



## Functional Discourse Grammar as a dualistic model of language

Kees Hengeveld

*Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication, University of Amsterdam*

---

P.C.Hengeveld@uva.nl

The first aim of this paper is to show how the dualistic nature of language is captured in Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG, Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008, 2010). A second aim is to show to what extent this approach is similar to and different from Discourse Grammar (DG, Heine, Kaltenböck, Kuteva & Long 2013).

FDG is a hierarchically organized typologically-based model of language structure that consists of four different levels of analysis: the Interpersonal, Representational, Morphosyntactic, and Phonological Levels. The Interpersonal Level is actional in nature: it describes linguistic units in terms of the communicative actions carried out by the speaker while producing an utterance. The Representational level is semantic in nature: it describes linguistic units in terms of their denotations. The Interpersonal and Representational Levels together map onto the Morphosyntactic and Phonological Levels, which take care of the form of linguistic units. The latter two levels will not play an important role in this paper.

The design of FDG crucially assumes the dualistic nature of language that is the topic of the workshop. The distinction between the Interpersonal and Representational Levels is representative of this dualistic nature of language: a wealth of grammatical and interpretational phenomena show that this distinction is crucial for the understanding of the nature of language. Among the phenomena that I will discuss are (the performative and non-performative uses of) speech act verbs and their modifiers, interjections, word order, and, if time permits, grammaticalization.

A distinction that comes close to the distinction of the Interpersonal and Representational Levels in FDG is the opposition between Thetical Grammar and Sentence Grammar in DG. Here too Thetical Grammar is, roughly speaking, concerned with the organization of discourse, while Sentence Grammar is responsible for the propositional organization of sentences. A crucial difference is, however, that in FDG *all* representational elements have an interpersonal counterpart (though not necessarily the other way around). DG, on the other hand, associates only extra-clausal elements with its Thetical Grammar, while clausal elements are part of Sentence Grammar. I will argue that this division of labour leans too heavily on the formal manifestation of linguistic elements, that functions rather than forms should be the point of departure in defining the dualistic nature of grammar, and that these functions can be traced in the grammatical behaviour of linguistic elements. In order to illustrate these points I will take noun phrases and their modifiers as an example.

### References

- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva & Haiping Long. 2013. An outline of discourse grammar. In Shannon Bischoff & Carmen Jany (eds.), *Functional Approaches to Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 175–233.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A Typologically-based Theory of Language Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2010. Functional Discourse Grammar. In: Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 367–400.