alternations in English. *Lexicon Project Working Papers 7*.
- Herslund, Michail and Finn Sorensen 1994: A Valence Based Theory of Grammatical Relations. Elisabeth Engberg-Pedersen et al. (eds.), *Function and Expression in Functional Grammar*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 81-95.
- Jackendoff, Ray 1990: *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport 1988: What to do with q-roles? W. Wilkins (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 21. London: Academic Press, 7-36.
- Mackenzie, J. Lachlan 1985: Nominalization and Valency Reduction. A. Machtelt Bolkestein et al. (eds.), *Predicates and Terms in Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris, 29-47.
- Nuyts, Jan 1992: *Aspects of a Cognitive-Pragmatic Theory of Language*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schack-Rasmussen, Lone 1994: Semantic functions in perspective-reconsidering meaning definitions. Elisabeth Engberg-Pedersen, Lisbeth Falster Jakobsen and Lone Schack Rasmussen (eds.), *Function and expression in Functional Grammar*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 41-63.
- Van Valin, Robert D. 1993: A Synopsis of Role and Reference Grammar. Robert D. Van Valin (ed.), *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1-164.
- Vossen, P. 1995: *Grammatical and Conceptual Individuation in the Lexicon*. Amsterdam: IFOTT.

