WPFG

The representation of nominal predicates in the fund
J. Lachlan Mackenzie
Free University of Amsterdam

The representation of nominal predicates in the fund:
a new proposal

J. Lachlan Mackenzie
Free University of Amsterdam

1. Reference and Predication

Functional Grammar (henceforth FG) is centrally concerned with the notions of _reference_ and _predication_ and their inter-dependence. This reflects the insight, which originated with Searle (1969), that the competent language-user seeks to achieve his communicative goals by performing complex illocutionary acts which include, _inter alia_, propositional acts, the latter being characterized by an interplay of _acts of reference_ and _acts of predication_. This interplay of reference and predication in FG is particularly clearly manifested in the prototypical use of the nominal predicate as the head of a term: such a predicate not only predicates but also contributes significantly to the role of the term as a referring expression. The purpose of this paper is to consider possible consequences of this aspect of FG for the representation of nominal predicates in the lexicon.

Dik (1978) presents reference as taking place 'within a pattern of verbal interaction', i.e. as involving minimally a Speaker and an Addressee. The Speaker performs an act of reference by uttering a term, 'any expression which can be used to refer to an entity or set of entities in some world'. Given the -- ultimately unbridgeable -- subjectivity of interlocutors, formalized in FG as differences in their 'pragmatic information', the act of reference can be nothing more than an _attempt_; at best, the Speaker 'intends to _guide_ his Addressee _toward_ some entity' [my emphases, JLM] (all quotations from Dik 1978: 55). The act is assessed, by the Speaker in his self-monitoring and by the Addressee in his attempt at interpretation, in terms of its (apparent) _success_. As Lyons has pointed out (1977: 181-182), 'successful reference does not depend upon the truth of the description contained in the referring expression. The speaker (and perhaps also the hearer) may mistakenly believe that some person is the postman, when he is in fact the professor of linguistics, and _incorrectly_, though _successfully_ [my emphases, JLM] refer to him by means of the expression "the postman". It is not even necessary that the speaker should believe that the description is true of the referent. He may be ironically employing a description he knows to be false or diplomatically accepting as correct a false description which his hearer believes to be true of the referent; and there are yet other possibilities.'

This pragmatic approach to reference, oriented towards

success, rather than correctness, is also reflected in the appli-
cation of Grice's (1975: 45) Maxim of Quantity ('make your contri-
bution as informative as is required for the current purposes of
the exchange; do not make your contribution more informative than
is required') to the construction of terms. In Dik's proposals
for term-formation, the information presented is offered in the
form of recursively stacked 'restrictors', each of which is an
open predication, i.e. a predication with at least one free-
variable argument. The purpose of restrictors is successively to
'narrow down the class of potential referents of the term used';
in keeping with the Gricean maxim, 'the Speaker will give neither
more nor less descriptive information about the intended
referents than is necessary for the Addressee to arrive at the
required identification ... The amount of descriptive information
to be given in a term is thus dependent upon the Speaker's
estimate of the Addressee's antecedent capacities for identifying
the intended referent. If the intended referent is some entity
about which the Speaker and Addressee have been talking for some
time, a minimum of descriptive information will be sufficient.
If, on the other hand, the intended referent is quite new within
the particular ongoing discourse, the Speaker will have to pro-
vide more descriptive information in order for the Addressee to
be able to arrive at the required identification' (all quotes
from Dik 1978: 55-56). This descriptive information will be
offered in hierarchically organized acts of predication, i.e. the
utterance of nouns, adjectives, relative clauses, etc. The
utterance of a term may consequently consist in either a simple
act of reference or in a combination of an act of reference and
one or more acts of predication.
     Whereas reference has from the inception of FG been
treated as a matter of pragmatics, predication, in practice if
not in principle, has been regarded as falling more under
semantics. Yet, at the very least, the functionalist orientation
of FG suggests the possibility of conceiving of predication, too,
as 'pragmatic, cooperative action'. Given the inevitable inter-
play of reference and predication within the term, but also at
predication level, where terms appear in slots generated by predi-
cation, such a pragmaticization of predicating can only lead to
greater conceptual unity. And work by Steen (1985) strongly
suggests that, if FG is adequately to account for the ubiquitous
phenomena of metaphor and metonymy, this will require that both
referring and predicating be taken as 'action within the pattern

of verbal interaction'.

An act of predication will, just like an act of reference, here be regarded as an <u>attempt</u> on the part of the Speaker: he is attempting to evoke a state of affairs with the linguistic means at his disposal. That this is no more than an attempt is particularly clear in the fumbling communications of language-learners or in the verbal behaviour of children: for lack of knowledge of the linguistic conventions, the learners/ children inventively fit their provisional competence as best as they can to what they need to convey. Whether the many resulting 'deviant' utterances are classified as 'errors' or not is dependent upon the analyst's purposes, but they are all manifestations of the learners'/children's creativity in the face of a limited command of language that does not do justice to the multitude of new states of affairs that arise and need to be talked about. The situation of the adult native-speaker does not differ in any essential aspect. It is surely illusory to suppose that the communicative competence of the mature human being is adequate to every situation he encounters. Rather, the use of language involves a creative quest for the words which provide the receiver of the message with the best clues, in the given setting, to the meaning the Speaker wishes to communicate. It is in this light that I wish to suggest that FG should adopt a unified approach to reference and predication, one in which attention is fixed on the degree of <u>success</u>, rather than <u>correctness</u>, that is achieved in the interplay of referential and predicational acts.

It may be objected that the proposal to model success rather than correctness in linguistic interaction is excessively inspired by the standpoint of the speaker, who has, it might be felt, a greater stake in success (getting his message 'across') than the hearer, who has more to gain from correctness. This objection fails, in my view, to grasp the essential cooperative nature of verbal interaction, in which the hearer is above all concerned to discern the speaker's intentions, as interpreted in the light of his own interests, and is prepared to tolerate incorrect or insufficient reference and predication as a mutually accepted and inevitable 'cost' of speedy and efficient oral interaction. Should it become apparent that communication is collapsing, or threatening to do so, conversational interaction allows various forms of 'repair' sequence whereby the <u>attempt</u> can be made to improve understanding: unimpaired transmission of information can however never be guaranteed.

2. Nominal and verbal predicates

It is in the fund that the language-user finds the primary tools
with which to carry out acts of predication. These tools take
the form of predicate frames, either basic (= listed in the
lexicon) or derived. Predicate frames are held to designate sets
of States of Affairs (SoA's), i.e. generalized mental represent-
ations of perceived real-world constellations (cf. Dik 1986). In
communicating, however, the language-user will very often [1] not
be interested in evoking a potentially infinite number of SoA's
all covered by the same predicate frame (e.g. all the SoA's in
any possible world designatable as acts of giving), but rather in
describing one particular SoA or a restricted number of such
SoA's. This is achieved by such means as introducing predicate
operators of Tense, spelling out Locative and Temporal implied
satellites and above all by performing acts of reference to
specific spatiotemporally locatable entities. This is a further
aspect of the interplay between an act of predication (here, the
choice of predicate frame) and one or more acts of reference. [2]
        The fund provides three major categories of predicate
frame: nominal, verbal and adjectival. For the purposes of this
paper we may concentrate on the largest categories, the nominal
and the verbal. How a particular predicate is categorized is, at
the very least, of great importance for its syntactic behaviour.
Given increasing acceptance of the notion that nouns and verbs
have prototypically distinct functions in discourse (cf.
especially Hopper and Thompson 1984), we may also expect that the
corresponding predicate frames will differ in their semantic
properties in a way that may be brought into correspondence with
their prototypical discourse function. For verbal predicate
frames, this poses no serious problem since, as was stated above,
predicate frames in general are held to designate SoA's, and this
is clearly true of verbal predicate frames. This lines up in an
obvious fashion with the prototypical use of verbs as being, in
Hopper & Thompson's words (1984: 708), to 'assert the occurrence
of an event of the discourse'. As for nominal predicate frames,
the established FG position is that they also designate SoA's.
These SoA's are typically States involving the assignment of a
property to a variable; with the smaller class of relational
nominal predicates, any other kind of SoA (e.g. Action, Position
or Process) may also be designated. This, I wish to point out,

is less easily squared with the prototypical discourse function
of nouns, namely to `introduce participants and "props"' (Hopper
& Thompson 1984: 710). Given the orientation of FG towards the
use of language in discourse, it is worth considering an
alternative approach that brings `the semantics closer to the
pragmatics'.

It may be deduced from the prototypical function of
verbs, 'to assert the occurrence of an event of the discourse',
and the fact that events usually involve a number of participants
and props, that verbal predicate frames will normally be charac-
terized by non-null valency, i.e. that they will introduce a
number of argument slots. In this way, the act of evoking a
verbal predicate frame contributes to the build-up of the dis-
course not only intrinsically but also by allowing potential
interaction with acts of reference. And indeed, the verbal
predicate frames of English, for example, show a range of valency
from 0 to 3: rain, hail (0); emerge, collapse (1); hit, see (2);
give, teach (3). Only the relatively marginal avalent predicates
fail to provide any slot for an act of reference.

Similarly, given the prototypical function of nouns as
names for participants and props, it would be natural to suppose
that such frames are normally avalent, and this is a position I
indeed shall defend. As might be predicted, the standard FG view
of nominal predicates as property-assigning entails that they are
normally monovalent, with the one argument representing the
entity to which the property is assigned. In the following
section, I shall submit the standard view of nominal predicates
to a critical examination.

3. Nominal predicates: the standard view

As was intimated above, nominal predicates are said to be either
relational or non-relational. Relational nominal predicates are
those which designate a relation between two, and possibly among
three participants. Non-relational nominal predicates, on the
other hand, serve to designate properties and are taken to
represent the unmarked case for nominal predicates. They will
consequently be dealt with first.

Non-relational predicates are represented in the fund as
monovalent:

(1) $\Phi_N (X_1)_{\emptyset}$

Thus <u>woman</u> is shown as follows:

(2)   woman$_N$ (x_1)$_\emptyset$

to be interpreted as (x_1) has the property 'woman(hood)' or,
equivalently, (x_1) is a member of the class of women. The
advantages of this representation are fourfold.

      Firstly, the presence of the ϕ-argument makes it clear
that the SoA designated belongs to the class of States, i.e. that
it is non-dynamic and non-controlled.

      Secondly, the presence of such predicate frames in the
fund makes it possible, in certain languages, directly to form
major property-assigning predications through the application of
the appropriate predicate-operators. This is very attractive for
those languages in which 'She is a woman' is expressed as
(Quasi-English) <u>She woman</u> or, with copula insertion, as <u>She is</u>
<u>woman</u>.

      Thirdly, the presence of an argument slot makes it
possible to express selection restrictions on the entities to
which the property can be assigned, as in (3a), in which the
restrictions are shown as predicates, or as in (3b), in which
they are shown as metalinguistic items (both representational
possibilities are encountered in the FG literature):

(3a)   woman$_N$ (x_1: animate(x_1): human(x_1): adult(x_1):
         female(x_1))

(3b)   woman$_N$ <anim, hum, adult, female> (x_1)$_\emptyset$

      Fourthly, integration of a predication formed from the
predicate frame into term structure, a typical destination for
nominal predications, is unproblematic: the material to the right
of the colon in the term schema (4) is merely replaced by the
open nominal predication (2) to give (5):

(4)   (Ωx_1: $\Phi(x_1)$)

(5)   (d1x_1: woman$_N$ (x_1)$_\emptyset$) 'the woman'

      The justification for the representation of relational
nominal predicates as polyvalent (i.e. two- or three-place) runs

largely parallel to that given for non-relational predicates. A
distinction has to be made, however, between α-relational and
ß-relational predicates. A-relational predicates designate
non-dynamic, non-controlled SoA's (States), are necessarily
two-place, one of the arguments having the semantic function
Zero and the other the function Ref(erence), and designate a
relationship between first-order entities; ß-relational predicates
may designate any type of SoA, may be either two- or three-place,
with a wide range of semantic functions for the arguments, and
designate a second-order entity that is an (abstract)
relationship between/among entities (or a third-order entity that
is the intensional correlate of the corresponding second-order
entity -- for details, see Lyons 1977: 445-446). Consider the
following examples:

(6a)   α-relational: $father_N$ $(x_1)_{\emptyset}$ $(x_2)_{Ref}$

(6b)   ß-relational: $destruction_N$ $(x_1)_{Ag}$ $(x_2)_{Go}$

Again, the advantages of these representations are fourfold.
        Firstly, the parallelism between relational nominal
predicates and lexically cognate verbal predicates is reflected
by the formalism. Consider, for example, the similarity between
the lexical representations of the α-relational noun <u>father</u> and
the verb <u>father</u> and of the ß-relational noun <u>destruction</u> and the
verb <u>destroy</u>:

(7a) $father_N$ $(x_1)_{\emptyset}$ $(x_2)_{Ref}$

(7b) $father_V$ $(x_1)_{Ag}$ $(x_2)_{Go}$

(8a) $destruction_N$ $(x_1)_{Ag}$ $(x_2)_{Go}$

(8b) $destroy_V$ $(x_1)_{Ag}$ $(x_2)_{Go}$

        Secondly, at least as far as α-relational predicates are
concerned, there is the possibility of directly forming major
predications by inserting terms into both argument positions.
This is attractive for languages with such constructions as <u>He
father of two children</u>, or, with copula insertion, <u>He is father
of two children</u>.
        Thirdly, for both α- and ß-relational predicates, there is

the possibility of stipulating selection restrictions on all the arguments of the predicate, e.g.:

(9) $father_N$ (x_1): animate(x_1): human(x_1): adult(x_1):
        male(x_1)) $(x_2$: animate(x_2))$_{Ref}$

(10) $destruction_N$ $(x_1$: animate(x_1))$_{Ag}$ $(x_2$: concrete(x_2))$_{Go}$

        Fourthly, for α-relational predicates, integration into
term structure is unproblematic: provided that the predication is
'open', i.e. has one of its arguments left variable (<u>in casu</u> that
with Zero-function), it can straightforwardly replace the
material to the right of the colon:

(11)   (d1x_1: $father_N$ (x_1))$_\omega$ (d2x_J: $child_N$ (x_J))$_{Ref}$ 'the father
        of the two children'

With β-relational predications, the situation is, as we shall see,
more complex, since none of the arguments of the nominal
predicate can be used to refer to the referent of the entire
term.

4. Term formation: the standard view

Before the special status of β-relational predicates can be
demonstrated, it will be necessary to devote brief consideration
to the 'orthodox' FG approach to term formation. As is well
known, the general schema for a term is as follows:

(12)   (Ωx_1: $\Phi(x_1)$)

The material to the right of the colon is to be read as 'an open
predication in x_1', which is understood as a predication that has
(at least) one of its argument positions left variable, namely
(x_1); this argument is necessarily coindexed with the variable to
the left of the colon. The predicate slot symbolized by Φ may be
filled by (a) a lexical predicate, drawn from the lexicon; (b) a
derived predicate, resulting from predicate formation; or (c) a
predicational predicate, formed by rule from a predication. In
Mackenzie (1986: 3), I pointed out that for this third class a
rule of Predication-Predicate Formation is tacitly assumed; it is

invoked whenever a predication serves as an argument or satellite
in a higher predication. This rule is formally parallel to
Term-Predicate Formation as discussed by Dik (1980: 105) and
Hannay (1985: 50), and has the following effect: given a
predication P, Predication-Predicate Formation will create,
productively, a derived predication P', the predicate of which is
derived from predication P:

(13)   PREDICATION-PREDICATE FORMATION

        Input: P
        Output: {P} $(x_1)_\omega$ (= P')
        Meaning: The predication P obtains

        For all types of terms, term formation merely involves
substituting for the material to the right of the colon in (12)
an open predication satifying the requirement set out above.
Where that predication has a non-relational predicate, the entry
in the fund will provide a variable, as in (1); this variable
will then be treated as coreferential with the variable to the
left of the colon. Where the predication has an α-relational
predicate, the entry in the fund will contain two or more
variables, as in (6a): the argument with the semantic function
Zero will be chosen to be coreferential with the variable to the
left of the colon; the other argument(s) may or may not be left
variable. Where the predication has a β-relational predicate,
Predication-Predicate Formation must apply: the variable
introduced by the rule, i.e. (x_1) in (13), will be coreferential
with the variable to the left of the colon.
        The approach to term formation sketched in the previous
paragraphs involves ascribing to, for example, the term phrase a
bachelor a representation that may be read, in quasi-English, as
'one indefinite entity such that the property "bachelor" is
predicated of that entity', or, more informally, 'someone who is
a bachelor'. This approach owes much to the generative-semantic
treatment of NP's, and in particular to Bach, who, it will be
recalled, proposed that 'all nouns ... are derived in one way,
namely from structures of roughly the form "Det + one + S" (1968:
92); in other words, he suggested that the same underlying
structure should be accorded to (14a) and (14b):

(14a)   I met someone who is a bachelor.

(14b)   I met a bachelor.

The underlying structure, Bach (1968: 121) adds, would look 'in some ways very much like the logical systems familiar from the work of modern logicians like Rudolf Carnap, Hans Reichenbach and others', and indeed he characterizes his proposals as involving 'a system of variables and quantifiers much like those of lower functional calculus' (1968: 91).

It is my contention that the 'orthodox' analysis of term phrases in FG is notationally equivalent to Bach's proposals and, as such, represents an undesirable importation of logical-semantic formalism into what is, as we saw above in the discussion of reference and predication, properly regarded as a pragmatic domain. The major drawback of the Bach-like representation of terms is that the notion of the production of a term as an attempt at a combined act of reference and predication is not captured. A more pragmatically oriented approach will analyse the term in (14b) not as 'one indefinite entity such that the property "bachelor" is predicated of that entity' but rather as 'one indefinite entity such that I, the Speaker, tender the name "bachelor"'. For all the reasons mentioned in Section 1 above, 'bachelor' may not be the ideal description of the individual referred to, but in the context of utterance it serves its purpose: as long as the Speaker, in his self-monitoring, or the hearer, in his effort to make sense of what is being said, does not object to the predicate tendered, the description is likely to stand, if that is perceived as contributing to the ongoing communication.

5.   Term formation: a new proposal

In this light, I should wish to present a representation of the term which differs only marginally from the 'orthodox' analysis yet which, I believe, does justice to the notion of referring and predicating as __attempts__ at communication. I assume that a term has, maximally, a twofold function in discourse. Firstly, it is by means of a term that a Speaker refers to an entity (of whatever order). The intended referent is represented by the x-variable to the left of the colon, the nature of the reference being narrowed down by term operators, if present, and indexing. In the familiar manner, term operators provide information about such matters as the assumed identifiability, specificity, proxi-

mity and cardinality of the referent(s). The index indicates the position of the intended referent in the store of pragmatic information that underpins the discourse: it can be regarded as the 'address' of a location in the memory of the Speaker. The Speaker will normally assume that the Addressee will have an equivalent address in his memory, or will be prepared to add one. It follows that many terms, especially those with purely ana- phoric or deictic function, e.g. he, that, two, will be represented without further ado as term operator + indexed variable. Anaphoric he, for example, can be represented merely as (x_n) where n is the address of the intended referent. There is no need for an anaphoric operator A that is encountered here and there in the FG literature since the anaphoricity will follow from the presence of n as an address in the memory, nor, as far as I can see, is there any need for specifications of definiteness or number, since these are indicated on or derivable from the first mention of (x_n); the masculine singular form he, rather than she, it or they will be used in accordance with the Speaker's judgment that that form represents the most effective clue to the intended referent; and the case form he rather than him will follow from the functional specification of the term.

The proposal is thus that there should be no explicit linking of the two functions of a term by means of co-indexed variables. This means, for example, that the term 'the woman' is to be represented as follows:

(15) $(d1x_i: woman_N)$

(15) differs from (5) in lacking any co-indexed variable to the right of the colon. Similarly, 'the father of the two children', given an orthodox representation as (11) above, now appears as (16):

(16) $(d1x_i: father_N (d2x_j: child_N)_{Ref})$ 'the father of the two children'

Terms that in orthodox FG require Predication-Predicate Formation can now be represented straightforwardly: 'Caesar's destruction of the city' may be shown as (17).

(17) $(d1x_k: destruction_N (d1x_i: Caesar_N)_{Ag} (d1x_j: city_N)_{Go})$

It must count as an advantage of my proposal that all terms are now formed in the same way, without any need to invoke a special predicate formation rule for one class.

6. Nominal predicates: a new proposal

Since there is no variable to the right of the colon in the proposed term representations, the opportunity arises to simplify the entries for nominal predicates in the fund. Accordingly, I will grasp this opportunity and show 'woman', 'father' and 'destruction' as follows [3]:

(18)   woman$_N$

(19)   father$_N$ $(x_1)_{Ref}$

(20)   destruction$_N$ $(x_1)_{Ag}$ $(x_j)_{Go}$

Each of these entries, with -- where relevant -- the argument slots either left variable or specified by other predicates, can be filled into a term, to the right of the colon, whenever the Speaker judges that it is appropriate to do so. The general schema for a term may now be shown as:

(21)   (Ωx_1: FUND ENTRY)

This schema does not exclude the possibility that the fund entry may contain a variable that is co-indexed with the variable to the left of the colon. Speakers are not denied the possibility of asserting an identity of this kind, and indeed it is this possibility that is expressed in English as a relative clause. Consider the following representation of 'the boy who is studying in the library':

(22)   (d1x_1: boy$_N$: PresProg study$_V$ $(x_1)_{Ag}$ (d1y_j: library)$_{Loc}$)

To summarize, the main points of my proposal are as follows:

1. -- to exclude from the formalism of FG the necessary co-indexing of the obligatory referring part of the term with the optional predicating part to the right of the

colon;

2. -- to banish from the fund entry for nominal predicates the argument variable proposed in earlier work, and thereby to present non-relational nominal predicates as explicitly avalent;

3. -- to do away with the rule of Predication-Predicate Formation, which turns out to be an artefact of the orthodox formalism.

7. Possible objections

It remains to be considered whether ridding FG of (a) co-indexing within the term, (b) the argument variable in the lexicon, and (c) Predication-Predicate Formation does not lead to a decrease in adequacy. Let us consider various possible objections to these proposals that may be derived from the justification for the orthodox approach to term formation (cf. section 3 above).
        Firstly, it may be objected that by dropping the Zero-function argument in the fund for non-relational and α-relational nominal predicates, we fail to make clear that such predicates designate a State. There is, however, a precedent in the representation of avalent verbal predicates (e.g. freeze in It's going to freeze tonight), which have no argument, but clearly can be assigned to a class of States of Affairs, e.g. on the basis of the tests evolved by Vester (1983) and De Groot (1983). In any case, the application of the SoA typology to first-order entities is obscure: either they are all vacuously States, in which case the objection fails, or cannot be classified in terms of the typology, in which case it fails again.
        Secondly, it may be felt that the parallel between nominal and verbal relational predicates, exemplified above with father, will be lost if $father_v$ is shown as bivalent and $father_N$ as monovalent. This may not be so serious, since few nominal relational predicates have a verbal counterpart: mother exists as a verb, but in a different semantic relationship to its nominal counterpart than father; son, daughter, brother, and sister are found only as nouns, and so also with most relational nominal predicates.
        Thirdly, the possibility of forming a nominal predication

directly from a fund entry by means of copula insertion is not
available in my proposal. The orthodox analysis of (23) is as in
(24):

(23)   This man is Peter

(24)   FUND ENTRY: Peter$_N$ (x_i)

        Pres Peter$_N$ (d+plx$_i$: man$_N$ (x_i)$_{\emptyset}$)

The predication is derived by substituting a specified term for
the variable in the fund entry. This approach suffers, however,
from treating the equating of two entities as though it were a
matter of one being in the valency of the other. The putative
semantic structure, which shows an argument dependent upon a
predicate (i.e. in its valency), is at variance with the notion
of an equation: a = b is equivalent to b = a, the only difference
lying in a pragmatic motivation, namely the decision to take
either a or b as the starting-point (Topic) for the presentation
of the equation. In the context of my proposal to treat nouns
like Peter and man as avalent, there is an alternative analysis
in which no appeal is made to valency but rather, and this would
appear more appropriate, to the assignment of pragmatic func-
tions. In the following representation of (23), the terms are
unordered and have no semantic function (i.e. dependence on a
predicate): this is the basis for their being interpreted as
equated with each other. The expression of (25) as (23), rather
than as Peter is this man, is derived purely from the assignment
of Top to this man and Foc to Peter:

(25)   Pres (d1x$_i$: Peter)$_{Foc}$ (d+plx$_j$: man)$_{Top}$

        It might be further objected, however, that my proposal
will run into difficulties with the distinction in Dutch between
(26a) and (26b), which can be captured in the orthodox approach
by deriving (26a) directly from the lexicon, whereas (26b)
requires term-predicate formation:

(26a)   Deze man is schilder (This man's job is to be a painter)
(26b)   Deze man is een schilder (This man is a painter)

The orthodox analysis of (26a) runs parallel to that of (23):

(27)   FUND ENTRY: $schilder_N$ (x_i)

Pres $schilder_N$ $(d+plx_i: man_N (x_i)_\emptyset)$

As we saw in section 3 above, the valency of a nominal predicate
is seen as involving a relation of class-membership, so that
(27), as a sentence expressing a relation of class-membership
(This man belongs to the class of painters), appears to be a very
attractive representation of (26a). It should be noted, however,
that the construction in question is limited as to the languages
it is found in, and, even within Dutch, is restricted to member-
ship of particular (especially professional) classes. Whether or
not it is legitimate to regard class-membership as a matter of
valency is undecidable as long as there is no agreed definition
of the latter term; what is incumbent upon me is to put forward
an alternative representation of (26a) that is in keeping with my
proposals. What I suggest is (28a), in which the zero-operator
and lack of index on the variable left of the colon indicate
formal invariance and non-referentiality respectively; (26b),
with its requirement of number agreement with the referential
(indexed) argument, may be shown as (28b) [4]:

(28a)   Pres $(x: schilder)_{Foc}$ $(d+plx_j: man)_{Top}$

(28b)   Pres $(1x: schilder)_{Foc}$ $(d+plx_j: man)_{Top}$

Fourthly, the objection may be anticipated that the oppor-
tunity of expressing selection restrictions in the fund is not
available in my proposal. Indeed, I cannot show in the fund that
prince 'requires' a male 'argument' and princess a female one, if
selection restrictions are to be shown as predicated of that argu-
ment, as shown in (3a) above. If, however, selection restric-
tions are included between angled brackets, as has been the case
in much recent FG work, and is exemplified in (3b) above, the
problem does not arise, woman appearing as (29):

(29) $woman_N$ <anim, hum, adult, female>

More generally, however, the desirability of selection restric-
tions in a pragmatically oriented grammar is highly disputable;
the case against selection restrictions in an FG has been elo-

quently argued by Steen (1985).

8. The advantages of the new proposals

I hope to have shown that my alternative approach to the representation of nominal predicates in the fund and the resultant ideas for the representation of term phrases is no less adequate than existing proposals. Indeed, by banning the co-indexation requirement, by streamlining the lexical entries for nominal predicates and by doing away with the requirement that β-relational predicates be introduced by Predication-Predicate Formation, I have achieved an increase in adequacy through a simplification of the representational apparatus and a further rapprochement of grammatical form and pragmatic function. The approach I propose presents the speaker not so much as a generator of well-formed predications but rather as an actor, seeking a balance between referential and predicational acts, proposing terms and tendering predicates in the hope that he will succeed in communicating. It is above all in this respect that I consider my apparently rather marginal proposal to have far-reaching implications for how we understand the role of Functional Grammar in relation to pragmatics.

Acknowledgements

Notes

[1] The exceptions concern the utterance of 'gnomic' propositions.

[2] In support of the notion of the choice of a predicate frame as an act, we may note that Bolkestein and Risselada (1985) have insisted on the pragmatic determination of that choice.

[3] It is interesting to note that in Weigand's (1986) Koto, a formal language based on FG predications, nominal predicates and terms are represented in a manner that is notationally equivalent to what is being proposed here. Weigand's motivation is representational simplicity: '[the] variable can be skipped without ambiguity' (1986:2). Weigand however adheres to the orthodox FG position that 'nouns ... are treated as one-place open predicates' (1986:2).

[4] Cf. the plural forms of (26a) and (26b) respectively: _Deze mannen zijn schilder_ and _Deze mannen zijn schilders_.

References

Bach, E. (1968). Nouns and noun phrases. In Bach, E. & R.T. Harms (eds) Universals in linguistic theory, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 91-122.

Bolkestein, A.M. & R. Risselada (1985). De tekstuele functie van valentie: Latijnse drieplaatisge predikaten in kontekst. In Dik, S.C. (ed.), Valentie in Funktionele Grammatika, Tijdschrift voor Taal- en Tekstwetenschap 5/2, 161-176.

Dik, S.C. (1978). Functional Grammar. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (Third printing, 1981, Dordrecht: Foris).

Dik, S.C. (1980). Studies in Functional Grammar. London & New York: Academic Press.

Dik, S.C. (1986). Linguistically motivated knowledge representation. WPFG 9.

Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds), Speech acts. Syntax and Semantics 3, New York: Academic Press, 41-58.

Groot, C. de (1983). Typology of states of affairs. In H. Bennis & W.U.S. van Lessen Kloeke (eds), Linguistics in the Netherlands 1983, Dordrecht: Foris, 73-81.

Hannay, M. (1985). English existentials in Functional Grammar. Dordrecht: Foris.

Hopper, P. & S.A. Thompson (1984). The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. Language 60, 703-752.

Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mackenzie, J.L. (1986). Aspects of nominalization in English and Dutch. WPFG 15.

Searle, J.J. (1969). Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steen, G. (1985). Grammar and metaphor: the consequences of an anomaly. WPFG 3.

Vester, E. (1983). Instrument and manner expressions in Latin. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Weigand, H. (1986). Functional Grammar as a formal language. In An overview of the conceptual language KOTO, Report IR-112, Department of Mathematics and Information Theory, Free University of Amsterdam.

WORKING PAPERS IN FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR

WPFG publishes papers which are (a) not (yet) ready for official publication, but sufficiently interesting as contributions to on-going discussions within FG and (b) papers that will be officially published, but whose publication will take at least one year after publication in WPFG. For all information contact the following address

> Caroline Kroon/Rodie Risselada
> Klassiek Seminarium
> University of Amsterdam
> Oude Turfmarkt 129
> NL-1012 GC Amsterdam
> tel. - (0)20 - 525 2559/2571

Papers can be ordered as follows :
(a) Transfer the required amount of money to postal account (giro) no. 5923629, in the name of C.H.M. Kroon -inz. WPFG-, Amsterdam;
(b) From abroad send an international money order or an EURO cheque written out in Dutch guilders to the editorial address. OTHER cheques or money orders are acceptable ONLY if ƒ 12.50 is added to cover the extra bank charges.
Please specify the required items.
For standing orders contact the above address.

The following papers are now available:

1. Martin Harris - Word order in contemporary French: a functional view. ƒ 5.00.
2. Simon Dik - Copula auxiliarization: how and why? ƒ 6.00.
3. Gerard Steen - Grammar and metaphor. The consequences of an anomaly. ƒ 6.00.
4. Peter Kahrel - Some aspects of derived intransitivity. ƒ 6.00.
5. Luke Zimmermann - Subordinate clauses in Australian aboriginal languages. ƒ 7.00.
6. Liesbeth Afman - Les constructions pronominales en français. ƒ 6.00.
7. Louis Goossens - The auxiliarization of the English modals. ƒ 6.00.
8. Machtelt Bolkestein - Parameters in the expression of embedded predications in Latin. ƒ 6.00.
9. Simon Dik - Linguistically motivated knowledge representation. ƒ 6.00.
10. A. Moutaouakil - Towards an adequate representation of illocutionary force in FG. ƒ 5.00.
11. Simon Dik - On the notion 'Functional Explanation'. ƒ 6.00.
12. Casper de Groot and Machiel Limburg - Pronominal elements: diachrony, typology and formalization in FG. ƒ 6.00.
13. Albert Rijksbaron - The pragmatics and semantics of conditional and temporal clauses; some evidence from Dutch and Classical Greek. ƒ 6.00
14. Jan Rijkhoff - Word order universals revisited: the principle of Head Proximity. ƒ 6.00.
15. Lachlan Mackenzie - Aspects of nominalization in English and Dutch. ƒ 6.00.
16. Co Vet - A pragmatic approach to tense in FG. ƒ 5.00.
17. Lourens de Vries - The Wambon relator system. ƒ 6.00
18. Simon Dik - Two papers on the computational application of FG. ƒ 6.00.
19. Bieke van der Korst - Twelve sentences: a translation procedure in terms of FG. ƒ 6.00.
20. Casper de Groot - Predicate formation in FG. ƒ 6.00.
21. Jan Nuyts - Negatives are not fond of travelling. A cognitive-pragmatic reconsideration of negative raising. ƒ 6.00.

Also available are Simon Dik's 1978 monograph Stepwise lexical decomposition (ƒ 5.00) and a complete bibliography of FG books, articles and papers (ƒ 2.50). These items can be ordered in the same way as a Working Paper.