

A Pragmatic Study of Connectives in Mosuli Dialect with Reference to English

Raghda Qiryaoqus Estaifo¹, Waleed Younus Meteab¹, & Ali Hussein Hazem^{1,2*}

¹Department of English, College of Education, University of Al-Hamdaniya, Iraq

²Department of Philology, University of Patras, Greece

Correspondence: Ali Hussein Hazem, Department of English, College of Education, University of Al-Hamdaniya, Iraq.

Received: May 6, 2023 Accepted: June 16, 2023 Online Published: June 26, 2023

doi:10.5430/wjel.v13n6p491

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n6p491>

Abstract

Connectives are used as discourse markers by speakers of Mosuli Iraqi Arabic so that listeners will pay more attention during their utterances. The current study investigates the pragmatic functions of connectives in Mosuli Iraqi Arabic, selected from seven comedy series presented by Hassan Fashel. These comedy series contain the commonly used connectives that were investigated in the current research. These connectives are *zee*, *kawee*, *dahiq*, *hasatta*, and they are assumed to have different functions in different contexts. The study aimed to prove that connectives in Mosuli are multifunctional and intended to guide the listener to interpret the speaker’s utterance. The data selected from the series were analyzed according to Brinton’s model (1996). It is concluded that these connectives are multifunctional in different contexts and that the connective *kawee* was the most common in Mosuli dialect. The study also concludes with some remarkable suggestions that will be valuable for further research.

Keywords: connectives, pragmatics, Mosuli Arabic, *zee*, *kawee*, *dahiq*, *hasatta*

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduce the Problem

This study is an attempt to investigate the different functions of connectives in the Mosuli dialect, which is a variation of Arabic. Few studies have been made of Mosuli Iraqi Arabic. Recently, Hazem and Mohammed (2021) researched mitigating devices in Mosuli Iraqi Arabic. In the current study, the data were drawn from seven comedy series presented in Mosuli dialect by Hassan Fashel. Different scholars have considered DMs and approached them using different models. This study adopts Brinton’s model (1996), which presented different textual and interpersonal roles or functions of connectives. The textual roles are: opening frame markers, closing frame markers, turntaking markers, fillers, topic switchers, new/old information indicators, sequence/relevance markers, and repair markers. The interpersonal roles are: back-channel signals, agreement markers, disagreement markers, reaction markers, and confirmation and threatening markers (*cf.* Hazem and Kanaan, 2020).

Investigating connectives in Mosuli dialect can be challenge, especially due to the lack of references related to the Mosuli dialect. Nevertheless, we aim to investigate two areas. First, we seek to identify the most common set of connectives used by Mosuli native speakers. Second, we analyzed the functions of selected connectives to show their pragmatic roles in conversation. The study hypothesizes that there are different expressions in the Mosuli dialect called connectives. These expressions have different functions according to the context in which they are used. We also hypothesize that Brinton’s model is suited to the study connectives because it provides us with different functions, the textual and interpersonal, which we can apply pragmatically. The scope of the study consists of seven comedy series presented on TV in 2008 by an actor/ comedian, Hassan Fashel.

The selected data from the series are analyzed according to Brinton’s model (1996). This study is of significance to native speakers of the Mosuli dialect, who may wish to know that there are expressions in their language called connectives. It is also of significance to teachers and students interested in linguistics and connectives.

The model of this study is Brinton’s model (1996), which classifies many pragmatic functions for connectives. These functions can be divided into textual and interpersonal, as in Table 1.

Table 1. Textual and interpersonal discourse

Textual	Interpersonal
Opening frame marker, closing marker, turntaking, filler, sequence marker, topic switcher, new and old information marker, and self or other repair markers	Agreement marker, disagreement marker, confirmation, reaction marker, threatening marker, and backchannel marker

1.2 Research Questions

State The current study tries to answer the following questions:

1. What are the common connectives used in the Mosuli dialect?
2. What are the pragmatic functions of these connectives?
3. How can Brinton's model account for connectives in the Mosuli dialect?

1.3 Literature Review

Connectives have been defined differently by different scholars as following: connectives are words or phrases that appear to have no grammatical or semantic function, such as you know, like, oh, well, I mean, actually, basically, OK, and the connectives like, because, so, and, but, and or, are commonly referred to as discourse particles or pragmatic indicators (Baker and Ellece, 2011). Connectives, according to Schiffrin (1987: 31) are defined as 'sequentially dependent items that bracket units of discussion'. Connectives such as discourse connectives and discourse particles are expressions that function as discourse indicators. Adverbials (e.g., frankly, reportedly, and sadly), interjections (e.g., yuck and oh), and expletives (e.g., damn and good grief) are all used as connectives. Blakemore (2002: 2). Connectives are comparatively syntactically independent and do not often modify the sentence truth conditional meaning because their main duty is at the (sequences of utterances) level rather than at the level of utterances or sentences Carol and Moder(2004). Connectives, according to Brinton (1996: 6), are lexical items that 'are optional, difficult to translate, marginal in terms of word class, syntactically relatively free, empty of lexical meanings, and lack propositional meanings or grammatical functions'. Connectives are distinguished by being used orally and largely (but entirely) in the opening position of the clause; they are frequently occurring and used optionally. Connectives are words or phrases that help the organization and sequence of a discourse item. Speech markers are described as indexical elements that link one item of discourse to another. The expression of these types of links and interrelations are important to spoken dialogic communication and a unique part of the native functional domain. They point to organizational and structural features as well as portions of the non-linguistic situation and surroundings by handling the theme structure and the turntaking system, among other aspects Diewald (2013: 2).

The area of connectives is a very important topic which has been studied by researchers for over thirty years. One example is Fraser, who published two papers on connective DMs. The first, 'An Account of Connectives' was published in 2009 in the International Review of Pragmatics. In this paper, he gives an account of DMs and the syntactic and semantic meaning of connectives. For example, the DM 'but' generally gives the meaning of contrast but pragmatically it has more than ten meanings. In 'Commentary Pragmatic Markers in English', Fraser divided DMs into two: those which give you the basic message conveyed by the utterance, and those which give you the communicative intention of the speaker, and as such function as pragmatic markers.

Salvador Pons Borderia is another writer who has focused on DMs, in his paper 'Do Connectives Exist? On the Treatment of DMs in Relevance Theory', published in 2008. In this paper, the writer presents three ideas on connectives concerning the relevance theory. These are: the distinction between conceptual and procedural; connectives as strictly procedural elements; and, monosemy as the best explanation of multifunctional connectives. He argues that conceptual and procedural features do exist within a single marker. Finally, Aitchison (2003: 428) states that "discourse analysts focus on many sides of communication" (cite in Abdurrahman et al, 2023:6).

Kanaan (2006) also deals with DMs in 'Connectives in Written Arabic'. He proves that DMs play a significant role in organizing Arabic discourse by giving us examples from the Holy Quran, namely Al Shams Sura. Furthermore, 'The Role of Connectives in Organizing Literary Discourse: H.G Wells' The Time Machine as a Case Study' is another paper published in 2021 by Khuder et al. These authors used the novel 'The Time Machine' as an example. They proved their hypothesis by giving examples of DM from this novel.

1.4 Termonolgy of Connectives

DMs are words or phrases that aid the organization and sequencing of a conversation. These elements have been variously referred to by scholars as follows: pragmatic devices (Van Dijk, 1979), gambits (Keller, 1979), discourse particles (Goldberg, 1980), connectives (Ostman, 1981; Schiffrin, 1987), discourse signaling devices (Polanyi and Scha, 1983), semantic conjuncts (Quirk et al., 1985), discourse connectives (Blackmore 1987, 1988), utterance particles (Luke, 1990), linguistic markers (Redeker, 1991), pragmatic expressions (Erma, 1992), pragmatic operators (Ariel, 1994), pragmatic markers (Fraser, 1996), and cue words (Horne et al., 2001).

Brinton (1996: 6) refers to DMs as lexical items with the following features: they are optional, difficult to translate, marginal with respect to word class, syntactically quite free, empty of lexical meanings, and have no propositional meaning or grammatical function. DMs are characterized by their preponderant use in oral discourse, their predominantly (not exclusively) initial clause position, their high frequency of occurrence, and their optional use (ibid.). Schiffrin (1987a: 328) states that the following conditions allow words to be used as DMs:

1. They are syntactically detachable
2. They often occupy the initial position
3. They cover a range of prosodic contours
4. They operate at both local and global levels

5. They operate on different planes of discourse.

Some features of DMs, according to Brinton (1996) and Jucker and Ziv (1998) are:

1. They are predominantly a feature of oral rather than written discourse
2. They appear with high frequency in oral discourse
3. They are short and phonologically reduced items
4. They may occur sentence initially, but also sentence medially and finally
5. They may be multifunctional, operating on the local and global levels simultaneously, although it is difficult to differentiate a pragmatically motivated use of the form from a non-pragmatically motivated one.

1.5 Functions of Connectives

Connectives have many different functions according to different scholars. According to Muller (2005: 8), the use of DMs makes it easier for the listener to grasp the talker's words, or, as Aijmer (1996: 210) suggests, "They operate as cues or guides to the hearer's interpretation". As a result, DMs primarily serve two purposes: discourse and interpersonal communication. For the former, "Textual or discoursal function refers to signal relations between prior, present, and subsequent discourse, separating one text unit from another or connecting discourse units further apart" (ibid.), while for the latter the 'interpersonal function' aids in the expression of the speaker or writer's point of view. 'Sentence openers', for example, can paint an image in the reader's mind and bring them into the composition by drawing them in. A verb, plural noun, collective noun, or preposition can be used as a sentence opening (ibid.).

'DMs give contextual coordinates for utterances: they index an utterance to the local settings in which utterances are created and in which they are to be interpreted', writes Schiffrin (1987: 326) of discourse's contribution to coherence. According to Lenk (1995: 341), DMs are utilized when 'the speaker feels a need to clearly indicate how it fits together effectively'. Hansen (1998: 197) observed that markers such as *by the way* may 'signal rather than the host speech is not intended to cohere or is at most intended to cohere in a somewhat loose sense with what preceded it'. Schiffrin (1987: 318) stated that the employment of markers guides the hearer's interpretation process because 'markers select a meaning relation from whatever prospective meanings are offered through the content of conversation, and present that link'. Blakemore (1992: 150) argued that 'By limiting the number of alternative readings, DMs assist the listener in this endeavor. As a result, they 'encode instructions for processing propositional representations' or 'encoding procedural meaning', as Blakemore puts it.

According to Muller (2005: 12), 'We must consider not just the lexical context of DMs, but also the pragmatic context if we are to understand their functions. However, regardless of the material, another critical question is how it is employed, or what role it plays in the analysis'. Several authors have uncovered a collection of key functions in an attempt to understand the roles of DMs (Eggins, 2004; Müller, 2005; Schiffrin, 2006; Blakemore, 2006; Downing, 2006; Murar, 2008), offering a number of functions ranging from general to specific:

1. In conversations containing speaker choice, DMs play a role in cohesion and coherence. As a result, the speaker must choose the most appropriate sign to create meaning and fit the required pragmatic meaning (Blakemore, 2006: 232);
2. DMs help to limit the discourse's discursive and contextual relevance.
3. DMs direct the listener's interpretation process toward a chosen meaning. As a result, this role entails following the correct inferential path in order to correctly grasp the message (Schiffrin, 2006: 315–338);
4. DMs also have interactive or expressive roles, including courtesy, face-saving or face-threatening, turn-taking, and signaling a speaker's emotional participation in their contribution (Murar, 2008: 135);
5. DMs have a deictic or indexical function, which refers to the DM's ability to illustrate the relationship between the preceding and subsequent discourse that the hearer must establish (ibid.);
6. DMs are functional elements of discourse. They are also useful for exchanging information or finding common ground amongst speakers;
7. DMs can demonstrate attentiveness, known as anchoring. Attentiveness can be demonstrated by confirming the listener's understanding of information on a regular basis (e.g., *you see, you got it*) or by demonstrating awareness of common knowledge (e.g., *you know, indeed*) (Murar, 2008: 125–139);
8. DMs are used in responses to indicate the listener's interest and participation. Many markers, such as *okay, right, see, and alright*, can be employed to perform this function. This category can also contain minimal answers like (*mhm*) (Müller, 2005).

2. Method

The data for this research consist of seven comedy series presented by an actor/comedian (Hassan Fashel) on television in 2008. The selected data contain the common DMs that have been analyzed (*zee, dahiq, kawee, hasatta*), and these were analyzed according to Brinton's model (1996). This section includes the analysis of DMs selected from the data source.

2.1 Zee

It is This DM is one of the most common DMs seen in this study. It has different functions in different contexts and can be used to express

emotional action, confirmation, or disagreement, or to indicate new information and turntaking.

Extract 1 (AP2: 1)

A: قلبي انا ع كدي منك اشنو تعطني فلوس انا غيخ انتخغ اشن لية بالفلوس
 B: دقل النفسك زي اذا كلمن يرجعو قلبو انتحر كان كل العالم خلصت قلبي فهمني اشنو السبب
 A: اهووو يقلي اشنو السبب اسباب عديدة لا تتسمع و لا تتحمل

In this utterance, *zee* functions as an emotional action which is one function of interpersonal functions. Speaker A has tried to commit a suicide because of social conditions in the country, but Speaker B rejects the idea. A insists on committing suicide and B tries to persuade him not to by offering him some money. A uses the DM *zee* in a loud voice to express his reaction and becomes upset with B, and so *zee* as a DM is used to express his emotions and to show how B blames A.

Extract 2 (AP2: 2)

A: ما اتقلي اشنون اتحمل من اسمع من الناس كن التهو بال اقشوغ وكن تركوا اللب وغيغ وغيغ حقي و الا ما حقي دحكي اغشع دحكي ما حقي انتخغ اي هسه دحكي زي
 B: اي احكي هذا الكلام كلامك كلو صحيح و تمام وكل الناس تعففوا اما قضية الانتحار فهذا ضعف و غلط.

Zee here functions as showing confirmation, which is also an interpersonal function. Speaker A is explaining to B about the exploitation of society. A explains to B why he is thinking of committing suicide. The DM *zee* comes in this context because A wants to confirm to B agreement with his speech (i.e., *zee* is used to show confirmation of the reason for suicide).

Extract 3 (AP3:3)

A: اي هههه ول يقلي خاغوف خاطر الله قلب لي هي عالم الحيوان يول قلبي مسجل بل نفوس انت عندك بطاقتك تموينيه
 B: اي اكيد عندي مسجل انت دطول خلقك هي زي ما اغيد الناي علمني شي يكون معفو هي كلي اعفنا انا.
 A: اشعلمك هذي كلها اساسيات انا بديتو معاك بل اساسيات وما تعفا لكن اشعلمك

In this sentence, *zee* indicates disagreement in the speech, as Speaker B asks A to teach him something related to a melody of new songs. A asks that B first learn the basics of the melody, but B refuses and disagrees because he wants something new.

Extract 4 (AP4: 4)

A: انا ما دطلقك بقي ما غيدا أخي ، ما اغيد مشاريعك
 B: باله ما عيب تحكي هذا الكلام ، انا سببتو كل الأصدقاء سببتو كل الأزواج و جيتو عليك تقلي روح لقلبك غير واحد . غير نستفاد انا وانت كم مليون ليش خبز الشعير ع فقير كثير
 مثل ما عم يستفيدوا انا و انت زي نستفاد.

In this context, *zee* is a new information indicator. A offers B his project and asks him if they can work together. B refuses but A is deceitful and uses the DM *zee* to give new information to A, affirming the benefits of his project as new information for A, to persuade him to accept his idea.

Extract 5 (AP5: 5)

A: طبعاً انت لا تعفف ليش لان اذا اقبل معناها غيخ اشارك بهذا الاجرام
 B: اي همم
 A: و اكو بعض الموظفين اصلا ما ياخذون ولا دينار.....
 B: زي اشن غاح تعمل اذا ما رهمت لكن

In this context, *zee* functions to indicate turntaking, which is a textual function. After speaking about the idea of bribery between A and B, B rejects the idea as we have seen in the previous extract. B then uses the DM to ask more questions of A. Thus, he uses *zee* to function as turntaking (i.e., B wants to take a turn to ask more questions).

2.2 Kawee

Appropriate Kawee is the second most common DM in Mosul dialect, used to express confirmation, act as a threatening marker, repair a speaker's utterance, show a reaction, or compliment).

Extract 6 (AP3: 6)

A: ببس سوري سوري مايفرنندز هاكذ تولد الألحان ولادة ولادة عملية ولادة قيصرية اي هذا اشنو بيديك اخي؟
 B: هذا العود ديربالك علينو كوي عود ما صاغ مثلو ابدا .

In this text, the DM *kawee* refers to confirmation of speech. The two people talk about the best fiddle, and speaker B emphasizes that the fiddle in his hand is better than the others. Thus, he is affirming the good quality of his fiddle.

Extract 7 (AP4: 7)

A: انت لا تخاف خليها على دا عيك وما عليك ول ابوي ما فلس فلسين يول ابوي هاي خمس ملايين .
 B: زين انت كوي الجريدة .. انت .. مالي علاقة بي الجريدة تروح عليك .

The DM *kawee* in this utterance is used to express disagreement. Speaker A is inviting B to work with him to produce a newspaper. B uses *kawee* to disagree and let A be the producer of the newspaper.

Extract 8 (AP5: 8)

A: زين *كوي* انا جيتو قبل كل هنولي العالم .

B : قلي عنلعب . ما عتغشع بعينك الشغل اغشع ايمهو اليجيني مستعجل اشنو القضية حالك حال هل عالم اخي .

In this text, the DM *kawee* indicates a threatening marker. Speaker A asks employee B to sign his transaction because he is in a hurry, but B replies that all people are equal. Then, A threatens B. Thus, *kawee* is used to express a face threatening act.

Extract 9 (AP5: 9)

A: عيقلك انت من الحلة كان اقتهمنتي هو ما عيقد الحلة المحافظة انت بس لو كن قتهمتو مضبوط كان لقتنا هي وطيجا .

B : اشون دفهمني يا اخوية *كوي* انا بالألغاز ما افتهم .

In this text, *kawee* indicates a speaker's repair. A hints at B with riddles to pay a bribe when spoke, but B does not know what these riddles mean. Thus, he uses *kawee* as a speaker repair, as he wants A to speak more clearly.

Extract 10 (AP7 : 10)

A : بهادي الحالة يقع حشم على كاكنا نجم واقتهمت هذا الحشم ينحل بالفصل العشائري اقتهمت .

B : هنولا اشنو اغشع صار بيها فصل عشائري ما تقلي انا *كوي* ما عافتهم منك شي .

Kawee is used in this context to express a reaction (emotional marker). Speaker A suggests that Speaker B take some money in exchange for hospital and doctors' expenses in treating his son, and B is surprised by these words. Thus, this DM is used to express an emotion.

Extract 11 (AP7: 11)

A : هاي الاسعار مرتبطة بالدولار واليورورو وحسب الظروف وحسب الكسغان ياخوية على كلن انا هسع رايح اقوم بالمهمة وأمر على ابو سعد اقلو *كوي* اقل من مليونين دينار ما تنقص والكلام رح اقلو عن لسانك وبعدين لا تطلعني كذاب معانو ها .

B : ما تقلي بخاطر الله هاي الاسعار من وين جبتا .

Kawee in this text refers to disagreement. Speaker A explains to Speaker B how much money he should take, but B refuses this idea.

Extract 12 (AP7: 12)

A: الي جا قلي اريد عشرة بالمية من الحصة اخ يا ابو فراس يا نصاب يا حيال .

B : بس هو الخسران لان حبل الكذب قصير مثل ما يقولون وجيرتنا وصدائقنا *كوي* محد يطيق يفرقها لا ابو فراس ولا غيره .

Kawee is used in this context to express confirmation of speech. Speaker B emphasizes to Speaker A that no one can hurt their relationship.

Extract 13 (AP7: 13)

A : اخ اريد القطو اخ ابو فراس يعني بكل حصة لك نصه بسيطة بحق ابو ثامر انا جيتوك لي هوني *كوي* اش تامر انا حاضر .

B : بيمعود ما عيب اش عتحتكي احنا جبران الفلوس اشني مليون دينار اشني لكن وبين المحبة وبين الجيرة الفلوس تروح وتجي بس الصداقة والجيرة رح تظل طول العمر .

In this text, *kawee* indicates new information. Speaker B emphasizes to Speaker A how much he loves him and how the love and friendship between them will last forever.

2.3 Dahiq

D This is the third most common DM in the Mosul dialect, used to express turntaking, reactions, agreement and confirmation.

Extract 14 (AP3: 14)

A- الفن اغيد اصبيغ فنان مشهور معروف والناس تقول هياتوو حسون

B- *دحيق* ابني سيد جنجون

A- ما جنجون حسون اي هسع ليش صبيغ عصبي يا استاذ دستريح استريح بس طول خلقتك علي انا هذي اعفا علمني غيغا شي يكون معفو يا استاذ

In this phrase, the DM *dahiq* signals turntaking. Speaker A is talkative and wants to become a famous artist but is then interrupted by B, who wants to take a turn, which he begins with *dahiq*. However, A continues his turn and completes his speech.

Extract 15 (AP4: 15)

A_ اح يبسي الله ، اهو *دحيق* من جا زي يا فتاح يا رزاق

B_ السلام عليكم

A_ السلام

B_ عيتنين ابو سعد اممم يا هيك البيبي يا ملازم

A_ بالعافية

B_ الله يعافيك

A_ نعم تفضل

B_ عيني ابو سعد جيتكم بمشروع ، مشروع يخيل نظيف لطيف قطيف ولا اكو منو انا وانت نستفاد

A_ كفو عني كفو عني لحاطر الله مشاريعك ما غيدا اي مشروع منك بالذات ما اغيد لقبلك غير زوج .

The DM *dahiq* in this utterance is a reaction marker. Speaker A sees that B is about to visit and says to himself the first utterance, including *dahiq*, to express his reaction because he

is upset that B is arriving. Speaker A hates B because he is deceitful, a liar and fraudulent.

Extract 16 (AP7: 16)

A_ هو كاكنا نجم الدين قال ها كذا حكي معقولة يعني

B_ اشون ما معقولي انت لا تقلي كاكنا نجم هذا تقشعو مسكين بس هذا حية جوا الثين الله يخليك تعلمني بينو

A_ بحق ابو فراس ما طول هكذا وما بالكذب جا وسال على ابني وجسو بالبيت روجو فعلا مليون مليون والعشرة بالمية هم تفلك اش تغيد

B_ هكذا انا اغيدك والله فلوسك كلها تصلك وانا جدا ممنون رش اخوي رش على كيفك

In this text, the *dahiq* suggests agreement. Since Speaker B deceives Speaker A, and because A is a naive and simple person, he believes B and agrees with his lies. He accepts money and gives a percentage of it to B.

Extract 17 (AP7: 17)

A_ هسا جينا باللك ها هاي اشقد صارلنا اشعجب اشعجب استريح استريح

B_ كوي بحق ابو ثامر انت دائما بقلبي ويشهد الله بيناتنا محبة واخوة وعشرة عمر وانا كوي

كنتو مسافر ابغداد من رجعتو من سمعتو قضية سعد و ثامر مسكتونو سعد و قلتونو قتلي عمرو ما ينسهاها حلف يمين احنا نشهد عليها احنا عنلعب كرة قوم بالساحة مثل كل مرة وصار احتكاك وطيختونو ووقع .

The DM *dahiq* here is a confirmation, since Speaker B emphasizes the love and brotherhood between himself and Speaker A, who confirms to B that he was traveling and could not visit him. Thus, B is resolving a misunderstanding that occurred between them.

2.4 Hasatta

Along This is the fourth most common DM used in the Mosul dialect, used to express disagreement, or to switch topics and act as an opener.

Extract 18 (AP5: 18)

A_ يا اخي لا تلوم ناس يغيدون يعيشون ما طول شغلها بيها فلوس انت عيش تضوج

B_ اشون حكي ماتقلي الحاطر الله اشنو يغيدون يعيشون يعمود هسي قبل نقول حقم الدولة ماكانت تعطي راتب مليح للموظف بصيغ ٧ ٨. بلشهر تخلص فلوسو اش يقوم بعمل يدين محد يدينو ف ممكن هناك الوقت ياخذ اكرامية اما هسعتنا مائنا الله الموظف ياخذلو ٣٠٠ ٤٠٠ او اكنغ حالتو المعاشية مليحة

In this utterance, *hasatta* indicates disagreement because Speaker B disagrees with A's opinion about paying a bribe to the employee.

Extract 19 (AP6: 19)

A_ اي اشنو قلتي انت ما من الموصل ما من المدينة ول بابا صارلي ساعة طالع من البيت از دحام اي هالشكل سيارات وانا نزلتو براس الجسر وجيتو مشي هاي السيارات يعني مايكفي يوميا جابينا 100 سيارة اي دكفي .

A_ هسعتنا ما عليك لاتاخذني حاصل فاصل جاي بارد قهوي اشنو

B_ انا مستعجل ما جاي دجربك لا جاي لا بارد قلتي اش ردت

In this sentence, *hasatta* acts as a topic switcher because, at the beginning of the conversation, B explains to A that he is late because of traffic in the city; A tries to change the subject by offering B tea or coffee.

Extract 20 (AP6: 20)

A_ هسعتنا انت عيش بكلشي تدخل عن تسئل الاخ يعني اشيلك از تك بل بحيرة

B_ اي عيش هسي انا ازت نفسي هسع اسبح لا دحق دقلك انت مايفيد معاك الكلام خلي نركب بالسيارة ونغوح على مكان ثاني

C_ بلا مثل ماتحبون تفضلو

In this context, *hasatta* is an opening and reaction marker, because Speaker A is very angry with B because he interferes too much.

3. Conclusion

In This study concerns DMs and their pragmatic functions in the Mosul dialect. We investigated *zee*, *dahiq*, *kawee*, and *hasatta*. The study used Brinton's model (1996), which includes different textual and interpersonal functions. The selected data was taken from a comedy series by Hassan Fashel. It is concluded that DMs are used widely in the Mosul dialect, with *kawee* being the most widely used to express functions as confirmation and disagreement, to perform as threatening acts, speaker repair, or reaction markers. The DM *zee* was used to express emotions, confirmation, and disagreement, and to indicate new information and turntaking. The DM *dahiq* was used

for turntaking, reactions, agreement and confirmation, while *hasatta* was used to indicate disagreement, topic switching and openings. In light of the results, we can make recommendations, as follows. There are many DMs in the Mosuli dialect that no one has touched upon and we therefore advise researchers and students to discover them. We recommend student researchers to perform systematic research into the determinants of discourse in the Mosuli dialect and reveal their impact on foreign language teaching and translation. These DMs have many different uses that vary according to the local dialect of the country and the text in which they are contained. One area that should be investigated is a comparison of the usage of DMs in Mosuli dialect Arabic with English, to see whether there are any parallels or variations in how they are used. Other fruitful projects would be to compare the use of DMs between certain dialects, such as Mosuli Arabic and Baghdadi Arabic, or to consider the difficulties that Arab learners have while translating DMs from English to Mosuli Arabic.

Acknowledgements

We, the researchers express our thanks to all those who help us during the preparation of this work especially.

References

- Abdurrahman, I. B., Hamad, R. A., Abdurrahman, R. B., & Hazem, A. H. (2023). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Feminism in Katherine Mansfield's Bliss. *Asian Journal of Human Services*, 24(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.14391/ajhs.24.1>
- Aitchison, J. (2003). *Linguistics*. In UK by Hodder Education and in US by the McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Ajmer, K. (1996). *Conversational Routines in English. Convention and Creativity*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Ariel, M. (1994). 'Pragmatic operators'. In R. E. Asher (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Bake, P., & Ellece, S. (2011). *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum International.
- Blakemore, D. (1987). Semantic Constraints on Relevance. Oxford: Blackwell
- Blakemore, D. (1988). *So as a constraint on relevance*. (Ed.) R.M. Kempson. Cambridge University Press Understanding Utterances.
- Blakemore, D. (1992) *Understanding Utterances. An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blakemore, D. (2002). *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486456>
- Blakemore, D. (2006). 'Discourse Markers'. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756959.ch10>
- Brinton, L. (1996). *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110907582>
- Brinton, L. (2008). *The Comment Clause in English Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Developments (Studies in English Language)*. Cambridge: CUP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511551789>
- Diewald, D. (2013). *Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199586783.013.0036>
- Downing, A. (2006). 'The English Pragmatic Marker surely and its Functional Counterparts in Spanish'. In: Pragmatic Markers in Contrast. (Eds.) Ajmer, Karin and Simon-Vandenberg. Oxford: Elsevier
- Egins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (2 nd ed.). New York/London: Continuum.
- Fraser, B. (1996a). *On Discourse markers*.
- Fraser, B. (2009). *An account of discourse markers' commentary pragmatic in English*. Boston University, USA.
- Goldberg, J. (1980). 'Discourse Particles: An Analysis of the role of 'you know', 'I mean', 'well', and 'actually' in conversation'. Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge University (England).
- Hansen, M. (1998). *The Function of Discourse Particles*. Pragmatics & Beyond New Series. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.53>
- Hazem, A. H., & Kanaan, M. H. (2020). Domain Adverbs in Legal English Texts: Problems and Strategies. *IUP Journal of English Studies*, 15(4), 130-141.
- Hazem, A. H., & Mohammed, S. I. (2021). Mitigating Devices in Mosuli Iraqi Arabic with Reference to English. *Ijaz Arabi Journal of Arabic Learning*, 4(2), 518-534. <https://doi.org/10.18860/ijazarabi.v4i3.13130>
- Horne, M., Hansson, P., Bruce, G., Frid, J., & Filipsson, M. (2001). Cue words and the topic structure of spoken discourse: The case of Swedish men 'but'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(00\)00044-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00044-8)
- Jucker, A., & Ziv, Y. (1998). *Discourse markers: Descriptions and theory*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.57>
- Kanaan, M. H. (2006). Discourse markers in written Arabic. *Teachers' College Researchers Journal*, 1(1), 232-243.
- Keller, E. (1979). Gambits: Conversational strategy signals. *Journal of Pragmatics*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(79\)90032-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(79)90032-8)
- Khuder, S. A., Hazem, A. H., & Kanaan, M. H. (2021). The Role of Discourse Markers in Organizing Literary Discourse: H.G. Wells' The

- Time Machine as a Case Study. *ADAB AL-RAFIDAYN*, 84(51), 1-26.
- Lenk, U. (1995). *Discours markers and conventional coherence 'In Organization in Discourse*. Turku: University of Turku.
- Luke, K. K. (1990). *Utterance particles in Cantonese conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.9>
- Muller, S. (2005). *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse*. John Benjamin Publishing Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.138>
- Murar, L. (2008). 'The Functionality of Discourse Markers in Conventional: Text'. University Craiova.
- Östman, J. (1981). *You Know. A Discourse-Functional Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pb.ii.7>
- Polanyi, L., & Scha, R. (1983). On the Recursive Structure of Discourse. In Ehlich, K. and van Riemsdijk, H., Eds., *Connectedness in Sentence, Discourse and Text*.
- Pons borderia, S. (2008). *'Do discourse markers exist? On the treatment of discourse markers in relevance theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.03.013>
- Quirk, R. S., Greenbaum, G. L., & J. Svartvik (1985), *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Redeker, G. (1991). *Linguistic markers of discourse structure*.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611841>
- Schiffrin, D. (2006). Discourse marker research and theory: revisiting and. In *Approaches to discourse particles* (pp. 315-338). Brill.
- Van Dijk, T. (1979). Pragmatic connectives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 3, 447-456. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(79\)90019-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(79)90019-5)

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).