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Abstract

This study aims at contrasting the metadiscourse items in Arabic and English. Metadiscourse plays a key role in organizing text, engaging readers, and unfolding text producer’s stance towards a certain subject matter. The study sets out to examine the comparison which shows the difference between both Arabic and English Languages. The concept of metadiscourse is still fuzzy and under-theorized. Contrary to English, Arabic is in need of well-categorized items of metadiscourse. This study is intended to bridge this gap between the two languages as metadiscourse is universal.

The study aims at exploring, identifying, and analyzing the linguistic and rhetorical function of metadiscourse items used in both Arabic and English languages.

It is found that Arabic uses metadiscourse items as English does, despite the fact that the classification system of metadiscourse in these two languages is somehow different.

It is concluded that metadiscourse, to some extent, is complicated area but very important part of language use; the role of metadiscourse is strategic in discourse and its misinterpretation leads to weakening the discourse and affecting on its intended meaning. Further, metadiscourse items are of importance for understanding discourse texture and intended meaning. The study also provides that categories of metadiscourse used in Arabic are applicable to English.

Keywords: Metadiscourse, taxonomies of metadiscorse, interpersonal metadiscourse and textal metadiscourse
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1. The Concept of Metadiscourse

This study handles the concepts of both English and Arabic metadiscourse as well as their taxonomies and subcategories. As the sources and studies are limited in Arabic metadiscourse comparing to English, this study starts with the metadiscourse in English. It has been well viewed and defined differently by many scholars, however, before embarking into that, we shall first see how scholars viewed the concept of discourse. It is important to identify discourse first to provide a clearer path for the term metadiscourse. Discourse can simply be seen as language in use (Brown & Yule, 1983 and Cook 1989: p87). By ‘language in use’, it is meant the set of expectations, norms, and preferences which connect language to context. Discourse is basically viewed as directing the speech toward others as a purpose of understating (Jam'an, 2016: p19). It is the explicit speech not the implicit; it is no more viewed as what we use to express what we want, but rather to hide what we want to express (Al Fajari, 2013: p42). Van Dijk’s view (cited in Jam'an, 2016) defines discourse as the major semantic structure of a text or the essential idea of it; nevertheless, this concept doesn’t mean the semantic development only, but also the main idea that has its ideological, intellectual, and cognitive origins in a text. Fowler (2013) says that every text is a discourse. Also, Khattabi (1991) sees discourse as a situationally bound in which the participants present texts as discursive acts and make communication during the speech.

The precise meaning of metadiscourse is unclear because it is a relatively recent term in discourse analysis. Splitting “metadiscoure” into two, we have “meta-”, which means “above, higher than, or beyond”, and “discourse”, which means “language which has been produced as a result of an act of communication” (P. John & P. Heidi, 2000: 138-139).

As for the term metadiscourse, it first appeared in (1959 ) in the writings of Harris who used it to refer to the secondary information of a text, the term has been developed after that to mean the attempts of a text author to direct a listener and make an effect on them. Thus, the term metadiscourse became the main interest of a large number of scholars (Hyland, 2015: Harris, 1959 and Hyland, 2005). It is considered as a way of understanding the written and spoken language through understating the intention of the writer or the speaker to direct listener to the text.
Hyland (2005: p35) defines metadiscourse as "discourse about discourse", intended to guide the reader to the correct perception. It also includes the linguistic elements that do not refer to the external aspects of a text as do the elements of reference, but rather refer to the organization of the discourse itself, and the relationship that develops between the text author and the reader (Crismore, 1984). Qasim (2016: p8) defines metadiscourse as the linguistic elements which are used to facilitate the understanding of a specific language. Moreover, these elements can determine the relationship between the text author and the reader.

Metadiscourse has important functions for both reader and writer such as to trigger the readers’ interest and attract their attention by providing texts which predict reader’s need and desire and take into consideration the limits of readers’ knowledge concerning the topic, for instance; the reader might be in need for additional information about the terms and ideas that are used in the text and were, to some extent, not clear for the reader of that text. Consequently, the writer would try to give some examples and pieces of evidence or connect these terms and ideas to specific situations to be obvious and understandable to the readers (Abbas, 2011: p24 and Jin & Shang 2016: p81).

2. Metadiscourse in English

The term of metadiscourse has always been viewed as a vague term because it is still controversial term. Hyland (2005: p34) describes metadiscourse as ‘discourse about discourse’ or ‘talk about talk’ to be related to features of the text. However, this is a very limited and inadequate interpretation of the term that has huge potentiality to contain elements of language that characterize not just how we arrange our thoughts, but also how we communicate with one another, and the way we are connected to our listeners and readers. This vagueness is noticed by Nash (1992: p42) who states that it is more difficult to set up the boundaries of metadiscourse, while it is easy to accept the concept in principle.

The language itself has some functions that have been proposed by Jakobson (1960: p23) who sees that the functions of language include expressive, directive, metalinguistic, and referential. With a concentration on psycholinguistics, Buhler (1966: p23) introduces the expressive
function, representational function, conative function, the language’s referential function. These scholars have an effect on metafunction’s theory of Halliday. Metafunction is considered as one of the main concepts of which shapes Halliday’s theory of systemic grammar. Halliday summarizes the concept of “metafunction” based on the former writings of Prague school and London school. Halliday considers language as a product of social interactions as well as performing a collection of functions.

In their theory, (Halliday and Hasan 1976: p74) show that the English clause is made up of three separate functional-semantic components, which are referred to as "metafunctions": the ideational (clause as representation), the interpersonal (clause as exchange) and the textual (clause as message).

1. The Ideational Component: It has two parts on the linguistic system, “the experiential and the logical, the former being more directly concerned with the representation of experience, of the “context culture” in Malinowski’s terms, while the latter expressed the abstract logical relations which derive only indirectly from experience” (Halliday and Hansan, 1976: 26). So, what the ideational component concerns is “the expression of ‘content’, with the function that the language has of being about something” (ibid.)

2. The Interpersonal Component: through his intervention into the text, the writer’s identity, attitude, and status, are displayed by a text which is defined as interpersonal component by Halliday and Hasan (1976). They point out that when a writer attempts to engage the reader as a human agent and an "interlocuter," the writer's interference into the text occurs, and this is a sign of the language's interpersonal function. The interpersonal function of language is seen in the following passage by Halliday and Hasan.

“The interpersonal component is concerned with the social, expressive and conative functions of language, with expressing the speaker’s / writer’s “angle”: his attitudes and judgements, his encoding of the role relationships in the situation, and his motive in saying anything at all. We can summarize these by saying that the ideational component represents the speaker in his role as observer, while the interpersonal component represents the speaker in his role as intruder”. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:}
The writer interferes into the text to express his feelings about the propositions or anticipates an illocutionary act of audience by making different recommendations. Halliday indicates that the interpersonal component is the speaker's own 'stamp' on the situation and his views in the communication process (Halliday, 1977: p53).

3. The Textual Component: It is the third component of metadiscourse which has to do with the texture of the text, that is “the text-forming component in the linguistic system” for “being operationally relevant and cohering within itself and with the context of situation” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 27). Theme-rheme relationship, cohesiveness, coherence, and rhetorical structure are all important elements of this metafunction. For them, the textual component includes patterns of meaning that exist outside of the system's hierarchical order. One of these is the information structure, which is the categorization of the text into given and new categories, regardless of its construction in terms of sentences, clauses, and the like. The textual component is also concerned with the cohesion, but without the rest of the semantic system cannot be engaged efficiently at all (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: p78).

2.1. Classification of Metadiscourse
Williams (1981) divides metadiscourse into three categories, and each has two types. This categorization scheme is shown in Table 1 below. Table (1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metadiscourse</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hedges and Emphatics</td>
<td>express the certainty with which a writer presents material</td>
<td>possibly, might indeed, it is obvious that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequencers and Topicalizers</td>
<td>lead a reader through a text</td>
<td>first, therefore in regard to, there is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributors and Narrators</td>
<td>tell a reader where facts or opinions come from</td>
<td>according to x, I found that, I would note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classification system for metadiscourse (Williams, 1981)
By considering the metadiscourse categories proposed by William’s (1981), Vande Kopple (1985), who is an early scholar concerned with the field of metadiscourse, offers a metadiscourse’s taxonomy which is laid on Halliday’s language metafunctions, which reveal the recognition of two kinds of metadiscourse which are: interpersonal and textual. Seven metadiscourse’s forms are identified by Vande Kopple (ibid.): text connectives, illocution markers, code glosses, narrators, validity markers, commentary, and attitude markers. The table below explains the categorization in written texts.

Table (2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXTUAL METADISCUSSION</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textual Connectives</td>
<td>Help readers recognize how texts are organized and how different parts of the text are connected to each other functionally or semantically</td>
<td>first, next, however, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code glosses</td>
<td>Help readers grasp and interpret the meanings of words and phrases</td>
<td>X means Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illocutionary Markers</td>
<td>Make explicit what speech act is being performed at certain points in texts</td>
<td>I hypothesize that, to sum up, I promise to, to give an example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrators</td>
<td>let readers know who said or wrote something</td>
<td>according to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERPERSONAL METADISCUSSION</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validity Markers</td>
<td>Assess the truth value of the propositional content and show the author’s degree of commitment to that assessment</td>
<td>Hedges Might, perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatics</td>
<td>Clearly, obviously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributor s</td>
<td>according to X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Markers</td>
<td>Reveal the writer’s attitude toward the propositional content</td>
<td>Surprisingly, it is fortunate that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentaries</td>
<td>Draw readers into an implicit dialogue with the author</td>
<td>you may not agree that, dear reader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Categorization system for Metadiscourse (Vande Kopple, 1985)

Crismore et al. (1993) develops Vande Kopple’s system in her studies, which kept the two major categories, textual and interpersonal metadiscourse but reorganizes his seven subcategories by deleting some or dividing some into several new ones, and they further distinguished specific functions within some of the subcategories.

Table (3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metadiscourse</th>
<th>Textual Markers for logical and ethical appeals</th>
<th>Interpretive Markers for logical and ethical appeals</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEXTUAL METADISCOURSE</td>
<td>Logical Connectives</td>
<td>Code Glosses</td>
<td>By this I mean</td>
<td>Therefore,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition,</td>
<td>Illocution Markers</td>
<td>I state again that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sequencers</td>
<td>Reminders</td>
<td>As I mentioned earlier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First, second</td>
<td>Now the question arises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL METADISCOURSE</td>
<td>Hedges (epistemic certainty markers)</td>
<td>Certainty Markers</td>
<td>Certainly, really</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Epistemic emphatics)</td>
<td>Attributors</td>
<td>X claimed that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude Markers</td>
<td>Surprisingly, doubtfully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>You may not agree that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Revised System for Metadiscourse Categories (Crismore et al., 1993 :47)

As can be observed in Crismore’s et al (1993), revised categorization, Vande Kopple's initial textual connectives are separated
into logical connectives and sequencers, which were then combined into a larger subcategory, textual markers. Code glosses, illocutionary markers, and announcements were renamed interpretative markers and placed in a separate category. Validity indicators were divided into three groups in interpersonal metadiscourse: hedges, certainty markers, and attributors. Attitude markers and commentary, the other two, were preserved as subcategories.

Another approach is presented by Longo (1994), based on Vande Kopple’s (1985) and Crismore’s et al. (1993). Metadiscourse can be categorized in six main groups (text connectives, illocution markers, code glosses, attitude markers, commentary, and validity/ modality markers) and sixteen subcategories (five within text connectives, four under commentary, three under code glosses, three within validity/ modality markers, and one under illocution markers). The table below illustrates Longo’s system.

**Table (4):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metadiscourse</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text Connectives</td>
<td>Logical/temporal connectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reminders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topicalizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sequencers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code Glosses</td>
<td>Defining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delimiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illocution Markers</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validity/ Modality</td>
<td>Hedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attributors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Comments on readers moods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>views, reactions to propositional content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on reading procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on anticipation for readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments in the first person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude Markers</td>
<td>Comments by author</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Metadiscourse’s classification system of Longo (1994)**
By the same context, Hyland differentiates between textual metadiscourse, or the devices that help to shape a coherent and convincing text by linking individual propositions to other texts (Hyland 1998), and interpersonal metadiscourse, that alerts the readers to the perspectives of the author towards both readers themselves and the propositional information. Hyland adopt the classification of Crismore et al. (1993) in his study of metadiscourse in academic articles. However, in these articles, he could make some changes to suit the meanings expressed. Table (4) shows the schema of metadiscourse in the academic texts in Hyland’s research.

Table (5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textual Metadiscours e</td>
<td>Logical Connectives</td>
<td>Express semantic relations Between main clauses</td>
<td>in addition to, but, therefore, thus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frame markers</td>
<td>Explicitly refer to discourse Acts or textual stages</td>
<td>finally, to repeat our aim here, we try</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endophoric Markers</td>
<td>Refer to information From other texts</td>
<td>noted above, see fig.1, table 2, below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidentials</td>
<td>Refer to source of information From other texts</td>
<td>according to X, Z states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code glosses</td>
<td>Help readers grasp Meanings of ideational material</td>
<td>namely, e.g., in other words, such as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Metadiscours e</td>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>Withhold writer’s full Commitment to statement</td>
<td>might, perhaps, it is possible, about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphatics</td>
<td>Emphasize force or Writer’s certainty in messages</td>
<td>in fact, definitely, it is clear that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude markers</td>
<td>Express writer’s attitude to Prepositional content</td>
<td>surprisingly, I agree, X claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relational Markers</td>
<td>Explicitly refer to or build Relationship with reader</td>
<td>Frankly, note that, you can see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person markers</td>
<td>Explicitly refer to authors</td>
<td>I, we, my, our</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hyland’s System for Metadiscourse Categories (Hyland, 1998)

In light of the preceding metadiscourse categorizations, this section gives a metadiscourse schema in English writings of literary function, which displays the functions of three metadiscourse groups and subcategories with examples drawn from the study's samples. It has been looked at the context of the samples while determining the categorization method to utilize. As previously said, the readers of literary texts must be persuaded to accept the information's authenticity and must be concerned
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with the opinion of the text author about the subject matter and themselves. Similarly, the assertions stated in the samples must be backed and validated by giving metadiscourse devices in order to achieve an impact via the strength and connection of the text author's logic. Given these circumstances, metadiscourse elements related with instances when the reader should be convinced to accept the text should be found in the sample texts. There is a broader range of metadiscourse elements in the example texts. As a result, we should not use the simpler method advocated by Williams (1981), Mauranen (1993b), and Hyland (1998) but, the method used here follows those researchers who traditionally split metadiscourse elements into what would be referred to as textual and interpersonal metadiscourse.

2.2. Textual Metadiscourse

As previously stated, the role of textual metadiscourse is to guide the reader's perceptions of propositional meanings and to produce a textural text. In other words, textual metadiscourse items assist readers make sense of propositional information by giving explicit devices among the excerpts the ST author gives, without concentrating on content or attitudinal elements (Fathi, 2005). Textual metadiscourse performs the five purposes listed below in this study.

2.2.1. Textual Connectives

Several studies distinguish between connectives based on semantic and pragmatic relationships. A differentiation between external and internal relationships has been made by (Martin, 1992:178). He states that, internal relations are described as “more rhetorical than experiential” as they “obtain the management of the text itself rather than in the organization of the world the text describes” (Ibid; 180). According to Martin, the fundamental conflict between the two is "text vs. reality." The external and internal relations have been also viewed by Francis (1990) and Whittaker (1995). According to Francis, examples such as “in this context” and “therefore” are considered as internal relations (Francis, 1990:62). Whittaker (1995:133) makes a distinction between external textual connectives and internal ones: internals provide information about “the organization of function of the text” and include “e.g., and but” whereas the external logical connectives express logical relationships that hold in the world outside the text and include “then and thus”. Martin (1992) describes “thus” as an internal connective, which engages with the
gloss of Whittaker on “thus” as an external connective. Halliday (1994:338) indicates that it is not easy to express the two parts. However, it could be discussed that connectives have both internal and external meanings. The first is perceived from pragmatic aspect, whereas the latter from semantic aspect. For instance, observe the following examples from Halliday and Hassan (1976:13), in which the relation is temporal one.

a- “First, he took a piece of string and tied it carefully round the neck of the bottle. Next, he passed the other end over a branch and weighted it down with a stone.”

b- “First, he has no experience of this kind of work. Next, he showed no sign of being willing to learn.”

In the example (a), the relation between two events is temporal (external relation); while in (b) the relation is between the steps is internal.

Vasconcellos (1985:155), who distinguishes between cognitive and noncognitive usage of connectives. The cognitive relates to an outward relationship, whereas the noncognitive refers to a relationship that exists within oneself. “There is no one, uniquely true inventory of the varieties of [connectives]: various categories are feasible, each of which would highlight different features of the fact,” as Halliday and Hasan (1976: 238) express it. This indicates that mastering connectives entails a high level of communication ability and linguistic knowledge. Some linguists and textbook authors, on the other hand, published lists of connectives based on grammar or function (see, Winterowd, 1970; Bandar, 1980; Zamel, 1983). Such lists may be deceptive because they fail to grasp that the most significant feature of connectives is that they are a collection of semantic relations rather than a class of items (Dubin and Olshtain, 1980: 356). Halliday and Hassan categorize conjunctive cohesion into four main headings:

2.2.1.1. Causals

The primary purpose of causal connectives is to create the groundwork for reasoning that will support the text author’s argument. These methods are frequently used by authors of literary texts to support their claims. He or she may wish to explain some facts by pointing to causes and reasons, or he may seek to show the validity or untruth of a statement. Some linguists (e.g., van Dijk, 1977; Fahnestock, 1983; Sloan,
1983) distinguish between two types of causal language. The first is referred to as a "premise," in which a second textual unit might be used as a reason, cause, or explanation for the one before it. The second category is "conclusion," which refers to when a second textual unit follows as a result, inference, or entailment of the one before it.

To sum up, connectives' semantic and pragmatic features are mirrored by connectives whose tasks are to denote links between propositions given by the text author. They are one of the types of coherent cues, foregrounding what comes before and marking what comes after as significant to the precedent. To put it another way, they serve both prospective and retrospective purposes.

2.2.1.2. Adversatives

Adversative relationships are defined by their unexpectedness: “contrary to the environment's expectations” (Halliday and Hasan, 1977: 190). Adversatives, in this sense, denote opposing and/or unexpected concepts. As a result, they tend to connect logical concepts with a complicated underlying structure. They are crucial literary methods used by the text author in the literary texts. Adversative connectives are ‘but, though’ (Fathi, 2005). Several academics have focused their attention on the adversative relationship, particularly the concessive one (e.g., Werlich, 1976; Fahnestock, 1983; Hatim, 1985; 1991).

2.2.1.3. Additives

The additive relation's primary purpose is to notify the reader/listener that the thoughts provided have some positive links. An additive conjunctive can indicate a second thought, as in “there is still another issue to consider in combination with the preceding one” (Halliday and Hassan, 1976: 246). In contrast to, the adversative relation, the additive relation might be regarded of as expected or continuous in the discourse, especially if nothing in the preceding discourse suggests the opposite. Additive connectives such as ‘also, and’ are considered as a part of the textual metadiscourse (Fathi, 2005).

2.2.1.4. Temporals

The primary purpose of temporal connectives is to organize events in the text in chronological order: one relationship follows the other. The presence of a temporal connective implies that events, actions, or states
occur in chronological sequence. This relationship is typically depicted in narrative or instructional writings. As a result, it's not unexpected that such methods are commonly used in narrative writings. Temporal connectives are ‘now, then, firstly, secondly’. (Fathi, 2005).

2.3. Interpersonal Metadiscourse

As already expressed, Halliday and Hasan (1976) emphasize the role of the writer in creating an interpersonal metadiscourse. As Dillon (1986:4) mentions that the reader is involved too, and “there's small powerful composing without the [interpersonal component], for the relationship between composing and perusing may be dramatized as a communication involvement.” Human subjects are the ones who induce and are persuaded. He states that “Influence brings the interpersonal work to life.” In this regard, interpersonal metadiscourse is not as it were a phonetic procedure utilized by the content maker, but an interactional one used to translate the content author's demeanors and save the relationship with readers, particularly in disagreeable writings. Interpersonal metadiscourse is subcategorized into the following.

2.3.1. Certainty Markers

The markers of certainty are usually used to empower a propositional statement and add to its sense of certainty. According to Williams (1981:49), such markers are employed when we “underscore we really believe what or would like our reader to think we believe”. However, according to Crismore et al. (1993:52), the subcategory of certainty markers is intricately connected to the subcategory of hedges because the items belonging to certainty markers also express the degree of the text author's commitment to the reality of the situation of the proposition, but at the opposite end of the scale. In other words, using certainty markers shows that you are completely committed to the propositional content. Many language expressions can be used to create certainty markers. They contain adverbs like (certainly, indeed, surely), phrases like (without a doubt, without no hesitation whatsoever), and sentences like (it is apparent that, it is certain that).

Certainty indicators serve as an expressive power in political discourse with a literary style, revealing the text author's attitudinal characteristics and contributing successfully to the pragmatic force of discourse Progress (Fathi, 2005).
2.3.2. Hedging

Hedging was coined in the early 1970s as a linguistic word. Hedging is defined by the Dictionary of Stylistics as “the qualifying and toning-down of utterances and assertions in order to lessen the riskiness of what one says.” Hedging is also associated with the areas of discourse analysis and speech act theory, according to the dictionary. Hedges are also known as “weakeners” (Brown and Levinson, 1978), “evidentiality” (Sweetser referenced in Schaffner, 1998), “approximators”, and “shields” (Brown and Levinson, 1978) (Prince et al., 1982) “Detensifiers” (Hubler, 1983), and “indicators of degrees of trustworthiness” (Chafe, 1986) are all terms used to describe “downtoners” (Holmes 1982; Quirk et al., 1985). Lakoff (1972) applies the term hedges to these words and phrases in his work on the logical features of words and phrases such as (rather, very, mainly). He sees hedges as “some of the most intriguing concerns are presented by the study of words whose meanings implicitly include fuzziness - words whose purpose it is to make things fuzzier or less hazy.” (Lakoff, 1972: 195-213).

Hedges recent researches have revealed that the hedges researchers may be classified into two distinct categories (cf. Crismore and Vande Kopple 1997:85-86; Lewin, 2003). Others agree that hedges are “weak qualifiers” (Barnet and Stubbs, 1983:335), and that the text author is the one who employs them in certainty “will be viewed as less strong and less believable” (Barnet and Stubbs, 1983:335). (Bell et al., 1984:28). As a result, they argue, hedges decrease and weaken the force of discourse.

Finally, there are those researchers who appear to be in the midst of the debate. They contend that hedges should only be used to communicate opinions, assessments, hypotheses, and forecasts. As a result, they advise authors to carefully consider the nature of their subject before deciding whether or not to use hedges. If the content isn't accurate, authors may want to hedge their chances (Ruggiero, 1981:227; Haristion, 1981:54; de Beagrande, 1985:17). As a result, skillful writing is peppered with hedges (Dillon, 1981:91).

2.3.3. Attributors

Attributors are “references to authorities that the writers employ to support their intellectual or persuasive arguments” (Crimore et al., 1993: 52). Narrators, on the other hand, refer to evidentials, which identify the source of textual information, such as John's claim that the
world is flat. The aim of evidentials, which Hyland (1998) categorized as textual metadiscourse, is to guide the reader's interpretation and establish intertextuality, for example, X stated that, this subcategory is included in the interpersonal category because attributors in English literary discourse have a major persuasive role by leveraging authority to support the text author's point.

2.3.4. Commentary

Commentary is used to establish links between the text author and his readers by expressing opinions or reactions to what is being discussed (Crismore et al., 1993: 54). They are mechanisms that text authors intentionally utilize to address readers, either by selectively focusing their attention or by incorporating them as participants in the text environment, as defined by Hyland (1998). The reader benefits from various features of commentary metadiscourse, as defined by Booth (1961): explanation, summaries of thinking processes, anticipation of mental states; reader direction; parts-to-whole relationships; and author-reader harmony. According to Crismore et al. (1993: 54), this subcategory includes (a) rhetorical inquiries, (b) imperatives / instructions with or without the second person pronoun, and (c) asides/comments to the reader that interrupt the propositional statement, the classified direct address to the reader using the second person pronouns as a subclass of commentary interpersonal metadiscourse. These strategies can foster a tight link between the text authors and the readers of contentious dialogue. To put it another way, they make the text dialogical (Crismore et al., 1993).

3. Metadiscourse in Arabic

Arabic and English are not alike; metadiscourse, in general, is a universal linguistic phenomenon (Crismore et al., 1993: p10). It seems that metadiscourse has not been brought to light by many ancient Arab grammarians and linguists who focused on structural features and language’s referential meanings. Nevertheless, the studies that have been done by Arab scholars and researchers about written texts unveil that the writings used in various phases, fields, and disciplines, have an increasing concern in the function of metadiscourse (Fathi, 2005: p30).

Metadiscourse shows up repeatedly a number of writings delivered by ancient Arab scholars specialized in different subjects such as linguistics rhetoric and philosophy (see for instance, Al-Jahidh, 1994; Al-Sakakki, UD; Qudamah 1980; Ibn – Al- Atheer ; Al-Jurjani,
1969). Moreover, metadiscourse has been used in the works of literature writers, and in media such as newspapers and magazines (Fathi, 2005). As Arabic differs from English in a number of aspects, including style, syntax, grammar, and culture, it appears to employ a variety of rhetorical tactics to use metadiscourse. Arabic can accomplish metadiscourse in ways that suit its nature and style, in addition to the metadiscursive techniques utilized in English.

Some old Arab scholars (Al-Jahidh, 1994; Al-Qazwini, 1983; and Al-Jurjani, 1969; 1978) make an effort to institutionalize the essential standards and conventions of utilizing rhetorical devices in language not as informative passing only (ideational meaning), but also interacted with the reader in order to make the text more dynamic (interpersonal and textual meanings). They argue that these rhetorical devices serve as a useful meaning (convincing and influencing the audience).

In his book دلائِل الأعجاز (Dala’el Al Ejaz) “Signs of Inimitability”, Al-Jurjani (1969; p25) is interested in text's texture. He believes that it is founded on textual levels. He maintains that the language is not a random collection of textual relations but, expressions of a language. He discusses connectives and how components in a discourse attach, as well as observing the functions of particular connectives. More crucially, he asserts that language should transcend beyond grammar's descriptive cases, hence that is why he used the term نظرية النظم “Systemic Theory of Meaning”. It can be seen how effectively phrases and concepts are interacted widely and run into one another. He argues that the misuse of إٌظُcn obstructs the clarity of propositions within the text and distorts the text. As a result, it could be said that Al Jurjani's book “Signs of Inimitability” is a masterwork of the literature of Arabic which requires much review and research from our side in order to comprehend the metadiscourse and discourse's concepts (Al-Jurjani, 1969:11).

The majority of old and present Arab grammarians concentrate on the form of the Arabic language instead of its function, and they perceive themselves to the sentence's boundaries. Parts of speech are divided into three categories suggested by Arab grammarians: verbals, nominals, and particles. It is obvious that the approach of the Arabs lacks arrangement and classification of metadiscourse devices. Nevertheless, a portion of linguistics phenomena that work as metadiscourse are implicitly given suitable weight by ancient Arab rhetoricians. They came to an agreement that metadiscourse could be an explanatory mean that will be utilized at
the textual level instead of at word, phrase, clause, or sentence levels (Fathi, 2005). Therefore, the categorization of metadiscourse components is well explained below.

3.1. Discourse Connectives (روابط الكلام)

Discourse connectives mainly includes the syndetion and asyndetion. Hence, the distinction between (syndetion and asyndetion) is well-presented by Arab rhetoricians, and it is expressed in the common statement in (Al-Qazwini, 1983:246) who states that “Rhetoric means discriminating syndetion from asyndetion”. Thus, it is a fundamental factor of impact of discourse to use the rhetorical device of conjunction in its proper place. “الوصل” (Syndeton) is different from “الفصل” (asyndetion) in that it uses “وأو العطف” (coordinate and) while the latter is determined by leaving it out. (Fathi, 2005)

“إذا لقوا الذين آمنوا قالوا أمنا وإذا خلوا إلى شياطينهم قالوا إنا نحن مستهزئون”

“الله يستهزئ بهم ويندهم في طغياتهم يعفون”

(القول: الأية: 14-15)

“When they meet those who believe, they say: “We believe;” but when they are alone with their evil ones, they say: “We are really with you we (were) only jesting.” Allah shall mock them, and give them rope in their trespasses; so they will wander like blind ones (to and from)”. (Khan and Al-Hilali, 2011).

In this example, the clauses “Allah shall mock them” which has the equivalence in Arabic “الله يستهزئ بهم” should not be connected with “We are really with you” “قالوا إنا معكم” otherwise, Allah and hypocrites will share the adjective of mockery. Consequently, the (coordinate and) “الفصل” “وأو العطف” should be omitted. The dis-conjuction (asyndetion) provides an implicit relation which is adversative rhetorical one between the propositions of the discourse while, conjunction (syndetion) “الوصل” is known by specifying (coordinate and) “وأو العطف”. An example from the Holly Quran is illustrated below:

“إلى الذين آمنوا أتقو الله و كونوا مع الصادقين”

(التوبة، الآية: 119)
"O ye who believe! Fear Allah and be with those who are true (in word and deed)" (Khan and Al-Hilali, 2011). In this matter, the existence of "وَأَوْالعَطْف" has the rhetorical function of linking "كونا" to what has been come before. (Al-Hashimi, 1960; Faris, 1979).

It is worth to mention that discourse connectives are considered as grammatical particles but as elements of textual metadiscourse. Discourse connectives used at first indicate the arranging of text’s framework and showing their intertextual connections, for instance, adversative relations "لكن، إلا أن، بل، بيد" (but rather, yet, however, but), sequential / temporal relations "أولا، ثم، وقد" (first, later, then), causal relations "ف، لأْ، لِلهْ" (because, for, consequently); and coordinating and additive relations "و، وَكَذَلِكَ، وَثُمَّ" (further, and). Such connectives have many functional meanings and depend heavily on the co-text and context that determine the functional values of these connectives (Fathi, 2005). These connectives or relations are illustrated below:

3.1.1. Causals

The causal relations "ف، لأْ، لِلهْ" (because, for, consequently) are used to compile that can be applied on the statements that give the cause meaning. Consider the following example:

"كَانَتْ هَذِهَ حَقَّيَةً مَثْعَرةً بَالنَّسِبَةِ لِي، فَلَمْ كَانْ أَحْسَبُ الأَرْضِ مَلَكاً لَجِدِي مِنْ خَلْقِ اللَّهِ الأَرْضِانَ" (Salih, 1964)

“This was new to me for I had imagined that the land had belonged to my grandfather ever since God’s Creation.” (Davies, 1966; p.21).

"ف" is used as a causal connective in the above example, he/she was accurate for choosing formal equivalence.

3.1.2. Adversatives

Unexpectedness is the basic meaning of Adversative relationships. In this way, adversatives indicate contrasting and/or unexpected ideas. The devices of adversative relations "لكن، إلا أن، بل، بيد" (but rather, yet, however, but) Consider the following as an illustration:
There’ll be terror, now, he told himself, in the middle of pleasure, and joy will suddenly vanish but it’s no fault of yours.” (Gassick and Badawi, 1984: p28)

“A happy heart is about to be terrified, and a time of pleasure is about to be destroyed but it’s not through any fault of yours.” (Elyas, 1974: p97)

### 3.1.3. Additives

Additives are considered as one of the main procedures of metadiscourse in Arabic, which provide a positive relation between two elements. The devices of additives in Arabic are "و، كذلك" (further, and). However, there are two types of additives those with a metadiscourse function and others with a stylistic function. As an illustration, consider the following:

"الشكر الله لكم"  
(Mahfouz, 1961; p11)

“I thank God and you, gentlemen”  
(Gassick and Basawi, 1984; p2)

“Thanks to God, and to all of you….”  
(Elyas, 1974; p55).

### 3.1.4. Temporals

The presence of temporal relations "الأول، ثم، "العلاقات التعاقدية" بعد ذلك" (first, later, then) indicate that actions, events, or states happens in chronological order. The textual metadiscourse’s sub-category has the highest frequency of this. Consider the following illustration:

"واجتمع التمر اكواما عالية، ثم رأيت قوما أقولوا واخذوا ي كيلونه بمكابيل ويصبونه في اكياس.  "  
(Salih, 1964)
“The dates were collected into mounds. Then saw people coming along and weighing them into measuring bins and pouring them into sacks.” (Davies, 1966; p.27).

It is obvious that the word “ثُم” refers to the time’s elapse. The function of this word is to manage the sequence of the events according to time. The translator might depend on the word (then) in English as an equivalent of the Arabic version.

3.2. Interpersonal Metadiscourse

Interpersonal metadiscourse is used to make the text dynamic in different ways and by many different scholars. However, we have subdivided them here to have a better understanding.

3.2.1. Circumlocution (الإطناب)

Other linguistic and rhetorical methods that can achieve interpersonal metadiscourse function that is identified by ancient Arab linguists and rhetoricians (see, for example, Al-Sakkaki, UD; Al-Qazwini, 1983). They, for example, place huge emphasis on the concept of “الإطناب”, which could be translated as (circumlocution), and regard it as a persuasive technique, explanation of the text author's deliberated meaning, the innovation of a strong relationship with the audience, and the interweaving of the discourse thread. Those rhetoricians and linguists distinguish between “الإطناب” (circumlocution) and “الحشو” (pleonasm). They define the first as the motivated employment of extra formal markers and elements in the expression of a given meaning and, therefore, believe that it is functional and useful in creating a text. According to Al-Sakkaki (UD), it is a feature of rhetorical discourse that can be used in every discourse and that is determined by the context of situation, therefore it is non-functional and redundant. In other words, “الإطناب” is considered as a rhetorical device which adds supplemental meanings to the text, whereas “الحشو” is irritating and is a consequence of careless use of unnecessary repetition in expressing ideas (See Shehab, 2020).

According to the ancient linguists and rhetoricians mentioned above, as well as modern Arab linguists (for example, Al-Hashimi, 1960 and Shunnaq, 1994), “الإطناب” is a large component of metadiscourse because it is one of the most powerful rhetorical devices in a text. The major goals of “الإطناب” are to express a specific topic after a broad one,
to provide clarification after ambiguity, to confirm after a warning, to disclose the speaker's attitude, and to engage the listener in an implicit dialogue. Various linguistic factors that, to our understanding, realize metadiscourse via “الإغتيال” have been identified by ancient and modern Arab linguists. They have not, however, adequately classified the linguistic features of which are relevant to metadiscourse. As a result, “الإغتيال” may be classified into the following categories, each of which serves as a metadiscourse component. For example, hyperbole “الإغتيال” is considered as one of the most important categories of circumlocution, which is mostly used in poetry that expresses an exaggeration of representation and description (Ibn Abi I-Asba', 1957:92; Al-Suyuti, 1988: 278). Consider the following example:

"O my people! Obey the Messengers. Obey those who ask no wages of you (for themselves), and who are rightly guided."

(Khan and Al-Hilali, 1417H:441).

The purpose of using of the utterance “وهم مهتدون” in the above example taken from the Holy Quran “who are rightly guided” is to urge people to follow the messengers. In this matter, the messengers are rightly guided, therefore this clause is considered as hyperbole.

3.2.2. Bracketing (الاعتراض)

"الاعتراض” is defined as “an utterance which is introduced into a single or compound expression. If it is omitted, the meaning will not change” (Ibn Al-Atheer, 1990: 172), the purpose of bracketing is to improve, strengthen and clarify the discourse. (Al-Zarkashi, 1972: 68), which is used in the speech or between two different clauses that have different functions. It may also include the speaker’s comments concerning the propositions addressed. However, in the matter of context it serves as an interpersonal and textual function, it may also include the speaker’s comments on the issues being discussed (Al-Suyuti, 2006:872).

3.2.3. Certainty (التوكيذ)

Certainty markers are used to realize metadiscourse. Such markers are employed to confirm the informative meaning, and the original meaning is not affected by the omission (Al-Suyuti, 1974: 337). Using
such markers is determined by discourse variables “عبارات خطابية” that see the statement of the readers in particular context which is “open-minded” (متبرء) (Hatem, 1997), or uncertain “متردد” (نطشن، لم التوكل، أن) (Al-Sakkaki 1974). Consequently, the standard of employing metadiscourse lay strongly on the situation’s context (Al-Sakkaki 1974). Assuming that the reader of a literary discourse is either, “متردد” (denier) or, at the very least, “متردد” (uncertain), it is reasonable to predict that the text authors in this study's corpus will utilize certainty indicators (Fathi, 2005).

Fresh studies reveal that frequent certainty marker’s use can be identified by two categories which are grammatical items such as “really, definitely and truly” (ْٔٛ اٌزٛو١ذ، لذ, إْ, لاَ اٌزٛو١ذ، أْ) and lextical items such as “oath, inclusion, object, cognate, emphatic adverbials” and “certainty verbs” (افؼبي اٌ١م١ٓ) such as “know, believe, assure” (عِلٌ,اعتقاد,اجضَ), (cf. Farghal, 1991).

3.2.4. Hedging (الاحتراز)

The term hedging “الاحتراز” is used by linguists to portray words that refer to uncertainty. Many questions about certainty, can be raised by this type of hedging regarding what is being said, as well as heighten readers' awareness of the value of anticipation. Hedging “الاحتراز” is most likely the equivalent of the word hedging which is a hybrid notion including the pragmatic and semantic aspects, unavailability of its definite function and an understandable form of linguistic. A hedge allows authors to reduce their assurance concerning their propositions, and for establishing the interpersonal interactions with the readers by setting up the potentiality of negotiations. To learn or to analyze how to apply hedges is not as easy as its thought to be, (Hinkel, 2004), “because there is no one-to-one correspondence between the function and form of hedging” (Fathi and Nasser, 2018).

3.2.5 Rhetorical Questions

This kind of questions can be defined as the questions that are not expected to be answered by the audience, such questions that have an essential function as an indicator to guide the audience and the flow of a discourse toward an assured trend which meet up with the author’s plan and aim (Al-Zarkashi,1972: 334,335). A rhetorical question is seen as a key tool that is frequently used to assure that questions are answered by themselves and actively make deductions and accessing previous information about the topic. (Ibn 'Asur {UD}, 1984) puts forward that the
audience’s respond to rhetorical questions is not expected to be answered. The audience, on the other hand, should have a well knowledge of such questions since they might help them to think about what the speaker has said and how he or she responded to the questions. As a result, rhetorical questions sustain interpersonal function.

The previous linguistic phenomenon is known as “الاقتباس” because it is possible to ignore them, preserve the content of proposition keep it unimpacted. They are, nonetheless, communicative, i.e., functional, and provide interpersonal and textual function to the Arabic discourse. They have specific purposes planned by a text creator once they become communicative (Fathi, 2005).

3.2.6 Non-analogous and Emotional Appeals

Most modern Arab grammarians, as previously indicated, have based their grammatical theory on the writings of medieval Arab grammarians, concentrating on the syntactic features of Arabic and the regulating power that governs nouns and verbs. (See, for example, Hasan, 1964; Abdul-Qadir, 1988). Hassan (1973), on the other hand, suggest a different approach. Instead of focusing on the traditional categories of the parts of speech which are (nouns, verbs, and particles) that are put forward by these scholars, Hassan focuses on another part of speech, which is termed (non-analogous) “الخلقاء” , that has been proposed by a group of Arabic linguists and grammarians and argues that it should be considered as an adding up part of speech because it functionally and formally differs from verbs, nouns, and particles.

Hassan (ibid.: 113) states that “the في DFA is a word or expression uttered by speaker to express emotiveness and action after being affected by a certain situation.” He also mentions that “the في DFA is considered as the closest exclamation’s equivalent in English. It can be viewed by different linguistic devices like rebuke verbs such as لاهانَيْتُ, لاهانَيْتُ”, forms of wishing like يَََّأْ, يَََّأْ”, the verbs of praise like حسنَ, حسنَ” forms of expressing wonder like لاهانَيْتُ, لاهانَيْتُ” and the vocative forms such as “يا” (Hassan 1973; Al Saqi, 1977; Al-Sanjary, 1977). It is worth mentioning that such forms share the feature of having an expressive role rather than an informational role. The major goal of uttering these forms is to communicate the speaker's interpersonal intrusion and emotional appeal towards a specific stimulus, rather than to give information. As a result, it may be claimed that “الخلقاء” is an important aspect of metadiscourse as it
shows the speaker's stance regarding propositional information. Yet, it could not cover the entire area of metadiscourse. (Fathi, 2005).

To sum up, Arab linguists and rhetoricians recognize the importance of metadiscourse, which may be achieved using a variety of linguistic devices. They indirectly show that metadiscourse is as significant as the propositional content. However, the devices referred to as "الأدخلالات الخطابية" need more systematic studies because they are scattered. The current research will be an attempt to examine metadiscourse in Arabic in a systematic way. This is an attempt to reveal that Arabic employs metadiscourse in the similar function (Crismore et al., 1993; Hyland, 1998). Fathi (2005) suggests that the metadiscourse items used in Arabic are presented in the following table:

### Table (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Metadiscourse in Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Connectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>لنتلك، لأن، ف</td>
<td>Textual Metadiscourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversative</td>
<td>لكن</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>و</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>ثم</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>لعل</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty Makers</td>
<td>لا شك، ل ظن، لا بد، والله</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracketing</td>
<td>أنها لا تتذكر، الحقيقة العربية</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>قول، يقول</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Question</td>
<td>&quot;لا ينعم مجلسنا الآن بالطماينة ؟&quot;&quot;لا ترى إلى نافعة دائما ؟&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-analogous and emotional appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wishing</td>
<td>هيهات،</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclamation</td>
<td>ما أجل الأيام الماضية ؟ ما أجل أن ننسدها الاغتناء بالفرح</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wondering</td>
<td>ولكن ما شكل سناء الآن ؟ هل تدري كم يجيها ؟</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>يا</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Metadiscourse in Arabic (Mahfouz, 1961)**

### 4. Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study the following conclusions are made:

1. Metadiscourse is a very important part of language use as it plays an important role in the corpus of this study. Thus, metadiscourse items
should be seen as important as the propositional items since they produce textness.

2. Metadiscourse, to some extent, is complicated area but very important part of language use; the role of metadiscourse is strategic in discourse and its misinterpretation leads to weakening the discourse and affecting on its intended meaning.

3. Metadiscourse depends highly on context. Understanding the function of the metadiscourse items is necessary to put them in their appropriate setting and genres which can show their appropriate use and meaning, i.e., English literary metadiscourse items have slightly different features from Arabic language.

4. The methods and the techniques that are used in English metadiscourse are somehow different from that in Arabic language. Arabic, unlike English, tends to use textual metadiscourse a lot, particularly text connectives. Nevertheless, using metadiscourse items a lot can cause redundancy and has a negative impact of the presentation of discourse. Consequently, metadiscourse items should be used only when they are needed.

5. Arabic is more elaborate in signaling compared to English. In other words, Arabic tends to use explicit textualization more than English does. This may be due to the absence of well-organized punctuation system in Arabic.
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دراسة مقارنة في الإدخالات الخطابية بين اللغة العربية والإنجليزية
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الخلاص:

تقوم هذه الدراسة بمقارنة مفردات الإدخالات الخطابية في اللغتين العربية والإنجليزية. وتؤدي الإدخالات الخطابية دوراً رئيسيًا في تنظيم النص وإشراك القارئ، وتوضح موقف مؤلف النص تجاه موضوع معين. تتناول هذه الدراسة إجراء مقارنة تظهر بدورها الفرق بين اللغتين العربية والإنجليزية، إذ أن مفهوم الإدخالات الخطابية في اللغة العربية لا يزال عاماً ومثيراً للجدل بالنسبة للأولى من اللغويين والباحثين. وعلى عكس اللغة الإنجليزية، فإن اللغة العربية تحتاج إلى تصنيف عناصر الإدخالات الخطابية. وعليه فإن هذه الدراسة ستتناول كيفية مدى هذه الفجوة بين اللغتين باعتبار أن الإدخالات الخطابية مهم مشترك بين اللغات.

وتهدف الدراسة إلى استكشاف وتحديد وتحليل الوظيفة اللغوية والبلاغية لعناصر الإدخالات الخطابية المستخدمة في اللغتين العربية والإنجليزية.

لقد توصلت هذه الدراسة إلى أن اللغة العربية تستعمل عناصر الإدخالات الخطابية كما هو الحال في اللغة الإنجليزية على الرغم من أن تصنيف الإدخالات الخطابية في لغتين اللغتين مختلف إلى حد ما.

استنتجت هذه الدراسة أن الإدخالات الخطابية ظاهرة معقدة ولكنها جزء مهم جدًا في استخدام اللغة إذ تؤدي دورًا استراتيجياً في النص الأدبي، وأن عدم القدرة على تفسير هذه الإدخالات الخطابية يؤدي إلى إضعاف الخطاب والإثرار على معنى المقصود. كما أظهرت الدراسة أن فئات الإدخالات الخطابية المستخدمة في اللغة العربية تنطبق على اللغة الإنجليزية. وأخيراً تم طرح بعض التوصيات، واقتراح عدد من مواضيع البحث الأخرى التي من الراجح أن تفهم في الارتباط بدراسة الإدخالات الخطابية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الإدخالات الخطابية، تفسيرات الإدخالات الخطابية، الإدخالات الخطابية أليبي شخصية، الإدخالات الخطابية النصية.
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