



Hedges in English and Arabic: A Contrastive Study

Jumanah Shakeeb Muhammad Taqi, *College of Education for Women, Iraqia University-Iraq*,
jumanah.taqi@aliraqia.edu.iq

Abstract. Hedging is a concept in academic writing which simply signifies the idea of being cautious in one's words. It is achieved through the use of various linguistic expressions to show uncertainty and indirectness in style. The concept of hedging is remarkably wide and interwoven. Its boundaries run over many fields of language. That is why the devices of hedging are discussed from many angles and viewpoints in linguistics. In English, the concept and its expressions are well known. The study in hand makes a thorough survey of them. Being a popular concept in English, the researcher thought of looking for it and its linguistic tools in Arabic which is a deeply expressive language. After a detailed exploration in Standard Arabic books of grammar and linguistics, peculiarly, it has been found that the concept of hedging is not apparently mentioned and its tools are not distinguishably categorized as hedges, as in English. However, Arabic too has its own devices of expressing hedging but without being classified as hedges. The study in hand scans these hedges in Arabic as counterparts of their peers in English.

Keywords: hedging, hedges, pragmatics, expressions, discourse analysis, denotation.

Received: 04.12.2020

Accepted: 21.01.2021

Published: 07.02.2021

INTRODUCTION

The study in hand investigates the concept of hedging, its signification, linguistic devices and connections with various domains of linguistics in English. On the other hand, it searches for the concept in Arabic to scan its tools to present them as counterparts and to categorize them as formally established terms of hedging.

The research contains three parts: the first one studies hedges in English, then the second one is devoted to hedges in Arabic, and finally the last part lists the contrast between the two languages in expressing this topic.

The Problem

The concept of hedging refers to the speaker's desire to be cautious in his words. Books of linguistics mention the devices of conveying this concept. These forms are of great importance in showing the speaker's attitude towards others or any issue tackled. It confines the speaker in a certain way to show that he is uncertain of something or he wants to appear so to avoid commitment. Books of English linguistics classify these hedges differently according to how they are viewed and whether they are single words or syntactic structures. Books of Arabic linguistics, on the other hand do not mention the concept, however, its expressions are widely utilized but under different categorizations. They convey hedging but they are not formally established forms of hedging.

The present study is a thorough examination of each term of hedging in its native language and a determination of the similarities and differences between the classification of these terms in both languages.

The present work is an attempt at tackling the problem of determining the correspondence which is a work not previously attempted to the best of the researcher's knowledge.

Aims of the Study

The study aims at the following

1. Investigating and showing how hedging is tackled in English and Arabic.
2. Identifying the points of similarities and differences between the two languages in expressing the concept of hedging.

Significance of the Study

Languages differ in the surface forms : the phonetic and phonological systems and grammatical patterns , however linguists have found that there are many concepts and topics among languages bear remarkable similarities called universals. The study in hand tries to show that even though Arabic has not classified certain structures and words as legal hedges , Arabic too has its own linguistic tools of expressing the idea of hedging. Studies like this paper can be of help to scholars studying universal similarities across languages to show certain facts about the linguistic production of people of various races and origins.

Limits of the Study

The study is limited to Standard English and Standard Arabic.

Chapter one

The Concept of Hedge in English

Hedge : Definition

Hedge is defined as" referring to a barrier , limit , defense or the act or means of protection or defense (OED, 1989, s .v. hedge). The word also refers to avoiding over precise commitment. " (www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition.retrieved on 29/8/2014 11:30p.m.)

This last point directly tackles the domain of the study. Thus, as far as linguistics is concerned, " hedge " is any linguistic expression by which a speaker avoids being compromised by a statement that is not acceptable, and so on.

Thus, instead of saying: " this argument is convincing " one might use a hedge and say: "As far as I can see, this argument is convincing "; and instead of simply giving an order : " Carry it into the kitchen! " , one might use an interrogative as a hedge and say: "Could you perhaps carry it into the kitchen?" (Matthews , 2007 : s. v. hedge).

Crystal (2012: s. v. hedge) points out that this concept is used in pragmatics and discourse analysis to give the general sense of being ' non - committal or evasive ' to a range of items which express a notion of imprecision or qualification.

Examples of hedging expressions include sort of , roughly, I mean , approximately etc.... Hedges may also be used in combination as e.g., something of the order of 10 per cent , more or less .

Remarkably, linguists name hedges differently like e.g.:

Stance markers , weakeners (Brown and Levinson , 1987), down toners (Holmes , 1982 ; Quirk et al. , 1985), detensifiers , understatements (Huebler , 1983) and commentary pragmatic markers (Mey, 2009: 192).

Also , the same notion can be found under various headings like, e.g. , evidentiality, mitigation, tentativeness and vagueness. However, the underlying notion is the same , (Ibid.:18) .

The Relation Between Hedges and Fields of Linguistics

Hedging is a multi-dimensional subject .When one tries to analyze how hedges work, he finds himself tackling the Grice's maxims because hedges are expressions that show people's concern about following the maxims while trying to be co-operative participants in conversation.

Thus, when one uses sort of or kind of as hedges on the accuracy of a statement , as in description such as

- His hair was kind of long or
- The book cover is sort of yellow (rather than it is yellow). These are examples of hedges on the , Quality maxim , other examples may include expressions such as:
- As far as I know..,
- I'm not absolutely sure, but ...

that people sometimes use when start a conversation. (Yule, 2010 : 148). Also when people talk about some event or anything that they are not definite of, they say that they think or feel (not know). Hence the difference between :

- Jackson is guilty. and
- I think It's possible that Jackson may be guilty (Ibid.)

Related to this issue is implicatures. Speakers may imply information that is not said. The term imply is used in an ordinary non-logical sense, and say to refer to sentence meaning. With the co-operative principle

and the maxims as guides, one can start to account for how people actually decide that someone is "implying" something in his words. Thus: "It may be raining" implies that the speaker does not know whether it is, for, if he did he would have said, "It is raining", which is more informative (Palmer, 1981: 174 and (Yule, 2010:148). The implicature here is encoded via the modal verb may.

Hedging is in fact a manifold subject. It is associated with discourse analysis as it has just been shown. Furthermore, it bears relations with pragmatics and sociolinguistics. Language is an interpersonal complex; it expresses the speaker's role in the speech situation, his personal commitment and his interaction with others (Halliday, 1973: 99).

In pragmatics, hedges are seen as realizations of interactional strategies in contexts of mitigation, politeness, indirection, etc. Fraser (1980) as cited in Markkanen and Schroder (1997:2). Hence, the speaker may use expressions like sort of, kind of to mitigate the harshness of one's action or descriptions. Other researchers, like House and Kasper (1981) and Blum-Kulka/ Ohlstein (1984) cited by Markkanen and Schroder (1997:6) have also discussed hedges as a means of modifying certain types of speech – acts, like e.g., requests and apologies.

Expressions of Hedging in English

No linguistic items are originally hedgy but can acquire this quality depending on the communicative context or the co-text. Darian (1995) as cited in Markkanen and Schroder (1997:8) claims that hedges can belong to any part of speech: nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. There is no limit to the linguistic expressions that can be considered as hedges.

This is because hedges have multi-functions. However, one can list the most comprehensive expressions that can signal hedging.

Syntactic Classification of Hedges

Verbs

a. Non-factive reporting verbs

They contain verbs like hint, imply, suggest, predict. These verbs give the signification that the information is not taken from an absolutely perfect source.

b. Cognitive verbs

They contain verbs like presume, feel, foresee, imagine, expect, believe, assume, doubt. These verbs give the signification that the accuracy of the information is gradable.

c. Liking verbs

They contain verbs like seem, look, appear, tend. They express uncertainty of the information.

d. Modals

they include, e.g., can-could, may-might, should, must. These help to express how much is the weightiness of the information.

Nouns

They include

a. Nonfactive nouns such as prediction, implication, claim, hint.

b. Cognition nouns like assumption point of view, presumption, suspicion.

c. Nouns of likelihood such as possibility, probability, tendency

These nouns and of course many others express the signification of something is possible, probable or not fully accurate.

Adjectives

a. Adjectives of inaccurate measure such as relative, reasonable, slight, large.

b. Adjectives of imprecise frequency such as typical, rare, common occasional, popular.

c. Adjectives of approximation, e.g., approximate and rough.

d. Adjectives of probability like possible, likely, apparent, potential.

Adverbs

- a. Adverbs of imprecise measure: they contain items such as slightly, widely, somewhat, fairly, mostly, quite.
- b. Adverbs of imprecise frequency : They include adverbs like usually, often, sometimes, seldom, generally, normally.
- c. Adverbs of approximation such as nearly, virtually, roughly, around about, almost.
- d. Adverbs of probability .These contain adverbs like probably, likely, perhaps, presumably, potentially.

Clauses

This is represented by if clauses.

Questions

Phrases

They include: at least, more than, less than , a great deal.

Classifying Hedges According to Their Denotation

Linguists attempted to categorize hedges depending on the sense they serve to convey in the language. Some linguists looked at hedges as words whose function is to render things less or more fuzzy, vague or indeterminate .

According to this view Prince 1976 and Prince-Fader –Bosk 1982) classified hedges into:

Approximates

These are hedges related to the truth value of propositions. They are of two kinds: " adaptors " such as somewhat and sort of as in: " He also has a somewhat low larynx". and " rounders" such as approximately and about as in: " His weight was approximately four point one kilograms ". "Adaptors" indicate how close to prototypicality a certain reality, is whereas "rounders" indicate that some term is a rounded – off representation of something. Prince et al. (1989:87) and (1982:87,93).

Shields

These hedges involve the propositional content and the speaker (Ibid. :85). People use such hedges for situations , they are somewhat uncertain about.

Examples of shields are the following :

- I think his face is blue.
- It is possible that the chemicals will interact.

Shields are of two types: attribution and plausibility shields.

- a. Attribution shields are used to attribute a proposition to someone else as in :

- According to news reports, Hurricane Hugo left 43 people dead in the early hours of the morning. (Ibid.)

- b. Plausibility shields

These are used to indicate a tentative or cautious assessment of the truth of the proposition. Thus, when people use hedges like: I think , perhaps and seemed they reduce the degree of liability of the proposition. (Huebler, 1983:18).

However, some linguists such as Skelton (1988: 38) and Markkanen and Schroder (1997: 5) believe that the classification of hedges above is true for separate sentences only and that the context in which they are used simultaneously determines their significations.

Schäffner's Classification of Hedges

Another important classification of hedges is drawn by Schäffner (1998: 185-203) who classifies them according to the way they influence the status of precision of the modified expression. Accordingly, they are categorized into:

Modifying Hedges

Examples of these are (typical, fairly, too) , ... etc. They change the scope of fuzziness of the utterance and modify expressions which are based on a scale of degrees as in :

- With the introduction of the new laws, police powers will essentially rest with these units.

Quantifying Hedges

These are related to the whole scope of precision such as, for example in every respect , in some respect, of every kind, etc... , as in :

- We need to present support of every kind to help those stricken by the famine . (Ibid.)

Despecifying Hedges

These extend the scope of fuzziness, e.g., kind of , roughly , etc. ... as in :

- During my stay in Rome, every aspect of life was plagued with that of insecure people were filled with fear. How can they work with that sort of thing going on ?

Specifying Hedges

These are related to vagueness of category membership. They narrow the scope of fuzziness such as, e.g., real , genuine , true , actually , exactly , etc... as in the sentence:

- This time the transition to free market is actually a matter of agreeing to the party's economic proposals. (Ibid.)

Metadiscourse Classifies Hedges into Four Categories

Illocution markers

These are used to make explicit to readers what speech or discourse act we are performing at certain points in our texts (Vande Kopple, 1989:7). Thus , people use such elements as : I hypothesize that , we claim that , etc. ... Goody (1978 : 151) states that such performative hedges are the most important linguistic means of satisfying the speaker's want and the minimal assumptions about his wants.

Illocution markers can be divided into weakeners and strengtheners (emphatic hedges) .

The force of the markers can be modified by adding certain forms to soften the force of the speech act when the speaker tries to avoid imposition or negative tones of his speech. Thus, a modal verb may be added to a direct request:

- I must ask that you don't use the party's name to lobby for support.
or an adverb phrase to a claim:
- As gently as possible we claim that most of the past mistakes were due to inefficiency.
or an introductory clause:
- I hate to have to do this, but I must ask that you all leave the hall at once.
- A tag question may soften the force of the speech act:
- Sit down , won't you?
(Fraser , 1975:342)

On the other hand, there are strengtheners (act as emphatic hedges) to boost the force of certain speech acts. This is done by using adverbs like exactly, precisely etc.... as in :

- I most sincerely promise .
- There are also other forms that boost the force of the speech as in :
- Do help me :
- Oh, so it is , to be sure.

Epistemology markers which are of two kinds:

Modality Markers

In general terms, modality can be defined as the "speaker's opinion or attitude towards the proposition that the sentence expresses or the situation that the proposition describe (Lyons, 1977:452) .

Linguists make distinction between epistemic modality and deontic modality. The first kind is used to reveal the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition expressed by the sentence he utters (Ibid. :797) and Coats (1983 : 11).

It reveals how confident we are about the truth of the speech people convey (Simpson , 1990 : 66-7).

Deontic modality , on the other hand, is related to degrees of permission and obligation , duty , volition ... etc. reflecting the speaker's attitude towards the desirability or non-desirability of certain actions or even with the necessity or possibility of acts performed by people (Lyons , 1977 : 823).

There are epistemic modals that show cautious or doubtful commitment to the truth of the ideational material to reduce the responsibility expressed (Huebler, 1983 : 18) and (Williams, 1989 : 49) .

This is expressed via certain linguistic forms:

1. Forms containing not and the prefixes im or in as , e.g., unlikely.
2. Adverbs such as perhaps and possibly .
3. Modal verbs such as might.
4. Lexical verbs such as seem and appear .
5. Tag questions . e.g.:
Arabic is a profound language, isn't it?
6. Parenthetical verbs in the first person present followed by that clause such as think , guess and suppose.
7. Phrases such as to our knowledge and to a certain degree .
8. Clauses such as : It is possible that they are thought to be , If I am not mistaken.
(Ibid.) and Ursmon (1952:481)

Evidential

Sweetser (1981 : 32) calls them evidentiality-hedges because they indicate the evidential states of the statement being made . The ideational information conveyed depends on different bases.

The speaker's sensory experience may lead him to convey a hedge using an evidential such as : it sounds like , it feels that , or it looks like.

The hedge may depend on the speaker's personal belief , e.g., I believe that. Inductions also lead to an evidentiality hedge as , e.g., evidently .

There are also " hearsay evidentials " whose source is other's talk as , e.g.:

- Alice told me.....
- According to professor Smith etc.

Deductions are another source for such hedges as , e.g. :

- He should be able to
- Young children presumably tell stories.

Worth noting , when the information agrees with what people expect , the deducer uses an evidential such as : of course otherwise evidential such as oddly enough are used . (Ibid .)

Attitude markers

Hedges of this sort are used to express the degree of desirability to the situations involved. Examples of such hedges are clauses such as I am afraid that , I am grateful that , etc....

Adverbs as e.g., luckily , happily , etc... exclamations such as how awful that .

Sometimes people may use quotation marks to express their attitudes as in: "Oh, sure he's a ' winner ' " .Vendee Kopple (1989: 9)

Commentaries

Commentaries are used to address people directly , to comment on their moods, views or reactions as in : (some of you will be amazed that ...) , to let them know our expectations as , e.g., (You will probably find the terminology somewhat difficult as the beginning) to ask them : (Would you mind skipping to the appendix?) (Ibid.: 10)

Chapter Two

The Concept of Hedge in Arabic

Expressions of Hedging in Arabic

Conditional/ inn / (conditional if)

When the fulfillment or non-fulfillment of the condition is possible, doubtful, rare and the like/inn/ is used. It expresses 'doubt'.

An example is : {And if you are in doubt concerning that which We have sent down to our slave} (Al-Baqarah:23)

The condition implies doubt to lessen the certainty of the fulfillment of the proposition.

(Assamaraai , 1991, IV : 448)

Al-Taftazani as cited in Assamaraai (Ibid. :449-450) says that a slave may answer out of fear from his lord when asked if he is at home:

-/in kan fiha ukhbiruka/=If he is there I shall tell you.

or out of being uncertain of the fulfillment of the condition.

This is exactly the significance of hedging in English : non – commitment and uncertainty.

Ibn Ya'eesh as cited in Assamaraai (Ibid.) mentions an example of /inn / :

-/In mittu fa iqdhu 'anni/=If I die, pay on my behalf.

He explains it as follows: /inn/ is used here because the date of death is unknown . Here lies the uncertainty.

Verbs of Probability

Wright (1995,II:48 – 49) mentions verbs of doubt or probability such as /dhanna / (to believe) , /hasiba / (to reckon) , /khala / (to imagine), /za'ama / (to think), /haja / (to opine) , and /habb / (to suppose).

Ar-Raghib as cited in Assamaraai (1991, II : 436) says : ' To suppose ' is to have a sign about some issue. When this sign gets stronger, the issue is certain of, otherwise it is very weak and the case is doubtful.

In Al-Muhkam as cited in Lisanul Arab states that supposition / adhann / is doubt and certainty at the same time. However, the certainty lacks touchable proofs. It depends on logic.

This meaning is evident in the following Qur'anic verse :

-{We do not think it but as a conjecture ,and we have no firm convincing belief (therein).}(Al-Jathiyah:32)

In the book of Al-Burhaan as cited in Assamaraai (Ibid.), when the verb/dhanna/ is accompanied by light/inn/, the proposition is doubtful as in :

{provided they feel that they can keep the limits ordained by Allah}

(Al-Baqarah:230)

-{Nay ,but you thought that the Messenger and the believers would never return to their families}(Al-Fath:12) (Ibid. : 437)

Hasiba / (to reckon, think or suppose)

It indicates a preponderant belief . Like /dhanna/, it expresses doubt as in : {The one who knows them not, thinks that they are rich because of modesty} (Al-Baqarah:273)

-{ And you would have thought them awake ,whereas they were asleep.}(Al-Kahf:18)

/Khala / (imagine or think)

It is used to signify a doubtful belief as in :

-/Khiltu S'aeedan 'affakan/=I thought S'aeed slanderous.

It is derived from ' / khayal / = imagination ' .it is weaker than /hasiba/ (to reckon) in probability (Ibid.: 442-3)

/ 'Addah / (to think)

It is used when the belief about a certain object turns to be incompatible with the truth as in :

-/Kuntu u'idduhu faqeeran fa bana ghaniyyan/=I thought him poor but he turned to be rich.

The speaker thought someone rich but he discovered him to be poor. So what he believed to be turned to be incorrect.

Ibn ' Aqeel (n. d., I:150) as cited in Assamaraai (Ibid. : 443-444)

/Za'ama/(to allege)

It means ' speech that is not based on a trusted proof, thus, it may be true or false'. Al-Laith as cited in Assamaraai states that Arabs say:

'Za'ama fulan= someone alleged ' when the speech is doubtful , otherwise they say ' dhakara fulan= someone mentioned ', the verb /za'ama / ' allege' is mostly used with void and evil speech as in the Qurânic verse:

-{The disbelievers pretend that they will never be resurrected (for the Account)}{At-Taghabun:7}

-{ Nay ,but you thought that We had appointed no meeting for you (with Us).}{Al-Kahf:48}

-/Za'amtani shaikhan wa lastu bishaikhin innama ashaikhu man yadubu dabeeban/=You alleged that I am an old man, but I am not ,an old man is the one who crawls.

/Haja / (to opine or to think)

It expresses doubt ; it is derived from /alhaja/ i.e. " the mind are the cleverness ". Arabs say:

-/Ahju bihi khairan/=I think he is a good man.

-/Hajawtuka munjidan/=I thought you helpful.

They mean that this is what their reasoning and logic drove them to think. Their thanking might be true or false.

/Habb/ (to suppose)

It is an imperative verb. It means ' reckon or think or to suppose'

-/Hab al hayata jameelatun/= Suppose (think) that life is wonderful.

In his essay on the meaning of doubt in the Glorious Quran, Hamid (retrieved on13/5/ 2013 : <http://m-arabia.com>) states that when the Qurânic speech discusses doubt, supposition, or any talk which lacks proofs or whose speaker is trying to be evasive and/or avoid any commitment. He states that each Qurânic verse uses certain structure or word to express the required meaning.

The Glorious Quran is wealthy and exact in expressing the desired significance, being a Devine Book. These meanings, mentioned above, are recurrent in the Quran which mirrors the human being's nature in speech.

Examples are the following:

-{ They follow but a guess }{An-Najm:28}

-{They follow only a conjecture and they only invent lies}{Yunus:66}

-{and they perceived that there is no fleeing from Allah ,and no refuge but with Him}{At-Taubah:118}

-{And the Mujrimun (criminals ,polytheists ,sinners) shall see the Fire and apprehend that they have to fall therein .}{Al-Kahf:53}

-{Thinking that some calamity is about to fall on them}{Al-Qiyamah:25}

The Structures : (I thought him/her would not do (something) and (I did not think him/her would do (something)= (/Dhanantuhu yaf'al) and (Ma dhanantuhu yaf'al/)

* Subject + think (affirmative) + + subject +verb (negative)

*Subject + think (negative) + + subject + verb (affirmative)

Examples are :

-{and they will perceive that they have no place of refuge (from Allâh's punishment)}{Fussilat:48}

{ You did not think that they would get out}{Al-Hashr :2}-

The difference between these two structures is that when one says ,e.g., (Ma dhanantu Muhammadan khisman) = I did not think that Muhammad was an opponent , they negate thinking of the matter at all whereas when one says (Dhanantu ma Muhammadun khismun) = I thought that Muhammad was not an opponent , they prove that they thought of the issue and that it came to their minds but finally they rejected the idea, which is (/Kawn Muhammad khism/) = Muhammad's being an opponent .

Other examples are :

-/Ma za'amtu Muhammadan sha'iran/=I did not allege Muhammad to be a poet.

-/Ma qultu Muhammadan muqasiran/=I did not say that Muhammad is remiss.

They indicate negation of the proposition, whereas

-/Za'amtu ma Muhammadun sha'irun/=I alleged that Muhammad was not a poet.

-/Qultu ma Muhammadun khismun/=I said that Muhammad was not an opponent.

indicate affirmation of the proposition.

(Assamaraai , 1989,II : 460-1)

The verb /Ra'a/ (to see=to think)

Grammarians state that it means ' think = doubt ' as in :

-{ Verily, they see it (the torment) afar off. But We see it (quite) near}

(Al-Ma'arij:6-7)

) 1989,II:429 , Assamaraai(

/Imaa/ (either...or)

Among other meanings, it indicates doubt as in :

-/Ja'ani imma Zaid wa imma 'Amr/=Either Zaid or 'Amr came to me.

If the speaker does not know who exactly came

/Ka'anna/ (as if)

Among other meaning, it signifies doubt as in :

-/ka'anaka bi ashita'i muqbilun/= As if you are coming in winter.

It means: I think it is coming.

The meaning of doubt is mentioned in Al-Mughni associated with /imaa/,/aw/ and/ka'anna/ previously talked about. When the speaker is not sure between two things, two people, two events ..., etc.

/La'alla/(may)

Expressive of expecting a desirable, undesirable or frightening matter. Al-Mubbarid (n. d. :III :73 & IV :108).

Examples are the following:

-/La'alla Zaidan ya'teena bikhair/=It may be that Zaid bring us some good things.

-/La'alla 'Amran yazuruna/=It may be that 'Amr may visit us.

He is uncertain of his saying . (Ibid. , III : 73)

Other examples are from Glorious Quran :

-{it may be that Allâh will afterward bring some new thing to pass}

(At-Talâq:1)

{ perhaps he may accept admonition or fear(Allâh)} (Taha:44)-

{And what can make you know that perhaps the Hour is close at hand?}-

(Ash-Shûra:17)

Verbs of appropinquation

Wright (1955,II:106-108) mentions verbs of opproprinquation . They are of two types. The second one includes:/ 'asa/ , /hara/ and /ikhlawlaqa/ . The first one is widely used , the other ones are rare. They mean may or perhaps.

- /'Asa Farajun ya'ti bihi Allah/=Perhaps Allah may bring some Joy.

- /'Asa alkarba alathi amsaita feeh yakunu wara'ahu farajun qareeb/=Perhaps some joy may be close behind the sorrow in which you are now.

-/'Asa rabukum an yarhamakum/= Perhaps Allah may have mercy on you.

Examples of /ikhlawlaqa/ and /hara/ are:

-/Ikhlawlaqat asama'u an tumtir/=The sky is likely to rain

-/Ikhlawlaqa an ya'ti/= He may come.

-/Hara Zaidun an yusafir/= Zaid may travel.

Chapter Three : The Contrastive Part

The Findings

In English

1. Hedging is well known as a linguistic concept and has its classified distinguished devices.
2. Hedging has manifold classifications due to its associations with many subjects :
 - a. In pragmatics and sociolinguistics , hedges are seen as realizations of interactional strategies in certain contexts.
 - b. It bears association to discourse analysis as , e.g., implicatures which are encoded in hedges.

3. Expressions of hedging have different classifications, they are :
 - a. Syntactically classified into lexical items such as verbs and nouns, etc... and structures such as phrases and questions.
 - b. They are classified according to their denotation into approximates and shields.
 - c. Schäffner (1998) classifies them into modifying hedges, specifying hedges,etc.

In Arabic

1. The case is quite different : the concept of hedging is not known as a linguistic one in the Arabic books of grammar and linguistic.
2. Its devices are not classified as 'hedges'.
3. There are expressions of the idea of hedging but not apparently stated as in English.
4. Syntactically speaking, the expressions of hedging are :
 - a. Verbs.
 - b. Linguistic particles.
 - c. Structures.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the paper improves that just as there are classified ways to express hedging in English ranging from structures reaching to single words, in Arabic too, there are variable expressions of this concept. Even though, the rendition of hedging is not categorized in Arabic, the search has arrived at many ways to convey the same idea. This supports the universality factor among languages even when their origins are not the same.

This sets the scene for future studies of the importance of hedging in different literary genres or in some other selected data of different nature. Because the concept of hedging is widely occurring by people in their social behavior, and they differ in expressing it according to their class, status, religion and other factors. Also, the significance of hedging arises from its correlation to language and society which is an interwoven relation.

REFERENCES

- Brown, P. and S. Levinson. (1978) "Universals in Language Use: Politeness Phenomena" In Goody, E.(ed.) Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press .
- Coats, Jennifer . (1983). The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries . London: Croom Helm.
- Derian; J.D. and M. J. Shapiro .(1989). International/ Intertextual Relations. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Fraser, Bruce . (1975). " Hedged Performative. In syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Act , ed .Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan , 187-210.New york : Academic Press .
- Goody, Esther N. (1978). Questions and Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1973) Explorations in the Functions of Language. London : Edward Arnold .
- Hedges, Ayel.(1983) Understatements and Hedges in English. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- Al-Hilali, Muhammad Taqi-ud-Deen and Muhammad Muhsin Khan. (Trans.) .(1417 A.H.). Translation of the Meanings of the Noble Quran in English Language. Madinah: King Fahd Complex for the Printing of the Holy Quran.
- Lyons, John (1977). Semantics . London : Cambridge University Press.
- Markkannen, Raija, and Hartmut Schroder. (1987).Hedging and Its Linguistic Realizations in German English and Finnish Philosophical Texts: A Case Study. " In Erikoiskielet Ja Kannosteoria. Vakki-Seminaari. VII. Voyer: 1.1.-1.2 1987, 47-57. Vaasa Vaasan: Korkeakoulu.
- Mey, Jacob. (1993). Pragmatics: An Introduction Oxford. Blackwell.
- Prince, Ellen F., Joel Frader and Charles Bosk. (1982). " On Hedging in Physician – Physician Discourse. In di Pietro, R. (ed.). Linguistics and the Profession . Proceedings of the Second Annual Delaware Symposium on Language Studies. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation , pp.83-97 .
- Prince, Ellen, F.(1976). " the Syntax and Semantics of Neg-raising , with Evidence from French. " Language" . 52 , pp.404-426.

- Schäffner , Christina . (1998). " Hedges in Political Texts A Translational Perspective. " In Hickey , Leo (ed.). *The Pragmatics of Translation* . Clarendon : Multilingual Matters Ltd . , pp. 185-202 .
- Schroder, Hartmut and Dagmar Zimmer. (1988). *Hedging Research in Pragmatics: A Bibliographical Research Guide to Hedging*. www.sw2euv-frankfurt-de/publicationen/markane/markane.html
- Simpson , Paul. (1990). "Modality in Literary – Critical Discourse" In Nash , Walter (ed.). *The Writing Scholar Studies in Academic Discourse* . Newbury Park , CA: Sage, pp.63-94 .
- Skelton , John .(1988). *Discourse Analysis : The Sociolinguistics Analysis of Natural Language* . Chicago: The University of Chicago Press .
- Sweetser , Eve . (1981). *The Definition of Lie : an Examination of the Folk Theories Underlying a Semantics Prototype*. (manuscript)
- The Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. (1989). Oxford .Clarendon Press.
- Urmson , J.O.(1952). *Paranetical Verbs in Mind* pp. 480-496 .
- Wright , W. (translator and editor). (1955). *A Grammar of The Arabic Language* . Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

ARABIC REFERENCES

The Glorious Qur'an

Assamaraai, Fadhil.(1989).**Ma'ani An-Nahu** .II &III (Vol. s).Higher Education Press: Mosul.

Ibn 'Aqeel, Bahaudeen Abdullah .(d. 769 A.H.)(n. d.) .**Sharhu Ibnu 'Aqeel**. Muhammad Muhideen Abdul Hameed(ed.).

Ibn Mandhoor , Muhammad Bin Makram .(d. 711 A.H.) . (n.d.). **Lisanul Arab Al-Muheet**. Yusuf Khayyat & Nadeem Mar'shli (ed. s). Lisanul Arab Press.

Mubarrid ,Abi 'Abbass Muhammad .(d.285 A.H.) (1963). **Al-Muqtadhib**. III&IV. (Vol. s) .Muhammad Abdul Khaliq 'Adhema (ed.) .'Alamul Kutub :Beirut.

Websites

Hamid, Abdul Salam.. **Fi Tawjeeh Ma'na Adhan fil Qur'an Al- Kareem**. <http://www.m-a-arabia.com/vb/showthread.php?t=3584> , retrieved on 13/5/ 2013.