

**Exceptive Constructions :
From the Arabic Grammatical Tradition to Functional Discourse Grammar**

Ahmed Moutaouakil
Mohammed v university, Rabat, Morocco

Abstract:

In the Arabic Grammatical Tradition, the chapter entitled *istithnā* is devoted to all the constructions involving a NP preceded by the particle *'illā* ('except'). The Case-marking properties of the *'illā*-NP in so-called 'full exceptive constructions' are approached in terms of what we may call the 'Deep Case Assigner Analysis' which is also proposed for other 'detached' constituents.

The deep similarities between the analysis in the Arabic Grammatical Tradition and FDG make it possible to 'translate' some relevant basic assumptions of the former and to incorporate them into the latter. The result is a unified approach which permits redefinition and delimitation of the true area of exceptive constructions and an account of their morphosyntactic and prosodic properties on the basis of their interpersonal status. This approach turns out to be applicable to all the instantiations of the general phenomenon of 'Detachment'.

1. Introduction

In Standard Modern Arabic, the particle *'illā* ('except') precedes a NP in constructions which I will call here '*'illā*-constructions'. In the Arabic Grammatical Tradition (hereafter AGT), all *'illā*-constructions are seen as involving the same phenomenon, called *istithnā* ('exception').

My aim in this study is to argue against this view and to show that the particle *'illā* occurs in two distinct types of construction displaying quite different properties: exceptive constructions and restrictive constructions. The interpersonal and structural differences between these two types of construction will be examined within the FDG framework. As far as exceptive *'illā*-NPs are concerned, it will turn out to be of great interest to deal with them as instantiations of the general phenomenon of 'constituent detachment'.

Throughout this study, and in the light of the general claim advocated in Moutaouakil (2008), it will be shown that some aspects of the analysis proposed in AGT for 'isolated' constituents must be revisited while some others can be incorporated into the general FDG approach.

2. *'illā*-NP in AGT

By AGT, I mean the work that ancient Arab grammarians devoted over centuries to the description of the structure of so-called 'Classical Arabic'.

As is well-known, the main point of view from which the structure of Arabic is examined in this tradition is the variation of the case marking patterns that can take place within NPs, linguistic expressions and even larger stretches of discourse.

As far as *'illā*-NP is concerned, its (Nominative/Accusative/Genitive) case marking is approached in terms of two parameters: (a) *tāmm* ('full') vs *mufarraġ* ('empty') exception and (b) *mūžab* ('positive') vs *manfī* ('negative') full exception.

2.1 'Full' vs 'empty' exception

The concept of *Istithnā* is defined in AGT as a relation of exclusion which holds between a set of entities involved in some event and an entity (or a subset of entities) meant to be excluded from this event. The former is called *mustathnā minhu* ('from which exception is made'), the second *mustathnā* ('excepted').

On the basis of this definition, ancient Arab grammarians distinguish between 'full exceptive constructions' which involve the two members of exception and 'empty exceptive constructions' where only the second member (expressed by *'illā*-NP) occurs.

Full and empty exceptive constructions are exemplified in (1) and (2) respectively:

- (1) mā qābaltu l-kuttāba, *'illā* Zaydan
Neg meet-PAST.1SG DEF-writer-PLUR-ACC except Zayd-ACC
'I did not meet the writers, except for Zayd'

- (2) mā qābaltu *'illā* Zaydan
Neg meet-PAST.1SG except Zayd-ACC
'I met only Zayd'

2.2 Positive vs negative full exception

As regards their polarity features, full exceptive constructions can be negative as in (1) or affirmative as in (3):

- (3) qābaltu l-kuttāba, 'illā Zaydan
meet-PAST.1SG DEF-writer-PLUR-ACC except Zayd-ACC
'I met the writers, except for Zayd'

As for empty exceptive constructions, they are obligatorily negative as can be made clear from the comparison between (2) and (4):

- (4)* qābaltu 'illā Zaydan
meet-PAST.1SG except Zayd-ACC

As will be shown below, constructions like (2) must be regarded as different from those exemplified in (1). The reasons are that they involve a restriction rather than an exception and that they display quite specific morpho-syntactic properties.

3. Exceptive vs Restrictive 'illā-NP

All 'illā-constructions share the property of containing a NP to which the particle 'illā is attached. This is probably the reason why ancient Arab grammarians conceive of them as involving the same phenomenon and deal with them under the same label in the same chapter.

The examined data show, however, that two categories of 'illā-constructions must be distinguished on the basis of differences in form as well as in content.

First of all, 'illā- and mā... 'illā do not have the same grammatical status. In exceptive constructions, 'illā stands as an autonomous morpheme while in restrictive constructions it obligatorily combines with the negative particle mā. This can be evidenced by the fact that 'illā can occur alone in exceptive constructions but not in restrictive ones, as becomes clear from the ungrammaticality of (6b):

- (5) a mā 'atā z-zuwwāru, 'illā Zaydan
NEG come-PAST.3MSG DEF-visitor-PLUR-NOM except Zayd-ACC
'The visitors did not come, except for Zayd'
b 'atā z-zuwwāru, 'illā Zaydan
come-PAST.3MSG DEF-visitor-PLUR-NOM except Zayd-ACC
'The visitors came, except for Zayd'
- (6) a mā 'atā 'illā Zaydan
NEG come-PAST. 3MSG except Zayd-NOM
'Only Zayd came'

According to ancient Arab grammarians, constructions like (12), where the case of *'illā*-NP conforms to the syntactic function of the preceding NP are ungrammatical:

- (12) * qadima -l-kuttābu, *'illā* *Zaydun*
 come-PAST. 3MSG DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except Zayd-NOM

By way of explanation, they analyse *'illā*-NP in positive exceptive constructions as the Object of the verb of the deleted (performative ?) sentence *'astathnī* ‘I except’. According to such an analysis, the ‘deep’ representation of (11) is (13):

- (13) [[qadim (l-kuttāb) _{Subj}], [*'astathnī* (Zayd) _{Obj}]]

The same grammarians point out that in negative counterparts of constructions such as (12) *'illā*-NP can take either the Accusative or the Nominative case:

- (14) a mā qadima l-kuttābu, *'illā* *Zaydan*
 NEG come-PAST. 3MSG DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except Zayd-ACC
 ‘The writers did not come, except for Zayd’
- b mā qadima l-kuttābu. *'illā* *Zaydun*
 NEG come-PAST. 3MSG DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except Zayd -NOM
 ‘The writers did not come. But Zayd came’

For constructions like (14a), they propose the same analysis as the one they suggest for the positive exceptive constructions exemplified in (11). In this view, (15) could be suggested as the underlying representation of (14a):

- (15) [[NEG qadim (l-kuttāb) _{Subj}], [*'astathnī* (Zayd) _{Obj}]]

As for *'illā*-NP in constructions such as (14b), it is analysed as a *'badal*’ (‘Apposition’) which agrees in case with the host NP. According to such an approach, the underlying representation of (14b) would be rather (16):

- (16) [[NEG qadim (l-kuttāb) _{Subj}], [(Zayd) _{Subj}]]

It is worthy of notice that in AGT the appositional NP is in general interpreted, at the ‘deep’ level, as belonging to a second clause whose predicate is a ‘copy’ of the verb occurring in the preceding clause. Accordingly, ‘deep’ representation (17) would be more appropriate than (16):

- (17) [[NEG qadim (l-kuttāb) _{Subj}], [qadim (Zayd) _{Subj}]]

Under this view, the Nominative case that the NP *Zayd* bears in (14b) is assigned not by the verb of the preceding clause but rather by its (deleted) ‘copy’.

Interestingly enough, the same analysis is proposed for other constructions containing a ‘detached’ constituent. Let me restrict myself here to what is called in AGT *'na't maqTū'* (‘cut-off adjective’).

The modifiers belonging to this class of adjectives have the property of being non-incorporated into the host NP, as becomes clear from the comparison between (18a) and (18b-c):

- (18) a *iltaqaytu* *bi-r- raḏuli* *l-karīmi*
 meet-PAST.1SG with-DEF-man-GEN DEF-generous-GEN
 ‘I met the generous man’
- b *iltaqaytu* *bi-r-raḏuli,* *l-karīma*
 meet-PAST.1SG with-DEF-man-GEN DEF-generous-ACC
 ‘I met the man, I mean the generous one.’
- c *iltaqaytu* *bi-r-raḏuli.* *l-karīmu*
 meet-PAST.1SG with-DEF-man-GEN DEF-generous -NOM
 ‘I met the man. He is the generous one’

In (18a), the adjective *l-karīmi* stands as an internal modifier within the NP *r-raḏuli l-karīmi*. In (18b-c), this adjective behaves as a detached constituent (expressing, as will be shown below, an autonomous discourse Act different from the one containing the host NP).

Let us next concentrate on the case marking properties of the modifier *l-karīm* in examples (18a-c). In (18a), the modifier agrees in case with the head noun of the host NP while in (18b) and (18c) it takes the Accusative and the Nominative case respectively.

To deal with this phenomenon, ancient Arab grammarians conceive of *l-karīm* as a NP which functions as an Object of the deleted deep verb *’a ’nī* (‘I mean’) in constructions like (18b) and as the predicate of a clause whose Subject term is the deleted pronoun *huwa* (‘he’) in the constructions exemplified in (18c). According to such an analysis, the underlying rough representations of (18b) and (18c) could be roughly (19) and (20) respectively:

(19) [[*ltaqay* (1SG)_{Subj} (*r-raḏuli*)_{Com}], [*’a ’nī* (*l-karīm*)_{Obj}]]

(20) [[*ltaqay* (1SG)_{Subj} (*r-raḏuli*)_{Com}], [*huwa*_{Subj} (*l-karīm*)_{Pred}]]

The AGT analysis outlined above principally calls for the following remarks:

Firstly, the postulation of a “deep” verb as an assigner of the Accusative/Nominative case and the deletion mechanism that it implies are obviously in contradiction with the standard of psychological adequacy. However, although there is no necessary one-to-one mapping, as emphasized in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008), between interpersonal units (eg. Acts) and morpho-syntactic templates (eg. Clauses), this analysis, being based on the assumption that exceptive constructions at a ‘deeper’ level consist of two clauses, can be taken as an argument in favour of approaching the *’illā*-NP as an autonomous Discourse Act as we will see below.

Secondly, it is not very clear why negative (but not positive) polarity allows the *’illā*-NP to bear either the Accusative or Nominative case. In my view, the NP in question is a detached modifier whose case marking properties are not determined by the preceding clause. Consequently, I assume that it can take either the Nominative or the Accusative case in negative as well as in positive ‘full exceptive’ constructions and that constructions such as (12), ruled out in AGT as ungrammatical, would be perfectly acceptable in some contexts as will be clear below.

These limitations do not mean that the AGT analysis is totally incorrect. The following four basic assumptions may be “re-interpreted” and integrated into FDG:

- (i) Exceptive *'illā*-NP should be related to the constituents referred to as *maqTū* ('detached') or *mafSūl* ('isolated') in the sense that they all involve the same phenomenon.
- (ii) These constituents stand as autonomous communicative units;
- (iii) The communicative autonomy of such constituents is a matter of degree;
- (iv) Case marking distinctions may serve also to signal discourse features.

5. Exceptive *'illā*-NP as a Discourse Act

5.1 Interpersonal constituency

In FDG terms, exceptive constructions exemplified in (1) express two Discourse Acts. The Act carried out by the Clause embodies a Communicated Content involving an Ascriptive Subact and a Referential Subact. In such constructions, the *'illā*-NP conveys an autonomous Discourse Act whose Communicated Content is restricted to only a Referential Subact.

The interpersonal structure of constructions (14a) and (14b) repeated here for convenience becomes clear from underlying representation (21) (where the relationship between the two Acts is intentionally left unspecified):

- (14) a mā qadima l-kuttābu, *'illā* Zaydan
 NEG come-PAST.3MSG. DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except Zayd-ACC
 'The writers did not come, except for Zayd'
- b mā qadima l-kuttābu. *'illā* Zaydun
 NEG come-PAST.3MSG. DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except Zayd -NOM
 'The writers did not come. But Zayd came'

- (21) (M₁: (A₁: [(DECL F₁) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₁: [(T₁)_{FOC} (+idR₁)_{TOP}] (C₁))] (A₁))
 (A₂: [(DECL F₂) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₂: [(+idR₂: Zayd (R₂))_{FOC}] ((C₂))] (A₂)) (M₁))

5.2 Interpersonal status

As put forward in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2006) and (2008), two kinds of relationship can be entertained by the Discourse Acts grouping in a Move: Dependence and Independence (or Equipollence).

As far as exceptive constructions are concerned, the Act expressed by *'illā*-NP can be a dependent Act as in (14a) or an independent (Nucleus) Act as in (14b).

This difference in communicative status between (14a) and (14b) becomes clear if we take into account the following features: First, in expressing a separate Discourse Act, exceptive *'illā*-NP stands at the phonological level of organization as an autonomous intonational unit. Notice that the pause setting it off from the preceding Intonational Phrase is generally perceived as slightly longer in constructions like (14b) than in constructions like (14a). Also worthy of notice is the fact that the pause can disappear in constructions like (14a) but not in constructions like (14b). We can find (22) beside (14a) but we cannot find (23) as a pauseless counterpart of (14b):

(22) mā qadima l-kuttābu 'illā Zaydan
 NEG come-PAST.3MSG. DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except Zayd -ACC
 ‘The writers did not come except for Zayd’

(23) * mā qadima l-kuttābu 'illā Zaydun
 NEG come-PAST.3MSG. DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except Zayd -NOM
 ‘The writers did not come except for Zayd’

I will return to this issue below. Second, *'illā*-NP occurring in exceptive constructions generally takes the Accusative case. However, as mentioned above, this NP may also bear the Nominative case. Ancient Arab grammarians signal the existence of this phenomenon but without providing a convincing explanation. Let me hypothesize that the NP in question functions as an independent Act when it bears the Nominative case and as a dependent Act when it bears the Accusative case.. If this claim is tenable, we can assume that the formal expression of *'illā*-NP conforms to the generalization that I argued for elsewhere (Moutaouakil (2007)) and formulated as follows:

(24) “Nominative case marks independent units; Accusative case marks dependent units.”

Third, in connection with this case marking variation, when *'illā*-NP occurs as a pronoun, it takes the bound form in constructions like (14a) and the free form in constructions such as (14b). The pronominalized counterpart of (14a) is (25a); the pronominalized counterpart of (14b) is (25b) but not (25c):

- (25) a qadima -l-kuttābu, 'illāhu
 come-PAST.3MSG. DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except-3MSG.
 ‘The writers came, except for him’
- b qadima -l-kuttābu. 'illā huwa
 come-PAST.3MSG. DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except him
 ‘The writers came. But he did not’
- c * qadima -l-kuttābu. 'illā hu
 come-PAST.3MSG. DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except-3MSG.

Fourth, as regards constituent ordering, the usual position for exceptive *'illā*-NP to occupy is the post-clausal position. Ancient Arab grammarians report, however, that in the Accusative case, it may occupy the initial position as in (26a). According to the same grammarians, it also can occur as a parenthetical constituent as becomes clear from (26b):

- (26) a 'illā Zaydan, ma ltaqaytu bi-l-kuttābi
 except Zayd-ACC Neg meet-PAST.1SG with-DEF-writer-PLUR-GEN
 ‘Except for Zayd, I did not meet the writers’
- b ma ltaqaytu -'illā Zaydan - bi-l-kuttābi
 Neg meet-PAST.1SG except Zayd-ACC with-DEF-writer-PLUR-GEN
 ‘I did not meet, except for Zayd, the writers’

When it bears the Nominative case, exceptive *'illā*-NP can only occur in the post-clausal position. Witness the ungrammaticality of constructions like (27a-b), where it is placed in other positions:

- (27) a * *'illā Zaydun ma ltaqaytu bi-l-kuttābi*
 except Zayd-NOM Neg meet-PAST.1SG with-DEF-writer-PLUR-GEN
- b * *ma ltaqaytu -'illā Zaydun - bi-l-kuttābi*
 Neg meet-PAST.1SG except Zayd-NOM with-DEF-writer-PLUR-GEN

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the *'illā*-NP is more loosely related to the preceding clause in constructions like (14b) than it is in constructions such as that exemplified in (14a). Witness the possibility of inserting linguistic material between them in (28a) but not in (28b):

- (28) a *qadima - l-kuttābu min mudunin kathīratin*
 come-PAST.3MSG. DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM from city-PLUR-GEN numerous-GEN
liyunaqīšū 'amran hāmma. 'illā Zaydun
 discuss PRES.3MPLUR. issue-ACC important-ACC except Zayd- NOM
 ‘The writers came from many cities to discuss an important issue. But Zayd did not come’.
- b * *qadima - l-kuttābu min mudunin kathīratin*
 come-PAST.3MSG. DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM from city-PLUR-GEN numerous-GEN
liyunaqīšū 'amran hāmma, 'illā Zaydan
 discuss PRES.3MPLUR.issue-ACC important-ACC except Zayd-ACC

Fifth, the two linguistic expressions are far from being equivalent. In (14a), the Speaker’s point is the exception process itself. In (14b), his/her point is rather to state that the event designated in the preceding clause did not occur. As for the exception process, it is embodied as a starting point within a new stretch of discourse (and possibly with another Speaker’s point). In this respect, there is no difference, in my opinion, between the phenomenon involved in constructions like (14b) and the one that ancient Arab grammarians call *'isti'nāf* (re-starting) and describe as a process which re-starts (possibly in a new, different direction) after a short or long interruption. That this is the case becomes clear from the possibility for (14b) but not for (14a) of hosting a comment:

- (29) a *qadima - l-kuttābu. 'illā Zaydun*
 come-PAST.3MSG. DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except Zayd -NOM
faqad kāna musāfiran
 PART be-PAST.3MSG. travel-PRES PARTICIPLE M-ACC
 ‘The writers came. But Zayd did not come because he was travelling’
- b * *qadima -l-kuttābu, 'illā Zaydan*
 come-PAST.3MSG. DEF-writer-PLUR-NOM except Zayd -ACC
faqad kāna musāfiran
 PART be-PAST.3MSG. travel-PRES PARTICIPLE M-ACC

On the basis of the distinction between Dependent and Independent Acts, we can propose (30) and (31) as the fully specified underlying interpersonal representations of (14a) and (14b) respectively:

(30) (M₁: (A₁: [(DECL F₁) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₁:
 [(T₁)_{FOC} (=idR₁)_{TOP}] (C₁))] (A₁))_{Nucl}
 < (A₂: [(DECL F₂) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₂:
 [(+idR₂: Zayd (R₂))_{FOC}] ((C₂))] (A₂))_{Dep} (M₁))

(31) (M₁: (A₁: [(DECL F₁) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₁:
 [(T₁)_{FOC} (+idR₁)_{TOP}] (C₁))] (A₁))_{Nucl}
 <> (A₂: [(DECL F₂) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₂:
 [(+idR₂: Zayd (R₂))_{FOC}] ((C₂))] (A₂))_{Nucl} (M₁))

It is to be noticed that the second Discourse Act in interpersonal representations like (30) could be assigned a rhetorical function (Clarification or Correction for example). However, the assignment of such a function would be superfluous in the sense that it has no impact on the form of the *'illā*-NP. In accordance with generalization (24), this constituent will take the Accusative case determined by its interpersonal status as expressing a dependent Discourse Act irrespective of the rhetorical function that could be assigned to this Discourse Act.

One of the most important arguments in favour of the approach proposed here for exceptive constructions is its applicability to a wider range of constructions containing detached constituents (nominal Appositions, Non-restrictive relatives...). Let us see, for example, how this approach accounts for constructions like (18a-c) repeated here for convenience:

- (18) a *iltaqaytu* *bi-r- raḏuli* *l-karīmi*
 meet-PAST.1SG with-DEF-man-GEN DEF-generous-GEN
 ‘I met the generous man’
- b *iltaqaytu* *bi-r-raḏuli,* *l-karīma*
 meet-PAST.1SG with-DEF-man-GEN DEF-generous-ACC
 ‘I met the man, I mean the generous one.’
- c *iltaqaytu* *bi-r-raḏuli.* *l-karīmu*
 meet-PAST.1SG with-DEF-man-GEN DEF-generous-NOM
 ‘I met the man. He is the generous one’

As mentioned above, the adjective *l-karīmi* functions in (18a) as an internal modifier within the NP *r-raḏuli l-karīmi*. Construction (18a) is a simple clause conveying a single Discourse Act where this NP has the interpersonal status of a second Referential Subact, as representation (32) shows:

(32) (M₁: (A₁: [(DECL F₁) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A (C₁:
 [(T₁)_{FOC} (+idR₁: [+S,-A] (R₁))_{TOP} (+idR₂)] (C₁))] (A₁))_{Nucl}

The same adjective should be taken in both (18b) and (18c) as expressing an autonomous Discourse Act, with the difference that this Act is dependent in (18b) and independent in (18c), as shown in underlying representations (33) and (34) respectively:

$$(33) \quad (M_1: (A_1: [(DECL F_1) (P_1)_S (P_2)_A (C_1: [(T_1)_{FOC} (+idR_1: [+S,-A] (R_1))_{TOP} (°idR_2)] (C_1))] (A_1))_{Nucl} < (A_2: [(DECL F_2) (P_1)_S (P_2)_A (C_2: [(+idR_3)_{FOC}] ((C_2))] (A_2))_{Dep} (M_1))$$

$$(34) \quad (M_1: (A_1: [(DECL F_1) (P_1)_S (P_2)_A (C_1: [(T_1)_{FOC} (+idR_1: [+S,-A] (R_1))_{TOP} (dR_2)] (C_1))] (A_1))_{Nucl} <> (A_2: [(DECL F_2) (P_1)_S (P_2)_A (C_2: [(+idR_3)_{FOC}] ((C_2))] (A_2))_{Nucl} (M_1))$$

5. 3 Structural configuration

In representations (30-31) and (33-34), Nucl and Dep stand as the indicators of the communicative relationships taking place between the two Acts. As such, they function as triggers of a part of the encoding mechanism.

It is possible, as mentioned above, to assign particular rhetorical functions to the dependent Act. However, since the two indicators suffice to activate the relevant morpho-syntactic and phonological encoding operations, the assignment of such functions becomes superfluous.

5. 3. 1 Morpho-syntactic organization

At the morpho-syntactic level, Nucl and Dep determine the case (Nominative vs Accusative) that the *'illā*-NP bears and its position within the Linguistic Expression which may be (a) either the post-clausal position or the pre-clausal position when it expresses a dependent Act and (b) only the former when it carries out an independent Act. The macrotemplates that are expected to be satisfied by the morpho-syntactic structure of the constructions in question are given in (35) and (36):

$$(35) \quad (Le_1: [(Np_1) (Cl_1)] (Le_1))$$

$$(36) \quad (Le_1: [(Cl_1) (Np_1)] (Le_1))$$

As in exceptive constructions, the interpersonal status of the ‘detached’ constituent (Dependency vs Independency) in constructions like (18b-c) is reflected in the structural configuration. It determines, in particular, the (Accusative vs Nominative) case marking. According to generalization (24), the detached adjective takes, as a dependent Act, the Accusative case as in (18b); when it expresses an independent Act as in (18c), it is assigned the Nominative case.

In such constructions, the position that it occupies is obligatorily the post-clausal one as becomes clear from the oddity of constructions like (37a-b):

(37) a * *l-karīma* iltaqaytu bi-r-ražuli
 the-generous-ACC meet-PAST.1SG with-DEF-man-GEN

b* *l-karīmu* iltaqaytu bi-r-ražuli
 the-generous-NOM meet-PAST.1SG with-DEF-man-GEN

The macrotemplate that the morpho-syntactic representation of these constructions must satisfy is thus (36) rather than (35).

It can also be said that in constructions exemplified in (18b-c), unlike in exceptive constructions, no special linearizing morpho-syntactic rule is needed to specify the position of the detached adjective and that the ordering of the interpersonal units is sent down to the morpho-syntactic level without change.

5.3.2 Prosodic expression

At the phonological level, the interpersonal status of the ‘detached’ constituent in exceptive constructions as well as in the constructions exemplified in (18b-c) impinges upon the prosodic structure of the construction in which it occurs. It stands as an autonomous intonational unit after a more or less long pause (depending upon the communicative relationship that it entertains, as a dependent vs independent Act, with the Act expressed by the preceding clause).

In this connection, I would like to close this section by a brief discussion of the exact nature of the intonational unit that realizes the Act expressed by the ‘detached’ constituent (exceptive NP, ‘isolated’ modifier...).

Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 432-433) signal and discuss the cases where a speedy delivery may condense more than one discourse Act into a single Intonational Phrase. When such a phenomenon occurs in the constructions under consideration, we should expect that the prosodic organization of (22) where the two Acts are mapped onto a single Intonational Phrase will conform to the general phonological pattern (38):

(38) (u₁: [(ip₁)] (u₁))

As regards constructions (14a) and (18b), the pattern that their prosodic organization is expected to satisfy is pattern (39) according to which the two Discourse Acts are realized in two distinct Intonational Phrases:

(39) (u₁: [(ip₁) (ip₂)] (u₁))

Now, as for constructions exemplified in (14b) and (18c), they have, as mentioned above, the property of exhibiting an obligatory substantial separating pause. With such a property, the expression of the second Discourse Act becomes not accessible to any prosodic condensation process on the one hand and requires a phonological realization larger than the Intonational Phrase on the other.

Given that the Utterance does not necessarily coincide with the Move and that the Intonational Phrase does not always coincide with the Discourse Act, as signalled in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008), the question that can arise is this: In such constructions, is the second Act realized by a mere Intonational Phrase (with the specificity of being set off by a more substantial

pause) within a single Utterance or rather by a full-fledged Utterance displaying the intonational features that are characteristic of Utterance boundaries? To put it another way, may the Utterance be the phonological realization not only of the whole Move but also of an independent, nucleus Discourse Act within this Move ?

If this turns out to be the case, we can assume that the recursion of similar units can also apply at the phonological level and that the prosodic structures of (14b) and (18c) conform to pattern (40) rather than to pattern (39):

(40) (u₁: [(ip₁) (u₂: [(ip₂) (u₂))] (u₁))

For the time being, I prefer to leave this question open.

6. Summary and conclusions

- (i) The re-examination of the data discussed in AGT reveals that *'illā*-constructions should not be dealt with as a homogeneous category of constructions. Two types of *'illā*-NP must be distinguished: restrictive *'illā*-NP and exceptive *'illā*-NP.
- (ii) Exceptive *'illā*-NP, unlike its restrictive congener, functions as an autonomous discourse Act which may be either dependent or independent with respect to the Act expressed by the host clause.
- (iii) The status that this NP displays at the interpersonal level is reflected at the Morphosyntactic Level in Case marking, constituent ordering and at the Phonological Level in intonational contour.
- (iv) Contrary to what is commonly asserted, the Nominative/Accusative distinction serves, according to the same principle (Dependency vs Independency) and applying to the same type of relation (Nucleus-Dependent), not only as a formal expression of grammatical relations but also as an encoding device for discourse features. The correlations established between case marking distinctions and communicative status provide strong support for the FDG claim that the Interpersonal Level should be directly linked to the encoding levels.
- (v) Some elements of the Arab traditional analysis of *'illā*-NP can be “re-interpreted” within the FDG framework. This results in a unified approach which enables us to distinguish between restrictive and exceptive *'illā*-constructions and to account in a satisfactory way for the interpersonal, morphosyntactic and prosodic properties of these two categories of construction as well as those of other detached NPs in Arabic and probably in other languages.
- (vi) I hope that I have given a good example of how a fruitful “dialogue” can take place between AGT and FDG in spite of their historical and epistemological specificities. The results arrived at in this study reinforce my conviction that further research in the same vein may reveal that many discourse-oriented analyses of other linguistic phenomena proposed in the former could be ‘translated into’ and hosted by the latter.

Aknowledgements

I am grateful to Prof. J. Lachlan MACKENZIE for correcting the English of the earlier version of this article and for his valuable comments which have markedly improved the text.

References

- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2006. Functional Discourse Grammar. In: Brown, Keith. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 2nd Edition Oxford: Elsevier
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie .2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Moutaouakil, Ahmed. 2007. Coordinative constructions in Arabic. Aspects of morpho-syntax as an indicator of Interpersonal status. In: Hattner, Marize & Kees Hengeveld, *Advances in Functional Discourse Grammar*. Brazil: *Alfa-Revista delinguistica* 51.2.
- Moutaouakil, Ahmed. 2008. *masā'ilu n-aHwi l-'arabi fi qaDdāyā naHwi l-khiTābi l-waDHīfi* (Arabic Grammar questions in Functional Discourse Grammar issues). Beirut: Dar al-kitāb.