

Functional Grammar and Argumentative Discourse Emphasis and Emphatic Marking in Arabic

Pr. Ahmed Moutaouakil

Mohammed V University, Rabat. Morocco

ahmed.moutaouakil@yahoo.com

Abstract:

In earlier work (Moutaouakil 1989)), I argued that within the framework of Functional Grammar (e.g. Dik 1997) inna-constructions in Standard Modern Arabic (hereafter SMA) be analysed as focus constructions where (Contrastive) Focus function is assigned to the predication. In Mackenzie (2009), it is argued that within the FDG framework these constructions should rather be approached in terms of Emphasis.

Subscribing to Mackenzie's view, I here re-examine the interpersonal and structural properties of inna-constructions (together with the other types of emphatic constructions in Arabic) in light of the way in which Emphasis and emphatic marking are described in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008). It is believed that the proposals made throughout this study will enrich the FDG approach in the area of argumentative discourse.

Keywords:

Functional Grammar, Standard Modern Arabic, argumentative discourse.

In Standard

1. Introduction

In Standard Modern Arabic (hereafter SMA), the particle *`inna* occupies the initial position in constructions where it is used to signal that special attention is on the transmitted content.

Within the framework of Functional Grammar (e.g. Dik 1997, henceforth FG), these constructions have been analysed as a type of focus constructions where (Contrastive) Focus is placed on the whole predication. (Moutaouakil 1989)

In a recent study, Mackenzie (2009) rightly points out that the properties of *`inna*-constructions can be more adequately accounted for if they are analysed in Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG) as emphatic rather than focus constructions.

Elaborating on the characterization of Emphasis given in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008), I would like to discuss this issue within a global approach to emphatic constructions in Arabic. I shall mainly be concerned with the following four aspects: (a) the extent to which it would be useful to distinguish between two kinds of emphasis: emotive emphasis (Exclamation) and what we may call ‘argumentative emphasis’ (Reinforcement), (b) the interpersonal status of the units that can be emphasized and the formal means by which the emphatic features can be realized, (c) the possibility for a construction to involve multiple emphatic marking and (d) the ordering of the emphatic markers as well as the principles by which it is ruled.

2. Emphasis in FDG

2.1. Definition

In Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008:64), Emphasis is defined as “the result of the Speaker’s intensification of the Discourse Act”, a definition which suggests that Emphasis is the opposite of Mitigation. Hengeveld and Mackenzie put forward the idea that Emphasis applies irrespective of the illocutionary value of the Discourse Act: it can combine with Declarative, Interrogative or Imperative Illocution. Examples from SMA are the following:

- (1) a- ^ʔinna Zaydan qadima
EMPH Zayd-ACC come-PAST.3MSG
‘I state / assert that Zayd came’
- b- hal ^ʔinna Zaydan qadima?
INT EMPH ZAYD-ACC come-PAST.3MSG
‘Do you state / assert that Zayd came?’
- c- lā tughādiranna!
PROHIB leave-2MSG-EMPH
‘I strongly forbid you to leave!’

This is taken as an argument in favour of the claim that Emphasis is not an illocution. I shall return to this issue below.

2.2. Emphasis vs Foc/ Contrast

Within FDG, the pragmatic functions recognized in FG have been revisited and redefined to conform with new insights.

More specifically, Contrast is now conceived of not as a subtype of Focus but as an autonomous full-fledged pragmatic function, signalling “the Speaker’s desire to bring out the particular differences between two or more Communicated Contents or between a Communicated Content and contextually available information.” (Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 96).

Focus function,, on the other hand, “signals the Speaker’s strategic selection of new information.” (Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008:89)). More often than not, emphatic constructions are analysed as Focus constructions, particularly in Grammars where Emphasis is lacking as working concept as is the case in FG. At the root of this confusion is probably the fact that in both kinds of construction some prominence (or salience) is involved.

The way in which Emphasis, Focus and Contrast are defined in FDG makes it possible to draw a clear distinction between these three notions: Emphasis differs from Focus in the sense that it applies to a unit not necessarily embodying new information; on the contrary, the emphasized unit typically conveys known information. It differs from Contrast, as Mackenzie (2009:6) points out, in not implying any information contrasting process.

Further evidence for distinguishing Emphasis and Contrast as two quite different processes is the fact that they can apply to the same unit within the same discourse Act. In example (2b), the predicate ‘*fāzat*’ is contrasted and emphasized at the same time:

- (2) A: rasabat Hindun
 fail-PAST.3FSG Hind-NOM
 ‘Hind failed’
- B: a- bi fāksi, **fāzat** !
 with-Def-contrary-GEN succeed- PAST.3FSG
 ‘On the contrary, she **succeeded!**’
- b- bi fāksi, qad **fāzat** !
 with-Def-contrary-GEN EMPH succeed- PAST.3FSG
 ‘On the contrary, she **DID succeed!**’

Such a process generally also takes place, as Mackenzie (2009:7) shows, in *inna*-constructions where the (nominal/adjectival) predicate bears the emphatic prefix *la-*. These constructions will be examined in more details later.

In sum, Focus and Contrast relate to the communicative status of pieces of information whereas Emphasis/Mitigation relates to the (energetic/moderate) way in which a given piece of information is presented.

2.3. Emphasis vs Illocution

In FG (Dik 1997:239), Exclamation is analysed, as well-known, as an illocution. Within the same framework, I argued in Moutaouakil (1999 and 2005) that it is not an illocution and that, therefore, it cannot be taken as having the same status as Declarative, Interrogative and Imperative. Rather, I argued, it is a sub-type of (emotional)

modality.

In FDG, Exclamation is no longer thought of as an illocution, instead, the properties of exclamatory constructions are captured by an emphatic operator.

That Emphasis is not an illocution is evidenced by the fact that it can combine, as Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008) point out, with any illocution. Furthermore, I shall show below that it may apply to the illocution itself.

It will become clear throughout this study that in defining Emphasis in a manner that permits to distinguish it from Illocution and Focus/Contrast, FDG renders possible to account in a more adequate way for truly emphatic constructions.

3. Emphatic operator: Exclamation vs Reinforcement

The examples given in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 66, 83) as instantiations of Emphasis are exclamatory constructions like (3) and also non-exclamatory constructions such as (4):

(3) She has grown!

(4) Doe je werk dan
Do your work EMPH
'Go on, do your work'

I would like to interpret this as an indication that Emphasis can be assumed to subsume different sub-types. If such an interpretation turns out to be correct, I would like to suggest distinguishing between – at least – two Emphasis sub-types: emotive Emphasis or Exclamation and 'argumentative' Emphasis or Reinforcement.

Supporting such a distinction are the following facts:

(i) Both Exclamation and Reinforcement serve as intensifying devices. They differ from each other, however, in that the former is the intensification of a Discourse Act performed as an (enthusiastic) emotional reaction towards a Communicated Content or Subact whereas the latter is the intensification of (a part of) a Discourse Act occurring as an argument or as an element of a more or less long argumentative chain.

(ii) With this characterization, exclamatory constructions and reinforcement constructions are expected to appear in two different discourse types (or genres): expressive and argumentative respectively.

(iii) The two kinds of constructions display quite different formal properties. In SMA, Exclamation is expressed, as shown in Moutaouakil (1999 and 2005), by a specific predicate form (*mā* □ *af* *ala*) and a specific intonational contour as for instance in (5):

(5) *mā* ^ˈ*āj**mala* *Najāt**an!*
EXCL-beautiful *Najāt*-ACC
'How beautiful is *Najāt*!'

As for Reinforcement, it is realized by various lexical and morpho-syntactic means depending upon the interpersonal status of the reinforced unit as will be shown below.

If such a proposal is tenable, we could represent the emphatic operator as follows

(6) Emph = {
 Excl
 Reinf

Having devoted a special study to Exclamation in Arabic (Moutaouakil (1999) and (2005)), I will concentrate here on Reinforcement.

4. Emphasis placement and emphatic marking

4.1. Emphatic markers

In general, Reinforcement can apply to any unit at the interpersonal level. It can be placed on the whole Discourse Act, on the Communicated Content or on one of the (Referential and Ascriptive) sub-acts it embodies.

As for its formal expression in SMA, Reinforcement is mediated through lexical or morpho-syntactic markers.

The lexical means used as Reinforcement markers are mainly modifiers such as *fi lan* (indeed), *Haqqan* (really, truly), *qaT an* (absolutely), *dūna šakkin* (undoubtedly), *jiddan* (seriously)...

It is noteworthy that *jiddan* and other adverbs like *biSarāHa* ('frankly') and *biSidq* (sincerely) which are commonly taken as lexical means for restricting (specifying or modifying) the (lexical / abstract) illocutionary predicate may also be used, in some contexts, to intensify the whole Discourse Act. In such contexts, it seems that they serve the interpersonal function of emphatic Discourse Act modifiers rather than mere illocutionary restrictors.

The morphological reinforcing markers are the particles *inna* and *qad*, the prefix *la-* and the verbal suffix *-anna*. In certain cases, constituent ordering can also take part in the formal expression of Reinforcement.

A very productive special construction is reserved to the expression of the reinforcement applying to the predicate. Such a construction is the result of what we could call 'Predicate-Copying Strategy' (hereafter PCS) which consists in resuming the predicate by its nominalized form within the same clause.

The choice between these various emphatic markers depends up on the interpersonal status of the reinforced unit and the interpersonal (and representational) features involved in the ('pure' / 'mixed') alignment of this unit.

4.2. Emphatic Acts

4.2.1. Reinforced Acts

A whole Discourse Act can be reinforced by such lexical means as modifiers like *qaT an* and *jiddan* (in its emphatic meaning). These modifiers occur in the pre-clause position as in (7a-b):

- (7) a- *qaT an*, *fāza* Badrun
 absolutely-ACC succeed- PAST.3MSG Badr-NOM
 'I categorically affirm that Badr succeeded'
- b- *jiddan*, *fāza* Badrun
 seriously-ACC succeed- PAST.3MSG Badr-NOM'
 'I categorically affirm that Badr succeeded'

They might also appear in the post-clause position as in (8a-b):

- (8) a- fāza Badrun qaT' an
 succeed- PAST.3MSG Badr-NOM absolutely-ACC
 b- fāza Badrun jiddan
 succeed- PAST.3MSG Badr-NOM seriously-ACC

It should be noticed, however, that the preferred position of this kind of modifiers is the pre-clausal position rather than the post-clausal one. Constructions (8a-b), if used at all, are less natural than constructions (7a-b). They become totally acceptable when they are uttered with an intonational pause between fāza *Badrun* and the modifier (*qaT' an /jiddan*), when this modifier is understood to carry out an autonomous Discourse Act as will be shown below.

Examples (7a-b) and (8a-b) can be represented the Interpersonal Level as follows:

- (9) (M₁: (A₁: [(DECL F₁) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₁: [(T₁)_{Foc} (+idR₁: Badr (R₁))_{Top}] (C₁))]) (A₁: qaT' an (A₁:)) (M₁)

- (10) (M₁: (A₁: [(DECL F₁) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₁: [(T₁)_{Foc} (+idR₁: Badr (R₁))_{Top}] (C₁))]) (A₁: jiddan (A₁:)) (M₁)

The reinforcement of a Discourse Act can also be achieved by morphological means. This task is fulfilled by two markers: the clause-initial particle *inna* and the verbal suffix *-anna*. Ancient Arab grammarians analyse constructions like (11) as involving a reinforcement of the Proposition. Mackenzie (2009:7) points out that, in such constructions, it is rather the whole Declarative Discourse Act that is reinforced. As for constructions such as (12), (13) and (14), they are given in Arabic Grammatical Tradition (hereafter AGT) as instances of reinforcement of other types of Discourse Acts, namely Imperative, Prohibitive and Commissive Discourse Acts respectively:

- (11) 'inna Zaydan qādimun

EMPH Zayd-ACC coming-3MSG-NOM
'I state / assert that Zayd is coming'

(12) iqdimanna!
IMP-come-2MSG-EMPH
'Go on, come!'

(13) lā tudaxxinanna!
PROHIB smoke-2MSG-EMPH
'I strongly forbid you to smoke!'

(14) la' aqdimanna!
COMM-come-FUT.1SG-EMPH
'I really commit myself to coming!'

Surprisingly, no attention has been paid in AGT to the relationship between □inna and -anna in spite of their obvious similarities both in form and content. In this respect, I would like to suggest the latter be taken as a mere distributional variant appearing in illocutionary contexts where the former cannot occur. If this claim is correct, we can conceive of □inna and -anna as the the morpho-syntactic realizations of the interpersonal operator combinations Reinf-DECL/INTER and Reinf-IMP/PROHIB/COMM respectively. Before closing this sub-section, let us recall that it is claimed in Dik 1997b: 234) that explicit performatives are 'emphatic', 'forceful' expressions of illocution. On the basis of this claim, constructions like (15b) could be analysed as reinforced counterparts of constructions such as (15a):

(15) a-^ʔ ādat Hindun
come back- PAST.3FSG Hind-NOM
'Hind came back'
b-^ʔ aqūlu ^ʔinna Hindan ^ʔādat
say-PRES.1SG that Hind-ACC come-back- PAST 3FSG
'I am saying that Hind came back'

4.2.2. Reinforcing Acts

Let us now consider the following examples:

(16) Zaydun šāʿ irun kabīrun, qaTʿ an
 Zayd-NOM poet-NOM great-NOM absolutely-ACC
 ‘Zayd is a great poet, absolutely!’

(17) Zaydun šāʿ irun kabīrun, jiddan
 Zayd-NOM poet-NOM great-NOM seriously-ACC
 ‘Zayd is a great poet, seriously!’

In (16) and (17), *qaTʿ an* and *jiddan* occupy a clause-external position and are intonationally set off from the preceding linguistic material. Unlike in (8a-b), they are not modifiers but rather autonomous Discourse Acts which function as a reinforcement of the Discourse Act carried out by the preceding clause.

The available (and, as far as I can judge, probably the most suitable) way to account for this kind of construction within the current FDG framework is to conceive of the reinforcement that it involves as a rhetorical function and to assign it to the second Discourse Act. Accordingly, the interpersonal representation of (16) and (17) could be (18) and (19) respectively:

(18) (M₁: (A₁: [(DECL F₁) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₁:
 [(T₁)_{Foc} (+idR₁: Zayd (R₁))_{Top}] (C₁))] (A₁))_{Nucl}
 < (A₂ [(DECL F₂) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₂:
 [qaTʿ an] ((C₂))] (A₂))_{Reinf} (M₁))

(19) (M₁: (A₁: [(DECL F₁) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₁:
 [(T₁)_{Foc} (+idR₁: Zayd (R₁))_{Top}] (C₁))] (A₁))_{Nucl}
 < (A₂ [(DECL F₂) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₂:
 [jiddan] ((C₂))] (A₂))_{Reinf} (M₁))

Interestingly enough, such an analysis may be proposed for other post-clausal constituents as well, particularly in the case of swearing, as illustrated in (20a-b):

truth-value to the Propositional Content contained in Speaker's order. "Rather, it functions as a rejection of the preceding order. In this use, it is not in opposition with *yes* but with *oka*".

In (22), *no* and *okay* are full Discourse Acts and not mere propositions.

In SMA, *na* ^ˈ*am* (yes) and *lā* (no) can be used as propositional answers as in (23) and also as actional responses as shown in (24):

(23) A: hal qadimat Hindun?
INT come-PAST.3FSG HIND-NOM
'Did Hind come?'

B: a- na^ˈam
'Yes'
b- lā
'No'

(24): A: zur Hindan!
IMP visit-2MSG Hind-ACC
'Pay a visit to Hind'

B: a- na^ˈam
'Okay'
b-lā
'No'

The peculiarity of SMA is that actional *na* ^ˈ*am* and *lā* have reinforced counterparts which are ^ˈ*ajal* (sure) and *kallā* (certainly no) respectively, used in exchanges such as the following:

(25) A: satusā^ˈ idunī
help-FUT.2MSG-1SG
'You will help me'

B: a-^ˈajal!
'Sure!'
b- kallā!
'Certainly no!'

4.3. Emphatic Communicated Content

The reinforcement of the Communicated Content takes place by lexical means, typically by modifiers like *fī* ^ˈ*lan*, *Haqqan* and *dūna* *šakkin*. The following examples illustrate the point:

(26) a- fi^ʿ lan, fāzat Munā
indeed-ACC succeed-PAST.3FSG Munā
‘Indeed, Mouna succeeded’

b- dūna šakkin, sayafūzu , ʿAliyyun
without doubt-GEN succeed-FUT.3MSG ʿAliyy-NOM
‘Undoubtedly, Ali will succeed’

c- Haqqan, Zaydun karīmun
Really-ACC Zayd-NOM generous-MSG-NOM
‘Really, Zayd is generous’

These modifiers generally occur in the pre-clausal position as in (26a-c). They also may occupy the post-clausal position as becomes clear from (27a-c):

(27) a- fāzat Munā fi^ʿ lan
succeed-PAST.3FSG Munā indeed-ACC
‘Mouna succeeded indeed’

b- sayafūzu ʿAliyyun dūna šakkin
succeed-FUT.3MSG ʿAliyy-NOM without doubt-
GEN

‘Ali will undoubtedly succeed’

c- Zaydun karīmun Haqqan
Zayd-NOM generous-MSG-NOM really-ACC
‘Zayd is really generous’

At the Interpersonal Level, (27b) can be represented as follows:

(28) (M₁: (A₁: [(DECL F₁) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₁:
[(T₁)_{Foc} (+idR₁: ʿAliyy (R₁))_{Top}] (C₁: dūna šakk (C₁))])
(A₁:))) (M₁))

Worthy of notice is that, in order to be understood as reinforcing the Communicated Content rather than another layer, these modifiers must occur in a clause-internal (initial, middle or final) position. When they appear in a peripheral (post-clausal) position, they stand as autonomous units and the unit they reinforce is not only the Communicated Content but rather the discourse Act in its entirety.

When they occur outside the clause proper, *fi*□*lan*, *Haqqan* and *dūna šakkin* display the same interpersonal status as *qaT* □ *an* and *jiddan* in (16) and (17), i.e. the status of full-fledged Discourse Acts bearing the Reinforcement rhetorical function.

4.4. Sub-acts

4.4.1. The Referential Sub-act

The typical means by which the reinforcement of the Referential sub-act is realized in SMA is the repetition of the same referring constituent, as exemplified in (29):

- (29) *qadima* *Zaydun* *Zaydun*
 come-PAST.3MSG *Zayd-NOM* *Zayd-NOM*
 ‘Zayd, (I say Zayd!) came!’

In AGT, other markers are signalled as means by which the reinforcement of Referential sub-act may be handled, namely reflexive pronoun as in example (30):

- (30) *qadima* *Zaydun* *nafsuhi*
 come-PAST.3MSG *Zayd-NOM* *self-NOM-3MSG*
 ‘Zayd himself came’

In its reinforcement reading, example (30) can be taken as synonymous with example (28) to the extent that the reflexive pronoun *nafsuhi* can be thought of as another way to reduplicate the NP *Zayd*.

Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008:123) point out that the reinforcement operator assigned to a Referential sub-act can also be realized by constituent ordering. They analyse example (31b) as involving a constituent to which a special emphasis is given in placing it in the clause-initial position:

- (31) A: Did you get a day off?
 B: a- A day off? The boss gave me a whole week
 b- A day off? A whole week the boss gave me

In the same vein, Caro (2007:125) reports that in Spanish the fronting of an Object-Given Topic (previously introduced into the discourse)

lends ‘emphasis’ or ‘prominence’ to this constituent.

A similar reinforcement process can also be found in Classical Arabic and to some extent in SMA.

Let us consider example (32b):

- (32) A: hal qābalta Hindan?
 INT meet-PAST.2MSG Hind-ACC
 ‘Did you meet Hind?’
 B: a- qābaltu Hindan
 meet-PAST.1MSG Hind-ACC
 ‘I met Hind’
 b- Hindan qābaltuhā
 Hind-ACC meet-PAST.1MSG-3FSG
 ‘Hind, I met’

In both (32a) and (32b) *Hindan* is an Object-Given Topic with the difference, however, that it receives some degree of reinforcement in (32b) (but not in (32a)).

What seems to be specific to Arabic is that the constituent placed in the pre-verbal position is resumed by an anaphorical pronoun in the post-verbal area. This resuming strategy makes it possible to distinguish between constructions exemplified in (32b) and constructions like (33) where the constituent occupying the pre-verbal position bears the Contrast function:

- (33) A: qābalta Zaynaba
 meet-2MSG Zaynab-ACC
 ‘You met Zaynaba’
 B: **Hindan** qābaltu (lā Zaynaba)
 Hind-ACC meet-PAST.1MSG not Zaynab-ACC
 ‘It was Hind that I met (not Zaynab)’

4.4.3. Ascriptive Sub-act

Reinforcement may also be placed on the Ascriptive sub-act. The means that SMA provides to fulfil this task are: (a) the particle *qad*, (b) the prefix *la-* and (c) PSG.

- (i) The particle *qad* precedes a verbal predicate in Perfective Past

form as in (34):

- (34) *qad qadima Zaydun*
 EMPH come-PAST.3MSG Zayd-NOM
 ‘Zayd DID come!’

(ii) The use of *qad* with a non-verbal predicate results in an ungrammatical construction. Witness:

- (35) * *Zaydun qad qādimun*
 Zayd-NOM EMPH coming-NOM

It is the prefix *la-* that combines with the non-verbal predicate in such cases. Notice that the predicate obligatorily occurs before the Subject constituent as becomes clear from the comparison between (36a) and (36b):

- (36) a- *laqādimun Zaydun*
 EMPH-coming-NOM Zayd-NOM
 ‘Zayd is surely coming!’
 b- * *Zaydun laqādimun*
 Zayd-NOM EMPH-coming-NOM
 c- *inna Zaydan laqādimun*
 EMPH Zayd-ACC EMPH-coming-NOM
 ‘I state / assert that Zayd is surely coming!’

This requirement holds in all cases except when it is overridden by one of the Function-Independent-Form rules (discussed in Moutaouakil (2004:147)) according to which the Subject-Topic NP is ‘attracted’ by the clause-initial particle \square *inna* and placed immediately after it as in (36c).

As regards the use of these two morphemes, we can speak of an instantiation of ‘mixed’ alignment in the sense that their occurrence at the morpho-syntactic level depends upon information coming from both the interpersonal and the representational levels, i.e. the emphatic operator, the TMA operator and the lexical category of the predicate.

(iii) As for PCS, it consists, as mentioned above, in resuming the

predicate by its nominalized copy. Example (37) illustrates the use of such a strategy:

- (37) fataHa Bakrun l-bāba fatHan
 open- PAST.3MSG Bakr-NOM DEF-Door-ACC opening-
 ACC
 ‘Bakr DID open the door’

The constructions exemplified in (37) share similarities with the ones analysed in Dik (1997b:316) as Focus constructions, namely the repetition of the predicate. However, the strategy taking place in SMA is not exactly the same as the one used in some West-African languages. Compare (37), in this respect, with the following “pseudo-English” example given in Dik:

- (38) (It’s) kiss (that) John kissed Mary

First, the predicate is not repeated as such but rather in its nominalized form. Second, the copy of the predicate does not undergo any fronting process; rather, it occupies a clause-internal position and behaves as a normal satellite constituent. Third, the repetition does not result in focusing on the predicate but in reinforcing it. In order to focus on the predicate, SMA uses a dummy cleft construction in which the predicate takes a nominalized form while the verb support *fa* □*al* occurs within the Topic-constituent as in (39):

- (39) mā faalahu Zaydun
 REL do-PAST.3MSG-3MSG Zayd- NOM
 kitābatu risālatin
 writing-NOM letter-GEN
 ‘What Zayd did is writing a letter’
 ‘Zayd did nothing but writing a letter’

5. Ambivalent markers

Some markers can be said ‘functionally ambivalent’ in the sense that they may serve to express a reinforcement as well as a mitigation.

As shown above, the particle *qad* is used as an emphatic marker when

it combines with a verbal predicate in Perfective Past form as in (34) repeated here for convenience:

- (34) qad sāfara Zaydun
 EMPH travel-PAST.3MSG Zayd-NOM
 ‘Zayd DID travel!’

When it combines with a verb in Non-Perfective Non-Past form as in (40), this particle behaves rather as a mitigating device:

- (40) qad yusāfiru Zaydun
 MITIG come-FUT.3MSG Zayd-NOM
 ‘Maybe, Zayd will travel’

Reportative modifiers applying to the Communicated Content are commonly used to mitigate what is being stated. However, they can serve, in certain contexts, to reinforce the statement rather than to mitigate it.

Let us consider the following example:

- (41) Hasaba n-nuHāti t-tawlīdiyyīna
 according DEF-grammarians-GEN DEF-generativist-GEN

 t-tarkību mustaqillun
 DEF-syntax-NOM autonomous-NOM
 ‘According to generativist grammarians, Syntax is
 autonomous’

In (41), the reportative modifier *Hasaba n-nuHāti t-tawlīdiyyīna* is understood as expressing mitigation if the Speaker is any non-generativist linguist merely relaying the views of others (with whom he does not necessarily agree). The same modifier may be interpreted as an emphatic device when the Speaker is a (radical) formalist who wants to reinforce his/her commitment to the ‘Autonomous Syntax’ hypothesis.

6. More than one emphatic marker

More often than not, emphatic constructions can contain more than

one emphatic marker. The examined data show that two main reasons can be evoked in this respect: (a) the possibility for many units to be reinforced within the same Discourse Act and (b) the gradable character of the notion of Reinforcement.

6.1. Multiple reinforcement

By ‘multiple reinforcement’ I mean the process involved in constructions where more than one unit is reinforced.

Let us give some examples. In (42a-b), Reinforcement applies to the Discourse Act and the Ascriptive Sub-act; in (43), it applies to the Discourse Act, the Referential Sub-act as well as to the Ascriptive Sub-act:

- (42) a- *inna Zaydan İaāidun*
 EMPH Zayd-ACC EMPH-coming back-NOM
 ‘I state / assert that Zayd is surely coming back!’
 b- *inna Zaydan qad āada*
 EMPH Zayd-ACC EMPH come back-PAST.3MSG
 ‘I state / assert that Zayd DID come back!’

- (43) *inna Zaydan zaydan İaāidun*
 EMPH Zayd-ACC Zayd-ACC coming back-NOM
 ‘I state / assert that Zayd, (I say Zayd!) is surely coming back!’

Representation (44) is the interpersonal level underlying the constructions exemplified in (42a-b):

- (44) (M₁: (Reinf A₁: [(DECL F₁) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₁:
 [(Reinf T₁)_{Foc} (dR₁: Zayd (R₁))_{Top}] (C₁))] (A₁:))

However, Reinforcement can hardly be placed on a layer and on one of its internal elements at once as in (45), for example, where both the Communicated Content and the Ascriptive Sub-act are reinforced:

- (45) *?fi lan qad qadima Zaydun*
 indeed-ACC EMPH come-PAST.3SGM Zayd-NOM

Constructions such as (45) are acceptable only if they are understood on the basis that the predicate bears a double reinforcement mediated through the modifier (*fi lan*) and the particle (*qad*) as in the data examined in the next sub-section.

6.2. Gradable reinforcement

Reinforcement, as all kinds of Emphasis (cf Moutaouakil (1999 and 2005) for the gradability of Exclamation and its representation in FG), is a matter of degree in the sense that the intensification of (some unit of) a Discourse Act varies depending upon the nature of the Addressee's reaction (approval, doubt, objection, rejection ...) at a given step of the ongoing exchange.

To take an example, if we conceive of argumentative genre, following Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 51), as Moves articulated into three parts, we could say that increasing Reinforcement is expected to take place within the developing Discourse Acts chain rather than in the introductory statement or in the conclusion.

We can speak of increasing reinforcement when the same unit bears more than one emphatic marker as in the following examples:

- (46) a- qaT' an, inna Zaydan qādimun
absolutely-ACC EMPH Zayd-ACC coming-NOM
'Absolutely, I state / assert that Zayd will come'
- b- qaT' an, laāta^uzawwajanna
absolutely-ACC COMM-marry-FUT.1SGM-EMPH
Hindan
Hind-ACC
'Absolutely, I strongly commit myself to marrying Hind'

- (47) a- qad qadima Zaydun quḍūman
EMPH come-PAST.3SGM Zayd-NOM coming-ACC
'Zayd really DID come'
- b- laqādimun Zaydun quḍūman
EMPH-coming-NOM Zayd-NOM coming-ACC
'No doubt that Zayd will surely come'

The modifier qaT' an combines in (46a) with the particle *inna* and in (46b) with the suffix *-anna* to increase the reinforcement of the discourse Act. In (47a-b), the particle *qad* and the prefix *la-* described above as emphatic markers apply to an Ascriptive sub-act already reinforced through PCS.

In such cases, the reinforced unit contain both a modifier and a Reinforcement operator as becomes clear from the comparison

(50) laqad qadima Zaydun
 EMPH-EMPH come-PAST.3MSG Zayd-NOM
 ‘Zayd really DID come!’

(51) (M₁: (A₁: [(DECL F₁) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₁:
 [(Reinf [Reinf T₁])_{Foc} (dR₁: Zayd (R₁))_{Top}] (C₁:)) (A₁:))

7. Emphatic marker ordering

In SMA, the placement and ordering of Reinforcement markers take place according to the following general procedure:

(i) The positional template in this language is template (52) which contains a pre-clausal and a post-clausal positions and five clause-internal positions divided into three absolute positions (clause-initial positions P₁ and P₂ and clause-middle position P_M) and two relative positions (P₂₊₁ and P_{M+1}):

(52) P^{pre} P¹ P² P²⁺¹ P^M P^{M+1} P^{post}

(ii) As far as the emphatic markers are concerned, Discourse Act and Communicated Content modifiers go either in P^{pre} or in P^{post} as in (7a-b), (26a-c) and (27a-c). The particle □*inna* and the Subject-Topic NP that it ‘attracts’ are hosted by P¹ and P² respectively. The particle *qad* occupies the position P¹ if it is available as in (34). When P¹ and P² are filled in by □*inna* and the Subject-Topic NP, this particle goes in P²⁺¹ as in (42b).

When available, P¹ is the position that houses the pre-verbal Object-Given Topic. As for constructions involving a PCS process, the predicate occupies the position P^M while its resuming nominalized copy goes in P^{M+1}.

(iii) The order of emphatic markers at the morpho-syntactic level tends to satisfy to the transparency and interpretability requirement in the sense that it generally reflects the organization of their underlying interpersonal sources. Let us take as an example the ordering of the particles □*inna* and *qad* when they co-occur in the same construction. The comparison between (53a) and (53b) shows that □*inna* obligatorily precedes *qad*:

- (53) a- *inna* Zaydan qad kharaja
EMPH Zayd-ACC EMPH go out-PAST.3MSG
'I state /assert that Zayd DID go out'
b- * qad *inna* Zaydan kharaja
EMPH EMPH Zayd-ACC succeed-PAST.3MSG

The reason is that \square *inna* is the expression of a reinforcement operator applying to a higher layer (Discourse Act). The same transparency requirement holds for the ordering of emphatic modifiers: Discourse Act modifiers must occur before Communicated Content modifiers. The reverse ordering results in ungrammatical constructions such as (54b):

- (54) a- qaT' an, fi' lan satazūrunā Hindun
absolutely-ACC indeed-ACC visit-FUT.3FSG Hind-NOM
'Absolutely, Hind will indeed pay a visit to us'
b- * fi' lan, qaT' an satazūrunā
Hindun
indeed-ACC absolutely-ACC visit-FUT.3FSG Hind-NOM

It also can be said that the order of emphatic markers tends to obey the 'Depth First Principle' (Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 23-25) in the sense that it can be taken as a manifestation of the "general analogy between production processes and the sequence of steps involved in a pass through the model of FDG." In accordance with this principle, the emphatic marker of the higher layer is expected to be sent ahead to the encoder before the emphatic marker of the lower layer.

8. Summary and conclusions

In regards to its typological adequacy, the FDG approach to Emphasis phenomena turns out to be applicable to a great extent to Arabic data. More importantly, in defining Emphasis as clearly distinct from the Focus and Contrast functions on the one hand and from Illocution on the other hand, this approach makes it possible

to be fair to a whole category of constructions that can be properly described only as emphatic constructions. In this respect, it also enables us to distinguish between two kinds of constructions usually taken as equivalent and, conversely, to capture significant deep relationships and similarities between constructions commonly conceived of as quite different.

On the basis of the examination of Arabic data together with some relevant ideas from AGT, I have made the following suggestions to hopefully improve the FDG analysis of Emphasis phenomena:

(i) It turns out to be possible and maybe necessary to distinguish between two kinds of Emphasis, ‘emotive emphasis’ and ‘argumentative emphasis’, involved in constructions with quite different functional, formal and occurrence properties.

(ii) Reinforcement is generally conceived of as an operator applying to (some unit of) a discourse Act. In certain contexts, however, it could be captured by means of a rhetorical function assigned to a whole discourse Act whose main role is to emphasize another (usually preceding) discourse Act.

(iii) In order to account for constructions containing many emphatic markers, the underlying interpersonal representation should take into account the fact that Reinforcement can apply to more than one unit within the same Discourse Act and that it is (like other kinds of Emphasis) a gradual process. In order to deal with such a process, a provisional representational procedure is proposed.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Prof. J. Lachlan MACKENZIE for revising the English language of the earlier version of this article and for his valuable comments.

Abbreviations used in glosses

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ACC	accusative
DECL	declarative
DEF	definite
EMPH	emphasis
EXCL	exclamative
F	feminine
FUT	future tense
IMPERS	impersonal
INGR	ingressive
INT	interrogative
M	masculine
MIR	mirative
NOM	nominative
PASS	passive
PAST	past tense
PEJOR	pejorative
PERF	perfect
PLUR	plural
PRES	present tense
PROGR	progressive
SG	singular

References

- Caro, Elena Martinez, 2007, Pragmatic frames, the thetic-categorical distinction and Spanish constituent order. In: Hartner, Marize and Hengeveld, Kees. *Advances in Functional Discourse Grammar*. Alfa Revisita de Linguística. 51(2). 119-142.
 - Dik, Simon C, 1997, *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 2: Complex and derived constructions*. Edited by Kees Hengeveld. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
 - Hengeveld, Kees and Mackenzie, John. Lachlan, 2006, Functional Discourse Grammar. In: BROWN, K. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 2nd Edition Oxford: Elsevier,
 - Hengeveld, Kees and Mackenzie, John. Lachlan, (2008), *Functional Discourse Grammar A typologically based theory of language structure*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
 - Mackenzie, John Lachlan. 2009. Revisiter Moutaouakil In: Bouchikhi, Azzeddine (ed). *Le Fonctionnalisme dans la Linguistique Arabe et ses Nouveaux Horizons*. Meknes: Université Moulay Ismail. Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines. Série de colloques 20.
 - Moutaouakil, Ahmed. 1989, *Pragmatic Functions in a Functional Grammar Of Arabic* FG Series 8 Dordrecht. Foris.
 - Moutaouakil, Ahmed, 1999, Exclamation in Functional Grammar: Sentence type, Illocution or Modality? WPPFG 69.
 - Moutaouakil, Ahmed, 2004, Function Independent Morpho-syntax. In: Aertsen, Henk, Hannay, Mike and Rod Lyall (eds) *Words in their places. A festschrift for J. Lachlan Mackenzie*. Amsterdam: Faculty of Arts 143-153.
 - Moutaouakil, Ahmed, 2005, Exclamation in Functionnal Grammar:
 - Sentence type, Illocution or Modality? In: Groot, Casper de and Hengeveld, Kees. *Morpho-syntactic expression in Functional Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 351-379.
 - Moutaouakil, AhmeF 2010 *Al-khiTāb wa khaSā' iS al-lughā al-Ē arabiyya* Beirut: Dar al-Ēulum al -Ē arabiyya.
 - Moutaouakil, Ahmed 2018 Issues in Functional Arabic Linguistics. In: Benmamoun, El A. and Bassiouney, R. *Routledge Handbook of Arabic Linguistics* Routledge New York.
 - Moutaouakil, Ahmed 2019 Noun Phrase Structure in Arabic; A Functional Discourse Grammar Approach. *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Arabic Linguistics*. New Issues in Linguistics CMERLLA Meknes Morocco.
 - Moutaouakil, Ahmed 2021 An adequate Expression Module for Modular Layered Functional Grammar. *The Linguist Vol 1 No1*.
-