Interpersonal Metadiscursive Features in contemporary Islamic Friday Sermon

ISRAA ISMAEEL MAHMOOD
Universiti Putra Malaysia
redsun05555@yahoo.com

ZALINA BT MOHD KASIM
Universiti Putra Malaysia

ABSTRACT

The Islamic Friday sermon is one of the most influential and educational means that plays an effective role in shaping the attitudes and beliefs of the individuals and society at large. Through the use of a powerful language, religious orators affect congregations emotionally and intellectually to achieve the Friday sermon's purposes. This paper examines how religious orators influence their listeners through the deployment of interactive and interactional metadiscourse features. The interpersonal metadiscourse is operated as framework to realize sermons as a form of social engagement, since it considers the crucial role of the use of discourse to manage both: the social relationship, and the organization of texts. Hyland's (2005) model of metadiscourse was adopted to analyse 30 transcriptions of Islamic Friday sermons delivered in the English language. The findings revealed that metadiscourse resources are used extensively, and that the orators rely more on the use of the interactional resources to achieve their persuasive aims. The findings will give insights on how metadiscourse markers can be effectively used to construct a persuasive context whether in religious discourse or other discourses such as spoken discourse. It gives meaningful hints to the students of religious schools about how to use metadiscourse features in formulating the sermon.

Keywords: interpersonal; metadiscourse; Friday sermon; interactive; interactional

INTRODUCTION

Religious discourse has been at the vanguard of academic and public interest of researchers and scholars for many years. In Kohnen (2010, p. 523) words "an analysis of religious discourse offers the possibility of creating a fascinating and continuous picture of the development of pragmatic phenomena across centuries". Wijsen (2013, as cited in Kim 2016 p. 58) also encourages scholars to take the advantage of discourse analysis in the discourse of religions, said "the potential usefulness of using discourse analysis in bridging the gap between theoretical and scientific approaches to religious studies and urged religious scholars to take a multidisciplinary approach by incorporating discourse analysis into their studies". In addition, the language of religious discourse could be an element that affects the non-religious field in terms of language planning (Liddicoat 2014). Yet, reviewing literature shows that religious texts especially in English language have received less attention than other texts (Malmström 2016, Sharif 2015). Wuthnow (1992, p. 60) refers to the deficiency in the studies of religious discourse stating "We even have frequency counts of the kinds of themes that are expressed on religious television shows or in religious books. But on religious discourse as discourse we have virtually nothing". He adds (1992, p. 61) "We want to discover how personalities are put together". This claim has been also raised in recent years. Kohnen (2010) argues "one of the basic difficulties for an overview of the field of English religious discourse is that the linguistic literature, in particular historical-pragmatic research, is scarce". In turn, this difficulty leads to the deficiency even in contemporary religious discourse studies.

In the same vein, as an Islamic religious discourse, the Friday sermon is a rhetorical public speech given by a preacher or religious orator (*khateeb*) during the mandatory act of worship holds on Friday at noon. The essential purpose of a Friday sermon is preaching as

well as teaching (Khader 2017). Friday sermon is described as a useful means that can serve various communicative purposes such as "sociopolitical praxis, a public platform for a leader to give weekly statement, an occasion for religious people to listen to some words of wisdom, admonition and remembrance, occasion for propaganda, or familiar advice" (Tayob 1999, p.1). Moreover, it has an essential role in calming down disturbances, averting division, restoring calmness and diverting wars in which people are willing to wage, as well as serving as an effective medium for educating people in a wide area of Islamic teaching (Abu Alyan 2016, p. 327). Generally, it is delivered to mend the social reality in the Muslims community in particular and in society in general. Consequently, the vital role of Friday sermon gives its discourse the power and valuable to be worth pursuing.

Some studies were conducted to examine Islamic Friday sermons discourse by focusing on: the analysis of the generic structure of Friday sermon (Saddhono 2010, Soepriatmadji 2009), language variety and function (Hidayat 1999), thematic and content analysis (Albayrak 2012, Errihani 2011, Hashem 2010, Onay 2004, Samuri, Mohd Al Adib & Hopkins 2017). However, although a religious orator uses a rhetorical language to achieve the Friday sermon purposes and to affect people's religious orientations, the review of literature showed that no investigation has been conducted on the performance of these rhetorical devises in English Islamic Friday Sermon (EIFS). Metadiscourse (MD) is one of those resources which are described by Hyland (2005) as a coherent set of elements and a rhetorical strategy used to obtain persuasion since it helps writers (speakers) to engage their audience and guide their understanding of a text. Moreover, metadiscourse contributes to the persuasion appeals: the rational appeals *logos* "the appeal to reason"; the credible appeals *ethos* "the personal appeal of one's character"; and the affective appeals *pathos* "the appeal to emotions". (Hyland 2005, p. 64)

On another plane, the concept of metadiscourse has attracted the attention of many scholars in discourse analysis (Bunton 1999, Crismore 1989, Hyland 1998, 2005, Vande Kopple 1985, Williams 1981, Ädel 2006, Ädel & Mauranen 2010). It was examined intensively in written discourse, particularly academic discourse, while Mauranen (2010) argues that its role is 'more important' in spoken discourse due to the great need for handling the spoken interaction in real time. However, metadiscourse has been studied thoroughly by many scholars. For example, Hyland (1998) investigated metadiscourse markers (MDMs) in company annual reports; Hyland and Tse (2004) in academic writing; Khedri, Ebrahimi & Heng (2013) in academic research article result and discussion sections; Aziz and Jin (2016) in the construction of gender identities among Malaysian ESL learners; Loan (2018) in English abstracts in Thai Rajabhat University journals. Metadiscourse features have been also examined in different disciplines and languages, for example (Blagojevic 2004, Dahl 2004). Metadiscourse has been also explored in social genres, such as in book reviews (Junqueira & Cortes 2014); in Online headlines (Yazdani & Hadi Salehi 2016); oral public speeches (Yipei & Lingling 2013); and many other genres. On the other hand, few studies were concerned with the metadiscourse of preaching. It was found that only two studies dealt with metadiscourse in sermons. The first is Boggel's (2009) study, studied metadiscourse in the Christian religious texts of the late Middle Ages and Renaissance. She dealt with this area for two reasons, first it hadn't received the attention of linguists before to investigate metadiscourse elements in religious genre; and second, this period of time demonstrates an imported historical shift-from Roman Catholicism to Protestantism. She used various types of taxonomies and she analysed and classified data for each of the taxonomies. Boggel's findings showed that the religious sermons are rich of metadiscourse features. Another study was conducted by Malmström (2016) who investigated the use of metadiscourse in contemporary Christian preaching manuscripts as a form of social and communicative engagement. The main purpose of Malmström's study was to help guide listeners through the

sermon by adding to the overall cohesion and coherence of the sermon. The corpus includes 150 sermons from three well established English Christian denominations with the total of 189,239 words, adopting Hyland (2005) metadiscourse taxonomy in his analysis. The findings showed that metadiscourse plays a significant role in contemporary Christian preaching, it was used more than in academic and non-academic studies, and preachers used interactional markers more than the interactive ones.

However, contemporary linguistic studies in Islamic discourse have not shown a comparable interest in studying metadiscourse resources as cohesive and persuasive devices. In other words, we do not have the knowledge about how orators exploit metadiscourse in Islamic sermons, especially when interpersonal and persuasion appeals are fundamental for communicating with audience. Therefore, the deficiency of linguistic research into metadiscourse elements in Islamic religious discourse particularly 'Friday sermon' is one of the key factors that necessitate this study. Thus, to understand the effects of linguistic features in English Islamic Friday sermons, this study is intended to (i) investigate the frequency of the occurrence of metadiscourse markers in the EIFS; and (ii) identify the functions of the metadiscoures markers in the contexts used by the religious orators. This study shows the status of MD in religious contexts as well as it raises the awareness of the orator about how to use MDMs appropriately to make the discourse organized, coherent and persuasive. Furthermore, this study will be added to the few studies that have been made on metadiscourse in religious discourse.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

THE CORPUS

The corpus used in this research comprises a sample of thirty Islamic Friday sermons delivered in the English Language, totalling 110,278 words. The duration of the message of any of the sermons is between around 22-38 minutes which contains between (1,460 – 6,671) words. The selected sermons are among the most powerful Friday sermons in western communities. They were delivered by well-known qualified religious orators. Fifteen of them are instructors in *Amaghrib institute www.almaghrib.org/instructors*. The rest of the orators are also prominent lecturers in various institutions, speakers, and some of them are authors, such as (*Dr.Bilal Philips and Dr.Munawar Haqu*). In addition, among them were preachers who were chosen as the most influential Islamic scholar, such as *Hamza Yusuf* (O'Sullivan 2011) and *Nouman Ali Khan* (Schleifer Abdallah 2017). Consequently, they are aware of using eloquent language to influence their listeners and achieve their speeches' goals. The sermons were selected purposively from various open access websites such as *khutbahbank.org* and *MuslimMatters.org*. The sampling was done only on the contemporary sermons that were delivered between around (2012-2018). To ensure the validity and reliability of the data, only the well recorded and broadcasted videos and audios forms of sermons were selected. This means that the published written texts sermons were excluded, because they may not be identical to the original delivered sermons. The verbatim transcribing of the selected sermons was done. Although this process consumes time, it provides valid data about the use of metadiscourse resources in sermons' texts. Only a single sermon from any one orator was selected to avoid indulging in a stylistic analysis of a particular orator.

THE ANALYTICAL METHOD

The present study adopts Hyland's (2005) model of metadiscourse to analyse the interpersonal communicative and persuasive strategies used by the orators. However, Hyland's model has been chosen among several taxonomies due to several reasons. It is applicable model since it was adopted in several non-academic, and spoken discourse (Yipei & Lingling 2013, Yazdani & Hadi Salehi 2016, Malmström 2016). It does not separate between the textual and interpersonal functions, as it affirms that all metadiscourse to be interpersonal. Hyland's model takes in consideration the textual experiences, process needs and the addressees' knowledge; this in turn equipped the speaker or writer with the sources of rhetorical appeals. In addition, the knowledge of addressers about the addressees' expectations contributes in emphasizing the role of discourse in interaction. Furthermore, the distinction of Hyland's model between interactive and interactional resources emphasizes the organizational and evaluative features of interaction and that draws a palpable guideline to analysis for a researcher.

According to Hyland (2005, p. 37) metadiscourse is "the cover term for the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting the writer (or speaker) to express a viewpoint and engage with readers (or listeners) as members of a particular community". Based on this notion, Hyland (2005) provides a clear classification of metadiscourse by dividing it into two main categories: the 'interactive and interactional' metadiscourse. To Hyland these two categories of matadiscourse are two sides of the same coin, in other words, the use of metadiscourse is very important for both managing the organisation of discourse as well as for managing social relationships (Hyland 2017).

As for the interactive markers, they involve shaping a context to meet addressees' needs and help them to understand the intended meaning of the addresser. These rhetorical resources are used to establish a coherent context and convince audience through organising the propositional information. Interactive metadiscourse in Hyland's (2005) words is "the writer's awareness of a participating audience and the ways he or she seeks to accommodate its probable knowledge, interest, rhetorical expectations and processing abilities" (p. 49). This category is divided into five subcategories: (i) transitions which are mostly adverbial phrases and conjunctions used to help audience "interpret pragmatic connections between the steps in an argument" (Hyland 2005, p. 50); (ii) frame markers that indicate text boundaries and used to sequence section of the text, to label the stages of the text, to signal topic shifts, and to announce the aims of the discourse; (iii) endophoric markers that are used to refer to other sections of the text to support audience understanding; (iv) evidentials, which are "metalinguistic representations of an idea from another source" (Hyland 2005, p. 51); and (v) code glosses, which are utilized to provide additional information by "rephrasing, explaining or elaborating what has been said" to support audience's perception to the addresser's intended meaning (Hyland 2005, p. 52).

On the other hand, interactional markers is concerned with involving audience in the discourse. These rhetorical features are "essentially evaluative and engaging, expressing solidarity, anticipating objections and responding to an imagined dialogue with others" (Hyland 2005, pp. 49-50). Similar to the interactive metadiscourse, interactional metadiscourse comprises five categories: (i) hedges, which show addresser's decision to emphasis other viewpoint and present information as an opinion rather than fact (Hyland 2005, p. 52); (ii) boosters, which are utilized to close down alternatives and present certainty of addresser's voice and "construct rapport by marking involvement with the topic and solidarity with an audience, taking a joint position against other voices" (Hyland 2005, p. 53); (iii) attitude markers that indicate addresser's affective through expressing his agreement, surprise, frustration, and his stance in general towards propositions; (iv) self-mention or the

addressor's presence in the context, which is signalled through the explicate existence of first person pronouns and possessive adjectives; and (v) engagement markers that involve addressing audience explicitly in the context to gain their attention or to show solidarity by including them as discourse participant. They are used to "either highlight or downplay the presence of their readers in the text" (Hyland 2005, p. 53). Table 1 below illustrates the interpersonal model (2005) of Hyland.

TABLE 1. Hyland's (2005) interpersonal model of metadiscourse

Category	Function	Examples
Interactive	**Help to guide the reader through the text**	**Resources**
Transitions	express relations between main clauses	*in addition, but, thus, and*
Frame markers	refer to discourse acts, sequences, or stages	*finally, to conclude, my purpose is*
Endophoric markers	refer to information in other parts of the text	*noted above, see Fig, in section 2*
Evidentials	refer to information from other texts	*according to X/ (Y, 1990) Z states*
Code glosses	elaborate propositional meanings	*namely, e.g., such as, in other words*
Interactional	**Involve the reader in the text**	**Resources**
Hedges	withhold commitment and open dialogue	*might, perhaps, possible, about*
Boosters	emphasize certainty or close dialogue	*in fact, definitely, it is clear that*
Attitude markers	express writer's attitude to proposition	*unfortunately, I agree, surprisingly*
Engagement markers	explicitly build relationships with reader	*can see that, note, consider*
Self-mentions	explicit reference to author(s)	*I, we, my, our*

ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

The first part of analysis includes the identification of the frequency of metadiscourse markers in the sermonic discourse. First of all, to prepare the data to be analysed, it was needed to clear the texts. This includes the deletion of the open and close prayers of the Friday sermons (which comprise a typical Islamic formula) and only focusing on the body of the sermons which includes the whole message. Next, the data was saved on text documents, and then they were analysed using MonoConc Pro 2.2 software (Barlow 2003). The search included all potential metadiscourse markers in khedri (2014), Lee & Subtirelu (2014), and Hyland's (2005) items list which mainly displays metadiscourse in written language (see pp. 218-224). In addition, based on the functions of metadiscourse markers in Hyland's (2005) model, some other items related to spoken discourse (specifically the genre of religious sermon) were identified (e.g., *sorry*, *dare I say* , *brothers and sisters, Wallahi, Subhanallah, Allahuakbar, unapologetically).* Considering that all the items "can realize either propositional or metadiscoursal meaning and that many can express either interactive or interpersonal meanings" (Hyland 2005, p. 218), the data was also tested to check whether the identified linguistics features function metadiscoursally or act as part of the text. For example, the expression *By the way* performs as propositional material when it is used to connect activities in the world outside (external relation), as in (1a) below; whereas, it functions as the transition metadiscourse marker when used to connect the steps of the argument (internal relation), as in (1b) below. So, all the features that express propositional meaning, i.e. the features that are "referring to real world enabling conditions which can affect outcomes" (Hyland 2005, p. 48) were deleted.

(1a) We are frustrated *by the way* that the media represents Muslims sometimes. But that doesn't make us react (*yasir Qadahi*)

(1b) All they're doing is they're fooling themselves. This is part, *by the way*, part of " و يمكرون ويمكر الله" (*Anas Hlayhel*)

Another examination has been done by identifying the multifunctional meaning of each metadiscourse item in its context, such as the form *'so'* which expressed consequence

transition in one context (as in Example 2a), and frame marker to shift listeners focus in another (as in Example 2b).

(2a) …. another proof that people were not forced to convert. And this is a complete fallacy. *So* Islam is a religion of tolerance for the people of other religions. (*Atif Jung*)

(2b) ….because you have a Nabi of Allah, subhanahu wa ta'ala, seeking forgiveness for them. *So* let me just repeat those three lessons inshallah. *(Navaid Aziz)*

Consequently, the identification of metadiscourse markers' functions allows the researcher to make rigorous categorization of MDMs and to determine the types of persuasive devices used by the orators.

Then, the qualitative phase displays how metadiscourse resources have been utilized in the Friday sermon texts in general, means, the function of each marker is discussed. For example, evidentials as interactive features were observed in their context and it is noticed that they were used to support the orator's argument and to encourage the listeners to follow them logically as in (3a and 3b below).

(3a) No! Excellence that *the prophet (SAWS) says* "strong person is not that the wrestler ….".
(*Alyas Karmani*)

(3b) I want to remind them that our religion gives us an undying commitment to ethics and values even when others might forget them. *Allah (Aza wa jal) said* in Surah al-Baqarah…(*AbuTaleb*)

It should be noted that in the next sections the frequency of the two categories of metadiscourse (the interactive and interactional) were counted per 1000 words in the total number of metadiscourse, and the percentage of the subcategories metadiscourse markers were counted in the total number of their category.

RESULTS AND DISCUSION

THE OVERALL FREQUENCY OF METADISCOURSE IN THE EIFS

According to the results in Table 2 below, a total of 16,839 cases of metadiscourse have been found in the corpus. This means that, for every 100 words in a sermon, 15 present or 15 cases were used with a metadicursive function and this indicates to the interpersonal aspect of Friday sermon discourse. A close look to Table 2 shows that the orators in the selected sermons used interactional metadiscourse approximately two times as much they used interactive metadiscourse. The very large differences between the two categories of metadiscourse could be due to the immediacy of face to face interaction in spoken language which leads a speaker to be concerned of engaging listeners into the argument more than guiding them through his speech (Cavalieri 2011, Ädel 2012). Moreover, to support the persuasive purposes of the sermons, the religious orators relied heavily on the interactional features since they functioned as the key factors to the establishment of the ethos and pathos aspects of persuasion. As Malmström (2016, p. 10) suggests "it is possible that those interactional metadiscursive resources serve this New Homiletic-performative purpose of the sermon to a better end and that they are therefore more frequently employed by preachers in trying to achieve preaching objectives".

TABLE 2. The overall frequency of metadiscourse categories in the Islamic Friday sermons

MD categories	Frequency	Per cent	Per 1000 words
Interactive	6,102	36.0	55.3
Interactional	10,737	63.8	97.3
Total tokens	16,839	100	152.7

In terms of the distribution of metadiscourse between its two categories, the present findings seem to be consistent with the two available comparable researches which tackled the Christian sermons (Boggel 2009, Malmström 2016). In both studies, interactional MD markers were used more extensively to communicate with the audience than the interactive ones.

The grand frequency of metadiscourse in this study is also noticeably higher than that portrayed in written academic and non-academic studies, for instance metadiscourse in post graduate dissertations (Hyland & Tse 2004), and metadiscourse in newspaper genre (Kuhi & Mojood 2014). This agrees with the results of previous studies that compared the status of metadiscourse in written and spoken language (Ädel 2010, Zhang et al. 2017). It is worth noting that this distinction could be attributed to the need to "manage spoken interaction in real time" more than in the written language (Mauranen 2010, p. 37). Table 3 below shows the frequency of the subcategories of metadiscourse markers:

TABLE 3.The frequency of the subcategories of metaddiscourse in the Islamic Friday sermons

Interactive markers	Freq.	%
Transitions	4,014	65.8
Frame markers	569	9.32
Endophoric markers	31	0.50
Evidentials	680	11.1
Code glosses	808	13.2
Interactional markers	**Freq.**	**%**
Hedges	1,116	10.4
Boosters	2,139	19.9
Attitude markers	1,099	10.2
Engagement markers	5,613	52.3
Self-mentions	770	7.2

INTERACTIVE METADISCOURSE MARKERS

Religious orators elaborate their arguments, support the logic of the sermon's propositional content, and help listeners to recover their reasoning in the sermon through the use of interactive markers. These rhetorical functions of interactive metadiscourse help the religious orators to establish persuasion through the appealing to reason (Logos).

TRANSITIONS

Transitions were the most frequent marker used by the orators in the sermons, forming 65.8% of the whole interactive metadiscourse. In terms of the communicative function of transition markers in sermonic discourse, they were used to help listeners follow the sub-messages in the sermon and so support their understanding. Management of the speech is achieved through signalling addition, comparison, and consequences (Hyland 2005, p.50). Expectedly, the primary subcategory of transitions in this study is addition markers (55.9%). This is due to the massive use of the coordinating conjunction 'And', as in (4a). The second frequently used subcategory of transitions is consequential devices (27.1%) which are mainly used to support the realization of the ideational content of sermons and provide rationale for the

sermons' proposition, as in (4b). The coordinating conjunction 'so' is the most frequently used followed by the conjunction 'because'. On the other hand, comparative expressions were the least used form (17%). They were represented to tie information together and help listeners to evaluate their comprehension of the sermon's message, as in (4c). The coordinating conjunction 'but' is the commonest comparison marker used in the sermons.

(4a) *And* this clearly shows us that the status of Sham is something that we as Muslims need to believe in. *And* In fact, in a hadith in the Musnad of Imam Ahmad, our Prophet said…. *And* it is a long hadith *and* we don't have time for all of it. *(Yasir Qadhi)*

(4b) you cannot handle the pressure. *So* go when you are young, and you will still enjoy when you go when you are older. *(Yaser Birjas)*

(4c) We recite the verse *but* quite often of the case we don't deeply reflect upon what this verse is actually enjoined upon us to do. *(Alyas Karmani)*

FRAME MARKERS

The results show that the orators used 9.32% of the total of interactive metadiscourse to realize frame markers. The orators organise the sermons' ideational meaning mainly through the use of sequences and topic shift devices forming 31.3% and 30%, respectively. These two functions were also a key feature in other oral genres, as was proved in the laboratory demonstration study of Garcia and Marco (1998). In the present study, however, for sequencing, the form '*then'* appeared frequently, used by the orators to sequence the ideational content of the sermon. The sequencers indicate the sections and sub-messages displayed by the orators to support the listeners' comprehension of the message of the sermon, as in (5a). On the other hand, although religious orators deployed just six types of frame markers to shift focus which are (*so, brothers and sisters, now, in terms, anyway, back to*), they used them repeatedly and '*so'* was the most frequent form. These sorts of frame markers were used by the orators to: separate between the basic sections of the sermon such as separating the open prayer from the main body; and to shift from one issue to another in the sermon, as in (5b). Religious orator deployed 19.5% of the frame markers to label discourse stages. The orators leaded listeners through the discourse by labelling the starting point of their speech; the end of the sermon's message; and the content of the sermon, as in (5c). Similarly, 19.2% of the total frame markers were also used to announce discourse goals, particularly, to declare the main topic of the whole sermon or to proclaim the topic of the sub-issues in the sermon's content, as in (5d).

(5a) I'll share something with you in general *then* come to these Ayat. *(Nouman Ali Khan)*

(5b) *Anyway*, so Allah has created… we have started with life, in the true life, in the presence of Allah because true life is in the presence of Allah. *(Hossam Roushdim)*

(5c) I know that we are short of time and I'd *start* very soon. *(Atif Jung)*

(5d) So the main concept *I want to talk* about is: Would you sacrifice your religion and your morals for a little bit of Donia? *(Omar Galal)*

ENDOPHORIC MARKERS

As for the overall frequency of endophorics in the corpus, results demonstrated that these rhetorical devices were the least represented in the sermonic discourse. Only 31 cases appeared in the entire corpus. This could be due to the fact that the interaction in sermons delivery takes only (15-35) minutes, so the orators may not need to refer listeners through the sermon. Another possible reason could be the absence of visual materials such as charts, figures, tables, sections of text (as in written discourse) which usually require to be referred

to. In terms of this interactive category's function, religious orators used endophoric markers to direct the congregation attention through their speeches, as in (6).

(6) Remember, *I told you the example of* the boxer. If this is how we're gonna be, how do we get out of it? (*Nouman Ali Khan*)

EVIDENTIAL MARKERS

Evidential markers shaped 11.1% of the total occurrence of the interactive markers. It is worth mentioning that reciting during the sermon at least one verse from the Quran and one Hadith, and reinforcing the sermon with real stories from the past or present-prophetic stories are all required elements in Friday sermons delivery (Khader 2017). Based on that, the religious orators used evidential markers basically to refer to (i) the scripture Quran (40.3%), as in (7). The high rate of referring to scripture could be due to the fact that relating the sermon's content to the scripture is one of the sub-purposes that any orator follows when he prepares the sermon's script (Soepriatmadji 2009). They also deployed evidentials almost similarly by referring to (ii) prophet sayings 21.6% in which the orator displays quotes from prophet Muhammad's sayings or other prophets' sayings, as in (7b); (iii) life experience 20.4%, in which the orator minimises the distance between him and his listeners by sharing them a short story or evidence from his own life, as in (7c); and (iv) narrations, and Ulama'a sayings 17.6%, in which the orator promotes quotes from religious people sayings, as in (7d). However, the key functions of evidentials in the genre of sermon are to support the orator's argument and to encourage the listeners to follow them logically. These functions signal a reasonable and convincing foundation for the orators' speech, as well as, accomplishes credibility. In turn, credibility and candour aspects contribute to build an effective ethos.

(7a) *Allah states* clearly "I have not created the jin or human kind except to worship me"
(*Bilal Philips*)
(7b) *the prophet (SAWS) says* "strong person is not that the wrestler who can through on over one wrestling, but the strong person is ……" (*Alyas Karmani*)
(7c) I remember one brother came to me and he was in his 50s. And he asked me a question. It was right after Ramadan, Subhanallah! Similar to this time. And *He said,* "Shaykh, could you please..." (*Yaser Birjas*)
(7d) and in fact, *the narrations say* that Abu Bakr asked the Prophet, "I haven't seen you coming and sitting with the people …." (*Abdul Nasir Jangda*)

CODE GLOSSES MARKER

Code glosses markers represented the second highest occurrence of the interactive markers (13.2%). This high rate illustrates the awareness of the religious orators that they should be clear and unambiguous when they deliver the sermon as long as they deal with an audience that comes from different backgrounds. The religious orators exploited the linguistic expressions of code glosses to achieve three functions: the first and the most used is translation (50.5% of the total occurrence of code glosses) which involves translating some Islamic terms, verses, and prophet sayings from Arabic into English and vice versa, as in (8a). The second function is to provide definitions, interpretation and explanation to the ideational message of the sermon as well as to simplify and clarify the meaning of verses, ahadith (prophet sayings) and some difficult terms. This function represents 41.8% of the total occurrence of code glosses resources, as in (8b). The third function (and the least used one, 7.7%) is to provide examples or (exemplification) as Hyland (2007) called, as in (8c).

However, all these functions are communicative sub-purposes employed by the orators to direct the propositions in a sermon delivery (Soepriatmadji 2009).

(8a) There is even a higher level than that which is "*Tarku ba'ath Al halal, kasheit al wookua fi al haram". "It is to distance yourself from some of the permissible things"* (*Muhammed Faqih*)

(8b) They don't just say it, they move towards it, and they carry it out. So *in other words*, we don't just talk the talk, but we walk the walk. *(Abdulla Hakim Quick)*

(8c) Everything a believer sees in the world is a combination of divine and of the divine qualities, *for example* the power, the river, ... (*Hossam Roushdim*)

INTERACTIONAL METADISCOURSE MARKERS

HEDGES

As it is shown in Table 3, a proportion of 10.4% of the occurrences of interactional metadiscourse was deployed for hedging. Religious orators expressed their uncertainty through the use of (i) epistemic verbs (e.g., *seem, predict, assume, indicate,…*); (ii) epistemic nouns (e.g., *doubt, possibility, apparently, uncertainty*); (iii) epistemic adverbs (e.g., *generally, fairly, perhaps, probably, sometimes*); (iv) modals (e.g., *can, could, may, might, would*); and (v) approximators (e.g., *around, less than, about, approximately*). They were deployed to: show the orator's humbleness of failure to perceive a statement completely, as in (9a); provide speculations about the distant past or the future, as in (9b); express doubt about the proposition and present alternative views to encourage the audience to think of further interpretations, as in (9c); negotiate an issue by reducing commitment and showing respect for the alternative assumptions, as in (9d); and separate the false assumption from the right 'certain' one and this contrast establishes the credibility to the right assumption, as in (9e).

(9a) So Inshallah today, just want to reflect on a very, very small story, *probably* the smallest story in the Qur'an, and no many people know about it. *(Omar Galal)*

(9b) Brothers and sisters in Islam, no doubt that is a test that is easier in this world, but *perhaps* in the next it *might be* more difficult. *Perhaps* for the next it *might be* more difficult. *(Yasir Qadhi)*

(9c) But if the verse *would* have ended there, then people *would* just know the different tribes and know the different nationalities. *(Kamal El Mekki)*

(9d) And *some may* say, "You are a Prophet…. you have time to go follow a little girl?" Yes, he made time. *(Muhammad Mana)*

(9e) In A study by the Institute for Social Policy and Understanding, they tracked incidents of Islamophobia and hate crimes from 2001 to 2013, *expecting* in the study that Islamophobia *might* spike during terrorist incidents that are rightfully or wrongfully ascribed to people who claim to be Muslims. And yet, shockingly, the study did not find that. (*AbuTaleb*)

BOOSTERS

Boosters were the second most frequent interactional markers (19.9 instances per 1000 words). Boosters in Islamic Friday sermons were realized through the use of different forms, such as the following: (i) verbs (e.g., *find, believe, know, dare)*; (ii) nouns (e.g., *the exact, the fact, reality, certainty*); (iii) adverbs (e.g., *absolutely, always, completely, definitely, yes, no*); (iv) modals (e.g., *will, cannot, has to, have to, must*); (v) quantifiers (e.g., *quite, particularly, significantly)*; (vi) clauses (e.g., *it is necessary, it is important, it is obvious*) and Arabic

expressions '*wallahi*' which means *I swear by God*; and (vii) superlative adjectives which were deployed to express certainty (e.g., *the best, the most, the greatest*). The orators used booster devices to construct their trustworthiness image (ethos) and so persuade the audience. This is usually done through the use of the first person pronoun with one of the booster's forms, as in (10a). Boosters were also used by the orators to emphasize and draw certainty about the statement, as in (10b).

(10a) If you say 'Alhamdulilah' once with meaning, I *swear* to you by Allah, I *swear* to you by Allah, you will have done something *so* huge you would struggle to understand the magnitude of it. (*Abu Easa Niamatullah*)

(10b) You will *actually* find a lot of answers to that question, and a lot of answers in a *very* interesting … in a logic way. (*Essam Mahgoub*)

ATTITUDE MARKERS

The total frequency of this interactional category was a little bit less than hedges, namely, 10.2%. They were realized through the use of verbs (*e.g., agree, encourage*), adverbs (*e.g., unfortunately, sadly*), adjectives (*e.g., beautiful, serious*), and clauses (Islamic Arabic expressions) which were also used in the sermonic discourse to express the orator's attitude (*e.g., Subhanallah, Masha'allah, Nauothobillah, Allahu'akbar*). However, providing a judgment or an opinion (personal evaluation) on a person or an event is one of the purposes of an orator to direct the propositional content in EIFS delivery (Soepriatmadju 2009). The key function of attitude markers in the sermonic discourse is often to express personal evaluative comments through showing surprise, pleasure, agreement and so on, which in turn strengthens the relationship with the audience. It is noted by Hyland (2005, p. 82) that attitude expressions "carry an implicit assumption that the readers (hearers) will experience the discourse in the same way, and so they create and emphasize a set of shared, taken-for-granted purposes and understandings". Therefore, the religious orators exploit the use of the linguistic expressions of the attitude marker to persuade the listeners and influence their religious orientations by appealing to emotion and passion (pathos). However, attitude markers were used to express the orators' positive tone, as in (11a), as well as their negative tone towards the propositional content, as in (11b).

(11a) *Alhamdulilah*, we have some organizations doing that. And we should support them all the way. *(Anas Hlayhel)*

(11b) but *more importantly* we haven't got enough positive role models for our men in our society. And as a result of that they gravitate towards *unfortunately* some the worse aspects of behavior. *(Alyas Karmani)*

SELF-MENTION

Indicating the orator's presence through self-mention devices is the least frequent with only 7.2% of the total occurrences of the interactional markers. The religious orators presented themselves in the sermons generally to show assertiveness and confidence when they express their stance towards the propositional content, or when they speak from their own perspective. Self-mentions presented the credibility of the sermon's argument by expressing lived experiences which have been performed as evidence and witness to support the ideational content, as in (12a). The religious orators also built a relationship with their listeners through the use of self-mention with attitude markers, or self-mention with the expression of code glosses (*mean*), as in (12b). Moreover, self-mention expressions were followed by engagement markers to show the orators' solidarity and unity with their listeners.

This happens when they address the audience, or when they expose particular shared attitudes, as in (12c). However, the orator appeals to emotion in the last two uses of self-mention markers to persuade their listeners.

(12a) *I was* walking through *my* university during the last year, then a student came running out of the classroom at full speed, and this was during exams week, final exams. (*Suleiman Salem*)

(12b) *I mean* first of all, *I think* everybody should be clear that no one can draw the prophet (ASWS). (*Anas Hlayhel*)

(12c) *I* just say this around of benefit to *myself and to you*. (*Abu Easa Niamatullah*)

ENGAGEMENT MARKERS

This marker was the most reoccurring one among all metadiscourse features (52.3% of the interactional marker, and 33.3% of the whole metadiscourse markers). Unsurprisingly, religious orators relied heavily on the use of engagement markers to establish the one way communication based on the Islamic concept of brotherhood in the Friday sermon event. They intended to show their solidarity and membership to the listeners. They do that basically by addressing the audience 4,673 times (83.3% of the total occurrences of engagement markers). Addressing the listeners makes them identify with the message (Mellor & Rinnawi 2016), as in (13a). Questions were the next most frequently used feature of engagement markers with 8.8%. They were deployed to provoke listeners' interest and encourage them to think about the sermon's proposition and let them expect the answer's issues, as in (13b). The third highest in frequency was directives (6.2%), which were used to instruct the audience to pay attention to particular points of the issue, and to do or not to do an action in the real world, as in (13c). The least frequent feature of engagement markers was vocatives with only 1.7%. Orators used them to address their audience explicitly and in this way they minimize the distance between them. Vocatives were also used to grab the listeners' attention to the sermon, as in (13d).

(13a) When it comes to Hajj, *you* can never explain it in words. I can tell you as much as *you* want about it, but Wallahi it is not being there and living Hajj *yourself*. (*Yaser Birja*s)

(13b) and *what does* Allah 'azza wa jall and *what does* His Messenger require of us? And *what can* we do as Muslims to help our fellow Muslims? (*Yasir Qadhi*)

(13c) But *start* with yourself and *help* others……. *Help* yourself first and then *help* the others, that's a good thing to remember……. *do* as much as you can and *push* yourself a little bit. *Don't say*…. (*Husni Hammuda*)

(13d) But *Muslims*, we need to wake up. We need advocacy groups, people need to support the groups that are out there, empower them. (*Hamza Yusuf*)

It is noteworthy that the four forms of engagement markers were among the reasons behind the development of the relationship between the religious orators and the audience, and thus, they were aspects of affective appeals (pathos) which contributed to establish persuasion in the sermonic discourse.

CONCLUSION

The descriptive analyses of the situation of metadiscourse in Islamic Friday sermons revealed that metadiscourse markers are indispensable rhetorical features in the discourse of Islamic sermon. The orators take the advantage of the use of these devices to achieve their persuasive aims in preaching and teaching as well. The high level of employment of metadiscourse resources indicates how English Friday sermons are extremely interpersonal. Additionally, it shows the orators' awareness of engaging listeners in the sermons content by relying more on the interactional resource rather than guiding them thought the text.

The conclusion of this research gives the first indicative picture of the place of metadiscourse in Islamic sermons delivered in the English language by leaning towards a quantitative analysis. For further implication of this study, it could be supported by qualitative analysis of another source of data, such as interviewing the orators and the congregation to observe their perceptions about the effects of the use of metadiscourse in sermons delivery.

However, it is hoped that such exhibition of metadiscourse markers in a new type of context 'Islamic Friday sermons' will contribute to illustrate the potential of metadiscourse in non-academic spoken discourse. Moreover, the findings of this study can be added to the few studies which tackled the problem of studying metadiscourse markers in religious discourse. Pedagogically, the findings will serve as input not only for applied linguists and language teachers, but also for teachers and researchers in theological schools for several courses such as public speaking.

REFERENCES

Abu Alyan, A. (2016). Friday sermon "khutbah" at the Mosque: Messages and emotions. In Carbaugh, D. (Ed.), *The Handbook of Communication in Cross-cultural Perspective*. New York, London: Routledge.

Ädel, A. (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English. John Benjamins*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia.

Ädel, A. (2010). Just to give you kind of a map of where we are going: A taxonomy of metadiscourse in spoken and written academic English. *Nordic Journal of English Studies. Vol. 9(2),* 69-97.

Ädel, A. (2012). "What I Want You to Remember Is…": Audience orientation in monologic academic discourse. *English Text Construction. Vol. 5*(1), 101–127.

Ädel, A. & Mauranen, A., (2010). Metadiscourse: diverse and divided perspectives. *Nordic J. English Stud. Vol. 9(2),* 1-11.Albayrak, I. (2012). Friday Sermons and the Question of home-trained Imams in Australia. *Australian EJournal of Theology. Vol. 19(1).*

Albayrak, I. (2012). Friday sermons and the question of home-trained imams in Australia. *Australian EJournal of Theology. Vol. 19*(1), 29-42

Aziz, R. A., Jin, C. C. & Nordin, N. M. (2016). The use of interactional metadiscourse in the construction of gender identities among Malaysian ESL learners. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature. Vol. 22*(1).

Barlow, M. (2003). *MonoConc Pro 2.2: A Professional Concordance Program*. Athelstan.

Blagojevic, S. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic prose: A contrastive study of academic articles written in English by English and Norwegian native speakers. *Studies about Languages. Vol. 5*, 60–67.

Boggel, S. (2009). *Metadisocurse in Middle English and Early Modern English Religious Texts: A Corpus Based Study.* Peter Lang.

Bunton, D. (1999). The use of higher level metatext in Ph.D theses. *English for Specific Purposes. Vol. 18*, 41–56.

Cavalieri, S. (2011). The role of metadiscourse in counsels' questions. In L. Cheng (Ed.). *Exploring Courtroom Discourse: The Language of Power and Control* (pp. 79–110). Routledge.

Crismore, A. (1989). *Talking With Readers: Metadiscourse As Rhetorical Act*. Lang.

Dahl, T. (2004). Textual metadiscourse in research articles: A marker of national culture or of academic discipline? *Journal of Pragmatics. Vol. 36*, 1807–1825.

Errihani, M. (2011). Managing religious discourse in the mosque: the end of extremist rhetoric during the Friday sermon. *The Journal of North African Studies. Vol. 16(3)*, 381–394.

Garcia, J. F. C. & Marco, M. J. L. (1998). A genre-based study of laboratory demonstrations. *Genre Studies in English for Academic Purposes. Vol. 1*, 271–296.

Hashem, M. (2010). The ummah in the khutba: A religious sermon or a civil discourse? *Journal of Muslim*

Minority Affairs. *Vol. 30(1)*, 49–61.

Hidayat, D. R. (1999). Pemakaian Bahasa Indonesia Ragam Lisan oleh Para Khotib di Kotamadya Bandung; Studi Deskriptif Terhadap Ragam dan Fungsi Bahasa. Bandung: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*. *Vol. 30*, 437–455.

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2017). Metadiscourse: What is it and where is it going? *Journal of Pragmatics*. *Vol. 113*, 16–29.

Hyland, K. & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*. *Vol. 25*(2), 156–177.

Junqueira, L. & Cortes, V. (2014). Metadiscourse in book reviews in English and Brazilian Portuguese : A corpus-based analysis. *Rhetoric, Professional Communication, and Globalization*. *Vol. 6*(1), 88-109.

Khader, M. J. (2017). The principles and required elements of the official Friday Sermon " Khotbat Al-Jumu'a' in Islam. Presented at Sermon Studies Conference. A Conference at Marshall University, October.

Khedri, M. (2014). A cross-disciplinary exploration of metadiscourse in experimental research articles. Unpublished PhD thesis, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia.

Khedri, M., Ebrahimi, S. J. & Heng, C. S. (2013). Interactional metadiscourse markers in academic research article result and discussion sections. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*. *Vol. 19*(1).

Kim, E. Y. J. (2016). Persuasive strategies in a chauvinistic religious discourse: The case of women's ordination. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*. *Vol.* 8(1), 58–83.

Kohnen, T. (2010). Religious discourse in Andreas H. Jucker, Irma Taavitsainen. *Historical Pragmatics*. 379–417.

Kuhi, D. & Mojood, M. (2014). Metadiscourse in newspaper genre: A cross-linguistic study of English and Persian editorials. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences. Vol. 98,* 1046-1055.

Loan, N. T. T. (2018). Rhetorical structures and linguistic features of English abstracts in Thai Rajabhat University Journals. 3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature. *Vol. 24*(4), 71-84.

Lee, J. J. & Subtirelu, N. C. (2015). Metadiscourse in the classroom: A comparative analysis of EAP lessons and university lectures. *English for Specific Purposes*. *Vol. 37*(1), 52–62.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2014). Language Approaches in the Public Practice of Religion. Paper presented at International Conference on Language and Religion. A Conference at the Research Centre for Languages and Cultures University of South Australia.

Malmström, H. (2016). Engaging the congregation: The place of metadiscourse in contemporary preaching. *Applied Linguistics*. *Vol. 37*(4), 561–582.

Mauranen, A. (2010). Discourse reflexivity: a discourse universal? The case of ELF. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*. *Vol. 9*(2), 13–40.

Onay, A. (2004). Content analysis of Friday sermons-DIB* sermons in the year 1999. *İslami Araştırmalar Dergisi. Vol. 17(1), 1-13*.

O'Sullivan, J. (2011, November 22). If You Hate the West, Emigrate to a Muslim Country. *The Guardian*.

Saddhono, K. (2012). The discourse of Friday sermon in Surakarta A socio-pragmatic study. *Wacana*. *Vol. 14*(1), 145–153.

Saddhono, K., Eko Wardani, N., Ulya, C. & Muflikh Raharjo, Y. (2016). The structure of Friday sermon in Indonesia: A socipragmatic studies. *Prosiding Prasasti.* 420–426.

Samuri, M. A. A., & Hopkins, P. (2017). Voices of Islamic authorities: Friday khutba in Malaysian mosques. *Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations*. *Vol. 28(1)*, 47–67.

Schleifer, A. (2017). Nouman Ali Khan Preachers and Spiritual Guides. *The Muslim 500: The world's 500 most influential Muslims*, 110. Amman, Jordan: The Royal Islamic Strategic Studies Centre.

Sharif, A. (2015). Persuasive discourse in selected cermonial speeches by Mother Teresa. Published PhD thesis, University Putra Malaysia, Malaysia.

Soepriatmadji, L. (2009). Genre analysis on Englsih Friday sermons prepared by the Islamic religious council of Singapore. *Jurnal Ilmiah Dinamika Bahasa Dan Budaya*. *Vol. 3*(2), 171–184.

Tayob, A. (1999). *Islam in South Africa Mosques, Imams, and Sermons*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida Gainesville.

Vande Kopple, W. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse". *College Composition and Communication*. *Vol. 36*, 82–93.

Williams, J. (1981). *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace.* Glenview, Illinois: Scott: Foresman and Company.

Wuthnow, R. (1992). *Rediscovering the Sacred: Perspectives on Religion in Contemporary Society*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Yazdani, A. & Hadi Salehi. (2016). Metadiscourse markers of online texts: English and persian online headlines use of metadiscourse markers. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*. *Vol. 4*(3), 41–46.

Yipei, N. & Lingling, L. (2013). Investigating the interpersonal and textual meanings of Steve Jobs Stanford speech in terms of Hyland's metadiscourse theory. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. *Vol. 1*(4), 90–96.

Zhang, M., Sun, W., Peng, H., Gan, Q. & Yu, B. (2017). A multidimensional analysis of metadiscourse markers across spoken registers. *Journal of Pragmatics*. *Vol. 117*, 106–118.