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Abstract

This is a corpus-based study focusing on the analysis of three highly frequent discourse markers (DMs) in Egyptian Colloquial Arabic, namely ba'a, ṭayyeb, and ṭab. Based on a purposeful sample of seven Egyptian films, ba'a, ṭayyeb, and ṭab have been analyzed qualitatively using the corpus software WordSmith Tools. The analysis shows that these markers fulfill a multitude of functions and can operate (sometimes simultaneously) on discourse and interpersonal levels. Since DMs enhance discourse coherence and signal speakers’ attitudes, thus facilitating interaction, it is reasonable to expect that insufficient or incorrect use of DMs by learners of Arabic as a foreign language would impede efficient communication or even lead to intercultural pragmatic failure. As important components of pragmatic and intercultural competence, DMs should be given more emphasis in Arabic language classrooms. The study ends by suggesting a number of corpus-based classroom activities aimed at raising students' awareness of ba'a, ṭayyeb, and ṭab in Egyptian Colloquial Arabic and their pragmatic importance.
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Transcription conventions (Adapted from El Shimi, 1992)

Broad phonetic transcription rather than narrow is used for the Arabic data.

The Arabic short vowel symbols are:

[a] as in ḥarb (war)  
[e] as in fehem (he understood)  
[o] as in ʾorb (drinking)

The long vowel symbols are:

[ā] as in fāt (he passed)  
[ē] as in fēn (where)  
[ī] as in ṭīn (figs)  
[ō] as in kōra (ball)  
[ū] as in śūra (picture)

The consonant symbols shared with English are:

/b/, /v/, /d/, /k/, /g/, /m/, /n/, /l/, /f/, /s/, /z/, /ʃ/, /ʒ/, /h/, /y/

The consonant symbols specific to Arabic are:

/q/ a uvular voiceless plosive, as in qanūn (law)  
/r/ a trill, as in rāḥ (he left)  
/ḥ/ a voiceless fricative, as in ḥāf (he was frightened)  
/ɣ/ a voiced fricative, as in ḡānī (rich)  
/h/ a pharyngeal voiceless fricative, as in ḥayā (life)  
/ʕ/ a pharyngeal voiced fricative, as in ʕamd (deliberate)

The velarized sounds are:

/t/ as in ṭār (he flew)  
/d/ as in ḍarb (beating)  
/ʃ/ as in ʃōt (voice)  
/ʒ/ as in ḟarīf (cute)

Lengthened consonants are represented by doubling the symbol.
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CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale of the Study and Statement of the Problem

1.1.1 Definition and Importance of Discourse Markers

The term *discourse marker* (DM) is used as an umbrella term for a group of items occurring outside the clause. They function more at the discourse plane than at the grammatical plane. Typically, they have low semantic and syntactic values, but a high pragmatic value. Famous examples from the English language include words or phrases like, *well, now, but, so, because, then, you know, I mean.* (O’Keeffe, Clancy, & Adolphs, 2011, p. 155) Even though recent advances in research (especially in corpus linguistics) have expanded our knowledge of DMs, it remains a challenge to accurately describe them in neat and tidy definitions.

Discourse markers are often idiosyncratic and untranslatable: no perfect equivalents can be found in other languages. Yet, there are few features of any language that reveal the cultural specificity of a given speech community better than its discourse markers. Moreover, DMs are ubiquitous, and their frequency in spoken language is strikingly high. “Their meaning is crucial to the interaction mediated by speech; they express the speaker’s attitude towards the addressee or towards the situation spoken about, his assumptions, his intentions, his emotions. If learners of a language failed to master the meaning of its particles [that is, DMs], their communicative competence would be drastically impaired” (Wierzbicka, p. 341). Furthermore, discourse markers “add greatly to the discourse repertoire of a learner in terms of oral fluency” (O’Keeffe et al., 2001, p. 157). The same view is shared by McCarthy (2002) and O’Keeffe et al. (2007). But despite all the difficulties associated with DMs, “It is important to remember that these items exist in all languages so language learners will not find them unusual” (O’Keeffe et al., 2011, p. 161).

1.1.2 Theoretical Frameworks
There are three distinct theoretical orientations within which DMs are discussed. The first theory is relevance theory (RT), and is associated with the name of Diane Blakemore (2002). Blakemore contributed to RT, originally developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986), by applying it to the study of discourse markers. Blakemore never defines DMs, however, maintaining that they do not form a coherent set of linguistic items. Her main contribution is the distinction she makes between conceptual and procedural meaning. Conceptual meaning roughly coincides with truth-conditional meaning, while procedural meaning roughly corresponds to non truth-conditional meaning.

The second theory is set forth by Bruce Fraser (1996). He claims that sentence meaning consists of two parts: propositional content and a set of discourse markers. He further claims that sentence meaning encodes four types of messages: 1) A single basic message: which corresponds to the propositional content; 2) Commentary messages: messages commenting on the basic message; 3) Parallel messages: messages added to the basic message; 4) Discourse messages: messages marking the link between the basic message of a sentence and the preceding discourse. Fraser maintains that different types of discourse markers correspond to different types of messages: Basic Markers (e.g., please); Commentary Markers (e.g., sentence adverbials such as frankly, certainly); Parallel Markers (e.g. Sir, Your Honor, damned); and Discourse Markers (e.g., and, so, but). Fraser (2005) provides his own definition of discourse markers, elaborating on their different functional classes.

A third approach to the study of discourse markers is that proposed by Deborah Schiffrin (1987). Using interview data, she adopts a perspective on discourse that involves the integration of structural, semantic, pragmatic, and social factors. She argues that discourse markers (DMs) function on a number of distinct planes of discourse. In Schiffrin’s view, DMs should be explored for their role in integrating “knowing, meaning, saying and doing” (Schiffrin, p. 29). Although she never defines DMs, she offers certain criteria which can be used to identify them.
Schiffrin studies DMs from the perspective of discourse coherence, asking whether DMs create coherence or merely display it.

1.1.3 Studies of Discourse Markers in Egyptian Colloquial Arabic

Searches in the American University in Cairo (AUC) library and in Google Scholar yielded two studies. The first study is an AUC MA dissertation by Amani El Shimi written in 1992. She explores the functions of the discourse marker *yaṣni* in Educated Egyptian Arabic. The second study is a PhD thesis written in 1993 by Atef Ghobrial under the supervision of Bruce Fraser at Boston University. Largely based on unstructured interviews, the study investigates the discourse markers *yaṣni*, *ṭayyeb*, and *enta ḫāref*.

1.1.4 Advantages of Corpus-Based Studies over Traditional Methodologies (Interviews, Role Plays, Discourse Completion Tasks, etc.)

Corpus-based studies do not rely on intuition, and, compared to conventional methodologies, corpus samples are huge, which adds to the objectivity and validity of the results. Corpora can also be used to study a great variety of topics in linguistics, including grammar, vocabulary, and pragmatics.

1.1.5 Notable Examples of Corpus-Based Studies of Discourse Markers

Among the pragmatic phenomena that are now part of a steadily growing body of work in corpus-based research are discourse markers. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2006) compiled studies of DMs in a number of different languages. Stenström (2006) compares English and Spanish DMs. Lewis (2006) contrasts adversative relational markers in English and French. The word *surely* and its Spanish equivalent are the focus of a study by Downing (2006), while Johansson (2006) conducts a study of *well* and its counterpart in German and Norwegian. A number of corpus-based studies have also compared native and non-native usages of discourse markers, although this is not the focus of the present thesis.

1.1.6 Statement of the Problem
This thesis attempts to bridge a gap that exists between the rapid proliferation, in English and other languages, of corpus-based research on discourse markers in recent years and the near total absence of such research in spoken Arabic. The study will benefit not only Arabic linguists, sociolinguists, pragmaticists and discourse analysts, but also teachers of Arabic as a foreign language. An overview of existing TAFL materials (books, syllabi, internet resources) shows a remarkable lack of emphasis on discourse markers, the reasons for which could be the topic of another MA thesis. Do language teachers avoid teaching DMs because of their idiosyncrasy and untranslatability? Or do they perhaps underestimate the importance of those little seemingly insignificant words in spoken interaction? Regardless of the answer, this thesis should contribute to a deeper understanding of DMs, which in turn should help the Arabic teacher present them to his or her students in a more systematic way. Research has indeed shown that absence of explicit instruction in the use of DMs can lead to pragmatic fossilization (Trillo, 2002).

Time and space limits have prevented the author from exploring more than three discourse markers in this thesis. *ba'a, tayyeb,* and *tab* have been selected for their very high frequency compared to other DMs. In addition, for a large number of learners of Egyptian Colloquial Arabic (based on the author's teaching experience), *ba'a* is a word that means all and nothing. Very few indeed have mastered it, with most learners overusing, underusing, or misusing it.

**1.2 Research Questions**

The study addresses four research questions:

1) What are the different functions of the discourse markers *ba'a, tayyeb,* and *tab?* This research question is further divided into three sub-questions:

- What is the role of *ba'a, tayyeb,* and *tab* in coherence?
- What is the role of *ba'a, tayyeb,* and *tab* in interpersonal management?
- What is the role of *ba'a, tayyeb,* and *tab* in speech act marking?
2) What is the syntactic behavior of *ba'a*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab*? This research question is further divided into two sub-questions:

- What are the frequencies of *ba'a*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab* in different clause positions (clause-initial, clause-medial, clause-final)?
- What are the frequencies of *ba'a*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab* in different sentence types (declarative, interrogative, imperative)?

3) What is the collocational behavior of *ba'a*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab*?

4) What are the pattern/function associations for *ba'a*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab*? (For example, how is a change in pattern, e.g. position of a discourse marker in the clause, associated with a change in function?)

### 1.3 Important Definitions

*Collocation* “refers to the habitual co-occurrence of words, for example *blond* and *hair*” (Sinclair, 1996). As McCarthy et al (2009) define it, collocation means the way words combine to form pairs which occur frequently together.

*Concordance* according to Sinclair is “an index to the places in a text where particular words and phrases occur” (2003, p. 173). “[T]he software programmes used to generate concordances generally present results in a Key Word in Context (KWIC) format, which features a *node* word, the subject of the query by the researcher, surrounded by the *co-text*, words that occur before and after it” (O’Keeffe et al., 2011, p. 13).

*Discourse Markers* have several functions. Their main function is “to organise stretches of text or conversation”, for example, marking openings, closings, marking the introduction of a new topic, marking a move to a new part of a story or argument, focusing on or emphasising a topic, marking a return to an earlier topic after an interruption or digression, or marking the sequence of items in a list (O’Keeffe et al., 2011, pp. 157-158).
Interactional Markers “most typically items such as you know, I mean, are a central feature of conversation. Their main function is as monitors, on the part of the speaker, of the ongoing delivery of speech. Hence, they are very much listener-oriented devices. The speaker uses them in an attempt to make the message clearer and to mark what is shared as well as what is new information” (O’Keeffe et al., 2011, p. 158).

Multi-Word Units (Greaves & Warren, 2010) are referred to in corpus-based studies using expressions such as routine formulae (Coulmas, 1979), lexicalised stems (Pawley & Syder, 1983), formulaic sequences (Wray, 2002; Schmitt, 2004), chunks (O’Keeffe et al., 2007), and lexical bundles (Biber et al., 1999; Biber & Conrad, 1999).

Pragmatic Competence relates to a “set of internalised rules of how to use language in socio-culturally appropriate ways, taking into account the participants in a communicative interaction and features of the context within which the interaction takes place” (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000, p. 19).

Pragmatic Marker is used “as an umbrella term for a number of items that occur outside the clause. They operate more at a discourse level than at a grammatical level. While they may have low syntactic or semantic value, they have high pragmatic value” (O’Keeffe et al., 2011, p. 155). Carter and McCarthy (2006) include three subcategories under the category pragmatic marker: discourse markers, interactional markers, and response tokens.

Relevance Theory is an attempt by Sperber and Wilson (1995) “to provide a cognitive account of how we understand what we hear.” They “maintain that the four Gricean maxims can be subsumed under the one overriding super-maxim of relation – a speaker's utterance should be relevant to previous utterances in the conversation” (O’Keeffe et al., 2011, p. 75).

Response Tokens “refer to the short utterances, such as mm, yeah, oh really, and non-verbal surrogates such as head nods and shoulder shrugs that listeners utter or make by way of response to what a speaker is saying” (O’Keeffe et al., 2011, p. 160).
### 1.4 Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFL</td>
<td>Arabic as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Adjacency Pair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conversation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANCODE</td>
<td>The Cambridge and Nottingham Corpus of Discourse in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>The Cambridge International Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Cooperative Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Discourse Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Discourse Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>Egyptian Colloquial Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>English as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Face Threatening Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Pragmatic Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Second Language Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 2 — LITERATURE REVIEW

Although research on discourse markers (henceforth DM) has increased dramatically over the past three decades (Lewis, 2014, p. 96), it is not an easy task to form a coherent theoretical model of the semantics/pragmatics of DMs. This difficulty is due to the extraordinary variability of DM research. Studies vary in terms of the languages focused on, the type of DMs selected, the terms employed, the functions under consideration, the problems addressed, and the methodologies used. Given this remarkable theoretical variety and the lack of an all-encompassing model, some researchers favor an eclectic approach. By way of a specific example, El Shimi (1992), in her analysis of yaʕni, draws on two quite different theoretical frameworks, namely Schiffrin's model and Leech's Interpersonal Rhetoric (p. 35). Even though El Shimi's study was published nearly a quarter century ago, the field of DM studies has not changed significantly in the sense that it is still “often very difficult to find the bits and pieces that constitute an original model of the meanings and functions of discourse particles” (Fischer, 2006, p. 1).

This overview is an attempt to make some sense of the bewildering diversity of DM studies. Taking care not to oversimplify, a review is provided of the spectrum of approaches to discourse markers. These are usually presented as binary oppositions: synchronic vs diachronic, semantic vs pragmatic, formal vs functional, linguistic vs cognitive, etc. Despite the complexity and heterogeneity of the DM research field, there are four central questions which need to be addressed (Fischer, 2006, p. 2). These will be dealt with in the following subsections.

2.1 Defining Discourse Markers

The first question has to do with the definitional status of discourse markers. A good definition should address the following points: a) The distinction between DMs and other similar linguistic items,
such as modals, conjunctions, and adverbs. b) The categorization of discourse markers. That is, whether a DM is a semantic, syntactic, or functional category. c) The type of definition used; whether it is based on necessary and sufficient conditions or on prototypes and family resemblances. d) The terminology employed and the justification for it. The two most common terms used are *discourse particle* and *discourse marker*, which mirror different conceptualizations of the items under investigation.

The term *discourse particle* evokes small monomorphemic words, thus setting apart particles from larger linguistic entities which perform similar tasks, like phrasal idioms. However, the term *particle* is problematic in several respects. Since the object it designates is prototypically small, uninflected words (e.g. *well*), it unnecessarily tends to exclude larger multi-word items that have very similar discoursal functions. Similarly, as the label *particle* implies a lexical item, it eliminates non-linguistic discourse-marking phenomena, like speech pauses, hesitations, and false starts. Moreover, a particle in one language can be expressed using a whole phrase in another language, thus undermining the importance of formal features as a defining criterion of discourse-marking expressions. These are some serious flaws of a purely formal terminology.

The term *discourse marker* is not unproblematic either. It has been argued that the term *marker* is more inclusive, and hence better, than the term *particle* since it avoids the arbitrary formal limitations associated with the latter. Yet the first major problem of a purely functional label, like *marker*, is that it appears to be too inclusive. Discourse-marking tasks can indeed be fulfilled by a large variety of linguistic and metalinguistic devices, like tag questions and parenthetic clauses. In practice, however, researchers who use the term *discourse marker* usually focus on linguistic items which are prototypically particles. Furthermore, they usually do not take into account non-linguistic practices, such as hesitations and pauses, which reveals that they do not use the term *discourse marker* in purely functional terms, and that formal properties, like lexicalization and idiomatization, are taken into
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consideration.

Although the label *pragmatic marker* is sometimes used interchangeably with *discourse marker*, some authors (Aijmer, Foolen, & Simon-Vandenbergen, 2006; Carter & McCarthy, 2006; Foolen, 2001; Fraser, 1996; Hansen, 2006) use it as a more general functional term that includes discourse markers, interactional markers, response tokens, politeness markers, and hesitation markers. (Instead of unnecessarily shifting back and forth between the labels *pragmatic marker* and *discourse marker*, this study will generally stick to the latter more common term)

Finally, according to some linguists, the term *marker* should be abandoned altogether because the items that are dubbed discourse markers do not, in their view, *mark* anything; they *create* meaning like any other lexical item. In other words, DMs have encoded meanings in the mental lexicon, and they are not simply signposts or, to use El Shimi's expression, “functional punctuation marks” (1992, p. 34) devoid of semantic content. For some analysts, however, *marking* and *creating* are not a matter of either/or. A DM can perform either role depending on the context. Consider example (1):

(1) Tom is home but Ben is out. (Blakemore, 2002, p. 37)

*But* simply marks the contrast between being home and being out. In other words, if *but* were removed, the hearer could still perceive the contrast between being home and being out. Hence the role of *but* here is simply to *foreground* this contrast. Note, however, example (2):

(2) Elizabeth has always been a very submissive wife, *but* she reads a lot of books

(Hansen, 2006, p. 26)

Here, the contrast is *created* by the DM *but*. The speaker implies that a contrast “between wifely submission and extensive book reading had never before occurred to the hearer” (Hansen, 2006, p. 26). Had the marker *but* been missing, the hearer would not spontaneously discern a contrast between wifely submission and avid reading. That is, the simple juxtaposition of the arguments is not enough
for the addressee to infer the intended relation. The ability of DMs to create or actively construct meaning undermines the view that *optionality* is the defining property of DMs. By that is meant the possibility to omit a marker without essentially changing the sense of its host utterance.

The “marking-or-creating” debate outlined above still leaves us with an important question. In cases where DMs are optional, why do we sometimes use them while at other times we do not? Lewis (2006, p. 57) notes that in most languages discourse relations are generally *implicated*, and only in a minority of cases are they overtly flagged by DMs. According to Lewis, there are three possible explanations for this tendency towards implicit communication. One is politeness: Attitudinal, speaker-based meanings, like evaluations or judgments, are potentially face threatening, and one good strategy for saving face is to invite inferences instead of being explicit, thus leaving room for a possible retreat. The second explanation is an argumentative one: Inducing the listener to draw his/her own conclusions could be more powerful than conveying an explicit message. The third explanation for preferring implicitness is simply economy, knowing that most discourse relations do not need clarifications.

A third perspective on discourse marking, represented by Diane Blakemore (2002), points to a conception of DMs that takes its point of departure in relevance theory (Sperber, Wilson, He, & Ran, 1986), which is situated within a cognitive framework. Thus Wilson and Sperber (1993) maintain that “the primary bearers of truth conditions are not utterances but conceptual representations” (p. 23). Along these lines, Blakemore argues that in order to gain a satisfactory understanding of DMs, our point of focus should be the cognitive processes (inferences, assumptions, beliefs, etc.) and not utterances. She makes a distinction between *conceptual* meaning and *procedural* meaning. The former roughly corresponds to propositional or truth conditional meaning, while the latter is close to non-propositional or non-truth conditional meaning. DMs, she points out, encode procedural meaning. By this is meant that they instruct the cognitive process of inferencing to take a particular inferential route,
and thus help the hearer to recover the intended meaning. In other words, they constrain the inferential computations involved in utterance interpretation. Witness, for example, the following sequence:

(3) (a) Tom can open Ben’s safe. (b) He knows the combination. (Blakemore, 2002, p. 78)

This sequence could be interpreted in two ways. The first interpretation is that utterance (b) is understood as evidence for the proposition expressed by utterance (a). The second interpretation is that utterance (b) is understood as a conclusion derived from utterance (a). Now consider the same sequence, only this time the segments are connected by discourse markers (Blakemore, 2002, p. 79):

(4) Tom can open Ben’s safe. So he knows the combination.

(5) Tom can open Ben’s safe. After all, he knows the combination.

In example (4), the DM *so* instructs the inferential process to take the conclusion route, whereas in example (5), the DM *After all* guides the inferential computations towards the evidence route. These examples illustrate how different DMs can encode different inferential procedures, and how speakers can make use of these linguistic devices to better communicate their intentions.

### 2.2 Interpreting Discourse Markers

The second question concerns the quality of the interpretations given to DMs. The different readings of a DM should be precise, exhaustive, and finite. The interpretations should accurately describe the relationship between a DM and its surrounding context in such a way that contextual factors (or contextualization cues) adequately contribute to the disambiguation of these interpretations. This context includes structural (e.g. syntax and prosody), sequential (e.g. position in the turn), situational, and sociocultural dimensions.

### 2.3 Interrelating Discourse Marker Readings

The third question addresses the relationship among the different DM readings and the
relationship between these readings and the particle lexeme. Failing to make conceptual connections between different uses of a DM implies that these items are treated as homonymous, that is, as completely unrelated items that happen to have the same phonetic realization.

2.4 Relating Discourse Markers to More General Linguistic Issues

The fourth question attempts to situate DM research in a broader linguistic context. For example, how DM studies can shed light on the semantics/pragmatics interface or on linguistic typology.

2.5 Which Units Do Discourse Markers Mark?

The debate is still open as to how to accurately describe the units of discourse that discourse markers are assumed to mark or connect. Some scholars speak of discourse segments or discourse utterances. Others find this characterization too narrow, because DMs can also link implicit or presupposed utterances. Hence their preference for the term discourse content over discourse segment. Other authors, like Schiffrin (1988), still find the term content inadequate because it tends to exclude many of the uses of discourse markers. In her account, discourse units can include turns of talk or speech acts. Because DMs can refer to different discourse domains (or planes, to use Schiffrin's term), they have been characterized in Schiffrin's model as “indexicals”. Indeed for many authors (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen, 2003; Diewald, 2006; El Shimi 1992; Fischer, 2006; Frank-Job, 2006; Schiffrin, 1988) deixis is considered a key feature of DMs. For instance, in El Shimi's study (1992), yašni is deictic on the grounds that it operates on the textual, ideational, and interpersonal domains (p. 3).

Other analysts, such as Hansen (2006), conceptualize the discourse domains to which DMs may refer in terms of a hierarchy of “levels” (p. 22). The nature of the speech event pertains to the most global level. DMs can also operate on a more local level, namely the sequential environment of the
DM. That is, the utterances surrounding the utterance the contains the discourse marker. These often include more than the immediately adjacent segments. Deemed by Hansen to be of utmost importance, this local level has been given due attention in this corpus-based study, taking advantage of the concordancer’s ability to vary the length of context accompanying the node (the DM) or, if more context is needed, to give access to the source text by simply double-clicking the concordance line in question. Finally the microlevel refers to the level of the host utterance, that is, the utterance containing or hosting the discourse marker. According to Hansen, hearers could decide on a specific interpretation of a DM by simultaneously integrating information from all three levels, using mechanisms similar to those used in reading comprehension, like bottom-up and top-down processing.

Hansen’s hierarchy of levels is comparable to another important concept in DM research, namely scope. Scope “corresponds to the size of the portion of discourse” (Waltereit, 2006, p. 75) upon which a DM can act. DMs are known for their scope variability, that is, they can have scope over parts of discourse ranging from intraclausal units to complete turns comprised of several sentences. Other researchers (Lewis, 2006), however, are of the opinion that discourse segments are not syntactic but rather information structural. Lewis further points out that discourse relations imply a certain asymmetry between the related arguments: One argument is presented as more foregrounded or salient than the other. Thus DMs also fulfil an information structuring role, backgrounding or foregrounding their host segments (p. 47).

It may have been noted that the perspectives discussed thus far in this subsection assume that DMs relate units of discourse. Although DMs typically have a relational function, it is not invariably the case: Stance marking, it has been argued, does not involve a relating or linking function. The same is true for a number of other discourse marking devices, like interjections and feedback signals. On that view, the relating function as such can not be taken to be the defining characteristic of DMs.
2.6 The Concept of Integratedness

Not only is it important to identify the discourse units that discourse markers act upon, but also the degree to which DMs are integrated in these units. Proposed by Fischer (2006), integratedness is a dimension that can account for some of the heterogeneity of approaches to DMs. She identifies two opposite poles on a continuum. On one end, there are DMs that are highly integrated in their host utterances, such as connectives. On the other end, we find highly unintegrated DMs that can even constitute stand-alone utterances, like interjections. The degree of integratedness of a particular DM is determined not only at the syntactic level, but also at semantic and prosodic levels.

According to Fischer, DM researchers can be classified along the dimension of integratedness, with some focusing on integrated items, while others concentrating on unintegrated items. These choices have important implications for the types of DM functions observed by each group of researchers. Those who analyze integrated DMs focus more on the connecting, coherence-related functions. In contrast, linguists who study unintegrated DMs tend to address functions pertaining to conversation management, like turn taking and topic structure. Besides, these two groups diverge in the kind of data they work with. Analysts who study integrated DMs usually work with written texts, whereas analysts investigating unintegrated DMs are more interested in spoken language. Nevertheless, this integrated/unintegrated division is not absolute. Several scholars indeed study DMs from the two poles. What is more, a DM can be integrated or unintegrated depending on the context.

2.7 The Polyfunctionality of Discourse Markers

The relationship between the phonological/orthographic form of a DM and its different interpretations has been dealt with in various ways, which can be grouped under three major approaches: Monosemy, homonymy, and polysemy approaches (Fischer, 2006). In monosemic analyses
of DMs, a single core meaning is posited, and individual interpretations of a DM are, therefore, the result of pragmatic processes and not directly related to the item itself. “The burden of interpretation”, so to speak, is left to pragmatics (Hansen, 2006, p. 24). Within the monosemy approach, various models exist, which try to account for the various DM senses by identifying the mechanisms which relate the core invariant meaning to the different possible readings. For example, the model can provide a general mechanism through which a particular meaning is instantiated in context. Another model conceptualizes the core meaning as an abstract schematic representation and the different senses as richer and more fully specified instances of the core sense. In other words, “[t]he individual readings all contain the core component plus further specifications” (Fischer, 2006, p. 14).

The homonymy approach, on the other hand, stands in opposition to the monosemy approach. Here the different readings of a DM are conceived of as distinct meanings, without assuming any relationship between these meanings. Homonymy interpretations hardly exist in DM research. In between these two poles (i.e. monosemy and homonymy), there are numerous perspectives which can be grouped under the polysemy approach. In a polysemic interpretation, distinct DM meanings are acknowledged and are assumed to be related in one way or another. This relationship could be metaphorical, metonymic, or could apply to other conceptual or pragmatic domains. Researchers who favor the polysemy approach usually take a diachronic perspective to account for the functional variability of DMs.

According to Diana Lewis, a defendant of the diachronic approach, some discourse-marking expressions can split over time to the point of developing opposite senses. A case in point is the polysemous DM *in fact* which can be employed either to preface a reinforcement of an argument or to preface a refutation of an argument (2006, p. 51). Compared to monosemy, polysemy is more dynamic in that it
allows for the conventionalization of new senses of morphemes and constructions, based on
frequently occurring contextual modulations of situated occurrences. These new senses are
themselves subject to contextual modulations and subsequent conventionalization of the latter,
such that the most recently created sense of a given item may in principle be quite far removed
from the meaning of its ultimate diachronic origin (Hansen, 2006, p. 36).

In the case of discourse markers, the historic process described in the aforementioned quote has
been termed *pragmaticalization*. It is “the process by which a syntagma or word form, in a given
context, changes its propositional meaning in favor of an essentially metacommunicative, discourse
interactional meaning” (Frank-Job, 2006, p. 361). Frank-Job notes this phenomenon involves a process
of routinization which results in “formally detectable features” of discourse markers (Frank-Job, 2006,
p. 364). According to her, pragmaticalization of a linguistic item is accompanied by five formal
features: frequency, phonetic reduction, syntactic isolation, co-occurrence in contiguity, and deletion.

**Frequency.** Discourse markers have a much higher frequency of occurrence than the lexemes
from which they are derived. A well-known example is the English DM *well*, which is used
approximately every 150 words (Svartvik, 1980, p. 169). Another interesting feature of DMs, Frank-
Job observes, is its co-occurrence with other discourse markers. Using examples from Italian, she shows
that co-occurring DMs do not necessarily perform the same discoursal function. Similarly, Gülich
argues that amount of DMs co-occurring in a certain place correlates with the structural significance of
their place in the discourse.

**Phonetic reduction.** This is a natural consequence of frequency of use. The more frequent a
word is used, the more it loses of its phonetic bulk, resulting in reduced or weak forms.

**Syntactic isolation.** Turning our attention now to syntax, we observe that the notion of
syntactic isolation is analogous to Fischer's concept of unintegratedness (see Section 2.6). To illustrate
how DMs become syntactically isolated, Frank-Job discusses the Italian DM guarda, which is originally a transitive verb (meaning look!) requiring an accusative complement. As the verb evolves into a full-fledged discourse marker, it no longer requires an object.

**Co-occurrence in contiguity.** As discourse markers undergo a process of semantic bleaching, losing their original rich semantic meaning, they can still co-occur with their lexical source in the same linguistic context.

**Deletion.** As pointed out by Bazzanella (1990) and other authors, removing the DM should not alter the content of the utterance. By *content* here is meant the propositional or truth-conditional content.

After conducting extensive diachronic studies, Traugott and Dasher (2001) have identified unidirectional tendencies of semantic change, including the tendency for senses to become increasingly subjective. That is, forms indicating objective, ideational, external senses acquire subjective, speaker-based, internal senses in the course of time. However, once the change has taken place, both uses become synchronically available, and a discourse-marking item can even be used to “express simultaneously [emphasis added] both external and speaker-oriented relations” (Lewis, 2006, p. 49).

Lewis (2006) also observes that certain DMs are used *only* to mark speaker-oriented, attitudinal relations, like after all which can only preface the reason for the utterer's stance and can not signal an external causal link, whereas because can indicate both external and internal links. The existence of DMs that are “blocked for use” (Lewis, 2006, p. 50) in one domain and not the other is, according to Lewis, evidence against the monosomy model, which posits a single core meaning for a DM and regards the different interpretations as pragmatic side-effects of the contexts in which they occur. The single core model fails to explain the lack of “synchronic productivity” (Lewis, 2006, p. 50), lending support to the hypothesis that these differences (i.e. the observation that some DMs are domain-
dependent while others are not) are semantically, and not pragmatically, motivated.

2.8 Discourse Markers and the Turn Taking Organization

Discourse marker analysts differ greatly in the importance they ascribe to the turn taking system. Whereas Hansen (1998, pp. 113–128), for example, argues that DMs are too versatile to act upon formal units like the turn, thus excluding this level of analysis from the scope of DM coverage, Frank-Job claims that “the first and basic function of DMs lies on the level of the succession of turns” (Frank-Job, 2006, p. 372). Roulet (2006) agrees with Hansen that the turn taking system should be removed from the scope of DMs, not because DMs are too dynamic to act upon turns, but rather because turns are “ill defined” units (p. 117).

2.9 Response Tokens

Treated by several scholars as a subclass of discourse markers, response tokens (henceforth RT) are “conversational objects that indicate that a piece of talk by speaker [sic] has been registered by the recipient of that talk.” They claim that “talk by another has been heard, acknowledged, perhaps understood or agreed with or treated as news, or not news” (Gardner, 2001, p. 14). Listener response can be minimal or nonminimal. Minimal responses “satisfy the minimal requirements of acknowledging receipt, showing understanding of the incoming talk, and keeping the back-channel open.” They are “enough to maintain the economy and transactional efficiency of the talk” (McCarthy, 2003, p. 43). Notable examples of minimal responses include Yes/Yeah and Okay in English and ṭab and ṭayyeb in Egyptian Colloquial Arabic (ECA). Nonminimal response tokens, on the other hand, “do more than just acknowledge or confirm, and show engagement and interactional bonding with interlocutors (McCarthy, 2002, p. 49). To use McCarthy’s expression, nonminimal response tokens are yes-plus words. Examples would be That’s great!, wonderful!, and perfect! in English or Tamām!,...
According to O’Keeffe and Adolphs (2008, p. 16,17), RTs have four broad functions in casual conversation, as Table 1 shows:

Table 1 *Types of Response Tokens*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of token</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Typical examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuer tokens</strong></td>
<td>Maintain the flow of the discourse.</td>
<td>Minimal forms such as <em>Yeah, mm.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convergence tokens</strong></td>
<td>Markers of agreement/convergence. They are linked to points in the discourse:</td>
<td>Many forms can perform this function such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) where there is a topic boundary or closure</td>
<td><em>single word items: yeah</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) where there is a need to converge on an understanding of what is common ground or shared knowledge between participants.</td>
<td><em>follow-up questions such as did you?, is she?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>short statements, e.g. agreeing statements: yeah it's pretty sad.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement tokens</strong></td>
<td>Markers of high engagement where addressee(s) respond on an affective level to the content of the message. These backchannels express genuine emotional responses such as surprise, shock, horror, sympathy, empathy and so on.</td>
<td>They manifest in many forms for example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>single-word forms, such as excellent, absolutely</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>short statements, repetitions: that's nice, oh wow, oh really</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>follow-up questions: did you?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information receipt tokens</strong></td>
<td>Markers of points in the discourse where adequate information has been received. These responses can impose a boundary in the discourse and can signal a point of topic transition or closure, and they can be indicative of asymmetrical discourse.</td>
<td><em>Right and okay</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
O’Keeffe and Adolphs’ continuer tokens and information receipt tokens roughly correspond to McCarthy’s minimal response tokens, while convergence tokens and engagement tokens can be considered nonminimal tokens. RTs could be backchannels, like continuers, acknowledgments, and brief agreements, giving continuity to the speaker, or they could constitute full turns. However McCarthy (2003, p. 32) notes that backchannels and full turns should not be conceived of as distinct categories, but rather as parts of a continuum or cline, observing that in real conversations it is often hard to locate RTs on that cline.

For McCarthy, the locus of choice for RTs is the “all-important” turn-initial slot “where speakers first attend retrospectively to the previous turn before engaging with their own, incremental contribution” (2003, p. 35). This view is also shared by Gardner (2005, p. 1) who adds a further dimension or continuum along which RTs could be placed, namely speakership incipiency (SI). The dictionary Merriam-Webster defines incipient as beginning to develop or exist. As the name implies, speakership incipiency refers to the readiness to shift from listenership or passive recipiency to active speakership. For example, RTs like *Mm hm* and *Uh huh* have very low speakership incipiency, whereas tokens such as *Oh!* have very high speakership incipiency.

Gardner also makes a distinction between change-of-state tokens, like *Oh!* and change-of activity tokens, like *Okay*. By a change of state he means that *Oh!* is employed to signal that its utterer has undergone a change in his/her state of knowledge or awareness. In other words, *Oh!* marks the previous talk as something the *Oh!* utterer did not know. Change-of activity tokens, on the other hand, invite dialog partners to move on to a new activity or topic.

Response tokens, Gardner points out, are qualitatively different from “typical” discourse markers in that their functions in dialog “have less to do with an inherent semantics than with their sequential position” (2005, p. 1). That is, the meaning of an RT is derived from what has been said (i.e.
prior talk) and, to a certain extent, from what follows (i.e. incoming talk). By analyzing the sequential environment of RTs in dialogs, researchers, such as McCarthy (2003, p. 36), found that RTs not only occur in the second slot (i.e. response) of a two-part exchange, but also in the third slot of a three-part exchange, i.e. a follow-up move (in Conversation Analysis, the parallel term third-turn receipt is used). Follow-up moves are highly frequent, for example, in classroom interactions, whereby instructors respond to their pupils’ responses, acknowledging and evaluating them. McCarthy also observed that RTs tend to be used in particular contexts. For instance, he suggests that Fine is typically used in dialog to make arrangements or reach decisions, while Certainly usually occurs as a response to a request for a favor or service.

For Bangerter and Clark (2003, p. 195), people use dialog to navigate joint projects. These, in turn, require the coordination of two kinds of transitions: vertical transitions and horizontal transitions. By vertical transitions is meant the entering and exiting of joint projects, using response tokens (or project markers) like Okay and All right. Horizontal transitions, on the other hand, refer to the continuation within joint projects, employing RTs such as Uh-huh, M-hm and Yeah.

Finally, response tokens, like other discourse markers, can be classified into two broad types: external (other terms: objective, ideational, coherence-oriented) and internal (or subjective, attitudinal, speaker-oriented). Coherence-oriented RTs include, for example, information receipt tokens whose function is mostly organizational, marking boundaries in the unfolding discourse, like topic transitions and closures. Examples of speaker-oriented RTs, on the other hand, would include engagement tokens, like Wow!, Excellent!, That’s nice! where the listener or addressee responds to the speaker on an affective level, expressing genuine emotions, such as astonishment, shock, sympathy, etc.
CHAPTER 3—METHODOLOGY AND DATA

3.1 Research Design

This thesis is primarily a qualitative, exploratory study of discourse markers in Egyptian films with implications for the Arabic language classroom. The qualitative paradigm (qual) has been chosen for a number of reasons: First, it is more suitable for answering what questions. The Quantitative paradigm (quan), on the other hand, often seeks to answer why questions. Second, qual is characterized by verbal descriptions as its data, while quan is characterized by the use of numerical values to represent its data. It may be worthwhile mentioning here that discourse analysis as an academic discipline has always had a predilection for the qualitative paradigm. The third reason for choosing qual relates to sampling. Qual seeks to extract information from small purposeful samples, which is the case of the corpus used in this study, whereas quan uses representative sampling (applicable to large multi-million word corpora) for generalizing results to target populations. This, however, does not mean that this study does not use numbers or statistics. The corpus analysis software WordSmith Tools indeed offers highly useful numerical data for word frequencies, collocates, and clusters.

This study is exploratory in the sense that it attempts to find out what is happening without supporting or confirming any particular hypothesis. However, this does not exclude the possibility of developing a theoretical hypothesis as the data accumulate over time.

3.2 Data Collection

3.2.1 The Corpus

The corpus used in the study is a collection of seven Egyptian films. Table 1 provides the film titles, the dates of production, and the number of words for each film, as well as the word count for the
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whole collection. It is important to mention that the corpus is made of film transcripts, not film scripts because scripts are usually modified when they are performed on screen.

Table 1 Film Titles, Dates of Production, and Word Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date of production</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ċemāret Yaļqubyān</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>16,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baḥebb El-Sīma</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ārḍ El-ḥōf</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>5,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Kit Kāt</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>10,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Bedāya</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>10,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Karnak</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>15,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fī Baytinā Ragol</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>16,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>86,592</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In pragmatics research, there is often no need for a huge corpus. “A small ‘home-made’ corpus is often more valuable . . . because the researcher has access to all of the contextual details and, because of its size, it can be used qualitatively and quantitatively” (O’Keeffe et al., 2011, p. 28). The availability of audiovisual files for the seven Egyptian films and the familiarity of the researcher with their storylines have helped in contextualizing the usages of the discourse markers ba’ā, ṭayyeb, and ṭab.

Although the sample is one of convenience, an effort has been made to ensure that the best sample is selected. One “should not think that such studies [using convenience samples] have little value,” but, rather, one needs to “take the findings from such studies with the understanding that they need to be replicated with different samples” (Perry Jr, 2011, p. 67). Perry concludes that many studies
select their samples using convenience sampling (Perry Jr, 2011, p. 66). As for the sampling paradigm, this study uses purposeful sampling. All the films included in the study are \textit{information-rich cases}, containing large numbers of the discourse markers being sought (that is, \textit{ba'a}, \textit{ṭayyeb}, and \textit{ṭab}).

3.2.2 The Authenticity of Film Language

Despite their drawbacks (see Limitations of the Study), films are still an important resource in the language classroom and “a valuable tool for the study of linguistic forms that describe a speech community” (Mestre de Caro, 2013). Films can also be appraised from the perspective of \textit{authenticity}. Nunan defines authentic materials as “spoken or written language data that has been produced in the course of genuine communication and not specifically for purposes of language teaching” (Nunan, 1999, p. 54). Examples of these materials include films, fiction, and songs. This view is echoed by Taylor (1994). In the same vein, Gilmore defines authentic language input as the language produced by “a real speaker/writer for a real audience, conveying a real message” (Gilmore, 2007, p. 98).

As a source of authentic language input, films have also been investigated by other scholars (Chapple & Curtis, 2000; Gebhardt, 2004; Heffernan, 2005; Ryan, 1998). Chapple and Curtis (2000) emphasized how intrinsically motivating language materials like films can greatly improve language learning. Although their emphases are slightly different, Ryan (1998), Gebhardt (2004), and Heffernan (2005) also call attention to the importance of films in enhancing learner motivation. Furthermore, the “rich narrative structure and visual context provided by . . . films help the learner to form a deep understanding of the language to be learnt and its culture” (Underwood, 2002, p. 7). Yet, Underwood believes that mere exposure to films is not enough for language acquisition. Key linguistic features (grammatical, lexical, discursive) should be made salient to the learner. Through films, language learners can see how native speakers interact in real life in various conversational contexts (Seferoğlu,
Films indeed “help bring the outside world into the classroom” (Tomalin, 1986, p. 9).

Still it may be argued that screen dialogs are written texts, and thus are not good representatives of natural spoken language. To test this hypothesis, Rodríguez Martín (2010) conducted a corpus-based study in which he compared conversational structures and processes in the British National Corpus (BNC) and a micro-corpus of film scripts. After creating three frequency lists, one for the film corpus, and two for the spoken and written components of the BNC, he compared the 50 most frequent items in each list. The comparison showed that the 50 top items in the film corpus are more similar to the spoken than to the written component of the BNC. Martín then concluded that the language of screen dialog is closer to natural conversations than to the written register.

### 3.2.3 Discourse Markers in Films Versus Naturally Occurring Language

Although film language differs from real spontaneous conversations in a number of important aspects, this does not seem to be the case for discourse markers. This conclusion is based on negative evidence from a study by Maria-Josep Cuenca (2008), published in the *Journal of Pragmatics*, in which she analyzes the occurrences of well in the film *Four Weddings and a Funeral*. In her conclusion, she points out that “[t]he analysis of ‘well’ in the film . . . supports several conclusions, which either confirm or challenge certain hypotheses about ‘well’ found in the literature” (Cuenca, 2008, p. 1388). The literature Cuenca refers to is a large collection of studies whose data are largely drawn from corpora of naturally occurring language. Even though Cuenca uses a corpus of film language, she does not shy away from generalizing her conclusions to spoken language as a whole. And this is also reflected in her general title “Pragmatic markers in contrast: The case of ‘well’”. Throughout her article, she never alludes to differences between film language and natural language. This seems to imply that discourse markers do not behave differently in film. Perhaps even more striking in Cuenca's
study is her relatively small sample size (a single film). She states that *Four Weddings and a Funeral* was selected “because it includes a great quantity and variety of discourse markers”, which clearly indicates that she uses the purposeful sampling paradigm.

However, unlike *Four Weddings and a Funeral*, which is a relatively recent film, some of the films explored in this study were produced in the seventies or even the sixties, which could undermine their representativeness, as language can become outdated over time. Nevertheless, DMs are relatively resistant to language change, since they belong more to the grammar than the lexicon, after they evolved from content words to become function words through a long process of grammaticalization. And as demonstrated by diachronic studies, grammatical items, or *closed-class* words, are more immune to change than lexical items, or *open-class* words.

Still, it would have been useful to compare this corpus of Egyptian films to a corpus of naturally occurring language. Unfortunately, ECA corpora hardly exist. Only two corpora (owned by the University of Pennsylvania) can be found on the internet: CALLHOME Egyptian Arabic Speech and CALLFRIEND Egyptian Arabic.

However, these corpora have a number of disadvantages:

1) They consist solely of telephone conversations, a very particular register of spoken language that can not be said to represent Egyptian Colloquial Arabic as a whole.

2) The language could be outdated: The calls have been recorded in 1996 and 1997, and thus can no longer reflect the way people talk on the telephone now. “As telephone technology changes with the addition of screening systems and answering devices it will be interesting to see how calls are managed to reflect these new ways of answering the telephone” (Wardhaugh, 2006, p. 300).
3) Interaction takes place within a restricted social circle: Most participants called family members or close friends.

4) All calls originated in North America. Although the corpus includes speaker information, like sex, age, and education, there is no documentation of the number of years the caller spent in North America. Long-term exposure to a foreign language could undermine native speaker status.

3.3 Data Analysis Tools

3.3.1 The Corpus Tool

WordSmith Tools is a collection of corpus linguistics tools for looking for patterns in a language. The software was devised by Mike Scott at the University of Liverpool. The tools include a concordancer, word-listing facilities, a tool for computing the keywords of a text or genre, and a series of other utilities.

3.3.2 Major Features of WordSmith Tools

Concordancer is a computer program that automatically constructs a concordance. Concordances are also used in corpus linguistics to retrieve alphabetically or otherwise sorted lists of linguistic data from the corpus in question, which the corpus linguist then analyzes.

Word frequency list is a sorted list of words together with their frequency, where frequency here usually means the number of occurrences in a given corpus.

Keywords can be identified as words which appear with statistically unusual frequency in a text or a corpus of texts; as such they are identified by software by comparing a word-list of the text in question with a word-list based on a larger reference corpus. A suitable term for the phenomenon is keyness.
The Type/token ratio (TTR) is a measure of vocabulary variation within a written text or a person’s speech. It is shown to be a helpful measure of lexical variety within a text. The number of words in a text is often referred to as the number of tokens. However, several of these tokens are repeated. The number of types is, instead, the number of single different words regardless of their frequency. The relationship between the number of types and the number of tokens is known as the type/token ratio. The more types there are in comparison to the number of tokens, the more varied is the vocabulary.

Lexical density is a useful measure of the difference between texts. To calculate it we must distinguish between lexical (the so-called content or information-carrying) words and function words (those words which bind together a text). It is shown to be a useful measure of how much information is contained within a text.

3.4 Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

3.4.1 Searching the Corpus

Of all the tools offered by WordSmith, the concordancer proved to be the most useful in analyzing the data. Although the other tools are frequently used in corpus-based studies, they were irrelevant to the purposes of this study. For example, there was no need to make use of the Word Frequency List program or to calculate the type/token ration or measure lexical density, since the study focuses on a particular set of words, and not on the type of vocabulary used in films in general. Similarly, there was no point in identifying the keywords of film language, since the goal of the study was not to characterize the language of screen dialog as a genre by comparing it to a reference text or genre.

Using the WordSmith concordancer Concord, I specify a particular DM, which the program will seek in all the text files (the film scripts) I have chosen. It will then present a concordance display, and give
access to information about collocates of the DM, dispersion plots showing where the search word
came in each file, cluster analyses showing repeated clusters of words (phrases) etc. The point of a
concordance is to be able to see lots of examples of a word or phrase, in their contexts. The
concordance line may come from the beginning, the middle or the end of one of the texts. It may be
made up of one sentence, part of a sentence or part of two sentences. Each concordance line in a set
includes the target word, i.e. the DM. The target word is always in the middle of the concordance line.
This means that when the DM is studied in a set of concordance lines, the immediate context can be
seen, i.e. the words which are used before it and after it.

Important patterns can also be revealed by using the sorting options of the concordancer. Sorting can be
done simply by pressing the top row of any list. The point of sorting is to find characteristic patterns. It
can be hard to see overall trends in the concordance lines, especially if there are lots of them. By
sorting them one can separate out multiple search words and examine the immediate context to left and
right. Sorting is done alphabetically by a given number of words to the left or right of the search word
(L1 [=1 word to the left of the search word], L2, L3, L4, L5, R1 [=1 to the right], R2, R3, R4, R5). For
example, the following pattern ( ba’a preceded by first and second person pronouns) could only be
discovered by sorting R1, that is, one word to the right of ba’a. As will be discussed later, this
structural pattern turn out to be functionally significant:
3.4.2 Sampling

The sampling process was simple and straightforward. Since the corpus is relatively small, all the tokens of *ba'a*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab* were examined. *ba'a* occurred 294 times, *ṭayyeb* 104 times, and *ṭab* 175 times. After eliminating the verb *ba'a*, the adjective *ṭayyeb*, and the noun *ṭebb*, the DMs were thoroughly studied. These amounted to 261 instances for *ba'a*, 96 for *ṭayyeb*, and 171 for *ṭab*.

3.4.3 Analysis
To study the syntactic behavior of *ba’a, tayyeb*, and *tab*, like their different positions in the clause or their occurrence in different sentence types, it was safe to rely solely on concordance lines, since it is easy to determine these syntactic features in the immediate textual context surrounding the discourse markers. Collocations, on the other hand, were identified automatically using the collocates tab of Concord, as shown in the Figure 2:

*Figure 2. ba’a collocates in Concord*

For example, the figure shows that the word *ya* (number 2 in the list) collocates with *ba’a* 47 times in seven different texts. In 37 instances, *ya* appears to the left of *ba’a*, while only ten instances appear to
To explore the functions of the three ECA DMs, the concordance lines were often insufficient, and the source files (the film script) were regularly consulted. This was simply done by clicking the title of the film, as shown in Figure 3, in the rightmost column:

![Figure 3. Film titles (rightmost column) in Concord](image)

Checking the source files was especially important to determine the role of a DM in interpersonal management, like signaling speaker attitudes and feelings or expressing politeness. To identify these functions, it is usually necessary to understand the larger social context, like speaker roles and social positions. In very rare cases, the audiovisual files were examined, especially when punctuation in the script contradicted with the context. For instance, sometimes a full stop was used when it made more sense to use a question mark, and vice versa. In these cases, it helped to listen to the utterance and examine its intonation to judge whether it is a declarative or interrogative sentence.
CHAPTER 4—RESULTS

In this chapter, ba'a, ṭayyeb, and ṭab are analyzed in terms of their raw frequencies in the corpus, the different functions they fulfill, namely their role in coherence, interpersonal management, and in speech act marking. Their syntactic properties are subsequently examined, namely their position in the clause and their occurrence in different sentence types. Finally, the collocational behavior of ba'a, ṭayyeb, and ṭab is explored, and the interaction between DM function and syntax is investigated.

4.1 The Discourse Marker ba'a

4.1.1 Raw Frequency

Out of a total of 294 instances of ba'a tokens in our film corpus, only 33 qualified as verbs while 261 were recruited for discourse marking. That is, the DM was nearly eight times as frequent as the lexeme. (Note: Due to space restrictions, the tables in the Results section will generally present only frequencies and percentages. For tables containing full listings of DM occurrences, see the Appendix.)

4.1.2 The Formal and Semantic Features of the Verb ba'a

The formal features of the DM ba'a can never be fully understood without examining, albeit briefly, the formal properties of the lexeme from which it derives. The lexeme ba'a is a past tense transitive verb, which inflects for person, gender, number, and tense. Semantically, the verb ba'a has the following senses and subsenses, according to A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic (Badawi & Hinds, p. 91). (The dictionary also provides examples to illustrate the different meanings):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to be</td>
<td>دا بقى جوزك؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a to become</td>
<td>حبلى دكتور إن شاء الله</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.3 Functions of the Discourse Marker *ba'a*

The DM *ba'a* is assigned two meanings (or sets of meanings) by *A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic* (Badawi & Hinds, p. 92):

In the following subsections, and based on an in-depth corpus analysis, the different functions of *ba'a* are discussed and compared to the dictionary definitions.

4.1.3.1 *ba'a* and coherence

*Marking contrast.* As can be seen in example (1), a relation of contrast is flagged by *ba'a.* The
speaker's preference for the actress Yousra is contrasted with her sisters' preference for the actress Nadia El Gendi:

(1) بتَهَبَب نَادِيَا الْجَنِّدِيَةِ؟ إِخْوَاتِي يِبِحُوُوا، بَسْ أَنَا يِبِحُ بَسْرَا.

Do you like Nadia El Gendi? My sisters like her, but I DM like Yousra.

It could be argued, however, that the contrastive relation is signaled by *bass*, not *ba'a*. In this example, the contrast may well be attributable, at least in part, to the marker *bass*. However, the picture is more complex than this single example would suggest. While interrogating the corpus and hunting for patterns, I noted that a general discourse-marking function, like signaling contrast, can interact with a specific pattern to yield a more specified sub-function, as shown in the following concordance lines:

*Figure 1.* clause-medial *ba'a* preceded by the first-person singular pronoun

Looking at these lines, we can observe that *ba'a* is clause-medial and is preceded by the first-person singular pronoun. A more in-depth analysis of these discourse segments in their larger context revealed a specific type of contrast. In all these examples, the speaker wants to convey a contrast or difference between *him-* or *herself* and the *rest of the group* of which he/she is part. Note also that in lines 72, 76, and 77, the contrastive marker *bass* is lacking; hence the contrast must be signaled by *ba'a*.

Interestingly, this pattern could equally be linked, at least indirectly or metaphorically, to the *conclusion* function: The speaker waits until the other views are expressed before concluding with his/her own view.
The contrastive function of *ba'a* is also evident in its collocational behavior. As seen in the concordance lines, *ba'a* collocates with contrastive particles, such as *amma*, *bass*, *lāken*, *ennama*, and *ğēr*:

![Figure 2. Contrastive particle *amma* collocates with *ba'a*](image)

![Figure 3. Contrastive particle *bass* collocates with *ba'a*](image)

![Figure 4. Contrastive particle *lāken* collocates with *ba'a*](image)
Figure 5. Contrastive particle *ennama* collocates with *ba'a*

Figure 6. Contrastive particle *ğēr* collocates with *ba'a*

The function of *ba'a* as a marker of contrast roughly corresponds to its second meaning in *A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic*, i.e. however, on the other hand.

**Marking the end of an encounter.** *ba'a* can mark the end of a conversation, as seen in Figure 7:
Marking a conclusion. *ba’a* marks its host utterance as a conclusion to a premise in the preceding discourse. In other words, the prior discourse is laying out some background information (ideas, actions, events, etc.) on which the concluding sequence is based. In the following examples, this background information is underlined to highlight the conclusion function of *ba’a*. In example (2), the utterance hosting *ba’a* is perceived as cohering with an element of the anterior discourse. Succinctly put, *ba’a* can be rephrased as “in conclusion”: *You have heart valve disease. In conclusion, stop eating fatty food:*

(2)  
\[ \text{\(\text{ba’a}\) marking the end of an encounter} \]

You have heart valve disease. Stop DM eating fatty food.

Likewise, the sequence in (3) exemplifies how *ba’a* can make an utterance appear optimally coherent by marking a concluding relation. In the discourse prior to *ba’a*, background information is laid out. The speaker tells his addressee she is a true artist, since her painting has been sold. *In conclusion, she should continue painting:*

(3)  
\[ \text{\(\text{ba’a}\) marking the end of an encounter} \]

None of my paintings have been sold. Yours is the only one that’s been sold. Didn’t I tell you you’re an artist? Keep drawing DM.
In example (4), the speaker uses *ba’a* to mark the logical relationship between breaking a promise and assuming responsibility for that action:

\[(4) \quad \text{كَانَ فِيهِ اتفاقيَّةَ مَا بَكِمْ وَانَتىَ خَالفتِهِ.} \quad \text{كل واحد في الدنيا بَيَّ بِتَحمِل نتِيَّةَ غَلُطتِهِ.}
\]

\[\text{كَانَ فِيهِ اتفاقيَّةَ مَا بَكِمْ وَانَتىَ خَالفتِهِ.}
\]

You broke your promise. You must accept the consequences of your actions *DM*.

The view that DMs are optional, redundant, or nonobligatory collides with empirical evidence from our film corpus. Looking at example (5), we can see how DMs actively create meaning:

\[(5) \quad \text{حَبُ السِّيِّمَا حَبُ السِّيِّمَا حَبُ السِّيِّمَا حَبُ السِّيِّمَا حَبُ السِّيِّمَا حَبُ السِّيِّمَا}
\]

\[\text{حب السِّيِّمَا حَبُ السِّيِّمَا حَبُ السِّيِّمَا حَبُ السِّيِّمَا حَبُ السِّيِّمَا حَبُ السِّيِّمَا}
\]

In the aforementioned example, *ba’a creates* a premise-conclusion relation between the host utterance and previous discourse. The caller intends the grandmother to make the following inference: Since she now knows that old women turn him on, she should therefore yield to his demand and tell him the color of her nightgown. By omitting *ba’a*, the intended interpretation is potentially altered or lost. Without the marker, the utterance seems to simply signal a change of topic. The caller shifts from talking about his lust for old women to asking about the color of the grandmother’s nightgown, with no apparent connection between the two topics. Hence optionality or redundancy is by no means a defining feature of DMs, as some scholars would suggest.

Examples of *ba’a* as a marker of conclusion abound in the corpus:
The concluding function of *ba’a* roughly matches its first meaning in Badawi and Hind’s dictionary, i.e. *so, then, now*. It should be noted, however, that *now* here is not to be understood in its literal temporal sense. Otherwise its co-occurrence with the word *تَدْرَضْ*، as in Figure 9, would be
redundant:

Figure 9. ba’\(a\) co-occurring with \textit{delwa’i} (now)

\(ba’\(a\)\) can mean \textit{now} in a nontemporal sense that can be rendered as \textit{based on prior discourse} or \textit{under the present circumstances}, which convey a \textit{conclusion} sense. This usage is exemplified in (6), in which a police officer interrogates a man, saying:

(6) 
في بيتنا رجل الد방 توقف بقى يا إبراهيم أفاضي .. أما أقولك يا حبيبي إنت حنتكلم حنتكلم 
\(šūf\) \(ba’\(a\)\) يا \textit{ibrahīm} \textit{afandi}. \textit{Lamma a’ollak enta ḥatetkallem ḥatetkallem.}
Look \textit{DM} (Now look), Mr \textit{Ibrahim}. When I order you to speak, you must speak.

Just as \textit{now} collocates with the verb \textit{look} in English, \(ba’\(a\)\) collocates with the verbs \textit{boṣṣ} and \textit{šūf}:

Figure 10. \(ba’\(a\)\) collocating with the verb \textit{boṣṣ}

Figure 11. \(ba’\(a\)\) collocating with the verb \textit{šūf}

Similarly, as English \textit{now} collocates with \textit{listen}, \(ba’\(a\)\) collocates with \textit{esmaʕ}:

Figure 12. \(ba’\(a\)\) collocating with the verb \textit{esmaʕ}

\textit{Role in turn-taking}. Contrary to the DMs \textit{ṭayyeb} and \textit{ṭab}, \(ba’\(a\)\) does not seem to operate on the
level of turn taking. *ba‘a* apparently does not play a central role in the dynamics of turn taking, as it is not used in backchanneling (i.e. non-turn-claiming talk), turn taking, turn holding, or turn quitting. Unlike *tayyeb*, it does not seem to indicate the moment when a change in turn is appropriate. Neither does it serve as a signal to open or close a conversation or to introduce a new thematic segment.

### 4.1.3.2 *ba‘a* and interpersonal management

**Affective stance.** Another salient function of *ba‘a* is to signal affective stance. That is, the marker conveys a subjective attitudinal meaning. English *Well*, for instance, can signal reluctance, resignation, or disappointment (Aijmer, 2013, pp. 14, 15). In the corpus data, *ba‘a* can mark the end of patience. The prior context usually involves building up of anger or irritation, until the speaker can not stand it anymore and “explodes” using *ba‘a*, as exemplified in (7) and (8). This “explosive” *ba‘a* self evidently carries a lot of intonation:

(7) 
\[ \begin{aligned} 
\text{Bass bass *ba‘a* fala‘tūni ḥarām ẁālēku!} \\
\text{Stop it! Stop it DM! I've had enough!} 
\end{aligned} \]

(8) 
\[ \begin{aligned} 
\text{Yalla oḥrog oḥrog *ba‘a*!} \\
\text{Get out! Get out DM!} 
\end{aligned} \]

The end of patience function is evidenced in sufficient quantity in our film corpus:
Some of the more common chunks associated with the **end of patience** meaning include *we ba'dēn ba'a!, we ba'dēn mašāk ba'a!, bass ba'a!, ḥalāṣ ba'a, kefāya ba'a!, and yōh ba'a!.*

The affinity between *ba'a* and the concept of END, as in **end of an encounter** or **end of patience**, is also reflected in *ba'a*’s collocational behavior. *Ba'a* has been shown to collocate with words conceptually related to END, such as *ḥalāṣ* and *kefāya*:

---

**Figure 13. ba'a marking the end of patience**

---

**Figure 14. ba'a collocating with ḥalāṣ**
Figure 15. *ba'a* collocating with *kefāya*

Apart from expressing impatience, *ba'a* can also express *surprise or sarcasm*, thus marking personal involvement, though in a different way. This particular affective overtone, however, is only associated with utterance-initial position. Furthermore, the host utterance must be an interrogative sentence, which often consists of two contrasting propositions. In example (9), the speaker expresses both incredulity and irony at the idea of letting a single person live in a palace, while all the others are to sleep in a little hut:

\[(9)\]

\[بؼكمؼامسفؾمإغتمغػرمظقحدهمؼـامممظماظؼصرمدهمواحـامغـامممظماظعشة؟\]

*DM* you pig, a single person sleeps in that palace, and all of us are supposed to sleep in this hut?!

In example (10), a mother expresses her disbelief at her husband’s rejection of a physician who sought to marry their daughter, while giving her away to a rogue:

\[(10)\]

\[في بینا رجل الأم بقی يا عجل انْت لوحده بنام في القصر ده واحنا ننام في العئة؟\]

*DM* we rejected a doctor who wanted to marry her (our daughter), and we give her away to that scoundrel?!

Other examples retrieved by the concordancer include:
Two of the well-known *ba'a* chunks that have this pattern are *ba'a da'smu kalām?* and *ba'a keda?*. A frequent frame also associated with this pattern is *ba'a enta* (word designating a positive quality) *enta*?. For example, *ba'a enta rāgel enta*?

According to El Shimi (1992), *yafni* can also signal sarcasm (p. 30), but whereas *yafni* disguises the sarcastic tone of the utterance, *ba'a* foregrounds it.

**Politeness.** Politeness is one of the three parameters (along with coherence and involvement) used by Aijmer (2013) to analyze discourse markers. Some of the *ba'a* examples returned by the corpus software can be included under the rubric of politeness. In the following exchange (11), *ba'a* mitigates
the strength of its host utterance:

\[(11) \quad \text{ana bəsarə́ha nəwət enni astəğell el-məhall}
\]
I've decided to make use of the shop.

\[\text{testəğellu fi ēh ba'ə?}
\]
How are you going to make use of it DM (if I may ask)?

A simple omission test highlights the face-saving, attenuator function of *ba'a*, without which the statement is potentially face-threatening. *ba'a* can thus be used strategically to take the sharpness from utterances.

### 4.1.3.3 Frequencies of *ba'a* across discourse-marking functions

Table 3 *Frequencies of ba'a across Discourse-Marking Functions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Encounter</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Management</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Patience</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise or Sarcasm</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.1.3.4 *ba'a* and speech acts

Different definitions and classifications exist for speech acts. The following classification by Searle (1975) has been adopted in this analysis:

Table 1 *Speech Act Types*
**Assertives**
Speech acts that commit a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, e.g. reciting a creed.

**Directives**
Speech acts that are to cause the hearer to take a particular action, e.g. requests, commands and advice.

**Commissives**
Speech acts that commit a speaker to some future action, e.g. promises and oaths.

**Expressives**
Speech acts that express the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards the proposition, e.g. congratulations, excuses and thanks.

**Declarations**
Speech acts that change the reality in accord with the proposition of the declaration, e.g. baptisms, pronouncing someone guilty or pronouncing someone husband and wife.

A speech act constitutes a unit of discourse upon which a discourse marker can act (Bazzanella, 2006; Diewald, 2006; Frank-Job, 2006; Fraser, 2006; Hansen, 2006; Rossari, 2006; Schiffrin, 1988; Sweester, 1990; Zeevat, 2005). Table 2 presents the frequencies and percentages of *ba'a* in various speech act classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech act type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertives</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissives</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One occurrence of *bn* in *El-Bedāya* could not be classified because the speaker is interrupted before he performs his speech act.

It must be noted that speech acts do not map onto sentence types. In particular, directives do not map onto imperatives, nor assertives onto declaratives. Likewise the speech act of asking (a subclass of directives) does not correspond to the grammatical class of interrogatives. For example, in *El-Karnak*
one of the characters impatiently tries to unlock his car saying لفتحي بفي. Although he uses the imperative form, he could not be ordering his car to be unlocked, but rather expressing his impatience and frustration. Thus although uttered in the imperative, this speech act has been classified as an expressive, not a directive. Similarly, in El-Bedāya, Şâdel responds to Amāl's view that love is the most important thing in the world by saying وأبه فابلة الحب يفي واحنا محبوسين زي العبيد. Although this utterance is expressed using the interrogative, it does not constitute an act of asking, as the speaker is not requesting information he does not know, but rather asserting that love is useless when one is imprisoned like a slave. It has, therefore, been classified as an assertive.

The DM ba'a can either strengthen or modify the illocutionary force of a speech act. When ba'a accompanies an expressive act, as in بويوه بفي، it strengthens the emotion expressed by بويوه بفي، but when it accompanies a directive act as in اعمل حاجة بفي، it modifies the illocutionary force of the statement by adding an expressive dimension (impatience, irritability, nervousness) to the order Do something. Unlike with expressive speech acts, where ba'a merely intensifies the act, in directive, assertive, and commissive speech acts, ba'a can form a completely independent speech act, namely an expressive one.

4.1.4 ba'a in Different Clause Positions

Table 4 Frequencies of ba'a in Different Clause Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Initial</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Medial</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Final</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4 reveals, there is a clear predilection for clause-final and clause-medial positions,
compared to only 5% of *ba'a* occurring clause-initially. The clause-initial *ba'a*, however, is associated with a very specific pattern. The DM is nearly always followed by a question consisting of two contrasting propositions, as shown in example (12):

\[
\text{بدأية سليم} \quad \text{بقب يا خجل إنت نفر وحده بنام في القصر وده واحنا نانم في الله!!}
\]

*ba'a* ya segl ena nafar lewahdu yenām fel-āṣr da, wehna nenām fel-ṣešša?! DM you pig, a single person sleeps in that palace, and all of us are supposed to sleep in this hut?!

Table 5 *Interaction between ba'a Function and Position in the Clause*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Initial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Medial</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Final</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of Encounter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Initial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Medial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Final</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Initial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Medial</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Final</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of Patience</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Initial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Medial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Final</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surprise or Sarcasm</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Initial</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clause-Medial 0
Clause-Final 0

**Politeness**

Clause-Initial 0
Clause-Medial 10
Clause-Final 8

4.1.5 *ba'a* in Different Sentence Types

Table 6 below summarizes the frequencies of *ba'a* in declaratives, interrogatives, and imperatives. As the numbers show, *ba'a* is most frequent in declarative sentences, with roughly equal distributions in interrogative and imperative sentences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 *Interaction between ba'a Function and Sentence Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of Encounter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Imperative

Conclusion
Declarative
Interrogative
Imperative

End of Patience
Declarative
Interrogative
Imperative

Surprise or Sarcasm
Declarative
Interrogative
Imperative

Politeness
Declarative
Interrogative
Imperative

4.1.6 ba'a 's Collocates

ba'a’s most frequent collocate is the vocative ya (47 times), usually occurring after the discourse marker (37 times), as shown in the following WordSmith screenshot:
Figure 17. *ba'a* collocating with the vocative *ya*

The second most frequent collocate is the first person singular pronoun *ana* (33 times), occurring mostly before the discourse marker (22 times), as seen in the following WordSmith screenshot:

*Figure 18. *ba'a* collocating with the first person singular pronoun *ana***

Other frequent collocates include the demonstrative *da* (30 times), the second person pronoun *enta* (24 times), the negation particle *meš* (24 times), and the interrogative *ēh* (17 times). Finally, although less frequently, *ba'a* also collocated with the discourse marker *ṭab* 12 times (7 times before and 5 times after).
4.2 The Discourse Marker ṭayyeb

4.2.1 Raw Frequency

ṭayyeb occurred 104 times, only eight of which were adjectives, while 96 were discourse markers.

4.2.2 The Formal and Semantic Features of the Adjective ṭayyeb

Before discussing the formal features of the DM ṭab, it is important to examine briefly the lexeme from which it is derived, namely the adjective ṭayyeb. Like other adjectives, ṭayyeb inflects for gender (ṭayyeba) and number (ṭayyebīn). Phonetically, it has two syllables ṭay and yeb. Having a semivowel [y] (rather than a consonant) in the middle of ṭayyeb possibly made it easy to eventually drop the [yyi], yielding the form ṭab, as will be explained in the next subsection. Semantically, the adjective ṭayyeb has the following senses and subsenses, according to A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic (Badawi & Hinds, p. 553):

ṭayyib¹ /adj⁴/ ¹ good-hearted, kind. raاغيل ṭayyib a good man.  fitteṭayyib marriiteg 7αβιτ [prov] he who is excessively kind is a fool. mًا-lak-f⁴  fitteṭayyib nاشیب you don’t have what it takes to mix with the good (people). ² naive. ³ [frozen contexts] good, excellent. kull⁴ sana wi-nτa ṭayyib ≃ may the reoccurrence of this day, or occasion, find you well (a greeting on all annually celebrated occasions). 人身 ṭayyibiin a good sum of money. fiwayya ṭayyiba or fiwayya ṭayyibiin (1) a good while. (2) a good quantity. ²/Zeet ṭayyib olive oil. - 7ιl-غافτα ṭayyiba (points-winning) ten of diamonds in koomi (q.v.). - /n, no pl/ ⁴ good turn(s), good deed(s). ⁵gíμi ɪ[t]ayyib wi-rmii l-bahır [prov] ≃ do good deeds for their own sake. - /adv/ ⁵ well. ⁶/امالـ ṭayyib you’ve done well. - /interj/ ⁶ all right! O.K.! see further under ¹ طب
Strictly speaking, only the first three senses should be taken as adjectival meanings. In 4, *ṭayyeb* is used as a noun; in 5, as an adverb; in 6, as a discourse marker.

### 4.2.3 Functions of the Discourse Marker *ṭayyeb*

*A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic* (Badawi & Hinds, p. 553, 529) defines the DM *ṭayyeb* as follows:

**ṭayyib /ɪntr/** all right! O.K.!

#### 4.2.3.1 Coherence (Role in turn-taking)

**Second and third moves**

As an *information receipt token*, *ṭayyeb* can be used by listeners to merely acknowledge the reception of incoming talk, without signaling convergence or agreement, as illustrated by the following examples:

(13) 
البداية، مجدي طيب، الكائن.

(14) 
البداية، صالح طيب، إديك يبقى على يومية.

As the examples show, *ṭayyeb* (stand-alone and turn-initial) can function as information receipt tokens, occurring in the second slot of a two-part exchange. In other words, they act as “an appropriate second pair part in an adjacency pair” (McCarthy, 2003, p. 43). In the following extracts, *ṭayyeb* (stand-alone and turn-initial) occur in the third slot of a three-part exchange, that is, as *follow-ups or third-turn receipts*:

(15) 
الكبد كات، أم حسن، عاوز حاجة؟
Empirical evidence from the corpus suggests that *ṭayyeb* is a *change-of-activity* token (Gardner, 2005, p. 1), frequently used for *vertical transitions*, that is, the entering and exiting of joint projects (conversations or topics), and is never employed for *horizontal transitions*, that is, enabling interlocutors to carry on with their current project. In other words, the *ṭayyeb* speaker signals that he or she is ready to take the floor. Indeed scholars have coined the term *speakership incipiency* (SI) to designate the readiness to shift from listenership or passive recipiency to active speakership, and response tokens have been shown to exhibit varying degrees of SI. For example, the RT *ṭab* has an extremely high speakership incipiency, as evidenced in the corpus by the fact that *ṭab* is *always* immediately followed by further talk (i.e. SI = 100%). Compared to *ṭab*, *ṭayyeb* has low speakership incipiency, since it can constitute a complete utterance, indicating that the speaker has nothing more to say. Although a very rough estimate, *ṭayyeb’s* SI can be measured by dividing those occurrences of *ṭayyeb* which are not followed by full stops (i.e. turn-initial *ṭayyeb*) by the total number of *ṭayyeb* occurrences: \( \frac{40}{96} \times 100 = 42\% \). Taken together, however, *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab* have an SI of 79%, which is relatively high.

Having pointed out that *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab* are used for vertical transitions, into and out of joint projects, it appears from the corpus analysis that stand-alone *ṭayyeb* can only signal transitions *out of* such projects, while turn-initial *ṭayyeb* has been found to mark transitions *both* into and out of joint projects.
Free-standing tayyeb and transition out of projects

When tayyeb stands alone, it occurs near the end of the conversation, proposing a readiness to end the exchange. The following are examples of free-standing tayyeb as a (pre-)closing device, used for exiting the main body of the conversation:

(17) 

الكتبت كات حني حني 
حتى هرم 
حسني طيب. 
عم فضلك. 
حسني سلام عليكم. 
فصحنام سلام ورحمة الله. 

(18) 

الكرنك أبو حلمي إسماعيل 
ابن مش تقعدوا تعيشوا معنا؟ 
أبوجي بلال والديي مستقبلي 
طيب. وتصبحوا على خير 
أبوجي باحتمال 
هند من أهله 

Turn-initial tayyeb and transition into and out of projects

In the following extracts, turn-initial tayyeb functions as a transition device out of joint projects, inviting the closure of a conversation:

(19) 

في بيننا رجل طالب 
ما تقولوا لنا إنتما تبعدوها على مين 
النظام تتالف إللي ساكن قصادك؟ 
الشيخ تلعت أبو العينين 
طيب خليات إنتما هنا .. تعالوا إنتما معايا
In examples (21), (22), and (23), turn-initial *tayyeb* navigates the transition *into* a joint project, inviting conversationalists to move on to a new topic:

### 4.2.3.2 Interpersonal management

**Giving consent.** Dialog partners often rely on *tayyeb* for giving consent to a joint arrangement.

In the following examples, recipients rely on *tayyeb* to give consent to a joint agreement:
Mitigating a directive act. Empirical evidence shows a remarkable affinity between the RT "tayyeb" and directive speech acts: 64% of speech acts following turn-initial "tayyeb" were directives.

Threatening. In the following fragments, "tayyeb" is used to perform the commissive speech act of threatening or vowing to retaliate:

(28) انتهُ كات. هرم. الناس بتنكلم. يقَالوا إنه حبِيَة الابن ونبِيَة عمارة. خالص.
خلصت التحقيق بشيخ حسن؟ قول لي. عاوز حاجة ثاني؟
حسن
أه، عاوز. عندك ألف جنيه سلف يا هرم
هل؟
حرم
حسن
طيب. طيب يا هرم. سلام عليكم.

(29) أنزل فين؟ أنزل فين؟ أنا ما راحشي حنة مانشي عارفها
انزل يا أخى
الشاعر
مخبر
كده؟ طيب .. طب أنا هاعرف أوريكم أنا ابن مين هنا في مصر

(30) أنا باديكم آخر فرصة أهلي هبطرقها .. واللي مش هبطرق حيندم طول حياتك .. ما احدث عاوز بتكلم؟ عامليني رحالة؟ طيب
خالد
الكزنك

(31) إنك بابن الفسالة باللي بتحك .. فين اللي ضحك؟ فين ابن الخدامة ابن الصورة القديمة اللي ضحك؟ طيب يا كلاب إن ما كنت أوريكم .. ما ابقاش أنا
حب السما
مدرس العربي
4.2.3.3 Frequencies of ṭayyeb across discourse-marking functions

Table 9 Frequencies of ṭayyeb across Discourse-Marking Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgment</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Consent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigating a Directive Speech Act</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3.4 ṭayyeb and speech acts

Table 8 Frequencies of ṭayyeb across Speech Act Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech act type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 ṭayyeb in Different Clause Positions

Table 10 Frequencies of ṭayyeb in Different Clause Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Initial</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Medial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Final</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-standing</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 Interaction between ṭayyeb Function and Position in the Clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgment (Information Receipt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Initial</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Medial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Final</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-Standing</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Consent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Initial</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Medial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Final</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-Standing</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigating a Directive speech act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Initial</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Medial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Final</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-Standing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Initial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Medial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-Final</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-Standing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.5 ṭayyeb in Different Sentence Types

Table 12 Frequencies of ṭayyeb in Different sentence Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-standing</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 *Interaction between ṭayyeb Function and Sentence Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgment (Information Receipt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-Standing</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Consent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-Standing</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigating a Directive speech act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-Standing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-Standing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.6 ṭayyeb's Collocates

Similar to ba'a, ṭayyeb’s most frequent collocate is the vocative ya (25 times), mostly occurring after the discourse marker (20 times). The second most frequent collocate is the word ma (particle lending emphasis to a suggestion or invitation) (7 times), occurring mostly subsequent to the discourse marker (5 times). Other frequent collocations include the negation particle meš (7 times) and the interrogative ǣh (5 times).

4.3 The Discourse Marker ṭab

4.3.1 Raw Frequency

ṭab occurred 171 times, after excluding four instances of ṣebb (medicine).

4.3.2 Functions of the Discourse Marker ṭab

A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic (Badawi & Hinds, p. 553, 529) defines the DM ṭab as follows:

ṭab /interj; contraction of ṭayyib (q.v./ all right (then), very well (then), o.k. (then). mif ḥa-ṭiggawwizi - ṭab ya sitt-i ḥa-nṣuf-lık veer-u you won’t marry him? very well, young lady, we’ll find you someone else. ṭab - niṣmil Seeh dilwaṣṭi O.K. - what do we do now?

4.3.2.1 ṭab and coherence (Role in turn-taking)

Second and third moves

As an information receipt token, ṭab can be used by listeners to merely acknowledge the reception of incoming talk, without signaling convergence or agreement, as illustrated by the following example:

(32) الكيب كات يوسف أنا باقول نرهن. ولما أسافر وأشتعل أبيقى أسددر الرهن.
As the example shows, \( tab \) can function as an information receipt token, occurring in the second slot of a two-part exchange. In other words, it acts as “an appropriate second pair part in an adjacency pair” (McCarthy, 2003, p. 43). In the following extract, \( tab \) occurs in the third slot of a three-part exchange, that is, as a follow-up or third-turn receipt:

(33) 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{عمارة يعقوبيان} \\
\text{بتيه} \\
\text{زكي} \\
\text{طب وستها ليه؟}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{بتيه} \\
\text{بتيه} \\
\text{بتيه} \\
\text{بتيه}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{بققو ابارس حلوة ..} \\
\text{باريس هى الدنيا كلها ..} \\
\text{بتيه} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{زكي} \\
\text{طب وستها ليه؟}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{عمارة يعقوبيان} \\
\text{بتيه} \\
\text{زكي} \\
\text{طب وستها ليه؟}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{بتيه} \\
\text{بتيه} \\
\text{بتيه} \\
\text{بتيه}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{بققو ابارس حلوة ..} \\
\text{باريس هى الدنيا كلها ..} \\
\text{بتيه} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{زكي} \\
\text{طب وستها ليه؟}
\end{array}
\]

**Vertical transitions**

Empirical evidence from the corpus suggests that \( tab \) is a change-of-activity token (Gardner, 2005, p. 1) frequently used for vertical transitions and is never employed for horizontal transitions. It appears from the corpus analysis that \( tab \) can only be recruited for transitions into joint projects, and as such it occurs around conversation or topic entry points, as illustrated in the following examples, where \( tab \) grounds the transition into a new topic:

(34) 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{في بيتنا رجل} \\
\text{عبد الحميد} \\
\text{انتفاضي} \\
\text{مش حتطلع معايا؟} \\
\text{سامية} \\
\text{لك عبد الحميد} \\
\text{انا مش حاوقول لحد إحدنا كنا فين} \\
\text{سامية} \\
\text{قولي إلي يعجبك} \\
\text{عبد الحميد} \\
\text{طب إمتي حاشوفات؟} \\
\text{سامية}
\end{array}
\]

(35) 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{عمارة يعقوبيان} \\
\text{زكي} \\
\text{ابتعدي رباب} \\
\text{وانا مانفىش؟} \\
\text{فنة البار} \\
\text{زكي} \\
\text{تنفحي وكل حاجة .. بس انا عايز رباب في موضوع} \\
\text{خاص بيها}
\end{array}
\]
tab’s tendency to mark transitions into joint projects, like introducing a new topic, is reflected in its collocational behavior. As shown in the following set of concordance lines, tab collocates with a specific grammatical construction that roughly translates to What about ...?, This construction is an interrogative sentence, consisting of the conjunction we, followed by a noun phrase:

Figure 19. tab collocating with conjunction we + noun phrase

tayyeb and tab differ with respect to the property of optionality, which some analysts see as the defining characteristic of DMs, that is, the fact that DMs are optional, meaning that they can be omitted without changing the propositional meaning of the utterance. The analysis of tayyeb and tab shows that while tab is always optional, tayyeb is not. To be more specific, turn-initial tayyeb is always optional, while stand-alone tayyeb is never optional. Consider the following examples:

In example (37), omitting the free-standing ṭayyeb would lead to a communication breakdown, because the speaker (Ismail) is expecting a response from his interlocutor (Zeinab), and her failure to respond would indicate that she did not receive the information (e.g. she did not hear Ismail) or that she did receive the information, but she did not approve of it (e.g. she does not want to leave home early). Both cases constitute a communication breakdown. In examples (38) and (39), turn-initial ṭayyeb and ṭab can be dropped without disrupting communication. This could be explained by the fact that they are followed by discourse, which, in the absence of overt response tokens, could be taken as an indirect acknowledgment of incoming talk.

The question of optionality could also be tackled from a different theoretical perspective, namely relevance theory (RT), championed in DM studies by Diane Blakemore (2002), as already alluded to in the literature review. She makes a distinction between conceptual and procedural meaning. The former roughly corresponds to propositional or truth-conditional meaning, while the latter is akin to nonpropositional or non-truth conditional meaning. According to Blakemore, DMs encode procedural meaning, and by this she means that they instruct the cognitive process of inferencing to take a particular inferential route, and thus help the hearer to recover the intended meaning. In other words, they constrain the inferential computations involved in utterance interpretation.
Thus even though a DM can be optional, in the sense that it can be deleted without affecting the propositional content of their host utterance, its deletion can still alter the inferential process. In other words, the use of a DM in an utterance or the lack thereof will not change the state of affairs in the world, but the route the mind takes to realize this state of affairs can be different in each case. This process can be illustrated by the following tab example:

(40)

السينما

ناعيم

نبيل

حب السينما

ماقدرشي يا جمجوم.. أيوك يعملها لنا حكاية

طب أحلام الفيلم اللي شفتته إمبارح

The state of affairs denoted by the utterance hosting tab is that Naim wants Nabil to tell him about the film he saw yesterday. This state of affairs is the same whether or not tab is used. However, in the absence of tab, Nabil would probably not make an inferential connection between what he just said and Naim's subsequent demand. He could think that Naim is not interested in what he said, and that he is, therefore, changing the topic. On the other hand, the insertion of tab by Naim would lead him make such a connection: namely, that Naim is asking Nabil to tell him about the film as a kind of compromise, since Nabil refuses to take him to the cinema.

The RTs tayyeb and tab could also be analyzed in terms of Hansen's hierarchy of levels (2006). According to her, DMs can refer to three different levels of discourse: a global level, pertaining to the nature of the speech event, a local level, which pertains to the sequential environment of the DM, and a microlevel, which refers the level of the host utterance. Since response tokens, like tayyeb and tab, are by definition responses to previous talk, they can be said to be acting on the local level or the sequential discourse. However, they can equally act on the mircolevel. Consider for example the following interaction:
In the aforementioned example, the sequential position of tayyeb is not enough to determine its meaning. It is the host utterance (the microlevel) which makes it clear that tayyeb is used for threatening. Without it, tayyeb means consent. To use WaltEit's term, tayyeb has “scope” variability (2006, p. 75).

Like all response tokens, tayyeb and tab are “invariably oriented to the prior turn” and they “provide the previous speaker . . . with information about the way the prior talk is being received by the producer of the RT (Gardner, 2005, p. 1). However, tab and turn-initial tayyeb can be said to have a double orientation, as language users rely on them as a means of “simultaneously attending to prior turn while also setting-up next-positioned matters” (Beach, 1993, p. 329). That is, in addition to their retrospective quality, they are “powerful projection device[s] pointing forwards to the next turn or discourse unit (Aijmer, 2013, p. 34).

4.3.2.2 tab and interpersonal management

Mitigating a directive act. Empirical evidence shows a remarkable affinity between tab and directive speech acts: 74% of speech acts subsequent to tab were directives.

4.3.2.3 Frequencies of tab across discourse-marking functions

Table 15 Frequencies of tab across Discourse-Marking Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgment</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.3.2.4 ẓab and speech acts

Table 14 *Frequencies of ẓab across Speech Act Types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech act type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertives</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissives</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.3 ẓab in Different Clause Positions

Ẓab is always clause-initial.

### 4.3.4 ẓab in Different Sentence Types

Table 16 below summarizes the frequencies of ẓab in declaratives, interrogatives, and imperatives. As the numbers show, ẓab is most frequent in imperative sentences and least frequent in declaratives:

Table 16 *Frequencies of ẓab in Different Sentence Types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.5 ṭab's Collocates

Similar to ba'a and ṭayyeb, ṭab’s most frequent collocate is the vocative ya (26 times), usually occurring after the discourse marker (24 times). The second most frequent collocate is the word ma (particle lending emphasis to a suggestion or invitation) (22 times), occurring always after the discourse marker. Other frequent collocations include the interrogative ēh (17 times), the first person pronoun ana (14 times), the adverb kedah (13 times). Last but not least, the discourse marker ba'a collocated with ṭab 12 times, mostly occurring after ṭab (7 times).
5.1 The Discourse Marker *ba'a*

5.1.1 The Relationship between the Lexeme and the Discourse Marker

Looking at the introduction to *A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic*, it is not clear how the authors arranged the senses and sub-senses of a given word. In the case of the verb *ba'a*, although the *to become* sense is intuitively the most frequent, it could be the case that the *to be* sense came before the *to become* sense in the dictionary because the concept of BEING is more basic than the concept of BECOMING. In logical terms, *becoming* necessarily implies *being*, whereas *being* does not necessarily imply *becoming*. The eight senses of *ba'a* are apparently arranged such that the conceptually more basic precedes the conceptually more specified, which might also explain why, for instance, *to be* preceded *to be (no longer)*, which in turn preceded *to be (no longer) engaged in*. Similarly, *to arrive* comes before *to arrive at the point of (doing s.th.)*. In a monosemy approach, *to be* would be the core invariant meaning of the lexeme *ba'a*, and all the eight senses (in addition to the discourse-marking uses) must contain this core component plus further specifications. Monosemic analyses are problematic in several ways. First of all, some word senses, as in the case of *ba'a*, are not transparent enough, and it is quite difficult to identify the semantic relationship between them and the core sense without a certain degree of arbitrariness. For instance, it is hard to tell how senses like *modal of constant or repeated action or modal of decision or emphasis* could be related to the core sense *to be*. The more so when we try to account for the discourse marking functions of *ba'a*. Equally problematic in the monosemy approach is that it “leaves the researcher at a loss to explain how the range of uses of a given item can vary systematically, both diachronically and in language acquisition” (Hansen, 2006, p. 24).
This corpus-based study is hence favoring a polysemy approach which allows for meaning extensions without positing a core invariant sense. These meaning extensions (including discourse-relational meanings) could simply be motivated by *family resemblance*. That is, meanings which are thought to be connected by one essential common feature could actually be connected by overlapping similarities, without a single component common to all.

As stated in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3), it is important to address the relationships among the various DM functions and the relationship between these functions and the meaning of the particle lexeme. These various senses can be conceived of as *nodes* in a network of semantic relations. These interconnected nodes need not share a core semantic component; a view which runs counter to the position held by monosemic approaches as alluded to earlier. The relationship between the different nodes is rather based on family resemblance and motivated by metaphoric or metonymic extensions. (“Metonymy is a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same domain” (Kovecses & Radden, 1998, p. 39).) In the case of *ba'a*, the primary sense of the lexeme, (*to become*) can be conceptually linked to the main sense of the DM (*the end of something*), which in turn can be related to a secondary sense of the DM (*conclusion*) in the following manner: *Becoming* something means *ending* up being something, and a *conclusion* is a kind of end. (*Becoming* is also diachronically prior to *end/conclusion*). This meaning chain is graphically represented in Figure 1:

![Figure 1. ba'a's semantic network](image-url)
5.1.2 *ba'a*s Functions

The distribution of *ba'a* across different discourse-marking functions shows a higher percentage of coherence-related functions (67%), compared to functions pertaining to interpersonal management (33%). The predominance of coherence-related discoursal functions could be attributed to the unidirectional tendencies of diachronic semantic change, including the tendency for senses to become increasingly subjective, as posited by Traugott and Dasher (2001). That is, forms indicating objective, ideational, external senses acquire subjective, speaker-based, internal senses in the course of time.

5.1.2.1 *ba'a* and coherence

By looking at the conclusion function of *ba'a*, which is the most important in terms of frequency (38%), we notice that, in the majority of examples, the prior discourse related by the DM *ba'a* is linguistic. It will be remembered that some scholars prefer *discourse content* over *discourse utterance*, finding the latter characterization too narrow, given that DMs can also link implicit or presupposed utterances, that is *non-linguistic* discourse. This may go some way towards explaining how a speaker can indeed initiate talk, using *ba'a*. The fact that the very first statement uttered in a given situation can host *ba'a* suggests that prior discourse can well be non-linguistic (cognitive, situational, etc.). In our screen dialog corpus, it is not uncommon for leave-taking expressions to host *ba’a*, as in سلام بقي. These utterances are usually discourse-initial and are not elicited by a dialog partner, suggesting that the utterance hosting *ba’a* is cohering with non-linguistic previous discourse. Moreover, the fact that leave-taking takes place at the end of an encounter to *conclude* an exchange provides further clues to the strong ties between the DM *ba’a* and the conceptual domain of END.

Still, the conclusion function of *ba’a* is to be distinguished from that of *entailment*. In her
analysis of yaʕni, El Shimi (1992) identifies several coherence-establishing functions, including highlighting entailment relations. Under the heading entailment, El Shimi states that “/yaʕni/ linked a logical inference or a conclusion derived from previous discourse” (p. 23). She gives the following example to illustrate this discourse-marking function:

(1) طببا حضرتاک الحكاية دی بتحصل لو ان الببی بيكون ولد. يعني فيه تفقة ما بين الولد والشتت

of course er this happens if the baby is a boy, (so) there is discrimination between boys and girls

Substitution tests reveal that the conclusion functions fulfilled by yaʕni and ba’a are not exactly the same. For instance, replacing yaʕni by ba’a in the aforementioned utterance yields an awkward result:

طببا حضرتاک الحكاية دی بتحصل لو ان الببی بيكون ولد. فيه تفقة ما بين الولد والشتت

However, in the following sequence, ba’a can be replaced by yaʕni, and the result is acceptable:

عندک صمّاکاک تعباین فی القلب. بلاش بقی مبیک والسمب والبئ والوت

عندک صمّاکاک تعباین فی القلب. يعني بلاش المبیک والسمب والبئ والوت

It would appear from these tests that the conclusion functions fulfilled by yaʕni are more general than those performed by ba’a.

The second most frequent function of ba’a is to mark contrast. Recruiting ba’a for this discourse-marking function could be accounted for if we take into consideration the primary meaning of the lexeme ba’a, i.e. to become. to become is to undergo change or development, which is akin to the concept of contrast, where two entities are compared to show how they differ, or how one entity becomes different from another.

Unlike tayyeb and tab, ba’a does not seem to operate on the level of turn taking, and this
probably has to do with its position in the clause. Discourse markers that play an important role in the
dynamics of turn taking are typically clause-initial. This strategic position facilitates turn taking, turn
quitting, and the opening or closing of conversations. *ba’a*, however, rarely occupies this slot, with
only 5% of instances occurring clause-initially.

Although infrequent, clause-initial *ba’a* is intriguing both structurally and functionally. Unlike
other positions, it is highly specified, both in terms of its syntactic structure and its function.

Syntactically, its host utterance must be an interrogative sentence, which often consists of two
contrasting propositions. Discourse-functionally, it signals a very specific affective stance, namely
surprise and/or sarcasm. However, a closer look at this pattern shows other layers of function, namely
*contrast* and *conclusion*, acting simultaneously. The contrast can be observed in the two juxtaposed
propositions that constitute the host utterance:

\[
\text{(2) في بيتنا رجل الأم المبقي إحسنا ما وضعتني بالدكتور إللي اقتمل لها } \quad \text{نقوم نرنيها للواد ده؟}
\]

الكركن ديبب بقي أن آشقي وأتعم وأصرف دم قلبي عليها وآدبيال؟

الجدة بحب السبما بقي إنت تصحيبي في عز الليل وتقولني إنني دفيانة؟

The second proposition can be seen as an unmarked *conclusion*, which can be revealed by adding to it
adverbs like *finally*, *eventually*, or *ultimately*, or, in Arabic, *أخرتها*:

\[
\text{في بيتنا رجل الأم المبقي إحسنا ما وضعتني بالدكتور إللي اقتمل لها } \quad \text{نقوم آخرتيها نرميه للواد ده؟}
\]

الكركن ديبب بقي أن آشقي وأتعم وأصرف دم قلبي عليها وآخرتيها أديبال؟

الجدة بحب السبما بقي إنت تصحيبي في عز الليل وآخرتيتها تقولني إنني دفيانة؟

This analysis is in line with Traugott and Dasher (2001), who point out that discourse markers can
simultaneously mark external and speaker-oriented relations.

5.1.2.2 *ba'a* and interpersonal management

*ba'a* has been shown to mark affective stances, like end of patience and surprise. Discourse markers in other languages which have similar stance-marking properties include the Norwegian *na* which can have the affective meaning (impatience, irritation, surprise)” (Hasselgard, 2006, p. 104).

5.1.2.3 *ba'a* and speech acts

*ba'a* accompanied all major speech act categories except declarations. *ba'a* was most frequent in directives (42%). A possible explanation for this might be that commands are often accompanied by emotions, like impatience and irritability, which, as has been shown, can be marked by *ba'a*. Declarations “change the state of the world in an immediate way” (Green, 2012, p. 13), and they include the speech acts of declaring war, baptizing, appointing, naming, awarding, etc. It would seem that *ba'a* does not accompany declarations for reasons related to the level of formality. In Arabic, declarations are normally made in highly formal settings using official, if not ceremonial, language, hence the unlikelihood of using very informal expressions like *ba'a*.

5.1.2.4 Interaction between *ba'a*'s function and its position in the clause

The interaction between *ba'a*'s function and its position in the clause can be observed, for example, in the affinity between *end of patience* and *end of encounter* functions and the clause-final position, where the functional *end* is mirrored by the structural *final*. When fulfilling these functions, *ba'a* never occupies clause-initial or clause-medial slots. The analysis also shows an affinity between the contrast function and the clause-medial position. Upon closer examination of this *ba'a* subcategory, it has been observed that *ba'a* is usually inserted right after the subject of the clause, as in *أنا بقى من عاجشي* to contrast the subject with an entity in prior discourse, which may explain the relationship between the
contrast-marking ba’a and the clause-medial position.

5.1.2.5 Interaction between ba’a’s function and sentence type

ba’a’s function also interacts with sentence type in interesting ways. For example, the contrastive function was understandably most frequent in declarative sentences and least frequent in imperatives. As for the end of encounter function, it never occurred in the interrogative, and occurred only once in the imperative. This is unsurprising because it would be highly unusual to take leave by asking a question or giving an order. The end of patience function, on the contrary, was most frequent in imperatives, since these are usually accompanied by affective states, like impatience and irritation. When used to express surprise, ba’a occurs only in interrogative sentences. A possible explanation for this might be that emotions of surprise are accompanied by a sense of incredulity and disbelief, which are best expressed in the form of a question that attempts to get the listener to supply information to validate or invalidate the sudden change in the speaker’s state of knowledge or awareness. Thus it would seem odd to express surprise and astonishment using declaratives or, much less, imperatives. Finally, when ba’a is used to mark politeness, it never occurs in the imperative, possibly due to the face-threatening potential of giving commands.

5.1.3 ba’a’s Collocational Behavior

The discourse marker ba’a is characteristic of the spoken register, and this can observed in ba’a’s collocation with the vocative ya and with first and second person pronouns. Its collocation with the negation particle meš could be attributed to ba’a’s contrastive function, since negation is perhaps the ultimate means of expressing contrast (x is y, x is not y).

5.2 The Discourse Markers țayyeb and țab

5.2.1 The Relationship between the Lexeme and the Discourse Marker
Before analyzing the relationship between the lexeme and the discourse marker, it may be worthwhile stopping briefly to discuss the terminology used. It will be recalled that there is a lack of consensus on the best term to use when referring to DMs, and that several researchers prefer the term *particle* over *marker* for reasons we have articulated already. When referring to response tokens, such as *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab*, I believe that the label *marker* is more accurate than *particle* because research on RTs does not limit itself to linguistic phenomena, but rather takes into account non-linguistic responses as well, like head nods and shoulder shrugs. For this reason, I have preferred to use the functional term *marker* over the formal *particle*.

Having justified the choice of terminology, I turn my attention to the semantics of *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab*. Since this study does not adopt a homonomy approach, it assumes a semantic relationship between the adjective *ṭayyeb* and the DMs *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab*. As is the case with *ba’a*, this relationship could be based on metaphorical mappings. It is, therefore, not surprising that the adjective *ṭayyeb*, which means *good*, eventually acquires discourse-marking functions, such as acknowledgment or consent. In both functions, it is as if the listener responds to his or her speaker by saying *That's good*.

### 5.2.2 The Relationship between *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab*

Although a diachronic study is needed to substantiate this claim, it seems plausible that the adverbial usage of *ṭayyeb*, as in *عمتي طيب* (Badawi & Hinds, p.553), was an intermediate stage between the adjective and the discourse marker. In this diachronic process, the scope of the lexical item widens gradually: adj -> noun, adv -> verb phrase, DM -> clause. The form *ṭab*, on the other hand, is a shortened variant of the DM *ṭayyeb*, and is believed to be diachronically posterior it. The fact that *ṭab* is prosodically highly integrated in subsequent discourse, leaving no room for a perceptible pause, could explain how it evolved diachronically from *ṭayyeb* into its current reduced form. The historical
relationship between the DMs ħāyyeb and ṭab is evidenced in the great similarity and overlap between their functions.

5.2.3 Differences between ħāyyeb and ṭab in Navigating Joint Projects

As we have seen in Chapter 4, both ħāyyeb and ṭab are used by interlocutors to navigate joint projects, specifically in vertical transitions, i.e. entering and exiting conversations and topics. Corpus evidence has shown, however, that ħāyyeb and ṭab act differently in this respect. While stand-alone ħāyyeb can only signal transitions out of joint projects, ṭab can only be recruited for transitions into such projects. Turn-initial ħāyyeb, on the other hand, has been found to mark transitions both into and out of joint projects. This variability could be explained if turn-initial ħāyyeb is conceived of as an intermediate stage between stand-alone ħāyyeb and ṭab.

5.2.4 ħāyyeb and ṭab and Interpersonal Management

Empirical evidence shows a remarkable affinity between the RTs ħāyyeb and ṭab and directive speech acts: 64% of speech acts following turn-initial ħāyyeb were directives, and 74% of speech acts subsequent to ṭab were also directives. This affinity could well be linked to the mitigating effect of ħāyyeb and ṭab on the harshness of directive acts, like giving orders. Due to their high face-threatening potential, directives can be prefaced by response tokens, like ħāyyeb and ṭab, thus signaling that talk by the dialog partner has been heard and acknowledged. It is as if the ħāyyeb or ṭab user is saying to his or her addressee I am giving you an order, after acknowledging and understanding what you just told me.

To illustrate this point, consider the following examples, with and without the RT. Omitting ħāyyeb and ṭab cancels their mitigating effect, leaving the commanding force of the directive unattenuated:

(3) تعرفي يا سامية أنا بيهيا لي إلك بتحبى عبد الحميد زي زمان
في بيتنا رجل نوال
لو كان بيهيا لك كده تبقى غلطانة

Samaia
The threatening sense of *ṭayyeb* may have emerged gradually as a pragmatic implicature of the existing *consent* sense. The threatening meaning could well be a “side effect” of the frequent occurrence of the consent meaning (or the adverbial *well* meaning) in a specific type of context, namely *irony*. Simply put, the threatening sense may have evolved historically from the ironic usage of the consent meaning.
CHAPTER 6—PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

6.1 Pedagogical Implications of the Study

6.1.1 The Impact of Discourse Markers on Second Language Learning

If a foreign language learner says *five sheeps* or *he goed*, he can be corrected by practically every native speaker. If, on the other hand, he omits a *well*, the likely reaction will be that he is dogmatic, impolite, boring, awkward to talk to, etc., but a native speaker cannot pinpoint an ‘error’ (Svartvik, 1980, p. 171).

As Svartvik observes, native speakers will easily detect errors related to morphology, while it is much harder to pinpoint an “error” in the use of DMs. Language learners underusing or misusing them would rather be deemed impolite or awkward. This difficulty in grasping “mistakes” in DM usage is due to the fact that this category of linguistic items belongs to subtle pragmatic aspects that reflect the cultural and social values of the language, and whose knowledge is the trademark of the native speaker. Therefore, language learners aspiring to native speaker proficiency can never attain that status without mastering DMs. However, this is not to imply that knowledge of DMs is important only for superior level learners. Since DMs enhance discourse coherence and signal speakers’ attitudes, thus facilitating interaction, it is reasonable to expect that insufficient or incorrect use of DMs by language learners would impede efficient communication or lead to intercultural pragmatic failure. Since L2 learners (and language users in general) take part in interactive discourse, it is their responsibility to indicate to their addressees the relations of utterances to prior and subsequent discourse, and to convey, at the same time, their attitudes and intentions, hence the importance of mastering DMs, both in comprehension and production, as necessary components of pragmatic and intercultural competence. Furthermore, and according to Ellis (1997), successful communication, as facilitated by DMs, could possibly accelerate
the learning of grammar, and so there could be a correlation between acquisition of grammar and the acquisition of DMs, which is another reason for emphasizing DMs both in the classroom and in linguistic research.

As I have shown in this study, ECA discourse markers, like in other languages, do play an important role in discourse coherence and interpersonal management, and their omission by the AFL learner could cause misinterpretations or give the impression that he or she is being impolite by ignoring the status or the feelings of his or her interlocutor. The following exchange, for instance, demonstrates the cohesive function of ba’a:

\[
(1) \quad \text{تجّقّكمصكمسزماظؾقؾموتؼقمشمإغؿكمدصقاغةموظلامبرداغةمآجكمأدصّقؽكم؟مؼااخكم} \\
\quad \text{جاتؽمغقؾةمدهمأغامضدمأعؽمؼاممضار} \\
\quad \text{الجدة} \\
\quad \text{بؽيبماظلقؿا} \\
\quad \text{عاػقمحلاوتفامصكمطدهم..مأغامباعقتمصقؽقامصكماظلـمدهم..مضقظقؾكم} \\
\quad \text{بؽك} \\
\quad \text{ملابلةمضؿقصمغقممظقغفمإؼفم؟مأمضرم؟} \\
\quad \text{م} \\
\quad \text{الدؿصؾ} \\
\quad \text{ba’a} \quad \text{creates} \quad \text{a premise-conclusion relation between the host utterance and previous discourse. The caller intends the grandmother to make the following inference: Since she now knows that old women turn him on, she should therefore yield to his demand and tell him the color of her nightgown. By omitting ba’a, the intended interpretation is potentially altered or lost. Without the marker, the utterance} \\
\quad \text{ضقظقؾكمبؼكملابلةمضؿقصمغقممظقغفمإؼف} \\
\quad \text{؟} \\
\quad \text{نيرودةقسمس نوم لوئه إيه ؟ أحمر ؟} \\
\text{ba’a creates a premise-conclusion relation between the host utterance and previous discourse. The caller intends the grandmother to make the following inference: Since she now knows that old women turn him on, she should therefore yield to his demand and tell him the color of her nightgown. By omitting ba’a, the intended interpretation is potentially altered or lost. Without the marker, the utterance} \\
\quad \text{ضقظقؾكمبؼكملابلةمضؿقصمغقممظقغفمإؼف} \\
\quad \text{؟} \\
\quad \text{نيرودةقسمس نوم لوئه إيه ؟ أحمر ؟} \\
\text{Seems to simply signal a change of topic. The caller shifts from talking about his lust for old women to asking about the color of the grandmother’s nightgown, with no apparent connection between the two topics.}

We have also seen that ba’a can be used to signal politeness, as in:

\[
(2) \quad \text{أنا بصراحة نوبه إني أسغل المحل} \\
\quad \text{انا بساراها نايت اني استغل المحل} \\
\quad \text{I've decided to make use of the shop.}
\]
testاغللع fi ّیح bة'a?
How are you going to make use of it bة'a (if I may ask)?

A deletion test can highlight the face-saving, attenuator function of bة'a, without which the statement is potentially face-threatening. Whereas sounds inquisitive and authoritarian, sounds curious, showing eagerness to know or learn something about the addressee. bة'a can thus be used strategically to take the sharpness from utterances.

The same can be said of ُةاطيب and ُةاب, which can be used, as we have pointed out, to mitigate directive speech acts. Due to their high face-threatening potential, directives can be prefaced by response tokens, like ُةاطيب and ُةاب, thus signaling that talk by the dialog partner has been heard and acknowledged. It is as if the ُةاطيب or ُةاب user is saying to his or her addressee I am giving you an order, after acknowledging and understanding what you just told me. To illustrate this point, consider the following examples, with and without the RT. Omitting ُةاطيب and ُةاب cancels their mitigating effect, leaving the commanding force of the directive unattenuated:

(3)

(4)
DMs should, therefore, occupy a more prominent position in Arabic learning and teaching. AFL teachers are advised to instruct their students about the different functions fulfilled by DMs. It may be better to first introduce concepts like discourse, coherence, and speaker-oriented meaning, whose understanding is necessary to grasp the role of DMs in spoken interaction. Once students are familiar with these concepts, they are cognitively ready to learn and acquire DMs. Although they constitute a “special kind” of lexical items, they can be taught by applying the techniques and strategies used in learning general vocabulary.

Research on vocabulary acquisition has shown us that lexical knowledge is not something that could be perfectly mastered. It deepens and expands over time, and the process could take years and years before the second language learner reaches native speaker competence. DMs, like other vocabulary items, can be acquired incidentally, i.e. indirectly, by exposure to the language, or intentionally through explicit classroom instruction. Teachers could start with noticing activities, by helping their students, using authentic material, to become aware of the existence of DMs in the first place. After noticing, they can make informed guesses about DM meanings, using the linguistic and
pragmatic context. Having received teacher feedback, confirming or rejecting their hypotheses, students should be presented with a clear and systematic explanation of the DMs in question, before they can start using them productively. In the following sections, a brief overview of corpus-based vocabulary instruction will be presented, and how it can be applied to the teaching and learning of DMs in particular, giving examples from ECA.

6.1.2 Corpus Linguistics and Second Language Teaching

6.1.2.1 Indirect applications

Corpora can also inform language teaching indirectly through materials development and syllabus design. “Corpora have proven to be an invaluable resource in the design of language teaching syllabi which emphasise communicative competence” (Hymes, 1972, 1992). The near absence of discourse markers in ECA books and curricula calls for corpus-inspired adjustments and for revised descriptions that present a more appropriate picture of language as it is actually used. Due to the lack of explicit instruction, “pragmatic transfer between language can, on occasion, make non-native speakers (NNSs) appear rude or insincere” (O’Keeffe et al., 2011, p. 138). Yoshimi (2001) used an experimental design to study the effects of explicit instruction on the use of discourse markers by English speakers of Japanese. She noted that instructed learners showed a remarkable increase in the frequency of using DMs, while no similar increase was seen in the control group.

6.1.2.2 Direct applications

This means direct access by learners and teachers to corpus tools in the language classroom. John Sinclair made the suggestion “to confront the learner as directly as possible with the data, and to make the learner a linguistic researcher” (Johns, 2002, p. 108). This is now widely known as data-driven learning. Corpora can be used in the classroom as language awareness-raising tools, thus
situating this approach within the larger field of *form-focused instruction*. This corpus-aided discovery learning fosters learners' motivation and autonomy. Concordancing has also been shown to “mimic the effects of natural contextual learning” (Cobb, 1997, p. 314). Through exposure to copious examples of discourse markers like *ba'a*, *ṭ tab*, *ṭayyeb*, *bass*, etc., ECA learners can develop a deeper understanding of the different roles they play in different contexts. The following are a number of corpus-based classroom activities that can be used in learning DMs:

*A KWIC (Key Word in Context) gap activity*

In this activity, a keyword, in this case *ba'a*, is shown surrounded by its co-text, as in the following concordance lines:

The software is then asked to “gap” the lines:
For a more user-friendly interface, the concordance lines can then be transferred to a Word file, to be used in a fill-in-the-spaces exercise. This activity can be rendered more challenging by mixing other DMs, like \textit{ṭayyeb}, and \textit{ṭab}. For more advanced levels, false gaps can be added, where students must study the context to decide on using or not using a DM. Another variation would be to include examples of the verb \textit{ba'a} and the adjective \textit{ṭayyeb} to see if students can distinguish the lexemes from the markers.

\textit{Observing the pattern to guess the meaning}

For example, students are asked to study these concordances:

First they are asked if they can notice a pattern. For instance, the fact that the \textit{ba'a} clause starts with the
first person pronoun, and that *ba'a* is clause-medial. Students are then asked to try to find a meaning common to all these examples, namely that the speaker wants to convey a contrast or difference between *him* or *herself* and the *rest of the group* of which he/she is part.

**Multiple choice**

For example, students are presented with a screenful of *ba'a* concordance lines taken randomly and a list of all the different functions fulfilled by the DM, and their task is to examine each line and decide which function is being used in each case. If the context seems insufficient, they can always access the source files.

**Testing hypotheses using corpus data**

In this activity, students take the opposite direction, moving from the source files, i.e. the film scripts, to the concordance lines. For example, they can be asked to examine several examples of *ṭayyeb* in a particular film, thinking about the context in which the DM occurs. They can then test their hypotheses by looking at corpus data.

**Comparing similar markers**

Learners can compare *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab* by looking for patterns in form and meaning. In what ways are the forms and meanings similar or different?

**Comparing learner corpora with native speaker corpora**

Comparisons can be made with regards to frequency of usage as well as structural and functional choices. Thus AFL learners can be made aware of their underuse, overuse, or misuse of DMs.

6.2 Limitations of the Study

6.2.1 Limitations of Corpus-Based Studies in General
Perhaps the most serious disadvantage has to do with the representativeness of the corpus. Since language is infinite, an even multi-billion word corpus is not adequately representative of language. Representativeness is closely linked to the concept of generalizability. As a general rule, corpus-based results are only generalizable to the selected sample. However, similar to experimental studies, the larger the sample (that is, the corpus), the more representative it is of the target population, and the more valid the results. Yet, the question of representativeness should not compromise the results of this study, because it uses the purposeful (not the representative) sampling paradigm. (see 2.2 Data Collection)

6.2.2 Limitations of Using Corpora to Study Pragmatics

These include the lack of textual features, like fonts, layout, photographs; lack of prosodic features; lack of non-verbal dimensions (gestures, facial expressions, etc.). The social background of speakers is also usually scanty. However, these disadvantages are not a problem in this study due to the availability of audiovisual files.

6.2.3 Limitations of Using Films to Study Pragmatics

“[H]ow well does film language represent the ways that people actually speak?” (Rose, 2001, p. 309) Kenneth Rose attempts to answer this question by comparing a corpus of compliments and compliment responses taken from forty American films with naturally occurring data. His results suggest that film language is most representative of natural speech in terms of pragmalinguistics (i.e. the forms and expressions used) and less so from the perspective of sociopragmatics (i.e. the sociological dimension).

Similarly, O’Keeffe et al. (2011) make a comparison between everyday casual conversation and the language of soap operas. They observe that argumentation and confrontation are central to the plot.
Their analysis of the most frequent three-word clusters in soap opera scripts reflects this feature of the dramatic genre. The list is topped by argumentative expressions like “I don’t think”, “no no no”, or “what do you?”. Also more face-threatening acts are expected to be found in soap operas than in naturally occurring everyday language.

Also, in a corpus-based study (Harris & Jaén, 2010) comparing parts of speech and semantic fields in the British National Corpus (BNC) and a corpus of films, it has been observed that singular and plural common nouns are overused in movies. This higher frequency of content words in screen dialog has been attributed to the need to tell exciting stories under a significant time constraint. As a consequence, films contain less interpersonal language (like discourse-marking expressions) and more ideational or informative content. However, from a qualitative perspective, discourse markers do not seem to behave differently in films compared to naturally occurring language, as implied by Cuenca (2008) in her study of well. (see 2.2 Data Collection)

Finally, film language can become obsolete over time. However, even though some of the films used in this study are relatively old, dating from the sixties or seventies, they are probably still representative, as far as discourse markers are concerned, since these belong to the grammar, after they evolved from lexical items to become grammatical markers through a long process of grammaticalization. As demonstrated by research on language change, grammatical items, or *closed-class* words are far more resistant to change than lexical items, or *open-class* words.

### 6.2.4 Limitations of the Corpus Software

Although WordSmith Tools is a suitable tool for the purposes of this study, it still lacks the abilities of multimodal corpora and morphological analyzers. These, however, are costly.

### 6.3 Suggestions for Future Research
Building on findings from this synchronic corpus-based study, future research may provide diachronic evidence, using data from earlier stages of Egyptian Colloquial Arabic, to establish the links between the different DM readings and how they gradually evolved from their lexemes. New light can also be shed on ba'a, tayyeb and tab, and their different functions by exploring the role played by sociolinguistic variables, such as speaker role, age, gender, and social class. Since this study had the limitation of using a small corpus of film language, it may be worthwhile replicating this study, based on a larger corpus of naturally occurring data, thus achieving more representativeness. Furthermore, better results will be obtained from the use of more sophisticated technologies than WordSmith Tools, like morphological analyzers and multimodal corpora, where audiovisual data, like gestural expressivity, emotions, and prosody, are annotated, which can provide valuable insight into the semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers. For pedagogical purposes, however, learner corpora of ECA can be especially useful, by comparing and analyzing native and non-native uses of discourse markers. It is hoped that this modest contribution will further our understanding of ECA discourse markers and pave the way for more research in this exciting new area.

6.4 Conclusion

To conclude, this study has explored how three Egyptian Colloquial Arabic discourse markers, namely ba'a, tayyeb and tab, are used in Egyptian film language, using corpus-based tools and methodologies. It emphasizes the importance of fine-grained analyses of Arabic corpora, where the corpus used in the study is indeed small and lends itself to such explorations. Interrogating the corpus has revealed a rather complex picture of uses of ba'a, tayyeb and tab, which challenges the notion that discourse markers are dismissible as communicatively superfluous, and thus can safely be dropped from language teaching curricula. This enquiry has demonstrated that ba'a, tayyeb and tab do not just
“sit in the gaps” between utterances, but they play a crucial role in constructing and consolidating both textual and social relations. The analysis of concordance lines and the source files has shown that *ba'a* facilitates discourse coherence by marking contrasts and conclusions. In addition, it can signal speaker attitudes and feelings, like impatience, surprise, and sarcasm. While *ba'a* can be used to initiate talk, *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab* are primarily response tokens with overlapping functions. The study has also shown how syntactic variables, like position of the DM within the clause or sentence type, can be associated with changes in function. Even though a diachronic study is needed to verify this claim, it is suggested that the DMs *ba'a*, *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab* and the functions they fulfil are semantically linked to the lexemes from which they were derived.
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**Film abbreviations:**

- سؿارةمؼعؼقبقانمممسل
- بحبماظلقؿاممممممبس
- أرضمالخقفممممممممأخ
- ظؽقتمطاتمممممممممطؽ
- ظؾداؼةمممممممممممممممب
- ظؽرغؽمممممممممممممممك
- مظمبقؿـامرجؾمممممصبرم
- ظؽمأخ
- و תוכלقبؽقمبؼكم
- ظؽمأخ
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ظؾلامبقـامبؼكم
- ظؾلامبقـامبؼكم
- غؼقممبؼكمطؽ
- أعّامأعشلمبؼكمغقـةمطؽ
- أدؿأذنمأغامبؼكمطؽ
- سـمإذغؽمأغامبؼكمطؽ
- ععؾش،مأد ئأذنمأغامبؼكمطؽ
- سدمشمأغامعاذقةمبؼكمبس
- دعقدةمبؼكمبس
- رملدامأذقصؽم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- اصؾلمغازلمبدريم
- رربمإؼفمالحؾمبؼكم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- طلام؟مب
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- حبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـام
- ظؽبرذقتمأخ
- دمبؼكمبقتمالدعؾؿمذمعـمػػَركم
- مظلمبؼكممظم
- ظؽلاممأخم
- بسمإحـامبؼكمعام
- ظؽمأخ
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- طلام؟مب
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- حبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـام
- ظؽبرذقتمأخ
- دمبؼكمبقتمالدعؾؿمذمعـمػػَركم
- مظلمبؼكممظم
- ظؽلاممأخم
- بسمإحـامبؼكمعام
- ظؽمأخ
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- طلام؟مب
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- حبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـام
- ظؽبرذقتمأخ
- دمبؼكمبقتمالدعؾؿمذمعـمػػَركم
- مظلمبؼكممظم
- ظؽلاممأخم
- بسمإحـامبؼكمعام
- ظؽمأخ
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- طلام؟مب
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- حبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـام
- ظؽبرذقتمأخ
- دمبؼكمبقتمالدعؾؿمذمعـمػػَركم
- مظلمبؼكممظم
- ظؽلاممأخم
- بسمإحـامبؼكمعام
- ظؽمأخ
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- طلام؟مب
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- حبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـام
- ظؽبرذقتمأخ
- دمبؼكمبقتمالدعؾؿمذمعـمػػَركم
- مظلمبؼكممظم
- ظؽلاممأخم
- بسمإحـامبؼكمعام
- ظؽمأخ
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- طلام؟مب
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- حبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـام
- ظؽبرذقتمأخ
- دمبؼكمبقتمالدعؾؿمذمعـمػػَركم
- مظلمبؼكممظم
- ظؽلاممأخم
- بسمإحـامبؼكمعام
- ظؽمأخ
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- طلام؟مب
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- حبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـام
- ظؽبرذقتمأخ
- دمبؼكمبقتمالدعؾؿمذمعـمػػَركم
- مظلمبؼكممظم
- ظؽلاممأخم
- بسمإحـامبؼكمعام
- ظؽمأخ
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- طلام؟مب
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- حبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـام
- ظؽبرذقتمأخ
- دمبؼكمبقتمالدعؾؿمذمعـمػػَركم
- مظلمبؼكممظم
- ظؽلاممأخم
- بسمإحـامبؼكمعام
- ظؽمأخ
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- طلام؟مب
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- حبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـام
- ظؽبرذقتمأخ
- دمبؼكمبقتمالدعؾؿمذمعـمػػَركم
- مظلمبؼكممظم
- ظؽلاممأخم
- بسمإحـامبؼكمعام
- ظؽمأخ
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- طلام؟مب
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- حبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـام
- ظؽبرذقتمأخ
- دمبؼكمبقتمالدعؾؿمذمعـمػػَركم
- مظلمبؼكممظم
- ظؽلاممأخم
- بسمإحـامبؼكمعام
- ظؽمأخ
- ٩ًصمػؾمعققامسؾكمخيرم
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- طلام؟مب
- ةاديوبمبؼكماغام
- حبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـام
- ظؽبرذقتمأخ
- دمبؼكمبقتمالد
الحاج محمد عزام
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(47) جوزها بقي راح

(48) بع بسن بقي عي

(49) انا بقي بسن

(50) إن لب عافه بسن

(51) بسن زي ما

(52) بجلوا بقي كل شيخ

(53) ولل طرقيه بسن

(54) لا لنا عازك تعرف

(55) بقي بين الي كان طالب بعي

(56) علي كده بقي

(57) الأحمر عنان اللحمة

(58) بسن

(59) دولها أشي بقي

(60) (نلم بتي كده

(61) و penet جنب الحيط

(62) بسن

(63) (يابا بتي كمله

(64) رسم بسن

(65) بليش بتي

(66) السيبك بسن

(67) (عندين بتي هند

(68) رسم بسن

(69) بسن زي بعضه

(70) بتي بسن

(71) (ماعرش بتي

(72) (شعرف بتي

(73) (خصر بسن

(74) (طبع اصص علي

(75) بقي بسن

(76) وقت خلص

(77) بتي نسوين بسن

(78) (كناوا اغتنا بتي

(79) (عيس

(80) الله لما بتي

(81) اشوف بتي بتي

(82) بليها رنا بتي

(83) واسع بتي لما
اضقظؽمبس

لازمماظلؽرتيرةم

بؿاسؿؽمبؼكمسل

71

۷۱

(72)

بعتى بقی عی

(73)

لا حيث كده بقی

دی تبقى غی

۷۴

ده انت مبطری

بقی عی

(75)

وبدین انا عايز

اڪمئ بقی عی

(76)

بعتى بقی عی

(77)

دی لبنا إحا

بقی عی

۷۸

ده شفنا بقی عی

بعتى بقی با حاج

۷۹

(80)

حُنی بقی لو

الحكم فيها عی

(81)

بعتى باعه

بعی

(82)

خلینا بقی في

المهم عی

(83)

اکید بقی تعرف

الاسناد حاچم عی

(84)

شفت بقی إنک

کذاب عی

(85)

خلینا بقی في

حارم رشد عی

(86)

آن بقی عی

بعتى بقی لو كنت

۷۷

غالی عندك بلاش

حضرتی عی

(88)

عايزه اعرف ایه

الافق بقی عی

(89)

كل واحد في

اقدی بقی يتحمل

نیجه غلطته عی

۸۰

ناخد بقی معاها

الصحیبين عی

۸۱

هوود بقی

۸۲
Table 2 Distribution of ba’a across Speech Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertives</th>
<th>Directives</th>
<th>Expressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لما أشوف.. انتضلي بقتي بفر</td>
<td>يجدع افهم بقتي كات</td>
<td>انتححي بقتي ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>انتحالي بقتي ك</td>
<td>عم بقتي؟ آخ</td>
<td>معش بقتي الكرة الطاجة ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فكروا إياي تواجهوا الأمر الواقع بقتي ب</td>
<td>يهوه بقتي كل حاجة حرام بس</td>
<td>يهوه بقتي ما ابت عارف إن أبوق بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بلانش بقتي الفساد بس</td>
<td>حلمي بقتي له انتحك فيها ي هوة</td>
<td>عدامي: يهوه بقتي س</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قومي ارقصي يا لفنلقة بقتي ك</td>
<td>لا تقول لي بقتي ولا أخف إذاعة كل</td>
<td>لا تقول لي بقتي ولا أخف إذاعة كل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عملنا بقتي اصمل ك</td>
<td>تغلق بقتي يا حرامي يا ابن الكلب بس</td>
<td>تغلق بقتي يا حرامي يا ابن الكلب بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خلاص بقتي أفال إليه اللي يملك فين</td>
<td>يهوه بقتي حموج بس</td>
<td>يهوه بقتي حموج بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ااملكي بقتي ك</td>
<td>إيه هل بقتي؟</td>
<td>إيه هل بقتي؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>باطلتنيش بقتي ك</td>
<td>وزدت ودهي.. ارتحت بقتي؟</td>
<td>وزدت ودهي.. ارتحت بقتي؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اسموا بقتي أنا محدش ب</td>
<td>يسف: إياي بقتي كات</td>
<td>يسف: إياي بقتي كات</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بتلاي بقتي اغل ب س</td>
<td>من إنمل بقتي الالة مدي كلا فير</td>
<td>من إنمل بقتي الالة مدي كلا فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تعالوا افزجو بقتي ب</td>
<td>لحمدني بقتي كات</td>
<td>لحمدني بقتي كات</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقتي بحوا الناحية الثانية أخ</td>
<td>تعال فولي بقتي تتجاوز من فينا بس</td>
<td>تعال فولي بقتي تتجاوز من فينا بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جربي بقتي تدوسي عليها ب</td>
<td>بص بقتي جداية قصرتب بس</td>
<td>بص بقتي جداية قصرتب بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بص بقتي .. دائرة قصرتب بس</td>
<td>وعدين معا بقتي آخ</td>
<td>وعدين معا بقتي آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بص بقتي .. دائرة قصرتب بس</td>
<td>وعدين معا بقتي آخ</td>
<td>وعدين معا بقتي آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بص بقتي .. دائرة قصرتب بس</td>
<td>وعدين معا بقتي آخ</td>
<td>وعدين معا بقتي آخ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
إن بقي، بمشكلة آخ

بينة: بس بقي يا هله عي

إحول في بالاتا احصي أه

وعليه بقي يعمل ترتيب في

يمكن بقي آخذ صوره ب

على كده بقي الأحمر عشان اللحمه عي

يمكن بقي أنس دهمي؟ ب

طب وأنا حاشر بقي الزنباء بنامه فين؟ ب

كني توريهم ب إيه بقي؟ ب

ما تعويش بني الفراخجي ناوي يعمل كات

أملا إيه بني اللي يبض اللقب؟ ك

وبه يبني اللي خلاص تانكد بالطريقه دى؟ ك

وبه الايامي بني اللي وجههلك النبأة؟ ك

شغالة فين بني إن شاء الله؟

تستعمل في إيه بني؟ كات

هه إنه مش يعنى البين باليهود؟ كات

إه عافر إيه اللي يجد بجي حرام عي

ومن بني حضرتي؟ عي

تسمح لي بسنيمي بني حباته إيه فرح

له بني؟ حلمي: اقتره بانعا ك

اسامع: أنا إيه بني؟ ك

واحنا مش هنكلع بني؟ كات

وإنك شم نسمح بني فير

مش كفاية بني عليكم كده؟ ب

كايه بني؟ أخ

بس فقد النظام ده بني كام سنة أخ

إحنا مش قنعانى نتفنف لشفنا بني ك

وإيه اللي يخيلك بني مش قادرة كات

إيه ده بني؟ مكينة كات

عابرة أره عافر الايامي دى بني عي

وأنا بني من المعاصر دى؟ ك

يمكن بني ننافض بنظام؟ ك

إشعمني بني؟ ب

إشعمني بني هوا؟

إروي بني والكلام ينام المحاضرة إيه؟ ب

مش كفاية سحر بني عي

من إيه بني يا ستي؟ فير

طب إنه اللحي بني يا ظفح أه ماج

أما بني اللي همادله بيحى في ورقة بس

أما بني اللي هبجع فكو أفل من بس

أما بني اللي هباعاد صفر هانيه بس
Commissives

Declarations

Table 3 Distribution of ba'a in Different Clause Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause-Initial</th>
<th>Clause-Medial</th>
<th>Clause-Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بالخدام جربى بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بال rencont بس حقي بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بال rencont بس حقي بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بال rencont بس حقي بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بال rencont بس حقي بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بال rencont بس حقي بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بال rencont بس حقي بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بال rencont بس حقي بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بال rencont بس حقي بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
<td>بقى احنا وده بوش بال rencont بس حقي بقى مبه بس بلائش بقى المساك بس</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
البحث: نموذج تحليلي بني هجين أرعة-
من إشاعات تقاوضية في كنها في-
شفت بني إنك كاذب-
وهوم أن تعيين البيسبول بني يعتقد-
إن غارب إيه التي يجد بني حرام-
ومين بني حضرت;

دمعي تهتمي بني حكمات إيه فبر-
من كيانية بني علب ليست-
لكن تولوي إيه بني في قلة التقل-
بس قدت النظام ده كيف كام سنة-
وإيه اللي يحتفظ بني بطش فاخرة-
أنا بني من العالصر دي؟

قول! هات بني-

 Atom: إيه ظحلك أهو... انتظر بني في-
الجهدة: بس كيدة بني-
تأس بي (تلث) لمغلفة بني-
با رود بلق بني-
بس بني تقنوني-
بوه بني كل حادة حرام-
بالحال بني كل مجم-
قولي بني لاية قمه بوم لونه إيه-
على اعتموا حساب الفائزين بني-
واسمع بني لما أقولك-
حلقي بني لو اكتمح فيها-

بي بني لو كنت طالع بنك بالش-
بوه بني ما إذا غارب إنيوك من-
اختر بني مالباث دولت-
ورث ود..! انتتح بني؟-
بوس! إزاي بني-
شفانة فين بني إن شاء الله-
وبعدن بني- أنا صبرت على البت-
بالها ماي بني-
وبعدن علاك بني-

تأنح في إيه بني؟
لي بني؟ جملي:- أقدمت بناه ل-
اسامع: أنا لي بني-
واتي مش تحدثك بني؟
آمال: فهمت بني؟-

ليه بيه دو اشراك بكم بلحة بني؟-
حتخصوانا بني؟-
خلاص بني مانشلوكاش بس-
دممطمتعكمدلادمغطُصّمب
جقزػامبؼكمراحمؼشؿغؾممظماظعراقمعاتمسل
م
بسمػقمبؼكمرادفمغاذػةمك
م
دهمبؼكمرعزمالخيرماظؾلمبؿقزّسفمب
م
أغا
م
ـامبؼكمزيمعامبقؼقظقاماظراجؾمك
م
إغتمبؼكمذقطانمأخ
م
دهمبؼكمسؼدمذراطةمبقنيموبينماظؾاذامسل
م
آػلمديمبؼكمسـدكمحؼمصقفامك
م
غلقؿؽمبؼكممظماظؽلاممأخ
م
اظدؼاغةمبؼكمصقفماظؾلمدامحقامسل
م
ضرغػؾةمديمبؼكمطاغتمعؾؽةماظرضصمكم
م
أغامػادقؾؽمإغتمبؼكمظؾؿطربمبؿاسؽمسل
م
أغامبؼكمظقامرأيممخؿؾػم
م
بسمأغامخاؼػمبؼكمعامغؼدرشمغلؿؿرمب
م
ظؽـمإغتمبؼكمعامتعرصشمشيرمحؽؿمغؾقفمب
م
بسماحـامبؼكمعامبـشؿغؾشمسـدكمب
م
أغامبؼكمعشمعلؿعدمب
م
واحـامبؼكمعشمحـلؿـكملدامنمقتمب
م
وأغامبؼكمعشمعـؼقلمعـمػـامك
م
أغامبؼكمعشمساجؾنيمب
م
تاخدمبؼكمععاػاماظصقػقينمسل
م
أغامبؼكمممؽـمأءثرمظؽمسؾكماظلتمب
م
أغامساؼزكمتعرفمبؼكمعينماظؾلمطانمسل
م
احـامبؼكمغاخدػامطعابلمك
م
وأغامحاجؾؾؽمبؼكمواحدمذؾابمأخ
م
سؾشانمبؼكمؼاماخؿكمطانمزعانمبرضفمصقفمك
م
إنمامإغتمبؼكمؼامرجبمبقفمغزظتمسؾقـامأخ
م
ضاظتمظفمبؼك:م
م
ؼامأخلمدهمإغتمسؿركمطؽ
م
أغامبؼكمؼامدقديممحضرمسل
م
طؾمواحدمبؼكمؼطؾعمدؾعةمجـقفمك
م
ػؿامبؼكمؼؼرروامصقؿفاموصقةمالحؽاؼةمأخ
م
أغامبؼكمؼقوهمبؼكمبس
م
ربمادؿـكمسؾلمبؼكمبس
م
ادؽتمبؼكمبس
م
دقؾفقظلمبؼكموأغامحأعرعطمبقفمالأرضمب
م
عامتؿفقزوامبؼكموتؿؾؿقامبس
م
ؼامخقاجةمبشرىمخؾقؽمعلاعحمبؼكمبس
م
تعالمبؼكمؼامحراعلمؼامابـماظؽؾبمبس
ذقفمبؼكمؼامإبراػقؿمأصـديمصبرم
بصمبؼكمؼامحاجسلم
م
سادل:مبسمبؼكمؼامأخلمب
م
بسمبؼكمؼامحاجسلم
م
دقؾفمبؼكمؼامػقؿةمطؽ
م
خلاصمبؼكمؼامأمماسماسقؾمك
م
ؼقوهمبؼكمؼاممصفقممبس
م
عامتؼقممبؼكمؼامراجؾمأخ
م
خلاصمبؼكمؼامأبقمغؾقؾمبس
م
ربمطػاؼةمبؼكمؼامغقالمصبرم
م
طػاؼةمبؼكمؼاموظقةمك
م
بـقـة:مبصمبؼكمؼامرفمسل
م
ضقممبؼكمؼاظلاماصقكمأخ
م
إغؽمذفؿمتلؿحمبؼكمصبر
م
طارمإؼفمبؼك؟مأخ
م
إحـامعشمضؾـام
م
ػـؾؿديمغؾؿػتمظشغؾـامبؼكمك
م
تقديمغػلؽمجفـؿ..مأسؿؾؽمإؼفمأغامبؼكمبس
م
سرصتيمبؼكمظقفمحؾقدينمب
م
إزايمبؼكمواظؽلاممبؿاعمالمح
م
اضرةمإؼاػا؟مب
م
عشمطػاؼةمدفرمبؼكمسل
م
عـمإؼفمبؼكمؼامدتي؟مصبرم
م
ربمإؼفمالحؾمبؼكمؼامروحمأعؽمأخ
م
إزايمبؼكمؼاماخقؼا؟مك
م
ظقفمبؼكمؼامذقخمحلني؟مطؽ
م
وبعدؼـمبؼكمؼامتحقة؟مصبرم
م
أممحلني:مإزايمبؼكمؼامابنيمطؽ
م
إحـامشفنناجنبي لتلتلت لمغثان بقى ك
م
نمودي نفسك بحم..أعمالا إيه أنا بقى
م
عرفنيتي بقى لهحي ببحب النوات ك
م
إيه دا؟كينكت كات
م
غابة أغرف إيه الانتفاص بقى ك
م
بس مبى؟ مين اللي يستاهل؟ عي
م
إشعمني بقى؟ب
م
وإيه فادئة الحب بقى كحنا محتوسين ب
م
إياي بقى واكلام بتحا محاضرة إيه؟ا ب
م
مش كلباهة شور بقى ك
م
من إيه بقى شا؟ في
م
ملب إيه الحبل بقى يا روج أءا كاخي
م
إياي بقى يا أخوه؟ ك
م
ليه بقى يا شيخ حسن؟ كا كاك
م
وبعديني بقى يا تحب؟ في
م
أم حسن: إياي بقى يا مي كات
سلم: لي يبني ب

قال المفضل: يبني اصرفي ب

استاذن أنا يبني كاك

استاذن أنا يبني حسن كاك

عبدا يبني بس

بس أنا فلت بني الحاج محمد عزام عي

ماب أنا رست بني بس

همستلمي يني يبني بس

بادوب يبني عي

طيب البيت بنك يبني عي

وعله يبني أنا خند نده كاك

وقب مطالبه؟ لبي: بكر يبني ب

عن إذنك! يبني فر

عدي يني ماهية بني بس

حبي بي يني بس

دي لعبنك يني يني ب

وجروا ورايا يني ب

فقلت في سري يبني جاز يكون حد كاك

لما نتوج يبني حتروز إزاي تاخ موقب ب

أنا زرس يني حرام علك بس

طيب يبني حمد الله على سلامتك ك

لا مواخذة يني خدي جنكي كاك

لا يني دي مش سالة معرفه ب

حيث كهد يني يني طاقة القشر عي

ده كلام فاخر يني. دي مهله ب

لا يني ده هدية يني ليها طعم تاني بس

إنت عرف يني زي ما إنت راس ك

نصبحوا على خير يني ب

لازم السكينة يناعته بني عي

وهو كسب. وذوقته يني ب.. 

إلا إذا كان أشر منا بني فر

بس أنا ما سكش يني كاك

ده إنت مفتمري يني عي

وبعدن أنا هايز أظلمك بني عي

ده شغنا يني عي

هيفود نا طرايزه نانه.. أمين يني عي

بس زي بعضه يني بس

نلم يني كده وللعد جنب الحيط بس

بس زي ما بيعنوا يني كل شيخ وله عي

من النهارده يني لا فيه طلب ولا نص! كاك

قلت يني لازم يكون عندك كاك
Table 4 Interaction between ba'a Function and Position in the Clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coherence</th>
<th>Interpersonal Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>End of Encounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-initial</td>
<td>Clause-initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>بـيـيـيـيـّـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـيـهـي~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-medial</td>
<td>Clause-medial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) آنا بقي احتوأر</td>
<td>(1) ضنئ بقي على</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أخ</td>
<td>فلوبس آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الرسالة بقي إلک</td>
<td>ده بقي اللي آنا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لو تثبت أفقر أصول أنج بقي</td>
<td>فاكه آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الحروف آخ</td>
<td>(2) فعد النظام ده بقي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) وخصوص بقي</td>
<td>كام سه آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المعلم ابراهيم</td>
<td>لغام تقولا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>صحها آخ</td>
<td>(4) لما بقى تقولا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) إنما إنت بقي يا رجب ده تزلت علينا</td>
<td>(5) تَحَي بقى تدوسي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بالرشوت آخ</td>
<td>(6) مكن لقي أسس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) ده بقي لبت</td>
<td>هدومي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المعلم شُفرك آخ</td>
<td>(7) مكن لقي أخذ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) وبا حابك بقي</td>
<td>صورة ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>واحد شاب آخ</td>
<td>(7) طب ونا حارف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى الزرام بناعي فين</td>
<td>(8) مكن لقي أخذ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الكلام آخ</td>
<td>(9) ودلوهقي بقى ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) دين أبنا بقى ما</td>
<td>(10) ولزم أبنا جارب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نيبه ب</td>
<td>(9) دين أبنا بقى ما</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فرصة للوادي ب</td>
<td>(11) إشميني بقى هوا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>(10) آنا بقي مش</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جاشحي ب</td>
<td>(12) المصيبة بقى إنها</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) آنا بقي مش</td>
<td>(13) نَفُر دلوهقي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مستعد ب</td>
<td>(13) لما تجوع بقى</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) هو ده بقى</td>
<td>(14) حترف إراي ناخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الکلام الغلط ب</td>
<td>(15) طيب إيديكو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مختلف ب</td>
<td>(16) بل على البومه ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) واحنا بقى مش</td>
<td>(15) آنا أعرض بقى</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حسننا لما مدنون!</td>
<td>الأمر على زايلب ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>(16) وإبا فدية المحب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) ظن إنما بقى ما تعرف غير حكم لبيه</td>
<td>ب</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(17) مش كتابة بقى
(16) ده بقى رمز
(15) الخبر اللي بتوزيعه ب
(14) بس أنا خايف
(13) بقى ما تندرس نسمع
(12) حلمي يحب
(11) الأدوات ك
(10) وأنا بقى مش
(9) ينقل من هناك ك
(8) أصل بقى اللي
(7) زى دول شبان ك
(6) أنا بقى رمز
(5) مابيقولا الواحل
(4) العالم لد
(3) وإيه بقى اللي
(2) خلاك نتأكد ك
(1) كل واحد بقى
(23) بقى رامش بإله
(22) لا فله طلب ولا نقص
(21) فسه بقى من
(20) لا تقول لي بقى
(19) ولا ألف إداعه كا
(18) الاختي كان زمان برضه
(17) فيه زعما ك
(16) من الهارد بقى
(15) الناصر دي كا
(14) وانتي مش
(13) هنكللي بقى ك
(12) حاق بقى
(11) تشريكن حتة بلوزة ك
(10) بقى مش قادرة كا
(9) الناظر دي بقى
(8) بناة الواود سليمان
(7) كات
(6) التهارد بقى
(5) بقى جايز يكون كات
(4) نبتي تدور له بقى
(3) على بعمة كات
(2) خاف بقى أقل
(1) من خمسة وثلاثين
(23) فطفت في سري بقى
(22) بقى معروف كات
(21) نبتي تدور له بقى
(20) على بعمة كات
(19) خاف بقى أقل
(18) من خمسة وثلاثين
(17) بقى جايز يكون كات
(16) نبتي تدور له بقى
(15) على بعمة كات
(14) خاف بقى أقل
(13) من خمسة وثلاثين
(12) بقى جايز يكون كات
(11) نبتي تدور له بقى
(10) على بعمة كات
(9) خاف بقى أقل
(8) من خمسة وثلاثين
(7) بقى جايز يكون كات
(6) نبتي تدور له بقى
(5) على بعمة كات
(4) خاف بقى أقل
(3) من خمسة وثلاثين
(2) بقى جايز يكون كات
(1) نبتي تدور له بقى
(2) على بعمة كات
(1) خاف بقى أقل
(0) من خمسة وثلاثين
بن
(3) اعتذائية بني فيه

الله سبحانه وتعال

الي له بطاط

بسط

(4) من أدفني نفي بني

الباحي

(5) في الحقيقة بني

نجزم دعظام في

بن

(3) بالى بني

المصلى

(3) وحنين بني هب

رسم

(4) ولله لما بني

اشوف بني بني

بلعا رمعا

(4) واسمع بني لما

الفلك

(2) بين بني الله

هبجزب أرسله

(3) لا ما جده بني

دي بني يد

حلو بني لو

انتحم فيها يد

(4) خلبا بني في

الدهم

(4) كام بني تعرف

الأسمل حاميم

(4) شغت بني إنك

كذاب

(4) خلبا بني في

حابل رهيم

(4) كل واحد في

انا بني يحمل

تيهج غلطغه

(5) ناخذ بني معاها

الصحفيين

(5) هو دى بني

الشيخ

(5) نسيح تفهمي

بين حكبلات

بالطابع

(5) وخلب بني يمل

ترتيب

(3) في الحقيقة بني

نجزم دعظام في

بن

(3) اعتذائية بني فيه

الله سبحانه وتعال

الي له بطاط

بسط
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(1) كاذ يه بعى؟ أخ
(2) لبي بى هى اشتراك
(3) بى كام بلحع بعى؟
(4) لملع بعى المرة
(5) باتل؟ بعى
(6) لا واحده بعى
(7) كاذ
(8) مش كتام سهر بعى
(9) يه
(10) أن شاه الله عى

(1) ما تقوم بعى يا راحل
(2) يا موه أمها؟ دى
(3) نواقع بعى
(4) لا ما دى حصة
(5) لا واتل بعى
(6) فكون إمزافتى تواجع
(7) الأعمر الواقع بعى
(8) تبرغ إمل瑞典 إكم
(9) برغ
(10) لا بى دى مش
(11) سلى معرفه
(12) حتى كونتى؟
(13) فكتى بى؟
(14) فهمتى بى؟
(15) كتام الشيخ
(16) افدقع لنفسى بى
(17) فتشى سىه بى!
(18) دى لى فصة
(19) كتام يبى
(20) لك
(21) كتام
(22) كام
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\[ \text{دي بقي لد} \] 20
\[ \text{هدي بقي بس} \] 21
\[ \text{فهي برقى يا} \] 22
\[ \text{قرنلية بقي لد} \] 23
\[ \text{يبة وأد بقي كد} \] 24
\[ \text{عما بابن اللكب} \] 25
\[ \text{سيوني في حالى بسن} \] 26
\[ \text{ماها أمي بقي بسن} \] 27
\[ \text{ففتحي بقي لد} \] 28
\[ \text{بتلا بني كملى رسم بسن} \] 29
\[ \text{وكلام كد} \] 30
\[ \text{وتعمدن بقي كد} \] 31
\[ \text{ناعفص بقي رجاء بس} \] 32
\[ \text{طب استنى على بسن} \] 33
\[ \text{كان بسن} \] 34
\[ \text{وقت خلاص بني نسوبى بسن} \] 35
\[ \text{كانوا أنتوا ببنى} \] 36
\[ \text{ببنى فلتونى حرام غلاباى بس} \] 37
\[ \text{باعتنا بني عيش جمجم بس} \] 38
\[ \text{年之 درى ببنى عيش} \] 39
\[ \text{لامز السكرتة ببنى عيش} \] 40
\[ \text{واعنة بني عيش} \] 41
\[ \text{ددة مفدى ببنى عيش} \] 42
\[ \text{وووه بوى بس} \] 43
\[ \text{وسى ببنى جاى} \] 44
\[ \text{لاى بلاى ببنى جاى} \] 45
\[ \text{عشي} \] 46
\[ \text{روى بنى لوكرت} \] 47
\[ \text{ماوسرى وفتى بنى} \] 48
\[ \text{فتى يدو على ببنى غاى} \] 49
\[ \text{فرترى بنى لوكرت} \] 50
\[ \text{يوه بوى بنى لوكرت} \] 51
\[ \text{يذى بنى بوى بنى} \] 52
\[ \text{وووه بنى بوى بنى} \] 53
\[ \text{وووه بوى ببنى العدي بى} \] 54
\[ \text{تستوى بنى لوكرت} \] 55
\[ \text{وووه بنى بوى بنى} \] 56
\[ \text{وووه بوى بنى لوكرت} \] 57
\[ \text{وووه ببنى بوى بنى} \] 58
\[ \text{وووه بنى لوكرت} \] 59
\[ \text{مودى برى بنى لوكرت} \] 60
\[ \text{وووه ببنى بوى بنى} \] 61
\[ \text{وووه بنى لوكرت} \] 62
\[ \text{وووه ببنى بوى بنى} \] 63
\[ \text{وووه برى بنى لوكرت} \] 64
\[ \text{وووه ببنى بوى بنى} \] 65
\[ \text{وووه بنى لوكرت} \] 66
\[ \text{وووه ببنى بوى بنى} \] 67
\[ \text{وووه بنى لوكرت} \] 68
\[ \text{وووه ببنى بوى بنى} \] 69
\[ \text{وووه برى بنى لوكرت} \] 70
\[ \text{وووه ببنى بوى بنى} \] 71
Table 5 Distribution of *ba'a* across Sentence Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أنا بقي الجحورت أت</td>
<td>بقي احنا ما رضيئنت بالدكؤر فير</td>
<td>لما شوف.. اننظلي بقي فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ماعرفش بقي اتصفي بس</td>
<td>ممكن بقي آخذ صوته بس</td>
<td>بلا دلبي بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ولزم بقي أحرب نبم وأماته بس</td>
<td>إيه ده بقي بس</td>
<td>اختني بقي بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أستاذن أني بقي كت</td>
<td>على كده بقي الأحمر عتان اللحمة عي</td>
<td>اطلعلي بقي كت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أستاذن أني بقي أسن كت</td>
<td>ممكن بقي أنس هدومي بس</td>
<td>يجدع اهمه بقي كت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أنا بقي أخاف أو كن النص الناني بس</td>
<td>طب وما حكرف بقي الزراب بتاعي فين بس</td>
<td>انظحي بقي كت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أنا أعتر بقي الأمر على زمايلي بس</td>
<td>هو ده بقى الشيخ عي</td>
<td>عيب بقى! أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سيدة بقي بس</td>
<td>كنتي نجريم بقى! إيه بقى بس</td>
<td>فكروا إزاي تواجهوا الأمر الواقع بقى بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بس أنا قلت بقي الحجاج محمد زعام فيي</td>
<td>وما احرفش بقي الفراخي ناوي عمل كت</td>
<td>معدل بقى الامرة الحالية ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هو ده بقي الكلام الطي بس</td>
<td>أمال إيه بقي اللي يبتر الطلب كت</td>
<td>بلاش بقى النسات بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أما بقي اللي هخطايطه بيحس في ورقة بس</td>
<td>وإيه بقى اللي خالك تناكد بظرطية دي كت</td>
<td>قومي إرقصي يا فرنة بقي كت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أما بقي اللي يجيب فيجو أقل من بس</td>
<td>وإيه الاتهام بقى اللي وجهوتونا النبيذ كت</td>
<td>اعمل حاجة بقي كت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أما بقى اللي هايحس صرف هامده بس</td>
<td>مين بقي اللي هيجنر أبصة عي</td>
<td>خلاص بقى أمال إيه اللي مزعلك فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أصل بقى اللي زي دول شبان كت</td>
<td>وزدت وهد.. ارتحت بقى! بس</td>
<td>اصات بقى امسك عي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ده بقى اللي أنا فاكرو اخ</td>
<td>من إبني بقي الوطنية دي كلها فير</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي المقدم.
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

كان ممكن أن ينطلق يتطلب ك،

إسماعلي بني؟ ب

إسماعلي بني هو ب

وإنه فداء الحب بني واحة مخيمين ب

نزاعي والكلام بنت المحاضرة ينهاي؟ ب

تش كفاءة عيد بني ع

من بني يا صدي؟ في

طب يا حبل بني يا روح أم، أخ

بني يا حبل؟ ب

إذا بني يا أخوب؟ ك

أني بني يا شيخ حني؟ كات

وأني بني يا نحية؟ في

أم حني: إزاى بني يا أني؟ كات

سلام: لبني ب

يبني يا حاثه كات

جلاء بني يا واحدة صافية لن ك

كفاءة بني يا آم إسماعيل ك

يوه بني يا حمطم ب

ما تقوم يا رايت أخ

جلاء بني يا آم تليل ب

طب كفاءة بني يا نوال فير

كفاءة بني يا ليلة ك

بيثنة: بني يا طه بع

قوم بني بالان أصحح آخ

وجلبه بن بعمل لزيبه فير
Table 6 Interaction between ba'a Function and Sentence Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coherence</th>
<th>Interpersonal management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contrast</strong></td>
<td><strong>End of encounter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) أنا بقى احتوىت</td>
<td>1) نصحوا على خبر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) أرسلت إلى بقى كلك</td>
<td>2) بقى براج</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) لو نتوهم أقدر أصل</td>
<td>3) أتلقى من السيرة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) نحن بقى كلك</td>
<td>4) بقى براج</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) الحروف أت</td>
<td>5) رسائل من السيرة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) رحب بقى بقى على</td>
<td>6) رسائل من السيرة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) كلام ك</td>
<td>7) رسائل من السيرة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) الحروف أت</td>
<td>8) رسائل من السيرة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

المصادر: مسند أبي زينيف، بقى بقى على، بقى بقى على، بقى بقى على
كث (28) نتعلم بنتي جدة
ب (25) بين أنا بقتي
ب (24) أبا بترى كات
ب (23) بين أنا ما تستتح
ب (22) يعني بقتي
ب (21) ونافع بقتي هند
ب (20) بين زي بعضه
ب (19) نفسي بين
ب (18) التهدر يبقي
ب (17) اختاري معلومات
ب (16) بين
ب (15) أنا بقتي اللي
ب (14) هيجيب فيك واقل
ب (13) من خمسة وتلايين
ب (12) بين
ب (11) وأنا بقتي اللي
ب (10) يبى خير صر بس
ب (9) أنا بقتي اللي
ب (8) هاشطه بيست بس
ب (7) لا بين دي هديه
بين لها طعم ثاني
ب (6) بين
ب (5) الديانة بين فيه
ب (4) اللي سامحوا فيه
ب (3) اللي له بطلاب
ب (2) بقتي
ب (1) بين
ب (42) بين
ب (41) حاج محمد عزام
ب (40) بقتي
ب (39) جوزه بقتي راح
ب (38) بينتله في العراق يبقي
ب (37) انا بقتي بايدي
ب (36) محضرنا
ب (35) بين زي ما
ب (34) بينوا بقتي كل شيخ
ب (33) ولا طرفهنا
ب (32) لا بقتي معاها
ب (31) بين اللي كان
ب (30) طالبنا
ب (29) زعم بقتي
ب (28) المشهور من اللحمه
ب (27) دلوقتي بقتي
ب (26) الله يهود بقتي
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41)  ده غير بني إن

42)  الدمشيرمكم إنم

43)  مظعءمظمةماغم

44)  شراكمةي وبين

لاشعا ماع

(3) في الحقيقة بني

(4) إذا كأن أشعر

منا بني فير

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>1)  بني د اسمه</td>
<td>2)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>2)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>3)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>3)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>4)  بني؟ ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)  زئي بني والكلام</td>
<td>2)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>3)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>3)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>4)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>5)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)  بني ماظفة هي اما</td>
<td>4)  مكن بني أسس</td>
<td>5)  مكن بني أخذ</td>
<td>6)  مكن بني أخذ</td>
<td>7)  مكن بني أخذ</td>
<td>8)  مكن بني أخذ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>4)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>5)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>6)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>7)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>8)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>6)  مكن بني بس</td>
<td>7)  مكن بني بس</td>
<td>8)  مكن بني بس</td>
<td>9)  مكن بني بس</td>
<td>10) مكن بني بس</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>7)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>8)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>9)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>10) بني؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>8)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>9)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>10) بني؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>9)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>10) بني؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)  بني؟ ب</td>
<td>10) بني؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1)  كأن هو إنتم

2)  نسيب هدوه

3)  كلم مكن

4)  كلم ما

5)  كلم ضد

6)  كلم ملك

7)  كلم على

8)  كلم هو

9)  كلم ما

10) كلم ما
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Imperative

1. غلبت iframe ب في لعبة
2. اこそن iframe ب علما
3. انشاء iframe ب في لعبة
4. إنشاء iframe ب علما
5. إنشاء iframe ب في لعبة

Imperative

1. قم بإن الإجابة
2. انشاء iframe ب علما
3. إنشاء iframe ب في لعبة
4. إنشاء iframe ب علما
5. إنشاء iframe ب في لعبة
6. إنشاء iframe ب علما

Imperative

1. غلبت iframe ب في لعبة
2. اこそن iframe ب علما
3. انشاء iframe ب في لعبة
4. إنشاء iframe ب علما
5. إنشاء iframe ب في لعبة
6. إنشاء iframe ب علما
(7) وفدوها سيرة بقى
(8) بقى بقى يا أخي! بقى
(9) طب خلاص بقى بقى
(10) قبص يوم بقى بقى
(11) معا بقى، بقى
(12) يا شيخ روح بقى
(13) معا بقى أقبل بقى
(14) فلنت بقى يا أم
(15) اسماعيل بقى
(16) قومي أرقص يا فناء بقى
(17) يا واد بطل بقى
(18) اعمل حاحا بقى
(19) معا في حالي
(20) اندعدج إفهيم بقى
(21) فني بالله
(22) المهم بقى
(23) خليسا بقى في حرام عليكوا بقى
(24) بقى لو كنت
(25) سبه بقى يا هبة
(26) بقى فلفتنو
(27) حرام شيد عي
(28) معا بقى، بقى
(29) غلاي بقى
(30) معا بقى، بقى
(31) لحسن ماذا زمانها جاية
(32) إبراهيم أفندي بقى
(33) بووه ماتعلمني
(34) معا بقى
(35) انطل بقى بقى
(36) معا بقى
(37) معا بقى
(38) معا بقى
(39) معا بقى
(40) معا بقى

Table 7 Distribution of tayyeb across Discourse-Marking Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment (information receipt)</th>
<th>Giving consent</th>
<th>Mitigating a directive speech act</th>
<th>Threatening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. جمجدي: الكوروبت عمو: تظهر</td>
<td>طيب بي أسفيم أخ</td>
<td>1. جمجدي: التقطلي عماي من هنا ب</td>
<td>مخبر: انصermal Yahoo: الناعر:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لما كنت باشري بر عن العين:</td>
<td>عادل: طيب.</td>
<td>2. 34. دؤر وشان. عادل: طيب.</td>
<td>مدل: طيب .. طيب أنا هاعرف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الكابن: طيب. ب</td>
<td>عادل: غنمي. عامل: طيب.</td>
<td>3. 34. المعلمة: مطمطت الإزار ده:</td>
<td>المصب: إيوه المعلمة: طيب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. تيب المشروعت دي كلها</td>
<td>عادل: غنمي. عامل: طيب.</td>
<td>4. نظف اللى هناك. ك</td>
<td>نظف: ما هناك. ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مش تكلفت كن: ب</td>
<td>عادل: جربي. عامل: طيب. ب</td>
<td>5. أنا اختارت الصورة. ب</td>
<td>عامليني راجلة؟ طيب ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 34. عادل: غنمي. عامل: طيب.</td>
<td>طيب يا أخوبا. رتى: يهدبات با</td>
<td>7. طيب طيب. طيب يا يا ب</td>
<td>أوريم كاك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أهوب. ب</td>
<td>طيب طيب. طيب يا يا ب</td>
<td>8. طيب، قلت لك من الأول. ب</td>
<td>طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. طيب أدبيكو بقي على</td>
<td>طيب، قلت لك من الأول. ب</td>
<td>9. طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
<td>طيب، قلت لك من الأول. ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اليومية: ب</td>
<td>أسمال: الكشكول أهه ..</td>
<td>10. طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
<td>طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. طيب آن أضر بقي الأضر</td>
<td>نزول أجري لت تريح ك</td>
<td>11. طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
<td>طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>على زنابل ب</td>
<td>أسمال: الكشكول أهه ..</td>
<td>12. طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
<td>طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. طيب وقبة: طالباتا ب</td>
<td>بكرة على محفظة الألوبيس ..</td>
<td>13. طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
<td>طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. حلمي: هتقدر مع الأساند خل</td>
<td>نزول بيري .. زينب: طيب ك</td>
<td>14. طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
<td>طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. الغريب .. المعلمة: طيب انفصلوا</td>
<td>صفارة الإدار تعطي النور ..</td>
<td>15. طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
<td>طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>المعلمة: طيب .. ك</td>
<td>16. طيب طيب. كاك</td>
<td>طيب طيب. كاك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. طيب يا احنا جالك خيبة في</td>
<td>11. أم حني: طيب طيب. كاك</td>
<td>12. طيب طيب. كاك</td>
<td>طيب طيب. كاك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>13. اخلص. حني: طيب. كاك</td>
<td>14. تقول إنك عاك نتشاك لا ك</td>
<td>طيب طيب. كاك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. طيب يا هرم: هرم: طيب. كاك</td>
<td>15. طيب طيب يا راجل مش تبعت</td>
<td>16. سلامات يا واعك ك</td>
<td>طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. طيب يفي حمد الله على</td>
<td>17. سلامات يا واعك ك</td>
<td>18. طيب طيب يا راجل مش تبعت</td>
<td>طيب طيب يا اسميال ..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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13) عادل: طيب يا حبيبي في
الثورة لا ك
14) أنا هادف الكتاب ده يا حلمي 
هل حلمي: طيب ك
15) أبو حلمي: طيب تصبحوا 
على خير ك
16) طيب بو زعانين من قول لي
لي كث
17) طيب زعانين مني لى؟ كث
18) طيب هو أنا يعني بعد البيت 
لي يا يوم ماجاها كث
19) حسنني: لا كنت خبرك يا 
حاجة. أم حسنني: طيب كث
20) يعني ما ستي؟ كث
21) طيب مكن كنني تعليما لنا 
رزي؟ كث
22) طيب. تبقى تدور له بقي على 
بعة. كث
23) طيب طيب طيب طيب طيب 
طيب. على مهالات شويا كث
24) الممثلة: يا أخويا سابق عليا 
النبي سبب. الممثل: طيب. أنا 
حاسبات. كث
25) طيب يا سيدي فكث بعافية. 
كث
26) طيب. فكث بعافية كث
27) طيب ما. لما تشجي تلعب يا 
بيت. كث
28) أه. طيب. أستاذن أنا يقي 
كث
29) كده؟ طيب خلاص كث
30) طيب يا أختي. على راحتكم 
كث
31) طيب طيب لما تقابل بعد 
النهار بليه تنفق بس
32) طيب أنا هاجصرف بس 
طبي بين فيك مستعد يكتب 
 Levi
33) طيب البيت يننك بقي عي 
34) كوري عباس ؟ طيب .. طيب 
35)
Table 8 Distribution of َتَيَعَب across Speech Act Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertives</th>
<th>Directives</th>
<th>Expressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طبيب الفضيل فير</td>
<td>طبيب نفتخ على خبر</td>
<td>طبيب البيت بنيت قبي علي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب مصلى قد</td>
<td>طبيب انفصلوا ك</td>
<td>طبيب نفتخ على ُعدم تملك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب انخل عمايا ب</td>
<td>طبيب الفضيل فير</td>
<td>طبيب هو اثني بعث البيت ليه؟ كلا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب الفضيل ما قبتش فير</td>
<td>طبيب انصلو عمايا ب</td>
<td>طبيب يا راج متش بيعق流出 إنك جايك؟ كلا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب المشروعة دي كهاش عش تكلف كثيرة ب</td>
<td>طبيب إدليكو قبي على ُعدم تملك</td>
<td>طبيب يا اثني جان خيبي في أنه كلا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب بي يفتي فير</td>
<td>طبيب إدليكو قبي على ُعدم تملك</td>
<td>طبيب يا بني اثني نفتخ فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب بس خلد بالك يا إبراهيم فير</td>
<td>طبيب بس خلد بالك يا إبراهيم فير</td>
<td>طبيب يا بني اثني نفتخ فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب ينين فير</td>
<td>طبيب ينين فير</td>
<td>طبيب يا بني اثني نفتخ فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب خلاص خلاص تعالى اثني عي</td>
<td>طبيب خلاص خلاص تعالى اثني عي</td>
<td>طبيب يا بني اثني نفتخ فير</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
طبيب خليفة إن هذا في
طبيب زعفلان متي ليا؟ كات
طبيب ما يجي نلعب يا بيت كات
طبيب ما دام هلص لنا الشر في
طبيب مش كنتي تمامى لنا رز كات
طبيب بين فيكم تستعد يكتب النفي
طبيب تفظ اللي هناك ك
طبيب وفية مطلابنا؟ ب
طبيب وله اختشتنا احنا بالدا؟ فبي
طبيب وهي عازية في إن؟ كات
طبيب يا باني مش كنت نسب الحكومة؟ فبي
طبيب يا باني لما حنز خروج فين؟ فبي
طبيب يا باني مش يمكن يروح يبلغ؟ فبي
طبيب يا باني مش يمكن البوليس مراقبة في

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissives</th>
<th>Declarations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طبيب إن شاء الله وحاجيلمكو معا بأخر الأخبار فير</td>
<td>طبيب أنا هانصرب بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب خلاص بروحوا هم السيا من 9 وانا آجي لك كات</td>
<td>طبيب خلاص بروحوا هم السيا من 9 وانا آجي لك كات</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب لما تقابل بعد الظهر نبقى نقف بس</td>
<td>طبيب لما تقابل بعد الظهر نبقى نقف بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب تازل بس</td>
<td>طبيب تازل بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب هناخدك بس</td>
<td>طبيب هناخدك بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب يا كالب إن ما كنت أورتم بس</td>
<td>طبيب يا كالب إن ما كنت أورتم بس</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Distribution of tayyeb in Different Clause Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause-Initial</th>
<th>Clause-Medial</th>
<th>Clause-Final</th>
<th>Free-standing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) طبيب المشروعات دي كلها</td>
<td>مش تلئت كنيبا ب</td>
<td>لما كنت بشر من عند العين..</td>
<td>مجدي: الكبريت مكول.. يطهير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) طبيب يا سيدى ولا تزع.. ب</td>
<td>الكاتين: طبيب. ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) طبيب إيديكرو بي على… ب</td>
<td>طبيب يا الخوا.. رنا يهديك يا</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>الإيومية. ب</td>
<td>طبيب يا الخوا.. رنا يهديك يا</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) طبيب وفية مطلابنا ب</td>
<td>طبيب من اختت الصورة. ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) حلمي: هتقدب مع الأساد طه</td>
<td>طبيب أنا آرع بقى الأصر على زعناي ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>الغريب.. المعلمة: طبيب انتملا</td>
<td>طبيب أنا آرع بقى الأصر على زعناي ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) طبيب يا احتى خاك خيانة في آيه ك</td>
<td>طبيب يا احتى خاك خيانة في آيه ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) طبيب يا راجل مش نبعث قول</td>
<td>طبيب هو زعفلان متي قول لي</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>إنات جاي نستباك.. ك</td>
<td>الله كات</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) طبيب فني حمد الله على سلامات با منم ك</td>
<td>طبيب فني حمد الله على سلامات با منم ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) طبيب. نصفي ندور له بقى على</td>
<td>طبيب. نصفي ندور له بقى على</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(9) عادل: طيب إيه؟ أين؟
(10) أبو حلمي: طيب تصبحوا على خبر؟
(11) طيب زعاف متي ليا؟ كات
(12) طيب هو أنا يعني بعت البيت ليه يا عم مراه؟ كات
(13) طيب وهي عازرا في إنه يعني يا بسي؟ كات
(14) طيب مش كنت تعلي لنا رة كات
(15) طيب يا سيدي فتاك بعفية.
(16) كات
(17) كده؟ طيب خلاص كات
(18) طيب يا أختي. على راحتك كات
(19) طيب طيب لما تنقلب بعد الظهر نتلق تفق بس تيلا
(20) طيب أنا هاتصرف بس
(21) طيب مين فيكم تستعد يكتبنا

(22) طيب البيت يتب كي عي
(23) طيب بش خد بالك يا إبراهيم فرح
(24) طيب وله اختنا إجنا باللذام
(25) طيب يا بني ميش يمك
(26) البوليس مراقبة في
(27) طيب يا بني لما حنمز
(28) هتروج فين؟ فير
(29) طيب يا بني مش كنت
(30) تسبب الحكومة فير
(31) طيب أريس ما بينش فير
(32) طيب .. ما تفرش إن
(33) الحاجات دي تسجل تيم فير
(34) طيب يا بني ميش يمك
(35) يروع يبلغ عن أصحاب فير
(36) طيب خليك إن هنا فير
(37) طيب ما دام حصل لنا الشرف
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(31) مخبر: ازلل يا أخي .. الناعور:
(32) كده طيب .. طيب أنا هاعرف
(33) أوريكم ك
(34) عامليني رجالة ? طيب ك
(35) حسني: طيب. طيب يا
(36) هوم كاك

Table 10 Interaction between ṭayyeb Function and Position in the Clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment (information receipt)</th>
<th>Giving consent</th>
<th>Mitigating a directive speech act</th>
<th>Threatening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause-initial</td>
<td>Clause-initial</td>
<td>Clause-initial</td>
<td>Clause-initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) طيب المنشووعات ذي كليها</td>
<td>طيب بس افهيم أخ</td>
<td>طيب انفطن بالفيا من هنا</td>
<td>طيب يا كلاب إن ما كنت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) عش تنلكف كتوب ب</td>
<td>طيب بس اسبيد ولا ترعل ب</td>
<td>المعلومة: نضاخت الاذاز ده؟</td>
<td>أوريكم كاك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) طيب جيزي لا ترعل ب</td>
<td>طيب يريكو بتي علي</td>
<td>الصبي: أوبو المعلومة: طيب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td>نضاخت اللي هناك ك. ك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) طيب خلاص .. خلاص غي</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) إبراهيم: عن إنذلك هاروح</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) دورة الملة .. الضابط: طيب</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) اعتقل في</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) بكره .. طيب إن شاه الله فبر</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) طيب يا كلاب إن ما كنت</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(31) مخبر: ازلل يا أخي .. الناعور:
(32) كده طيب .. طيب أنا هاعرف
(33) أوريكم ك
(34) عامليني رجالة ? طيب ك
(35) حسني: طيب. طيب يا
(36) هوم كاك

Table 10 Interaction between ṭayyeb Function and Position in the Clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment (information receipt)</th>
<th>Giving consent</th>
<th>Mitigating a directive speech act</th>
<th>Threatening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause-initial</td>
<td>Clause-initial</td>
<td>Clause-initial</td>
<td>Clause-initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) طيب المنشووعات ذي كليها</td>
<td>طيب بس افهيم أخ</td>
<td>طيب انفطن بالفيا من هنا</td>
<td>طيب يا كلاب إن ما كنت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) عش تنلكف كتوب ب</td>
<td>طيب بس اسبيد ولا ترعل ب</td>
<td>المعلومة: نضاخت الاذاز ده؟</td>
<td>أوريكم كاك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) طيب جيزي لا ترعل ب</td>
<td>طيب يريكو بتي علي</td>
<td>الصبي: أوبو المعلومة: طيب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td>نضاخت اللي هناك ك. ك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) طيب خلاص .. خلاص غي</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) إبراهيم: عن إنذلك هاروح</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) دورة الملة .. الضابط: طيب</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) اعتقل في</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) بكره .. طيب إن شاه الله فبر</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) طيب يا كلاب إن ما كنت</td>
<td>طيب طيب هانخاد ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free-standing</th>
<th>Clause-medial</th>
<th>Clause-medial</th>
<th>Clause-medial</th>
<th>Clause-medial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) مخبر: إنزل يا أخي، الشاعر:</td>
<td>(1) آمال: دُوّر ونَك، عادل: طيب، لما كنت بشرًا من عند العين</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) طيب، آمال: طيب</td>
<td>(2) عادل: عنصري، آمال: طيب، الكاتب: طيب</td>
<td>(2) طيب، آمال: طيب، ربما يهدت يا اخويا ب</td>
<td>(2) عادل: جرُّبي، آمال: طيب، ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) طيب، آنا اختارت الصورة، ب</td>
<td>(3) طيب، آنا هاذا الكتاب دها يا حلمي</td>
<td>(3) طيب، لو زعلان هдвی قول لي له كاف</td>
<td>(3) عادل: اتُشترْلو، آمال: طيب، ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) طيب، آن أعترض بني الأمور</td>
<td>(4) تعالي، طيب يا يا! ب</td>
<td>(4) طيب، تعلُّوجي أو ما سمتعي صفة الإذارة تطوى النور</td>
<td>(4) طيب، تعلُّوجي أو ما سمتعي صفة الإذارة تطوى النور</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) خيال: لا، كثر خبرك يا حاجة</td>
<td>(5) طيب، طيب طيب، طيب، كاف</td>
<td>(5) طيب، لو زعلان هдвی قول لي له</td>
<td>(5) طيب، لو زعلان هдвی قول لي له</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) أم حسني: طيب، كاف</td>
<td>(6) طيب، طيب طيب، كاف، على ههلك شوهر كاف</td>
<td>(6) طيب، لو زعلان هдвی قول لي له</td>
<td>(6) طيب، لو زعلان هдвی قول لي له</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) حسني: لا، كثر خبرك يا حاجة</td>
<td>(7) طيب، طيب طيب، كاف</td>
<td>(7) طيب، لو زعلان هдвی قول لي له</td>
<td>(7) طيب، لو زعلان هдвی قول لي له</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) وآرجوكي إذا لم تسمعي</td>
<td>(8) طيب، طيب، على ههلك شوهر كاف</td>
<td>(8) طيب، لو زعلان هдвی قول لي له</td>
<td>(8) طيب، لو زعلان هдвی قول لي له</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) أم حسني: طيب، كاف</td>
<td>(9) طيب، طيب طيب، كاف</td>
<td>(9) طيب، لو زعلان هдвی قول لي له</td>
<td>(9) طيب، لو زعلان هдвی قول لي له</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) الممثلة: يا اخويا ساق عليل</td>
<td>(10) حسني: يا هم، حسني: طيب</td>
<td>(10) حسني: يا هم، حسني: طيب</td>
<td>(10) حسني: يا هم، حسني: طيب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) العربي: طيب، آمال: طيب، آنا حسابك، كاف</td>
<td>(11) طيب، طيب طيب، كاف</td>
<td>(11) طيب، طيب طيب، كاف</td>
<td>(11) طيب، طيب طيب، كاف</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) كوري يا خيال كيف، كوف</td>
<td>(12) طبيت يا هم، كاف</td>
<td>(12) طبيت يا هم، كاف</td>
<td>(12) طبيت يا هم، كاف</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) طبيت يا هم، كاف</td>
<td>(13) طبيت يا هم، كاف</td>
<td>(13) طبيت يا هم، كاف</td>
<td>(13) طبيت يا هم، كاف</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) عرام: إنه يا باشا! هدي</td>
<td>(14) عرام: إنه يا باشا! هدي</td>
<td>(14) عرام: إنه يا باشا! هدي</td>
<td>(14) عرام: إنه يا باشا! هدي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 Distribution of tāyyēb in Different sentence Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Free-Standing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) طيب يا أخني جاكل خيبة في الله</td>
<td>1) طيب يا أخني نصين في الله</td>
<td>1) طيب يا بديع ولا تزل البكاء</td>
<td>1) مجدي: الكبريتي ميلول يظهر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) طيب يا حيدري يتحلى في الله</td>
<td>2) طيب يا حيدري يتحلى في الله</td>
<td>2) طيب يا حيدري يتحلى في الله</td>
<td>لما كنت شرب من عند النبي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) طيب يا نبينا يلقي في الله</td>
<td>3) طيب يا نبينا يلقي في الله</td>
<td>3) طيب يا نبينا يلقي في الله</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 Interaction between ṭayyeb Function and Sentence Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment (information receipt)</th>
<th>Giving consent</th>
<th>Mitigating a directive speech act</th>
<th>Threatening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Declarative)</td>
<td>(Declarative)</td>
<td>(Declarative)</td>
<td>(Declarative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) طبيب يا اختي جاك خيبة في أمه. ك</td>
<td>1) طبيب بتقيني نك خية في أر. ك</td>
<td>1) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>1) طبيب يا ثلاث ق نك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) طبيب بتقيني نك خية في أر. ك</td>
<td>2) طبيب بتقيني نك خية في أر. ك</td>
<td>2) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>2) طبيب يا ثلاث ق نك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) طبيب نزلي نزلي نزلي نزلي نزلي</td>
<td>3) طبيب نزلي نزلي نزلي نزلي نزلي</td>
<td>3) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>3) طبيب يا ثلاث ق نك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>4) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>4) طبيب يا ثلاث ق نك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>5) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>5) طبيب يا ثلاث ق نك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>6) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>6) طبيب يا ثلاث ق نك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>7) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>7) طبيب يا ثلاث ق نك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>8) طبيب يا بالك ان ما كنت</td>
<td>8) طبيب يا ثلاث ق نك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب المشروبات دي كله</td>
<td>طلب المشروبات دي كله</td>
<td>طلب المشروبات دي كله</td>
<td>طلب المشروبات دي كله</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من تكلّف كثير؟ ب</td>
<td>طلب وثيقة مطالبة</td>
<td>طلب يا أخي مش تبعت تقول</td>
<td>إنها جاي تستناد لها</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عادل: طلب يه يأي في الثورة ك</td>
<td>طلب زمان مي ليه؟ كله</td>
<td>طلب وهو يعاني في يه</td>
<td>يعني يا ستي؟ كله</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب من يدي يستعد يكتب عن</td>
<td>طلب من يدي يستعد يكتب عن</td>
<td>طلب من يدي يستعد يكتب عن</td>
<td>طلب من يدي يستعد يكتب عن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب ولية اختترا إحنا بالذات لا فير</td>
<td>طلب يا أتي مش يمكن البوين مرافقة فير</td>
<td>طلب يا أتي لما حنزل هتروج فير فير</td>
<td>طلب يا أتي مش كنت تسبب الحكومة فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب يا أتي مش يمكن الاحتياجات دي ينجلح تم فير</td>
<td>طلب يا أتي مش يمكن الاحتياجات دي ينجلح تم فير</td>
<td>طلب يا أتي مش يمكن الاحتياجات دي ينجلح تم فير</td>
<td>طلب يا أتي مش يمكن الاحتياجات دي ينجلح تم فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب ما دام حصل لنا الشرف فير</td>
<td>طلب ما دام حصل لنا الشرف فير</td>
<td>طلب ما دام حصل لنا الشرف فير</td>
<td>طلب ما دام حصل لنا الشرف فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free-standing</th>
<th>Free-standing</th>
<th>Free-standing</th>
<th>Free-standing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>جدّ</th>
<th>جدّ</th>
<th>جدّ</th>
<th>جدّ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
<td>طب طب طب</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 Distribution of $\text{tab}$ across Discourse-Marking Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment (information receipt)</th>
<th>Giving consent</th>
<th>Mitigating a directive speech act</th>
<th>Threatening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) طبب كنت تقول يا زاجل أخ (\text{tab}) ثبات ولديدين آخ</td>
<td>1) طبب انعموا حساب الغابيين يفدي ب</td>
<td>1) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>1) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) طبب مش يمكن صاحبها بسال عنها آخ</td>
<td>2) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>2) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>2) طبب حذى نامي إنت وانا حكم بك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) طبب يا واد قبل ما ينفدهما ما تنتج الحواريات دي وعرف جواها</td>
<td>3) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>3) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>3) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) طبب ما يئدما ما يندبها</td>
<td>4) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>4) طبب حذى نامي إنت وانا حكم بك</td>
<td>4) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) طبب كوبس قوي ب</td>
<td>5) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>5) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>5) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) طبب يلألا دور إنت من هنا بيلأ ب</td>
<td>6) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>6) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>6) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) طبب ما أتار شتست متها ب</td>
<td>7) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>7) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>7) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) طبب استولا لما أتبي ب</td>
<td>8) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>8) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>8) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) طبب يا جمعية. تسحبوا على خير بقبي ب</td>
<td>9) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>9) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>9) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) طبب أفغد فين ب</td>
<td>10) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>10) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>10) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) طبب غضبي عينينا كده ب</td>
<td>11) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>11) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>11) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) طبب باقول كاك يفدي ب</td>
<td>12) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>12) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>12) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) طبب ما أتار شتست متها ب</td>
<td>13) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>13) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>13) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) طبب الطلب ورصي وك</td>
<td>14) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>14) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>14) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) طبب وانا حافر بقبي الزمام بتاني فين ب</td>
<td>15) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>15) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>15) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) طبب أتار مستعد أتبي لك نصبي بك</td>
<td>16) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>16) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>16) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) طبب ما يئدما على بلحابه ب</td>
<td>17) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>17) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>17) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) طبب والنهاده مه عن غير معاخذة شمله إراتي؟ ب</td>
<td>18) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>18) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>18) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) طبب وانت عايز بقبي كا ب</td>
<td>19) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>19) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>19) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) طبب ما لوهما كده من الصح؟ بك</td>
<td>20) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>20) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>20) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) طبب فين؟ هنال؟ إراتي؟ ب</td>
<td>21) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>21) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>21) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) طبب بر نتفاهم معاك يا</td>
<td>22) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td>22) طبب حذى إنت جوا ب</td>
<td>22) طبب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جماعة ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 طب هو عندك كأم ست على</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كدها؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 طب والجماعة بناءة احتر</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الثيم إذا شعب دي؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 طب هي في الفرحة النبي</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جُنُفْع على البيض؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 طب لو كنتا راحلة تزود ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب مس من غير ما تُشْت</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>من فضلكا ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 طب أما مسعت أضرف لكم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بُحْة ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 طب يقول خمسة ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 طب هات بي إي زفت</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وخليصي ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 طب كدها طب كدها ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 طب خلاص بقى ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 طب اكتني با سني ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 طب والشبان رجعيين برضه؟</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 طب أهه ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 طب سلميلي عليها ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 طب أما أنزل أسلم عليه ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 طب ما أنا برضه معلم وكسبب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 بقي كده يا دياب طب والله</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لأوريات ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 طب ما هو الرقص كمان</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>واجب ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 طب خشي غرير هدوء لك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 طب أنا هاعرف أورويكن أنا</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ابن بنك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 طب مش جاز رحتنوهم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حنة نانية ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 طب مش لفهؤي لفهمهم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كي ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 طب إخوة عفحة ما عندك ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 طب غور من وشي غور من</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وشي ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 طب إنسي يسكونوا لا ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 طب أهه عسان تستري ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ربمضـامإؼفمػكماظـقرةم
(49) طب قنآ إيه هي الثورة
الخليفة ل ك
(50) طب بتدفع الابن كام آ ك
(51) طب والملشورات ك
(52) طب وحلمي هو سنون حي
ولا منطقة ل ك
(53) طب خيال خدوها ل ك
(54) طب والسلح اللى كان
ماكم في الإجبار واَلى هددوا
ببه صاحب المصنع جبوت بوين أ
ك
(55) طب إيه التنظيم اللى وراء
حادثة المصنع ك ك
طب والكتب اللى تطشاها
في شفتا ل ك
(56) طب ووري بي سدي بطاقات
ك
(57) طب سنين ك
(58) طب الفضل ل ك
(59) طب أن حاقات على وصفة
كوسة ك
(60) طب العلم منه يا أخيل وما
تطوّد خلفيات على فرقتق ك
(61) طب قول حاجة يا اسماعيل
ك
(62) طب ليه ل أته كم ك
(63) طب وننا إسرائيل دى
محتاجة ده كله ك ك
(64) طب أنا إيش فهمتي ك كت
(65) طب ما تشنت هنا يا إبني ك
كاك
(66) طب والنادي يا وتي ك كت
(67) طب لو سمحت والله يندهو
لي كت
(68) طب افلن الباب وراك كت
(69) طب إزيت يا سالم كت
(70) طب يا أخيل ما تروح لأنها
وتجيبها كت
(71) طب باقول كت إيه أنا في
تعرّضات كت
(72) طب وعشا خاطري كت
(33) طلب ما كنت أخوف عنده
طلب زيتيون في بيتي بس
(24) طلب واليتحت لونه إيه؟
بس
(25) طلب ما تقولي ليتنك ما هي
من الصبح تتحك بس
(26) طلب ليه احتوت فوقيا؟ بس
طلب تحكي الفيلم اللي
شفته إمامرا بس
(28) طلب ما تكميلي بس
(29) طلب كتابي عنثي أنا بس
طلب بلا قدمي بس
(31) طلب ده؟ بس
(32) طلب خد خد كل بس
طلب ممكن يعني لوممكن
أمان "المنتقم" بس
(34) طلب ممكن يعني إذا كان
ممكن أه اوه "المنتقم" بس
طلب ما سبي لاحبه بس
(36) طلب ودوني سيما الأول بس
طلب يا حبيبي ناخد الادم بس
(38) طلب يفع أشرب مية ثانية؟
بس
(39) طلب لما أشوكل بقي بس
(40) طلب وقابلاها ليه! بس
(41) طلب لو سمعي قمه طمنيني
بس
(42) طلب ما أنا حاي وفاكر أملك
موجودة بس
(43) طلب خلاص بس ماتقولة
لحد بس
(44) طلب استني على بتي بس
(45) طلب بس بس
(46) طلب ماييحي نروح السينما
هن؟ بس
(47) عدلي طلب تقل الشباك بس
(48) طلب ماتطلب ويسكي ياياحا
غي
(49) طلب مايزوج بارات الفنادق
غي
(50) طلب حاسي عي
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Table 14 Distribution of ṭab across Speech Act Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertives</th>
<th>Directives</th>
<th>Expressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا عندي حل تاني عي طب ده انت فيه في كل حنة في راسك بطحية عي</td>
<td>طب الفنطل ك طب إكليلي الفنيل انتشته ابراح بس</td>
<td>طب اعمال لكي هو واني شعونة كده؟ عي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ستنين ك طب كوبس فوي ب طب ما أنا جاي وفاكر أمك موجودة بس</td>
<td>طب بعض وترهم بس لاحسن تينين بع طب أنا برحه عيم وكيب ك</td>
<td>طب أفده يا هرم كت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ما هو الوقس كمك واجب ك طب ما أنا معك اهو ب</td>
<td>طب أفده فيب ك طب افلاء الباب وراك كت</td>
<td>طب افلاء الباب وراك كت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ما أنا شروت منها ب طب ما انت أخوك عندن للفوزون في بيتك ب</td>
<td>طب اكل كتي يا سي ب طب العبد وريني ب</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب وربنا إسرائيل دي ما حاجضها ده كله ك</td>
<td>طب اقلبي حاتشونة في</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب يا جماعة تصحوا على خير ب</td>
<td>طب اقلبي حاتشونة في</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنت لتفع فيك كانة جذوبلا؟ عي</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب هدي وصحيدي شوية عي</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب إيه الحيل كي يا روح أهلا؟ أخ</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب إيه التنظيم اللي وراء جائحة المصمغة ك</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بقاول لك إنه باب ما كل واحد يسمع ب</td>
<td>طب بقاول لك إنه باب ما كل واحد يسمع ب</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بقاول لك إنه كانة في عرضك كت</td>
<td>طب بقاول لك إنه كانة في عرضك كت</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بقاول إنه يا كاليل له عي</td>
<td>طب بقاول إنه يا كاليل له عي</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بتدفع اشتراك كام ك</td>
<td>طب بتدفع اشتراك كام ك</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب بين ما غنا ما نشتج ب</td>
<td>طب انتن حاتشونا في</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CORPUS-BASED STUDY OF THREE ECA DISCOURSE MARKERS

156
طلب ما تطلب وسكي يا باشا عي
طلب ما يجي نروح النسما س
طلب ما نافع العصر غي
طلب ما ننهب نك دار نا حلوا غي
طلب مش يمكن صحنا يسأل عنها: أُح
طلب مش فهموني تهمتيم يا؟ ك
طلب مش فيهمنا يا العكباك؟ في
طلب مش جايز رحلنهم حتة ثانية ك
طلب مش حفل مي ينن؟ في
طلب مش الفهم الأول انتو مي
طلب مش هنشب حاحة: غي
طلب ممكن نفشه؟ في
طلب ممكن ينها إذا كان ممكن ك
طلب ممكن ينها لو ممكن ك
طلب نقعد هنا شوية في
طلب نقل الشاب ك
طلب هات لي أي زفت ب
طلب هالثبي المدير غي
طلب هملع إيه مغادة خصص غي
طلب هي لي ما الغوزش قبنة دلوفتي غي
طلب والخيران ك
طلب والحكمة بنعة أحمد اللهم ك
طلب والسلاح اللي كان معاكم ك
طلب والشاي يا نن؟ كت
طلب والعمل يا سر غي
طلب واللي تحت لونه إيه ك
طلب واللي كتول لك على حاحة غي
طلب والمنشوات ك
طلب والظام دم من غير مأخذة ك
طلب وأنا حافرة إيا؟ غي
طلب وأنا حارف بقى الزيام تناعي ك
طلب وانت إيه اللي ماعطت ك
طلب وبعدين: وأنا أعمل إيه ك
طلب وحلمي هو مسؤول حي ك
طلب وورني يا سيدي بطاقات ك
طلب وورني عرض كنافية في
طلب ويبس لها ين غي
طلب وشمان خاطري كات
طلب وما جينوش معاك ليه؟ في
طلب ومومي أخ
طلب وهو فين؟ ما جاش معالك ين؟ في
طب وهي إيه العلاقة بين ده وبين اللي أخ
طب يا ابني خذ المصحف ده في
طب يا ابني وصف لي البيت في
طب يا وان قبل ما تتفح يجابات أخ
طب يا أخ ما تربط لأمها وتتجهم كله
طب بالله بالله روح اقلمي جزئت كله
طب بالله بالله كله
طب بالله بالله قدامك بالله قدامك أست
طب بالله بالله دور أست من هنا ب
طب بتمنع أشرب مية ناني بس

Commissives

Declarations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>عصبية</th>
<th>دغل</th>
<th>ضرر</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طب استننى على يمي بس</td>
<td>طب أنا أزل أمى على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا أزل ألم على كد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا أزل أمى على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 Distribution of تاب across Sentence Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طب أما أزل أمى على كد</td>
<td>طب إزاي مسكوكو؟ كد</td>
<td>طب أعلم منه يا أخى كد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا مدلى حل ناني مي</td>
<td>طب أزليف بالباس كله</td>
<td>طب أظل كله</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب أعملك يا ونتي شغونو كده؟ كده</td>
<td>طب أحكيلي الفيلم بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب أفرد فين؟ بس</td>
<td>طب استنوى لنا أشرب بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب إنمي حاحولك؟ كله</td>
<td>طب إنمي ناني بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب إنمي يحيحوقا معانا؟ كله</td>
<td>طب إنمي ناني بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا حاحولك على وصفة كصة كد</td>
<td>طب إنمي كله فيمكى؟ كله</td>
<td>طب إنمي ناني بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا كدرت ألم على اللة كد</td>
<td>طب إفاض حد جاننا كله</td>
<td>طب إنمي ناني بس</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>