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Abstract

Metapragmatics is a relatively new field of study that attracts the attention of many scholars in linguistics; it refers to the use of language about language use. In trials of political figures, such as Saddam Hussein and William Clinton, Iraqi and American legal discourses have not been addressed that much, if ever, metapragmatically; thus, the study aims to analyze these discourses metapragmatically. This paper attempts to answer central questions about identifying the metapragmatic expressions, explaining their functions, and describing the layers of metapragmatic monitoring of the detected metapragmatic expressions in the Iraqi and American legal discourse. Accordingly, the objectives are to identify the metapragmatic expressions detected by specific indicators and investigate their functions and role in monitoring the Iraqi and American broadcast political court discourses. Some extracts of the two figures mentioned above are analyzed according to a developed model encompassing Caffi’s (2016) model, Hubler and Bublitz’s (2007) metapragmatic parameters, and Culpuper and Haugh’s (2014) metapragmatic awareness indicators, and forms. The current study is hoped to be helpful for those researchers interested in the fields of pragmatics, politics, and applied linguistics. Since metapragmatics deals with the pragmatic meaning of language, this study highlights the importance of metapragmatic expressions in promoting productive interaction and organizing communication within the court, regardless of the language used. Further investigation of metapragmatics is recommended while analyzing political, literary, religious, social, and media discourse to understand the functions of the metapragmatic utterances used in different settings.
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Introduction

Metapragmatics is a recently emerged area of linguistics that has been addressed by many scholars like (Caffi (1993, 1994, 2006), Lucy (1993), Verschueren (1995, 2000), and Mey (2009). They have attempted to systemize and categorize metapragmatic language in various ways. Etymologically, the Greek-derived (meta-) refers to ‘after’ or ‘beyond’. Epistemologically, the meaning of (meta-) is ‘about’ the thing it is attached to; for example, metapragmatics means pragmatics about pragmatics, and metalanguage means language about language (Culpeper & Haugh, 2014, p.236). According to Hübler (2011), metapragmatics is a slippery term; "many meanings have been ascribed to it, too many perhaps" (p. 107).

Linguistic anthropologist Silverstein (1976) was the first to coin metapragmatics; he has defined it as "reflexive pragmatic functioning" (p.36). Several scholars, for example, Hübler and Bublitz (2007), adopt this meaning of metapragmatics with more elaboration and enhancements on some specific details. Still, others go far and present different senses, such as Caffi (1993, 2006, 2016), who has given three senses of metapragmatics: Theoretical discussion on pragmatics, the conditions of actions and interactive communication, and management of discourse on which the present study concentrates. Caffi's (2006) third sense, the focus of this study, concentrates on the speaker's competence in judging and managing the appropriateness of language use. A speaker may look critically at their discourse and make adjustments and corrections or explain some comments on their discourse. Simply speaking, this is the scope of metapragmatics. The setting for the study's data is the court; legal discourse refers to verbal communication in legal contexts; it is authorized institutionally and socially (Goodrich, 1984). Metapragmatics is a linguistic approach that deals with the participants' interpretation; therefore, selecting these two different legal discourses in these two other languages is not for comparison but to confirm their universality. To contribute effectively to this field of study, this study will address a special kind of Iraqi Arabic and American English political discourse. Despite the interest within these political discourses, frequently tackled linguistically, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, Iraqi Arabic and American English legal discourses in trials of political figures have not been addressed that much, if ever, metapragmatically. The trial of Saddam and his comrades in Aldujail case occupied the opinion of the public and the world at its time in 2005; Clinton's impeachment in 1998 was one of the critical trials of political figures in the twentieth century. Hence, filling this gap is the concern of this study, which attempts to answer the following questions.

1. What are the metapragmatic expressions of the Arabic and English legal discourses in trials of Iraqi and American political figures?
2. What are the indicators of these metapragmatic expressions?
3. What are the functions of the metapragmatic expressions used in such trials?

This research paper is hoped to be helpful for those researchers interested in the fields of pragmatics, politics, and applied linguistics. In pragmatics, learners are expected to understand the workings of metapragmatic theories within Arabic and English legal discourse, which is restricted and argumentative. This work will provide political observers with the metapragmatic expressions utilized by Arabic and English politicians. In applied linguistics, teachers, students, and translators can use this work to address speaking on language use more efficiently. Besides, those researchers engaged in forensic linguistics can benefit from the findings offered by this study, particularly those related to trials.
Literature Review

The studies that have tackled metapragmatics in terms of Caffi’s (2006) third sense are of two veins. The first vein addresses the metapragmatic structures and markers in various settings. One of the studies is Culpeper and Haugh's (2014), which summarizes most of the fruitful conclusions of several studies discussing the metapragmatic indicators. They have presented four kinds of metapragmatic indicators: 1) the pragmatic expressions or markers that indicate how vague terms such as “sort of” and “kind of” should be understood, 2) reported language use, which involves the quotative use in language, 3) metapragmatic commentary which includes the attitudinal categories, action verbs, and some of the deixis, and 4) social discourse (p.241).

The second vein deals with metapragmatic functions discussed in several studies, such as Jacobs (1999), who first explored metapragmatic discourse's dramatic, reliability, distancing, and attitude functions. Verschueren (2000) has discussed the identity construction function. Subsequently, Hübler and Bublitz (2007) have listed some general functions of metapragmatic expressions, such as managing conflict, engaging in affiliation, etc. The Typology of Metapragmatic functions (Bublitz & Hubler, 2007) has won much attention in illustrating the various metapragmatic functions an utterance can serve. According to their functional taxonomy of metapragmatic acts, the utterance 'You are repeating yourself 'can be instrumental, evaluative, or communication-oriented. Being communication-oriented, this utterance could be conflictual (face threatening), deciding on the best expression (establishing the best code), (inter-)personal, expressive, affiliative, means related, negotiating linguistic meaning, and organizing. This typology is regarded as an essential step toward explaining the distinctive features and functions of metapragmatic expressions; therefore, Caffi's (2016) model for analyzing them has depended highly on it.

Dubrovskaya's (2017) study examined how judges use language in judicial discourse. The study found that judges use meta-utterances to construct the judge's identity and the social institution they represent. The study analyzed trial transcripts in Russian and English and classified meta-utterances into three groups based on reality types. Jürgen (2021) integrated metapragmatics into genre analysis to examine metapragmatic discourse about generic references used by speakers. Seven YouTube videos and comments were analyzed using textually oriented discourse analysis. The findings suggest that generic references can take various forms when referring to a particular type or genre of discourse. Blasch (2021) used metapragmatics to study how registers conceptualize authenticity in visual political communication. The study analyzed 84 photos from the social media campaign of the former Austrian chancellor, Sebastian Kurz, during the country's parliamentary elections in 2017. Merminod and Vitorio's (2023) study found that reflexive practices shape language ideologies and identity construction. Metapragmatic discourse analysis helps researchers understand how language use is affected. Research interviews help understand how people reconfigure or oppose existing indexicalities.

Simply put, there have been two directions in investigating metapragmatics; one concentrates on its structure and indicators, and the second is on its functions using different approaches. The current study focuses on the two directions using the metapragmatic approach.

Theoretical Framework

Building upon previous research that has examined metapragmatic indicators and functions, this study aims to investigate how metapragmatic expressions are used in the legal discourse in courts and their functions in this institutional setting.
Aspects of Metapragmatics

Several scholars such as Silverstein (1976, 1993), Bateson (1972), Schiffrin (1987), Lucy(1993), Caffi (1994,2006), Hübler & Bublitz (2007), and others have tried to explain the metapragmatic language in various ways and give interpretations in their literature despite the overlapping ideas within their studies. They confirm that the metapragmatic dimension is essential in all language use since language typically refers to itself differently; this mode facilitates communication because it deeply grounds utterances to a specific context, puts them in a participation frame, and predicts turn-taking. They claim that metapragmatics is an extensive and interdisciplinary field; it deals with the communicated messages in any discourse and the linguistic codes used to convey those messages, and both of them constitute the structure of speech. However, eminent aspects of metapragmatics are discussed within studies on metapragmatics, and they contribute largely to clarifying it. They are Silverstein's (1976) understanding of metalingual use and its relation with indexicality, Bateson's study of metacommunicative use (1972) and Lucy’s concept of reflexivity (1993), and Caffi's distinguished contributions in metapragmatics.

Silverstein's Metalingual Use

Silverstein is regarded as the one who has aroused interest in metapragmatics. His work (1976, 1985) has generally posited metapragmatics as the description of the pragmatic use of language or as the metalinguistic reporting of that description, i.e., the use of language to communicate about using language. Silverstein (1993) demonstrates that in addition to the semantic codes that interpret the plain meaning of words, there are pragmatic codes that infer the implicit meanings. Metapragmatic expressions refer to "the linguistic signs that deal with the pragmatic codes to explicate the extra semantic encoded meanings in speech" (Silverstein,1993,p.39).

Bateson’s Metacommunicative Use

Metacommunication has been generalized by the anthropologist Bateson (1972). It refers to the cues through which needful communicative information can be interpreted. It is closely related to metapragmatics because it stems from metalanguage study (Bridges, 2019). Bateson (1972) has claimed that metacommunication is synonymous with metalanguage, whereas metapragmatics can be studied within the umbrella of metacommunication. In discourse, there are types of metacommunicative utterances that secure dialogue management and communication efficiency. Metacommunication is a risky activity and a complex concept. It may be implicit, not expressed by explicit words, and what one means may not be what others interpret. Whenever there is communication, "there will also be metacommunication associated with it, making sense of the meaning" (Mateus, 2017, p.83). Sawyer (2003), cited in (Deschrijve, 2021, p.9), has explained that metacommunication is necessary for successful communication. It clarifies utterances and interpretations, provides information about the interlocutors and context, and negotiates frames.

Lucy's Reflexivity

Reflexivity is a distinctive feature of natural language, distinguishing it from other semiotic systems specifically in its adequacy of describing itself; it has been studied anthropologically and cross-culturally by Lucy (1993). Linguistically, reflexivity can be demonstrated in the speakers' capacity to communicate on the communication they are engaged in. Defining and modifying the
speakers' comments and partners can be rooted in their metapragmatic reflexivity to achieve mutual understanding. Reflexivity and awareness are essential to understand metapragmatics. Lucy (1993) clarifies that to use language reflexively means "to speak about speech; using language to communicate about the activity of using language" (p. 9). He argues that speech is distinguished as reflexive when the speaker reports utterances and remarks on language, describes and indexes aspects of speech events, invokes familiar names, and leads the listeners to an appropriate interpretation of their utterances. According to him, metapragmatic language can regenerate speech, reforming it in a new environment with a new goal. The interactants practice metapragmatics, reflecting on "all the meaningfulness of signs connected with ongoing usage in contexts of communication" (Lucy 1993, p. 17). Thus, metapragmatics supplements language reflexivity so that speakers can speak about and investigate the kinds of linguistic phenomena in addition to the aspects covered by the metalinguistic (metasemantic) practice.

Reflexivity functions as a means of "explaining and modifying, exemplifying and glossing, repairing and evaluating, which help to infer entailed, presupposed and implicated meaning" (Lucy, 1993, p. 10). Naturally, speakers can direct a metapragmatic act, such as criticizing or commenting on themselves. However, when they target other’s behavior in the same way, this may cause face-threatening and thus risky.

In one of the dimensions submitted by Silverstein (1993), metapragmatics is demonstrated as "a reflexive relation to the pragmatic or indexical dimension of language" (p. 41). Metapragmatics is related to reflexivity and indexicality.

Indexicality

It is worth noting that indexicality is tightly intertwined with metapragmatics, as the essence of both concepts encompasses language practices and social groups' complex histories. Ponzio (2006) observed that indexicality, discussed by Peirce (1974), concerns the strong relation between verbal language and referents in the real world. Silverstein (2006) has explained that Jakobson (1960), among many linguists, has noted the prevalent role of indexing in natural language beyond the deictic reference to include the context-suffused and context-dependent character of linguistic communication; indexicality can be revealed when linguistic or other signs point their users to the conditions of their use. The deictic elements are the words and expressions that refer to objects, situations, persons, etc., by ‘pointing’ to them, such as "I, you, here, there, now, this, that, etc..." (p. 757). Moreover, he adds that the language one speaks reveals ('indexes') her social or local roots; through indexicality, an utterance may show many things about the utterer: sex, age, region, education, or social affiliation, etc.

Metapragmatics helps regiment indexicals into interpretable events (Silverstein, 1993); metapragmatic awareness enables speakers to draw upon social indexes based on language. Thus, "metapragmatics is the reconstruction of an indexical signaling event, the picking out of and supplying information about a pragmatic act. It is a description of an indexical signaling event" (p. 159). Indexicality can be viewed as reflexivity; it may refer to the events that enable their articulation.

Caffi's Contributions to Metapragmatics

One of the linguists who has made influential contributions to metapragmatic is Caffi. According to Caffi (1994), metapragmatics is the ability to reflect on language by connecting language to context. Therefore, metapragmatic resolutions demand awareness of both linguistic
and world or contextual knowledge, i.e., metapragmatic awareness. Caffi (1993) explains that metapragmatic knowledge enables the speaker not to abide firmly by the familiar socio-communicative routines and roles absorbed by them; it is essential to "an ecology of communication" (p. 43).

The focus is on the pragmatics of the actual meta-utterances that comment on the ongoing discourse or text. This means metapragmatics determines how the speaker's usage of some utterance becomes practical and possible. Specifically, an utterance or expression is metapragmatic if it elaborates on the pragmatics of a speech. Caffi (2006) clarifies that the metapragmatic level mirrors the mediator between linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge, i.e., it empowers the speaker to join language and the world by connecting the appropriate utterances with the factual contexts (p.626). She has established three senses of metapragmatics:

1) The metatheoretical sense
2) The second sense discusses the conditions that make the exchange influential (thinkability, feasibility, and recognizability). These conditions are simultaneous in social communication.
3) The third sense is concerned with the “management of discourse,” which is "the investigation of speakers 'know-how in reflecting judgments of appropriateness in their own and others 'communication" (Caffi, 2006, p. 626). Metapragmatic expressions can monitor one’s own (self-referential) and another’s language (other-referential). For example, "No offense but…” and "Do not get me wrong…” are self-referential utterances, referring to the speaker's language, and they could be used to monitor others' responses (other-referential) and minimize the risk of being held accountable for one’s actions as a discursive strategy used to shield the speaker of being accused of offensiveness. Such utterances explain that the speaker is reflexively commenting on the risk that the addressee may misunderstand her intentions or may disagree with the used utterance. Being mindful of potential offense or disagreement is a metapragmatic skill. It enables the speakers to monitor their language so that their messages are not misinterpreted. Caffi (1993) shows that there are two distinctive features of the third sense of metapragmatics: Common knowledge and reflexivity; the former includes shared knowledge and folk theories; common sense or knowledge is not ideological but epistemological, whereas the latter, i.e., reflexivity, indicates its possibility of thinking and speaking about its thinking (p.33).

In outlining the sequence of speech, the speaker can describe it, name it, and decide whether it is appropriate so that the speaker can go back over her steps and correct herself.

In the last few years and as a step toward creating an applicable model for analyzing practical data, Caffi (2016, p.800) has initiated three interlinked layers, according to which she examines the metapragmatic expressions. These metapragmatic expressions monitor the discourse at these intertwined layers. The first layer is the sequential layer, the meta-discourse layer, which focuses on controlling and organizing the exchange. The second relational layer concentrates on the speaker and the hearer relation. At the third layer, the topical meta-textual layer, the metapragmatic expressions affect the linearity of the act sequence and form a vertical perspective, which is the hierarchy of acts. Moreover, the utterances at this layer can be further subdivided into groups depending on (a) Topical hierarchization. (b) Topical focalization. (c) Defining topics at hand. (d) Topical exclusion. (e) Topical resetting.

Data Collection and Methodology

To answer the research questions and obtain its objectives (identifying the metapragmatic expressions, their indicators, and functions), attain the aim of the study (analyzing the Iraqi and
American legal discourse of political figures metapragmatically), and provide an ample overview of the metapragmatic expressions, the following procedure is adopted:

1. Selecting public broadcast trials for the Iraqi Arabic and American English political figures, i.e., Saddam Hussein and William Clinton, to be the study's data. The selected extracts have been broadcast on local and global TV channels before and are available in the public domain. The chosen extracted parts, for both Arabic and English, are for the different members of the courtroom, i.e., the judge, the lawyers, the prosecutors, the defendants, the witnesses, etc…

2. Developing a metapragmatic model to conduct a qualitative metapragmatic analysis of illustrative examples of the data under study (see figure 1):
   
   A. Detecting the metapragmatic expressions according to Culpeper and Haugh's (2014) indicators.
   
   B. For witnessing the importance of awareness in reflexing on self and others, Culpeper and Haugh's (2014) metapragmatic awareness is the adopted model for detecting this kind of awareness.

   C. To analyze the metapragmatic expressions, the study at hand advocates Caffi's model (2016) with a high focus on the three metapragmatic layers: The Meta Discourse Layer, The Meta Relational Layer, and The Topical Meta Textual Layer.

   D. For presenting a comprehensive analysis, Hubler and Bublitz's (2007) metapragmatic parameters (functions) are also addressed.

   
   ![](figure1.png)

   Figure 1. Developed model for metapragmatic analysis

Data Analysis and Findings

The Arabic Extract

This section includes an analysis of extracts taken from the Iraqi political court discourse within the trial of Saddam and seven defendants in the alleged events in Aldujail, where Saddam Hussein's motorcade was ambushed in an assassination attempt in 1982. The extracts were translated with the help of the professional sworn translator Hameed Mana (hameed.mana@qu.edu.iq).
Extract One

The following extracted chunks were between Raouf Abdulrahman, the judge, Jaafar Almosaway, the prosecutor, and Saddam Hussein, the defendant; the exchange is available for public service at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t-L0_euuFEY&t=1902s.

المدعي: ما هو العدد التقريبي لحمايتك عندما قدمت الى الدجيل بتاريخ 8/7/1982؟
Prosecutor: what was the approximate number of your protection when you came to Aldujail on 8/7/1982?

صدام: السؤال الي سأله الادعاء معتمد على الإفادة وانا عندي تعليق على الإفادة
Saddam: The question raised by the prosecution is based on the statement, and I have a comment on the statement

القاضي (2:28): انت جوابك على السؤال. وضع الجهاب على السؤال؟
Judge (2:28): Your answer should be to the question. Explain the answer to the question.

صدام: أنا طلبت منك الكلام تعليقا على ما سجل في إفادة صدام حسين
Saddam: I asked you to speak, commenting on what was recorded in Saddam Hussein's statement

القاضي: مخالف طلبت. احنا نريد بحدود القانون ننطيك الفرصة احنا كلناك بإمكانك عدم الإجابة وفي حالة الإجابة في حدود القانون وفي حدود السؤال
Judge: It is okay that you requested, but it should be within the limits of the law. We give you the opportunity. We have told you that you have the right not to answer, and if you answer, it should be within the limits of the law and the limits of the question.

صدام:... انا طلبت منك أعلق على الإجابة وكلتلي تفضل تمام لولا؟
Saddam: ...I requested you to comment on the answer, and you said go ahead. Am I right or not?

القاضي: ادخل مباشرة بالموضوع
Judge: Get straight to the point

القاضي (9:43): ما علاقة هذه الخطبة بموضوع السؤال الموجه الك وضحلنة مدى علاقة هذه الخطبة الطويلة بموضوع السؤال سؤاله محدد؟
Judge (9:43): What is the relationship of this sermon to the subject of the question addressed to you? Explain to us the extent to which this long speech relates to the subject of the question, his question is specific.

صدام: هذه الخطبة قانونية بشأن افادة قدمت باسم القانون طلب مني ان اکولها
Saddam: This speech is legal regarding a statement that was submitted in the name of the law, which I was asked to give.

القاضي: تقصد افادتك؟
Judge: You mean your statement?

صدام: نعم
Saddam: Yes

القاضي:... انت هسة جاوب على السؤال ضمن المطالعة ماتلك... هسة سوال موجه لك على الجهاب... احنا كلاك هيئة محكمة قضية جنائية مالهه علاقة بمجال سياسى ولاخطب سياسى ولا عدادك السابقين أو اللاحقين جاوب على السؤال (16:25)
Judge: ... now answer the question within your perusal...now a question is directed to you, you have to answer it...we have told you this is a court of criminal case that has nothing to do with political issues and political speeches or your former or later enemies, answer the question...

(16:25) Go back to the question

صدام: ...فتعليقي هو حول الشيء الذي سمي بالإفادة الي الادعاء مستند عليها في استلطني
Saddam: ...So my comment is about the thing called a statement on which the prosecution based in my questions
In the above extract, the judge expresses his disagreement with Saddam's irrelevant and lengthy speech through his metapragmatic commentaries, i.e., indicators of metapragmatic awareness (Culpeper & Haugh, 2014). 'Your answer should be to the question. Explain the answer to the question', '...it should be within the limits of the law and the limits of the question', and '...Explain the extent to which this long speech relates to the subject of the question; his question is specific'. The judge refers to Saddam's answer as a sermon, indicating that his speech was long but should be brief and straightforward. Metacognitive awareness is apparent when Saddam gets the cognitive information that the judge means (his speech is long). He informs the judge that his speech is legal since it relates to the statement on which many of the prosecutor's questions would depend: '...So my comment is about the thing called a statement on which the prosecution based my questions. It is an explicit metapragmatic utterance wherein Saddam refers to his preceding speech as a comment; it is detected by the pragmatic marker 'So.' This conclusive metapragmatic utterance indicates Saddam's intention. The metalinguistic descriptor 'means' detects the judge's metapragmatic utterance, 'You mean your statement?' he corrects Saddam's speech.

The prosecutor uses insinuation in his utterance, 'What do you want to say on the statement written down by the investigation committee in the presence of your lawyer and with your signature...' It is to cast doubt on Saddam's testimony that he signed his statement in the presence of his lawyer. Moreover, he ends his utterance by requesting clarification, i.e., one of the procedural metapragmatic strategies, 'A question I am asking you?' to indicate that Saddam's answer is obscure; thus, he violates the maxim of manner. Saddam's utterance 'Are you telling me what I should say?' is detected as a metapragmatic commentary involving the linguistic verb of action 'tell.' It expresses Saddam's anger since the prosecutor's reflexive presentation of the information makes Saddam realize how he should take the upcoming information: 'What do you want to say on the statement written down by the investigation committee in the presence of your
lawyer and with your signature, so what do you want to say? ...You say that this statement… (interrupted by Saddam)…'

The prosecutor's meta utterance ' ...are you challenging it, saying it is not true?' is a situated comment about his evaluation of the defendant's language use. The linguistic action verb 'challenge' detects this metapragmatic utterance. The focus is on the illocutionary force of the verb 'challenge.'

The utterance 'Yes, I challenge it, and there will be a speech about the contest' is explicitly metapragmatic, and it prepares the audience for the prospective speech. The judge's reflection on Saddam's utterance,' What is understood from your words is that you challenge the statement submitted before the investigating judge?' is metapragmatic and detected by the verb 'understood,' which explains the evidential status of what is meant.

The first layer of Caffi's layers focuses on the horizontal organization of the interaction between the interactants, involving some attempts to gain or maintain the floor; it demonstrates the meta-discursive layer. For instance, Saddam's metapragmatic utterance, 'I requested you to comment on the answer, and you said go ahead, Am I Right or not?' shows the speaker reflecting on the prosecutor's question and his approval in addition to his prospective comment. According to Hubler and Bublitz (2007) parameters, it is instrumentalized because it reinforces the communicative norms in court, i.e., the norm of interrogating besides the norm of asking the judge's permission to talk inside the court. The judge's reflections on Saddam's answers affect the discourse management 'Your answer should be to the question. Explain the answer to the question', '... it should be within the limits of the law and the limits of the question', '... Explain the extent to which this long sermon relates to the subject of the question; his question is specific.' and '... answer the question... (16):25) Go back to the question'

The metapragmatic layer of construction identity monitoring concentrates on the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Explicit metapragmatic utterances monitor the construction identity can be found in the judge's utterances: 'We have told you that you have the right not to answer, and if you answer, it should be within the limits of the law and the limits of the question,' 'Get straight to the point,' and '...now answer the question within your perusal...now a question is directed to you, you have to answer it...' According to Hubler and Bublitz (2007), the evaluative function can be involved in these utterances since they evaluate Saddam's preceding speech as irrelevant and unlawful. Moreover, they seem to be conflictual, i.e., face threatening. The judge frequently tried to threaten Saddam's negative and positive face by interrupting him, giving him direct orders to answer briefly and to the point, and questioning the appropriateness of his answers. By his turn, Saddam tries to protect his positive face by explaining the reasons behind the action and defending their appropriateness as in his utterances:' ...I requested you to comment on the answer, and you said go ahead, Am I right or not? Furthermore,' '...So my comment is about the statement on which the prosecution based in my questions. In Aldujail's case, it is not unusual to find that the defendant tries to threaten the interrogator's face, for instance, by interrupting the prosecutor and even the judge or resisting questioning, such as Saddam's utterance 'Are you telling me what I should say?..' reflecting on the prosecutor's speech. Saddam still tries to construe his role identity as the president of Iraq and considers others' questioning as an attempt to bully him. This metapragmatic utterance has a negative fixed interpretation in social discourse, which approves Caffi's words that common knowledge is an essential feature of metapragmatics.

The third metapragmatic layer is topical–argumentative monitoring, which focuses on the discourse, i.e., on the hierarchy of acts of the exchange. The metapragmatic utterances at this layer
can be classified into subgroups; for example, the judge's metapragmatic utterances can define the topic of the exchange in '... now answer the question within your perusal...now a question is directed to you, you have to answer it...' and ' What is understood from your words is that you challenge the statement submitted before the investigating judge?. The hierarchy of the organization of the topic is determined in the defendant's metapragmatic utterance, 'Yes, I contest it, and there will be a speech about the challenge.' In the judge's metapragmatic utterance, '...now a question is directed to you, you have to answer it.... answer the question... (16:25). Go back to the question', the topical hierarchicalization is obvious.

Extract Two

Saddam: Your honor, last time, you promised me that I could talk. I will not take much time.

The judge: You are right.

Saddam: In the name of God, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful (Say, "O disbelievers, I do not worship what you worship...) It is not meant for anyone present in the hall........... This is a psychological problem that whoever believes the Quranic verse targets them, while I mean someone else by it...

Saddam: Your honor, you are looking for things that are clear to you, you know it, and you disregard it, for example the bulldozing of the orchards in Aldujail.... (Interruption)

The judge (resentfully): A minute {stop talking for a while}

Saddam: There is no need for you to go after other people; I bulldozed it, meaning not that I got on the bulldozer and bulldozed it. It was a decision issued by the Revolutionary Command Council for all the orchards bulldozed, those who were proven or not proven against.

The judge: What does 'proven or not proven against them' mean?

Saddam: Yes? If they are proven guilty of the crime that occurred, their land gets bulldozed according to Iraqi law; the government has the right to confiscate public property... 12:07 the government has the right to confiscate, compensate, and do what is necessary. Where is the crime in this? Because I am the one who signed it. No one can force me to sign this decision if I do not want to. Therefore, why are you bringing this farmer ... from Aldujail? If I wanted, I would not have referred them to the Revolutionary Court; I referred them to court... 13:13 Hence, when the
main person *confesses* and *declares* that he is responsible, why are you going after all these people...

14:02 Saddam: If, far be it from you to criticize, there is any entity pressuring you, paying, and trying hard from wherever they may be. (The judge interrupts him)

The judge: No authority over this court but the law, and God is witness

27:14 Saddam: If the investigation in the possibility that the people who shot at Saddam Hussein with bullets... The bullets were in front of my eyes; I was in the car with the driver and one of my friends... My car was hit and from my direction precisely and reached the last layer and penetrated but I survived... God saved me. If you consider that someone is accused because of an assassination attempt against the president of state, where is the crime?... I referred all these people to court. I was the president, and the president is one, and the president is now present and confessing, judge the one, and let the others go.

16:15 Saddam: If there is nothing in the law that does not give revolutionary counsel the right to decide to expropriate the lands and compensate their owners, then go to the chairman of the revolutionary council; he is here, this is me. Why are you looking for other people, for officials?... Yes, the court has the right to protect the witness inside and outside the court if necessary. 17:37 *However*, your honor, your honor, if the witness is (x), the plaintiff is (x), and the saying is (x), so this is... not for us, it is not a challenge.

The judge: This is left for the consideration of the court.

Saddam: It is left to you, but referring the witness to a defendant would harm... (The judge interrupts him)

The judge: This was a request from the prosecution. The request is left to the court, and the court will make a decision.

Saddam: I do not make decisions; you make decisions. I want to clarify its effect on the other witnesses.

The metalinguistic descriptor, represented by the linguistic action verb 'mean,' indicates the metapragmatic utterance ‘It is not meant for anyone present in the hall... This is a psychological problem, that whoever believes the Quranic verse targets them, while I mean someone else by it...' It confirms and modifies the definition given by Saddam. It is on the micro level of monitoring, which involves speech on speech; thus, it is used to clarify the misinterpretation and the unintended attitudinal or relational implication. Metacognitive awareness plays a vital role in understanding...
Saddam's utterance, 'You are looking for things...' meaning investigating and questioning people. In the meta utterances, 'the judge (resentfully): A minute {stop talking for a while}," This is left to the court's consideration,' and 'This was a request from the prosecution. The request is left to the court, and the court will decide.' The judge defines himself as the authority to monitor the organization of the exchange, reflecting the institutional power (court). The use of the referring expression 'this' index is a known referent for the participants in the interaction because of their shared knowledge and their communicative awareness. The judge monitors the organization of the exchange; he always gains and maintains the floor, which demonstrates the first metapragmatic layer, Sequential Monitoring, i.e., the metadiscursive layer.

The metapragmatic utterance' I bulldozed it, meaning not that I got on the bulldozer and bulldozed it; it was a decision issued by the Revolutionary Command Counsel' explains what Saddam has intended; therefore, it functions as a means-related in that it clarifies his use of language by deciding on the best expression. The echoic instance of the defendant's language use in' what is meant by 'proven or not proven against them?'' functions as communication-oriented; it is means-related since the judge negotiates the linguistic meaning.

Saddam summarizes the previous exchange by giving feedback on what has been introduced in the ongoing interaction, using the pragmatic markers (therefore and hence). They are usually used to conclude a matter. Thus, they can be regarded as indicators of the metapragmatic utterances: 'Therefore, why are you bringing this farmer,...', 'Hence, when the main person confesses and declares that he is responsible for what happened, why are you going after these people ...'

It is evident that Saddam's utterance, 'If, far be it from you to criticize ...' prepares the listener that what is followed is a criticism, not intended, as Saddam claims. It can be considered a disclaimer that functions as a mitigation device; therefore, it is a metapragmatic utterance.

Because of the metacognitive awareness, which depends highly on the common knowledge of both the judge and Saddam, the judge gets the reflexive presentation of the information Saddam tries to convey in 'If far be it from you to criticize, there is any entity pressuring you, paying, and trying hard from wherever they may be...'. Accordingly, the judge interrupts him, 'No authority over this court but the law, and God is witness. ' This metapragmatic utterance is instrumentalized for constructing identity since, through it, the judge profiles himself as an assertive person with high social status, trying to protect the institutional image. This can represent the second metapragmatic layer, the meta-relational layer.

Saddam's reflexive comment,' My car was hit and from my direction precisely and reached the last layer and penetrated but I survived...; God saved me,' functions as communication-oriented since it is expressive; it expresses what Saddam means by 'I survived.' Through the exchange between the judge and the defendant, it is clear that the judge's questions threaten the negative face of the defendant, Saddam. Saddam tries to simultaneously enhance and protect his positive and negative face by expressing magnanimity, defending truthfulness, and asserting rights respectfully in his metapragmatic utterances: 'I was the president, and the president is one, and the president is now present and confessing, judge the one and let the others go' and '...Hence, when the main person confesses and declares that he is responsible, why are you going after all these people...'

Most of the metapragmatic utterances in this extract concentrate on developing the topic and organizing the discourse. The third metapragmatic layer of Caffi's (2016) model, Topical – Argumentation Monitoring, is dealt with in the Meta textual layer. The definition of the topic, a subgroup in this layer, is evident; for instance, in the defendant's metapragmatic utterance,' Hence, if the main person confesses and declares that he is responsible for what happened...' The judge's
metapragmatic utterance settles the debate in the exchange by saying, ‘This was a request from the prosecution. The request is left to the court, and the court will make a decision.’ Instead of indulging in specific details of a particular topic, the speaker disregards it and mentions a topic that he considers fundamental in the interaction, i.e., topical exclusion, another subgroup in this layer as in ‘If far be it from you to criticize, there is any entity pressuring you, …’. The metapragmatic utterance is if the government has the right to confiscate, compensate, and do what is necessary. Where is the crime in this? Because I am the one who signed it…’ it serves as a conclusion to the previous discussion and a starting point for a new one.

**The English Extract**

This section analyzes extracts of the impeachment trial of the American president of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, on August 17th, 1998. The whole impeachment trial is available for public service at [https://www.c-span.org/video/?111990-1/presidential-grand-jury-testimony](https://www.c-span.org/video/?111990-1/presidential-grand-jury-testimony), and the written text is at [http://www-personal.umich.edu/~graceyor/govdocs/impeach.html#clintgrand](http://www-personal.umich.edu/~graceyor/govdocs/impeach.html#clintgrand)

He faced a federal grand jury to investigate whether the president had committed perjury or obstructed justice in the Paula Jones case, a harassment case. The following chunks are between Mr. Wisenberg, a Deputy Independent Counsel, President Clinton, a witness, and Mr. Kendall, the president’s attorney.

**Extract One**

1:29 Mr. Wisenberg: You are appearing voluntarily today as a part of an agreement worked out between your attorney, the Office of the Independent Counsel, and with the approval of Judge Johnson. Is that correct, sir?
Clinton: That is correct.
1:33 Mr. Kendall: Mr. Wisenberg, excuse me. You referred to Judge Johnson's order. I'm not familiar with that order. Have we been served that, or not?
2:57 Mr. Wisenberg: I'm going to talk briefly about your rights and responsibilities as a grand jury witness. Normally, grand jury witnesses, while not allowed to have attorneys in the grand jury room with them, can stop and consult with their attorneys. Under our arrangement today, your attorneys are here and present for consultation and you can break to consult with them as necessary, ... Do you understand that, sir?
Clinton: I do understand that.
Mr. Wisenberg: Mr. President, I would like to read for you a portion of Federal Rule of Evidence 603… It says that the oath's purpose is "calculated to awaken the witness's conscience and impress the witness's mind with the duty" to tell the truth. Could you please tell the grand jury what that oath means to you for today's testimony?
Clinton: I have sworn an oath to tell the grand jury the truth, and that's what I intend to do.
Mr. Wisenberg: You understand that it requires you to give the whole truth, that is, a complete answer to each question, sir?
Clinton: Yes, I do understand that.
5:40 Mr. Wisenberg: And it meant the same to you then as it does today?
Clinton: Yes, no one read me a definition then, and we didn't go through this exercise. I swore an oath to tell the truth, and I believed I was bound to be truthful, and I tried to be.
6:13 Mr. Wisenberg: Your counsel, Mr. Bennett, indicated on page 5 of the deposition, lines 10 through 12, and I'm quoting, 'the President intends to give complete answers as Ms. Jones is
entitled to have”. My question to you is, do you agree with your counsel that a plaintiff in a sexual harassment case is, to use his words, entitled to have the truth?

Clinton: I believe that I was bound to give truthful answers, yes, sir.

Mr. Wisenberg: But the question is, sir, do you agree with your counsel that a plaintiff in a sexual harassment case is entitled to have the truth?

The reflection of Mr. Kendall, Clinton's attorney, on which the deputy explained that there is an agreement on Clinton's appearance to testify with Judge Johnson's approval, is evident by using the verb 'referred to' in 'Mr. Wisenberg, excuse me. You referred to Judge Johnson's order. I'm not familiar with that order…' which can be regarded as an explicit metapragmatic utterance. Mr. Kendall's reflection on the previous speech shows him as a dexterous and accurate attorney who feels responsible towards his client in focusing on the minute details; he reinforces his identity role as a lawyer.

The deputy identifies and describes his prospective talk with the president as a grand jury witness and prepares him for the questions he will face through the trial by the metapragmatic utterance,' I'm going to talk briefly about your rights and responsibilities as a grand jury witness. Normally, grand jury witnesses...' More than one of Hubler and Bublitz's metapragmatic functions can be demonstrated in the metapragmatic utterance,' I'm going to talk briefly about your rights...'. It is evaluative in describing the talk of the deputy as brief, it is communication-oriented since it is means-related in organizing the court exchange, and it is instrumentalized, first for reinforcing a court communicative norm, i.e., explaining witness' rights and responsibilities in a trial and second for constructing the identity of the deputy and the witness.

The metapragmatic commentary 'that's what I intend to do' is detected using the verb 'intend', which expresses an emotive-cognitive state-process; Clinton explains his intention. The deputy tries to reformulate his speech in 'You understand that it requires you to give the whole truth, that is, a complete answer to each question, sir? He clarifies what he means by 'the whole truth,' i.e., it is a metapragmatic expression. It is communication-oriented (Hubler & Bublitz, 2007) since it is means-related in negotiating the linguistic meaning of 'the whole truth.'

The participants' indexical use of the referring expression 'it,' i.e., the oath under which Clinton was, and the temporal deixis 'then,' i.e., the time of his deposition in Paula Jones' case, in 'And it meant the same to you then as it does today?' assures their metapragmatic awareness, i.e., the metacognitive awareness'. Moreover, it helps them in getting the appropriate interpretation. It reflects the cognitive status of the information dealt with as known information, given, and expected ones.

The descriptor verb of action 'quote' explicitly indicates the metapragmatic awareness in' Your counsel, Mr. Bennett, indicated on page 5 of the deposition, lines 10 through 12, and I'm quoting, 'the President intends to give full…' This utterance can be considered metapragmatic since the deputy refers to the illocutionary act 'quoting'. In the deputy's comment, 'But the question is sir, do you agree with your counsel that a plaintiff in a sexual harassment case is entitled to have the truth?' the use of 'but' indicates that the president's answer is insufficient. The deputy is unsatisfied with the witness's (Clinton's) answer.

Regarding Caffi's (2016) first layer, the metapragmatic layer of Sequential Monitoring, most of the metapragmatic utterances express the organization of the interaction. It is clear that the deputy independent counsel, Mr. Wisenberg, representing the Office of Independent Counsel, holds and maintains the floor in the impeachment trial by putting forward the questions and controlling the proceeding of the investigation as in the following metapragmatic utterances: 'I'm
going to talk briefly about your rights and responsibilities as a grand jury witness. Normally, grand jury witnesses...' 'You understand that it requires you to give the whole truth, that is, a complete answer to each question, sir?' Your counsel, Mr. Bennett, indicated on page 5 of the deposition, lines 10 through 12, and I'm quoting, 'the President intends to give complete answers as Ms. Jones is entitled to have'.

The allocution used by the participants (the deputy, the counsel, the witness) as mentioned in the above metapragmatic utterances: 'Sir, excuse me, thank you, Mr. President,' indexes respect and deference among them; the deputy still has the superiority in directing the procedure of the examination although the witness is the president of The United States of America. This demonstrates the metapragmatic layer of Construction Identity Monitoring, i.e., The Meta-relational Layer, which helps assign the relation among the participants and their identities during the interaction.

The third layer is the metapragmatic layer of Topical-argumentative monitoring, i.e., The Metatextual Layer. The hierarchy of acts in the metapragmatic utterances in the present extract is evident in the definition of the topic, a sub-group of the metapragmatic utterances in this layer, as in 'I'm going to talk briefly about your rights and responsibilities as a grand jury witness. Normally, grand jury witnesses...' Here, the deputy identifies the topic of the following exchange between him and the president but as a witness. Clinton's metapragmatic utterance '...that's what I intend to do,' and the deputy's 'You understand that it requires you to give the whole truth, that is, a complete answer to each question, sir?' Illustrate the topical focalization.

**Extract Two**

Mr. Wisenberg: Can you tell the grand jury what is tricky about the question, "Did anyone other than your attorneys ever tell you" –

President Clinton: No, there's nothing – I'm just telling – I have explained. I will now explain for the third time, sir. I was being asked several questions here. I was struggling to remember then… I probably would have talked to Vernon Jordan about the Monica Lewinsky problem if he had never been involved. So, I was not trying to mislead them. I tried to answer this question with the first person who told me that.

Mr. Wisenberg: Do you understand that if you answered, "I don't think so," to the question, has anyone other than your attorneys told you that Monica Lewinsky had been served with a subpoena in this case, that if you answered, "I don't think so, but you knew Vernon Jordan had been telling you all about it, you understand that that would be a false statement, presumably perjurious?

President Clinton: Mr. Wisenberg, I have testified about this three times. Now, I will do it the fourth time. I am not going to answer your trick questions… if the implication of your question is that somehow I didn't want anybody to know I had ever talked to Vernon Jordan about this, that's just not so…And now that – as I said, you have made this the most important issue in America. I mean, you have made it the most important issue in America from your point of view. Mr. Wisenberg: Are you saying, sir, that you forgot when you were asked this question that Vernon Jordan had come on December 19th, just three and a half weeks before, and said that he had met that day, the day that Monica got the subpoena?

President Clinton: It's quite possible – it's a sort of a jumbled answer. It's quite possible that I had gotten mixed up … In those three and a half weeks…Again, I say, sir, just from the tone of your voice and the way you are asking questions here, it's obvious that this is the most essential
thing in the world and that everybody was focused on all the details at the time. But that's not the way it worked. I was, I was doing my best to remember…Now, maybe – you seem to be criticizing me because they didn't ask better questions …

In the above extract, Clinton attempts to give feedback on the ongoing interaction with Mr. Wisenberg in his comments, ' No, there's nothing – I'm just telling – I have explained. I will now explain for the third time, sir...' and ' So, I was not trying to mislead them. I was trying to answer this question with the first person who told me that.' epitomizing his true intentions to answer Jones' questions—Clinton's comment, 'Mr. Wisenberg, I have testified about this three times. Now, I will do it the fourth time. I am not going to answer your trick questions...' refers to violating the cooperative principle of communication; therefore, it is a metapragmatic utterance. Clinton threatens the positive face of the deputy, modifying his questions as tricky ones. Hubler and Bublitz's (2007) metapragmatic function 'interpersonal' in its subtype 'face-threatening' is available in this sense. Clinton discusses the pragmatic meaning of Mr. Wisenberg's speech: 'If the implication of your question is that somehow I didn't want anybody to know I had ever talked to Vernon Jordan about this, that's just not so…'; hence, his comment is metapragmatic. It is to avoid the unwanted attitudinal implication by the other; it is means-related in negotiating the linguistic meaning of his speech. Mr. Wisenberg's reflection on Clinton's speech 'Are you saying, sir, that you forgot when you were asked this question that Vernon Jordan had come on December 19th, just three and a half weeks before, and said that he had met that day, the day that Monica got the subpoena?' is detected by the verb of action 'say.' Mr. Wisenberg threatens Clinton's positive face by questioning his recalling. In this sense, it could be Hubler and Bublitz's parameter 'communication oriented' in its subtype interpersonal/face-threatening. On his turn, Clinton tries to protect his positive face by suggesting reasons: ' It's quite possible – it's a sort of a jumbled answer. It's quite possible that I had gotten mixed up between whether she had met with him or talked to him on the telephone. …'. Clinton's comment, 'Again, I say, sir, just from the tone of your voice and the way you are asking questions here, it's obvious that this is the essential thing in the world and that everybody was focused on all the details at the time. But that's not the way it worked.' This can be regarded as metapragmatic since the meta utterances may target the accompanying nonverbal means of communication (Hubler & Bublitz, 2007). 'Now, maybe – you seem to be criticizing me because they didn't ask better questions…' is considered a metapragmatic utterance since he comments on the illocutionary function (criticizing).

Mr. Wisenberg's question in which he represents himself as 'the grand jury' 'Can you tell the grand jury what is tricky about the question, 'Did anyone other than your attorneys ever tell you?'' – ' illustrates the sequential monitoring of the acts during the interaction. However, Clinton takes his time answering the directed questions, expressing his point of view: ' No, there's nothing – I'm just telling – I have explained. I will now explain for the third time, sir...', 'Mr. Wisenberg, I have testified about this three times. Now, I will do it the fourth time. I am not going to answer your trick questions...' and '...if the implication of your question is that somehow I didn't want anybody to know I had ever talked to Vernon Jordan about this, that's just not so…'. Several attempts to hold and maintain the floor by Mr. Wisenberg and Clinton affect the organization of the ongoing discourse.

The meta relational layer, which explains the relation type between the interlocutors, can be demonstrated by Clinton's metapragmatic utterances: 'Now, maybe – you seem to be criticizing me because they didn't ask better questions…', ' Again, I say, sir, just from the tone of your voice and the way you are asking questions here, it's obvious that this is the most important thing in the
world and that … But that's not the way it worked.' and 'Mr. Wisenberg, I have testified about this three times. Now, I will do it the fourth time. I am not going to answer your trick questions…' These metapragmatic utterances index Mr. Wisenberg's dissatisfaction with Clinton's answers in which he tries to construe his identity role.

Topical focalization is demonstrated in Clinton's metapragmatic utterance, 'So, I was not trying to mislead them. I was trying to answer this question with the first person who told me that. Now, I realize that wasn't the specific question.'

Discussion
Concerning the first question, the analysis has shown that the Iraqi Arabic and the American metapragmatic expressions are culture-specific. The speakers reflect on language use prospectively or retrospectively because of their metapragmatic awareness. In the extracts, the metapragmatic expressions were about the participants' use of language or their reflection on their speech or other interactants. The metapragmatic utterances used by the judges and prosecutors in the Arabic and American extracts underline similar pragmatic meanings due to the general legal objectives in legal discourse. Regarding the second question, as shown in Table (1), it has been illustrated that the indicators of metapragmatic awareness in the data analyzed are the temporal and spatial deixes, indexical references, metapragmatic commentary, and pragmatic markers. The reported speech (quotative use of language and the echoic instances of language use) as a metapragmatic indicator is recognized; the speakers' intention is not only to report speech. The prosecutor's questions have been in light of what the defendants or witnesses said or talked about in their previous testimonies to confirm or question their version of events. Some of the metapragmatic utterances in Arabic and English extracts are determined by situated commentaries about the evaluations of language use involving linguistic verbs of action. There have been metapragmatic utterances with fixed interpretations in the social discourse. The illocutionary force of an utterance indicates the speaker's intention; thus, referring to or commenting on the illocutionary force of the speech of one of the interlocutors can be within metapragmatics.

As regards the third question, the analysis of Iraqi Arabic and American English legal discourse has revealed that Hubler and Bublitiz's (2007) metapragmatic parameters should be rearranged according to their importance and effect in the selected extracts, as follows: 1) Instrumentalized for a) constructing identity b) reinforcing communicative norms or convictions. 2) Communication oriented a) (inter)personal (conflictual, affiliative, expressive) b) means-related (organizing for clarification, negotiating linguistic meaning by re-editing or summarizing information as mentioned earlier, establishing best code, and deciding on the best expression). 3) Evaluative
Conclusion
Building on specific aspects of metapragmatics, the present paper enhances our understanding of the mechanism of metapragmatics in achieving effective mutual communication. It has approached a developed model to analyze metapragmatically specific extracts from Saddam's trial and Clinton's impeachment. The data analysis reveals that in addition to the identified different functions of the detected metapragmatic expressions or utterances in the Iraqi and American legal discourse, these expressions effectively monitor and organize the exchange among the communicators inside the court. The sequential organization monitoring is evident by the participants' holding and maintaining their regular turns, the identity construction monitoring is apparent by assigning the relation among the participants inside the courtroom even though the witnesses are distinguished political figures at their time, and the argumentative monitoring is expressed by identifying or focusing on the topic at stake. From a pragmatic perspective, this study chimes with the idea that metapragmatics is concerned with the communicative meaning of the utterances no matter the language. Additionally, following Caffi's (2006) and Hubler and Bublitz' (2007) metapragmatic studies, it has been confirmed that the detected meta utterances that illustrate the violation of the principles of communication in addition to those that describe speech sequence from an illocutionary perspective in legal discourse are metapragmatic. The illocutionary force of an utterance indicates the speaker's intention; thus, referring to or commenting on the illocutionary force of the speech of one of the interlocutors can be within metapragmatics. The meta utterances targeted the nonverbal means of communication, such as the tone of voice, head nodding, and the way of asking questions. They are considered metapragmatic since they reflect communicative acts.
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