COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AND FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS

JAN NUYTS

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is an inquiry into how Cognitive Linguistics relates to, complements, and/or differs from other approaches within the wider field of functionally oriented linguistics (of which Cognitive Linguistics is a member as well). In order to avoid terminological confusion, I will use the notion "Functional Linguistics" strictly to refer to such "other functional approaches" only, to the exclusion of Cognitive Linguistics. The notion "functionally oriented linguistics" will serve as a cover term for all functional approaches to language, including Cognitive Linguistics.

This chapter is organized as follows. In section 2, I will discuss the problem of delimiting Cognitive Linguistics on the one hand, and Functional Linguistics on the other. The subsequent sections deal with major dimensions along which one can compare Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics. Section 3 assesses the position of the two paradigms vis-à-vis the basic theoretical notions from which their names have been derived: "functionalism" and "cognition." Section 4 considers how and to what extent these two paradigms deal with major dimensions of the object domain of language (structure, meaning, discourse, etc.). Section 5 briefly addresses the methods of inquiry. Section 6, finally, turns to the views on

the nature and status of (linguistic) knowledge espoused in Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics, including what may be the most significant distinctive element between them, namely, the "pattern" versus "process" issue.

2. DELIMITING COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AND FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS

In order to uncover the differences and similarities between Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics, one obviously needs a clear notion of how these research fields or paradigms can be mutually delimited. It is far from easy, however, to draw an actual borderline. Cognitive Linguistics is generally considered to have a clear scientific identity, distinguishing it from other approaches in linguistics, and thus also from Functional Linguistics. The existence of the present *Handbook*, specifically devoted to Cognitive Linguistics, may testify to this point. However, when it comes to characterizing this identity, it soon turns out that there are very few criteria (if any) that are really specific or unique to Cognitive Linguistics and allow us to oppose Cognitive Linguistics to other functional approaches. Ultimately, any delimitation of Cognitive Linguistics is bound to be, to some extent, arbitrary, or inspired by nonscientific criteria, such as social ones (see below). Consequently, opinions about where to draw the line can easily diverge. The present *Handbook* can again serve as an illustration, as it features several subjects that many would consider to go well beyond Cognitive Linguistics proper, into the realm of Functional Linguistics, while others might find that the *Handbook* covers too narrow a section of the entire field of Cognitive Linguistics.

Here, then, is a brief characterization of how I will delimit the fields of Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics for the purpose of this chapter, in terms of research groups or traditions belonging to each.

Cognitive Linguistics

I define the field of Cognitive Linguistics at two "levels of extension." At the first level, I define it fairly narrowly (more narrowly than the present *Handbook*), confining it to what could be considered its "core": a body of research centering around semantic analyses of the type pioneered by Talmy (1988a, 1988b, 1991, 2000a, 2000b); Lakoff (1987; Lakoff and Johnson 1980; see also Gibbs 1994); Fauconnier (in his semantic "Mental Spaces" theory; 1985, 1997); Langacker (in his model of "Cognitive Grammar"; 1987, 1991); and further found in several of the grammatical models labeled "Construction Grammar." Construction Grammar is

itself a conglomerate of approaches (see Croft, this volume, chapter 18), some of which can be more or less unambiguously situated within the range of Cognitive Linguistics (e.g., the variants by Lakoff 1987; Goldberg 1995; Croft 2001). Other variants of Construction Grammar do not fall under the Cognitive Linguistics heading. This is most notably true for the version that could rightfully claim the patent on the label and the concept of Construction Grammar, namely, the version by Fillmore, Kay, and colleagues (Fillmore 1988; Fillmore, Kay, and O'Connor 1988; Fillmore et al., forthcoming), which has been "under construction" since the mid-eighties. This branch of Construction Grammar is currently clearly inclining toward a grammar model such as Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (usually abbreviated to HPSG; Pollard and Sag 1994)—not the kind of model one would readily associate with Cognitive Linguistics.[2]

There is one straightforward nonscientific, geographical and thus social element which binds together Cognitive Linguistics as characterized above, namely, the fact that all the linguists mentioned have worked for at least part of their careers at Californian universities in the 1980s and 1990s, mostly at the University of California at Berkeley and at San Diego. (Of course, in the mean time, PhD students of these linguists, and even some of these linguists themselves, have spread to many other places in the United States and beyond, so that the geographical criterion has mainly become a historical one, and its validity is weakening rapidly as time goes by.) One important consequence of this social fact is that it has facilitated the dissemination of a number of basic views, notions, and research attitudes (which will be explicated in the following sections) among these scholars. This process has no doubt been stimulated considerably by the additional fact that quite a few of these linguists have gone through much of the same scientific developments: many of them had their roots in Generative Grammar, subsequently turned to Generative Semantics, and have ultimately come to completely reject the generative paradigm (Generative Semantics was a first step in their reaction to orthodox Generative Grammar and can be considered a stepping-stone to the creation of the Cognitive Linguistics movement).

Not all of these cognitive linguists have been influenced by the same ideas and notions to the same degree, however: even among the group of cognitive linguists considerable heterogeneity remains. Furthermore, (most of) the ideas characterizing this group are not exclusive to it. On the one hand, certain elements of the cognitive linguistic views and notions have developed independently in (functional) linguistic circles elsewhere, even if they have not always acquired the same central status there. What characterizes Cognitive Linguistics, then, is not any of these views or notions in particular, but rather the whole cluster of them. On the other hand, since UC Berkeley and UC San Diego have been strong attraction poles for linguists from around the world, the ideas developed there have had ample chance to influence other research paradigms

In a quite sizeable group of linguists, however, there has been such a strong mutual influence between the ideas and perspectives from Cognitive Linguistics and from other linguistic traditions—particularly, Functional Linguistics—that a blend of the two fields has emerged. Although many scholars in that situation

squarely situate themselves within the field of Cognitive Linguistics (rather than within Functional Linguistics), I will call them "functional-cognitive linguists," in order to distinguish their approach from that of the cognitive linguists as defined above. These functional-cognitive linguists, then, represent the second "level of extension" in the present definition of Cognitive Linguistics. In a way, this characterization already applies to Croft's (2001) version of Construction Grammar (although it has been included in the above overview of "core" cognitive linguistic work), as it blends ideas from Cognitive Linguistics and language typology. The characterization certainly applies to scholars such as Kemmer (1993, 2003; Barlow and Kemmer 2000), Verhagen (1995, 2000; Kemmer and Verhagen 1994), or Geeraerts (1989, 1993, 1997), to name just a few (many more will be mentioned later in this chapter).[3] In fact, it applies to nearly the entire "European branch" of Cognitive Linguistics (of which Verhagen and Geeraerts are representatives, of course). After all, whereas the North American branch of Cognitive Linguistics has to a considerable extent grown out of a negative reaction against the Generative Grammar tradition that has been prevailing on that continent, the members of the European branch have mostly been trained in one of the European, functionally oriented (structuralist or post-structuralist) linguistic schools or traditions and have adopted the ideas from Californian Cognitive Linguistics in the course of their careers, while at the same time retaining many of the basic ideas and research attitudes they have been raised with. This is possible because there is usually perfect compatibility between the "old" and the "new" ideas (see below).[4]

Functional Linguistics

The field of Functional Linguistics is even harder to delimit, at least in terms of scholars or research groups belonging to it, because it is much wider and much more diverse than that of Cognitive Linguistics. In fact, the only reasonable characterization of Functional Linguistics is in terms of all research in linguistics (and directly related fields) that adopts a functional approach to the analysis of linguistic phenomena (see section 3)—this would, in principle, include Cognitive Linguistics, if it were not for the terminological conventions specified in the introduction. In other words, unlike Cognitive Linguistics, Functional Linguistics cannot be caught in terms of some specific, regional, social, or related (e.g., historical) criterion, but only in terms of a general "conceptual" criterion, namely, a single basic research attitude shared by many researchers and research groups all over the world.

Although it is nearly impossible to give an exhaustive overview, the best way to give an impression of the extension of Functional Linguistics is to present a survey of some of its major exponents.[5] This survey should obviously include a number of "schools" of functional grammar models, the most important of which are Systemic-Functional Grammar (as part of the wider field of Systemic Linguistics; Halliday 1994), Functional Grammar as developed in the Amsterdam tradition

(Dik 1997), and Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin 1993)—see also Butler (2003). It should also cover a range of conceptual frameworks or traditions that have not really taken the shape of a (more or less formalized) model, but do formulate sets of (theoretical) principles aimed at grasping and explaining linguistic facts within different domains of the organization and functioning of language, including domains which are not covered by classical functional grammar models. These include, among many others:[6]

a. In the domain of "grammar": the discourse-oriented syntactic work by Givón (1984, 1990, 1995) and Chafe (1994), the Columbia School (e.g., Otheguy, Stern, and Reid 2002), and the strong tradition in cross-linguistic and typological research (usually more data-oriented than theoretical) in the style of Greenberg (1966, 1978; see also Comrie 1981; Croft 1990; and the typology group at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology).

b. In the domain of semantics: the framework developed by Wierzbicka (1980, 1996), and also the "semantic-typological" work of the "cognitive anthropologists" at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (Pederson et al. 1998),[7] work done in Slobin's (1996) "thinking for speaking" framework,[8] or in the Whorfian tradition (Lucy 1992a, 1992b).

c. In the domain of discourse studies: Mann and Thompson's (1988, 1992) Rhetorical Structure Theory, the linguistically oriented branches of Conversation Analysis (see Ochs, Schegloff, and Thompson 1996), Discourse Analysis (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975), and the framework developed by Halliday and Hasan (1976).[9]

d. In the domain of diachronic studies (grammatical and semantic): the body of research focusing on grammaticalization and related semantic phenomena such as subjectification[10] (Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeyer 1991; Hopper and Traugott 1993; Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994).[11]

Let us see, then, to what extent we can pinpoint distinctive features between Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics, both in their specific research goals and practices and in their theoretical viewpoints. In line with what has been suggested above, the following survey of potential sources of divergence will not reveal any points of radical opposition. When differences do emerge, they are rarely clean-cut, but rather involve tendencies within (one of) the two paradigms, to which there are (often numerous and important) exceptions on both sides (especially the "functional-cognitive linguists," who systematically defy any attempts at formulating oppositions). Further, differences rarely involve real incommensurability: they are mainly cases of complementarity or relatively minor differences in opinion.

than with basic research orientations or positions. Yet, it is well known that, for example, taking a narrow or a broad perspective on some dimension of a research object (i.e., a perspective which either is or is not informed by the characteristics of other dimensions of the same research object) may lead to very different and often hardly reconcilable conceptions of that dimension.[13] So the matter is not without theoretical importance.

Although, arguably, there is cognitive linguistic work on practically all major domains of language (see parts IV and V of the present *Handbook*), Cognitive Linguistics as defined above is predominantly oriented to semantic phenomena (witness part I of the present *Handbook*, which almost exclusively features purely semantic notions). What is more, these semantic concerns are to a considerable extent (though certainly not exclusively) directed at phenomena such as categorization and schematization in conceptualizing the world (cognitive models, mental spaces, type-token relations, metaphorization, imagery, etc.). Cognitive Linguistics also pays serious attention to language-structural phenomena proper in Cognitive Grammar and in various Construction Grammars,[14] but research in this area is not as well represented as the semantically oriented research. Moreover, in its analysis of structure, Cognitive Grammar (much more so than the various Construction Grammars) is strongly oriented to semantics (in particular, the semantic aspects relating to human categorization) and is therefore as much a semantic model as it is a syntactic one. The level of discourse structure is practically absent in Cognitive Linguistics, except for considerations such as those in Langacker (2001a)—but see Sanders and Spooren (this volume, chapter 35) for more references from a more broadly defined field of Cognitive Linguistics. Finally, Cognitive Linguistics has a strongly synchronic orientation. Few exceptions apart (including Sweetser 1990), there is hardly any consideration of diachrony.[15] However, given a broader delimitation of the field of Cognitive Linguistics—which would then include the functional-cognitive linguists—the situation regarding diachrony is completely different: many European cognitive linguists, in particular, have always shown a very active interest in the issue of language change (again, not surprisingly, with a main focus on semantic issues; see, e.g., Geeraerts 1997; Blank and Koch 1999).

Functional Linguistics, by contrast, is mainly oriented toward an account of linguistic structure.[16] Functional Linguistics, too, has seen a few predominantly semantic approaches, such as that by Wierzbicka (which, in a way, is also about the basics of human categorization) or by the cognitive anthropologists at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (see also several contributions in Nuyts and Pederson 1997). But, on the whole, purely semantic research, particularly of the kind predominating in Cognitive Linguistics, is rare in Functional Linguistics. Of course, meaning does play a crucial role in functional linguistic approaches to structural phenomena, as it is one of the central elements of the functionalist orientation (see also Harder 1996), and this sometimes even implies a certain concern with semantic phenomena proper. A prime example is the considerable attention in Functional Linguistics (more so than in Cognitive Linguistics) to phenomena of sentence modification and evaluation, that is, what is often called "Tense-Aspect-Modality," or "TAM," marking (despite the fact that it also involves other semantic

categories, such as negation, space, and evidentiality).[17] The topic is central to very different branches of Functional Linguistics, including several of the major grammar models (see the proposals for "layered" or "hierarchical" representations of operators and adverbials/satellites in Functional Grammar and Role and Reference Grammar—see, e.g., Van Valin 1993; Van Valin and LaPolla 1997; Hengeveld 1989; Dik 1997; several contributions in Nuyts, Bolkestein, and Vet 1990; see also Nuyts 2004), the typological literature (e.g., Comrie 1976, 1985; Chafe and Nichols 1986; Willett 1988; Kahrel and van den Berg 1994; Palmer 2001; among many others), and the diachronic literature (Tense-Aspect-Modality markers are obviously crucial in both the grammaticalization and the subjectification literature—see, e.g., Traugott 1989, 1997; Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994). However, the functional linguistic interest in these semantic categories is primarily due to the fact that their linguistic expression tends to exhibit remarkable grammatical properties that pose a challenge to many accounts of linguistic structure. Interest in the topic of Tense-Aspect-Modality markers is therefore primarily inspired by structural phenomena, and semantics are dealt with as "instrumental" to an account of the structural dimension.[18] (This strong bias toward the structural end often leads to a biased view of the semantic issues involved and to problems in handling Tense-Aspect-Modality markers in grammar; see Nuyts 2001, 2003.) The purely semantic work on space by the cognitive anthropologists obviously belongs in the same category of semantic investigations but is not biased by the structural dimension.

The attention to structure in Functional Linguistics not only pertains to the level of the sentence, but also to the level of discourse. To be sure, not all of the work in Functional Linguistics dealing with sentence structure is also explicitly concerned with discourse structure proper. For example, (traditional) Functional Grammar,[19] Role and Reference Grammar, and much typological and diachronic research shows little interest in discourse structure. But Systemic Linguistics, or the work by researchers such as Givón or Chafe (Givón 1983; see section 3 for further references), clearly does. And there is work that is even exclusively concerned with discourse structure, including, quite prominently, the frameworks of Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis. Still, even in the "sentence structure only" approaches, there is much attention to the way the internal structure of a sentence or clause is adjusted to its discourse environment (e.g., consider the elaborate work on information structure and its effect on word order in the clause), probably more so than in cognitive linguistic syntax. In Cognitive Grammar, for example, there is considerable attention for information structuring and perspectivization, namely, in the form of "construal" operations (where we find notions such as "trajectory" and "landmark"), but these are treated from a purely semantic perspective, in terms of how a speaker conceptualizes a situation and not in terms of how (the information in) an utterance relates to its preceding context (which would involve issues of topic continuity and topic shift, rhematicity of information and text development, contrastivity, etc.).

As already indicated, diachrony also figures prominently in Functional Linguistics; witness the flourishing of research on grammaticalization and, to a lesser extent, on subjectification.

So, on the whole, as far as the object of investigation is concerned, Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics are to a considerable extent complementary in their concerns. As a result, relating their views on different aspects of the same object may offer a wealth of new insights on both "sides". Ideally, one might even strive for a direct integration of models. But doing so is obviously only possible if these models are compatible, not only in general terms (see section 3), but also at a more concrete level. As a matter of fact, areas in which Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics have overlapping concerns (the domain of grammatical or syntactic description) demonstrate that there may be divergence in terms of their views on the nature of (linguistic and general) knowledge (see section 6 below).

5. Methods

Maybe the difference between Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics has to do with different research traditions, styles, and methods. Again, this is not the case in any principled way. Neither Cognitive Linguistics nor Functional Linguistics bar the use of any type of strategy to investigate a specific phenomenon; all methods are considered potentially valid.[20] In practice, however, they differ to some extent in terms of the default methods used in empirical research.

Systematic corpus-based analyses of phenomena are rather common in Functional Linguistics, but less so in Cognitive Linguistics. Of course, even in Functional Linguistics, corpus studies are far from general practice. Corpus investigation (including the use of quantitative methods) is, for example, almost obligatory in a framework such as Systemic Linguistics (in both its lexicogrammatical branch, i.e., Systemic-Functional Grammar, and its discourse-oriented branch); it is also popular in much other discourse-oriented work (such as that of Givón and Chafe or frameworks such as Rhetorical Structure Theory or Discourse Analysis) and in most diachronic research. By contrast, it is rather exceptional in frameworks such as Dik's Functional Grammar or Van Valin's Role and Reference Grammar. Similarly, Cognitive Linguistics shows exceptions to the general trend: corpus linguistics is very rare (if present at all) in core Cognitive Linguistics, but it is far from exceptional in the work of the functional-cognitive linguists, notably in the work of Barlow and Kemmer (see Barlow 1996; Kemmer and Barlow 2000) and of several European cognitive linguists (see, e.g., several of the contributions in Rudzka-Ostyn 1988; Geeraerts 1999).

Further, the systematic and large-scale use of cross-linguistic data is common in Functional Linguistics, but hardly so in Cognitive Linguistics (see van der Auwera and Nuyts, this volume, chapter 40). Thus, as already indicated in section 2, typology is a prominent and continuously growing branch of Functional Linguistics, and the same applies to comparative linguistics (where much smaller sets of languages are studied). In Cognitive Linguistics, the use of cross-linguistic data is far

less common. Admittedly, one scholar who has been associated with Cognitive Linguistics in section 2, is also a major player in typology, namely, Croft. Then again, Croft is clearly one of those who are standing on the edge between Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics (having his roots in a functional linguistic context—the Greenbergian school). Note, incidentally, that among the versions of Construction Grammar cited above, his was the most recent to emerge. Of course, many cognitive linguistic issues are being considered from a comparative perspective to the extent that they are tested by scholars across the world on languages other than English (including non-Indo-European languages; see, e.g., Casad and Langacker 1985; Yu 1998; Casad and Palmer 2003), but this remains relatively limited in comparison to comparative research in Functional Linguistics.

One would expect cognitively oriented frameworks to develop a special interest in experimental methods. Yet this is not really true as far as Cognitive Linguistics is concerned: there is some experimental research, though mainly by language psychologists who have taken an interest in Cognitive Linguistics (e.g., Gibbs and Colston 1995; see also Sinha, this volume, chapter 49). A few more "linguistic" examples are Sandra and Rice (1995) and Brisard, Frisson, and Sandra (2001). In Functional Linguistics, a similar situation holds: in the more cognitively oriented branches, some experimental research exists, but again it is fairly limited. Interestingly, in the case of Functional Linguistics, experimental research has more often been carried out by genuine linguists, sometimes in collaboration with psychologists (e.g., Carroll and von Stutterheim 1993; Carroll 1997; Tomlin 1997; Nuyts and Vonk 1999; Dickinson and Givón 2000). Of course, much depends on what one calls an "experiment": much of the research of the cognitive anthropologists at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics is also based on "controlled data elicitation" (Pederson et al. 1998), as is the research in the context of Slobin's "thinking for speaking" project (Berman and Slobin 1994), but many experimental psychologists would consider this a marginal kind of experiment—a remark that may also apply to several of the other experiments just cited. Another issue is where to draw the disciplinary borderlines between psychology and linguistics: in addition to Slobin, there are several other psychologists who are very close to Functional Linguistics and who make systematic use of experimental techniques, including McNeill and collaborators (e.g., McNeill 1992, 1997, 2000) and Clark and collaborators (Clark 1992, 1996).

A recent development in Cognitive Linguistics, which is virtually absent in Functional Linguistics, is the attempt to use neurological or neuropsychological evidence as a means to substantiate theories. However, even within Cognitive Linguistics, this new approach has so far been mainly confined to the Lakoffian framework of Cognitive Semantics (see Lakoff and Johnson 1999).

All in all, then, Cognitive Linguistics is—more so than Functional Linguistics—inclined to draw on the linguistic practices which have become established since the generative revolution in the fifties and sixties, namely, to use artificial examples or natural examples which have occasionally or accidentally been picked from written or spoken discourse, although the way in which cognitive linguists—or functional linguists applying similar methods, for that matter—use such examples is incomparable to the way generative linguists use them.

6. THEORETICAL CONCEPTIONS OF LANGUAGE AND GRAMMAR

Last but not least, one may wonder to what extent there are systematic differences in the theoretical views in Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics regarding the nature, the organization, and the wider cognitive embedding of language and grammar at a more concrete level than the one discussed in section 3 above. Of course, the two paradigms are in themselves far from theoretically coherent. Thus, in Cognitive Linguistics, the grammatical analyses in Langacker's Cognitive Grammar are in several respects substantially different from those in Construction Grammar approaches, and they do not appear easily reconcilable. Likewise, in spite of many basic similarities, Talmy's, Lakoff's, Fauconnier's, and Langacker's views on the nature and organization of (conceptual) semantic representation are far from identical, and the differences may go well beyond placing different accents or being concerned with different facets of the issue (for example, they probably do not share the same view on the status of metaphor in semantics). In that respect, it is probably no coincidence that there is little explicit mutual discussion of views among these four scholars or their research groups. Similarly, in Functional Linguistics the major alternative grammar models often differ in substantial respects (e.g., Systemic-Functional Grammar is in many respects irreconcilable with Functional Grammar or Role and Reference Grammar), as do the various conceptions of discourse organization (recall the radical disputes between conversational analysts and discourse analysts—see, e.g., Levinson 1983: 286–94).

Still, at a sufficiently high level of generality, some patterns emerge. First of all, Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics share a few basic views regarding the status of grammar. In line with their shared functionalist orientation, they both adopt a "usage-based" concept of grammar (see Langacker 1988; Barlow and Kemmer 2000). In other words, they reject a "competence" view of grammar of the kind espoused in Chomskyan Generative Grammar, in which linguistic knowledge is considered fully independent of linguistic performance (see Nuyts 1992, 1994a). In Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics, linguistic knowledge is "knowledge for use." Correspondingly, both Cognitive Linguistics and the "cognitively conscious" branches of Functional Linguistics see the linguistic system as an integrated subpart of human cognition and reject a (strongly) modular view of the language faculty as it is adopted in the generative tradition in linguistics (or in some branches of psychology, following Fodor 1983). Thus, the principles inherent in language are assumed to be (potentially) instantiations of more general cognitive principles, and the grammar is seen as fully interconnected and tuned in with other dimensions of cognitive functioning, including the conceptual systems.

In this latter respect, there may be different tendencies in Functional Linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics with regard to the default assumptions about the nature of conceptual representation (see Pederson and Nuyts 1997 on alternative views of conceptual structure). To the extent that this issue is at stake in Functional Linguistics, there is a strong inclination to adopt a strongly language-related, or at least a propositional view. This can range from strongly language-bound views (in which conceptual structure is considered to feature linguistic or language-like structures, including the lexical material of languages), such as Dik's (1987) or the Whorfian view (Lucy 1992a, 1992b), to slightly more abstract views (which are often decompositional, i.e., assuming semantic-conceptual structure to operate in terms of semantic primitives), such as Wierzbicka's (1980), or Van Valin's (1993)—see Levinson (1997) and Nuyts (1993b, 2001) for critical discussion of some of these proposals. Many other functional linguists who take conceptual structure into consideration remain vague about its nature (see Nuyts 1996). Cognitive linguists, on the other hand, often stress the "imagery" nature of conceptualization (consider, e.g., Lakoff 1987; Langacker 1987), which might suggest that they are thinking along the lines of a vision-based view of conceptual structure. Still, closer scrutiny of their actual views reveals uncertainty regarding the issue—think, for instance, of Langacker's insistence on predicates (an essentially propositionalist notion) as the basic building blocks of conceptualization or Lakoff's openness to conceptual models of all conceivable types, including propositional ones (see Nuyts 1993a, 2001 for discussion).[21] So, even in this regard, there are probably no real incommensurabilities between Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics.

Still, there appears to be one major difference between Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics in their conception of grammar and of conceptualization, and probably of cognition in general. This difference concerns the status of structures as opposed to processes in a cognitive model. It is most conspicuous when comparing the grammatical models in the two paradigms, that is, the domain in which the two are overlapping most clearly (see section 4).

Both Cognitive Grammar and Construction Grammar stress the role of structures or "constructions" in linguistic knowledge, while they hardly consider processing, that is, the procedures or rules that might be applied by a speaker or a hearer in "building" linguistic or semantic structures (the following applies to language production and comprehension alike, but for the sake of simplicity, I will phrase the issue from the perspective of production). The point is not only that the cognitive linguistic models do not formulate the procedures or rules needed to construct utterances (many functional grammar models do not do so, either); the point is also that in models such as Cognitive Grammar or (versions of) Construction Grammar procedures are attributed only a small role: they are reduced to (probably quite simple) mechanisms combining (or "unifying") fixed, coded patterns (that are stored as such in the mind) of different degrees of complexity and schematicity—the "constructions"—in order to "assemble" a full linguistic expression. Most of the combining is presumably a matter of checking the compatibility of properties of the constructions involved. A grammar is, thus, a "structured inventory of conventional linguistic units" (Langacker 1987: 57), or, in yet other words, a network of constructions.

The functional linguistic concept of a grammar, by contrast, is essentially that of a system of rules or procedures which compose utterances.[22] To some extent, functional grammars involve coded patterns as well, such as the elements stored in the lexicon (which includes more complex idiomatic expressions that cannot be considered compositional anymore) or constructional schemata for basic word-order patterns in an utterance—such as the "constituent ordering templates" in Functional Grammar (see Dik 1997) or the "syntactic inventory" in Role and Reference Grammar (see Van Valin and LaPolla 1997). But the role of coded patterns is minimal in comparison to the role they play in the cognitive linguistic models: essentially, whatever structure is considered linguistically "productive" Functional Linguistics handles entirely in terms of productive devices (see, e.g., Dik 1997: 342–45 for a discussion of productivity in grammar).

This different conception of grammar is representative of the cognitive linguistic and functional linguistic concepts of cognition in general. Thus, it is probably no coincidence that, in semantics, cognitive linguists tend to put great emphasis on the role of metaphor (i.e., the mapping between semantic domains) when describing meaning relations or processes, whereas functional linguists in actual practice tend to think in terms of metonymy (a gradual process of contextual transfer between semantic domains) even when they are concerned with the same phenomena.[23] A case in point is the discussion about the role of metaphor as opposed to metonymy in diachronic semantic change in the range of "grammatical" or "qualificational" meanings (consider, e.g., Sweetser 1990, as opposed to Traugott 1989 and Traugott and König 1991; see Nuyts 2001: 182–83 for discussion).

There need not be incompatibility between process and representation in a cognitive model: as Barsalou and Hale (1993) argue, any viable model of linguistic (or other) behavior must be concerned with both in a balanced and integrated fashion. But the critical point is that many things that are handled by means of procedures or rules in functional linguistic models are handled in terms of constructional patterns in Cognitive Linguistics. Even so, one might claim there is no incompatibility per se: one could imagine that the mental systems for language use contain procedures that allow the productive composition of any analyzable pattern, but that frequently produced (i.e., well-entrenched) output of those systems is nevertheless stored in the form of ready-made patterns for immediate reuse (at the same time, it is not obvious whether this notion is compatible with the basic philosophy and the actual formalization of the Cognitive Grammar and Construction Grammar models).[24] However, such a concept seems to be precluded at least by Langacker (1987: 63–64; 1997), who explicitly argues against a process view of grammar (see Nuyts 1993a, 2001: 16–19 for discussion). It might seem, then, that we are facing a basic conflict between a strongly dynamic view of grammar and language in Functional Linguistics versus a static one in Cognitive Linguistics. Then again, at least in these terms, the idea of a conflict is preempted by Langacker's (1997, 2000, 2001b) argument that Cognitive Grammar does represent a dynamic, procedural view of language and cognition—a view that he reconciles with the strongly representational nature of grammar at a metatheoretical level, namely, in terms of the "phenomenological status" of a grammatical model (Langacker 1997: 239–40).

Still, this argument clearly does not preempt the apparent conflict between functional linguistic and cognitive linguistic models with regard to the actual role of processes or procedures as opposed to constructions in them. This issue definitely requires further attention in order to see to what extent we are really facing incompatibilities and in order to find out how Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics can work toward a closer integration, not only at the level of grammatical description, but also in other domains of language such as conceptual structure or discourse.

7. Conclusion

In sum, although there are certainly "practical" differences between Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics in terms of the domains of language they actively consider and in terms of the methods they apply, none of these appear to be clear-cut or seem to involve incommensurabilities. As to their basic philosophy, the two paradigms are essentially in agreement, and, no doubt, Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics can learn a lot from each other in many respects. But in order to find out how far the friendship can go, one critical matter needs to be resolved, namely, the "process versus pattern" view of language and mind, which, at least at first sight, holds the potential of becoming an issue of real dispute.

NOTES

1. The narrow definition is used simply for the sake of the present discussion: as will be obvious from the foregoing considerations and from the discussion in the following sections, the wider one sets the margins of Cognitive Linguistics (e.g., as in the present

Handbook), the more difficult it becomes to find any distinctive features between Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics. This should definitely not be taken as a plea for maintaining a separated, narrow field of Cognitive Linguistics. Quite on the contrary: to foreshadow the conclusions of this chapter, there is every reason to consider Cognitive Linguistics a "school" within the wider field of Functional Linguistics and to strive for a stronger integration of the two.

2. Models of the HPSG style are not usually considered part of Functional Linguistics either: they are much rather considered part of the generative tradition in linguistics (see Sag and Wasow 1999). Yet they have clearly adopted a few basic ideas from syntactic approaches in European structuralism (which was, unlike its American counterpart, overwhelmingly functionalist in orientation), most notably the concept of dependency as it was originally developed by Tesnière (1959). As such, they are taking some kind of middle way between the classical formalist and functionalist traditions in the theory of grammar.

3. Determining the borderlines between the field of Cognitive Linguistics in its wider definition (including the two "levels of extension" defined above) and the field of Functional Linguistics is, even more so than for core Cognitive Linguistics, a matter of applying social criteria: one would probably have to use a criterion such as membership in the International Cognitive Linguistics Association or regular participation in its conferences to determine who is a cognitive linguist, rather than a functional linguist. On most other criteria, there will be no ground to make a clear distinction, as will appear below.

4. Incidentally, European cognitive linguists have played a major role in disseminating the ideas of Cognitive Linguistics, for example, by creating the International Cognitive Linguistics Association (of which René Dirven is the founding father) and by establishing the *Cognitive Linguistics* journal (thanks to Dirk Geeraerts) and, more recently, the *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* (thanks to Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza).

5. In order to allow the reader to "objectify" the present chapter, I should mention that my own research is to be situated in the framework of Functional Linguistics, rather than Cognitive Linguistics (at least its narrowly defined "core"), even if in many respects it is fairly close to the latter (especially in its wider definition). See, for example, Nuyts (1992, 2001).

6. The borderlines between the different domains—and especially between the domains of grammar and semantics—are obviously very vague, and many of the linguists and traditions mentioned above defy straightforward classification.

7. The question is whether these "cognitive anthropologists" can be called linguists or not. This is not the place to enter into a debate regarding the demarcation of disciplines, but I include them in Functional Linguistics on the basis of the observation that the majority of scholars who have been working in this group have a linguistic background.

8. Slobin is, of course, at least as much a psychologist as a linguist. Again, limits of space prevent me from dealing with the question where to draw the disciplinary borderline, in this case between Functional Linguistics or Cognitive Linguistics on the one hand, and language psychology on the other. (See part VI of the present *Handbook*.)

9. In fact, Mann and Thompson's and Sinclair and Coulthard's frameworks are also, to a considerable extent, inspired by the work on discourse in Systemic Linguistics.

10. "Subjectification" is meant here in the sense of Traugott (1989, 1995), not in the cognitive linguistic sense as developed by Langacker (1990).

11. Because of its very wide definition of Cognitive Linguistics, some of these traditions are also represented in the present *Handbook*; for example, some of the typological literature, some of the work on discourse structure, and the grammaticalization and subjectification literature. In fact, (at least some members of) these traditions have been influenced very directly by some of the ideas developed in Cognitive Linguistics (see this volume, chapters 35, 36, and 40).

12. There is no unanimity among functionalists regarding the analysis of the functional dimension of language use (see Nuyts 1993c), nor about the question of how language structure and language function might relate. Illustrative for the latter is the difference in opinion among functionalist linguists as to whether a grammar requires separated, parallel networks to account for different functional dimensions of (different aspects or components of) linguistic structure (as is the case in Systemic-Functional Grammar; Halliday 1994), or, alternatively, whether a grammar should deal with different functional dimensions as interacting forces which jointly codetermine all dimensions and aspects of linguistic structure (as is advocated by Dik 1986).

13. This fact offers a clear argument against "methodological modularity," the approach advocated in generative linguistics to deal with one domain (syntax) to the *a priori* exclusion of any other related domains, including semantics. Whether or not modularity is maintainable as a theoretical concept can only be settled on the basis of empirical evidence, but "methodological modularity" prevents one from searching for such evidence. There is, however, not enough room to go into this issue in the present contribution.

14. I am using the notion of "language structural phenomena" as a cover term for all aspects of the structural organization of the sentence, that is, including not only the syntactic but also the morphological and the phonological levels.

15. Langacker has, of course, indicated potential links between his notion of "subjectification" (Langacker 1990) and the diachronic notion of subjectification introduced by Traugott (1989, 1995), and he also relates his concept of subjectification to aspects of grammaticalization. But this is different from active involvement with diachrony, of course.

16. Surely, not all aspects of language structure are equally well covered in Functional Linguistics. Specifically, phonology is quite underrepresented. But this is of no further interest here.

17. This is obviously not to say that these phenomena do not play a role at all in Cognitive Linguistics: see, for example, Talmy's (1988a, 2000a) and Sweetser's (1990) accounts of the meanings of the modal auxiliaries or Langacker's (1987) concept of "grounding," which pertains to the meaning of grammatical markers such as modals and tense markers. But, all in all, Cognitive Linguistics deals much less systematically and elaborately with TAM-related issues than Functional Linguistics (see also Nuyts 2002 on the relation between Langacker's notion of grounding and the functional linguistic literature on qualificational categories).

18. This is precisely how most of the functional linguistic accounts of qualificational categories differ from treatments of such categories in Cognitive Linguistics (see above): the latter clearly aim at an account of the meanings involved rather than the linguistic behavior of the expression forms.

19. At least, this was true of Functional Grammar until recently. Lately, there has been a tendency to try to expand the sentence grammar into a discourse grammar. See several contributions in Mackenzie and Gómez Gonzáles (2004) and Butler (2003).

20. This might seem obvious, but it is not. In Generative Grammar only constructed data based on intuitions of grammaticality are considered valid. On the other hand, in the (wider) margins of Cognitive Linguistics, some have argued that not all methods have equal potential in terms of what they can reveal about the cognitive organization of language (e.g., Croft 1998; Sandra 1998). One may disagree with some of these claims (as I do specifically with regards to Sandra's), but this is not the place to go into this issue.

21. These observations regarding the vagueness, implicitness, or uncertainty among cognitive and functional linguists regarding the nature of conceptualization should not be taken as a criticism. On the contrary: our current understanding of the issue is so poor that it is only fair to steer away from any radical claims in this regards.

22.   The following not only applies to the established schools of grammar: it characterizes the default view of linguistic knowledge (not only syntactic, but also semantic and discursive) in Functional Linguistics in general. One of the established grammars, namely, Systemic-Functional Grammar, stands somewhat apart in a few respects: due to its systemic network formalism, it is difficult to talk about procedures or rules in this framework in other than strongly metaphorical terms. Still, the basic concept of a grammar described below, as a device which "composes" rather than "assembles" utterances, does apply to this model, as well.

23.   This is, of course, again a simplified rendering of a complicated situation, since quite many cognitive linguists do not deny the role of metonymy in certain semantic relations (see below) and functional linguists do not deny the role of metaphor. Note, by the way, that this statement about the more intensive concern with metaphor versus metonymy in Cognitive versus Functional Linguistics applies at the "object level": it applies to what linguists actually do when describing semantic processes. At a metalevel, there is even more concern with the nature of metonymy (in relation to metaphor) among cognitive linguists than among functional linguists. This is, not surprisingly, again especially true for the European functional-cognitive linguists. And correspondingly, it is the latter group especially that deviates from the core cognitive linguists in tending toward a more balanced application of metonymy, next to metaphor, in the description of semantic phenomena (see, e.g., Goossens 1990; Panther and Radden 1999; Barcelona 2000).

24.   Something comparable could be maintained for the metaphor versus metonymy issue: one might consider metaphor to be a macrolevel characterization of global semantic relations, which have, however, come into existence—and can in principle be reconstructed—through microlevel metonymic processes (this is, e.g., how Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeyer 1991 and Heine 1993 reconcile metaphorical and metonymic accounts of semantic change in the range of qualificational meanings).

REFERENCES

Barcelona, Antonio, ed. 2000. *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barlow, Michael. 1996. Corpora for theory and practice. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 1: 1–37.

Barlow, Michael, and Suzanne Kemmer, eds. 2000. *Usage-based models of language.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Barsalou, Lawrence W., and Christopher R. Hale. 1993. Components of conceptual representation: From feature lists to recursive frames. In Iven Van Mechelen, James Hampton, Ryszard S. Michalski, and Peter Theuns, eds., *Categories and concepts* 97–144. London: Academic Press.

Berman, Ruth A., and Dan I. Slobin. 1994. *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Blank, Andreas, and Peter Koch, eds. 1999. *Historical semantics and cognition.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brisard, Frank, Steven Frisson, and Dominiek Sandra. 2001. Processing unfamiliar metaphors in a self-paced reading task. *Metaphor and Symbol* 16: 87–108.

Butler, Chris. 2003. *Structural-functional grammars.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan L., Revere D. Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carroll, Mary. 1997. Changing place in English and German: Language-specific preferences in the conceptualization of spatial relations. In Jan Nuyts and Eric Pederson, eds., *Language and conceptualization* 137–61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carroll, Mary, and Christiane von Stutterheim. 1993. The representation of spatial configurations in English and German and the grammatical structure of locative and anaphoric expressions. *Linguistics* 31: 1011–42.

Casad, Eugene, and Ronald Langacker. 1985. 'Inside' and 'outside' in Cora grammar. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 51: 247–81. Repr. in Ronald Langacker, *Concept, image, and symbol* 33–57. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990.

Casad, Eugene, and Gary Palmer, eds. 2003. *Cognitive linguistics and non-Indo-European languages.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chafe, Wallace. 1970. *Meaning and the structure of language.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chafe, Wallace. 1980. The deployment of consciousness in the production of a narrative. In Wallace Chafe, ed., *The pear stories* 9–50. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Chafe, Wallace. 1994. *Discourse, consciousness, and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chafe, Wallace, and Johanna Nichols, eds. 1986. *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Clark, Herbert H. 1992. *Arenas of language use.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clark, Herbert H. 1996. *Using language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1981. *Language universals and linguistic typology.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell. (2nd ed., 1989)

Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Croft, William. 1990. *Typology and universals.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Croft, William. 1998. Linguistic evidence and mental representations. *Cognitive Linguistics* 9: 151–73.

Croft, William. 2001. *Radical construction grammar: Syntactic theory in typological perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dickinson, Connie, and Talmy Givón. 2000. The effect of the interlocutor on episodic recall: An experimental study. In Michel Barlow and Suzanne Kemmer, eds., *Usage-based models of language* 151–96. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Dik, Simon C. 1986. On the notion 'functional explanation.' *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 1: 11–52.

Dik, Simon C. 1987. Linguistically motivated knowledge representation. In Makato Nagao, ed., *Language and artificial intelligence* 145–70. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Dik, Simon C. 1997. *The theory of functional grammar.* 2 vols. Ed. Kees Hengeveld. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fauconnier, Gilles. 1985. *Mental spaces: Aspects of meaning construction in natural language.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Fauconnier, Gilles. 1997. *Mappings in thought and language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1988. The mechanisms of "construction grammar." *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14: 35–55.

Fillmore, Charles J., Paul Kay, Laura A. Michaelis, and Ivan A. Sag. Forthcoming. *Construction Grammar.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Fillmore, Charles J, Paul Kay, and Mary C. O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical construction: The case of *let alone*. *Language* 64: 501–38.

Fodor, Jerry A. 1983. *The modularity of mind.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Geeraerts, Dirk. 1989. Prospects and problems of prototype theory. *Linguistics* 27: 587–612.

Geeraerts, Dirk. 1993. Vagueness's puzzles, polysemy's vagaries. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4: 223–72.

Geeraerts, Dirk. 1997. *Diachronic prototype semantics: A contribution to historical lexicology.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Geeraerts, Dirk. 1999. Idealist and empiricist tendencies in cognitive linguistics. In Theo Janssen and Gisela Redeker, eds., *Cognitive Linguistics: Foundations, scope, and methodology* 163–94. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gibbs, Raymond W., Jr. 1994. *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbs, Raymond W., Jr., and Herbert L. Colston. 1995. The cognitive psychological reality of image schemas and their transformations. *Cognitive Linguistics* 6: 347–78.

Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On understanding grammar.* New York: Academic Press.

Givón, Talmy, ed. 1983. *Topic continuity in discourse: A quantitative cross-language study.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1984. *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction.* Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1990. *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction.* Vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1995. *Functionalism and grammar.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goossens, Louis. 1990. Metaphtonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic actions. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1: 323–40.

Greenberg, Joseph. 1966. *Language universals: With special reference to feature hierarchies.* The Hague: Mouton.

Greenberg, Joseph, ed. 1978. *Universals of human language.* 4 vols. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1994. *An introduction to functional grammar.* 2nd ed. London: Arnold. (3rd ed., 2004)

Halliday, Michael A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Harder, Peter. 1996. *Functional semantics: A theory of meaning, structure and tense in English.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heine, Bernd. 1993. *Auxiliaries: Cognitive forces and grammaticalization.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hengeveld, Kees. 1989. Layers and operators in functional grammar. *Journal of Linguistics* 25: 127–57.

Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (2nd ed., 2003)

Kahrel, Peter, and René van den Berg, eds. 1994. *Typological studies in negation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The middle voice.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kemmer, Suzanne. 2003. Human cognition and the elaboration of events: Some universal conceptual categories. In Michael Tomasello, ed., *The new psychology of language: Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure* 2: 89–118. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kemmer, Suzanne, and Michael Barlow. 2000. Introduction. In Michael Barlow and Suzanne Kemmer, eds., *Usage-based models of language* vii–xxviii. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Kemmer, Suzanne, and Arie Verhagen. 1994. The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events. *Cognitive Linguistics* 5: 115–56.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought.* New York: Basic Books.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of cognitive grammar.* Vol. 1, *Theoretical prerequisites.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1988. A usage-based model. In Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn, ed., *Topics in cognitive linguistics* 127–61. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1990. Subjectification. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1: 5–38.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of cognitive grammar.* Vol. 2, *Descriptive application.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1997. The contextual basis of cognitive semantics. In Jan Nuyts and Eric Pederson, eds., *Language and conceptualization* 229–52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2000. A dynamic usage-based model. In Michael Barlow and Suzanne Kemmer, eds., *Usage-based models of language* 1–63. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2001a. Discourse in cognitive grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 12: 143–88.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2001b. Dynamicity in grammar. *Axiomathes* 12: 7–33.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1997. From outer to inner space: Linguistic categories and non-linguistic thinking. In Jan Nuyts and Eric Pederson, eds., *Language and conceptualization* 13–45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lucy, John A. 1992a. *Grammatical categories and cognition: A case study of the linguistic relativity hypothesis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lucy, John A. 1992b. *Language diversity and thought: A reformulation of the linguistic relativity hypothesis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mackenzie, Lachlan, and María A. Gómez Gonzáles, eds. 2004. *A new architecture for functional grammar.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mann, William C., and Sandra Thompson. 1988. Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text* 8: 243–81.

Mann, William C., and Sandra Thompson, eds. 1992. *Discourse description.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

McNeill, David. 1992. *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McNeill, David. 1997. Growth points cross-linguistically. In Jan Nuyts and Eric Pederson, eds., *Language and conceptualization* 190–212. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McNeill, David, ed. 2000. *Language and gesture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nuyts, Jan. 1992. *Aspects of a cognitive-pragmatic theory of language.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nuyts, Jan. 1993a. Cognitive Linguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 20: 269–90.

Nuyts, Jan. 1993b. From language to conceptualization: The case of epistemic modality. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 29, vol. 2 (parasession): 271–86.

Nuyts, Jan. 1993c. On determining the functions of language. *Semiotica* 94: 201–32.

Nuyts, Jan. 1994a. Autonomous vs. non-autonomous syntax. In Jan Verschueren, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jan Blommaert, eds., *Handbook of pragmatics* 80–85. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nuyts, Jan. 1994b. Functionalism versus formalism. In Jef Verschueren, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jan Blommaert, eds., *Handbook of pragmatics* 293–300. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nuyts, Jan. 1996. Consciousness in language. *Pragmatics & Cognition* 4: 153–80.

Nuyts, Jan. 2001. *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nuyts, Jan. 2002. Grounding and the system of epistemic expressions in Dutch: A cognitive-functional view. In Frank Brisard, ed., *Grounding: The epistemic footing of deixis and reference* 433–66. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nuyts, Jan. 2003. Layering of qualifications in a cognitive perspective. In Clara Molina Ávila, María Luisa Blanco Gómez, Juana Marín Arrese, Ana Laura Rodríguez Redondo, and Manuela Romano Mozo, eds., *Cognitive linguistics in Spain at the turn of the century* 81–101. Madrid: Universidade Autonoma de Madrid.

Nuyts, Jan. 2004. Remarks on layering in a cognitive-functional language production model. In J. Lachlan Mackenzie and Maria A. Gómez Gonzáles, eds., *A new architecture for functional grammar* 275–98 Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nuyts, Jan, A. Machtelt Bolkestein, and Co Vet, eds. 1990. *Layers and levels of representation in language theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nuyts, Jan, and Eric Pederson, eds. 1997. *Language and conceptualization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nuyts, Jan, and Wietske Vonk. 1999. Epistemic modality and focus in Dutch. *Linguistics* 37: 699–737.

Ochs, Elinor, Emanuell Schegloff, and Sandra Thompson, eds. 1996. *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Otheguy, Ricardo, Nancy Stern, and Wallis Reid, eds. 2002. *Signal, meaning, and message*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Palmer, Frank R. 2001. *Mood and modality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe, and Günter Radden, eds. 1999. *Metonymy in language and thought*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pederson, Eric, Eve Danziger, David Wilkins, Stephen Levinson, Sotaro Kita, and Gunter Senft. 1998. Semantic typology and spatial conceptualization. *Language* 74: 557–89.

Pederson, Eric, and Jan Nuyts. 1997. On the relationship between language and conceptualization. In Jan Nuyts and Eric Pederson, eds., *Language and conceptualization* 1–12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pollard, Carl, and Ivan Sag. 1994. *Head-driven phrase structure grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rudzka-Ostyn, Brigida, ed. 1988. *Topics in cognitive linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sag, Ivan, and Thomas Wasow. 1999. *Syntactic theory*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Sandra, Dominiek. 1998. What linguists can and can't tell you about the human mind: A reply to Croft. *Cognitive Linguistics* 9: 361–78.

Sandra, Dominiek, and Sally Rice. 1995. Network analyses of prepositional meaning: Mirroring whose mind—the linguist's or the language user's? *Cognitive Linguistics* 6: 89–130.

Sinclair, John, and Malcolm Coulthard. 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Slobin, Dan I. 1996. From "thought and language" to "thinking for speaking." In John Gumperz and Stephen C. Levinson, eds., *Rethinking linguistic relativity* 70–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, Leonard. 1988a. Force dynamics in language and cognition. *Cognitive Science* 12: 49–100.

Talmy, Leonard. 1988b. The relation of grammar to cognition. In Brigida Rudzka-Ostyn, ed., *Topics in cognitive linguistics* 165–205. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Talmy, Leonard. 1996. Fictive motion in language and "caption." In Paul Bloom, Mary A. Peterson, Lynn Nadel, and Merrill F. Garrett, eds., *Language and space* 211–76. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000a. *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Vol. 1, *Concept structuring systems*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000b. *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Vol. 2, *Typology and process in concept structuring*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Tesnière, Lucien. 1959. *Eléments de syntaxe structurale*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Tomlin, Russell S. 1997. Mapping conceptual representations into linguistic representations: The role of attention in grammar. In Jan Nuyts and Eric Pederson, eds., *Language and conceptualization* 162–89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65: 31–55.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995. Subjectification in grammaticalisation. In Dieter Stein and Susan Wright, eds., *Subjectivity and subjectivisation* 31–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1997. Subjectification and the development of epistemic meaning: The case of promise and threaten. In Toril Swan, and Olaf J. Westvik, eds., *Modality in Germanic languages: Historical and comparative perspectives* 185–210. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, and Ekkehard König. 1991. The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, eds., *Approaches to grammaticalization* 1: 189–218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Van Valin, Robert D. 1993. A synopsis of role and reference grammar. In Robert van Valin, ed., *Advances in role and reference grammar* 1–164. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Van Valin, Robert D., and Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verhagen, Arie. 1995. Subjectification, syntax, and communication. In Dieter Stein and Susan Wright, eds., *Subjectivity and subjectivisation in language* 103–28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verhagen, Arie. 2000. Interpreting usage: Construing the history of Dutch causal verbs. In Michael Barlow and Suzanne Kemmer, eds., *Usage-based models of language* 261–86. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1980. *Lingua mentalis: The semantics of natural language*. Sydney: Academic Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1996. *Semantics: Primes and universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willett, Thomas. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12: 51–97.

Yu, Ning. 1998. *The contemporary theory of metaphor: A perspective from Chinese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.