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This is a corpus-based study focusing on the analysis of three highly frequent discourse markers (DMs) in Egyptian Colloquial Arabic, namely \textit{ba'a}, \textit{tayyeb}, and \textit{t\text{ab}}. Based on a purposeful sample of seven Egyptian films, \textit{ba'a}, \textit{tayyeb}, and \textit{t\text{ab}} 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 \textit{ba'a}, \textit{tayyeb}, and \textit{t\text{ab}} 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 ṣorb (drinking)

The long vowel symbols are:

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

The consonant symbols shared with English are:

/b/, /d/, /g/, /m/, /n/, /l/, /f/, /s/, /z/, /š/, /ʒ/, /h/, /y/

The consonant symbols specific to Arabic are:

/’/ a glottal stop, as in ’ām (he rose)
/q/ a uvular voiceless plosive, as in qanūn (law)
/r/ a trill, as in rāḥ (he left)
/ḥ/ a voiceless fricative, as in ḥaf (he was frightened)
/ḡ/ a voiced fricative, as in ġani (rich)
/h/ a pharyngeal voiceless fricative, as in hayā (life)
/ṣ/ a pharyngeal voiced fricative, as in ġamd (deliberate)

The velarized sounds are:

/t/ as in tār (he flew)
/d/ as in dārb (beating)
/s/ as in sōt (voice)
/z/ as in zarīf (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 *yašni* 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 *yašni*, *ṭayyeb*, and *enta ūref*.

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*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab* 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*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab*? This research question is further divided into three sub-questions:

- What is the role of *ba’a*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab* in coherence?
- What is the role of *ba’a*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab* in interpersonal management?
- What is the role of *ba’a*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab* 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

**Adj**  
Adjective

**Adv**  
Adverb

**AFL**  
Arabic as a Foreign Language

**AP**  
Adjacency Pair

**CA**  
Conversation Analysis

**CANCODE**  
The Cambridge and Nottingham Corpus of Discourse in English

**CIC**  
The Cambridge International Corpus

**CP**  
Cooperative Principle

**DA**  
Discourse Analysis

**DM**  
Discourse Marker

**ECA**  
Egyptian Colloquial Arabic

**EFL**  
English as a Foreign Language

**FTA**  
Face Threatening Act

**IMP**  
Imperative

**N**  
Noun

**NEG**  
Negative

**NP**  
Noun Phrase

**PM**  
Pragmatic Marker

**Prep**  
Preposition

**PP**  
Prepositional Phrase

**SLA**  
Second Language Acquisition

**V**  
Verb
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
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 that 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!
Gamīl!, and šażīm! In ECA.

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>Continuer tokens</td>
<td>Maintain the flow of the discourse.</td>
<td>Minimal forms such as Yeah, mm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Convergence tokens     | Markers of agreement/convergence. They are linked to points in the discourse: 1) where there is a topic boundary or closure 2) where there is a need to converge on an understanding of what is common ground or shared knowledge between participants. | Many forms can perform this function such as:  
  - single word items: yeah  
  - follow-up questions such as did you?, is she?  
  - short statements, e.g. agreeing statements: yeah it's pretty sad. |
| Engagement tokens      | 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. | They manifest in many forms for example:  
  - single-word forms, such as excellent, absolutely  
  - short statements, repetitions: that's nice, oh wow, oh really  
  - follow-up questions: did you? |
| Information receipt tokens | 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. | Right and okay |
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
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>‘Emāret Ya’qubyān</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>‘Arḍ 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><strong>El-Bedāya</strong></td>
<td><strong>1986</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,569</strong></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‘a*, *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 *information-rich cases*, containing large numbers of the discourse markers being sought (that is, *ba'a*, *tayyeb*, and *fab*).

### 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 *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*, *ṭayyeb*, and *ṭab*, 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](image)

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
the right of the DM.

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>لا بقى جوزك؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a to become</td>
<td>حبيتي دكتور إن شاء الله</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2—to be (no longer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3—to arrive, attain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4a—there has elapsed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>4b—there has accumulated or accrued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5—to begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>5b—to be (no longer) engaged in or accustomed to (doing s.th.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6—to arrive at the point of (doing s.th.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7—modal of constant or repeated action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8—modal of decision or emphasis</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):

> baça² /part/ 1 so, then, now. ruwuḥu baça go, then! very well, go! Sana ḫ-aqallim-ak baça I'll teach you then! Sixtifi baça that's enough now! 2 however, on the other hand. Sana ᵁafaɗqal il-qism il-Sadabi - w aldibaça ḫayiz-ni ᵁaxuß iq-tîbb I prefer the arts side, but my father wants me to go into medicine.

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:

\[\text{(1)}\]

\[
\text{Betḥebb nadya el-gendi? Elḥwāṭi beyhebbūha, bass ana ba'a baḥebb yosra.}
\]

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:

\[\text{Figure 1. clause-medial ba'a preceded by the first-person singular pronoun}\]

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 \textit{ba'a} is also evident in its collocational behavior. As seen in the concordance lines, \textit{ba'a} collocates with contrastive particles, such as \textit{amma}, \textit{bass}, \textit{lāken}, \textit{ennama}, and \textit{ğēr}:

\begin{figure}[h]
  \centering
  \includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.png}
  \caption{Contrastive particle \textit{amma} collocates with \textit{ba'a}}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
  \centering
  \includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3.png}
  \caption{Contrastive particle \textit{bass} collocates with \textit{ba'a}}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
  \centering
  \includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure4.png}
  \caption{Contrastive particle \textit{lāken} collocates with \textit{ba'a}}
\end{figure}
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) 

萱دنک شماملن تاشيبن في البال. بالاش بني المسبك.  
*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) 

لاهتك الوحدة اللى اتباعت ولوجي كلها قاعدة.. مش قللباك انك فنانة.. بالا بني كلمى رسم  
*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’ara* to mark the logical relationship between breaking a promise and assuming responsibility for that action:

\[
\text{*Kān fīh ettefā’ ma benkom wenti ḥalefīh. Koll wāhed fel-donya *ba’ara\\n\text{You broke your promise. You must accept the consequences of your actions.}}
\]

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:

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

Examples of *ba’ara* as a marker of conclusion abound in the corpus:
Figure 8. ba’a marking a conclusion

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 دوماً, as in Figure 9, would be
redundant:

Figure 9. ba’a co-occurring with delwa’i (now)

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

(6) في بيتنا رجل الدباغ شوف بقى يا إبراهيم أفندي.. أما أقولك يا حبيبك إنت حتكلم حتكلم
šūf ba’a ya ibrahīm afandi. Lamma a’ollak enta ḥatetkallem ḥatetkallem.
Look DM (Now look), Mr Ibrahim. When I order you to speak, you must speak.

Just as now collocates with the verb look in English, ba’a collocates with the verbs boṣṣ and šūf:

Figure 10. ba’a collocating with the verb boṣṣ

Figure 11. ba’a collocating with the verb šūf

Similarly, as English now collocates with listen, ba’a collocates with esmaʕ:

Figure 12. ba’a collocating with the verb esmaʕ

Role in turn-taking. Contrary to the DMs ṭayyeb and ţab, 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) *

*بَسْ.. بس بقي فلتنتي حرام عليكوا*

*Bass bass ba‘a fala’tūni ḥarām ẓalēku!*

Stop it! Stop it *DM*! *I've had enough!*

(8) *

*يَلَّا اخْرُج.. اخرج بقي*

*Yalla ṣḥrōg ṣḥrōg ba‘a!*

Get out! Get out *DM*!

The *end of patience* function is evidenced in sufficient quantity in our film corpus:
ما يلبش بعض نفسه متأذل عزنصبه. شهيرة: الحب بين شوقتنا. المعلقة: العب يتكلم. 135
أولاً أنا واحد من فريقك. كيف ماتشانك؟ أمستك في أمسك ماتظلتي. عبد ربه: بس دو كثير يابيّه.
أدى إذن الهي اواعز تيودي نفسك بهجمة. أعملك إيه أنا بني؟ كل اللي بيتموا في الأقمار دول هيروجوا النجائر
الاختيارات... الاختيارات مالا ينتين الحاجة عادل: بس بني يا أخلي طب خلصنا بيتا توبيا إلى إخرين.
تشونوا عروساً لأبوها بالمرة... أبو حلمي: يا واد بطل بفيّ. عن إنكوا... زينب: متر منقشب الشاي معنا
زينب: عشان إيه 2 متر حاجي؟ سيبني في حالي قيّه. مخبر: ماجش داعي للحاجة دو... إني عارفة
» نيين: نيينالا. إنبيالا (21 فزاء): منتقلسنا إلى مساح: ما دام عاملين دربة كده متر حبرف
الله جاوي بسم علّك قبل ما تمته... رجل: خلصني بني يا رضالة صافنيا لين... نين: صافنيا لين... المعلم
بشر يحمى إنك كتد بتجنّي على يننك... العين: خلصني بني يا أبو نبيل... سباحة دو... الجدة: وحية نبيل
يا راجل إذن القسم: يا جماعة يا جماعة. خلصني بصين مشتعلن. خلصني. قلّ إني يا أبو نبيل؟
طبيب التحاليل: إبرك بالولد دو... نعيم: ماما أنا زهنت بني... إني يبيعني دوّندا... الراجل دو متر عازو يدخلنا
.. أنا باكره بنيا والكنزة وغيره الكنيسة. أنا زهنت بني حرام علّك... نعيم: ده إني اللي موجودة هنا؟
.. حلمي.. خلصني.. حلمي.. حلمي.. طالب: زهنت بني حرام ورام.. طالب: إنك طلبت الكلمة؟ طالب:
ابنآ.. هن ده العيشة اللي إحدستحقها. وفّقها سيرة أتّي سليم: أصيح عادل: التورث مكثّر... يعني إذا كنت
إلا الحلق ولا شيء مرافق. إعلان: ده كلام دارغ في... دمّزنة 147 (القاسم): آفي على بتهمة
مش عدنا.. أم سامع.. يا مصبيتي.. ديبا: كناية بني يا أم سامع.. ساتنا في القسم قاتنا واحد ضبايط
ده بنا حلف إنك متي تحتجوزي؟ سامية: طلب كناية بني يا دول سبيتي لودي.. أنا مش عايرة أقد مع حد
ده من تحت راس 88 اسمايل ابن يهية.. ديبا: كناية بني يا ولاية غصنمت مش هي تعمل حاجة.. أم زينب: إحنا
عيب وده حرام.. وده كان حرام.. الجدة: بس كناية بني.. علني: حرام.. حرام.. نعيم: فيه إيه؟ إيه
Figure 13. ba'a marking the end of patience

Some of the more common chunks associated with the end of patience meaning include we baśden ba'a!, we baśden 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 14. ba'a collocating with ḥalāṣ
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) 

*بَعِكمِامْفَمِإَٔغْتمَغَعْدَهْمِاُمْـامَمْمَظُكَضَرْمْعِمْدَمْاُمَمْغِمْعَقْفَمَمْضَرْمْدَهْمْ؟*

*بَعِقْبِيْبَأِعِجلْإَمْنَفْرْلُوْحَدْهِْبْنَامْفيْالقَصرْدْهِْوَاحْنَاْنَامْفيْالعَمْةْ؟*

*ba'a ya ٍُعِكَلْ ٍْنَعْاَنَفْرْلََِّهِْبْنَامْْفِيَالقَصرْدْهِْوَبْعِقْبِيْبَأِعِجلْإَمْنَفْرْلُوْحَدْهِْبْنَامْْفِيْالعَمْةْ؟*

*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) 

*فيَبِنْتَةَرَجْلَالأَمْبِقْيَبَأْحَنَاْماَرْضِيْيْشْبَالدَكْتَوْرْإِلْيْيْانْتَقْمَلْهَاْنَكْوُمْنَرْمِيْهَاَلْلُوَادْدَهْ؟ْ*

*باَّءِرَحْنَاْمَاْرْضِيْيْشْبَالدَكْتَوْرْإِلْيْيْانْتَقْمَلْهَاْنَكْوُمْنَرْمِيْهَاَلْلُوَادْدَهْ؟ْ*

*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), yaʕni can also signal sarcasm (p. 30), but whereas yaʕni 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:

\[
\text{انہا بصراحة نویت اینی استقل المال}
\]

\[
\text{I've decided to make use of the shop.}
\]

\[
\text{تسئله في ایہ بقی؟}
\]

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

### 4.1.3.3 Frequencies of \textit{ba'a} across discourse-marking functions

Table 3 *Frequencies of \textit{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 \textit{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 2 Frequencies of *ba'a* accross 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>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 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 افتحني بني. 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, ʕādel responds to Amāl's view that love is the most important thing in the world by saying وإفصدلاامالحبمماعمحبزامماعيامممةدمنمزوماممامةدا. 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'ā can either strengthen or modify the illocutionary force of a speech act. When ba'ā accompanies an expressive act, as in ɓووده ـبني، it strengthens the emotion expressed by ɓووده ـبني، but when it accompanies a directive act as in اعمل حاجة ـبني، 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'ā merely intensifies the act, in directive, assertive, and comissive speech acts, ba'ā can form a completely independent speech act, namely an expressive one.

4.1.4 ba'ā in Different Clause Positions

Table 4 Frequencies of ba'ā 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):

\begin{equation}
\text{DM you pig, a single person sleeps in that palace, and all of us are supposed to sleep in this hut?}!
\end{equation}

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>
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 6 *Frequencies of ba'a 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>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 1

Conclusion
Declarative 47
Interrogative 27
Imperative 24

End of Patience
Declarative 13
Interrogative 4
Imperative 39

Surprise or Sarcasm
Declarative 0
Interrogative 12
Imperative 0

Politeness
Declarative 7
Interrogative 11
Imperative 0

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:
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 17. ba'a collocating with the vocative ya**

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 ūbayeb

4.2.1 Raw Frequency

ūbayeb 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 ūbayeb

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

ūayib¹ /adj */¹ good-hearted, kind. raagil ūayib a good man. šīt-ūayib marrieen ḡaibīt [prov] he who is excessively kind is a fool. ma-lak-f¹ šīt-ūayib našiib you don’t have what it takes to mix with the good (people). 2 naive. 3 [frozen contexts] good, excellent. kull¹ sana wi-nta ūayib ≈ may the reoccurrence of this day, or occasion, find you well (a greeting on all annually celebrated occasions). qirfeen ūayibin a good sum of money. šiwayya ūayiba or šiwayya ūayibin (1) a good while. (2) a good quantity. ||zeet ūayib olive oil. - ūif-.ValidationError ū-yib (points-winning) ten of diamonds in koom (q.v.). — /n, no pl/ 4 good turn(s), good deed(s). ūgmil šīt-ūayib wi-ntu l-bahr [prov] ≈ do good deeds for their own sake. — /adv/ 5 well. ǧamalt¹ ūayib you’ve done well. — /interj/ 6 all right! O.K.! see further under ūayib
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:

طب **ṭayyib** /ˈɛntɪ/ 6 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:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{البداية} & \text{الكابتن} \\
\text{طبيب} & \text{مجدي} \\
\end{array}
\]

(13) الكابتن طبيب! يظهر لما كنت باشرب من عند العين.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{البداية} & \text{صالح} \\
\text{طبيب} & \text{عادل} \\
\end{array}
\]

(14) النهاردة ما فيش شغل. النهاردة أجازة.

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*:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{الكابتن} & \text{أحمد} \\
\text{عوز حاجة} & \text{عوز حاجة} \\
\end{array}
\]

(15)
**Vertical transitions**

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 interactants 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: 40/96 x 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)

أبوسأصلني كنت عازٍ أنكلم معاك في موضوع مهم كده يعني إذا كان ممكن

حسني حنني

بعدين. بعدين يا شيخ حنسي. اخلع.

حسني طيب.

شوف طريتك.

حسني سلام عليكم.

سلام ورحمة الله.

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:

(18)

الرحيم الله مش تقعدوا تعشوا معانا؟

إسماعيل لا علش أصل والدتي مستنائي

أبو حلمي طيب. تصبحوا على خير

إسماعيل وانت من أهله

(19)

ما تقولوا لنا إنتما تبدروا علي مين

طالب مين إلي ساكن قصدك؟

الظابط الشيخ طلعت أبو العينين

طيب خليك إننت هنا .. تعالوا إننتوا معايا
CORPUS-BASED STUDY OF THREE ECA DISCOURSE MARKERS

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 \textit{tayyeb} and directive speech acts: 64\% of speech acts following turn-initial \textit{tayyeb} were directives.

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

\begin{align*}
\text{(25) & } & \\
\text{ال💕كنك} & \text{إسماعيل} & \text{الكشكول أهه... بكرة على محطة الأتوبيس .. تنزل بدرى} & \text{طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{ز١ب} & & \\
\text{(26) & } & \\
\text{في بيتنا رجل} & \text{إبراهيم} & \text{عن إذنك هاروح دورة المية} & \text{طيب اتفضل} \\
\text{ضاي١ب} & & \\
\text{(27) & } & \\
\text{بحب السي١ما} & \text{نعيم} & \text{وتاخذوني السينما .. مش إنتي بنخرجي تنسحني إنتي ولمعي .. خدوني السينما} & \text{نوعة} \\
\text{طيب طيب هناددخ} & & \\
\text{Mitigating a directive act. Empirical evidence shows a remarkable affinity between the RT} & & \\
\text{\textit{tayyeb} and directive speech acts: 64\% of speech acts following turn-initial \textit{tayyeb} were directives.} & & \\
\text{Threatening. In the following fragments, \textit{tayyeb} is used to perform the commissive speech act} & & \\
of threatening or vowing to retaliate:} & & \\
\text{(28) & } & \\
\text{الأهو كلام. الناس بتكلم. بقولوا إنه حيده البيت وبينه عمانة. خلص.} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{خلصت التحقيق با شيخ حنفي ظو ي لي. عاوز حاجة ثاني؟} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{حنفي} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{أه} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{عاعر} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{لكني} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{(29) & } & \\
\text{اللكن} & \text{الشاعر} & \text{أزنل فين? أزنل فين؟ أنا ما روحش حتة مانيش غارفها} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{انزل يا أخى} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{كدة؟ طيب .. طبل أنا هاعرف أوريكيم أنا ابن مين هنا في مصر} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{(30) & } & \\
\text{اللكن} & \text{خالد} & \text{انا باديكم آخر فرصة أهه الالي هيعترف هافكه .. واللي مش هيعترف هيندم} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{طول حباته .. محادش عايز بتكلم؟ عمليشلي رجاله؟ طيب} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{(31) & } & \\
\text{يحب السي١ما} & \text{مدرس العربي} & \text{إنت ياين الفسالة باللي بتحلل .. مين اللي ضحك؟ مين ابن الخدامة ابن} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.} \\
\text{الصو١ة القديمة اللي ضحك؟ طيب يا كلااب إن ما كنت أوريكيم .. ما افيش أنا} & \text{طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب. طيب.}
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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>Acknowledgment (Information Receipt)</strong></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><strong>Giving Consent</strong></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><strong>Mitigating a Directive speech act</strong></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><strong>Threatening</strong></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 ēh (5 times).

4.3 The Discourse Marker ṭab

4.3.1 Raw Frequency

ᵗᵃᵇ occurred 171 times, after excluding four instances of ṭebb (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:

طيب ṭab /interj; contraction of ṭyyib (q.v.)/ all right (then), very well (then), o.k. (then). míʃ ḥa-ᵗiggawwizii
- ṭab ya sīt-i ḥanufs-liʃ veer-u you won’t marry him?
very well, young lady, we’ll find you someone else. ṭab -
ṇijmil Seeh dīlwaḥti 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:

اأنا باقول نرهن. ولما أسافر وأشترل أبقى أسدد الرهن.

(32)
As the example shows, \textit{ṭab} 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, \textit{ṭab} occurs in the third slot of a three-part exchange, that is, as a follow-up or third-turn receipt:

\begin{verbatim}
(33)
عمارة يعقوبيان

بتهية
زكي
طب وستها له؟

بتهية
لا حلوه .. باريس هي الدنيا كلها ..

بتهية
بقولوا باريس حلوه ..
\end{verbatim}

\textit{Vertical transitions}

Empirical evidence from the corpus suggests that \textit{ṭab} is a change-of-activity token (Gardner, 2005, p. 1) frequently used for \textit{vertical transitions} and is never employed for \textit{horizontal transitions}. It appears from the corpus analysis that \textit{ṭab} 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 \textit{ṭab} grounds the transition into a new topic:

\begin{verbatim}
(34)
في بيتنا رجل عبد الحميد

سامية مش حتطلع معاب؟

لأ عبد الحميد

سامية أنا مش حاقلول حجد إحنا كنا فين

سامية قوللي إلي بعيجلك

طيب إمتى حاشوفات؟

(35)
عمارة يعقوبيان

زكي

فتها البار

زكي

ونا مانتفش؟

زكي

تفعي وكل حاجة .. بس انا مايزي رباب في موضوع

خاص بها
\end{verbatim}
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 *ṭab* example:

(40) خدغكمععاكماظـؿا غعقؿ بحب السیما نعیم ماقدرش يا جمجوم .. أبوک بعملها لنا حکایة نبيل مصقمم..مأبقكمؼعؿؾفامظـامحؽاؼة طب احکیلی الیم الفیلم الی شفته إیمبارح نعیم

The state of affairs denoted by the utterance hosting *ṭab* is that Naim wants Nabil to tell him about the film he saw yesterday. This state of affairs is the same whether or not *ṭab* is used. However, in the absence of *ṭab*, 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 *ṭab* 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 *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab* 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 *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab*, 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 \textit{ṭayyeb} is not enough to determine its meaning. It is the host utterance (the microlevel) which makes it clear that \textit{ṭayyeb} is used for \textit{threatening}. Without it, \textit{ṭayyeb} means \textit{consent}. To use Waltereit’s term, \textit{ṭayyeb} has “scope” variability (2006, p. 75).

Like all response tokens, \textit{ṭayyeb} and \textit{ṭab} 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, \textit{ṭab} and turn-initial \textit{ṭayyeb} 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).

\textbf{4.3.2.2 \textit{ṭab} and interpersonal management}

\textit{Mitigating a directive act}. Empirical evidence shows a remarkable affinity between \textit{ṭab} and directive speech acts: 74\% of speech acts subsequent to \textit{ṭab} were directives.

\textbf{4.3.2.3 Frequencies of \textit{ṭab} 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 ṭab and speech acts

Table 14 Frequencies of ṭab 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 ṭab in Different Clause Positions

enerative is always clause-initial.

4.3.4 ṭab in Different Sentence Types

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

Table 16 Frequencies of ṭab 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 tab's Collocates

Similar to ba'a and tayyeb, tab’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 tab 12 times, mostly occurring after tab (7 times).
CHAPTER 5—DISCUSSION

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](attachment:image.png)
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 يبقى استاذان أنا يبقى. 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 *yašni*, El Shimi (1992) identifies several coherence-establishing functions, including highlighting entailment relations. Under the heading *entailment*, El Shimi states that “*yašni* 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 حضرتك الحكاية دي يتحصل لو إن الببسي بكون ولد، يعني فيه تفرقة ما بين الولد والبنت

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 *yašni* and *ba’a* are not exactly the same. For instance, replacing *yašni* by *ba’a* in the aforementioned utterance yields an awkward result:

طببا حضرتك الحكاية دي يتحصل لو إن الببسي بكون ولد، فيه تفرقة ما بين الولد والبنت

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

طببا حضرتك الحكاية دي يتحصل لو إن الببسي بكون ولد، فيه تفرقة ما بين الولد والبنت

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

 baik صمامين عبانين في القلب، بلاش بقي المسبك والسمين والبط والوز
 baik صمامين عبانين في القلب، يعني بلاش المسبك والسمين والبط والوز

It would appear from these tests that the conclusion functions fulfilled by *yašni* 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:

(2) في بيتنا رجل الأم
بقي إمتهنا ما رضيتا بالدكتور إلي اتقحم لها
نقولهم نزهم لها لوالد ده؟
الكرنك دياب
بقي أنا أشكي وأتعم وأصرف دم قلبي عليها
وأديبالات؟
الجدة بحب السما
بقي إني تصحبي في عز الليل
وتطولني إني دفية؟

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, *أتيتها*:

في بيتنا رجل الأم
بقي إمتهنا ما رضيتا بالدكتور إلي اتقحم لها
نقولهم نزهم لها لوالد ده؟
الكرنك دياب
بقي أنا أشكي وأتعم وأصرف دم قلبي عليها
وأديبالات؟
الجدة بحب السما
بقي إني تصحبي في عز الليل
وتطولني إني دفية؟

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 أنّنا نعيّن مصّ عاجنی, 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 *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab*

#### 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 *عملت 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 َتَيَيَب and َتَب is evidenced in the great similarity and overlap between their functions.

### 5.2.3 Differences between َتَيَيَب and َتَب in Navigating Joint Projects

As we have seen in Chapter 4, both َتَيَيَب and َتَب 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 َتَيَيَب and َتَب act differently in this respect. While stand-alone َتَيَيَب can only signal transitions out of joint projects, َتَب can only be recruited for transitions into such projects. Turn-initial َتَيَيَب, 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 َتَيَيَب is conceived of as an intermediate stage between stand-alone َتَيَيَب and َتَب.

### 5.2.4 َتَيَيَب and َتَب and Interpersonal Management

Empirical evidence shows a remarkable affinity between the RTs َتَيَيَب and َتَب and directive speech acts: 64% of speech acts following turn-initial َتَيَيَب were directives, and 74% of speech acts subsequent to َتَب were also directives. This affinity could well be linked to the mitigating effect of َتَيَيَب and َتَب on the harshness of directive acts, like giving orders. Due to their high face-threatening potential, directives can be prefaced by response tokens, like َتَيَيَب and َتَب, thus signaling that talk by the dialog partner has been heard and acknowledged. It is as if the َتَيَيَب or َتَب 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 َتَيَيَب and َتَب cancels their mitigating effect, leaving the commanding force of the directive unattenuated:

(3)

في بيتنا رجل نوال تعرف يا سامية أنا بيهيا لي Allah يتحب عبد الحميد زي زمان

سامية لو كان بيهيا لك كده تبقى غلطانة
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*:

\[
(1) \text{بحب السما الجدة تصحّني في عز الليل وتقولي إنني دفيانة ولا بردانة آجي أدفيّي؟ يالخي جائك نيلة ده أنا قد أمك يا حمار المنصِّل ماهو حلاوتها في كده .. أنا باموت فيكوا في السن ده .. قوليلي بقى لابسة قميص نوم لونه إيه؟ أحمر؟}
\]

*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.

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

\[
(2) \text{بحسني أنا بصراحة نويت إني أستغل المحل}
\]

\[\text{ana besarāha nawēt enni astaġell el-maḥall}\]

I've decided to make use of the shop.
A deletion test can highlight the face-saving, attenuator function of *ba'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. *ba'a* can thus be used strategically to take the sharpness from utterances.

The same can be said of *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab*, 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 *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab*, thus signaling that talk by the dialog partner has been heard and acknowledged. It is as if the *ṭayyeb* 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 *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab* cancels their mitigating effect, leaving the commanding force of the directive unattenuated:

(3) تعرفي يا سامية أنا بتيه للي إنك بنحيي عبد الحميد زي زمان لو كان بيته لك كده تفي غلطانة خلاص بقي أمالي إلهي مزعلك ده بابا حلف إنك مش حتجوزيه طب كفاية بقي يا نوال سيبني لوحدي

(4) وبعد كده ما قابلش حد ثاني ؟ لميه لميه لا يا بيه ولا نزلش من البيت ثاني ؟ لميه لميه لا يا بيه ما نزلش
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*, *ṭab*, *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 ṭayyeb, and ḏab. 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 ba'a and the adjective ṭayyeb to see if students can distinguish the lexemes from the markers.

*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 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*, *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab*, 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*, *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab*, 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*, *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab*, 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*, *ṭayyeb* and *ṭab* 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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Table 1 Distribution of ba'a across Discourse-Marking Functions

<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>1) أنبا، بنيت بنيت كاتب</td>
<td>2) معنى النهاية، النجاح، النصر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) أنبا، بنيت بنيت كاتب</td>
<td>2) معنى النهاية، النجاح، النصر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) أنبا، بنيت بنيت كاتب</td>
<td>2) معنى النهاية، النجاح، النصر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) أنبا، بنيت بنيت كاتب</td>
<td>2) معنى النهاية، النجاح، النصر</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Film abbreviations:

 Asphalt
 Metropolis
 Final Verdict
 Final Curtain
 Final Accounts
 Final Cut
 Final Score
 Final Destination
 Final理想
 Final Version
 Final Results
 Final Decision
 Final Mission

appendix

Table 1 Distribution of ba’a across Discourse-Marking Functions
اؤهنك بين
(21) لازم السكنة
(22) بناءت بيته علي
(23) هينجرزمخت أمثله
(24) لا حيث كده بي
(25) دى بنى غي
(26) به لنفسي
(27) كان لاما عايز
(28) اطمك نفسي
(29) بص بنى غي
(30) دى ليننا إجا
(31) بنى غي
(32) له شغلنا بي
(33) بص بنى يا حاج
(34) جب بنى نفسي
(35) الحكم فيها غير
(36) بص بنى باعه
(37) بنى غي
(38) المهم
(39) بنى غي
(40) الأستاذ حاطم
(41) كذاب
(42) بنى خليتا
(43) حاطم رضو
(44) أم بنى غي
(45) بص بنى لو كنت
(46) غالي عندك بلاش
(47) حضرتاتي
(48) عادةً لازم
(49) الاتفاق
(50) كل واحد في
(51) الدنيا
(52) نتخب
(53) نواد
(54) معاها
(55) الصحنيين
(56) هود
(57) بنى
### Table 2: Distribution of ba’a across Speech Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Acts</th>
<th>Assertives</th>
<th>Directives</th>
<th>Expressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above shows the distribution of ba’a across different speech acts.
النهائي إن كي بقي ل
حملي: يا شيخ روح بقي ك
سيبيني أفل بقي ل
وفاعه سيرة بقي ب
درب بقي شوقتنا ب
طب خلاص بقي ب
قول هنأ بقي ب
أدبها ضحك أهو.. انفصل بي في
الجد: بقينا أبا بقي س
ما (قل ش) ديل به مبقي ب
طيب إديكو مبقي على الوضوء ب
تبيم ندور بقي على بركة كات
طمن بقي على لفقات آخ
يا واد بل بقي ك
خلينا بقي في الجام ريدا مبقي
خلينا بقي في الجام
يا أبا كم يرس ب
وقولزي بقي لابسة في لونه ب
طب عمل أساين نفيس مبقي ب
واسمه بقي لما أفلوه في
بتنبتي لو كنت غالي عن بنيك.
خرج بقي بالاشتراك دعت في
خلاص بقي انتظاره مبقي
سيبيني في حالي بقي ك
سابقي بني في الفتنة بنتنات ديك
إدال له فرصه بدافع ع لفقاته
بسكو بقي ب
سيبيني بقي وأمان حاربته به الأراضي
لا تجوزوا بقي وزنموا ب
يا خواجه جلي خدمه سماحه بتي ب
шуق بقي بأكره أفرد في
يص بقي يا حاجي
عادل: بتي ب يأجري
بتي ب يا حاجي
سبو بني يا مهده كات
خلاص بتي يا رحالة فظف في
كعنا بني يا استعمال
ما تقوم بتي راجل
خلاص بتي يا أبو نبيل
طب كفاية بتي يا نول في

آمال: جميل بتي ب
نبيه د ه اشرك بكم بريحة بتي ب
تحلصمون بقي ب
بتي عنيت تحتذي ب يا وس لله يا ك
لكن تقولى إني بتي في فلة العقل ب
بتي كده يا حسب الله ك
بتي كده يا دباب ك
بتي كده يخرج بقينه ك
بتي كده طبي شعيب على حق ب
بتي إترو لمهيمنين إتو أخ
بتي ده اسمه كلا ب
بتي ده اسمه كلا ب
بتي ده ربط ده تقل بيه ك
بتي انا بني برساس بالدكتور في
بتي أنا أفقى وأفص ك
بتي إن حcheinى في ع الليل ب
لودي نشاك جهم.. أعلمك إني أني بتي ب
عرفى بتي لحمي برح الندواك ل
ننس بني كين الهم نساهل ك
بتي يا جمل إني ب
بتي إني يا أربو ب
ليه بتي يا شيخ حسي كات
وبعد من بتي يا اتحى ك
أم حسينى: إني إني كات
هسامل من إن بتي ب
أتو وجريا برآ وجريا برآ
لا مواقعة بتي خدعي جنبك كده كات
تسي بتي بيع جنب الحب خ
تلي بكي بين الله خ
وقت خلاق بكي مبيوني ب
عنوان بكي يا آتي كان زمان برضه فإ ك
أنا أمشى بكي يا نيتا كات
طيب بكي حمد الله على سلامتكم ك
إنه بني نحن آن
بس آنا ما سكنت بني كاك
do إن متفر قبلي
وبعد آنا عايض أحلامته بني عي
do نفشا قبلي
دو بني عقد شركته بني وبن البان في
هشوعت لنا طرابها ثانية.. آمن بني
آهي دي بني عدد أمع فيها ك

نسبة قبلي في الكلام آن
الديانة بني فيها سامحا في
قفتته دي بني كانت حكمة الوج ك
قلت بني لازم يكون كدك

أنا هايس بك أتاي قبلي للمطرم تابعته في
آني بني لاي رأي مختلف ب
بس آنا فلا يبقي ما ينذرين نستبر
لكن إن بني ما يترفص غير حكم نبي ب
بس اختي ما ينفشي عدد ب
دي لمثناا انا بني .. مش أوزعر في
أنا بني مش مستعد ب
واحنا بني مش حسننا لما نموت ب
أنا بني مش عاججي ب
ناخد بني معاها الصحفين ن
أنا بني ممكن أمان للك على السب
احنا بني ناخدها كامي ك
كانوا انتوا بني .. غ
ما دام حكم الشرف بني وتعوسفي
كتاب الشيخ هو حكم بني ونش ك
أنا بني حكم غداء بني ومن وقته ك
إنه إن بني يا رجب به نزلت علينا أت
لا مؤاخذة يا الشيخ عبيد. نقوم بني كاك
ابين أحا لنا بني يا ولد ب
قالت له بني: يا أتي حي ها متمرك كاك
أنا بني يا ميدي محضر عي
هما بني يثرروا صحه وصحة الحكماة أت
لا بني دي مش ساسة معرفة ب

كانية بني يا وليد ك
بينه: بص بني يا طه في
قوم بني بالله اصحي آن
وخلية بني يمل ترative في
مكن بني أخ صورة ب
على كده بني الأحمر عشان اللحمه في
مكن بني آلس هدوي؟ ب
طيب وأنا حاولت بني ازعم بتاعي فين؟ ب
كني نوريهم بني ب؟ س

ما تصرف بني الفراحي ناوي بعمل كاك
أمال إن بني اللي يضم القلب؟ ك
هب واني بني الهداء تتأكد بالطريقة دي؟ ك
هبه الائم بني اللي وجاههولك النابية؟ ك
شفلاني في بني إن شاء الله عن

ستفله في بني كاك
هو إن شن بيع البيت بني بالفوهر؟ ك
إنه عارف بني اليد يرد بني حرام في
ومن بني حضرنه؟ في
تسميي لتهمي قبلي حكماهات بيفر
لي بني؟ حلمي: ادك يباعا ك
اساعيل: أنا بني؟ ك
واشي مش هنكلكي قبلي كاك
وشكله شم لسم بني فير
مش كباية قبلي عليك كده؟ ب
كراك كافر بني؟ أخ

بس قعد النظام ده بني كام سنة أخ
احنا مش قبلي هندي نتفر نفنا بني ك
وإنه اللي يطبع قبلي مش قادرة كاك

إنه ده بني؟ نيكب كاك
عابرة أعرف بني الفدرافق بني في
وأنا بني من العاصري؟ ك
مكن بني ننافين بظام؟ ك

يشعبي بني؟ ب
يشعبي بني هوا ب

إراي بني والكلام ينام المحاضرة إياه؟ ب
مش كباية سهر بني في
من بني يا ستي؟ في
طيب بني الحلق بني يا روح أمان آخ
أما بني اللي هاجهته يصق في وراق بسا
أما بني اللي هيجب فيكو أفل من بس
أما بني اللي هباخد صفر هانده بس
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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 ما ريضيت بالدكتور بير</td>
<td>بلواش بقى المسياك بس</td>
<td>إيه ده بقى؟ بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى أنا أشي وأدبك ك</td>
<td>جربى بقى تدوسي عليها ب</td>
<td>على كده بقى الأحمر عدن الحجة عي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى إنت بصيحبي في غز الليل ب</td>
<td>طيب إيدكوا بقى على البوهة ب</td>
<td>كنتي بعبيهم إيه بقى؟ بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى إنت علميت إنو اخ</td>
<td>بقى تدور له بقى على بعبة كاك</td>
<td>لما أشوف... افصلت بقى بير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى ده اسمه كلام؟ ب</td>
<td>اطلس بقى على فلساته بع鑫ى</td>
<td>بلنا بنا بقى إخوانا كاك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى ده اسمه كلام؟ فر</td>
<td>خليت بقى في حامان رشد عي</td>
<td>شوة بقى؟ ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى ده خط ده نقل بعى؟ ك</td>
<td>خليت بقى في المهم عي</td>
<td>استنى بقى ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى عائز تشدني يا وش ألمان ك</td>
<td>بس سيلات بقى من الهيلو دب كامك</td>
<td>كيدج الهم بقى ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى كده يا حسباً اذا ك</td>
<td>لا تقول لي بقى ولا أخف إذاعة كاك</td>
<td>التفتيح بقى ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى كده يا دياب ك</td>
<td>وخليت بقى يعمل ترابه فير</td>
<td>عيب بقى؟ أخط</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى كده فترحجي قلهم ك</td>
<td>ممكن بقى خهد صورة ب</td>
<td>فكووا إرا معوجها الأدب الواقع بقى ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى كده طب شهيمى على حق عى</td>
<td>طب وانا حافر بقى الزعم بنعي فين؟ ب</td>
<td>ملك بقى مرة الجلية ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى يا عجل إنت ب</td>
<td>هو ده بقى الشيخ في</td>
<td>فومي إرقصى يا فرقلة بقى ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقى أنا اشترى البيت ولازم أبول كك</td>
<td>وما ترفش بقى التفرج ناوي يعمل كاك</td>
<td>اعمل حاجة بقى ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>خلاص بقى فنال إيه بقى مزعجل فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>أسى بقى اءت في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>مانظماة بقى بس</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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من بقى اللي هيجوز أرعة عي
من إخى بقى الوطنيرة كي كلهأ فر
شفت بقى دل كلذفي: عي
هوا إذن معايحب البتم لب بقى دلهقهأ؟ كاك
إن عرف بإي بقى يد بقى حرام عي
ومن بقى حضرن: عي

سمعي لهذا لب بقى حبكةك بإي فر
من كتاتي بقى عيلل كك! ب
لكن دولوهي بقى بقى في فلة الغر في
بس قعد الدناه ده بقى كام سنا دح
وإي الل لاخدق بقى مش فادية كك
ون بقى معا الإعصار ذي! ك
يمكن بقى نتخش بنظام كك

أتي بقى هو ب أب
أتي بقى الحورذ أخ
ولازم بقى أجذب بني وتأملن ب
أتي بقى أفه أفل كك النح التاني ب
أتي بقى عرض بقى الأبتر على زمالي ب
هوذه بقى الكلام اللفد ب
أما بقى اللي هاجنش بيج في أفق سين
أما بقى اللي هيجم فيكو أقل من دن
أما بقى اللي جباخد صر هاملا ب
أصل بقى اللي زي دول شان كده بقى اللي أنا
فاكر ب أخ
ومحسوبكو بقى المعلم إبراهيم الحورذ أخ
الهارد بقى امتحان محسباتوت وبحرح بس
ده غير بقى إن المنافعنة مدينة
إن عرف بقى إن أنا راجل مدكر ك
لى ما يلبته: بقى! أنا طهبت كك
الرسالة بقى إنك لو تب تافق وصول أخ
أتي رأي بقى إنها فرصة لوجه ب
العينية بقى إنها فرج دلوي ب
بس أني بحفر بس كك

التارح دي بقى بناءة الود سبيلكن كك
ده بقى المعلم شكوخ أخ
يا إبا بقى تسفيح: أسارا لودحي عي
حقق بقى تشتركل حنة بلغه ك
آكد بقى تفع الأسئد حالم رشتل عي
كهتنا بقى جراي وكدل ك
عن إنذان أنا بقى حاريز أنا كاك
عايزين بقى حضرات شرفنا ك

اسموا بقى أنا حد候ذ ب
بالالا بقى ازلو س
تاعوا الفرجوا بقى ب
بالالا بقى بدعا النابحة التانيه أخ
تاع قدلي بقى تيجوز مينا بسا
بس بقى دارة قصر الليل ب
تاعلي إني بقى ك
هلمي: يا شيخ روح بقى ك
ساببي أنقلي بقى ك
فضوهوا سرة بقى ب
العم بقى سوقنا ب
طلب خلال بقى ب
paused

آديني ضحكته: إه.. افضل بقى فر
الجدد: بقى كتة بقى س
ما (تكش) دعافات بقى عي
با واد بطل بقى ك
بس بقى فقتنى بس
بفوه بقى كل حادة حرام بس
بالالا بقى كملهم بس
قولي بقى لاية فمي نفس نمو لونه إي بس
على انفثح 할ب الفلابين بقى ب
واسع بقى لما أقبال عي
هلمي بقى لو التحيم فيها عي

بس بقى لو كنت عادي باند باد ب
بفوه بقى ما ستره ازوه إن أوك مس
خرج بقى ملبقش دولن عي
وبزت وده.. ارتحب بقى؟ بس
بويبس أجي بقى كاك
شافانة بقى إن شان املدا عي
وبعدين بقى.. أنا صرت مليكى كبر ك
نقالا مي بقى بس
وبعدين طالق بقى أخ
تتقله في إيه بقى؟ كاك
لي بقى! حلمي: أنا بناكنا ك
ابسانع: أنا! إيه بقى ك
واتي بقى ملبكلاني بقى ك
آمال: فهتمت بقى أب

لي بقى او استودك بكمال بلعه بقى ب
حتفلوكنا بقى أب
خلاص بقى مانشلوبنوف بس
وفي ذلك بقيه ده لما تخلصت ب جوزها بقي راح يتمشلى في العراق مات غي
بس هو بقي راسا ناشفه ل
ده بقي رمز الخبر اللي بتوزعه ب
أنا هنا بقي زي ما بتقولوا الراج ل
انت بقي شيطان أخ
ده بقي عدد شركه ببني وبين البانشعي
آهي دي بقي عدي حق فيها ل
نسبات بقي في الكلام أخ
الدبانه بقي فيه اللي ساهموا في
قرنلة دي بقي كانت كلمة الرقص ل
انا هايسياك إنت بقي للمطر بكاتشعي
انا بقي لي راي مختلف ب
بنانا خايف بقي ما ندقير جد نسامي ب
لكن إنت ما تفصيل غير حكم نبى ب
بس احب بقي ما بنفصل عنك ب
انا بقي مش مستعد ب
واحنا بقي مش حسننني لما نموت ب
وأنا بقي مش منقول من هنا ل
انا بقي مش واجيتي ب
ناخد بقي معاها الصحينين ع
انا بقي ممكن أزور لكي على السب
انا عايزك تعرف بقي بين اللي كان عي
احنا بقي ناحنا كاكا ب
واحنا حاجللك بقي واحد شباب أخ
ظلان بقي يا حتى كان زمان برضه في ك
إنا إنت بقي يا رجب ب هن زنلت بكتا أخ
قالت له بقي: ما يا خي ده إنت عملك كاك
انا بقي يا بدي محرض عي
كل واحد في الدنيا بقي يتحمل نتيجة عي
كل واحد بقي يطلع سبع جنحة ك
همما بقي بتقروا صحتها وصحة الحكايه أخ

سيبوني في حالي بقي ل
إدي له فرصة دافع عن نفسه بقي ب
عادي: بوع بقي ب
على استي علي بقي ب
استك بقي ب
سيهولي بني وأنا حاربتي في الأرض ب
ما نتجروا بقي ولمنوا ب
با خواجة بشري خليط منبع بقي ب
تقال بني يا حرامي يا ابن الكلب ب
شوف بني يا إبراهيم أفيدي غير
بس بني يا حاجي با
عادل: بس بني يا أخلي ب
بس بني يا حاجي با
سيب بني يا همة كنا
خلاص بني يا رجالة أفاء بني لد
كتابة بني يا أم اسماعيل ل
بوكيا بني يا جمجم بس
ما لاقون بني يا راجل أخ
خلاص بني يا أبو نبيل بس
طلب كتابة بني يا توال فير
كتابة بني يا وليه لد
أتبة: بس بني يا هل به
قوم بني بالا أصح بني
وأناك تشم تسحم بني فير
كاسي إيه بني؟ أخ
إحنا مش قلي بصري عاشت لتفه بني ك
نودي نسامل جهني.. أعمله إيه أنا بني ب
عرفني بني له حليمي يبجح الندوات ل
إيه ده بني؟ مكنه كاك
عاية أعرف إيه الاتهان بنيعي
بس بين بني؟ بين اللي يستاهل؟ عي
إشمعني بني؟ ب
ويه فإيدة الحسب بني واحنا محمدين ب
إزي بني والكلام يعان المحاضرة إيه؟ ب
مش كتابة شهر بني عي
من إيه بني يا شي؟ بير
طلب إيه الحل بني يا روح أمنا أخ
إزي بني يا إخوي ك
ليه بني يا شيخ حسن؟ كاك
وبعدين بني يا حبي ؟ بير
ام حسني: إزي بني يا حني كاك
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سليم: ليه بني ب

نادر فشقي يب نستري بس

أسنان أنا بني كك

أسنان أنا بني حسن كك

سعيدة بني بس

 بين أنا قلت بني الحاج محمد ز.U.. ي

ما أنا زهفته بني بس

هستماني إين بني بس

بادوب بني غي

طيب البيت يباني بني غي

ولعلما بني أنا خذ تمغرة كك

وقية مطالبًا؟ ليه: بكرة بني ب

عن إنكوا بني قر

عديل أنا ماهية بني بس

حسي بني بس

دي لمناك إين بني ب

وتجروا وسيا بني ب

فطنت في سري بني جايز يكون حند كك

لما توجع بني حتفه إزاي نأخذ موقف ب

أما زهفته بني حرام على بس

طيب بنيمحمد الله على سلاتناك ك

لا مشاده بني خذني جنبك كك كك

لا بني دي مش سالا معرفة ب

حيث كده بني بني طاقة التدري غي

ده كلام فارغ بني بدي مهنة ب

لا بني ده هدية تبي لبي ليا طم تاني بس

إين عرف بني زي ما إنت راس ك

تتصوا على خير بني ب

لازم السكرية تناعات بني غي

وهو كب. ودوقفي بني ب

لا إستا كان أُصر مما بني فر

بين ما سكتش بني كك

ده إنت مفتري بني غي

وبدين أنا غايز أطفالك بني غي

ده شغلنا بني غي

هيشوف لنا طرايزه ثانية .. أمان بني غي

بين زي بعضه بني بس

نلثم بني كده ونقد جنب الحيط بس

بين زي ما بيقعلوم بني كل شيخ وله غي

من انهاره بني لا فيه طلب ولا تع.. كك

قلت بني لازم يكون عندك كك
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>Clause-initial</td>
<td>Clause-initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>End of Encounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>بقه ده اسه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>بقه ده خط ده</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>بقه كده ياء دباب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>بقه كده يا حسب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>بقه انت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-medial</td>
<td>Clause-medial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) أنا بقي احتذرت</td>
<td>(1) أطفال يقي على</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أخ</td>
<td>غلوسات آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) الرسالة بقي إلك</td>
<td>(2) ده يقي اللي آنا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تلقين آخر أصل كت آخ</td>
<td>فاحه آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) ومحوبيك بقي</td>
<td>(3) فدل النظام ده بقي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>العلماء إبراهيم الحوت آخ</td>
<td>صحتها آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) إنما إن تي بيا رجل بين زنت على</td>
<td>(4) جرتي بقي ندوعي عليها ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بالموت آخ</td>
<td>(5) ممكن يقي أببس هذهي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) ده بقي بيت المعلم شتراك آخ</td>
<td>(5) ممكن يقي أببس هذهي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) وأنا حاجبک بقي واحد شاب آخ</td>
<td>(6) وأنا حجرت آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) تنائب بمي في الكلام آخ وست إجنا بقي ما</td>
<td>(7) تنائب بمي في الكلام آخ وست إجنا بقي ما</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) بالموت فلك آخ</td>
<td>(8) بالموت فلك آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) وافد ونا حطر كان آخ</td>
<td>(9) وافد ونا حطر كان آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) فارس لنا ما في الكلام آخ</td>
<td>(10) فارس لنا ما في الكلام آخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) إشبى تي بدي هوا</td>
<td>(11) إشبى تي بدي هوا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) جميرة بين حربها</td>
<td>(12) جميرة بين حربها</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) الدين بين مسألة</td>
<td>(13) الدين بين مسألة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) بطي إديثو مختلف ب</td>
<td>(14) بطي إديثو مختلف ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) وأنا نت بقي مش حسننا لما تموت!</td>
<td>(15) وأنا نت بقي مش حسننا لما تموت!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) ب</td>
<td>(16) ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) لكل إنه بقي ما تعرئ بني كي</td>
<td>(17) لكل إنه بقي ما تعرئ بني كي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>السطر</td>
<td>التعليم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 بقَي اجَهْرَت أَخ</td>
<td>بقَي احْتَا ما رضِنِاش بِلَدَنْكُور فِر</td>
<td>لم أَشُوَفْ. اضْتِمَلْي بقَي فِر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مَاعفْش بقَي اصْرِفي بِس</td>
<td>ممَكَن بقَي أَخْد صْرُوْة; بِ</td>
<td>بلَلا بَيْنِي بقَي إِخْوَانْنا كَك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وازم بقَي أَحْرَبْ بِهْب وِأَماتِه بِ</td>
<td>إِهِدَ بقَي; بِ</td>
<td>شُوَءْ بقَي; بِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أسَآدن أَنِي بقَي كَك</td>
<td>عَلَى كَدْه بقَي الأَحْمِر عَشْان الْلَحْمَة عَي</td>
<td>اسْتِنِي بقَي بِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أَسَآدن أَنِي بقَي أَحْسُن كَك</td>
<td>ممَكَن بقَي أَيْس هِدْوُوِي بِ</td>
<td>اطْلُعْي بقَي كَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أَنَآ بقَي أَخْف أُلْعُنُ لِك النَّص النَّانِي بِ</td>
<td>طَبْ وَأَنَآ حَأْفْر بقَي الْزِرَام بِنَاعُي فْيْن; بِ</td>
<td>يجْدُعْ اهْمِي الْي بقَي كَأَلْ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أَنَآ أَعْرَض بقَي الأَمِر عَلَى زِمَايي بِ</td>
<td>هَوُه بقَي الْشَّيْخ; عَي</td>
<td>انْفَحْي بقَي كَأَلْ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سُيِدَة بقَي س</td>
<td>كِنْتُي بْنَوْيِم إِهْي بقَي؟ بِس</td>
<td>عِبْب بقَي أَحْيْ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بَس أَنَآ قَلْت بقَي الْحَاج مُحَمَد غَزْان عَي</td>
<td>وَمَا لَعْفْش بقَي النَّرَفْحِي نَأْي بِعَمْك كَك</td>
<td>فَكَرْوْا إِزَي نِاْجْهْوا الأَمْر الْواَفْق بقَي بِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هَوُه بقَي الْكَلَام الْفَطْم بِ</td>
<td>أَمَال إِي بقَي الْي بِنِرْق الْلْقْب; كَ</td>
<td>مَعْلُو بقَي الْوَرْمَة الْحَلَيْة لَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أَمَا بقَي الْي هاَطْهِه بِيْسِ في وَرْق بِس</td>
<td>إِنَآ بقَي الْي خَلَكْ تَأْكَد بِالْطَرْفِ دِي كَلُ</td>
<td>بَلْاَش بقَي الْمَسْبِس بِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أَمَا بقَي الْي هِجْبِ فيْكُو أَقْل مِن س</td>
<td>وَإِب الْي اَلْتَيْم بقَي الْي وِجْهُوَتْنَ الْيِبَأْبَأْ; كَ</td>
<td>فَوْمِي اَرْقَمْي بِرَنْئَة بقَي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أَمَا بقَي الْي هِبْحُ صْر هَآمَهْد بِ</td>
<td>مِنْي بقَي الْي هِيْجْرُ أَرْلَنْع عَي</td>
<td>اعْمَل حُاَجْة بقَي كَأَلْ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أَصْلُ بقَي الْي زِي دُوْلُ شْبَان كِ</td>
<td>وَزْمِتْ وَدْهْ. اَرْحَتْ بقَي; بِ</td>
<td>خَلاَص بقَي أَمَل إِي الْي مُزْعَلْكُ فِر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دْفُل بقَي الْي أَنَا فَآكْر أَخ</td>
<td>مِنْبِي بقَي الْوَلِوْدَة دِي كِلْيَآ فِرْ</td>
<td>اسْتِ أَنِي إِسْمَع عَي</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 بفي اتجوزت</td>
<td>1. أنا بفي اتجوزت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أخ</td>
<td>أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بفي ب</td>
<td>ده بفي هلي أنا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لإك</td>
<td>لإك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. كلمول أقدر أوصل</td>
<td>2. كلمول أقدر أوصل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كله كات</td>
<td>كله كات</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>صحتها أخ</td>
<td>غمسية مما من السيرة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. باني إنا باني بفي</td>
<td>باني إنا باني بفي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. يووهو وريا بفي</td>
<td>يووهو وريا بفي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. جرب بيه زلت عليا</td>
<td>جرب بيه زلت عليا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بالبروش أخ</td>
<td>بالبروش أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. مانلينيا من السيرة</td>
<td>مانلينيا من السيرة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. سعدية بفي بفي</td>
<td>سعدية بفي بفي</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<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>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
<td>{مك}</td>
<td>من influential to Á نآبأة للإحأه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) تعلّمّي إلّي بقّي كّلّي</td>
<td>2) تّعلّمّي إلّي بقّي علّي إخوانّا كّلّي</td>
<td>3) طلّعّبّي بقّي تدوّنّي</td>
<td>4) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الناحيّة ثانّيّة</td>
<td>5) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الغابيّنّ بقّي بّ</td>
<td>6) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الغابيّنّ بقّي بّ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) قومّي بقّي أخّي</td>
<td>2) تّعلّمّي إلّي بقّي بقّي بّ</td>
<td>3) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الناحيّة ثانّيّة</td>
<td>4) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الغابيّنّ بقّي بّ</td>
<td>5) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الناحيّة ثانّيّة</td>
<td>6) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الناحيّة ثانّيّة</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) طلّعّبّي بقّي الحكابّيّنّ إلّي بقّي بّ</td>
<td>2) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الناحيّة ثانّيّة</td>
<td>3) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الناحيّة ثانّيّة</td>
<td>4) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الناحيّة ثانّيّة</td>
<td>5) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الناحيّة ثانّيّة</td>
<td>6) طلّعّبّي بقّي حسبّ الناحيّة ثانّيّة</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) فيّر</td>
<td>2) فيّر</td>
<td>3) فيّر</td>
<td>4) فيّر</td>
<td>5) فيّر</td>
<td>6) فيّر</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(7) طيب إيديكو بتي
(8) بس بتي يا أخي!
(9) طبل خلاد بتي لسة
(10) فقاص نوم لونه إيه
(11) هات بتي. ب
(12) يا شيخ روح بتي ك
(13) سبيتي أهيل بتي ك
(14) كفاية بتي يا آم
(15) كفاية بتي يا وليا ك
(16) قومي ارقص يا
(17) يا واد بتعل بتي ك
(18) اعمل حاجة بتي ك
(19) سيبوني في حالي
(20) قدح بفي ك
(21) أسمع بتي لما
(22) اطلعي بتي ل ك
(23) خلاق بتي يا
(24) رجالة ك
(25) يا جذع افقم بتي
(26) كاك
(27) اعمموا بقي كاك
(28) سبي بتي يا هيمة
(29) كاك
(30) خلباي بتي في
(31) العمي غي
(32) بس بتي فلتوني
(33) حرام عليكوا بس
(34) اسك بتي بس
(35) غالي عدنك بلاش
(36) حضرت كي
(37) شوف بتي يا
(38) إبراهيم أفندي فير
(39) بووه ماعطلينش
(40) بقبي
(41) لحسن ماما زمانها جاية
(42) يا بس
(43) رديف
(44) رفيق بتي فير
(45) خلاق بتي بس
(46) نبيل بس
(47) خلاق بتي
(48) مانطلوهاس بس
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. بطقا مأع رو فك وحكن.. بطقا</td>
<td>1. طيقا وطنداش من ها. بطقا</td>
<td>1. طيقا فينصش عننا. بطقا</td>
<td>1. بطقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. بطقا مأع رو فك وحكن.. بطقا</td>
<td>2. طيقا فينصش عننا. بطقا</td>
<td>2. طيقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
<td>2. بطقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. مأع رو فك وحكن.. بطقا</td>
<td>3. طيقا وطنداش من ها. بطقا</td>
<td>3. طيقا فينصش عننا. بطقا</td>
<td>3. بطقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. بطقا مأع رو فك وحكن.. بطقا</td>
<td>4. طيقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
<td>4. طيقا فينصش عننا. بطقا</td>
<td>4. بطقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. بطقا مأع رو فك وحكن.. بطقا</td>
<td>5. طيقا فينصش عننا. بطقا</td>
<td>5. طيقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
<td>5. بطقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. مأع رو فك وحكن.. بطقا</td>
<td>6. طيقا فينصش عننا. بطقا</td>
<td>6. طيقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
<td>6. بطقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. بطقا مأع رو فك وحكن.. بطقا</td>
<td>7. طيقا فينصش عننا. بطقا</td>
<td>7. طيقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
<td>7. بطقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. مأع رو فك وحكن.. بطقا</td>
<td>8. طيقا فينصش عننا. بطقا</td>
<td>8. طيقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
<td>8. بطقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. مأع رو فك وحكن.. بطقا</td>
<td>10. طيقا فينصش عننا. بطقا</td>
<td>10. طيقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
<td>10. بطقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. بطقا مأع رو فك وحكن.. بطقا</td>
<td>11. طيقا فينصش عننا. بطقا</td>
<td>11. طيقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
<td>11. بطقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. مأع رو فك وحكن.. بطقا</td>
<td>12. طيقا فينصش عننا. بطقا</td>
<td>12. طيقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
<td>12. بطقا كامف.. بطقا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
1. Permission is granted.
2. Permission is refused.
3. Permission is conditional.
4. Permission is denied.
5. Permission is requested.
6. Permission is withdrawn.
7. Permission is revoked.
8. Permission is extended.
9. Permission is renewed.
10. Permission is denied.
11. Permission is refused.
12. Permission is conditional.
13. Permission is denied.
14. Permission is denied.
(14) حالة: طيب يا حبيبي بن
(15) حالة لله لا طبيبة
(16) طيب يا حبيبي بن
(17) طيب هناء
(18) طيب خلاص.. خلاص
(19) عزام: يا باشا! اديه
(20) إبراهيم: عن إذن ناروج
(21) بمغفرة.. طيب إن شاء الله
(22) طيب يا بني إللي نشوفي
(23) طيب يا مرحبا
(24) طيب يا نادي
(25) طيب يا نادي
(26) طيب يات مرحبا
(27) طيب يا ولي
(28) طيب يا حبيبي
(29) طيب خلاص
(30) طيب يا أختي، على راحتك
(31) طيب لما نتقابل بعد
(32) طيب أنا هاصرف يبن
(33) طيب من فيك مستعد يكتب
(34) طيب البيت يبن
(35) كوري عباس؟ طيب .. طيب
Table 8 Distribution of tāyyeb across Speech Act Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertives</th>
<th>Directives</th>
<th>Expressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طيب البيت بتلت بقية عي</td>
<td>طيب تقي حمد الله على سلامتك ك</td>
<td>طيب هو أما يعني بعث البيت ليه؟ ك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب صحبوا على خبر ك</td>
<td>طيب انهضوا ك</td>
<td>طيب إديكو بقى على اليوبيا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب يا سبدي فنان باعفية كلك</td>
<td>طيب افصلي معايا ب</td>
<td>طيب إيت في شروطه دي كلا كم تتكفل كنيرا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب افصلي ما قتلت فير</td>
<td>طيب افصلي ما قتلت فير</td>
<td>طيب افصلي ما قتلت فير</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>طبيب إن شاء الله وحاجيكلان معايا آخر الأخبار فير</td>
<td>طبيب ما أتى تصرف بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما دام حصل لنا الشرف فير</td>
<td>لما كنت بشرب من عند العين..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب ما دام حصل لنا الشرف فير</td>
<td>طبيب مش كننا تمثل لنا رو كات</td>
<td>الكاتان: طبيب. ب</td>
<td>الكاتان: طبيب. ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب مش كننا تمثل لنا رو كات</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>الاخوابا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>الاخوابا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>الاخوابا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>الاخوابا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>الاخوابا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>الاخوابا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>طبيب ما تقابل بعد الضره لبقي نتفق بس</td>
<td>الاخوابا ب</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) مجد: الکربت سملول! يظهر
2) لما كنت بشرب من عند العين..  
3) الاخوابا ب
4) الكاتان: طبيب. ب
5) الاخوابا ب
6) الكاتان: طبيب. ب
7) الاخوابا ب
8) الكاتان: طبيب. ب
9) الاخوابا ب
10) الكاتان: طبيب. ب
11) الاخوابا ب
12) الكاتان: طبيب. ب
13) الاخوابا ب
14) الكاتان: طبيب. ب
15) الاخوابا ب
16) الكاتان: طبيب. ب
Table 10 Interaction between ṯayyeb 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><strong>Clause-initial</strong></td>
<td><strong>Clause-initial</strong></td>
<td><strong>Clause-initial</strong></td>
<td><strong>Clause-initial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) طيب با أخ بس أفهم من هنا. ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) طيب با بس أفهم للاسر بس</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) طيب با بس أفهم أش علی الإيديا وين قصب بال erst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) طيب با بس أفهم شر حسن حسن</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) طيب با بس أفهم من هنا. ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) طيب با بس أفهم من هنا. ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) طيب با بس أفهم من هنا. ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) طيب با بس أفهم من هنا. ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) طيب با بس أفهم من هنا. ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
إنما جات نستنن؟ كه
7 طلبت ين جمد الله علي
8 سلاطين يا نعم ك
9 عادل: طلبت إنه رأيت في
10 الثورة؟ ك
11 أبو حمدي: طلبت تصبحوا
على خبر ك
12 طلب زمان مرنا ليا؟ كه
13 طلب هو أنا يعنى بعت البيت
ليه يا عم بجاها؟ كه
14 طلب وهي عازراني في إنه
يغنى يا دي؟ كه
15 طلب بش كتني تملي لنا
رز؟ كه
16 طلب يا سيد فلتك ماعية.
كه
17 طلب ما ما تمشي تلعب يا
بت كه
18 كدهطلب خلاص كه
19 الطهر نقي نفق س
20 طلب أنا هلاصرف س
21 طلب بين فيكم مستعد يكتب
عي
22 طلب البيت بينت ين عي
23 طلب بين خذ بالك يا
إبراهيم فين
24 طلب وله اختنا إجها بالنادات
لا فر
25 طلب يا ابني بش يمكن
البوليس مراقبة فير
26 طلب يا ابني لما حنن
هتروج فين؟ فير
27 طلب يا ابني بش كنت
نسب الحكومة فير
28 طلب افرض ما فيلتش فير
29 طلب .. ما تعرض إن
الحاجات دي يستحب فتر
30 طلب يا ابني بش يمكن
النص المُندرج في الصورة يُشير إلى تحليل روحي يتضمن أبحاث غير مستند إلى النص. يُستخدم النص بشكل عام لتحليل جملة في إحدى الجمل الآتية:

1. ما هو سبب فوزك؟
2. كيف تشعر عندما تتألق?
3. هل هناك شخص يحبك كثيرًا؟
4. ما هو السبب الرئيسي لخيبة أملك؟
5. ما هو السبب الرئيسي لإحباطك؟

يُجدر بتذكير أن النص المُندرج يُشير إلى إحدى الأبحاث التي تمثلت في عرض متعدد نصية في السياق. يُمكنني مساعدتك في التحليل لاحقًا، إذا كنت مهتمًا بذلك.
Table 11 *Distribution of *ṭayyeb* 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 أختي جاك خيبة في كله.</td>
<td>1. مجدي: الدعاء باللحيق! يظهر.</td>
<td>1. طيب يا سديدي، لا تزل ب،.</td>
<td>1. لم كنت شاب من عندهم،.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. طيب يا ابني بني على.</td>
<td>2. طيب يا أدمبكو في على.</td>
<td>2. طيب أيضاً.</td>
<td>2. المقالة: طيب، ب.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. طيب يا ابني بني على.</td>
<td>3. طيب يا ابني بني على.</td>
<td>3. طيب يا ابني بني على.</td>
<td>3. المقالة: طيب، ب.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. وهو على بني بني على.</td>
<td>4. طيب يا أدمبكو في على.</td>
<td>4. طيب يا أدمبكو في على.</td>
<td>4. المقالة: طيب، ب.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. طيب يا أدمبكو في على.</td>
<td>5. كنت شاب من عندهم،.</td>
<td>5. كنت شاب من عندهم،.</td>
<td>5. المقالة: طيب، ب.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. طيب يا أدمبكو في على.</td>
<td>7. كنت شاب من عندهم،.</td>
<td>7. كنت شاب من عندهم،.</td>
<td>7. المقالة: طيب، ب.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. طيب يا أدمبكو في على.</td>
<td>15. كنت شاب من عندهم،.</td>
<td>15. كنت شاب من عندهم،.</td>
<td>15. المقالة: طيب، ب.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. طيب يا أدمبكو في على.</td>
<td>17. كنت شاب من عندهم،.</td>
<td>17. كنت شاب من عندهم،.</td>
<td>17. المقالة: طيب، ب.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. طيب يا أدمبكو في على.</td>
<td>18. كنت شاب من عندهم،.</td>
<td>18. كنت شاب من عندهم،.</td>
<td>18. المقالة: طيب، ب.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 Interaction between тayyeb Function and Sentence Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment (information receipt)</th>
<th>Giving consent (Declarative)</th>
<th>Mitigating a directive speech act (Declarative)</th>
<th>Threatening (Declarative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) طيب يا دافع يا خادم في عيني</td>
<td>1 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>1 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>1 طيب يا كلام إن ما كنت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) يا أهمل يا حسب الخاطيء</td>
<td>2 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>2 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>2 طيب يا كلام إن ما كنت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>3 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>3 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>3 طيب يا كلام إن ما كنت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>4 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>4 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>4 طيب يا كلام إن ما كنت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>5 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>5 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>5 طيب يا كلام إن ما كنت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>6 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>6 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>6 طيب يا كلام إن ما كنت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>7 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>7 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>7 طيب يا كلام إن ما كنت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>8 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>8 طيب يا أهمل يا في خدي</td>
<td>8 طيب يا كلام إن ما كنت</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>1. طبب المشروعت دي كلا</td>
<td>مش تكلَف كنتر؟ ب</td>
<td>طيب وققة بطانط؟ ب</td>
<td>طيب يا أختي، على راحتك؟ كلا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. طيب وققة بطانط؟ ب</td>
<td>طيب يا أختي، على راحتك؟ كلا</td>
<td>طيب يا أختي، على راحتك؟ كلا</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. طيب يا أختي، على راحتك؟ كلا</td>
<td>طيب يا أختي، على راحتك؟ كلا</td>
<td>طيب يا أختي، على راحتك؟ كلا</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. طيب يا أختي، على راحتك؟ كلا</td>
<td>طيب يا أختي، على راحتك؟ كلا</td>
<td>طيب يا أختي، على راحتك؟ كلا</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. طيب زعان متي ليه كلا</td>
<td>طيب زعان متي ليه كلا</td>
<td>طيب زعان متي ليه كلا</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. طيب هو أنا يعني بتلوت البيت</td>
<td>ليه يا عم محاهده كلا</td>
<td>طيب هو أنا يعني بتلوت البيت</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. طيب هو عرانطكي في إنه</td>
<td>يعني يا سب؟ كلا</td>
<td>طيب هو عرانطكي في إنه</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. طيب مش كيني تعليمينا زي</td>
<td>كلا</td>
<td>طيب مش كيني تعليمينا زي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. طيب بين فيك مستعد يكتب</td>
<td>كلا</td>
<td>طيب بين فيك مستعد يكتب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. طيب ولته اختنو إحكنا بالدات</td>
<td>كلا</td>
<td>طيب ولته اختنو إحكنا بالدات</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. طبيب يا ابني مش يمكن</td>
<td>البوليس مراقبه فير</td>
<td>طبيب يا ابني لما حننزل</td>
<td>هرود فير؟ فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. طبيب يا ابني لما حننزل</td>
<td>هرود فير؟ فير</td>
<td>طبيب يا ابني مش كنت</td>
<td>تسبب الحكومة فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. طبيب يا ابني مش كنت</td>
<td>تسبب الحكومة فير</td>
<td>طبيب يا ابني مش يمكن</td>
<td>بروج يغفل عن أصحاب فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. طبيب ما تعلمش إن</td>
<td>احتاجات دي يسجلن تيم فير</td>
<td>طبيب يا ابني مش يمكن</td>
<td>بروج يغفل عن أصحاب فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. طبيب ما دام حصلنا الشرف</td>
<td>فير</td>
<td>طبيب يا ابني مش يمكن</td>
<td>بروج يغفل عن أصحاب فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. طبيب لما دام حصلنا الشرف</td>
<td>فير</td>
<td>طبيب يا ابني مش يمكن</td>
<td>بروج يغفل عن أصحاب فير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. طبيب نسخلي أفضي السكة؟</td>
<td>فير</td>
<td>طبيب يا ابني مش يمكن</td>
<td>بروج يغفل عن أصحاب 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>1) طيب أفقل عباما عن هذا. ب دوره صناعيا .. الضابط.. طيب اقتحم فبر</td>
<td>1) طيب اقتحم عباما عن هذا. ب دوره صناعيا .. الضابط.. طيب اقتحم فبر</td>
<td>1) طيب اقتحم عباما عن هذا. ب دوره صناعيا .. الضابط.. طيب اقتحم فبر</td>
<td>1) طيب اقتحم عباما عن هذا. ب دوره صناعيا .. الضابط.. طيب اقتحم فبر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) طيب ابيديكو بقي على الوبية. ب</td>
<td>2) طيب ابيديكو بقي على الوبية. ب</td>
<td>2) طيب ابيديكو بقي على الوبية. ب</td>
<td>2) طيب ابيديكو بقي على الوبية. ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) حلمي: هندتم مع الأستاذ طه العرفي .. المعتمد .. طيب اقتحم فبر</td>
<td>3) حلمي: هندتم مع الأستاذ طه العرفي .. المعتمد .. طيب اقتحم فبر</td>
<td>3) حلمي: هندتم مع الأستاذ طه العرفي .. المعتمد .. طيب اقتحم فبر</td>
<td>3) حلمي: هندتم مع الأستاذ طه العرفي .. المعتمد .. طيب اقتحم فبر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) طيب با دخل بلات يا إبراهيم فبر</td>
<td>4) طيب با دخل بلات يا إبراهيم فبر</td>
<td>4) طيب با دخل بلات يا إبراهيم فبر</td>
<td>4) طيب با دخل بلات يا إبراهيم فبر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) طيب افرخ ما فيلش فبر</td>
<td>5) طيب افرخ ما فيلش فبر</td>
<td>5) طيب افرخ ما فيلش فبر</td>
<td>5) طيب افرخ ما فيلش فبر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) طيب خليلون إننا فبر</td>
<td>6) طيب خليلون إننا فبر</td>
<td>6) طيب خليلون إننا فبر</td>
<td>6) طيب خليلون إننا فبر</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>1) مجدي: الكوبرن مكلن! ينفر ب جريبي مونك .. عادل: طيب ..</td>
<td>1) مجدي: الكوبرن مكلن! ينفر ب جريبي مونك .. عادل: طيب ..</td>
<td>1) مجدي: الكوبرن مكلن! ينفر ب جريبي مونك .. عادل: طيب ..</td>
<td>1) مجدي: الكوبرن مكلن! ينفر ب جريبي مونك .. عادل: طيب ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لما كنت باشبر من عند العين .. الكأنين: طيب ..</td>
<td>لما كنت باشبر من عند العين .. الكأنين: طيب ..</td>
<td>لما كنت باشبر من عند العين .. الكأنين: طيب ..</td>
<td>لما كنت باشبر من عند العين .. الكأنين: طيب ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب يا اخوي .. راها يهديد يا اخوي ..</td>
<td>طيب يا اخوي .. راها يهديد يا اخوي ..</td>
<td>طيب يا اخوي .. راها يهديد يا اخوي ..</td>
<td>طيب يا اخوي .. راها يهديد يا اخوي ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب .. أنا أختار الصورة .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. أنا أختار الصورة .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. أنا أختار الصورة .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. أنا أختار الصورة .. طيب ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب .. أنا أطور بني الأم .. على زعيملي ب</td>
<td>طيب .. أنا أطور بني الأم .. على زعيملي ب</td>
<td>طيب .. أنا أطور بني الأم .. على زعيملي ب</td>
<td>طيب .. أنا أطور بني الأم .. على زعيملي ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب يا بيدا ب</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب يا بيدا ب</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب يا بيدا ب</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب يا بيدا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب يا اسامعيل ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب يا اسامعيل ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب يا اسامعيل ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب يا اسامعيل ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
<td>طيب .. طيب .. طيب .. طيب ..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 Distribution of ṭab 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 طلب كنت تقول يا راجل أخ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 طلب اعملوا حساب الغابيين</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 طلب وبعدين أأخ</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 طلب روح إنت دلوقتي ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 طلب مش يمكن صاحبها بسال</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 طلب خشي إنت جوًا ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 طلب يا واد قبل ما ينده بها ما</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 طلب خشي نامي إنت وانا</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تتحج الجوابات دي ودير جواها</td>
<td></td>
<td>حكفل ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إيه؟ أأخ</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 طلب اقد با هرم كك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب كوبس قوي ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>طلب اهدئ واشيعي شوية عي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ييلا ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>طلب قولي على الجامع اللي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 طلب يلا يلا دوز إنت من هنا</td>
<td></td>
<td>انت بصلي فيه عي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ييلا ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>طلب كتابة بني يا نوال سبيلي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 طلب يا جماعة. تصبحوا علي</td>
<td></td>
<td>لوحدي فير</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خبر بغي ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 طلب روح إنت فير</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب اقد فين؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 طلب روح إنت فير</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب غضبي عينيك كده ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 طلب اقد فين؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب باقول لك إيه ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 طلب فندي على بلحابه ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب ما أنا معاك أهوب</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 طلب بالله نكوني الكا ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب أبدا فين ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 طلب ماقلك من غير</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بناغي فين ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 طلب أبدا عند أعم لك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب أنا مستع بضع لك</td>
<td></td>
<td>تصمي ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب دعَ يبدع على بلحابه ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 طلب يبدع على بلحابه ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب والتعلم دم عن غير</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 طلب يبدع على بلحابه ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مؤخدة نعمل إراي ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 طلب أبدا عند أعم لك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب وانت عايز بني كا ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 طلب والتعلم دم عن غير</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب ما نفهم ب كده من</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 طلب أبدا عند أعم لك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الصح؟ ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 طلب يستفاهم ودع بالا ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب فين؟ هن؟ إراي ب</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 طلب فين؟ هن؟ إراي ب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طلب بس نتفهم مع بد يأ</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 طلب بس نتفهم مع بد يأ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جملة ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 طبع هو عندنا كام ست على</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 كدها ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 طبع والحكمه بناعة احدر</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 النتمد إذا شعب دي ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 طبع هي في الفرحة اللي</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 حفزه على البش ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 طبع لو كنتو رجالة لوهو ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 طبع بين من غير ما تشنج</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 من فتلاك ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 طبع أتا مستعد أصرف لكم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 بيتجة ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 طبع يقول خمسه ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 طبع هان لب إيز فت</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 وحصطي ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 طبع كدها طبع كدها ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 طبع خلاص بغي ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 طبع اكتني يا ستي ب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 طبع والشبان رجعين برنه؟</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 طبع أهه ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 طبع سلميلي عليها ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 طبع أنا أنزل أسلم عليه ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 طبع ما أنا برنه معلم وكسب</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 نقي كده يا دياب طبع ولله</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 لأوريات ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 طبع ما هو الرقص كمان</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 واجب ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 طبع خشي غيري هدوكم ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 طبع أنا هاعرف أوريكم أنا</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 ابن بن ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 طبع مش جزي رحتهم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 حئنة ثانية ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 طبع مش لقيمونه لهمهم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 إيه ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 طبع إيمي هبعقروا معنا ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 طبع غور من وشي غور من</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 وشي ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 طبع إراي يمسكو كا ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 طبع أهه عمان تستريح ك</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(continued)
(22) طب ماانت أخذت عند
تليفونك في بيتك
(24) طب والي تحت لونه إيه؟
بس
(25) طب ما تقولي لنبات ما هي
من الصح ضحك بي
(26) طب ليه اخترت فقيرة؟ بس
(27) طب احكيلي الفيلم اللي
شемых بس
(28) طب ما كتملها بس
(29) طب كفية عناني أنا بس
(30) طب بالا قدمي بس
(31) طب ده؟ بس
(32) طب خذ خذ كله بس
(33) طب يمكنعي لو ممكن
أشوف "النقط" بس
(34) طب يمكنعي إذا كان
ممكن أشوف "النقط" بس
(35) طب ما نسبه لراحته بس
(36) طب ودوني سيما الأول بس
(37) طب يا حبيبي ناخذ الدي بس
(38) طب يففع أشرب مياه ثاني؟
بس
(39) طب لماشوف鍌ي بس
(40) طب وثقاباها له؟ بس
(41) طب لسمعني قمه طمنيني
بس
(42) طب ما أنا جاي وفاكر أمك
موجودة بس
(43) طب خلص بس ماتقولش
لخد بس
(44) طب استني على بقتي بس
(45) طب بس بس
(46) طب مايتي نروج السينما
ه؟ بس
(47) طب الدلي طب نقل الشباك بس
(48) طب ماتطلوب ويسكي باباش
عي
(49) طب ماتروح بارات النادي
عي
(50) طب حاسي عي
111) طب مانشوفلك دايرة حلولة
112) طب والعمل يا مترآ ؛ مع
113) طب مانشوفلك توجع
114) طبانا إغد حاول
115) طب است تعرف ان اباب
كانت مهجورة واحد قبل اباب ؟
116) طب مانشوفلك على حق مع
117) طب مانشوفلك على حضور مع
118) طب مانشوفلك على ظهور مع
119) طب وستها ليه ؛ مع
120) طب واللي تقولك على حاجه تروق بالك مع
121) طب لعالي معايا جود مع
122) طب شهد إين فيه في كل
123) طب باقول اي يا كمال يه
124) طب مانشوفلك دايرة حلولة
125) طب والعمل يا مترآ ؛ مع
126) طب مانشوفلك توجع
127) طبانا إغد حاول
128) طب است تعرف ان اباب
كانت مهجورة واحد قبل اباب ؟
129) طب مانشوفلك على حق مع
130) طب مانشوفلك على حضور مع
131) طب مانشوفلك على ظهور مع
132) طب وستها ليه ؛ مع
133) طب باقول اي يا كمال يه
طب هل تعتمل ايه عثمان
خلخل من المعيبه دي ؟ الذي
طب وانها حافظة ازارى اى
طب بح معال السكر تاني
شمال عي
طب يا ايني وصف لي
البيت فيه
طب افروض يا أخبو
طب افروض حده حانة اير
طب وناكل وشرب ازاي ؟
طيب
طب ودي فيها حاجة اير
طب ما انا بانفي من أول
رعنان فيه
طب انا مستعد ايدي لت
ورقة فيه
طب والجيران اير
طب يشتي فيها اير
طب باللا روحي الاقلبي
جزمك وشراك فيه
طب بش تحتلي يا بني ؟
طيب
طب حظاكم عليكم ازاي ؟
طيب
طب يا اني خد المصحف
هد اديهو واير
طب باللا بينا اير
طب ممكن اشوف؟ اير
طب لحظة واحدة اير
طب ما لمحش اي رقم ؟
طيب
طب إمني حائفه؟ اير
طب لحظه واحدة اير
طب وانت تائف انت
هنديري الشاعر اير
طب ورني عرض كنافات
طيب
طب غمر من وشي فيه
طيب
طب عن ذلك انه
طب مش نفهمنا ايه
Table 14 Distribution of tab across Speech Act Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertives</th>
<th>Directives</th>
<th>Expressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طب أتني عندي حل تاني في</td>
<td>طب افعل منه يا أخي كط</td>
<td>طب اعمل لك إيه واني منهمونا كده؟ بني ايه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ده انت فيه في كل حنة في رسالك بطحه في</td>
<td>طب الفضل كط</td>
<td>طب أه عنان سيريح بني ايه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب سنتين كط</td>
<td>طب احكيه الفيلم اللي شفته اباجرب بس</td>
<td>طب أه .. بصي .. بجي كط</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب كوس قوي بط</td>
<td>طب ازاي يمسكو؟ كط</td>
<td>طب كنت تقول يا راح أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ما أتني جاي وفاكر أمل موجوده بس</td>
<td>طب اسئتو لما أشرب ب</td>
<td>طب ليه؟ بني ؟ كط</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ما أنا بالتي من أول رسمان في</td>
<td>طب اعملوا حساب الذخليين يقي ب</td>
<td>طب ما نفهمنا كده من الصبح ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ما أنا برضه علم وكسب كط</td>
<td>طب الفرض حمد جالا فر</td>
<td>طب هو اللالي يحب حض يوم بيده؟ أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ما هو الرقص كمان واجب كط</td>
<td>طب الفهم معانات الاقتراحات عي</td>
<td>طب هو عنده كام ست على كده؟ بين أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ما أنا معاك أهوب ب</td>
<td>طب أفيف يا هرم كط</td>
<td>طب وفي النروحة اللي حتىقد؟ بين أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ما أنا شروت منها ب</td>
<td>طب أفيف الفاب واك كط</td>
<td>طب والشان رحيمين برجه؟ كط</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ما أتني أخركل عندن تلفزون في بنه بس</td>
<td>طب أفيف يا سيي بط</td>
<td>طب والفلك اللي طبطالها في شقات كط</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب وربنا إسرائيل دى ما محتاجه ده كله كط</td>
<td>طب الفم حاوشفناء فر</td>
<td>طب وانت بالصفي كنا ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب يا جماعة تصبحوا على خير ب</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب وديها الحاجة فر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أنا أيل فيليفي كط</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب وقابالها ليه بس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أتني لعرف إن أمل كانت متجوزة؟ بني</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب ونكل وننهراب إزاي الفر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أهدي وعسيمي شهية في</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب ونكل وننهراب إزاي الفر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب إيه الحل بقي يا روح أمل؟ أخ</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب أهدي وعسيمي شهية في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب إيه التنظيم اللي وراء حادله المصنعة كط</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب إيه الحل بقي يا روح أمل؟ أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بأقول لك إيه بالي بلد ما كل واحد يسمع ب</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب إيه التنظيم اللي وراء حادله المصنعة كط</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بإقول لك إيه أنا في عرضاك كط</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب إيه الحل بقي يا روح أمل؟ أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بأقول إيه يا كمال ليه عي</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب إيه التنظيم اللي وراء حادله المصنعة كط</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بتدفع اشراك كام؟ كط</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب إيه الحل بقي يا روح أمل؟ أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب ينس من غير اتناجح ب</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب إيه الحل بقي يا روح أمل؟ أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بس لفظها معه د كاجماعة ب</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب إيه الحل بقي يا روح أمل؟ أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بس لفظها معه د كاجماعة ب</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب إيه الحل بقي يا روح أمل؟ أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بس لفظها معه د كاجماعة ب</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب إيه الحل بقي يا روح أمل؟ أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بس لفظها معه د كاجماعة ب</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب إيه الحل بقي يا روح أمل؟ أخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب بس لفظها معه د كاجماعة ب</td>
<td>طب إني جيهحقو مانان كط</td>
<td>طب إيه الحل بقي يا روح أمل؟ أخ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORPUS-BASED STUDY OF THREE ECA DISCOURSE MARKERS 155
طلب ما تطلب ويسكي يا باشا عم
طلب ما تتيجي نزوج السينما بس
طلب ما ننافر العصر عم
طلب ما ننوف أن دائرة حلوة عم
طلب مش يمكنك صاحبه سأل عنها؟ أما
طلب مش تفهموني تفهمونا إيه؟ لم
طلب مش نفهمونا إيه الحكاي؟ في
طلب مش جايز رحلتكم حنة ثانية؟ لم
طلب مش حريتي يا بني؟ في
طلب مش اهم الأول انوو نن؟ عم
طلب مش هشترب حافة؟ عم
طلب ممكن أشوهه؟ في
طلب ممكن يعني إذا كن ممكن؟ بي
طلب ممكن يعني لو ممكن؟ بي
طلب نقعد هنا شوية فيبر
طلب تنقل الشباك بس
طلب هات لي أي وقت ب
طلب هاليلالي العيد عم
طلب هنعمل إيه عليلن نخلص عم
طلب هي لي ما الجوزة؟ ثانية داونلي عم
طلب والجران؟ فيبر
طلب والحكاي بناحة contradiclion? ب
طلب والسلال اللي كان معكم؟ ك
طلب والنشاي يا بني؟ كت
طلب وعمل يا بر؟ عم
طلب واللي تحت لونه ينه؟ بي
طلب واللي قول لك على حافة؟ عم
طلب والمشوات؟ ك
طلب واللود د من غير مؤذندة؟ ب
طلب وأنا حارفه إراي؟ عم
طلب وإن جافرف قي الزمام بناعي؟ ب
طلب وانت اللي اللي مائه؟ أخ
طلب وبديين؟ وأنا أعمل إيه؟ أخ
طلب وحلامي هو مسئول حي؟ ك
طلب وربي يا سيدي بطاقات ك
طلب وربي عرض كنافات فير
طلب وستها ليه؟ عم
طلب مشا مشا خاطري كات
طلب وما جبنتش معاك ليه؟ فير
طلب وموسي أخ
طلب وهو فين؟ ما جاش معاك ليه؟ فير
Table 15 Distribution of ťab across Sentence Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طب أتعلم منه يا أخي لك</td>
<td>طب إذا يمسكوكوا لك</td>
<td>طب اقتفل لك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أتعلم منه يا أخي لك</td>
<td>طب أتعلم من ي نفسك كأك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أتعلم من ي نفسك كأك</td>
<td>طب أتعلم من ي نفسك كأك</td>
<td>طب أتعلم من ي نفسك كأك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طب أتعلم من ي نفسك كأك</td>
<td>طب أتعلم من ي نفسك كأك</td>
<td>طب أتعلم من ي نفسك كأك</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bs..طب نحطة واحدة في
طب وللتي تحت ولتون إنا بس
طب وللتي تدولت على حاجة نتروق في
طب ومتشورات ك
طب وانظام ده من غير مؤخدة ب
طب ولانا هافهرف اراي في
طب ولانا حاهرف بقى الزمام بتاعي فين ب
طب ولانت إلها القياناعه إنا ب
طب ولانت مالك إنت هنترتيى فبر
طب ولانت عاز بيزي كنا ب
طب وعددين أخ
طب ومحمي هو مسول حي ولادا ل
طب ودي فيها حاجة فبر
طب وسنتها لى سي
طب ومنشان خاجري كنا
طب وقاليها اياه ب
طب وما جنس ش معاك لى فيبر
طب وموسي أخ
طب وناكل وشرب إزاى فبر
طب وهو فين فيبر
طب وهى إيه العلاقة بين ده وبين اللي ب أخ
طب بنفع أشرب فين ب
طب وباحل الفر صيعي
طب ودولي سينما الأول بس
طب وريني يا بدي بطاقات ك
طب وريني عرض كاناك ك
طب يا ابني خد المصحف هذه فبر
طب يا ابني اوصف لي البيت فبر
طب يا واد، قبل ما يفدهوا، ما تفتح أخ
طب يا أخى ما تروح لأنها كاك
طب باللا روحي الهامب جزمنك فبر
طب باللا بنا .. أفضل فبر
طب باللا قلاكي بس
طب بلا بلا دُور إنا من هنا ب