

Aspects of Sentence Analysis in the Theory of Functional Grammar of Arabic

¹ **Boudrama Zaidi**

z.boudrama@univ-setif2.dz

Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University, Sétif 2, Algeria

² **Medkour Nouredine**

Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University, Sétif 2, Algeria

n.medkour@univ-setif2.dz

³ **Meghezi Ahmed said**

a.moghzi@univ-setif2.dz

Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University, Sétif 2, Algeria

⁴ **Boukhennoufa Nouredine**

n.boukhennoufa@univ-setif2.dz

Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University, Sétif 2, Algeria

Received: 06.03.2026 Accepted: 02.08.2026 Publishing: 12.09.2026

Abstract:

Functional Grammar Theory is one of the pragmatic theories that emerged from the need to study different forms of discourse while taking into account the external contexts in which they are produced. In accordance with this conception, functionalists developed a descriptive apparatus that brings together structure and function, gives priority to function, and recognizes its role in determining the particular structural properties of an utterance. They adopted a specific view of the sentence, inspired by what pragmatic theory had proposed: the sentence is a linguistic act characterized by structural properties reflected in pragmatic-semantic properties. The Moroccan researcher Ahmed al-Mutawakkil adopted its theoretical framework and employed it in the study of various aspects of Arabic, initially focusing on the sentence with all its elements and circumstances, in what came to be known as Functional Grammar of Arabic. This article seeks to clarify the various aspects addressed by al-Mutawakkil that are relevant to the analysis of the Arabic sentence. If both General Functional Grammar Theory and Functional Grammar of Arabic maintain that linguistic structure must be treated together with the function that gives rise to it, what new contribution has this theory made in comparison with earlier linguistic theories? Is it legitimate to explain different structural patterns on the basis of function? What aspects does this theory emphasize in its analysis of different sentences? And does it encompass all the elements of the sentence?.

Keywords: sentence; Arabic language; Functional Grammar; pragmatics.

Introduction:

Consulting the various linguistic theories provides insight into the perspectives offered by human intellectual inquiry in its understanding of language, as well as into the premises and objectives pursued by each theory. This broadens the reader's horizons and enables them to adopt a particular

theory with greater awareness, while also helping them contribute to its development. Among the most prominent theories deserving theoretical consideration is Simon Dik's Functional Grammar Theory and Ahmed al-Mutawakkil's application of it to the study of Arabic in a theory he called Functional Grammar of Arabic. This article presents this theory's conception of the sentence and the issues it addresses, which differ from those traditionally encountered in various linguistic theories, such as structuralism and transformational-generative grammar.

1- The Theoretical and Methodological Framework of Functional Grammar Theory:

It is well known that Functional Grammar Theory is one of the theories belonging to the pragmatic trend, which distinguished itself from other approaches (structuralism and transformational-generative grammar) by focusing on the study and interpretation of the circumstances surrounding discourse, drawing on factors that go beyond the limits of closed structure and an exclusively internal perspective. This is achieved by taking into account the circumstances in which a structure is produced within a specific communicative context. It has been established beyond doubt that "when we speak of language use, this use is not neutral with regard to its effects on communication, nor on the linguistic system itself. It is indeed obvious that some words (deictic expressions referring to time, place, or persons, such as now, here, and I) cannot be interpreted except within the context in which they are uttered. It is no less obvious that in linguistic exchange we convey meanings that exceed what the words themselves indicate. Finally, it is not simplistic to say that the use of linguistic forms, in turn, leads to incorporating use into the system itself; the meaning of an utterance rests on an explanation of the circumstances of its use, that is, of the performance of that utterance" (Muschler & Reboul, 2010, p. 21). Pragmatics gained its legitimacy from this new perspective on language, one that earlier theories had not addressed. This is confirmed by Geoffrey Leech, who states that for "the generation that came after Bloomfield, linguistics ... meant phonetics and phonemics; if we dared, we might say it meant morphophonemics, whereas grammatical syntax was considered so highly abstract that it was effectively regarded as beyond every horizon of discovery" (Leech, 2013, p. 9). In other words, linguistic study under the structuralists, particularly American structuralism, did not go beyond classifying the elements of the corpora under investigation, determining the nature of their constituent elements and their relations, without addressing questions of meaning, its representation, or its status. The same approach continued in the early stages of generative linguistics: "Like the structuralists, they continued to regard semantics in general as confused territory for serious observation and reflection. By the beginning of 1960 (when linguistics was rapidly advancing), Katz and his associates (Katz and Fodor, 1963; Katz and Postal, 1964; and Kator, 1964) began to discover how semantics could be incorporated into formal linguistic theory ... Lakoff and others soon began arguing that syntax could not legitimately be separated from the study of language use, and thus pragmatics was placed on the linguistic map from that point onward" (Leech, 2013, p. 10). This means that meaning in its broad sense—the meaning conveyed by linguistic units as they are used in living contexts—is the fundamental concern of pragmatics, a concern that earlier theories had not seriously addressed. Accordingly, scholars who laid its foundations state that pragmatics seeks to answer questions that had not previously been raised, such as: "What do we do when we speak? What exactly

do we say when we speak? Why do we ask our neighbor at the table to hand us something when it is obvious that they can do so? Who is speaking, then? To whom are they speaking? Who speaks with whom? Who speaks and for whose benefit? What must we do to remove ambiguity from one sentence or another? What does promising mean? How can we say something other than what we intended to say? Can we rely on the literal meaning of an intention? What are the uses of language? What criterion determines the capacity of human beings for language?” (Armengaud, 1986, p. 4).

Pragmatics does not stop at dealing with the meaning that can be determined on the basis of what the uttered structure itself indicates, or in relation to the other elements mentioned alongside it. Rather, it goes beyond this to deal with meaning—which is precisely what distinguishes it—that cannot be determined without invoking elements external to the utterance (psychological, cultural, social, and other factors). These aspects had not been studied or theorized by earlier linguistic theories and approaches. Accordingly, pragmatists focused in their research and analyses on what is not “explicitly stated in the text, implicatures, shared knowledge between the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader, presuppositions, expressions with context-dependent meanings; deixis, entailment and speech acts, argumentative discourse strategies, the way in which the recipient understands the linguistic message in the material and situational contexts surrounding the linguistic communicative process, and the recipient’s linguistic or behavioral response to the message,” with a clear and decisive emphasis on what they call the speaker’s/writer’s intention behind the linguistic message, the context in which linguistic communication takes place, the effect of the linguistic message on the recipient, and its performative capacities (Al-Farawi, 2017, p. 16). These issues—deixis, speech acts, entailment, and so forth—constituted the major concerns of pragmatics.

Functional Grammar Theory sought to make use of this body of knowledge in constructing its descriptive apparatus. It therefore adopted numerous concepts, such as speech act, illocutionary force, propositional content, reference, and other issues that will become evident in the course of this analysis.

Functional Grammar is distinguished by its attempt to construct a descriptive apparatus that accounts for linguistic structure while taking into consideration the various stages involved in producing and interpreting an utterance, as well as the external circumstances in which it is performed. It also assigns a level to the study of aspects of the system that cannot be understood without invoking the communicative situation; these are referred to as pragmatic aspects or pragmatic properties. Al-Mutawakkil states: “All pragmatic properties of linguistic expressions (such as modal properties, illocutionary properties, and the pragmatic functions borne by the components of the expression, etc.) must be represented within the grammar itself (that is, in the current form of Functional Grammar), within the grammatical framework and not outside it” (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 20).

This theory was founded and framed by the Dutch linguist Simon Dik in the 1970s, and subsequently developed through the efforts of researchers who gathered around its founder and his ideas. Thanks to “the research of Dik and a group of linguists who addressed various phenomena belonging typologically to different languages, they sought to elaborate the aspects of the pragmatically founded linguistic theory and to raise some of the empirical and theoretical problems confronting the

functional linguist. These works culminated in Dik's volume (1989), which reflects the growing interest among functionalists in developing Functional Grammar, raising it to the level of explanatory adequacy, and refining it so that it could serve as a theoretical framework for approaching languages belonging to different linguistic families, such as Dutch (Dik et al.), English (McKethry), Hungarian (Ducrot), and Arabic (al-Mutawakkil et al.)" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 91). Al-Mutawakkil emphasizes the importance of this approach and its superiority over other approaches, stating: "Through adopting Functional Grammar Theory, it became possible to establish a comprehensive functional grammar of Arabic that revealed several new aspects of the language that could not have been uncovered through either traditional Arabic grammar or modern formal grammars, whether structuralist or transformational-generative" (Al-Mutawakkil, 2006, p. 143). He also points out that this orientation established itself because it proceeded from several research principles designed to avoid the pitfalls into which earlier theories had fallen. These include the following (Al-Mutawakkil, 2006, p. 60):

1. This approach starts from relations and functions (semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic), and thus favors an approach based on relations and functions over one based on tree categories (noun phrase, verb phrase), which occur only in some languages.
2. The underlying structure in this approach is unordered, while ordering mechanisms operate at the surface level according to a set of rules that vary from one language to another.
3. It provides pragmatic concepts.
4. It can be applied to typologically different languages (configurational and non-configurational).

In general, owing to these characteristics and its sound theoretical and methodological foundations, the approach was able to establish itself alongside the major linguistic theories. What, then, are these foundations?

Al-Mutawakkil maintains that the foundations and principles on which Functional Grammar rests are primarily related to the concept of explanatory adequacy; that is, each principle explains and clarifies one aspect of this adequacy. In this theory, explanatory adequacy is divided into three interrelated and complementary forms of adequacy: pragmatic adequacy, psychological adequacy, and typological adequacy (Al-Mutawakkil, 2006, p. 63). Accordingly, the principles proposed by functionalists generally remain within the conceptions associated with these three forms of adequacy. Al-Mutawakkil summarizes most of them in his book *Functional Linguistics: A Theoretical Introduction*, stating that:

- a. Language is a structure (syntactic, morphological, and semantic) created by the function of communication.
- b. The functional properties of natural languages largely determine their structural properties.
- c. Morphosyntactic structure results from the interaction of three types of properties: semantic, pragmatic, and syntactic.
- d. There are three relations among sentence constituents: semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic.

- e. Semantic and pragmatic relations are universal relations used in an adequate description of all natural languages, whereas syntactic relations are non-universal and may be dispensed with in an adequate description of some natural languages.
- f. The three relations are not derived relations resulting from particular tree configurations.
- g. A functional structure links semantic structure with morphosyntactic structure by assigning pragmatic and syntactic functions.
- h. The sentence is derived by transferring semantic structure into morphosyntactic structure.
- i. The sentence is derived without relying on transformational rules, because such rules have been shown to lack psychological adequacy.
- j. The structure from which derivation begins is an unordered structure in which lexical, semantic, and pragmatic aspects are represented in a logical manner; this facilitates the representation of the underlying structure of all natural languages.
- k. The underlying structure represents only general properties that may occur in all natural languages, whereas language-specific properties are represented at the morphosyntactic level. The ordering of constituents and of the constituents relative to one another occurs at a later stage, at the level of constituent structure (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, pp. 126–127).

A consideration of the content of these forms of adequacy shows that pragmatic adequacy seeks to reveal the properties of linguistic expressions in relation to the purpose for which they are used. These properties include modal properties (the speaker's attitude toward the content of the discourse), illocutionary properties (the intentional load of the sentence or utterance), and pragmatic functions (the relation of the sentence or one of its constituents to the context). Psychological adequacy seeks to ensure that the grammar reflects psychological models of linguistic competence and linguistic behavior (production and comprehension), while excluding whatever has been demonstrated to be psychologically unreal, as well as whatever casts doubt on its psychological reality. The grammar is therefore to be constructed on the basis of providing two mechanisms: a generator and an analyzer. Typological adequacy, meanwhile, seeks to make the grammar capable of constructing descriptions of languages belonging to different types, while simultaneously identifying what these typologically different languages have in common and what distinguishes them (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, pp. 28–29).

By comparing the concepts that functionalists assign to these three forms of adequacy with the principles on which Functional Grammar is based, we can see that some principles address pragmatic aspects, their representation, and their role in constructing morphosyntactic structure; others provide the framework for psychological adequacy, as in principle (i); while the remainder fall under typological adequacy, as in principles (j–k). In light of these principles, functionalists were able to conclude that (Al-Mutawakkil, 2006, pp. 69–71):

1. Linguistic expressions have two types of properties: properties related to use (the majority of properties) and properties independent of use and unrelated to its circumstances.

2. Linguistic expressions are means used by the speaker to communicate particular purposes. This requires representing all features associated with the speaker's intention and giving those features priority.
3. Since general and specific knowledge plays a role in communication, it should be represented in the form of communicative competence.
4. Grammatical rules must possess the capacity for abstraction so that they can apply to the largest possible number of languages.

2- Al-Mutawakkil's Efforts in Studying Arabic from a Functional Perspective

Since 1982, Al-Mutawakkil has sought to construct a functional theory of Arabic, which he called Functional Grammar of Arabic. It takes Arabic as its object of study and the principles of General Functional Grammar Theory as its starting point for analysis and interpretation. This new orientation was able to establish itself in the Maghreb and across most Arab countries "through teaching, academic research, publication, and the organization of international seminars within Moroccan universities" (Al-Zuhri, 2014, p. 16). Al-Mutawakkil developed a specific analytical plan and methodological perspective, together with objectives to be achieved. At the forefront of these objectives are linguistic description and explanation, theoretical grounding, and application. To achieve the first objective, he and his students sought to "construct functional grammars for several national and foreign languages for purposes of comparison and in pursuit of typological adequacy, although the greater part of the resulting research focused on Arabic and its dialects. In pursuit of the second objective, Al-Mutawakkil (1982 and 2000) established a scientific methodology for linking functional linguistic research in Arabic with the Arabic linguistic heritage in grammar, rhetoric, principles of jurisprudence, and exegesis, treating that heritage as a source of evidence and a source for borrowing and enrichment. The third objective was embodied in the effort to bring functional linguistic research into the sphere of social, economic, and cultural development by employing its mechanisms and applying its findings to vital sectors such as communication in its various forms, text analysis, translation, language learning, and psycholinguistic disorders" (Al-Zuhri, 2014, p. 17). Accordingly, his writings explained the theory in its general dimensions and applied it to the study of Arabic at its various levels. They were also dynamic, keeping pace with developments in the broader functionalist field. Unlike other theories, they opened a space for borrowing from elements compatible with the functional perspective found in the Arabic linguistic heritage. Al-Mutawakkil repeatedly emphasizes this point in his writings, for example: "The functional orientation in Arab linguistic research seeks to achieve two interrelated and complementary objectives: first, to observe and describe the phenomena of Arabic, both Standard Arabic and its dialects, and to attempt to explain them synchronically and diachronically on the basis of the principle of the interrelation between function and structure, with the latter being subordinate to the former. Second, to reread the Arabic linguistic heritage and establish links between it and its modern linguistic extensions" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993b, p. 11).

In light of the foregoing, we find that the Functional Grammar of Arabic that Al-Mutawakkil sought to establish underwent the same developments as General Functional Grammar Theory. These include

the pre-standard phase, also called the sentence phase or the nucleus model, because it constituted the starting point and foundation upon which subsequent developments and additions were built. The theory then expanded into a new phase known as the Standard Theory, in which the first model was enriched and a model was introduced to explain how speakers use their language and how recipients understand it. The grammatical framework alone was not sufficient to represent this use; other frameworks had to be added that interact with the grammatical framework and contribute to the production and interpretation of an expression by both speaker and recipient, such as the logical, cognitive, and social frameworks. “Each of these frameworks constitutes an independent system of rules distinguished from the others in terms of its subject matter and mechanisms, yet all these frameworks are linked to one another through interaction” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 9). They are framed by the communicative situation and the type of conceptual content carried by the sentence. Thus, “there are cases that require all five frameworks (the linguistic, logical, cognitive, social, and perceptual frameworks) to operate in interpreting a linguistic expression ... The richer the expression is in terms of the information it carries, the less important the role of frameworks other than the grammatical framework; and the poorer the expression is in terms of its informational load, the greater the need to resort to these frameworks (or some of them)” (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 35). The latest model is the post-standard model, or discourse grammar, which encompasses studies that extend toward text and discourse. It includes what became known as layered grammar, in which the structure of discourse (sentence and non-sentence) is viewed as consisting “of three levels: a rhetorical level containing three layers that signal the deictic center, the discourse type, and its style; a relational level containing the attention, illocution, and modality layers; and a semantic level based on the three familiar layers mentioned above: the predication, quantification, and descriptive layers” (Al-Mutawakkil, 2006, p. 78). This model also includes what is known as functional discourse grammar, in which pragmatics and semantics are separated so that they become two independent frameworks, while the surface structure resulting from the expression rules is made suitable for phonological, linear, and gestural interpretation (Al-Mutawakkil, 2006, p. 87).

Since this paper will focus on sentence grammar rather than the other models, because it is the basic model on which the remaining models were built, and because we wish to concentrate on aspects of the sentence, we shall focus on what serves this perspective. Here we recall that Al-Mutawakkil’s earliest studies addressed the aspect that distinguished the functional orientation from other approaches, namely the study of the pragmatic aspects of the sentence, including pragmatic functions, to which he devoted the first book in which he presented both General Functional Grammar Theory and Functional Grammar of Arabic. These are functions assigned to the sentence or one of its constituents by taking into account the context in which the expression is produced (Focus, Topic, Theme, Tail, and Vocative). Al-Mutawakkil states: “The group of phenomena with which we are concerned ... are pragmatic phenomena associated with context, that is, with the various contextual circumstances in which sentences are produced; consequently, the concepts of Theme, Focus, Topic, and others constitute pragmatic relations holding among the constituents of the sentence” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 9). He provided evidence for their existence in Arabic in particular and showed

that they correspond in the Arabic heritage to what rhetoricians and scholars of legal theory refer to as specification, restriction, and emphasis (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 7). He also explained how they are represented in Functional Grammar Theory, setting out the stages through which the sentence is constructed and taking into account other functions associated with it or with a structural part of it, such as modal functions (which he initially called syntactic functions), as well as the semantic functions of the predicate and the arguments it requires. He further discussed the expression rules responsible for shaping the sentence and its constituents. Thus, the book *Pragmatic Functions* became an introduction to Functional Grammar and its descriptive apparatus in general, and to pragmatic functions in particular. For example, he states that “syntactic functions are assigned and then pragmatic functions” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 34). In the grammatical analysis of focused structures, he notes that the elements of the functional structure constitute “input to the expression rules that transfer functional structure into constituent structure; this transfer takes place through case-assignment rules, constituent-placement rules, and stress-and-intonation assignment rules” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 46). He needed to mention all these issues in outline because together they constitute the descriptive apparatus proposed in Functional Grammar Theory. He focused particularly on pragmatic functions, and once this general perspective had become clear, he devoted a separate book or a chapter of a book to each component. He did so with the two syntactic functions, Subject and Object: the former was treated in *Studies in the Functional Grammar of Arabic*, and the latter in *From Predicative Structure to Constituent Structure: The Object Function in Arabic*. He also devoted the book *Lexical Issues* to the study of predicates and the derivation of branches from roots (predicates and arguments). Throughout his analyses, he drew attention to the types of simple sentences (nominal, verbal, and copular). Since the nominal and verbal sentences were the two commonly recognized types, he needed to elaborate on the copular sentence by explaining its characteristics and the grounds for treating it as an independent type; hence he wrote *On Issues of the Copula in Arabic*. He then expanded his treatment to other, more complex types of sentences, which he called compound sentences, and devoted *The Compound Sentence in Arabic* to their presentation and the explanation of how they are constructed. This was because his earlier research had generally remained “within the framework of the simple sentence, the sentence that does not contain more than one predication; I dealt only incidentally with the properties distinguishing compound sentences, that is, sentences containing more than one predication” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1988, p. 6). He also wrote other books addressing particular phenomena of Arabic and its dialects, or attempting to engage with the linguistic heritage and approach its analyses from the perspective of Functional Grammar. His constant aim was to construct a functional theory of Arabic, make it responsive to new developments, and avoid excluding the traditional linguistic scholarship. Among the works he produced for this purpose are *Function and Structure: A Functional Approach to Some Syntactic Issues in Arabic*; *Functionalism between Universality and Typology*; *Functional Constructions: Issues and Approaches*; *The Functional Orientation in Arab Linguistic Thought*; and *Issues of Arabic Grammar in Functional Grammar*, in addition to many other articles and books.

3- Aspects of Sentence Analysis in Functional Grammar of Arabic

We shall first determine the concept of the sentence that characterizes the functional orientation. This concept is undoubtedly inspired by the general orientation adopted by the theory and is consistent with its principles. We shall then present the various aspects addressed by Al-Mutawakkil in Functional Grammar of Arabic.

A- The Concept of the Sentence and Perspectives on It in Functional Grammar:

It is to be expected that the definition of the sentence will reflect the fundamental premise on which the linguistic theory is based, and this is indeed the case in structuralist, transformational-generative, and functional theories. However, a common feature of these theories is the restriction of the definition to consideration of the formal aspect. The structuralist conception maintained a purely formal orientation, excluding semantics (especially in American structuralism) on the grounds that it was a vague and elusive domain that could not be precisely delimited. One of the most prominent definitions is Bloomfield's definition of the sentence as "a linguistic form which is not included by virtue of any grammatical construction in any larger linguistic form" (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 170). David Crystal confirms in his Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics that structuralists viewed it as "the largest structural unit in a grammatical system of a language ... and that Bloomfield based its identification on the notion of structural independence, such that it does not enter into any larger linguistic construction" (Crystal, 2008, p. 432). This form, however, is not arbitrary. Its elements are connected by relations of "coordination, harmony, and association among smaller units, namely morphemes. Within a particular sequence (sentence) of morphemic units, constituents expand in the form of a hierarchical structure from the smallest unit, the morpheme, to the largest unit, the sentence" (Gulfan, 2010, p. 57). In other words, "the sentence is not a set of morphemes placed side by side arbitrarily; rather, in all natural languages it is subject to a set of constraints and rules governing the various relations controlling the adjacency of its constituent units" (Gulfan, 2013, p. 397). The formal aspect also appears in the generativists' definition of the sentence. Chomsky viewed it as "a string consisting of a set of successive words [that] constitutes a sentence" (Lyons, 1995, p. 99). This aspect is also evident in his definition of language, which he described as "a set of sentences, each of determinate length and constructed out of a finite set of elements ... and each sentence can be represented as a sequence of phonemes" (Zakaria, 1986, p. 91). Generativists may additionally draw attention to the semantic interpretation associated with this form (Zakaria, 1986, p. 91), and they distinguish between grammatical sentences and ungrammatical sentences (Zakaria, 1986, p. 108). In Functional Grammar, the formal aspect is also taken into consideration. The sentence is conceived as "every linguistic expression that contains a predication (nuclear or extended) and an external constituent (or constituents). According to the typology proposed here, the sentence is a category above the predication, since it contains it in addition to an external constituent (or external constituents)" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1988, p. 27). Predication is the product of "a predicate and a number of arguments; the predicate expresses a state of affairs, while the arguments denote the entities that participate in the state of affairs by bringing it about, as well as the circumstances surrounding its realization" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1988, p. 8). These definitions provided by Al-Mutawakkil hardly go

beyond the formal perspective, that is, they do not explicitly incorporate function (particularly pragmatics) into the definition of the sentence. Professor Baitich, after criticizing Simon Dik and Al-Mutawakkil, attempted to connect it with the conception presented in speech-act theory and concluded that the functional view of the sentence leads to considering it a speech act. Baitich states: “A careful examination of the literature of Functional Grammar Theory, both in Dik’s and Al-Mutawakkil’s research, especially in its early stages, reveals no clear definition of the concept of the sentence that links it to the concept of the speech act according to Austin and his disciple Searle ... despite the close relationship between the general concept of the sentence and Searle’s concept of the speech act in particular ... Moreover, when Al-Mutawakkil dealt with it in 1989 in his book *Functional Linguistics: A Theoretical Introduction*, he confined himself to presenting a general summary of it within a general theoretical framework that does not differ from the general framework in which he presented functionalism in the ancient Arabic linguistic tradition or in modern linguistic thought ... and, as noted above, he did not link it to the concept of the sentence in Functional Grammar Theory, which was fundamentally based on exploiting Austin’s and Grice’s notion of the speech act, enriching Searle’s concepts in particular, and developing them” (Baitich, 2011, p. 89). He then justifies treating it as a speech act and argues that this does not contradict the principles or foundations of Functional Grammar, stating that “a close examination of the basic principles underlying this theory, especially the principle of communicative function, and more particularly pragmatic analyses based on the concept of illocutionary force (*Force Illocutoire*), makes it readily apparent that, despite the widespread use of the term sentence in this theory, its concept is clearly connected with speech-act theory as developed by philosophers of ordinary language ... The general idea of this view is that the analysis of sentences in natural languages proceeds on the basis that they are systems whose properties cannot be determined except through the circumstances of their production, starting from the intentions of their utterers during communication. Language is therefore function and structure, and the sentence is ultimately a speech act” (Baitich, 2011, p. 90). The matter does not stop at recognizing the sentence as a speech act; it goes further by asserting that it is a speech act characterized by pragmatic-semantic properties reflected in morphosyntactic structural properties, which the natural-language user exploits to meet the needs of the linguistic community in which they live (Baitich, 2011, p. 167). In other words, the sentence itself is a speech act because the speaker performs it in a specific context with the intention of bringing about a particular act. It is a verbal structure whose form results from the contribution of semantic, pragmatic, and morphosyntactic aspects, without which it would not exist. The functional conception takes these aspects into consideration and therefore constructs its descriptive apparatus by representing them. The starting point is that a speaker situated in a particular communicative situation has an idea that they seek to convey to the recipient, taking the topic and the general context into account in constructing it. Functionalists therefore invoke all the components required to construct a particular sentence. Thus, “the descriptive apparatus must satisfy the following two basic conditions: (a) among its components, it must include a component responsible for representing pragmatic aspects, in addition to the components responsible for representing the other aspects, namely semantic, morphosyntactic, and

phonological aspects; and (b) it must be organized on the basis that pragmatic aspects play a role in determining morphosyntactic aspects, that is, on the basis that the output of the pragmatic component constitutes the input to the rules of the morphosyntactic component” (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 100). The aspects addressed therefore include semantic, pragmatic, and morphosyntactic aspects, which fall under what is known as the stages of sentence derivation. The sentence “is derived through the construction of three structures: predicative structure, then functional structure, and finally constituent structure. These three structures are constructed through the application, respectively, of three sets of rules: basic rules, function-assignment rules, and expression rules” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 11). The predicative structure represents logical-semantic aspects; the functional structure represents syntactic and pragmatic functions; and the constituent structure represents the various morphosyntactic aspects responsible for realizing predicates and arguments on the basis of the preceding semantic and functional load (case assignment, placement, argument specifications, etc.).

B- Semantic Aspects of the Arabic Sentence and Their Representation:

In the functional conception, the sentence begins with an idea in the speaker’s mind expressing a particular state of affairs. This state of affairs is expressed in the form of a predication consisting of a predicate and a set of arguments. These elements—the predicate and the arguments—are lexical items supplied by the lexicon, which is “a basic component of the grammatical framework in Functional Grammar Theory (as in other linguistic theories, especially those adopting a lexical orientation). It is fundamental because it constitutes the repository that supplies the other components with lexical material, and it is fundamental also because the lexical entry, as a structure, constitutes an initial miniature representation of the structure of the sentence as a whole” (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 63). Although the predicate carries its semantic function in itself because it denotes a state of affairs, a state of affairs, in the functional conception, is a concept associated with an event (action, event, state, situation) that exists in one of the possible worlds and is realized through the participation of a number of entities (Baitich, n.d., p. 230). Al-Mutawakkil states: “Predication refers to a state of affairs, that is, to something that can be said to have occurred in one of the possible worlds, something that can be perceived through the senses (such as being seen or heard) and can be located in time and space” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 14). The semantic functions that may be assigned to arguments are inferred from their relationship to the predicate. Thus, Zayd in “Zayd went to the market” is related to went in that Zayd is the Agent of the action, whereas to the market represents Zayd’s location or destination. The argument the language students in “The language students are hardworking” is related to the predicate hardworking in that it is characterized as being in a particular state, since it indicates their status and position.

In Functional Grammar Theory, a predicate, in terms of its lexical category, may be a verb (e.g., ate, drank), a noun (e.g., religion, love, brother), an adjective (e.g., black-eyed, Muslim), an adverb (e.g., above, in front of), an adpositional phrase (e.g., Zayd is in the house), or an adverbial phrase (e.g., the bird is above the tree).

Each predicate is represented in two parts: “a predicative frame and a semantic definition. The predicative frame represents the structural properties characterizing the lexical item, whereas the

semantic definition, as the term suggests, determines the meaning of the lexical item. In the case of basic lexical items, the lexical entry therefore takes the following general form: 1- P: S, where P = predicative frame and S = semantic definition” (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 72). The predicative frame specifies the semantic function that may be assigned to the predicate (action, event, etc.) and the semantic functions taken by the arguments. Here, the valency of the predicate (quantity and quality) must be taken into account, that is, the number and type of arguments (selectional restrictions) required by the predicate according to its lexical meaning. This meaning is indicated in the second part of the lexical entry, namely the semantic definition, which “is responsible for recording the meaning of the predicate” (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 113) and the meanings of its lexical items. This is achieved by defining the lexical items (predicate and arguments) using simpler lexical items, for example: kick = strike something with one’s foot; slap = strike the face of the person struck with one’s hand; kill = cause someone to die; give = cause someone to possess; child = person, male/female, not adult; school = building, primary educational institution. It should be noted that the semantic definition of the predicate and its arguments does not contribute to the derivation of the sentence (the transfer of underlying structure into constituent structure) as much as it contributes to its semantic (lexical) interpretation. To achieve this semantic definition of lexical items, each lexical item in the predicative frame is replaced by its appropriate semantic definition (the decomposition of meaning into simpler, more explicit meanings) (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 114). To clarify the semantic aspects further, the sentence “Khalid killed Bakr yesterday in the street” may be represented as follows (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 74):

State of affairs — Core participant — Core participant — Satellite — Satellite

Predicate	Two arguments		Satellites	
killed	Khalid	Bakr	yesterday	in the street
action/event	Agent	Patient	Time	Place

Thus, killing is a state of affairs denoting an action, and its lexical category is the verb. Khalid is the first core argument, whose semantic interpretation in relation to the predicate is established by mentioning him; his semantic relation to the predicate is that of Agent. Bakr is the second core argument required by the semantic definition of the predicate (killing logically requires a killer and a victim); his semantic relation to the predicate is that of Patient, the entity affected by the action. Yesterday is a satellite rather than a core argument because the definition of the state of affairs does not depend on it; rather, it restricts the state of affairs and specifies one of its relevant aspects. Its relation to the predicate is that it indicates the time at which the state of affairs occurred, and it is assigned the semantic function Time. The same applies to in the street: it is a satellite indicating the place where the killing occurred and is assigned the semantic function Place. It can be represented in an abstract frame as follows: q-t-l (Act) F (x1: Khalid) Ag (x2: Bakr) Pat (x3: yesterday) Tim (x4: in the street) Loc.

C- Pragmatic Aspects of the Arabic Sentence and Their Representation:

Functional Grammar Theory seeks to achieve three forms of adequacy: psychological adequacy, typological adequacy, and pragmatic adequacy. The latter is the one relevant here. It refers to

identifying “the properties of linguistic expressions that make it possible to relate these properties to the rules and principles governing linguistic interaction. Consequently, linguistic expressions should not be regarded as isolated entities, but as instruments used by the speaker within a context determined by the preceding expressions” (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 19). This means that a pragmatically adequate grammar is “a grammar capable of highlighting the properties of linguistic expressions with respect to the way in which those expressions are used, provided that these properties can be connected to the rules and principles governing linguistic interaction. In other words, linguistic expressions are not treated as isolated elements, but as means by which the speaker reveals their intention to the addressee within a context determined by the surrounding expressions and the most important elements of the communicative situation ... Functional grammars therefore need to be equipped with a conceptual apparatus capable of identifying the pragmatic properties of linguistic phenomena” (Taghzaoui, 2014, p. 99). Among the most important pragmatic properties treated in Al-Mutawakkil’s writings within what is known as Functional Grammar of Arabic are pragmatic functions, the predication operator and its satellites (the illocutionary forces that may be assigned to it), propositional satellites (especially those expressing the speaker’s attitude toward what is presented), and reference. These properties are pragmatic because their identification depends on invoking the communicative situation in which discourse occurs (the context). We shall summarize them in the following points.

C-1 Pragmatic Functions:

Pragmatic functions, according to Functional Grammar, are “functions assigned to sentence constituents in terms of the relations linking these constituents within the information structure; that is, in terms of the information carried by these constituents within particular contextual layers. In other words, pragmatic functions are assigned to sentence constituents according to the relation holding between speaker and addressee within a particular contextual layer” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993b, p. 17). This means that their determination is closely linked to context in both its situational and textual dimensions, because “the task of the latter is to determine the communicative status of constituents within the communicative environment in which they are used. The communicative situation is shaped by the informational background possessed by the speaker and the addressee and by the socio-cultural background governing the processes of production and comprehension” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993b, p. 226). These functions make a major contribution to determining sentence structure (the placement of certain elements, the assignment of grammatical cases, etc.), and they also play an important role in providing learners with the contextual concepts that must be invoked during sentence analysis.

These pragmatic functions are divided into two types: external pragmatic functions, assigned to constituents outside the predication, and internal pragmatic functions, assigned to constituents within the predication. The three external pragmatic functions are Theme, Tail, and Vocative, whereas the two internal functions are Topic and Focus.

Focus is the function assigned to the constituent “carrying the most important or most prominent information in the sentence” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 28) and “which the speaker believes is most

worthy of being added to the addressee's store of information" (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 116). Understanding this function therefore depends on understanding the informational state of both speaker and recipient: the speaker may possess the information or not, and the same applies to the recipient, who may possess the information but not in the form represented by the speaker, or may not possess it at all, and vice versa. On the basis of this distinction, Functional Grammar differentiates between two types of Focus: New Focus and Contrastive Focus. New Focus is "the Focus assigned to the constituent carrying information unknown to the addressee (information that does not form part of the common information shared by speaker and addressee)" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 28; Al-Mutawakkil, 1993b, p. 148). Contrastive Focus, by contrast, is "the Focus assigned to the constituent carrying information whose occurrence the addressee doubts or whose occurrence the addressee denies" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 29; Al-Mutawakkil, 1993b, p. 148).

Topic constitutes the information shared and agreed upon by speaker and addressee (shared information) and which forms the subject matter of the discourse. Dik defined it as a pragmatic function assigned to "the entity (in the broad sense) that constitutes the focus of a discourse, or the entity that constitutes the subject matter of the informational content contained in a discourse" (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 111). "This definition indicates that the constituents assigned the Topic function are characterized by carrying information that belongs to the common knowledge shared by speaker and addressee, unlike the constituents assigned the Focus function." The definition applies to the constituent *Zaynab* in the sentences "Who accompanied *Zaynab*?" and "*Zaynab* accompanied *Amr*" (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 229). The two examples make clear that *Zaynab* is the subject matter of the discourse, and therefore the pragmatic function Topic is assigned to it. Al-Mutawakkil considers Topic a pragmatic function because it is assigned to a constituent "by virtue of the communicative situation existing between speaker and addressee within a particular contextual layer" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 69).

As for the external pragmatic function Theme, it is "what determines the domain of discourse (Universe of Discourse) with respect to which the predication is relevant" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 115). That is, the predication is what is said about the Theme, which constitutes the domain around which the predication revolves. Theme is characterized by being followed by a predication; if no predication follows it, it cannot be considered a Theme but rather an argument required by selectional restrictions, as in "*Zayd* is departing" and "The book is in the house" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 105). Theme is thus a pragmatic function characterized by the fact that it does not constitute one of the arguments of the predicate. If it is one of the predicate's arguments, it normally bears another pragmatic function, namely Topic.

With regard to the external pragmatic function Tail, the term reflects its position: it always occurs after the predication. Its post-predicative position serves to provide a correction or qualification of previously stated information in the predication. Al-Mutawakkil defines it according to the function it performs: "The Tail carries information that clarifies, modifies, or corrects information within the predication" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 147). Thus, the speaker's corrective addition may take the

form of clarification, modification, or correction. This leads to three types of Tail: Clarifying Tail, Modifying Tail, and Corrective Tail, each associated with the contextual layer that calls for it.

The Vocative is one of the pragmatic functions omitted by Simon Dik, whereas Al-Mutawakkil considered it necessary to add it, justifying this necessity by stating that “a linguistic description seeking adequacy cannot overlook the vocative constituent because it occurs in all natural languages and has particularly rich properties in some of them, such as Arabic” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 160). The Vocative cannot be regarded as one of the arguments of the predicate because it is independent of it; it “plays no role with respect to the state of affairs ... denoted by the sentence predicate and does not contribute to determining the perspective from which this state of affairs is presented” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 162). Rather, it is strongly connected with context, which makes it a pragmatic function. Al-Mutawakkil therefore defines it with reference to context as “a function assigned to the constituent denoting the entity being addressed in a particular context” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 161). The concept of vocativity includes the forms of lament, appeal for help, and vocative, the latter constituting “three types of the same function, namely the Vocative function” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a). Since vocative expressions are formed by specific particles, each particle has its own contexts of use. This led Al-Mutawakkil to formulate a distinct insertion rule for each particle (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 170).

C-2 The Predication Operator (the Illocutionary Force of the Sentence):

The operator is “a mechanism used to represent, at the level of logical structure (predicative structure), a class of relevant linguistic items” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993b, p. 103). It includes information that contributes to the realization of the modifier at the level of constituent structure, and it varies according to the type of operator, which may be an argument, a predicate, or a predication.

Al-Mutawakkil restricts the predication operator to the illocutionary force attached to it and the satellites accompanying that force (Al-Mutawakkil, 1988, p. 32). Illocutionary force refers to “the speech act accompanying the performance of the sentence. The illocutionary meaning may be a statement ... a question ... a promise ... or something else. There are cases in which the sentence carries two illocutionary meanings: the literal illocutionary meaning indicated by the form of the sentence itself, and the (implicated) illocutionary meaning derived dialogically, that is, the meaning accompanying the sentence by virtue of the conversational context. In other words, there are cases in which, by uttering a sentence, two speech acts are performed: a direct speech act (the speech act corresponding to the form of the sentence) and an indirect speech act, that is, the speech act inferred from the context” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1988, p. 16). Accordingly, illocutionary force is the information the speaker wishes to convey to the recipient, and it is represented at the level of predicative structure by means of the predication operator. The predication operator is the marker occurring at the level of predicative structure to indicate that force.

To represent it in any Arabic sentence, the following procedures are required (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 157): 1. The illocutionary force accompanying the predication is marked by the predication operator (FO), as in [FO [Predicate (x1), (x2) ... (xn)]]. 2. Since some sentences have two illocutionary forces—a literal illocutionary force and an implicated illocutionary force—the single

illocutionary force is marked by a simple predication operator, while the double illocutionary force is marked by a complex predication operator consisting of two markers. 3. The illocutionary force is marked by the predication operator at the level of functional structure on the basis of particular contextual conditions.

There is another type of expression considered subordinate to the predication operator. It “provides additional specifications concerning the manner in which the speech act accompanying the sentence is performed, the purpose of performing it, the conditions on its performance, or the time or place of its performance” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 62). This means that “the illocutionary load has two parts: an operator and satellites” (Al-Mutawakkil, 2006, p. 114). An example is “Frankly, I was not honest with you.” The word frankly is related to the illocutionary force of informing, not to the predicate, because it can be attached to the performative verb, as in “I tell you frankly,” but it cannot be attached to the predicate of the sentence that follows it. Al-Mutawakkil proposes representing it as follows (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 94): [Operator [Predication] Satellite].

C-3 Reference:

Reference is an essentially pragmatic concept, because understanding the referent depends on invoking something external to the structure. The act of reference means “referring, by means of a linguistic expression, to a person existing in the external world” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 151). This does not mean that the expression has no lexical meaning; rather, a distinction must be made between the lexical meaning of the expression and its referential meaning. The former is understood from the form and the lexical items with which it is associated, whereas the latter is understood by invoking the external entity. Functional Grammar distinguishes several types of reference according to the perspective from which it is considered (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, pp. 76–77):

A. According to the addressee’s mental store: constructive reference or identificational reference. “Reference is constructive when it is intended to lead the addressee to construct a representation of an entity not available in their mental store, and identificational when it is intended to lead the addressee to identify an entity already included in their mental store” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 78). Constructive reference occurs when the speaker constructs or adds a representation of a person or thing that was not part of the addressee’s existing mental store; this corresponds to the classical Arab rhetoricians’ notion of informational benefit. By contrast, reference is identificational when the addressee knows the information but does not know precisely who performed the action; the speaker then identifies the referent. For example, “A man visited me today” informs the addressee of a person’s visit about whom the addressee previously had no knowledge. In “The person who visited you yesterday visited me today,” the addressee knows that someone visited, but does not know exactly who that person is; the speaker identifies the referent. This corresponds to what classical rhetoricians called the necessary informational implication.

B. According to the referent—that is, the entity referred to—the referent may be (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 381): 1. definite/indefinite; 2. generic/specific; 3. unbounded/bounded.

C-4 Propositional Satellites:

This category includes “all expressions used by the speaker to evaluate the propositional content of the sentence, or part of the propositional content. The largest proportion of this category consists of expressions indicating the speaker’s attitude toward the propositional content carried by the sentence” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993a, p. 62). These are pragmatic aspects because they are related to the speaker rather than to an element of the structure. Al-Mutawakkil developed this category by classifying it into three types: inherent modality, objective modality, and epistemic modality. Inherent modality includes all linguistic means by which the speaker specifies the relation between one of the participants in the state of affairs and the realization of that state of affairs; it is usually expressed through ability, desire, obligation, or permission, as in *can* and *permitted* in “Khalid can persuade Hind” and “Amr was permitted to go.” Objective modality includes all linguistic means through which the speaker evaluates the state of affairs in relation to their knowledge of the general circumstances in which states of affairs are generally realized, such as certainty, probability, possibility, or impossibility, as in *may* and *must* in “Khalid may come” and “The brother must honor his brother.” Epistemic modality includes all linguistic means by which the speaker expresses their attitude toward the truth of the proposition, such as expressing an opinion, a wish, or the source on which their judgment of the truth of the proposition is based, as in *without doubt* and *according to my personal experience* in “Khalid will visit us today, without doubt” and “According to my personal experience, only those who work hard succeed” (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 165).

It can be observed from the foregoing that Al-Mutawakkil succeeded in incorporating the various aspects associated with context and representing them independently while demonstrating what distinguishes each of them. This gave the Functional Grammar of Arabic that he developed a form of pragmatic adequacy that constitutes one of its distinguishing features and contributes to the precision of its analyses.

D- Morphosyntactic Aspects in Sentence Analysis:

The semantic and pragmatic aspects constitute abstract information about the sentence and its constituents. This information is then translated “into an actual form, that is, a morphological form, through the application of a particular set of expression rules” (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 249). The predicate and its elements are transferred from a simple abstract level into complete constituents, and the designation of these elements changes according to the structure in which they occur. At the level “prior to constituent structure ... these elements are considered arguments, whereas at the level of constituent structure these arguments are transferred into phrases” (Al-Mutawakkil, 1988, p. 73). The elements of the predicate and the elements of the arguments are called morphemes after having been semantic or pragmatic features (operators), because “operators and functions are realized in the form of morphemes (or morphological units).”

This transfer is carried out through a system of rules called expression rules, which include: 1. argument-formation rules; 2. predicate-formation rules; 3. rules for inserting the illocutionary-force marker and satellites; 4. placement rules; and 5. stress- and intonation-assignment rules (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 148).

Al-Mutawakkil also presents another set of rules, which he sometimes mentions independently (Al-Mutawakkil, 1987, p. 106) and at other times integrates into other rules. These are case-assignment rules. A close examination shows that they are complementary to the formation of arguments and predicates; however, because they are concerned with a set of criteria that must be observed, it is preferable to treat them as independent rules.

Argument-formation rules are responsible for transferring arguments into phrases, taking into account the operators and restrictions associated with the arguments at the level of logical-semantic structure. Predicate rules transfer the predicate from its abstract form into a complete morphological realization on the basis of the information contained in the functional structure concerning the predicate's operators for aspect and tense. The same applies to case-assignment rules, which assign grammatical cases to predicates and arguments according to their syntactic, semantic, or pragmatic functions (Al-Mutawakkil, 1987, p. 238). As for the rules for inserting the illocutionary-force marker, satellites, and determiners, each has its own role. Determiners are realizations of operators (and vary according to the operator). Al-Mutawakkil states: "Determiners (the definite article, deictics, quantifiers, etc.) are represented in the framework of Functional Grammar in the form of abstract operators, and these determiners appear at the level of constituent structure as realizations of the abstract operators" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993b, p. 55). Satellites and markers include "the devices linking two elements, such as prepositions, embedding devices, and relative pronouns" (Al-Mutawakkil, 1993b, p. 21), as well as the various devices marking illocutionary force, such as the interrogative particles *hamza* and *hal* in Arabic. Placement rules are responsible for ordering sentence elements because, in the two preceding structures (predicative and functional), they are unordered. "Among the elements occurring in the underlying structure, whether at the level of the argument or at the level of the sentence as a whole, there are various relations (semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic), but there is no ordering (or sequential) relation among them. This situation necessitates the formulation of placement rules that undertake the ordering of elements within the argument and elements within the sentence, and also necessitates the search for general principles that can serve as universal constraints on these rules" (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 221). Stress and intonation assignment remains the final stage because it primarily concerns the phonetic-performative dimension: "stress is assigned to constituents according to their functional status, whereas intonation is determined by the illocutionary force accompanying the sentence. Through the application of the stress- and intonation-assignment rules, constituent structure is completed and becomes fully specified, ready for the application of phonological rules that transfer it into an actualized sentence" (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 248).

The aspects collected here from Al-Mutawakkil's books take into consideration sentence production from the speaker's perspective. From the recipient's perspective, however, the process is reversed: it begins with sounds and ends with meaning, that is, the realized expression is analyzed and restored to its underlying structure (Al-Mutawakkil, 2010b, p. 204). These aspects encompass the elements of the sentence and clarify the relations among them from the moment an idea is formed until it becomes an actual sentence in a specific communicative situation.

Conclusion:

On the basis of the foregoing discussion, a number of important points can be identified that highlight the aspects taken into account by the functional approach in studying the sentence:

- Functional Grammar Theory views the sentence as a speech act characterized by semantic, pragmatic, and morphosyntactic properties.
- The semantic properties relate primarily to the meaning of the predicate and its relation to the arguments.
- The pragmatic aspects include everything that links structure to context and cannot be interpreted without invoking the context.
- The morphosyntactic aspects concern the realization of arguments, predicates, and the sentence in the form of actual words and constructions.
- These aspects are founded on the principle that function precedes structure and determines it, which is the principle that distinguishes Functional Grammar from other grammatical approaches.

References:

1. Armengaud, F. (1986). *Pragmatic Approach* (translated by Saeed Alloush). National Development Center.
2. Al-Zuhri, N. (2014). *Discourse Analysis in Functional Grammar Theory*. Al-Ikhtilaf Publications; Dar al-Aman.
3. Al-Zuhri, N. (n.d.). *Command and Prohibition in Arabic*.
4. Al-Farawi, K. J. M. (2017). *Pragmatics in Critical Thought*. United Arab Company.
5. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (1985). *Pragmatic Functions in Arabic*. Dar al-Thaqafa.
6. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (1987). *Issues of the Copula in Arabic*. Okad Publications.
7. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (1988). *The Compound Sentence in Arabic*. Okad Publications.
8. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (1993). *New Horizons in Functional Grammar Theory*. Dar al-Hilal al-Arabiyya.
9. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (1993). *Function and Structure: Functional Approaches to Some Syntactic Issues in Arabic*. Okad Publications.
10. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (1995). *Issues of Arabic in Functional Linguistics: Underlying Structure or Pragmatic-Semantic Representation*. Dar al-Aman.
11. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (1995). *Issues of Arabic in Functional Linguistics: Constituent Structure or Morphosyntactic Aspects*. Dar al-Aman.
12. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (2001). *Issues of Arabic in Functional Linguistics: Discourse Structure from Sentence to Text*. Dar al-Aman.
13. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (2006). *The Functional Orientation in Arab Linguistic Thought: Foundations and Extensions*. Dar al-Aman.
14. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (2010). *Discourse and the Properties of Arabic: A Study of Function, Structure, and Typology*. Al-Ikhtilaf Publications; Dar al-Aman.

25. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (2010). *Functional Linguistics: A Theoretical Introduction*. Dar al-Kitab al-Jadid al-Muttahida.
26. Al-Mutawakkil, A. (2013). *Issues of Arabic in Functional Linguistics*. Al-Ikhtilaf Publications; Dar al-Aman.
27. Baitich, Y. (2011). *The Speech Act between Philosophy and Grammar: Presentation and Theoretical Grounding of the Concept of the Speech Act among Philosophers of Language and in Functional Grammar Theory*. In Hafiz Ismaili Alawi (Ed.), *Pragmatics: The Science of Language Use*. Modern World of Books.
28. Baitich, Y. (n.d.). *Toward a Functional Theory of Arabic Grammar*.
29. Taghzaoui, Y. (2014). *Pragmatic Functions and Strategies of Linguistic Communication in Functional Grammar Theory*. Modern World of Books.
30. Zakaria, M. (1986). *Transformational-Generative Linguistics and the Grammar of Arabic: Linguistic Theory*. University Foundation for Studies, Publishing and Distribution.
31. Gulfan, M. (2010). *Generative Linguistics: From the Pre-Standard Model to the Minimalist Program: Concepts and Examples*. Modern World of Books.
32. Gulfan, M. (2013). *Structural Linguistics: Methodologies and Trends*. Dar al-Kitab al-Jadid al-Muttahida.
33. Leech, G. (2013). *Principles of Pragmatics* (translated by Abd al-Qadir Qanini). Africa East.
34. Lyons, J. (1995). *Chomsky's Linguistic Theory* (translated and annotated by Hilmi Khalil). Dar al-Ma'rifa al-Jami'iyya.
35. Muschler, J., & Reboul, A. (2010). *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Pragmatics* (translated by a group of researchers, supervised by Izz al-Din al-Majdoub). Dar Sinatras.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. George Allen and Unwin.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Blackwell Publishing.